

Role of the autophagy-related marker LC3 expression in hepatocellular carcinoma: a meta-analysis

Yu-Chen Meng¹ · Xiao-Li Lou¹ · Li-Yuan Yang¹ · Dong Li² · Yan-Qiang Hou¹

Received: 30 December 2019 / Accepted: 2 March 2020 / Published online: 10 March 2020 @ The Author(s) 2020

Abstract

Background Microtubule-associated protein 1 light chain 3 (LC3), an autophagic gene, has been reported as a vital marker for many diseases and cancers. However, the role of LC3 in hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) was not still investigated. Therefore, we conducted a meta-analysis to examine the association of LC3 with its clinicopathological and prognostic in HCC. **Methods** We consulted the PubMed, Cochrane Library, Web of Science, EMBASE, China National Knowledge Infrastructure and Wan Fang databases for published studies on LC3 in HCC. Newcastle–Ottawa scale was used to screen the quality of the literature. The statistical analysis was calculated by STATA 14.2.

Results Of the 1329 titles identified, 10 articles involving 949 patients in HCC were included in this meta-analysis. The results of our study show that increased LC3 expression is related to size of tumor, but not to gender, age, number of tumor, liver cirrhosis, HBsAg, TNM stage, alpha fetoprotein, vascular invasion and histological grade. Positive LC3 expression was associated with overall survival by pooled hazard ratio.

Conclusions This meta-analysis indicated that positive LC3 expression was related to size of tumor, and could predict prognosis in human hepatocellular carcinoma.

Keywords LC3 · Hepatocellular carcinoma · Meta-analysis · Prognosis

Introduction

Hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) is the third leading cause of cancer-related death and the fifth most common incidence rate (Yao et al. 2019), and it has a poor prognosis (Liang et al. 2018). About 800,000 of new cases of HCC in each year were examined worldwide, People's Republic of China count more than 50% of these cases (Gingold et al. 2018). Currently, HCC was treated with surgery, chemotherapy, radiotherapy and sorafenib-targeted drug therapy (Hartke et al. 2017; Boyvat 2017). Although the treatment measures

Dong Li lidong@tongji.edu.cn

Yan-Qiang Hou houyanqiang@aliyun.com

¹ Department of Central Laboratory, Songjiang Hospital Affiliated First People's Hospital, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, 746 Zhongshan Road, Shanghai 201600, China

² Department of Laboratory Medicine, Tongji Hospital of Tongji University School of Medicine, 389 Xincun Road, Shanghai 200065, China have made a great progress recently, the clinical cure rate is still poor, especially number of patients miss the surgery because of the lack of early detection and treatment (Grandhi et al. 2016). Therefore, developing effective early predictive marker is necessary to HCC.

Autophagy is an intracellular catabolic process which contributes to homeostasis, differentiation, recycling of damaged organelles or long-lived proteins (Lee and Jang 2015; Han et al. 2014). Increasing evidences have demonstrated that autophagy is associated with tumor development and progression (Lv et al. 2019). Several proteins are involved in the human autophagic pathway, the microtubule-associated protein 1 light chain 3 (LC3) and Beclin-1 play an important role which have been reported to associate with the physiology and pathogenesis of human liver disease (Chih et al. 2017).

LC3, the mammalian homolog of the yeast Atg8p, is considered as the crucial component of autophagosomes (Maruyama et al. 2014). It includes three isoforms of LC3A, LC3B, LC3C, of which LC3B is associated with autophagy levels (Wu et al. 2014a). LC3 has been reported in several tumors (including ovarian cancer (Shen et al. 2008), brain cancer (Ghavami et al. 2014), colorectal cancer (Wu et al. 2015), prostate cancer (Zhang et al. 2017), breast cancer (Jiang et al. 2017), melanoma (Segala et al. 2017). A meta-analysis of LC3 and ovarian cancer has shown that LC3 expression is associated with FIGO stage (Zhao et al. 2017). LC3 expression has also been found to show controversial results in the clinicopathological features in HCC patients (Lee et al. 2013; Bao et al. 2014; Ding et al. 2008). Wu et al. (2015) have indicated that LC3 expression is significantly associated with vascular invasion; high LC3 expression had indicated a poor overall survival (OS). However, Wu et al. (2014b) have found that LC3 expression is significantly correlated with male gender, large tumor size, tumor stage and worse relapsefree and OS. Chih et al. (2017) have demonstrated that the absence of LC3 expression is strongly predictive of immediate mortality for HCC. Hence, we conducted a meta-analysis to explore the relationship between LC3 expression and its clinicopathological characteristics and prognostic value in HCC.

Methods

Search strategy

A literature search of the PubMed, Web of Science, Cochrane Library, EMBASE, Chinese China National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI) and Chinese WanFang was performed to English and Chinese articles published before September 2019 using combinations of the following search terms: "LC3" or "microtubule-associated protein 1 light chain 3" or "Atg8p" and "hepatocellular carcinoma" or "HCC" or "liver cancer" or "hepatic tumor" or "liver tumor" or "hepatic cancer".

