

Association of *p53* Arg72Pro and *MDM2* SNP309 polymorphisms with glioma

J.N. Zhang^{1*}, S.H. Yi^{2*}, X.H. Zhang^{3*}, X.Y. Liu⁴, Q. Mao³, S.Q. Li³, W.H. Xiong³, Y.M. Qiu³, T. Chen⁴ and J.W. Ge³

¹Operation Room, Shanghai Children's Medical Center, School of Medicine, Shanghai Jiaotong University, Shanghai, P.R. China
²Teaching and Research Section of Epidemiology, Hunan Normal University, Changsha, P.R. China
³Department of Neurosurgery, School of Medicine, Renji Hospital, Shanghai Jiaotong University, Shanghai, P.R. China
⁴State Key Laboratory of Respiratory Disease for Allergy at Shengzhen University, School of Medicine, Shenzhen University, Shenzhen, Guangdong, P.R. China

*These authors contributed equally to this study. Corresponding authors: J.W. Ge / T. Chen E-mail: gejianweiok@hotmail.com / chan_tone@yahoo.com.cn

Genet. Mol. Res. 11 (4): 3618-3628 (2012) Received January 23, 2012 Accepted June 7, 2012 Published October 4, 2012 DOI http://dx.doi.org/10.4238/2012.October.4.9

ABSTRACT. Epidemiological studies of the association of variants *p53* Arg72Pro and *MDM2* single-nucleotide polymorphism 309 (SNP309) with glioma risk have produced inconsistent results. The aim of the current study was to evaluate the association of these 2 variants with glioma susceptibility using a meta-analysis approach. For *p53* Arg72Pro, 10 case-control studies including 2587 glioma patients and 4061 unrelated controls were identified. The pooled odds ratios (ORs) for Arg/Pro heterozygotes and Pro/Pro homozygotes were 1.08 [95% confidence interval (95%CI) = 0.85-1.37] and 1.08 (95%CI = 0.85-1.36), respectively, when compared to Arg/Arg carriers. Under the dominant effect model, Pro allele carriers also showed no significantly elevated glioma risk (pooled OR = 1.11, 95%CI =

Genetics and Molecular Research 11 (4): 3618-3628 (2012)

0.90-1.38), and similar results were found under the recessive-effect model (pooled OR = 1.17, 95%CI = 0.85-1.61). For variant *MDM2* SNP309, 3 case-control studies including 606 cases and 309 controls were identified. A marginal association with glioma risk was found for heterozygous G/T carriers (pooled OR = 1.95, 95%CI = 1.00-3.81), whereas homozygous G/G carriers showed an increased but not significantly elevated risk of glioma (pooled OR = 2.14, 95%CI = 0.71-6.45) compared with that of T/T homozygotes. We also found no significant association between the *MDM2* SNP309 polymorphism and glioma risk (pooled OR = 1.86, 95%CI = 0.94-3.67 and pooled OR = 1.25, 95%CI = 0.62-2.56, respectively) under the dominant and recessive models. Taken together, the current data suggested that the 2 polymorphisms may not contribute to glioma susceptibility.

Key words: p53; MDM2; Glioma risk; Polymorphisms; Meta-analysis

INTRODUCTION

Glioma is the most frequent central nervous system tumor that occurs in the brain or spine. In terms of cell type, glioma can be divided into ependymoma, astrocytoma, oligodendroglioma, and mixed glioma subtypes. According the World Health Organization classification, glioma can be categorized into 4 grades, from the least advanced disease with the best prognosis (grade I) to the most advanced disease with the worst prognosis (grade IV) (Louis et al., 2007). Environmental and genetic factors involved in the progression of glioma are not completely understood. Some studies have reported that dietary, personal, and residential exposures may lead to glioma development (Wrensch et al., 2005), whereas others have suggested that genetic alterations may be involved (Gu et al., 2009). Gene mutations such as epidermal growth factor receptor amplification or nuclear factor kappa B inhibitor alpha deletion have been reported in the development of glioma (Hunter et al., 1995; Bredel et al., 2011). Recently, genome-wide association studies have reported that single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) in the loci at 5p15.33 (rs2736100, TERT), 8q24.21 (rs4295627, CCDC26), 9p21.3 (rs4977756, CDKN2A/ CDKN2B), 20q13.33 (rs6010620, RTEL1), and 11q23.3 (rs498872, PHLDB1) are associated with glioma susceptibility (Shete et al., 2009; Wrensch et al., 2009). However, additional factors that contribute to glioma susceptibility require further investigation.

The well-known tumor suppressor gene p53 participates in many cellular functions, including cell cycle arrest, apoptosis, DNA repair, and cell migration. Approximately half of glioma patients reportedly manifest p53 mutations that may cause glioma (Ohgaki et al., 2004). *MDM2* is a well-known protein that negatively regulates p53 activity and whose amplification has also been found in approximately 10-15% of malignant gliomas (Biernat et al., 1997; Suzuki and Iwaki, 2000). Because *MDM2* is an E3 ligase, its overexpression enhances the degradation of p53 through the proteasomal pathway (Haupt et al., 1997; Kubbutat et al., 1997). *MDM2* also facilitates p53 nuclear exportation and decreases the DNA binding ability of p53 to its target genes, which attenuates p53 tumor suppression in cells (Oliner et al., 1993; Kussie et al., 1996). Given the importance of p53

Genetics and Molecular Research 11 (4): 3618-3628 (2012)

J.N. Zhang et al.

and MDM2 in cells, many studies have been designed to evaluate the variants on these genes and their association with cancer susceptibility. Two variants, p53 Arg/Pro and MDM2 SNP309, have been widely studied in many types of cancer. The p53 Arg/Pro variant displays an amino acid change at codon 72 in exon 4 and decreases the pro-apoptosis activity of p53 (Dumont et al., 2003). MDM2 SNP309 locates at the promoter of the gene and the T to G change increases the affinity of transcription factor Sp1 and further enhances the transcription of MDM2 (Bond et al., 2004).

