a Open Access Full Text Article

#### ORIGINAL RESEARCH

# Genetic Association Study Revealed Three Loci Were Associated Risk of Myopia Among Minors

Zixiu Zhou Sizhen Li Qingsong Yang Xiaodong Yang Kuanxiao Hao Yating Liu Shanshan Xu

Nanjing Tongren Hospital, School of Medicine, Southeast University, Nanjing, 211102, People's Republic of China

Correspondence: Sizhen Li Nanjing Tongren Hospital, School of Medicine, Southeast University, No. 2007, Jinyindadao Street, Jiangning District, Nanjing, 211102, People's Republic of China Tel +86-25-66987318 Email li\_nice091@163.com

Background: Myopia has raised a predominant public concern among minors. A recent genome-wide association study (GWAS) identified six novel loci in Asian adults. Whether these genetic loci works for myopia in minors remains unknown and worthy of exploration. Methods: In order to validate the findings, here we performed a case-control study (600 myopia minors, 110 high myopia (HM) minors, and 800 non-myopia minors as controls) utilizing the TaqMan single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) genotyping assays. Adjusted odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) was adopted.

**Results:** The median ages in controls, myopia, and HM were 15.1, 15.0, and 15.1, respectively, while the means  $\pm$  standard deviations for them were 0.32 $\pm$ 0.41, - 3.2  $\pm$ 1.6, and -9.8 ±2.2, respectively. We found rs2246661 (allelic OR: 1.29; 95% CI: 1.09-1.52; P =0.003), rs74633073 (allelic OR: 1.41; 95% CI: 1.12–1.78; P =0.004), and rs76903431 (allelic OR: 1.42; 95% CI: 1.11-1.81; P =0.005) were significantly associated with increased risk of myopia. Rs2246661 was also significantly associated with increased risk of HM in minors (OR: 1.37; 95% CI: 1.02-1.84; P =0.035).

Conclusion: We identified three loci contributed to myopia in minors and these findings gave new insight into the genetic susceptibility mechanisms of myopia at the molecular level.

Keywords: myopia, genome-wide association study; GWAS, SNP, minors

#### Introduction

Myopia, the most common refractive error, results in a significant threat on global public health worldwide.<sup>1</sup> As the myopic population increases globally, the severity of its impact is predicted.<sup>2</sup> Children with early onset are particularly susceptible to myopia-related complications, like high myopia (HM) and myopic macular degeneration.<sup>3</sup> According to a recent school-based epidemiology study of myopia in China with 14,551 participants (ages ranging from 5 to 16 years), the overall prevalence of myopia is 78.2%.<sup>4</sup> Myopia is a complex disease which is contributed by various environmental and genetic factors. Environmental factors includes low outdoor time and near work, dim light exposure, the use of LED lamps for homework, low sleeping hours, and short reading distance.<sup>3,5</sup> Meanwhile, there is growing evidence that susceptibility genes play a crucial role in the risk of myopia and single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) may contribute to the risk of myopia.<sup>6-10</sup>

Recently, a genome-wide association study (GWAS) identified six novel loci (rs2246661, rs74633073, rs76903431, rs698047, rs17029206, and rs72748160) in Asian adults, and revealed the important role of genes in the nervous system in the pathogenesis of myopia.<sup>11</sup> The findings highlighted a nervous system role in

Pharmacogenomics and Personalized Medicine 2021:14 547-551

547

CO 0 S C2021 Zhou et al. This work is published and licensed by Dove Medical Press Limited. The full terms of this license are available at https://www.dovepress.com/terms.php you hereby accept the Terms. Non-commercial uses of the work are permitted without any further permission from Dove Medical Press Limited, provided the work is properly attributed. For permission for commercial use of this work, please see paragraphs 4.2 and 5 of our Terms (https://www.dovepress.com/terms.php).

pathogenesis of myopia. Minors are better suited to studying the genetic factors of myopia. Whether these genetic loci works for myopia in minors remains unknown and worthy to be explored. Thus, here we aimed to evaluate the potential role of these GWAS identified loci in occurrence of myopia in this case-control study including 600 myopia minors, 110 HM minors and 800 non-myopia minors.

