Genome-wide profiling of DNA methylation in human cancer cells
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1. Introduction

DNA methylation is an important component of the epigenetic regulation of gene expression in eukaryotic cells. Methylation of CpG dinucleotides within transcriptional regulatory sequences often results in reduced expression or silencing of adjacent genes [1–3]. Global hypomethylation has been associated with chromosomal instability, while hypermethylation of the promoters of certain tumor suppressor genes is an important event in malignant transformation [4–8].

There are three predominant methods for investigating DNA methylation. The first method is an antibody-based, affinity purification procedure that captures methylated DNA [5–11]. The second method is bisulfite sequencing, which converts unmethylated cytosines to uracils while hypermethylated cytosines remain as cytosines [12,13]. The third method is digital sequencing (MSDS) method that can assess DNA methylation on a genomic scale. MSDS is a simple, low-cost method that combines the use of methylation-sensitive restriction enzymes with second generation sequencing technology. DNA methylation in two colon cancer cell lines, HT29 and HCT116, was measured using MSDS. When methylation levels were compared between the two cell lines, many differentially methylated regions (DMRs) were identified in CpG island shore regions (located within 2 kb of a CpG island), gene body regions and intergenic regions. The number of DMRs in the vicinity of gene transcription start sites correlated with the level of expression of TACC1, CLDN1, and PLEKHC1 (FERMT2) genes, which have been linked to carcinogenesis. The MSDS method has the potential to provide novel insight into the functional complexity of the human genome.

Global changes in DNA methylation correlate with altered gene expression and genomic instability in cancer. We have developed a methylation-specific digital sequencing (MSDS) method that can assess DNA methylation on a genomic scale. MSDS is a simple, low-cost method that combines the use of methylation-sensitive restriction enzymes with second generation sequencing technology. DNA methylation in two colon cancer cell lines, HT29 and HCT116, was measured using MSDS. When methylation levels were compared between the two cell lines, many differentially methylated regions (DMRs) were identified in CpG island shore regions (located within 2 kb of a CpG island), gene body regions and intergenic regions. The number of DMRs in the vicinity of gene transcription start sites correlated with the level of expression of TACC1, CLDN1, and PLEKHC1 (FERMT2) genes, which have been linked to carcinogenesis. The MSDS method has the potential to provide novel insight into the functional complexity of the human genome.

© 2011 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.
methylation of an enzyme’s specific recognition sites. Analysis of the global DNA methylation profile of the genome at the single-base level requires bisulfite sequencing. Whole genome bisulfite sequencing has been accomplished in Arabidopsis and humans by using second generation sequencing technology [23,24,37]. However, the widespread application of this method is currently limited due to the vast quantity of data it generates and its huge cost. Here, we report a simple, low-cost method to detect global DNA methylation, which combines the use of methylation-sensitive restriction enzymes together with second generation sequencing technology.

2. Methods

2.1. Cell culture and sample preparation

Tumor samples examined in the present study comprised colon cancer cell lines HT29 and HCT116 obtained from the ATCC. Cells were cultured in McCoy’s 5A medium supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum. Genomic DNA was isolated using a QiAamp DNA mini kit (Qiagen) according to the manufacturer’s protocol.

