Title: Development of circulating cell-free DNA reduced representation

bisulfite sequencing for clinical methylomics diagnostics

Authors: Andries De Koker[1,3,8]†, Lennart Raman[2,4,5]†, Ruben Van Paemel[4,5,8], Malaïka Van

der Linden[6,8], Sofie Van de Velde[4,5,8], Paul Van der Leest[9], Bram Van Gaever[6,8], Anxhela

Zaka[1,3,8], Karim Vermaelen[8,10], Ingel Demedts[11], Veerle Surmont[8,10], Ulrike Himpe[11],

Franceska Dedeurwaerdere[12], Liesbeth Ferdinande[2], Kathleen Claes[4,5,8], Jilke De Wilde[4,5,8],

Wim Timens[9], Vincent D. de Jager[9], T. Jeroen N. Hiltermann[13], Bram De Wilde[4,7,8], Björn

Menten[4,5,8], Katleen De Preter[4,5,8], Ed Schuuring[9], Jo Van Dorpe[2,8]* and Nico Callewaert[1,3,8]*

Affiliations:

[1] Center for Medical Biotechnology, VIB; Technologiepark 75, 9052 Zwijnaarde, Belgium.

[2] Department of Pathology, Ghent University, Ghent University Hospital; Corneel

Heymanslaan 10, 9000 Ghent, Belgium.

[3] Department of Biochemistry and Microbiology, Ghent University; Technologiepark 75,

9052 Zwijnaarde, Belgium.

[4] Center for Medical Genetics, Ghent University, Ghent University Hospital; Corneel

Heymanslaan 10, 9000 Ghent, Belgium.

[5] Department of Biomolecular Medicine, Ghent University, Ghent University Hospital;

Corneel Heymanslaan 10, 9000 Ghent, Belgium.

[6] Department of Diagnostics Sciences, Ghent University, Ghent University Hospital; Corneel

Heymanslaan 10, 9000 Ghent, Belgium.

[7] Department of Pediatric Hematology Oncology and stem cell transplantation, Ghent

University, Ghent University Hospital; Corneel Heymanslaan 10, 9000 Ghent, Belgium.

[8] Cancer Research Institute Ghent (CRIG); Corneel Heymanslaan 10, 9000 Ghent, Belgium.

[9] Department of Pathology, University of Groningen, University Medical Center Groningen,
Hanzeplein 1, 9713 GZ Groningen, Netherlands.
[10] Department of Respiratory Medicine, Ghent University, Ghent University Hospital;

Corneel Heymanslaan 10, 9000 Ghent, Belgium.

[11] Deparment of Pulmonary Diseases, AZ Delta; Deltalaan 1, 8800 Roeselare, Belgium.

[12] Deparment of Pathology, AZ Delta; Deltalaan 1, 8800 Roeselare, Belgium.

[13] Department of Pulmonary Medicine, University of Groningen, University Medical Center

Groningen, Hanzeplein 1, 9713 GZ Groningen, Netherlands.

†A.D.K. and L.R. share first authorship. *N.C. and J.V.D. share corresponding authorship.

Email: Nico.Callewaert@vib-ugent.be and Jo.vandorpe@uzgent.be.

One Sentence Summary: Novel methodology enables facile and cost-effective methylation

profiling of fragmented plasma DNA, allowing for routine liquid biopsy clinical diagnostics,

exemplified here for differential diagnosis of lung cancer subtupes.

Abstract: The methylation profile of circulating cell-free DNA (cfDNA) is of great interest

as a liquid biopsy for the detection and monitoring of cancer and other pathologies. Here we

introduce 'circulating cell-free DNA reduced representation bisulfite sequencing' (cf-RRBS),

enabling the use of highly effective RRBS on highly fragmented plasma cfDNA as well as on

FFPE-archived cancer tissues. The method enriches the CpG-rich RRBS target regions by

enzymatic degradation of all off-target DNA rather than by targeted capture, in contrast to

previous methods. Critical steps are fully enzymatic in a single-tube, making it rapid, cost-

effective, robust and easily implemented on a liquid-handling station for high-throughput

sample preparation. We benchmark cf-RRBS results to those obtained by previous more

complex methods and exemplify its use for accurate non-invasive subtyping of lung cancer, a

frequent onco-pathology task. cf-RRBS enables any molecular pathology lab to tap into the

cfDNA methylome, only making use of off-the-shelf reagents and open-source data analysis

tools.

Main Text:

INTRODUCTION

Altered DNA methylation is an almost universal hallmark of oncogenic transformation and,

in a broader sense, of tissue pathology (1). Recent studies (2–5) have demonstrated that

methylation profiles derived from cfDNA not only enable the detection of tumors, but also

reveal the tissue of origin for various cancer entities. To fully realize the potential of DNA

methylation based diagnostics, obviating tissue biopsy is necessary, instead detecting altered

DNA methylation patterns in easily sampled body fluids like blood plasma, i.e. through

'liquid biopsy'.

The most popular tissue methylation profiling approaches are based on the array technology

of Illumina (Infinium 450K or EPIC BeadChip) (6,7) or on Reduced Representation Bisulfite

Sequencing (RRBS) (8), which fail on highly fragmented low input DNA such as it is found as circulating cell-free DNA (cfDNA) in blood plasma. At present, whole-genome bisulfite sequencing (WGBS) on cfDNA can be used, but remains too costly for routine application, mainly because of its non-targeted nature, requiring very substantial sequencing budget in order to enable robust quantitation of methylation levels (9). Hence, the key to cost-effectively obtaining robust information on the methylation status of regulatory sections of the genome leaked by dying cells as circulating free plasma DNA, is not to dilute sequencing budget over the entire genome, but to focus it on CpG-rich genomic regions (10). Therefore, methods to capture CpG-rich regions have been developed, using expensive custom-designed and often proprietary reagents, such as capture probes in SeqCap Epi (11) and similar products, or methylated DNA-binding antibodies in cfMeDIP-seq (12), involving complex and lengthy protocols that are difficult to automate (Figure 1A).

