Thrombosis Research 135 (2015) 739-747

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Thrombosis Research

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/thromres



Regular Article

Impact of gamma-glutamyl carboxylase gene polymorphisms on warfarin dose requirement: A systematic review and meta-analysis



Yifan Sun^{a,1}, Zhitong Wu^{b,1}, Shan Li^c, Xue Qin^c, Taijie Li^c, Li Xie^c, Yan Deng^c, Junqing Chen^{d,*}

^a Department of Clinical Laboratory, Liuzhou Hospital of Traditional Chinese Medicine, 32 Jiefang North Road, Liuzhou 545001, Guangxi, People's Republic of China

^b Department of Clinical Laboratory, Guigang City People's Hospital, 1 Zhongshan Middle Road, Guigang 537100, Guangxi, People's Republic of China

^c Department of Clinical Laboratory, First Affiliated Hospital of Guangxi Medical University, 6 Shuangyong Road, Nanning 530021, Guangxi, People's Republic of China

^d Department of Gastrointestinal Surgery, First Affiliated Hospital of Guangxi Medical University, 6 Shuangyong Road, Nanning 530021, Guangxi, People's Republic of China

Department of Gustonnestinal Surgery, First Affinated Hospital of Guarget medical Onversity, o Shaangyong Koud, Nanning 550021, Guarget, Feople's Republic of China

ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 20 September 2014 Received in revised form 11 December 2014 Accepted 30 January 2015 Available online 7 February 2015

Keywords: Gamma-glutamyl carboxylase Polymorphism Warfarin Meta-analysis

ABSTRACT

Background: The Gamma-glutamyl carboxylase (GGCX) gene, as with Vitamin K Epoxide Reductase Complex Subunit 1(VKORC1), CytochromeP450 Complex Subunit 14 F2 (CYP4F2) and CytochromeP450 Complex Subunit2C9 (CYP2C9), is a candidate predictor for appropriate maintenance warfarin dose. However, the association between GGCX gene polymorphisms and warfarin dose requirement is still controversial. To quantify the influence of GGCX polymorphisms on warfarin dose requirements, we performed a systematic review and meta-analysis. Methods: According to PRISRM statement (Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses), a comprehensive literature search was undertaken through August 2014 looking for eligible studies in Embase, Pubmed,Web of Science and the Cochrane Library. The impact of GGCX polymorphisms on mean daily warfarin dose (MDWD) was counted by means of Z test. RevMan 5.2.7 software (developed by the Cochrane Collaboration) was applied to analyze the relationship between GGCX gene polymorphisms and warfarin dose requirements. Results: Nineteen articles including 21 studies with a total of 6957 patients were included in the meta-analysis. Among three investigated single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs), rs11676382 showed higher CC genotype frequencies in Asian than those in Caucasian (97.7% vs. 86.9%); patients who were "G carriers" (that is, carried the GGCX rs11676382 CG or GG genotypes) required 27% lower warfarin dose than CC genotype[95%Confidence Interval(CI) = 17%-37%, P = 0.000, $P^{2} = 82.0$ and $P_{Q} = 0.000$], moreover, stratified analysis by ethnicity showed similar results in Caucasian (23% lower, 95%CI = 12%-33%), but not in Asian. With respect to genetic variation of rs699664 and rs121714145 SNPs, no significant impact on warfarin dose requirements were demonstrated. Conclusions: This meta-analysis suggested that GGCX rs11676382 polymorphism may be one of factors affecting the dose of warfarin requirement, and the effects are different in different ethnicities. Further studies about this topic in different ethnicities with larger samples are expected to be conducted to validate our results.

© 2015 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND licenses (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

Introduction

Warfarin is commonly used in clinical treatment of various disorders, especially thromboembolic disease. The narrow therapeutic range of warfarin dosage may increase the risk of recurrence of thromboembolism and bleeding [1], so it is difficult to establish the appropriate dose of warfarin to achieve anticoagulation. Over time, many factors have proven to be associated with therapeutic warfarin dose requirements, including basic elements such as gender, age, weight, and body surface area [2–4]; however, these elements do not explain all of the differences that currently exist among warfarin dose requirements among different individuals and different ethnicities.

In recent years, it has been shown that the genetic variability of the pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of warfarin may be important in determining the individual and interethnic differences in appropriate warfarin dosage [5–9]. VKORC1, CYP4F2, and CYP2C9 polymorphisms contribute to inter-population difference in warfarin doses among diverse geographic regions [5,7,8]. GGCX, as a key cofactor for the activation of clotting factors (VII, IX, X) to reduce Vitamin K [10], is also a possible candidate, given that recent studies have found a significant relationship between *GGCX* genotype and warfarin dose [11–18].

The association between *GGCX* SNPs polymorphisms and warfarin dose requirements is biologically plausible. The *GGCX* gene, located on chromosome 2p12 in humans and consisting of 15 exons, plays the critical pharmacodynamic role in the generation of vitamin K-dependent

0049-3848/© 2015 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

^{*} Corresponding author. Tel.: +86 771 5356052; fax: +86 771 5353342.

E-mail addresses: sunyifan13@126.com (Y. Sun), ggwuzhitong@126.com (Z. Wu), lis8858@126.com (S. Li), qinxue919@126.com (X. Qin), 54963242@qq.com (T. Li), drlixie@163.com (L. Xie), 260126145@qq.com (Y. Deng), junqiangchen8@163.com (J. Chen).

¹ Yifan Sun and Zhitong Wu contributed equally to the article, so they should be considered as the co-first authors

proteins. GGCX can active the clotting factors VII, IX, X, and prothrombin by reducing vitamin K to vitamin K-2, 3-epoxide [19]. In addition, GGCXknockout mice die at birth from massive hemorrhage [20]. Crosier et al. [21] found that GGCX SNPs showed significant associations with percent undercarbosylated osteocalcin, a measure of vitamin K-dependent carboxylation in extra-hepatic proteins, which would influence warfarin dose requirements in order to achieve stable oral anticoagulation.

For the past decades, a number of studies on the relationship between *GGCX* gene and warfarin dose requirement had been reported [11–18, 22–30]. These studies provide certain evidences that the genotypebased dose predictions may in future enable personalised drug treatment from the start of warfarin therapy. In those studies, the rs699664 SNP in exon 8, rs12714145 SNP in intron 2, and rs11676382 SNP in intron 14 were the most researched SNPs. However, variant *GGCX* alleles have been associated with warfarin dosing in some studies with different ethnicities [12,23,31], but have not been consistently replicated in other studies [32,33]. Therefore, it is necessary to substantiate or validate the impact of *GGCX* polymorphisms in patients taking warfarin. The aim of this study was to quantify the effects of individual *GGCX* genotype on warfarin dose requirements, by means of a systematic literature review and meta-analysis.

Materials and Methods

This meta-analysis was conducted according to PRISMA statement (Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses), including search strategy, selection criteria, data extraction and data analysis [34].

Identification of Eligible Studies

We used the following search terms: "Gamma-glutamyl carboxylase" or "GGCX" in combination with "polymorphism," "mutation," or "variant" in combination with "warfarin," in Embase, PubMed, Web of Science and the Cochrane Library up to Aug, 2014. Two investigators (YFS and LS) conducted an extensive literature search independently for all publications. There was no language restriction. Articles in reference lists were also hand-searched. Only human studies were searched.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

The following criteria were used to choose suitable studies:

- (1) The following GGCX gene SNPs was studied: rs699664 (G8016A, c.974G>A), rs12714145 (c.214+597G>A, 3261G>A), rs11676382 (12970C>G);
- (2) Studies offering information regarding the number of genotypes, the maintenance dose of warfarin (mean with either standard deviation or 95% confidence interval) separately for GGCX genotype groups.

Publications were excluded from the meta-analysis if:

- (1) Review articles, letters, case reports, editorials, and conference abstracts.
- (2) The articles did not include genotype frequencies or warfarin dose, and this information was not available from the authors contacted.

Data Extraction

Two investigators (YFS and LS) independently extracted data from the included studies. The recorded data mainly included genotype frequencies of *GGCX* and warfarin dose (mean, SD) for each genotype. Also extracted from the eligible studies was basic information including the first author's name, publication date, country, ethnicity, indication of warfarin, total sample size (male, female), mean age of sample, target value of international normalized ratio (INR), and genotyping method. Accuracy of the extracted information was verified by ensuring that the data recorded by the 2 investigators matches; if it did not, the investigators rechecked the data extracted. If the two investigators could not reach an agreement, the dispute was submitted to a third reviewer (QX) to decide.

Quality Score Assessment

The quality of the selected studies was independently assessed by two investigators (CL and YFS) independently following the criteria predefined by Little et al. [35]. These quality criteria were based on: (1) analytic validity of genotyping (genotyping method, quality control measures, timing of sample collection and analysis, and types of samples used); (2) selection of study subjects (geographic area recruitment period, exclusion criteria for cases and controls, mean age and standard deviation or age range of study subjects, and distribution by sex); (3) confounding factors, including population stratification (potential correlation of the genotype identified and taken into consideration in design or analysis); and (4) statistical issues (method of analysis used in reference, and software used to perform the analysis). If most of the above criteria were satisfied, a study was graded as "++". A study that fulfilled some of the criteria would be graded as "++"; few or no criteria fulfilled resulted in a grade of "-" [35].

