



ADRB3 Gene Trp64Arg Polymorphism and Essential Hypertension: A Meta-Analysis Including 9,555 Subjects

Yan-yan Li^{1,2*†}, Xin-zheng Lu^{3†}, Hui Wang³, Yan-hong Zhou¹, Xin-xing Yang¹, Hong-yu Geng^{1,4}, Ge Gong^{1,5} and Hyun Jun Kim⁶

¹ Department of Geriatrics, First Affiliated Hospital of Nanjing Medical University, Nanjing, China, ² Clinical Research Center, First Affiliated Hospital of Nanjing Medical University, Nanjing, China, ³ Department of Cardiology, First Affiliated Hospital of Nanjing Medical University, Nanjing, China, ⁴ Department of Intensive Care Unit, Baoding First Central Hospital, Baoding, China, ⁵ Department of Geriatrics, Nanjing General Hospital, Nanjing, China, ⁶ Department of Physiology, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH, United States

OPEN ACCESS

Edited by:

Naoki Osada, Hokkaido University, Japan

Reviewed by:

Divya Mehta, Queensland University of Technology, Australia Gang Shi, Xidian University, China

*Correspondence:

Yan-yan Li lyynjmu123@126.com

[†]These authors have contributed equally to this work.

Specialty section:

This article was submitted to Evolutionary and Population Genetics, a section of the journal Frontiers in Genetics

> Received: 02 February 2018 Accepted: 16 March 2018 Published: 04 April 2018

Citation:

Li Y, Lu X, Wang H, Zhou Y, Yang X, Geng H, Gong G and Kim HJ (2018) ADRB3 Gene Trp64Arg Polymorphism and Essential Hypertension: A Meta-Analysis Including 9,555 Subjects. Front. Genet. 9:106. doi: 10.3389/fgene.2018.00106 **Background:** Presence of the β 3-Adrenergic receptor (ADRB3) gene Trp64Arg (T64A) polymorphism may be associated with an increased susceptibility for essential hypertension (EH). A clear consensus, however, has yet to be reached.

Objective and methods: To further elucidate the relationship between the *ADRB3* gene Trp64Arg polymorphism and EH, a meta-analysis of 9,555 subjects aggregated from 16 individual studies was performed. The combined odds ratios (ORs) and their corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CI) were evaluated using either a random or fixed effect model.

Results: We found a marginally significant association between *ADRB3* gene Trp64Arg polymorphism and EH in the whole population under the additive genetic model (OR: 1.200, 95% CI: 1.00–1.43, P = 0.049). Association within the Chinese subgroup, however, was significant under allelic (OR: 1.150, 95% CI: 1.002–1.320, P = 0.046), dominant (OR: 1.213, 95% CI: 1.005–1.464, P = 0.044), heterozygous (OR: 1.430, 95% CI:1.040–1.970, P = 0.03), and additive genetic models (OR: 1.280, 95% CI: 1.030–1.580, P = 0.02). A significant association was also found in the Caucasian subgroup under allelic (OR: 1.850, 95% CI: 1. 260–2.720, P = 0.002), dominant (OR: 2.004, 95% CI: 1.316–3.052, P = 0.001), heterozygous (OR: 2.220, 95% CI: 1.450–3.400, P = 0.0002), and additive genetic models (OR: 2.000, 95% CI: 1.330–3.010, P = 0.0009).

Conclusions: The presence of the *ADRB3* gene Trp64Arg polymorphism is positively associated with EH, especially in the Chinese and Caucasian population. The Arg allele carriers of *ADRB3* gene Trp64Arg polymorphism may be at an increased risk for developing EH.

Keywords: ADRB3, Trp64Arg, polymorphism, essential hypertension, rs4994

1

INTRODUCTION

Essential hypertension (EH) is a frequently-occurring condition that is associated with an increased risk of atherosclerosis, stroke, heart failure, and kidney failure (Ding et al., 2018; Omisore et al., 2018; Owolabi et al., 2018). These two factors combined, EH presents a significant barrier to health. The genetic epidemiological studies show that EH is a hereditary disease caused by the interplay of multiple genes and the environment. To explore the pathogenesis of EH, researchers are employing techniques from molecular biology to analyze potential genes that may act as risk factors and many believe the *ADRB3* to be a strong candidate (Kawaguchi et al., 2006).

The β 3-adrenergic receptor (β 3-AR, ADRB3) is an important component of sympathetic nervous system that primarily mediates lipolysis and thermogenic function. When the receptor is excited, lipolysis is increased locally. Mutation of the *ADRB3* gene can either reduce gene expression on the cytomembrane gene expression or cause an abnormal protein conformation that impairs ADRB3 function. The reduced cellular signal transduction from the repair which prevents adipose tissue heat production and decomposition can contribute to the pathogenesis of multiple conditions, including EH, diabetes mellitus (DM), and obesity.

Human *ADRB3* gene, located in 8p11.1–p12, contains 2 exons and 1 intron and encodes 408 amino acids. Mutation of the thymine in the 190th place to cytosine changes the 64th amino acid tryptophan (Trp) into an arginine (Arg) residue in the first intracellular loop of the ADRB3 receptor. This mutation is associated with a ten-fold decrease in adipocyte receptor sensitivity. The Trp64Arg (rs4994) variant is located in the 1st cellular inner ring which is crucial for both the movement and effector function of this receptor. The *ADRB3* Trp64Arg variant acts as a "thrifty" gene and has already been associated with obesity, DM, and insulin resistance (IR) (Hoffstedt et al., 1999).

Though many studies on the relationship between *ADRB3* gene Trp64Arg polymorphism and EH have been performed, a consensus has yet to be reached. In 2001, Wang et al. found a positive association in a Chinese Beijing population with the 64Arg allele acting as a risk factor for EH (Wang Y. et al., 2001). In 2000, Ringel et al. found the same result in a German population (Ringel et al., 2000). However, other papers reported no significant association in a Beijing and Hong Kong Chinese population (Thomas et al., 2000; Liu et al., 2015). While in 2005, Masuo et al. found the 64Trp allele is candidate allele for EH in a Japanese population (Masuo et al., 2005).

To explore the association of *ADRB3* gene Trp64Arg polymorphism and EH, we conducted a meta-analysis of 5,088 EH patients and 4,467 controls from 16 separate studies to evaluate the relationship of *ADRB3* gene Trp64Arg polymorphism and EH (**Supplementary Table 1**).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Publication Search and Inclusion Criteria

The electronic databases PubMed, the Wan Fang database, the VIP database, the China National Knowledge Infrastructure, the China Biological Medicine Database, Embase, and the Web of Science were searched using the terms " β 3-Adrenergic receptor," "ADRB3," "Trp64Arg," "essential hypertension" and "polymorphism." The publication years ranged from 1997 to 2015 with the most recent update occurring on March 3, 2018.

TABLE 1 | Characteristics of the investigated studies of the association between β3-Adrenergic receptor (ADRB3) gene Trp64Arg polymorphism and essential hypertension (EH).

Author/Year	Region	Genotype		EH			Control		Matching criteria	SAMPLE size (EH/control)
			TT	ТА	AA	TT	ТА	AA	-	
Chen et al., 2008	China (Fujian)	PCR-RFLP	266	96	10	233	67	6	Sex, Cr, ethnicity	372/306
Ding et al., 2002	China (Jiangsu)	PCR-RFLP	22	12	4	53	16	З	Ethnicity	38/72
Guo et al., 2006	China (Xinjiang)	PCR-RFLP	149	39	1	103	30	0	Ethnicity	189/133
Liang et al., 2004	China (Liaonig)	PCR-RFLP	94	40	10	119	42	7	Ethnicity	144/168
Liu et al., 2015	China (Beijing)	TaqMan	637	265	18	488	180	13	Age, sex, ethnicity	920/681
Tan et al., 2005	China (Guangdong)	PCR-RFLP	99	25	4	47	9	2	Ethnicity	128/58
Thomas et al., 2000	China (Hongkong)	PCR-RFLP	286	70	7	81	28	З	Sex, ethnicity	363/212
Wang et al., 2013	China (Beijing)	TaqMan	584	258	11	474	169	19	Age, sex, ethnicity	865/665
Wang Y. et al., 2001	China (Beijing)	PCR-RFLP	39	36	4	34	7	1	Age, sex, BP, ethnicity	179/42
Zhang et al., 2012	China (Neimenggu)	PCR-RFLP	71	26	5	72	19	2	Age, BMI, BP, ethnicity	102/91
Baba et al., 1998	Japan	PCR-RFLP	28	9	0	30	14	2	Age, sex, BMI, ethnicity	37/46
Ding et al., 2009	Japan	PCR-RFLP	860	408	60	904	433	49	Age, sex, BP, ethnicity	1328/1386
Fujisawa et al., 1997	Japan	PCR-RFLP	68	31	2	48	23	2	Cholesterol, ethnicity	101/73
Masuo et al., 2005	Japan	TaqMan	35	5	1	71	44	2	Age, smokers, ethnicity	41/117
Ringel et al., 2000	German	PCR-RFLP	150	30	0	214	23	0	Age, BMI, ethnicity	180/237
Tonolo et al., 1999	Italy	PCR-RFLP	184	29	0	262	19	0	Age, Cholesterol, ethnicity	213/281

HDL, high density lipoprotein-cholesterol; BP, blood pressure; TG, triglyceride; LDL, low density lipoprotein-cholesterol; BMI, body mass index; PCR-LDR, Polymerase chain reaction-restriction fragment length polymorphism; Case-control study design was adopted in the above studies.

Genetic model	Pooled OR (95% CI)	Z-value	P-value	Study number	EH size	Control size	P _{HTG(<i>I</i>_%)}
Allelic genetic model	1.130 (0.990–1.280)	1.86	0.063	16	5,088	4,467	0.005 ^a (55.0%)
Chinese subgroup	1.150 (1.002–1.320)	1.99	0.046 ^a	10	3,188	2,327	0.07 (43.0%)
Japanese subgroup	0.820 (0.570–1.160)	1.13	0.26	4	1,507	1,622	0.06 (59.0%)
Caucasian subgroup	1.850 (1.260–2.720)	3.13	0.002 ^a	2	393	518	0.69 (0%)
Recessive genetic model	1. 150 (0.890–1.480)	1.06	0.29	16	5,088	4,467	0.47 (0%)
Chinese subgroup	1.040 (0.730-1.470)	0.20	0.84	10	3,188	2,327	0.33 (13.0%)
Japanese subgroup	1.280 (0.890-1.860)	1.33	0.18	4	1,507	1,622	0.66 (0%)
Caucasian subgroup	NE			2	393	518	
Dominant genetic model	1.174 (0.985–1.400)	1.79	0.073	16	5,088	4,467	0.001 ^a (59.0%)
Chinese subgroup	1.213 (1.005–1.464)	2.02	0.044 ^a	10	3,188	2,327	0.062 (44.6%)
Japanese subgroup	0.719 (0.427-1.210)	1.24	0.214	4	1,507	1,622	0.034 ^a (65.3%)
Caucasian subgroup	2.004 (1.316-3.052)	3.24	0.001 ^a	2	393	518	0.718 (0%)
Homozygous genetic model	1.160 (0.900–1.500)	1.13	0.26	16	5,088	4,467	0.39 (6%)
Chinese subgroup	1.110 (0.780–1.580)	0.56	0.58	10	3,188	2,327	0.22 (24.0%)
Japanese subgroup	1.220 (0.840–1.770)	1.05	0.29	4	1,507	1,622	0.62 (0%)
Caucasian subgroup	NE			2	393	518	
Heterozygous genetic model	1.250 (0.950-1.650)	1.62	0.11	16	5,088	4,467	<0.00001 ^a (80.0%)
Chinese subgroup	1.430 (1.040–1.970)	2.21	0.03 ^a	10	3,188	2,327	<0.0001 ^a (76.0%)
Japanese subgroup	0.520 (0.220-1.220)	1.50	0.13	4	1,507	1,622	0.0005 ^a (83.0%)
Caucasian subgroup	2.220 (1.450-3.400)	3.69	0.0002 ^a	2	393	518	0.74 (0%)
Additive genetic model	1.200 (1.001-1.430)	1.97	0.049 ^a	16	5,088	4,467	<0.0001 ^a (69.0%)
Chinese subgroup	1.280 (1.030–1.580)	2.25	0.02 ^a	10	3,188	2,327	0.002 ^a (65.0%)
Japanese subgroup	0.690 (0.410-1.180)	1.35	0.18	4	1,507	1,622	0.01 ^a (73.0%)
Caucasian subgroup	2.000 (1.330–3.010)	3.33	0.0009 ^a	2	393	518	0.71 (0%)

TABLE 2 Summary of meta-analysis of association between β 3-Adrenergic receptor (ADRB3) gene Trp64Arg polymorphism and essential hypertension (EH).

