

# O EVA-ANALYSIS

# Prognostic Value of Long Non-coding RNAs in Urological Malignancies: A Systematic Review, and Meta-Analysis

Zeinab Bagheri<sup>1</sup> and Mohammad-Hassan Arjmand<sup>2,3,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Deputy of Research and Technology, Shahrekord University of Medical Sciences, Shahrekord, Iran <sup>2</sup>Medical Plants Research Center, Basic Health Sciences Institute, Shahrekord University of Medical Sciences, Shahrekord, Iran <sup>3</sup>Cancer Research Center, Shahrekord University of Medical Sciences, Shahrekord, Iran

# Abstract:

# Background:

Many studies have explored the potential roles of long non-coding RNAs (lncRNAs) in urological cancer (UC) progression. The clinical outcome and prognosis of UCs remain weak. Therefore, finding clinical prognostic markers is needed to improve therapeutic potential. The aim of this study was to consider the possible association between the lncRNAs expression with the survival time and clinical outcomes in patients with UC.

# Methods:

A literature search was performed in several related databases to find eligible English papers published before 9 February 2021. Hazard ratios (HRs) with 95% CI were calculated to investigate the association between lncRNAs expression and overall survival in patients with UC.

#### Results:

A total of 46 studies, including 39 lncRNAs were identified. Results indicated that lncRNAs expression was significantly correlated with poor overall survival (OS) outcome in patients with UCs (HR: 1.923, 95% CI: 1.448-2.554, P<0.001). Also, we divided included studies into up-regulated and down-regulated subgroups according to lncRNAs expression. The results indicated a significant association with poor OS outcomes in both up-regulated (HR=2.546, 95% CI: 1.896-3.41, P<0.001) and down-regulated (HR=0.33, 95% CI: 0.22-0.49, P<0.001). Moreover, expression of lncRNAs was significantly associated with lymph node metastasis (LNM) (OR=0.25, 95% CI: 0.13-0.47, P<0.001)

# Conclusion:

Abnormal expression of various lncRNAs is a potential novel marker for predicting the clinical outcomes of urological tumors.

Keywords: Long non-coding RNAs, Urological cancer, Prognosis, Meta-analysis, Diagnosis, Urological tumors.

Article History	Received: May 20, 2021	Revised: July 7, 2021	Accepted: July 15, 2021

# **1. INTRODUCTION**

Urological Cancers (UCs) comprise approximately 1.5 percent of all malignancies and 12% of cancer-related deaths around the world. The incidences of UCs are the most common in the western world compared to Asian countries [1]. Prostate cancer, renal cell carcinoma, bladder, and testis are most commonly defined as urological malignancies. Among all tumor types related to the urological system, Prostate Cancer (PC) is the most prevalent and the third most common cause of cancer death in men [2]. The prevalence increases with age and

these malignancies are the main source of morbidity and mortality in men over forty years old [3]. Despite the development of treatment for UCs, clinical outcome and prognosis remain weak and useful biomarkers to estimate prognosis and early diagnosis can increase the survival time and help optimal treatment of patients.

The rapid evolution of techniques for whole-genome and transcriptome sequencing have helped demonstrate the critical roles of long non-coding RNA (lncRNA) in the pathogenesis of a wide range of human diseases, especially cancer and tumor genesis [4, 5]. LncRNAs are a class of non-coding RNAs >200 nucleotides long but with no protein-coding potential that modulate different signaling pathways by acting as transcriptional or post-transcriptional regulators [6, 7]. There is

<sup>\*</sup> Address correspondence to this author at Cancer Research Center, Shahrekord University of Medical Sciences, Shahrekord, Postal code; 8815764646, Iran; Fax: 038 3334 9113; E-mails: Arjmandmh1@gmail.com; Arjmand.m@skums.ac.ir

accumulating evidence that they have a critical role in urological system malignancies, and these molecules have the potential to be used as biomarkers for diagnosis and prognosis in the clinic [8]. For example, Chen et al. indicated that upregulated lncRNA-n336928 in patients with Bladder Cancer (BC) might have a relative with poor prognosis [9]. In another study, Xue *et al.* also demonstrated that NBAT1, as a novel lncRNA associated with poor prognosis in patients with cell renal cell carcinoma [10].

Currently, the special expression profiles of lncRNAs have been determined in UCs, and abnormal expression of lncRNAs that may regulate tumor genesis and metastasis-associated genes has been reported so as to discover the association between lncRNAs deregulation and estimation of survival rate and prognosis of patients with UCs; we conducted this quantitative meta-analysis.

# 2. METHODS

#### 2.1. Search Strategy

A primary search was performed on the PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, and Google scholar databases to find eligible English papers published before 9 February 2021. Also, we screened all selected paper references lists for further prospective periodicals. The search terms used included "Long Noncoding RNA" OR "IncRNA" OR "Long ncRNA" OR "Long Non-Translated RNA" OR "Neoplasm" OR "Cancer" OR "Malignancy" OR "Carcinoma" OR "Urogenital Neoplasm" OR "Genitourinary Neoplasm" OR "Genitourinary Cancers" OR "Urological Neoplasm" OR "Urological cancers" OR "Urinary Tract neoplasm" OR "Urinary Tract Cancers" OR "Urological malignancies" OR "Penis Cancers" OR "Prostate Cancer" OR "Testis Cancers" OR "Renal Cancer" OR "Renal cell carcinoma" OR "Bladder cancer" OR " Cancer of Ureter" OR "Prognosis" OR "Prognostic" OR "Survival" OR 'Outcome". We did not try to assess not published papers.

#### 2.2. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

The following criteria in this Meta-analysis were: 1) English papers, 2) studies that evaluated the lncRNA expression level in tissue samples with presented the clinicopathological features, 3) papers that explored the link between the expression level of lncRNA and survival rate, 4) papers that provided a Hazard ratio (HR) with 95% confidence interval (CI) or Kaplan Meier curves or sufficient data to extract HR and their 95% CI.

Exclusion criteria in this study included: 1) Non-English papers, 2) animal or cell studies, 3) reviews, case reports, and editorial articles, 4) studies that just concentrated on lncRNA genetic problems like polymorphism or epigenetic changes, 5) duplicated data.

# 2.3. Data Extraction

Two authors (MHA and ZB) undertook the data extraction from all the included studies independently. Any discrepancies were resolved by consensus. For each study, the first author's name and the year of publication, country. UC type, tumor size, sample size, lymph node metastasis (LNM), distance metastasis (DM), TNM stage, laboratory method in lncRNA expression, and HR with its 95% CI were recorded. The quality of data was evaluated by two authors according to the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS).