Statistical Analysis

To remove any heterogeneity caused by deviation in warfarin pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics sensitivity among different study populations, in our meta-analysis, the maintenance of warfarin dose for each *GGCX* genotype group was normalized using the homozygous wild-type group as a reference. The normalization procedure was performed by dividing the mean dose and associated standard deviations in each group by the mean maintenance dose in the GGCX reference group [36].

For the *GGCX* rs699664 and rs12714145, we defined carriers of AG or AA genotype as "A carriers", A carriers (AG+AA), AA and AG were compared with GG genotype (reference group).With respect to *GGCX* rs11676382, CG or GG genotype were defined as "G carriers", because GG frequencies were too small, only G carriers (CG+GG) were compared with CC genotype (reference group). The calculated mean differences represent relative rather than absolute differences in maintenance dose; in other words, a mean difference of 0.5 would indicate a 50% increase in warfarin dose requirement [36].

The weight is the inverse of its standard differences of warfarin dose in each study, and the effect of each GGCX genotype on warfarin dose was defined as mean difference (MD), which was calculated by subtracting the normalized mean warfarin dose for the respective genotypes from the reference. The Weight Mean Difference (WMD) was used as indicator of effect, which was calculated by multiplying the MD and related weight of each study. Each study's WMD was summed to arrive at the total WMD [31]. The impact of GGCX SNPs on mean daily warfarin dose (MDWD) was counted by means of Z test; a P value <0.05 was considered statistically significant. Heterogeneity was assessed by a chi-squared Q test and Isquared statistics, as has been previously described in the literature [37, 38]. If $P_Q < 0.1$ or $l^2 > 50\%$, we considered the heterogeneity significant, and a random-effects model was conducted using the DerSimonian and Laird method. Otherwise, a fixed-effects model (the Mantel-Haenszel method) was used. Stratified analysis was carried out by ethnicity and the mean target INR. We defined the mean target INR < 2.5 and INR \geq 2.5 as two separated subgroups.

Sensitivity analyses were carried out by excluding studies one by one, especially excluded study with low quality or small sample size. Begg's funnel plot and Egger's test were used to investigate the publication bias in the meta-analysis; P < 0.05 indicated that the result was statistically significant.

All the tests in this meta-analysis were conducted with RevMan 5.2.7 (Cochrane Collaboration) and STATA software (version 12.0; Stata Corporation, College Station, Texas, USA).

Results

Literature Selection and Study Characteristics

Fig. 1 shows the flow of selecting studies. According to the inclusion and exclusion criteria, 19 articles including 21 studies in 143 candidate publications were included in the meta-analysis. A total of 6957 patients were included between 2005 and 2014, of which 3552 patients for rs6996694, 1842 patients for rs11676382 and 1771 patients for rs12714145. Eleven eligible studies referred to the presence of the GGCX rs6996694 polymorphism [11–16,22,23,25], five for rs11676382 [18,23,26–28] and five for rs12714145 [3,17,18,22,29]. The articles by Schelleman H et al. [23] and Cavallari L et al. [3] were separated as different studies because they included two ethnicities and two SNPs respectively. Most of the studies are from Asian [12–17,22,25–27]; two studies from USA [18,23]. The main indications of warfarin are for use during heart valve replacement (HVR), deep vein thrombosis (DVT), atrial fibrillation (AF), pulmonary embolism (PE), and ischemic stroke. All studies except Schelleman H et al. [23] were graded as "++" during the quality score assessment; one article in Chinese [25] and the others were published in English. The characteristics of the included studies are shown in Table 1.

Allele Frequencies in Different Ethnicities

GGCX gene frequencies and warfarin dose requirements are shown in Table 1. On average, the *GGCX* rs699664 frequencies of GG, GA and AA were 46.0%, 44.7%, and 9.3% for Asian, and 45.6%, 46.3% and 8.1% for Caucasian. No statistically significant difference was shown between the two ethnicities ($\chi^2 = 0.296$, P = 0.863). Similar results were showed in G allele vs. A allele model ($\chi^2 = 0.021$, P = 0.884). However, the frequencies of GG, GA and AA in African American were 20.9%, 44.3% and 34.8% respectively, which was significant difference with the other two ethnicities($\chi^2 = 158.98$, P = 0.000).

For the *GGCX* rs11676382, genotype and allele frequencies of this site showed significant difference among Asian and Caucasian population (P = 0.000). The Asian population have a higher CC frequency than that of Caucasian group (97.7% vs. 86.9%). There was no GG genotype reported in Asian population.

With respect to GGCX rs12714145, significant difference was showed in genotype frequencies comparison ($\chi^2 = 17.770$, P = 0.000) in Caucasian and Asian, but not in allele frequencies comparison, and the Caucasian population have a higher GG frequency than that of Asian population (46.5% vs. 36.7%). However, the frequencies of GG, GA and AA in African American were similar with Asian population



Fig. 1. Flow diagram of included studies for this meta-analysis.

Table 1

The characteristics of the included studies.

Study	Country	Ethnicity	Number (men %)	Age	Indication of warfarin	INR target range	Gene frequ	encies	%	Warfarin dose (mean \pm SD, n	nd/day)		Quality score
rs699664							GG	GA	AA	GG	GA	AA	
Loebstein,R 2005	Israel	Caucasian	100(52)	62.0	HV,AF, DVT,PT	2.7 ± 0.5	50.0	41.0	9.0	5.50 ± 1.80	5.8 ± 1.90	5.14 ± 2.00	++
Kimura R 2007	Japan	Asian	93(71)	68.1 ± 10.0	Stoke	1.6-2.6	51.6	41.9	6.5	3.25 ± 1.19	2.63 ± 0.77	2.79 ± 1.07	++
Ohno M 2009	Japan	Asian	125(60)	73.1 ± 11.6	AF,DVT, PE	1.5-3.0	54.4	37.6	8.0	2.86 ± 1.26	2.49 ± 1.24	2.15 ± 1.11	++
Liu Y 2010	China	Asian	794(43)	46.8 ± 11.9	HV	1.8-3.0	45.3	45.7	8.9	1.54 ± 1.18	1.55 ± 1.05	1.61 ± 1.11	++
Choi JR 2011	Korean	Asian	564(54)	63.2 ± 11.7	HVR,AF,DVT,PT	2.1 ± 0.8	47.0	44.3	8.7	3.50 ± 2.00	3.00 ± 1.80	3.00 ± 2.00	++
SL Zhong 2012	China	Asian	841(42)	51.3 ± 7.5	HVR,AF,DVT	1.8-3.0	45.5	45.5	8.9	3.00 ± 1.67	2.90 ± 1.67	2.90 ± 1.67	++
Schelleman 2010	USA	African	22	N/A	N/A	2.0-3.0	9.1	45.5	45.5	6.96 ± 1.13	6.61 ± 2.49	5.71 ± 2.38	+
		American											
		Caucasian	36	N/A	N/A	2.0-3.0	33.3	61.1	5.6	5.80 ± 2.57	5.25 ± 2.17	5.19 ± 1.29	+
Lou Y 2012	China	Asian	488(44.7)	56.7 ± 12.1	HVR,AF,DVT,PT	1.8-2.5	45.5	42.0	12.5	3.65 ± 1.52	3.37 ± 1.36	3.63 ± 1.24	++
Liang Y 2013	China	Asian	280(46.0)	47.9 ± 12.5	N/A	1.5-3.0	42.5	48.9	8.5	3.09 ± 1.04	3.46 ± 1.24	3.51 ± 1.44	++
Cavallari L 2013	USA	African	208	58 ± 16	N/A	3.0	22.1	44.2	33.7	5.88 ± 0.74	5.98 ± 0.79	6.20 ± 1.22	++
		American											
rs11676382								66	66		66	66	
Krishna 2014	Indian	Asian	240(36.7)	43.3 ± 11.2	HVR AF DVT	30-35	97.9	21	-	48 ± 220	26 ± 0.50	N/A	++
King CR 2014	LISA	Caucasian	985(50.7)	60(15)	N/A	23(04)	88.6	11.2	0.2	4.0 ± 2.20 4.9 ± 1.60	41 ± 1.60	38 ± 220	++
Rathore SS 2014	Indian	Asian	225(67.1)	377 ± 13	VT	20-35	94.2	49	0.2	$0.056(0.023)^*$	$0.053(0.024)^*$	N/A	++
Wypasek E 2014	Poland	Caucasian	479(53)	48.8 ± 14.7	N/A	20-30	843	14.8	0.9	$47.8 + 8.79^{\#}$	$33.87 + 3.67^{\#}$		++
Schelleman 2010	USA	Caucasian	36	N/A	N/A	2.0-3.0	88.9	11.1	N/A	$46.5 \pm 23.06^{\#}$	$38.3 \pm 4.73^{\#}$	N/A	+
Senenenian 2010	00.1	eudeubluit	50			210 310	00.0		,	1010 1 20100	5615 <u>+</u> 175		
rs121714145							GG	GA	AA	GG	GA	AA	
Liang Y 2013	China	Asian	283(46.0)	47.9 ± 12.5	N/A	1.5-3.0	36.7	51.6	11.7	3.20 ± 1.02	3.39 ± 1.25	3.35 ± 1.35	++
Huang SW 2010	China	Asian	217(41.5)	51.3 (15.0)	HVR,AF,DVT	1.8-3.0	38.7	53.9	7.3	2.69 ± 1.07	2.91 ± 1.16	3.39 ± 1.40	++
Geisen C 2011	Germany	Caucasian	75(49.3)	64 (19–92)	HVR,AF,VT	2.0-3.0	34.7	45.3	20.0	2.14 ± 0.28	2.16 ± 0.39	2.33 ± 0.46	++
King CR 2010	USA	Caucasian	985(50.7)	60 (15)	N/A	2.3 (0.4)	47.7	41.1	11.7	5.1 ± 1.60	4.7 ± 1.60	4.7 ± 1.60	++
Cavallari L 2013	USA	African	211	58 ± 16	-	3.0	33.6	50.7	15.6	5.88 ± 0.84	5.93 ± 1.02	5.90 ± 0.92	
		American											

