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Abstract: Vitamin D participates in the calcification of enamel and dentin and the appropriate immune responses to oral microbial infections. We aimed to assess the association between the most common vitamin D receptor (VDR) polymorphisms (ApaI, FokI, TaqI, BsmI, and BglII) and the risk of dental caries in children. Methods: PubMed/MEDLINE, Cochrane Library, Web of Science, and Scopus databases were comprehensively searched until 19 January 2021. Meta-analysis with odds ratios as the effect estimate along with 95% confidence intervals and subgroup analysis were conducted using Review Manager 5.3 software. Publication bias and sensitivity analyses were conducted by Comprehensive Meta-Analysis, version 2.0 software. Results: Seventy-eight studies were retrieved from the databases, with nine studies included in the final analysis. Based on five genetic models, there was no association between the VDR polymorphism and the risk of dental caries, except for the FokI (rs10735810) polymorphism. Conclusion: Among the VDR polymorphisms considered, an association was found between the FokI (rs10735810) polymorphism and the risk of dental caries, with a protective role of the f allele and ff genotype.
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1. Introduction

Dental caries is considered a complex and multifactorial disease as well as one of the most common diseases in industrialized and developing countries [1]. In the world, early childhood caries is considered to be the most common oral health problem in children [2] and is the most common childhood disease [3]. The age-standardized prevalence of dental caries in deciduous and permanent teeth was 7.8% and 29.4% and the number of prevalent cases was 532 and 2302 million in 2017, respectively [4]. In most developed countries, the prevalence of dental caries is declining sharply, while in developing countries, it is increasing [1]. Several genes such as genes included in enamel development, immune response, and saliva function can be associated with susceptibility to caries [5]. A genome-wide meta-analysis [6] showed that consideration of the environment and aggregate genetic
effects is more significant than specific genetic variants. A genome-wide association scan [7] reported that several genomic regions showed suggestive evidence for association with dental caries. The heritability of dental caries varies between 40 and 60% [8–10]. Vitamin D is a fat-soluble steroid that is essential for maintaining the body’s mineral balance [11], and it plays an important role in the calcification of enamel and dentin and the immune response to microbial infections of the mouth [12–15]. The function and biological activity of vitamin D are modulated by its interaction with the vitamin D receptor (VDR) protein [16], and the activity of the VDR protein is affected by polymorphisms of the VDR gene [17]. More than 200 polymorphisms of the VDR gene have been reported [18,19]. The VDR gene was found to impact the activity of a major metabolite of vitamin D, which participates in the formation of tooth enamel [18,20], which demonstrates its potential implication for dental caries risk [21–23]. The most common functional VDR polymorphisms found to be potentially involved in oral and systemic conditions are BsmI, FokI, TaqI, BglI, and ApaI [24]. BsmI, TaqI, and ApaI polymorphisms were found to influence VDR protein structure, with FokI also influencing the transcriptional activity translation [25]. The aim of this meta-analysis is to evaluate the association between these VDR polymorphisms (ApaI, FokI, TaqI, BsmI, and BglI) and susceptibility to dental caries in children.

2. Materials and Methods

This systematic review was performed according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) protocols [26].

2.1. Data Sources and Literature Search

Searches in PubMed/MEDLINE, Cochrane Library, Web of Science, and Scopus databases were comprehensively performed until January 19, 2021, without any restrictions. The search strategies for each database are shown in Table 1. The titles and abstracts were checked by two authors (M.S. and S.K.T.) and any disagreement was resolved by consensus with a third author (A.G.). We also checked the references of all included studies to ensure no study was missed.

| Database         | Search                                                                 |
|------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| PubMed           | (“Vit D”[Title/Abstract] OR “Vitamin D” [Title/Abstract] OR “calciferol”[Title/Abstract] OR “VDR”  
|                  | [Title/Abstract]) AND (“dental caries” [Title/Abstract] OR “caries”[Title/Abstract] OR “decay”[Title/Abstract]) AND (“gene”[Title/Abstract] OR “polymorphism”[Title/Abstract] OR “variant”[Title/Abstract] OR “allele”[Title/Abstract] OR “genetic”[Title/Abstract]) |
| Cochrane Library | (“Vit D”:ti,ab,kw OR “Vitamin D”:ti,ab,kw OR “calciferol”:ti,ab,kw OR “VDR”:ti,ab,kw) AND (“dental caries”:ti,ab,kw OR “caries”:ti,ab,kw OR “decay”:ti,ab,kw) AND (“polymorphism*”:ti,ab,kw OR “variant*”:ti,ab,kw OR “genotype*”) |
| Web of Science   | TS = (“Vit D” OR “Vitamin D” OR “calciferol” OR “VDR”) AND TS = (“dental caries” OR “caries” OR “decay”) AND TS = (“polymorphism*” OR “variant*” OR “allele*” OR “genotype*”) |
| Scopus           | TITLE-ABS-KEY(“Vit D”) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(“Vitamin D”) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(“calciferol”) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(“VDR”) AND (TITLE-ABS-KEY (“dental caries”) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY (“caries”) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY (“polymorphism*”) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY (“variant*”) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY (“allele*”) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(“genotype*”)) |

2.2. Eligibility Criteria and Study Selection

The inclusion criteria were: (1) case–control studies focusing on the association between VDR polymorphisms and the risk of dental caries; (2) studies reporting VDR polymorphisms (ApaI (rs7975232), FokI (rs10735810), TaqI (rs731236), BsmI (rs1544410), FokI (rs2228570), and BglI (rs739837)) in children (age < 18 years); (3) dental caries confirmed by clinical examinations; (4) studies reporting the frequencies of alleles or genotypes; and (5) a control group with no tooth decay. Reviews, conference papers, and studies with no control group or those among adults or reporting other polymorphisms of VDR were
excluded. The data from published studies were retrieved independently by two authors (M.S. and R.S.) to retrieve the necessary information. In case of discrepancies between the data extracted by the two authors, a duplicate data extraction was performed by a third author (M.G.).

2.3. Quality Assessment

Three reviewers (M.S., A.K., and N.N.) independently assessed the quality of the selected studies by scoring them according to Table 2. We developed a quality assessment tool specifically for this study, which consisted of 7 criteria. The range of scores varies from 0 to 11, with higher scores indicating better study quality.

