

Correlation of Q223R and K109R polymorphisms in Ieptin receptor gene with susceptibility of breast cancer: A systematic review and meta-analysis

۲

Shaoliang Zhu^a, Zhenyong Tang^a, Yi Tang^a, Tingting Tan^a, Bin Chen^a, Dongyi Xie^a, Shaowei Xie^a, Honglin Luo^b, Wenyu Jiang^{c,*}, Yuntian Tang^{a,*}, Jianrong Yang^{a,*}

^aDepartment of Hepatobiliary, Pancreas and Spleen Surgery, The People's Hospital of Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region, Guangxi Academy of Medical Sciences, Nanning, China; ^bDepartment of Oncology, The People's Hospital of Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region, Guangxi Academy of Medical Sciences, Nanning, China; ^cDepartment of Neurological Rehabilitation, Jiangbin Hospital of Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region, Nanning, China

Abstract

Background: Increasing evidence has suggested a strong association of Q223R (rs1137101) and K109R (rs1137100) polymorphisms in leptin receptor (LEPR) gene with susceptibility of breast cancer (BC), but inconsistent results were obtained. To provide a quantitative assessment of this association, a systematic review and meta-analysis was performed.

Methods: A literature search of PubMed, EMBASE, Google Scholar, and the Chinese National Knowledge Infrastructure was collected. Odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (95% CIs) were calculated.

Results: A total of 20 case-control studies for Q223R polymorphism and 8 case-control studies for K109R polymorphism were included. Significant association between Q223R polymorphism and BC risk was not found in total, Asian or Caucasian population, but in African population: allelic model, OR = 0.72, 95% Cl = 0.60-0.86, p < 0.001; recessive model, OR = 0.67, 95% Cl = 0.52-0.87, P = 0.003; dominant model, OR = 1.58, 95% Cl = 1.15-2.17, p = 0.004; homozygous model, OR = 0.51, 95% Cl = 0.36-0.78, p < 0.001. Significant association between K109R polymorphism and BC risk was not found in total or Caucasian population, but in Asian population: dominant model, OR = 0.24, 95% Cl = 0.07-0.84, p = 0.03; heterozygous model, OR = 1.87, 95% Cl = 1.07-3.26, p = 0.03.

Conclusion: The available evidence suggests that Q223R polymorphism may be significantly associated with BC risk in African population. K109R polymorphism may be significantly associated with BC risk in Asian population.

Keywords: Breast cancer; Leptin receptor; Meta-analysis; Polymorphism; System review

1. INTRODUCTION

Breast cancer (BC) is the leading cause of cancer death, followed by colorectal and lung cancer for incidence.¹ Even though lots of factors are being investigated to explain these trends and the

* Address correspondence. Dr. Jianrong Yang, Department of Hepatobiliary, Pancreas and Spleen Surgery, The People's Hospital of Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region, Guangxi Academy of Medical Sciences, 6, Taoyuan Road, Nanning 530021, China. E-mail address: yangjianrong2022@163.com (J. Yang); Dr. Yuntian Tang, Department of Hepatobiliary, Pancreas and Spleen Surgery, The People's Hospital of Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region, Guangxi Academy of Medical Sciences, 6, Taoyuan Road, Nanning 530021, China. E-mail address: tangyuntian2021@163.com (Y. Tang); Dr. Wenyu Jiang, Department of Neurological Rehabilitation, Jiangbin Hospital of Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region, 85, Hedi Road, Nanning 530021, China. E-mail address: wenyu_jiang@163.com (W. Jiang). Author contributions: Dr. Shaoliang Zhu, Dr. Zhenyong Tang and Dr. Yi Tang contributed equally to this work.

Conflicts of interest: The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interests related to the subject matter or materials discussed in this article.

Journal of Chinese Medical Association. (2023) 86: 549-556.

Received May 16, 2022; accepted February 19, 2023.

doi: 10.1097/JCMA.000000000000918.

Copyright © 2023, the Chinese Medical Association. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/ by-nc-nd/4.0/)

www.ejcma.org

different incidence rates of BC in various populations, there is yet no consensus. Among those factors, mutation in BRCA1 and BRCA2 have been investigated for a long time. Others factors which have been reported are alteration in menstruation (early menarche age and delayed menopause), alteration in reproduction (late age at first birth), hormone levels, intake of alcohol, as well as obesity.² It has been reported that obesity and weight gain were risk factors and associated with poor prognosis of BC and the mechanisms for this connection may be related to resistance to insulin, chronic hyperinsulinemia, local inflammation, adipokine secretion, such as leptin (LEP), and more exposure of estrogen.³ Nevertheless, the exact pathogenesis is still unclear. Thus, the main focus for BC risk was gradually shifted to obesity-related genes.

LEP is a 16-kDa adipocyte-derived peptide hormone that plays a vital role in conrtolling food intake, energy expenditure and neuroendocrine function. In obese subjects, high levels of leptin have been frequently observed.⁴ In addition to playing an important role in regulating energy expenditure and body weight, leptin is vital for tumor cell growth and exerts its biologic effects through selective binding to the leptin receptor (LEPR). LEPR, which is encoded by LEPR gene (located on chromosome 1p21) is a single membrane-spanning receptor of the class I cytokine receptor family and expressed in many tissues including the mammary gland.^{5,6} Therefore, it was hypothesized that polymorphisms

549

۲

Zhu et al.

in the LEPR gene could modulate individual differences in levels of LEPR and thus may play a role in contributing to an alteration in the biologic effects of LEP, leading to an effect on the susceptibility to BC. Several polymorphisms in the LEPR gene including rs1137101, rs1137100, rs1137100, rs8179183, rs4655537, and rs3762274 have been identified. In addition, several common sequence variants have been described and their potential associations with obesity have been proposed.7 Nevertheless, their potential associations with BC risk have not been fully investigated. Among them, Q223R (rs1137101)⁸⁻²⁷ and K109R (rs1137100)^{8,13,16,21-23,27,28} polymorphisms for BC have been most commonly studied. However, the results were inconsistent. Taking K109R, for example, several studies reported positive relationships,^{16,22,23,28} whereas others held different views.^{8,13,21,27} The results of those published meta-analyses²⁹⁻³⁴ were also inconclusive and contradictory because of limited sample sizes or diverse ethnicity. Thus, more comprehensive and well-designed metaanalyses with larger samples should be performed.

As some new studies published, a system review and metaanalysis of all relevant literatures for the association between Q223R and K109R polymorphisms and BC risk was conducted in order to raise more reliable evidence and insights.

2. METHODS

2.1. Searching strategy

An electronic literature search which was restricted to humans was conducted on PubMed, EMBASE, Google Scholar, and the Chinese National Knowledge Infrastructure databases without language restrictions using the following searching strategy: (*leptin receptor* or *LEPR* or *Q223R* or *K109R* or *rs1137101* or *rs1137100*) and (*polymorphisms* or *SNP* or *variant* or *variants* or *variation* or *genotype* or *genetic* or *mutation*) and (*BC* or *mammary cancer* or *mammary adenocarcinoma*). The last search was updated in February 21, 2023.

2.2. Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Studies were included if they met the following criteria: (a) studies had a case-control design to assess the association between LEPR Q223R (rs1137101) and/or K109R (rs1137100) polymorphisms and BC risk in humans; (b) genotype frequencies were provided. (c) the full text was available and it reported genotype frequencies in cases and controls, or sufficient data to estimate odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs).

Studies were excluded if they: (a) were not a case-control study; (b) did not report precise genotypes; (c) were duplicate publications of data from the same study; (d) were meta-analyses, letters, reviews, or editorial articles; and (e) investigated other polymorphisms of LEPR.

2.3. Data extraction

Two authors (S.L.Z. and J.R.Y.) independently selected eligible studies and extracted the following data: the surname of first author, year of publication, ethnicity, country, sample size, type of controls, genotyping method, genotype distribution, p value for the Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium among controls, and matched parameters.

2.4. Assessment of methodological quality

The quality of included studies was assessed independently by two investigators (S.L.Z. and J.R.Y.) using the Newcastle– Ottawa Scale.³⁵ Scores of 0 to 4 were considered to indicate poor methodological quality; scores of 5 to 9, high quality.³⁶ Any disagreements about scoring were resolved through comprehensive reassessment by the other authors. Only high-quality studies were included in the meta-analysis.

2.5. Statistical analysis

•

The strength of association of Q223R and K109R polymorphisms with BC risk was calculated in terms of unadjusted OR with 95% CIs based on genotype frequencies in cases and controls. The significance of pooled OR was determined using the Z test, with p < 0.05 defined as significant. Meta-analysis was conducted using a fixed-effect model when p > 0.10 for the Q test, indicating lack of heterogeneity among studies; otherwise, meta-analysis was conducted using a random-effect model. All statistical tests for meta-analyses were performed using Review Manager 5.3 (Cochrane Collaboration). Publication bias was assessed using Begg's funnel plot and Egger's weighted regression in Stata 12.0 (Stata Corp, College Station, TX, USA), with p < 0.05 considered statistically significant.

3. RESULTS

3.1. Description of studies

The search strategy retrieved 522 potentially relevant studies. Four hundred ninety-seven of which were excluded on the basis of titles and abstracts (Fig. 1). Another study³⁴ was excluded because it was review article, one studies³⁷ were excluded because it was a case-only study, two studies^{38,39} were excluded they were not case-control studies. Ultimately, 21 studies⁸⁻²⁸ were included in this meta-analysis. Their characteristics and genotype distributions are summarized in Table 1.

Twenty studies⁸⁻²⁷ focused on Q223R and eight^{8,13,16,21-23,27,28} on K109R. The distribution of genotypes in controls was consistent with the Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium in all but five studies.^{12,18,21,22,25} The mean Newcastle–Ottawa score for the 12 studies was 6.60 (range, 5-8). Thus the overall quality of the included studies was adequate.

3.2. Quantitative data synthesis

3.2.1. Q223R and BC risk

Meta-analysis of data from 6238 cases and 7105 controls in 20 studies⁸⁻²⁷ did not indicate a significant association between Q223R polymorphism and BC risk (Table 2): allelic model, OR = 0.89, 95% CI = 0.77-1.04, p = 0.13; recessive model, OR = 0.99, 95% CI = 0.75-1.08, p = 0.26; dominant model, OR = 1.15, 95% CI = 0.89-1.48, p = 0.29; homozygous model, OR = 0.84, 95% CI = 0.62-1.13, p = 0.25; heterozygous model, OR = 0.90, 95% CI = 0.70-1.15, p = 0.38.



