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Prognostic significance of CCL20 and its receptor CCR6 in cancers: a meta-analysis
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Abstract: Growing evidence from recent publications has shown the association of CC chemokine ligand 20 (CCL20) and CC chemokine receptor 6 (CCR6) with outcomes of cancer, but the results remained controversial. The present meta-analysis was performed to investigate the prognostic value of CCL20 and CCR6 in cancer patients. PubMed and Embase were systematically searched to identify eligible studies. Two investigators independently performed study selection, data extraction and quality assessment. Hazard ratio (HR) and 95% confidence interval (CI) regarding overall survival (OS), disease-free survival (DFS) and relapse-free survival (RFS) were extracted and utilized to calculate pooled effect size. A total of 18 cohort studies with 2429 participants were included. High expression of CCL20 was demonstrated to associate with worse OS (HR = 2.38, 95% CI: 1.94-2.92, P < 0.001), DFS (HR = 2.16, 95% CI: 2.01-2.32, P < 0.001) and RFS (HR = 2.29, 95% CI: 1.58-3.33, P < 0.001) by fixed-effect model. Elevated CCR6 predicted poor OS (HR = 1.50, 95% CI: 1.02-2.20, P = 0.040) but not DFS (HR = 1.41, 95% CI: 0.56-3.53, P = 0.460) by random-effects model. Moreover, subgroup and sensitivity analyses for OS studies suggested that the results of CCL20 were robust, but caution should be taken for CCR6 analysis because of potential heterogeneity. This meta-analysis suggests that high expression of CCL20 and CCR6 predict poor prognosis in patients with carcinomas. Nevertheless, more well-designed and powerful cohort studies are required to further verify these conclusions.
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Introduction

Cancer as a global health problem contributes to the highest mortality in developed countries and the second highest in developing countries [1]. A total of 1,658,370 new cancer cases and 589,430 cancer deaths are predicted to occur in 2015 in the United States [2]. One of the main reasons for high cancer mortality rates is lack of effective methods of diagnosis and treatment, especially in early stage. Meanwhile, there are few valid biomarkers for prognosis, which could provide critical information for clinical treatment efficacy.

Chemokines are a superfamily of small chemoattractive cytokines which are classified into C, CC, CXC and CX3C subfamilies based on the position of conserved cysteine residues and exerts their biological functions by interacting with special transmembrane G-protein-coupled receptor [3-5]. The CC chemokine ligand 20 (CCL20), also named macrophage inflammatory protein-3 alpha (MIP-3α), belongs to the CC subfamily and exhibits chemoattractant properties towards leukocytes [6]. Moreover, increasing evidence indicated that CCL20 plays a crucial role in cancer progression involving tumorigenesis, cell proliferation, angiogenesis, invasion and metastasis [7-9]. CC chemokine receptor 6 (CCR6) is a selective receptor for CCL20 [10]. Previous studies have demonstrated that CCR6 is expressed by dendritic cells, B-lymphocytes cells, memory T-lymphocytes as well as by tumor cells [6]. Currently, high expression of CCR6 has been detected in various cancers such as pancreatic cancer, hepatocellular carcinoma, colorectal malignancy and prostate cancer [11-14]. Dysregulated expression of CCR6 was shown to participate in many physiological progresses of cancer by interacting with CCL20 and closely associate with multiple
Prognostic significance of CCL20 and CCR6 in cancers

Clinicopathological features such as tumor size, differentiation and TNM stage which strongly disclosed the potential role of CCL20 and CCR6 in early diagnosis and clinical treatment for cancer [15-17].

More importantly, accumulating data confirmed that elevated CCL20 and CCR6 in various types of cancers predicted distinctively poor outcomes with regard to overall survival (OS), diseases-free survival (DFS) and relapse-free survival (RFS), which suggested that CCL20 and CCR6 might serve as valuable prognostic markers for cancer patients [17-19]. Although both of the biomarkers have been intensively studied, most of the research studied them separately and the results were not fully consistent. Therefore, it is necessary to perform a meta-analysis to summarize those inconsistent literatures.

