Prognostic and clinical significance of long non-coding RNA SNHG12 expression in various cancers
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Abstract

Background: Recently, dysregulation of lncRNA SNHG12 has been determined in kinds of cancers. However, definite prognostic value of SNHG12 remains unclear. We conducted this meta-analysis to evaluate the association between SNHG12 expression levels and cancér prognosis.

Methods: A literature retrieval was conducted by searching kinds of databases. The meta-analysis of prognostic and clinicopathological parameters was performed by using Revman 5.2 and Stata 12.0 software. Besides, The Cancer Genome Atlas dataset was analyzed to validate the results in our meta-analysis via using Gene Expression Profiling Interactive Analysis.

Results: High SNHG12 expression significantly predicted worse overall survival (HR=1.97, 95%CI 1.56-2.48, P<0.01) and recurrence-free survival (HR=1.71, 95%CI 1.05-2.78, P<0.01). Tumor type, sample size, survival analysis method, and cut-off value did not alter SNHG12 prognosis value according to stratified analysis results. Additionally, patients with elevated SNHG12 expression were more prone to unfavorable clinicopathological outcomes, including larger tumor size, lymph node metastasis, distant metastasis, advanced clinical stage. Online cross-validation in TCGA dataset further proved that cancer patients with upregulated SNHG12 expression had worse overall survival and disease-free survival.

Conclusion: Elevated SNHG12 expression was associated with poor survival and unfavorable clinicopathological features in various cancers, and therefore might be a potential prognostic biomarker in human cancers.

Background

Nowadays, cancer has been a leading cause of mortality worldwide and has brought huge burdens to patients, families and society(1). Despite numerous achievements in surgical resection, radiotherapy, chemotherapy, and immunotherapy(2–4), cancer patients suffer from disappointing survival outcomes and life quality, especially for patients with advanced clinical stage or metastatic cancer(5). The insufficiency of effective prognosis biomarkers is supposed to be a crucial reason for this. Consequently, there remains a need to identify new prognostic biomarkers and therapeutic targets.

LncRNAs is a class of noncoding RNA that are more than 200 nucleotides (nt) long(6). Previous studies suggest that lncRNAs play important roles in regulating chromatin dynamics, gene expression, protein ubiquitination and protein degradation(7). Long noncoding RNAs (lncRNAs) have been proved to play vital roles in chromatin dynamic regulation, protein ubiquitination, protein degradation and genomic imprinting in oncogenesis(7). Recently, accumulating evidences have showed that large number of lncRNAs are aberrantly expressed or mutated in various cancers, and are closely linked to tumorigenesis, tumor stage, metastasis and recurrence(8–11). Therefore, these evidences implicated the potential of lncRNAs serving as prognostic biomarkers and therapeutic targets for human cancers.

Small nucleolar RNA host gene 12 (SNHG12) is a newly identified IncRNA with aberrant expression in various human cancers(12–14). Recent published studies have shown that SNHG12 may play important
roles in the tumorigenesis and progression of cancers such as proliferation, migration, invasion, and apoptosis(15, 16). Furthermore, emerging evidence has implicated the significance of IncRNA SNHG12 in multiple cancer-related pathways, including Slug/zinc finger E-box-binding homeobox 2 (ZEB2), Notch2/Notch, PI3K/AKT, and Wnt/β-catenin signaling pathway(17–20). Also, upregulated SNHG12 expression was closely linked to reduced survival in multiple cancers(21). Among these cancers, elevated SNHG12 expression levels were significantly correlated with unfavorable clinicopathological outcomes, such as tumor size, lymph nodes metastasis (LNM), distant metastasis (DM), clinical stage, and drug resistance. Collectively, SNHG12 may act as a risk biomarker and therapeutic target for multiple kinds of human malignancies.