AF, Atrial Fibrillation; HVR, Heart Valve Replacement; MI, Myocardial Infarction; DVT, Deep Vein Thrombosis; PVR, Prosthetic Valve Replace; PE, Pulmonary Embolism; N/A, no data. ++, High score; +, Low score.

* mean daily dose, mg/kg body weight (SD).

[#] Warfarin dose (mean \pm SD, md/week).

(37.6%, 52.6% and 9.8% for Asian, 33.6%, 50.7% and 15.6% for African American, respectively)

Meta Analyses Results

Impact of GGCX rs699664 on MDWD

The influence of GGCX rs699664 polymorphism on warfarin dose requirement is shown in Fig. 2. The total number of patients carrying AA, AG and GG were 367, 1476 and 1511, respectively. When compared to individuals with the homozygous GG genotype, all comparison model showed no significant impact on warfarin dose requirements. Stratified analysis by ethnicity and mean target INR showed similar results with the overall analysis (Table 2).

Impact of GGCX rs12714145 on MDWD

The influence of GGCX rs12714145 on warfarin dose requirement is shown in Fig. 3. The total number of patients carrying AA, AG and GG were 252, 807 and 752, respectively. The impact of rs12714145 on MDWD were similar to rs699664 and no significant difference was found in overall analysis. Only the analysis of AA vs. AG shows homogeneity ($I^{2}\% = 0.0$ and $P_{Q} = 0.500$ for heterogeneity) and a fixed-effects model was used, however, the other comparison models were all used random-effects model. Stratified analysis by ethnicity and mean target INR showed similar results with the overall analysis, however, the AA+AG vs. GG comparison model showed an decreased effect in Caucasian population, but opposite effect for Asian (Table 2).

Impact of GGCX rs11676382 on MDWD

The influence of *GGCX* rs11676382 on warfarin dose requirement is shown in Fig. 4. The total number of patients carrying CC, CG and GG

were 1638, 1930 and 11, respectively. However, because the GG genotype frequencies of the rs11676382 variant was below 5%, this metaanalysis only performed a CG+GG vs. GG comparison model. Analysis showed statistical heterogeneity in this comparison model. Analysis showed statistical heterogeneity in this comparison model ($I^2 = 82\%$ and $P_Q = 0.000$), hence a random-effects model was used. The result provided an evidence that G allele carriers required 27% (P = 0.000, 95%CI = 22%-33%) lower MDWD than that of CC genotype. Stratified analysis by ethnicity and mean target INR showed showed similar results in Caucasian group (23% lower, P = 0.000, 95%CI = 12%-33%, $I^2 = 84\%$ and $P_Q = 0.002$ for heterogeneity), INR < 2.5 group (17% lower, P = 0.000, 95%CI = 11%-23%, only one study) and INR ≥ 2.5 group (31% lower, P = 0.000, 95%CI = 18%-44%, $I^2 = 75\%$ and $P_Q =$ 0.008 for heterogeneity) using random-effects model, but not in Asian subgroup (P = 0.270) (Table 2).

Subgroup Analysis

Considering the influence of ethnicity on warfarin dosage requirement and the main determinant of warfarin dose adjustment is the value of INR, we also performed a stratified analysis by ethnicity and the mean target INR (Table 2). No statistically significant results happened in Asian group in all analysis, yet, with respect to rs11676382, G allele carriers showed 23% (P = 0.000, 95%CI = 12%-33%) lower warfarin dose requirement than CC genotype in Caucasian group. The results of stratified analysis according to the mean target INR were similar with the overall analysis and stratified analysis by ethnicity.

Sensitivity Analysis and Publication Bias

Sensitivity analysis was carried out by excluding each study one at a time. Further sensitivity analysis was performed by excluding the study of Schelleman H et al. [23], in which the sample is obviously smaller than that in other studies, moreover, the study was



Fig. 2. Forest plots of impact of GGCX gene rs699664 polymorphism on warfarin dose requirement. A: AA vs. GG carriers, B: AG vs. GG carriers, C: A carriers (AA+AG) vs. GG carriers, D: AA vs. AG carriers. Mean (SD): mean and standard deviation of normalized warfarin doses associated with each genotype. CI: confidence interval.

defined as "+" according to quality score assessment. However, we did not find that this analysis revealed any significant change or revision in findings.

We also performed a stratified analysis by ethnicity (Table 2). No statistically significant results happened in Asian group in all analysis, yet, with respect to rs11676382, G allele carriers showed 23% (P =

Table 2

Stratified analysis by ethnicity and mean target INR.

Comparison models	overall	Ethnicities		Mean INR		
		Caucasian	Asian	African-American	INR < 2.5	INR ≥ 2.5
rs699664						
AA vs. GG	0[-4,4]	-8[-3,14]	-3[-9,3]	-1[-22,19]	-3[-9,3]	3[-3,9]
AG vs. GG	-4[-9,2]	3[-10,16]	-6[-13,2]	2[-3,6]	-6[-13,2]	2[-2,6]
AA vs. AG	2[-2,6]	-8[-29,12]	3[-3,9]	2[-3,8]	3[-3,9]	2[-4,7]
AA+AG vs. GG	-4[-9,2]	1[-11,14]	-5[-13,2]	3[-2,7]	-5[-13,2]	2[-2,8]
rs12714145						
AA vs. GG	2[-6,10]	0[-17,16]	10[-3,24]	0[-6,6]	4[-13,21]	2[-4,8]
AG vs. GG	1[-5,7]	-4[-13,5]	7[0,14]	1[-4,6]	1[-10,13]	1[-3,5]
AA vs. AG	1[-3,5]	2[-4,7]	4[-10,17]	-1[-7,5]	1[-5,7]	1[-5,7]
AA+AG vs. GG	1[-6,8]	-7[-11,-4]	7[1,14]	1[-3,5]	2[-10,14]	1[-3,5]
rs11676382						
CG+GG vs. CC	-27[-37,-17]	-23[-33,-12]	-33[-70,5]	N/A	-17[-23,-11]	-31[-44,-18]

Data were showed as weight mean difference [95% Confidence Intervals]. -, reduction of warfarin dose requirement.

N/A, no data.

0.000, 95%CI = 13%-33%) lower warfarin dose requirement than CC genotype in Caucasian group.

Begg's funnel plot and Egger's linear regression test were also conducted to investigate the publication bias; the results of each study's genotype with respect to effect on warfarin dose reductions against the inverse standard error showed that no significant publication bias was detected in each compared model (All P > 0.05, data not shown).

