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Abstract

Background: We previously reported an association between rs2660753, a prostate cancer susceptibility polymorphism, and invasive epithelial ovarian cancer (EOC; OR = 1.2, 95% CI = 1.0–1.4, P trend = 0.01) that showed a stronger association with the serous histological subtype (OR = 1.3, 95% CI = 1.1–1.5, P trend = 0.003).

Methods: We sought to replicate this association in 12 other studies comprising 4,482 cases and 6,894 controls of white non-Hispanic ancestry in the Ovarian Cancer Association Consortium.

Results: No evidence for an association with all cancers or serous cancers was observed in a combined analysis of data from the replication studies (all: OR = 1.0, 95% CI = 0.9–1.1, P trend = 0.61; serous: OR = 1.0, 95% CI = 0.9–1.1, P trend = 0.85) or from the combined analysis of discovery and replication studies (all: OR = 1.0, 95% CI = 1.0–1.1, P trend = 0.28; serous: OR = 1.1, 95% CI = 1.0–1.2, P trend = 0.11). There was no evidence for statistical heterogeneity in ORs across the studies.

Conclusions: Although rs2660753 is a strong prostate cancer susceptibility polymorphism, the association with another hormonally related cancer, invasive EOC, is not supported by this replication study.


Introduction

Invasive epithelial ovarian cancer (EOC) has a recognized genetic component, but known high penetrance genes, such as BRCA1 and BRCA2, explain less than 10% of EOC risk (1). The remaining unexplained risk is probably caused by a combination of multiple low to moderate penetrance genetic variants (2).
We previously reported an association between rs2660753 on chromosome 3p12 and invasive EOC (OR = 1.2, 95% CI = 1.0–1.4, \( P_{\text{trend}} = 0.01 \), 1,973 cases/3,419 controls) that showed a stronger association with the serous histological subtype (OR = 1.3, 95% CI = 1.1–1.5, \( P_{\text{trend}} = 0.003 \), 901 cases/3,303 controls; ref. 3). rs2660753 is a prostate cancer susceptibility polymorphism identified from a genome-wide association study of Europeans (4) and replicated in independent populations of European (5) and non-European (6) ancestry. The nearest genes (70–198 kb away) to rs2660753, VGLL3, CHMP2B, and Pit-1/POU1F1, encode proteins with potential roles in tumorigenesis (3) and the 3p12.3-pcen region has been identified as a candidate tumor suppressor gene locus (7).

In this investigation, we sought to replicate the association between rs2660753 and invasive EOC in a larger sample of 12 additional studies from the international Ovarian Cancer Association Consortium (OCAC) comprising 4,482 cases and 6,894 controls.

**Materials and Methods**

**Study population**

Sixteen ovarian cancer case-control studies contributed data to this analysis. Four of the studies were included in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study(^a)</th>
<th>Controls(^b)</th>
<th>Cases(^b)</th>
<th>MAF(^b)</th>
<th>P(^{\text{HWE}})(^b)</th>
<th>OR (95% CI)(^b)</th>
<th>( P_{\text{trend}} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STA</td>
<td>AA Aa aa</td>
<td>AA Aa aa</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>1.3 (0.8–2.0)</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKO</td>
<td>141 39 1</td>
<td>197 67 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAL</td>
<td>467 89 5</td>
<td>366 95 5</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>1.3 (1.0–1.8)</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>677 115 2</td>
<td>368 66 4</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1.2 (0.8–1.6)</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary, discovery</td>
<td>2,305 430 14</td>
<td>1,576 370 22</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>1.2 (1.1–1.4)</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replication set</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAW</td>
<td>123 33 2</td>
<td>53 16 0</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9 (0.5–1.7)</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS</td>
<td>271 80 6</td>
<td>84 21 3</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.0 (0.6–1.5)</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>306 58 5</td>
<td>221 54 0</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>1.1 (0.7–1.6)</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GER</td>
<td>341 83 6</td>
<td>174 31 1</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.7 (0.5–1.1)</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCI</td>
<td>350 93 8</td>
<td>225 44 7</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.9 (0.6–1.2)</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USC</td>
<td>376 108 11</td>
<td>297 73 5</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.8 (0.6–1.1)</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL</td>
<td>435 142 18</td>
<td>187 68 2</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.9 (0.7–1.2)</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOP</td>
<td>453 131 10</td>
<td>227 57 7</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.9 (0.7–1.3)</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOV</td>
<td>572 141 6</td>
<td>419 105 7</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>1.1 (0.8–1.4)</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCO</td>
<td>575 153 9</td>
<td>491 112 2</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.8 (0.6–1.0)</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>692 179 18</td>
<td>450 150 13</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.2 (1.0–1.5)</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUS</td>
<td>884 202 14</td>
<td>685 182 9</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1.1 (0.9–1.4)</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary, replication</td>
<td>5,378 1,403 113</td>
<td>3,513 813 56</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.0 (0.9–1.1)</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary, combined</td>
<td>7,683 1,833 127</td>
<td>5,089 1,283 78</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.0 (1.0–1.1)</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)STA, GEOCS (Genetic Epidemiology of Ovarian Cancer Study), California; UKO, UKOPS (United Kingdom Ovarian Cancer Population Study), United Kingdom; MAL, MALOVA (Malignant Ovarian Cancer Study), Denmark; SEA, SEARCH (Studies of Epidemiology and Risk Factors in Cancer Heredity Ovarian Cancer Study), England; HAW, HAWAII (Hawaii Ovarian Cancer Study), Hawaii; NHS (Nurses’ Health Study); MAY, MAYO (Mayo Clinic Ovarian Cancer Case Control Study), Mid-west; GER, GOCS (German Ovarian Cancer Study), Germany; UCI (the Orange and San Diego Counties California Study), California; USC, LAC-CCOC (Los Angeles County Case-Control Studies of Ovarian Cancer), California; POL (Polish Ovarian Cancer Study), Poland; HOP, HOPE (Hormones and Ovarian Cancer Prediction Study), Pittsburg; DOV, DOVE (Diseases of the Ovary and their Evaluation), Washington; NCO, NCOCs (North Carolina Ovarian Cancer Study), North Carolina; NEC, NECC (New England based Case-Control Study), New England; AUS, AOCS (Australian Ovarian Cancer Study) and ACS (Australian Cancer Study-Ovarian cancer), Australia.