However, majority of studies evaluating the prognostic potential of SNHG12 in cancer survival outcomes have been limited by their small sample size and discrete outcomes, leading to the uncertainty in the prognostic value of SNHG12. In our meta-analysis, we quantitatively evaluate the correlation between SNHG12 expression, survival, and clinicopathological outcomes in human pan-cancers, which may provide newly promising biomarkers for cancer prognosis and therapeutic strategy.

Methods

Search strategy

We rigorously projected, reviewed and reported this meta-analysis in line with the PRISMA checklist(Supplementary Table 1)(22, 23). A systematic literature searching was conducted in several electronic databases, including PubMed, Web of Science, Embase, Scopus, the Cochrane Library, and China National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI) and Wanfang databases for eligible studies published by December 25, 2019. The search strategy was as follows: “small nucleolar RNA host gene 12 OR SNHG12” AND “cancer OR tumor OR carcinoma OR sarcoma OR malignancy”. Two authors independently completed the literature search, selection, and had discussion to solve any disagreement. Moreover, we checked the citations of retrieved articles for potentially relevant studies.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

All eligible studies were critically reviewed and evaluated by two independent investigators (CHZ and XLR). The study would be included in the meta-analysis if it met the following standards : (a) the level of SNHG12 was examined in cancer tissues and adjacent normal tissues; (b) patients were divided into high and low expression groups according to the cut-off value of SNHG12 expression; (c) correlation between SNHG12 expression and survival or clinicopathological features were implicated; and (d) available hazard ratios (HRs) with 95% confidence interval (CI) for OS or RFS could be extracted directly or indirectly.

While the studies meeting following criteria should be excluded: (a) case reports, reviews, letters, meta-analysis and conference reports; (b) irrelevant to human cancer and SNHG12; (c) focused on the function and molecular mechanisms of SNHG12 rather than its association with cancer survival; and (d) animal studies and duplicate publications.
Data extraction and quality control

Two independent investigators (CHZ and XLR) extracted the following data from each included study: first author name, publication year, tumor type, sample size, number of high SNHG12 expression and low expression groups, follow-up months, detection assay, clinical stage, metastasis, cut-off value, survival outcomes including overall survival(OS), recurrence-free survival(RFS), and disease-free survival(DFS). The missing data regarding survival outcomes was obtained by contacting the corresponding author of eligible articles. If only Kaplan-Meier (K-M) curves were available in the study, the Engauge Digitizer (Version 10.8) was used to synthesize the pooled HRs and corresponding 95%CI via indirect extraction from the curves(24, 25). Since all studies included in this meta-analysis were cohort studies, the study quality was assessed in line with the Newcastle–Ottawa Scale (NOS) by two investigators (WCZ and LQ)(26). NOS scores ranged from 0 to 9, and studies with score ≥ 6 were considered of high methodological quality (Supplementary Table 2).

Online cross-validation in TCGA datasets

We used Gene Expression Profiling Interactive Analysis (GEPIA) to verify the association with OS and DFS and examine SNHG12 expression levels in multiple kinds of cancers. The matched normal data in The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) was used in the validation(27). The survival analysis was evaluated by Kaplan-Meier method and log-rank test, and the HR and \( p \) value were shown in the K-M curves.

Statistical analysis

Extracted data was analyzed by using RevMan 5.3 (The Cochrane Collaboration, Copenhagen, Denmark) and STATA 12.0 (Stata, College Station, TX). Pooled HRs and corresponding 95%CI were utilized to assess the correlation between SNHG12 and prognosis. ORs and 95%CI were applied to evaluate the association between SNHG12 expression and clinicopathological features. Chi square-based Q test and Higgins \( I^2 \) statistics were employed to determine the heterogeneity across the included studies. \( I^2 \) value>50% or \( p \)-value<0.05 were considered statistically significant and the random-effect model was adopted, otherwise, the fixed-effect model was applied. Sensitivity analysis was conducted by sequentially omitting each single study in order to assess the stability of results. Additionally, Eggers'sregressiontest and Beggs funnel plot were conducted to evaluate potential publication bias. All \( p \)-value were two-sided and a \( p \)-value<0.05 was considered significant