# 2.4. Statistical Analysis

The pooled HR and 95% CI were considered to evaluate the effect of lncRNAs expression on UCs (overall survival of multivariate analysis). An observed HR >1 suggested a worse prognosis. Also, we used an odd ratio (OR) with 95% CI to estimate the association between lncRNAs and clinicopathological parameters. In some publications, we extracted HRs from Kaplan Meier curves according to the methods reported by Parmar [11]. Cochran's Q test and Isquared statistics were performed to determine Heterogeneity between studies. The random-effect model was selected if the Heterogeneity was significant (I<sup>2</sup>>50% and P value<0.05); otherwise, the fixed-effect model was used. Subgroup and sensitivity analyses were done to investigate the source of heterogeneity. The Egger's test was performed to determine publication bias. P-value less than 0.05 is defined as statistical significance. Comprehensive Meta-Analysis software (CMA) was used for all analyses.

# **3. RESULTS**

# 3.1. Literature Search

The detailed process of screening and the flow diagram of study selection is shown in Fig. (1). We explored 185 studies in the PubMed, Web of sciences, Scopus, and Google scholar databases. Initially, 42 duplicated articles were excluded in the initial search. After screening the titles and abstracts, 97 papers were excluded as basic research and insufficient data; finally, 46 eligible articles with 7597 patients were included in the current meta-analysis.



Fig. (1). Flow diagram of the study selection.

#### 3.2. Study Characteristics

The main features and data of the selected articles are

summarized in Table 1. These studies investigated a total of 4597 cases among these 46 studies, and all were from china. A total of 39 lncRNAs were explored in these 46 included studies. Three different types of UCs including bladder cancer (BC) [9, 12 - 27], PC [28 - 42], and renal cell carcinoma (RCC) [10, 43 - 53] were evaluated in this study. LncRNAs expression levels were measured in tumor tissues by quantitative Real-Time Polymerase Chain Reaction (qRT-PCR). The HR values

were directly reported from thirty studies while, for fourteen studies, the HRs were considered through data reading from Kaplan-Meier survival curves. In addition, twenty-nine articles provided data regarding the association between lncRNAs expression and LNM, sixteen articles described DM, twenty sis papers reported TNM stage, and twenty-six studies reported tumor size.

G . 1	Age		Tumor	Tumor Fumor	Tumor Sizo Somple	Male	TNM		1	Expre	ession			Cut	а · .				Sample
Study Year	(High/	Country	Tumor Type	Size (High/	Sample	(High/Low) Female	Stage of Tumor	Н	ligh(n)		I	.ow(n)		off	Analysis	HR (CI)	Method	LncRNA name	Sample Type
	Low)			Low)		(High/Low)	(High/Low)	Total	LNM	DM	Total	LNM	DM	value					
Shen 2020	≥65 5/36 <65 3/20	China	BC	≥3 cm 2/30 <3 cm 6/26	64	8/49 0/7	NR	8	0	-	56	26	-	NR	OS	0.203 (0.05-0.86)	RT-qPCR	Lnc-8996	Tissue
Shen 2020	≥65 5/36 <65 6/17	China	BC	≥3 cm 5/36 <3 cm 6/17	64	9/48 2/5	NR	11	0	-	53	26	-	NR	OS	0.15 (0.03-0.73)	RT-qPCR	Lnc-4265	Tissue
Li 2020	≥60 36/31 <60 14/17	China	BC	NR	98	34/28 16/20	NR	50	47	-	40	24	-	NR	OS	2.381 (1.821–7.012)	RT-qPCR	Lnc- PVT1	Tissue
Zhang 2020	>50 26/29 ≤50 27/24	China	BC	>2cm 39/25 ≤2cm 14/28	106	44/39 9/14	I/II 17/31 III/IV 36/22	53	31	38	53	19	27	NR	OS	2.27 (1.26-4.06)	RT-qPCR	Lnc-PCAT6	Tissue
Cai 2020	NR	China	RCC	≥4cm 20/6 <4cm 4/17	47	17/14 7/9	I/II 9/11 III/IV 15/12	24	-	19	23	-	6	NR	OS	1.503 (0.314-7.196)	RT-qPCR	Lnc-PCGEM1	Tissue
Bai 2020	≥65 39/33 <65 25/33	China	PC	NR	130	NR	I/II 23/40 III/IV 41/26	64	30	21	66	15	7	NR	OS	2.111 (1.735–10.295)	RT-qPCR	Lnc- NEAT1	Tissue
Sun 2020	≥60 46/57 <60 95/85	China	RCC	NR	283	98/96 43/46	NR	114	-	-	103	-	-		OS	0.982 (0.444-2.171)	RT-qPCR	Lnc- APOC1P1	Tissue
Xia 2020	≥60 49/39 <60 17/22	China	PC	NR	127	NR	I/II 29/42 III/IV 37/19	66	24	-	61	9	-	NR	OS	2.839 (1.921–8.382)	RT-qPCR	Lnc- SNHG7	Tissue
Duan 2019	≥60 21/14 <60 20/27	China	RCC	>7cm 10/4 ≤7cm 31/37	82	23/36 5/18	I/II 30/39 III/IV 11/9	41	-	-	41	-	-	NR	OS	3.23 (0.6-3.2)	RT-qPCR	Lnc-LINC-PINT	Tissue
Qian 2019	≥55 44/39 <55 48/51	China	RCC	≥ 4 cm 32/40 <4 cm 60/50	182	52/58 40/32	I/II 58/48 III/IV 34/42	92	18	19	90	34	31	NR	OS	2.897 (1.275-4.387)	RT-qPCR	Lnc- PGM5-AS1	Tissue
Shan 2019	≥50 28/23 <20/25	China	BC	≥3cm 23/24 <3cm 25/24	96	34/28 14/20	I/II 12/30 III/IV 36/18	48	-	7	48	-	1	NR	OS	2.102 (1.145 3.859)	RT-qPCR	FAM83H□AS1	Tissue
Zhu 2019	>60 24/27 ≤60 30/28	China	PC	NR	109	NR	I/II 34/42 III/IV 20/13	54	15	-	55	5	-	NR	OS	2.985 (1.238-4.015)	RT-qPCR	Lnc- FEZF1- AS1	Tissue
Li 2019	≥65 22/22 <60 31/30	China	PC	≥2.5cm 26/20 <2.5cm 27/32	105	NR	I/II 28/31 III/IV 25/21	53	17	25	52	11	13		OS	2.984 (1.263-4.198)	RT-qPCR	Lnc-LINC00662	Tissue
Xu 2019	NR	China	PC	NR	70	NR	NR	35	-	-	35	-	-	NR	OS	0.47 (0.19-1.152)	RT-qPCR	Lnc-TUG1	Tissue
Wang 2019	NR	China	BC	NR	112	NR	NR	56	-	-	56	-	-	NR	OS	3.45(1.93-6.16)	RT-qPCR	Lnc- OIP5 AS1	Tissue
Xu 2019	NR	China	BC	NR	82	NR	NR	48	-	-	34	-	-	NR	OS	0.45 (0.19-1.02)	RT-qPCR	Lnc-NOTCH	Tissue
Li 2018	≥ 65 55/56 <65 13/18	China	PC	NR	141	NR	NR	67	21	-	74	55	-	NR	OS	5.047 (4.863-5.488)	RT-qPCR	Lnc- BDNF-AS	Tissue
Huang 2018	>60 25/45 ≤60 68/83	China	PC	NR	54	NR	NR	93	45	-	128	31	-	NR	OS	3.302(1.380-7.89)		Lnc- TMPO-AS1	Tissue

# Table 1. Basic characterisitcis of included studies.

# 118 The Open Biomarkers Journal, 2021, Volume 11

(Table 1) contd.....

