1 RESEARCH ARTICLE

2

3 Association between the *ACE* I/D gene polymorphism and progressive
4 renal failure in autosomal dominant polycystic kidney disease: A meta-
5 analysis

6

7

8 Noel Pabalan^{1*}, Phuntla Tharabenjasin¹, Yardnapar Parcharoen¹, Adis Tasanarong^{1, 2}

9

10
11 ¹ Chulabhorn International College of Medicine, Thammasat University, Pathum Thani, Thailand

12 ² Nephrology Unit, Faculty of Medicine, Thammasat University, Pathum Thani, Thailand

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 * noelpabalan@mail.com

20

21

22 **Short title:** Meta-analysis *ACE* I/D polymorphism progressive renal failure ADPKD

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

List of abbreviations

ABP	Australia Bulgaria Poland
ACE	angiotensin converting enzyme gene
ACE	angiotensin converting enzyme protein
ADPKD	autosomal dominant polycystic kidney disease
AM	analysis model
BF	Bayes Factor
BFR	Belgium France
CB	Clark-Baudouin
CC	case-control
CI	confidence interval
CO	cohort
CS	cross-sectional
D	decreased risk
DD	variant homozygous genotype
DNA	deoxyribonucleic acid
EH	eliminated heterogeneity
ES	elevated significance
F	fixed-effects
GS	gained significance
HWE	Hardy-Weinberg Equilibrium
I	increased risk
I ²	measure of variability
I/D	polymorphism
ID	heterozygous genotype
II	common homozygous genotype
LS	lost significance
maf	minor allele frequency
mRNA	messenger ribonucleic acid
N	total number of comparisons
n	number of studies
<i>n</i>	frequency of occurrence
OR	odds ratio
P ^a	P-value for association
P ^b	P-value for heterogeneity
PRF	progressive renal failure
PRISMA	Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses
PRO	pre-outlier
PSO	post-outlier
R	random-effects
[R]	Reference of studies
RNS	retained non-significance
RH	reduced heterogeneity
UKA	United Kingdom Australia
USA	United States of America

Abstract

Objective The *angiotensin converting enzyme* insertion/deletion (*ACE I/D*) gene

polymorphism is involved in a wide range of clinical outcomes. This makes *ACE I/D* an important genetic marker. Updating the genetic profile of *ACE I/D* and raising the evidence for its role in renal disease is therefore needed. Reported associations of *ACE I/D* with progressive renal failure (PRF) in autosomal dominant polycystic kidney disease (ADPKD) have been inconsistent, prompting a meta-analysis to obtain more precise estimates.

Methods Multi-database search yielded 18 articles for inclusion in the meta-analysis. Risks (odds ratios [ORs] and 95% confidence intervals) were estimated by comparing the *ACE* genotypes (heterozygote ID, homozygotes DD and II). Heterogeneous (random-effects) pooled associations were subjected to outlier treatment which yielded fixed-effects outcomes and split the findings into pre- (PRO) and post- (PSO) outlier status. Subgroup analysis was based on ethnicity (Asian/Caucasian) and minor allele frequency (maf). The ≥ 0.50 maf subgroup indicates higher frequency of the variant II genotype over that of the common DD genotype, otherwise, the subgroup is considered < 0.50 maf. Stability of the associative effects was assessed with sensitivity treatment. Temporal trend of association was examined with cumulative meta-analysis.

Results In the PSO analysis, overall effects were null (ORs 0.99-1.02) but not in the subgroups (Asian and ≥ 0.50 maf), where in presence of the D allele (DD/ID) and the I allele (II), increased (ORs 1.63-5.62) and reduced (OR 0.22) risks were observed, respectively. Of these pooled effects, the Asian and ≥ 0.50 maf homozygous DD genotypes had high ORs (5.01-5.63) indicating elevated magnitude of effects that were highly significant ($P^a < 10^{-5}$) and homogeneous ($I^2 = 0\%$), in addition to their robustness. In contrast, the Caucasian and < 0.50 maf subgroup effects were: (i) non-heterogeneous (fixed-effects) at the outset, which did not require outlier treatment and (ii) non-significant (ORs 0.91-1.10, $P^a = 0.15-0.79$). Cumulative meta-analysis revealed increased precision of effects over time.

Conclusions PRF in ADPKD impacted the Asian and ≥ 0.50 maf subgroups where DD homozygote carriers were up to 6-fold susceptible. The high magnitude of these effects were highly significant, homogeneous and robust indicating strong evidence of association.

Keywords: *ACE*, I/D polymorphism, progressive renal failure, ADPKD, meta-analysis

Introduction

Autosomal dominant polycystic kidney disease (ADPKD) is an inherited systemic disease characterized by fluid filled cysts in the kidneys leading to end stage renal failure in later years of life [1]. Preventing progressive renal failure (PRF) is mainly treated with controlling blood pressure and reducing proteinuria [2]. However, these reno-protective measures do not benefit all patients [3]. These differential treatment outcomes may in part be attributed to genetics. Studies on mouse and human models suggest that genetic variation plays a significant role in PRF associated with ADPKD [4,5]. One genetic variation is the insertion/deletion (I/D) polymorphism in the *angiotensin converting enzyme (ACE)* gene, a 24 kb sequence of DNA in intron 16 of chromosome 17q23. This gene encodes the ACE protein, which is found in mammalian tissues and body fluids as ectoenzymes on cell surfaces and in serum [6]. The I/D polymorphism has been shown to determine the levels of circulating ACE enzymes [7]. ACE enzyme levels have been suggested to associate with the *ACE* genotypes (heterozygote ID, homozygotes DD and II) possibly affecting therapeutic response [8].

Individuals carrying the DD homozygote genotype were found to exhibit the highest serum ACE activity when compared to carriers of II homozygote and ID heterozygote genotype who showed low and intermediate activity, respectively [7]. The relationship between ACE activity and *ACE* genotypes, specifically homozygous DD appears to be the central concept in the clinical genetics of renal disease [9]. In a modification of ACE activity, a meta-analysis of 46 studies revealed that the genotypes (ID, DD) containing the D allele showed higher plasma ACE activity than the homozygous II genotype [10]. In ADPKD patients, the DD homozygote genotype was found to correlate with progression of renal insufficiency [11]. In addition, ADPKD patients have hypertension, a severe complication in which the *ACE* gene is most likely involved [10]. The value of *ACE* I/D as a genetic marker lies in its association with risk of a wide range of clinical outcomes that include response to ACE inhibitor therapy