Eligibility criteria

Studies included in the meta-analysis had to meet the following inclusion criteria: (1) cohort or case-control design; (2) the patients were diagnosed with HCC and included clinicophathological or survival information; (3) LC3 expression was determined by immunohistochemistry (IHC). (4) The literature was published in English or Chinese and the full text was available.

The exclusion of studies were as follows: (1) case reports, reviews, letters, conference abstracts, simple commentaries, unpublished reports, (2) republished studies using the same dataset or patients, (3) the cohort or case-control design were unclear.

Data extraction

All data were assessed by two reviewers (Xiaoli Lou and Liyuan Yang) who extracted data that include the first author's name, publication year, sample size, country, type of cancer, detection method, patient characteristics, hazard ratio (HR) with 95% confidence interval (CI) for OS.

Quality assessment

Quality assessment was assessed using the Newcastle–Ottawa Scale (NOS). The NOS total scores ranged from 0 to 9, and scores 1–3, 4–6, 7–9 were defined as low-, moderate-, or high-quality studies, respectively. The ten articles included in this meta-analysis were considered to have a high quality.

Statistical analysis

The STATA software of version 14.2 (Stata Corporation, College Station, TX, USA) was performed in meta-analysis to assess the correlation between LC3 expression and clinicopathological features in HCC. Heterogeneity between the studies was tested using chi-squared test (Q test) and l^2 test. There was no significant heterogeneity when p value (Qtest) > 0.1 and $l^2 \le 50\%$, the fixed-effects model was chosen; otherwise, a random-effects model was used. To explore the sources of heterogeneity, we conducted subgroup analyses based on sample size, NOS score, area and average age. Publication bias was assessed by Begg's test and funnel plot.

Results

A total of 1329 relevant studies were identified from the database, and 1281 studies were excluded based on screening of duplication, titles, abstracts, non-LC3 relation (Fig. 1). Full text of 48 articles was retrieved and assessed for eligibility. Among 48 studies, 38 were excluded because of ineligible and duplicated data about LC3 expression. Finally, ten publications were eligible for this meta-analysis (Wu et al. 2014a, b, 2016; Lee et al. 2013; Xi et al. 2013; Yu et al. 2018; Li et al. 2018; Zhao et al. 2016; Lu 2012; Song et al. 2014), all of which were cohort studies.

The characteristics of the included articles are summarized in Table 1. Four of the ten studies were written in English and six were in Chinese. These studies were published from 2012 to 2018 and a total of 949 patients with HCC were comprised. The number of patients ranged from 48 to 190; 6 studies include \leq 100 patients, and 4 studies include > 100 patients. Among the ten studies, nine were from China, one Fig. 1 Flow chart of study

selection



from Korea. LC3 expression were investigated through IHC staining. The quality of each included article was evaluated by NOS. These scores of studies were all \geq 6, indicating the high quality of included studies (Table 2).

Meta-analysis of clinicopathological characteristics

In this study, we assessed the correlation between LC3 expression and the clinicopathological features of HCC. As shown in Fig. 2 and Table 3, positive LC3 expression was positively associated with tumor size (OR 1.28, 95% CI [1.00, 1.65], p = 0.050, fixed effect). However, the expression of LC3 was not associated with gender (OR 1.13, 95% CI [0.82, 1.56], p = 0.452, fixed effect), age (OR 1.01, 95% CI [0.80, 1.28], p = 0.920, fixed effect), number of tumors (OR 0.97, 95% CI [0.67, 1.39], p = 0.838, fixed effect), TNM stage (OR 0.90, 95% CI [0.70, 1.16], p = 0.424, fixed effect), alpha fetoprotein (AFP) (OR 1.22, 95% CI [0.85, 1.73], p = 0.276, fixed effect), vascular invasion (OR 1.17, 95%

CI [0.84, 1.64], p = 0.357, fixed effect), liver cirrhosis (OR 0.92, 95% CI [0.68, 1.26], p = 0.618, fixed effect), HBsAg (OR 1.11, 95% CI [0.83, 1.48], p = 0.483, fixed effect) and histological grade (OR 0.95, 95% CI [0.70, 1.28], p = 0.718, random effect).

Subgroup analysis

As shown in Table 4, to explore the potential sources of heterogeneity, the subgroup analysis for histological grade and tumor size was performed using the sample size, NOS score, area and mean age. When the classifications of subgroups were based on sample size, LC3 expression was related to tumor size (n > 100: OR 1.39, 95% CI [1.02, 1.88], p = 0.034, random effect) in the large sample size but not in the subgroup of small sample size. Heterogeneity of histological grade were in the small sample size subgroup ($n \le 100$, $I^2 = 66.9$), and tumor size were in the large sample size subgroup (n > 100, $I^2 = 66.1$). However,