Classical reduced representation bisulfite sequencing (RRBS) (8), in contrast, achieves its CpG-rich region focus by digesting high molecular weight genomic DNA (gDNA) extracted from tissues with a restriction enzyme (typically MspI) that cuts CpG-rich sequences (i.e., 'CpG islands'). This is followed by size-based gel electrophoresis separation of the short resulting MspI/MspI-fragments from the genomic DNA input material, empowering high sequencing coverage of the CpG-enriched ~2% of the genome within these short MspI/MspI fragments. The limited required sequencing budget is similar to what is presently routinely used in Non-Invasive Prenatal Testing (NIPT) (13), which serves as a benchmark for clinical implementation, as it is the most widespread genomic sequencing-based molecular diagnostic test in use today. RRBS does not require any customized target-selective reagents, making it a universal method for genome-wide methylome profiling across pathologies. While RRBS is hence very attractive as a concept for clinical liquid biopsy, its current implementations are totally unsuited for use in liquid biopsy applications, as the minute amounts of cell-free plasma DNA input come naturally already (highly) fragmented, making the critical size separation of the MspI/MspI fragments from the fragmented input cfDNA impossible (see Figure 1B for an illustration of this problem).

To overcome this, we set out to develop cell-free RRBS (cf-RRBS), which incorporates key RRBS innovations to fit the fragmented cfDNA input material. At the same time, we removed low-throughput manual steps such as gel separation, enabling high-throughput automation that is essential for robust use in the diagnostic molecular pathology laboratory.

Here we report on the development of cf-RRBS, characterization and benchmarking of the methodology and we illustrate its power in a key application: non-invasive histology subtyping of lung cancer.

RESULTS

cf-RRBS method development

Conceptually, rather than affinity-purifying a CpG-dense genomic target subsample as in previous methods, we inverted the problem, and chose to enzymatically destroy all off-target DNA in the sample upon protecting only the targeted MspI/MspI restriction-site flanked CpG-rich genomic subsample. This ~2% of the genome has been amply demonstrated as a very effective measure of genome-wide methylation status ever since RRBS was invented (8,14).

In short (Figure 1C), in cf-RRBS, input DNA is first dephosphorylated by recombinant Shrimp Alkaline Phosphatase (rSAP). Fragments are subsequently digested by MspI, resulting in novel phosphorylated 5'-ends, marking MspI cuts. Upon 5' overhang filling, dA-tailing and hairpin-shaped adapter ligation, exclusively MspI/MspI-fragments are typified by fully ligated and hence unnicked ends. These 'circular' (i.e., with hairpins at both ends) MspI/MspI-fragments are uniquely resistant to an optimized mixture of single- and double-stranded 3'>5' and/or 5'>3' exonucleases, whereas all other DNA is degraded, effectively achieving the RRBS target enrichment. Finally, following adapter opening and bisulfite conversion, fragments are amplified, and a sequencing library is obtained. With robustness and ease of automation in mind, we thoroughly optimized the implementation of this method concept, such that only sequential reagent additions and incubations are needed in a single tube, up to the first DNA amplification. This required the reagent concentrations and compositions to be precisely tuned to avoid interference with subsequent enzymatic reactions: e.g., dATP is used by Klenow for dA-tailing, but an excessive amount inhibits T4 DNA ligase during hairpin ligation (15). Similarly, heat-labile variants of selected enzymes were introduced, including rSAP and Antarctic thermolabile Uracil-DNA Glycosylase (used for adapter opening), such that enzyme inactivation can simply be achieved with an intermittent heating step.

The elimination of all intermittent purification steps and tube transfers up to bisulfite conversion allowed for robustness in working with the very minute DNA samples extractable

from patient plasma (Figure 1A). Other design optimization parameters included short

runtime and low cost, achieving a total cost including sequencing not surpassing that of the

routinely used NIPT test, a benchmark for successful sequencing-based molecular pathology

tests. All of this required substantial optimization and we recommend users to adhere tightly

to the finalized protocol parameters set out in detail in the Online Methods, including how to

automate cf-RRBS on a TECAN EVO200 liquid handling platform. Adaptation to other

commonly used liquid handling platforms should be straightforward.

cf-RRBS target enrichment performance

Most of the cfDNA comes in fragments of the length of one nucleosomal winding (i.e.

166bp), with a smaller fraction corresponding to the length of DNA wound around two

nucleosomes, and vanishingly small amounts of multiple-nucleosome fragments (16). Hence,

we defined the target genomic subsample of cf-RRBS as all MspI/MspI-fragments sized 20-

200 bp, as longer MspI/MspI genomic fragments would only rarely be present. These

targeted MspI/MspI fragments make up ~2% of the human genome, consistent with the 42.4

+/- 3.2-fold enrichment of this target observed with the method (n=16) (Figure 2A), resulting

in >90% of the reads mapping to the target MspI/MspI regions (Figure 2B). In Figure 2A we

also illustrate that the >40-fold target enrichment factor achieved on the highly fragmented

cfDNA is in the same range as is achieved with classical RRBS on high-MW gDNA. The

data also make it clear that this gel-based size-separation classical RRBS implementation is

incapable of achieving high and robust target enrichment when applied to fragmented

cfDNA.