Table 2. Criteria for quality assessment.

| Criteria                                      | Score |
|-----------------------------------------------|-------|
| 1. Representativeness of cases                |       |
| Consecutive/randomly selected from case population with clearly defined sampling frame | 2     |
| Consecutive/randomly selected from case population without clearly defined sampling frame or with extensive inclusion/exclusion criteria | 1     |
| Not described                                | 0     |
| 2. Source of controls                         |       |
| Population- or community-based                | 2     |
| Hospital-based                                | 1     |
| Not described                                | 0     |
| 3. Ascertainment of dental caries             |       |
| Clinical examination                         | 2     |
| Diagnosis of caries by patient medical record | 1     |
| Not described                                | 0     |
| 4. Sample size                                |       |
| >1000                                         | 2     |
| 200–1000                                      | 1     |
| <200                                          | 0     |
| 5. Age and sex were matched between cases and controls |       |
| Yes                                           | 1     |
| No/Not described                              | 0     |
| 6. Quality control of genotyping methods      |       |
| Repetition of partial/total tested samples    | 1     |
| Not described                                | 0     |
| 7. Hardy–Weinberg equilibrium in control subjects |       |
| Hardy–Weinberg equilibrium                   | 1     |
| Hardy–Weinberg disequilibrium                 | 0     |

2.4. Statistical Analysis

The association between polymorphisms and dental caries susceptibility was calculated by odds ratios (ORs) with 95% confidence intervals (CIs) based on five genetic models (allele, homozygote, heterozygote, recessive, and dominant models). To calculate heterogeneity, a chi-square-based Q test and the $I^2$ statistic were used \cite{27,28}. A $p$-value of $> 0.10$ and $I^2 < 50\%$ indicated that there was no heterogeneity between the studies. However, considering the diversity in the effect sizes and populations between the studies, we used a random effects model in all analyses. Subgroup analysis (based on ethnicity and genotyping method) and sensitivity analysis (“one study removed” and “cumulative analysis”) were applied to find the effect of subgroups on the overall results and the stability of results, respectively. Funnel plots were used to determine publication bias. The $p$-value of (two-sided) $< 0.05$ was considered significant, but the size of the effect was also taken into consideration to determine the association between the polymorphism and dental caries. The forest plots and subgroup analysis were conducted by Review Manager 5.3 (RevMan 5.3) software, while publication bias and sensitivity analyses were performed using Comprehensive Meta-Analysis version 2.0 (CMA 2.0) software. The polymorphisms
(Apal (rs7975232), FokI (rs10735810), TaqI (rs731236), BsmI (rs1544410), FokI (rs2228570), and BglI (rs739837)) were demonstrated to not be in strong linkage disequilibrium (LD) with each other ($r^2 < 1$) using the LDlink online tool (https://ldlink.nci.nih.gov) (accessed on 6 November 2020) [29], and therefore all polymorphisms were included in the present meta-analysis.

3. Results

3.1. Study Selection

Seventy-eight studies were retrieved from the databases (Figure 1). After removing and excluding duplicate and irrelevant records, 14 full texts were evaluated for eligibility. Then, five full-text articles were excluded for different reasons: one article was a systematic review, one article had no control group, one article reported other VDR polymorphisms, and two articles reported VDR polymorphisms in adults. At last, nine studies were included in the qualitative and quantitative analysis.

Figure 1. Flowchart of the study selection. * One article was a systematic review. One article had no control group. One article reported other vitamin D receptor (VDR) polymorphisms. Two articles reported VDR polymorphisms in adults.

3.2. Quality Assessment

The seven criteria used for quality assessment are shown in Table 2. The maximum possible score was 11, while the minimum was 0.
3.3. Characteristics of Studies

Table 3 shows the characteristics of nine studies included in the meta-analysis [21,30–37]. Out of nine studies, three each were reported from China [21,36,37] and Brazil [31,33,35], and one each from Turkey [32], Czech Republic [34], and India [30]. There were three studies each on Caucasian, Asian, and mixed ethnic participants. The source of the control was population-based/school-based in all studies.

Table 3. Background characteristics of studies included in the meta-analysis.

| First Author, Publication Year | Country | Ethnicity | Source of Control | Genotyping Method | Quality Score |
|-------------------------------|---------|-----------|------------------|------------------|--------------|
| Cogulu, 2016 [32]            | Turkey  | Caucasian | Population-based | PCR-RFLP         | 7            |
| Holla, 2017 [34]             | Czech Republic | Caucasian | Population-based | TaqMan           | 9            |
| Kong, 2017 [21]              | China   | Asian     | School-based     | PCR              | 8            |
| Yu, 2017 [37]                | China   | Asian     | School-based     | PCR-RFLP         | 10           |
| Qin, 2019 [36]               | China   | Asian     | Population-based | TaqMan           | 10           |
| Aribam, 2020 [30]            | India   | Caucasian | Population-based | PCR              | 9            |
| Barbosa, 2020 [31]           | Brazil  | Mixed     | School-based     | Real-Time PCR    | 8            |
| Fatturi, 2020 [33]           | Brazil  | Mixed     | School-based     | Real-Time PCR    | 10           |
| Madalena, 2020 [35]          | Brazil  | Mixed     | School-based     | Real-Time PCR    | 9            |

Abbreviations: PCR, polymerase chain reaction; RFLP, restriction fragment length polymorphism.

The prevalence of alleles and genotypes of six polymorphisms is shown in Table 4. In addition, the p-value of the Hardy–Weinberg equilibrium (HWE) for controls is reported.

Table 4. Prevalence of alleles and genotypes of the polymorphisms in cases and controls.

| First Author, Publication Year | Groups (N) | ApaI (rs7975232) | FokI (rs10735810) | TaqI (rs731236) | BsmI (rs1544410) | p-Value of HWE |
|-------------------------------|------------|------------------|-------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|
|                              |            | AA    | Aa    | aa    | FF    | Ff    | ff    | TT    | Tt    | Tt    | BB    | Bb    | bb    |            |
| Cogulu, 2016 [32]            | Case (112) | -     | -     | -     | 35    | 46    | 31    | -     | -     | -     | 152   | 97    | 0.132 |
|                              | Control (38) | -     | -     | -     | 15    | 14    | 9     | -     | -     | -     | 60    | 71    | 0.615 |
| Holla, 2017 [34]             | Case (235) | -     | -     | -     | 95    | 87    | 118   | 112   | 48    | 230   | 19    | 0     | 0.011 |
|                              | Control (153) | -     | -     | -     | 51    | 85    | 17    | -     | -     | -     | 152   | 97    | 0.037 |
| Kong, 2017 [21]              | Case (249) | 44    | 87    | 118   | 69    | 132   | 48    | 230   | 19    | 0     | 152   | 97    | 0.011 |
|                              | Control (131) | 18    | 43    | 70    | 34    | 63    | 34    | 120   | 11    | 0     | 60    | 71    | 0.615 |
| Yu, 2017 [37]                | Case (200) | 33    | 85    | 82    | 86    | 96    | 18    | 171   | 29    | 0     | 0     | 36    | 164   | 0.210 |
|                              | Control (200) | 24    | 79    | 97    | 65    | 86    | 49    | 158   | 42    | 0     | 0     | 31    | 169   | 0.097 |
| Qin, 2019 [36]               | Case (304) | 17    | 129   | 158   | 98    | 160   | 46    | 1     | 274   | 29    | 0     | 28    | 276   | 0.895 |
|                              | Control (245) | 21    | 100   | 124   | 75    | 119   | 51    | 1     | 207   | 37    | 1     | 31    | 213   | <0.001 |
| Aribam, 2020 [30]            | Case (60)  | -     | -     | -     | -     | 22    | 25    | 13    | -     | -     | -     | 0.158 |
|                              | Control (60) | -     | -     | -     | -     | 26    | 23    | 11    | -     | -     | -     | 0.71  |