Refer- ences	Year	Country	type	Num- ber of patients	Sex Male (+/-) Female (+/-)	Age older (+/-) middle aged (+/-)	HbsAg yes (+/-) no (+/-)	Liver cir- rhosis yes (+/-) no (+/-)	AFP positive (+/-) negative (+/-)	Tumor size > 5 cm (+/-) $\leq 5 \text{ cm}$ (+/-)	Tumor number single (+/-) multiple (+/-)	Vascular invasion yes (+/-) no $(+/-)$	Histo- logical grade low (+/-) and moder- ate, high (+/-)	TNM stage I, II I(+/-) III, IV (+/-)	Method	Cutoff C	S data rovide
Wu et al. (2014a)	2014	China	нсс	156	113/30 11/2	55/18 69/14	93/24 31/8	86/26 38/6	NA	60/11 64/21	79/22 45/10	33/2 91/30	109/28 15/4	52/20 72/12	IHC 4		es
Wu et al. (2014b)	2014	China	НСС	150	52/74 32/14	18/58 37/07	4773 8773	50/86 5/0	NA	52/54 3/44	48/20	NA	104/32 55/95	35/80 30/15	IHC 50%		es
Xi et al. (2013)	2013	China	HCC	125	58/50 10/7	34/30 34/27	61/45 7/12	22/16 22/16	42/14 26/43	38/38	NA	37/19 31/38	29/10 39/47	30/32 38/25	IHC 1		es
Lee et al. (2013)	2013	Korea	HCC	190	32/126 8/24	23/74 17/76	27/110 13/40	20/76 20/74	9/47 31/103	16/60 24/90	NA	NA	11/25 29/125	17/63 23/87	IHC 5	2	lo
Yu et al. (2018)	2018	China	НСС	56	30/10 9/7	26/10 13/7	28/10 11/7	NA	23/7 16/10	25/7 14/10	NA	NA	NA	NA	IHC 4	2	o
Li et al. (2018)	2018	China	НСС	49	25/13 6/5	19/14 12/4	25/11 6/7	NA	16/10 15/8	20/9 11/9	NA	8/2 23/16	24/12 7/6	25/14 6/4	IHC 4	4	lo
Zhao et al. (2016)	2016	China	нсс	52	13/22 8/9	11/16 10/15	17/30 4/1	15/25 6/6	16/24 5/7	10/23 13/6	NA	0/1 21/30	19/15 2/16	17/14 4/17	IHC 4	4	9
Lu et al. (2012)	2012	China	нсс	62	20/26 9/9	14/13 13/22	21/28 6/7	NA	NA	NA	22/24 5/11	NA	11/3 16/32	22/33 6/3	IHC 1	Z	lo
Song et al. (2014)	2014	China	НСС	48	18/19 5/6	11/8 17/12	20/3 22/3	21/2 24/1	NA	9/12 14/13	NA	6/10 17/15	6/16 17/9	15/8 8/17	IHC 4	4	0
Wu et al. (2016)	2016	China	HCC	61	18/35 1/7	6/9 13/33	19/35 0/7	18/37 1/5	NA	18/27 1/15	NA	5/19 14/23	15/41 4/1	NA	IHC 1	Z	lo
HCC, hep?	tocelula	tr carcino	ma; AFP, a	ulpha fetopr	otein; NA, n	tot applicat	le; IHC, imr	nunohistoc	hemistry; T.	'NM stage, 1	tumor-node	-metastasis	stage				

 Table 1
 Characteristics of studies included in the meta-analysis

Table	2	Newcastle-	-Ottawa sca	le for	quality	assessment
-------	---	------------	-------------	--------	---------	------------

Study	Selection				Comparability	Outcome			Total score
	Exposed cohort	Non- exposed cohort	Ascertain- ment of exposure	Outcome of interest	Control for factor	Assessment of outcome	Follow-up long enough	Adequacy of follow-up	
Dong-Hao Wu	*	*	*	*	**	*	*	*	9
Wen-Yong Wu	*	*	*	*	**	*	*		8
Shao-Yan Xi	*	*	*	*	**	*	*	*	9
Yoo Jin Lee	*	*	*	*	**	*	*	*	9
Yu Hai	*	*	*	*	**	*			7
Li Fang	*	*	*	*	**	*			7
Ya-Tong Zhao	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	8
Yu-Dong Lu	*	*	*	*	**	*			7
Meng-Qi Song	*	*	*	*	*	*			6
Wen-Yong Wu	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	8

A study can be awarded one star for each numbered item within the selection and outcome categories. A maximum of two stars can be given for comparability. *1 points of score are added in quality assessment. **2 points of score are added in quality assessment. https://www.ohri.ca/progr ams/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.asp

there was no heterogeneity in the tumor size with the small simple size and histological grade with the large simple size. The subgroup was classified by NOS score, LC3 expression was correlated with tumor size (n > 7): OR 1.33, 95% CI [1.00, 1.76], *p* = 0.051, random effect). Heterogeneity was in both subgroups of histological grade $(n > 7, I^2 = 52.9; n < 7, I^2 = 63.3)$. There was no heterogeneity in subgroup of tumor size $(n \le 7, I^2 = 0.0)$. On the basis of the area, the LC3 expression was connected with tumor size (midland: OR 1.73, 95% CI [1.04, 2.88], p = 0.035, random effect) and histological grade (north: OR 0.94, 95% CI [0.51, 1.75], p = 0.035, random effect; midland: OR 1.51, 95% CI [0.80, 2.86], p = 0.033, random effect). There was no heterogeneity in southern subgroup of tumor size and histological grade. Subgroup analysis based on mean age showed that expression of LC3 was associated with tumor size (age \geq 55: OR 1.81, 95% CI [1.22, 2.70], p = 0.003, random effect). Heterogeneity was observed in tumor size subgroup (age ≥ 55 , $I^2 = 61.0$) and histological grade subgroup (age < 55, $I^2 = 66$). Results of subgroups analysis revealed that the sample size, NOS score, area and mean age score most likely caused heterogeneity in tumor size and histological grade.