[12], cardiovascular diseases [10], diabetes-related [13,14], cancer [15], longevity [16], Alzheimer's disease [17] and muscle performance [18]. The span of *ACE* involvement in a wide variety of clinical conditions and evidence of elevated *ACE* activity associated with the *ACE* D allele prompted a Genome-Wide Association Study (GWAS) from the quantitative trait loci perspective [19], with no mention of ADPKD. Another GWAS profiled ADPKD from an epigenetic perspective [20], with no mention of *ACE* I/D. Thus, GWAS has involved *ACE* I/D and ADPKD which were not reported in the same study. One study that examined both *ACE* I/D and ADPKD was a meta-analysis, which was published in 2006 [21]. Since then, new primary studies have emerged, with inconsistent results. Given the variability of results and length of time (13 years) since the last synthesis, we undertook this meta-analysis for three reasons: (i) obtain less ambiguous, clearer estimates and updated role of *ACE* I/D with renal failure progression in ADPKD; (ii) apply novel meta-analysis techniques (e.g. outlier treatment) in order to raise the strength of evidence and (iii) examine the cumulative trend of association. Simultaneous application of meta-analysis treatments that focus on the pathophysiological role of *ACE* I/D precluded inclusion of other polymorphisms in this study. This meta-analysis aims for better understanding of the genetics of PRF in ADPKD, so that it may provide important information that might be useful to decision makers in healthcare, particularly in the field of nephrology.

Materials and Methods

Selection of studies

Two authors (NP and PT) performed primary screening (titles/abstracts) and disagreements were resolved through screening of the title/abstract in question by a third author (YP). Three databases (PubMed in MEDLINE, Google Scholar and Science Direct) were searched for

association studies as of March 12, 2019. Terms used were “*angiotensin converting enzyme*”, “*ACE*”, “*ADPKD*”, “autosomal dominant polycystic kidney disease” and “polymorphism” as medical subject heading and text, restricted to the English language. Additional eligible studies were identified from references cited in the retrieved articles. Inclusion criteria were: (i) case–control study design evaluating the association between *ACE* I/D and PRF in ADPKD and (ii) sufficient genotype or allele frequency data to allow calculation of odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs). Exclusion criteria are: (i) studies without controls or studies whose genotype or allele frequencies were unusable/absent; (ii) those that did not cover the polymorphism or disease in question, (iii) reviews and (iv) non-English articles ([S1 List](#)).

S1 List Excluded studies

Data extraction

Two investigators independently extracted the data that resulted in consensus. Extracted information from each article included the first author’s name, publication year, country of origin, ethnicity, study design and whether the articles addressed the Hardy-Weinberg Equilibrium (HWE). Articles which were not included in a previous meta-analysis [\[21\]](#) are indicated by an asterisk under the author column ([Table 1](#)). Primary study authors were contacted in order to obtain more information on incomplete data. Less than a third of the included studies mentioned influence of the environment, but data were not provided.

Data distribution, power calculations and HWE assessment

Data distribution was assessed with the Shapiro-Wilks (SW) test using SPSS 20.0 (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY, USA). Normal distribution ($P > 0.05$) warranted descriptive and inferential expressions of mean $\pm$ standard deviation (SD) and the parametric approach, respectively. Otherwise, the median (with interquartile range) and non-parametric tests were used, respectively. Using the G*Power program [\[22\]](#), we evaluated statistical power as its

adequacy bolsters the level of associative evidence. Assuming an OR of 1.5 at a genotypic risk level of $\alpha = 0.05$ (two-sided), power was considered adequate at $\geq 80\%$. HWE was assessed using the application in <https://ihg.gsf.de/cgi-bin/hw/hwa1.pl>.

Methodological quality of the studies

We used the Clark-Baudouin (CB) scale to evaluate methodological quality of the included studies [23]. The CB criteria include P-values, statistical power, correction for multiplicity, comparative sample sizes between cases and controls, genotyping methods and the HWE. In this scale, low, moderate and high have scores of < 5 , 5-6 and ≥ 7 , respectively.

Genetic models

From the 18 included studies [24-41], minor allele frequency (maf) of the homozygous II genotype among controls was < 0.50 in 11 of them [25,30-33,35-37,39-41] and not (≥ 0.50) the remaining seven [24,26-29,34,38]. Non-uniformity of the maf across the studies (S1 Table) influenced our study design in two ways: (1) maf data were dichotomized into ≥ 0.50 maf (DD $<$ II) and < 0.50 maf (DD $>$ II) and (2) precluded the use of standard genetic modeling. Thus, we opted for the allele-genotype model, wherein we compared (i) DD homozygotes with the ID/II genotype; (ii) II homozygotes with ID/DD genotype and (iii) heterozygous ID genotype carriers with homozygotes of the II and DD genotypes.

S1 Table Quantitative features of the included studies

Data synthesis

Risks of PRF in ADPKD (using raw data for frequencies) were estimated for each study and comparing the effects on the same baseline, we calculated pooled ORs. We performed a cumulative meta-analysis to examine changes in the pooled ORs with accumulation of data over time. Subgrouping was ethnicity-based (Asians and Caucasians) and maf-based (≥ 0.50 maf and < 0.50 maf). To assess the strength of evidence, we used three indicators: First, the

magnitude of effects are higher or lower when the pooled ORs are farther from or closer to the OR value of 1.0 (null effect), respectively [42]. Second, the P-value is contextualized from the Bayesian perspective of the Bayes Factor (BF). The BF compares support from the null and alternate hypotheses, in contrast to the P-value, which addresses the null only [43]. Thus, P-values (Z-scores) of 0.05 and 0.001 (corresponding to minimum BFs of ≥ 0.15 and 0.005) indicate moderate and strong (to very strong) evidence, respectively [44]. The BF rests on the likelihood paradigm [45], indicative of how strong the hypotheses are supported by the data [43]. Thus, the likelihoods between the absence (null hypothesis) and presence (alternate hypothesis) of association of *ACE* I/D with PRF in ADPKD are compared. Third, homogeneity is preferred to heterogeneity, but heterogeneity is unavoidable [46]. Thus, occurrence of heterogeneity between studies was estimated with the χ^2 -based Q test [47], with threshold of significance set at $P^b < 0.10$. Heterogeneity was also quantified with the I^2 statistic which measures variability between studies [48]. I^2 values of $> 50\%$ indicate more variability than those $\leq 50\%$ with 0% indicating zero heterogeneity (homogeneity). Evidence of functional similarities in population features of the studies warranted using the fixed-effects model [49], otherwise the random-effects model [50] was used. Sources of heterogeneity were detected with the Galbraith plot [51] followed by re-analysis (outlier treatment). Of note, outlier treatment dichotomized the comparisons into pre-outlier (PRO) and post-outlier (PSO). Sensitivity analysis, which involves omitting one study at a time and recalculating the pooled OR, was used to test for robustness of the summary effects. We assessed publication bias for comparisons that met two conditions: (i) ≥ 10 studies only [52] and (ii) significant outcomes. Except for heterogeneity estimation [47], two-sided P-values of ≤ 0.05 were considered significant. All associative outcomes were Bonferroni-corrected in order to control for Type 1 error. Data for the meta-analysis were analyzed using Review

Manager 5.3 (Cochrane Collaboration, Oxford, England), SIGMASTAT 2.03, and SIGMAPLOT 11.0 (Systat Software, San Jose, CA).