Two key steps in the cf-RRBS method enable specific MspI/MspI-fragment enrichment

without relying on DNA size: first, marking of natural fragment ends through

dephosphorylation by rSAP, enabling bistranded ligation of closed hairpin adapters only to

MspI/MspI digested target fragments (which regain 5' phosphates at both ends in the digest);

and, second, degrading unprotected off-target fragments by a mixture of exonucleases (Figure

1C). We evaluated the effect of omitting one or both of these steps. As illustrated by

visualizing the resulting sequencing reads that map to a randomly chosen 2.5 kb genomic

stretch on chromosome 1, removing either the initial dephosphorylation or the exonuclease

digestion of off-target DNA indeed obviates the precise enrichment of MspI/MspI-fragments

(Figure 2C). These observations were confirmed at genome-wide scale (Figure 2D): only

with inclusion of both key steps can the >40-fold MspI/MspI target enrichment be achieved.

cf-RRBS quantifies methylation status highly reproducibly and yields equivalent results with established more complex and/or more costly cfDNA methylation profiling methods.

The methylation profiling accuracy of cf-RRBS was benchmarked by pairwise concordance analyses using cfDNA samples that were also analyzed by SeqCap Epi (genome-wide targeted capture method from Roche-Nimblegen). Both CpG site- and island-level 'beta values' (i.e., the ratio of the number of reads that indicate methylation over the total number of reads mapping to a CpG site or CpG island) were considered, measuring agreement by Pearson correlation and mean absolute error (~the average 'disagreement' between both methods). The genomic region target of SeqCap Epi and cf-RRBS are only partially overlapping, so these analyses are limited to the genomic regions that are sampled by both technologies. Results from a representative sample are shown (Figure 3A). Correlations were very high between both methods: average r = 0.96 for sites and r = 0.98 for islands, and mean absolute errors were consistently below 6% (Figure 3B). Of note, both target-enrichment methods compared equally well to results from WGBS analysis: concordance with WGBS was substantially better at the CpG island level (which averages the methylation status of many CpG sites) than at individual CpG level, which is likely caused by inaccurate single CpG methylation status sequencing by the low per-site coverage that is obtained in WGBS (Figure S1).

A selected cfDNA sample was analyzed in triplicate by both cf-RRBS and SeqCap Epi to estimate technical variation. Both methods performed highly consistently (r>0.95; Figure 3C). The CpG site call 'overlap' between technical replicates was more than 80% and was largely similar for both methods (Figure 3C, right). In exploratory experiments, and in keeping with the method having been designed to operate on highly fragmented DNA, we have also successfully applied cf-RRBS to DNA extracted from formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded (FFPE) tissues and report on this elsewhere (17). Hence, the same cf-RRBS method can be used both on patient cfDNA and on the most commonly available archived samples of diseased tissues in histopathological collections, which should greatly facilitate making direct correlations between cfDNA methylation alterations and those in the diseased tissues under study (which can be used as reference methylome atlases to deconvolute cfRRBS data obtained from plasma).

cf-RRBS predominantly targets gene promoters

The functional genomic coverage of cf-RRBS was compared to method alternatives by mapping individual CpG calls to CpG islands and publicly available tracks of regulatory elements (i.e., promoters; promoter flanking regions; enhancers; CTCF (CCCTC-Binding factor) binding sites; and remaining unannotated transcription factor binding sites and open chromatin regions). A representative 25 kb chunk of the methylation profiles of the same cfDNA sample, obtained either by cf-RRBS or by SeqCap Epi, visually demonstrates that the spatial distribution of CpG calls is, as expected, highly enriched in CpG islands and regulatory elements (Figure 3D).

The number of CpG methylation calls is of course highly related to sequencing depth. At 20 million reads (Paired-End 75), cf-RRBS provides methylation information on more than 3 million CpG sites (Figure 3E). Since the SeqCap Epi kit was designed by the manufacturer to capture-enrich a larger genomic subsample than cf-RRBS, it naturally covers more CpG sites when this target is sequenced at a depth according to protocol guidelines, requiring about 50 million reads (Paired-End 100). However, the fraction of CpGs calls in islands is, overall, greater for cf-RRBS than for SeqCap Epi (Figure 3F). In contrast to WGBS, both of the CpG-rich genomic area targeting methods have a much higher CpG call rate in annotated regulatory elements of the genome (Figure 3G). Notably, 53.4% of CpG calls made by cf-RRBS cover promoters, whilst promoters, as currently annotated in the human genome only embody ~2.5% of the human genome (18). Differential promoter methylation is a key information source as to the cell type of origin of methylated DNA and hence of key diagnostic importance (19).

Non-invasive cfDNA methylation profiling by cf-RRBS allows specific histological lung cancer subtyping

While cf-RRBS is very widely applicable and studies are ongoing in our lab and several others in a multitude of clinical diagnostic settings (2, 17, 20, 21), we illustrate its utility by providing a proof-of-principle study on lung cancer. Lung cancer is fundamentally subdivided in small cell lung cancer (SCLC) and non-SCLC. Approximately 85% of diagnoses are non-SCLC of which the most common subtypes are adenocarcinoma (LUAD) or squamous cell carcinoma (LUSC). These distinctions have long been therapeutically relevant, especially for targeted treatment approaches (22) and even for chemotherapy selection (23,24). Most importantly, diagnosing SCLC currently suffices to initiate

(chemo)therapy, as currently, no targeted treatments are routinely used, rendering further

molecular characterization as yet unnecessary. Also, transformation to SCLC is often seen as

a mechanism of resistance upon treatment of non-SCLC (25), an event which might be

intercepted using liquid biopsy-based disease monitoring instead of invasive lung biopsy.