\(^b\)AA, homozygous major allele; Aa, heterozygous; aa, homozygous minor allele; MAF, minor allele frequency in controls; \( P^{\text{HWE}} \), \( P \) values from the chi-square test assessing deviation of genotype frequencies among controls from those expected under HWE.

\(^c\)OR and 95% CI adjusted for age (<40, 40–49, 50–59, 60–69, and ≥70 years) in study-specific analyses and for age and study in summary analyses.
our initial report (discovery set; ref. 3) and 12 were
included in follow up genotyping (replication set).
Details of each of the studies have been published pre-
viously (8). Each study received ethics committee
approval and all study subjects provided informed writ-
ten consent. Pathologic and questionnaire data included
tumor behavior, histology, age at diagnosis (or compar-
able date for controls), family history of breast or ovarian
cancer and ethnicity/race.

Genotyping
Genotyping was carried out by using the 5' nuclease
Taqman allelic discrimination assay (Applied Biosys-
tems), except the Australian Ovarian Cancer Study and the
Australian Cancer Study-Ovarian Cancer that used the
Sequenom iPLEX protocol (Sequenom Inc.), and by
using similar conditions as the original study (3). Con-
sistency across laboratories was assessed by genotyping a
common set of 95 DNAs (90 CEPH trios and 5 duplicate
samples) with 98% or more concordance in genotype
calls. Details of OCAC's criteria for acceptable genotyp-
ing have been described previously (8).

Statistical analysis
Analyses were restricted to white non-Hispanic sub-
jects. We excluded cases with non-EOC and borderline
tumors. Genotypes of participants were used to estimate
allele frequencies and departure from Hardy–Weinberg
equilibrium (HWE) was assessed in controls by by using
a chi-squared test. Single nucleotide polymorphism asso-
ciations were evaluated by using unconditional logistic
regression under ordinal and codominant genetic models
to estimate ORs and 95% CIs. Statistical models were
adjusted for age (<40, 40–49, 50–59, 60—69, and ≥70
years) in study-specific analyses and for age and study
in combined analyses. Prior to pooling, tests of hetero-
genosity in ORs across studies were conducted by using the
likelihood ratio test comparing models with and
without a product term for genotype and study. Statisti-
tical tests were implemented with SAS software (SAS
Institute).

Results
Genotype distributions for controls in all the studies
were consistent with HWE (Table 1). No evidence for an
association was observed at rs2667053 in the replication
set (OR = 1.0, 95% CI = 0.9–1.1, \( P_{\text{trend}} = 0.61 \) for all 4,482
cancers and OR = 1.0, 95% CI = 0.9–1.1, \( P_{\text{trend}} = 0.85 \) for
2,515 serous cancers) or in the combined discovery and
replication sets (OR = 1.0, 95% CI = 1.0–1.1, \( P_{\text{trend}} = 0.28 \)
for all 6,450 cancers and OR = 1.1, 95% CI = 1.0–1.2, \( P_{\text{trend}}
= 0.11 \) for 3,563 serous cancers) under the ordinal model
(Fig. 1). No statistically significant associations were
observed under the codominant model (data not shown).
There was no statistical heterogeneity in ORs for all
ovarian cancers or serous cancers when the discovery
and replication sets were combined (\( P_{\text{heterogeneity}} > 0.10 \)).
Analyses stratified by family history of breast or ovarian cancer in first-degree relatives did not show statistically significant associations for all cancers (OR = 0.9, P = 0.67, 481 cases with family history and OR = 1.0, P = 0.81, 1,576 cases without family history) or for serous cancers (OR = 1.1, P = 0.70, 297 cases with family history and OR = 1.0, P = 0.93, 928 cases without family history).

Discussion

Our findings, based on 12 studies participating in the international OCAC, do not support an association between rs2667053 and invasive EOC overall or for the serous histological type. We used a larger sample size and applied similar assays and stringent quality control criteria to genotype data as in the original study. In the current study, the power to detect an OR of 1.2, as previously reported (3), with minor allele frequency of 0.12 and Type 1 error of 0.01 was 87%. To detect smaller effects, as observed for serous cancers in the current study, a much larger sample is required. There was no evidence of statistical heterogeneity in ORs across studies or of effect modification by family history. Although variant rs2667053 is a strong candidate for prostate cancer susceptibility, it does not seem to be a candidate risk factor for ovarian cancer.
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