## **Patients and Methods**

#### Study Population

A total of 600 consecutive myopia minors, 110 HM minors, and 800 non-myopia minors, which were frequencymatched by age and gender, were recruited in this casecontrol study. All subjects were Chinese Han population. Myopia was defined as mean spherical equivalent (MSE) of both eyes  $\leq -0.5$  diopters (D), while HM was defined as MSE less than or equal to -6.0 D.<sup>12</sup> Patients with a predisposition to myopic eye disease, other known ocular or systemic diseases were excluded. Controls were selected from subjects coming for routine vision screening. The criteria for the control group were as follows: minors with MSE between -0.5 D and +1.0 D, best unaided visual acuity  $\geq 0.8$ , and no other known ocular or systemic diseases.<sup>13</sup> Patients are tested for refractive errors using an automated refractometer (Topcon RM-8000B, Topcon

Table I	Characteristics	of Participatin	ng Minors
---------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------

Co., Tokyo, Japan). The refraction was taken under cycloplegia. Information of all participants, including age, gender, body mass index (BMI, calculated using weight/ height<sup>2</sup>), self-reported outdoors time, self-reported time using electronic equipment, and parental myopia, was collected through questionnaire responses, and all subjects donated 5 mL peripheral venous blood. The study protocol was approved by the ethics committee of Nanjing Tongren Hospital. All subjects gave their written informed consent, and the study complied with the Declaration of Helsinki.

### DNA Extraction and Genotyping

Genomic DNA was extracted by blood DNA extraction kit (Promega, Madison, Wisconsin, USA) and stored in TE buffer. Genotyping was performed by TaqMan assay in 384-well ABI 7900HT Real-Time PCR system (Applied Biosystems [ABI], Foster City, CA). The qPCR reactions proceeded in a final volume of 10  $\mu$ L mix including 5  $\mu$ L TaqMan Genotyping Master Mix (Thermo Fisher Scientific), 0.5  $\mu$ L pre-designed TaqMan probe (Thermo Fisher Scientific), 20 ng genomic DNA and ultrapure water. Each plate included blank samples as negative controls to verify genotyping quality. Genotype data were analyzed using their System SDS Allelic Discrimination Software version 2.3 (Applied Biosystems). For quality control, about 5% of the samples were genotyped

	Non-Myopia Minors	Myopia Minors		High Myopia Minors	
	(N=800)	N=600	P value	N=110	P value
Age (years)	15.1 (14.1, 15.9)	15.0 (14.0,15.9)	0.787	15.1 (13.9, 16.0)	0.919
Gender					
Boys Girls	436 (54.4%) 364 (45.6%)	338 (56.3%) 262 (43.7%)	0.495	62 (56.4%) 48 (43.6%)	0.713
BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	18.3 (4.8)	18.9 (4.1)	0.014	18.8 (4.3)	0.300
Self-reported outdoors time (h/day)	1.3 (0.7)	1.1 (0.6)	<0.001	1.0 (0.5)	<0.001
Self-reported time using electronic equipment (h/ day)	1.1 (0.6)	1.2 (0.6)	0.002	1.8 (1.1)	<0.001
Parental Myopia					
Yes No	153 (19.1%) 647 (80.9%)	122 (20.3%) 478 (79.7%)	0.573	32 (29.7%) 78 (70.3%)	0.015
Mean spherical equivalent (diopters)	0.32 (0.41)	-3.2 (1.6)	<0.001	-9.8 (2.2)	<0.001

Notes: Values are means (SD), median (quartiles), or absolute numbers (percentages). P value in bold means statistically significant.

repeatedly with Sanger sequencing and the results of both methods were in good agreement.

#### Statistical Analysis

SPSS 22.0 (SPSS, Chicago, IL) was used for statistical analysis, and a two-sided P-value of less than 0.05 was used as statistical significance. Chi -square goodness-of-fit test was adopted to derive the Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium (HWE). In the case-control study, Student *t*-test and/or Chi - square test were used to demonstrate how demographic and clinical characteristics and frequency of genotypes differ between case and control groups. Using unconditional logistic regression model, adjusted odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were adopted (only significant variables in Table 1 were included for adjustment) to evaluate the effects of SNPs and to quantify the association between the SNPs and myopia in minors.

#### Results

#### Characteristics of Study Population

Table 1 presented the 600 myopia minors, 110 HM minors, and 800 non- myopia minors in this case-control study. The groups were comparable in age, and gender (P>0.05). While the highly myopic spent more time using electronic devices (P<0.001), less time outdoors (P<0.001) and had more myopic parents than non-myopic ones (P=0.015). The median ages in controls, myopia, and HM were 15.1, 15.0, and 15.1, respectively, while the means  $\pm$ standard deviation for them were 0.32 $\pm$ 0.41, -3.2  $\pm$ 1.6, and -9.8 $\pm$ 2.2, respectively.