2.2. Generation of methylation-specific digital sequencing (MSDS) libraries

Genomic DNA (1 μg) was digested sequentially with the methylation-sensitive enzymes, SacII, EagI and BssHII (Table 1). DNA was first digested by SacII (NEB) at 37 °C for 3 h, then by EagI (NEB) at 37 °C for 3 h, and finally by BssHII (NEB) at 50 °C for 3 h. Digested samples were then purified by phenol-chloroform extraction and the fragments were ligated to biotinylated linkers containing synthetic restriction sites using T4 DNA ligase (Invitrogen), as follows: (BssHII-A, 5′-bio-CCACTACCGCTCGTTTCTCTATGGCGAGTCCGTTGATC-3′, BssHII-B, 5′-pho-GCCCGATCACCGACTGCCCATAGAGAGGAAAGCGGAGGCGTAGTGGTT-3′, SacII-A, 5′-bio-CCACTACCGCTCGTTTCTCTATGGCGAGTCCGTTGATC-3′, SacII-B, 5′-pho-GCCCGATCACCGACTGCCCATAGAGAGGAAAGCGGAGGCGTAGTGGTT-3′). The ligated DNA was then fragmented randomly using an ultrasonic device and 110–160 bp fragments were isolated by PAGE. Non-methylated ends were enriched using streptavidin beads. The ends of the DNA were repaired using the End-it DNA End repair kit (Epicentre) so that they were blunt-ended. Repaired fragments were then ligated to the following blunt-ended linkers using T4 DNA ligase: (blunt-linker-A, 5′-CTGCCGGGTTTCTCTATGGCGAGTCCGTTGATC-3′, blunt-linker-B, 5′-AGAGAATGGAGAAGCCGGGCGATC-3′). The ligated DNA was amplified by PCR using linker-specific primers (primer-A, 5′-CCACTACCGCTCGTTTCTCTATGGCGAGTCCGTTGATC-3′, primer-B, 5′-CTGCCGGGTTTCTCTATGGCGAGTCCGTTGATC-3′) and sequenced in 35 bp reads on the Life Technologies’ SOLiD sequencer (Fig. 1A).

2.3. Data analysis

Sequencing data (30/35 bp per sequencing read) was analyzed using Corona Light software. Human genome sequence and mapping information (Mar. 2006, hg18) was downloaded from the University of California Santa Cruz Genome Bioinformatics Site and used to construct a virtual BssHII, EagI and SacII tag library on the basis of the genome sequence. Genes neighboring each restriction enzyme site were also identified in order to determine the effect of methylation on their expression.

Each enzyme site contributes two tags to the sequence library: a plus-strand library tag and a minus-strand library tag. The methylation level of an enzyme site can be inferred by either of the two sequence tag counts; we selected the tag that generated the greater number of counts. When the distance between two successive restriction enzyme sites is less than about 100 bp, the tags cannot be sequenced, because the tags are deleted by the PAGE selection. CpGs localized in close proximity to one another are often co-methylated [37], such that the level of methylation of one enzyme site can usually be inferred from the level of methylation of other sites localized within the same area, when the distance between sites is small. In situations where the distance between these enzymes sites was <100 bp, the sites were considered together as a group, and we again selected the tag that generated the greatest number of counts within the group. If the tag sequence matched a site within a repeated sequence or at more than two sites within the whole human genome, the tag was excluded. Excluding such sequences, 86,897 sites were analyzed (Table 1).

2.4. Bisulfite sequencing

Bisulfite modification of genomic DNA was performed using the EpiTect Bisulfite Kit (Qiagen). Primers were designed using Methyl Primer Express software (Life Technologies). Bisulfite-treated DNA was amplified by PCR. The PCR products were cloned into the pCR2.1-TOPO Vector, then transformed into One Shot TOP10 Competent Cells (Invitrogen). At least 24 clones were sequenced using an ABI3730 Sequencer (Life Technologies). The data was analyzed using the Quantification Tool for Methylation Analysis (Riken Institute of Physical and Chemical Research).

2.5. Gene expression data

Gene expression data for the HT29 cells was generated as described previously [28], while for the HCT116 cells, this data was obtained using 5’SOLiD technology [28]. Analysis of gene expression data was based on the 5’ SOLiD method [28].