Results

Search results and study features

Figure 1 outlines the study selection process in a PRISMA-sanctioned flowchart (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses). Initial search resulted in 548 citations, followed by a series of omissions (S1 List) that eventually yielded 18 articles for inclusion [24-41].

Fig 1 Summary flow chart of literature search

S1 List Excluded studies

Characteristics of the included studies

Table 1 shows that the number of Caucasian (n = 12) studies was twice that of the Asians (n = 6). Methodological quality of the component studies was moderate based on mean and SD (6.37 ± 1.24) of the normally distributed CB scores (SW test: $P = 0.33$). S1 Table shows the quantitative features of the included studies, specifically the differential frequencies of the ACE genotypes between the race subgroups, where II was higher (83%: 5/6) in the Asian studies and lower (17%: 2/12) in the Caucasian studies. Adequate statistical power was absent in the Asian studies, and present in two Caucasian studies [31,34]. At the aggregate level, however, power in both ethnic subgroups was > 80% (Asian: 97.3%; Caucasian: 100.0%). Control frequencies deviated from the HWE in four studies [27,28,36,41]. This meta-analysis followed the PRISMA and genetic association guidelines (S2-S3 Tables).

S1 Table Quantitative features of the included studies

S2 Table PRISMA checklist

S3 Table Meta-analysis checklist

Table 1 Characteristics of the included studies that examined *ACE* I/D polymorphism associations with PRF in ADPKD

	First author	[R]	Year	Country	Ethnicity	Study design	Addressed HWE	CB
1	Konoshita	[24]	2001	Japan	Asian	CS	Yes	7
2	Lee	[25]	2000	Korea	Asian	CS	NM	5
3	Ramanathan *	[26]	2016	India	Asian	CC	Yes	6
4	Tripathi	[27]	2006	India	Asian	CC**	NM	7
5	Tripathi *	[28]	2008	India	Asian	CC**	NM	8
6	Uemasu	[29]	1997	Japan	Asian	CC	NM	5
7	Baboolal	[30]	1997	UKA	Caucasian ^a	CS	Yes	7
8	Buraczynska *	[31]	2006	Poland	Caucasian	CC**	Yes	7
9	Ecder	[32]	2003	USA	Caucasian	CS	Yes	8
10	Gumprecht *	[33]	2007	Poland	Caucasian	CS	NM	4
11	Lovati *	[34]	2001	Switzerland	Caucasian ^a	CC**	Yes	9
12	Merta	[35]	2003	Czechoslovakia	Caucasian	CC	Yes	5
13	Perez-Oller	[36]	1999	Spain-	Caucasian	CS	NM	6
14	Persu	[37]	2003	BFR	Caucasian	CS	Yes	6
15	Saggar-Malik	[38]	2000	UK	Caucasian	CO	NM	6
16	Schiavello	[39]	2001	ABP	Caucasian	CS	Yes	6
17	van Dijk *	[40]	2000	Netherlands	Caucasian	CC**	Yes	6
18	Wanic-Kossowska *	[41]	2014	Poland	Caucasian	CC**	NM	7

ACE: angiotensin converting enzyme gene; I/D: polymorphism; PRF: progressive renal failure; ADPKD: autosomal dominant polycystic kidney disease; [R]: reference number of the studies; UKA: United Kingdom Australia; USA: United States of America; BFR: Belgium France; ABP: Australia Bulgaria Poland; CS: cross-sectional; CC: case-control; CO: cohort; ** diluted cases (ADPKD was one of the disease conditions of the patients); HWE: Hardy-Weinberg Equilibrium; NM: not mentioned; CB: Clark-Baudouin; *not in the Pereira (2006) meta-analysis; Caucasian ^a: admixed population

Meta-analysis outcomes

The overall PRO homozygote DD genotype outcome indicating increased risk (OR 1.37) was marginally significant ($P^a = 0.05$) and nullified in the PSO analysis (OR 1.02, $P^a = 0.78$). HWE analysis validated the overall outcomes (Table 2). In the subgroups (Table 3), seven associative outcomes (Asian and ≥ 0.50 maf) were statistically significant, moderate in PRO ($P^a = 0.01-0.02$) and high in PSO ($P^a < 10^{-4}$ to 10^{-5}). The PSO outcomes survived the Bonferroni-correction, but the PRO did not. The highly significant PSO outcomes had the following features: (i) all were homogeneous ($I^2 = 0\%$); (ii) magnitude of the homozygote DD increased risk effects was more (ORs 5.01-5.62) than that in heterozygote ID (ORs 1.63-1.68); and (iii) the pooled homozygote II effect indicated reduced risk (OR 0.22). In contrast, Caucasian and < 0.50 maf outcomes were non-associative between ACE I/D and PRF in ADPKD (ORs 0.91-1.10, 95% CI 0.79-1.31, $P^a = 0.15-0.79$), and initially non-heterogeneous (fixed-effects) which precluded outlier treatment (Table 3).

Table 2 Overall and modified outcomes of ACE I/D effects on PRF in ADPKD

	Test of association								Test of heterogeneity								Effect of outlier treatment		
	n	OR	95% CI	P ^a	Risk	P ^b	I ² (%)	AM	n	OR	95% CI	P ^a	Risk	P ^b	I ² (%)	AM	Signi- ficance	Hetero- geneity	
PRO									PSO										
Overall																			
DD	18	1.37	1.00-1.88	0.05*	I	10 ⁻⁵	82	R	15	1.02	0.90-1.16	0.78	Null	0.27	0	F	LS	EH	
ID	18	0.96	0.78-1.19	0.70	D	10 ⁻⁵	89	R	15	1.01	0.88-1.15	0.91	Null	0.24	19	F	RNS	RH	
II	18	0.83	0.59-1.18	0.30	D	10 ⁻⁵	84	R	13	0.99	0.85-1.16	0.95	Null	0.15	29	F	RNS	RH	
HWE																			
DD	14	1.14	0.91-1.42	0.27	I	0.01	53	R	12	0.99	0.84-1.16	0.87	Null	0.27	18	F	RNS	RH	
ID	14	0.96	0.86-1.08	0.51	D	0.11	34	F	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	
II	14	0.83	0.63-1.08	0.17	D	0.0009	63	R	13	1.00	0.87-1.15	0.95	Null	0.20	24	F	RNS	RH	