^aP < 0.05. Cl, confidence interval; OR, odds ratio; EH size, the total number of EH cases; control size, the total number of control group; Allelic genetic model, A allele distribution frequency; Dominant genetic model, AA+TA vs. TT; Recessive genetic model, AA vs. TA+TT; Heterozygous genetic model, TA vs. TT; Homozygous genetic model, AA vs. TT; Additive genetic model, T vs. A. NE, not estimable.

The selected studies evaluated on the following criteria: (a) Evaluation of the relationship of EH and *ADRB3* gene Trp64Arg polymorphism. (b) EH diagnosis by a systolic BP no <140 mmHg and a diastolic BP no <90 mmHg measured three times on different days after the secondary hypertension was excluded. (c) The included studies should be case-controlled or officially published cohort studies. (d) The genotype number of *ADRB3* gene Trp64Arg polymorphism in the control group should follow the Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium (HWE).

Data Extraction

The data was extracted using a standardized protocol carried out by three investigators. Two were responsible for searching for duplicates among individual while the third one acting as an arbiter to settle differences. The studies violating the inclusion criteria, published repeatedly, or providing inadequate data were rejected. Similar data appeared in different papers by the same author group was adopted only once. The following items as publication year, ethnicity, region, the first author's name, genotyping method, matching criteria, genotype number, and total number of cases and controls should be included in the listed data table.

Statistical Analyses

Six genetic models were used in the current meta-analysis: allelic (A allele distribution frequency), recessive (AA vs. TA+TT), dominant (AA+TA vs. TT), homozygous (AA vs. TT), heterozygous (TA vs. TT), and additive (T vs. A) genetic models. The odds ratios (ORs) and their corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were used to compare the relationship of *ADRB3* gene Trp64Arg polymorphism and EH. The heterogeneity (HTG) among the individual studies was calculated by using a chi-square-based Q-tests with the significance set at P < 0.05 level (Cochran, 1968). The random-effects model (DerSimonian and Laird method) would be adopted when the HTG existed among the different studies (DerSimonian and Laird, 1986). If not, the fixed-effect model would be used (the Mantel–Haenszelmethod) (Mantel and Haenszel, 1959). The pooled OR was assessed by a *Z*-test with significance set at P < 0.05.

The HWE was evaluated by using Fisher's exact test with significance set at P < 0.05 level. Potential publication bias was assessed using a funnel plot. The funnel plot symmetry was evaluated by using Egger's linear regression test on the natural logarithm scale of the OR with significance set at P < 0.05 level (Egger et al., 1997). The statistical analyses were performed by using Stata 12.0 (StataCorp, College Station, TX, USA) and Revman 5.0 software.

RESULTS

Studies and Populations

Information was extracted from a total of 5,088 EH cases and 4,467 controls (Table 1) (Fujisawa et al., 1997; Baba et al., 1998; Tonolo et al., 1999; Ringel et al., 2000; Thomas et al., 2000;

	EH gr	oup	Control	group		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% Cl
1.4.1 Chinese subg	гоир						
Chen H 2008	116	744	79	612	9.2%	1.21 [0.93, 1.57]	+
Ding GX 2002	20	76	22	144	4.0%	1.72 [1.01, 2.95]	
Guo YY 2006	41	378	30	266	5.3%	0.96 [0.62, 1.50]	+
Liang Y 2004	60	288	56	336	7.5%	1.25 [0.90, 1.74]	+-
Liu JL 2015	301	1840	206	1362	12.3%	1.08 (0.92, 1.27)	+
Tan H 2005	33	256	13	116	3.4%	1.15 (0.63, 2.10)	
Thomas 2000	84	726	34	224	6.6%	0.76 (0.53, 1.10)	
Wang H 2013	280	1706	207	1324	12.3%	1.05 (0.89, 1.24)	+
Wang Y 2001	44	158	9	84	2.9%	2.60 [1.33, 5.06]	
Zhang XY 2012	36	204	23	186	4.7%	1.43 [0.88, 2.32]	+
Subtotal (95% Ch		6376		4654	68.2%	1.15 [1.00, 1.32]	•
Total events	1015	0010	679		001010		
Heterogeneity Tau	= 0.02 Ch	² = 15.6	8 df = 9 /8	P = 0.07	· I ² = 439	6	
Test for overall effer	+ 7 = 1 99	(P = 0.04	0, ai - 5 (i 5)	- 0.07	.1 - 457		
			·,				
1.4.2 Japanese sul	αιοπο						
Baba T 1998	9	74	18	92	24%	0.62 (0.30, 1.30)	
Ding YB 2009	528	2656	531	2772	13.9%	1.04 [0.93, 1.16]	+
Fujisawa T 1997	35	202	27	146	51%	0.94 (0.59, 1.48)	-
Masuo K 2005	7	82	48	234	2.4%	0.42 (0.00, 1.40)	
Subtotal (95% CI)		3014	10	3244	23.8%	0.82 [0.57, 1.16]	•
Total events	579	0014	624	0211	Loion	0.02 [0.01, 110]	
Heterogeneity: Tau	= 0.07 Ch	r = 7.33	df = 3 (P	= 0.06).	I ² = 59%		
Test for overall effer	+ 7=113	P = 0.26	(u) = 0 (i	- 0.00),	1 - 55 %		
		0.20	~				
1.4.3 Caucasian su	baroup						
Ringel J 2000	30	360	23	474	4 2%	1 72 [1 02 2 91]	
Topolo G 1999	29	426	10	562	3.8%	2 01 [1 14 3 54]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	20	786		1036	7.9%	1.85 [1.26, 2.72]	•
Total events	59		42	1000			
Heterogeneity Tau	= 0.00 Ch	$i^2 = 0.16$	df = 1 (P	- 0 69)-	$1^2 = 0.96$		
Test for overall effer	+ 7 = 3 13	P = 0.00	12)	0.00/			
		() = 0.00	-/				
Total (95% CI)		10176		8934	100.0%	1.13 [0.99, 1.28]	•
Total events	1653		1345				
Heterogeneity: Tau ²	= 0.03; Ch	i ² = 33.0	0, df = 15	(P = 0.0)	05); I ² = 5	5%	
Test for overall effe	t: Z = 1.86	(P = 0.08	5)				U.UT U.T 1 10 100
Test for subgroup d	ifferences:	Chi ² = 9	.83, df = 2	(P = 0.0)	07), I ² = 7	9.6%	decreased EH risk Increased EH risk
				151			

FIGURE 1 | Forest plot of EH associated with ADRB3 gene Trp64Arg polymorphism under an allelic genetic model (distribution of Arg allelic frequency of ADRB3 gene Trp64Arg polymorphism).

	EH gro	up	Control o	roup		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
1.5.1 Chinese subgr	oup						
Chen H 2008	10	362	6	300	5.8%	1.39 [0.50, 3.88]	
Ding GX 2002	4	34	3	69	1.6%	2.93 [0.62, 13.93]	
Guo YY 2006	1	188	0	133	0.5%	2.14 [0.09, 52.84]	
Liang Y 2004	10	134	7	161	5.3%	1.77 [0.66, 4.80]	
Liu JL 2015	18	902	13	668	13.2%	1.03 [0.50, 2.11]	
Tan H 2005	4	124	2	56	2.4%	0.90 [0.16, 5.06]	
Thomas 2000	7	356	3	109	4.1%	0.71 [0.18, 2.79]	
Wang H 2013	11	842	19	643	19.2%	0.43 [0.21, 0.92]	
Wang Y 2001	4	75	1	41	1.1%	2.25 [0.24, 20.86]	
Zhang XY 2012	5	97	2	91	1.8%	2.42 [0.46, 12.79]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		3114		2271	55.0%	1.04 [0.73, 1.47]	•
Total events	74		56				
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	10.29, df:	= 9 (P =	= 0.33); I ² :	= 13%			
Test for overall effect	Z = 0.20 (P = 0.8	4)				
1.5.2 Japanese subo	roup						
Baha T 1998	0	37	2	44	2.0%	0.23 (0.01.4.87)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Ding YB 2009	60	1268	49	1337	41 1%	1 31 [0 89 1 92]	
Euiisawa T 1997	2	31	2	71	1.0%	2 38 (0 32 17 71)	
Masuo K 2005	1	40	2	115	0.9%	1 45 (0 13 16 42)	
Subtotal (95% CI)		1376	-	1567	45.0%	1.28 [0.89, 1.86]	•
Total events	63		55				
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	1.61 df=	3 (P =	0.66) 12=	0%			
Test for overall effect	Z=1.33 (P = 0.1	8)				
1.5.3 Caucasian sub	group						
Ringel J 2000	. 0	180	0	237		Not estimable	
Tonolo G 1999	0	213	0	281		Not estimable	
Subtotal (95% CI)	1.5	393		518		Not estimable	
Total events	0		0				
Heterogeneity: Not a	oplicable						
Test for overall effect	Not applie	able					
Total (95% Ch		4883		4356	100.0%	1.15 [0.89, 1.48]	•
Total events	137		111				
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	12.66 df:	= 13 (P	= 0 47) P	² = 0%			
Test for overall effect	7=1.06/	P=02	9)	- 5 10			0.01 0.1 1 10 100
	2-7.00(- 0.2					decreased EH risk increased EH risk
URE 2 Forest plot of EH associated with ADR	33 aene	Trp6	4Ara p	olvmc	prohism	under a reces	sive genetic model (AA vs. TA+TT).
	50 90110	pc		0.,1110			

Study		%
ID	OR (95% CI)	Weight
Chinese subgroup		
Chen H (2008)	1.27 (0.90, 1.80)	9.02
Ding GX (2002)	2.03 (0.88, 4.65)	3.38
Guo YY (2006)	0.92 (0.54, 1.58)	6.05
Liang Y (2004)	1.29 (0.80, 2.08)	6.84
Liu JL (2015)	1.12 (0.90, 1.40)	11.44
Tan H (2005)	1.25 (0.58, 2.72)	3.74
Thomas (2000)	0.70 (0.43, 1.14)	6.75
Wang H (2013)	1.16 (0.93, 1.45)	11.35
Wang Y (2001)	4.36 (1.79, 10.59)	3.05
Zhang XY (2012)	- 1.50 (0.79, 2.85)	4.84
Subtotal (I-squared = 44.6%, p = 0.062)	1.21 (1.01, 1.46)	66.47
Japanese subgroup		
Baba T (1998)	0.60 (0.23, 1.58)	2.67
Ding YB (2009)	1.02 (0.87, 1.20)	12.48
Fujisawa T (1997)	0.93 (0.49, 1.76)	4.90
Masuo K (2005)	0.26 (0.10, 0.68)	2.78
Subtotal (I-squared = 65.3%, p = 0.034)	0.72 (0.43, 1.21)	22.83
Caucasian subgroup		
Ringel J (2000)	1.86 (1.04, 3.33)	5.50
Tonolo G (1999)	2.17 (1.18, 3.99)	5.20
Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.718)	2.00 (1.32, 3.05)	10.70
Overall (I-squared = 59.0%, p = 0.001)	1.17 (0.99, 1.40)	100.00
NOTE: Weights are from rendem effects enclusis		
.0944 1	10.6	