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enzyme</th>
<th>Recognition site</th>
<th>No. of total sites in human genome</th>
<th>No. of genes containing the recognition site within the promoter region</th>
<th>No. of CpG island containing the recognition site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BssHII</td>
<td>C^CGCG</td>
<td>6 bp</td>
<td>72,899</td>
<td>8787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagl</td>
<td>C^CGCG</td>
<td>6 bp</td>
<td>90,190</td>
<td>9089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SacII</td>
<td>CCGC^CG</td>
<td>6 bp</td>
<td>66,312</td>
<td>9178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BssHII + Eagl + SacII</td>
<td>C^CGCG</td>
<td>6 bp</td>
<td>229,401</td>
<td>13,978</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Defined site data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of defined sites within human genome</th>
<th>No. of genes containing the defined site within the promoter region</th>
<th>No. of CpG island containing the defined site</th>
<th>No. of CpG island shore containing the defined site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSDS method</td>
<td>86,897</td>
<td>11,217</td>
<td>19,592</td>
<td>8522</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Promoter region is defined as the region 500 bp either side of the TSS.
3. Results

3.1. MSDS analysis

We have developed a simple method, which we call MSDS, to detect global DNA methylation. The method makes use of three methylation-sensitive restriction enzymes (BssHII, EagI, and SacII) and second generation sequencing technology. There are two CpG dinucleotides within the recognition sequence of each enzyme (GCGCGC, CGGCCG, and CCGCGG, respectively). Short sequence tag fragments derived from the sites cleaved by these restriction enzymes can be mapped to unique sites within the genome. In silico Methylation-sensitive digestion → Ligate to biotinylated linker → Cleave with sonication → Capture with streptavidin beads → Ligate to blunt-ended linker → Amplification with PCR and sequencing with second generation sequencing technology. Tag mapping and statistical analysis.

Fig. 1. Flow chart schematic of the methylation-specific digital sequencing (MSDS) method and the correlation between methylation level as assessed by bisulfite sequencing and the MSDS methylation tag count. A. Genomic DNA was digested with methylation-sensitive restriction enzymes and ligated to biotinylated linkers. The ligated sample was then cleaved by sonication and the fragments were captured with streptavidin beads. The captured DNA fragments were ligated to blunt-end linkers, amplified by PCR, and sequenced on the Life Technologies’ SOLiD sequencer. B. Scatter diagram of MSDS tag counts corresponding to 100 regions selected at random that were also subjected to bisulfite sequencing. Sample labels a–d and e–j indicate sets of genes whose pattern of methylation was similar (a–d) or different (e–j) between HT29 and HCT116 cells. C. DNA methylation of genes a–j as analyzed by bisulfite sequencing. Gray squares represent CpG sites within restriction enzyme sites. Circles represent potential methylation sites (CpG) where the shading intensity indicates the frequency at which the site was found to be methylated amongst the clones analyzed (0–100%). a. TNFRSF8 (tumor necrosis factor receptor superfamily, member 8) gene promoter; b. CXCL5 (chemokine (C–X–C motif) ligand 5) gene promoter; c. SNX14 (sorting nexin 14) gene promoter; d. intergenic region within CpG island; e. NKAIN3 (Na+/K+ transporting ATPase interacting 3) gene; f. GJC1 (gap junction protein, gamma 1, 45kDa) gene promoter; g. NPHS1 (nephrosis 1, congenital, Finnish type (nephrin)) gene exon; h. CD47 (CD47 molecule) gene promoter; i. B7H6 (B7 homolog 6) gene intron; j. intergenic region within CpG island. D. and E. Correlation between methylation level as assessed by bisulfite sequencing and methylation tag count as assessed by MSDS. Horizontal bars represent methylation as determined by bisulfite sequencing. In E, boxes represent the quartiles and whiskers mark the 5th and 95th percentiles.
analyses indicate that there are 72,899, 90,190 and 66,312 recognition sites for BssHI, EagI and SacI within the human genome, respectively (Table 1). These restriction sites cover 64% (13,978) of unique gene promoters (within 500 bp of the TSS) and 75% (21,164) of the CpG islands within the genome. This combination of restriction enzymes allowed the most comprehensive coverage of CpG islands without using a greater number of enzymes. After excluding certain uninformative sites as described in Section 2.3, we analyzed a total of 86,897 sites. These defined sites cover 51% (11,217) of unique gene promoters (Supplemental Table 1), 69% (19,592) of CpG islands, and 8522 CpG island shores within the genome (Table 1).