Many studies have suggested a significant association between these variants and the risk of lung, colorectal, gastric, and other cancers (Dai et al., 2009; Liu et al., 2011). Other studies have evaluated the association between these 2 variants and glioma risk, although the results have been inconsistent. A study conducted by Parhar et al. (2005) has suggested a possible association between the *p53* Arg72Pro polymorphism and glioma susceptibility, particularly for high-grade astrocytomas. However, other studies have reported no association between the variant and glioma risk (Wang et al., 2004; Malmer et al., 2005). With respect to *MDM2* SNP309, 2 reports have found no correlation with glioma risk (El Hallani et al., 2007; Tsuiki et al., 2007), whereas a study conducted by Khatri et al. (2008) has found that allele G may be a low-penetrance susceptibility allele for glioblastoma multiforme.

Because the associations between these 2 polymorphisms and glioma risk remain elusive, we conducted a systematic assessment of published studies and a meta-analysis to evaluate the correlation of the 2 variants and glioma susceptibility. Our results show that neither of these variants has a statistically significant association with the glioma risk based on the current published data.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Identification and selection of eligible studies

We searched the PubMed database for eligible studies that had been published online before December 2011. The terms glioma, glioblastoma, ependymocytoma, oligo-dendroglioma, or astrocytoma in combination with *p53*, *MDM2*, rs1042522, rs2279744, *p53* codon 72, or *MDM2* SNP309 were used to identify studies that evaluated *p53* Arg/ Pro and *MDM2* SNP309 polymorphisms and glioma risk. References within the identified publications were also checked to find any studies missed in the database search.

Eligible studies included in the meta-analysis met the following criteria: 1) they assessed the association of p53 Arg/Pro and MDM2 SNP309 polymorphisms and the risk of glioma; 2) they provided sufficient data for the frequency of the genotypes, and 3) they were case-control, cohort, or cross-sectional studies reported in the English language.

Data extraction

Two of the authors individually reviewed the selected articles, and the details of the studies were extracted from the eligible publications: first author name, publication year, design of the study, country of origin, sample size, and genotype distribution data of the variants in the cases and controls (Tables 1 and 2).

Genetics and Molecular Research 11 (4): 3618-3628 (2012)

Statistical methods

We used the Pearson chi-square test for goodness of fit to determine whether any study departed from Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium (HWE) for the genotype distribution in the control group. For each study, the association of the 2 variants and glioma susceptibility was presented as the crude odds ratio (OR) and its 95% confidential of intervals (95%CI) based on the genotype frequencies in the cases and controls. The standard inverse variance weighting method was used to calculate the pooled ORs and their 95%CIs under the fixed-effect model. The DerSimonian-Laird method (DerSimonian and Laird, 1986) was used to calculate the pooled estimate and its 95%CI under the random-effect model. We investigated the association between the 2 genetic variants and glioma risk under homozygote and hetero-zygote comparisons and dominant and recessive genetic models.

Heterogeneity between the studies was quantified using the Cochran Q test in combination with the I² statistic, which represents the percentage of variability across studies that is attributable to heterogeneity rather than to chance. Heterogeneity among studies was considered significant when P was less than 0.1 for the Q-test or when the I² value was greater than 25%. If significant heterogeneity was found among the studies, the overall pooled estimate under the random-effect model rather than the fixed-effect model was acceptable, and vice versa. The publication bias of the selected studies was examined with funnel plots and further assessed using the tests of asymmetry of Begg and Egger (Begg and Mazumdar, 1994; Egger et al., 1997). P values less than 0.05 were considered to be statistically significant in the meta-analysis. All the statistical analysis was performed with the R software and its Meta package (www.r-project.org).

RESULTS

Association between *p53* Arg72Pro and glioma susceptibility

We identified 10 reports that evaluated the association of p53 Arg72Pro and glioma susceptibility (Wang et al., 2004; Parhar et al., 2005; Malmer et al., 2005, 2007; Rajaraman et al., 2007; Idbaih et al., 2008; Lima-Ramos et al., 2008; Pinto et al., 2008; El Hallani et al., 2009; and Jha et al., 2011; see Table 1). Included were 2587 cases and 4061 controls, and all data were used in the current meta-analysis. Two of the studies reported a statistically significant association between p53 Arg72Pro and glioma risk; the others found no significant association of this allele and glioma risk (Parhar et al., 2005; Jha et al., 2011). The study conducted by Parhar et al. (2005) suggested a possible association between p53 Arg72Pro polymorphisms and susceptibility to brain tumors, particularly for high-grade astrocytoma. The study reported by Jha et al. (2011) in an Indian population suggested a significantly increased risk for glioma associated with the Pro allele of p53 codon 72. However, the study conducted by Jha et al. (2011) showed a significant departure of the p53 Arg/Pro allele from HWE in the control groups (P = 0.005).

From the meta-analysis, we found that the pooled OR for heterozygous carriers of Arg/Pro was 1.08 with a 95%CI of 0.85-1.37 compared to Arg/Arg homozygous carriers under the random-effect model (Figure 1A). The fixed-effect model showed similar results (OR = 1.05, 95%CI = 0.94-1.17). The Q-test and I² statistic showed significant heterogeneity between studies [Q = 37.3, degrees of freedom (d.f.) = 9, P < 0.0001; I² = 75.9%; Table 3]. The Begg rank correlation test and the Egger linear regression test showed no published bias (P = 0.9287

Genetics and Molecular Research 11 (4): 3618-3628 (2012)

J.N. Zhang et al.

and 0.7139, respectively). The pooled OR for homozygous Pro/Pro carriers was 1.08 with a 95%CI = 0.85-1.46 (Figure 1B). We also found significant heterogeneity among the studies (Q = 10.99, d.f. = 9, P = 0.2765; I² = 18.10%; see Table 3). No asymmetry of the funnel plot was found (Begg and Egger tests, P = 0.089 and 0.089, respectively), indicating the absence of publication bias. Under the dominant model, the pooled OR for Pro allele carriers was 1.11 (95%CI = 0.90-1.38). Under the random-effect model, significant heterogeneity among studies was found (Q = 32.48, d.f. = 9, P = 0.0002; I² = 72.3%; Figure 1C). Begg and Egger tests showed that no publication bias was present (P = 0.4208 and 0.3171, respectively).