			AA			GG			Mean Difference		Mean Difference	^
	Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	r	V, Random, 95% Cl	A
	Cavallari L2013	1	0.16	33	1	0.14	71	28.6%	0.00 [-0.06, 0.06]		+	
	Geisen C2011	1.09	0.21	15	1	0.13	26	20.2%	0.09 (-0.03, 0.21)			
	Huang SW2010	1.26	0.52	16	1	0.4	84	7.3%	0.26 [-0.01, 0.53]			
	King CR2010	0.92	0.31	115	1	0.31	467	28.6%	-0.08 [-0.14, -0.02]			
	Liang Y2013	1.05	0.42	33	1	0.32	104	15.3%	0.05 (-0.11, 0.21)			
	Total (95% CI)			212			752	100.0%	0.02 [-0.06, 0.10]		+	
	Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.01: C	hi ² = 1	2.02. df	= 4 (P =	= 0.02)	: I ² = 6	7%		1 <u> </u>		
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.52$ (P = 0.60)										-1 -0.5	0 0.5	1
			AG			GG			Mean Difference		Mean Difference	-
	Study or Subaroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV. Random, 95% CI	r	V. Random, 95% CI	в
	Cavallari L2013	1.01	0.17	107	1	0.14	71	24.5%	0.01 [-0.04, 0.06]		+	2.5
	Geisen C2011	1.01	0.18	34	1	0.13	26	19.1%	0.01 [-0.07, 0.09]		_ _	
	Huang SW2010	1.08	0.43	117	1	0.4	84	13.7%	0.08 [-0.04, 0.20]			
	King CR2010	0.92	0.31	403	1	0.31	467	25.1%	-0.08 [-0.12, -0.04]		-	
	Liang Y2013	1.06	0.39	146	1	0.32	104	17.6%	0.06 (-0.03, 0.15)			
	2											
	Total (95% CI)			807			752	100.0%	0.01 [-0.05, 0.07]		•	
	Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.00: C	hi ² = 1	6.33. df	= 4 (P =	= 0.003	3); I ² = 1	76%	• • •	<u>⊢</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
	Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.19) (P = 0).85)						-1 -0.5	0 0.5	1
			•									
		A	A+AG			GG			Mean Difference		Mean Difference	0
	Study or Subgroup	A Mean	A+AG SD	Total	Mean	GG SD	Total	Weight	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	r	Mean Difference V, Random, 95% Cl	С
-	Study or Subgroup Cavallari L2013	A <u>Mean</u> 1.01	A+AG SD 0.17	Total 140	Mean 1	GG SD 0.14	Total 71	Weiqht 26.3%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI 0.01 [-0.03, 0.05]	r	Mean Difference V. Random, 95% Cl	С
-	Study or Subgroup Cavallari L2013 Geisen C2011	A Mean 1.01 1.03	A+AG SD 0.17 0.59	<u>Total</u> 140 49	<u>Mean</u> 1	GG SD 0.14 0.13	<u>Total</u> 71 26	Weiqht 26.3% 10.3%	Mean Difference <u>IV, Random, 95% CI</u> 0.01 [-0.03, 0.05] 0.03 [-0.14, 0.20]	r	Mean Difference V, Random, 95% Cl	С
-	<u>Study or Subgroup</u> Cavallari L2013 Geisen C2011 Huang SW2010	A <u>Mean</u> 1.01 1.03 1.1	A+AG SD 0.17 0.59 0.45	Total 140 49 133	<u>Mean</u> 1 1	GG SD 0.14 0.13 0.4	<u>Total</u> 71 26 84	Weight 26.3% 10.3% 16.2%	Mean Difference <u>IV, Random, 95% CI</u> 0.01 [-0.03, 0.05] 0.03 [-0.14, 0.20] 0.10 [-0.01, 0.21]	<u>г</u>	Mean Difference V, Random, 95% Cl	C
-	Study or Subgroup Cavallari L2013 Geisen C2011 Huang SW2010 King CR2010	A <u>Mean</u> 1.01 1.03 1.1 0.92	A+AG SD 0.17 0.59 0.45 0.31	Total 140 49 133 518	<u>Mean</u> 1 1 1	GG SD 0.14 0.13 0.4 0.31	Total 71 26 84 467	Weight 26.3% 10.3% 16.2% 26.9%	Mean Difference <u>IV, Random, 95% CI</u> 0.01 [-0.03, 0.05] 0.03 [-0.14, 0.20] 0.10 [-0.01, 0.21] -0.08 [-0.12, -0.04]	<u>г</u>	Mean Difference V, Random, 95% Cl	С
-	Study or Subgroup Cavallari L2013 Geisen C2011 Huang SW2010 King CR2010 Liang Y2013	A Mean 1.01 1.03 1.1 0.92 1.06	A+AG SD 0.17 0.59 0.45 0.31 0.4	Total 140 49 133 518 179	<u>Mean</u> 1 1 1 1	GG SD 0.14 0.13 0.4 0.31 0.32	Total 71 26 84 467 104	Weight 26.3% 10.3% 16.2% 26.9% 20.3%	Mean Difference <u>IV, Random, 95% CI</u> 0.01 [-0.03, 0.05] 0.03 [-0.14, 0.20] 0.10 [-0.01, 0.21] -0.08 [-0.12, -0.04] 0.06 [-0.02, 0.14]	г	Mean Difference V, Random, 95% Cl	C
-	Study or Subgroup Cavallari L2013 Geisen C2011 Huang SW2010 King CR2010 Liang Y2013	A <u>Mean</u> 1.01 1.03 1.1 0.92 1.06	A+AG SD 0.17 0.59 0.45 0.31 0.4	Total 140 49 133 518 179	<u>Mean</u> 1 1 1 1	GG SD 0.14 0.13 0.4 0.31 0.32	Total 71 26 84 467 104	Weiqht 26.3% 10.3% 16.2% 26.9% 20.3%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI 0.01 [-0.03, 0.05] 0.03 [-0.14, 0.20] 0.10 [-0.01, 0.21] -0.08 [-0.12, -0.04] 0.06 [-0.02, 0.14]	ŗ	Mean Difference V, Random, 95% Cl	<u> </u>
-	Study or Subgroup Cavallari L2013 Geisen C2011 Huang SW2010 King CR2010 Liang Y2013 Total (95% CI)	A <u>Mean</u> 1.01 1.03 1.1 0.92 1.06	A+AG SD 0.17 0.59 0.45 0.31 0.4	Total 140 49 133 518 179 1019	<u>Mean</u> 1 1 1 1	GG SD 0.14 0.13 0.4 0.31 0.32	Total 71 26 84 467 104 752	Weight 26.3% 10.3% 16.2% 26.9% 20.3% 100.0%	Mean Difference <u>IV, Random, 95% CI</u> 0.01 [-0.03, 0.05] 0.03 [-0.14, 0.20] 0.10 [-0.01, 0.21] -0.08 [-0.12, -0.04] 0.06 [-0.02, 0.14] 0.01 [-0.06, 0.08]	<u> </u>	Mean Difference V, Random, 95% Cl	<u> </u>
-	Study or Subgroup Cavallari L2013 Geisen C2011 Huang SW2010 King CR2010 Liang Y2013 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	A <u>Mean</u> 1.01 1.03 1.1 0.92 1.06 0.00; C	A+AG SD 0.17 0.59 0.45 0.31 0.4 hi ² = 1	Total 140 49 133 518 179 1019 8.99, df	<u>Mean</u> 1 1 1 1	GG SD 0.14 0.13 0.4 0.31 0.32 = 0.000	Total 71 26 84 467 104 752 08); I ² =	Weight 26.3% 10.3% 16.2% 26.9% 20.3% 100.0%	Mean Difference <u>IV, Random, 95% CI</u> 0.01 [-0.03, 0.05] 0.03 [-0.14, 0.20] 0.10 [-0.01, 0.21] -0.08 [-0.12, -0.04] 0.06 [-0.02, 0.14] 0.01 [-0.06, 0.08]	r	Mean Difference V, Random, 95% Cl	;
-	Study or Subgroup Cavallari L2013 Geisen C2011 Huang SW2010 King CR2010 Liang Y2013 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect.	A <u>Mean</u> 1.01 1.03 1.1 0.92 1.06 0.00; C Z = 0.38	A+AG SD 0.17 0.59 0.45 0.31 0.4 hi ² = 1 3 (P = 0	Total 140 49 133 518 179 1019 8.99, df).72)	<u>Mean</u> 1 1 1 1 1	GG <u>SD</u> 0.14 0.13 0.4 0.31 0.32 = 0.000	Total 71 26 84 467 104 752 08); I ² =	Weight 26.3% 10.3% 16.2% 26.9% 20.3% 100.0% 79%	Mean Difference <u>IV. Random, 95% CI</u> 0.01 [-0.03, 0.05] 0.03 [-0.14, 0.20] 0.10 [-0.01, 0.21] -0.08 [-0.12, -0.04] 0.06 [-0.02, 0.14] 0.01 [-0.06, 0.08]	r 	Mean Difference V, Random, 95% Cl	<u>C</u>