We analyzed a first cohort, obtained from the University Hospital of Ghent (UZGent), of 56

liquid biopsies (lung cancer n=47 and non-tumor pulmonary disease n=9) by cf-RRBS. A

second cohort, obtained from the University Medical Center of Groningen (UMCG), of 69

liquid biopsies (lung cancer n=39 and healthy controls n=30) was analyzed as well by cf-

RRBS for classifier validation purposes. As a healthy control reference, 46 healthy controls

cfDNA samples (UZGent) were used. Clinical parameters per cohort are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Clinical parameters per cohort

Patient cohort UZGent		
Variable	**Parameter**	**No. of patients**
Age	Median (range)	66 (44-80)
Sex	Male	31 (66%)
	Female	16 (34%)
Smoking history	Smoker	14 (30%)
	Ex-smoker	29 (62%)
	Non-smoker	3 (6%)
	unknown	1 (2%)
Stage	III	6 (13%)
	IV	41 (87%)
Histology	Adenocarcinoma	20 (42%)
	Squamous cell carcinoma	14 (30%)
	Small cell	13 (28%)

Patient cohort UMCG		
Variable	**Parameter**	**No. of patients**
Age	Median (range)	65 (40-83)
Sex	Male	18 (47%)
	Female	20 (53%)
Smoking history	Smoker	28 (74%)
	Ex-smoker	9 (24%)
	Non-smoker	1 (3%)
	unknown	0 (0%)
Stage	III	2 (5%)
	IV	36 (95%)
Histology	Adenocarcinoma	26 (68%)
	Squamous cell carcinoma	12 (32%)
	Small cell	0 (0%)

Control cohort UZGent		
Variable	**Parameter**	**No. of patients**
Age	Median (range)	59 (41-71)
Sex	Male	7 (78%)
	Female	2 (22%)

Control cohort UMCG		
Variable	**Parameter**	**No. of patients**
Age	Median (range)	63 (48-77)
Sex	Male	14 (47%)
	Female	16 (53%)

240 A customized data processing and modeling approach for the methylation-based tumor

241 classification was developed. First, we clustered the CpGs of which the methylation level

could be determined in >50% of the UZGent healthy control samples, according to a scheme (detailed in the Supplementary Methods) that optimally accommodates that cf-RRBS-detected CpGs are located close together in short MspI/MspI fragments. This results in more than 500,000 such clusters (Table S2), and methylation levels on these clustered CpGs were averaged into a cluster-specific beta value. These clusters were also cross-checked in these healthy control cf-RRBS datasets (n=46) to determine which ones had stable methylation level across healthy controls, in this way minimizing interference of e.g. age-or sex-related methylation alterations (26,27). Illustrating how publicly available tumor methylation data can be reutilized in designing classification models for cf-RRBS-based diagnosis, we extracted these same CpG-cluster methylation values from 719 lung tumor methylomics datasets, so as to be able to determine which ones were most informative for the lung tumor subtype classification task at hand. This procedure resulted in approximately 450 to 500 clusters that were propagated in our classification models (Table S3). t-SNE analysis using the selected clusters demonstrated an almost complete separation of the different lung cancer subtypes in the publicly sourced tumor methylation reference dataset (Figure 4A). Hence, the prioritized set of CpG clusters was used to perform deconvolution (5), designed to assign cf-RRBS data of patients to four subfractions: healthy, LUAD, LUSC and SCLC.

This model was then used to classify the cf-RRBS-profiled patients and controls according to the model subgroup for which the highest disease-specific fraction was assigned. A very high diagnostic accuracy was observed: the multi-class area under the curve across both cohorts to differentiate the three lung cancer classes and controls was 0.94. A ROC curve is shown differentiating control versus tumor in Fig S2. For the clinical key question of differentiation lung cancer subtypes in patients with a predetermined presence of a tumor, the multi-class area under the curve rises to 0.95. For treatment purposes, the differentiation of NSCLC and SCLC is most important; the receiver operating characteristic curve using the SCLC score with an AUC of 0.93 is shown in Fig 4A. In Supplementary Fig S2, ROC curves are also shown for the differentiation of LUAD versus LUSC using the LUAD test score (AUC = 0.92) and LUSC test score (AUC = 0.91), respectively. At a conservative cutoff of 3.5% of the classifier's attribution to one of the cancer subtypes, none of the control plasma was falsely predicted with a lung cancer. The very few false predictions that remained (Figure 4B & 4C– brown-colored lines), had all been annotated by expert pathologists as uncertain diagnosis (Figure 4B & 4C – brown-colored crosses) except for one patient per cohort (Figure 4B & 4C – brown-colored dots). Only considering the cases where pathology was

univocal, the confusion matrices across both cohorts were updated (Figure 4D-E). We

suspected that the required model fraction cutoff at 3.5% derived from the well-known liquid

biopsy problem that some patient's tumors do not shed enough DNA for the differential

methylation signal to raise above the healthy tissue-derived cfDNA background. Our data

show that ~79% (36/47 for UZGent cohort and 32/39 for UMCG cohort) of patients have

sufficient circulating tumor DNA to allow for reliable non-invasive histological subtyping by

methylation profiling. The patients for whom this methodology can be used, are easily

identified by the indicative subtype fraction based on the cf-RRBS methylome data

(Methods). Explicitly the term 'indicative subtype fraction' was used as no comparability is

implied with 'Variant Allele Fraction' synonym to 'estimated ctDNA fraction'.

Deconvolution methods using methylation data can in an *in silico* experiment estimate

subfractions in a mixed sample near-perfect, this differs from a real-world scenario, like in

this study, where reference profiles are often incomplete, generated in other laboratories, with

other protocols or methods and often on impure samples (28). In the UMCG cohort the VAF

on different driver mutations was determined using the AVENIO ctDNA Expanded Kit. After

log2 transformation, a correlation of $R^2=0.5683$ between VAF and indicative subtype fraction

by methylation was calculated (Fig 4F). It was observed that low VAF did not necessarily

mean wrong subclassification.