(Tuble I	Tumor Male TNM Expression																		
Study	Age	Country	Tumor	Size	Sample	(High/Low)	/Low) Stage nale of Tumor		ligh(n)	c xpr	ession	ow(n)		Cut	Survival		Mathad	I noPNA nomo	Sample
Year	Low)	Country	Туре	(High/	Size	Female		Total		, Invi	Total	LI NM	рм	Value	Analysis	lik (Cl)	Wiethou	LICKIVA name	Туре
Zheng 2018	≥65 32/19 <65 16/8	China	PC	≥2 cm 32/10 <2 cm 16/17	75	(High/Low) NR	I/II 34/20 III/IV 14/7	48	5	32	27	6	7	NR	OS	2.134 (1.214–3.753)	RT-qPCR	Lnc-NAP1L6	Tissue
Zheng 2018	≥65 16/18 <65 11/8	China	PC	≥2.5 cm 15/12 <2.5cm 12/1	53	NR	I/II 6/18 III/IV 21/8	27	10	-	26	3	-	NR	OS	2.63(1.16-5.96)	RT-qPCR	Lnc-HULC	Tissue
Ma 2018	≥60 19/22 <60 17/9	China	BC	NR	67	14/19 22/12	I/II 11/21 III/IV 25/10	36	27	21	31	11	8	NR	OS	3.68(1.17-11.54)	RT- qPCR	Lnc-SNHG5	Tissue
Li 2018	≥60 28/37 <60 9/16	China	BC	≥3cm 13/14 <3cm 24/39	90	31/37 6/16	I/II 14/33 III/IV 23/20	37	7	-	53	3	-	NR	OS	1.30 (1.01-1.68)	RT-qPCR	Lnc-NORAD	Tissue
Cao 2018	≥60 13/9 <60 12/12	China	BC	NR	46	17/15 8/6	I/II 6/15 III/IV 19/6	25	17	20	21	2	8	NR	OS	3.21 (1.28-8.06)	RT-qPCR	Lnc- SNHG16	Tissue
Su 2018	≥55 16/16 <55 14/15	China	RCC	NR	61	21/25 9/6	I/II 25/15 III/IV 5/16	30	0	0	31	3	4	NR	OS	5.378 (2.084-13.88)	RT-qPCR	Lnc-ENSG00000241684	Tissue
Liu 2018	>60 22/23 ≤11/4	China	BC	>3cm 29/19 ≤3cm 6/6	60	32/21 3/4	NR	35	-	-	25	-	-	NR	OS	3.729 (1.127-12.346)	RT-qPCR	Lnc-n346372	Tissue
Zhang 2017	≥60 29/20 <60 16/7	China	PC	≥2.5cm 18/11 <2.5cm 27/16	72	NR	NR	45	9	-	27	4	-	NR	OS	4.871 (2.604–9.110)	RT-qPCR	Lnc-LOC44004	Tissue
Yang 2017	≥65 16/17 <65 13/12	China	BC	NR	58	26/25 3/4	I/II 12/21 III/IV 17/8	29	7	-	29	3	-	NR	OS	0.379 (0.152-0.947)	RT-qPCR	Lnc-ASAP1-IT1	Tissue
Yang 2017	>60 42/21 ≤60 47/42	China	PC	NR	152	NR	I/II 45/31 III/IV 44/32	89	43	-	63	15	-	NR	OS	2.14 (1.29-3.55)	RT-qPCR	Lnc-PVT1	Tissue
Wu 2017	≥65 44/12 <65 10/4	China	PC	NR	73	NR	NR	54	33	-	16	5	-	NR	OS	4.003 (1.038–15.67)	RT-qPCR	Lnc-LINC01296	Tissue
Shi 2017	>60 11/9 <60 7/9	China	RCC	>3cm 17/5 <3cm 5/9	36	12/9 7/8	I/II 6/13 III/IV 13/4	19	-	-	17	-	-	NR	OS	1.93 (0.73-5.17)	qRT-PCR	Lnc-ROR	Tissue
Ning 2017	>55 19/27 ≤55 18/12	China	RCC	>5cm 29/18 ≤5cm 8/21	76	15/19 22/20	NR	37	18	28	39	6	27	NR	OS	2.13 (1.102-4.15)	qRT-PCR	Lnc-NEAT1	Tissue
Li 2017	≥60 24/22 <60 40/34	China	BC	≥3cm 29/28 <3cm 35/28	120	28/26 36/30	I/II 20/32 III/IV 44/24	64	21	-	56	7	-	NR	OS	2.056 (1.236-3.879)	qRT-PCR	Lnc- MALAT1	Tissue
Du 2017	≥60 16/13 <60 29/21	China	BC	≥3cm 17/18 <3cm 28/16	79	25/21 20/13	I/II 20/7 III/IV 25/27	45	9	-	34	13	-	NR	OS	0.52 (0.23-1.18)	qRT-PCR	Lnc- NBAT1	Tissue
Zhao 2017	≥70 23/20 <70 20/22	China	PC	NR	85	NR	NR	43	10	6	42	12	8	NR	OS	0.15 (0.028-0.791)	qRT-PCR	Lnc- FALEC	Tissue
Xiao 2017	>60 124/106 ≤60 100/118	China	RCC	NR	448	152/135 72/89	I/II 112/148 III/IV 112/76	224	-	46	224	-	25		OS	1.124 (1.043-1.211)	qRT-PCR	Lnc-Lucat1	Tissue
Zhang 2016	≥65 19/15 <65 23/18	China	BC	≥2cm 29/16 <2cm 13/17	75	37/27 5/6	I/II 42/33	42	-	-	33	-	-	NR	OS	2.362 (1.504-4.83)	qRT-PCR	Lnc-UNMIBC	Tissue
Bao 2017	≥60 21/30 <60 37/41	China	RCC	>7cm 22/10 ≤7cm 36/61	129	49/48 9/23	I/II 33/63 III/IV 25/8	58	-	-	71	-	-	NR	OS	4.445 (1.396–14.153)	qRT-PCR	Lnc-PVT1	Tissue
Wang 2016	≥65 33/22 <65 17/9	China	PC	≥2.5cm 18/16 <2.5cm 32/15	81	NR	I/II 34/25 III/IV 16/6	50	7	27	31	5	6	NR	OS	2.116 (1.231–3.638)	qRT-PCR	Lnc- LOC400891	Tissue

#### IncRNAs Value in UCs Prognosis

(Table 1) contd.....