Two colon cancer cell lines (HT29 and HCT116) were utilized to confirm the utility of this method. Using the SOLiD platform, 2,397,132 and 2,971,226 tags were mapped to the human genome in HT29 and HCT116 cells, respectively. After excluding uninformative sites as noted above, 1,493,950 tags (62.3% of total tags) in HT29 cells and 1,886,310 tags (63.5% of total tags) in HCT116 cells were matched to the remaining informative sites (Table 2, Supplementary Fig. 1). There were 35,309 (40.6%), and 48,141 (55.4%) zero tag count or un-hit sites in HT29 and HCT116 cells, respectively (Table 3).

3.2. Correlation between methylation level (bisulfite sequencing) and MSDS tag counts

To validate the accuracy of the MSDS method, MSDS tag counts were compared with the results of direct DNA methylation analysis, which were generated by bisulfite sequencing at more than 100 random CpG sites (Fig. 1B). In both cell lines, CpG sites that generated the highest number of tags corresponded to those that also exhibited a low level of methylation by bisulfite sequencing analysis, such as those within the SNX14 (sorting nexin 14) gene promoter. CpG sites that generated relatively fewer tags in both cell lines corresponded to those that were highly methylated in both cell lines according to the bisulfite sequence analysis, such as those within the TNF5RS8 (tumor necrosis factor receptor superfamily, member 8) gene promoter. Some sites appeared to be differentially methylated between the two cell lines. CpG sites that gave rise to many tags in HT29 cells alone were poorly methylated only in these cells, such as those within the promoter of the CD47 (CD47 molecule) gene. Similarly, CpG sites that gave rise to many tags in HCT116 cells alone were poorly methylated only in these cells, such as those within the promoter of the NKA13 (Na\(^+\)/K\(^+\) transporting ATPase interacting 3) gene (Fig. 1C). Thus, the methylation levels determined by bisulfite sequencing correlated inversely with the MSDS tag count in both cell lines. Based on these results (Fig. 1D), we classified the genes into three arbitrary groups, based on the number of tag counts at each restriction enzyme site. Sites represented by \( \geq 16 \) tags were considered to be poorly methylated (<20% methylated), whereas sites represented by \( \leq 5 \) tags were considered to be highly methylated (>80% methylated), and sites represented by 6–15 tags were considered to be methylated at an intermediate level (21–79% methylated) (Fig. 1E).

3.3. Genome-wide DNA methylation

The results of the genome-wide DNA methylation analysis are presented in Table 3. 56.7% (49,307) and 64.6% (56,172) of unique CpG sites were highly methylated, and 31.6% (27,478) and 29.0% (25,240) were poorly methylated in HT29 and HCT116 cells, respectively, indicating that a majority of CpG sites were either highly or poorly methylated, which is consistent with what has been reported previously [37,38]. As CpGs in close proximity are often co-methylated [37], we considered the tag with the greatest number of counts within such promoter regions as representative of the methylation level of those regions. Some gene promoters overlap CpG islands, whereas others do not. 48% of the promoters evaluated in both cell lines were poorly methylated (Fig. 2B-1); those that did not overlap CpG islands were methylated to a greater extent than those that contained a CpG island within the promoter region (P=0.01) (Figs. 2B-2, 3). Within gene body regions, 63% of enzyme sites were highly methylated in both cell lines (Figs. 2C-1) and the methylation level of CpG islands in such regions was lower than in other regions of the gene body (P<0.01) (Figs. 2C-2, 3). In promoter and gene body, the extent of methylation within CpG islands was lower than that in regions outside of the CpG islands (P<0.01). In addition, there was a difference in the extent of methylation between CpG islands within the promoter and CpG islands within the gene body. Methylation within CpG islands has previously been reported to be dependent upon the position of the island within the promoter region or within the gene body [36].