ACE: angiotensin converting enzyme gene; I/D: polymorphism; PRF: progressive renal failure; ADPKD: autosomal dominant polycystic kidney disease; DD and II: homozygote genotypes; ID: heterozygote genotype; HWE: Hardy-Weinberg Equilibrium; n: number of studies; OR: odds ratio; CI: confidence interval; P^a: P-value for association; I: increased risk; D: decreased risk; Null ORs = 0.97-1.03; P^b: P-value for heterogeneity; I²: measure of variability; AM: analysis model; R: random-effects; F: fixed-effects; PRO: pre-outlier; PSO: post outlier; LS: lost significance; RNS: retained non-significance; EH: eliminated heterogeneity; RH: reduced heterogeneity; values in bold indicate significant associations; *did not survive the Bonferroni correction

Table 3 Subgroup effects of the *ACE* I/D polymorphism on PRF in ADPKD

	Test of association								Test of heterogeneity			Test of association					Test of heterogeneity			Effect of outlier treatment	
	n	OR	95% CI	P ^a	Risk	P ^b	I ² (%)	AM	n	OR	95% CI	P ^a	Risk	P ^b	I ² (%)	AM	Signi- ficance	Hetero- geneity			
	PRO								PSO												
Asian																					
DD	6	2.84	1.25-6.44	0.01*	I	10 ⁻⁴	83	R	4	5.62	3.93-8.04	10 ⁻⁵	I	0.96	0	F	ES	EH			
ID	6	1.13	0.58-2.20	0.73	I	10 ⁻⁵	87	R	5	1.63	1.27-2.10	10 ⁻⁴	I	0.61	0	F	GS	EH			
II	6	0.48	0.22-1.04	0.06	D	10 ⁻⁵	89	R	3	0.22	0.16-0.29	10 ⁻⁵	D	0.44	0	F	GS	EH			
Caucasian																					
DD	12	1.02	0.89-1.16	0.79	Null	0.18	27	F	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---			
ID	12	0.92	0.81-1.03	0.15	D	0.22	23	F	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---			
II	12	1.09	0.95-1.26	0.23	I	0.24	21	F	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---			
≥ 0.50 maf (DD < II)																					
DD	7	2.73	1.21-6.18	0.02*	I	10 ⁻⁵	91	R	5	5.01	3.60-6.96	10 ⁻⁵	I	0.49	0	F	ES	EH			
ID	7	1.01	0.62-1.64	0.97	Null	10 ⁻⁵	85	R	4	1.68	1.29-2.18	10 ⁻⁴	I	0.54	0	F	GS	EH			
II	7	0.52	0.26-1.04	0.07	D	10 ⁻⁵	92	R	4	1.05	0.85-1.29	0.65	I	0.27	23	F	RNS	RH			
< 0.50 maf (DD > II)																					
DD	11	1.03	0.88-1.19	0.73	Null	0.35	10	F	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---			
ID	11	0.91	0.79-1.04	0.17	D	0.22	23	F	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---			
II	11	1.10	0.92-1.31	0.28	I	0.21	25	F	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---			

ACE: angiotensin converting enzyme gene; I/D: polymorphism; PRF: progressive renal failure; ADPKD: autosomal dominant polycystic kidney disease; DD and II: homozygote genotypes; ID: heterozygote genotype; maf: minor allele frequency; n: number of studies; OR: odds ratio; CI: confidence interval; P^a: P-value for association; I: increased risk; D: decreased risk; Null: ORs = 0.97-1.03; P^b: P-value for heterogeneity; I²: measure of variability; AM: analysis model; R: random-effects; F: fixed-effects; PRO: pre-outlier; PSO: post outlier; ES: elevated significance; GS: gained significance; RNS: retained non-significance; EH: eliminated heterogeneity; RH: reduced heterogeneity; values in bold indicate significant associations; * did not survive the Bonferroni correction

Mechanism and impact of outlier treatment

The mechanism of outlier treatment for the homozygous DD genotype in the Asian subgroup is visualized in Figs 2-4. Fig 2 shows the PRO forest plot, moderately significant (OR 2.84, 95% CI 1.25-6.44, $P^a = 0.01$) and heterogeneous ($P^b < 10^{-4}$, $I^2 = 83\%$). The Galbraith plot identifies two studies [25,26] as the sources of heterogeneity (outliers), located below the -2 confidence limit (Fig 3). In Fig 4, the PSO outcome (outliers omitted) shows eliminated heterogeneity ($P^b = 0.96$, $I^2 = 0\%$); intensified increased risk effect (OR 5.62, 95% CI 3.93-8.04) and escalated significance ($P^a < 10^{-5}$). This operation is numerically summarized in Table 2.

Fig 2 Forest plot outcome of the Asian *ACE* homozygous DD effects on PRF in ADPKD

Fig 3 Galbraith plot analysis for the *ACE* homozygous DD genotype in the Asian subgroup

Fig 4 Forest plot outcome of outlier treatment on the Asian *ACE* homozygous DD effects on PRF in ADPKD

Sensitivity analysis and publication bias

The high magnitude (ORs 5.01-5.62) of the homozygote DD Asian and ≥ 0.50 maf effects were robust, but not the heterozygote ID and homozygote II genotypes (Table 4). In the DD homozygote genotype, the Asian effects were more robust than the ≥ 0.50 maf subgroup (Table 4). Thus, the Asian DD effects were more stable than that in ≥ 0.50 maf.

Only the PRO overall analysis for the homozygous DD genotype was eligible for publication bias assessment. Non-normal distribution (SW test: $P < 10^{-4}$) of its operating data (ORs) prompted the use of Begg-Mazumdar test of correlation [53] which showed no evidence of publication bias (Kendall's $\tau = 0.23$, $P = 0.19$).

Table 4 Sensitivity analysis of significant *ACE* I/D ADPKD outcomes

Comparison	Geno- type	PRO	PSO	A	B
Overall	DD	Robust	Robust	0	2
Asian	DD	Robust	Robust	0	2
Asian	ID	-----	[28]	1	0
Asian	II	-----	[24,26]	2	0
≥ 0.50 maf	DD	[27,29,38]	Robust	3	1
≥ 0.50 maf	ID	-----	[28]	0	1
A		3	4		
B		2	3		

ACE: angiotensin converting enzyme gene; I/D: polymorphism; ADPKD: autosomal dominant polycystic kidney disease; maf: minor allele frequency; DD and II: homozygote genotypes; ID: heterozygote genotype; A: Number of references contributing to non-robustness; numbers in brackets indicate references that contributed to non-robustness; B: Number of robust outcomes; PRO: pre-outlier; PSO: post-outlier

Cumulative meta-analysis

Fig 5 outlines the trend of pooled effects from 1997 to 2016. Here, the “decline effect” is apparent where initial studies show the early extreme phenomenon [54] compared with the subsequent and modulated pooled ORs. Significance was observed in the early studies (1997-1999), lost in the subsequent ones (2000-2006), and then regained in the recent studies (2008-2016). A trend of increasing precision (narrowing of the CIs) is readily observed in the graph.