-	Study or Subgroup Cavallari L2013 Geisen C2011 Huang SW2010 King CR2010 Liang Y2013 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect.	A Mean 1.01 1.03 1.1 0.92 1.06 0.00; C Z = 0.36	A+AG SD 0.17 0.59 0.45 0.31 0.4 hi ² = 1 0.4 hi ² = 1 0.4	Total 140 49 133 518 179 1019 8.99, df 0.72)	Mean 1 1 1 1 1	GG <u>SD</u> 0.14 0.13 0.4 0.31 0.32 = 0.000 AG	Total 71 26 84 467 104 752 08); I ² =	Weight 26.3% 10.3% 16.2% 26.9% 20.3% 100.0% 79%	Mean Difference <u>IV. Random, 95% CI</u> 0.01 [-0.03, 0.05] 0.03 [-0.14, 0.20] 0.10 [-0.01, 0.21] -0.08 [-0.12, -0.04] 0.06 [-0.02, 0.14] 0.01 [-0.06, 0.08] Mean Difference	р нн -1 -0.5 М	Mean Difference V. Random, 95% Cl	C
-	Study or Subgroup Cavallari L2013 Geisen C2011 Huang SW2010 King CR2010 Liang Y2013 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect. Study or Subgroup	A Mean 1.01 1.03 1.1 0.92 1.06 0.00; C Z = 0.36 Mean	A+AG SD 0.17 0.59 0.45 0.31 0.4 hi ² = 1 b (P = 0 AA SD	Total 140 49 133 518 179 1019 8.99, df 0.72) Total	Mean 1 1 1 1 1 5 4 (P = Mean	GG <u>SD</u> 0.14 0.13 0.31 0.32 = 0.000 AG SD	Total 71 26 84 467 104 752 08); I ² = Total	Weight 26.3% 10.3% 16.2% 26.9% 20.3% 100.0% 79% Weight	Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI 0.01 [-0.03, 0.05] 0.03 [-0.14, 0.20] 0.10 [-0.01, 0.21] -0.08 [-0.12, -0.04] 0.06 [-0.02, 0.14] 0.01 [-0.06, 0.08] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI	р -1 -0.5 М	Mean Difference V. Random, 95% CI	C
-	Study or Subgroup Cavallari L2013 Geisen C2011 Huang SW2010 King CR2010 Liang Y2013 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect. Study or Subgroup Cavallari L2013	A Mean 1.01 1.03 1.1 0.92 1.06 0.00; C Z = 0.36 Mean 1	A+AG SD 0.17 0.59 0.45 0.31 0.4 hi ² = 1 0.4 hi ² = 1 0.4 AA SD 0.16	Total 140 49 133 518 179 1019 8.99, df).72) Total 33	Mean 1 1 1 1 7 4 (P = <u>Mean</u> 1.01	GG <u>SD</u> 0.14 0.13 0.4 0.31 0.32 = 0.000 AG <u>SD</u> 0.17	Total 71 26 84 467 104 752 08); I ² = <u>Total</u> 107	Weight 26.3% 10.3% 16.2% 26.9% 20.3% 100.0% 79% Weight 40.6%	Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI 0.01 [-0.03, 0.05] 0.03 [-0.14, 0.20] 0.10 [-0.01, 0.21] -0.08 [-0.12, -0.04] 0.06 [-0.02, 0.14] 0.01 [-0.06, 0.08] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -0.01 [-0.07, 0.05]	г -1 -0.5 М IV	Mean Difference V. Random, 95% CI	C
-	Study or Subgroup Cavallari L2013 Geisen C2011 Huang SW2010 King CR2010 Liang Y2013 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect . Study or Subgroup Cavallari L2013 Geisen C2011	A <u>Mean</u> 1.01 1.03 1.1 0.92 1.06 0.00; C Z = 0.38 <u>Mean</u> 1.09	A+AG <u>SD</u> 0.17 0.59 0.45 0.31 0.4 hi ² = 1 0.4 hi ² = 2 AA <u>SD</u> 0.16 0.21	Total 140 49 133 518 179 1019 8.99, df 0.72) Total 33 15	Mean 1 1 1 1 5 = 4 (P = <u>Mean</u> 1.01 1,01	GG <u>SD</u> 0.14 0.13 0.4 0.31 0.32 = 0.000 AG <u>SD</u> 0.17 0.18	Total 71 26 84 467 104 752 08); I ² = <u>Total</u> 107 34	Weight 26.3% 10.3% 16.2% 26.9% 20.3% 100.0% 79% Weight 40.6% 10.9%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI 0.01 [-0.03, 0.05] 0.03 [-0.14, 0.20] 0.10 [-0.01, 0.21] -0.08 [-0.12, -0.04] 0.06 [-0.02, 0.14] 0.01 [-0.06, 0.08] Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% CI -0.01 [-0.07, 0.05] 0.08 [-0.04, 0.20]	г -1 -0.5 М	Mean Difference V, Random, 95% Cl	C
-	Study or Subgroup Cavallari L2013 Geisen C2011 Huang SW2010 King CR2010 Liang Y2013 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect . Study or Subgroup Cavallari L2013 Geisen C2011 Huang SW2010	A <u>Mean</u> 1.01 1.03 1.1 0.92 1.06 0.00; C Z = 0.38 <u>Mean</u> 1.09 1.26	A+AG <u>SD</u> 0.17 0.59 0.45 0.31 0.4 hi ² = 1 0.4 hi ² = 2 AA <u>SD</u> 0.16 0.21 0.52	Total 140 49 133 518 179 1019 8.99, df 0.72) Total 33 15 16	Mean 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 5 4 (P = <u>Mean</u> 1.01 1.01 1.08	GG <u>SD</u> 0.14 0.13 0.4 0.31 0.32 = 0.000 AG <u>SD</u> 0.17 0.18 0.43	<u>Total</u> 71 26 84 467 104 752 08); I ² = <u>Total</u> 107 34 117	Weight 26.3% 10.3% 16.2% 20.3% 100.0% 79% Weight 40.6% 10.9% 2.3%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI 0.01 [-0.03, 0.05] 0.03 [-0.14, 0.20] 0.10 [-0.01, 0.21] -0.08 [-0.12, -0.04] 0.06 [-0.02, 0.14] 0.01 [-0.06, 0.08] Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% CI -0.01 [-0.07, 0.05] 0.08 [-0.04, 0.20] 0.18 [-0.09, 0.45]	г -1 -0.5 М	Mean Difference V, Random, 95% CI	C
-	Study or Subgroup Cavallari L2013 Geisen C2011 Huang SW2010 King CR2010 Liang Y2013 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect. Study or Subgroup Cavallari L2013 Geisen C2011 Huang SW2010 King CR2010	A <u>Mean</u> 1.01 1.03 1.1 0.92 1.06 0.00; C Z = 0.36 <u>Mean</u> 1.09 1.26 0.92	A+AG <u>SD</u> 0.17 0.59 0.45 0.31 0.4 hi ² = 1 0 (P = 0 AA <u>SD</u> 0.16 0.21 0.52 0.31	Total 140 49 133 518 179 1019 8.99, df 0.72) Total 33 15 16 115	Mean 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 Mean 1.01 1.01 1.08 0.92	GG <u>SD</u> 0.14 0.13 0.4 0.31 0.32 = 0.000 AG <u>SD</u> 0.17 0.18 0.43 0.31	Total 71 26 84 467 104 752 08); I ² = <u>Total</u> 107 34 117 403	Weight 26.3% 10.3% 16.2% 26.9% 20.3% 100.0% 79% Weight 40.6% 10.9% 2.3% 39.5%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI 0.01 [-0.03, 0.05] 0.03 [-0.14, 0.20] 0.10 [-0.01, 0.21] -0.08 [-0.12, -0.04] 0.06 [-0.02, 0.14] 0.01 [-0.06, 0.08] Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% CI -0.01 [-0.07, 0.05] 0.08 [-0.04, 0.20] 0.18 [-0.09, 0.46] 0.00 [-0.06, 0.06]	н <u></u> -1 -0.5 М	Mean Difference V, Random, 95% CI	C