3.4. Comparison of MSDS methylation with gene expression

There is a strong relationship between gene expression and DNA methylation. Therefore, we analyzed gene expression in the HT29 and HCT116 cell lines and compared the results to the methylation data from the same cell lines. The genes were divided into three groups: high expression (\( \geq 100 \) copies), low expression (\( \leq 1 \) copy), and moderate expression (1<copies<100) [28]; and the level of expression of the genes within these groups was compared to the level of methylation. Highly and moderately expressed genes exhibited a low level of methylation within the promoter and a high level of methylation within the gene body. Genes with a low expression level exhibited a moderate level of methylation within both the gene promoter and the gene body. These results are consistent with those of previous reports [35,36] (Fig. 3).

3.5. Differentially methylated regions between HT29 and HCT116

Next, we compared the extent of methylation of the HT29 and HCT116 cells. Of the sites measured, 77% were methylated to a similar extent in the two cell lines: 52% of the sites measured were poorly methylated, and 23% of the sites measured were highly methylated (Figs. 2A-1). DMRs between the two cell lines were defined as enzyme sites that were highly methylated in one cell line and poorly methylated in the other cell line. Such sites made up 9% of the sites.

Table 2
Summary of the results of sequence analysis for methylation tags, MSDS data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enzyme</th>
<th>No. of tags mapped to the human genome (% of total tags)</th>
<th>No. of defined tags</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HT29</td>
<td>HCT116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BssHI</td>
<td>648,117 (27.0%)</td>
<td>889,793 (29.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EagI</td>
<td>1,077,327 (44.9%)</td>
<td>1,141,883 (38.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SacI</td>
<td>671,688 (28.0%)</td>
<td>819,590 (31.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BssHI + EagI + SacI</td>
<td>2,397,132</td>
<td>2,971,226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
Level of DNA methylation at CpG sites in HT29 and HCT116 cells.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methylation level</th>
<th>No. of CpG sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HT29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>27,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>10,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>49,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 tag counts</td>
<td>35,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CpG sites</td>
<td>86,897</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Low level corresponds to 0–20% methylation, by bisulfite sequencing analysis, and corresponds to a tag count of greater than 16, whereas the high level corresponds to 80–100% methylation and is correlated with tag counts between zero and five.
Fig. 2. DNA methylation in the vicinity of the TSSs and gene bodies. The number under each panel represents the total number of CpG sites for each pie chart. A. Pie charts represent the distribution of restriction enzyme sites, which are divided into four categories: poorly methylated in both cell lines, highly methylated in both cell lines, DMRs and other sites. B. The chart on the left represents methylation within 500 bp of the TSS. The charts on the right represent methylation within or outside of the CpG islands that are within 500 bp of the TSS. C. The chart on the left represents methylation within the gene body. The charts on the right represent methylation within or outside of CpG islands in the gene body.

Fig. 3. Correlation of the extent of methylation assessed by MSDS relative to the distance from the TSS with the level of gene expression assessed by 5′-end SOLiD transcriptome analysis. Genes were categorized into three groups based on the 5′-end SOLiD transcriptome data: low expression, ≤1 copy; high expression, ≥100 copy; moderate expression, 1<copies<100.
measured. Two percent of the sites measured were highly methylated in HT29 cells and poorly methylated in HCT116 cells, while 7% of the sites measured were highly methylated in HCT116 cells and poorly methylated in HT29 cells. As shown in Table 4, many DMRs were observed not in the gene promoter region, but instead in the gene body, intergenic or CpG island shore regions.