DISCUSSION

cf-RRBS is a RRBS method that is applicable on cfDNA by effectively overcoming the challenges associated with low abundant and highly fragmented input material. MspI digestion and subsequent size-based (20-200 bp) fragment selection results in capturing the majority of promoters and CpG islands (14), uncovering most of the methylation-determined information on cellular (patho)physiology (29). With cf-RRBS, the same representative section of the epigenome is obtained, achieving a similar cost-benefit balance (i.e., ~$200 per sample (30)) as provided by classic RRBS, rendering our method feasible for large-scale studies and routine diagnostics, all the more given its design accounts for automatability.

On the moment of writing only two 'whole-genome' approaches have been published which similarly target CpG-rich regions in highly fragmented cfDNA: SeqCap Epi and cfMeDIPSeq. Close inspection of associated protocols indicates longer hands-on and total runtimes in comparison to cf-RRBS (Figure 1A). More importantly, in stark contrast to the cf-RRBS' mostly single-tube workflow, SeqCap Epi and cfMeDIPSeq incorporate a great number of complex sample handling steps, including solid-phase reversible immobilization magnetic bead purifications, vacuum concentrator drying stages, and many sample transfer steps temperature-sensitive steps (Figure 1A). Some of these (like drying steps) are difficult to validate in routine diagnostics workflows and the combination of all of these make automation far from trivial. We anticipate that cf-RRBS, like NIPT testing, will be much easier to implement in hospital diagnostic laboratories provided with validated reagents and software, rather than having to rely on a model in which patient samples necessarily have to be shipped to central highly specialized laboratories, which is not practical nor economical in many parts of the world. cf-RRBS only relies on a few enzymes and bisulfite conversion, which offers supplier versatility and more common paths of diagnostic reagent qualification than is the case e.g. with complex libraries of synthetic capture probes.

cf-RRBS is performed using a series of ordinary enzymatic reagents, which should allow straightforward implementation in clinics without complex laboratory platform changes that often frustrate the translation of 'omics' studies into clinical practice. Moreover, other than human DNA, species with similar characteristics concerning methylation and spatial CpG distribution, such as mouse models, represent excellent cf-RRBS candidates, requiring no protocol adaptations. Also, preliminary results indicate its capability to analyze fragmented formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded DNA, potentially activating a large biobank of archival material for retrospective research.

Recently two other RRBS-based protocols which can be applied on cfDNA, cfMethyl-Seq (EarlyDx) (31), and FFPE-derived fragmented DNA, FFPE-RRBS (32), were published. Both methods resemble closely our cf-RRBS protocol and also crucially depend on the pre-treatment of input fragmented DNA with a DNA phosphatase. While the latter protocol does not include a strategy to avoid the use of non-MspI digested 3'-ends, the first protocol is actively blocking non-MspI digested 3'-ends with dideoxynucleotides. In contrast, our cf-RRBS protocol is actively removing DNA pieces that were not digested by MspI. The authors of the cfMethyl-Seq method state that their method could be superior because of two reasons: Firstly, they expect that cfMethyl-Seq retains significantly more cfDNA because exonuclease digestion removes all DNA fragments that contain nicks, a scenario that has been estimated to occur in 30% of cfDNA fragments, leading to the loss of precious cfDNA. And secondly, in cf-RRBS, adapters and ligases are consumed by the majority of cfDNA fragments, including those without the desired digestion sites, leading to lower ligation efficiency for the fragments of interest and lower library yields. However, the authors fail to show real data evidence for this statement. Raw cfMethyl-Seq data access was asked for, but we never received this data. We were able to perform the protocol as published but we are still in doubt if the libraries are of the same quality as those from the original authors.

The method's application is illustrated on a relevant problem related to lung cancer diagnosis. Here, for patients with inaccessible lesions or substantial comorbidity, tissue examination might be delayed or simply not possible (33). Moreover, SCLC transformation, seen as a mechanism of therapy resistance (25), is difficult to intercept by classic disease monitoring standards (i.e., no serial tumor biopsies possible; mostly imaging-based). Our first cohort included one such case, correctly subtyped as SCLC according to its cfDNA methylation profile. Unfortunately, a plasma sample at initial diagnosis, prior to transformation, was lacking. Overall, we show that accurate histological subtyping of lung cancer is feasible when the indicative subtype fraction is above 3.5%.

Beyond an already-published pediatric oncology study (2) and the above-presented proof-of-principle analysis on lung cancer, clinical efforts to further explore cf-RRBS's range of application are in process. Building on ongoing rapid developments in epigenomic sequencing of tumors and non-cancerous pathologies, such as immune/inflammatory diseases (34), degenerative diseases (35), infectious diseases (36), substance abuse (37) and prenatal complications (38), cf-RRBS is poised for broad clinical utility.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

All wet-lab and computational methods, as well as patient characteristics are included in the Online Methods.

List of Supplementary Materials

Supplementary Methods

Figure S1 to S2

Table S1 to S12 (excel files)

References (S1–S13)

References and Notes

1.   Kulis M, Esteller M. DNA Methylation and Cancer. In: Herceg Z, Ushijima T, editors. Advances in Genetics [Internet]. Academic Press; 2010 [cited 2022 May 25]. p. 27–56. (Epigenetics and Cancer, Part A; vol. 70). Available from: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780123808660600022

2.   Van Paemel R, De Koker A, Vandeputte C, van Zogchel L, Lammens T, Laureys G, et al. Minimally invasive classification of paediatric solid tumours using reduced representation bisulphite sequencing of cell-free DNA: a proof-of-principle study. Epigenetics. 2020 Jul 14;1–13.

3.   Kang S, Li Q, Chen Q, Zhou Y, Park S, Lee G, et al. CancerLocator: non-invasive cancer diagnosis and tissue-of-origin prediction using methylation profiles of cell-free DNA. Genome Biol. 2017 Mar 24;18(1):53.