| First Author, Publication Year | Groups (N) | FokI (rs2228570) | BglII (rs739837) | p-Value of HWE |
|-------------------------------|------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Barbosa, 2020 [31]            | Case (164 and 163) | 19    | 64    | 81    | 29    | 82    | 52    | 0.691 |
|                              | Control (179 and 188) | 17    | 80    | 82    | 43    | 87    | 58    | 0.347 |
| Fatturi, 2020 [33]            | Case (204 and 213) | 22    | 85    | 97    | 63    | 101   | 49    | 0.435 |
|                              | Control (132 and 121) | 13    | 63    | 56    | 36    | 58    | 27    | 0.692 |
| Madalena, 2020 [35]           | Case (138 and 99) | 19    | 60    | 59    | 13    | 52    | 34    | 0.649 |
|                              | Control (19 and 12) | 2     | 7     | 10    | 1     | 6     | 5     | 0.665 |

Abbreviation: HWE, Hardy–Weinberg equilibrium. AA, FF, TT, BB—homozygous dominant; Aa, Ff, Tt, Bb—heterozygous; aa, ff, bb—homozygous recessive.

3.4. Meta-Analysis

Table 5 shows the pooled analysis of the association between the ApaI (rs7975232) polymorphism and the risk of dental caries. The pooled ORs for allele, homozygote, heterozygote, recessive, and dominant were 0.89 (95%CI: 0.70, 1.13; p = 0.34; I² = 52%), 0.86 (95%CI: 0.49, 1.50; p = 0.59; I² = 57%), 0.83 (95%CI: 0.42, 1.62; p = 0.58; I² = 69%), 0.91 (95%CI: 0.55, 1.50; p = 0.71; I² = 50%), and 0.87 (95%CI: 0.69, 1.10; p = 0.24; I² = 8%), re-
spectively. These results indicate that there was no association between the Apal (rs7975232) polymorphism and susceptibility to dental caries.

Table 5. The results of pooled analysis for association between Apal (rs7975232) polymorphism and dental caries risk based on five genetic models.

| Genetic Model       | First Author, Publication Year | Case Events | Total | Control Events | Total | Weight | Odds Ratio (M-H, Random, 95%CI) |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|-------------|-------|----------------|-------|--------|-------------------------------|
| a vs. A             | Kong, 2017 [21]                 | 323         | 498   | 183            | 262   | 30.3%  | 0.80 [0.58, 1.10]             |
|                     | Yu, 2017 [37]                   | 249         | 400   | 273            | 400   | 33.4%  | 0.77 [0.57, 1.03]             |
|                     | Qin, 2019 [36]                  | 445         | 608   | 348            | 490   | 36.4%  | 1.11 [0.85, 1.45]             |
| Subtotal (95%CI)    |                                | 1506        | 1152  |                |       | 100.0% | 0.89 [0.70, 1.13]             |
| Total events        |                                | 1017        | 804   |                |       |        |                               |
| Heterogeneity:      | Tau^2 = 0.02; Chi^2 = 4.19, df = 2 (p = 0.12); I^2 = 52%; Test for overall effect: Z = 0.95 (p = 0.34) |
| aa vs. AA           | Kong, 2017 [21]                 | 118         | 162   | 70             | 88    | 33.9%  | 0.69 [0.37, 1.29]             |
|                     | Yu, 2017 [37]                   | 82          | 115   | 97             | 121   | 34.8%  | 0.61 [0.34, 1.12]             |
|                     | Qin, 2019 [36]                  | 158         | 175   | 124            | 145   | 31.3%  | 1.57 [0.80, 3.11]             |
| Subtotal (95%CI)    |                                | 452         | 354   |                |       | 100.0% | 0.86 [0.49, 1.50]             |
| Total events        |                                | 358         | 291   |                |       |        |                               |
| Heterogeneity:      | Tau^2 = 0.14; Chi^2 = 4.68, df = 2 (p = 0.10); I^2 = 57%; Test for overall effect: Z = 0.54 (p = 0.59) |
| Aa vs. AA           | Kong, 2017 [21]                 | 87          | 164   | 43             | 61    | 33.7%  | 0.47 [0.25, 0.89]             |
|                     | Yu, 2017 [37]                   | 85          | 118   | 79             | 103   | 34.4%  | 0.78 [0.43, 1.44]             |
|                     | Qin, 2019 [36]                  | 129         | 146   | 100            | 121   | 31.8%  | 1.59 [0.80, 3.18]             |
| Subtotal (95%CI)    |                                | 428         | 285   |                |       | 100.0% | 0.83 [0.42, 1.62]             |
| Total events        |                                | 301         | 222   |                |       |        |                               |
| Heterogeneity:      | Tau^2 = 0.24; Chi^2 = 6.50, df = 2 (p = 0.04); I^2 = 69%; Test for overall effect: Z = 0.55 (p = 0.58) |
| aa + Aa vs. AA      | Kong, 2017 [21]                 | 205         | 249   | 113            | 131   | 34.0%  | 0.74 [0.41, 1.34]             |
|                     | Yu, 2017 [37]                   | 167         | 200   | 176            | 200   | 35.6%  | 0.69 [0.39, 1.22]             |
|                     | Qin, 2019 [36]                  | 287         | 304   | 224            | 245   | 30.4%  | 1.58 [0.82, 3.07]             |
| Subtotal (95%CI)    |                                | 753         | 576   |                |       | 100.0% | 0.91 [0.55, 1.50]             |
| Total events        |                                | 659         | 513   |                |       |        |                               |
| Heterogeneity:      | Tau^2 = 0.10; Chi^2 = 4.03, df = 2 (p = 0.13); I^2 = 50%; Test for overall effect: Z = 0.37 (p = 0.71) |
| aa vs. AA + Aa      | Kong, 2017 [21]                 | 118         | 249   | 70             | 131   | 28.2%  | 0.78 [0.51, 1.20]             |
|                     | Yu, 2017 [37]                   | 82          | 200   | 97             | 200   | 33.4%  | 0.74 [0.50, 1.10]             |
|                     | Qin, 2019 [36]                  | 158         | 304   | 124            | 245   | 38.5%  | 1.06 [0.75, 1.48]             |
| Subtotal (95%CI)    |                                | 753         | 576   |                |       | 100.0% | 0.87 [0.69, 1.10]             |
| Total events        |                                | 358         | 291   |                |       |        |                               |
| Heterogeneity:      | Chi^2 = 2.16, df = 2 (p = 0.34); I^2 = 8%; Test for overall effect: Z = 1.18 (p = 0.24) |