Finally, we investigated the correlation between the extent of methylation in the vicinity of the TSS and the expression of the associated gene. We evaluated the expression of several genes localized to DMRs within 1000 bp of the TSS and whose expression level differed at least five-fold between HT29 and HCT116 cells. Of these genes, we analyzed those associated with carcinogenesis. These included SMPD3 (sphingomyelin phosphodiesterase 3, neutral membrane (neutral sphingomyelinase II)), VASH1 (vasohibin 1), and TACC1 (transforming acidic coiled-coil containing protein 1), which are involved in the cell cycle; RIP3 (receptor-interacting serine-threonine kinase 3), and TNFSF9 (tumor necrosis factor (ligand) superfamily, member 9), which are involved in apoptosis; and CLDN1 (claudin 1), NELL1 (NELL-like 1 (chicken)), ROBO1 (roundabout, axon guidance receptor, homolog 1 (Drosophila)), ENG (endoglin), PLEKHC1 (pleckstrin homology domain containing, family C (FERMT2 (fermitin family member 2)), which are involved in cell adhesion. In these genes, the DMRs localize to several positions within the gene, in some cases only upstream of the TSS (e.g. VASH1 and TACC1); in some cases only downstream of the TSS (e.g. SMPD3, RIP3, TNFSF9, CLDN1, NELL1 and ENG); and in some cases, both upstream and downstream of the TSS (e.g. ROBO1 and PLEKHC1 (FERMT2)) (Fig. 4). In TNFSF9, NELL1 and ENG genes, CpG sites closer to the TSS than the DMR were methylated to a similar level in both cell lines (Fig. 4). This result demonstrates that these DMRs are not localized solely in the vicinity of the TSS.

4. Discussion

Diverse methods for the measurement of DNA methylation have been developed [9,11,16–24]. Moreover, second generation sequencing technology has facilitated genome-wide analyses of DNA methylation. However, this technology generates too much data and is too expensive to be accessible to most researchers in the field. Therefore, we have developed a method for detecting global DNA methylation that makes use of methylation-sensitive restriction enzymes combined with second generation sequencing technology. The methylation level can be determined by monitoring the number of times a particular recognition site is sequenced within the genomic pool. This method optimizes data handling by limiting the data generated to only the restriction enzyme sites.

Changes in DNA methylation profiles have been observed during normal development and tumorigenesis. However, differences in the genome-wide methylation pattern between related cancer cell lines derived from related tumors have not been examined previously. We found many sites, localized predominantly to CpG island shore and intergenic regions, which are differentially methylated in HT29 and HCT116 cells. Differences between the HT29 and HCT116 cell lines may have arisen in the process of transforming from normal tissue to cancer tissue, or may be due to differences in the cells before they became cancerous. Regions of the genome that are differentially methylated may provide insight into the variety of regions of the genome where differential gene expression is linked to the development of cancer. By searching regions of the genome that are differentially methylated between cell lines from similar tissue, it may be possible to reveal differences in the initiation of cancer and/or in the types of cells that cause the malignant transformation: from a basal cell or layer cell, for example.

The following genes have been reported to exhibit tumor suppressor activity and to be regulated by methylation within their promoter regions: SMPD3 [39], VASH1 [40], RIP3 [41], TNFSF9 [42], NELL1 [43,44], ROBO1 [45–47], ENG [43,48]. In this study, we identified additional genes characterized by a link between DNA methylation and expression: TACC1, CLDN1, and PLEKHC1 (FERMT2). These genes may also be important in carcinogenesis.