Fig. 1 Flowchart showing search strategies, selection criteria, and included studies.

www.ejcma.org

Original Article. (2023) 86:6

Table 1

Characteristics of studies included in the meta-analysis

Sample size															
				Genotyp-	<i>p</i> for	Control	(Cases/	No.	of		No.	of		NOS	
First author	Year	Ethnicity	Country	ingmethod	HWE	source	Controls)	case	es (n))	con	trols		score	Matched parameters
LEPR Q223R								AA	AG	GG	AA	AG	GG		
(rs1137101)															
Woo et al8	2006	Asian	Korea	PCR	0.513	PB	45/45	0	12	33	0	8	37	8	Age, BMI
Snoussi et al ⁹	2006	African	Tunisia	PCR	0.162	PB	308/222	65	145	98	30	90	102	6	Age, Family history,
Gallicchio et al10	2007	Caucasian	America	TaqMan	0.261	HB	53/872	14	24	15	278	443	151	7	Age, BMI
Okobia et al11	2008	African	Nigerian	PCR-RFLP	0.704	HB	209/209	56	107	46	46	107	56	6	Age
Han et al ¹²	2008	Asian	China	PCR-RFLP	< 0.001	PB	240/500	33	41	166	12	78	410	7	Age, regional occupation, race
Ulybina et al13	2008	Caucasian	Russia	PCR	0.993	HB	110/105	24	69	17	36	51	18	6	Age
Teras et al ¹⁴	2009	Caucasian	America	PCR	0.672	PB	641/650	128	332	181	125	314	211	7	Age, race (White, Black, other), and blood draw date
Cleveland et al15	2009	Caucasian	America	PCR	0.333	PB	1049/1098	173	521	355	187	551	360	7	Age, BMI, menopausal status
Nyante et al16	2011	Caucasian	America	PCR	0.563	PB	1972/1775	494	952	526	416	874	485	8	Age,r ace
Kim et al ¹⁷	2012	Asian	Korea	PCR	0.975	PB	390/447	8	88	294	6	91	350	7	Age, BMI, age at menarche, age at menopause
Anuradha et al18	2012	Asian	India	PCR-RFLP	< 0.001	PB	194/186	17	92	85	8	110	68	7	Age
Mohammadzadeh et al19	2014	Asian	Iran	PCR-RFLP	0.693	PB	100/100	19	56	25	6	40	54	8	Age, family history
Mahmoudi et al ²⁰	2015	Asian	Iran	PCR-RFLP	0.730	HB	45/41	1	25	19	6	18	17	5	Undetermined
Khandouzi et al ²¹	2016	Asian	India	PCR-RFLP	0.001	HB	205/205	5	54	146	9	37	159	5	Undetermined
Rodrigoet al22	2017	Asian	Sri Lanka	PCR	< 0.001	PB	80/80	65	9	6	60	6	14	8	Age, BMI, menopausal status
Huerta et al23	2017	Caucasian	Mexico	PCR	0.074	PB	142/132	58	52	32	32	76	24	6	Age, weight, height, BMI, familial history of cancer
EI-Hussiny et al ²⁴	2017	African	Egypt	PCR-RFLP	0.146	PB	48/48	9	15	24	2	24	22	8	Age, BMI, familial history of cancer
Fard et al ²⁵	2020	Asian	Iran	PCR-RFLP	< 0.001	PB	158/158	21	10	127	42	8	108	7	Age, BMI
Tayel et al ²⁶	2020	Caucasian	Egypt	PCR	0.447	PB	40/30	6	13	21	13	12	5	8	Age, menstrual state
Hołysz et al27	2021	Caucasian	Poland	PCR-RFLP	0.536	PB	209/202	33	110	66	45	96	61	6	Age, weight, height, BMI
LEPR K109R (rs113	37100)							AA	AG	GG	AA	AG	GG		
Woo et al ⁸	2006	Asian	Korea	PCR	0.217	PB	44/45	0	13	31	0	14	31	8	Age, BMI
Liu et al28	2007	Asian	Taiwan	PCR-RFLP	0.006	PB	47/41	2	13	32	4	7	30	6	Age
Ulybina et al13	2008	Caucasian	Russia	PCR	0.383	PB	110/105	58	45	7	42	52	11	6	Age
Nyante et al16	2011	Caucasian	America	PCR	0.476	PB	1970/1776	122	673	1175	79	615	1082	8	Age, race
Khandouzi et al ²¹	2016	Asian	India	PCR-RFLP	0.203	HB	205/205	9	59	137	13	64	128	5	Undetermined
Rodrigo et al ²²	2017	Asian	Sri Lanka	PCR	0.293	PB	80/80	34	22	24	59	18	3	8	Age, BMI, menopausal status
Huerta et al ²³	2017	Caucasian	Mexico	PCR	0.128	PB	142/132	94	42	6	60	52	20	6	Age, weight, height, BMI, familial history of cancer
Hołysz et al27	2021	Caucasian	Poland	PCR-RFLP	0.062	PB	209/202	19	92	98	25	75	102	6	Age, weight, height, BMI

BMI = body mass index; HB = hospital-based source of control; HWE = Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium; HRM = high-resolution melting; LEPR = leptin receptor; NOS = Newcastle–Ottawa Scale; PB = population-based source of control; PCR = polymerase chain reaction; RFLP = restriction fragment length polymorphism.

Next, meta-analysis of data from 1457 Asian cases and 1762 Asian controls in nine studies^{8,12,17-22,25} also showed no evidence of a significant association between the Q223R polymorphism and BC risk (Table 2): allelic model, OR = 0.79, 95% CI = 0.54-1.16, p = 0.24; recessive model, OR = 0.75, 95% CI = 0.51-1.09, p = 0.13; dominant model, OR = 1.33, 95% CI = 0.58-3.03, p = 0.50; homozygous model, OR = 0.66, 95% CI = 0.26-1.63, p = 0.36; heterozygous model, OR = 0.92, 95% CI = 0.42-2.01, p = 0.83.

Similarly, no evidence of an association between the Q223R polymorphism and BC risk was observed in the meta-analysis of data from 4216 Caucasian cases and 4864 Caucasian controls in eight studies^{10,13-16,23,26,27} (Table 2): allelic model, OR = 1.07, 95% CI = 0.93-1.23, p = 0.36; recessive model, OR = 1.07, 95% CI = 0.89-1.30, p = 0.46; dominant model, OR = 0.92, 95% CI = 0.72-1.17, p = 0.50; homozygous model, OR = 1.13, 95% CI = 0.87-1.46, p = 0.35; heterozygous model, OR = 1.04, 95% CI = 0.81-1.33, p = 0.76.

Last, meta-analysis of data from 565 African cases and 479 African controls in three studies^{9,11,24} indicated a significant association between Q223R polymorphism and BC risk in African population (Table 2 and Fig. 2): allelic model, OR = 0.72, 95%

www.ejcma.org

CI = 0.60-0.86, p < 0.001; recessive model, OR = 0.67, 95% CI = 0.52-0.87, p = 0.003; dominant model, OR = 1.58, 95% CI = 1.15-2.17, p = 0.004; homozygous model, OR = 0.51, 95% CI = 0.36-0.78, p < 0.001.

3.2.2. K109R and BC risk

Meta-analysis of data from 2807 cases and 2586 controls in eight studies^{8,13,16,21-23,27,28} did not indicate a significant association between the Q223R polymorphism and BC risk (Table 3): allelic model, OR = 1.03, 95% CI = 0.73-1.44, p = 0.87; recessive model, OR = 0.96, 95% CI = 0.66-1.38, p = 0.82; dominant model, OR = 0.93, 95% CI = 0.54-1.61, p = 0.80; homozygous model, OR = 1.09, 95% CI = 0.52-2.27, p = 0.83; heterozygous model, OR = 0.99, 95% CI = 0.65-1.51, p = 0.96.

Next, meta-analysis of data from 376 Asian cases and 371 Asian controls in four studies^{8,21,22,28} indicated a significant association between K109R polymorphism and BC risk (Table 3 and Fig. 2): dominant model, OR = 0.24, 95% CI = 0.07-0.84, p = 0.03; heterozygous model, OR = 1.87, 95% CI = 1.07-3.26, p = 0.03.

۲

Zhu et al.

Toble 2

Genetic model	OR [95 % CI]	Z (p value)	Heterogenei	ity of study design		Analysis model
		·	χ2	df (p value)	l² (%)	
Q223R polymorphism in total population	ı					
from 20 case-control studies ^{8–27}						
(6238 cases and 7105 controls)						
Allelic model (G-allele vs. A-allele)	0.89 [0.77, 1.04]	1.50 (0.13)	108.55	19 (<0.001)	82	Random
Recessive model (GG vs AG + AA)	0.99 [0.75, 1.08]	1.14 (0.26)	71.42	19 (<0.001)	73	Random
Dominant model (AA vs AG + GG)	1.15 [0.89, 1.48]	1.06 (0.29)	84.70	18 (<0.001)	79	Random
Homozygous model (GG vs AA)	0.84 [0.62, 1.13]	1.14 (0.25)	89.36	18 (<0.001)	80	Random
Heterozygous model (AG vs AA)	0.90 [0.70, 1.15]	0.87 (0.38)	62.31	18 (<0.001)	71	Random
Q223R polymorphism in Asian population	n					
from 9 case-control studies ^{8,12,17–22,25}	j					
(1457 cases and 1762 controls)						
Allelic model (G-allele vs. A-allele)	0.79 [0.54, 1.16]	1.19 (0.24)	63.69	8 (<0.001)	87	Random
Recessive model (GG vs AG + AA)	0.75 [0.51, 1.09]	1.50 (0.13)	38.56	8 (<0.001)	79	Random
Dominant model (AA vs AG + GG)	1.33 [0.58, 3.03]	0.67 (0.50)	47.99	7 (<0.001)	85	Random
Homozygous model (GG vs AA)	0.66 [0.26, 1.63]	0.91 (0.36)	52.65	7 (<0.001)	87	Random
Heterozygous model (AG vs AA)	0.92 [0.42, 2.01]	0.22 (0.83)	30.33	7 (<0.001)	77	Random
Q223R polymorphism in Caucasian popul	Ilation					
from 8 case-control studies ^{10,13–16,23,2}	6,27					
(4264 cases and 4912 controls)						
Allelic model (G-allele vs A-allele)	1.07 [0.93, 1.23]	0.91 (0.36)	23.91	7 (0.001)	71	Random
Recessive model (GG vs AG + AA)	1.07 [0.89, 1.30]	0.74 (0.46)	16.75	7 (0.02)	58	Random
Dominant model (AA vs AG + GG)	0.92 [0.72, 1.17]	0.67 (0.50)	23.92	7 (0.001)	71	Random
Homozygous model (GG vs AA)	1.13 [0.87, 1.46]	0.93 (0.35)	18.70	7 (0.009)	63	Random
Heterozygous model (AG vs AA)	1.04 [0.81, 1.33]	0.31 (0.76)	22.26	7 (0.002)	69	Random
Q223R polymorphism in African populat	tion					
from 3 case-control studies9,11,24						
(517 cases and 431 controls)						
Allelic model (G-allele vs A-allele)	0.72 [0.60, 0.86]	3.62 (<0.001)	2.06	2 (0.36)	3	Fixed
Recessive model (GG vs AG + AA)	0.67 [0.52, 0.87]	2.97 (0.003)	3.50	2 (0.17)	43	Fixed
Dominant model (AA vs AG + GG)	1.58 [1.15, 2.17]	2.85 (0.004)	3.09	2 (0.21)	35	Fixed
Homozygous model (GG vs AA)	0.51 [0.36, 0.74]	3.60 (<0.001)	2.06	2 (0.36)	3	Fixed
Heterozygous model (AG vs AA)	0.72 [0.51, 1.00]	1.96 (0.05)	4.08	2 (0.13)	51	Fixed

95% CI = 95% confidence interval; LEPR = leptin receptor; OR = odds ratio.

Last, meta-analysis of data from 2431 Caucasian cases and 2215 Caucasian controls in four studies^{13,16,23,27} did not indicate a significant association between the Q223R polymorphism and BC risk was observed (Table 3): allelic model, OR = 0.75, 95% CI = 0.55-1.02, p = 0.07; recessive, OR = 0.73, 95% CI = 0.49-1.09, p = 0.12; dominant model, OR = 1.45, 95% CI = 0.97-2.18, p = 0.07; homozygous model, OR = 0.59, 95% CI = 0.31-1.11, p = 0.10; heterozygous model, OR = 0.75, 95% CI = 0.51-1.10, p = 0.14.

3.2.3. Sensitivity analysis

To assess the reliability of the outcomes in the meta-analysis, we repeated the meta-analysis after excluding five studies in which the p value associated with the Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium was less than $0.05^{12,18,21,22,25,28}$ one by one. Any of the individual study^{12,18,21,22,25,28} deleted did not

Any of the individual study^{12,18,21,22,25,28} deleted did not materially influence the pooled ORs and CIs under all genetic models for either Q223R or K109R polymorphisms (data not shown), indicating that our findings were stable and reliable.

