# Original Article A systematic review and meta-analysis of 4 candidate polymorphisms with the risk of gout

Yong Chen<sup>1</sup>, Ying Ying<sup>1,2</sup>, Shanfen Shi<sup>3</sup>, Liangda Li<sup>3</sup>, Yi Huang<sup>4</sup>, Huadan Ye<sup>2</sup>, Qiongyao Gong<sup>1,2</sup>, Haiyan Huang<sup>1,2</sup>, Huihui Ji<sup>2</sup>, Tao Huang<sup>2</sup>, Shiwei Duan<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Rheumatology, Ningbo No. 2 Hospital, Ningbo 315010, Zhejiang, China; <sup>2</sup>Medical Genetics Center, School of Medicine, Ningbo University, Ningbo 315211, Zhejiang, China; <sup>3</sup>Department of Rheumatology, Yinzhou People's Hospital, Ningbo 315010, Zhejiang, China; <sup>4</sup>Department of Neurosurgery, Ningbo First Hospital, Ningbo Hospital of Zhejiang University, Ningbo 315010, Zhejiang, China

Received December 24, 2015; Accepted May 18, 2016; Epub August 15, 2016; Published August 30, 2016

**Abstract:** The purpose of this research was to assess the contribution of 4 genetic polymorphisms to the risk of gout. A systematic search was performed for qualified case-control studies on 4 variants with gout among PubMed, EMBASE, CNKI and China Wanfang literature databases. Using the REVMAN software, odds ratios (ORs) with 95% confidence intervals (Cls) were calculated to evaluate the contribution of the 4 genetic variants to gout. We harvested a total of 19 studies among 6,797 cases and 15,904 controls for the current meta-analyses. Our results showed that *ABCG2* rs2231142 (OR = 2.13, 95% Cl = 1.81-2.50, P < 0.00001), *SLC2A9* rs3733591 (OR = 0.78, 95% Cl = 0.67-0.91, P = 0.002), *SLC2A9* rs16890979 (OR = 0.33, 95% Cl = 0.18-0.58, P = 0.0002), and *SLC2A9* rs6855911 (OR = 0.66, 95% Cl = 0.56-0.77, P < 0.00001) were significantly associated with the risk of gout. Our results showed four genetic variants (including *ABCG2* rs2231142, *SLC2A9* rs3733591, rs16890979 and rs6855911) were significantly associated with gout.

Keywords: Gout, ABCG2, SLC2A9, meta-analysis, polymorphism

#### Introduction

Gout is a common disease based on hyperuricemia, which is caused by urate crystals deposited in synovial fluid and adjacent connective tissues [1]. The typical clinical manifestations of gout are comprised of a high level of serum urate, crystal inflammatory arthritis, unbearable pain tophi, uric acid urolithiasis and uric acid nephrolithiasis [2]. Gout is known to be caused by unhealthy life-styles and dietary habits, such as excessive alcohol drinking and a surfeit of seafood consumption [3].

The incidence of gout and hyperuricemia was increasing recently in the world. Domestic survey in 1980s showed that the prevalence rate of hyperuricemia was 1.3% to 1.4% [4], and it rose to 12.5% for hyperuricemia and 1.93% for gout in 2006 [5]. Family members of gout patients have an increased risk of asymptomatic hyperuricaemia, and gout is often seen in the middle-aged men to elderly men and postmenopausal women [6].

Genome-wide association studies have identified numerous genetic loci associated with gout, and those genetic loci may help provide a cost-effective and personalized gout treatment in clinic [7]. Meanwhile, case-control studies have also identified gene polymorphisms associated with gout [8, 9]; however, other literatures have found opposite results [10, 11]. The discrepancies in the association results may be due to various ethnic populations or the limited detection power in association tests the moderate sample size [12, 13]. Meta-analysis is able to combine the data from various studies and overcome the limitation in the case-control study with moderate sample size. Here, the goal of our meta-analyses is to establish the association of four genetic variants with gout.

#### Materials and methods

#### Literature search

Our literature search was conducted among electronic databases including PubMed, EM-



BASE, CNKI and China Wanfang literature databases. The search terms in the PubMed and EMBASE were "gout", "podagra", "arthrolithiasis", "uarthritis", "crystal arthritis", "crystal arthropathy", or "tophus" combined with "polymorphism", "allete", "genotype", "variant", or "SNP". And the equivalent Chinese terms were also used to search for related publications in CNKI and China Wanfang literature databases.

# Data extraction and quality assessment

Publications were excluded if they didn't have genotyping or allelic data or odds ratio (OR) to infer the combined statistics in the meta-analysis. We focused on four genetic variants with at least three independent genotypic datasets. The details (the name of first author, publication year, country, and genotype) for the data extraction were described previously [14-17]. In addition, the risk-of-bias in the included studies was also assessed with the Review Manager software (version 5.2, Cochrane Collaboration, Oxford, United Kingdom) by using the logistic regression with odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (95% CIs). Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium (HWE) was analyzed by the chisquare test.

# Statistical analysis

All the statistical analyses were performed using the Review Manager software (version 5.2, Cochrane Collaboration, Oxford, United Kingdom). Heterogeneity of the metaanalyses was measured by using Cochran's Q statistic and the inconsistency index  $(I^2)$ .  $I^2 \ge 50\%$  indicated a significant heterogeneity among the studies in the meta-analyses. Random-effect model was used in the meta-analysis with large heterogeneity: otherwise the fixed-effect model was used instead. A twosided P < 0.05 was considered as significant. Funnel plot was used to judge whether publication bias existed in the meta-analysis.

## Results

# Characteristics of the involved studies

Our initial search for the eligible studies retrieved 1018 articles from PubMed, EMBASE, CNKI and China Wanfang literature databases updated through December, 2015. Among them, we discarded 122 duplicate studies, 722 studies with irrelevant titles and abstracts, 131 studies lacking of genotyping data. Among the remaining articles, we further discarded 19 studies with less than three independent genotypic datasets for the same genetic variants, and 5 studies with duplicate data. Finally, 19 studies (including 14 English and 5 Chinese articles) involving with 6,797 cases and 15,904 controls were included in the current metaanalyses (**Figure 1**).

A total of four variants on two genes were eligible for the present meta-analyses. These variants comprised *ABCG2* rs2231142 and *SLC-2A9* rs3733591, rs16890979, and rs6855911. A Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium (HWE) test showed that the genotype distribution in healthy controls didn't meet HWE (P = 0.003 and 0.025, **Table 1**) for *ABCG2* rs2231142 [18] and *SLC2A9* rs6855911 [19] in two studies,