In the current study, we carried out the first comprehensive meta-analysis to evaluate the role of CCL20 and CCR6 as prognostic biomarkers in cancers. Particularly, we analyzed the prognostic value of CCL20 and CCR6 on OS, DFS and RFS. In addition, subgroup analyses were performed to evaluate whether diseases, specimen types, sample sizes, methods of estimating hazard ratio (HR) as well as quality of included studies influence the prognostic effect of CCL20 and CCR6. Sensitivity analyses were carried out to examine robustness of the results.

Materials and methods

The present meta-analysis was performed according to the guidelines of the Meta-analysis of Observational Studies in Epidemiology group (MOOSE) [20]. Study search, quality assessment, data extraction and statistical analysis were performed by two authors, individually. Any disagreement was resolved by discussing with a third author.

Search strategy

Two reviewers independently searched PubMed and Embase to identify relevant studies published from database inception to April 17, 2015 utilizing the following search terms: (CC chemokine ligand 20 or CCL20 or macrophage inflammatory protein-3-alpha or macrophage inflammatory protein-3α or MIP-3-alpha or MIP-3α or CC chemokine receptor 6 or CCR6) and (cancer or neoplasm or tumor or carcinoma) and (prognosis or survival or outcome). Manual search was performed to further obtain additional publications through the references of relevant literatures.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

The following criteria must be satisfied in an eligible study: (1) patients were diagnosed with any type of cancer; (2) expression of CCR6 or CCL20 was measured in tumor tissues or blood specimens; (3) the association between CCR6 or CCL20 expression level and survival status was investigated. Articles were excluded according to the following criteria: (1) reviews, meeting articles, letters or laboratory studies; (2) studies dividing participants by non-dichotomous CCR6 and CCL20 levels; (3) lack of key information regarding survival outcomes such as HR, 95% confidence interval (CI) and P-value. When several articles about a study or the same patients cohort included in two or more publications were identified, only the latest or complete study was selected.

Quality assessment

Eligible studies were critically assessed according to Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale (NOS) [21] for cohort studies with moderate modification. Each included study was judged on 3 main perspectives: (1) the selection of the study groups, (2) the comparability of the groups and (3) the outcome of the groups. Study with a score of 6 or higher was considered as high quality.

Data extraction and conversion

Data as follows were extracted from all eligible studies: the name of first author, publication year, country of population, sample size, tumor type, specimen type, methods of detecting CCL20 and CCR6 expression, cut-off value and follow-up time and HR of CCL20 and CCR6 for OS, DFS and RFS along with 95% CI. When HR and 95% CI were not directly reported, the number of observed events and the quantity of each group were extracted to compute HR using methods described by Parmar [22]. Alternatively, if only Kaplan-Meier curves were provided, we estimated HR and 95% CI by extracting survival data from the plots [22, 23]. If the article contained insufficient data, we...
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Study selection

A total of 675 articles were identified by initial search algorithm. Among them, 634 articles were excluded by scanning titles and abstracts for the reason that they were reviews, meeting reports, letters or irrelevant to the present study. After reading full texts of the remaining 41 publications, we excluded 23 reports because 21 articles did not report survival data and two articles did not contain key information for evaluating HR. It was worth mentioning that there were two studies [25, 26] included in this meta-analysis, both analyzed the prognostic effect of CCL20 on OS in nasopharyngeal carcinoma and were performed by the same author Chang et al. However, no evidence showed that the same patients were included in both of the studies. Hence, we included the two studies in this meta-analysis. Finally, 18 studies were included [12, 17, 18, 25-39] in the present meta-analysis. The flow chart of the literature research and study selection is shown in Figure 1.