Analysis of DNA methylation using microarrays suffers from a bias towards gene promoter regions and CpG islands. The microarray method can only provide relative data, and therefore requires a reference standard. Methods based on restriction enzymes possess inferior sensitivity to bisulfite sequencing, but do allow a quantitative comparison of methylation patterns. Bisulfite sequencing allows analysis of DNA methylation at the single nucleotide level, but at a very high cost for a genome the size of the human genome [37]. Established methods that make use of methylation-sensitive restriction enzymes include methylation-specific digital karyotyping (MSDK) [15], modified methylation-specific digital karyotyping (MMSDK) [25], methyl-sensitive cut counting (MSCC) [35] and others. The MMSDK method is similar to the MSDK method that we have developed. Both methods are based on digital karyotyping technology. The process of digestion of genomic DNA with a methylation-sensitive restriction enzyme, and the use of a fragmenting enzyme with which to generate short sequence tags is essential to both methods. The key difference between MSDK and MMSDK is the location of the short sequence read using second generation sequencing technology. The MMSDK method targets the nearest Nalll sites to the methylation-sensitive enzymes, while the MSDK method targets the methylation-sensitive enzyme sites themselves. This difference simplifies the construct preparation process. It results in a shortening of the duration of the procedure and reduces loss of the sample. Furthermore, it requires less PCR cycles, and therefore minimizes PCR bias. During data analysis, the directly identifiable measurement positions make it easy to perform direct sequencing of the cleavage site. However, because direct sequencing is employed, when a restriction enzyme site exists within a repeated sequence, these tags are considered unreliable and excluded. Accordingly, MSDK method is not able to measure repeated sequences. The difference between MSCC and MSDKs is the combination of methylation-sensitive enzymes used. MSCC uses the HpaII enzyme, while MSDK uses three enzymes (BssHII, EagI and ScaII).

Methods that make use of methylation-sensitive restriction enzymes are limited to profiling the methylation of these enzyme's recognition sites, suggesting that use of enzymes that cleave at a greater number of sites is advantageous. The HpaII and MspI enzymes are four base encoding enzymes, and the recognition site of each enzyme contains one CpG dinucleotide within an identical recognition sequence, CCGG. HpaII cleaves only at unmethylated sites, whereas MspI cleaves both methylated and unmethylated sites. In silico analyses reveal that there are approximately two million recognition sites for these enzymes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gene position</th>
<th>No. of sites in each gene position</th>
<th>No. of differentially methylated sites</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tags mapped to genome</td>
<td>86,857</td>
<td>7903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CpG island</td>
<td>46,985</td>
<td>3682</td>
<td>1.67E−44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CpG island shore</td>
<td>9895</td>
<td>1219</td>
<td>2.12E−32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other region</td>
<td>30,017</td>
<td>3002</td>
<td>1.47E−11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* CpG island shore; 2000 bp within CpG island.
within the human genome. The MSDS method reported here makes
data analysis simpler because it results in analysis of fewer sites and
therefore fewer tags.

Within the data obtained via the MSDS methods, zero tag count or
un-hit sites made up about 40–50% of the uninformative sites. These
sites may be fully methylated or just false negative. The use of enzymes
that recognize six-base target sequences obviates the need for a
comparison target, as is the case when evaluating MspI against HpaII.
To verify this, we performed bisulfite sequencing at 44 CpG sites that
gave rise to a MSDS tag count of zero. We found that 41 of the 44 sites
were highly methylated. This finding suggests that the bias due to PCR or
cleavage efﬁciency of the restriction enzymes was small, and that the
number of sequence tag counts was enough to cover the total restriction
enzyme sites. At the same time, this false negative rate is considered low.

Under the MSDS method, we determined the cut-off values for poorly,
moderately and highly methylated sites, based on the results of bisulfite
sequencing. The depth of the MSDS sequence affects the cut-off values,
and deeper sequencing coverage should improve accuracy, as is the case
with the MSCC method[35]. Quantitative information was based on the
comparison between bisulfite sequencing data and MSDS tag counts in

Fig. 4. Correlation between the extent of methylation within DMRs and the level of expression of the associated gene. We selected five genes containing DMRs in close proximity to
the TSSs: TACC1, TNFSF9, CLDN1, NELL1, and PLEKHC1 (FERMT2). The panel to the left shows relative MSDS tag counts (circles) at the relevant sites within each gene in each cell line.
A black box around the two circles represents the position of the DMRs that were selected. The panel on the right shows the relative expression of each gene in each cell line.

5. Accession number

MSDS tags have been deposited in the NCBI Short Read Archive
under the project accession SRA028119. Expression tags for HT29 and
Supplementary materials related to this article can be found online at doi:10.1016/j.ygeno.2011.07.003.
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