SNP	Year	Author	Ethnic Group	Case/ Control	Genotype (Case/Control)			p (HWE)	Allele (Case/Control)	
ABCG	62 rs22	31142			CC	CA	AA		С	А
	2009	Matsuo	Japanese	159/865	41/462	87/316	31/87	0.003	169/1240	149/490
	2009	Stark	German	677/1552	500/1241	168/299	9/12	0.191	1168/2781	186/323
	2010	BB Wang	Chinese	200/235	64/103	91/112	45/20	0.172	219/318	181/152
	2010	P Green (a)	Maori	178/212	142/172	34/39	2/1	0.440	318/383	38/41
	2010	P Green (b)	Pacific Islander	173/109	58/69	78/36	37/4	0.793	194/174	152/44
	2010	P Green (c)	Caucasian	211/558	122/425	76/125	13/8	0.728	320/975	102/141
	2010	P Green (d) Eastern P		201/210	160/173	39/36	2/1	0.547	359/382	43/38
	2010	P Green (e) Western P		129/71	29/36	66/31	34/4	0.419	124/103	134/39
	2010	Yamagishi	Yamagishi Japanese		15/1767	18/1556	12/354	0.670	48/5090	42/2264
	2012	DS Ye	Chinese	102/102	23/53	42/40	37/9	0.713	88/146	116/58
	2012	XJ Zhang	Chinese	110/236	35/120	55/96	20/20	0.897	125/336	95/136
	2013	3 YQ You Chinese 4 DQ Zhou Chinese		154/160	48/98	78/49	28/13	0.064	174/245	134/75
	2014			352/350	87/167	181/150	84/33	0.935	355/484	349/216
	2014	Q Wang	Chinese	185/311	64/157	86/126	35/28	0.707	214/440	156/182
	2014	XL Zhang	XL Zhang Chinese		30/167	79/134	38/20	0.312	139/468	155/174
	2015	015 W Wan Chinese		97/101	22/54	49/38	26/9	0.539	93/146	101/56
	2015	YS Kim	Korean	109/102	26/53	51/44	32/5	0.275	103/150	115/54
SLC2A9 rs3733591					CC	CT	TT		С	Т
	2010	Urano	Japanese	178/576	27/56	93/252	58/268	0.771	147/364	209/788
	2010	HP Tu (a)	Chinese	38/191	NA	NA	NA	NA	37/121	39/261
	2010	HP Tu (b)	Solomom Islander	23/113	NA	NA	NA	NA	27/90	19/136
	2011	Moffatt (a)	Maori	202/328	101/164	83/138	18/26	0.684	285/466	119/190
	2011	Moffatt (b)	E Polynesian	232/334	119/169	92/139	21/26	0.726	330/477	134/191
	2011	Moffatt (c)	W Polynesian	172/138	39/33	88/57	45/48	0.054	166/123	178/153
	2011	Moffatt (d)	Caucasian	313/636	217/417	87/196	9/23	0.996	521/1030	105/242
	2012	M Li	Chinese	297/211	47/21	138/88	112/102	0.753	232/130	362/292
	2015 W Wan Chinese		97/100	12/9	49/46	36/45	0.569	73/64	121/136	
SLC2	A9 rs16	6890979			CC	СТ	TT		С	Т
2009 Moffatt (a)		Moffatt (a)	Maori	55/117	53/83	2/30	0/4	0.534	108/196	2/38
	2009	Moffatt (b)	Pacific Islander	68/40	68/35	0/5	0/0	0.673	136/75	0/5
	2009	Moffatt (c)	Caucasian	131/551	103/338	24/183	4/30	0.427	230/859	32/243
	2010	Urano	Japanese	180/591	178/580	2/11	0/0	0.819	358/1171	2/11
	2012	YQ You	Chinese	154/160	102/43	42/69	10/48	0.084	246/155	62/165
	2012	M Li	Chinese	297/211	293/204	4/7	0/0	0.806	590/415	4/7
	2015	YS Kim	Korean	109/102	0/0	0/2	109/100	0.920	0/2	218/202
SLC2A9 rs6855911					AA	AG	GG		А	G
	2009	Stark	German	677/1546	429/829	233/603	15/114	0.763	1091/2261	263/831
	2010	Urano	Japanese	179/581	177/570	2/11	0/0	0.818	356/1151	2/11
	2011	M Guan	Chinese	166/206	160/197	6/9	0/0	0.749	326/403	6/9
	2012	DS Ye	Chinese	102/102	101/65	1/37	0/0	0.025	203/167	1/37

Table 1. The detailed information of the enrolled studies in the meta-analysis\*

\*: NA stands for not available.

and thus the two studies were not included in the follow-up meta-analyses.

As shown in **Figure 2**, there was significant heterogeneity for *ABCG2* rs2231142 ( $I^2 = 72\%$ ), *SLC2A9* rs3733591 ( $I^2 = 53\%$ ) and rs16890-

979 ( $l^2 = 62\%$ ). No heterogeneity was observed for *SLC2A9* rs6855911 ( $l^2 = 0\%$ , **Figure 2**). Thus, a random-effect model was applied for the meta-analyses of *ABCG2* rs2231142, *SLC2A9* rs3733591 and rs16890979, and a fixed-effect model was applied for the meta-

