

p16 promoter methylation is a potential predictor of malignant transformation in oral epithelial dysplasia.

Gillian L Hall^{1,2}, Richard J Shaw^{1,3,4}, E Anne Field¹, Simon N Rogers⁴, David N Sutton^{1,4}, Julia A Woolgar², Derek Lowe⁴, T Liloglou⁵, John K Field⁵, Janet M Risk^{1,*}

1. Molecular Genetics & Oncology Group, School of Dental Sciences, University of Liverpool, Liverpool L69 3GN, UK

2. Department of Oral Pathology, School of Dental Sciences, University of Liverpool, Liverpool L69 3GN, UK

3. Division of Surgery & Oncology, School of Cancer Studies, University of Liverpool, 5th Floor UCD Block, Royal Liverpool University Hospital, Liverpool L69 3GA, UK

4. Regional Maxillofacial Unit, University Hospital Aintree, Longmoor Lane, Liverpool L9 7AL, UK

5. University of Liverpool Cancer Research Centre, Roy Castle Lung Cancer Research Programme, 200 London Rd, Liverpool L3 9TA, UK

Running title: p16 methylation potentially predicts malignant transformation

Key Words: promoter methylation, head and neck squamous cell carcinoma, oral dysplasia, p16

Author for correspondence:

Janet M Risk,
Molecular Genetics & Oncology Group,
Dept of Clinical Dental Sciences,
University of Liverpool,
Liverpool L69 3BX, UK
email: j.m.risk@liverpool.ac.uk

* Supported by grants from British Association for Oral and Maxillofacial Surgeons (RJS, JMR), NHS R&D (EAF, SNR, DNS, JKF), and Roy Castle Lung Foundation (TL, JKF).

Abstract

Management of the patient with oral epithelial dysplasia depends on the ability to predict malignant transformation. Histological grading of this condition fails in this regard and is also subject to inter and intra-pathologist variability. This study uses longitudinal clinical samples to explore the prognostic value of a previously validated panel of methylation biomarkers in a cohort of patients with histologically proven oral dysplasia. Methylation enrichment pyrosequencing assays were employed to provide the sensitivity of traditional methylation specific PCR (MSP) with the additional specificity advantages of a subsequent confirmatory sequencing reaction. In 57% (8/14) patients with a lesion that transformed to oral squamous cell carcinoma (OSCC), 26% (26/100) of longitudinal samples collected over ≥ 3 years demonstrated *p16* methylation. Only 1% (2/184) of samples from 8% of patients (2/24) not undergoing malignant transformation within 3 years had *p16* methylation. Both of these samples with *p16* promoter methylation were the most recently collected and the patients remain under continuing clinical review. Promoter methylation of *MGMT*, *CYGB* and *CCNA1* did not correlate with malignant progression. We thus conclude that methylation of the *p16* gene promoter shows promise as a predictor for malignant transformation (Fishers exact $P=0.002$) in a subset of patients.

Introduction

Leukoplakia and erythroplakia¹ are the most common precursor lesions of oral squamous cell carcinoma (OSCC). Dysplasia is reported to be present in up to 25% of biopsies of leukoplakia whereas the majority of erythroplakia are expected to harbour dysplastic features which frequently amount to severe dysplasia or carcinoma in-situ². Optimal management of these patients depends on the ability to predict malignant transformation thus allowing for closer monitoring, risk factor reduction, surgical excision or pharmacological intervention.

The conventional management of oral epithelial dysplasia (OED) is based on histological grading into mild, moderate and severe dysplasia and carcinoma in-situ. Sites such as floor of mouth and ventral tongue, and non-homogenous and red lesions are cited as high risk^{3;4}. However, only two significant prognosticators were identified in one recent study, namely clinical appearance of lesion and size³. The grading of dysplasia did not correlate with the course of the lesions, a finding reported by others⁵. Additionally, inter and intra-pathologist variability in grading of dysplasia is well described and may act as a confounding factor⁶. A further limitation in the search for predictive markers is the relatively low frequency (<1-18%⁴) with which such premalignant lesions actually acquire invasive potential although this may be as high as 50% when severe dysplasia or carcinoma in-situ is present².