	EU ar		Control	roun		Oddo Patio	Oddo Patio
Study or S	ubaroun Evente	Total	Evente	Total	Moinht	B/ Random 95% CL	By Bandom 95% Cl
1.2.1 Chine	ese subaroun		Lyonto	.5(a)		retrandont 50% Cr	
Chep H 20	08 96	266	67	233	8 1 %	1 40 00 96 2 041	
Ding GX 20	102 12	200	16	53	4 1 %	2 77 [1 00 7 72]	
Guo YY 20	12 12 NG 39	149	30	103	6.8%	0.86 (0.49, 1.51)	
Liang Y 20	04 40	94	42	119	6.9%	1 36 (0 78 2 37)	
Liu.II 201	5 265	637	180	488	9.0%	1 22 [0 96 1 55]	-
Tan H 200	5 25	99	9	47	4 9%	1 43 [0 61 3 36]	
Thomas 20	0 70	286	28	81	7 1 %	0.61 [0.36 1.04]	
Wang H 20	13 258	584	169	474	8.9%	1 43 [1 11 1 83]	-
Wang Y 20	01 36	39	7	34	2.6%	46 29 [10 95 195 67]	
Zhang XY 2	2012 26	71	19	72	5.8%	1 61 0 79 3 29	+ -
Subtotal (9	15% CI)	2247		1704	64.2%	1.43 [1.04, 1.97]	•
Total event	s 867		567		o ne lo		
Heterogen	eit/ Tau ² = 0 17: Ch	i ² = 36 1	R1 df = 9 (P < 0.00	101): I ² = 1	76%	
Test for over	erall effect: $7 = 2.21$	(P = 0.0)	(3)	. 0.01			
			,				
1.2.2 Japa	nese subgroup						
Baba T 199	38 9	28	14	30	3.9%	0.54 (0.19, 1.58)	
Ding YB 20	109 408	860	433	904	9.2%	0.98 [0.81, 1.18]	+
Fujisawa T	1997 31	68	23	48	5.6%	0.91 [0.43, 1.91]	
Masuo K 2	005 5	35	44	71	3.9%	0.10 (0.04, 0.30)	<u> </u>
Subtotal (9	5% CI)	991		1053	22.6%	0.52 [0.22, 1.22]	
Total event	s 453		514				
Heterogen	eity: Tau ² = 0.58; Ch	i ² = 17.1	34. df = 3 (P = 0.00	$(005): ^2 = 1$	83%	
Test for ove	erall effect: Z = 1.50	(P = 0.1)	3)				
1.2.3 Cauc	asian subgroup						
Ringel J 20	000 30	150	23	214	6.6%	2.08 [1.15, 3.74]	
Tonolo G 1	999 29	184	19	262	6.5%	2.39 [1.30, 4.42]	
Subtotal (9	15% CI)	334		476	13.1%	2.22 [1.45, 3.40]	•
Total event	s 59		42				
Heterogen	eity: Tau ² = 0.00; Ch	i ² = 0.1	1, df = 1 (P	= 0.74)	; l² = 0%		
Test for over	erall effect: Z = 3.69	(P = 0.0)	002)				
Total (95%	CI)	3572		3233	100.0%	1.25 [0.95, 1.65]	•
Total event	s 1379		1123				
Heterogen	eity: Tau² = 0.20; Ch	i ² = 74.	14, df = 15	(P < 0.0	00001); I²	= 80%	
Test for over	erall effect: Z = 1.62	(P = 0.1)	1)				decreased EH risk increased EH risk
FIGURE 5 Forget plot of EU accessisted with	+h 10002 ~~~	o Tro	GAAre -		orphics	n undor o hotara	zurgeune genetie model (TA vie TT)
FIGURE 9 FOREST PLOT OF EH associated W	un <i>ADRB3</i> ger	ie irp	04Arg p	Joiym	orphism	n under a neteroz	zygous genetic model (TA Vs. TT).