3.2.4. Publication bias

No obvious asymmetry was observed in allelic model of Q223R polymorphism in Begg's funnel plots (p = 0.347, Fig. 3A) and Egger's tests (t = 0.60, p = 0.556, Fig. 3B). Similarly, no obvious

asymmetry was observed in allelic model of K109R polymorphism in Begg's funnel plots (p = 0.174, Fig. 3C) and Egger's tests (t = 0.87, p = 0.419, Fig. 3D). These findings indicated no potential publication bias.

4. DISCUSSION

Polymorphisms in LEPR gene and their potential associations with cancer risk have been explored.40,41 In recent years, increasing evidence from meta-analyses have indicated a significant association between LEPR polymorphisms and BC risk. Metaanalysis by Wang et al³² with nine case-control studies suggested that Q223R and K109R polymorphisms were significantly correlated with BC risk and the A allele of Q223R variant and the G allele of K109R variant were low-penetrant risk factors for developing BC. Meta-analysis by Wang et al²⁹ with 11 case-control studies also showed A allele of Q233R variant was low-penetrant risk factor for developing BC. Meta-analysis by Shi et al³³ with five case-control studies indicated that the K109R genetic polymorphism did not significantly affect the risk of cancer, but in the stratified analysis, A allele of K109R were found protective against under additive genetic model. Meta-analysis by Liu and Liu³¹ with nine case-control studies showed that the association between Q223R and BC risk was only statistically significant in East Asians, but not in Caucasians or Africans. Similarly, meta-analysis by Luan et al³⁴ with 13 case-control studies

 (\bullet)