Results

Characteristics and eligible studies

A total of 182 studies were initially identified as potential articles, and 103 studies were excluded as duplicates. After reviewing titles and abstracts, 44 studies were excluded since they were non-comparative studies or irrelevant topics. Then, 35 potentially eligible articles were selected for full-text assessed, and 17 studies were excluded due to the lack of survival data. Thus, 18 studies compromising 1290 patients were
considered eligible in the light of the inclusion and exclusion criteria. The screen procedure was thoroughly implicated via a flow diagram in Figure 1.

The characteristics of the eligible studies are presented in Table 1. These studies were published between 2017 and 2020, and their sample size ranged from 20 to 199. A total of ten different cancer types were included in our meta-analysis, including prostate cancer, gastric cancer, colorectal cancer, renal cell carcinoma, osteosarcoma, nasopharyngeal carcinoma, glioblastoma, cervical cancer, breast cancer, and hepatocellular carcinoma. Among these 18 studies, quantitative real-time polymerase chain reaction (qRT-PCR) was used as detection assay in 17 studies, and fluorescence in situ hybridization (FISH) analysis was performed in one study. As for survival outcomes, association between SNHG12 expression level and OS were reported in all studies except for three studies only reporting RFS and clinicopathological outcomes respectively. In all included studies, patients were divided into high or low SNHG12 expression groups according to the cut-off value. Moreover, the follow-up months ranged from 45 to 160 months, and univariate or multivariate analysis were used in each survival analysis. As for clinical stage, there were four kinds of clinical stage classification system, including tumor node metastasis (TNM) classification system, the International Federation of Gynecology and Obstetrics (FIGO) stage, Enneking stage, and The World Health Organization (WHO) grade. Additionally, all eligible studies were considered as high methodological quality with their NOS scores \( \geq 7 \).

**Association between IncRNA SNHG12 and OS/ RFS**

A total of 15 studies were included for OS analysis. Since no obvious heterogeneity was observed among these studies ($I^2=0.0\%$, $p=0.967$), fixed-effects model was employed to synthesize pooled HR and corresponding 95% CI. The aggregated data suggested that high expression level of SNHG12 was significantly correlated to poor OS (HR=1.97, 95%CI 1.56-2.48, $p<0.001$) (Figure 2A), indicating that lower SNHG12 expression in cancer patients may predict a better survival outcome.

Two studies regarding prostate cancer and hepatocellular carcinoma provided related data for RFS analysis. In the absence of apparent heterogeneity among these studies ($I^2=0.0\%$, $p=0.380$), fixed-effects model was applied to calculate the HR and its 95%CI. As demonstrated in Figure 2B, the pooled results indicated that high SNHG12 expression level predicted unfavorable RFS in prostate cancer and hepatocellular carcinoma (HR=1.71, 95%CI 1.05-2.78, $p<0.05$).

**Sensitivity analysis**

Sensitivity analysis was performed in order to assess whether any individual study would affect the result of pooled OS. By removing each included study, we found that the pooled result had a slight fluctuation when “Zhang, R 2019” was removed (Figure 2C). Thus, the pooled HR was analyzed again after omitting “Zhang, R 2019”, and the result demonstrated that high expression of SNHG12 was still correlated to worse OS in different kinds of cancers (HR=2.02, 95%CI 1.57-2.59, $p<0.00001$, and $I^2=0.0\%$, $p=0.957$, fixed model), indicating the stability and reliability of this meta-analysis.
Publication bias

Begg's funnel plot and Eggers regression test were employed to evaluate potential publication bias. As shown in Figure 2D, no apparent asymmetry was observed in the Begg funnel plot and the rest of Eggers regression further proved it (p>|t|=0.160). Therefore, no significant publication bias existed in this meta-analysis.

