# Original Article Association of programmed death-1 gene polymorphism rs2227981 with tumor: evidence from a meta analysis

Umarjan Mamat<sup>1</sup>, Muyassar Arkinjan<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Surgery, The Fourth Affiliated Chinese Medicine Hospital of Xinjiang Medical University; <sup>2</sup>Division of Surgery, The Second Affiliated Hospital of Xinjiang Medical University

Received March 29, 2015; Accepted July 10, 2015; Epub August 15, 2015; Published August 30, 2015

**Abstract:** To investigate the association of programmed death-1 gene polymorphism rs2227981 with tumor risk. The PubMed, Medline, Ovid Medline, EMBASE, Web of Knowledge were searched. Meta-analyses were conducted using RevMan 5.2.2 software. Total six researches involving in a total of 1427 tumor patients and 1811 healthy control people were included into this meta analysis. There was no association of PD-1 gene polymorphism with total tumor risk under four genetic models. (CT+TT vs CC, OR=1.09, 95% CI=0.80-1.49, P=0.59; CT+CC vs TT, OR=0.93, 95% CI=0.52-1.66, P=0.61; TT vs CC, OR=0.99, 95% CI=0.57-1.72, P=0.97; CT vs CC, OR=1.16, 95% CI=0.80-1.70, P=0.43). The sub-group analysis shown there were a significantly difference on association of PD-1 gene polymorphism with digestive system tumor risk between tumor patients and healthy control people, except recessive model. (CT+TT vs CC, OR=1.57, 95% CI=1.20-2.07, P=0.001; TT vs CC, OR=1.67, 95% CI=1.12-2.49, P=0.01; CT vs CC, OR=1.51, 95% CI=1.13-2.01, P=0.005). Moreover, the meta analysis results shown that there were association of PD-1 gene polymorphism with tumor risk under two models for the tumor specific occurring only in women. (CT+TT vs CC, OR=0.80, 95% CI=0.67-0.95, P=0.01; TT vs CC, OR=0.61, 95% CI=0.44-0.83, P=0.002). This study suggests that PD-1 gene polymorphism rs2227981 is associated with specific tumor types, including digestive system tumor and tumor specific occurring in woman.

Keywords: Programmed death-1, polymorphism, tumor, genetic models, RevMan, meta analysis

#### Introduction

Lots of factors involves in cause of tumor, including infectious aspects, environment factors, and genetic factors [1-3]. Human immune system plays an important role in resisting tumors, of which the T lymphocyte is the most important anti-tumor immune regulator. Therefore, it is suggest that some immune response-related genes polymorphisms may contribute to tumor pathogenesis.

Programmed death-1 (PD-1), a 55 KDa type I transmembrane glycoprotein, is a potent immunoregulatory molecule expressed on lots of cells, including natural killer T cells (NKTs), monocytes, activated T and B lymphocytes [4]. As we know, PD-1 plays a crucial role in assisting cancer cell to escape the host immune system. Inhibition of PD-1 can improve the antitumor activity of immune system [5]. Other study reported that PD-1 is involved in the arthritis, which indicated that PD-1 may play a center role in development of autoimmune disease [6]. Moreover, there was a evidence that PD-1 gene polymorphism is associated with susceptibility of systemic lupus erythematosus [7]. Moreover, more and more studies have focus on the rheumatoid arthritis [8], type 1 diabetes [9] and ankylosing spondylitis [10], however, little is known the relationship between PD-1 gene polymorphism with tumor susceptibility, especially PD-1 rs2227981 (+7785).

The aim of this meta analysis was to comprehensively and quantitatively summarize the all world results to evaluated PD-1 gene polymorphism rs2227981 with tumor risk.

## Methods

Lots of databases included PubMed, Medline, Ovid Medline, EMBASE, Web of Knowledge were searched form 1990 to present. The main

Study Vear F		<b>E</b> (1, 1, 1)	<b>-</b>		Case							Control					
Study	rear	Ethnicity	Tumor type	CC	СТ	TT	CC+CT	CC+TT	CT+TT	N	CC	CT	TT	CC+CT	CC+TT	CT+TT	N
Dehaghani	2009	Iran	gestational trophoblastic neoplasms	42	37	13	79	55	50	92	118	56	121	174	239	177	295
Haghshenas	2011	Iran	breast cancer	194	191	50	385	244	241	443	137	145	46	282	183	191	328
Hua	2011	China	breast cancer	295	169	22	464	317	191	490	244	210	24	454	268	234	512
Mojtahedi	2012a*	Iran	colon cancer	47	102	26	149	73	128	175	75	89	36	164	111	125	200
	2012b*		Rectal cancer	12	7	6	19	18	13	25	75	89	36	164	111	125	200
Savabkar	2013	Iran	gastric cancer	50	66	6	116	56	72	122	89	70	7	159	96	77	166
Yousefi	2013	Iran	Colorectal Cancer	18	27	35	45	53	62	80	43	45	22	88	65	67	110

Table 1. Charateristics of Studies Included in the Meta-analysis

\*from the same study.