Original Article. (2023) 86:6

J Chin Med Assoc

(u)		Case	s	Contr	ol		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Study	or Subaroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H. Fixed. 95% CI	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Snous	si 2006	341	616	294	444	52.5%	0.63 [0 49 0 81]	-
Okobi	a 2008	199	418	219	418	39.5%	0.83 [0.63, 1.08]	-=+
El-Hus	ssiny 2017	63	96	68	96	8.0%	0.79 [0.43, 1.45]	
						0.070		
Total	(95% CI)		1130		958	100.0%	0.72 [0.60, 0.86]	•
Total e	events	603		581				
Hetero	ogeneity: Chi ² =	2.06, df = 2	2 (P = 0).36); l ² =	3%			
Test fo	or overall effect:	Z = 3.62 (F	- = 0.0	003)				0.2 0.5 1 2 5
/ 1. \				,				
(b)	Q223R Recess	ive model	(GG vs	5. AG + A	4) in A	frican po	pulation	
. ,		Cases	5	Contr	ol		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Study	or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Snous	ssi 2006	98	308	102	222	59.7%	0.55 [0.38, 0.78]	
Okobia	a 2008	46	209	56	209	32.2%	0.77 [0.49, 1.21]	
El-Hus	ssiny 2017	24	48	22	48	8.1%	1.18 [0.53, 2.63]	
Total	(95% CI)		565		479	100.0%	0.67 [0.52, 0.87]	━
Total e	events	168		180				
Hetero	ogeneity: Chi ² =	3.50, df = 2	2 (P = 0	0.17); l² =	43%			
Test fo	or overall effect:	Z = 2.97 (F	P = 0.0	03)				0.1 0.2 0.0 1 2 0 10
(C)	Q223R Domina	ant model	(AA vs	. AG + G	G) in A	frican po	pulation	
\ -/		Case	5	Contr	ol		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Study	or Subaroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Snous	si 2006	65	308	30	222	43.8%	1.71 [1.07. 2.75]	
Okobi	a 2008	56	209	46	209	53.6%	1.30 [0.83, 2.03]	
El-Hus	ssinv 2017	9	48	2	48	2.6%	5.31 [1.08, 26,04]	
		•		-				
Total	(95% CI)		565		479	100.0%	1.58 [1.15, 2.17]	•
Total e	events	130		78			• • •	
Hetero	paeneity: Chi ² =	3.09. df = 2	2 (P = 0).21): l ² =	35%			
Hetero Test fo	ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect:	3.09, df = 2 Z = 2.85 (F	2 (P = 0 P = 0.00	0.21); l² = 04)	35%			+ + + + + 0.02 0.1 1 10 50
Hetero Test fo (d)	ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>Q223R Homo</i>	3.09, df = 2 Z = 2.85 (F zygous mo Cases	2 (P = 0 P = 0.00 odel (G s	0.21); I ² = 04) <i>G vs. AA)</i> Contr	35% in Afr ol	ican popu	ulation Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Hetero Test fo (d) Study	ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>Q223R Homo:</i> <u>or Subgroup</u>	3.09, df = 2 Z = 2.85 (F zygous mo Cases <u>Events</u>	P = 0.00 $P = 0.00$	0.21); I ² = 04) <i>G vs. AA)</i> Contr <u>Events</u>	35% in Afr ol Total	ican popu	ulation Odds Ratio <u>M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl</u>	Odds Ratio
Hetero Test fo (d) <u>Study</u> Snous	ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>Q223R Horno:</i> <u>r or Subgroup</u> ssi 2006 - 2000	3.09, df = 2 Z = 2.85 (f zygous mo Cases <u>Events</u> 98	2 (P = 0 P = 0.00 odel (G s <u>Total</u> 163	0.21); l ² = 04) <i>G vs. AA</i>) Contr <u>Events</u> 102	35% in Afr ol <u>Total</u> 132	ican pope <u>Weight</u> 54.4%	ulation Odds Ratio <u>M-H. Fixed. 95% CI</u> 0.44 [0.27, 0.74]	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed, 95% Cl
Hetero Test fo (d) <u>Study</u> Snous Okobia	ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>Q223R Homo:</i> <u>vor Subgroup</u> ssi 2006 a 2008 a 2017	3.09, df = 2 Z = 2.85 (f zygous mc Case: <u>Events</u> 98 46	2 (P = 0 P = 0.00 odel (G s Total 163 102	0.21); l ² = 04) <i>G vs. AA</i>) Contr <u>Events</u> 102 56	35% in Afr ol <u>Total</u> 132 102	<i>Weight</i> 54.4% 37.2%	ulation Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl 0.44 [0.27, 0.74] 0.67 [0.39, 1.17]	Odds Ratio
Hetero Test fo (d) <u>Study</u> Snous Okobia EI-Hus	ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>Q223R Homo:</i> or Subgroup ssi 2006 a 2008 ssiny 2017	3.09, df = 2 Z = 2.85 (f zygous mo Cases <u>Events</u> 98 46 24	2 (P = 0 P = 0.00 s Total 163 102 33	0.21); l ² = 04) <i>G vs. AA</i> Contr <u>Events</u> 102 56 22	35% in Afr ol 132 102 24	<i>Weight</i> 54.4% 37.2% 8.4%	ulation Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 0.44 [0.27, 0.74] 0.67 [0.39, 1.17] 0.24 [0.05, 1.25]	Odds Ratio
Hetero Test fo (d) Study Snous Okobia EI-Hus	ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>Q223R Homo:</i> vor Subgroup ssi 2006 a 2008 ssiny 2017 (95% CI)	3.09, df = 2 Z = 2.85 (F zygous mc Case: Events 98 46 24	2 (P = 0 P = 0.00 odel (G s Total 163 102 33 298	0.21); l ² = 04) <i>G vs. AA)</i> Contr Events 102 56 22	35% in Afr ol <u>Total</u> 132 102 24 258	<i>Weight</i> 54.4% 37.2% 8.4%	ulation Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed, 95% CI 0.44 [0.27, 0.74] 0.67 [0.39, 1.17] 0.24 [0.05, 1.25] 0.51 [0.36, 0.74]	Odds Ratio
Hetero Test fo (d) Study Snous Okobia EI-Hus Total	ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>Q223R Homo:</i> or Subgroup ssi 2006 a 2008 ssiny 2017 (95% CI)	3.09, df = 2 Z = 2.85 (F zygous mc Case: <u>Events</u> 98 46 24	2 (P = 0 P = 0.00 odel (G s Total 163 102 33 298	0.21); l ² = 04) <i>G vs. AA</i>) Contr <u>Events</u> 102 56 22	35% in Afr ol <u>Total</u> 132 102 24 258	<i>Weight</i> 54.4% 37.2% 8.4% 100.0%	Ulation Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 0.44 [0.27, 0.74] 0.67 [0.39, 1.17] 0.24 [0.05, 1.25] 0.51 [0.36, 0.74]	0.02 0.1 1 10 50 Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl →
Heteror Test for (d) Study Snous Okobia EI-Hus Total of Heteror	ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>Q223R Homo:</i> or Subgroup ssi 2006 a 2008 sssiny 2017 (95% CI) events conceptity: Chi ² =	3.09, df = 2 Z = 2.85 (f zygous mc Case: <u>Events</u> 98 46 24 168 2.06 df = 2	2 (P = 0 P = 0.00 odel (G s Total 163 102 33 298 2 (P = 0	0.21); ² = 04) <i>G vs. AA</i>) Contr <u>Events</u> 102 56 22 180 26): ² =	35% in Afr ol 132 102 24 258	ican popu <u>Weight</u> 54.4% 37.2% 8.4% 100.0%	ulation Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl 0.44 [0.27, 0.74] 0.67 [0.39, 1.17] 0.24 [0.05, 1.25] 0.51 [0.36, 0.74]	Odds Ratio
Heteror Test for (d) Study Snous Okobia EI-Hus Total of Heteror Test for	ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>Q223R Homo:</i> or Subgroup ssi 2006 a 2008 ssiny 2017 (95% CI) events ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect.	3.09, df = 2 Z = 2.85 (f zygous mc Case <u>Events</u> 98 46 24 168 2.06, df = 2 7 = 3.60 (f	2 (P = 0 D = 0.00 D = 0.00 D = 0.00 S Total 163 102 33 298 2 (P = 0 C = 0.00	0.21); ² = 04) <i>G vs. AA</i> j Contr <u>Events</u> 102 56 22 180 0.36); ² = 033	35% in Afr ol 132 102 24 258 3%	ican popu Weight 54.4% 37.2% 8.4% 100.0%	ulation Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 0.44 [0.27, 0.74] 0.67 [0.39, 1.17] 0.24 [0.05, 1.25] 0.51 [0.36, 0.74]	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl 0.02 0.1 1 10 50
Heteror Test for (d) Snous Okobia El-Hus Total of Heteror Test for	ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>Q223R Homos</i> or Subgroup ssi 2006 a 2008 ssiny 2017 (95% CI) events ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect:	3.09, df = 2 Z = 2.85 (f zygous mc Case: <u>Events</u> 98 46 24 24 168 2.06, df = 2 Z = 3.60 (f	2 (P = 0 pdel (G s Total 163 102 33 298 2 (P = 0 P = 0.00	0.21); I ² = 04) <i>G vs. AA</i> j Contr <u>Events</u> 102 56 22 180 0.36); I ² = 003)	35% in Afr ol 132 102 24 258 3%	ican popu Weight 54.4% 37.2% 8.4% 100.0%	ulation Odds Ratio <u>M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl</u> 0.44 [0.27, 0.74] 0.67 [0.39, 1.17] 0.24 [0.05, 1.25] 0.51 [0.36, 0.74]	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed, 95% Cl 0.02 0.1 1 10 50
Heteror Test for (d) Snous Okobia El-Hus Total of Heteror Test for (e)	ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>Q223R Homos</i> ssi 2006 a 2008 ssiny 2017 (95% CI) events ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>K109R Domina</i>	3.09, df = 2 Z = 2.85 (f zygous mc Casee <u>Events</u> 98 46 24 168 2.06, df = 2 Z = 3.60 (f ant model	2 (P = 0 odel (G s Total 163 102 33 298 2 (P = 0 P = 0.00 (AA vs	0.21); ² = 04) <i>G vs. AA</i>) Contr <u>Events</u> 102 56 22 180 0.36); ² = 003) <i>: AG + G</i>	35% in Afr ol 132 102 24 258 3% 3%	<i>Weight</i> 54.4% 37.2% 8.4% 100.0%	ulation Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 0.44 [0.27, 0.74] 0.67 [0.39, 1.17] 0.24 [0.05, 1.25] 0.51 [0.36, 0.74] pulation	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed, 95% Cl 0.02 0.1 1 10 50
Heteror Test for (d) Study Snous Okobia El-Hus Total e Heteror Test for (e)	ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>Q223R Homos</i> ssi 2006 a 2008 ssiny 2017 (95% CI) events ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>K109R Domina</i>	3.09, df = 2 Z = 2.85 (f zygous mc Case: <u>Events</u> 98 46 24 168 2.06, df = 2 Z = 3.60 (f	2 (P = 0 P = 0.00 adel (G Total 163 102 33 298 2 (P = 0 P = 0.00 (AA vs	0.21); ² = 04) G vs. AA) Contr Events 102 56 22 180 0.36); ² = 003) . AG + GO	35% in Afr ol 132 102 24 258 3% 5) in A	<i>Weight</i> 54.4% 37.2% 8.4% 100.0%	ulation Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 0.44 [0.27, 0.74] 0.67 [0.39, 1.17] 0.24 [0.05, 1.25] 0.51 [0.36, 0.74] pulation	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed, 95% CI 0.02 0.1 1 10 50
Heteror Test for (d) Study Snous Okobia El-Hus Total e Heteror Test for (e)	ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>Q223R Homos</i> ssi 2006 a 2008 ssiny 2017 (95% CI) events ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>K109R Domina</i>	3.09, df = 2 Z = 2.85 (f zygous mc Case: <u>Events</u> 98 46 24 168 2.06, df = 2 Z = 3.60 (f ant model Cases Events	2 (P = 0 P = 0.00 pdel (G 5 Total 163 102 33 298 2 (P = 0 P = 0.00 (AA vs Total	0.21); ² = 04) <i>G vs. AA</i>) Contr Events 102 56 22 180 0.36); ² = 003) <i>c. AG + G</i> (Control	35% in Afr ol 132 102 24 258 3% 5) in A	ican popu <u>Weight</u> 54.4% 37.2% 8.4% 100.0% frican pop Weight	ulation Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl 0.44 [0.27, 0.74] 0.67 [0.39, 1.17] 0.24 [0.05, 1.25] 0.51 [0.36, 0.74] 0.51 [0.36, 0.74] pulation Odds Ratio M-H. Random 95% C	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 0.02 0.1 1 10 50 0.02 0.1 1 10 50 Odds Ratio 0.02 0.1 1 10 50
Heteror Test for (d) Study Snous Okobia El-Hus Total Heteror Test for (e) Study	ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>Q223R Homo;</i> or Subgroup ssi 2006 a 2008 ssiny 2017 (95% CI) events ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>K109R Domina</i>	3.09, df = 2 Z = 2.85 (f zygous mc Case: <u>Events</u> 98 46 24 168 2.06, df = 2 Z = 3.60 (f ant model Cases <u>Events</u>	2 (P = 0) pdel (G) $rac{1}{5}$ 163 102 33 298 2 (P = 0) (AA vs) Total 44).21); ² = 04) <i>G vs. AA</i>) Contr Events 102 56 22 180 0.36); ² = 03) <i>: AG + G</i> (Control Events	35% in Afr ol 132 102 24 258 3% 6) in A s Fotal 45	ican popu <u>Weight</u> 54.4% 37.2% 8.4% 100.0% frican pop <u>Weight</u> 12.9%	ulation Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl 0.44 [0.27, 0.74] 0.67 [0.39, 1.17] 0.24 [0.05, 1.25] 0.51 [0.36, 0.74] 0.51 [0.36, 0.74] pulation Odds Ratio M-H. Random. 95% C	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Heteror Test for (d) Snous Okobia EI-Hus Total e Heteror Test for (e) Study Woo 2 Liu 200	ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>Q223R Homos</i> or Subgroup ssi 2006 a 2008 ssiny 2017 (95% CI) events ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>K109R Domina</i> <u>or Subgroup</u> 2006 07	3.09, df = 2 Z = 2.85 (f zygous mc Casee <u>Events</u> 98 46 24 168 2.06, df = 2 Z = 3.60 (f ant model Cases <u>Events</u> 0 2	2 (P = 0 P = 0.00 s Total 163 102 33 298 2 (P = 0 P = 0.00 (AA vs Total 44 47).21); ² = 04) <i>G vs. AA</i>) Contr Events 102 56 22 180 0.36); ² = 003) <i>. AG + G</i> 0 Control Events 31 4	35% in Afr ol <u>Total</u> 132 24 258 3% 3% 5) in A s <u>5</u>) in A 45 45	ican popu <u>Weight</u> 54.4% 37.2% 8.4% 100.0% frican pop frican pop <u>Weight</u> 12.9% 21.8%	ulation Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 0.44 [0.27, 0.74] 0.67 [0.39, 1.17] 0.24 [0.05, 1.25] 0.51 [0.36, 0.74] 0.51 [0.36, 0.74] pulation Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% C 0.01 [0.00, 0.09] 0.41 [0.07, 2.37]	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Heteror Test for (d) Snous Okobia EI-Hus Total e Heteror Test for (e) Study Woo 2 Liu 200 Khand	ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>Q223R Homos</i> ssi 2006 a 2008 ssiny 2017 (95% Cl) events ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>K109R Domina</i> 2006 07 louzi 2016	3.09, df = 2 Z = 2.85 (f zygous mc Cases <u>Events</u> 98 46 24 168 2.06, df = 2 Z = 3.60 (f ant model Cases <u>Events</u> 0 2 9	2 ($P = 0$ or $P = 0.00$ s Total 163 102 33 298 2 ($P = 0.00$ (AA vs Total 44 47 205).21); ² = 04) <i>G vs. AA</i>) Contr Events 102 56 22 180 0.36); ² = 003) <i>: AG + G</i> (Control Events 31 4 13	35% in Afr ol Total 132 24 258 3% 6) in A 5) in A 5 5) in A 45 41 205	ican popu <u>Weight</u> 54.4% 37.2% 8.4% 100.0% frican pop <u>Weight</u> 12.9% 21.8% 31.6%	ulation Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 0.44 [0.27, 0.74] 0.67 [0.39, 1.17] 0.24 [0.05, 1.25] 0.51 [0.36, 0.74] 0.51 [0.36, 0.74] pulation Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl 0.01 [0.00, 0.09] 0.41 [0.07, 2.37] 0.68 [0.28, 1.62]	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl
Heteror Test for (d) Study Snous Okobia El-Hus Total d Heteror Test for (e) Study Woo 2 Liu 200 Khand Rodrig	ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>Q223R Homos</i> ssi 2006 a 2008 ssiny 2017 (95% Cl) events ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>K109R Domina</i> 2006 07 Jouzi 2016 jo 2017	3.09, df = 2 Z = 2.85 (f zygous mc Cases Events 98 46 24 168 2.06, df = 2 Z = 3.60 (f ant model Cases Events 0 2 9 34	2 ($P = 0$ 3 ($P = 0.00$ 5 Total 163 102 33 298 2 ($P = 0.00$ ($AA vs$ Total 44 47 205 80).21); ² = 04) <i>G vs. AA</i>) Contr Events 102 56 22 180 0.36); ² = 003) <i>: AG + G</i> (Control Events 31 4 359	35% in Afr ol Total 132 24 258 3% 3% 5) in A s Total 45 41 205 80	ican popu 54.4% 37.2% 8.4% 100.0% frican pop 12.9% 21.8% 31.6%	ulation Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 0.44 [0.27, 0.74] 0.67 [0.39, 1.17] 0.24 [0.05, 1.25] 0.51 [0.36, 0.74] 0.51 [0.36, 0.74] pulation Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% C 0.01 [0.00, 0.09] 0.41 [0.07, 2.37] 0.68 [0.28, 1.62] 0.26 [0.14, 0.51]	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 0.02 0.1 1 10 50 0.02 0.1 1 10 50 0.02 0.1 1 10 50 0dds Ratio 0dds Ratio
Heterc Test fc (d) Snous Okobia El-Hus Total a Heterc Test fc (e) Study Woo 2 Liu 200 Khand Rodrig	ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>Q223R Homos</i> ssi 2006 a 2008 ssiny 2017 (95% Cl) events ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>K109R Domina</i> 2006 07 bouzi 2016 go 2017	3.09, df = 2 Z = 2.85 (f zygous mcc Case: Events 98 46 24 168 2.06, df = 2 Z = 3.60 (f ant model Cases Events 0 0 2 9 34	2 (P = 0) $a = 0.00$ $b = 0.00$ $a = 0.00$ $b = 0.00$ $a = 0.00$ $a = 0.00$ $a = 0.00$ $(AA vs)$ $b = 0.00$ $(AA vs)$ $($	0.21); I ² = 04) <i>G vs. AAj</i> Contr Events 102 56 22 180 0.36); I ² = 003) <i>: AG + Gi</i> Control Events 31 4 13 59	35% in Afr ol Total 132 24 258 3% 5) in A s Total 45 41 205 80	ican popu 54.4% 37.2% 8.4% 100.0% frican pop frican pop 21.8% 31.6% 33.7%	Ulation Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 0.44 [0.27, 0.74] 0.67 [0.39, 1.17] 0.24 [0.05, 1.25] 0.51 [0.36, 0.74] 0.51 [0.36, 0.74] pulation Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl 0.01 [0.00, 0.09] 0.41 [0.07, 2.37] 0.68 [0.28, 1.62] 0.26 [0.14, 0.51]	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Heteror Test for (d) Shous Okobia El-Hus Total a Heteror Test for (e) Study Woo 2 Liu 200 Khand Rodrig Total 4	ogeneity: Chi² = or overall effect: Q223R Homo; or Subgroup ssi 2006 a 2008 ssiny 2017 (95% Cl) events ogeneity: Chi² = or overall effect: <i>K109R Domina</i> cor Subgroup 2006 07 douzi 2016 op 2017 (95% Cl)	3.09, df = 2 Z = 2.85 (f zygous mc Case: <u>Events</u> 98 46 24 168 2.06, df = 2 Z = 3.60 (f ant model Cases <u>Events</u> 0 2 9 34	2 (P = 0.00) 2 (P = 0.00) 163 - 102 163 - 102 33 - 298 2 (P = 0.00) (AA vs) Total - 44 47 - 205 80 - 376	0.21); ² = 04) <i>G vs. AAj</i> Contr 102 56 22 180 0.36); ² = 003) <i>. AG + G</i> 0 Control <u>Events</u> 31 4 13 59	335% in Afr ol 132 24 258 3% 5) in A s 5) in A s 41 205 80 371	ican popu 54.4% 37.2% 8.4% 100.0% frican pop frican pop 21.8% 31.6% 33.7% 100.0%	ulation Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed, 95% CI 0.44 [0.27, 0.74] 0.67 [0.39, 1.17] 0.24 [0.05, 1.25] 0.51 [0.36, 0.74] 0.51 [0.36, 0.74] 0.51 [0.36, 0.74] 0.01 [0.00, 0.09] 0.41 [0.07, 2.37] 0.68 [0.28, 1.62] 0.26 [0.14, 0.51] 0.24 [0.07, 0.84]	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Heterc Test fc (d) Shous Okobia Ei-Hus Total e Heterc Test fc (e) Study Woo 2 Liu 200 Khand Rodrig Total e	ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>Q223R Homos</i> or Subgroup ssi 2006 a 2008 ssiny 2017 (95% CI) events ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>K109R Domina</i> cor Subgroup 2006 07 douzi 2016 go 2017 (95% CI) events	3.09, df = 2 Z = 2.85 (f zygous mc Cases 98 46 24 168 2.06, df = 2 Z = 3.60 (f ant model Cases Events 0 2 9 34 45	2 (P = 0.00) 2 (P = 0.00) 102 = 0.00 102 = 333 298 2 (P = 0.00) (AA vs) Total 44 47 205 80 376 102	0.21); ² = 04) <i>G vs. AA</i>) Contr Events 102 56 22 180 0.36); ² = 003) <i>. AG + G</i> 0 Control Events 31 4 13 59	35% in Afr ol 132 24 258 3% 5) in A s 5) in A 5) in A 45 41 205 80 371	ican popu 54.4% 37.2% 8.4% 100.0% frican pop 12.9% 21.8% 31.6% 33.7% 100.0%	ulation Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 0.44 [0.27, 0.74] 0.67 [0.39, 1.17] 0.24 [0.05, 1.25] 0.51 [0.36, 0.74] 0.51 [0.36, 0.74] 0.51 [0.36, 0.74] 0.01 [0.00, 0.09] 0.41 [0.07, 2.37] 0.68 [0.28, 1.62] 0.26 [0.14, 0.51] 0.24 [0.07, 0.84]	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed, 95% Cl
Heterc Test fc (d) Shous Okobia EI-Hus Total 6 Heterc Total 6 Khand Rodrig Total 6 Heterc	ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>Q223R Homos</i> ssi 2006 a 2008 ssiny 2017 (95% CI) events ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>K109R Domina</i> 07 douzi 2016 go 2017 (95% CI) events ogeneity: Tau ² =	3.09, df = 2 Z = 2.85 (f zygous mc Case: <u>Events</u> 98 46 24 168 2.06, df = 2 Z = 3.60 (f ant model Cases <u>Events</u> 0 2 9 34 45 1.13; Chi ² 2	2 (P = 0.00) ddel (G s - 1.00) s s - 1.00 2 (P = 0.00) 163 - 1.00 33 - 298 2 (P = 0.00) (AA vs - 20) 80 - 376 12.97 - 300 376 - 12.97 - 100	0.21); ² = 04) <i>G vs. AA</i>) Contr 102 56 22 180 0.36); ² = 003) <i>AG + G</i> (Control Events 31 4 33 59 107 , df = 3 (F	335% in Afr ol Total 132 24 258 3% 5) in A s Total 45 41 45 41 205 80 371 = 0.000	ican popu 54.4% 37.2% 8.4% 100.0% frican pop 12.9% 21.8% 31.6% 33.7% 100.0%	ulation Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 0.44 [0.27, 0.74] 0.67 [0.39, 1.17] 0.24 [0.05, 1.25] 0.51 [0.36, 0.74] 0.51 [0.36, 0.74] 0.51 [0.36, 0.74] 0.01 [0.00, 0.09] 0.41 [0.07, 2.37] 0.68 [0.28, 1.62] 0.26 [0.14, 0.51] 0.24 [0.07, 0.84]	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 0.02 0.1 1 10 50 Odds Ratio 0.02 0.1 1 10 50 Odds Ratio 0.02 0.1 1 10 50 Odds Ratio 1 0 50 0.02 0.1 1 10 50 0.01 0.1 1 10 50 0.00 0.01 0.1 1 00 1000 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.0
Heterc Test fc (d) Shous Okobia EI-Hus Total d Heterc Test fc (e) Study Woo 2 Liu 200 Khand Rodrig Total 1 Heterc Total 1 Heterc	ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>Q223R Homos</i> ssi 2006 a 2008 ssiny 2017 (95% CI) events ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>K109R Domina</i> 2006 07 douzi 2016 jo 2017 (95% CI) events ogeneity: Tau ² = or overall effect: <i>X</i>	3.09, df = 2 Z = 2.85 (f zygous mc Case: <u>Events</u> 98 46 24 168 2.06, df = 2 Z = 3.60 (f ant model Cases <u>Events</u> 0 2 9 34 45 1.13; Chi ² = Z = 2.23 (P	2 (P = 0.00) $abdel (G = 0.00)$ $abdel (G = 0.00)$ $abdel (G = 0.00)$ $abdel (G = 0.00)$ $2 (P = 0.00)$ $(AA vs)$ 44 47 205 80 376 $= 12.97$ $= 0.03$	0.21); I ² = 04) <i>G vs. AAj</i> Contr Events 102 56 22 180 0.36); I ² = 003) <i>. AG + G</i> Control Events 31 4 13 59 107 , df = 3 (F)	35% in Afr ol 132 102 24 258 3% <i>258</i> 3% <i>3</i> <i>3</i> <i>3</i> <i>4</i> 5 <i>4</i> 5 <i>4</i> 5 <i>4</i> 5 <i>4</i> 5 <i>3</i> 71 <i>2</i> 05 <i>8</i> 0 <i>3</i> 71	ican popu 54.4% 37.2% 8.4% 100.0% frican pop 12.9% 21.8% 31.6% 33.7% 100.0% 95); l ² = 77	Ulation Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 0.44 [0.27, 0.74] 0.67 [0.39, 1.17] 0.24 [0.05, 1.25] 0.51 [0.36, 0.74] 0.51 [0.36, 0.74] 0.51 [0.36, 0.74] 0.045 Ratio M-H, Random, 95% C 0.01 [0.00, 0.09] 0.41 [0.07, 2.37] 0.68 [0.28, 1.62] 0.26 [0.14, 0.51] 0.24 [0.07, 0.84]	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 0.02 0.1 1 10 50 Odds Ratio 0.02 0.1 1 10 50 Odds Ratio 1 M-H, Random, 95% Cl 0.001 0.1 1 10 1000
Heteror Test for (d) Shouse Okobie EI-Hus Total e Heteror Test for (e) Study Woo 2 Study Khand Rodrig Total e Heteror Total e	ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>Q223R Homo;</i> or Subgroup ssi 2006 a 2008 ssiny 2017 (95% CI) events ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>K109R Domina</i> cor Subgroup 2006 07 douzi 2016 go 2017 (95% CI) events oggeneity: Tau ² = or overall effect; <i>X</i>	3.09, df = 2 Z = 2.85 (f zygous mc Case: Events 98 46 24 168 2.06, df = 2 Z = 3.60 (f ant model Cases Events 0 2 9 34 45 1.13; Chi ² = 2.23 (P	2 (P = 0) del (G s Total 163 102 33 298 2 (P = 0) (AA vs) (AA vs) AT vs AT	0.21); I ² = 04) <i>G vs. AA</i> j Control 56 22 180 0.36); I ² = 003) <i>. AG + G</i> (Control Events 31 4 13 59 107 , df = 3 (F)	335% in Afr ol Total 132 102 24 258 3% 5) in A s Total 45 41 205 80 371 = 0.000 2 45	ican popu 54.4% 37.2% 8.4% 100.0% frican pop 21.8% 31.6% 33.7% 100.0% 95); l ² = 77	Ulation Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 0.44 [0.27, 0.74] 0.67 [0.39, 1.17] 0.24 [0.05, 1.25] 0.51 [0.36, 0.74] pulation Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% C 0.01 [0.00, 0.09] 0.41 [0.07, 2.37] 0.68 [0.28, 1.62] 0.26 [0.14, 0.51] 0.24 [0.07, 0.84]	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio
Heterc Test fc (d) Snous Okobia El-Hus Total e Heterc Test fc (e) Study Woo 2 Liu 200 Khand Rodrig Total e Heterc Total e (f)	ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>Q223R Homos</i> or Subgroup ssi 2006 a 2008 ssiny 2017 (95% CI) events ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>K109R Domina</i> con Subgroup 2006 07 douzi 2016 jo 2017 (95% CI) events ogeneity: Tau ² = or overall effect; <i>K109R Homoz</i>	3.09, df = 2 Z = 2.85 (f zygous mcc Case: <u>Events</u> 98 46 24 168 2.06, df = 2 Z = 3.60 (f ant model Cases <u>Events</u> 0 2 9 34 45 1.13; Chi ² = Z = 2.23 (P ygous mcc	2 (P = 0) $del (G G$ $Total 102$ 33 298 $2 (P = 0)$ $(AA vs)$ $(AA vs)$ $Total 44$ 47 205 80 376 $= 12.97$	0.21); ² = 04) <i>G vs. AA</i>) Contra 102 56 22 180 0.36); ² = 003) <i>AG + GC</i> Control Events 31 4 13 59 107 , df = 3 (F) ; <i>vs. AA</i>) <i>j</i>	335% in Afrir ol 132 102 24 258 3% 5) in A s 5 (14) 45 41 205 80 371 2 = 0.000 n Afric	ican popu 54.4% 37.2% 8.4% 100.0% frican popu frican popul 21.8% 31.6% 33.7% 100.0% 12.9% 21.8% 5); l ² = 77 can popul	ulation Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed, 95% CI 0.44 [0.27, 0.74] 0.67 [0.39, 1.17] 0.24 [0.05, 1.25] 0.51 [0.36, 0.74] pulation Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% C 0.01 [0.00, 0.09] 0.41 [0.07, 2.37] 0.68 [0.28, 1.62] 0.26 [0.14, 0.51] 0.24 [0.07, 0.84]	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio 0.02 0.1 1 10 50 Odds Ratio 0.02 0.1 1 10 50 Odds Ratio
Heterc Test fc (d) Snous Okobia EI-Hus Total 6 Heterc Test fc (e) Study Woo 20 Liu 200 Khand Rodrig Total 6 Heterc Test fc (f)	ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>Q223R Homos</i> si 2006 a 2008 ssiny 2017 (95% CI) events ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>K109R Domina</i> 07 louzi 2016 go 2017 (95% CI) events ogeneity: Tau ² = or overall effect: <i>K109R Homos</i>	3.09, df = 2 Z = 2.85 (f zygous ma Cases 98 46 24 168 2.06, df = 2 Z = 3.60 (f ant model Cases Events 0 2 9 34 45 1.13; Chi ² = Z = 2.23 (P ygous mad	2 (P = 0.00) del (G s Total 163 33 102 33 298 $2 (P = 0.00)(AA vs)(AA vs)44 47 205 80376 = 12.97 = 0.03del (GG s$	0.21); ² = 04) <i>G vs. AA</i>) Contr Events 102 56 22 180 0.36); ² = 003) <i>AG + G</i> (Control Events 31 4 3 1 31 4 59 107 , df = 3 (F) ; <i>vs. AA</i>) <i>f</i>	35% in Afrr ol Total 132 24 258 3% 5) in A s Total 45 5 80 371 = 0.000 n Afrricols	ican popu <u>Weight</u> 54.4% 37.2% 8.4% 100.0% frican pop 12.9% 21.8% 21.8% 31.6% 33.7% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0%	ulation Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 0.44 [0.27, 0.74] 0.67 [0.39, 1.17] 0.24 [0.05, 1.25] 0.51 [0.36, 0.74] pulation Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% C 0.01 [0.00, 0.09] 0.41 [0.07, 2.37] 0.68 [0.28, 1.62] 0.26 [0.14, 0.51] 0.24 [0.07, 0.84] %	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl Odds Ratio Odds Ratio