Characteristics of included studies

Among the 18 studies published from 2006 to 2015, nine studies investigated CCL20, eight studies investigated CCR6 and there was one article [33] that reported CCR6 and CCL20 together. A total of 1488 participants from China, Japan, France and Israel and 1069 participants from China, Japan and Taiwan were enrolled in CCL20 and CCR6 analyses, respec-
Table 1. Characteristics of the studies included in this meta-analysis for CCL20 and CCR6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Biomarker</th>
<th>Cancer type</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Specimen type</th>
<th>Assay</th>
<th>Cut-off for high expression</th>
<th>HR estimation</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Follow-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wang 2015</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>CCL20</td>
<td>NSCLC</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Tissue</td>
<td>IHC</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cai 2014</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>CCL20</td>
<td>NPC</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Serum</td>
<td>ELISA</td>
<td>&gt; 110 pg/ml</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>48 (5-61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang 2014</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>CCL20</td>
<td>NSCLC</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>Serum</td>
<td>ELISA</td>
<td>&gt; 57 pg/ml</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>RFS</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheng 2014</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>CCL20</td>
<td>CRC</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>Tissue</td>
<td>IHC</td>
<td>IRS &gt; 4-6</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>OS, DFS</td>
<td>61 (3-105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itawa 2013</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>CCL20</td>
<td>CRC</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>Serum</td>
<td>ELISA</td>
<td>&gt; 28.2 pg/ml</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>47.6 (5.1-142.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ding 2012</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>CCL20</td>
<td>HCC</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Tissue</td>
<td>IHC</td>
<td>IHC score &gt; 182</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>OS, RFS</td>
<td>47.9 (6-76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang 2011</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>CCL20</td>
<td>NPC</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Serum</td>
<td>ELISA</td>
<td>&gt; 6.5 pg/ml</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang K 2011</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>CCL20</td>
<td>OSCC</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Tissue</td>
<td>IHC</td>
<td>IHC score &gt; 150</td>
<td>R, DE</td>
<td>OS, DFS</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang 2008</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>CCL20</td>
<td>NPC</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>Serum</td>
<td>ELISA</td>
<td>&gt; 65 pg/ml</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang 2012</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>CCL20,CCR6</td>
<td>Glioma</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Tissue</td>
<td>IHC</td>
<td>IRS &gt; 5</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qiu 2015</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>CCR6</td>
<td>HCC</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Tissue</td>
<td>IHC</td>
<td>Score &gt; 4</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu J 2014</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>CCR6</td>
<td>CRC</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>Tissue</td>
<td>IHC</td>
<td>&gt; Median</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu 2014</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>CCR6</td>
<td>HCC</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>Tissue</td>
<td>IHC</td>
<td>Score &gt; 4</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minamiya 2011</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>CCR6</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Tissue</td>
<td>RT-PCR</td>
<td>Specific value &gt; 3</td>
<td>R, DE</td>
<td>OS, DFS</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirshberg 2011</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>CCR6</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Tissue</td>
<td>IHC</td>
<td>Positive cell &gt; 50%</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>DFS</td>
<td>0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassier 2011</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>CCR6</td>
<td>Breast cancer</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>Tissue</td>
<td>IHC</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>OS, RFS</td>
<td>120 (117.6-121.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andre 2006</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>CCR6</td>
<td>Breast cancer</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Tissue</td>
<td>IHC</td>
<td>Score &gt; 1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>OS, DFS</td>
<td>156 (3.6-332.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuhida 2006</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>CCR6</td>
<td>HCC</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Tissue</td>
<td>RT-PCR</td>
<td>&gt; Mean</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>DFS</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NSCLC, no-small cell lung cancer; NPC, nasopharyngeal carcinoma; CRC, colorectal cancer; HCC, hepatocellular carcinoma; OSCC, oral cavity squamous cell carcinoma; LA, lung adenocarcinoma; IHC, immunohistochemistry; NR, not reported; IRS immunoreactive score, DE data extrapolated; R, reported.
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Table 2. Study quality assessment based on Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5A</th>
<th>5B</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wang 2015</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cai 2014</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang 2014</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheng 2014</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itawa 2013</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ding 2012</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang 2011</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang K 2011</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang 2008</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang 2012</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qiu 2015</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu J 2014</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu 2014</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minamiya 2011</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirshberg 2011</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassier 2011</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andre 2006</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuhida 2006</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quality assessment

Specifically, we assessed representativeness of the exposed cohort, selection of the non-exposed cohort, ascertainment of exposure, outcome of interest, comparability of cohorts, assessment of outcome and adequacy of follow up for each study. The scores of the 18 studies ranged from 6 to 9. The results of quality assessment are shown in Table 2.