#### Genetic Association Study of Myopia

All six SNPs analyzed were in HWE in non-myopia controls, indicating that the sampled subjects were representative of the population and did not show any bias in genotype frequency (p>0.05). Subsequently, we evaluated the associations between the selected SNPs and the risk of myopia adjusting for BMI, self-reported outdoors time, and self-reported time using electronic equipment. Table 2 showed the results of genotypic frequency analysis for selected loci. SNP rs2246661 (allelic OR: 1.29; 95% CI: 1.09–1.52; P =0.003), rs74633073 (allelic OR: 1.41; 95% CI: 1.12–1.78; P =0.004), and rs76903431 (allelic OR: 1.42; 95% CI: 1.11–1.81; P =0.005) significantly contributed to elevated susceptibility of myopia. Under additive genetic model, all of three SNPs showed statistically significant associations. For rs2246661, the CT genotype was 
 Table 2
 Associations
 Between
 Candidate
 Loci and
 Myopia in

 Minors

 </

Variants	Myopia (n=600)	Controls (n=800)	OR (95% CI)*	P
rs2246661				
тт	281	442	I.00 (reference)	
СТ	257	296	1.42 (1.12–1.81)	0.004
СС	62	62	1.64 (1.1–2.43)	0.014
C vs T			1.29 (1.09–1.52)	0.003
rs7463307	3			
сс	449	645	1.00 (reference)	
СТ	137	147	1.39 (1.05–1.85)	0.022
тт	14	8	2.61 (1.12-6.08)	0.026
T vs C			1.41 (1.12–1.78)	0.004
rs7690343	I	·		
тт	457	660	I.00 (reference)	
AT	131	133	1.48 (1.11–1.97)	0.007
AA	12	7	2.57 (1.04-6.37)	0.041
A vs T			1.42 (1.11–1.81)	0.005
rs698047				
СС	163	233	I.00 (reference)	
CG	298	397	1.12 (0.77–1.62)	0.563
GG	139	170	1.22 (0.85–1.74)	0.286
G vs C			1.06 (0.91–1.24)	0.452
rs1702920	6			
TT	288	349	I.00 (reference)	
СТ	241	346	0.88 (0.74–1.04)	0.124
СС	71	105	0.85 (0.66–1.1)	0.227
C vs T			0.91 (0.78–1.06)	0.234
rs7274816	0			
GG	484	674	I.00 (reference)	
GT	110	121	1.32 (0.96–1.8)	0.087
тт	6	5	1.74 (0.52–5.83)	0.37
T vs G			1.22 (0.94-1.59)	0.144

Notes: \*Adjusted for BMI, self-reported outdoors time, and self-reported time using electronic equipment. P value in bold means statistically significant.

associated with a 1.42-fold increased risk (95% CI = 1.-12–1.81; P=0.004), while the TT genotype conferred 1.64-fold increased risk of myopia (95% CI = 1.1–2.43; P=0.014), compared with the TT genotype. For rs74633073, the CT genotype was associated with a 1.39fold increased risk (95% CI = 1.05–1.85; P=0.022), while the TT genotype conferred 2.61-fold increased risk of myopia (95% CI = 1.12–6.08; P=0.026). For rs76903431, genotype GG was associated with a 1.48-