Fig 5 Cumulative meta-analysis of the associations between the *ACE* homozygous DD genotype and PRF in ADPKD

Discussion

Summary of associations

Evidence of association between the *ACE* homozygous DD genotype and risk of PRF in ADPKD is tenuous in the overall analysis but strong in the subgroups (Asian and ≥ 0.50) at the PSO level. This strength rests on the three indicators: (i) high magnitude of effects (up to

5.6-fold), which were (ii) homogeneous (indicating combinability of the studies) and (iii) highly significant (up to $P^a < 10^{-5}$). Of note in the Asian subgroup, the II homozygous effect indicating 78% reduced risk also met the high strength of evidence criteria (Table 3), but was found to be non-robust, which contrasted with robustness of the homozygous DD effect. Our use of subgroup analysis and outlier treatment have unraveled significant and homogeneous associations in three contexts, (i) not achieved in a previous meta-analysis; (ii) neither present in the overall analysis; (iii) nor in the component single-study outcomes. However, the process of subgrouping and performing outlier treatment reduced the number of studies and sample sizes of the comparisons. These may decreased statistical power and risked Type 1 error, especially in light of a few (three to five) PSO studies generating multiple significant outcomes in the subgroup analyses. Fortunately, adequate statistical powers of the three to five Asian studies (82.2-97.3%) and their P-values surviving the Bonferroni correction served to minimize the possibility of false-positives and increase confidence in the outcomes. Non-associative outcomes in previous primary studies may be attributed to their lack of power and small sample sizes. Underpowered outcomes appear to be common in candidate gene studies [55] and are prone to the risk of Type 1 error. Other highlights of our findings are differential effects between the ethnic (Asian versus Caucasian) and maf (≥ 0.50 versus < 0.50) subgroups. Significant outcomes in Asian but not in Caucasians may be attributed to differences in maf between the two ethnicities [56].

Cumulative meta-analysis

Studies on associations between *ACE* I/D and PRF in ADPKD from the last 20 years produced outcomes that reduced the magnitude and retained the heterogeneity of associations. On the other hand, the sustained increased precision and cumulative significance of effects as well as increase in the number of studies may help establish evidence of association.

Comparison with other meta-analyses

Five previous meta-analyses relate to our study, four of them not as direct as the fifth. The first [57] focused on angiotensin II types 1 and 2 receptor genes (*AGTR1* and *AGTR2*) in various renal diseases that did not include ADPKD. The second to the fourth meta-analyses [13,14,58] focused on *ACE* I/D with the outcome of end-stage renal disease (ESRD). All three demonstrated associations of *ACE* I/D with ESRD, two of which drew race-specific conclusions, one for Caucasians [58] and the other for Asians [14]. The fifth [21] directly relates to our study which was published 13 years ago (2006); the features of both are outlined in Table 4. Pereira et al [21] included non-English articles and meeting abstracts, which we did not in our study because we evaluated methodological quality of the included studies. Methodology-wise, Pereira et al used the recessive model (homozygous DD versus heterozygous ID + homozygous II genotypes) versus the genotype model (homozygous DD, and II, heterozygous ID) in ours. Comparative outcomes are based on the homozygous DD genotype (Table 5). Three differences mark the overall analyses (ours and the previous): (i) the number of studies (18 versus eight); (ii) significance of outcome ($P^a = 0.05$ versus $P = 0.21$) and (iii) magnitude of outcome (1.4-fold versus 1.2-fold). In the racial subgroups, Pereira et al showed no material differences between the Asian and Caucasian outcomes (both indicated non-significant increased risks, randomly-derived). In contrast, our outcomes differentiated between the Asians and Caucasians (up to 6-fold versus null). In the Asian outcomes, ours and the previous differed in terms of: (i) significance ($P^a = 0.01-10^{-4}$ versus $P = 0.23$) and magnitude of effect (up to 5.6-fold versus 1.6-fold). In the Caucasian analyses, ours versus previous differed in the number of studies (12 versus four) and outcomes (null versus 1.2-fold).

Table 4 Comparison of features between the two meta-analyses

	This study	Pereira et al [21]
General features		
Year	2019	2006
Country	Thailand	Brazil
Subgroups	Race/minor allele frequency	Race
Genetic modeling	Allele/Genotype	Recessive
Methods / Treatments		
HWE as inclusion criterion	Yes	No
Modifier analysis	Yes	No
Outlier analysis	Yes	No
Heterogeneity	Q statistic, I^2	Q statistic
Sensitivity analysis	Yes	No
Publication bias	Yes	Yes

HWE: Hardy-Weinberg Equilibrium

473 **Table 5** Comparison of outcomes between the current meta-analysis and the 2006 meta-analysis

		This study							Pereira et al [21]						
Comparison		Homozygous DD genotype							Homozygous DD versus heterozygous ID + homozygous II genotypes						
		n	OR	95% CI	P ^a	Effect	P ^b	AM	n	OR	95% CI	P ^a	Effect	P ^b	AM
All	PRO	18	1.37	1.00-1.88	0.05*	I	10 ⁻⁵	R	8	1.23	0.89-1.80	0.21	I	0.29	R
	PSO	15	1.02	0.90-1.16	0.78	Null	0.27	F							
Asian	PRO	6	2.84	1.25-6.44	0.01*	I	10 ⁻⁴	R	4	1.56	0.75-3.24	0.23	I	0.79	R
	PSO	4	5.63	3.93-8.04	10⁻⁴	I	0.96	F							
Caucasian	-----	12	1.02	0.89-1.16	0.79	Null	0.18	F	4	1.17	0.76-1.80	0.47	I	0.09	R

474 ACE: angiotensin converting enzyme gene; I/D: polymorphism; DD and II: homozygote genotypes; ID: heterozygote genotype; PRO: pre-outlier;
 475 PSO: post-outlier; n: number of studies; OR: odds ratio; CI: confidence interval; P^a: P-value for association; I: increased risk; Null: ORs = 0.97-1.03;
 476 P^b: P-value for heterogeneity; AM: analysis model; R: random-effects; F: fixed-effects; values in bold indicate significant associations; *did not survive
 477 the Bonferroni correction

Genetic correlates

Understanding the impact of *ACE* I/D on renal disease might clarify the role of the homozygous DD genotype in PRF and/or variable responses to renoprotective therapy. Based on the evidence that the homozygous DD genotype elicits high ACE activity [7], it was hypothesized that the homozygous DD genotype were resistant to renoprotective therapy [9]. However, it has also been hypothesized that *ACE* I/D is in linkage disequilibrium with an unknown DNA section containing a silencer motif that could inhibit ACE mRNA translation [59,60]. This suggests variability of ACE expression at the DNA/mRNA level. Studies have reported increased ACE mRNA expression in homozygous DD genotype patients in renal [61] and other tissues [62,63]. It is then possible to identify different polymorphisms in the *ACE* gene to identify patients at risk for PRF or therapy resistance. Evidence for the association between serum ACE levels and ADPKD has not been consistent [33,39]. The numerous studies that examined associations at the gene level had conflicting outcomes. An association between the D allele of *ACE* I/D among ADPKD patients has been detected in various populations [24,30,37,40], but not in others [25,29,32,33,35,36,39].