Data synthesis: CCL20

For nine studies involving 1285 cancer patients analyzing the relationship between CCL20 expression and OS, statistical heterogeneity was not observed ($I^2 = 0\%, P = 0.82$). Therefore, fixed-effect model was applied to calculate the pooled HR with the corresponding 95% CI. The result showed that high expression of CCL20 significantly correlated with worse OS in various types of cancers (HR = 2.38, 95% CI: 1.94-2.92, $P < 0.001$) (Figure 2A).

Subsequently, subgroup analyses were carried out according to the diseases, specimen types, sample sizes, HR estimation methods and NOS scores. None of the subgroups had significantly different combined HR compared to overall analysis. All results of subgroup analyses are summarized in Table 3. Moreover, sensitivity analysis was performed by omitting one study at a time and the pooled HRs were ranged from 2.29 (95% CI: 2.01-2.32, $P < 0.001$) to 2.51 (95% CI: 1.99-3.16) which further indicated that the result of OS analysis was robust.

Although there were only two studies including 312 patients reported the effect of CCL20 on DFS and two containing 328 patients on RFS, we analyzed the combined HR and the results showed that pooled HR for DFS was 2.16 (95% CI: 2.01-2.32, $P < 0.001$) and for RFS was 2.29 (95% CI: 1.58-3.33, $P < 0.001$), providing hints that elevated CCL20 was associated with reduced DFS and RFS in cancer patients (Figure 2B and 2C).

Data synthesis: CCR6

Seven studies with 990 participants were subjected to evaluate the association between CCR6 and OS. The random-effects model was used to calculate the pooled HR due to evident heterogeneity detected among the seven stud-
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In order to analyze the source of heterogeneity and robustness of the result, subgroup analyses were performed based on ethnicity, types of cancer, sample sizes, HR estimation methods and NOS scores (Table 3). To a large extent heterogeneity was reduced within two non-Asian ethnicity studies ($I^2 = 0\%$, $P = 0.48$), three non-digestive system tumor studies ($I^2 = 54\%$, $P = 0.12$) and four digestive system tumors studies ($I^2 = 62\%$, $P = 0.05$), which indicated that ethnicity and diseases were the factors responsible for high heterogeneity. Besides, sensitivity analysis was also performed to explore the heterogeneity. Yet obvious heterogeneity still existed by omitting one study at a time with the combined HRs ranging from $1.32$ (95% CI: 0.91-1.93) to $1.71$ (95% CI: 1.21-2.40) which demonstrated that the statistical heterogeneity was not generated by one study, and that no individual study was dominant in the pooled HR.

Four studies exploring the relationship between CCR6 and DFS were utilized to pool HR by random-effects model due to prominent heterogeneity ($I^2 = 79\%$, $P = 0.003$). However, the combined HR was calculated to be $1.41$ (95% CI: 0.56-3.53, $P = 0.46$), showing no significant connection between high expression of CCR6 and DFS (Figure 3B). Regrettably, there was only one study [30] reporting the impact of CCR6 on RFS which suggested that CCR6 was not associated with RFS in multivariate analysis (HR = $1.93$, 95% CI: 0.99-3.77, $P = 0.55$).