Table 6 demonstrates that the f allele (0.58 (95%CI: 0.38, 0.88); p = 0.01; I^2 = 85%), homozygote (0.52 (95%CI: 0.29, 0.92; p = 0.02; I^2 = 66%), and dominant models (0.53 (95%CI: 0.33, 0.87; p = 0.01; I^2 = 64%) of the FokI (rs10735810) ff genotype polymorphism had a protective role for the risk of dental caries, and the likelihood of caries in the individuals with these polymorphisms was approximately half that of those without these polymorphisms. The pooled ORs for other genetic models of FokI (rs10735810) polymorphisms (heterozygote and recessive) were not significant and the effect estimate was nearer to 1. There was no association between the TaqI (rs731236) polymorphism and susceptibility to dental caries based on the five genetic models (Table 7).

Table 8 shows that the pooled ORs for allele, homozygote, heterozygote, recessive, and dominant were 0.92 (95%CI: 0.58, 1.46; p = 0.73; I^2 = 68%), 3.89 (95%CI: 0.16, 95.85; p = 0.41), 2.71 (95%CI: 0.11, 69.34; p = 0.55), 3.74 (95%CI: 0.15, 92.12; p = 0.42), and 0.86 (95%CI: 0.48, 1.54; p = 0.61; I^2 = 76%), respectively. Although the effect estimates for homozygote, heterozygote, and recessive models were >1, these estimates were derived from only one study each, and wider confidence intervals indicate that the sample sizes in these studies were very small. These findings indicate that there was no association between the BsmI (rs1544410) polymorphism and susceptibility to dental caries.
Table 6. Meta-analysis for association between FokI (rs10735810) polymorphism and dental caries risk based on five genetic models.

| Genetic Model | First Author, Publication Year | Case Events | Control Events | Weight | Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI |
|---------------|--------------------------------|-------------|---------------|--------|-------------------------------|
| f vs. F       | Kong, 2017 [21]                | 228         | 131           | 262    | 32.7% 0.84 [0.63, 1.14]       |
|               | Yu, 2017 [37]                  | 132         | 184           | 400    | 33.1% 0.58 [0.43, 0.77]       |
|               | Qin, 2019 [36]                 | 152         | 221           | 490    | 34.2% 0.41 [0.31, 0.52]       |
| Subtotal (95% CI) |                              | 1506        | 1152          |        | 100.0% 0.58 [0.38, 0.88]     |
| Total events  |                                | 512         | 536           |        |                               |

Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.12; Chi² = 13.37, df = 2 (P = 0.001); F = 85%; Test for overall effect: Z = 2.56 (p = 0.01)

ff vs. FF

| First Author, Publication Year | Case Event | Control Event | Weight | Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI |
|-------------------------------|------------|---------------|--------|-------------------------------|
| Kong, 2017 [21]               | 48         | 34            | 68     | 32.3% 0.70 [0.38, 1.27]       |
| Yu, 2017 [37]                 | 18         | 49            | 114    | 31.3% 0.28 [0.15, 0.52]       |
| Qin, 2019 [36]                | 46         | 51            | 126    | 36.4% 0.69 [0.42, 1.14]       |
| Subtotal (95% CI)             |            | 365           | 308    | 100.0% 0.52 [0.29, 0.92]     |
| Total events                 |            | 112           | 134    |                               |

Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.17; Chi² = 5.91, df = 2 (P = 0.05); I² = 66%; Test for overall effect: Z = 2.24 (p = 0.02)

Ff vs. FF

| First Author, Publication Year | Case Event | Control Event | Weight | Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI |
|-------------------------------|------------|---------------|--------|-------------------------------|
| Kong, 2017 [21]               | 132        | 63            | 97     | 23.3% 1.03 [0.62, 1.72]       |
| Yu, 2017 [37]                 | 96         | 86            | 151    | 35.5% 0.84 [0.55, 1.30]       |
| Qin, 2019 [36]                | 160        | 144           | 258    | 41.2% 0.69 [0.42, 1.14]       |
| Subtotal (95% CI)             |            | 641           | 442    | 100.0% 0.96 [0.75, 1.24]     |
| Total events                 |            | 388           | 268    |                               |

Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.54, df = 2 (P = 0.76); I² = 0%; Test for overall effect: Z = 0.29 (p = 0.77)

ff + Aa vs. FF

| First Author, Publication Year | Case Event | Control Event | Weight | Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI |
|-------------------------------|------------|---------------|--------|-------------------------------|
| Kong, 2017 [21]               | 48         | 34            | 68     | 33.6% 0.91 [0.57, 1.48]       |
| Yu, 2017 [37]                 | 18         | 49            | 200    | 29.9% 0.67 [0.41, 1.09]       |
| Qin, 2019 [36]                | 46         | 51            | 126    | 36.6% 0.68 [0.44, 1.05]       |
| Subtotal (95% CI)             |            | 753           | 576    | 100.0% 0.93 [0.65, 1.53]     |
| Total events                 |            | 388           | 268    |                               |

Heterogeneity: Chi² = 2.09, df = 2 (P = 0.35); I² = 4%; Test for overall effect: Z = 1.66 (p = 0.10)

ff vs. FF + Ff

| First Author, Publication Year | Case Event | Control Event | Weight | Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI |
|-------------------------------|------------|---------------|--------|-------------------------------|
| Kong, 2017 [21]               | 48         | 34            | 68     | 33.6% 0.68 [0.41, 1.09]       |
| Yu, 2017 [37]                 | 18         | 49            | 200    | 29.9% 0.67 [0.41, 1.09]       |
| Qin, 2019 [36]                | 46         | 51            | 126    | 36.6% 0.68 [0.44, 1.05]       |
| Subtotal (95% CI)             |            | 753           | 576    | 100.0% 0.93 [0.65, 1.53]     |
| Total events                 |            | 388           | 268    |                               |

Heterogeneity: Chi² = 2.56, df = 2 (P = 0.01); I² = 0%; Test for overall effect: Z = 2.56 (p = 0.01)

Abbreviation: CI, confidence interval.