# PD-1 polymorphism and tumor risk



Figure 1. The meta analysis of PD-1 gene polymorphism with total tumor. A. CT+TT vs CC; B. CT+CC vs TT; C. TT vs CC; D. CT vs CC.

А	Experim	ental	Cont	rol		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Moitahedi et al. 2012a	128	175	125	200	37.3%	1.63 [1.05, 2.54]	
Moitahedi et al. 2012b	13	25	125	200	15.9%	0.65 (0.28, 1.50)	
Savabkar et al., 2013	72	122	77	166	31.8%	1.66 [1.04, 2.67]	
Yousefi et al., 2013	62	80	67	110	15.1%	2.21 [1.15, 4.23]	
Total (95% CI)		402		676	100.0%	1.57 [1.20, 2.07]	•
Total events	275		394				
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 5.	44, df = 3 (	P = 0.14	); 12 = 45	%			
Test for overall effect: Z	= 3.28 (P =	0.001)				F	avours experimental Favours control
В	Experime	ental	Contro	bl		Odds Ratio	Odds Batio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight I	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	M-H, Random, 95% CI
Mojtahedi et al.,2012a	26	175	36	200	30.3%	0.79 (0.46, 1.38)	
Mojtahedi et al.,2012b	6	25	36	200	21.7%	1.44 [0.54, 3.86]	
Savabkar et al.,2013	6	122	7	166	19.5%	1.17 [0.38, 3.59]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Yousefi et al.,2013	35	80	22	110	28.5%	3.11 [1.64, 5.92]	
Total (95% CI)		402	0.962556	676	100.0%	1.44 [0.70, 2.94]	-
Total events	73	20220702	101	27-5-25 - 14	1.1.29931		
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.3	$36; Chi^2 = 1$	0.07, df	= 3 (P =	0.02); P	<sup>e</sup> = 70%		0.01 0.1 1 10 100
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 1.00 (P =	0.32)					Favours experimental Favours control
С	Experim	ental	Cont	rol		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
C Study or Subgroup	Experim Events	ental Total	Cont Events	rol Total	Weight	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
C Study or Subgroup Mojtahedi et al.,2012a	Experim Events 26	ental <u>Total</u> 73	Contr Events 36	rol <u>Total</u> 111	Weight 50.5%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Fixed, 95% CI</u> 1.15 [0.62, 2.15]	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
C Study or Subgroup Mojtahedi et al.,2012a Mojtahedi et al.,2012b	Experim Events 26 6	ental <u>Total</u> 73 18	Contr Events 36 36	rol <u>Total</u> 111 111	Weight 50.5% 18.4%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.15 [0.62, 2.15] 1.04 [0.36, 3.00]	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
C Study or Subgroup Mojtahedi et al.,2012a Mojtahedi et al.,2012b Savabkar et al.,2013	Experim Events 26 6 6	ental <u>Total</u> 73 18 56	Contr Events 36 36 7	rol <u>Total</u> 111 111 96	Weight 50.5% 18.4% 12.6%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Fixed, 95% CI</u> 1.15 [0.62, 2.15] 1.04 [0.36, 3.00] 1.53 [0.49, 4.79]	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
C Study or Subgroup Mojtahedi et al.,2012a Mojtahedi et al.,2012b Savabkar et al.,2013 Yousefi et al.,2013	Experim Events 26 6 6 35	ental Total 73 18 56 53	Contr Events 36 36 7 22	rol <u>Total</u> 111 111 96 65	Weight 50.5% 18.4% 12.6% 18.4%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.15 [0.62, 2.15] 1.04 [0.36, 3.00] 1.53 [0.49, 4.79] 3.80 [1.77, 8.18]	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
C Study or Subgroup Mojtahedi et al.,2012a Mojtahedi et al.,2012b Savabkar et al.,2013 Yousefi et al.,2013	Experim Events 26 6 6 35	ental Total 73 18 56 53	Contr Events 36 36 7 22	rol <u>Total</u> 111 111 96 65	Weight 50.5% 18.4% 12.6% 18.4%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Fixed, 95% CI</u> 1.15 [0.62, 2.15] 1.04 [0.36, 3.00] 1.53 [0.49, 4.79] 3.80 [1.77, 8.18]	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
C Study or Subgroup Mojtahedi et al.,2012a Mojtahedi et al.,2012b Savabkar et al.,2013 Yousefi et al.,2013 Total (95% CI)	Experim Events 26 6 6 35	ental Total 73 18 56 53 200	Contr Events 36 36 7 22	rol <u>Total</u> 111 111 96 65 383	Weight 50.5% 18.4% 12.6% 18.4% 100.0%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.15 [0.62, 2.15] 1.04 [0.36, 3.00] 1.53 [0.49, 4.79] 3.80 [1.77, 8.18] 1.67 [1.12, 2.49]	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