Subgroup analysis of association between SNHG12 and OS

Even though the study heterogeneity was low in OS analysis ($I^2=0.0\%, p=0.967$), several stratified analyses were performed based on tumor type (digestive system tumor or others), sample size (more or less than 60), survival analysis method (univariate or multivariate analysis), and cut-off value (mean or median). As shown in Figure 3 and Table 2, all subgroup analyses based on different stratified factors did not alter the association between SNHG12 and OS in multiple kinds of cancers.

Association between SNHG12 and clinicopathologic characteristics

ORs and corresponding 95%CI were applied to investigate the association between SNHG12 and clinicopathologic features including age, gender, tumor size, Gleason score, TNM stage, WHO grade, LNM and DM. Fixed-effect model was applied in all analyses and no statistically significant correlation was detected between SNHG12 and age, gender (Supplementary Figure 1, Table 3). Recognizing, as demonstrated in Figure 4 and Table 3, high SNHG12 expression had significant association with larger tumor size (OR=5.05, 95%CI 2.67-9.55, p<0.00001), LNM (OR=3.32, 95%CI=2.32-4.75, p<0.00001), DM (OR=2.35, 95%CI 1.46-3.78, p=0.005), poorer TNM stage (OR=3.61, 95%CI 2.51-5.17, p<0.00001), higher WHO grade (OR=11.34, 95%CI 4.60-27.95, p<0.00001) and higher Gleason score in prostate cancer (OR=2.69, 95%CI 1.59-4.53, p=0.0002). We could not assess the association between SNHG12 expression and other clinicopathological parameters owing to insufficient data.

Online cross-validation in TCGA dataset

We used TCGA dataset to evaluate SNHG12 expression levels in multiple kinds of cancers in order to further validate the pooled results. As depicted in Figure 5, SNHG12 showed aberrant expression levels in breast invasion carcinoma (BRCA), cervical squamous cell carcinoma and endocervical adenocarcinoma (CESC), liver hepatocellular carcinoma (LIHC), colon adenocarcinoma (COAD), rectum adenocarcinoma (READ), kidney renal clear cell carcinoma (KIRC), kidney renal papillary cell carcinoma (KIRP), sarcoma (SARC), and stomach adenocarcinoma (STAD) when compared with normal control. Moreover, the violin plot implicated that SNHG12 expression level was significantly correlated with pathological stage in human pan-cancers. Additionally, the survival plots in GEPIA indicated that high expression of SNHG12 predicted worse OS (HR=1.1, p<0.05) and DFS (HR=1.1, p<0.05), which verified our results in this meta-analysis.

Discussion
LncRNAs were previously regarded as “transcriptional noise” without any coding effects and did not get much attention among investigators over the past decades(28). Recently, increasing evidence of next-generation genome wide sequencing and single-cell RNA-sequencing has revealed that LncRNAs have aberrant expressions and mutations in human pan-cancers(29–31). More and more studies have showed that abnormally expressed LncRNAs are emerging as important regulators in tumorigenesis and show a significant association with cancer prognosis(32–35). SNHG12 is dysregulated in multiple kinds of human cancers, including prostate cancer(12), gastric cancer(19), cervical cancer(36), hepatocellular carcinoma(37), renal cell carcinoma(38), nasopharyngeal carcinoma(39), glioma(40), breast cancer(41), non-small cell lung cancer(17), ovarian cancer(14), colorectal cancer(42), and osteosarcoma(18). Additionally, upregulated SNHG12 expression levels play important roles in the cellular process of tumorigenesis, including cancer cell proliferation(12, 19, 39, 43), migration(18, 37), invasion(36, 38), apoptosis(16, 44), epithelial-mesenchymal transition (EMT) (17) and chemoresistance(45).