Table 7. Association between TaqI (rs731236) polymorphism and dental caries risk based on five genetic models.

| Genetic Model | First Author, Publication Year | Case Events | Control Events | Weight | Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI |
|---------------|--------------------------------|-------------|---------------|--------|-------------------------------|
| t vs. T       | Cogulu, 2016 [32]              | 108         | 32            | 76     | 7.3% 1.28 [0.76, 2.16]       |
|               | Holla, 2017 [34]               | 170         | 119           | 306    | 27.3% 0.89 [0.66, 1.20]      |
|               | Kong, 2017 [21]                | 19          | 11            | 262    | 4.1% 0.91 [0.57, 1.48]       |
|               | Yu, 2017 [37]                  | 29          | 42            | 400    | 11.6% 0.67 [0.41, 1.09]      |
|               | Qin, 2019 [36]                 | 332         | 281           | 490    | 42.0% 0.89 [0.70, 1.14]      |
| Subtotal (95% CI) |                              | 753         | 576           | 100.0% 0.53 [0.33, 0.87]     |
| Total events  |                                | 709         | 530           |        |                               |

Heterogeneity: Chi² = 4.47, df = 5 (P = 0.48); I² = 0%; Test for overall effect: Z = 1.03 (p = 0.30)

tt vs. T

| First Author, Publication Year | Case Events | Control Events | Weight | Odds Ratio M-H, Random, 95% CI |
|-------------------------------|-------------|---------------|--------|-------------------------------|
| Cogulu, 2016 [32]             | 31          | 9             | 24     | 22.2% 1.48 [0.57, 3.85]       |
| Holla, 2017 [34]              | 30          | 17            | 68     | 53.1% 0.95 [0.48, 1.88]       |
| Kong, 2017 [21]               | 0           | 0             | 120    | Not estimable                 |
| Yu, 2017 [37]                 | 0           | 0             | 158    | Not estimable                 |
| Qin, 2019 [36]                | 13          | 11            | 37     | 3.4% 0.78 [0.05, 13.07]       |
| Aribam, 2020 [30]             | 13          | 11            | 37     | 21.3% 1.40 [0.52, 3.73]       |
| Subtotal (95% CI)             |            | 657           | 440    | 100.0% 1.15 [0.72, 1.86]     |
| Total events                 |            | 703           | 530    |                               |

Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.79, df = 3 (P = 0.85); I² = 0%; Test for overall effect: Z = 0.58 (p = 0.56)
Table 7. Cont.

| Genetic Model | First Author, Publication Year | Case | Control | Weight | Odds Ratio |
|---------------|--------------------------------|------|---------|--------|------------|
|               |                                | Events | Total | Events | Total | M-H, Random, 95%CI |
| Tt vs. TT     | Cogulu, 2016 [32]              | 46    | 81     | 14     | 29   | 7.6%   | 1.41 [0.60, 3.30] |
|               | Holla, 2017 [34]               | 110   | 205    | 85     | 136  | 40.5%  | 0.69 [0.45, 1.08] |
|               | Kong, 2017 [21]                | 19    | 249    | 11     | 131  | 11.4%  | 0.90 [0.42, 1.96] |
|               | Yu, 2017 [37]                  | 29    | 200    | 42     | 200  | 30.7%  | 0.64 [0.38, 1.07] |
|               | Qin, 2019 [36]                 | 274   | 275    | 207    | 208  | 0.7%   | 1.32 [0.08, 21.29] |
|               | Aribam, 2020 [30]              | 25    | 47     | 23     | 49   | 9.0%   | 1.28 [0.58, 2.86] |
| Subtotal (95% CI) |                               | 1057  | 753    |        |      |          | 0.81 [0.62, 1.07] |
|               | Total events                   | 503   | 382    |        |      |          |                |

Heterogeneity: Chi² = 4.36, df = 5 (P = 0.50); I² = 0%; Test for overall effect: Z = 1.49 (p = 0.14)

| tt + Tt vs. TT | Cogulu, 2016 [32]              | 77    | 112    | 23     | 38   | 8.7%   | 1.43 [0.67, 3.08] |
|               | Holla, 2017 [34]               | 140   | 235    | 102    | 153  | 40.5%  | 0.74 [0.48, 1.13] |
|               | Kong, 2017 [21]                | 19    | 249    | 11     | 131  | 10.8%  | 0.90 [0.42, 1.96] |
|               | Yu, 2017 [37]                  | 29    | 200    | 42     | 200  | 29.1%  | 0.64 [0.38, 1.07] |
|               | Qin, 2019 [36]                 | 303   | 304    | 244    | 245  | 0.7%   | 1.24 [0.08, 19.96] |
|               | Aribam, 2020 [30]              | 38    | 60     | 34     | 60   | 10.1%  | 1.32 [0.63, 2.75] |
| Subtotal (95% CI) |                               | 1160  | 827    |        |      |          | 0.85 [0.66, 1.11] |
|               | Total events                   | 606   | 456    |        |      |          |                |

Heterogeneity: Chi² = 4.89, df = 5 (P = 0.43); I² = 0%; Test for overall effect: Z = 1.21 p = 0.23

| tt vs. TT + Tt | Cogulu, 2016 [32]              | 31    | 112    | 9      | 38   | 13.2%  | 1.23 [0.52, 2.90] |
|               | Holla, 2017 [34]               | 30    | 235    | 17     | 153  | 24.5%  | 1.17 [0.62, 2.21] |
|               | Kong, 2017 [21]                | 0     | 249    | 0      | 131  | Not estimable |                  |
|               | Yu, 2017 [37]                  | 29    | 200    | 37     | 245  | 50.5%  | 0.59 [0.35, 1.00] |
|               | Qin, 2019 [36]                 | 13    | 60     | 11     | 60   | 11.7%  | 1.23 [0.50, 3.02] |
|               | Aribam, 2020 [30]              | 152   | 152    | 60     | 60   | 11.7%  | 1.23 [0.50, 3.02] |
| Subtotal (95% CI) |                               | 1160  | 827    |        |      |          | 0.93 [0.62, 1.40] |
|               | Total events                   | 103   | 74     |        |      |          |                |