Table 3 Associations Between	Candidate	Loci a	and High	Myopia
in Minors				

rs2246661     47     442     1.00 (reference)     0.044       CT     50     296     1.55 (1.01–2.37)     0.044       CC     13     62     1.88 (1.03–3.43)     0.040       CV vs T     1     1.00 (reference)     0.035       rs74633073     1.37 (1.02–1.84)     0.035       rs74633073     255     147     1.39 (0.83–2.34)     0.214       TT     25     147     1.39 (0.83–2.34)     0.214       TT     3     8     3.07 (0.86–10.9)     0.084       T vs C     1     1.35 (0.86–2.14)     0.193       rs7690343     1.47     0.88–2.48)     0.142       AA     2     7     2.33 (0.5–10.96)     0.282       AA     2     7     2.33 (0.5–10.96)     0.282       AA vs T     1     1.30     1.47 (0.88–2.48)     0.142       AA     2     7     2.33 (0.5–10.96)     0.282       Avs T     1     1.31 (0.82–2.09)     0.264       rs698047     1.27 (0.66–2.45)     0.469	Variants	High Myopia (n=110)	Controls (n=800)	OR (95% CI)*	P		
CT     50     296     1.55 (1.01-2.37)     0.044       CC     13     62     1.88 (1.03-3.43)     0.040       C vs T     13     62     1.37 (1.02-1.84)     0.040       rs74633073	rs2246661						
CC C vs T     13     62     1.88 (1.03–3.43) 1.37 (1.02–1.84)     0.040 0.035       rs7463307J	тт	47	442	1.00 (reference)			
C vs T     I.37 (1.02–1.84)     0.035       rs74633073	СТ	50	296	1.55 (1.01–2.37)	0.044		
rs74633073     I.00 (reference)     I.39 (0.83–2.34)     0.214       TT     25     147     1.39 (0.83–2.34)     0.214       TT     3     8     3.07 (0.86–10.9)     0.084       T vs C     1     1.35 (0.86–2.14)     0.193       rs76903431     1.35 (0.86–2.14)     0.193       TT     84     660     1.00 (reference)       AT     24     133     1.47 (0.88–2.48)     0.142       AA     2     7     2.33 (0.5–10.96)     0.282       A vs T     1     1     0.142     2.33 (0.5–10.96)     0.282       A vs T     1     1     0.164     0.142       AG     2     7     2.33 (0.5–10.96)     0.282       A vs T     1     1     0.142     0.31     0.346       GG     28     233     1.00 (reference)     0.446       GG     25     170     1.24 (0.71–2.17)     0.446       GC     107     0.79–1.46     0.367       rs17029206     101     0.	СС	13	62	1.88 (1.03–3.43)	0.040		
CC     82     645     1.00 (reference)     0.214       TT     3     8     3.07 (0.86–10.9)     0.084       T vs C     1.35 (0.86–2.14)     0.193     0.193       rs7690343J     1.35 (0.86–2.14)     0.193       rs7690343J     1.47 (0.88–2.48)     0.142       AA     2     7     2.33 (0.5–10.96)     0.282       A vs T     1     1.31 (0.82–2.09)     0.264       rs698047     1.31 (0.82–2.09)     0.264       rs698047     1.31 (0.82–2.09)     0.264       rs698047     1.00 (reference)     1.31 (0.82–2.09)     0.264       rs698047     1.31 (0.82–10.9)     0.264     1.31 (0.82–2.09)     0.264       rs698047     1.00 (reference)     0.466     1.07 (0.79–1.46)     0.667       CC     28     233     1.00 (reference)     0.469       G vs C     170     1.24 (0.71–2.17)     0.446       GC     1.00 (reference)     0.469     0.469       G vs C     105     0.77 (0.44–1.33)     0.346       Cvs T	C vs T			1.37 (1.02–1.84)	0.035		
CT     25     147     1.39 (0.83–2.34)     0.214       TT     3     8     3.07 (0.86–10.9)     0.084       T vs C     1.35 (0.86–2.14)     0.193       rs76903431     1.35 (0.86–2.14)     0.193       TT     84     660     1.00 (reference)       AT     24     133     1.47 (0.88–2.48)     0.142       AA     2     7     2.33 (0.5–10.96)     0.282       A vs T     1     1.00 (reference)     0.142       AA     2     7     2.33 (0.5–10.96)     0.282       A vs T     1     1.00 (reference)     0.264       rs698047     1.24 (0.71–2.17)     0.446       GG     25     170     1.24 (0.71–2.17)     0.446       GG     25     170     1.27 (0.66–2.45)     0.469       Gvs C     10     1.07 (0.79–1.46)     0.667       rs17029206     121     0.355 (0.62–1.18)     0.342       CC     12     105     0.77 (0.44–1.33)     0.346       CVs T     1	rs74633073	3					