4.   Li W, Li Q, Kang S, Same M, Zhou Y, Sun C, et al. CancerDetector: ultrasensitive and non-invasive cancer detection at the resolution of individual reads using cell-free DNA methylation sequencing data. Nucleic Acids Res. 2018 Sep 6;46(15):e89.

5.   Moss J, Magenheim J, Neiman D, Zemmour H, Loyfer N, Korach A, et al. Comprehensive human cell-type methylation atlas reveals origins of circulating cell-free DNA in health and disease. Nat Commun. 2018 Nov 29;9(1):5068.

6.   Dedeurwaerder S, Defrance M, Calonne E, Denis H, Sotiriou C, Fuks F. Evaluation of the Infinium Methylation 450K technology. Epigenomics. 2011 Dec;3(6):771–84.

7.   Zhou W, Laird PW, Shen H. Comprehensive characterization, annotation and innovative use of Infinium DNA methylation BeadChip probes. Nucleic Acids Res. 2017 Feb 28;45(4):e22.

8.   Meissner A, Gnirke A, Bell GW, Ramsahoye B, Lander ES, Jaenisch R. Reduced representation bisulfite sequencing for comparative high-resolution DNA methylation analysis. Nucleic Acids Res. 2005;33(18):5868–77.

9.   Yong WS, Hsu FM, Chen PY. Profiling genome-wide DNA methylation. Epigenetics Chromatin. 2016;9:26.

10.   Deaton AM, Bird A. CpG islands and the regulation of transcription. Genes Dev.

2011 May 15;25(10):1010–22.

11.   Wendt J, Rosenbaum H, Richmond TA, Jeddeloh JA, Burgess DL. Targeted Bisulfite Sequencing Using the SeqCap Epi Enrichment System. In: Tost J, editor. DNA Methylation Protocols [Internet]. New York, NY: Springer; 2018 [cited 2022 May 25]. p. 383–405. (Methods in Molecular Biology). Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-7481-8_20

12.   Shen SY, Burgener JM, Bratman SV, De Carvalho DD. Preparation of cfMeDIP-seq libraries for methylome profiling of plasma cell-free DNA. Nat Protoc. 2019 Oct;14(10):2749–80.

13.   Kostenko E, Chantraine F, Vandeweyer K, Schmid M, Lefevre A, Hertz D, et al. Clinical and Economic Impact of Adopting Noninvasive Prenatal Testing as a Primary Screening Method for Fetal Aneuploidies in the General Pregnancy Population. Fetal Diagn Ther. 2019;45(6):413–23.

14.   Gu H, Smith ZD, Bock C, Boyle P, Gnirke A, Meissner A. Preparation of reduced representation bisulfite sequencing libraries for genome-scale DNA methylation profiling. Nat Protoc. 2011 Apr;6(4):468–81.

15.   Rossi R, Montecucco A, Ciarrocchi G, Biamonti G. Functional characterization of the T4 DNA ligase: a new insight into the mechanism of action. Nucleic Acids Res. 1997 Jun 1;25(11):2106–13.

16.   Jiang P, Lo YMD. The Long and Short of Circulating Cell-Free DNA and the Ins and Outs of Molecular Diagnostics. Trends Genet. 2016 Jun 1;32(6):360–71.

17.   De Wilde J, Van Paemel R, De Koker A, Roelandt S, Van de Velde S, Callewaert N, et al. A Fast, Affordable, and Minimally Invasive Diagnostic Test for Cancer of Unknown Primary Using DNA Methylation Profiling. Lab Investig J Tech Methods Pathol. 2024 Aug;104(8):102091.

18.   Zerbino DR, Wilder SP, Johnson N, Juettemann T, Flicek PR. The Ensembl Regulatory Build. Genome Biol. 2015 Mar 24;16(1):56.

19.   Taryma-Leśniak O, Sokolowska KE, Wojdacz TK. Current status of development of methylation biomarkers for in vitro diagnostic IVD applications. Clin Epigenetics. 2020 Jul 6;12(1):100.

20.   Cornelli L, Van Paemel R, Ferro dos Santos MR, Roelandt S, Willems L, Vandersteene J, et al. Diagnosis of pediatric central nervous system tumors using methylation profiling of cfDNA from cerebrospinal fluid. Clin Epigenetics. 2024 Jul 5;16(1):87.

21.   Baetens M, Van Gaever B, Deblaere S, De Koker A, Meuris L, Callewaert N, et al. Advancing diagnosis and early risk assessment of preeclampsia through noninvasive cell-free DNA methylation profiling. Clin Epigenetics. 2024 Dec 18;16:182.

22.   Chan BA, Hughes BGM. Targeted therapy for non-small cell lung cancer: current standards and the promise of the future. Transl Lung Cancer Res [Internet]. 2015 Feb [cited 2022 May 25];4(1). Available from: https://tlcr.amegroups.com/article/view/2699

23.   Scagliotti GV, Parikh P, von Pawel J, Biesma B, Vansteenkiste J, Manegold C, et al. Phase III study comparing cisplatin plus gemcitabine with cisplatin plus pemetrexed in chemotherapy-naive patients with advanced-stage non-small-cell lung cancer. J Clin Oncol Off J Am Soc Clin Oncol. 2008 Jul 20;26(21):3543–51.

24.   Huang CY, Ju DT, Chang CF, Muralidhar Reddy P, Velmurugan BK. A review on the effects of current chemotherapy drugs and natural agents in treating non–small cell lung cancer. BioMedicine. 7(4):23.

25.   Oser MG, Niederst MJ, Sequist LV, Engelman JA. Transformation from non-small-cell lung cancer to small-cell lung cancer: molecular drivers and cells of origin. Lancet Oncol. 2015 Apr;16(4):e165–72.