C Study or Subgroup Mojtahedi et al.,2012a Mojtahedi et al.,2012b Savabkar et al.,2013 Yousefi et al.,2013 Total (95% CI) Total events	Experim Events 26 6 6 35 73	ental Total 73 18 56 53 200	Contr Events 36 36 7 22 101	rol <u>Total</u> 111 111 96 65 383	Weight 50.5% 18.4% 12.6% 18.4% 100.0%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.15 [0.62, 2.15] 1.04 [0.36, 3.00] 1.53 [0.49, 4.79] 3.80 [1.77, 8.18] 1.67 [1.12, 2.49]	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
C Study or Subgroup Mojtahedi et al.,2012a Mojtahedi et al.,2012b Savabkar et al.,2013 Yousefi et al.,2013 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 6.	Experim Events 26 6 35 35 73 58, df = 3 (	ental <u>Total</u> 73 18 56 53 <b>200</b> P = 0.09	Contr Events 36 36 7 22 101 ); I <sup>2</sup> = 54	rol <u>Total</u> 111 111 96 65 383	Weight 50.5% 18.4% 12.6% 18.4% 100.0%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.15 [0.62, 2.15] 1.04 [0.36, 3.00] 1.53 [0.49, 4.79] 3.80 [1.77, 8.18] 1.67 [1.12, 2.49]	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
C Study or Subgroup Mojtahedi et al.,2012a Mojtahedi et al.,2012b Savabkar et al.,2013 Yousefi et al.,2013 Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 6. Test for overall effect: Z	Experim 26 6 35 73 58, df = 3 ( = 2.51 (P =	ental <u>Total</u> 73 18 56 53 <b>200</b> P = 0.09 0.01)	Contr <u>Events</u> 36 36 7 22 101 ); I <sup>2</sup> = 54	rol <u>Total</u> 111 111 96 65 383	Weight 50.5% 18.4% 12.6% 18.4% 100.0%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.15 [0.62, 2.15] 1.04 [0.36, 3.00] 1.53 [0.49, 4.79] 3.80 [1.77, 8.18] 1.67 [1.12, 2.49] F	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
C Study or Subgroup Mojtahedi et al.,2012a Mojtahedi et al.,2012b Savabkar et al.,2013 Yousefi et al.,2013 Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 6. Test for overall effect: Z =	Experim Events 26 6 6 35 73 58, df = 3 ( = 2.51 (P = Experim	ental <u>Total</u> 73 18 56 53 <b>200</b> P = 0.09 0.01) ental	Contri <u>Events</u> 36 36 7 22 101 ); I <sup>2</sup> = 54 Contri	rol <u>Total</u> 111 111 96 65 383 %	Weight 50.5% 18.4% 12.6% 18.4% 100.0%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Fixed, 95% CI</u> 1.15 [0.62, 2.15] 1.04 [0.36, 3.00] 1.53 [0.49, 4.79] 3.80 [1.77, 8.18] 1.67 [1.12, 2.49] F Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
C Study or Subgroup Mojtahedi et al.,2012a Mojtahedi et al.,2012b Savabkar et al.,2013 Yousefi et al.,2013 Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 6. Test for overall effect: Z : D Study or Subgroup	Experim Events 26 6 6 35 73 58, df = 3 ( = 2.51 (P = Experim Events	ental <u>Total</u> 73 18 56 53 <b>200</b> P = 0.09 0.01) ental Total	Contri <u>Events</u> 36 36 7 22 101 ); I <sup>2</sup> = 54 Contri Events	rol <u>Total</u> 111 111 96 65 383 % rol Total	Weight 50.5% 18.4% 12.6% 18.4% 100.0%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.15 [0.62, 2.15] 1.04 [0.36, 3.00] 1.53 [0.49, 4.79] 3.80 [1.77, 8.18] 1.67 [1.12, 2.49] F Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
C Study or Subgroup Mojtahedi et al.,2012a Mojtahedi et al.,2012b Savabkar et al.,2013 Yousefi et al.,2013 Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 6. Test for overall effect: Z: D Study or Subgroup Mojtahedi et al.,2012a	Experim Events 26 6 6 35 73 58, df = 3 ( = 2.51 (P = Experim Events 102	ental <u>Total</u> 18 56 53 200 P = 0.09 0.01) ental <u>Total</u> 149	Contr <u>Events</u> 36 36 7 22 101 ); I <sup>2</sup> = 54 <u>Contr</u> <u>Events</u> 89	rol <u>Total</u> 111 96 65 383 % rol <u>Total</u> 164	Weight 50.5% 18.4% 12.6% 18.4% 100.0% Weight 35.2%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.15 [0.62, 2.15] 1.04 [0.36, 3.00] 1.53 [0.49, 4.79] 3.80 [1.77, 8.18] 1.67 [1.12, 2.49] F Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.83 [1.15, 2.90]	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