ACE gene, ACE protein and RAAS

The renin-angiotensin aldosterone system (RAAS) is critical in regulating blood pressure and electrolyte balance [64,65]. The activity of RAAS system in turn, is regulated by the ACE protein where it mediates the rate of production of angiotensinogen from renin [66]. RAAS is activated in progressive kidney disease leading to hypertension [67]. The role of hypertension in the progression of kidney deterioration in ADPKD places the *ACE* I/D polymorphism at the core of this research. On a morphological level, the pathophysiology of ADPKD involves RAAS where it directly stimulates the growth of renal cysts [68]. Angiotensin II, a RAAS component was observed within cysts and tubules leading to the cyst expansion [69].

Strengths and limitations

Interpreting our findings should consider its limitations and strengths. Limitations include:

(i) Eighty-nine percent of the component studies were underpowered; (ii) of the 29 comparisons, 22 (76%) were heterogeneous; (iii) pathological conditions of the some cases were diluted, where ADPKD comprised part of the patients' condition and (iv) despite the high significance ($P^a < 10^{-5}$) and magnitude (5-fold) as well as homogeneity ($I^2 = 0\%$) of the homozygous DD PSO pooled effects in the Asian and ≥ 0.50 maf comparisons, their wide CIs (3.60-8.04), suggests imprecision which may have compromised the durability of effects. Larger sample sizes may be needed to ameliorate this limitation [70]. Of note, precision in this study had opposing effects, reduced (wide CIs) with subgroup treatment but increased (narrow CIs) with cumulative meta-analysis. The methodology may explain this paradox in terms of sample size and number of studies (n), which was reduced with subgroup analysis but increased with cumulative meta-analysis.

On the other hand, the strengths comprise of the following: (i) the combined sample sizes of the overall and subgroups translated to high statistical power; (ii) ten (56%) of the 18 articles addressed HWE concerns. Confining the analysis to studies in HWE did not materially alter the pooled ORs; in fact, HWE-analysis validated the overall pooled effects. Given this outcome, the risk of genotyping errors appears to be a minor issue which minimizes methodological weakness in our study; (iii) outlier treatment reduced and eliminated heterogeneity and enabled significance; (iv) the significant PSO ORs in the Asian and ≥ 0.50 maf subgroups survived the Bonferroni correction, thus minimizing the possibility of a Type 1 error; (v) sensitivity treatment conferred robustness to the overall and Asian homozygous DD findings and (vi) publication bias was not evident in the PRO overall comparison.

Conclusions

We have shown that associations of *ACE* I/D with PRF in ADPKD are genotype dependent. Substantial amount of evidence presented here may render *ACE* I/D useful as prognostic markers for PRF in ADPKD. In spite of the evidence for associations, the complexity of ADPKD involves interactions between genetic and non-genetic factors allowing for the possibility of environmental involvement. Gene-gene and gene-environment interactions have been reported to have roles in associations of other polymorphisms with ADPKD. All but five [29,32,38,39,41] of the 18 articles acknowledged gene-environment interaction. Addressing gene-gene and gene-environment interactions [71] may help address the pathophysiological significance of *ACE* I/D and PRF in ADPKD. Four of the included articles mentioned haplotype analysis [26,27,35,39] with one presenting haplotype data [26]. Focus on *ACE* haplotypes have been suggested for future association studies [72]. Additional well-designed studies exploring other parameters would confirm or modify our results in this study and add to the extant knowledge about the association of the *ACE* polymorphism and PRF in ADPKD.

References

1. Sun Y, Zhou H, Yang BX (2011) Drug discovery for polycystic kidney disease. *Acta Pharmacol Sin* 32: 805-816.
2. Remuzzi G, Ruggenti P, Benigni A (1997) Understanding the nature of renal disease progression. *Kidney Int* 51: 2-15.
3. Jafar TH, Stark PC, Schmid CH, Landa M, Maschio G, et al. (2003) Progression of chronic kidney disease: the role of blood pressure control, proteinuria, and angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibition: a patient-level meta-analysis. *Ann Intern Med* 139: 244-252.
4. Hoefele J, Mayer K, Scholz M, Klein HG (2011) Novel PKD1 and PKD2 mutations in autosomal dominant polycystic kidney disease (ADPKD). *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 26: 2181-2188.
5. Wu G, Tian X, Nishimura S, Markowitz GS, D'Agati V, et al. (2002) Trans-heterozygous Pkd1 and Pkd2 mutations modify expression of polycystic kidney disease. *Hum Mol Genet* 11: 1845-1854.
6. Villard E, Tired L, Visvikis S, Rakotavao R, Cambien F, et al. (1996) Identification of new polymorphisms of the angiotensin I-converting enzyme (ACE) gene, and study of their relationship to plasma ACE levels by two-QTL segregation-linkage analysis. *Am J Hum Genet* 58: 1268-1278.
7. Rigat B, Hubert C, Alhenc-Gelas F, Cambien F, Corvol P, et al. (1990) An insertion/deletion polymorphism in the angiotensin I-converting enzyme gene accounting for half the variance of serum enzyme levels. *J Clin Invest* 86: 1343-1346.
8. Haas M, Yilmaz N, Schmidt A, Neyer U, Arneitz K, et al. (1998) Angiotensin-converting enzyme gene polymorphism determines the antiproteinuric and systemic hemodynamic effect of enalapril in patients with proteinuric renal disease. Austrian Study Group of the Effects of Enalapril Treatment in Proteinuric Renal Disease. *Kidney Blood Press Res* 21: 66-69.
9. Kleij FGHVD (2002) Angiotensin-converting enzyme gene insertion/deletion polymorphism and renal disease. Groningen: University of Groningen.
10. Agerholm-Larsen B, Nordestgaard BG, Tybjaerg-Hansen A (2000) ACE gene polymorphism in cardiovascular disease: meta-analyses of small and large studies in whites. *Arterioscler Thromb Vasc Biol* 20: 484-492.
11. Osono E, Kurihara S, Hayama N, Sakurai Y, Ohwada K, et al. (1998) Insertion/deletion polymorphism in intron 16 of the ACE gene and left ventricular hypertrophy in patients with end-stage renal disease. *Am J Kidney Dis* 32: 725-730.
12. Scharplatz M, Puhan MA, Steurer J, Bachmann LM (2004) What is the impact of the ACE gene insertion/deletion (I/D) polymorphism on the clinical effectiveness and adverse events of ACE inhibitors?--Protocol of a systematic review. *BMC Med Genet* 5: 23.
13. Yu ZY, Chen LS, Zhang LC, Zhou TB (2012) Meta-analysis of the relationship between ACE I/D gene polymorphism and end-stage renal disease in patients with diabetic nephropathy. *Nephrology (Carlton)* 17: 480-487.
14. Shen W, Jiang XX, Li YW, He Q (2019) I/D polymorphism of ACE and risk of diabetes-related end-stage renal disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur Rev Med Pharmacol Sci* 23: 1652-1660.
15. Zmorzynski S, Szudy-Szczyrek A, Popek-Marciniec S, Korszen-Pilecka I, Wojciewska-Litwin M, et al. (2019) ACE Insertion/Deletion Polymorphism (rs4646994) Is Associated With the Increased Risk of Multiple Myeloma. *Front Oncol* 9: 44.
16. Garatachea N, Marin PJ, Lucia A (2013) The ACE DD genotype and D-allele are associated with exceptional longevity: a meta-analysis. *Ageing Res Rev* 12: 1079-1087.
17. Narain Y, Yip A, Murphy T, Brayne C, Easton D, et al. (2000) The ACE gene and Alzheimer's disease susceptibility. *J Med Genet* 37: 695-697.
18. Papadimitriou ID, Lucia A, Pitsiladis YP, Pushkarev VP, Dyatlov DA, et al. (2016) ACTN3 R577X and ACE I/D gene variants influence performance in elite sprinters: a multi-cohort study. *BMC Genomics* 17: 285.
19. Chung CM, Wang RY, Chen JW, Fann CS, Leu HB, et al. (2010) A genome-wide association study identifies new loci for ACE activity: potential implications for response to ACE inhibitor. *Pharmacogenomics J* 10: 537-544.
20. Woo YM, Bae JB, Oh YH, Lee YG, Lee MJ, et al. (2014) Genome-wide methylation profiling of ADPKD identified epigenetically regulated genes associated with renal cyst development. *Hum Genet* 133: 281-297.