26.   Horvath S. DNA methylation age of human tissues and cell types. Genome Biol. 2013

450 Dec 10;14(10):3156.

27. Heyn H, Li N, Ferreira HJ, Moran S, Pisano DG, Gomez A, et al. Distinct DNA methylomes of newborns and centenarians. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 2012 Jun 26;109(26):10522–7.

28. De Ridder K, Che H, Leroy K, Thienpont B. Benchmarking of methods for DNA methylome deconvolution. Nat Commun. 2024 May 16;15(1):4134.

29. Bock C. Epigenetic biomarker development. Epigenomics. 2009 Oct;1(1):99–110.

30. Boyle P, Clement K, Gu H, Smith ZD, Ziller M, Fostel JL, et al. Gel-free multiplexed reduced representation bisulfite sequencing for large-scale DNA methylation profiling. Genome Biol. 2012 Oct 3;13(10):R92.

31. Stackpole ML, Zeng W, Li S, Liu CC, Zhou Y, He S, et al. Cost-effective methylome sequencing of cell-free DNA for accurately detecting and locating cancer. Nat Commun. 2022 Sep 29;13(1):5566.

32. Zhang S, He S, Zhu X, Wang Y, Xie Q, Song X, et al. DNA methylation profiling to determine the primary sites of metastatic cancers using formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded tissues. Nat Commun. 2023 Sep 14;14:5686.

33. Stokstad T, Sørhaug S, Amundsen T, Grønberg BH. Medical complexity and time to lung cancer treatment – a three-year retrospective chart review. BMC Health Serv Res. 2017 Jan 17;17(45).

34. Liu Y, Aryee MJ, Padyukov L, Fallin MD, Hesselberg E, Runarsson A, et al. Epigenome-wide association data implicate DNA methylation as an intermediary of genetic risk in rheumatoid arthritis. Nat Biotechnol. 2013 Feb;31(2):142–7.

35. Urdinguio RG, Sanchez-Mut JV, Esteller M. Epigenetic mechanisms in neurological diseases: genes, syndromes, and therapies. Lancet Neurol. 2009 Nov;8(11):1056–72.

36. Pacis A, Tailleux L, Morin AM, Lambourne J, MacIsaac JL, Yotova V, et al. Bacterial infection remodels the DNA methylation landscape of human dendritic cells. Genome Res. 2015 Dec;25(12):1801–11.

37. Cecil C a. M, Walton E, Smith RG, Viding E, McCrory EJ, Relton CL, et al. DNA methylation and substance-use risk: a prospective, genome-wide study spanning gestation to adolescence. Transl Psychiatry. 2016 Dec 6;6(12):e976.

38. Yuen RK, Peñaherrera MS, von Dadelszen P, McFadden DE, Robinson WP. DNA methylation profiling of human placentas reveals promoter hypomethylation of multiple genes in early-onset preeclampsia. Eur J Hum Genet. 2010 Sep;18(9):1006–12.

Acknowledgments: We thank Hans Van Vlierberghe and Xavier Verhelst for providing blood samples from patients with liver disease. We thank Tim Lammens and Geneviève Laureys for providing the neuroblastoma samples. We thank Jo Vandesompele, Anneleen Decock, Wim Van Criekinge and their teams for the reuse data on neuroblastoma patients.

Funding:

Research Foundation Flanders 11R8616N (ADK)

Research Foundation Flanders 11B3718N (RVP)

Research Foundation Flanders 1S90621N (JDW)

Research Foundation Flanders 18B1712N (BDW)

Research Foundation Flanders (AZ)

Bijzonder Onderzoeksfonds BOF.STA.2017.0002.01 (LR)

Kom Op Tegen Kanker KotK_UG/2020/12444/1 (ADK)

VIB (ADK, NC)

VIB Grand Challenges project VR 2021 1712 DOC. 1492/4 (ADK, NC)

Ghent University (ADK, LR, RVP, MVdL, JDW, BDW, BM, KDR, JVD, NC)

UZ Innovation Fund (BVG)

Author contributions:

Conceptualization: ADK, LR, RVP, JVD, NC

Methodology: ADK, LR, RVP

Software: ADK, LR, RVP, SVdV, BVG

Validation: ADK, LR, RVP, MVdL, JDW

Formal analysis: ADK, LR, RVP, MVdL

Investigation: ADK, LR, RVP, MVdL

Resources: KV, ID, VS, UH, FD, LF, KC

Data curation: ADK, LR, RVP, SVdV, MVdL, JDW

Writing – original draft: ADK, LR, NC

Writing – review & editing: ADK, LR, RVP, SVdV, AZ, KDR, JVD, NC

Visualization: ADK, LR, RVP, SVdV

Supervision: BDW, BM, KDR, JVD, NC

Project administration: ADK, LR, RVP, MVdL

Funding acquisition: BDW, BM, KDR, JVD, NC

Competing interests:

A.D.K. and N.C. are listed as inventors in patent application PCT/EP2017/056850: MEANS

AND METHODS FOR AMPLIFYING NUCLEOTIDE SEQUENCES related to the methods

disclosed in this manuscript.

Data and materials availability:

 Figures

 Fig. 1

Figure 1. cf-RRBS is technically less complex than SeqCap Epi and cfMeDIPSeq. (A) A

simplified protocol comparison between (mostly single-tube) cf-RRBS, SeqCap Epi and cfMeDIPSeq

in function of time. Both SeqCap Epi and cfMeDIPSeq take longer than cf-RRBS: additional steps

include sample transfers (dots), solid-phase reversible immobilization magnetic bead purifications

(triangles), vacuum concentration steps (rectangles). (B) A digital gel image of gDNA and cfDNA,

either undigested or MspI-digested. In classic RRBS, MspI/MspI-fragments ranging from 20 to 200

bp (indicated with a green rectangle; 'the target') are to be extracted from the gel. The undigested

gDNA runs above the upper marker (UM) and is not observed. After MspI digestion, three (indicated

with asterisks) characteristic satellite DNA bands appear near the lower maker (LM). With cfDNA,

target extraction includes undigested DNA, since cell-free fragments are naturally highly fragmented.