	Δge			Tumor		Male	TNM		]	Expr	ession			Cut					
Study Year	(High/	Country	Tumor Type	Size (High/	Sample Size	(High/Low) Female	Stage of Tumor	I	ligh(n)	)	I	Low(n)		off	Survival Analysis	HR (CI)	Method	LncRNA name	Sample Type
	Low)		••	Low)		(High/Low)	(High/Low)	Total	LNM	DM	Total	LNM	DM	value					
Wu 2016	>60 15/19 ≤60 23/20	China	RCC	>4cm 24/25 ≤4cm 14/14	77	25/23 13/16	I/II 6/16 IIII/IV 32/23	38	-	8	39	-	12	NR	OS	2.577 (1.233-5.387)	qRT-PCR	Lnc- Linc00152	Tissue
Zheng 2016	≥65 40/25 <60 19/12	China	PC	≥2.5cm 22/20 <2.5cm 37/18	1 96 1	NR	I/II 14/22 III/IV 46/14	59	10	32	37	5	8	NR	OS	2.292 (1.370 -3.528)	qRT-PCR	Lnc- CCAT2	Tissue
Xue 2015	≥65 27/18 <65 22/31	China	RCC	≥4 cm 18/19 <4cm 31/30	98	26/28 23/21	I/II 38/25 III/IV 11/24	49	3	-	49	11	-	NR	OS	3.701(1.261-9.784)	qRT-PCR	Lnc-NBAT-1	Tissue
Chen 2015	>60 31/40 ≤60 21/17	China	BC	>3cm 31/34 ≤3cm 13/17	98	31/40 13/11	NR	44	-	-	51	-	-	NR	OS	2.377 (1.007-5.610)	qRT-PCR	Lnc- n336928	Tissue
Zhao 2015	≥ 59 14/12 <59 24/18	China	BC	≥3 cm 17/14 <3cm 21/16	68	22/16 16/14	NR	38	18	-	30	1	-	NR	OS	3.716 (2.084-6.719)	qRT-PCR	Lnc-SPRY4-IT1	Tissue
Zhang 2014	≥ 65 25/20 <65 27/26	China	RCC	≥ 4 cm 20/17 <4cm 32/29	98	29/25 23/21	I/II 26/37 III/IV 26/9	52	13	14	46	1	2	NR	OS	3.829 (2.274-8.178)	qRT-PCR	Lnc- SPRY4-IT1	Tissue
Yan 2014	≥59 22/5 <59 68/15	China	BC	≥3.5cm 28/7 <3.5cm 62/13	110	63/17 27/3	NR	90	-	-	20	-	-	NR	OS	4.712 (2.894–8.714)	qRT-PCR	Lnc-HOTAIR	Tissue
Yao 2014	>60 21/19 ≤60 11/13	China	RCC	≥4cm 22/24 <4cm 10/8	64	18/20 14/12	I/II 30/24 III/IV 2/8	32	-	-	32	-	-	NR	os	0.211(0.088-0.504)	qRT-PCR	Lnc- CADM1-AS1	Tissue

BC: Bladder Cancer, PC: Prostate Cancer, RCC: Renal Cell Carcinoma, DM: Distance Metastasis, LNM: Lymph Node Metastasis, OS: Overall Survival



Fig. (2). Forest plot showing the relationship between OS and different abnormal lncRNAs expression overall and based on different UCs.

#### 3.3. Association between lncRNAs Level and OS in UCs

The OS was evaluated in 44 studies, respectively. Significant heterogeneity between included studies was found  $(I^2=97.13\%, P<0.001)$ , therefore, the random effect model was performed to calculate the pooled HR and 95% CI. As a result, the pooled HR for all the studies showed a significant association between different lncRNAs expression and poor OS outcome (HR: 1.923, 95% CI: 1.448-2.554, P<0.001) (Fig. 2). Also, we divided included studies into up-regulated and down-regulated subgroups according to lncRNAs expression in UC. The results indicated a significant association with poor OS outcomes in both up-regulated (HR=2.546, 95% CI: 1.896-3.41, P<0.001, I<sup>2</sup>=97.3% P<0.001, Random model) and down-regulated (HR=0.33, 95% CI: 0.22-0.49, P<0.001, I2=0% P=0.4, Fix model) group. Also, we found a significant association between lncRNAs with sample size (≥100 vs. <100) (OR=1.893, 95% CI: 1.492-2.400, P<0.001, I<sup>2</sup>: 97.13% P<0.001, Random model). Furthermore stratified analysis according to urology cancer types revealed a significant association between the expression of lncRNAs with BC (HR=1.524, 95% CI: 1.074-2.163, P=0.018), PC (HR= 2.376, 95% CI: 1.66-3.4, P<0.001) and RCC (HR=2.389, 95% CI: 1.543-3.69, P<0.001) (Fig. **3**).

# 3.4. LncRNAs Expression and Clinicopathological Characteristics

The association between lncRNAs expression level and the clinicopathological parameters was assessed by calculating the ORs, and the main results are summarized in Table **2**. Accordingly, no significant correlation was seen for age (OR=1.301, 95% CI: 0.88-1.92, P=0.18, I<sup>2</sup>=89.23% P<0.001, Random model), tumor size (OR=1.159, 95% CI: 0.66-2.015, P=0.6, I<sup>2</sup>=90.307% P<0.001, Random model), TNM stage (OR=1.359, 95% CI: 0.8—2.309, P=0.25, I<sup>2</sup>=91.17% P<0.001, Random model), and DM (OR=0.507, 95% CI: 0.187-1.374, P=0.18, I<sup>2</sup>=95.35% P<0.001, Random model). Also, a significant relationship between lncRNAs expression and LNM (OR=0.25, 95% CI: 0.13-0.47, P<0.000, I<sup>2</sup>=92.140% P<0.001, Random model) (Fig. **4**). The association between lncRNAs expression and clinicopathological characteristics are summarized in Table **2**.



Fig. (3). Forest plot for the association of lncRNAs expression level with OS in subgroup analysis according to the urological tumor type.

Study name	1	Statistics 1	or each stu	Jdy	Odds ratio and 95% CI
	Odds ratio	Lower	Upper limit	p-Value	
Shen2020	0.003	0.000	0.195	0.006	<b>k−1</b>     I
Shen 2020	0.002	0.000	0.104	0.002	
LI 2020	245.444	47.110	1278.775	0.000	
Zhang 2020	1.986	0.917	4.300	0.082	
Bal 2020	0.779	0.389	1.559	0.480	
Xia 2020	0.327	0.161	0.664	0.002	
Qlan 2019	0.059	0.029	0.123	0.000	<b>⊬</b>
Zhu 2019	0.148	0.064	0.343	0.000	<b>k∎</b> ∔
LI 2019	0.223	0.099	0.504	0.000	
LI 2018	0.208	0.100	0.432	0.000	
Huang 2018	0.879	0.494	1.562	0.660	
Zheng 2018	0.014	0.004	0.050	0.000	
Zheng2018	0.346	0.115	1.044	0.060	
Ma 2018	9.000	3.097	26.155	0.000	
LI2018	0.054	0.017	0.174	0.000	k—I
Cao 2018	4.516	1.376	14.820	0.013	
Su 2018	0.000	0.000	0.014	0.000	k
Zhang 2017	0.063	0.022	0.176	0.000	k—I
Yang 2017	0.101	0.030	0.337	0.000	
Yang2017	0.874	0.485	1.573	0.653	
Wu 2017	2.469	1.139	5.353	0.022	
Ning 2017	0.898	0.361	2.233	0.816	
LI 2017	0.239	0.114	0.499	0.000	
Du 2017	0.063	0.022	0.176	0.000	₩
Zhao 2017	2.250	0.376	13.465	0.374	
Wang 2016	0.027	0.009	0.082	0.000	
Zheng2016	0.042	0.016	0.109	0.000	k
Xue 2015	0.004	0.001	0.022	0.000	K I I I
Zhao 2015	0.810	0.329	1.993	0.647	
Zhang 2014	0.111	0.046	0.270	0.000	
	0.250	0.132	0.475	0.000	

Fig. (4). Forestplot for the association between lncRNAs expression and LNM.