TT     3     8     3.07 (0.86–10.9)     0.084       T vs C     1.35 (0.86–2.14)     0.193       rs76903431     rs76903431     0.142       TT     84     660     1.00 (reference)     0.142       AT     24     133     1.47 (0.88–2.48)     0.142       AA     2     7     2.33 (0.5–10.96)     0.282       A vs T     1     1     1.31 (0.82–2.09)     0.264       rs698047     2     397     1.24 (0.71–2.17)     0.446       GG     25     170     1.27 (0.66–2.45)     0.469       G vs C     1     170     1.27 (0.66–2.45)     0.469       G vs C     1     170     1.27 (0.66–2.45)     0.469       G vs C     1     100     (reference)     0.667       rs17029206     1     1.00 (reference)     0.342       CC     12     105     0.77 (0.44–1.33)     0.346       CV vs T     1     0.5     0.77 (0.44–1.33)     0.346       CV vs T     10     0.99	сс	82	645	1.00 (reference)			
T vs C     I.35 (0.86–2.14)     0.193       rs7690343J     rs7690343J     I.33     I.300 (reference)     A       AT     24     133     I.47 (0.88–2.48)     0.142       AA     2     7     2.33 (0.5–10.96)     0.282       A vs T     I     I     I.31 (0.82–2.09)     0.264       rs698047     I.31 (0.82–2.09)     0.264       rs698047     I.31 (0.82–2.09)     0.264       rs698047     I.24 (0.71–2.17)     0.446       GG     25     170     1.24 (0.71–2.17)     0.446       GG     25     170     1.27 (0.66–2.45)     0.469       G vs C     I     I.00 (reference)     0.667       rs17029206     II     I.00 (reference)     0.342       CC     12     105     0.77 (0.44–1.33)     0.346       CV vs T     I     I05     0.77 (0.44–1.33)     0.346       CC     12     105     0.77 (0.44–1.33)     0.346       CV vs T     I     I05     0.99 (0.72–1.37)     0.950  <	СТ	25	147	1.39 (0.83–2.34)	0.214		
rs76903431     Image: Problem state	тт	3	8	3.07 (0.86–10.9)	0.084		
TT     84     660     1.00 (reference)     0.142       AT     24     133     1.47 (0.88–2.48)     0.142       AA     2     7     2.33 (0.5–10.96)     0.282       A vs T     1     1     0     1.31 (0.82–2.09)     0.264       rs698047     1.31 (0.82–2.09)     0.264     0.264     0.264       rs698047     2     233     1.00 (reference)     0.264       CC     28     233     1.00 (reference)     0.264       GG     57     397     1.24 (0.71–2.17)     0.446       GG     25     170     1.27 (0.66–2.45)     0.469       Gv s C     1     170     1.27 (0.66–2.45)     0.469       Gv s C     1     170     1.27 (0.62–1.18)     0.342       CC     12     105     0.77 (0.44–1.33)     0.346       CV s T     1     105     0.77 (0.44–1.33)     0.346       C vs T     1     105     0.99 (0.72–1.37)     0.950       rs72748160     1.21     1.32 (0.74	T vs C			1.35 (0.86–2.14)	0.193		
AT   24   133   1.47 (0.88–2.48)   0.142     AA   2   7   2.33 (0.5–10.96)   0.282     A vs T   1   1   1.31 (0.82–2.09)   0.264     rs698047   1.31 (0.82–2.09)   0.264     CC   28   233   1.00 (reference)   0.446     GG   57   397   1.24 (0.71–2.17)   0.446     GG   25   170   1.27 (0.66–2.45)   0.469     G vs C   1   170   1.07 (0.79–1.46)   0.667     rs17029206   7   1.00 (reference)   0.342     CC   12   105   0.77 (0.44–1.33)   0.346     C.vs T   1   105   0.77 (0.44–1.33)   0.346     C.vs T   1   105   0.99 (0.72–1.37)   0.950     rs72748160   1.20   1.32 (0.74–2.35)   0.353	rs7690343	l			•		
AA     2     7     2.33 (0.5–10.96) 1.31 (0.82–2.09)     0.282 0.264       rs698047	тт	84	660	I.00 (reference)			
A vs T     I     I.31 (0.82–2.09)     0.264       rs698047     rs698047     I.31 (0.82–2.09)     0.264       CC     28     233     I.00 (reference)     1.24 (0.71–2.17)       CG     57     397     I.24 (0.71–2.17)     0.446       GG     25     I70     I.27 (0.66–2.45)     0.469       G vs C     I     I/00 (reference)     0.667       rs17029206     I     I/00 (reference)     0.342       CC     12     105     0.77 (0.44–1.33)     0.346       C vs T     I     I/05     0.77 (0.44–1.33)     0.950       rs72748160     I     I/00 (reference)     0.950       GG     88     674     1.00 (reference)     0.353	AT	24	133	1.47 (0.88–2.48)	0.142		