Study (first author, year)	Study type	Location	Sampe size (case/control)	Genotype distribution (case/control)			
				Arg/Arg	Arg/Pro	Pro/Pro	
Wang, 2004	Case-control	USA	309/342	165/194	126/128	18/20	
Malmer, 2005	Population-based case-control	Sweden	205/374	116/211	59/106	30/57	
Parhar, 2005	Case-control	USA	135/117	38/72	94/42	3/3	
Malmer, 2007	Population-based case-control	Nodic-UK	680/1555	361/801	241/556	34/104	
Rajaraman, 2007	Hospital-based case-control	USA	388/553	213/300	146/209	27/38	
Idbaih, 2007	Population-based case-control	France	275/144	149/87	108/49	18/8	
Lima-Ramos, 2007	Hospital-based case-control	Portugal	171/526	101/298	56/197	14/31	
Pinto, 2008	Population-based case-control	Brazil	94/100	53/48	34/42	7/10	
Hallani, 2010	Population-based case-control	France	254/238	140/142	92/82	22/14	
Jha, 2010	Population-based case-control	Indian	76/112	24/27	27/70	33/15	

The recessive model also showed no statistically significant association between the p53 Arg/Pro polymorphism and glioma risk (pooled OR = 1.17, 95%CI = 0.85-1.61; Figure 1D) for homozygous p53 Arg/Arg carriers compared with p53 Arg/Pro and p53 Pro/Pro carriers. No significant heterogeneity among the studies was found, nor was significant publication bias present. The study conducted by Jha et al. (2011) showed significant departure from HWE in the meta-analysis. We repeated the meta-analysis after excluding this study, but no significant change in the overall results was found. These data together suggested that p53 Arg/Pro is not associated with glioma risk.

Association between MDM2 SNP309 and glioma risk

Three studies evaluating the association of *MDM2* SNP309 and glioma risk were identified in our literature search (El Hallani et al., 2007; Tsuiki et al., 2007; and Khatri et al., 2008; see Table 2). The 3 reports had recruited 606 cases and 390 controls. Among them, studies reported by El Hallani et al. (2007) and Tsuiki et al. (2007) found no significant association between the *MDM2* SNP309 variant and glioma risk. The study conducted by Khatri et al. (2008) with 98 glioblastoma multiforme patients and 102 cancer-free controls showed that allele G confers an increased risk of glioma; however, the study showed significant deviation from HWE for the allele distribution in the control group (P < 0.001).

Our meta-analysis showed that heterozygous G/T carriers had a marginally statistically significant increased risk of glioma, with a pooled OR = 1.95 (95%CI = 1.00-3.81; Figure 2A) under the random-effect model (Q = 5.63, d.f. = 2, P = 0.0598; I² = 64.50%; see Table 3). However, no significantly increased risk was found for homozygous G/G carri-

Genetics and Molecular Research 11 (4): 3618-3628 (2012)

A		l.	OR	95%CI	W (fixed)	W (random
Wang, 2004		1	1.16	[0.84; 1.60]	11.6%	11.4%
Malmer, 2005			1.01	[0.68; 1.50]	7.8%	10.4%
Parhar, 2005			- 4.24	[2.48; 7.24]	4.2%	8.3%
Malmer, 2007		-	0.96	[0.79; 1.17]	31.3%	13.0%
Rajaraman, 2007		+	0.98	0.75: 1.301	15.9%	12.0%
Idbaih 2007		- [1 29	0 84 1 981	6.5%	98%
Ramos 2007			0.84	10 58 1 221	8.6%	10.6%
Pinto 2008			0.73	[0.40: 1.33]	3.4%	7.6%
Pillo, 2006			0.15	[0.40, 1.55]	3.470	1.0%
Jha, 2010		[0.43	[0.21; 0.88]	2.4%	6.4%
Fixed effect model		¢.	1.05	[0.94; 1.17]	100%	
Heterogeneity: I-squared = 75.9	9%. P<0	0001	1.08	[0.85; 1.37]	-	100%
	0.1	Odds ratio	10			
3 Study			OR	95%CI	W (fixed)	W (random
Wang 2004			1.06	[0 54 2 07]	9.2%	10.0%
Malmer 2005		K	0.06	[0.58: 1.57]	16.7%	15.8%
Parhar 2005			1 80	10.36 9.841	1 5%	1 0%
Malmor 2007			0.72	[0.30, 3.04]	24 00/	20.00/
Deieremen 2007		i i	0.73	[0.40, 1.09]	24.9%	20.0%
rajaraman, 2007		i	1.00	[0.59, 1.69]	15.0%	14.0%
Iupain, 2007			1.31	[0.55; 3.15]	0.4%	6.3%
Ramos, 2007			1.33	[0.68; 2.60]	9.2%	9.9%
Pinto, 2008			0.63	[0.22; 1.80]	3.8%	4.6%
Hallani, 2010			1.59	[0.78; 3.24]	8.2%	9.0%
Jha, 2010			2.48	[1.09; 5.63]	6.1%	7.0%
Fixed effect model Random effects model	10(D = 1		1.05 1.08	[0.85; 1.28] [0.85; 1.36]	100% 	100%
Heterogeneity: I-squared = 18.1	1%, P = (0.5 4 0	10			
	0.1	0.5 1 2 Odds ratio	10			
C Study		li:	OR	95%CI	W (fixed)	W (random
,						
Wang, 2004		10	1.14	[0.84; 1.56]	11.2%	11.4%
Malmer, 2005		- R -	0.99	[0.70; 1.40]	9.1%	10.8%
Parhar, 2005			- 4.08	[2.41; 6.93]	3.9%	7.8%
Malmer 2007		+	0.92	10 77 1 121	30.5%	13 4%
Rajaraman 2007			0.99	10 76 1 281	15.7%	12.2%
Idhaih 2007		E.	1 20	[0.96: 1.04]	6 49/	0.6%
Demos 2007		i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	1.29	[0.60, 1.94]	0.4%	9.0%
Ramos, 2007			0.91	[0.64; 1.29]	8.8%	10.79
Pinto, 2008			0.71	[0.41; 1.26]	3.4%	7.3%
Hallani, 2010		- <u>10</u>	1.20	[0.84; 1.72]	8.4%	10.5%
Jha, 2010			0.79	[0.42; 1.51]	2.6%	6.3%
Fixed effect model Random effects model			1.05	[0.95; 1.16] [0.90: 1.38]	100%	100%
Heterogeneity: I-squared = 72.3	%, P = 0	0002		[0.00, 1.00]		
	0.1	0.5 1 2	10			
		Odds ratio				
Study			OR	95%CI	W (fixed)	W (random
			1.0-			10.55
wang, 2004		1	1.00	[0.52; 1.92]	8.9%	10.6%
Maimer, 2005			0.95	[0.59; 1.54]	16.8%	13.4%
Parhar, 2005	-	-	0.86	[0.17; 4.36]	1.5%	3.2%
Malmer, 2007			0.74	[0.49; 1.10]	24.2%	14.8%
Rajaraman, 2007			1.01	[0.60; 1.68]	14.7%	12.9%
Idbaih 2007		<u>G</u>	1 10	10 50 2 811	5 2%	8.0%
Ramos 2007		10 10 mm	1 42	10 74 2 741	9.0%	10.6%
Pinto 2008			0.72	[0.26: 1.00]	3 00/	6.5%
Lallani 2010			0.12	[0.20, 1.99]	0.000	0.0%
naliani, 2010 Jha, 2010			- 4.18	[2.08; 8.41]	8.0% 7.9%	10.0%
		6			101000	
Fixed effect model		\$	1 10	TO 90 1 331	100%	
Fixed effect model Random effects model			1.10	[0.90; 1.33] [0.85; 1.61]	100%	100%
Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: 1-squared = 56.6	5%, <u>P = 0</u>	0142	1.10 1.17	[0.90; 1.33] [0.85; 1.61]	100%	100%
Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: I-squared = 56.5	5%, <u>P = 0</u> 0 1	0142	1.10 1.17	[0.90; 1.33] [0.85; 1.61]	100% 	100%