21. Pereira TV, Nunes AC, Rudnicki M, Magistroni R, Albertazzi A, et al. (2006) Influence of ACE I/D gene polymorphism in the progression of renal failure in autosomal dominant polycystic kidney disease: a meta-analysis. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 21: 3155-3163.
22. Faul F, Erdfelder E, Lang AG, Buchner A (2007) G*Power 3: a flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behav Res Methods* 39: 175-191.
23. Clark MF, Baudouin SV (2006) A systematic review of the quality of genetic association studies in human sepsis. *Intensive Care Med* 32: 1706-1712.
24. Konoshita T, Miyagi K, Onoe T, Katano K, Mutoh H, et al. (2001) Effect of ACE gene polymorphism on age at renal death in polycystic kidney disease in Japan. *Am J Kidney Dis* 37: 113-118.
25. Lee KB, Kim UK, Lee CC (2000) Association of the ACE gene polymorphism with the progression of autosomal dominant polycystic kidney disease. *J Korean Med Sci* 15: 431-435.
26. Ramanathan G, Ghosh S, Elumalai R, Periyasamy S, Lakkakula BV (2016) Influence of angiotensin converting enzyme (ACE) gene rs4362 polymorphism on the progression of kidney failure in patients with autosomal dominant polycystic kidney disease (ADPKD). *Indian J Med Res* 143: 748-755.
27. Tripathi G, Dharmani P, Khan F, Sharma RK, Pandirikkal V, et al. (2006) High prevalence of ACE DD genotype among north Indian end stage renal disease patients. *BMC Nephrol* 7: 15.
28. Tripathi G, Sharma RK, Baburaj VP, Sankhwar SN, Jafar T, et al. (2008) Genetic risk factors for renal failure among north Indian ESRD patients. *Clin Biochem* 41: 525-531.
29. Uemasu J, Nakaoka A, Kawasaki H, Ishikawa I, Yoshino Y, et al. (1997) Association between angiotensin converting enzyme gene polymorphism and clinical features in autosomal dominant polycystic kidney disease. *Life Sci* 60: 2139-2144.
30. Baboolal K, Ravine D, Daniels J, Williams N, Holmans P, et al. (1997) Association of the angiotensin I converting enzyme gene deletion polymorphism with early onset of ESRF in PKD1 adult polycystic kidney disease. *Kidney Int* 52: 607-613.
31. Buraczynska M, Ksiazek P, Drop A, Zaluska W, Spasiewicz D, et al. (2006) Genetic polymorphisms of the renin-angiotensin system in end-stage renal disease. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 21: 979-983.
32. Ecdar T, McFann KK, Raynolds MV, Schrier RW (2003) No effect of angiotensin-converting enzyme gene polymorphism on disease progression and left ventricular hypertrophy in autosomal dominant polycystic kidney disease. *Am J Nephrol* 23: 466-470.
33. Gumprecht J, Zychma MJ, Karasek D, Grzeszczak W (2007) ACE gene I/D polymorphism and the presence of renal failure or hypertension in autosomal dominant polycystic kidney disease (ADPKD). *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 22: 1483.
34. Lovati E, Richard A, Frey BM, Frey FJ, Ferrari P (2001) Genetic polymorphisms of the renin-angiotensin-aldosterone system in end-stage renal disease. *Kidney Int* 60: 46-54.
35. Merta M, Reiterova J, Stekrova J, Rysava R, Rihova Z, et al. (2003) Influence of the alpha-adducin and ACE gene polymorphism on the progression of autosomal-dominant polycystic kidney disease. *Kidney Blood Press Res* 26: 42-49.
36. Perez-Oller L, Torra R, Badenas C, Mila M, Darnell A (1999) Influence of the ACE gene polymorphism in the progression of renal failure in autosomal dominant polycystic kidney disease. *Am J Kidney Dis* 34: 273-278.
37. Persu A, El-Khattabi O, Messiaen T, Pirson Y, Chauveau D, et al. (2003) Influence of ACE (I/D) and G460W polymorphism of alpha-adducin in autosomal dominant polycystic kidney disease. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 18: 2032-2038.
38. Saggarr-Malik AK, Afzal AR, Swissman JS, Bland M, Sagnella GA, et al. (2000) Lack of association of ACE/angiotensinogen genotype with renal function in autosomal dominant polycystic kidney disease. *Genet Test* 4: 299-303.
39. Schiavello T, Burke V, Bogdanova N, Jasik P, Melsom S, et al. (2001) Angiotensin-converting enzyme activity and the ACE Alu polymorphism in autosomal dominant polycystic kidney disease. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 16: 2323-2327.
40. van Dijk MA, Breuning MH, Peters DJ, Chang PC (2000) The ACE insertion/deletion polymorphism has no influence on progression of renal function loss in autosomal dominant polycystic kidney disease. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 15: 836-839.
41. Wanic-Kossowska M, Posnik B, Kobelski M, Pawliczak E, Pawlaczyk K, et al. (2014) The polymorphism of the ACE gene affects left ventricular hypertrophy and causes disturbances in left ventricular systolic/diastolic function in patients with autosomal dominant polycystic kidney disease. *ScientificWorldJournal* 2014: 707658.