Table 2. meta-analysis of the association between DDRs expression and clinicopathological characteristics.

Sturtified Amelantic	No. of	No. of	Test of Association	Test of Heterogeneity			
Stratified Analysis	Studies	Patients	Pooled OR (95% CI)	p-value	I <sup>2</sup> (%)	P-value	Model
Age (≥60 vs. <60)	42	4286	1.301 (0.88-1.92)	0.18	89.23%	< 0.001	R
Tumor size (large vs. small)	28	2401	1.159 (0.66-2.015)	0.6	90.307%	< 0.001	R
Tumor stage (III+IV vs. I+II)	28	2909	1.359 (0.8-2.309)	0.25	91.17%	< 0.001	R
DM	17	1879	0.507 (0.187-1.374)	0.18	95.35%	< 0.001	R
LNM	30	2546	0.25 (0.13-0.47)	0.000	92.140%	< 0.001	R

# 3.5. Sensitivity Analysis and Publication Bias

Sensitivity analysis was performed to assess the effect of each independent study on overall outcomes. After removing any single study, there was no significant change observed, so the results revealed the stability and robustness of the pooled results (Fig. 5). Moreover, the Funnel plot and Egger's tests were also used to evaluate the publication bias. In this Metaanalysis, the graphic assessment of the funnel plot and Egger's test indicated that there was significant publication bias through the included studies (P=0.01) (Fig. 6). When we removed six studies [12, 17, 24, 32, 40, 54], recalculated result showed no publication bias (P=0.1).

5

10

Study name	Stat	istics with	h study re	moved		Haz	ard ratio (95%	CI) with study removed
	Point	Lower limit	Upper limit	p-Value				
Shen2020	2.006	1.507	2.670	0.000	- T	1	T.	1 - <b>1</b> - 1 - 1
Shen 2020	2.008	1.509	2.672	0.000				<b>-₽</b> −
Li 2020	1.920	1.433	2.574	0.000				I <b>-∎</b> - I I
Zhang 2020	1.925	1.442	2.570	0.000				<b>∎</b>
Cai 2020	1.941	1.457	2.585	0.000				I <b>-∎</b> - I I
Bai 2020	1.925	1.431	2.588	0.000				<b>_</b>
Sun 2020	1.963	1.473	2.617	0.000				· <b>→</b> · · ·
Duan 2019	1.920	1.441	2.557	0.000				<b>_</b>
Qian 2019	1.916	1.436	2.556	0.000				<b>_</b>
Xia 2020	1.913	1.431	2.558	0.000				<b>_</b>
Shan 2019	1.929	1.445	2.575	0.000				<b>_</b>
Zhu 2019	1.915	1.436	2.554	0.000				
Xu2019	1.997	1.500	2.659	0.000				_ <b>-</b> ₽-
Xu 2019	1.994	1.497	2.655	0.000				<b>-#</b> -
Wang 2019	1.906	1.427	2.544	0.000				<b>−</b> ∰−
Li 2019	1.915	1.436	2.554	0.000				
Li2018	1.940	1.590	2.366	0.000				I 🛨 I I
Huang 2018	1.911	1.432	2.549	0.000				
Zheng2018	1.928	1.444	2.574	0.000				
Zheng 2018	1.910	1.433	2.546	0.000				
Ma 2018	1.910	1.433	2.546	0.000				
Li 2018	1.954	1.463	2.609	0.000				
Cao 2018	1.912	1.434	2.551	0.000				
Su 2018	1.892	1.419	2.523	0.000				
Liu 2018	1.910	1.433	2.546	0.000				<b>_</b>
Zhang 2017	1.890	1.416	2.523	0.000				
Yang 2017	2.003	1.504	2.666	0.000				<del></del>
Yang2017	1.928	1.444	2.574	0.000				
Wu 2017	1.910	1.433	2.545	0.000				
Shi 2017	1.933	1.450	2.578	0.000				
Ning 2017	1.929	1.445	2.574	0.000				
Li 2017	1.930	1.445	2.577	0.000				
Du 2017	1.992	1.495	2.653	0.000				
Zhao 2017	2.005	1.507	2.667	0.000				· - <u>∓</u> · · ·
Xiao 2017	2.000	1.577	2.535	0.000				
Zhang 2016	1.923	1.439	2.569	0.000				
Bao 2017	1.903	1.428	2.537	0.000				
Wang 2016	1.929	1.444	2.5/5	0.000				
Wu 2016	1.920	1.439	2.562	0.000				
Zheng 2016	1.925	1.441	2.5/0	0.000				
Aue 2015	1.909	1.432	2.545	0.000			1	
Chen 2015	1.924	1.443	2.567	0.000		1	- 1	
Zhao 2015	1.902	1.425	2.540	0.000		1	- 1	
Zhang 2014	1.900	1.422	2.538	0.000			1	
Tan 2014	1.890	1.415	2.524	0.000		1	- 1	
140 2014	2.031	1.02/	2.700	0.000			1	
	1.933	1.455	2.570	0.000				
					0.1	0.2	0.5	1 2 5 10
						Favo	ours A	Favours B

Fig. (5). Sensitivity analysis of the effect of each study on the final HRs of OS.



Fig. (6). Funnel plot analysis of potential publication bias for meta-analysis.

# 4. DISCUSSION

Although there have been substantial developments in the therapy of UCs in past decades, they are often detected at a late stage, because of the lack of effective biomarkers. Moreover, the evaluation of cancer prognosis is required for the selection of treatment type and understanding the disease process and survival rate [55]. UCs are associated with significant morbidity and mortality. The growing incidence of UCs in the western world indicates that these types of cancer will remain a significant health problem in the future. Therefore, the identification of new and effective biomarkers UCs is a crucial clinical need.