(C) A simplified cf-RRBS workflow, where thick lines indicate DNA fragment strands. Fragments are

subject to dephosphorylation, MspI digestion, dA-tailing, and ligation of hairpin-shaped adapters.

Only MspI/MspI-fragments yield unnicked DNA molecules without free ends, providing protection

against exonucleases.

 Fig. 2

Figure 2. cf-RRBS solves the target enrichment problem of classic RRBS on cfDNA. (A) While a
similar target fold enrichment is observed between classic RRBS and cf-RRBS on gDNA (n=4),
RRBS demonstrates poor enrichment when executed on cfDNA (n=23), which can be restored by
using cf-RRBS (n=16). Same-sample dots are connected. (B) A histogram of the mapped reads in
function of the target length shows that cf-RRBS reads map the target at a higher frequency than
classic RRBS. (C) The per base fold enrichment of a representative chromosomal stretch of 2.5 kb is
visualized across four samples, annotated by cf-RRBS protocol deviations at the right-hand side,
including missing steps concerning rSAP dephosphorylation, exonuclease (exo) degradation, both or
none. The top track presents *in silico* predicted MspI digestion sites and MspI/MspI-fragments (sized
20-200 bp). Pie charts clarify on- and off-target fractions of the visualized genomic stretch. (D)
Similar to C but the overall genome-wide target fold enrichment is shown.

Fig. 3

Figure 3. Methylation profiling with cf-RRBS is accurate. (A) Methylation profile scatter plot

comparison between cf-RRBS and SeqCap Epi of representative patient LP10's cfDNA, at CpG site-

level (left) and at CpG island-level (right). A least squares fit (dotted line), corresponding Pearson

correlation (r), and the mean absolute error (MAE), are given for both comparisons. (B)

Swarm/boxplot combinations of the Pearson correlation (left) and mean absolute error (right) between

cfDNA samples analyzed by cf-RRBS and SeqCap Epi. (C) Pairwise comparisons between cfDNA

samples analyzed in triplicate by cf-RRBS and SeqCap Epi. Paired relations are connected. Analyses

include the Pearson correlation between CpG site beta values (left); the mean absolute error between

CpG site beta values (middle); and the positional overlap in CpG calls (right), calculated as the

number of recurrent CpGs over the total number of CpGs in the sample with the lowest sequencing

depth. (D) Methylation profiles of representative patient LP10's cfDNA derived by cf-RRBS (black)

and SeqCap Epi (green) of a genomic stretch sized 25 kb. Frequency histograms of CpG beta values

are shown, one for each technique (right). Similarly, the spatial distribution of CpG calls is clarified

by positional frequency histograms below. The bottom two bars contain tracks of CpG islands and

regulatory elements, of which the legend is provided by G. (E) the number of raw cfDNA sequencing

reads is shown in relation to the total number of CpG calls for three technical cf-RRBS replicates,

randomly sampled to 1, 2, 4, 8, 12 and 16 million reads. A log regression fit, with 95% confidence

interval (given by shading), indicates three million CpG calls are obtained with less than 20 million

reads. (F) Swarm/boxplot combinations of the number of CpG calls located in CpG islands compared

between cfDNA samples analyzed by cf-RRBS and SeqCap Epi. The scatter plot at the right-hand

side provides the relation with the total number of CpG calls for each technique, given by least

squares fits. cf-RRBS provides relatively more calls located in CpG islands. (G) Pie charts indicate

the average fractions of CpGs that cover regulatory elements per cfDNA methylation profiling

method. The far-left pie demonstrates the genomic background. Included regulatory elements are

unannotated transcription factor binding sites (TFBSs) and open chromatin regions (OCRs); (parts of)

CTCF binding sites (BSs) that do not travel across other elements; enhancers; promoter flanking

regions (FRs); and promoters.

Fig. 4

Figure 4. Methylation profiles obtained by cf-RRBS enable non-invasive lung cancer subtyping at high specificity. **(A)** Predictive modeling workflow. Prior to modeling, CpG clusters according to spatial distribution optimized for cf-RRBS were defined in order to reduce data complexity with minimal data loss. Control liquid biopsies (n=46); and LUAD, LUSC and SCLC tissue samples (n=719), served as a reference set. Based on these, CpG clusters for modeling were selected using a two-step procedure: first, variable clusters in controls were removed based on the standard deviation (stdev); second, per lung cancer subtype, the most divergent clusters in comparison to controls were kept (cluster overlap between subtypes is indicated by Venn diagram). The reference set is visualized by t-SNE analysis, based on previously selected clusters. Finally, following modeling by deconvolution, validation was executed using two cohorts, patient (n=47 or n=39) and control liquid biopsies (n=9 or n=30). Differential diagnosis of NSCLC versus SCLC across both cohorts is indicated by receiver operating characteristic analysis, summarized by AUROC. (B-C) Indicative subtype fractions of each lung cancer subtype for in-house cohort (B) and UMCG cohort (C). Samples are grouped per type. For controls and patients, every fraction is shown, where same-sample dots are connected. The dotted line at 3.5% represent a 'noise' cutoff: control liquid biopsies are consistently below this limit. (D-E) Confusion table of both cohorts combined at the 3.5% 'noise' cutoff and with the equivocal pathology samples excluded. (F) Correlation log2(VAF) versus log2(combined indicative subtype fraction) on UMCG cohort. Correct prediction + univocal pathology (green), equivocal pathology (orange), wrong prediction + univocal pathology (red)