	Cas	е	Cont	rol		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
ABCG2 rs2231142								
Asian								
BB Wang 2009	181	400	152	470	7.0%	1 73 [1 31 2 28]		
DQ Zhou 2014	349	704	216	700	7.6%	2.20 [1.77, 2.74]	-	
DS Ye 2012	116	204	58	204	5.6%	3.32 [2.20, 5.01]		
Q Wang 2014	156	370	182	622	7.1%	1.76 [1.35, 2.31]	-	
W Wan 2015	101	194	56	202	5.6%	2.83 [1.87, 4.30]		
XJ Zhang 2012	95	220	136	472	6.4%	1.88 [1.35, 2.62]	-	
XL Zhang 2014	155	294	174	642	6.9%	3.00 [2.25, 4.00]		
Yamagishi 2010	42	90	2264	7354	5.6%	1.97 [1.30, ∠.99]		
YQ You 2013	134	308	75	320	6.3%	2.52 [1.79, 3.55]		
YS Kim 2015	115	218	54	204	5.6%	3.10 [2.06, 4.67]		
Subtotal (95% CI)		3002		11190	63.8%	2.31 [1.99, 2.69]	•	
l otal events	1444	2 40	3367	0 00	0. 17 - 54	~		
Heterogeneity: Tau* =	0.03; Ch	r= 19.4	43, at = 9	(P = 0.0	2); 1 = 54	20		
rest for overall effect.	2 = 10.88	(P < 0.	00001)					
non-Asian								
P Green (a) 2010	38	356	41	474	5 1 %	1 1 2 10 70 1 781	_ <b>_</b>	
P Green (c) 2010	152	346	44	218	5.8%	3 10 [2 09 4 59]		
P Green (d) 2010	102	422	141	1116	6.9%	2 20 [1 66, 2 93]	-	
P Green (e) 2010	43	402	38	420	5.1%	1.20 [0.76, 1.91]		
PGreen (b) 2010	134	258	39	142	5.3%	2.85 [1.83, 4.44]		
Stark 2009	186	1354	323	3104	7.9%	1.37 [1.13, 1.66]	+	
Subtotal (95% CI)		3138		5424	36.2%	1.82 [1.31, 2.53]	◆	
Total events	655		626					
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.13; Chi	<sup>2</sup> = 27.5	51, df = 5	(P < 0.0	001); l² =	82%		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 3.55 (	(P = 0.0)	004)					
Total (95% CI)		6140		16614	100.0%	2.13 [1.81, 2.50]		
Total events	2099		3993			3.00		
Heterogeneity: Tau* =	0.08; Ch	1-= 28.0	JU, af = 1	5 (P < U	.00001);1	·= /4%		
Taskfor susuall offersk	7 0 00	0.00	00043				0.01 0.1 1 10 1	100
Test for overall effect:	Z = 9.22	(P < 0.0	0001)	1/0 - 0	20) 18 - 2	20.4%	Favours [case] Favours [control]	100
Test for overall effect: Test for subaroup diff	Z = 9.22 ( erences:	(P < 0.0 Chi² = 1	0001) I.65. df=	1 (P = 0	1.20). I² = 3	39.4%	Favours [case] Favours [control]	100
Test for overall effect: Test for subaroup diff	Z = 9.22 ( erences:	(P < 0.0 Chi² = 1	0001) I.65. df=	1 (P = 0	1.20). I² = 3	39.4%	Favours [case] Favours [control]	100
Test for overall effect: Test for suboroup diff	Z = 9.22 ( erences: Cas	(P < 0.0 Chi² = 1 e	0001) I.65. df= Contr	1 (P = 0	1.20). I² = 3	39.4% Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio	100
Test for overall effect: Test for suboroup diff Study or Subgroup	Z = 9.22 ( erences: Cas Events	(P < 0.0 Chi² = 1 e <u>Total</u>	0001) I.65. df= Contr Events	1 (P = 0 rol <u>Total</u>	1.20).  ² = 3 Weight	39.4% Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl	100
Test for overall effect: Test for subaroup diff <u>Study or Subgroup</u> SLC2A9 rs3733591	Z = 9.22 ( erences: Cas Events	(P < 0.0 Chi² = 1 e <u>Total</u>	0001) I.65. df= Contr <u>Events</u>	1 (P = 0 rol Total	1.20).  ² = 3 Weight	39.4% Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% Cl</u>	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI	100
Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup diff <u>Study or Subgroup</u> SLC2A9 rs3733591 Asian	Z = 9.22 ( erences: Cas Events	(P < 0.0 Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1 e <u>Total</u>	0001) 1.65. df = Contr Events	1 (P = 0 rol <u>Total</u>	1.20). I² = 3 Weight	39.4% Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% CI</u>	UUN U.N N NUN Favours [case] Favours [control] Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% Cl</u>	100
Test for overall effect: Test for subaroup diff <u>Study or Subgroup</u> SLC2A9 rs3733591 Asian HP Tu(a) 2010	Z = 9.22 erences: Cas Events 39	(P < 0.0 Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1 e <u>Total</u> 76	0001) 1.65. df = Contr Events 261	1 (P = 0 rol <u>Total</u> 382	1.20). I <sup>2</sup> = 3 <u>Weight</u> 6.7%	39.4% Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% Cl</u> 0.49 (0.30, 0.80)	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl	100
Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup diff Study or Subgroup SLC2A9 rs3733591 Asian HP Tu(a) 2010 M Li 2012	Z = 9.22 ( erences: Cas Events 39 362	(P < 0.0 Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1 e <u>Total</u> 76 594	0001) 1.65. df = Contr Events 261 292	1 (P = 0 rol <u>Total</u> 382 422	0.20), I <sup>2</sup> = 3 <u>Weight</u> 6.7% 13.5%	39.4% Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% CI</u> 0.49 [0.30, 0.80] 0.69 [0.53, 0.90]	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup diff Study or Subgroup SLC2A9 rs3733591 Asian HP Tu(a) 2010 M Li 2012 Urano 2010	Z = 9.22 ( erences: <u>Cas</u> <u>Events</u> 39 362 209	(P < 0.0 Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1 e <u>Total</u> 76 594 356	0001) 1.65. df = Contr Events 261 292 788	1 (P = 0 rol <u>Total</u> 382 422 1152	0.20). I <sup>2</sup> = 3 <u>Weight</u> 6.7% 13.5% 14.3%	39.4% Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% CI</u> 0.49 [0.30, 0.80] 0.69 [0.53, 0.90] 0.66 [0.51, 0.84]	UUT U.T T TU Favours [case] Favours [control] Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% Cl</u>	
Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup diff Study or Subgroup SLC2A9 rs3733591 Asian HP Tu(a) 2010 M Li 2012 Urano 2010 W Wan 2015 Subtet J (05% CD)	Z = 9.22 ( erences: <u>Cas</u> <u>Events</u> 39 362 209 121	(P < 0.0 Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1 e <u>Total</u> 76 594 356 194	0001) I.65. df = <b>Contr</b> <u>Events</u> 261 292 788 136	1 (P = 0 rol <u>Total</u> 382 422 1152 2000	0.20). I <sup>2</sup> = 3 <u>Weight</u> 6.7% 13.5% 14.3% 8.5% 12.4%	39.4% Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.49 [0.30, 0.80] 0.69 [0.53, 0.90] 0.66 [0.51, 0.84] 0.78 [0.51, 1.18] 0.78 [0.51, 1.73]	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup diff SLC2A9 rs3733591 Asian HP Tu(a) 2010 M Li 2012 Urano 2010 W Wan 2015 Subtotal (95% CI)	Z = 9.22 ( erences: Cas <u>Events</u> 39 362 209 121	(P < 0.0 Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1 e <u>Total</u> 76 594 356 194 <b>1220</b>	0001) I.65. df = Contr Events 261 292 788 136	1 (P = 0 Total 382 422 1152 200 <b>2156</b>	.20).  ² = 3 <u>Weight</u> 6.7% 13.5% 14.3% 8.5% 43.1%	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.49 (0.30, 0.80) 0.69 (0.53, 0.90) 0.66 (0.51, 0.84) 0.78 (0.51, 1.18) 0.67 (0.57, 0.78]	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup diff SLC2A9 rs3733591 Asian HP Tu(a) 2010 M Li 2012 Urano 2010 W Wan 2015 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events	Z = 9.22 ( erences: Cas Events 39 362 209 121 731	(P < 0.0 Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1 e <u>Total</u> 76 594 356 194 <b>1220</b>	0001) I.65. df = Contr Events 261 292 788 136 1477 5. df = 2	1 (P = 0 rol <u>Total</u> 382 422 1152 200 <b>2156</b> P = 0.6	6.7% 6.7% 13.5% 14.3% 8.5% 43.1%	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.49 (0.30, 0.80) 0.69 (0.53, 0.90) 0.66 (0.51, 0.84) 0.78 (0.51, 1.18) 0.67 (0.57, 0.78]	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup diff SLC2A9 rs3733591 Asian HP Tu(a) 2010 M Li 2012 Urano 2010 W Wan 2015 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect	Z = 9.22 ( erences: Cas Events 39 362 209 121 731 :0.00; Ch 7 = 5.09	(P < 0.0 Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1 e <u>Total</u> 594 356 194 <b>1220</b> i <sup>2</sup> = 2.1 (P < 0.0	0001) I.65. df= Contri Events 261 292 788 136 1477 5, df = 3 ( 00001)	1 (P = 0 Total 382 422 1152 200 2156 (P = 0.5-	6.7% 6.7% 13.5% 14.3% 8.5% 43.1%	39.4% Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% CI</u> 0.49 [0.30, 0.80] 0.69 [0.53, 0.90] 0.66 [0.51, 0.84] 0.78 [0.51, 1.18] 0.67 [0.57, 0.78]	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup diff SLC2A9 rs3733591 Asian HP Tu(a) 2010 M Li 2012 Urano 2010 W Wan 2015 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect:	Z = 9.22 ( erences: Cas Events 39 362 209 121 731 0.00; Ch Z = 5.08	(P < 0.0 Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1 e <u>Total</u> 594 356 194 <b>1220</b> i <sup>2</sup> = 2.1 (P < 0.0	0001) I.65. df= Contr Events 261 292 788 136 1477 5. df= 3 ( 00001)	1 (P = 0 Total 382 422 1152 200 2156 (P = 0.5-	6.7% 6.7% 13.5% 14.3% 8.5% 4 <b>3.1</b> %	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.49 (0.30, 0.80) 0.69 (0.53, 0.90) 0.66 (0.51, 0.84) 0.78 (0.51, 1.18) 0.67 (0.57, 0.78]	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup diff SLC2A9 rs3733591 Asian HP Tu(a) 2010 M Li 2012 Urano 2010 W Wan 2015 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: non-Asian	Z = 9.22 ( erences: Cas Events 39 362 209 121 731 0.00; Ch Z = 5.08	(P < 0.0 Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1 e <u>Total</u> 594 356 194 <b>1220</b> i <sup>2</sup> = 2.1 (P < 0.0	0001) I.65. df= Contri Events 261 292 788 136 1477 5. df= 3 ( 00001)	1 (P = 0 Total 382 422 1152 200 2156 (P = 0.5)	.20).  ² = 3 <u>Weight</u> 6.7% 13.5% 14.3% 8.5% 43.1% 4);  ² = 0%	39.4% Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% CI</u> 0.49 (0.30, 0.80) 0.69 (0.53, 0.90) 0.66 (0.51, 0.84) 0.78 (0.51, 1.18) 0.67 <b>[0.57, 0.78]</b>	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup diff SLC2A9 rs3733591 Asian HP Tu(a) 2010 M Li 2012 Urano 2010 W Wan 2015 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: non-Asian HP Tu(b) 2010	Z = 9.22 ( erences: Cas Events 39 362 209 121 731 0.00; Ch Z = 5.08	(P < 0.0 Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1 e <u>Total</u> 76 594 356 194 <b>1220</b> i <sup>2</sup> = 2.1 (P < 0.0	0001) I.65. df= Contr Events 261 292 788 136 1477 5. df=3 ( 00001) 136	1 (P = 0 Total 382 422 1152 200 2156 (P = 0.5- 226	.20).  ² = 3 <u>Weight</u> 6.7% 13.5% 14.3% 8.5% 43.1% 4);  ² = 0% 4.6%	39.4% Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% CI</u> 0.49 (0.30, 0.80) 0.69 (0.53, 0.90) 0.66 (0.51, 0.84) 0.78 (0.51, 1.18) 0.67 (0.57, 0.78)	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup diff SLC2A9 rs3733591 Asian HP Tu(a) 2010 M Li 2012 Urano 2010 W Wan 2015 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: non-Asian HP Tu(b) 2010 Moffatt(a) 2011	Z = 9.22 ( erences: Cas Events 39 362 209 121 731 0.00; Ch Z = 5.08 19 119	(P < 0.0 Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1 e <u>Total</u> 76 594 356 194 <b>1220</b> i <sup>2</sup> = 2.1 (P < 0.0 46 404	0001) 1.65. df = <u>Conta</u> <u>Events</u> 261 292 788 136 1477 5. df = 3 ( 00001) 136 190	1 (P = 0 Total 382 422 1152 200 2156 (P = 0.5) 226 656	.20).  ² = 3 <u>Weight</u> 6.7% 13.5% 14.3% 8.5% 43.1% 4);  ² = 0% 4.6% 13.2%	39.4% Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.49 [0.30, 0.80] 0.69 [0.53, 0.90] 0.66 [0.51, 0.84] 0.78 [0.51, 1.18] 0.67 [0.57, 0.78] 0.47 [0.24, 0.89] 1.02 [0.78, 1.34]	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup diff SLC2A9 rs3733591 Asian HP Tu(a) 2010 M Li 2012 Urano 2010 W Wan 2015 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: non-Asian HP Tu(b) 2010 Moffatt(a) 2011	Z = 9.22 ( erences: Cas <u>Events</u> 39 362 209 121 731 0.00; Ch Z = 5.08 19 119 134	(P < 0.0 Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1 e <u>Total</u> 76 594 356 194 <b>1220</b> i <sup>2</sup> = 2.1 (P < 0.0 (P < 0.0 46 404 464	0001) 1.65. df = Contu Events 261 292 788 136 1477 5. df = 3 ( 00001) 136 190 191	1 (P = 0 Total 382 422 1152 200 2156 (P = 0.5) 226 656 668	.20).  ² = 3 <u>Weight</u> 6.7% 13.5% 14.3% 8.5% 43.1% 4);  ² = 0% 4.6% 13.2% 13.6%	39.4% Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.49 [0.30, 0.80] 0.69 [0.53, 0.90] 0.66 [0.51, 0.84] 0.78 [0.51, 1.18] 0.67 [0.57, 0.78] 0.67 [0.57, 0.78] 1.02 [0.78, 1.34] 1.01 [0.78, 1.32]	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup diff SLC2A9 rs3733591 Asian HP Tu(a) 2010 M Li 2012 Urano 2010 W Wan 2015 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: non-Asian HP Tu(b) 2010 Moffatt(a) 2011 Moffatt(b) 2011	Z = 9.22 ( erences: Cas <u>Events</u> 39 362 209 121 731 0.00; Ch Z = 5.08 19 119 134 174	(P < 0.0 Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1 e <u>Total</u> 356 194 <b>1220</b> i <sup>2</sup> = 2.1 (P < 0.0 404 464 464 344	0001) 1.65. df = Contu <u>Events</u> 261 292 788 136 1477 5. df = 3 ( 0001) 136 190 191 153	1 (P = 0 Total 382 422 1152 200 2156 (P = 0.5) 226 656 668 276	.20).  ² = 3 Weight 6.7% 13.5% 14.3% 8.5% 43.1% 4);  ² = 0% 4.6% 13.2% 13.6% 11.5%	39.4% Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.49 [0.30, 0.80] 0.69 [0.53, 0.90] 0.66 [0.51, 0.84] 0.78 [0.51, 1.18] 0.67 [0.57, 0.78] 0.67 [0.57, 0.78] 1.02 [0.78, 1.34] 1.01 [0.78, 1.32] 0.86 [0.63, 1.18]	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup diff SLC2A9 rs3733591 Asian HP Tu(a) 2010 M Li 2012 Urano 2010 W Wan 2015 Subtotal (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: non-Asian HP Tu(b) 2010 Moffatt(a) 2011 Moffatt(b) 2011 Moffatt(d) 2011	Z = 9.22 ( erences: Cas <u>Events</u> 39 362 209 121 731 0.00; Ch Z = 5.08 19 119 119 134 174 174 174	(P < 0.0 Chi <sup>≈</sup> = 1 e <u>Total</u> 356 194 1220 i <sup>≈</sup> = 2.1 (P < 0.0 (P < 0.0 404 464 344 626	0001) 1.65. df = Contu <u>Events</u> 261 292 788 136 1477 5. df = 3 ( 0001) 136 190 191 153 242	1 (P = 0 Total 382 422 1152 200 2156 (P = 0.5) 226 656 668 276 1272	.20).  ² = 3 Weight 6.7% 13.5% 14.3% 8.5% 43.1% 4);  ² = 0% 4.6% 13.2% 13.6% 11.5% 14.0%	39.4% Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.49 [0.30, 0.80] 0.69 [0.53, 0.90] 0.66 [0.51, 0.84] 0.78 [0.51, 1.18] 0.67 [0.57, 0.78] 0.67 [0.57, 0.78] 1.02 [0.78, 1.34] 1.01 [0.78, 1.32] 0.86 [0.63, 1.18] 0.86 [0.67, 1.10]	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup diff SLC2A9 rs3733591 Asian HP Tu(a) 2010 M Li 2012 Urano 2010 W Wan 2015 Subtotal (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: non-Asian HP Tu(b) 2010 Moffatt(a) 2011 Moffatt(b) 2011 Moffatt(c) 2011 Subtotal (95% Cl)	Z = 9.22 ( erences: Cas <u>Events</u> 39 362 209 121 731 0.00; Ch Z = 5.08 19 119 134 178 105	(P < 0.0 Chi <sup>≈</sup> = 1 e <u>Total</u> 356 194 1220 i <sup>≈</sup> = 2.1 (P < 0.0 404 464 344 626 1884	0001) 1.65. df = Contri <u>Events</u> 261 292 788 136 1477 5. df = 3 ( 0001) 136 190 191 153 242	1 (P = 0 Total 382 422 1152 200 2156 656 656 656 668 276 1272 3098	.20).  ² = 3 Weight 6.7% 13.5% 14.3% 8.5% 43.1% 43.1% 43.1% 13.2% 13.6% 11.5% 14.0% 56.9%	0dds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.49 [0.30, 0.80] 0.69 [0.53, 0.90] 0.66 [0.51, 0.84] 0.78 [0.51, 1.18] 0.67 [0.57, 0.78] 0.67 [0.57, 0.78] 1.02 [0.78, 1.34] 1.01 [0.78, 1.32] 0.86 [0.67, 1.10] 0.90 [0.76, 1.06]	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup SLC2A9 rs3733591 Asian HP Tu(a) 2010 M Li 2012 Urano 2010 W Wan 2015 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: non-Asian HP Tu(b) 2010 Moffatt(a) 2011 Moffatt(b) 2011 Moffatt(d) 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events	Z = 9.22 ( erences: Cas <u>Events</u> 39 362 209 121 731 0.00; Ch Z = 5.08 19 119 134 178 105 555	(P < 0.0 Chi <sup>≈</sup> = 1 e <u>Total</u> 356 194 1220 i <sup>≈</sup> = 2.1 (P < 0.0 (P < 0.0 46 404 464 344 626 <b>188</b> 4	0001) 1.65. df = Contri <u>Events</u> 261 292 788 136 1477 5. df = 3 ( 0001) 136 190 191 153 242 912	1 (P = 0 Total 382 422 1152 200 2156 656 656 656 668 276 1272 <b>3098</b>	.20).  ² = 3 Weight 6.7% 13.5% 14.3% 8.5% 43.1% 43.1% 43.1% 13.2% 13.6% 11.5% 14.0% 56.9%	39.4% Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.49 [0.30, 0.80] 0.69 [0.53, 0.90] 0.66 [0.51, 0.84] 0.78 [0.51, 1.18] 0.67 [0.57, 0.78] 1.02 [0.78, 1.34] 1.01 [0.78, 1.32] 0.86 [0.63, 1.18] 0.86 [0.67, 1.10] 0.90 [0.76, 1.06]	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup SLC2A9 rs3733591 Asian HP Tu(a) 2010 M Li 2012 Urano 2010 W Wan 2015 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: non-Asian HP Tu(b) 2010 Moffatt(a) 2011 Moffatt(b) 2011 Moffatt(c) 2011 Moffatt(d) 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	Z = 9.22 ( erences: Cas <u>Events</u> 39 362 209 121 731 0.00; Ch Z = 5.08 19 119 134 178 105 555 0.01; Ch	(P < 0.0 Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1 e <u>Total</u> 356 194 1220 i <sup>2</sup> = 2.1 (P < 0.0 404 464 344 626 <b>1884</b> i <sup>2</sup> = 5.8	0001) 1.65. df = Contri Events 261 292 788 136 1477 5. df = 3 ( 0001) 136 190 191 153 242 912 5. df = 4 (	1 (P = 0 Total 382 422 1152 200 2156 656 656 656 226 1272 3098 (P = 0.2'	.20).  ² = 3 Weight 6.7% 13.5% 14.3% 8.5% 43.1% 43.1% 43.1% 13.2% 13.6% 11.5% 14.0% 56.9% 1);  ² = 329	39.4% Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.49 [0.30, 0.80] 0.69 [0.53, 0.90] 0.66 [0.51, 0.84] 0.78 [0.51, 1.18] 0.67 [0.57, 0.78] 1.02 [0.78, 1.34] 1.01 [0.78, 1.32] 0.86 [0.63, 1.18] 0.86 [0.67, 1.10] 0.90 [0.76, 1.06]	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup SLC2A9 rs3733591 Asian HP Tu(a) 2010 M Li 2012 Urano 2010 W Wan 2015 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: non-Asian HP Tu(b) 2010 Moffatt(a) 2011 Moffatt(b) 2011 Moffatt(c) 2011 Moffatt(c) 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect:	Z = 9.22 ( erences: Cas <u>Events</u> 39 362 209 121 731 0.00; Ch Z = 5.08 19 119 134 178 105 555 0.01; Ch Z = 1.24	(P < 0.0 Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1 e <u>Total</u> 356 194 1220 i <sup>2</sup> = 2.1 (P < 0.0 404 464 344 626 1884 i <sup>2</sup> = 5.8 (P = 0.2	0001) 1.65. df = Contri Events 261 292 788 136 1477 5. df = 3 ( 0001) 136 190 191 153 242 912 5. df = 4 ( 21)	1 (P = 0 Total 382 422 1152 200 2156 656 656 656 226 1272 3098 (P = 0.2	.20).  ² = 3 Weight 6.7% 13.5% 14.3% 8.5% 43.1% 43.1% 43.1% 13.6% 13.6% 14.0% 56.9% 1);  ² = 329	39.4% Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.49 [0.30, 0.80] 0.69 [0.53, 0.90] 0.66 [0.51, 0.84] 0.78 [0.51, 1.18] 0.67 [0.57, 0.78] 1.02 [0.78, 1.34] 1.01 [0.78, 1.32] 0.86 [0.63, 1.18] 0.86 [0.67, 1.10] 0.90 [0.76, 1.06]	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup SLC2A9 rs3733591 Asian HP Tu(a) 2010 M Li 2012 Urano 2010 W Wan 2015 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: non-Asian HP Tu(b) 2010 Moffatt(a) 2011 Moffatt(b) 2011 Moffatt(c) 2011 Moffatt(c) 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect:	Z = 9.22 ( erences: Cas <u>Events</u> 39 362 209 121 731 0.00; Ch Z = 5.08 19 119 134 105 555 0.001; Ch Z = 1.24	(P < 0.0 Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1 e <u>Total</u> 356 194 1220 i <sup>2</sup> = 2.1 (P < 0.0 404 464 344 626 1884 i <sup>2</sup> = 5.8 (P = 0.2	0001) 1.65. df = Contri Events 261 292 788 136 1477 5. df = 3 ( 0001) 136 190 191 153 242 912 5. df = 4 ( 21)	1 (P = 0 Total 382 422 1152 200 2156 656 658 276 1272 3098 (P = 0.2)	.20).  ² = 3 Weight 6.7% 13.5% 14.3% 8.5% 43.1% 4);  ² = 0% 4.6% 13.2% 13.6% 11.5% 14.0% 56.9% 1);  ² = 329	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.49 [0.30, 0.80] 0.69 [0.53, 0.90] 0.66 [0.51, 0.84] 0.78 [0.51, 1.18] 0.67 [0.57, 0.78] 0.67 [0.57, 0.78] 1.02 [0.78, 1.34] 1.01 [0.78, 1.32] 0.86 [0.67, 1.10] 0.90 [0.76, 1.06]	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup SLC2A9 rs3733591 Asian HP Tu(a) 2010 M Li 2012 Urano 2010 W Wan 2015 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: non-Asian HP Tu(b) 2010 Moffatt(a) 2011 Moffatt(b) 2011 Moffatt(c) 2011 Moffatt(c) 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect:	Z = 9.22 ( erences: Cas Events 39 362 209 121 731 0.00; Ch Z = 5.08 19 119 134 178 105 555 0.01; Ch Z = 1.24	(P < 0.0 $Chi^2 = 1$ e <b>Total</b> 76 594 356 194 1220 $i^2 = 2.1$ (P < 0.0) $i^2 = 2.1$ (P < 0.0) $i^2 = 2.1$ (P < 0.0) $i^2 = 5.8$ (P = 0.2) 3104	0001) 1.65. df = Contri Events 261 292 788 136 1477 5. df = 3 ( 00001) 136 190 191 153 242 912 5. df = 4 ( 21)	1 (P = 0 Tol 382 422 1152 200 2156 (P = 0.5) 226 656 668 276 1272 3098 (P = 0.2) 5254	.20).  ² = 3 Weight 6.7% 13.5% 14.3% 8.5% 43.1% 4);  ² = 0% 4.6% 13.2% 13.6% 11.5% 14.0% 56.9% 1);  ² = 329 100.0%	39.4% Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.49 [0.30, 0.80] 0.69 [0.53, 0.90] 0.66 [0.51, 0.84] 0.78 [0.51, 1.18] 0.67 [0.57, 0.78] 1.02 [0.78, 1.34] 1.01 [0.78, 1.32] 0.86 [0.63, 1.18] 0.86 [0.67, 1.10] 0.90 [0.76, 1.06] %	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup SLC2A9 rs3733591 Asian HP Tu(a) 2010 M Li 2012 Urano 2010 W Wan 2015 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: non-Asian HP Tu(b) 2010 Moffatt(a) 2011 Moffatt(b) 2011 Moffatt(c) 2011 Moffatt(c) 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: Total (95% CI) Total events	Z = 9.22 ( erences: Cas Events 39 362 209 121 731 0.00; Ch Z = 5.08 19 119 134 178 105 555 0.01; Ch Z = 1.24 1286	(P < 0.0 $Chi^2 = 1$ e <b>Total</b> 76 594 356 194 1220 $i^2 = 2.1$ (P < 0.0) $i^2 = 2.1$ (P < 0.0) $i^2 = 2.1$ $i^2 = 2.1$ $i^2 = 5.8$ (P = 0.2) 3104	0001) 1.65. df = Contu Events 261 292 788 136 1477 5. df = 3 ( 00001) 136 190 191 153 242 912 5. df = 4 ( 2389	1 (P = 0 Tol 382 422 1152 200 2156 (P = 0.5) 226 656 668 276 1272 3098 (P = 0.2) 5254	.20).  ² = 3 Weight 6.7% 13.5% 14.3% 8.5% 43.1% 4);  ² = 0% 4.6% 13.2% 13.6% 11.5% 14.0% 56.9% 1);  ² = 329 100.0%	39.4% Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.49 [0.30, 0.80] 0.69 [0.53, 0.90] 0.66 [0.51, 0.84] 0.78 [0.51, 1.18] 0.67 [0.57, 0.78] 1.02 [0.78, 1.34] 1.01 [0.78, 1.32] 0.86 [0.63, 1.18] 0.86 [0.67, 1.10] 0.90 [0.76, 1.06] % 0.78 [0.67, 0.91]	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI	
Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup SLC2A9 rs3733591 Asian HP Tu(a) 2010 M Li 2012 Urano 2010 W Wan 2015 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: non-Asian HP Tu(b) 2010 Moffatt(a) 2011 Moffatt(b) 2011 Moffatt(c) 2011 Moffatt(c) 2011 Moffatt(c) 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	Z = 9.22 ( erences: Cas Events 39 362 209 121 731 0.00; Ch Z = 5.08 19 119 134 178 105 555 0.01; Ch Z = 1.24 1286 0.03; Ch	(P < 0.0 $Chi^2 = 1$ e <b>Total</b> 76 594 356 194 1220 $i^2 = 2.1$ (P < 0.0) $i^2 = 2.1$ (P < 0.0) $i^2 = 2.1$ (P < 0.0) $i^2 = 5.8$ (P = 0.2) 3104 $i^2 = 16.$	0001) 1.65. df = Contu Events 261 292 788 136 1477 5. df = 3 ( 00001) 136 190 191 153 242 912 5. df = 4 ( 2389 88, df = 8	1 (P = 0 Total 382 422 1152 200 2156 (P = 0.5) 226 656 668 276 1272 3098 (P = 0.2) 5254 5(P = 0.1)	.20).  ² = 3 Weight 6.7% 13.5% 14.3% 8.5% 43.1% 4);  ² = 0% 4.6% 13.2% 13.6% 11.5% 14.0% 56.9% 1);  ² = 329 100.0% 03);  ² = 53	39.4% Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.49 [0.30, 0.80] 0.69 [0.53, 0.90] 0.66 [0.51, 0.84] 0.78 [0.51, 1.18] 0.67 [0.57, 0.78] 1.02 [0.78, 1.34] 1.01 [0.78, 1.32] 0.86 [0.63, 1.18] 0.86 [0.67, 1.10] 0.90 [0.76, 1.06] % 0.78 [0.67, 0.91]	Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI	 [100
Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup SLC2A9 rs3733591 Asian HP Tu(a) 2010 M Li 2012 Urano 2010 W Wan 2015 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: non-Asian HP Tu(b) 2010 Moffatt(a) 2011 Moffatt(b) 2011 Moffatt(c) 2011 Moffatt(c) 2011 Moffatt(c) 2011 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect:	Z = 9.22 ( erences: Cas Events 39 362 209 121 731 0.00; Ch Z = 5.08 19 119 134 178 105 555 0.01; Ch Z = 1.24 1286 0.03; Ch Z = 3.14	(P < 0.0 $Chi^2 = 1$ e <b>Total</b> 76 594 356 194 1220 $i^2 = 2.1$ (P < 0.0) $i^2 = 2.1$ (P < 0.0) $i^2 = 2.1$ (P < 0.0) $i^2 = 5.8$ (P = 0.0) 3104 $i^2 = 16.$ (P = 0.0)	0001) 1.65. df= Contu Events 261 292 788 136 1477 5. df = 3 ( 00001) 136 190 191 153 242 912 5. df = 4 ( 2389 88, df = 8 002)	1 (P = 0 Tol 382 422 1152 200 2156 (P = 0.5) 226 656 668 276 1272 3098 (P = 0.2) 5254 (P = 0.1)	.20).  ² = 3 <u>Weight</u> 13.5% 14.3% 8.5% 43.1% 4);  ² = 0% 4.6% 13.2% 13.6% 11.5% 14.0% 56.9% 1);  ² = 329 100.0% 03);  ² = 53	39.4% Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI 0.49 [0.30, 0.80] 0.69 [0.53, 0.90] 0.66 [0.51, 0.84] 0.78 [0.51, 1.18] 0.67 [0.57, 0.78] 0.67 [0.57, 0.78] 1.02 [0.78, 1.34] 1.01 [0.78, 1.32] 0.86 [0.63, 1.18] 0.86 [0.67, 1.10] 0.90 [0.76, 1.06] % 0.78 [0.67, 0.91]	0.01 0.1 1 10 1 Favours [case] Favours [control] Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl	100