-	Study or Subgroup Cavallari L2013 Geisen C2011 Huang SW2010 King CR2010 Liang Y2013 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect : Study or Subgroup Cavallari L2013 Geisen C2011 Huang SW2010 King CR2010 Liang Y2013	A Mean 1.01 1.03 1.1 0.92 1.06 0.00; C Z = 0.36 Mean 1.09 1.26 0.92 1.05	A+AG <u>SD</u> 0.17 0.59 0.45 0.31 0.4 hi ² = 1 0 (P = 0 AA <u>SD</u> 0.16 0.21 0.52 0.31 0.42	Total 140 49 133 518 179 1019 8.99, df 0.72) Total 33 15 16 115 33	Mean 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1.01 1.01 1.01 0.92 1.06	GG <u>SD</u> 0.14 0.13 0.4 0.31 0.32 = 0.000 AG <u>SD</u> 0.17 0.18 0.43 0.31 0.39	Total 71 26 84 467 104 752 08); I ² = Total 107 34 117 403 146	Weight 26.3% 10.3% 16.2% 26.9% 20.3% 100.0% 79% Weight 40.6% 10.9% 2.3% 39.5% 6.6%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI 0.01 [-0.03, 0.05] 0.03 [-0.14, 0.20] 0.10 [-0.01, 0.21] -0.08 [-0.12, -0.04] 0.06 [-0.02, 0.14] 0.01 [-0.06, 0.08] Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% CI -0.01 [-0.07, 0.05] 0.08 [-0.04, 0.20] 0.18 [-0.09, 0.45] 0.00 [-0.06, 0.06] -0.01 [-0.17, 0.15]	н <u>н</u> -1 -0.5 IV	Mean Difference V. Random, 95% Cl	C
_	Study or Subgroup Cavallari L2013 Geisen C2011 Huang SW2010 King CR2010 Liang Y2013 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect. Study or Subgroup Cavallari L2013 Geisen C2011 Huang SW2010 King CR2010 Liang Y2013	A Mean 1.01 1.03 1.1 0.92 1.06 0.00; C Z = 0.38 Mean 1.09 1.26 0.92 1.05	A+AG <u>SD</u> 0.17 0.59 0.45 0.31 0.4 bi ² = 1 0.4 (P = 0 AA <u>SD</u> 0.16 0.21 0.52 0.31 0.42	Total 140 49 133 518 179 1019 8.99, df 0.72) Total 33 15 16 115 33	Mean 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1.01 1.01 1.01 1.02 1.06	GG SD 0.14 0.13 0.4 0.31 0.32 = 0.000 AG SD 0.17 0.18 0.43 0.31 0.39	Total 71 26 84 467 104 752 08); I ² = 107 34 117 403 146	Weight 26.3% 10.3% 16.2% 26.9% 20.3% 100.0% 79% Weight 40.6% 10.9% 2.3% 39.5% 6.6%	Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI 0.01 [-0.03, 0.05] 0.03 [-0.14, 0.20] 0.10 [-0.01, 0.21] -0.08 [-0.12, -0.04] 0.06 [-0.02, 0.14] 0.01 [-0.06, 0.08] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -0.01 [-0.07, 0.05] 0.08 [-0.04, 0.20] 0.18 [-0.09, 0.45] 0.00 [-0.06, 0.06] -0.01 [-0.17, 0.15]	г -1 -0.5 ТV	Mean Difference V. Random, 95% CI	C
_	Study or Subgroup Cavallari L2013 Geisen C2011 Huang SW2010 King CR2010 Liang Y2013 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect : Study or Subgroup Cavallari L2013 Geisen C2011 Huang SW2010 King CR2010 Liang Y2013 Total (95% CI)	A Mean 1.01 1.03 1.1 0.92 1.06 0.00; C Z = 0.36 Mean 1.09 1.26 0.92 1.05	A+AG SD 0.17 0.59 0.45 0.31 0.4 $hi^{2} = 11$ 0.4 $hi^{2} = 1$ 0.4 0.1 0.4 0.2 0.1 0.4 0.2 0.16 0.21 0.42	Total 140 49 133 518 179 1019 8.99, df 0.72) Total 33 15 16 115 33 212	Mean 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	GG SD 0.14 0.13 0.4 0.31 0.32 = 0.000 AG SD 0.17 0.18 0.43 0.31 0.39	Total 71 26 84 467 104 752 08); I [≠] = Total 107 34 117 403 146 807	Weight 26.3% 10.3% 16.2% 26.9% 20.3% 100.0% Weight 40.6% 10.9% 2.3% 39.5% 6.6% 100.0%	Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI 0.01 [-0.03, 0.05] 0.03 [-0.14, 0.20] 0.10 [-0.01, 0.21] -0.08 [-0.12, -0.04] 0.06 [-0.02, 0.14] 0.01 [-0.06, 0.08] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -0.01 [-0.07, 0.05] 0.08 [-0.04, 0.20] 0.18 [-0.09, 0.45] 0.00 [-0.06, 0.06] -0.01 [-0.17, 0.15] 0.01 [-0.03, 0.05]	г -1 -0.5 М	Mean Difference V. Random, 95% CI	C
-	Study or Subgroup Cavallari L2013 Geisen C2011 Huang SW2010 King CR2010 Liang Y2013 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect. Study or Subgroup Cavallari L2013 Geisen C2011 Huang SW2010 King CR2010 Liang Y2013 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = :	A Mean 1.01 1.03 1.1 0.92 1.06 0.00; C Z = 0.38 Mean 1 1.09 1.26 0.92 1.05 3.35, df	A+AG SD 0.17 0.59 0.45 0.31 0.4 $hi^2 = 1$ δ (P = 0 AA SD 0.16 0.21 0.52 0.31 0.42 = 4 (P	Total 140 49 133 518 179 1019 8.99, dt 0.72) Total 33 15 16 115 33 212 = 0.50)	Mean 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	GG SD 0.14 0.13 0.4 0.31 0.32 = 0.000 AG SD 0.17 0.18 0.43 0.31 0.39	Total 71 26 84 467 104 752 08); ⁼= 107 34 117 403 146 807	Weight 26.3% 10.3% 16.2% 26.9% 20.3% 100.0% Weight 40.6% 10.9% 2.3% 39.5% 6.6% 100.0%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI 0.01 [-0.03, 0.05] 0.03 [-0.14, 0.20] 0.00 [-0.01, 0.21] -0.08 [-0.12, -0.04] 0.06 [-0.02, 0.14] 0.01 [-0.06, 0.08] Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% CI -0.01 [-0.07, 0.05] 0.08 [-0.04, 0.20] 0.18 [-0.09, 0.45] 0.00 [-0.06, 0.06] -0.01 [-0.17, 0.15] 0.01 [-0.03, 0.05]	-1 -0.5 M IV	Mean Difference V. Random, 95% CI	C
_	Study or Subgroup Cavallari L2013 Geisen C2011 Huang SW2010 King CR2010 Liang Y2013 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect. Study or Subgroup Cavallari L2013 Geisen C2011 Huang SW2010 King CR2010 Liang Y2013 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = : Test for overall effect:	A Mean 1.01 1.03 1.1 0.92 1.06 0.00; C Z = 0.38 Mean 1 1.09 1.26 0.92 1.05 3.35, df Z = 0.39	A+AG SD 0.17 0.59 0.45 0.31 0.4 $hi^2 = 11$ δ (P = 0 AA SD 0.16 0.21 0.52 0.31 0.42 = 4 (P (P = 0	Total 140 49 133 518 179 1019 8.99, dt 0.72) Total 33 15 16 115 33 212 = 0.500) 0.69)	Mean 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	GG SD 0.14 0.13 0.4 0.31 0.32 = 0.000 AG SD 0.17 0.18 0.43 0.31 0.39	Total 71 26 84 467 104 752 08); ² = 107 34 117 403 146 807	Weight 26.3% 10.3% 16.2% 26.9% 20.3% 100.0% 79% Weight 40.6% 10.9% 2.3% 39.5% 6.6% 100.0%	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI 0.01 [-0.03, 0.05] 0.03 [-0.14, 0.20] 0.08 [-0.12, -0.04] 0.06 [-0.02, 0.14] 0.06 [-0.02, 0.14] 0.01 [-0.06, 0.08] Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% CI -0.01 [-0.07, 0.05] 0.08 [-0.04, 0.20] 0.18 [-0.09, 0.45] 0.00 [-0.06, 0.06] -0.01 [-0.17, 0.15] 0.01 [-0.03, 0.05]	-1 -0.5 -1 -0.5 -1 -0.5 -0.25	Mean Difference V, Random, 95% CI	C