rs698047     28     233     1.00 (reference)     0.446       GG     57     397     1.24 (0.71–2.17)     0.446       GG     25     170     1.27 (0.66–2.45)     0.469       G vs C     100 (reference)     0.667     0.667       rs17029206     170     1.00 (reference)     0.667       CT     44     346     0.85 (0.62–1.18)     0.342       CC     12     105     0.77 (0.44–1.33)     0.346       CV vs T     105     0.99 (0.72–1.37)     0.950       rs72748160     121     1.00 (reference)     0.950	AA	2	7	2.33 (0.5–10.96)	0.282		
CC     28     233     1.00 (reference)     0.446       GG     57     397     1.24 (0.71–2.17)     0.446       GG     25     170     1.27 (0.66–2.45)     0.469       G vs C     1.07 (0.79–1.46)     0.667       rs17029206     7     349     1.00 (reference)       CT     44     346     0.85 (0.62–1.18)     0.342       CC     12     105     0.77 (0.44–1.33)     0.346       C vs T     1     0.5     0.99 (0.72–1.37)     0.950       rs72748160     1     1.00 (reference)     0.353       GG     88     674     1.00 (reference)     0.353	A vs T			1.31 (0.82–2.09)	0.264		
CG     57     397     1.24 (0.71–2.17)     0.446       GG     25     170     1.27 (0.66–2.45)     0.469       G vs C     1.07 (0.79–1.46)     0.667       rs17029206     TT     54     349     1.00 (reference)       CT     44     346     0.85 (0.62–1.18)     0.342       CC     12     105     0.77 (0.44–1.33)     0.346       C vs T     1     0.99 (0.72–1.37)     0.950       rs72748160     GG     88     674     1.00 (reference)     1.32 (0.74–2.35)     0.353	rs698047						
GG     25     170     1.27 (0.66–2.45)     0.469       G vs C     1.07 (0.79–1.46)     0.667       rs17029206     1.00 (reference)     0.469       TT     54     349     1.00 (reference)       CT     44     346     0.85 (0.62–1.18)     0.342       CC     12     105     0.77 (0.44–1.33)     0.346       C vs T     0     0.99 (0.72–1.37)     0.950       rs72748160     5     5     5       GG     88     674     1.00 (reference)     0.353       GT     20     121     1.32 (0.74–2.35)     0.353	сс	28	233	1.00 (reference)			
G vs C     I.07 (0.79–1.46)     0.667       rs17029206     I.00 (reference)     I.07 (0.79–1.46)     0.667       TT     54     349     I.00 (reference)     I.0342       CT     44     346     0.85 (0.62–1.18)     0.342       CC     12     105     0.77 (0.44–1.33)     0.346       C vs T     I     0.99 (0.72–1.37)     0.950       rs72748160     I.00 (reference)     I.032 (0.74–2.35)     0.353	CG	57	397	1.24 (0.71–2.17)	0.446		
rs17029206     TT   54   349   1.00 (reference)     CT   44   346   0.85 (0.62–1.18)   0.342     CC   12   105   0.77 (0.44–1.33)   0.346     C vs T   0   0.99 (0.72–1.37)   0.950     rs72748160	GG	25	170	1.27 (0.66–2.45)	0.469		
TT     54     349     1.00 (reference)       CT     44     346     0.85 (0.62–1.18)     0.342       CC     12     105     0.77 (0.44–1.33)     0.346       C vs T     -     -     0.99 (0.72–1.37)     0.950       rs72748160     -     -     -     -     0.342       GG     88     674     1.00 (reference)     -     -       GT     20     121     1.32 (0.74–2.35)     0.353	G vs C			1.07 (0.79–1.46)	0.667		
CT     44     346     0.85 (0.62–1.18)     0.342       CC     12     105     0.77 (0.44–1.33)     0.346       C vs T     0     0.99 (0.72–1.37)     0.950       rs72748160     GG     88     674     1.00 (reference)       GT     20     121     1.32 (0.74–2.35)     0.353	rs17029206						
CC C vs T     12     105     0.77 (0.44–1.33) 0.99 (0.72–1.37)     0.346 0.950       rs72748160	тт	54	349	1.00 (reference)			
C vs T     0.99 (0.72–1.37)     0.950       rs72748160     GG     88     674     1.00 (reference)       GT     20     121     1.32 (0.74–2.35)     0.353	СТ	44	346	0.85 (0.62-1.18)	0.342		
rs72748160 GG 88 674 1.00 (reference) GT 20 121 1.32 (0.74–2.35) 0.353	сс	12	105	0.77 (0.44–1.33)	0.346		
GG     88     674     I.00 (reference)       GT     20     121     I.32 (0.74–2.35)     0.353	C vs T			0.99 (0.72–1.37)	0.950		
GT 20 121 1.32 (0.74–2.35) 0.353	rs72748160						
	GG	88	674	1.00 (reference)			
	GT	20	121	1.32 (0.74–2.35)	0.353		
11 <u>2</u> <u>5</u> <u>5.17 (0.67–15.05)</u> <u>0.144</u>	ТТ	2	5	3.19 (0.67–15.05)	0.144		
T vs G I.23 (0.74–2.05) 0.424	T vs G			1.23 (0.74–2.05)	0.424		