Correlation of LC3 expression with overall survival (OS)

Based on meta-analysis, we evaluated the prognostic value of LC3 that high LC3 expression was correlation

with the overall survival (HR 1.809, 95% CI [1.164, 2.812], p = 0.008, fixed effect) (Fig. 3).

Publication bias

As shown in Fig. 4, the Begg's test was used to evaluate potential publication bias. No publication bias was confirmed to exist in gender (p = 0.074), age (p = 0.474), liver cirrhosis (p = 0.548), HBsAg (p = 0.592), number of tumors (p = 0.296), size of tumors (p = 0.466), TNM stage (p = 0.266), AFP (p = 0.806), OS (p = 0.602), vascular invasion (p = 0.133), histological grade (p = 0.348). We conduct a sensitivity analysis by excluding one study in turn. Interestingly, heterogeneity of histological grade declined from $I^2 = 50.3$ to $I^2 = 37.6$ after removing the article from Zhao et al. (2016).

Discussion

Autophagy plays a crucial role in immune responses, cellular metabolism, apoptosis, and cell death (Choi et al. 2013). It has been reported that autophagy remains multiple roles in tumor, it may promote tumor progression and also can inhibit tumor transformation (Morselli et al. 2009). The attention of the relationship between autophagy and cancer have been increased. Recent studies have focused on evaluating the clinicopathological and prognostic values of autophagy-related markers in

Fig. 2 Forest plot of studies assessing the relationship between LC3 expression and a gender, **b** age, $\hat{\mathbf{c}}$ liver cirrhosis, d HbsAg, e tumor number, f AFP, g tumor size, h TNM stage, i vascular invasion, j histological grade. CI confidence interval; OR odds ratio

Α		В
Study ID	OR (95% CI) Weight%	Study \mathbb{D}
Dong-Hao Wu (2014)	0.93 (0.40, 2.16), 15.64	Dong-Hao Wu (
Wen-Yong Wu (2014)	3 30 (0 95 11 44) 5 13	Wen-Yong Wu
Shao-Van Xi (2013)	0.91 (0.39, 2.12), 15.58	Shao-Y an Xi (2
Yoo Tin Lee (2013)	0.81 (0.34, 1.92) 15:30	Yoo Jin Lee (20
Yu Hai (2018)	- 133 (0.52, 3.43) 10.55	Yu Hai (2018)
Li Fang (2018)	- 1.21 (0.40, 3.68) 7.94	Li F ang (2018)
Yatong Zhao (2016)	0.79 (0.28, 2.27) 10.68	Y atong Zhao (2)
Yu-Dong Lu (2012)	0.99 (0.35, 2.79) 10.07	Yu-Dong Lu (20
Meng-Qi Song (2014)	- 1.07 (0.32, 3.55) 7.26	Meng-Qi Song (
Wen-Yong Wu (2016)	2.72 (0.32, 23.24) 1.84	Wen-Yong Wu
Overal1 (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.820)	1.13 (0.82, 1.56) 100.00	Overall (I-squar
.043 1	23.2	
С		D
Study ID	OR (95% CI) Weight%	Study ID
Dong-Hao Wu (2014)	0.89 (0.53, 1.49) 36.17	Dong-Hao Wu (201 Wen-Yong Wu (20
Wen-Yong Wu (2014)	1.03 (0.35, 3.01) 7.89	Shao-Yan Xi (2013
Shao-Van Xi (2013)	0.01 (0.48, 1.72) 23.60	Yoo Jin Lee (2013)
	0.02 (0.50, 1.04) 10.86	Yu Hai (2018)
	0.96 (0.30, 1.94) 19.80	Li Fang (2018)
Y atong Zhao (2016)	0.75 (0.24, 2.36) 7.82	Yatong Zhao (2016
Meng-Qi Song (2014) *	0.70 (0.11, 4.51) 3.02	Yu-Dong Lu (2012)
Wen-Yong Wu (2016)	1.96 (0.22, 17.42) 1.64	Wen Vong Wu (20)
Overall (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.993)	0.92 (0.68, 1.26) 100.00	Overall (I-squared
.0574 1	17.4	.010
E		F
		Study ID
Study ID	OR (95% CI) Weight%	
		Shao-Yan Xi (201
Dong-Hao Wu (2014)	- 1.05 (0.64, 1.71) 53.65	Y oo Jin Lee (2013
Shao-Yan Xi (2013)	- 0.95 (0.50, 1.82) 32.67	1 u riai (2018)
Yu-Dong Lu (2012)	0.65 (0.21, 2.01) 13.67	Y atong Zhao (201