C Study or Subgroup Mojtahedi et al.,2012a Mojtahedi et al.,2012b Savabkar et al.,2013 Yousefi et al.,2013 Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 6. Test for overall effect: Z = D Study or Subgroup Mojtahedi et al.,2012a Mojtahedi et al.,2012b	Experim Events 26 6 6 35 73 58, df = 3 ( = 2.51 (P = Experim Events 102 7	ental Total 73 18 56 53 200 P = 0.09 0.01) ental Total 149 19	Contr <u>Events</u> 36 36 7 22 101 ); I <sup>2</sup> = 54 <u>Contr</u> <u>Events</u> 89 89	rol <u>Total</u> 111 111 96 65 383 % rol <u>Total</u> 164 164	Weight 50.5% 18.4% 12.6% 18.4% 100.0% Weight 35.2% 15.4%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Fixed, 95% CI</u> 1.15 [0.62, 2.15] 1.04 [0.36, 3.00] 1.53 [0.49, 4.79] 3.80 [1.77, 8.18] <b>1.67 [1.12, 2.49]</b> F Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Fixed, 95% CI</u> 1.83 [1.15, 2.90] 0.49 [0.18, 1.31]	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 0.01 0.1 1 10 100 avours experimental Favours control Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
C Study or Subgroup Mojtahedi et al.,2012a Mojtahedi et al.,2012b Savabkar et al.,2013 Yousefi et al.,2013 Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 6. Test for overall effect: Z = D Study or Subgroup Mojtahedi et al.,2012a Mojtahedi et al.,2012b Savabkar et al.,2013	Experim Events 26 6 35 73 58, df = 3 ( = 2.51 (P = Experim Events 102 7 66	ental Total 73 18 56 53 200 P = 0.09 0.01) ental Total 19 116	Contr <u>Events</u> 36 36 7 22 101 ); I <sup>2</sup> = 54 <u>Contr</u> <u>Events</u> 89 89 70	rol <u>Total</u> 111 111 96 65 383 % rol <u>Total</u> 164 164 159	Weight 50.5% 18.4% 12.6% 18.4% 100.0% Weight 35.2% 15.4% 33.5%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Fixed, 95% CI</u> 1.15 [0.62, 2.15] 1.04 [0.36, 3.00] 1.53 [0.49, 4.79] 3.80 [1.77, 8.18] <b>1.67 [1.12, 2.49]</b> F Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Fixed, 95% CI</u> 1.83 [1.15, 2.90] 0.49 [0.18, 1.31] 1.68 [1.04, 2.72]	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 0.01 0.1 1 10 100 avours experimental Favours control Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
C Study or Subgroup Mojtahedi et al.,2012a Mojtahedi et al.,2012b Savabkar et al.,2013 Yousefi et al.,2013 Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 6. Test for overall effect: Z D Study or Subgroup Mojtahedi et al.,2012a Mojtahedi et al.,2012a Savabkar et al.,2013 Yousefi et al.,2013	Experim Events 26 6 35 73 58, df = 3 ( = 2.51 (P = Experim Events 102 7 66 27	ental Total 73 18 56 53 200 P = 0.09 0.01) ental Total 149 19 116 45	Contr <u>Events</u> 36 36 7 22 101 ); I <sup>2</sup> = 54 <u>Contr</u> <u>Events</u> 89 89 70 45	rol <u>Total</u> 111 96 65 383 % rol <u>Total</u> 164 159 88	Weight 50.5% 18.4% 12.6% 18.4% 100.0% Weight 35.2% 15.4% 33.5% 16.0%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.15 [0.62, 2.15] 1.04 [0.36, 3.00] 1.53 [0.49, 4.79] 3.80 [1.77, 8.18] 1.67 [1.12, 2.49] F Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.83 [1.15, 2.90] 0.49 [0.18, 1.31] 1.68 [1.04, 2.72] 1.43 [0.69, 2.97]	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 0.01 0.1 1 10 100 avours experimental Favours control Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 
C Study or Subgroup Mojtahedi et al.,2012a Mojtahedi et al.,2012b Savabkar et al.,2013 Yousefi et al.,2013 Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 6. Test for overall effect: Z D Study or Subgroup Mojtahedi et al.,2012a Mojtahedi et al.,2012a Mojtahedi et al.,2013 Yousefi et al.,2013	Experim Events 26 6 35 73 58, df = 3 ( = 2.51 (P = Experim Events 102 7 66 27	ental Total 73 18 56 53 200 P = 0.09 0.01) ental 149 19 116 45	Contri <u>Events</u> 36 36 7 22 101 ); I <sup>2</sup> = 54 <u>Events</u> 89 89 70 45	rol <u>Total</u> 111 96 65 383 % rol <u>Total</u> 164 159 88	Weight 50.5% 18.4% 12.6% 18.4% 100.0% Weight 35.2% 15.4% 33.5% 16.0%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Fixed, 95% C1</u> 1.15 [0.62, 2.15] 1.04 [0.36, 3.00] 1.53 [0.49, 4.79] 3.80 [1.77, 8.18] <b>1.67 [1.12, 2.49]</b> F Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Fixed, 95% C1</u> 1.83 [1.15, 2.90] 0.49 [0.18, 1.31] 1.68 [1.04, 2.72] 1.43 [0.69, 2.97]	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