Heterogeneity: Chi² = 4.14, df = 3 (P = 0.25); I² = 28; Test for overall effect: Z = 0.72 (p = 0.35)

Table 8. The results of meta-analysis exploring the association between BsmI (rs1544410) polymorphism and dental caries risk based on five genetic models.

| Genetic Model | First Author, Publication Year | Case | Control | Weight | Odds ratio |
|---------------|--------------------------------|------|---------|--------|------------|
|               |                                | Events | Total | Events | Total | M-H, Random, 95%CI |
| b vs. B       | Kong, 2017 [21]                | 346   | 498    | 202    | 262  | 38.6%  | 0.68 [0.48, 0.96] |
|               | Yu, 2017 [37]                  | 364   | 400    | 369    | 400  | 31.1%  | 0.85 [0.51, 1.40] |
|               | Qin, 2019 [36]                 | 580   | 608    | 457    | 490  | 30.3%  | 1.50 [0.89, 2.51] |
| Subtotal (95% CI) |                               | 1506  | 1506   | 1152   | 1152 | 100.0% | 0.92 [0.58, 1.46] |
|               | Total events                   | 1290  | 1028   |        |      |          |                |

Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.11; Chi² = 6.24, df = 2 (P = 0.04); I² = 68%; Test for overall effect: Z = 0.34 (p = 0.73)

| bb vs. BB     | Kong, 2017 [21]                | 97    | 97     | 71     | 71   | Not estimable |                  |
|               | Yu, 2017 [37]                  | 164   | 164    | 169    | 169  | Not estimable |                  |
|               | Qin, 2019 [36]                 | 276   | 276    | 213    | 214  | 100.0% | 3.89 [0.16, 95.85] |
| Subtotal (95% CI) |                               | 537   | 454    |        |      |          | 3.89 [0.16, 95.85] |
|               | Total events                   | 537   | 453    |        |      |          |                |

Heterogeneity: Not applicable; Test for overall effect: Z = 0.83 (p = 0.41)

| Bb vs. BB     | Kong, 2017 [21]                | 152   | 152    | 60     | 60   | Not estimable |                  |
|               | Yu, 2017 [37]                  | 36    | 36     | 31     | 31   | Not estimable |                  |
|               | Qin, 2019 [36]                 | 28    | 28     | 31     | 32   | 100.0% | 2.71 [0.11, 69.34] |
| Subtotal (95% CI) |                               | 216   | 216    | 123    | 123  | 100.0% | 2.71 [0.11, 69.34] |
|               | Total events                   | 216   | 122    |        |      |          |                |

Heterogeneity: Not applicable; Test for overall effect: Z = 0.60 (p = 0.55)

Abbreviation: CI, confidence interval. tt– homozygous recessive.
Table 8. Cont.

| Genetic Model     | First Author, Publication Year | Case Events | Case Total | Control Events | Control Total | Weight M-H, Random, 95% CI | Odds Ratio | 95% CI |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|-------------|------------|----------------|---------------|-----------------------------|------------|--------|
| bb + Bb vs. BB    | Kong, 2017 [21]                | 249         | 249        | 131            | 131           | Not estimable               | 3.74       | [0.15, 92.12] |
|                   | Yu, 2017 [37]                  | 200         | 200        | 200            | 200           | Not estimable               | 3.74       | [0.15, 92.12] |
|                   | Qin, 2019 [36]                 | 304         | 304        | 244            | 245           | 100.0%                      | 3.74       | [0.15, 92.12] |
| Subtotal (95%CI)  |                                | 753         | 756        |                |               | 100.0%                      | 3.74       | [0.15, 92.12] |

Heterogeneity: Not applicable; Test for overall effect: Z = 0.81 (p = 0.42)

Total events 753 576 100.0% 3.74 [0.15, 92.12]

Table 9 demonstrates that there was no association between the FokI (rs2228570) polymorphism and susceptibility to dental caries and there was a lack of heterogeneity between the studies (I^2 = 0%) in all five genetic models. The odds ratio for most of these models was closer to 1, with narrow confidence intervals indicating no association.

Table 9. Results exploring the association between FokI (rs2228570) polymorphism and dental caries risk based on five genetic models.

| Genetic Model     | First Author, Publication Year | Case Events | Case Total | Control Events | Control Total | Weight M-H, Random, 95% CI | Odds Ratio | 95% CI |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|-------------|------------|----------------|---------------|-----------------------------|------------|--------|
| f vs. F           | Barbosa, 2020 [31]             | 226         | 328        | 244            | 358           | 46.3%                       | 1.04       | [0.75, 1.43] |
|                   | Fatturi, 2020 [33]             | 279         | 408        | 175            | 264           | 42.9%                       | 1.10       | [0.79, 1.53] |
|                   | Madalena, 2020 [35]            | 178         | 276        | 27             | 38            | 10.8%                       | 0.74       | [0.35, 1.56] |
| Subtotal (95%CI)  |                                | 683         | 1012       |                |               | 100.0%                      | 1.03       | [0.83, 1.28] |

Heterogeneity: Chi^2 = 0.91, df = 2 (P = 0.63); I^2 = 0%; Test for overall effect: Z = 0.29 (p = 0.77)

Total events 1012 660 100.0% 1.03 [0.83, 1.28]

ff vs. FF          | Barbosa, 2020 [31]             | 81          | 100        | 82             | 99            | 47.5%                       | 0.88       | [0.43, 1.82] |
|                   | Fatturi, 2020 [33]             | 97          | 119        | 56             | 69            | 39.7%                       | 1.02       | [0.48, 2.19] |
|                   | Madalena, 2020 [35]            | 59          | 78         | 10             | 12            | 12.8%                       | 0.62       | [0.32, 1.09] |
| Subtotal (95%CI)  |                                | 297         | 297        |                |               | 100.0%                      | 0.91       | [0.55, 1.50] |

Heterogeneity: Chi^2 = 0.32, df = 2 (P = 0.85); I^2 = 0%; Test for overall effect: Z = 0.37 (p = 0.71)

Total events 297 180 100.0% 0.91 [0.55, 1.50]

ff vs. FF + Ff      | Barbosa, 2020 [31]             | 145         | 164        | 162            | 179           | 48.2%                       | 0.72       | [0.34, 1.49] |
|                   | Fatturi, 2020 [33]             | 182         | 204        | 119            | 132           | 41.4%                       | 0.90       | [0.44, 1.86] |
|                   | Madalena, 2020 [35]            | 119         | 138        | 17             | 19            | 10.9%                       | 0.74       | [0.16, 3.45] |
| Subtotal (95%CI)  |                                | 209         | 209        |                |               | 100.0%                      | 0.77       | [0.46, 1.27] |