42. Chen H, Cohen, P, and Chen, S, (2010) How Big is a Big Odds Ratio? Interpreting the Magnitudes of Odds Ratios in Epidemiological Studies. *Communications in Statistics—Simulation and Computation* 39: 860–864.
43. Goodman SN (2005) Introduction to Bayesian methods I: measuring the strength of evidence. *Clin Trials* 2: 282-290; discussion 301-284, 364-278.
44. Goodman SN (1999) Toward evidence-based medical statistics. 2: The Bayes factor. *Ann Intern Med* 130: 1005-1013.
45. Royall R (1997) *Statistical evidence: The likelihood paradigm*. London: Chapman and Hall.
46. Higgins JP (2008) Commentary: Heterogeneity in meta-analysis should be expected and appropriately quantified. *Int J Epidemiol* 37: 1158-1160.
47. Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG (2003) Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *Bmj* 327: 557-560.
48. Higgins JP, Thompson SG (2002) Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. *Stat Med* 21: 1539-1558.
49. Mantel N, Haenszel W (1959) Statistical aspects of the analysis of data from retrospective studies of disease. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 22: 719-748.
50. DerSimonian R, Laird N (1986) Meta-analysis in clinical trials. *Control Clin Trials* 7: 177-188.
51. Galbraith RF (1988) A note on graphical presentation of estimated odds ratios from several clinical trials. *Stat Med* 7: 889-894.
52. Ioannidis JP, Trikalinos TA (2007) The appropriateness of asymmetry tests for publication bias in meta-analyses: a large survey. *CMAJ* 176: 1091-1096.
53. Begg CB, Mazumdar M (1994) Operating characteristics of a rank correlation test for publication bias. *Biometrics* 50: 1088-1101.
54. Pfeiffer T, Bertram L, Ioannidis JP (2011) Quantifying selective reporting and the Proteus phenomenon for multiple datasets with similar bias. *PLoS One* 6: e18362.
55. Dumas-Mallet E, Button KS, Boraud T, Gonon F, Munafo MR (2017) Low statistical power in biomedical science: a review of three human research domains. *R Soc Open Sci* 4: 160254.
56. Crisan D, Carr J (2000) Angiotensin I-converting enzyme: genotype and disease associations. *J Mol Diagn* 2: 105-115.
57. Braliou GG, Grigoriadou AM, Kontou PI, Bagos PG (2014) The role of genetic polymorphisms of the Renin-Angiotensin System in renal diseases: A meta-analysis. *Comput Struct Biotechnol J* 10: 1-7.
58. Zhou TB, Yin SS, Qin YH (2014) Association between angiotensin-converting enzyme insertion/deletion gene polymorphism and end-stage renal disease susceptibility. *J Renin Angiotensin Aldosterone Syst* 15: 22-31.
59. Jardine AG, Padmanabhan N, Connell JM (1998) Angiotensin converting enzyme gene polymorphisms and renal disease. *Curr Opin Nephrol Hypertens* 7: 259-264.
60. Navis G, van der Kleij FG, de Zeeuw D, de Jong PE (1999) Angiotensin-converting enzyme gene I/D polymorphism and renal disease. *J Mol Med (Berl)* 77: 781-791.
61. Mizuiri S, Hemmi H, Kumanomidou H, Iwamoto M, Miyagi M, et al. (2001) Angiotensin-converting enzyme (ACE) I/D genotype and renal ACE gene expression. *Kidney Int* 60: 1124-1130.
62. Davis GK, Millner RW, Roberts DH (2000) Angiotensin converting enzyme (ACE) gene expression in the human left ventricle: effect of ACE gene insertion/deletion polymorphism and left ventricular function. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2: 253-256.
63. Studer R, Reinecke H, Muller B, Holtz J, Just H, et al. (1994) Increased angiotensin-I converting enzyme gene expression in the failing human heart. Quantification by competitive RNA polymerase chain reaction. *J Clin Invest* 94: 301-310.
64. Grobe JL, Grobe CL, Beltz TG, Westphal SG, Morgan DA, et al. (2010) The brain Renin-angiotensin system controls divergent efferent mechanisms to regulate fluid and energy balance. *Cell Metab* 12: 431-442.
65. Turner AJ, Hooper NM (2002) The angiotensin-converting enzyme gene family: genomics and pharmacology. *Trends Pharmacol Sci* 23: 177-183.
66. Rigat B, Hubert C, Corvol P, Soubrier F (1992) PCR detection of the insertion/deletion polymorphism of the human angiotensin converting enzyme gene (DCP1) (dipeptidyl carboxypeptidase 1). *Nucleic Acids Res* 20: 1433.
67. Bell PE, Hossack KF, Gabow PA, Durr JA, Johnson AM, et al. (1988) Hypertension in autosomal dominant polycystic kidney disease. *Kidney Int* 34: 683-690.
68. Torres VE, Chapman AB, Perrone RD, Bae KT, Abebe KZ, et al. (2012) Analysis of baseline parameters in the HALT polycystic kidney disease trials. *Kidney Int* 81: 577-585.

69. Hian CK, Lee CL, Thomas W (2016) Renin-Angiotensin-Aldosterone System Antagonism and Polycystic Kidney Disease Progression. Nephron 134: 59-63.
70. Poole C (2001) Low P-values or narrow confidence intervals: which are more durable? Epidemiology 12: 291-294.
71. Moore JH, Williams SM (2002) New strategies for identifying gene-gene interactions in hypertension. Ann Med 34: 88-95.
72. Sayed-Tabatabaei FA, Oostra BA, Isaacs A, van Duijn CM, Witterman JC (2006) ACE polymorphisms. Circ Res 98: 1123-1133.

Author contributions

Conceptualization: NP, PT

Data curation: NP, PT and YP

Formal analysis: NP, PT and YP

Investigation: NP, PT

Methodology: NP, PT and YP

Project administration: NP, PT

Resources: PT, NP and AT

Software: NP, PT

Supervision: NP

Validation: NP, PT, YP and AT

Visualization: NP, PT and YP

Writing – original draft: NP, PT

Writing – review & editing: NP, PT, YP and AT

Data availability statement

All relevant data are within the paper and its Supporting information files

Funding

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors

Competing interests

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare

Supporting information

S1 List	Excluded articles	DOCX
S1 Table	Quantitative	DOCX
S2 Table	PRISMA checklist	DOCX
S3 Table	Genetic checklist	DOCX
S5 Data	Raw data code	XLS

March 12, 2019

“angiotensin converting enzyme”, *“ACE”*, *“ADPKD”*, *“autosomal dominant polycystic kidney disease”* and *“polymorphism”*