Study or Subgroup Verifis Total Events Total Weight IV, Random, 95% CI 1.3.1 Chinese subgroup Chen H 2008 (I) 6 22 122 4.1% CS M Random, 95% CI Chen H 2008 10 62.79 533 8.6% 1.3.0 [0.95, 1.78] Ding GX 2002 206 66 2.5.7.157] Liang Y 2004 60 0.28 1.1.20 [0.60, 2.40] Total weight 10.2% 1.07 [0.88, 1.31] Wang H 2013 280 1.28 [1.03, 1.58] Total events 1015 67.9 Mage 200 52.87, df = 0.002); IP = 65% Test for overail effect $Z = 2.25$ (P = 0.02) 1.3.2 Japanese subgroup Baba T 1988 9 0.07; Chi ^P = 25.87, df = 0.02); IP = 65% Test for overail effect $Z = 1.25$ (P = 0.02) 1.3.2 Japanese		EH ar	ano	Control	aroup		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
1.3.1 Chinese subgroup Chen H 2008 116 628 79 533 8.6% 1.30 [0.95, 1.78] Ding GX 2002 20 56 22 122 4.1% 2.53 [1.23, 5.16] Guo YY 2006 41 337 30 236 6.1% 0.95 [0.57, 1.57] Liang Y 2004 60 228 56 280 7.2% 1.43 [0.94, 2.16] Liu J, 2015 301 1539 206 1156 10.3% 1.12 [0.92, 1.36] Tan H 2005 33 223 13 103 4.3% 1.20 [0.60, 2.40] Thomas 2000 84 642 34 190 6.9% 0.69 [0.45, 1.07] Wang H 2013 280 1426 207 1117 10.2% 1.07 [0.88, 1.31] Wang Y 2011 44 114 9 75 3.6% 4.61 [2.09, 10.18] Zhang XY 2012 36 168 23 163 5.3% 1.66 [0.93, 2.95] Subtotal (95% C)) 5361 3975 66.7% 1.28 [1.03, 1.58] Total events 1015 679 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.07; Ch ² = 25.87, df = 9 (P = 0.002); P = 65% Test for overall effect Z = 2.25 (P = 0.02) 1.3.2 Japanese subgroup Baba T 1998 9 65 18 74 3.1% 0.50 [0.21, 1.21] Ding YB 2009 528 2128 531 2241 10.9% 1.06 [0.93, 1.22] Fujisawa T 1997 35 167 27 119 5.4% 0.99 [0.61, 1.59] Masuok 2005 7 75 48 186 3.3% 0.30 [0.13, 0.69] Subtotal (95% C)) 2435 2620 22.7% 0.69 [0.41, 1.18] Total events 579 624 Heterogeneity; Tau ² = 0.00; Ch ² = 1.12, df = 3 (P = 0.01); P = 73% Test for overall effect Z = 1.35 (P = 0.18) 1.3.3 Caucasian subgroup Ringel J 2000 30 330 23 451 5.5% 1.86 [1.06, 3.27] Tonolo G 1999 29 397 19 543 5.1% 2.17 [1.20, 3.30] 1.3.3 Caucasian subgroup Ringel J 2000 30 330 23 451 5.5% 1.86 [1.06, 3.27] Total events 1653 1345 Heterogeneity; Tau ² = 0.00; Ch ² = 1.12, df = (P = 0.71); P = 0% Test for overall effect Z = 1.37 (P = 0.05) Total (95% C)) 8523 7589 100.0% 1.20 [1.00, 1.43] Total events 1653 1345 Heterogeneity; Tau ² = 0.00; Ch ² = 1.43, df = 15 (P < 0.0001); P = 68% Test for overall effect Z = 1.97 (P = 0.05) Total (95% C)) 8523 7589 100.0% 1.20 [1.00, 1.43] Total events 1653 1345 Heterogeneity; Tau ² = 0.05; Ch ² = 4.2, hrist increased EH risk	Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% Cl
Chen H 2008 116 628 79 533 8.6% 1.30 [0.95, 1.78] Ding OX 2002 20 56 22 122 4.1% 2.53 [1.23, 5.16] Oue Y 2006 41 337 30 236 61% 0.95 [0.57], 1.57] Liang Y 2004 60 228 56 280 7.2% 1.43 [0.94, 2.16] Liu J, 2015 301 1539 206 1156 10.3% 1.12 [0.92, 1.36] Tan H 2005 33 223 13 103 4.3% 1.20 [0.80, 2.40] Thomas 2000 84 642 34 190 6.9% 0.69 [0.45, 1.07] Wang H 2013 280 1426 207 1117 10.2% 1.07 [0.88, 1.31] Wang Y 2014 44 114 9 75 3.6% 4.61 [2.09, 10.18] Zhang X 7012 36 168 23 163 5.3% 1.66 [0.93, 2.95] Subtotal (95% CI) 5361 3975 66.7% 1.28 [1.03, 1.58] Total events 1015 679 Heterogeneity, Tau ² e.0.7; ChF = 2.537 df = 9 (P = 0.002); P = 65% Testfor overall effect Z = 2.25 (P = 0.02) 1.32 Japanese subgroup Baba T 1998 9 65 18 74 3.1% 0.50 [0.21, 1.21] Ding VB 2009 528 2128 531 2241 10.9% 1.06 [0.93, 1.22] Fujisawa T 1997 35 167 27 119 5.4% 0.90 [0.51, 1.59] Masuo K 2005 7 75 48 186 3.3% 0.30 [0.13, 0.69] Subtotal (95% CI) 2435 2020 22.7% 0.90 [0.41, 1.18] Total events 579 624 Heterogeneity, Tau ² = 0.01 ChF ² = 11.22, df = 3 (P = 0.01); P = 73% Testfor overall effect Z = 1.35 (P = 0.18) 1.33 Caucasian subgroup Ringel J 2000 30 330 23 451 5.5% 1.86 [1.06, 3.27] Tonolo 6 1999 29 397 19 543 51% 2.17 [1.20, 344] Subtotal (95% CI) 727 994 10.6% 2.00 [1.33, 3.01] Total events 1653 1345 Heterogeneity, Tau ² = 0.00; ChF ² = 1.14, df = 1 (P = 0.71); P = 0% Testfor overall effect Z = 1.97 (P = 0.05) Total (95% CI) 8523 7589 100.0% 1.20 [1.00, 1.43] Total events 1653 1345 Heterogeneity, Tau ² = 0.00; ChF ² = 0.14, df = 1 (P = 0.71); P = 69% Testfor overall effect Z = 1.97 (P = 0.05) Total (95% CI) 8523 7589 100.0% 1.20 [1.00, 1.43] Total events 1653 1345 Heterogeneity, Tau ² = 0.07; ChF ² = 4.23, df = 15 (P < 0.0001); P = 69% Testfor overall effect Z = 1.97 (P = 0.05)	1.3.1 Chinese subg	roup						
Ding GX 2002 20 56 22 122 4.1% 2.53 [1.23,5.16] Guo YY 2006 41 337 30 236 6.1% 0.95 [0.57, 1.57] Liang Y 2004 60 228 56 280 7.2% 1.43 [0.94,2.16] Liu J, 2015 301 1539 206 1156 10.3% 1.12 [0.92, 1.36] Tan H 2005 33 223 13 103 4.3% 1.20 [0.92,40] Thomas 2000 84 642 34 190 6.9% 0.69 [0.45, 1.07] Wang Y 2011 244 114 9 75 3.6% 4.61 [2.09, 2.40] That events 1015 679 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.07; Chi ² = 25.87, df = 9 (P = 0.002); P = 65% Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.25$ (P = 0.02) 1.3.2 Japanese subgroup Baba T 1988 9 65 18 74 3.1% 0.50 [0.21, 1.21] Ding YB 2009 528 2128 531 2241 10.9% 1.06 [0.93, 1.22] Fuisawa T 1997 35 167 27 119 5.4% 0.90 [0.51, 1.59] Masuo K 2005 7 75 48 186 3.3% 0.30 [0.13, 0.69] Subtotal (95% Ct) 2435 2620 22.7% 0.69 [0.41, 1.18] Total events 1579 624 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.20; Chi ² = 11.22, df = 3 (P = 0.01); P = 73% Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.35$ (P = 0.18) 1.3.3 Caucasian subgroup Ringel J 2000 30 330 23 451 5.5% 1.86 [1.06, 3.27] Tonolo G 1989 29 397 19 543 5.1% 2.17 [1.20, 3.94] Subtotal (95% Ct) 7277 994 10.6% 2.00 [1.33, 3.01] Total events 1653 1345 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.14, df = 1 (P = 0.71); P = 0% Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.37$ (P = 0.009) Total (95% Ct) 8523 7589 100.0% 1.20 [1.00, 1.43] Total events 1653 1345 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 4.31, df = 15 (P < 0.0001); P = 69% Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.97$ (P = 0.05) Proceeded (A vs. T)	Chen H 2008	116	628	79	533	8.6%	1.30 [0.95, 1.78]	
Guo YY 2006 41 337 30 236 6.1% 0.95 $[0.57, 1.57]$ Liang Y 2004 60 228 56 280 7.2% 1.43 $[0.94, 2.16]$ Tan H 2005 33 223 13 103 4.3% 1.20 $[0.60, 2.40]$ Thomas 2000 84 642 34 190 6.9% 0.69 $[0.45, 1.07]$ Wang H 2013 280 1426 207 1117 10.2% 1.07 $[0.88, 1.31]$ Wang Y 2011 44 114 9 75 3.6% 4.61 $[2.09, 10.18]$ Zhang XY 2012 36 168 23 163 5.3% 1.66 $[0.93, 2.95]$ Subtotal (95% Ct) 5361 3975 66.7% 1.28 $[1.03, 1.58]$ Total events 1015 679 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.07; Ch ² = 25.87, df = 9 (P = 0.002); P = 65% Test for overall effect Z = 2.25 (P = 0.02) 1.32 Japanese subgroup Baba T 1998 9 65 18 74 3.1% 0.50 $[0.21, 1.21]$ Ding YB 2009 528 2128 531 2241 10.9% 1.08 $(0.93, 1.22]$ Total events 579 624 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.20; Ch ² = 11.22, df = 3 (P = 0.01); P = 73% Test for overall effect Z = 1.35 (P = 0.18) 1.33 Caucasian subgroup Ringel 2000 30 30 23 451 5.5% 1.86 $[1.06, 3.27]$ Tonolo G 1999 29 397 19 543 5.1% 2.17 $[1.20, 3.94]$ Subtotal (95% Ct) 727 79 994 10.0% 1.20 $[1.33, 3.01]$ Total events 59 42 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Ch ² = 0.14, df = 1 (P = 0.71); P = 0% Test for overall effect Z = 1.33 (P = 0.009) Total events 1653 1345 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.07; Ch ² = 48.31, df = 15 (P < 0.0001); P = 69% Test for overall effect Z = 1.97 (P = 0.05) Total events 1653 1345 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.07; Ch ² = 48.31, df = 15 (P < 0.0001); P = 69% Test for overall effect Z = 1.97 (P = 0.05) Total events $D = 0.14$, df = 1 (P = 0.71); P = 0% Test for overall effect Z = 1.97 (P = 0.05)	Ding GX 2002	20	56	22	122	4.1%	2.53 [1.23, 5.16]	
Liang Y 2004 60 228 56 280 7.2% 1.43 $[0.94, 2.16]$ Liu J. 2015 301 1539 206 1156 10.3% 1.12 $[0.92, 1.36]$ Tan H 2005 33 223 13 103 4.3% 1.20 $[0.60, 2.40]$ Thomas 2000 84 642 34 190 6.9% 0.68 $[0.45, 1.07]$ Wang H 2013 280 1426 207 1117 10.2% 1.07 $[0.88, 1.31]$ Wang Y 2001 44 114 9 75 3.6% 4.61 $[2.09, 1.08]$ Zhang XY 2012 36 168 23 163 5.3% 1.66 $[0.93, 2.95]$ Subtotal (95% C) 5361 3975 66.7% 1.28 $[1.03, 1.58]$ Total events 1015 679 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.07, Chi ² = 25.87, df = 9 (P = 0.002); P = 65% Test for overall effect $Z = 2.25$ (P = 0.02) 1.3.2 Japanese subgroup Baba T 1998 9 65 18 74 3.1% 0.50 $[0.21, 1.21]$ Ding YE 2009 528 2128 531 2241 10.9% 1.06 $[0.93, 1.22]$ Fuisawar 1997 35 167 27 119 5.4% 0.90 $[0.51, 1.59]$ Masuo K 2005 7 75 48 186 3.3% 0.30 $[0.13, 0.69]$ Subtotal (95% C) 2435 2620 22.7% 0.69 $[0.41, 1.18]$ Total events 573 624 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.20; Chi ² = 11.22, df = 3 (P = 0.01); P = 73% Test for overall effect $Z = 1.35$ (P = 0.18) 1.3.3 Caucasian subgroup Ringel J 2000 30 330 23 451 5.5% 1.86 $[1.06, 3.27]$ Tonolo G 1999 29 397 19 543 5.1% 2.17 $[1.20, 3.94]$ Subtotal (95% C) 727 994 10.6% 2.00 $[1.33, 3.01]$ Total events 59 42 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.14, df = 1 (P = 0.71); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 1.33$ (P = 0.009) Total events 1653 1345 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.07; Chi ² = 43.31, df = 15 (P < 0.0001); P = 69% Test for overall effect $Z = 1.97$ (P = 0.05) Total events 1653 1345 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.07; Chi ² = 43.31, df = 15 (P < 0.0001); P = 69% Test for overall effect $Z = 1.97$ (P = 0.05) Total events 1653 1345 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.07; Chi ² = 43.31, df = 15 (P < 0.0001); P = 69% Test for overall effect $Z = 1.97$ (P = 0.05)	Guo YY 2006	41	337	30	236	6.1%	0.95 [0.57, 1.57]	-
Liu U. 2015 301 1539 206 1156 10.3% 1.12[0.92,1.36] Tan H 2005 33 223 13 103 4.3% 1.20 [0.60, 2.40] Thomas 2000 84 642 34 190 6.9% 0.68 [0.45,1.07] Wang H 2013 280 1426 207 1117 10.2% 1.07 [0.88,1.31] Wang Y 2011 44 114 9 75 3.6% 4.61 [2.09, 10.18] Zhang XY 2012 36 168 23 163 5.3% 1.66 [0.93, 2.85] Subtotal (95% C) 5361 3975 66.7% 1.28 [1.03, 1.58] Total events 1015 679 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.07; Chi ² = 25.87, df = 9 (P = 0.002); P = 65% Test for overall effect $Z = 2.25$ (P = 0.02) 1.3.2 Japanese subgroup Baba T 1998 9 65 18 74 3.1% 0.50 [0.21, 1.21] Ding YB 2009 528 2128 531 2241 10.9% 1.06 [0.93, 1.22] Fujisawa T 1997 35 167 27 119 5.4% 0.90 [0.51, 1.59] Masuo K 2005 7 75 48 186 3.3% 0.30 [0.13, 0.69] Subtotal (95% C) 2435 2620 22.7% 0.69 [0.41, 1.18] Total events 579 624 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 1.12, df = 3 (P = 0.01); P = 73% Test for overall effect $Z = 1.35$ (P = 0.18) 1.3.3 Caucasian subgroup Ringel J 2000 30 330 23 451 5.5% 1.86 [1.06, 3.27] Tonolo G 1999 29 397 19 543 5.1% 2.17 [1.20, 3.94] Subtotal (95% C) 7277 994 10.6% 2.00 [1.33, 3.01] Total events 1653 1345 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.14, df = 1 (P = 0.71); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 1.37$ (P = 0.009) Total (95% C) 8523 7589 100.0% 1.20 [1.00, 1.43] Total events 1653 1345 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.14, df = 1 (P = 0.71); P = 68% Test for overall effect $Z = 1.97$ (P = 0.05) Pociated with $AOBEB3$ gene Tro64Ard polymorphism under an additive genetic model (A vs. T)	Liang Y 2004	60	228	56	280	7.2%	1.43 [0.94, 2.16]	
Tan H 2005 33 223 13 103 4.3% 1.20 $[0.60, 2.40]$ Thomas 2000 84 642 34 190 6.9% 0.68 $[0.45, 1.07]$ Wang H 2013 2280 1426 207 1117 10.2% 1.07 $[0.88, 1.31]$ Wang Y 2011 44 114 9 75 3.8% 4.61 $[2.09, 10.18]$ Zhang XY 2012 36 168 23 163 5.3% 1.66 $[0.93, 2.95]$ Subtrotal (6% C) 5361 3975 66.7% 1.28 $[1.03, 1.58]$ Total events 1015 679 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.07; Chi ² = 25.87, df = 9 (P = 0.002); P = 65% Test for overall effect Z = 2.25 (P = 0.02) 1.32 Japanese subgroup Baba T 1998 9 65 18 74 3.1% 0.50 $[0.21, 1.21]$ Ding YB 2009 528 2128 531 2241 10.9% 1.08 $[0.93, 1.22]$ Fujisawar 1997 35 167 27 119 5.4% 0.90 $[0.51, 1.59]$ Masuo K 2005 7 75 48 186 3.3% 0.30 $[0.13, 0.68]$ Subtrotal (95% C) 2435 2620 22.7% 0.69 $[0.41, 1.18]$ Total events 579 624 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.20; Chi ² = 11.22, df = 3 (P = 0.01); P = 73% Test for overall effect Z = 1.35 (P = 0.18) 1.33 Caucasian subgroup Ringel 2000 30 330 23 451 5.5% 1.86 $[1.06, 3.27]$ Tonolo G 1999 29 397 19 543 5.1% 2.17 $[1.20, 3.94]$ Subtrotal (95% C) 727 994 10.0% 2.00 $[1.33, 3.01]$ Total events 59 42 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.14, df = 1 (P = 0.71); P = 0% Test for overall effect Z = 1.37 (P = 0.05) Total events 1653 1345 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.07; Chi ² = 48.31, df = 15 (P < 0.0001); P = 69% Test for overall effect Z = 1.97 (P = 0.05) Proceed EH risk increased EH risk	Liu JL 2015	301	1539	206	1156	10.3%	1.12 [0.92, 1.36]	+