	Case		Control		Odds Ratio		Odds Ratio		
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	M-H, Random, 95% Cl		
SLC2A9 rs16890979									
Asian									
M Li 2012	4	594	7	422	13.3%	0.40 [0.12, 1.38]			
Urano 2010	2	360	11	1182	10.2%	0.59 [0.13, 2.70]			
YQ You 2013	62	308	165	320	29.8%	0.24 [0.17, 0.34]	-		
YS Kim 2015	218	218	202	204	3.3%	5.40 [0.26, 113.05]		+	
Subtotal (95% CI)		1480		2128	56.6%	0.40 [0.17, 0.90]	-		
Total events	286		385						
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.33; Chi	<sup>2</sup> = 5.7	4, df = 3 (	P = 0.1	3); l <sup>2</sup> = 48	%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.20 (	P = 0.0	)3)						
non-Asian									
Moffatt(a) 2009	2	110	38	234	10.9%	0.10 [0.02, 0.40]			
Moffatt(b) 2009	0	136	5	80	3.5%	0.05 [0.00, 0.92]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Moffatt(c) 2009	32	262	243	1102	29.0%	0.49 [0.33, 0.73]			
Subtotal (95% CI)		508		1416	43.4%	0.19 [0.04, 0.85]			
Total events	34		286						
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	1.17; Chi	<sup>2</sup> = 7.0	0, df = 2 (	P = 0.0	3); I <sup>2</sup> = 71	%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.18 (	P = 0.0	)3)						
Total (95% CI)		1988		3544	100.0%	0.33 [0.18, 0.58]	-		
Total events	320		671						
Heterogeneity: Tau² =	0.26; Chi	<sup>2</sup> = 15.	63, df = 6	(P = 0.	.02); I <sup>2</sup> = 6	2%		1	
Test for overall effect: Z = 3.78 (P = 0.0002)									
Test for subaroup differences; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 0.71. df = 1 (P = 0.40).   <sup>2</sup> = 0%									
Experimental		Control		Odds Ratio		Odds Ratio			
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI		
SLC2A9 rs6855911									
M Guan 2011	6	332	9	412	1.9%	0.82 [0.29, 2.34]			
Stark 2009	263	1354	831	3092	96.9%	0.66 (0.56, 0.77)			
Urano 2010	2	358	11	1162	1.2%	0.59 [0.13, 2.66]			
Total (95% CI)		2044		4666	100.0%	0.66 [0.56, 0.77]	◆		
Total events	271		851						
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 0.20, df = 2 (P = 0.90); l <sup>2</sup> = 0%								L D	