Study ID	OR (95% CI) Weight
Dong-Hao Wu (2014)	0.91 (0.56, 1.46) 25.67
Wen-Yong Wu (2014)	0.77 (0.40, 1.48) 14.94
Shao-Y an Xi (2013)	0.95 (0.53, 1.72) 16.09
Yoo Jin Lee (2013)	1.30 (0.65, 2.58) 10.23
Yu Hai (2018) *	- 1.11 (0.47, 2.63) 7.03
Li Fang (2018) *	0.77 (0.30, 1.96) 7.06
Y atong Zhao (2016)	1.02 (0.37, 2.81) 5.28
Yu-Dong Lu (2012) *	1.40 (0.56, 3.46) 5.63
Meng-Qi Song (2014)	1.40 (0.51, 3.81) 4.58
Wen-Yong Wu (2016)	1.42 (0.46, 4.38) 3.48
Overal1 (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.964)	1.01 (0.80, 1.28) 100.00
.228 1	4.38

Dong-Hao Wu (2014)	1.00 (0.58, 1.72) 29.23
Wen-Yong Wu (2014)	1.47 (0.63, 3.44) 10.57
Shao-Yan Xi (2013)	1.56 (0.62, 3.93) 8.68
Yoo Лп Lee (2013)	0.80 (0.39, 1.67) 17.48
Yu Hai (2018)	1.21 (0.49, 2.95) 9.93
Li Fang (2018)	1.50 (0.50, 4.49) 6.09
Yatong Zhao (2016)	0.45 (0.11, 1.88) 5.81
Yu-Dong Lu (2012)	0.93 (0.31, 2.77) 7.46
Meng-Qi Song (2014)	0.95 (0.22, 4.20) 4.01
Wen-Yong Wu (2016)	→ 5.37 (0.29, 98.43) 0.75
Overall (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.839)	1.11 (0.83, 1.48) 100.00
.0102 1	98.4

OR (95% CI) Weight%

Study ID	OR (95% CI)	Weight
Dong-Hao Wu (2014)	1.05 (0.64, 1.71)	53.65
Shao-Yan Xi (2013)	0.95 (0.50, 1.82)	32.67
Yu-Dong Lu (2012)	0.65 (0.21, 2.01)	13.67
Overall (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.754)	0.96 (0.67, 1.39)	100.00
.212 1	4.72	

Study ID	OR (95% CI)	Weight%
Shao-Yan Xi (2013)	* 1.99 (1.09, 3.64)	27.18
Y oo Jin Lee (2013) *	0.69 (0.31, 1.55)	27.19
Yu Hai (2018)	1.25 (0.55, 2.85)	18.20
Li Fang (2018) *	0.94 (0.38, 2.32)	17.56
Y atong Zhao (2016)	0.96 (0.29, 3.17)	9.87
Overall (I-squared = 18.1%, p = 0.300)	1.22 (0.85, 1.73)	100.00
275 1	3.64	

G

н

Study ID	OR (95% CI) Weight?	study ID	OR (95% CI) Weight%
Dong-Hao Wu (2014)	1.12 (0.70, 1.80) 29.79	Dong-Hao Wu (2014)	0.84 (0.52, 1.36) 30.42
Wen-Yong Wu (2014)	7.19 (2.13, 24.27) 2.85	Wen-Yong Wu (2014)	0.53 (0.27, 1.04) 18.44
Shao-Yan Xi (2013)	1.22 (0.67, 2.23) 17.71	Shao-Yan Xi (2013)	0.80 (0.44, 1.45) 20.06
Yoo Jin Lee (2013)	1.00 (0.50, 2.01) 14.56	Yoo Jin Lee (2013)	0.98 (0.49, 1.96) 13.36
Yu Hai (2018)	1.34 (0.58, 3.11) 8.66	Li Fang (2018)	1 07 (0 35 3 31) 4 81
Li Fang (2018)	1.25 (0.49, 3.18) 7.32	Vatong Zhao (2016)	2 88 (0 85 9 77) 2 79
Yatong Zhao (2016)	0.44 (0.16, 1.20) 10.50	Va Dana Lu (2012)	2.35 (0.35, 9.77) 2.79
Meng-Qi Song (2014)	0.83 (0.30, 2.28) 7.60	Yu-Dong Lu (2012)	0.39 (0.19, 1.88) 5.87
Wen-Yong Wu (2016)	→ 6.40 (0.79, 51.89) 1.03	Meng-Qi Song (2014)	2.04 (0.73, 5.70) 4.26
Overall (I-squared = 49.7%, p = 0.044)	1.28 (1.00, 1.65) 100.00	Overall (I-squared = 23.5%, p = 0.242)	0.90 (0.70, 1.16) 100.00
i 	51.9	J	9.77
Study ID	OR (95% CI)	Veight% Study ID	OR (95% CI) Weight?
		Dong-Hao Wu (2014)	0.99 (0.48, 2.04) 17.31
Dong-Hao Wu (2014)	1.25 (0.72, 2.17)	36.15 Wen-Yong Wu (2014) *	0.60 (0.14, 2.59) 4.96
Shao-Yan Xi (2013)	1.47 (0.81, 2.66)	28.59 Shao-Yan Xi (2013)	0.61 (0.33, 1.12) 30.23
Li Fang (2018)	- 136(0.47.3.03)	Yoo Jin Lee (2013)	1.62 (0.74, 3.55) 10.62
	1.50 (0.47, 5.55)	Li Fang (2018)	0.81 (0.28, 2.32) 9.12
Ya-Tong Zhao (201 6) *	0.80 (0.03, 20.39)		
Meng-Qi Song (2014)	0.78 (0.26, 2.36)	1.41 Yu-Dong Lu (2012)	0.42 (0.16, 1.12) 13.88
Wen-Yong Wu (2016)	0.55 (0.18, 1.73)	3.35 Meng-Qi Song (2014)	2.40 (0.81, 7.13) 5.14
Overall (I-squared = 0.0% p = 0.708)	1.17 (0.84, 1.64)	00.00 Wen-Y ong Wu (2016)	0.33 (0.08, 1.40) 6.55
		Overall (I-squared = 50.3%, p = 0.041)	0.95 (0.70, 1.28) 100.00
.0313 1	32	.0416 1	24.1

