

Letter to the editor “Prognostic value of microRNAs in colorectal cancer: a meta-analysis”

Rama Jayaraj¹
Chellan Kumarasamy²
KM Gothandam³

¹College of Health and Human Sciences, Charles Darwin University, NT, Australia; ²North Terrace Campus, University of Adelaide, SA, Australia; ³School of Biosciences and Technology, Vellore Institute of Technology, Vellore, Tamil Nadu, India

Dear editor

The systematic review and meta-analyses published by Gao et al¹ regarding the topic of microRNAs as prognostic markers in colorectal cancer (CRC) has been of great interest to us. Although previous systematic reviews and meta-analyses highlighting the prognostic value of miRNAs as prognostic markers in CRC exist, each of those studies is primarily focused on a single miRNA per study.^{2,3} Gao et al,¹ via this expansive study, have managed to assess and highlight the prognostic utility of a variety of miRNAs in CRC. Both miR-21 and miR-181 have been highlighted in previous studies as being potential prognostic markers, but interestingly, Gao et al's¹ study is the first to highlight miR-224 and miR-141 as strong prognostic biomarkers, specifically in CRC.

Although the systematic review and meta-analysis does provide a comprehensive analysis of currently existing literature on miRNAs as prognostic markers in CRC, the pool of literature available, is itself too small to provide any conclusive evidence. This is reflected in the conclusions drawn about miR-141 as a strong prognostic marker in CRC. On first glance, the pooled hazard ratio (HR) of 2.52 (95% CI 1.68–3.77) for miR-141 indicates a strong prognostic effect; however, further observation shows that only two studies were included to generate this result. Additionally, when we consider that even more well-established prognostic indicators such as perineural invasion and high lymph node ratio are associated with HRs for poor overall survival of <2.5, the conclusions reached by Gao et al's¹ study, regarding miR-141 seem imprecise, requiring further validation.⁴

Furthermore, the mean effect estimate of HR is used more in meta-analysis when compared to the parameters of statistical significance and sample size of studies. This is primarily due to the binary interpretation of statistical data that statistical significance as a parameter promotes, simply indicating whether an intervention works or not. On the other hand, effect size as a parameter provides more clinical utility as it examines the validity of the intervention in a range of contexts.⁵ As Gao et al's¹ study focuses primarily on statistical significance as the method of comparison, we would like to suggest the inclusion of analysis based on the mean effect estimate of HR as well, so as to estimate the possible clinical utility of the presented results.

Correspondence: Rama Jayaraj
College of Health and Human Sciences,
Charles Darwin University, Ellengowan
Drive, Darwin,
NT 0909, Australia
Email Rama.Jayaraj@cdu.edu.au

We acknowledge that a systematic review and meta-analysis is defined by the quality of studies included and the issues caused by a lack of published research in the field of miRNAs as prognostic markers in CRC cannot be attributed to Gao et al¹ or the meta-analysis study itself. We would simply like to indicate that the conclusions currently provided may not be considered absolute, and an updated review few years down the line with more studies included may serve to provide a more comprehensive idea regarding the topic.

Disclosure

The authors report no conflicts of interest in this communication.

References

1. Gao S, Zhao ZY, Wu R, Zhang Y, Zhang ZY. Prognostic value of microRNAs in colorectal cancer: a meta-analysis. *Cancer Manag Res*. 2018;10: 907–929.
2. Gu X, Jin R, Mao X, Wang J, Yuan J, Zhao G. Prognostic value of miRNA-181a/b in colorectal cancer: a meta-analysis. *Biomark Med*. 2018;12(3): 299–308.
3. Xia X, Yang B, Zhai X, et al. Prognostic role of microRNA-21 in colorectal cancer: a meta-analysis. *PLoS One*. 2013;8(11):e80426.
4. Rogers AC, Winter DC, Heeney A, et al. Systematic review and meta-analysis of the impact of tumour budding in colorectal cancer. *Br J Cancer*. 2016;115(7):831–840.
5. Coe R. It's the effect size, stupid: what effect size is and why it is important. Paper presented at: Annual Conference of the British Educational Research Association; September 12–14; 2002; University of Exeter, England.

Authors' reply

Song Gao^{1,*}

Zhi-Ying Zhao^{2,*}

Rong Wu¹

Yue Zhang³

Zhen-Yong Zhang¹

¹Second Department of Clinical Oncology, Shengjing Hospital of China Medical University, ²School of Computer Science and Engineering, Northeastern University, Shenyang, ³First Clinical Medical College, Shandong University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Jinan, China

*These authors contributed equally to this work

Correspondence: Yue Zhang
First Clinical Medical College, Shandong University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, 16369 Jingshi Road, Lixia, Jinan, Shandong 250014, People's Republic of China
Tel +86 531 6861 6426
Fax +86 531 8260 2948
Email zhangyue0811@hotmail.com

Dear editor

Thanks for your letter to our study. To begin with, I agree with you that the pool of a small literature may lead to relatively unreliable conclusion. However, we have tried our best to collect relevant articles in the research field of colorectal cancer, and the number of them was fixed and usually limited. In addition, we are also in favor of your opinion that when it comes to perineural invasion and high lymph node ratio, the conclusions reached by us seem imprecise. This limitation is caused by the truth that we only focused on the data regarding patients' survival results. Finally, thank you for your constructive suggestions about the inclusion of analysis based on the mean effect estimate hazard ratio. In a word, our study has several limitations which currently cannot be solved, and a larger sample size study and prospective clinical trials are urgently needed.

Disclosure

The authors report no conflicts of interest in this communication.

Dove Medical Press encourages responsible, free and frank academic debate. The content of the Cancer Management and Research 'letters to the editor' section does not necessarily represent the views of Dove Medical Press, its officers, agents, employees, related entities or the Cancer Management and Research editors. While all reasonable steps have been taken to confirm the content of each letter, Dove Medical Press accepts no liability in respect of the content of any letter, nor is it responsible for the content and accuracy of any letter to the editor.

Cancer Management and Research

Publish your work in this journal

Cancer Management and Research is an international, peer-reviewed open access journal focusing on cancer research and the optimal use of preventative and integrated treatment interventions to achieve improved outcomes, enhanced survival and quality of life for the cancer patient. The manuscript management system is completely online and includes

Submit your manuscript here: <https://www.dovepress.com/cancer-management-and-research-journal>

a very quick and fair peer-review system, which is all easy to use. Visit <http://www.dovepress.com/testimonials.php> to read real quotes from published authors.

Dovepress