Test for overall effect: Z = 5.33 (P < 0.00001)

Figure 2. Forest plots for the meta-analyses of four polymorphisms.

analysis of *SLC2A9* rs6855911. In addition, funnel plots were demonstrated that there was no publication bias for all the meta-analyses (**Figure 3**).

#### Results of meta-analysis

Meta-analysis of *ABCG2* rs2231142 was involved with 12 studies [19-30] among 3,070 gout cases and 8,307 controls. Meta-analysis of *SLC2A9* rs3733591 was involved with 5 studies [30-34] among 1552 gout cases and 2627 controls. Meta-analysis of *SLC2A9* rs1-6890979 was involved with 5 studies among 994 gout cases and 1,772 controls [24, 28, 33-35]. Meta-analysis of *SLC2A9* rs6855911 was involved with 3 studies among 1,022 gout cases and 2,333 controls [26, 34, and 36]. As shown in **Figure 2**, *ABCG2* rs2231142 was associated with the risk of gout (overall OR = 2.13, 95% CI = 1.81-2.50, P < 0.00001), and three *SLC2A9* variants were associated with

the protection of gout (rs3733591: the overall OR = 0.78, 95% CI = 0.67-0.91, P = 0.002; SLC2A9 rs16890979: the overall OR = 0.33, 95% CI = 0.18-0.58, P = 0.0002; SLC2A9 rs6855911: the overall OR = 0.66, 95% CI = 0.56-0.77, P < 0.00001).

Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

Further subgroup meta-analyses by ethnic populations showed that *SLC2A9* rs3733591 was significantly associated with gout in Asian populations (the overall OR = 0.67, 95% CI = 0.57-0.78, P < 0.00001) but not in non-Asian populations. However, the rest three variants were shown to be significantly associated with gout in both Asian and non-Asian populations. In addition, the power was 1.000 for the meta-analyses of all the four variants.

#### Discussion

In the present study, we carried out a comprehensive systematic overview of genetic associ-



Figure 3. Funnel plots for the meta-analyses of four polymorphisms.

ation studies with gout. Our meta-analyses established significant association of four variants with gout. Specifically, our results indicated that *ABCG2* rs2231142-A was a risk allele of gout, and *SLC2A9* rs37333591-T, rs16890979-T, and rs6855911-G were protective alleles of gout. Our observation was also supported by a recent GWAS of gout in different populations [37]. Since the GWAS provided an adjusted OR, their data was not included in the current meta-analysis.