Figure 1. Forest plot of the glioma risk and the *p53* Arg72Pro for: **A**. *p53* Arg72Pro heterozygosity (Arg/Pro vs Arg/Arg); **B**. *p53* Arg72Pro homozygosity (Pro/Pro vs Arg/Arg); **C**. dominant model (Arg/Pro and Pro/Pro vs Arg/Arg), and **D**. recessive model (Pro/Pro vs Arg/Pro and Arg/Arg). The box size represents the study weight under the random-effect model. OR = odds ratio; 95%CI = 95% confidence interval.

Genetics and Molecular Research 11 (4): 3618-3628 (2012)

©FUNPEC-RP www.funpecrp.com.br

J.N. Zhang et al.

Table 2. Main characteristics of the three studies included for MDM2 SNP309 and glioma risk.									
Study (first author, year)	Study type	Location	Sampe size (case/control)	Genotype distribution (case/control)					
				T/T	T/G	G/G			
Hallani, 2007 Tsuiki, 2007 Khatri, 2008	Population-based case-control Hospital-based case-control Hospital-based case-control	France Japan USA	254/238 254/50 98/102	98/109 62/15 5/23	114/96 126/18 79/74	42/33 66/17 14/5			

A		5	ĩ.,				
Study				OR	95%CI	W (fixed)	W (random)
Hallani, 2007			-	1.32	[0.90; 1.94]	71.1%	44.7%
Tsuiki, 2007		100	Ē.	1.69	[0.80; 3.58]	18.7%	31.6%
Knatri, 2008			1	4.91	[1.77; 13.59]	10.2%	23.1%
Fixed effect model		1	\Leftrightarrow	1.58	[1.14; 2.19]	100%	
Random effects model		-		1.95	[1.00; 3.81]	-	100%
Heterogeneity: I-squared = 64.5	1%, P = 1	0.0698	-i				
	0.2	0.5 1	2 5				
		Odds	ratio				
в							
Study				OR	95%CI	W (fixed)	W (random)
Hallani, 2007				1.42	[0.83: 2.41]	62.1%	39.2%
Tsuiki, 2007			-	0.94	[0.43; 2.04]	29.1%	35.5%
Khatri, 2008				→ 12.88	[3.16; 52.57]	8.9%	25.3%
Fixed effect model		<		1 53	[1 01 2 32]	100%	
Random effects model			<u> </u>	2.14	[0.71; 6.45]		100%
Heterogeneity: I-squared = 80.8%	6, P = C	.0065					
	0.2	0.5 1	2 5				
	0.2	Odds rs	Z J				
		Odds 18					
С		r.	a 2	1.5	-		and a stress real
Study			11	OR	95%CI	W (fixed)	W (random)
			11				
Hallani, 2007		+		1.35	[0.94; 1.93]	70.8%	43.2%
Hallani, 2007 Tsuiki, 2007		+	-	1.35 1.33	[0.94; 1.93] [0.68; 2.59]	70.8% 20.4%	43.2% 33.3%
Hallani, 2007 Tsuiki, 2007 Khatri, 2008		-	- -	1.35 1.33 → 5.42	[0.94; 1.93] [0.68; 2.59] [1.97; 14.91]	70.8% 20.4% 8.9%	43.2% 33.3% 23.5%
Hallani, 2007 Tsuiki, 2007 Khatri, 2008 Fixed effect model		+		1.35 1.33 → 5.42 1.52	[0.94; 1.93] [0.68; 2.59] [1.97; 14.91] [1.12; 2.05]	70.8% 20.4% 8.9% 100%	43.2% 33.3% 23.5%
Hallani, 2007 Tsuiki, 2007 Khatri, 2008 Fixed effect model Random effects model				1.35 1.33 → 5.42 1.52 1.86	[0.94; 1.93] [0.68; 2.59] [1.97; 14.91] [1.12; 2.05] [0.94; 3.67]	70.8% 20.4% 8.9% 100%	43.2% 33.3% 23.5%
Hallani, 2007 Tsuiki, 2007 Khatri, 2008 Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: I-squared = 69.99	%, P = 0			1.35 1.33 → 5.42 1.52 1.86	[0.94; 1.93] [0.68; 2.59] [1.97; 14.91] [1.12; 2.05] [0.94; 3.67]	70.8% 20.4% 8.9% 100%	43.2% 33.3% 23.5%
Hallani, 2007 Tsuiki, 2007 Khatri, 2008 Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: I-squared = 69.99	%, P = 0 0 2	05 1	2 5	1.35 1.33 → 5.42 1.52 1.86	[0.94; 1.93] [0.68; 2.59] [1.97; 14.91] [1.12; 2.05] [0.94; 3.67]	70.8% 20.4% 8.9% 100%	43.2% 33.3% 23.5% 100%
Hallani, 2007 Tsuiki, 2007 Khatri, 2008 Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: I-squared = 69.99	%, P = 0 0.2	0.5 1 Odds r	2 5 ratio	1.35 1.33 → 5.42 1.52 1.86	[0.94; 1.93] [0.68; 2.59] [1.97; 14.91] [1.12; 2.05] [0.94; 3.67]	70.8% 20.4% 8.9% 100%	43.2% 33.3% 23.5% - 100%
Hallani, 2007 Tsuiki, 2007 Khatri, 2008 Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: I-squared = 69.99	%, P = 0 0.2	0.5 1 Odds r	2 5 atio	1.35 1.33 → 5.42 1.52 1.86	[0.94; 1.93] [0.68; 2.59] [1.97; 14.91] [1.12; 2.05] [0.94; 3.67]	70.8% 20.4% 8.9% 100%	43.2% 33.3% 23.5% 100%
Hallani, 2007 Tsuiki, 2007 Khatri, 2008 Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: I-squared = 69.94	%, P = 0 	0.5 1 Odds r	2 5 atio	1.35 1.33 → 5.42 1.52 1.86	[0.94; 1.93] [0.68; 2.59] [1.97; 14.91] [1.12; 2.05] [0.94; 3.67]	70.8% 20.4% 8.9% 100%	43.2% 33.3% 23.5% 100%