C Study or Subgroup Mojtahedi et al.,2012a Mojtahedi et al.,2012b Savabkar et al.,2013 Yousefi et al.,2013 Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 6. Test for overall effect: Z D Study or Subgroup Mojtahedi et al.,2012a Mojtahedi et al.,2013 Yousefi et al.,2013 Yousefi et al.,2013	Experim Events 26 6 35 73 58, df = 3 ( = 2.51 (P = Experim Events 102 7 66 27	ental Total 73 18 56 53 200 P = 0.09 0.01) ental Total 149 19 116 45 329	Contri <u>Events</u> 36 36 7 22 101 ); I <sup>2</sup> = 54 <u>Contri Events</u> 89 89 70 45	rol <u>Total</u> 111 96 65 383 % rol <u>Total</u> 164 159 88 575	Weight 50.5% 18.4% 12.6% 18.4% 100.0% Weight 35.2% 15.4% 33.5% 16.0% 100.0%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.15 [0.62, 2.15] 1.04 [0.36, 3.00] 1.53 [0.49, 4.79] 3.80 [1.77, 8.18] 1.67 [1.12, 2.49] F Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.83 [1.15, 2.90] 0.49 [0.18, 1.31] 1.68 [1.04, 2.72] 1.43 [0.69, 2.97] 1.51 [1.13, 2.01]	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 0.01 0.1 1 10 100 avours experimental Favours control Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
C Study or Subgroup Mojtahedi et al.,2012a Mojtahedi et al.,2012b Savabkar et al.,2013 Yousefi et al.,2013 Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 6. Test for overall effect: Z D Study or Subgroup Mojtahedi et al.,2012a Mojtahedi et al.,2012a Mojtahedi et al.,2013 Yousefi et al.,2013 Yousefi et al.,2013	Experim Events 26 6 35 73 58, df = 3 ( = 2.51 (P = Experim Events 102 7 66 27 202	ental Total 73 18 56 53 200 P = 0.09 0.01) ental 149 19 116 45 329	Contr <u>Events</u> 36 36 7 22 101 ); I <sup>2</sup> = 54 <u>Contr</u> <u>Events</u> 89 89 70 45 293	rol <u>Total</u> 111 96 65 383 % rol <u>Total</u> 164 159 88 575	Weight 50.5% 18.4% 12.6% 18.4% 100.0% Weight 35.2% 15.4% 33.5% 16.0% 100.0%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.15 [0.62, 2.15] 1.04 [0.36, 3.00] 1.53 [0.49, 4.79] 3.80 [1.77, 8.18] 1.67 [1.12, 2.49] F Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.83 [1.15, 2.90] 0.49 [0.18, 1.31] 1.68 [1.04, 2.72] 1.43 [0.69, 2.97] 1.51 [1.13, 2.01]	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 0.01 0.1 1 10 100 avours experimental Favours control Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
C Study or Subgroup Mojtahedi et al.,2012a Mojtahedi et al.,2012b Savabkar et al.,2013 Yousefi et al.,2013 Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 6. Test for overall effect: Z D Study or Subgroup Mojtahedi et al.,2012a Mojtahedi et al.,2012a Mojtahedi et al.,2013 Yousefi et al.,2013 Yousefi et al.,2013 Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 5.	Experim Events 26 6 35 73 58, df = 3 ( = 2.51 (P = Experim Events 102 7 66 27 202 89, df = 3 (	ental Total 73 18 56 53 200 P = 0.09 0.01) ental 149 19 116 45 329 P = 0.12	Contri <u>Events</u> 36 36 7 22 101 ); I <sup>2</sup> = 54 <u>Contri Events</u> 89 89 70 45 293 ); I <sup>2</sup> = 49	rol <u>Total</u> 111 96 65 383 % rol <u>Total</u> 164 159 88 575 %	Weight 50.5% 18.4% 12.6% 18.4% 100.0% Weight 35.2% 15.4% 33.5% 16.0% 100.0%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.15 [0.62, 2.15] 1.04 [0.36, 3.00] 1.53 [0.49, 4.79] 3.80 [1.77, 8.18] 1.67 [1.12, 2.49] F Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.83 [1.15, 2.90] 0.49 [0.18, 1.31] 1.68 [1.04, 2.72] 1.43 [0.69, 2.97] 1.51 [1.13, 2.01]	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 0.01 0.1 1 10 100 avours experimental Favours control Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 0.01 0.1 1 10 100