**Publication bias**

Both funnel plot and Egger's test were used to evaluate the publication bias of the OS studies.
NOS score ≥ 8 6 0% 0.640 Fixed 2.54 1.97-3.28 < 0.001
NOS score ≤ 7 3 0% 0.860 Fixed 2.12 1.51-2.97 < 0.001

CCR6/Ethnicity
Asian 5 78% 0.001 Random 1.73 1.09-2.76 0.020
Non-Asian 2 0% 0.480 Fixed 1.00 0.69-1.44 1.000

CCR6/Disease
Digestive system 4 62% 0.050 Random 2.10 1.49-2.97 < 0.001
Non-digestive system 3 54% 0.120 Random 0.82 0.47-1.44 0.490

CCR6/Sample size
Number > 150 3 76% 0.020 Random 1.82 1.10-3.01 0.020
Number < 150 4 82% 0.001 Random 1.22 0.61-2.43 0.580

CCR6/HR estimation
Reported 3 86% 0.001 Random 1.51 0.68-3.34 0.310
DE 4 75% 0.008 Random 1.48 0.89-2.46 0.130

CCR6/NOS score
NOS score ≥ 8 5 78% 0.001 Random 1.62 0.92-2.86 0.100
NOS score ≤ 7 2 76% 0.040 Random 1.23 0.74-2.05 0.430

Discussion

In the present meta-analysis, we investigated the evidence that demonstrated the prognostic value of CCL20 and CCR6 to obtain a further understanding of the two biomarkers. The results demonstrated that high expression of CCL20 was significantly related to poor OS, DFS and RFS. Moreover, subgroup and sensitivity analyses further clarified the reliability of the results. As for CCR6, we proved that elevated CCR6 predicted worse OS but not DFS. Nevertheless, conclusion should be interpreted cautiously and needed to be refined for several reasons. Above all, the number of eligible cohort studies was insufficient to draw a completely convincing conclusion to date. Besides, all the included studies reported multiple cancers that might be a source of potential heterogeneity. Therefore, caution should be taken when apply the conclusion to a specific cancer.

Interestingly, among all the included studies in this meta-analysis, there was one article [33] that reported the prognostic value of co-expression of CCL20 and CCR6 which demonstrated that CCL20-high/CCR6-high expression was correlated with worse OS and was identified as an independent prognostic factor by Cox proportional hazard model for patients with gliomas. Considering the close relationship between CCL20 and CCR6, we speculate that combining both of the biomarkers might strengthen the prognostic effect of survival status for cancer patients. Hence, many more studies are needed to be performed to investigate the prognostic value of CCL20 combined with its special receptor not only in gliomas but also in some other carcinomas.

Recently, there were reviews paying attention to the crucial roles of both of the biomarkers in cancer progression and prognosis. A review by Huang et al. found that CCL20 and CCR6 were associated with hepatocellular carcinoma involving low differentiation and poor prognosis [40]. Ghadjar et al. reviewed studies focusing on colorectal cancer and showed that interaction of CCL20 and CCR6 participated in colorec-
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I. Prognostic significance of CCL20 and CCR6 in cancers

Tal liver metastasis which accounted for the high mortality in patients [19]. However, both of them just simply summarized poor effect of CCL20 and CCR6 rather than systematically analyzed relevant literatures or provided exact pooled HR which could effectively show the prognostic value. Likewise, there were two studies that investigated the relationship between CCL20 or CCR6 and prognostic status providing no HRs or key information for calculating it, one performed by Hou et al. [41] demonstrated that expression of CCL20 in hepatocellular carcinoma closely correlated with OS ($P < 0.001$) and RFS ($P < 0.001$), the other carried out by Zhang et al. [42] showed that patients with higher CCL20 will suffer a shorter period of time ($P = 0.0198$) in non small cell lung cancer. Compared to those publications, the present meta-analysis systematically summarized 18 high-quality cohort studies and offered convincing evidence by pooling HRs.