Heterc Test fc (d) Shous Okobia EI-Hus Total 6 Heterc Test fc (e) Study Woo 2 Liu 200 Khand Rodrig Total 6 Heterc Test fc (f)	ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>Q223R Homos</i> ssi 2006 a 2008 ssiny 2017 (95% CI) events ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>K109R Domina</i> 07 douzi 2016 go 2017 (95% CI) events ogeneity: Tau ² = or overall effect: <i>K109R Homoz</i> y	3.09, df = 2 Z = 2.85 (f zygous mcc Case: <u>Events</u> 98 46 24 168 2.06, df = 2 Z = 3.60 (f ant model Cases <u>Events</u> 0 2 9 34 45 1.13; Chi ² = 2.23 (P ygous mcc Case: <u>Events</u>	2 (P = 0.00) 2 (P = 0.00) 3 (G = 0.00) 163 (G = 0.00) 163 (G = 0.00) 163 (G = 0.00) 298 (2 (P = 0.00) 44 (2 - 0.00) 44 (2 - 0.00) 44 (2 - 0.00) 44 (2 - 0.00) 47 (2 - 0.00) 376 (G = 0.00)	0.21); ² = 04) <i>G vs. AA</i>) Contr 102 56 22 180 0.36); ² = 003) <i>AG + G</i> (Control Events 107 , df = 3 (F) <i>Control</i> <i>System Control</i> <i>Control</i> <i>Control</i> <i>Control</i> <i>Control</i> <i>Control</i> <i>Control</i> <i>Control</i> <i>Control</i> <i>Control</i> <i>Control</i> <i>Control</i> <i>Control</i> <i>Control</i> <i>Control</i>	35% in Afrir ol Total 132 102 24 258 3% 5) in A s Total 45 45 45 45 40 371 = 0.00 n Africols Total	ican popu Weight 54.4% 37.2% 8.4% 100.0% frican popu 12.9% 21.8% 31.6% 33.7% 100.0% 10.0% 105); l ² = 77 can popul Weight	Ulation Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed. 95% CI 0.44 [0.27, 0.74] 0.67 [0.39, 1.17] 0.24 [0.05, 1.25] 0.51 [0.36, 0.74] pulation Odds Ratio M-H. Random. 95% CI 0.26 [0.14, 0.51] 0.24 [0.07, 0.84] % Vation Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed. 95% CI	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl Odds Ratio 0.02 0.1 1 10 50 Odds Ratio 0.02 0.1 1 10 50 Odds Ratio 1 M-H, Random, 95% Cl 0.001 0.1 1 10 1000 Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Heterc Test fc (d) Snous Okobii EI-Hus Total e Heterc Test fc (e) Study Woo 2 Liu 20 Khand Rodrig Total e Heterc Test fc (f) Study Woo 2	ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>Q223R Homo;</i> or Subgroup ssi 2006 a 2008 ssiny 2017 (95% CI) events ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>K109R Domina</i> cor Subgroup 2006 07 douzi 2016 go 2017 (95% CI) events ogeneity: Tau ² = or overall effect: <i>X</i> <i>K109R Homoz</i> 2006	3.09, df = 2 Z = 2.85 (f zygous mcc Case: Events 98 46 24 168 2.06, df = 2 Z = 3.60 (f ant model Cases Events Z = 3.60 (f 2 9 34 45 1.13; Chi ² = Z = 2.23 (P ygous moc Cases Events 13	2 (P = 0) del (G s Total 163 102 33 298 2 (P = 0) (AA vs) Total 44 47 205 80 376 = 12.97 = 0.03 376 = 12.97 = 0.03 376 376 = 12.97 = 0.03 376 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 377 3 77 3 77 3 77 3 77 3 77 3 77 3 77 3 77 3 77 3 77 3 77 3 77 3 77 3 77 3 77 3 77 3 77 3 77 3 77 3 7	0.21); I ² = 04) <i>G vs. AA</i> j Contro 102 56 22 180 0.36); I ² = 003) <i>. AG + G(</i> Contro Events 31 4 13 59 107 , df = 3 (F) <i>i vs. AA</i>) <i>i</i> Contro <i>i</i> <i>i vs. AA</i>) <i>i</i> Contro <i>i</i> <i>i vs. AA</i>) <i>i</i> Contro <i>i</i> <i>i vs. AA</i>) <i>i</i> <i>i</i> <i>i vs. AA</i>) <i>i</i> <i>i</i> <i>i vs. AA</i>) <i>i</i> <i>i</i> <i>i vs. AA</i>) <i>i</i> <i>i</i> <i>i vs. AA</i>) <i>i</i> <i>i vs. AA</i>) <i>i</i>	335% in Afrir ol 132 102 24 258 3% 3) in A 5) in A 5 5 101 45 41 205 80 371 = 0.00 n Afric ols Total 14 4 5 41 205 80 371	ican popul 54.4% 37.2% 8.4% 100.0% frican pop 21.8% 21.8% 31.6% 33.7% 100.0% 95); l ² = 77 can popul Weight	Ulation Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 0.44 [0.27, 0.74] 0.67 [0.39, 1.17] 0.24 [0.05, 1.25] 0.51 [0.36, 0.74] pulation Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.26 [0.14, 0.51] 0.24 [0.07, 0.84] % lation Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI Not estimable 0 The estimable	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed. 95% CI Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio M-H. Random. 95% CI Odds Ratio M-H. Random. 95% CI Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed. 95% CI
Heteror Test for (d) Shous Okobia EI-Hus Total 4 Heteror Test for (e) Study Woo 2 Ei-Khand Rodrig Total 4 Heteror Test for (f) Study Woo 2 Ei-Hus Study Woo 2 Ei-Hus Noor Heteror Test for (f)	ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>Q223R Homos</i> or Subgroup ssi 2006 a 2008 ssiny 2017 (95% CI) events ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>K109R Domina</i> cor Subgroup 2006 07 douzi 2016 go 2017 (95% CI) events ogeneity: Tau ² = or overall effect: <i>K109R Homozy</i> or Subgroup 2006	3.09, df = 2 Z = 2.85 (f zygous mcc Case: <u>Events</u> 98 46 24 168 2.06, df = 2 Z = 3.60 (f ant model Cases <u>Events</u> 0 2 9 34 45 1.13; Chi ² = Z = 2.23 (P ygous mcc Case: <u>Events</u> 13 13	2 (P = 0) del (G S = 0.00) del (G S = 10.00) 163 = 102 = 3.00 102 = 3.00 298 = 2.00 (AA vs = 0.00) (AA vs = 0.00)	0.21); I ² = 04) <i>G vs. AAj</i> Contra 56 22 180 0.36); I ² = 003) <i>AG + GC</i> Control Events 107 , df = 3 (F)) <i>i vs. AAji</i> <i>Contra</i> 59 107 , df = 3 (F) <i>i vs. AAji</i> <i>Contra</i> 14 7 <i>Contra</i>	335% in Afrir ol Total 132 102 24 258 3% 5) in A s s Total 45 41 205 80 371 2 = 0.000 in Afric ols Total	ican popul 54.4% 37.2% 8.4% 100.0% frican popul 12.9% 21.8% 31.6% 33.7% 100.0% 15); l ² = 77 can popul Weight 5.9% 40.00°	Ulation Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 0.44 [0.27, 0.74] 0.67 [0.39, 1.17] 0.24 [0.05, 1.25] 0.51 [0.36, 0.74] pulation Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.26 [0.14, 0.51] 0.26 [0.14, 0.51] 0.24 [0.07, 0.84] % lation Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI Not estimable 3.71 [0.54, 25.59]	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl Odds Ratio
Heterc Test fc (d) Snous Okobia EI-Hus Total e Heterc Test fc (e) Study Woo 2 Khand Rodrig Total e Heterc Test fc (f) Study Woo 2 Khand	ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: Q223R Homos si 2006 a 2008 ssiny 2017 (95% CI) events ogeneity: Chi ² = or overall effect: <i>K109R</i> Domina cor Subgroup 2006 07 douzi 2016 go 2017 (95% CI) events ogeneity: Tau ² = or overall effect: <i>K109R</i> Homozy <i>cor</i> Subgroup 2006 07 douzi 2016 go e 2017	3.09, df = $2 Z = 2.85$ (f zygous mcc Case: 98 46 24 168 2.06, df = $2 Z$ 2 3.60 (f ant model Cases Events 0 2 9 34 45 1.13; Chi ² = Z = 2.23 (P ygous mcc Case: Events 13 13 59 2 2	2 (P = 0) 2 (P = 0) ddel (G s s 163 102 333 298 2 (P = 0) (AA vs) 44 47 205 80 376 s 12.977 s 12.977 s 12.975 12.977 s 12.9777 12.97	$(1, 2, 2)$; $ ^2 = 04)$ G vs. $AAContrEvents10256221800.36; ^2 = 003AG + GGControlEvents107G$ f = 3 (F) (rs. AA) (rs. AA) (rs. AA)	35% in Afrir ol Total 132 24 258 3% 5) in A s 5) in A s 5) in A s 5) in A s 102 24 258 3% 5) in A s 102 24 258 3% 5) in A s 102 24 258 3% 5) in A s 102 24 258 3% 5) in A s 102 24 258 3% 5) in A s 102 24 258 3% 5) in A 5 102 24 258 3% 5) in A 5 102 24 258 3% 102 258 102 258 102 258 102 258 102 258 102 258 102 258 102 258 102 258 102 258 102 258 102 258 102 258 102 258 102 258 102 258 102 258 102 258 102 258 102 102 258 102 258 102 258 102 258 102 258 102 258 102 258 102 258 102 102 102 102 102 102 102 102	ican popu Weight 54.4% 37.2% 8.4% 100.0% frican popu 12.9% 31.6% 33.7% 100.0% 15); l ² = 77 can popul Weight 5.9% 43.6% 5.9%	Ulation Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 0.44 [0.27, 0.74] 0.67 [0.39, 1.17] 0.24 [0.05, 1.25] 0.51 [0.36, 0.74] pulation Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl 0.01 [0.00, 0.09] 0.41 [0.07, 2.37] 0.68 [0.28, 1.62] 0.26 [0.14, 0.51] 0.24 [0.07, 0.84] % fation Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl Not estimable 3.71 [0.54, 25.59] 1.33 [0.53, 3.34] 2.12 [1.0.04 [5]	Odds Ratio M-H. Fixed, 95% Cl Odds Ratio Odds Ratio
Heteror Test for Shous Okobia EI-Hus Total 6 Heteror Test for (e) Study Woo 22 Khand Rodrig Total 6 Heteror Test for (f) Study Woo 22 Khand Rodrig Study	ogeneity: Chi² = or overall effect: Q223R Homos or Subgroup ssi 2006 a 2008 ssiny 2017 (95% Cl) events ogeneity: Chi² = or overall effect: <i>K109R Domina</i> 07 louzi 2016 jog 2017 (95% Cl) events ogeneity: Tau² = or overall effect: <i>K109R Homozy</i> or Subgroup 2006 07 0007 ouzi 2016 jogeneity: Tau² = or overall effect: <i>K109R Homozy</i> or Subgroup 2006 007 douzi 2016 go 2017	3.09, df = 2 Z = 2.85 (f zygous ma Cases 98 46 24 168 2.06, df = 2 2 3.00 (f ant model Cases Events 0 2 9 34 45 1.13; Chi ² = 2.23 (P ygous model Cases 1.13; Chi ² = 1.13; Chi ² = 1.13; Chi ² = 1.13; Chi ² = 2.23 (P ygous model Cases 1.13; Chi ² = 2.23 (P ygous model Cases 2.23 (P ygous model Cases 2.23 (P ygous model Cases 2.23 (P ygous model Cases 2.23 (P ygous model 2.23 (P ygous model Cases 2.23 (P ygous model 2.23 (P ygous model 2.23 (P ygous model Cases 2.23 (P ygous model 2.23 (P ygous model 2.24 (P) 2.24 (P) 2.24 (P) 2.25	2 (P = 0) 2 (P = 0.00) del (G s 163 102 33 298 2 (P = 0) (A vs) 44 47 205 80 376 = 12.97 = 0.03 del (GG s Total 13 13 13 13 15 68 56	$(1, 2, 2)$; $ ^2 = 04)$ G vs. AA) Contr Events 102 56 22 180 $(.36)$; $ ^2 = 003)$ AG + GC Control Events 31 4 13 59 107 , df = 3 (F) (r)	35% in Afrir ol Total 132 24 258 3% 5) in A s Total 45 80 371 = 0.00 n Africols Total 14 17 77 77	ican popu 54.4% 37.2% 8.4% 100.0% frican popu 12.9% 21.8% 21.8% 31.6% 33.7% 100.0% 95); l ² = 77 can popul weight 5.9% 43.6% 50.5%	ulation Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 0.44 [0.27, 0.74] 0.67 [0.39, 1.17] 0.24 [0.05, 1.25] 0.51 [0.36, 0.74] pulation Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.01 [0.00, 0.09] 0.41 [0.07, 2.37] 0.68 [0.28, 1.62] 0.26 [0.14, 0.51] 0.24 [0.07, 0.84] % lation Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI Not estimable 3.71 [0.54, 25.59] 1.33 [0.53, 3.34] 2.12 [1.00, 4.50]	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl Odds Ratio 0.02 0.1 1 10 50 Odds Ratio 0.01 0.1 1 10 1000 Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Heteror Test for (d) Shouss Okobii EI-Hus Total d Heteror Test for (e) Study Woo 2 Liu 200 Khand Rodrig Total 1 Heteror Test for (f) Study Woo 20 Khand Rodrig Total 1	ogeneity: Chi² = or overall effect: Q223R Homos verall effect: Q223R Homos ssi 2006 a 2008 ssiny 2017 (95% CI) events ogeneity: Chi² = or overall effect: <i>K109R Domina</i> 007 douzi 2016 go 2017 (95% CI) events ogeneity: Tau² = or overall effect: <i>K109R Homozy</i> or Subgroup 2006 007 douzi 2016 og 2017 (95% CI) 2006 007 douzi 2016 go 2017 (95% CI)	3.09, df = $2 Z = 2.85$ (f zygous mcc Case: Events 98 46 24 168 2.06, df = $2 Z$ 3.60 (f case: Events 0 2 9 34 45 1.13; Chi ² = Z = 2.23 (P ygous mcc Case: Events 13 13 59 22	2 (P = 0) del (G S = 0.00) del (G S = 0.00) 163 = 0.00 102 = 0.00 2 (P = 0) 2 (P = 0) (AA vs = 0.00) (AA vs = 0.	0.21); I ² = 04) <i>G vs. AA</i> j Contr Events 102 56 22 180 0.36); I ² = 003) <i>AG + G</i> (Control Events 31 4 13 59 107 , df = 3 (F) <i>i vs. AA</i>) <i>i</i> Control Events 107 , df = 3 (F) <i>i vs. AA</i>) <i>i</i> Control Events 14 7 64 18	35% in Afr ol 132 102 24 258 3% 3) in A 5) in A 5) in A 5 5) in A 5 5 101 45 41 205 80 371 = 0.00 5 105 105 107 177 77	ican popul 54.4% 37.2% 8.4% 100.0% frican popul 12.9% 21.8% 31.6% 33.7% 100.0% 05); l ² = 77 can popul Weight 5.9% 43.6% 50.5%	Ulation Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 0.44 [0.27, 0.74] 0.67 [0.39, 1.17] 0.24 [0.05, 1.25] 0.51 [0.36, 0.74] pulation Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.01 [0.00, 0.09] 0.41 [0.07, 2.37] 0.68 [0.28, 1.62] 0.26 [0.14, 0.51] 0.24 [0.07, 0.84] "% lation Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI Not estimable 3.71 [0.54, 25.59] 1.33 [0.53, 3.34] 2.12 [1.00, 4.50] 1.87 [1.07, 3.26]	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio I Odds Ratio
Heteror Test for (d) Shouse Okobie EI-Hus Total e Heteror Test for (e) Study Woo 2 Khand Rodrig Total e Fest for (f) Study Woo 2 Liu 200 Khand Rodrig Total e Heteror Test for (f)	ogeneity: Chi² = or overall effect: Q223R Homo; or Subgroup ssi 2006 a 2008 ssiny 2017 (95% Cl) events ogeneity: Chi² = or overall effect: <i>K109R Domina</i> cor Subgroup 2006 07 bogeneity: Chi² = or overall effect: <i>K109R Domina</i> cor Subgroup 2006 07 bogeneity: Tau² = or overall effect: : <i>K109R Homozy</i> or Subgroup 2006 07 cors 2017 (95% Cl) events 2006 07 (95% Cl) events	3.09, df = $2 Z = 2.85$ (f zygous mcc Case: Events 98 46 24 168 2.06, df = $2 Z$ 2 3.60 (f ant model Cases Events 0 2 9 34 45 1.13; Chi ² = 2.23 (P ygous moc Case: Events 13 13 5 5 22 107	2 (P = 0) 2 (P = 0) del (G s Total 163 102 33 298 2 (P = 0) (AA vs) 2 (P = 0) (AA vs) Total 44 47 205 80 376 = 12.97 = 0.03 del (GG s Total 13 15 68 56 152	0.21); I ² = 04) <i>G vs. AAj</i> Control 22 180 0.36); I ² = 003) <i>AG + G(</i> Control Events 31 4 13 59 107 , df = 3 (F) <i>i</i> vs. AA <i>) j</i> Control <i>Events</i> 14 7 64 18 103	335% in Afrir ol 132 102 24 258 3% <i>5) in A</i> <i>s</i> <i>s</i> <i>s</i> <i>45</i> <i>41</i> 205 <i>80</i> <i>371</i> <i>=</i> 0.00 <i>n Afric</i> <i>10</i> <i>45</i> <i>41</i> 205 <i>80</i> <i>371</i> <i>45</i> <i>41</i> 205 <i>80</i> <i>371</i> <i>45</i> <i>41</i> 205 <i>80</i> <i>371</i> <i>45</i> <i>41</i> 205 <i>80</i> <i>371</i> <i>45</i> <i>41</i> 205 <i>80</i> <i>371</i> <i>45</i> <i>41</i> 205 <i>80</i> <i>371</i> <i>45</i> <i>41</i> 205 <i>80</i> <i>371</i> <i>45</i> <i>41</i> 205 <i>80</i> <i>371</i> <i>45</i> <i>41</i> 205 <i>80</i> <i>371</i> <i>45</i> <i>41</i> 205 <i>80</i> <i>371</i> <i>45</i> <i>41</i> 205 <i>80</i> <i>371</i> <i>45</i> <i>41</i> 205 <i>80</i> <i>371</i> <i>45</i> <i>41</i> 205 <i>80</i> <i>371</i> <i>45</i> <i>41</i> 205 <i>80</i> <i>371</i> <i>45</i> <i>41</i> 205 <i>80</i> <i>371</i> <i>45</i> <i>41</i> 205 <i>80</i> <i>371</i> <i>10</i> <i>45</i> <i>41</i> <i>205</i> <i>80</i> <i>371</i> <i>10</i> <i>45</i> <i>41</i> <i>205</i> <i>80</i> <i>371</i> <i>10</i> <i>45</i> <i>41</i> <i>205</i> <i>80</i> <i>371</i> <i>10</i> <i>45</i> <i>41</i> <i>205</i> <i>80</i> <i>371</i> <i>10</i> <i>45</i> <i>41</i> <i>205</i> <i>80</i> <i>371</i> <i>10</i> <i>45</i> <i>41</i> <i>205</i> <i>80</i> <i>371</i> <i>11</i> <i>11</i> <i>7</i> <i>17</i> <i>17</i> <i>17</i> <i>17</i> <i>1</i>	ican popul 54.4% 37.2% 8.4% 100.0% frican popul 21.8% 31.6% 33.7% 100.0% 05); l ² = 77 can popul <u>Weight</u> 5.9% 43.6% 50.5% 100.0%	Ulation Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 0.44 [0.27, 0.74] 0.67 [0.39, 1.17] 0.24 [0.05, 1.25] 0.51 [0.36, 0.74] pulation Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.01 [0.00, 0.09] 0.41 [0.07, 2.37] 0.68 [0.28, 1.62] 0.26 [0.14, 0.51] 0.24 [0.07, 0.84] % lation Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI Not estimable 3.71 [0.54, 25.59] 1.33 [0.53, 3.34] 2.12 [1.00, 4.56] 1.87 [1.07, 3.26]	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl Odds Ratio