Heterogeneity: Chi^2 = 0.08, df = 2 (P = 0.96); I^2 = 0%; Test for overall effect: Z = 1.04 (p = 0.30)

Total events 209 150 100.0% 0.77 [0.46, 1.27]

ff vs. FF + Ff      | Barbosa, 2020 [31]             | 145         | 164        | 162            | 179           | 47.7%                       | 0.80       | [0.40, 1.60] |
|                   | Fatturi, 2020 [33]             | 182         | 204        | 119            | 132           | 41.4%                       | 0.90       | [0.44, 1.86] |
|                   | Madalena, 2020 [35]            | 119         | 138        | 17             | 19            | 10.9%                       | 0.74       | [0.16, 3.45] |
| Subtotal (95%CI)  |                                | 386         | 386        |                |               | 100.0%                      | 0.84       | [0.52, 1.35] |

Heterogeneity: Chi^2 = 0.09, df = 2 (P = 0.96); I^2 = 0%; Test for overall effect: Z = 0.73 (p = 0.46)

Total events 386 298 100.0% 0.84 [0.52, 1.35]

Abbreviation: CI, confidence interval.
The pooled ORs for allele, homozygote, heterozygote, recessive, and dominant were 1.06 (95%CI: 0.86, 1.31; \(p = 0.61\); \(I^2 = 0\%\)], 1.15 (95%CI: 0.75, 1.75; \(p = 0.53\); \(I^2 = 0\%\)], 1.15 (95%CI: 0.79, 1.67; \(p = 0.48\); \(I^2 = 0\%\)], 1.14 (95%CI: 0.80, 1.62; \(p = 0.46\); \(I^2 = 0\%\)], and 1.02 (95%CI: 0.73, 1.42; \(p = 0.91\); \(I^2 = 0\%\)], respectively (Table 10). There was no association between the BglII (rs739837) polymorphism and susceptibility to dental caries.

### Table 10. The results from meta-analysis of the association between BglII (rs739837) polymorphism and dental caries risk based on five genetic models.

| Genetic Model | First Author, Publication Year | Case Events | Control Events | Weight | Odds Ratio 95% CI | M-H, Random, 95% CI |
|---------------|--------------------------------|-------------|---------------|--------|-------------------|---------------------|
| b vs. B       | Barbosa, 2020 [31]              | 186         | 326           | 48.1%  | 1.13 [0.84, 1.53]  |
|               | Fatturi, 2020 [33]              | 199         | 426           | 45.2%  | 1.02 [0.74, 1.40]  |
|               | Madalena, 2020 [35]             | 120         | 198           | 6.7%   | 0.77 [0.31, 1.88]  |
| Subtotal (95%CI) |                               | 495         | 642           | 100.0% | 1.06 [0.86, 1.31]  |
| Total events  |                                | 505         | 331           |        |                   |                     |
| Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.74, df = 2 (\(p = 0.69\); \(I^2 = 0\%\)]; Test for overall effect: Z = 0.51 (\(p = 0.61\) |
| b vs. BB      | Barbosa, 2020 [31]              | 52          | 81            | 45.8%  | 1.33 [0.73, 2.43]  |
|               | Fatturi, 2020 [33]              | 49          | 112           | 48.1%  | 1.04 [0.56, 1.93]  |
|               | Madalena, 2020 [35]             | 34          | 47            | 6.1%   | 0.52 [0.06, 4.91]  |
| Subtotal (95%CI) |                               | 147         | 170           | 100.0% | 1.15 [0.75, 1.75]  |
| Total events  |                                | 185         | 240           |        |                   |                     |
| Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.80, df = 2 (\(p = 0.67\); \(I^2 = 0\%\)]; Test for overall effect: Z = 0.63 (\(p = 0.53\) |
| Bb vs. BB     | Barbosa, 2020 [31]              | 82          | 111           | 40.7%  | 1.40 [0.80, 2.44]  |
|               | Fatturi, 2020 [33]              | 101         | 164           | 55.1%  | 1.00 [0.59, 1.68]  |
|               | Madalena, 2020 [35]             | 52          | 65            | 4.2%   | 0.67 [0.07, 6.03]  |
| Subtotal (95%CI) |                               | 235         | 231           | 100.0% | 1.15 [0.79, 1.67]  |
| Total events  |                                | 235         | 231           |        |                   |                     |
| Heterogeneity: Chi² = 1.00, df = 2 (\(p = 0.61\); \(I^2 = 0\%\)]; Test for overall effect: Z = 0.71 (\(p = 0.48\) |
| bb vs. BB + Bb| Barbosa, 2020 [31]              | 134         | 163           | 40.9%  | 1.37 [0.81, 2.32]  |
|               | Fatturi, 2020 [33]              | 150         | 213           | 54.7%  | 1.01 [0.62, 1.64]  |
|               | Madalena, 2020 [35]             | 86          | 99            | 4.4%   | 0.60 [0.07, 5.05]  |
| Subtotal (95%CI) |                               | 475         | 321           | 100.0% | 1.14 [0.80, 1.62]  |
| Total events  |                                | 475         | 321           |        |                   |                     |
| Heterogeneity: Chi² = 1.06, df = 2 (\(p = 0.59\); \(I^2 = 0\%\)]; Test for overall effect: Z = 0.73 (\(p = 0.46\) |
| bb vs. BB     | Barbosa, 2020 [31]              | 52          | 163           | 53.1%  | 1.05 [0.67, 1.65]  |
|               | Fatturi, 2020 [33]              | 49          | 213           | 38.4%  | 1.04 [0.61, 1.77]  |
|               | Madalena, 2020 [35]             | 34          | 99            | 8.5%   | 0.73 [0.22, 2.48]  |
| Subtotal (95%CI) |                               | 135         | 90            | 100.0% | 1.02 [0.73, 1.42]  |
| Total events  |                                | 135         | 90            |        |                   |                     |
| Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.30, df = 2 (\(p = 0.86\); \(I^2 = 0\%\)]; Test for overall effect: Z = 0.11 (\(p = 0.91\) |

Abbreviation: CI, confidence interval.