It is well known that CCL20 and its receptor CCR6 are responsible for the recruitment of immature dendritic cells to inflammatory environment [6]. Currently, emerging publications have demonstrated that the ligand-receptor pair CCL20/CCR6 was utilized by cancer cells for multiple physiological functions involving tumorigenesis, angiogenesis, invasion and metastasis [40, 43-45]. Moreover, reports revealed that Akt, ERK-1/2, SAPK/JNK and MAPKs signal pathways could be activated by CCL20 and resulted in a significant increase of cell proliferation and migration [46]. Zeng et al. demonstrated that CCL20/CCR6 promoted cell invasion and migration via activating NF-κB and stimulating the expression and secretion of MMP-3 [47]. CCR6 was illustrated to play a crucial role in liver metastasis of colon, thyroid and ovarian tumors with a potential mechanism that CCR+ cancer cells could be attracted and selected by liver that constitutively expressed CCL20 [48]. Additionally, high expression of CCL20 and CCR6 has been shown in multiple tumors such as breast cancer, lung cancer, colorectal malignancy, hepatocellular carcinoma [49-52]. Previous studies suggested that CCL20 and CCR6 were demonstrated to be remarkably overexpressed compared with the normal cancer tissues, and that elevated CCL20 and CCR6 were not only significantly associated with multiple physiological functions but also closely related to clinicopathological characteristics [53, 54].

More importantly, a series of cohort studies disclosed that high expression of CCL20 or CCR6 was strongly correlated with prognosis in various types of cancers. Cheng et al. conclu-

Figure 3. Forest plots of the analyses about CCR6. Survival data were reported as OS (A) and DFS (B).
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Figure 4. Funnel plots for publication bias of the included OS studies about CCL20 and CCR6. OS studies of CCL20 (A) and OS studies of CCR6 (B).

ed that patients with high CCL20 level had poorer OS and DFS compared to those with lower level of CCL20 in colorectal cancer [34]. At the same time, another group demonstrated that high expression CCL20 in hepatocellular carcinoma was an independent risk factor for prognosis by multivariate analyses [37]. Moreover, up-regulated CCR6 could effectively predict prognosis in patients with colorectal cancer, hepatocellular carcinoma and glioma [12, 27, 33]. However, stronger expression of CCR6 was also proved to be an independent predictor of better prognosis in lung adenocarcinoma [28]. Though previous studies were shedding light on the correlation between prognosis and the expression of CCL20 and CCR6, there was no quantitative analysis that was carried out to help determine their prognostic value. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first meta-analysis performed to gather those scattered and discrepant results and pool the significant prognostic effects of the two biomarkers.

However, our meta-analysis does have several limitations. Firstly, the total number of patients included in the studies was relatively small with only 1488 and 1069 for CCL20 and CCR6, respectively, and the sample sizes of several studies were rather small. For instance, the studies of Kirshberg et al. [29], Cuhida et al. [31] and Qiu et al. [17] included no more than 50 patients. Therefore, to this issue many more high quality studies with larger sample sizes are needed to further strengthen our conclusion. Secondly, potential heterogeneity was observed among CCR6 studies, which could not be effectively reduced via subgroup and sensitivity analyses. Hence, we used random-effects model to combine HRs to minimize the influence of heterogeneity on pooled effect size. Thirdly, survival data of several studies, such as Cheng et al. [34], Qiu et al. [17] and Liu et al. [27], could only be estimated by survival curves according to Parmar [22]. Although the estimated data approximates true values, it might weaken the reliability of the results. In addition, we failed to obtain the HRs of two studies [41, 42] that might enhance the convincingness of our meta-analysis despite our utmost efforts to contact the authors.

In summary, despite the limitations above, our study strongly suggests that high expression of CCL20 and CCR6 are associated with poor prognosis in various carcinomas. Considering the widespread involvement of CCL20 and CCR6 in tumor progression and the close rela-
tionship between outcomes of cancers and high expression of CCL20 and CCR6, both of the biomarkers may serve as crucial indicators that can effectively predict prognosis for cancer patients as well as potential candidates that can help to guide clinical treatment. In addition, more well-designed clinical trials with relatively larger sample sizes are needed to be performed to further verify the prognostic value of CCL20 and CCR6 in the near future.
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