$\underline{\textcircled{O}}$ Springer

Table 3 LC3 clinicopathological features for HCC

Clinicopathological features	Number of	Number of	Pooled OR (95% CI)	Meta-regression	Heterogen	neity	Model used
	studies	patients		<i>p</i> value	p value	$I^{2}(\%)$	
Gender	10	949	1.13 (0.82, 1.56)	0.452	0.820	0.0	Fixed
Age	10	949	1.01 (0.80, 1.28)	0.920	0.964	0.0	Fixed
HbsAg	10	949	1.11 (0.83, 1.48)	0.483	0.839	0.0	Fixed
AFP	5	472	1.22 (0.85, 1.73)	0.276	0.300	18.1	Fixed
Liver cirrhosis	7	782	0.92 (0.68, 1.26)	0.618	0.993	0.0	Fixed
Tumor size	9	887	1.28 (1.00, 1.65)	0.050	0.044	49.7	Fixed
Tumor number	3	343	0.97 (0.67, 1.39)	0.838	0.754	0.0	Fixed
Vascular invasion	6	491	1.17 (0.84, 1.64)	0.357	0.708	0.0	Fixed
Histological grade	9	893	0.95 (0.70, 1.28)	0.718	0.004	50.3	Random
TNM stage	8	783	0.90 (0.70, 1.16)	0.424	0.242	23.5	Fixed

,Fixed fixed-effects model, Random random-effects model

Table 4Subgroup analysis ofhistological grade and tumorsize by sample size, NOS score,area and average age

Subgroups	Number of studies	Number of patients	Pooled OR (95% CI)	p value	PHet	$I^{2}(\%)$	Model used
Tumor size							
Sample							
n>100	4	621	1.39 (1.02, 1.88)	0.034	0.031	66.1	Random
$n \leq 100$	5	218	1.09 (0.70, 1.69)	0.697	0.166	38.2	Fixed
NOS score							
>7	6	734	1.33 (1.00, 1.76)	0.051	0.009	67.6	Random
≤7	3	105	1.15 (0.68, 1.95)	0.610	0.753	0.0	Fixed
Area							
North	2	246	1.13 (0.66, 1.92)	0.662	0.600	0.0	Fixed
Midland	4	311	1.73 (1.04, 2.88)	0.035	0.001	81.2	Random
South	3	330	1.17 (0.83, 1.66)	0.364	0.964	0.0	Fixed
Average age							
≥55	5	506	1.81 (1.22, 2.70)	0.003	0.036	61.0	Random
< 55	4	381	1.01 (0.73, 1.40)	0.967	0.340	10.6	Fixed
Histological g	grade						
Sample							
n > 100	4	621	0.88 (0.60, 1.31)	0.536	0.251	26.8	Fixed
$n \leq 100$	5	272	1.05 (0.64, 1.71)	0.843	0.017	66.9	Random
NOS score							
>7	6	734	0.96 (0.67, 1.37)	0.822	0.059	52.9	Random
≤ 7	3	159	0.91 (0.51, 1.62)	0.746	0.065	63.3	Random
Area							
North	2	252	0.94 (0.51, 1.75)	0.854	0.035	77.5	Random
Midland	4	311	1.51 (0.80, 2.86)	0.206	0.033	65.7	Random
South	3	330	0.76 (0.49, 1.16)	0.205	0.596	0.0	Fixed
Average age							
≥55	4	450	0.95 (0.55, 1.64)	0.859	0.230	30.3	Fixed
<55	5	443	0.94 (0.65, 1.36)	0.751	0.019	66.0	Random

NOS Newcastle-Ottawa Scale



Fig. 3 Forest plot of studies assessing the relationship between LC3 expression andOS in HCC patients

cancer revealed their clinical significances. LC3 is identified autophagy-related gene that plays a crucial role in the process of tumorgenesis (Galais et al. 2019). Currently, the role of LC3 in HCC is controversial reported. Therefore, we performed this meta-analysis to evaluating clinicopathological and prognostic values of LC3 in HCC.