Notes: \*Adjusted for self-reported outdoors time, self-reported time using electronic equipment, and parental myopia. P value in bold means statistically significant.

fold increased risk (95% CI = 1.11-1.97; P = 0.007), while the GG genotype conferred 2.57-fold increased risk of myopia (95% CI = 1.04-6.37; P = 0.041), compared with the CC genotype.

## Genetic Association Study of HM

We further evaluated the associations of these six candidate SNPs with HM adjusting for self-reported outdoors time, self-reported time using electronic equipment, and parental myopia. We only found rs2246661 (OR: 1.37; 95% CI: 1.02–1.84; P =0.035), significantly contributed to elevated susceptibility of HM (Table 3). Under additive genetic model, the CT genotype was associated with a 1.55-fold increased risk (95% CI= 1.01-2.37; P = 0.044), while the TT genotype conferred 1.88-fold increased risk of myopia (95% CI=1.03-3.43; P = 0.040), compared with the TT genotype.

#### Discussion

The current study investigated the potential function of six GWAS identified loci in occurrence of minors' myopia in a case-control study in Chinese population. We found three loci, including rs2246661, rs74633073, and rs76903431, significantly contributed to elevated risk of myopia. Besides, we also found rs2246661 significantly contributed to HM in minors. Our results confirm the GWAS findings in Asian adults and further provide a causal explanation for the occurrence of myopia at the molecular level.

The prevalence of myopia grew rapidly in minors.<sup>3,5,14</sup> Finding the causes of the disease and taking effective preventive measures are vital to controlling the damage caused by myopia in young people. To date, a series of GWASs have been conducted to characterize the molecular mechanism responsible for myopia worldwide.<sup>11, 15–20</sup> However, not all could be replicated. For example, Wang et al<sup>21</sup> replicated findings of two Japanese GWAS in a Chinese population, and got null results. This was because myopia in adults was a genetically heterogeneous disease, which was influenced by inborn genetic factors and acquired environmental factors. On the contrary, minors are better suited to exploring the genetic factors of myopia. Thus, we attempted to classify the occurrence of myopia in minors was affected by GWAS loci identified in adults in this case-control study.

In the current study, rs2246661, rs74633073, and rs76903431 were identified to be associated risk of myopia in minors. Through searching Pubmed, we did not find any other genetic associations. According to RegulomeDB 2.0, rs2246661 and rs74633073 were located at the transcription factor (TF) binding site, which could affect the combination of TFs and their targets.<sup>22</sup> HaploReg v4.1 revealed rs2246661 could cause Ets Motifs change, and rs74633073 could cause AP-2, RFX5 Motifs change, while rs76903431 could cause CDP, Pbx-1, RXRA Motifs change.<sup>23</sup> This evidence supported the important role of these genetic loci.

Our study had several limitations. First, the selection bias of a case-control study design cannot be avoided. Second, early-onset myopia, which refers to myopia occurring before the age of 11 years, was not evaluated in current study, due to the limitations of sample size.<sup>24</sup> Third, based on existing sample size, the associations might not have the strength to achieve real results, especially for HM. Fourth, the biological function of these SNPs and its detailed effect on occurrence of myopia need to be deep investigated by further biological studies. There are also several strengths in our research, including the detailed inspection and accurate diagnosis of cases, structured questionnaire by well-trained interviewers, and strict quality control of genotyping.

#### Conclusions

Conclusively, this study provides the evidence of the promotional role of rs2246661, rs74633073, and rs76903431 loci on the susceptibility of myopia. Replicated researches in independent ethnic samples and functional investigation are needed to confirm our findings.

#### Disclosure

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

#### References

- 1. Foster PJ, Jiang Y. Epidemiology of myopia. *Eye (Lond)*. 2014;28 (2):202–208. doi:10.1038/eye.2013.280
- Angle J, Wissmann DA. The epidemiology of myopia. Am J Epidemiol. 1980;111(2):220–228. doi:10.1093/oxfordjournals.aje.a112889
- Grzybowski A, Kanclerz P, Tsubota K, Lanca C, Saw SM. A review on the epidemiology of myopia in school children worldwide. *BMC Ophthalmol.* 2020;20(1):27. doi:10.1186/s12886-019-1220-0
- Wang J, Li Y, Zhao Z, et al. School-based epidemiology study of myopia in Tianjin, China. *Int Ophthalmol.* 2020;40(9):2213–2222. doi:10.1007/s10792-020-01400-w
- Mak CY, Yam JC, Chen LJ, Lee SM, Young AL. Epidemiology of myopia and prevention of myopia progression in children in East Asia: a review. *Hong Kong Med J.* 2018;24(6):602–609.
- Kunceviciene E, Liutkeviciene R, Budiene B, Sriubiene M, Smalinskiene A. Independent association of whole blood miR-328 expression and polymorphism at 3'UTR of the PAX6 gene with myopia. *Gene*. 2019;687:151–155. doi:10.1016/j.gene.2018.11.030
- Zhang D, Zeng G, Hu J, McCormick K, Shi Y, Gong B. Association of IGF1 polymorphism rs6214 with high myopia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ophthalmic Genet*. 2017;38(5):434–439. doi:10.1080/13816810.2016.1253105