### 3.5. Subgroup Analysis

As there was an adequate number of studies on the TaqI (rs731236) polymorphism, subgroup analyses in relation to ethnicity and genotyping were conducted (Table 11). The overall effect still remained insignificant with none of the subgroups demonstrating any association between the TaqI (rs731236) polymorphism and susceptibility to dental caries across the five genetic models.

### Table 11. Subgroup analyses based on ethnicity and genotyping method for TaqI (rs731236) polymorphism.

| Variable (N) | t vs. T OR (95%CI), \(p, I^2\) | t vs. TT OR (95%CI), \(p, I^2\) | Tt vs. TT OR (95%CI), \(p, I^2\) | tt vs. Tt vs. TT OR (95%CI), \(p, I^2\) | tt vs. TT + Tt OR (95%CI), \(p, I^2\) |
|--------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Ethnicity    |                                |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |
| Caucasian (3) | 1.02 (0.81, 1.29), 0.86, 2%   | 1.17 (0.72, 1.89), 0.53, 0%    | 0.96 (0.59, 1.56), 0.87, 36%   | 1.02 (0.64, 1.61), 0.94, 39%   | 1.20 (0.77, 1.87), 0.42, 0%    |
| Asian (3)    | 0.85 (0.69, 1.05), 0.13, 0%    | 0.75 (0.05, 13.07), 0.87      | 0.72 (0.47, 1.10), 0.13, 0%    | 0.72 (0.47, 1.10), 0.13, 0%    | 0.59 (0.35, 1.00), 0.05        |
| Genotyping method |                          |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                 |
| PCR (4)      | 0.99 (0.71, 1.37), 0.95, 27%   | 1.44 (0.72, 2.85), 0.30, 0%   | 0.91 (0.62, 1.33), 0.63, 14%   | 0.96 (0.64, 1.43), 0.83, 28%   | 1.23 (0.66, 2.29), 0.51, 0%    |
| TaqMan (2)   | 0.89 (0.74, 1.08), 0.23, 0%    | 0.94 (0.48, 1.82), 0.85, 0%   | 0.71 (0.46, 1.09), 0.12, 0%    | 0.75 (0.49, 1.14), 0.17, 0%    | 0.81 (0.42, 1.58), 0.54, 62%   |

Abbreviations: OR, odds ratio; CI, confidence interval.
3.6. Sensitivity Analysis

We conducted “cumulative analysis” and “one study removed” analyses to evaluate the stability of the findings related to six polymorphisms. The results show that the results were consistent/stable for the six polymorphisms. Additionally, for the **TaqI (rs731236)** polymorphism, we removed two studies [34,36] reporting an HWE deviation in the control group and found that the pooled ORs still remained the same.

3.7. Publication Bias

The funnel plots (Figure 2) and \( p > 0.05 \) for both Egger’s and Begg’s tests demonstrate a lack of publication bias with regard to all six polymorphisms considered in this review.

**Figure 2.** Funnel plots for association between six polymorphisms of vitamin D receptor (**VDR**) and dental caries risk based on five genetic. (A): **ApaI** (rs7975232). (B): **FokI** (rs10735810). (C): **TaqI** (rs731236). (D): **BsmI** (rs1544410). (E): **FokI** (rs2228570). (F): **BglI** (rs739837).
4. Discussion

The present meta-analysis evaluated the association between VDR polymorphisms (Apal (rs7975232), FokI (rs10735810), TaqI (rs731236), BsmI (rs1544410), FokI (rs2228570), and BglII (rs739837)) and the risk of dental caries in children. None of the polymorphisms were associated with the risk of dental caries, except for the FokI (rs10735810) polymorphism, with the f allele and ff genotype of this polymorphism having a protective role in dental caries occurrence.

The role of genetic factors in the risk of dental caries is still largely unknown despite numerous studies. Dental caries is a multifactorial disease caused by interactions between environmental factors, behavioral factors, several genetic factors, and gene–environment interactions [31]. Advances in transcriptional research have provided a variety of data on the interaction between VDR and other transcriptionally active proteins, demonstrating the potential of VDR to exert a wide range of biological reactions [38]. Vitamin D is known as a modulator of calcium homeostasis and plays an important role in regulating electrolytes and blood pressure. Evidence has shown that the most active metabolite of this vitamin can regulate the immune response and also has anti-inflammatory activity [39]. VDR gene polymorphisms have been shown to be strongly related to mineral density [32,40,41] and a meta-analysis [42] confirmed this. Although results from individual studies remain inconsistent, a meta-analysis of controlled clinical trials showed that early vitamin D supplementation could reduce the risk of dental caries by 47–54% [20]. Although the mechanism of action is unknown, VDR gene polymorphisms could modulate the effect of vitamin D supplementation. For instance, one study found some VDR polymorphisms to modify the association of vitamin D supplementation with the risk of a specific type of cancer [43]. The role of VDR polymorphisms in modifying the effect of vitamin D supplementation on dental caries needs further exploration.

VDR plays an important role in regulating the expression of genes associated with the immune response, calcium homeostasis, and cell differentiation and proliferation [18]. The distribution of VDR polymorphisms could show different patterns based on ethnicities and age [44–47]. Research has shown ethnic differences in vitamin D status and their correlation to hormonal homeostasis and bone phenotype, as well as the influence of environmental factors such as lifestyle, diet, and sun exposure [17,18]. However, we could not find any differences based on ethnicities in this meta-analysis.

Our meta-analysis showed a protective role of the FokI (rs10735810) polymorphism on dental caries. This might be due to its interactions with co-transcription factors [18] and its location (Figure 3) [18,48].

![Figure 3. The location of vitamin D receptor (VDR) polymorphisms reported in the meta-analysis.](image-url)
The meta-analysis has several limitations and strengths. Limitations include the presence of fewer published reports on this topic hindering the performance of any meta-regression analysis, studies with small sample sizes, and clinical and statistical heterogeneity between the studies. Some studies included in the meta-analysis did not match cases with controls, used genotyping methods different from other studies, and had controls with a deviation of the HWE. It also needs mentioning that we could not conduct any analysis to adjust the effect of multiple testing or multiplicity within the included studies. Despite the limitations, this review demonstrates several strengths in the form of the lack of publication bias, the suitable quality of all the included studies, and the use a population-based source for recruiting controls in all the studies. More studies on larger sample sizes and different ethnicities will help to explore the influence of different VDR polymorphisms on the risk of dental caries.

5. Conclusions

Out of the six VDR polymorphisms explored in this meta-analysis, an association was only observed between the FokI (rs10735810) polymorphism and the risk of dental caries, with the f allele and ff genotype demonstrating a protective role in the occurrence of dental caries.
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