ABCG2 encodes a multi-specific apical membrane transporter expressed in several tissues [38]. ABCG2 is able to transport nucleotide analogs that are structurally similar to urate [39]. SLC2A9 encodes a putative fructose transporter [40] highly expressed in the proximal renal tubular cells [41]. SLC2A9 is an important modulator responsible for the urate reabsorption in the apical membrane of the renal proximal tubules [42]. Our meta-analyses were involved with three SLC2A9 variants (rs-3733591, rs16890919 and rs6855911). The linkage disequilibrium (LD) among these three variants showed a significant LD between rs16890979 and rs6855911 ( $r^2 = 0.784$  in HapMap CEU and  $r^2 = 0.494$  in HapMap CHB). However, much weaker LD values were observed between rs3733591 and rs16890979 ( $r^2 = 0.098$  in HapMap CEU;  $r^2 = 0.058$  in HapMap CHB), and between rs3733591 and rs6855911 ( $r^2 = 0.086$  in HapMap CEU;  $r^2 = 0.028$  in HapMap CHB). This might explain that the association of *SLC2A9* rs3733591 with gout was found only in Asian populations, however, the association of other two *SLC2A9* variants with gout was found in Asian and non-Asian populations.

Prior to the current meta-analyses, there were four meta-analyses of the *ABCG2* rs2231142 and gout [43-46]. Compared with the previous meta-analyses [43-46], ours included 8, 7, 6 and 3 more articles, respectively. We didn't include the data from unpublished data in the meta-analysis by Dong et al [43], and we also discarded the data of the Abbas's study [37] in the meta-analysis by Lv et al [44], since it provided an adjusted OR value. There were several limitations in our study. Selection or publication biases might exist although our analyses didn't identify them among the studies in the current meta-analyses, since only publications in English and Chinese languages were included in the current meta-analyses. Meanwhile, there was a lower chance of publication for the investigations with negative findings. In addition, gout is a complicated disorder influenced by numerous factors, including gender, age and dietary differences. However, due to a lack of relative information in the original research articles, a subgroup meta-analysis by these factors could not be performed to test their interactions with genetic factors.

In conclusion, our meta-analyses established that *ABCG2* rs2231142, *SLC2A9* rs3733591, rs16890979 and rs6855911 were significantly associated with the risk of gout.

## Acknowledgements

The research was supported by the grants from National Natural Science Foundation of China (81371469), Natural Science Foundation of Zhejiang Province (LR13H020003), Fumin and Huimin project of Science and Technology of Ningbo (2015C50013), Medical of Science and Technology Project of Zhejiang Province (2015KYB346), and K. C. Wong Magna Fund in Ningbo University.

## Disclosure of conflict of interest

None.

Address correspondence to: Dr. Shiwei Duan, Zhejiang Provincial Key Laboratory of Pathophysiology, School of Medicine, Ningbo University, Ningbo 315211, Zhejiang, China. E-mail: duanshiwei@nbu. edu.cn

## References

- Taniguchi A, Urano W, Yamanaka M, Yamanaka H, Hosoyamada M, Endou H and Kamatani N. A common mutation in an organic anion transporter gene, SLC22A12, is a suppressing factor for the development of gout. Arthritis Rheum 2005; 52: 2576-2577.
- [2] Choi HK, Mount DB and Reginato AM. Pathogenesis of gout. Ann Intern Med 2005; 143: 499-516.
- [3] Miao Z, Li C, Chen Y, Zhao S, Wang Y, Wang Z, Chen X, Xu F, Wang F, Sun R, Hu J, Song W, Yan S and Wang CY. Dietary and lifestyle changes

associated with high prevalence of hyperuricemia and gout in the Shandong coastal cities of Eastern China. J Rheumatol 2008; 35: 1859-1864.

- [4] Fang Q, You K and Lin QS. The investigation of Chinese people's blood uric acid and the relationship between it and blood-lipid.1983.
- [5] Mao YS, Zhou LN, Ye HY, Huang T, Chen CX, Du J, Hong ZL and Hu RM. Epidemiological survey on prevalences of hyperuricemia and gout in staff of a petrochemical corporation in Ningbo. Chinese Journal of Endocrinology and Metabolism 2006; 22: 338-341.
- [6] Scott JT. Gout. Baillieres Clin Rheumatol 1987; 1: 525-546.
- [7] Zhou D, Liu Y, Zhang X, Gu X, Wang H, Luo X, Zhang J, Zou H and Guan M. Functional polymorphisms of the ABCG2 gene are associated with gout disease in the Chinese Han male population. Int J Mol Sci 2014; 15: 9149-9159.
- [8] Cai Y, Peng YH, Tang Z, Guo XL, Qing YF, Liang SH, Jiang H, Dang WT, Ma Q, He C and Zhou JG. Association of Toll-like receptor 2 polymorphisms with gout. Biomed Rep 2014; 2: 292-296.
- [9] Flynn TJ, Phipps-Green A, Hollis-Moffatt JE, Merriman ME, Topless R, Montgomery G, Chapman B, Stamp LK, Dalbeth N and Merriman TR. Association analysis of the SLC22A11 (organic anion transporter 4) and SLC22A12 (urate transporter 1) urate transporter locus with gout in New Zealand case-control sample sets reveals multiple ancestral-specific effects. Arthritis Res Ther 2013; 15: R220.
- [10] Li C, Yu Q, Han L, Wang C, Chu N and Liu S. The hURAT1 rs559946 polymorphism and the incidence of gout in Han Chinese men. Scand J Rheumatol 2014; 43: 35-42.
- [11] Nakayama A, Matsuo H, Shimizu T, Takada Y, Nakamura T, Shimizu S, Chiba T, Sakiyama M, Naito M, Morita E, Ichida K and Shinomiya N. Common variants of a urate-associated gene LRP2 are not associated with gout susceptibility. Rheumatol Int 2014; 34: 473-476.
- [12] Torres RJ, de Miguel E, Bailen R, Banegas JR and Puig JG. Tubular urate transporter gene polymorphisms differentiate patients with gout who have normal and decreased urinary uric acid excretion. J Rheumatol 2014; 41: 1863-1870.
- [13] Sakiyama M, Matsuo H, Chiba T, Nakayama A, Nakamura T, Shimizu S, Morita E, Fukuda N, Nakashima H, Sakurai Y, Ichida K, Shimizu T and Shinomiya N. Common variants of cGKII/ PRKG2 are not associated with gout susceptibility. J Rheumatol 2014; 41: 1395-1397.
- [14] Xu X, Zheng J, Liao Q, Zhu H, Xie H, Shi H and Duan S. Meta-analyses of 4 CFTR variants associated with the risk of the congenital

bilateral absence of the vas deferens. J Clin Bioinforma 2014; 4: 11.

- [15] Dai D, Wang Y, Yuan J, Zhou X, Jiang D, Li J, Zhang Y, Yin H and Duan S. Meta-analyses of 10 polymorphisms associated with the risk of schizophrenia. Biomed Rep 2014; 2: 729-736.
- [16] Merriman TR, Choi HK and Dalbeth N. The genetic basis of gout. Rheum Dis Clin North Am 2014; 40: 279-290.
- [17] Yang B, Mo Z, Wu C, Yang H, Yang X, He Y, Gui L, Zhou L, Guo H, Zhang X, Yuan J, Dai X, Li J, Qiu G, Huang S, Deng Q, Feng Y, Guan L, Hu D, Wang T, Zhu J, Min X, Lang M, Li D, Hu FB, Lin D, Wu T and He M. A genome-wide association study identifies common variants influencing serum uric acid concentrations in a Chinese population. BMC Med Genomics 2014; 7: 10.
- [18] Matsuo H, Takada T, Ichida K, Nakamura T, Nakayama A, Ikebuchi Y, Ito K, Kusanagi Y, Chiba T, Tadokoro S, Takada Y, Oikawa Y, Inoue H, Suzuki K, Okada R, Nishiyama J, Domoto H, Watanabe S, Fujita M, Morimoto Y, Naito M, Nishio K, Hishida A, Wakai K, Asai Y, Niwa K, Kamakura K, Nonoyama S, Sakurai Y, Hosoya T, Kanai Y, Suzuki H, Hamajima N and Shinomiya N. Common defects of ABCG2, a high-capacity urate exporter, cause gout: a function-based genetic analysis in a Japanese population. Sci Transl Med 2009; 1: 5ra11.
- [19] Ye DS, Zhao DB. The research of risk factors and urate transporter polymorphism in Han Chinese gout patients. 2012.
- [20] Phipps-Green AJ, Hollis-Moffatt JE, Dalbeth N, Merriman ME, Topless R, Gow PJ, Harrison AA, Highton J, Jones PB, Stamp LK and Merriman TR. A strong role for the ABCG2 gene in susceptibility to gout in New Zealand Pacific Island and Caucasian, but not Maori, case and control sample sets. Hum Mol Genet 2010; 19: 4813-4819.
- [21] Wang B, Miao Z, Liu S, Wang J, Zhou S, Han L, Meng D, Wang Y, Li C and Ma X. Genetic analysis of ABCG2 gene C421A polymorphism with gout disease in Chinese Han male population. Hum Genet 2010; 127: 245-246.
- [22] Zhou DQ, Liu YQ, Zhang XJ, Gu XY, Wang H, Luo XH, Zhang J, Zou HJ and Guan M. Functional polymorphisms of the ABCG2 gene are associated with gout disease in the Chinese Han male population. Int J Mol Sci 2014; 15: 9149-9159.
- [23] Zhang XJ and Li CG. The investigation into associations between gout and polymorphisms of rsl3124007, rs6850166, rs2231142 in Chinese Han females.
- [24] You YQ and Li YN. Study on relationship between Single nucleotide polymorphism of the SLC2A9, SLC17A3, ABCG2 gene genetic sus-