Recently, various studies focused on the clinical roles of lncRNAs, and many investigations showed that lncRNAs have the potential to be a molecular biomarker in UCs patients for predicting prognosis. About 15,000 lncRNAs have been found to exist in the genome of humans, and many of these are involved in carcinogenesis [4]. Many studies have demonstrated that lncRNAs can act as a transcriptional regulator playing roles in many cells processes such as cell growth and apoptosis-related to cancer. For instance, Cao et al. showed that lncRNA-SNHG16 promotes the proliferation of BC cells by affecting G1/S transition and reduce apoptosis. Also, they found that high-level expression of SNHG16 was associated with the overall survival of patients with BC [56]. Li et al. indicated that lncRNA LINC00662 by targeting miR-34a promotes the PC tumor genesis. They found a positive association between LINC00662 with clinical features such as distance metastasis and poor survival in patients with PC [31]. In addition, some lncRNAs have the role of tumor suppressors. Recently recognized lncRNA NBAT1 was able to control neuroblastoma and breast cancer progression through regulating cell proliferation [57, 58]. Du et al. showed reduced expression of lncRNA NBAT1 was related to promoting cell proliferation and epithelial mesangial transition and poor prognosis in patients with BC [24]. Our result showed that the down-regulation of 7 lncRNAs includes TUG1, NOTCH1, NBAT1, CADM1-ASP, FALEC, ENST00000598996 and ENST00000524265, were associated with poor OS in patients with UC.

This meta-analysis has summarized the current studies on the relationship between abnormal lncRNAs expression and the prognosis of patients with UC. Our result revealed a significant association between lncRNAs expression and poor prognosis in patients with UCs in both up-regulated and down-regulated groups. Next, we analyzed the association between lncRNAs level and the clinical features in patients with UC. LncRNAs expression was closely related to LNM and sample size but not associated with AGE, tumor size, TNM stage, and DM. In general, the pooled data showed that lncRNAs expression may represent a significant prognostic factor for survival outcomes in urological cancers.

There are some limitations to our meta-analysis. First, we estimated the HR and 95% CI from Kaplan-Meier curves by using DigitizeIT software and the methods reported by Parmar, which may also have affected the accuracy of our results. Second, all included studies in our meta-analysis were from China, our data might not be globally appropriate, third, the

data were of various lncRNAs, which may have promoted the heterogeneity between the studies and conflict with the result.

# CONCLUSION

This meta-analysis explored the relationship between the expression of lncRNAs and prognosis in UCS. Abnormal lncRNAs expression is linked to the poor prognosis of UCs patients and can therefore be a probable marker for UC. Although our knowledge about the biological effects of lncRNAs is limited, lncRNAs are probable have the potential to be biomarkers for UC. Finally, we need more studies with larger samples to confirm the conclusion of our meta-analysis in the future.

#### LIST OF ABREVIATIONS

BC	= Bladder Cancer
CI	= Confidence Interval
DM	= Distance Metastasis
HRs	= Hazard Ratios
IncRNAs	= Long Non-coding RNAs
LNM	= Lymph Node Metastasis
NOS	= Newcastle-Ottawa Scale
ORs	= Odds Ratios
OS	= Overall Survival
PC	= Prostate Cancer
qRT-PCR	= Quantitative Real-time Polymerase Chain Reaction
UC	= Urological Cancer
RCC	= Renal Cell Carcinoma

# **AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS**

MH.A and ZB researched literature and interpretation of data, MHA, final approval of the version to be published.

# CONSENT FOR PUBLICATION

Not applicable.

# STANDARDS OF REPORTING

PRISMA guidelines were followed in this study.

#### FUNDING

This study was supported by grants awarded by the Shahrekord University of Medical Sciences (Grant No. 5646).

# **CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

# ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the Shahrekord University of Medical Science to provide conditions for access to databases.

# REFERENCES

- Torre LA, Bray F, Siegel RL, Ferlay J, Lortet-Tieulent J, Jemal A. Global cancer statistics, 2012. CA Cancer J Clin 2015; 65(2): 87-108. [http://dx.doi.org/10.3322/caac.21262] [PMID: 25651787]
- [2] Siegel RL, Miller KD, Jemal A. Cancer statistics, 2017. CA Cancer J

Clin 2017; 67(1): 7-30.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.3322/caac.21387] [PMID: 28055103]

- Hoffman A, Half EE. Update on screening for urological malignancies. Rambam Maimonides Med J 2017; 8(4)
   [http://dx.doi.org/10.5041/RMMJ.10318] [PMID: 29059045]
- [4] Prensner JR, Chinnaiyan AM. The emergence of lncRNAs in cancer biology. Cancer Discov 2011; 1(5): 391-407.
   [http://dx.doi.org/10.1158/2159-8290.CD-11-0209] [PMID: 22096659]
- [5] Wang A, Bao Y, Wu Z, et al. Long noncoding RNA EGFR-AS1 promotes cell growth and metastasis via affecting HuR mediated mRNA stability of EGFR in renal cancer. Cell Death Dis 2019; 10(3): 154.
- [http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41419-019-1331-9] [PMID: 30770799]
   [6] Gibb EA, Brown CJ, Lam WL. The functional role of long non-coding RNA in human carcinomas. Mol Cancer 2011; 10(1): 38.
   [http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/1476-4598-10-38] [PMID: 21489289]
- [7] Li X, Wu Z, Fu X, Han W. Long noncoding RNAs: Insights from biological features and functions to diseases. Med Res Rev 2013; 33(3): 517-53.
- [http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/med.21254] [PMID: 22318902]
  [8] Qi P, Du X. The long non-coding RNAs, A new cancer diagnostic and therapeutic gold mine. Mod Pathol 2013; 26(2): 155-65.
- [http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/modpathol.2012.160] [PMID: 22996375]
   [9] Chen T, Xie W, Xie L, *et al.* Expression of long noncoding RNA lncRNA-n336928 is correlated with tumor stage and grade and overall survival in bladder cancer. Biochem Biophys Res Commun 2015; (49(4)) 667 (510)

468(4): 666-70.
[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.bbrc.2015.11.013] [PMID: 26551459]
[10] Xue S, Li QW, Che JP, Guo Y, Yang FQ, Zheng JH. Decreased expression of long non-coding RNA NBAT-1 is associated with poor

- expression of long non-coding RNA NBAT-1 is associated with poor prognosis in patients with clear cell renal cell carcinoma. Int J Clin Exp Pathol 2015; 8(4): 3765-74. [PMID: 26097558]
- Parmar MK, Torri V, Stewart L. Extracting summary statistics to perform meta-analyses of the published literature for survival endpoints. Stat Med 1998; 17(24): 2815-34.
   [http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0258(19981230)17:24<2815::A ID-SIM110>3.0.CO;2-8] [PMID: 9921604]
- [12] Shen C, Wang Y, Wu Z, et al. Long noncoding RNAs, ENST00000598996 and ENST00000524265, are correlated with favorable prognosis and act as potential tumor suppressors in bladder cancer. Oncol Rep 2020; 44(5): 1831-50. [http://dx.doi.org/10.3892/or.2020.7733] [PMID: 33000254]

[13] Li B, Guo LH, Ban ZQ, Liu L, Luo L, Cui TY. Upregulation of IncRNA plasmacytoma variant translocation 1 predicts poor prognosis in patients with muscle-invasive bladder cancer. Medicine (Baltimore) 2020; 99(28)e21059