In order to determine the prognostic value of SNHG12 in human cancers, for the first time, we carried out this meta-analysis. The synthesized results implicated that high expression levels of SNHG12 predicted worse OS and RFS, and the stratified analyses of OS indicated similar results. Moreover, one study reported that gastric cancer patients with upregulated SNHG12 expression had a worse DFS after surgery(15). Therefore, SNHG12 overexpression was closely associated with poor prognosis in cancer patients. The pooled results also showed that patients with higher SNHG12 expression level were more exposed to worse clinicopathological outcomes including larger tumor size, higher Gleason score in prostate cancer, advanced TNM stage, higher WHO grade in glioma, LNM and DM. Besides, some clinically meaningful parameters only reported in a single study or presented by divergent cut-off values were not included in the pooled results. For instance, prostate cancer patients with high SNHG12 expression were more prone to higher serum prostate-specific antigen (PSA) value (p = 0.0349), residual tumor (p = 0.002), and bone metastasis (p < 0.001)(12, 44). Additionally, patients with SNHG12 upregulation had more possibility developing advanced Enneking stage (p = 0.038) in osteosarcoma and vascular invasion in hepatocellular carcinoma (p = 0.0093) (5, 18). Therefore, our results suggested that high SNHG12 expression level might be an unfavorable biomarker for cancer prognosis. Further, we conducted GEPIA online analyses to validate the prognostic value of SNHG12 in human cancers based on TCGA dataset, and the online validation indicated similar results. Taken together, SNHG12 could act as a functional regulator in cancer progression and promising prognostic biomarker in pan-cancer patients.

Even though many studies have revealed the prognostic significance of SNHG12 in human cancers, the further mechanisms remain indistinct. The present evidence revealed that SNHG12 could function as ceRNA by directly binding to miRNA and thereby regulating target genes in human cancers. For instance, SNHG12 upregulation increased the expression of hypoxia-inducible factor 1 α (HIF1α) by targeting miR-199a-5p, which induced cell proliferation, migration, and invasion in renal cell carcinoma(38). Moreover, doxorubicin resistance in osteosarcoma was promoted by SNHG12 via targeting miR-320a to upregulate myeloid cell leukemia 1 (MCL1)(45). Similar mechanism was also reported in other human cancers, such as miR-133b or miR-195/cyclin E1 (CCNE1) in prostate cancer (12, 44), miR-199a/b-5p/ mixed-lineage protein kinase 3 (MLK3) in hepatocellular carcinoma (37), miR-424-5P or miR-125b/ signal transducer and
activator of transcription 3 (STAT3) in cervical cancer (36, 46), miR-16 or miR-320 in gastric cancer (13, 15), miR-218/Slug/ZEB2 in non-small cell lung cancer (17), miR-129/SRY-box transcription factor 4 (SOX4) in ovarian cancer (14), miR-16 in colorectal cancer (42), miR-129-5p/WW domain-containing E3 ubiquitin protein ligase 1 (WWP1) in laryngeal squamous cell carcinoma (47), and miR-195/SRY-box transcription factor 5 (SOX5) in glioma (48). Besides, SNHG12 could be involved into cancer progression by interacting with various kinds of signaling pathways. SNHG12 overexpression promoted cell invasion, migration and EMT in non-small cell lung cancer via engaging into Slug/ZEB signaling pathway to regulate expression of E-cadherin, matrix metalloproteinase 9 (MMP-9) and vimentin (17). Similarly, SNHG12 was found to have cross-talk with other crucial signaling pathways in tumorigenesis including PI3K/Akt/mTOR (19), Notch (39), Wnt/β-catenin (20). Therefore, more studies are still needed to thoroughly explore the underlying mechanisms of SNHG12 in human cancers.

Recognizing, some limitations to this study should be addressed. First, all the eligible studies were carried out in Chinese population, thus caution must be noticed since these results might not be broadly applied to other population. Second, some HR values were computed according to software reconstruction of K-M curves rather than directly obtaining original data, which might lead to bias. Third, the pooled result of SNHG12 expression on RFS should be given caution when the result is generalized to other cancers, since only two studies containing hepatocellular carcinoma and prostate cancer were included. Fourth, mean or median value was set as cut-off value in all eligible studies without a consensus standard or detailed description on the calculation process and original data. Thus, the uncertainty about cut-off values across all eligible studies might bring about potential bias.