Fig. 2 Forest plot showing the relationship between LEPR Q223R (rs1137101) and breast cancer risk according to different genetic models in African population: (A) allelic model (G-allele vs A-allele), (B) recessive model (GG vs AG + AA), (C) dominant model (AA vs AG + GG), (D) homozygous model (GG vs AA) Forest plot showing the relationship between K109R (rs1137100) and breast cancer risk according to different genetic models in African population: (E) dominant model (AA vs AG + GG), (E) heterozygous model (AG vs AA). CI = confidence interval; df = degree of freedom; M-H = Mantel-Haenszel.

showed that Q223R polymorphism could decrease BC risk in Asians but not in overall individuals and Caucasians. Different from their results,²⁹⁻³⁴ the data from the current meta-analysis

www.ejcma.org

with 20 case-control studies indicated that G-allele and GG genotype but not A allele of Q223R may protect against BC only in Africans. On the contrary, A-allele and AA genotype of Q223R

۲

01-Jun-23 12:30:22

۲

۲

Zhu et al.

Table 3										
Overall meta-analysis of the association between LEPR K109R (rs1137100) polymorphism and breast cancer risk										
Genetic model	OR [95 % CI]	Z (p value)	Heterogene	eity of study design		Analysis model				
			χ2	df (p value)	l² (%)					
K109R polymorphism in total population from 8 case-control studies ^{8,13,16,21–23,}	27,28									
(2807 cases and 2586 controls)										
Allelic model (G-allele vs A-allele)	1.03 [0.73, 1.44]	0.16 (0.87)	51.93	7 (<0.001)	87	Random				
Recessive model (GG vs AG + AA)	0.96 [0.66, 1.38]	0.22 (0.82)	25.41	7 (<0.001)	72	Random				
Dominant model (AA vs AG + GG)	0.93 [0.54, 1.61]	0.25 (0.80)	35.69	6 (<0.001)	83	Random				
Homozygous model (GG vs AA)	1.09 [0.52, 2.27]	0.22 (0.83)	34.90	6 (<0.001)	83	Random				
Heterozygous model (AG vs AA)	0.99 [0.65, 1.51]	0.05 (0.96)	18.30	6 (0.006)	67	Random				
K109R polymorphism in Asian population from 4 case-control studies ^{8,21,22,28} (376 cases and 371 controls)	n									
Allelic model (G-allele vs A-allele)	1.59 [0.77. 3.26]	1.26 (0.21)	18.61	3 (<0.001)	84	Random				
Recessive model (GG vs AG + AA)	1.63 [0.70, 3.82]	1.13 (0.26)	12.98	3 (0.005)	77	Random				
Dominant model (AA vs AG + GG)	0.24 [0.07, 0.84]	2.23 (0.03)	12.97	3 (0.005)	77	Fixed				
Homozvaous model (GG vs AA)	4.31 [0.89, 20,78]	1.82 (0.07)	7.94	2 (0.02)	75	Bandom				
Heterozygous model (AG vs AA)	1.87 [1.07, 3.26]	2.21 (0.03)	1.12	2 (0.57)	0	Fixed				
K109R polymorphism in Caucasian popul from 4 case-control studies ^{13,16,23,27} (2431 cases and 2215 controls)	lation	()								
Allelic model (G-allele vs A-allele)	0 75 [0 55 1 02]	1 83 (0 07)	1/ 99	3 (0 002)	80	Bandom				
Becessive model (GG vs $\Delta G \pm \Delta \Delta$)	0.73 [0.49, 1.09]	1.50 (0.07)	8 54	3 (0.04)	65	Random				
Dominant model ($\Delta \Delta$ vs $\Delta G \pm GG$)	1 /5 [0.97 2 18]	1.80 (0.07)	8.98	3 (0.03)	67	Random				
Homozyaous model (GG vs AA)	0.50 [0.31, 1.11]	1.65 (0.07)	10.61	3 (0.03)	70	Random				
		1.00 (0.10)	7 /1	2 (0.06)	60	Bandom				
neterozygous model (AG VS AA)	0.75[0.51, 1.10]	1.40 (U.14)	1.41	3 (0.00)	00	Ranuom				

95% CI = 95% confidence interval; LEPR = leptin receptor; OR = odds ratio.





554

۲

www.ejcma.org

۲

Original Article. (2023) 86:6

may confer increasing BC risk in Africans. It is possible that larger sample size may lead to the identification of statistically significant correlation. The current study contains more casecontrol studies with larger sample, making our results should be more reliable. It is worth mentioning that the results of a metaanalysis by Sayad et al⁴² with only 14 case-control studies for Q223R published in 2021 were similar to ours. Our data also suggested that GG genotype of K109R in Asian population may also protect against BC, while AG genotype of K109R in Asian population may confer elevated susceptibility of BC.