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/MD.00000000021059] [PMID: 32664121]

 Zhang D, Du D, Yi S, Li X. LncRNA PCAT6: A potential biomarker for diagnosis and prognosis of bladder cancer. Ann Diagn Pathol 2020; 49151642
 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.anndiagpath.2020.151642]
 [PMID:

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.anndiagpath.2020.151642] [PMID: 33142195]

[15] Shan H, Yang Y, Zhu X, Han X, Zhang P, Zhang X. FAM83H-AS1 is associated with clinical progression and modulates cell proliferation, migration, and invasion in bladder cancer. J Cell Biochem 2019; 120(3): 4687-93.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jcb.27758] [PMID: 30537032]

- [16] Wang Y, Shi F, Xia Y, Zhao H. LncRNA OIP5-AS1 predicts poor prognosis and regulates cell proliferation and apoptosis in bladder cancer. J Cell Biochem 2018; 120(5): 7499-505. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jcb.28024] [PMID: 30485498]
- [17] Xu Z, Huang B, Zhang Q, He X, Wei H, Zhang D. NOTCH1 regulates the proliferation and migration of bladder cancer cells by cooperating with long non-coding RNA HCG18 and microRNA-34c-5p. J Cell Biochem 2019; 120(4): 6596-604. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jcb.27954] [PMID: 30426533]
- [18] Ma Z, Xue S, Zeng B, Qiu D. IncRNA SNHG5 is associated with poor prognosis of bladder cancer and promotes bladder cancer cell proliferation through targeting p27. Oncol Lett 2018; 15(2): 1924-30. [PMID: 29434891]
- [19] Li Q, Li C, Chen J, et al. High expression of long noncoding RNA NORAD indicates a poor prognosis and promotes clinical progression and metastasis in bladder cancer. Urol Oncol-Semin Orig Investig 2018; 36(6): 310.e15-22.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.urolonc.2018.02.019] [PMID: 29605462]

- [20] Cao X, Xu J, Yue D. LncRNA-SNHG16 predicts poor prognosis and promotes tumor proliferation through epigenetically silencing p21 in bladder cancer. Cancer Gene Ther 2018; 25(1-2): 10-7. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41417-017-0006-x] [PMID: 29234154]
- [21] Liu A, Zhang Z, Xu W, et al. Overexpression of long non □coding RNA n346372 in bladder cancer tissues is associated with a poor prognosis. Mol Med Rep 2018; 18(6): 5437-44. [http://dx.doi.org/10.3892/mmr.2018.9597] [PMID: 30365104]
- [22] Yang L, Xue Y, Liu J, et al. Long noncoding RNA ASAP1-IT1 promotes cancer stemness and predicts a poor prognosis in patients with bladder cancer. Neoplasma 2017; 64(6): 847-55. [http://dx.doi.org/10.4149/neo\_2017\_606] [PMID: 28895409]
- [23] Li C, Cui Y, Liu LF, et al. High expression of long noncoding rna malat1 indicates a poor prognosis and promotes clinical progression and metastasis in bladder cancer. Clin Genitourin Cancer 2017; 15(5): 570-6.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.clgc.2017.05.001] [PMID: 28648755]

- [24] Du D, Zhang Z, Yin YF, Min MY, Du JH, Fu J, et al. Decreased expression of long noncoding RNA NBAT1 indicates a poor prognosis and promotes cell proliferation and EMT in bladder cancer. Int J Clin Exp Med 2017; 10(6): 9214-21.
- [25] Zhang S, Zhong G, He W, Yu H, Huang J, Lin T. IncRNA upregulated in nonmuscle invasive bladder cancer facilitates tumor growth and acts as a negative prognostic factor of recurrence. J Urol 2016; 196(4): 1270-8.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.juro.2016.05.107] [PMID: 27267320]

[26] Zhao XL, Zhao ZH, Xu WC, Hou JQ, Du XY. Increased expression of SPRY4-IT1 predicts poor prognosis and promotes tumor growth and metastasis in bladder cancer. Int J Clin Exp Pathol 2015; 8(2): 1954-60.

[PMID: 25973088]

- [27] Yan TH, Lu SW, Huang YQ, et al. Upregulation of the long noncoding RNA HOTAIR predicts recurrence in stage Ta/T1 bladder cancer. Tumour Biol 2014; 35(10): 10249-57. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s13277-014-2344-8] [PMID: 25030736]
- [28] Bai J, Huang G. Role of long non-coding RNA NEAT1 in the prognosis of prostate cancer patients. Medicine (Baltimore) 2020; 99(22)e20204
   [http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/MD.00000000020204] [PMID:

[http://dx.doi.org/10.109//MD.000000000020204] [PMID: 32481386]

- [29] Xia Q, Li J, Yang Z, Zhang D, Tian J, Gu B. Long non-coding RNA small nucleolar RNA host gene 7 expression level in prostate cancer tissues predicts the prognosis of patients with prostate cancer. Medicine (Baltimore) 2020; 99(7)e18993 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/MD.000000000018993] [PMID: 32049793]
- [30] Zhu LF, Song LD, Xu Q, Zhan JF. Highly expressed long non-coding RNA FEZF1-AS1 promotes cells proliferation and metastasis through Notch signaling in prostate cancer. Eur Rev Med Pharmacol Sci 2019; 23(12): 5122-32. [PMID: 31298365]
- [31] Li N, Zhang LY, Qiao YH, Song RJ. Long noncoding RNA LINC00662 functions as miRNA sponge to promote the prostate cancer tumorigenesis through targeting miR-34a. Eur Rev Med Pharmacol Sci 2019; 23(9): 3688-98. [PMID: 31114993]
- [32] Xu T, Liu CL, Li T, Zhang YH, Zhao YH. LncRNA TUG1 aggravates the progression of prostate cancer and predicts the poor prognosis. Eur Rev Med Pharmacol Sci 2019; 23(11): 4698-705. [PMID: 31210308]
- [33] Li W, Dou Z, We S, et al. Long noncoding RNA BDNF-AS is associated with clinical outcomes and has functional role in human prostate cancer. Biomed Pharmacother 2018; 102: 1105-10. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biopha.2018.03.118] [PMID: 29710528]
- [34] Huang W, Su X, Yan W, *et al.* Overexpression of AR-regulated lncRNA TMPO-AS1 correlates with tumor progression and poor prognosis in prostate cancer. Prostate 2018; 78(16): 1248-61. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/pros.23700] [PMID: 30105831]
- [35] Zheng Y, Gao Y, Li X, et al. Long non-coding RNA NAP1L6 promotes tumor progression and predicts poor prognosis in prostate cancer by targeting Inhibin-β A. OncoTargets Ther 2018; 11: 4965-77. [http://dx.doi.org/10.2147/OTT.S163680] [PMID: 30154665]
- [36] Zheng P, Li H, Xu P, et al. High lncRNA HULC expression is associated with poor prognosis and promotes tumor progression by regulating epithelial-mesenchymal transition in prostate cancer. Arch Med Sci 2018; 14(3): 679-86.