**Conclusions**

Upregulated expression of SNHG12 was markedly associated with worse survival and clinicopathological outcomes in multiple cancers, and therefore might be applied as a promising prognosis predictor and potential therapeutic target in human cancers. However, studies with a larger sample size, broader spectrum of cancers, or even prospective design are still needed to verify these results.
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Tables

**TABLE 1.** Summary of the main characteristics of the studies included in the meta-analysis.

| DFS: disease-free survival; DM: distant metastasis; FISH: fluorescence in situ hybridization; FIGO: the International Federation of Gynecology and Obstetrics; LNM: lymph node metastasis; N/A: not available; NOS: Newcastle-Ottawa Scale; OS: overall survival; RFS: recurrence-free survival; SNHG12: small nucleolar RNA host gene 12; TNM: tumor node metastasis; WHO grade: World Health Organization grade |

**TABLE 2.** Stratified analyses of the pooled HRs of overall survival by tumor type, sample size, survival analysis method, and cut-off value.

| CI: confidence interval; HR: hazard ratio |

**TABLE 3.** Correlation between lncRNA SNHG12 expression and clinicopathologic parameters for cancers.

| CI: confidence interval; DM: distant metastasis; LNM: lymph node metastasis; OR: odds ratio; SNHG12: small nucleolar RNA host gene 12; WHO grade: World Health Organization grade |

**Additional File**

**Supplementary Figure 1.** Forest plots evaluating the association between SNHG12 expression, age and gender. No statistically significant correlation was detected between SNHG12, age(A), and gender(B).

**Supplementary Table 1.** PRISMA Checklist.

**Supplementary Table 2.** Study quality and bias in the retrospective cohort studies judged by the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) checklist.