Fig. 3. Forest plots of impact of GGCX gene rs12714145 polymorphism on warfarin dose requirement. A: AA vs. GG carriers, B: AG vs. GG carriers, C: A carriers (AA+AG) vs. GG carriers, D: AA vs. AG carriers. Mean (SD): mean and standard deviation of normalized warfarin doses associated with each genotype. CI: confidence interval.



Fig. 4. Forest plots of impact of GGCX gene rs11676382 polymorphism on warfarin dose requirement. Only CG+GG vs. CC model was carried out in this study because of few GG genotype. Mean (SD): mean and standard deviation of normalized warfarin doses associated with each genotype. CI: confidence interval.

Discussion

In the current systematic review and meta-analysis, our results indicated that *GGCX* polymorphisms influence warfarin dose requirements. The G carriers of the *GGCX* rs11676382 require warfarin dose that are 27% lower than that in carriers of CC genotype. However, no effects were found in the genetic variants of the *GGCX* rs699664 and rs12714145 SNPs. These results are based on data from almost 6957 patients, and the estimates are likely to be the most comprehensive published to date.

Genetic variation has a clinically important impact on stable warfarin dose. The association of CYP2C9 genotype and warfarin dose requirement has previously been investigated in a meta-analysis, which included approximately 8000 patients, and demonstrated that that carriers of the CYP2C9 *1/*2, *1/*3, *2/*2, *2/*3, and *3/*3 genotypes require warfarin doses that are 19.6, 33.7, 36.0, 56.7, and 78.1% lower than in carriers of the wild-type CYP2C9 *1/*1 genotype, respectively [36]. Yang et al. [31] performed a meta-analysis based on 19 studies to investigate the impact of VKORC1 gene polymophism on warfarin dosage requirement, and their results indicates that the VKORC1 1173CT and - 1639GA heterozygosities carriers required approximately 50% higher warfarin doses than 1173TT and -1639AA homozygosities carriers. Caldwell et al. [7] also found that patients with 2 TT alleles of CYP4F2 require approximately 1 mg/day more warfarin than patients with 2 CC alleles. However, it has been found that polymorphisms of the above three genes, together with clinical characters such as gender, age, weight and body surface area, can only explain about 50% of the effect on warfarin dose requirement [7,39,40]. Therefore, other genetic variants, as this study suggested, the GGCX polymorphism may be considered in warfarin-dosing algorithms in predicting warfarin dose among different patients, although our pooled analysis indicated that effect of GGCX polymorphisms was lower than that of CYP2C9 and VKORC1 in terms of influencing warfarin maintenance dose

Over the past decades, the rs699664 loci is the most studied SNP of *GGCX*, however, the importance of genetic polymorphisms of this SNP on warfarin dose requirement is still controversial. Our meta-analysis expanded the sample size and increasing the efficiency of statistical tests, and found no significant association between *GGCX* rs699664 polymorphism and warfarin dose requirement. Therefore, *GGCX* rs699664 polymorphism was not considered to affect individual warfarin dose requirements. Actually, Only three studies examined the effect of a subset of *GGCX* rs699664 polymorphism on warfarin dose in our systematic review, interestingly, this studies are all performed in Asia [12,15, 22]. Selection bias and recall bias of the study population should be considered when explained these inconsistent results.

Of note, a study shows that rs699664 and rs12714145 are within a region of strong linkage disequilibrium (LD) [9], however, rs11676382 is an unaffiliated tagSNP with rs699664 [41], therefore, it is not surprised that rs699664 and rs12714145 polymorphism showed the same impact on warfarin dose requirement in overall analysis, and the genetic variations of rs11676382 loci has a different impact on warfarin dose requirement. In addition, this study found rs12714145 A carriers showed different impact on warfarin dose compared to GG genotype in Caucasian and Asian group, but not in rs699664. In fact, for the

rs12714145 SNP, only two studies for Caucasian and Asian populations respectively, rendering the analysis a lower statistical power, therefore, the inconsistent results may be due to insufficient studies for rs12714145 SNP.

Considering racial background influenced warfarin dosage, we carried out a stratified analysis by ethnicity. The results indicated the impact of rs11676382 polymorphism on warfarin dose requirement mainly existed in Caucasian. This difference, however, was not statistically significance, although there was similar trend, in Asian group, which indicates that the effects of rs11676382 polymorphism on warfarin dose requirement are different in ethnicities. In fact, the genotype and allele frequencies of GGCX rs11676382 showed significant difference among Asian and Caucasian population in our systematic review, therefore, different genetic backgrounds may contribute to the discrepancy. However, we should notice that there are only two Asian studies in the analysis of GGCX rs11676382, and limited studies and small sample sizes may lead to insufficient statistical power, therefore, we should carefully interpreted the negative results. No significant difference in the allele frequency of rs699664 and rs12714145 SNPs between Asian and Caucasian, thus, rs699664 and rs12714145 may not be the genetic factor attributing to ethnic differences in warfarin dose.

The main determinant of warfarin dose adjustment is the value of INR, while the racial background, such as genetic, cultural (diet related), or both, is a determinant of warfarin dosage to maintain the target INR [42]. After adjusted for confounding factors, Dang et al. [43] found that all of the mean weekly warfarin doses were significantly different in Asians, Hispanics, Whites and African Americans, with a INR goal of 2 to 3. Therefore, the target INR is mainly influenced by ethnicity. Our subgroup analysis further confirmed this point, and it is possible to understand the results of subgroup analysis according to the mean target INR were similar with stratified analysis by ethnicity. In addition, target INR is also affected by age. The guidelines of the Japanese Circulation Society for the treatment of nonvalvular atrial fibrillation suggested that target INR 2.0-3.0 is suitable for patients < 70 years of age and lower intensity with INR 1.6-2.6 for ≥70 years of age [44]. However, our systematic review found only one study with patients ≥70 years of age [13], therefore, we did not further performed a stratified analysis by different age.

Due to different warfarin dose in different study populations, it is understandable that significant heterogeneity were observed in some compared models, however, any significant change or revision in findings was also not found in sensitivity analysis, especially excluded the study with low quality scores and small sample numbers. Taken together, we believe our pooled analysis of the impact of GGCX genotype on warfarin dose requirements are reliable.

Limitations and Perspectives

There are several limitations in our meta-analysis that need to be considered when interpreting the results. First, as we know now, VKORC1, CYP2C9, and CYP4F2 have been confirmed as predictors of warfarin dose requirement. Theoretically, the normalization procedure used in our meta-analysis should remove any influences of VKORC1, CYP2C9 and CYP4F2 genotype on the GGCX–warfarin dose association. However, due to lack of original data from authors or studies that combine two or more of the above genes (i.e., the *GGCX* polymorphism with one of the other 3 genes), this remains to be shown in future studies. Second, although the warfarin dose effects of rs11676382 is demonstrated, we should notice that the number of studies in patients of rs11676382 SNP was small (n = 5). It is possible that the lack of association in the Asian group in rs11676382 SNP is related to insufficient studies. Therefore, the results need to be further confirmed in larger sample and different ethnicities. At last, previous studies most focus on Asian and Caucasian populations, other ethnicity are need to further investigate because our study indicates that the effects are different in ethnicities.

In the past few years, the novel oral anticoagulants (NOACs), such as Xa inhibitors rivaroxaban, apixaban, and edoxaban, have been approved for clinical use. An advantage of the NOACs over warfarin is their stable and consistent pharmacokinetics. However, despite being significantly more costly than warfarin (approximately \$6–7 per day), it is difficult to find an suitable antidote in the event of major bleeding using NOACS [45]. For now, warfarin is still the most important anticoagulants, and need for modeling more precise warfarin-dosing algorithms based on pharmacogenomics.

Conclusions

This is the first meta-analysis about the impact of GGCX gene polymorphisms on warfarin dose requirements and the results showed that GGCX rs11676382 polymorphism have a significant impact on warfarin dose requirements, especially in Caucasian populations. More and larger studies in multiethnic population are expected to be published on this topic in the future, as it remains a topic of concern and interest.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Authors' Contributions

YS, SL and XQ conducted the literature search and quality assessment and contributed to the drafting of the manuscript. YS and TL performed data extraction and statistical analysis. XL consulted on statistical analysis. YD and ZW critically revised drafts of the manuscript. JC conceived and designed the review, assisted with the inclusion/exclusion criteria, acted as independent assessors and critically revised drafts of the manuscript. All of the authors contributed to the interpretation of data and all of the authors critically revised the manuscript. All of the authors are guarantors for the study. All of the authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgements

We thank *Scribendi.com* for its linguistic assistance during the preparation of this manuscript. This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No: 81360378). The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Funding: This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No: 81360378). The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Appendix A. Supplementary Data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at http://dx. doi.org/10.1016/j.thromres.2015.01.029.