- [http://dx.doi.org/10.5114/aoms.2017.69147] [PMID: 29765457]
   [37] Zhang C, Liu C, Wu J, *et al.* Upregulation of long noncoding RNA LOC440040 promotes tumor progression and predicts poor prognosis in patients with prostate cancer. OncoTargets Ther 2017; 10: 4945-54. [http://dx.doi.org/10.2147/OTT.S138354] [PMID: 29066914]
- [38] Yang J, Li C, Mudd A, Gu X. LncRNA PVT1 predicts prognosis and regulates tumor growth in prostate cancer. Biosci Biotechnol Biochem 2017; 81(12): 2301-6. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09168451.2017.1387048] [PMID:

29050519] [39] Wu J, Cheng G, Zhang C, *et al.* Long noncoding RNA LINC01296 is

- [37] Ward, Cheng G, Zhang C, et al. Europenheum protecting (AVE) Interface 1230 is associated with poor prognosis in prostate cancer and promotes cancer-cell proliferation and metastasis. OncoTargets Ther 2017; 10: 1843-52.
   [http://dx.doi.org/10.2147/OTT.S129928] [PMID: 28392705]
- [40] Zhao R, Sun F, Bei X, *et al.* Upregulation of the long non-coding RNA FALEC promotes proliferation and migration of prostate cancer cell lines and predicts prognosis of PCa patients. Prostate 2017; 77(10): 1107-17.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/pros.23367] [PMID: 28585762]

- [41] Wang J, Cheng G, Li X, et al. Overexpression of long non-coding RNA LOC400891 promotes tumor progression and poor prognosis in prostate cancer. Tumour Biol 2016; 37(7): 9603-13. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s13277-016-4847-y] [PMID: 26797783]
- [42] Zheng J, Zhao S, He X, et al. The up-regulation of long non-coding RNA CCAT2 indicates a poor prognosis for prostate cancer and promotes metastasis by affecting epithelial-mesenchymal transition. Biochem Biophys Res Commun 2016; 480(4): 508-14. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.bbrc.2016.08.120] [PMID: 27558961]
- [43] Cai X, Zhang X, Mo L, Zhu J, Yu H. LucRNA PCGEM1 promotes renal carcinoma progression by targeting miR-433-3p to regulate FGF2 expression. Cancer Biomark 2020; 27(4): 493-504. [http://dx.doi.org/10.3233/CBM-190669] [PMID: 31958075]
- [44] Sun C, Zhou Z, Shi H, Li F, Zhang G. Identification of long noncoding RNA APOC1P1 as an oncogene in clear cell renal cell carcinoma. Disease Markers 2019.
- [http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2019/2814058]
- [45] Duan J, Ma X, Shi J, et al. Long noncoding RNA LINC-PINT promotes proliferation through EZH2 and predicts poor prognosis in clear cell renal cell carcinoma. OncoTargets Ther 2019; 12: 4729-40. [http://dx.doi.org/10.2147/OTT.S202938] [PMID: 31417274]
- [46] Qian M, Zheng JL, Kang N, Su YL. Down-regulation of long noncoding RNA PGM5-AS1 correlates with tumor progression and predicts poor prognosis in clear cell renal cell carcinoma. Eur Rev Med Pharmacol Sci 2019; 23(24): 10685-90. [PMID: 31858536]
- [47] Su H, Wang H, Shi G, Zhang H, Sun F, Ye D. Downregulation of long non-coding RNA ENSG00000241684 is associated with poor prognosis in advanced clear cell renal cell carcinoma. Eur J Surg

Oncol 2018; 44(6): 840-6.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ejso.2018.01.013] [PMID: 29433989]

- [48] Shi J, Zhang W, Tian H, Zhang Q, Men T. IncRNA ROR promotes the proliferation of renal cancer and is negatively associated with favorable prognosis. Mol Med Rep 2017; 16(6): 9561-6. [http://dx.doi.org/10.3892/mmr.2017.7775] [PMID: 29039528]
- [49] Ning L, Li Z, Wei D, Chen H, Yang C. LncRNA, NEAT1 is a prognosis biomarker and regulates cancer progression via epithelialmesenchymal transition in clear cell renal cell carcinoma. Cancer Biomark 2017; 19(1): 75-83. [http://dx.doi.org/10.3233/CBM-160376] [PMID: 28269753]
- [50] Xiao H, Bao L, Xiao W, et al. Long non-coding RNA Lucat1 is a poor prognostic factor and demonstrates malignant biological behavior in clear cell renal cell carcinoma. Oncotarget 2017; 8(69): 113622-34. [http://dx.doi.org/10.18632/oncotarget.21185] [PMID: 29371934]
- [51] Bao X, Duan J, Yan Y, et al. Upregulation of long noncoding RNA PVT1 predicts unfavorable prognosis in patients with clear cell renal cell carcinoma. Cancer Biomark 2017; 21(1): 55-63. [http://dx.doi.org/10.3233/CBM-170251] [PMID: 29081406]
- [52] Wu Y, Tan C, Weng WW, et al. Long non-coding RNA Linc00152 is a positive prognostic factor for and demonstrates malignant biological behavior in clear cell renal cell carcinoma. Am J Cancer Res 2016; 6(2): 285-99. [PMID: 27186403]
- [53] Zhang HM, Yang FQ, Yan Y, Che JP, Zheng JH. High expression of long non-coding RNA SPRY4-IT1 predicts poor prognosis of clear cell renal cell carcinoma. Int J Clin Exp Pathol 2014; 7(9): 5801-9. [PMID: 25337221]
- [54] Yao J, Chen Y, Wang Y, et al. Decreased expression of a novel lncRNA CADM1-AS1 is associated with poor prognosis in patients with clear cell renal cell carcinomas. Int J Clin Exp Pathol 2014; 7(6): 2758-67. [PMID: 25031695]
- [55] Altman DG, Lyman GH. Methodological challenges in the evaluation of prognostic factors in breast cancer 1998.
- [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-5195-9\_28]
- [56] Cao R, Yuan L, Ma B, Wang G, Tian Y. Immune-related long noncoding RNA signature identified prognosis and immunotherapeutic efficiency in bladder cancer (BLCA). Cancer Cell Int 2020; 20(1): 276.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12935-020-01362-0] [PMID: 32607061]

- [57] Pandey GK, Mitra S, Subhash S, et al. The risk-associated long noncoding RNA NBAT-1 controls neuroblastoma progression by regulating cell proliferation and neuronal differentiation. Cancer Cell 2014; 26(5): 722-37.
- [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ccell.2014.09.014] [PMID: 25517750]
   [58] Hu P, Chu J, Wu Y, *et al.* NBAT1 suppresses breast cancer metastasis by regulating DKK1 via PRC2. Oncotarget 2015; 6(32): 32410-25.
   [http://dx.doi.org/10.18632/oncotarget.5609] [PMID: 26378045]

#### © 2021 Bagheri and Arjmand

This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Public License (CC-BY 4.0), a copy of which is available at: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode. This license permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.