Figure 2. The meta analysis of PD-1 gene polymorphism with digestive system tumor. A. CT+TT vs CC; B. CT+CC vs TT; C. TT vs CC; D. CT vs CC.

terms "programmed death-1", "PD-1", "polymorphism", "cancer", "tumor", "carcinoma" in the title and/or abstract were used. References cited in the retrieved articles were also searched for relevant titles.

#### Data extraction and quality assessment

Two investigators independently reviewed all potentially eligible studies and collected data. The discussion and consensus were considered if the there were discrepancies. The quality of all collected data was ranked in accordance with the score of the non-randomized controlled clinical trial quality evaluation standard.

#### Statistical methods

The all collected data were included into Review Manager software (5.2.2). Heterogeneity was evaluated by  $X^2$  and  $I^2$ . The dichotomous vari-

# PD-1 polymorphism and tumor risk



Figure 3. The meta analysis of PD-1 gene polymorphism with tumor specific occurring in woman. A. CT+TT vs CC; B. CT+CC vs TT; C. TT vs CC; D. CT vs CC.

ables was analyzed via estimation of odds ratios (OR) with 95% confidence interval (95% Cl). Heterogeneity was considered if the  $I^2$  statistic was >50% or P<0.05.

#### Results

#### Study characteristics

The characteristics of all included studies were summarized in **Table 1**. We collected the data from six studies [11-16], involving in a total of 1427 tumor patients and 1811 healthy control people. Two studies involved in colorectal cancer [14, 16], of which one study involved in rectal cancer [14], one research involved in gastric cancer [15], two papers involved in breast cancer [12, 13], and one article involved in gestational trophoblastic neoplasms [11]. Five studies were from Iran [11, 13-16], only on from China [13]. More detail can be found in **Table 1**.

## No association of PD-1 gene polymorphism with tumor risk

As shown in **Figure 1**, the meta analysis results shown that there was no association of PD-1 gene polymorphism with tumor risk under four genetic models. (CT+TT vs CC, OR=1.09, 95% CI=0.80-1.49, P=0.59; CT+CC vs TT, OR=0.93, 95% CI=0.52-1.66, P=0.61; TT vs CC, OR=0.99, 95% CI=0.57-1.72, P=0.97; CT vs CC, OR=1.16, 95% CI=0.80-1.70, P=0.43).

## Sub-group analysis

We further explored potential causes of the PD-1 gene polymorphism with different tumors. As shown in **Figure 2**, there were a significantly difference on association of PD-1 gene polymorphism with digestive system tumor risk between tumor patients and healthy control people, except recessive model. (CT+TT vs CC, OR=1.57, 95% CI=1.20-2.07, P=0.001; TT vs CC, OR=1.67, 95% CI=1.12-2.49, P=0.01; CT vs CC, OR=1.51, 95% CI=1.13-2.01, P=0.005).

For the tumor occurring only in women, the meta analysis results shown that there were association of PD-1 gene polymorphism with tumor risk under two models. (CT+TT vs CC, OR=0.80, 95% Cl=0.67-0.95, P=0.01; TT vs CC, OR=0.61, 95% Cl=0.44-0.83, P=0.002) However, the results under other two models indicated there were no correlation. (CT+CC vs TT, OR=0.57, 95% Cl=0.26-1.25, P=0.16; CT vs CC, OR=0.99, 95% Cl=0.61-1.62, P=0.98) (Figure 3).