Thomas 2000 84 642 34 190 6.9% 0.69[0.45, 1.07] Wang H 2013 280 1426 207 1117 10.2% 1.07[0.88, 1.31] Wang Y 201 44 114 9 75 3.6% 4.61 [2.09, 1.08] Zhang XY 2012 36 168 23 163 5.3% 1.68 [0.93, 2.95] Subtotal (95% CI) 5361 3975 66.7% 1.28 [1.03, 1.58] Total events 1015 679 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.07; Ch ² = 25.87, df = 9 (P = 0.002); P = 65% Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.25 (P = 0.02)$ 1.3.2 Japanese subgroup Baba T 1998 9 65 18 74 3.1% 0.50 [0.21, 1.21] Ding YE 2009 528 2128 531 2241 10.9% 1.06 [0.93, 1.22] Fujisawa T 1997 35 167 27 119 5.4% 0.90 [0.51, 1.59] Masuo K 2005 7 75 48 186 3.3% 0.30 [0.13, 0.69] Subtotal (95% CI) 2435 2620 22.7% 0.69 [0.41, 1.18] Total events 579 624 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.20; Ch ² = 11.22, df = 3 (P = 0.01); P = 73% Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.35 (P = 0.18)$ 1.3.3 Caucasian subgroup Ringel J 2000 30 330 23 451 5.5% 1.86 [1.06, 3.27] Tonolo G 1939 29 397 19 543 5.1% 2.17 [1.20, 3.94] Subtotal (95% CI) 727 994 10.6% 2.00 [1.33, 3.01] Total events 165 42 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.14, df = 1 (P = 0.71); P = 0% Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.37 (P = 0.009)$ Total events 1653 1345 Total events 1653 7346 126 (P < 0.0001); P = 69% Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.97 (P = 0.05)$ Exercised EH risk increased EH risk	Tan H 2005	33	223	13	103	4.3%	1.20 [0.60, 2.40]	
Wang H 2013 280 1426 207 1117 10.2% 1.07 [0.88, 1.31] Wang Y 2001 44 114 9 75 3.6% 4.61 [2.09, 10.18] Zhang XY 2012 36 168 23 163 5.3% 1.66 [0.39, 2.95] Subtotal (95% CI) 5361 3975 66.7% 1.28 [1.03, 1.58] Total events 1015 679 Heterogeneity: Tau" = 0.07; Ch" = 25.87, df = 9 (P = 0.002); P = 65%. Test for overall effect: Z = 2.25 (P = 0.02) 1.3.2 Japanese subgroup Baba T 1998 9 65 18 74 3.1% 0.50 [0.21, 1.21] Ding YB 2009 528 2128 531 2241 10.9% 1.06 [0.33, 1.22] Fujisawa T 1997 35 167 27 119 5.4% 0.30 [0.13, 0.69] Subtotal (95% CI) 2435 2620 22.7% 0.69 [0.41, 1.18] 1.67 Total events 579 624 5.5% 1.86 [1.06, 3.27] 1.00 (% 2.00 [1.33, 3.01] Tonolo G 1999 29 397 19 543 5.1% 2.17 [1.20, 3.94] <td>Thomas 2000</td> <td>84</td> <td>642</td> <td>34</td> <td>190</td> <td>6.9%</td> <td>0.69 [0.45, 1.07]</td> <td></td>	Thomas 2000	84	642	34	190	6.9%	0.69 [0.45, 1.07]	
$\begin{aligned} & \text{Wang Y 2001} & 44 & 114 & 9 & 75 & 3.8\% & 4.61 (2.09, 10.18) \\ & \text{Zhang XY 2012} & 36 & 168 & 23 & 163 & 5.3\% & 1.66 (0.93, 2.95) \\ & \text{Subtotal (95% C)} & 5361 & 3975 & 66.\% & 1.28 (1.03, 1.58) \\ & \text{Total events} & 1015 & 679 \\ & \text{Heterogeneity: Tau2 = 0.07; Chi2 = 25.87, df = 9 (P = 0.002); P = 65\% \\ & \text{Testfor overall effect } Z = 2.25 (P = 0.02) \\ \hline & \textbf{1.32. Japanese subgroup} \\ & \text{Baba T 1998} & 9 & 65 & 18 & 74 & 3.1\% & 0.50 (0.21, 1.21) \\ & \text{Ding YB 2009} & 528 & 2128 & 531 & 2241 & 10.9\% & 1.06 (0.93, 1.22) \\ & \text{Fuljsawar T 1997} & 35 & 167 & 27 & 119 & 5.4\% & 0.90 (0.51, 1.59) \\ & \text{Masuo K 2005} & 7 & 75 & 48 & 186 & 3.3\% & 0.30 (0.13, 0.68) \\ & \text{Subtotal (95% C))} & 2435 & 2620 & 22.7\% & 0.69 (0.41, 1.18) \\ & \text{Total events} & 579 & 624 \\ & \text{Heterogeneity: Tau2 = 0.20; Chi2 = 11.22, df = 3 (P = 0.01); P = 73\% \\ & \text{Testfor overall effect } Z = 1.35 (P = 0.18) \\ \hline & \textbf{1.33. Caucasian subgroup} \\ & \text{Ringel 2000} & 30 & 330 & 23 & 451 & 5.5\% & 1.86 (1.06, 3.27) \\ & \text{Total events} & 59 & 42 \\ & \text{Heterogeneity: Tau2 = 0.00; Chi2 = 0.14, df = 1 (P = 0.71); P = 0\% \\ & \text{Test for overall effect } Z = 3.33 (P = 0.009) \\ & \text{Total events} & 1653 & 1345 \\ & \text{Heterogeneity: Tau2 = 0.00; Chi2 = 0.14, df = 1 (P = 0.71); P = 0\% \\ & \text{Test for overall effect } Z = 1.97 (P = 0.05) \\ & \text{Total events} & 1653 & 1345 \\ & \text{Heterogeneity: Tau2 = 0.07; Chi2 = 48.31, df = 15 (P < 0.0001); P = 69\% \\ & \text{Test for overall effect } Z = 1.97 (P = 0.05) \\ & \text{Cociated with } AOBEB3 \text{ opene Tro64Are polymorphism under an additive genetic model (A vs. T)} \\ & \text{Cociated with } AOBEB3 \text{ opene Tro64Are polymorphism under an additive genetic model (A vs. T)} \\ & \text{Cociated with } AOBEB3 \text{ opene Tro64Are polymorphism under an additive genetic model (A vs. T)} \\ & \text{Cociated with } AOBEB3 \text{ opene Tro64Are polymorphism under an additive genetic model (A vs. T)} \\ & \text{Cociated with } AOBEB3 \text{ opene Tro64Are polymorphism under an additive genetic model (A vs. T)} \\ & \text{Cociated with } AOBEB3 $	Wang H 2013	280	1426	207	1117	10.2%	1.07 [0.88, 1.31]	i +
Zhang XY 2012 36 168 23 163 5.3% 1.66 [0.93, 2.95] Subtotal (95% Cl) 5361 3975 66.7% 1.28 [1.03, 1.58] Total events 1015 679 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.07; Ch ² = 25.87, df = 9 (P = 0.002); P = 65% Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.25$ (P = 0.02) 1.3.2 Japanese subgroup Baba T 1998 9 65 18 74 3.1% 0.50 [0.21, 1.21] Ding YB 2009 528 2128 531 2241 10.9% 1.06 [0.93, 1.22] Fujisawa T 1997 35 167 27 119 5.4% 0.90 [0.51, 1.59] Masuo K 2005 7 75 48 186 3.3% 0.30 [0.13, 0.69] Subtotal (95% Cl) 2435 2620 22.7% 0.69 [0.41, 1.18] Total events 579 624 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.20; Chi ² = 11.22; df = 3 (P = 0.01); P = 73% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.35 (P = 0.18) 1.3.3 Caucasian subgroup Ringel J 2000 30 330 23 451 5.5% 1.86 [1.06, 3.27] Tonolo G 1999 29 397 19 543 5.1% 2.17 [1.20, 3.94] Subtotal (95% Cl) 727 994 10.6% 2.00 [1.33, 3.01] Total events 569 42 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.14, df = 1 (P = 0.71); P = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.37 (P = 0.009) Total (95% Cl) 8523 7589 100.0% 1.20 [1.00, 1.43] Total events 1653 1345 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.07; Chi ² = 48.31, df = 15 (P < 0.0001); I ² = 69% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.97 (P = 0.05) Proceed EH risk increased EH risk inc	Wang Y 2001	44	114	9	75	3.6%	4.61 [2.09, 10.18]	
Subtotal (95% CI) 5361 3975 66.7% 1.28 [1.03, 1.58] Total events 1015 679 Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.587$, $df = 9 (P = 0.002)$; $P = 65\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.25 (P = 0.02)$ 1.3.2 Japanese subgroup Baba T 1998 9 65 18 74 3.1% 0.50 [0.21, 1.21] Ding YB 2009 528 2128 531 2241 10.9% 1.06 [0.93, 1.22] Fujisawa T 1997 35 167 27 119 5.4% 0.90 [0.51, 1.59] Masuo K 2005 7 75 48 186 3.3% 0.30 [0.13, 0.68] Subtotal (95% CI) 2435 2620 22.7% 0.69 [0.41, 1.18] Total events 579 624 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.20; Ch ² = 11.22, df = 3 (P = 0.01); P = 73% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.35 (P = 0.18) 1.3.3 Caucasian subgroup Ringel 2000 30 330 23 451 5.5% 1.86 [1.06, 3.27] Tonolo 6 1999 29 397 19 543 5.1% 2.17 [1.20, 3.94] Subtotal (95% CI) 727 994 10.6% 2.00 [1.33, 3.01] Total events 59 42 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Ch ² = 0.14, df = 1 (P = 0.71); P = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.97 (P = 0.05) Total (95% CI) 8523 7589 100.0% 1.20 [1.00, 1.43] Total events 1653 1345 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.07; Ch ² = 48.31, df = 15 (P < 0.0001); P = 69% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.97 (P = 0.05) Proceed (A vs. T)	Zhang XY 2012	36	168	23	163	5.3%	1.66 [0.93, 2.95]	
Total events 1015 679 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.07; Chi ² = 25.87, df = 9 (P = 0.002); P = 65% Test for overall effect $Z = 2.26$ (P = 0.02) 1.3.2 Japanese subgroup Baba T 1998 9 65 18 74 3.1% 0.50 [0.21, 1.21] Ding YB 2009 528 2128 531 2241 10.9% 1.06 [0.93, 1.22] Fujisawar 11997 35 167 27 119 5.4% 0.90 [0.51, 1.59] Masuo K 2005 7 75 48 186 3.3% 0.30 [0.13, 0.69] Subtotal (95% CI) 2435 2620 22.7% 0.69 [0.41, 1.18] Total events 579 624 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.20; Chi ² = 11.22, df = 3 (P = 0.01); P = 73% Test for overall effect $Z = 1.35$ (P = 0.18) 1.3.3 Caucasian subgroup Ringel J 2000 30 330 23 451 5.5% 1.86 [1.06, 3.27] Tonolo G 1999 29 397 19 543 5.1% 2.17 [1.20, 3.84] Subtotal (95% CI) 727 994 10.6% 2.00 [1.33, 3.01] Total events 563 42 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.14, df = 1 (P = 0.71); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 1.33$ (P = 0.009) Total events 1653 1345 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.07; Chi ² = 48.31, df = 16 (P < 0.0001); P = 69% Test for overall effect $Z = 1.97$ (P = 0.05) Total events 1653 1345 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.07; Chi ² = 48.31, df = 15 (P < 0.0001); P = 69% Total effect $Z = 1.97$ (P = 0.05)	Subtotal (95% CI)		5361		3975	66.7%	1.28 [1.03, 1.58]	◆
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.07; Chi ² = 25.87, df = 9 (P = 0.002); P = 65% Test for overall effect $Z = 2.25$ (P = 0.02) 1.3.2 Japanese subgroup Baba T 1998 9 6 5 18 74 3.1% 0.50 [0.21, 1.21] Ding YB 2009 528 2128 531 2241 10.9% 1.06 [0.93, 1.22] Fujisawa T 1997 35 167 27 119 5.4% 0.90 [0.51, 1.59] Masuo K 2005 7 75 48 186 3.3% 0.30 [0.13, 0.69] Subtotal (95% Cl) 2435 2620 22.7% 0.69 [0.41, 1.18] Total events 579 624 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.20; Chi ² = 1.12, df = 3 (P = 0.01); P = 73% Test for overall effect Z = 1.35 (P = 0.18) 1.3.3 Caucasian subgroup Ringel J 2000 30 330 23 451 5.5% 1.86 [1.06, 3.27] Tonolo G 1999 29 397 19 543 5.1% 2.17 [1.20, 3.94] Subtotal (95% Cl) 727 994 10.6% 2.00 [1.33, 3.01] Total events 59 42 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.14, df = 1 (P = 0.71); P = 0% Test for overall effect Z = 1.37 (P = 0.009) Total (95% Cl) 8523 7589 100.0% 1.20 [1.00, 1.43] Total events 1653 1345 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.07; Chi ² = 4.3.1, df = 15 (P < 0.0001); P = 69% Test for overall effect Z = 1.97 (P = 0.05)	Total events	1015		679				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.25$ (P = 0.02) 1.3.2 Japanese subgroup Baba T 1988 9 65 18 74 3.1% 0.50 [0.21, 1.21] Ding YB 2009 528 2128 531 2241 10.9% 1.06 [0.93, 1.22] Fujisawa T 1997 35 167 27 119 5.4% 0.90 [0.51, 1.59] Masuo K 2005 7 75 48 186 3.3% 0.30 [0.13, 0.69] Subtotal (95% CI) 2435 2620 22.7% 0.69 [0.41, 1.18] Total events 579 624 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.20; Chi ² = 11.22, df = 3 (P = 0.01); I ² = 73% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.35 (P = 0.18) 1.3.3 Caucasian subgroup Ringel 2000 30 330 23 451 5.5% 1.86 [1.06, 3.27] Tonolo G 1999 29 397 19 543 5.1% 2.17 [1.20, 3.94] Subtotal (95% CI) 727 994 10.6% 2.00 [1.33, 3.01] Total events 59 42 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.14, df = 1 (P = 0.71); I ² = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.97 (P = 0.05) Total events 1653 1345 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.07; Chi ² = 4.31, df = 15 (P < 0.0001); I ² = 69% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.97 (P = 0.05) Cociated with $AOBRB3$ gene Tro64Arg polymorphism upder an additive genetic model (A vs. T)	Heterogeneity: Tau ^a	= 0.07; Ch	i ² = 25.1	87, df = 9	(P = 0.0)	02); I ² = 6	5%	
1.3.2 Japanese subgroup Baba T 1998 9 65 18 74 3.1% 0.50 [0.21, 1.21] Ding YE 2009 528 2128 531 2241 10.9% 1.06 [0.93, 1.22] Fujisawa T 1997 35 167 27 119 5.4% 0.90 [0.51, 1.59] Masuo K 2005 7 75 48 186 3.3% 0.30 [0.13, 0.69] Subtotal (95% C)) 2435 2620 22.7% 0.69 [0.41, 1.18] Total events 579 624 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.20; Chi ² = 11.22, df = 3 (P = 0.01); P = 73% Test for overall effect $Z = 1.35$ (P = 0.18) 1.3.3 Caucasian subgroup Ringel J 2000 30 330 23 451 5.5% 1.86 [1.06, 3.27] Tonolo G 1999 29 397 19 543 5.1% 2.17 [1.20, 3.94] Subtotal (95% C)) 727 994 10.6% 2.00 [1.33, 3.01] Total events 59 42 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.14, df = 1 (P = 0.71); P = 0% Test for overall effect $Z = 1.37$ (P = 0.009) Total events 1653 1345 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.07; Chi ² = 48.31, df = 15 (P < 0.0001); P = 69% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.97 (P = 0.05) Cociated with ADBRS3 gene Tro64Arg polymorphism under an additive genetic model (A vs. T)	Test for overall effer	t: Z = 2.25	(P = 0.0)	(2)				