Allelic imbalance and ploidy analysis have been reported to be useful in prediction of progression, although neither has translated into the clinical setting. Loss of heterozygosity (LOH) at 3p and 9p has been suggested to increase the risk of malignant progression by a factor of 3.8, whilst additional loss on chromosome arms 4q, 8p, 11q or

17p leads to a 33-fold increase in risk⁷. However a significant number of dysplastic lesions (47%) investigated by Tabor et al⁸ showed no detectable LOH and four non-dysplastic lesions showed extensive losses. The significance of ploidy analysis remains controversial with the recent retraction of several prominent studies by Sudbo^{9;10}. Some evidence supports ploidy abnormalities in leukoplakia although the previously reported prognostic importance has not been substantiated¹¹.

Few studies have investigated promoter methylation in the setting of OED. Unfortunately, none of the previously published reports have longitudinal clinical follow up and therefore cannot correlate molecular changes with malignant progression. Some of these studies investigated OED in clinically normal mucosa at the periphery of invasive squamous cell carcinoma^{12;13} although this strategy clearly introduces bias. Variable rates of *p16* methylation ranging from 28% to 75% have been reported¹¹⁻¹³, while methylation of the *MGMT* gene has been shown to be methylated in 56% of leukoplakia¹⁴ and in 41% of normal appearing mucosa adjacent to tumour¹².

Investigation of promoter methylation of tumour suppressor genes in the setting of OED seems appropriate given the relatively high frequency of this epigenetic change in OSCC itself¹⁵ and the numerous reports of methylation in premalignant lesions at other sites¹⁶ including breast¹⁷, pancreas¹⁸, cervix, oesophagus¹⁹ and stomach²⁰. Early epigenetic changes could predispose cells to further genetic abnormalities that allow progression of the neoplastic process. For example, silencing of *p16* may allow epithelial cells to escape senescence leading to genetic instability and permit accumulation of genetic mutations¹⁷ and *p16* methylation has been suggested as a valuable biomarker in the prediction of malignant change in gastric dysplasia²⁰. Furthermore, the potential

for demethylation and re-expression of *p16* and RAR- β by 5-aza-2-deoxycytidine has been shown in OED cell lines²¹.

Methods of evaluating and quantifying methylation in clinical samples continue to evolve. All previous studies of OED have utilised methylation specific PCR (MSP). Although highly sensitive, this method lacks internal control for adequacy of bisulphite treatment and is prone to false positives, which can occur relatively frequently, particularly when a high number of PCR cycles are used²². Pyrosequencing offers the advantage of relatively high throughput with confirmation of adequacy of bisulphite treatment and is semi-quantitative. Methylation enrichment pyrosequencing (MEP) is a relatively recently described modification of these two techniques that utilises methylation specific primers but is followed by a confirmatory pyrosequencing step that allows elimination of false positives²². This is particularly appropriate in the analysis of samples where target DNA concentrations may be low, such as mucosal scrapes and saliva. These surrogate samples have been shown to be useful in the investigation of oral squamous cell carcinoma (OSCC) with studies demonstrating good agreement of LOH patterns between OSCC and DNA extracted from saliva and lesion brushings²³. Surrogate samples are non-invasive and seem more acceptable to the patient as a means of OED surveillance than continual biopsy.

In order to exploit the preponderance of molecular data generated in cancer research to develop clinically valuable strategies in OED, two challenges are apparent. Firstly to identify biomarkers that predict those lesions at high risk for progression with high sensitivity and specificity, and second, to determine if the underlying molecular aberrations are amenable to pharmacological intervention.

The aim of this study is to explore the prognostic value of a panel of methylation biomarkers previously validated in OSCC¹⁵ in a cohort of patients with OED. This study utilises longitudinal tissue collection from a patient cohort with prolonged clinical follow-up. We describe the utility of non-invasive oral scrapes as a surrogate for repeated invasive biopsies, and our assays make use of MEP in order to improve the specificity and sensitivity of the methylation assays.

Materials and methods

Patients

Patients with biopsy proven OED were prospectively enrolled in the study subject to appropriate ethics and consent. Scrapes of visible leukoplakia and erythroplakia were obtained, as well as clinically normal, usually contralateral, oral mucosa. When multiple lesions were present, each was sampled separately. Patients whose lesions were perceived to be at high risk based on existing clinical criteria underwent surgical excision. These patients were retained within the observed cohort and the surgical site or any residual lesion subsequently sampled after healing. Scrapes were obtained using faecal sampling spoons, snap frozen in liquid nitrogen and stored at -80°C. Re-biopsy was performed as clinically indicated and, if sufficient tissue was available, a portion was separated and snap frozen in liquid nitrogen for research use. Clinical parameters, site and past medical and habit history were recorded.