## Discussion

In this meta analysis, the results shown that there were significantly difference on association of PD-1 rs2227981 gene polymorphism with special tumor type, including digestive system tumor and tumor occurring in woman under specific genetic models.

Human tumors have lots of genetic and epigenetic changes, which can produce some immune system-recognizing tumor antigens [17]. PD-1, liking CTLA-4, is a member of the B7-CD28 family and is potential therapeutic anticancer target based on its role of regulating T cell activation. PD-1 is a key immune-checkpoint receptor, which regulates immunosuppression by expression on activated T cell. Therefore, the PD-1 maybe a potential molecular target for tumor progression in tumors. The relative studies revealed that the association of CD28 and CTLA-4 gene polymorphisms with tumor risk is present [18-20]. Compared to the CTLA-4, the PD-1 is involve in the later of a T cell response in order to limit the T cell activity in the tumor microenvironment [21].

In our study, we demonstrated that PD-1 gene polymorphism rs2227981 is not relevant to total tumor types risk. So, we performed a subgroup analysis. The meta analysis results shown that an association of PD-1 gene polymorphism rs2227981 with digestive system tumors or tumors only occurring in woman under specific genetic models. Savabkar et al. [15] and Mojtahedi et al. [14] reported that significant association in CT genotype and gastric cancer and colon cancer risk. Similarly, other study demonstrated association of CT genotype of the PD-1 gene polymorphism and rheumatoid arthritis [22]. Moreover, PD-1 gene polymorphism CC genotype and C allele may play a potential risk in tumor specific occurring in woman, including breast cancer [13], which all are consistent with our results.

In here, five studies involved in Iran, only research is from China, which limited the meta analysis results. Moreover, other limitation in this meta analysis should be addressed. Firstly, a relatively small number of studies and sample size were included into this study, which may influence the statistical power of the analysis. Secondly, our meta analysis results were based on unadjusted estimates, while a more precise analysis could be conducted if individual data were available.

In conclusion, this study suggested that PD-1 gene polymorphism rs2227981 is associated with specific tumor types, including digestive system tumor and tumor specific occurring in woman. However, more studies needed to be included into this meta analysis.

## Disclosure of conflict of interest

None.

Address correspondence to: Umarjan Mamat, Department of Surgery, The Fourth Affiliated Chinese Medicine Hospital of Xinjiang Medical University, 116<sup>#</sup> Huanghe Road, Urumchi, Xinjiang Uygur-Autonomous Region, China. Tel: +86-991-8080808; Fax: +86-991-8080808; E-mail: umarjanm@163. com

## References

- [1] Fan X, Yu K, Wu J, Shao J, Zhu L, Zhang J. Correlation between squamous cell carcinoma of the lung and human papillomavirus infection and the relationship to expression of p53 and p16. Tumour Biol 2015; 36: 3043-9.
- [2] Kukulj S, Popović F, Budimir B, Drpa G, Serdarević M, Polić-Vižintin M. Smoking behav-

iors and lung cancer epidemiology: a cohort study. Psychiatr Danub 2014; 26: 485-9.