Pharmacogenomics and Personalized Medicine

#### Publish your work in this journal

Pharmacogenomics and Personalized Medicine is an international, peer-reviewed, open access journal characterizing the influence of genotype on pharmacology leading to the development of personalized treatment programs and individualized drug selection for improved safety, efficacy and sustainability. This journal is indexed

- Jin GM, Zhao XJ, Chen AM, Chen YX, Li Q. Association of COL1A1 polymorphism with high myopia: a Meta-analysis. *Int J Ophthalmol.* 2016;9(4):604–609.
- Liang Y, Song Y, Zhang F, Sun M, Wang N. Effect of a single nucleotide polymorphism in the LAMA1 promoter region on Transcriptional activity: implication for pathological myopia. *Curr Eye Res.* 2016;41 (10):1379–1386. doi:10.3109/02713683.2015.1118129
- Chen T, Shan G, Ma J, Zhong Y. Polymorphism in the RASGRF1 gene with high myopia: a meta-analysis. *Mol Vis.* 2015;21:1272–1280.
- Meguro A, Yamane T, Takeuchi M, et al. Genome-wide association study in asians identifies novel loci for high myopia and highlights a nervous system role in its pathogenesis. *Ophthalmology*. 2020;127 (12):1612–1624. doi:10.1016/j.ophtha.2020.05.014
- Luo HD, Gazzard G, Liang Y, Shankar A, Tan DT, Saw SM. Defining myopia using refractive error and uncorrected logMAR visual acuity >0.3 from 1334 Singapore school children ages 7–9 years. Br J Ophthalmol. 2006;90(3):362–366. doi:10.1136/bjo.2005.079657
- Tideman JW, Polling JR, Voortman T, et al. Low serum vitamin D is associated with axial length and risk of myopia in young children. *Eur J Epidemiol.* 2016;31(5):491–499. doi:10.1007/s10654-016-0128-8
- Recko M, Stahl ED. Childhood myopia: epidemiology, risk factors, and prevention. *Mo Med.* 2015;112(2):116–121.
- Huang Y, Kee CS, Hocking PM, et al. A genome-wide association study for susceptibility to visual experience-induced myopia. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* 2019;60(2):559–569. doi:10.1167/iovs.18-25597
- Khor CC, Miyake M, Chen LJ, et al. Genome-wide association study identifies ZFHX1B as a susceptibility locus for severe myopia. *Hum Mol Genet*. 2013;22(25):5288–5294. doi:10.1093/hmg/ddt385
- Meng W, Butterworth J, Bradley DT, et al. A genome-wide association study provides evidence for association of chromosome 8p23 (MYP10) and 10q21.1 (MYP15) with high myopia in the French Population. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.* 2012;53(13):7983–7988. doi:10.1167/iovs.12-10409
- 18. Li Z, Qu J, Xu X, et al. A genome-wide association study reveals association between common variants in an intergenic region of 4q25 and high-grade myopia in the Chinese Han population. *Hum Mol Genet*. 2011;20(14):2861–2868. doi:10.1093/hmg/ddr169
- Solouki AM, Verhoeven VJ, van Duijn CM, et al. A genome-wide association study identifies a susceptibility locus for refractive errors and myopia at 15q14. *Nat Genet.* 2010;42(10):897–901. doi:10.1038/ng.663
- Hysi PG, Young TL, Mackey DA, et al. A genome-wide association study for myopia and refractive error identifies a susceptibility locus at 15q25. *Nat Genet.* 2010;42(10):902–905. doi:10.1038/ng.664
- Wang Q, Gao Y, Wang P, et al. Replication study of significant single nucleotide polymorphisms associated with myopia from two genome-wide association studies. *Mol Vis.* 2011;17:3290–3299.
- Boyle AP, Hong EL, Hariharan M, et al. Annotation of functional variation in personal genomes using Regulome DB. *Genome Res.* 2012;22(9):1790–1797. doi:10.1101/gr.137323.112
- Ward LD, Kellis M. HaploReg v4: systematic mining of putative causal variants, cell types, regulators and target genes for human complex traits and disease. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 2016;44(D1):D877– 881. doi:10.1093/nar/gkv1340
- 24. Baird PN, Saw SM, Lanca C, et al. Myopia. *Nat Rev Dis Primers*. 2020;6(1):99.

#### **Dove**press

55 I

on the American Chemical Society's Chemical Abstracts Service (CAS). The manuscript management system is completely online and includes 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.

Submit your manuscript here: https://www.dovepress.com/pharmacogenomics-and-personalized-medicine-journal