**Figures**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tumor type</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>SNHG12 expression</th>
<th>Follow-up months</th>
<th>Detection assay</th>
<th>Clinical stage</th>
<th>Metastasis analysis</th>
<th>Outcome measure</th>
<th>Survival analysis</th>
<th>Cut-off value</th>
<th>NOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cheng, G et al</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Prostate cancer</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>qRT-PCR</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>LNM</td>
<td>RFS</td>
<td>Univariate</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhao, G et al</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Gastric cancer</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>qRT-PCR</td>
<td>TNM</td>
<td>I-IV</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang, R et al</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Gastric cancer</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>FISH</td>
<td>TNM</td>
<td>I-IV</td>
<td>LNM</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang, X et al</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Prostate cancer</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>qRT-PCR</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song, J et al</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Prostate cancer</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>qRT-PCR</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>TNM</td>
<td>LNM</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu, Y et al</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Colorectal cancer</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>qRT-PCR</td>
<td>TNM</td>
<td>I-IV</td>
<td>LNM</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen, Q et al</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Renal cell cancer</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>qRT-PCR</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhou, S et al</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Osteosarcoma</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>qRT-PCR</td>
<td>Enneking stage</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>Univariate</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhou, B et al</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Osteosarcoma</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>qRT-PCR</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang, B et al</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Gastric cancer</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>qRT-PCR</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>Univariate</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu, Z et al</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Nasopharyngeal cancer</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>qRT-PCR</td>
<td>TNM</td>
<td>I-IV</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>Multivariate</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu, X et al</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Glioblastoma</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>qRT-PCR</td>
<td>WHO grade</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>Univariate</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lei, W et al</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Glioblastoma</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>qRT-PCR</td>
<td>WHO grade</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>Univariate</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dong, J et al</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Cervical cancer</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>qRT-PCR</td>
<td>FIGO stage</td>
<td>LNM</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>Univariate</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang, O et al</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Breast cancer</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>qRT-PCR</td>
<td>TNM</td>
<td>I-IV</td>
<td>LNM</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang, J et al</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Colorectal cancer</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>qRT-PCR</td>
<td>TNM</td>
<td>I-IV</td>
<td>DM</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lan, T et al</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Hepatocellular cancer</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>qRT-PCR</td>
<td>TNM</td>
<td>I-IV</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>OS/RFS</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang, H et al</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Gastric cancer</td>
<td>60-</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>qRT-PCR</td>
<td>TNM</td>
<td>I-IV</td>
<td>LNM/DM</td>
<td>OS/DFS</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subgroup analysis</td>
<td>No. of studies</td>
<td>No. of patients</td>
<td>Pooled HR (95% CI)</td>
<td>Heterogeneity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed model</td>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>I² (%)</td>
<td>p-value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumor type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digestive system tumor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>1.67 (1.20, 2.33)</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>2.30 (1.66, 3.19)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;60</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>1.72 (1.21, 2.45)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>2.18 (1.60, 2.97)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.698</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survival analysis method</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univariate</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>1.89 (1.44, 2.47)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.982</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multivariate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>2.21 (1.39, 3.52)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut-off value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>1.69 (1.26, 2.27)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>2.53 (1.73, 3.69)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinicopathologic parameters</th>
<th>No. of Studies</th>
<th>No. of Participants</th>
<th>Pooled OR (95% CI)</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Heterogeneity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chill, P-value, I² (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (&gt;60/≤60)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>0.93 (0.51, 1.70)</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>0.30, 0.86, 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>0.99 (0.73, 1.36)</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>4.86, 0.90, 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumor size (&gt;5cm/≤5cm)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>5.05 (2.67, 9.55)</td>
<td>&lt;0.00001</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>2.23, 0.53, 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LNM</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>3.32 (2.32, 4.75)</td>
<td>&lt;0.00001</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>12.20, 0.09, 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>2.35 (1.46, 3.78)</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>9.00, 0.11, 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNM stage</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>3.61 (2.51, 5.17)</td>
<td>&lt;0.00001</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>2.29, 0.94, 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO grade</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>11.34 (4.60, 27.95)</td>
<td>&lt;0.00001</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>0.30, 0.58, 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gleason score (&gt;7/≤7)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>2.69 (1.59, 4.53)</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>1.34, 0.25, 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1

Flow diagram of the literature selection procedure.
Figure 2

Forest plots of studies assessing the HRs of high SNHG12 expression in human cancers for (A) overall survival and (B) recurrence-free survival. (C) sensitivity analysis of pooled Hazard ratio for overall survival. (D) Begg's funnel plot for publication bias of SNHG12 on overall survival.
Figure 3

Stratified analyses of SNHG12 expression on overall survival according to subgroups: (A) tumor type, (B) sample size, (C) survival analysis method and (D) cut-off value.
Figure 4

Forest plots evaluating the association between SNHG12 expression and clinicopathological parameters, including (A) tumor size (>5cm/≤5cm), (B) lymph node metastasis, (C) distant metastasis, (D) TNM stage, (E) WHO grade, and (F) Gleason score (>7/≤7).
Figure 5

Validation of SNHG12 expression level in multiple cancers in TCGA cohort. (A) The expression level of SNHG12 in breast invasion carcinoma (BRCA), cervical squamous cell carcinoma and endocervical adenocarcinoma (CESC), liver hepatocellular carcinoma (LIHC), colon adenocarcinoma (COAD), rectum adenocarcinoma (READ), kidney renal clear cell carcinoma (KIRC), kidney renal papillary cell carcinoma (KIRP), sarcoma (SARC), and stomach adenocarcinoma (STAD). (B) Violin plot implicating SNHG12 expression levels in different pathological stage of human pan-cancers in TCGA cohort. (C) Overall survival plot of SNHG12 in TCGA cohort (n=9497). (D) Disease-free survival plot of SNHG12 in TCGA cohort (n=9497).
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