ceptibility to gout. Chinese J Rheumatol 2013; 17: 114-118.

- [25] Yamagishi K, Tanigawa T, Kitamura A, Kottgen A, Folsom AR and Iso H. The rs2231142 variant of the ABCG2 gene is associated with uric acid levels and gout among Japanese people. Rheumatology (Oxford) 2010; 49: 1461-1465.
- [26] Stark K, Reinhard W, Grassl M, Erdmann J, Schunkert H, Illig T and Hengstenberg C. Common polymorphisms influencing serum uric acid levels contribute to susceptibility to gout, but not to coronary artery disease. PLoS One 2009; 4: e7729.
- [27] Wang Q, Wang C, Wang XB, Miao ZM, Cui Y and Li CG. Association between gout and polymorphisms of rs2231142 in ABCG2 in female Han Chinese. Progress In Modern Biomedicine 2014; 14: 2437-2449.
- [28] Kim YS, Kim Y, Park G, Kim SK, Choe JY, Park BL and Kim HS. Genetic analysis of ABCG2 and SLC2A9 gene polymorphisms in gouty arthritis in a Korean population. Korean J Intern Med 2015; 30: 913-920.
- [29] Zhang XL, Zeng XJ. The association between ABCG2 polymorphism and gout and hyperuricemia by establish queue about staff hyperuricemia. 2014.
- [30] Wan W, Xu X, Zhao DB, Pang YF and Wang YX. Polymorphisms of uric transporter proteins in the pathogenesis of gout in a Chinese Han population. Genet Mol Res 2015; 14: 2546-2550.
- [31] Tu HP, Chen CJ, Tovosia S, Ko AM, Lee CH, Ou TT, Lin GT, Chang SJ, Chiang SL, Chiang HC, Chen PH, Wang SJ, Lai HM and Ko YC. Associations of a non-synonymous variant in SLC2A9 with gouty arthritis and uric acid levels in Han Chinese subjects and Solomon Islanders. Ann Rheum Dis 2010; 69: 887-890.
- [32] Hollis-Moffatt JE, Gow PJ, Harrison AA, Highton J, Jones PB, Stamp LK, Dalbeth N and Merriman TR. The SLC2A9 nonsynonymous Arg265His variant and gout: evidence for a population-specific effect on severity. Arthritis Res Ther 2011; 13: R85.
- [33] Li M, Zhou JG. Association of the polymorphisms of SLC2A9 gene with primary gout and uric acid levels in Chinese Han Population. 2012.
- [34] Urano W, Taniguchi A, Anzai N, Inoue E, Sekita C, Endou H, Kamatani N and Yamanaka H. Association between GLUT9 and gout in Japanese men. Ann Rheum Dis 2010; 69: 932-933.
- [35] Hollis-Moffatt JE, Xu X, Dalbeth N, Merriman ME, Topless R, Waddell C, Gow PJ, Harrison AA, Highton J, Jones PB, Stamp LK and Merriman TR. Role of the urate transporter SLC2A9 gene in susceptibility to gout in New Zealand Maori,

Pacific Island, and Caucasian case-control sample sets. Arthritis Rheum 2009; 60: 3485-3492.

- [36] Guan M, Zhou D, Ma W, Chen Y, Zhang J and Zou H. Association of an intronic SNP of SLC2A9 gene with serum uric acid levels in the Chinese male Han population by high-resolution melting method. Clin Rheumatol 2011; 30: 29-35.
- [37] Dehghan A, Kottgen A, Yang Q, Hwang SJ, Kao WL, Rivadeneira F, Boerwinkle E, Levy D, Hofman A, Astor BC, Benjamin EJ, van Duijn CM, Witteman JC, Coresh J and Fox CS. Association of three genetic loci with uric acid concentration and risk of gout: a genome-wide association study. Lancet 2008; 372: 1953-1961.
- [38] Lian J, Fang P, Dai D, Ba Y, Yang X, Huang X, Li J, Chen X, Guo J, Guan F, Peng P, Zhao R, Zhang S, Gao F, Tang L, Zhang C, Ji H, Hong Q, Ye H, Xu L, Zhong Q, Liu P, Zhou J and Duan S. Association between 3279C>T and coronary artery disease: A case-control study and a meta-analysis. Biomed Rep 2014; 2: 879-885.
- [39] Kondo C, Suzuki H, Itoda M, Ozawa S, Sawada J, Kobayashi D, leiri I, Mine K, Ohtsubo K and Sugiyama Y. Functional analysis of SNPs variants of BCRP/ABCG2. Pharm Res 2004; 21: 1895-1903.
- [40] Brandstatter A, Kiechl S, Kollerits B, Hunt SC, Heid IM, Coassin S, Willeit J, Adams TD, Illig T, Hopkins PN and Kronenberg F. Sex-specific association of the putative fructose transporter SLC2A9 variants with uric acidlevels is modified by BMI. Diabetes Care 2008; 31: 1662-1667.
- [41] Augustin R, Carayannopoulos MO, Dowd LO, Phay JE, Moley JF and Moley KH. Identification and characterization of human glucose transporter-like protein-9 (GLUT9): alternative splicing alters trafficking. J Biol Chem 2004; 279: 16229-16236.

- [42] Vitart V, Rudan I, Hayward C, Gray NK, Floyd J, Palmer CN, Knott SA, Kolcic I, Polasek O, Graessler J, Wilson JF, Marinaki A, Riches PL, Shu X, Janicijevic B, Smolei-Narancic N, Gorgoni B, Morgan J, Campbell S, Biloglav Z, Barac-Lauc L, Pericic M, Klaric IM, Zgaga L, Skaric-Juric T, Wild SH, Richardson WA, Hohenstein P, Kimber CH, Tenesa A, Donnelly LA, Fairbanks LD, Aringer M, McKeigue PM, Ralston SH, Morris AD, Rudan P, Hastie ND, Campbell H and Wright AF. SLC2A9 is a newly identified urate transporter influencing serum urate concentration, urate excretion and gout. Nat Genet 2008; 40: 437-442.
- [43] Dong Z, Guo S, Yang Y, Wu J, Guan M, Zou H, Jin L and Wang J. Association between ABCG2 Q141K polymorphism and gout risk affected by ethnicity and gender: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Int J Rheum Dis 2015; 18: 382-391.
- [44] Lv X, Zhang Y, Zeng F, Yin A, Ye N, Ouyang H, Feng D, Li D, Ling W and Zhang X. The association between the polymorphism rs2231142 in the ABCG2 gene and gout risk: a meta-analysis. Clin Rheumatol 2014; 33: 1801-1805.
- [45] Qiu Y, Liu H, Qing Y, Yang M, Tan X, Zhao M, Lin M and Zhou J. The ABCG2 gene Q141K polymorphism contributes to an increased risk of gout: a meta-analysis of 2185 cases. Mod Rheumatol 2014; 24: 829-834.
- [46] Li R, Miao L, Qin LY, Xiang Y, Zhang X, Peng H, Mailamuguli, Sun Y and Yao H. A meta-analysis of the associations between the Q141K and Q126X ABCG2 gene variants and gout risk. Int J Clin Exp Pathol 2015; 8: 9812-9823.