In this meta-analysis, 949 patients from 10 studies were performed. Positive LC3 expression is related to tumor size but not to gender, age, number of tumors, HBsAg, liver cirrhosis, TNM stage, AFP, vascular invasion and histological grade. The relationship between LC3 expression and tumor size was explored, using 887 patients from 9 articles. Eight of the nine studies showed that LC3 expression was not associated with tumor size, but the pooled results showed a positive correlation between LC3 expression and tumor size. Tumor growth can cause the ischemic and hypoxic environment, LC3 may alleviate this state and enhance the environmental viability of tumor. The increase in tumor diameter induces a sustained increase in LC3 levels in tumor cells, which in turn induces autophagic recycle, provides nutrients for the tumor cells, and promotes tumor proliferation. Thus, this result indicates that LC3 may plays an important role in the occurrence and development of HCC. Moreover, our data indicated that high LC3 expression level is related to the overall survival in HCC, which also confirmed by Wu et al. (2014a) and Lee et al. (2013) studies. Therefore, the change of LC3 level may be related to the occurrence, evolution and poor prognosis of tumor, suggesting that the expression of LC3 is closely related to the occurrence and development of HCC.

This study has been the first comprehensive and systematic meta-analysis exploring the relationship between LC3 and its clinicopathological fators in HCC. Recent reports show that the combination of other related genes can improve clinical predictive value. Zhao et al. (2017) have found that beclin1 and LC3 can be potential prognostic markers in retrospective studies of ovarian cancer. Wu et al. (2018) have demonstrated that ULK1 combined with LC3B would improve prognosis assessment of the HCC patients and so on. Thus, LC3 can also be combined with other related genes for clinical diagnosis.

Significant heterogeneity with the correlation of LC3 expression and histological grade or tumor size was determined in this analysis. Sensitivity and subgroup analysis were performed to explore the sources of the heterogeneities. Subgroup analysis based on NOS showed that LC3 expression was uncorrelated with histological grade of HCC patients. The heterogeneity existed in subgroup of tumor size $(n \le 7)$. The subgroups were classified by sample size, LC3 expression was related to tumor size (n > 100) but not to histological grade. On the basis of the area, heterogeneity was both in midland subgroup of tumor size and histological grade. Subgroup analysis based on mean age, heterogeneity was observed in tumor size subgroup (age \geq 55) and histological grade subgroup (age < 55). This suggests that the reasons leading to the heterogeneity have many different characteristics. First, the detection methods and publication years are different. Second, IHC, a semi-quantitative assessment method, which is affected by many factors such as the concentration and incubation time of the antibody and diaminobezidin, the quality of the antibody, and so on, some of which are based on individual manners. This may be a potential factor for the occurrence of heterogeneity. Third, diverse sample sources exist in each study. Finally, lack of eligible articles for this meta-analysis. Therefore, more highquality and large-scale studies on the relationship of LC3 and HCC should be performed in the future.

Limitations of the study

Our meta-analysis has some limitations including: (1) the number of included articles was less, more high-quality studies need to be included; (2) included studies have different

Fig. 4 Funnel plot of studies assessing publication bias of the relationship betweenLC3 expression and **a** gender, **b** age, **c** liver cirrhosis, **d** HbsAg, **e** tumor number, **f**AFP, **g** tumor size, **h** TNM stage, **i** vascular invasion, **j** histological grade



cut-off values for IHC scores, this may lead to a potential heterogeneity. The exploration of heterogeneity may have been inadequate, due to the limited variables collected from included studies; (3) of the included studies, nine were from China and one was from Korea, studies from other regions were not available; (4) some individual research data could not be obtained, and the analysis of the prognostic role of LC3 included only three studies, the research volume was relatively small.

Conclusions

In summary, our meta-analysis indicated that positive LC3 is only positively correlated with tumor size in clinicopathological features of HCC. LC3 can be used a prognostic marker in HCC and combined with other related genes may improve clinical value. However, these results need to be confirmed by more large sample size and high-quality articles.

Acknowledgements This work was supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC; no. 81702729), Shanghai Songjiang District Science and Technology Research Project (no. 18sjkjggbb) and Shanghai Municipal Health Bureau Project (no. 201940025).

Author contributions All authors contributed to this work. Study design: Y-QH. Writing, constitute figures and tables and data analysis: Y-CM. Screening of abstracts and articles: X-LL and L-YY. Critically reviewing manuscript: DL and Y-QH.

Compliance with ethical standards

Conflict of interest The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/.

References

- Bao L, Chandra PK, Moroz K et al (2014) Impaired autophagy response in human hepatocellular carcinoma. Exp Mol Pathol 96:149–154
- Boyvat F (2017) Interventional radiologic treatment of hepatocellular carcinoma. Exp Clin Transplant 15(suppl 2):25–30