Analysis of clinical data from all enrolled patients diagnosed between 2000 and 2003 was undertaken in 2006 to establish 2 cohorts. Firstly, a subset of 24 patients was identified with stable or non-transforming dysplasia ("NT" group). The criteria for inclusion were a histological diagnosis of dysplasia in a patient who had been followed for a period of at least 36 months with no evidence of clinical or histological progression,

or perhaps even regression. The second sample set (transformers: "T") consisted of 14 patients who, following a biopsy diagnosis of dysplasia, developed invasive carcinoma at the same site at a time interval of at least 6 months following the index biopsy. This time criteria allowed exclusion of an inadequate or non-representative biopsy. For those patients with multiple pre-malignant lesions, development of carcinoma at any one of the sites triggered inclusion to the transforming group. In total, 284 scrape samples were collected from 38 patients with OED over 3 years (NT group mean: 7.6, median: 8, range: 2-15 samples per patient. T group mean: 7.1, median: 8, range 2-25 samples per patient).

DNA extraction

For both scrapes and tissue samples, DNA was extracted using a phenol-chloroform based extraction procedure which gives superior yield from small samples²⁴. Bisulphite treatment of each sample was undertaken using the EZ DNA methylation kit (Zymo Research). A quality check of converted DNA was performed using pyrosequencing methylation assay (PMA) primers¹⁵ specific for bisulphite treated DNA, which confirmed the DNA content prior to analysis and assessed the efficiency of bisulphite conversion using an internal control (a C residue not followed by a G residue in the sequence being examined, which will not be subject to methylation and therefore should be completely converted to Uracil). Any samples showing less than 100% conversion were rejected as these are likely to produce false +ves in any methylation dependent assay.

Methylation analysis

Methylation enrichment pyrosequencing (MEP) was employed as previously described²². Hot-start PCR was carried out with HotStar Taq® Master Mix Kit (Qiagen Ltd.) using 120ng bisulphite treated DNA. MEP primers and annealing temperatures are shown in Table 1. PCR conditions were as follows: 1 cycle at 94°C for 15 minutes; 40 cycles of [94°C for 30 seconds, annealing temperature for 30 seconds, 72°C for 30 seconds]; 1 cycle of 72°C for 5 minutes. The presence or absence of PCR products and freedom from PCR contamination was established on 2% agarose gels with ethidium bromide staining. Gel-positive PCR products were subject to confirmatory pyrosequencing to ensure that methylation was >95% at all CpG dinucleotides interrogated. This constituted our criterion for designation of a sample as 'methylation positive'. These specific CpG targets in 4 genes have previously been demonstrated to be methylated in a tumour specific pattern in OSCC¹⁵. Pyrosequencing was carried out using the PSQ96MA System (Biotage) according to manufacturer's protocol, as previously described¹⁵.

Statistical analysis

Differences in methylation frequency between NT and T groups were tested using Fishers Exact test. Tests involving samples were not undertaken because interdependence of samples from the same patient was assumed. Differences in the number of methylated genes between NT & T patient groups were tested using the Mann-Whitney Test.

Results

Clinical

Of the 24 patients in the NT group, 13 (54%) had mild, 5 (21%) moderate and 6 (25%) had severe OED on the initial biopsy. Of the 14 patients in the T group 6 (43%) had mild, 3 (21%) moderate and 5 (36%) severe OED, although several patients underwent subsequent biopsies that showed a progression to a higher grade. The differences were not significant. There was also no significant difference in the distribution of affected sub-sites between NT and T groups (data not shown). Smoking history was obtained in 22 of the 24 NT patients. Only 2 had never smoked, most having sustained the habit over a prolonged (>20 year) period. Four of the 14 T patients denied ever smoking, 6 were current long term smokers and there were 3 ex-smokers.

Gene promoter methylation analysis

In total, 293 gel positives were obtained from all investigated genes, of which 65% were eliminated either as unmethylated or as non-target PCR products (i.e. the pyrosequencing reaction failed).

p16

Methylation of the *p16* promoter predicted for malignant transformation, being present in 26% (26/100) of samples from T patients compared with 1% (2/184) of samples from the NT group (Table 2). Overall, 57% of patients from the T group were positive in at least one scrape compared with only 8% of patients from the NT group (Fishers Exact $P=0.002$). Furthermore, this *p16* promoter methylation was retained in subsequent samples in 4/5 patients where the first sample testing positive was not the most recently collected. Almost twice as many of the positive samples in the T group

were from lesions than from normal tissue (Table 3). Notably, only 2 samples showed p16 promoter methylation amongst the NT group and these samples were the most recently collected from those patients. Transforming patients who demonstrated methylation of the *p16* promoter (n=8; Table 2) displayed variable time intervals between their first presentation of *p16* promoter methylation and the development of OSCC (range 0-70 months; median 18 months) which did not appear to correlate with pathological staging.