Hallani, 2007 Tsuiki, 2007 Khatri, 2008 Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: I-squared = 69.94 D Study	% P = 0 0.2	0.5 1 Odds r	2 5 atio	1.35 1.33 → 5.42 1.52 1.86	[0.94; 1.93] [0.68; 2.59] [1.97; 14.91] [1.12; 2.05] [0.94; 3.67] 95%CI	70.8% 20.4% 8.9% 100% - W (fixed)	43.2% 33.3% 23.5% 100% W (random)
Hallani, 2007 Tsuiki, 2007 Khatri, 2008 Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: I-squared = 69.99 D Study Hallani, 2007	%, P = 0 Γ 0.2	0.5 1 Odds r	2 5 atio	1.35 1.33 → 5.42 1.52 1.86 OR	[0.94; 1.93] [0.68; 2.59] [1.97; 14.91] [1.12; 2.05] [0.94; 3.67] 95%CI	70.8% 20.4% 8.9% 100% W (fixed)	43.2% 33.3% 23.5% 100% W (random) 40.6%
Hallani, 2007 Tsuiki, 2007 Khatri, 2008 Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: 1-squared = 69.99 D Study Hallani, 2007 Tsuiki, 2007	%, P = 0 Γ 0.2	.0359 0.5 1 Odds r	2 5 atio	1.35 1.33 → 5.42 1.52 1.86 OR 1.23 0.68	[0.94; 1.93] [0.68; 2.59] [1.97; 14.91] [1.12; 2.05] [0.94; 3.67] 95%CI [0.75; 2.02] [0.36; 1.30]	70.8% 20.4% 8.9% 100% - W (fixed) 55.6% 32.3%	43.2% 33.3% 23.5% 100% W (random) 40.6% 35.6%
Hallani, 2007 Tsuiki, 2007 Khatri, 2008 Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: I-squared = 69.99 D Study Hallani, 2007 Tsuiki, 2007 Khatri, 2008	%, P = 0 Γ 0.2	0.5 1 Odds r	2 5 atio	1.35 1.33 → 5.42 1.52 1.86 OR 1.23 0.68 — 3.23	[0.94; 1.93] [0.68; 2.59] [1.97; 14.91] [1.12; 2.05] [0.94; 3.67] 95%CI [0.75; 2.02] [0.36; 1.30] [1.12; 9.35]	70.8% 20.4% 8.9% 100% - W (fixed) 55.6% 32.3% 12.1%	43.2% 33.3% 23.5% - 100% W (random) 40.6% 35.6% 23.8%
Hallani, 2007 Tsuiki, 2007 Khatri, 2008 Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: I-squared = 69.99 D Study Hallani, 2007 Tsuiki, 2007 Tsuiki, 2007 Khatri, 2008	%, P = 0 0.2	0.5 1 Odds r	2 5 atio	1.35 1.33 → 5.42 1.52 1.86 OR 1.23 0.68 → 3.23	[0.94; 1.93] [0.68; 2.59] [1.97; 14.91] [1.12; 2.05] [0.94; 3.67] 95%CI [0.75; 2.02] [0.36; 1.30] [1.12; 9.35]	70.8% 20.4% 8.9% 100% - W (fixed) 55.6% 32.3% 12.1%	43.2% 33.3% 23.5% - 100% W (random) 40.6% 35.6% 23.8%
Hallani, 2007 Tsuiki, 2007 Khatri, 2008 Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: I-squared = 69.99 D Study Hallani, 2007 Tsuiki, 2007 Khatri, 2008 Fixed effect model Random effects model	%, P = 0 0.2	0.5 1 Odds r	2 5 atio	1.35 1.33 → 5.42 1.52 1.86 OR 1.23 0.68 3.23 1.14 1.25	[0.94; 1.93] [0.68; 2.59] [1.97; 14.91] [1.12; 2.05] [0.94; 3.67] 95%CI [0.75; 2.02] [0.36; 1.30] [1.12; 9.35] [0.79; 1.65] [0.62; 2.56]	70.8% 20.4% 8.9% 100% - W (fixed) 55.6% 32.3% 12.1% 100%	43.2% 33.3% 23.5%
Hallani, 2007 Tsuiki, 2007 Khatri, 2008 Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: I-squared = 69.99 D Study Hallani, 2007 Tsuiki, 2007 Khatri, 2008 Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: I-squared = 67.89	%, P = 0 0.2 6, P = c	0.5 1 Odds r	2 5 atio	1.35 1.33 → 5.42 1.52 1.86 OR 1.23 0.68 3.23 1.14 1.25	[0.94; 1.93] [0.68; 2.59] [1.97; 14.91] [1.12; 2.05] [0.94; 3.67] 95%CI [0.75; 2.02] [0.36; 1.30] [1.12; 9.35] [0.79; 1.65] [0.62; 2.56]	70.8% 20.4% 8.9% 100% W (fixed) 55.6% 32.3% 12.1% 100% 	43.2% 33.3% 23.5%
Hallani, 2007 Tsuiki, 2007 Khatri, 2008 Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: I-squared = 69.99 D Study Hallani, 2007 Tsuiki, 2007 Khatri, 2008 Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: I-squared = 67.89	%, P = 0 0.2	0.5 1 Odds r	2 5 atio	1.35 1.33 → 5.42 1.52 1.86 OR 1.23 0.68 3.23 1.14 1.25	[0.94; 1.93] [0.68; 2.59] [1.97; 14.91] [1.12; 2.05] [0.94; 3.67] 95%CI [0.75; 2.02] [0.36; 1.30] [1.12; 9.35] [0.79; 1.65] [0.62; 2.56]	70.8% 20.4% 8.9% 100% W (fixed) 55.6% 32.3% 12.1% 100% 	43.2% 33.3% 23.5% - 100% W (random) 40.6% 35.6% 23.8% - 100%
Hallani, 2007 Tsuiki, 2007 Khatri, 2008 Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: I-squared = 69.99 Study Hallani, 2007 Tsuiki, 2007 Khatri, 2008 Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: I-squared = 67.89	%, P = 0 0.2 6, P = c 0.2	0.5 1 Odds r	2 5 atio	1.35 1.33 → 5.42 1.52 1.86 OR 1.23 0.68 3.23 1.14 1.25	[0.94; 1.93] [0.68; 2.59] [1.97; 14.91] [1.12; 2.06] [0.94; 3.67] [0.94; 3.67] [0.36; 1.30] [1.12; 9.36] [0.62; 2.56]	70.8% 20.4% 8.9% 100% W (fixed) 55.6% 32.3% 12.1% 100% 	43.2% 33.3% 23.5% - 100% W (random) 40.6% 35.6% 23.8% 100%