1.3.2 Japanese subgroup Baba T 1998 9 65 18 74 3.1% 0.50 [0.21, 1.21] Ding YB 2009 528 2128 531 2241 10.9% 1.06 [0.93, 1.22] Fujisawa T 1997 35 167 27 119 5.4% 0.90 [0.51, 1.59] Masuo K 2005 7 75 48 186 3.3% 0.30 [0.13, 0.69] Subtotal (95% C) 2435 2620 22.7% 0.69 [0.41, 1.18] Total events 579 624 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.20; Chi ² = 11.22 df = 3 (P = 0.01); P = 73% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.35 (P = 0.18) 1.3.3 Caucasian subgroup Ringel 2000 30 330 23 451 5.5% 1.86 [1.06, 3.27] Tonolo G 1999 29 397 19 543 5.1% 2.17 [1.20, 3.94] Subtotal (95% C) 727 994 10.6% 2.00 [1.33, 3.01] Total events 59 42 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.14, df = 1 (P = 0.71); P = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 3.33 (P = 0.0009) Total (95% CI) 8523 7589 100.0% 1.20 [1.00, 1.43] Total events 1653 1345 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.07; Chi ² = 48.31, df = 15 (P < 0.0001); P = 69% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.97 (P = 0.05)								
Baba T 1988 9 65 18 74 3.1% 0.50 [0.21, 1.21] Ding YB 2009 528 2128 531 2241 10.9% 1.06 [0.93, 1.22] Fujisawa T 1997 35 167 27 119 5.4% 0.90 [0.51, 1.59] Masuo K 2005 7 75 48 186 3.3% 0.30 [0.13, 0.69] Subtotal (95% CI) 2435 2620 22.7% 0.69 [0.41, 1.18] Total events 579 624 Heterogeneily: Tau ² = 0.20; Ch ² = 11.22, df = 3 (P = 0.01); P = 73% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.35 (P = 0.18) 1.3.3 Caucasian subgroup Ringel 2000 30 330 23 451 5.5% 1.86 [1.06, 3.27] Tonolo G 1999 29 397 19 543 5.1% 2.17 [1.20, 3.94] Subtotal (95% CI) 727 994 10.6% 2.00 [1.33, 3.01] 10.6% Total events 59 42 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Ch ² = 0.14, df = 1 (P = 0.71); P = 0% 120 [1.00, 1.43] 100 Total events 1653 1345 145 10.01 <td< td=""><td>1.3.2 Japanese sul</td><td>ogroup</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>	1.3.2 Japanese sul	ogroup						
Ding YB 2009 528 2128 531 2241 10.9% 1.06 [0.93, 1.22] Fujisawa T 1997 35 167 27 119 5.4% 0.90 [0.51, 1.59] Masuo K 2005 7 75 48 188 3.3% 0.30 [0.13, 0.69] Subtotal (95% C) 2435 2620 22.7% 0.69 [0.41, 1.18] Total events 579 624 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.20; Chi ² = 11.22, df = 3 (P = 0.01); P = 73% Test for overall effect Z = 1.35 (P = 0.18) 1.3 Caucasian subgroup Ringel J 2000 30 330 23 451 5.5% 1.86 [1.06, 3.27] Tonolo G 1999 29 397 19 543 5.1% 2.17 [1.20, 3.94] Subtotal (95% C) 727 994 10.6% 2.00 [1.33, 3.01] Total events 59 42 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.14, df = 1 (P = 0.71); P = 0% Test for overall effect Z = 1.37 (P = 0.009) Total (95% C) 8523 7589 100.0% 1.20 [1.00, 1.43] Total events 1653 1345 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.07; Chi ² = 4.31, df = 15 (P < 0.0001); I ² = 69% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.97 (P = 0.05)	Baba T 1998	9	65	18	74	3.1%	0.50 [0.21, 1.21]	
Fujisawa T1997 35 167 27 119 5.4% 0.90 [0.51, 1.59] Masuo K 2005 7 75 48 186 3.3% 0.30 [0.13, 0.69] Subtotal (95% CI) 2435 2620 22.7% 0.69 [0.41, 1.18] Total events 579 624 Heterogeneity: Tau"= 0.20; Chi" = 11.22, df = 3 (P = 0.01); P = 73% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.36 (P = 0.18) 1.3.3 Caucasian subgroup Ringel J 2000 30 330 23 451 5.5% 1.86 [1.06, 3.27] Tonolo G 1999 29 397 19 543 5.1% 2.17 [1.20, 3.94] Subtotal (95% CI) 727 994 10.6% 2.00 [1.33, 3.01] 1 Total events 59 42 Heterogeneity: Tau"= 0.00; Chi"= 0.14, df = 1 (P = 0.71); P = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 3.33 (P = 0.0009) Total events 1653 1345 14 10 10 Heterogeneity: Tau"= 0.07; Chi"= 48.31, df = 15 (P < 0.0001); P = 69%	Ding YB 2009	528	2128	531	2241	10.9%	1.06 [0.93, 1.22]	í †
Masuo K 2005 7 75 48 186 3.3% 0.30 [0.13, 0.69] Subtoal (95% Cl) 2435 2620 22.7% 0.69 [0.41, 1.18] Total events 579 624 Heterogeneily: Tau ² = 0.20; Ch ² = 11.22, df = 3 (P = 0.01); P = 73% Test for overall effect Z = 1.35 (P = 0.18) 1.3.3 Caucasian subgroup Ringel 2000 30 330 23 451 5.5% 1.86 [1.06, 3.27] Tonolo G 1999 29 397 19 543 5.1% 2.17 [1.20, 3.94] Subtotal (95% Cl) 727 994 10.6% 2.00 [1.33, 3.01] Total events 59 42 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Ch ² = 0.14, df = 1 (P = 0.71); P = 0% Test for overall effect Z = 3.33 (P = 0.0009) Total events 1653 1345 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.07; Ch ² = 48.31, df = 15 (P < 0.0001); P = 69% 0.01 0.1 10 Test for overall effect Z = 1.97 (P = 0.05) 0.01 0.1 10 10 100 decreased EH risk increased EH risk increased EH risk increased EH risk 50 20 20 20	Fujisawa T 1997	35	167	27	119	5.4%	0.90 [0.51, 1.59]	
Subtratal (95% CI) 2435 2620 22.7% 0.69 [0.41, 1.18] Total events 579 624 Heterogeneity: Tau" = 0.20, Chi" = 11.22, df = 3 (P = 0.01); P = 73% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.35 (P = 0.18) 1.3.3 Caucasian subgroup Ringel J 2000 30 330 23 451 5.5% 1.86 [1.06, 3.27] Tonolo G 1999 29 397 19 543 5.1% 2.17 [1.20, 3.94] Subtratal (95% CI) 727 994 10.6% 2.00 [1.33, 3.01] Total events 59 42 Heterogeneity: Tau" = 0.00; Chi" = 0.14, df = 1 (P = 0.71); I" = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 3.33 (P = 0.0009) Total (95% CI) 8523 7589 100.0% 1.20 [1.00, 1.43] Test for overall effect: Z = 1.97 (P = 0.05) 1.20 [1.00, 1.43] 0.01 0.1 1 10 Vociated with $AOBRB3$ gene Tro64Arg polymorphism upder an additive genetic model (A vs. T) Vociated with $AOBRB3$ gene To64Arg polymorphism To To	Masuo K 2005	7	75	48	186	3.3%	0.30 [0.13, 0.69]	
Total events 579 624 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.20; Chi ² = 11.22, df = 3 (P = 0.01); P = 73% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.36 (P = 0.18) 1.3.3 Caucasian subgroup Ringel 2000 30 330 23 451 5.5% 1.86 [1.06, 3.27] Tonolo G 1999 29 397 19 543 5.1% 2.17 [1.20, 3.94] Subtotal (95% Cl) 727 994 10.6% 2.00 [1.33, 3.01] Total events 59 42 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.14, df = 1 (P = 0.71); P = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 3.33 (P = 0.0009) Total (95% Cl) 8523 7589 100.0% 1.20 [1.00, 1.43] Total events 1653 1345 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.07; Chi ² = 48.31, df = 15 (P < 0.0001); P = 69% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.97 (P = 0.05)	Subtotal (95% CI)		2435		2620	22.7%	0.69 [0.41, 1.18]	➡
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.20; Ch ² = 11.22, df = 3 (P = 0.01); P = 73% Test for overall effect Z = 1.35 (P = 0.18) 1.3.3 Caucasian subgroup Ringel 2000 30 330 23 451 5.5% 1.86 [1.06, 3.27] Tonolo G 1999 29 397 19 543 5.1% 2.17 [1.20, 3.94] Subtotal (95% Cl) 727 994 10.6% 2.00 [1.33, 3.01] Total events 59 42 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.14, df = 1 (P = 0.71); P = 0% Test for overall effect Z = 3.33 (P = 0.0009) Total events 1653 1345 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.07; Chi ² = 48.31, df = 15 (P < 0.0001); P = 69% Test for overall effect Z = 1.97 (P = 0.05) Cociated with ADBB3 gene Tro64Arg polymorphism upder an additive genetic model (A vs. T)	Total events	579		624				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.35$ (P = 0.18) 1.3.3 Caucasian subgroup Ringel J 2000 30 330 23 451 5.5% 1.86 [1.06, 3.27] Tonolo G 1999 29 397 19 543 5.1% 2.17 [1.20, 3.94] Subtrati (95% CI) 727 994 10.6% 2.00 [1.33, 3.01] Total events 59 42 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.14, df = 1 (P = 0.71); i ² = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 3.33 (P = 0.009) Total (95% CI) 8523 7589 100.0% 1.20 [1.00, 1.43] Total events 1653 1345 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.07; Chi ² = 48.31, df = 15 (P < 0.0001); i ² = 69% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.97 (P = 0.05)	Heterogeneity: Tau ^a	= 0.20; Ch	i ² = 11.1	22, df = 3	(P = 0.0)	1); I ² = 73	%	
1.3.3 Caucasian subgroup Ringel J 2000 30 330 23 451 5.5% 1.86 [1.06, 3.27] Tonolo G 1999 29 397 19 543 5.1% 2.17 [1.20, 3.94] Subtotal (95% CI) 727 994 10.6% 2.00 [1.33, 3.01] Total events 59 42 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.14, df = 1 (P = 0.71); P = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 3.33 (P = 0.0009) Total (95% CI) 8523 7589 100.0% 1.20 [1.00, 1.43] Total events 1653 1345 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.07; Chi ² = 48.31, df = 15 (P < 0.0001); P = 69%	Test for overall effe	et: Z = 1.35	(P = 0.1	8)				
Ringel J 2000 30 330 23 451 5.5% 1.86 [1.06, 3.27] Tonolo G 1999 29 397 19 543 5.1% 2.17 [1.20, 3.94] Subtotal (95% CI) 727 994 10.6% 2.00 [1.33, 3.01] Total events 59 42 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Ch ² = 0.14, df = 1 (P = 0.71); P = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 3.33 (P = 0.0009) Total (95% CI) 8523 7589 100.0% 1.20 [1.00, 1.43] Total (95% CI) 8523 7589 100.0% 1.20 [1.00, 1.43] Total events 1653 1345 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.07; Ch ² = 48.31, df = 15 (P < 0.0001); P = 69%	1.3.3 Caucasian su	baroup						
Tonolo G 1999 29 397 19 543 5.1% 2.17 [1.20, 3.94] Subtratal (95% CI) 727 994 10.6% 2.00 [1.33, 3.01] Total events 59 42 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.14, df = 1 (P = 0.71); P = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 3.33 (P = 0.0009) Total events 1653 Test for overall effect: Z = 1.97 (P = 0.05) Dotal effect: Z = 1.97 (P = 0.05) Cociated with ADBRB3 gene Tro64Arg polymorphism upder an additive genetic model (A vs. T)	Ringel J 2000	30	330	23	451	5.5%	1.86 [1.06.3.27]	
Subtortal (95% CI) 727 994 10.6% 2.00 [1.33, 3.01] Total events 59 42 Heterogeneity: Tau" = 0.00; Chi" = 0.14, df = 1 (P = 0.71); I" = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 3.33 (P = 0.0009) Total events 1653 1345 Heterogeneity: Tau" = 0.07; Chi" = 48.31, df = 15 (P < 0.0001); I" = 69%	Tonolo G 1999	29	397	19	543	5.1%	2 17 [1 20 3 94]	
Total events 59 42 Heterogeneiky: Tau ² = 0.00; Ch ² = 0.14, df = 1 (P = 0.71); P = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 3.33 (P = 0.0009) Total (95% Cl) 8523 Total (95% Cl) 8523 Total events 1653 Heterogeneiky: Tau ² = 0.07; Ch ² = 48.31, df = 15 (P < 0.0001); P = 69%	Subtotal (95% CI)	20	727		994	10.6%	2.00 [1.33, 3.01]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.14, df = 1 (P = 0.71); i ² = 0% Test for overall effect: Z = 3.33 (P = 0.0009) Total (95% Cl) 8523 7589 100.0% 1.20 [1.00, 1.43] Total (95% Cl) 8523 7589 100.0% 1.20 [1.00, 1.43] Total events Total events 18523 7589 100.0% 1.20 [1.00, 1.43] Total (95% Cl) 8523 7589 100.0% Total events Total events Total events 1345 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.07; Chi ² = 48.31, df = 15 (P < 0.0001); I ² = 69% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.97 (P = 0.05) Colated with ADBB3 gene Tro64Arg polymorphism under an additive genetic model (A vs. T)	Total events	59		42		1010 /0	2.00 [
Test for overall effect: Z = 3.33 (P = 0.0009) Total (95% Cl) 8523 7589 100.0% 1.20 [1.00, 1.43] Total events 1653 1345 Heterogeneity: Tau" = 0.07; Chi" = 48.31, df = 15 (P < 0.0001); I" = 69%	Heterogeneity: Tau ³	*= 0.00° Ch	$i^2 = 0.1$	4 df = 1 (F	P = 0.71	$ ^{2} = 0\%$		
Total (95% Cl) 8523 7589 100.0% 1.20 [1.00, 1.43] Total events 1653 1345 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.07; Chi ² = 48.31, df = 15 (P < 0.0001); I ² = 69% 0.01 0.1 1 100 Test for overall effect: Z = 1.97 (P = 0.05) decreased EH risk increased EH risk increased EH risk increased EH risk	Test for overall effer	t Z = 3.33	(P = 0.0)	009)	5.11,	. 0.0		
Total (95% Cl) 8523 7589 100.0% 1.20 [1.00, 1.43] Total events 1653 1345 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.07; Chi ² = 48.31, df = 15 (P < 0.0001); I ² = 69% 0.01 0.1 1 10 100 Test for overall effect: Z = 1.97 (P = 0.05) decreased EH risk increased EH risk increased EH risk 10 100								
Total events 1653 1345 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.07; Ch ² = 49.31, df = 15 (P < 0.0001); P = 69% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.97 (P = 0.05) Cociated with ADBB3 gene Tro64Arg polymorphism under an additive genetic model (A vs. T)	Total (95% CI)		8523		7589	100.0%	1.20 [1.00, 1.43]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.07; Chi ² = 48.31, df = 15 (P < 0.0001); I ² = 69% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.97 (P = 0.05) Cociated with ADBB3 gene Tro64Arg polymorphism under an additive genetic model (A vs. T)	Total events	1653		1345				
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.97 (P = 0.05) 0.01 0.1 1 10 100 decreased EH risk increased EH risk cociated with ADBB3 gene Tro64Arg polymorphism under an additive genetic model (A vs. T)	Heterogeneity: Tau ²	= 0.07; Ch	i ² = 48.3	31. df = 15	6 (P < 0.)	0001); I ² =	: 69%	
accreased EH risk increased EH risk	Test for overall effer	t: Z = 1.97	(P = 0.0)	15)				0.01 0.1 1 10 10
sociated with $ADBR3$ gene Tro64Arg polymorphism under an additive genetic model (A vs. T)								decreased EH risk increased EH risk
sociated with ADBB3 gene Tro64Arg polymorphism under an additive genetic model (Δ vs. T)								
sociated with ADBR3 gene Tro64Arg polymorphism under an additive genetic model (A vs. T)								
	associated with ΔDI	R3 den	e Trof	54Δra r	olym	ornhiem	n under an addit	tive genetic model (Δ vs. T)