Significant results were obtained and we really hope they would provide a reference for future studies, nonetheless, several limitations that may affect interpretation of the results still existed in this work. First, the significant results on Q223R were only got from two case-control studies in African population. Given the limited sample size, more multicenter studies with larger sample sizes are necessary to clarify the relationships. Indeed, neither in total nor in Asian and Caucasian population significant association between Q223R polymorphism and BC risk was observed. Second, the p value for HWE was less than 0.05 in five studies of Q223R polymorphism^{12,18,21,22,25} and one study of K109R polymorphism,28 suggesting that these populations may not be representative of the broader target population. Nevertheless, we decided to retain these studies in the meta-analysis because the corresponding pooled ORs were not substantially altered in any of the five models after excluding one at a time. Third, confounding factors, such as menopausal, menstruation status, tumor status, BMI, or age may affect the results. However, not all studies reported these baseline data or aggregated them in different ways, resulting in a failure to include them in the meta-analysis. Last, methods which were used to test polymorphisms were not uniform and they varied in sensitivity and specificity, leading to a reduction of the robustness in this meta-analysis.

In conclusion, this study performed an extensive assessment based on a larger sample size than the previous pooled analysis and suggested that LEPR Q223R polymorphism may be significantly associated with BC risk in African population. And LEPR K109R polymorphism may be significantly associated with BC risk in Asian population.

REFERENCES

- 1. Sung H, Ferlay J, Siegel RL, Laversanne M, Soerjomataram I, Jemal A, et al. Global cancer statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. *CA Cancer J Clin* 2021;71:209–49.
- 2. Fahad Ullah M. Breast cancer: current perspectives on the disease status. *Adv Exp Med Biol* 2019;**1152**:51–64.
- Carpenter CL, Ross RK, Paganini-Hill A, Bernstein L. Effect of family history, obesity and exercise on breast cancer risk among postmenopausal women. *Int J Cancer* 2003;106:96–102.
- 4. Lorincz AM, Sukumar S. Molecular links between obesity and breast cancer. *Endocr Relat Cancer* 2006;13:279–92.
- Kentish SJ, Vincent AD, Kennaway DJ, Wittert GA, Page AJ. High-fat diet-induced obesity ablates gastric vagal afferent circadian rhythms. J Neurosci 2016;36:3199–207.
- 6. Wang D, Xu C, Wang T, Li H, Li Y, Ren J, et al. Discovery and functional characterization of leptin and its receptors in Japanese quail (*Coturnix japonica*). *Gen Comp Endocr* 2016;**225**:1–12.
- 7. Thompson DB, Ravussin E, Bennett PH, Bogardus C. Structure and sequence variation at the human leptin receptor gene in lean and obese Pima Indians. *Hum Mol Genet* 1997;6:675–9.
- Woo HY, Park H, Ki CS, Park YL, Bae WG, et al. Relationships among serum leptin, leptin receptor gene polymorphisms, and breast cancer in Korea. *Cancer Lett* 2006;237:137–42.
- 9. Snoussi K, Strosberg AD, Bouaouina N, Ahmed SB, Helal AN, Chouchane L. Leptin and leptin receptor polymorphisms are associated with increased risk and poor prognosis of breast carcinoma. *BMC Cancer* 2006;6:1–10.

www.ejcma.org

10. Gallicchio L, McSorley MA, Newschaffer CJ, Huang HY, Thuita LW, Hoffman SC, et al. Body mass, polymorphisms in obesity-related genes, and the risk of developing breast cancer among women with benign breast disease. *Cancer Detect Prev* 2007;**31**:95–101.

()

- 11. Okobia MN, Bunker CH, Garte SJ, Zmuda JM, Ezeome ER, Anyanwu SN, et al. Leptin receptor Gln223Arg polymorphism and breast cancer risk in Nigerian women: a case control study. *BMC Cancer* 2008;8:338–8.
- 12. Han CZ, Du LL, Jing JX, Zhao XW, Tian FG, Shi J, et al. Associations among lipids, leptin, and leptin receptor gene Gin223Arg polymorphisms and breast cancer in China. *Biol Trace Elem Res* 2008;**126**:38–48.
- Ulybina YM, Imyanitov EN, Vasilyev DA, Berstein LM. Polymorphic markers associated with genes responsible for lipid and carbohydrate metabolism disorders and insulin resistance in cancer patients. *Mol Biol* 2008;42:843–51.
- Teras LR, Goodman M, Patel AV, Bouzyk M, Tang W, Diver WR, et al. No association between polymorphisms in LEP, LEPR, ADIPOQ, ADIPOR1, or ADIPOR2 and postmenopausal breast cancer risk. *CEBP* 2009;18:2553.
- Cleveland RJ, Gammon MD, Long CM, Gaudet MM, Eng SM, Teitelbaum SL, et al. Common genetic variations in the LEP and LEPR genes, obesity and breast cancer incidence and survival. *Breast Cancer Res Tr* 2009;120:745–52.
- Nyante SJ, Gammon MD, Kaufman JS, Bensen JT, Lin DY, Barnholtz-Sloan JS, et al. Common genetic variation in adiponectin, leptin, and leptin receptor and association with breast cancer subtypes. *Breast Cancer Res Tr* 2011;129:593–606.
- 17. Kim KZ, Shin A, Lee YS, Kim SY, Kim Y, Lee ES, et al. Polymorphisms in adiposity-related genes are associated with age at menarche and menopause in breast cancer patients and healthy women. *Hum Reprod* 2012;27:2193–200.
- Anuradha C, Ranjit PM, Surekha D, Raghunadharao D, Rani NS, Vishnupriya S. Association of leptin receptor (LEPR) Q223R polymorphism with breast cancer. *GJMR* 2012;12:21–9.
- Mohammadzadeh G, Ghaffari MA, Bafandeh A, Hosseini SM. Effect of leptin receptor Q223R polymorphism on breast cancer risk. *Iran J Basic Med Sci* 2014;17:588–94.
- Mahmoudi R, Noori Alavicheh B, Nazer Mozaffari MA, Fararouei M, Nikseresht M, et al. Polymorphisms of leptin (-2548 G/A) and leptin receptor (Q223R) genes in Iranian women with breast cancer. *Int J Genomics* 2015;2015:1–6.
- Khandouzi M, Deka M, Baruah MN, Rozati R, Kordafshari M, Kashyap P, et al. Genetic variation in adiponectin, leptin and leptin receptor with reference to risk of breast cancer in northeast obese women in India. *Biosci Biotech Res C* 2016;9:163–70.
- 22. Rodrigo C, Tennekoon KH, Karunanayake EH, De Silva K, Amarasinghe I, Wijayasiri A, et al. Circulating leptin, soluble leptin receptor, free leptin index, visfatin and selected leptin and leptin receptor gene polymorphisms in sporadic breast cancer. *Endocr J* 2017;64:393–401.
- 23. Huerta L, Cabrera C, Montes R, Cuellar H, López J, Covarrubias S, et al. Association between leptin and leptin receptor gene polymorphisms and breast cancer risk in premenopausal and postmenopausal Mexican women. *Cancer Res Front* 2017;3:56–63.
- El-Hussiny MAB, Atwa MA, Rashad WE, Shaheen DA, Elkady NM. Leptin receptor Q223R polymorphism in Egyptian female patients with breast cancer. Wspolczesna Onkol 2017;21:42–7.
- Fard ZT. Evaluation of leptin receptor Q223R (rs1137101) polymorphism based on histopathological and body mass index characteristics in Iranian females with breast cancer. *Int J Cancer Manag* 2020;13:e92731.
- Tayel SI, Alhanafy AM, Ahmed SM, Eltorgoman AA, Elsayed IE, et al. Biochemical study on modifying role of variants of leptin gene and its receptor on serum leptin levels in breast cancer. *Mol Biol Rep* 2020;47:3807–20.
- Hołysz H, Paszel-Jaworska A, Romaniuk-Drapała A, Grodecka-Gazdecka S, Rubiś B. LEP (- 2548G> A LEP) and LEPR (223Gln> Arg, 109Lys> Arg) polymorphisms as breast cancer risk factors in the Polish female population. *Mol Biol Rep* 2021;48:3237–44.
- Liu CL, Chang YC, Cheng SP, Chern SR, Yang TL, Lee JJ, et al. The roles of serum leptin concentration and polymorphism in leptin receptor gene at codon 109 in breast cancer. Oncology (Huntingt) 2007;72:75–81.
- 29. Wang Y, Yang H, Gao H, Wang H. The association between LEPR Q223R polymorphisms and breast cancer risk. *Breast Cancer Res Tr* 2015;151:1–6.

()

Zhu et al.

- 30. He B, Pan Y, Zhang Y, Xu YQ, Wang SK. Effect of LEPR Gln223Arg polymorphism on breast cancer risk in different ethnic populations: a meta-analysis. *Mol Biol Rep* 2012;**39**:3117–22.
- Liu C, Liu L. Polymorphisms in three obesity-related genes (LEP, LEPR, and PON1) and breast cancer risk: a meta-analysis. *Tumor Biol* 2011;32:1233–40.
- 32. Wang LQ, Shen W, Xu L, Chen MB, Gong T, Lu PH, et al. The association between polymorphisms in the leptin receptor gene and risk of breast cancer: a systematic review and pooled analysis. *Breast Cancer Res Tr* 2012;136:231–9.
- 33. Shi H, Shu H, Huang C, Gong J, Yang Y, Liu R, et al. Association of LEPR K109R polymorphisms with cancer risk: a systematic review and pooled analysis. *J BUON* 2014;19:847–54.
- 34. Luan H, Zhang H, Li Y, Wang P, Cao L, Ma H, et al. Association of two obesity-related gene polymorphisms LEPG2548A rs7799039 and LEPRQ223R rs1137101 with the risk of breast cancer. *Oncotarget* 2017;8:59333–44.
- 35. Wells GA, Shea B, O'Connell D, Peterson J, Welch V, Losos M, et al. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses. 2019 Available at http://www.ohri.ca/ programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.htm
- Ownby RL, Crocco E, Acevedo A, John V, Loewenstein D. Depression and risk for Alzheimer disease: systematic review, meta-analysis. Arch Gen Psychiat 2006;63:530–8.

- 37. Méndez-Hernández A, Gallegos-Arreola MP, Moreno-Macías H, Fematt JE, Pérez-Morales R. LEP rs7799039, LEPR rs1137101, and ADIPOQ rs2241766 and 1501299 polymorphisms are associated with obesity and chemotherapy response in Mexican women with breast cancer. *Clin Breast Cancer* 2017;17:453–62.
- Boothby-Shoemaker W, Benham V, Paithankar S, Shankar R, Chen B, Bernard JJ. The relationship between leptin, the leptin receptor and FGFR1 in primary human breast tumors. *Cells* 2020;9:2224.
- 39. Gu F, Kraft P, Rice M, Michels KB. Leptin and leptin receptor genes in relation to premenopausal breast cancer incidence and grade in Caucasian women. *Breast Cancer Res Tr* 2012;131:17–25.
- 40. Liu P, Shi H, Liu R, Yang Y, Yang Y, Huang C, et al. Lack of association between LEPR Q223R polymorphisms and cancer susceptibility: evidence from a meta-analysis. *J BUON* 2014;19:855–62.
- Rong G, Tang W, Wang Y, Qiu H, Chen S. Investigation of leptin receptor rs1137101 G> A polymorphism with cancer risk: evidence from 35936 subjects. *Bioscience Rep* 2019;39:BSR20182240.
- Sayad S, Dastgheib SA, Farbod M, Farbod M, Asadian F, Karimi-Zarchi M, et al. Association of PON1, LEP and LEPR polymorphisms with susceptibility to breast cancer: a meta-analysis. *Asian Pac J Cancer P* 2021;22:2323–34.

556