Figure 2. Forest plot of the colorectal cancer associated with: **A.** *MDM2* SNP309 heterozygosity (G/T vs T/T); **B.** *MDM2* SNP309 homozygosity (G/G vs T/T); **C.** dominant model (G/T and G/G vs T/T), and **D.** recessive model (G/G vs G/T and T/T). Box size represents the study weight under the random-effect model. OR = odds ratio; 95%CI = 95% confidence interval.

Genetics and Molecular Research 11 (4): 3618-3628 (2012)

[©]FUNPEC-RP www.funpecrp.com.br

ers compared with that of homozygous T/T carriers, in which the pooled OR = 2.14 with a 95%CI = 0.71-6.45 (Figure 2B). Significant heterogeneity among the studies was found (Q = 10.42, d.f. = 2, P = 0.0055; I² = 80.8%; see Table 3). Under the dominant model, allele G carriers showed an 86% increased risk of glioma; however, the association was not statistically significant (Figure 2C). The recessive model showed that the pooled OR for homozygous GG carriers compared to G/T and T/T carriers was 1.25 with a 95%CI = 0.62-2.56 (Figure 2D). Significant heterogeneity among the studies was found under both the dominant and the recessive models (see Table 3). No significant publication bias was found in the meta-analysis. The study conducted by Khatri et al. (2008) showed a departure from HWE, and we excluded this study from further analysis. However, no significant change in the results was found after the exclusion. The results indicated that *MDM2* SNP309 may not be associated with glioma risk.

Variant	Genetic model	OR-fixed-effect model	OR-random-effect model	Q	d.f.	Р	I^2	Begg test	Egger test
<i>p53</i> Arg72Pro	Arg/Arg	1	1						
	Arg/Pro	1.05 (0.94-1.17)	1.08 (0.85-1.37)	37.3	9	< 0.0001	75.90%	0.9287	0.7139
	Pro/Pro	1.05 (0.85-1.28)	1.08 (0.85-1.36)	10.99	9	0.2756	18.10%	0.089	0.089
	Dominant	1.04 (0.95-1.16)	1.11 (0.90-1.38)	32.48	9	0.0002	72.30%	0.4208	0.3171
	Recessive	1.10 (0.90-1.33)	1.17 (0.85-1.61)	20.68	9	0.0142	56.50%	0.1797	0.3886
<i>MDM2</i> SNP309	T/T	1	1						
	G/T	1.58 (1.14-2.19)	1.95 (1.00-3.81)	5.63	2	0.0598	64.50%	0.1172	0.2862
	G/G	1.53 (1.01-2.32)	2.14 (0.71-6.45)	10.42	2	0.0055	80.80%	0.6015	0.4560
	Dominant	1.52 (1.12-2.05)	1.86 (0.94-3.67)	6.65	2	0.0359	69.90%	0.1172	0.4148
	Recessive	1.14 (0.79-1.65)	1.25 (0.62-2.56)	6.21	2	0.0449	67.80%	0.6015	0.6386

OR = odds ratio; d.f. = degrees of freedom.

DISCUSSION

The *p53* Arg72Pro and *MDM2* SNP309 variants have been found to be significantly associated with susceptibility of various types of cancer, including lung (Dai et al., 2009), colorectal (Fang et al., 2011; Liu et al., 2011), and gastric (Zhou et al., 2007), among others. However, the association of these 2 variants with glioma is not fully understood. Our metaanalysis found no association of these 2 variants with glioma risk. For p53, the common polymorphism rs1042522, located at codon 72 of exon 4, leads to an amino acid change (Arg to Pro). In vitro study has demonstrated that the minor allele Pro has a decreased ability to trigger apoptosis compared to that of the Arg allele (Dumont et al., 2003). The Arg allele on p53 showed stronger transcription activity compared with that of the Pro allele for p53-regulated genes such as death receptor 4, NOXA, p53 upregulated modulator of apoptosis, and p53induced gene 3, which are involved in the apoptosis pathways of cell models (Jeong et al., 2010). The genes induced by p53 at the highest levels compared with baseline levels also tend to be synthesized better by the Arg allele than by the Pro allele (Jeong et al., 2010). The *p53* Arg72Pro polymorphism may influence the capability of certain conformational p53 mutants to form stable complexes with p73, correlating with a loss of p73 DNA-binding capability and consequently affecting the capability to serve as a sequence-specific transcriptional activator

Genetics and Molecular Research 11 (4): 3618-3628 (2012)

J.N. Zhang et al.

and an inducer of apoptosis (Marin et al., 2000). The Arg allele on p53 also shows greater localization to the mitochondria, which leads to the release of cytochrome c into the cytosol and further enhances apoptosis activity compared to that with the Pro allele (Dumont et al., 2003).