FIGURE 7 | The funnel plot for the association of EH with *ADRB3* gene Trp64Arg polymorphism under an additive genetic model (A vs. T). The horizontal and vertical axis correspond to the OR and confidence limits. OR: odds ratio.



Wang Y. et al., 2001; Ding et al., 2002, 2009; Liang et al., 2004; Masuo et al., 2005; Tan et al., 2005; Guo et al., 2006; Chen et al., 2008; Zhang et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2013; Liu et al., 2015; **Supplementary Table 2**). Twenty-five papers were obtained through the search process, among which 16 papers were included for the present meta-analysis. Among the nine excluded studies, three papers were of review character and four papers deviated from the HWE (Wang M. Q. et al., 2001; Liu et al., 2006, 2013; Niu et al., 2007). Two papers had nothing with the *ADRB3* gene Trp64Arg polymorphism or EH.

Pooled Analyses

A marginally significant association between *ADRB3* gene Trp64Arg polymorphism and EH was found in the whole population under the additive genetic model (OR: 1.200, 95% CI: 1.00–1.43, P = 0.049). The Chinese subgroup showed a

significant association under allelic (OR: 1.150, 95% CI: 1.002– 1.320, P = 0.046), dominant (OR: 1.213, 95% CI: 1.005–1.464, P = 0.044), heterozygous (OR: 1.430, 95% CI:1.040–1.970, P =0.03), and additive genetic models (OR: 1.280, 95% CI: 1. 030– 1.580, P = 0.02). A significant association was also found in Caucasian subgroup under allelic (OR: 1.850, 95% CI: 1. 260– 2.720, P = 0.002), dominant (OR: 2.004, 95% CI: 1.316–3.052, P = 0.001), heterozygous (OR: 2.220, 95% CI:1.450–3.400, P =0.0002), and additive genetic models (OR: 2.000, 95% CI: 1. 330–3.010, P = 0.0009). (**Table 2, Figures 1–6**).

Significant HTG was detected under allelic, dominant, heterozygous, and additive genetic models (allelic: $P_{HTG} = 0.005$, $I^2 = 55.0\%$; dominant: P_{HTG} = 0.001, $I^2 = 59.0\%$; heterozygous: P_{HTG} < 0.00001, I^2 = 80.0%; additive: P_{HTG} < 0.0001, I^2 = 69.0%). Stratification by ethnicity, however, resulted in no significant HTG under the allelic genetic model in the Chinese $(P_{HTG} = 0.07, I^2 = 43.0\%)$, Japanese $(P_{HTG} = 0.06, I^2 = 59.0\%)$, or Caucasian subgroups ($P_{HTG} = 0.69$, $I^2 = 0\%$). Stratification significantly decreased in all of the three subgroups under the dominant, (Chinese: $P_{HTG} = 0.062$, $I^2 = 44.6\%$; Japanese: P_{HTG} = 0.034, I^2 = 65.3%; and Caucasian subgroup: P_{HTG} = 0.718, I^2 = 0%), the heterozygous (Chinese: $P_{HTG} < 0.0001$, $I^2 = 76.0\%$; Japanese: $P_{HTG} = 0.0005$, $I^2 = 83.0\%$; Caucasian subgroup: P_{HTG} = 0.740, $I^2 = 0\%$), and the additive genetic model (Chinese: $P_{HTG} = 0.002, I^2 = 65.0\%$; Japanese: $P_{HTG} = 0.01, I^2 = 73.0\%$; Caucasian subgroup: $P_{HTG} = 0.71$, $I^2 = 0\%$).

Bias Diagnostics

We found no publication bias in the funnel plot under the additive genetic model (**Figure 7**). In addition, there was no significant difference in the Egger's test yet, which implied that no publication bias existed in the present meta-analysis under the dominant genetic model (T = -0.86, P = 0.975) (**Figure 8**).

Sensitivity Analysis

The subsequent sensitivity analysis has been performed to observe whether the results are stable. After each study was excluded from the current meta-analysis, the significant was still significant under the additive genetic model (**Figure 9**).

DISCUSSION

A significant relationship was found in the present meta-analysis between *ADRB3* gene Trp64Arg polymorphism and EH under an additive genetic model (OR: 1.200, 95% CI: 1.00–1.43, P = 0.0049) in the whole population. In the Chinese subgroup, the association was more significant under allelic (OR: 1.150, 95% CI: 1.002–1.320, P = 0.046), dominant (OR: 1.213, 95% CI: 1.005–1.464, P = 0.044), heterozygous (OR: 1.430, 95% CI:1.040–1.970, P = 0.03), and additive genetic models (OR: 1.280, 95% CI: 1.030–1.580, P = 0.02). An increased association was also found in Caucasian subgroup under allelic (OR: 1.850, 95% CI: 1.260–2.720, P = 0.002), dominant (OR: 2.004, 95% CI: 1.316–3.052, P = 0.001), heterozygous (OR: 2.220, 95% CI: 1.450–3.400, P = 0.0002), and additive genetic models (OR: 2.000, 95% CI: 1. 330–3.010, P = 0.0009).



The fixed model was used for the recessive or homozygous genetic models because no significant heterogeneity was detected $(P_{HTG} > 0.05)$. Although there was significant HTG under the allelic, dominant, heterozygous, and additive genetic models $(P_{HTG} < 0.05)$, it was reduced significantly when stratified by ethnicities, lending further strength to the positive association between the polymorphism and EH. In addition, the average 64Arg minor allele frequency is 0.16, 0.18, 0.06 in the Chinese, Japanese, and Caucasian populations. The minor allele frequencies of the polymorphism is different across different populations. The lower the minor allele frequency, the more significant the association of this mutation and EH. It might explain why the OR is diluted when assessing the whole sample as compared to only the Chinese or Caucasians. As six genetic models were used, only the analysis using additive genetic model was identified a prior and primary analysis. Other analyses under the allele, recessive, dominant, heterozygous, and homozygous genetic models were listed as secondary analyses.

EH is one of the most common cardiovascular conditions and its morbidity has increased annually in China recently. EH increases a patient's risk of coronary artery disease (CAD), stroke, cardiovascular disease, and renal injury. Among the many risk factors involved in the pathogenesis of EH, IR, and dyslipidemia are likely the most important. EH is almost always accompanied by CAD, obesity, hyperlipemia, and/or DM. Reaven et al. call it X syndrome. The central links are IR and dyslipidemia which are considered to have the common hereditary basis (Reaven and Chen, 1988).

The ADRB3 receptor is widely distributed throughout human adipose tissue. Trp64Arg polymorphism is the only functional variant of ADRB3 protein. It has been found that this polymorphism has a significant influence on peak cAMP levels upon excitement with a selective β -receptor agonist, and receptor down-regulation induced by other agonists (Piétri-Rouxel et al., 1997). The *ADRB3* 64Arg carriers have the *ADRB3* gene expression defects and abnormal ADRB3 protein structure which lead to the decreased ADRB3 protein function. The impaired and inhibited cellular signal transduction caused the decreased visceral fat lipolysis and energy production which contributed to an increased body weight and a reduced basal metabolic rate (Guay et al., 2014; De Luis Román et al., 2017). The body mass was thus increased and the norepinephrine's sensitivity was improved, and the blood pressure was elevated (Baba et al., 1998).

In 2010, the meta-analysis by Kitsios et al. found a significant association for the Trp64Arg variant of the *ADRB3* gene and EH only under the dominant model (OR: 1.31, 95% CI: 1.07–1.60), not under the allele contrast model (OR: 1.00, 95% CI: 0.83–1.21) (Kitsios and Zintzaras, 2010). While the Kitsios analysis only included 6 studies or 13 studies in HWE under the allele or dominant respectively, the current meta-analysis included 16 studies in HWE under six genetic models and may therefore present a more objective perspective. In addition, stratification by ethnicity may make this analysis more comprehensive than that by Kitsios et al.

The PRISMA workflow was followed by the current metaanalysis (Page and Moher, 2017). Our analysis, however, does not substitute for a large-scale or prospective study on the relationship of *ADRB3* gene Trp64Arg polymorphism and EH. Serum ADRB3 levels can be influenced by a number of factors. such as obesity, DM, and hyperlipemia. The micro-effects of other genes combined may additionally influence an individual's susceptibility for EH. Polymorphisms in other genes, such as *angiotensin converting enzyme* gene insertion/deletion polymorphism, α -Adducin Gly460Trp gene mutation, bradykinin β 2 receptor-58T/C gene polymorphism, TNF- α G308A gene polymorphism may additionally influence the EH susceptibility (Li, 2012a,b; Li et al., 2012; Li Y., 2012).