- Chih WL, Chih CH, Lee PH et al (2017) The autophagy marker LC3 strongly predicts immediate mortality after surgical resection for hepatocellular carcinoma. Oncotarget 8:91902–91913
- Choi AM, Ryter SW, Levine B (2013) Autophagy in human health and disease. N Engl J Med 368:651–662
- Ding ZB, Shi YH, Zhou J et al (2008) Association of autophagy defect with a malignant phenotype and poor prognosis of hepatocellular carcinoma. Cancer Res 68:9167–9175
- Galais M, Pradel B, Vergne I et al (2019) LAP (LC3-associated phagocytosis): phagocytosis or autophagy? Med Sci (Paris) 35:635-642
- Ghavami S, Shojaei S, Yeganeh B et al (2014) Autophagy and apoptosis dysfunction in neurodegenerative disorders. Prog Neurobiol 112:24–49
- Gingold JA, Zhu D, Lee DF et al (2018) Genomic profiling and metabolic homeostasis in primary liver cancers. Trends Mol Med 24:395–411
- Grandhi MS, Kim AK, Ronnekleiv-Kelly SM et al (2016) Hepatocellular carcinoma: from diagnosis to treatment. Surg Oncol 25:74–85
- Han Y, Xue XF, Shen HG et al (2014) Prognostic significance of Beclin-1 expression in colorectal cancer: a meta-analysis. Asian Pac J Cancer Prev 15:4583–4587
- Hartke J, Johnson M, Ghabril M (2017) The diagnosis and treatment of hepatocellular carcinoma. Semin Diagn Pathol 34:153–159
- Jiang X, Bao Y, Liu H et al (2017) VPS34 stimulation of p62 phosphorylation for cancer progression. Oncogene 36:6850–6862
- Lee YJ, Jang BK (2015) The role of autophagy in hepatocellular carcinoma. Int J Mol Sci 16:26629–26643
- Lee Y, Hah YJ, Kang YN et al (2013) The autophagy-related marker LC3 can predict prognosis in human hepatocellular carcinoma. PLoS ONE 8:e81540
- Li F, Xu P, Gao TT et al (2018) Expression and significance of autophagy related protein Beclin1, LC3, and mTOR in hepatic carcinoma. Chin J Gerontol 8:3890–3892
- Liang CJ, Ge H, Zhang KT et al (2018) Role of beclin1 expression in patients with hepatocellular carcinoma: a meta-analysis. Onco-Targets Ther 4:2387–2397
- Lu YD (2012) Expression and significance of autophagy related protein LC3. MA thesis. Taiyuan: Shanxi medical University, China
- Lv C, Zhang Z, Zhao T et al (2019) The anti-tumour effect of Mel and its role in autophagy in human hepatocellular carcinoma cells. Am J Transl Res 11:931–941
- Maruyama Y, Sou S, Kageyam S et al (2014) LC3B is indispensable for selective autophagy of p62 but not basal autophagy. Biochem Biophys Res Commun 446:309–315
- Morselli E, Galluzzi L, Kepp O et al (2009) Anti- and pro-tumor functions of autophagy. Biochim Biophys Acta 1793:1524–1532
- Segala G, David M, de Medina P et al (2017) Dendrogenin A drives LXR to trigger lethal autophagy in cancers. Nat Commun 8:1903
- Shen Y, Liang LZ, Hong MH et al (2008) Expression and clinical significance of microtubule-associated protein 1 light chain 3 (LC3) and Beclin1 in epithelial ovarian cancer. Ai Zheng 27:595–599
- Song MQ, Xue YK, Sun YX et al (2014) Expression and clinical significance of mammalian target of rapamycin and microtubulesassociated protein 1 light chain 3-β in hepatocellular carcinama. Chin J Exp Surg 31:1108–1110
- Wu DH, Jia CC, Chen J et al (2014a) Autophagic LC3B overexpression correlates with malignant progression and predicts a poor prognosis in hepatocellular carcinoma. Tumor Biol 35:12225–12233

- Wu WY, Kim H, Zhang CL et al (2014b) Clinical signification of autophagic protein LC3 levels and its correlation with XIAP expression in hepatocellular carcinoma. Med Oncol 31:108
- Wu S, Sun C, Tian D et al (2015) Expression and clinical significances of Beclin1, LC3 and mTOR in colorectal cancer. Int J Clin Exp Pathol 8:3882–3891
- Wu WY, Meng XL, Qi Y et al (2016) Clinical significance of LC3B and p62 expression in human hepatocellular carcinoma. J Clin Exp Pathol 32:366–369
- Wu DH, Wang TT, Ruan DY et al (2018) Combination of ULK1 and LC3B improve prognosis assessment of hepatocellular carcinoma. Biomed Pharmacother 97:195–202
- Xi SY, Lu JB, Chen JW et al (2013) The "stone-like" pattern of LC3A expression and its clinicopathologic significance in hepatocellular carcinoma. Biochem Biophys Res Commun 431:760–766
- Yao LL, Zhou YD, Sui AH et al (2019) HBV-encoded miR-2 functions as an oncogene by downregulating TRIM35 but upregulating RAN in liver cancer cells. EBioMedicine 09:1–13

- Yu H, Liu QH, Xiao PL et al (2018) Expression and clinical significance of Beclin1, LC3, and mTOR in hepatic carcinoma. Anhui Med Pharm J 22:246–249
- Zhang S, Li J, Zhou G et al (2017) Aurora-A regulates autophagy through the Akt pathway in human prostate cancer. Cancer Biomark 19:27–34
- Zhao YT, Pang ZG, Ma DM et al (2016) Expression of forkhead transcription factor group O1 and autophagy related protein microtubule associated protein 1 light chain 3-II in hepatocellular carcinama and significance. Chin J Exp Surg 33:492–494
- Zhao Z, Xue J, Zhao X et al (2017) Prognostic role of autophagyrelated proteins in epithelial ovarian cancer: a meta-analysis of observational studies. Minerva Med 108:277–286

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.