These data indicate that the p53 variant may have a distinct function and that the differences that occur may confer cancer risk. The polymorphism was first reported to be significantly associated with an increased risk of glioma in a study conducted by Parhar et al. (2005). The study included 92 adult and 43 pediatric cases consisting of 64 high-grade astrocytomas and 71 non-astrocytomas. However, the small sample size and the multiethnic population of the study made the results controversial. A study conducted in the Indian population also indicated that the Pro allele may increase glioma risk; however, the allele distribution in the control group showed significant derivation from HWE (P = 0.005) and may have biased the results (Jha et al., 2011). In the present meta-analysis of 2587 cases and 4061 controls, we found no statistical association for the p53 Arg/Pro variant and glioma risk under any genetic model. The results indicated that p53 Arg/Pro may not affect glioma risk.

An SNP in the promoter region of MDM2 (rs2279744, T > G) that may lead to different transcription levels by Sp1 was first reported by Bond et al. (2004). At this locus, the T to G change extends the length of a putative Sp1 binding site and increases the affinity of this region for Sp1 (Bond et al., 2004). It may also lead to an elevated level of MDM2 and the subsequent attenuation of p53 in the cell. The variant is associated with accelerated tumor formation in both hereditary and sporadic cancers. Many types of cancer have been reported to be significantly associated with the MDM2 SNP309 variant, including non-small-cell lung cancer (Bai et al., 2009), colorectal cancer (Fang et al., 2011), and gastric carcinoma (Yang et al., 2007). The SNP309 G allele has been significantly associated with an increased risk of glioma in a study conducted by Khatri et al. (2008). However, the allele distribution in the control group showed significant departure from HWE. The other selected studies reported no significant association between SNP309 and glioma risk (El Hallani et al., 2007; Tsuiki et al., 2007). As suggested by Minelli et al. (2008), studies that deviate from HWE in a meta-analysis should be investigated further for weaknesses in their design. However, these studies should not be excluded unless other grounds for doubting the quality of the study are also present. From the pooled results of the 3 studies of MDM2 SNP309, we found no overall significant association between the variant and glioma risk except for a marginally statistically significant increased risk of glioma in comparisons of heterozygous G/T carriers and homozygous T/T carriers in which the pooled OR was 1.95 (95%CI = 1.00-3.81) under the random-effect model. Due to the small size of the current meta-analysis - with only 606 cases and 390 controls - additional studies are needed to evaluate the association of the variant and glioma risk more fully.

Our current study had several weaknesses. First, the sample size was relatively small, and all the data were from case-control studies. Second, the type of glioma was not specified (e.g.; astrocytomas or oligodendrogliomas). Third, the ethnicity of the participants was not specified, and the majority of studies were conducted in European populations or in the Americas, so evidence is lacking from other populations. Thus, more studies that evaluate the associations of the 2 polymorphisms and glioma are needed.

In summary, the overall results from the present data suggested that the p53 Arg72Pro and MDM2 SNP309 polymorphisms have no statistically significant association with glioma risk, although the MDM2-p53 pathway may be involved in glioma tumorigenesis. Additional studies are necessary to address this association.

Genetics and Molecular Research 11 (4): 3618-3628 (2012)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Research supported by grant from the Shanghai Science and Technology Commission (#10JC1409802), the Shanghai Education Commission (#11YZ50), and the Key Laboratory Construction (grant #SW201110010) from Science, Industry, Trade and Information Technology Commission of Shenzhen Municipality.

REFERENCES

- Bai J, Dai J, Yu H, Shen H, et al. (2009). Cigarette smoking, MDM2 SNP309, gene-environment interactions, and lung cancer risk: a meta-analysis. J. Toxicol. Environ. Health A 72: 677-682.
- Begg CB and Mazumdar M (1994). Operating characteristics of a rank correlation test for publication bias. *Biometrics* 50: 1088-1101.
- Biernat W, Kleihues P, Yonekawa Y and Ohgaki H (1997). Amplification and overexpression of MDM2 in primary (de novo) glioblastomas. J. Neuropathol. Exp. Neurol. 56: 180-185.
- Bond GL, Hu W, Bond EE, Robins H, et al. (2004). A single nucleotide polymorphism in the *MDM2* promoter attenuates the *p53* tumor suppressor pathway and accelerates tumor formation in humans. *Cell* 119: 591-602.
- Bredel M, Scholtens DM, Yadav AK, Alvarez AA, et al. (2011). *NFKBIA* deletion in glioblastomas. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 364: 627-637.
- Dai S, Mao C, Jiang L, Wang G, et al. (2009). P53 polymorphism and lung cancer susceptibility: a pooled analysis of 32 case-control studies. Hum. Genet. 125: 633-638.

DerSimonian R and Laird N (1986). Meta-analysis in clinical trials. Control Clin. Trials 7: 177-188.

- Dumont P, Leu JI, Della Pietra AC, George DL, et al. (2003). The codon 72 polymorphic variants of *p53* have markedly different apoptotic potential. *Nat. Genet.* 33: 357-365.
- Egger M, Davey SG, Schneider M and Minder C (1997). Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. *BMJ* 315: 629-634.
- El Hallani S, Marie Y, Idbaih A, Rodero M, et al. (2007). No association of *MDM2* SNP309 with risk of glioblastoma and prognosis. *J. Neurooncol.* 85: 241-244.
- El Hallani S, Ducray F, Idbaih A, Marie Y, et al. (2009). TP53 codon 72 polymorphism is associated with age at onset of glioblastoma. Neurology 72: 332-336.
- Fang F, Yu XJ, Yu L and Yao L (2011). *MDM2* 309 T/G polymorphism is associated with colorectal cancer risk especially in Asians: a meta-analysis. *Med. Oncol.* 28: 981-985.

Gu J, Liu Y, Kyritsis AP and Bondy ML (2009). Molecular epidemiology of primary brain tumors. *Neurotherapeutics* 6: 427-435. Haupt Y, Maya R, Kazaz A and Oren M (1997). Mdm2 promotes the rapid degradation of p53. *Nature* 387: 296-299.