In brief, *ADRB3* gene Trp64Arg polymorphism was significantly correlated with increased EH risk, especially in the Chinese and Caucasian population. Carriers of the Arg allele of *ADRB3* gene Trp64Arg polymorphism may be at an increased risk of EH. This conclusion maybe helpful in the formulation of a novel personalized EH treatment approach. Considering the limitations mentioned above, more researches on the association of *ADRB3* gene Trp64Arg polymorphism and EH are needed to further confirm the conclusions.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

YL and XL: Conceived and designed the experiments; YL and HW: Performed the experiments; YL and YZ: Analyzed the data; YL: Contributed reagents, material, and analysis tools; YL: Wrote the manuscript; YL and XY: Reference collection and data management; YL, HG, HK, and GG: Statistical analyses and paper writing; YL: Study design.

REFERENCES

- Baba, T., Nakajima, S., and Yajima, Y. (1998). Beta3-adrenergic receptor gene polymorphism is not associated with hypertension in NIDDM patients without nephropathy. *Horm. Metab. Res.* 30, 629–632. doi: 10.1055/s-2007-978947
- Chen, H., Tang, Y., Luo, J. W., Wu, X. Y., Sun, H., Wu, Y. A., et al. (2008). Relationship between β3 –AR gene T190C polymorphism and the first cardiovascular and cerebrovascular events in hypertensive patient. *Chin. J. Clin.* 2, 1378–1385.
- Cochran, W. G. (1968). The effectiveness of adjustment by subclassification in removing bias in observational studies. *Biometrics* 24, 295–313. doi: 10.2307/2528036
- De Luis Román, D. A., Primo, D., Izaola, O., and Aller, R. (2017). Relation of Trp64Arg polymorphism of beta 3 adrenoreceptor gene with metabolic syndrome and insulin resistance in obese women. *Nutr. Hosp.* 34, 383–388. doi: 10.20960/nh.384
- DerSimonian, R., and Laird, N. (1986). Meta-analysis in clinical trials. Control. Clin. Trials 7, 177–188. doi: 10.1016/0197-2456(86)90046-2
- Ding, C., Yang, Z., Wang, S., Sun, F., and Zhan, S. (2018). The associations of metabolic syndrome with incident hypertension, type 2 diabetes mellitus and chronic kidney disease: a cohort study. *Endocrine*. doi: 10.1007/s12020-018-1552-1. [Epub ahead of print].
- Ding, G. X., Shen, J., and Chen, J. W. (2002). Association of polymorphisms of β3adrenergic receptor, angiotensinogen and angiotensin-converting enzyme gene with hypertension in type 2 DM. *J. Nanjing Med. Univ.* 16, 22–27.
- Ding, Y. B., Qi, Y., Dou, G. W., and Wu, Z. H. (2009). No association between ADRB3 gene Trp64Arg polymorphism and essential hypertension in Japanese. *J. Southwest Univ.* 31, 64–68. doi: 10.13718/j.cnki.xdzk.2009.04.029
- Egger, M., Davey Smith, G., Schneider, M., and Minder, C. (1997). Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. *Br. Med. J.* 315, 629–634. doi: 10.1136/bmj.315.7109.629
- Fujisawa, T., Ikegami, H., Yamato, E., Hamada, Y., Kamide, K., Rakugi, H., et al. (1997). Trp64Arg mutation of beta3-adrenergic receptor in essential hypertension: insulin resistance and the adrenergic system. *Am. J. Hypertens.* 10, 101–105. doi: 10.1016/S0895-7061(96)00297-X
- Guay, S. P., Brisson, D., Lamarche, B., Biron, S., Lescelleur, O., Biertho, L., et al. (2014). ADRB3 gene promoter DNA methylation in blood and visceral adipose

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was funded by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC 81100073 to YL), Excellent Young and Middle-Aged Teachers Assistance Program of Nanjing Medical University for YL (2013–2015, JX2161015034) and the Priority Academic Program Development of Jiangsu Higher Education Institutions (PAPD). This work was also funded by the Natural Science Foundation of Jiangsu Province (BK 2012648 to HW), six talent peaks project in Jiangsu Province (2015-WSN-033). Thank all our colleagues working in the First Affiliated Hospital of Nanjing Medical University.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

The Supplementary Material for this article can be found online at: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fgene. 2018.00106/full#supplementary-material

Supplementary Table 1 | PRISMA Checklist.

Supplementary Table 2 | PRISMA Flow Diagram.

tissue is associated with metabolic disturbances in men. *Epigenomics* 6, 33–43. doi: 10.2217/epi.13.82

- Guo, Y. Y., Zhao, L., Wang, K., Shagendeke, Y., and He, B. X. (2006). Association of essential hypertension and polymorphism of β 3-adrenergic receptor gene in xinjiang kazak population. *Int. J. Genet.* 29, 476–478.
- Hoffstedt, J., Poirier, O., Thörne, A., Lönnqvist, F., Herrmann, S. M., Cambien, F., et al. (1999). Polymorphism of the human beta3-adrenoceptor gene forms a well-conserved haplotype that is associated with moderate obesity and altered receptor function. *Diabetes* 48, 203–205. doi: 10.2337/diabetes.48.1.203
- Kawaguchi, H., Masuo, K., Katsuya, T., Sugimoto, K., Rakugi, H., Ogihara, T., et al. (2006). beta2- and beta3-adrenoceptor polymorphisms relate to subsequent weight gain and blood pressure elevation in obese normotensive individuals. *Hypertens. Res.* 29, 951–959. doi: 10.1291/hypres.29.951
- Kitsios, G. D., and Zintzaras, E. (2010). Synopsis and data synthesis of genetic association studies in hypertension for the adrenergic receptor family genes: the CUMAGAS-HYPERT database. Am. J. Hypertens. 23, 305–313. doi: 10.1038/ajh.2009.251
- Li, Y. (2012). The angiotensin converting enzyme gene insertion/deletion (I/D) polymorphism and essential hypertension in the Chinese population: a meta-analysis including 21058 participants. *Int. Med. J.* 42, 439–444. doi: 10.1111/j.1445-5994.2011.02584.x
- Li, Y. Y. (2012a). α-Adducin Gly460Trp gene mutation and essential hypertension in a Chinese population: a meta-analysis including 10960 Subjects. *PLoS ONE* 7:e30214. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0030214
- Li, Y. Y. (2012b). Tumor necrosis factor-alpha G308A gene polymorphism and essential hypertension: a meta-analysis involving 2244 participants. *PLoS ONE* 7:e35408. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0035408
- Li, Y. Y., Zhang, H., Xu, J., Qian, Y., Lu, X. Z., Yang, B., et al. (2012). Bradykinin β2 receptor–58T/C gene polymorphism and essential hypertension: a metaanalysis. *PLoS ONE* 7:e43068. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0043068
- Liang, Y., Zhao, Y. Y., Liu, H., and Shi, J. P. (2004). The genotype analysis of β adrenergic receptor gene family in high risk population of hypertension in northeast China. *Chin. J. Med. Genet.* 21, 124–127.
- Liu, J. L., Zhang, B., Li, M., Li, C., Liu, Y., Wang, Z. G., et al. (2015). Study on relationship between Trp64Arg polymorphism of B3-adrenergic receptor gene and obesity and blood lipids. *Natl. Med. J. China* 95, 1558–1562. doi: 10.3760/cma.j.issn.0376-2491.2015.20.003

- Liu, Y. S., Han, H. B., Zheng, L. W., Wen, Y. F., and Liu, C. (2013). Relationship between genetic polymorphism of beta-3-adrenergic-receptor gene and type 2 diabetic and essential hypertension. *Chin. J. Lab Diagn.* 17, 82–84. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1007-4287.2013.01.028
- Liu, Z. Q., Mo, W., Yu, Q. J., Tan, Q., Tan, Y. M., and Zhou, H. H. (2006). Relationship between genetic polymorphism of β 3 adrenoceptor and obesity and hypertension. *China J. Modern Med.* 16, 1811–1814. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1005-8982.2006.12.014
- Mantel, N., and Haenszel, W. (1959). Statistical aspects of the analysis of data from retrospective studies of disease. J. Natl. Cancer Inst. 22, 719–748.
- Masuo, K., Katsuya, T., Fu, Y., Rakugi, H., Ogihara, T., and Tuck, M. L. (2005). Beta2- and beta3-adrenergic receptor polymorphisms are related to the onset of weight gain and blood pressure elevation over 5 years. *Circulation* 111, 3429–3434. doi: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.104.519652
- Niu, Y. H., Xie, Z. X., and Yin, Y. H. (2007). Beta-adrenoceptor gene polymorphism and essential hypertension. J. Clin. Rehabil. Tissue Eng. Res. 11, 2243–2246. doi: 10.3321/j.issn:1673-8225.2007.12.031
- Omisore, A. D., Famurewa, O. C., Komolafe, M. A., Asaleye, C. M., Fawale, M. B., and Afolabi, B. I. (2018). Association of traditional cardiovascular risk factors with carotid atherosclerosis among adults at a teaching hospital in south-western Nigeria. *Cardiovasc. J. Afr.* 29, 1–7. doi: 10.5830/CVJA-2018-014
- Owolabi, M. O., Sarfo, F., Akinyemi, R., Gebregziabher, M., Akpa, O., Akpalu, A., et al. (2018). Ovbiagele B; SIREN Team; as part of H3Africa Consortium. Dominant modifiable risk factors for stroke in Ghana and Nigeria (SIREN): a case-control study. *Lancet Glob. Health* 6, e436–e446. doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(18)30002-0
- Page, M. J., and Moher, D. (2017). Evaluations of the uptake and impact of the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) Statement and extensions: a scoping review. Syst. Rev. 6:263. doi: 10.1186/s13643-017-0663-8
- Piétri-Rouxel, F., St John Manning, B., Gros, J., and Strosberg, A. D. (1997). The biochemical effect of the naturally occurring Trp64–>Arg mutation on human beta3-adrenoceptor activity. *Eur. J. Biochem.* 247, 1174–1179.
- Reaven, G. M., and Chen, Y. D. (1988). Role of insulin in regulation of lipoprotein metabolism in diabetes. *Diabetes Metab. Rev.* 4, 639–652. doi: 10.1002/dmr.5610040703
- Ringel, J., Kreutz, R., Distler, A., and Sharma, A. M. (2000). The Trp64Arg polymorphism of the beta3-adrenergic receptor gene is associated with

hypertension in men with type 2 diabetes mellitus. Am. J. Hypertens. 13, 1027–1031. doi: 10.1016/S0895-7061(00)00290-9

- Tan, H., Chen, F. R., Tang, Q. D., and Liu, L. (2005). The study on the association of Beta3-adrenergic receptor gene polymorphism and hypertension. J. Pract. Med. 21, 35–36. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1006-5725.2005.01.014
- Thomas, G. N., Tomlinson, B., Chan, J. C., Young, R. P., and Critchley, J. A. (2000). The Trp64Arg polymorphism of the beta3-adrenergic receptor gene and obesity in Chinese subjects with components of the metabolic syndrome. *Int. J. Obes. Relat. Metab. Disord.* 24, 545–551. doi: 10.1038/sj.ijo. 0801193
- Tonolo, G., Melis, M. G., Secchi, G., Atzeni, M. M., Angius, M. F., Carboni, A., et al. (1999). Association of Trp64Arg beta 3-adrenergic-receptor gene polymorphism with essential hypertension in the Sardinian population. *J. Hypertens.* 17, 33–38. doi: 10.1097/00004872-199917010-00006
- Wang, H., Li, M., Wang, L. J., Zhang, B., Liu, J. L., Liu, Y., et al. (2013). Association of β3-adrenergic receptor gene polymorphisms and essential hypertension in the Northern Han Chinese population. J. Cardiovasc. Pulmonary Dis. 32, 41–45. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1007-5062.2013.01.013
- Wang, M. Q., Xu, W. L., Qu, Y. D., and Cui, L. F. (2001). Relationship between β3 adrenergic receptor gene Trp64Arg mutation and hypertension and coronary heart disease. *Railway M cal J.* 29, 225–227.
- Wang, Y., Xiao, J. Z., and Li, G. W. (2001). Association of insulin resistance and the polymorphism of adrenergic receptor gene in the population of essential hypertention. *Chin. J. Endocrinol. Metab.* 17, 148–150.
- Zhang, X. Y., Wei, F. J., Xu, L., and Yin, S. Y. (2012). Association of beta 3 adrenergic receptor gene polymorphism and essential hypertension in Mongolian population. *Chin. J. Integr. Med.* 10, 658–660.

Conflict of Interest Statement: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Copyright © 2018 Li, Lu, Wang, Zhou, Yang, Geng, Gong and Kim. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.