- [3] Romani C, Calza S, Todeschini P, Tassi RA, Zanotti L, Bandiera E, Sartori E, Pecorelli S, Ravaggi A, Santin AD, Bignotti E. Identification of optimal reference genes for gene expression normalization in a wide cohort of endometrioid endometrial carcinoma tissues. PLoS One 2014; 9: e113781.
- [4] Sharpe AH, Wherry EJ, Ahmed R, Freeman GJ. The function of programmed cell death 1 and its ligands in regulating autoimmunity and infection. Nat Immunol 2007; 8: 239-45.
- [5] Shindo Y, Yoshimura K, Kuramasu A, Watanabe Y, Ito H, Kondo T, Oga A, Ito H, Yoshino S, Hazama S, Tamada K, Yagita H, Oka M. Combination Immunotherapy with 4-1BB Activation and PD-1 Blockade Enhances Antitumor Efficacy in a Mouse Model of Subcutaneous Tumor. Anticancer Res 2015; 35: 129-36.
- [6] Nishimura H, Nose M, Hiai H, Minato N, Honjo T. Development of lupus-like autoimmune diseases by disruption of the PD-1 gene encoding an ITIM motif-carrying immunoreceptor. Immunity 199; 11: 141-51.
- [7] Prokunina L, Castillejo-López C, Oberg F, Gunnarsson I, Berg L, Magnusson V, Brookes AJ, Tentler D, Kristjansdóttir H, Gröndal G, Bolstad AI, Svenungsson E, Lundberg I, Sturfelt G, Jönssen A, Truedsson L, Lima G, Alcocer-Varela J, Jonsson R, Gyllensten UB. A regulatory polymorphism in PDCD1 is associated with susceptibility to systemic lupus erythematosus in humans. Nat Genet 2002; 32: 666-9.
- [8] Liu C, Jiang J, Gao L, Hu X, Wang F, Shen Y, Yu G, Zhao Z, Zhang X. A Promoter Region Polymorphism in PDCD-1 Gene Is Associated with Risk of Rheumatoid Arthritis in the Han Chinese Population of Southeastern China. Int J Genomics 2014; 2014: 247637.
- [9] Pizarro C, García-Díaz DF, Codner E, Salas-Pérez F, Carrasco E, Pérez-Bravo F. PD-L1 gene polymorphisms and low serum level of PD-L1 protein are associated to type 1 diabetes in Chile. Diabetes Metab Res Rev 2014; 30: 761-6.
- [10] Yang M, Zou Y, Bai Y, Li M. The programmed cell death 1 gene polymorphisms (PD 1.3 G/A, PD 1.5 C/T and PD 1.9 C/T) and susceptibility to ankylosing spondylitis: a meta-analysis. J Orthop Sci 2015; 20: 55-63.
- [11] Dehaghani AS, Kashef MA, Ghaemenia M, Sarraf Z, Khaghanzadeh N, Fattahi MJ, Ghaderi A. PDCD1, CTLA-4 and p53 gene polymorphism and susceptibility to gestational trophoblastic diseases. J Reprod Med 2009; 54: 25-31.

- [12] Haghshenas MR, Naeimi S, Talei A, Ghaderi A, Erfani N. Program death 1 (PD1) haplotyping in patients with breast carcinoma. Mol Biol Rep 2011; 38: 4205-10.
- [13] Hua Z, Li D, Xiang G, Xu F, Jie G, Fu Z, Jie Z, Da P, Li D. PD-1 polymorphisms are associated with sporadic breast cancer in Chinese Han population of Northeast China. Breast Cancer Res Treat 2011; 129: 195-201.
- [14] Mojtahedi Z, Mohmedi M, Rahimifar S, Erfani N, Hosseini SV, Ghaderi A. Programmed death-1 gene polymorphism (PD-1.5 C/T) is associated with colon cancer. Gene 2012; 508: 229-32.
- [15] Savabkar S, Azimzadeh P, Chaleshi V, Nazemalhosseini Mojarad E, Aghdaei HA. Programmed death-1 gene polymorphism (PD-1.5 C/T) is associated with gastric cancer. Gastroenterol Hepatol Bed Bench 2013; 6: 178-82.
- [16] Yousefi AR, Karimi MH, Shamsdin SA. PD-1 gene polymorphism in iranian patients with colorectal cancer. Lab Medicine 2013; 44: 23-6.
- [17] Chittenden TW, Howe EA, Culhane AC, Sultana R, Taylor JM, Holmes C, Quackenbush J. Functional classification analysis of somatically mutated genes in human breast and colorectal cancers. Genomics 2008; 91: 508-11.
- [18] Baek J, Lee H, Hwang KW, Kim E, Min H. The association of CD28 polymorphism, rs311-6496, with Cancer: A meta-analysis. Comput Biol Med 2015; 61: 172-7.
- [19] Gao X, Zhang S, Qiao X, Yao Y, Wang L, Dong D, Ma X, Wang T. Association of cytotoxic T lymphocyte antigen-4 +49A/G polymorphism and cancer risk: An updated meta-analysis. Cancer Biomark 2014; 14: 287-94.
- [20] Lee YH, Song GG. A meta-analysis of the association between CTLA-4 +49 A/G, -318 C/T, and IL-1 polymorphisms and susceptibility to cervical cancer. Neoplasma 2014; 61: 481-90.
- [21] Fife BT and Bluestone JA. Control of peripheral T-cell torelance and autoimmunity via the CTLA-4 and PD-1 pathways. Immunol Rev 2008; 224: 166-82.
- [22] Lin SC, Yen JH, Tsai JJ, Tsai WC, Ou TT, Liu HW, Chen CJ. Association of a programmed death 1 gene polymorphism with the development of rheumatoid arthritis, but not systemic lupus erythematosus. Arthritis Rheum 2004; 50: 770-5.