- Hunter SB, Abbott K, Varma VA, Olson JJ, et al. (1995). Reliability of differential PCR for the detection of EGFR and MDM2 gene amplification in DNA extracted from FFPE glioma tissue. J. Neuropathol. Exp. Neurol. 54: 57-64.
- Idbaih A, Boisselier B, Marie Y, Sanson M, et al. (2008). Influence of MDM2 SNP309 alone or in combination with the *TP53* R72P polymorphism in oligodendroglial tumors. *Brain Res.* 1198: 16-20.
- Jeong BS, Hu W, Belyi V, Rabadan R, et al. (2010). Differential levels of transcription of *p53*-regulated genes by the arginine/proline polymorphism: *p53* with arginine at codon 72 favors apoptosis. *FASEB J.* 24: 1347-1353.
- Jha P, Jha P, Pathak P, Chosdol K, et al. (2011). *TP53* polymorphisms in gliomas from Indian patients: Study of codon 72 genotype, rs1642785, rs1800370 and 16 base pair insertion in intron-3. *Exp. Mol. Pathol.* 90: 167-172.
- Khatri RG, Navaratne K and Weil RJ (2008). The role of a single nucleotide polymorphism of MDM2 in glioblastoma multiforme. J. Neurosurg. 109: 842-848.
- Kubbutat MH, Jones SN and Vousden KH (1997). Regulation of p53 stability by Mdm2. Nature 387: 299-303.
- Kussie PH, Gorina S, Marechal V, Elenbaas B, et al. (1996). Structure of the MDM2 oncoprotein bound to the p53 tumor suppressor transactivation domain. Science 274: 948-953.
- Lima-Ramos V, Pacheco-Figueiredo L, Costa S, Pardal F, et al. (2008). *TP53* codon 72 polymorphism in susceptibility, overall survival, and adjuvant therapy response of gliomas. *Cancer Genet. Cytogenet.* 180: 14-19.
- Liu L, Wang K, Zhu ZM and Shao JH (2011). Associations between *P53* Arg72Pro and development of digestive tract cancers: a meta-analysis. *Arch. Med. Res.* 42: 60-69.
- Louis DN, Ohgaki H, Wiestler OD, Cavenee WK, et al. (2007). The 2007 WHO classification of tumours of the central nervous system. *Acta Neuropathol*. 114: 97-109.

Malmer B, Feychting M, Lonn S, Ahlbom A, et al. (2005). p53 Genotypes and risk of glioma and meningioma. Cancer

Genetics and Molecular Research 11 (4): 3618-3628 (2012)

Epidemiol. Biomarkers Prev. 14: 2220-2223.

- Malmer BS, Feychting M, Lonn S, Lindstrom S, et al. (2007). Genetic variation in *p53* and *ATM* haplotypes and risk of glioma and meningioma. *J. Neurooncol.* 82: 229-237.
- Marin MC, Jost CA, Brooks LA, Irwin MS, et al. (2000). A common polymorphism acts as an intragenic modifier of mutant p53 behaviour. Nat. Genet. 25: 47-54.
- Minelli C, Thompson JR, Abrams KR, Thakkinstian A, et al. (2008). How should we use information about HWE in the meta-analyses of genetic association studies? *Int. J. Epidemiol.* 37: 136-146.
- Ohgaki H, Dessen P, Jourde B, Horstmann S, et al. (2004). Genetic pathways to glioblastoma: a population-based study. *Cancer Res.* 64: 6892-6899.
- Oliner JD, Pietenpol JA, Thiagalingam S, Gyuris J, et al. (1993). Oncoprotein *MDM2* conceals the activation domain of tumour suppressor p53. *Nature* 362: 857-860.
- Parhar P, Ezer R, Shao Y, Allen JC, et al. (2005). Possible association of p53 codon 72 polymorphism with susceptibility to adult and pediatric high-grade astrocytomas. *Brain Res. Mol. Brain Res.* 137: 98-103.
- Pinto GR, Yoshioka FK, Silva RL, Clara CA, et al. (2008). Prognostic value of TP53 Pro47Ser and Arg72Pro single nucleotide polymorphisms and the susceptibility to gliomas in individuals from Southeast Brazil. Genet. Mol. Res. 7: 207-216.
- Rajaraman P, Wang SS, Rothman N, Brown MM, et al. (2007). Polymorphisms in apoptosis and cell cycle control genes and risk of brain tumors in adults. *Cancer Epidemiol. Biomarkers Prev.* 16: 1655-1661.
- Shete S, Hosking FJ, Robertson LB, Dobbins SE, et al. (2009). Genome-wide association study identifies five susceptibility loci for glioma. *Nat. Genet.* 41: 899-904.
- Suzuki SO and Iwaki T (2000). Amplification and overexpression of *mdm2* gene in ependymomas. *Mod. Pathol.* 13: 548-553.
- Tsuiki H, Nishi T, Takeshima H, Yano S, et al. (2007). Single nucleotide polymorphism 309 affects murin-double-minute 2 protein expression but not glioma tumorigenesis. *Neurol. Med. Chir.* 47: 203-208.
- Wang LE, Bondy ML, Shen H, El-Zein R, et al. (2004). Polymorphisms of DNA repair genes and risk of glioma. Cancer Res. 64: 5560-5563.
- Wrensch M, Fisher JL, Schwartzbaum JA, Bondy M, et al. (2005). The molecular epidemiology of gliomas in adults. *Neurosurg. Focus* 19: E5.
- Wrensch M, Jenkins RB, Chang JS, Yeh RF, et al. (2009). Variants in the CDKN2B and RTEL1 regions are associated with high-grade glioma susceptibility. Nat. Genet. 41: 905-908.
- Yang M, Guo Y, Zhang X, Miao X, et al. (2007). Interaction of P53 Arg72Pro and MDM2 T309G polymorphisms and their associations with risk of gastric cardia cancer. Carcinogenesis 28: 1996-2001.
- Zhou Y, Li N, Zhuang W, Liu GJ, et al. (2007). P53 codon 72 polymorphism and gastric cancer: a meta-analysis of the literature. Int. J. Cancer 121: 1481-1486.

Genetics and Molecular Research 11 (4): 3618-3628 (2012)