References

- Wysowski DK, Nourjah P, Swartz L. Bleeding complications with warfarin use: a prevalent adverse effect resulting in regulatory action. Arch Intern Med 2007; 167(13):1414–9.
- [2] Miao L, Yang J, Huang C, Shen Z. Contribution of age, body weight, and CYP2C9 and VKORC1 genotype to the anticoagulant response to warfarin: proposal for a new dosing regimen in Chinese patients. Eur J Clin Pharmacol 2007;63(12):1135–41.
- [3] Momary KM, Shapiro NL, Viana MA, Nutescu EA, Helgason CM, Cavallari LH. Factors influencing warfarin dose requirements in African-Americans. Pharmacogenomics 2007;8(11):1535–44.
- [4] Budnitz DS, Shehab N, Kegler SR, Richards CL. Medication use leading to emergency department visits for adverse drug events in older adults. Ann Intern Med 2007; 147(11):755–65.
- [5] Takahashi H, Wilkinson GR, Nutescu EA, Morita T, Ritchie MD, Scordo MG, et al. Different contributions of polymorphisms in VKORC1 and CYP2C9 to intra- and inter-population differences in maintenance dose of warfarin in Japanese, Caucasians and African-Americans. Pharmacogenet Genomics 2006;16(2):101–10.
- [6] D'Andrea G, D'Ambrosio RL, Di Perna P, Chetta M, Santacroce R, Brancaccio V, et al. A polymorphism in the VKORC1 gene is associated with an interindividual variability in the dose-anticoagulant effect of warfarin. Blood 2005;105(2):645–9.
- [7] Caldwell MD, Awad T, Johnson JA, Gage BF, Falkowski M, Gardina P, et al. CYP4F2 genetic variant alters required warfarin dose. Blood 2008;111(8):4106–12.
- [8] Herman D, Peternel P, Stegnar M, Breskvar K, Dolzan V. The influence of sequence variations in factor VII, gamma-glutamyl carboxylase and vitamin K epoxide reductase complex genes on warfarin dose requirement. Thromb Haemost 2006;95(5):782–7.
- [9] Wadelius M, Chen LY, Downes K, Ghori J, Hunt S, Eriksson N, et al. Common VKORC1 and GGCX polymorphisms associated with warfarin dose. Pharmacogenomics J 2005;5(4):262–70.
- [10] Harrington DJ, Underwood S, Morse C, Shearer MJ, Tuddenham EG, Mumford AD. Pharmacodynamic resistance to warfarin associated with a Val66Met substitution in vitamin K epoxide reductase complex subunit 1. Thromb Haemost 2005;93(1):23–6.
- [11] Loebstein R, Vecsler M, Kurnik D, Austerweil N, Gak E, Halkin H, et al. Common genetic variants of microsomal epoxide hydrolase affect warfarin dose requirements beyond the effect of cytochrome P450 2C9. Clin Pharmacol Ther 2005;77(5):365–72.
- [12] Kimura R, Miyashita K, Kokubo Y, Akaiwa Y, Otsubo R, Nagatsuka K, et al. Genotypes of vitamin K epoxide reductase, gamma-glutamyl carboxylase, and cytochrome P450 2C9 as determinants of daily warfarin dose in Japanese patients. Thromb Res 2007;120(2):181–6.
- [13] Ohno M, Yamamoto A, Ono A, Miura G, Funamoto M, Takemoto Y, et al. Influence of clinical and genetic factors on warfarin dose requirements among Japanese patients. Eur J Clin Pharmacol 2009;65(11):1097–103.
- [14] Liu YZSL, Yang M, Tang HH, Fei HW. Impact of gamma-glutamyl carboxylase gene genovariation in Chinese Han population on the response of warfarin initial anticoagulant therapy. South China. J Cardiol 2010;12(4):203–9.
- [15] Choi JR, Kim JO, Kang DR, Yoon SA, Shin JY, Zhang X, et al. Proposal of pharmacogeneticsbased warfarin dosing algorithm in Korean patients. J Hum Genet 2011;56(4):290–5.
- [16] Zhong SL, Yu XY, Liu Y, Xu D, Mai LP, Tan HH, et al. Integrating interacting drugs and genetic variations to improve the predictability of warfarin maintenance dose in Chinese patients. Pharmacogenet Genomics 2012;22(3):176–82.
- [17] Huang SW, Xiang DK, Wu HL, Chen BL, An BQ, Li GF. Impact of five genetic polymorphisms on inter-individual variation in warfarin maintenance dose. Zhonghua Yi Xue Yi Chuan Xue Za Zhi 2011;28(6):661–5.
- [18] King CR, Deych E, Milligan P, Eby C, Lenzini P, Grice G, et al. Gamma-glutamyl carboxylase and its influence on warfarin dose. Thromb Haemost 2010;104(4):750–4.
- [19] Rost S, Fregin A, Koch D, Compes M, Muller CR, Oldenburg J. Compound heterozygous mutations in the gamma-glutamyl carboxylase gene cause combined deficiency of all vitamin K-dependent blood coagulation factors. Br J Haematol 2004;126(4):546–9.
- [20] Zhu A, Sun H, Raymond Jr RM, Furie BC, Furie B, Bronstein M, et al. Fatal hemorrhage in mice lacking gamma-glutamyl carboxylase. Blood 2007;109(12):5270–5.
- [21] Crosier MD, Peter I, Booth SL, Bennett G, Dawson-Hughes B, Ordovas JM. Association of sequence variations in vitamin K epoxide reductase and gamma-glutamyl carboxylase genes with biochemical measures of vitamin K status. J Nutr Sci Vitaminol 2009; 55(2):112–9.
- [22] Liang Y, Chen Z, Guo G, Dong X, Wu C, Li H, et al. Association of genetic polymorphisms with warfarin dose requirements in Chinese patients. Genet Test Mol Biomarkers 2013;17(12):932–6.
- [23] Schelleman H, Brensinger CM, Chen J, Finkelman BS, Rieder MJ, Kimmel SE. New genetic variant that might improve warfarin dose prediction in African Americans. Br J Clin Pharmacol 2010;70(3):393–9.
- [24] Vecsler M, Loebstein R, Almog S, Kurnik D, Goldman B, Halkin H, et al. Combined genetic profiles of components and regulators of the vitamin K-dependent gammacarboxylation system affect individual sensitivity to warfarin. Thromb Haemost 2006; 95(2):205–11.
- [25] Lou Y. The Study of Warfarin Maintenance Dose Algorithm in Chinese Han Population. [PHD] Peking Union Medical College; 2012.
- [26] Krishna Kumar D, Shewade DG, Loriot MA, Beaune P, Balachander J, Sai Chandran BV, et al. Effect of CYP2C9, VKORC1, CYP4F2 and GGCX genetic variants on warfarin maintenance dose and explicating a new pharmacogenetic algorithm in South Indian population. Eur J Clin Pharmacol 2014;70(1):47–56.
- [27] Rathore SS, Agarwal SK, Pande S, Singh SK, Mittal T, Mittal B. CYP4F2 1347 G > A & GGCX 12970 C > G polymorphisms: frequency in north Indians & their effect on dosing of acenocoumarol oral anticoagulant. Indian J Med Res 2014;139(4):572–8.
- [28] Wypasek E, Branicka A, Awsiuk M, Sadowski J, Undas A. Genetic determinants of acenocoumarol and warfarin maintenance dose requirements in Slavic population: A potential role of CYP4F2 and GGCX polymorphisms. Thromb Res 2014;134(3):604–9.

- [29] Lippi G, Targher G, Montagnana M, Salvagno GL, Zoppini G, Guidi GC. Relation between red blood cell distribution width and inflammatory biomarkers in a large cohort of unselected outpatients. Arch Pathol Lab Med 2009;133(4):628–32.
- [30] Koma Y, Onishi A, Matsuoka H, Oda N, Yokota N, Matsumoto Y, et al. Increased red blood cell distribution width associates with cancer stage and prognosis in patients with lung cancer. PLoS One 2013;8(11):e80240.
- [31] Yang L, Ge W, Yu F, Zhu H. Impact of VKORC1 gene polymorphism on interindividual and interethnic warfarin dosage requirement–a systematic review and meta analysis. Thromb Res 2010;125(4):e159–66.
- [32] Cha PC, Mushiroda T, Takahashi A, Saito S, Shimomura H, Suzuki T, et al. Highresolution SNP and haplotype maps of the human gamma-glutamyl carboxylase gene (GGCX) and association study between polymorphisms in GGCX and the warfarin maintenance dose requirement of the Japanese population. J Hum Genet 2007;52(10):856–64.
- [33] Dada OA, Uche E, Akinbami A, Odesanya M, John-Olabode S, Adediran A, et al. The relationship between red blood cell distribution width and blood pressure in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus in Lagos, Nigeria. J Blood Med 2014;5:185–9.
- [34] Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. Ann Intern Med 2009;151(4): 264–9.
- [35] Little J, Bradley L, Bray MS, Clyne M, Dorman J, Ellsworth DL, et al. Reporting, appraising, and integrating data on genotype prevalence and gene-disease associations. Am J Epidemiol 2002;156(4):300–10.
- [36] Lindh JD, Holm L, Andersson ML, Rane A. Influence of CYP2C9 genotype on warfarin dose requirements-a systematic review and meta-analysis. Eur J Clin Pharmacol 2009;65(4):365–75.

- [37] Higgins J, Thompson SG. Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. Stat Med 2002;21(11):1539–58.
- [38] Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. Br Med J 2003;327(7414):557.
- [39] Carlquist JF, Horne BD, Muhlestein JB, Lappe DL, Whiting BM, Kolek MJ, et al. Genotypes of the cytochrome p450 isoform, CYP2C9, and the vitamin K epoxide reductase complex subunit 1 conjointly determine stable warfarin dose: a prospective study. J Thromb Thrombolysis 2006;22(3):191–7.
- [40] Geisen C, Watzka M, Sittinger K, Steffens M, Daugela L, Seifried E, et al. VKORC1 haplotypes and their impact on the inter-individual and inter-ethnical variability of oral anticoagulation. Thromb Haemost 2005;94(4):773–9.
- [41] Albayrak S, Zengin K, Tanik S, Bakirtas H, Imamoglu A, Gurdal M. Red cell distribution width as a predictor of prostate cancer progression. Asian Pac J Cancer Prev 2014; 15(18):7781–4.
- [42] Blann A, Hewitt J, Siddiqui F, Bareford D. Racial background is a determinant of average warfarin dose required to maintain the INR between 2.0 and 3.0. Br J Haematol 1999;107(1):207–9.
- [43] Dang MT, Hambleton J, Kayser SR. The influence of ethnicity on warfarin dosage requirement. Ann Pharmacother 2005;39(6):1008–12.
- [44] The Japanese Circulation Society. Guidelines for pharmacotherapy of Atrial Fibrillation (JCS 2008). Circ J 2008;72:1581–638.
- [45] Baker WL, Chamberlin KW. New oral anticoagulants vs. warfarin treatment: no need for pharmacogenomics? Clin Pharmacol Ther 2014;96(1):17–9.