Cyclin A1 (*CCNA1*)

Methylation at this gene promoter was similar between T (50%) and NT (58%) patient cohorts (Table 2), however, a tendency for methylation in the T samples was observed (12% vs. 22%). Within both groups, the majority of positive samples were derived from clinically apparent lesions (Table 3).

Cytoglobin (*CYGB*)

Methylation at *CYGB* was frequent in both cohorts, seen in 46% and 57% of patients in the NT and T groups respectively (Table 2). Methylation was seen in 10% of NT samples compared with 25% of samples from the T group. Methylation was observed more consistently in longitudinal samples from the T group, whereas a more sporadic distribution of positive results were seen in the NT group, leading to the frequency of positive samples from normal and lesional tissue shown in Table 3.

MGMT

MGMT showed the lowest level of methylation with only 3% and 4% of NT and T samples respectively being positive, corresponding to 21% and 29% of patients. The positive samples were usually solitary findings amongst multiple negative samples thus explaining the discrepancy between the percentages of positive samples and patients.

Methylation at multiple gene promoters

The number of genes showing promoter methylation in each patient was compared between the two groups (Table 4). Methylation of one gene appeared to be a relatively frequent event amongst stable (NT) patients. A higher proportion of patients with 3 or 4 methylated gene promoters was observed in the T group (6/14 vs 1/24, T vs NT) but this was not significant. Neither single gene methylation, nor an overall pattern of increasing methylation correlated with the histological grade of malignancy (data not shown).

Methylation in oral scrapes vs corresponding biopsy tissue

Where both incisional biopsy and corresponding scrape material was available from the same lesion, a comparison was made of methylation status between the two sources of DNA. Concordance of methylation status between scrape and tissue was seen in 80% of cases (61 concordant results, 15 non-concordant). Interestingly, in the discrepant cases the scrape was more likely to show positivity than the biopsy, perhaps reflecting a masking of methylation in dysplastic cells by contaminating unmethylated DNA from stroma and inflammatory cells in the latter samples.

Discussion

This study demonstrates that methylation of *p16* in oral epithelial dysplasia (OED) is potentially a specific predictive marker of malignant transformation. However, it has limited sensitivity as only 57% of the transforming patients showed this change. In our cohort, histological grading of dysplasia neither correlated with development of invasive carcinoma, in keeping with previous reports³, nor with *p16* promoter methylation. Our

study is the first to analyse methylation patterns in multiple longitudinal samples from OED patients with no previous history of oral squamous cell carcinoma (OSCC), and who were later divisible on the basis of remaining stable for more than 36 months or showing progression to carcinoma. However, no clear conclusions could be drawn about the timing of *p16* promoter methylation and disease progression in this small sample of patients, although this is clearly an important consideration when determining the suitability of *p16* promoter methylation as a potential biomarker.

The OED/OSCC continuum provides a model in which to study molecular aberrations triggering malignant change in pre-cancerous states. The study of disease progression at any site is often limited by the difficulty in obtaining samples from the same lesion over time and correlation with clinical and histological change. The opportunities offered by the oral cavity are its relative accessibility and the ability to obtain surrogate tissue samples such as mucosal scrapes and saliva. Few previous studies have investigated methylation in the setting of OED and most have used MSP which is prone to false positive results²². This was highlighted in our study by the proportion of samples in which “gel positive” products were subsequently rejected following pyrosequencing. These failures include priming from unmethylated alleles thus generating unmethylated products and mispriming, which is known to be a problem with low concentrations of target DNA and high numbers of PCR cycles. MEP offers several advantages in clinical samples of this type. A relatively large sample set can be processed at moderate cost since only ‘gel positive’ samples require the confirmatory pyrosequencing step. Validation by pyrosequencing allows the exclusion of all false positive results and also checks for adequacy of bisulphite conversion. Furthermore, the quantity of DNA obtained from a mucosal scrape may be small and will almost certainly include contaminating oral tissue and salivary DNA. In these situations, MEP is an ideal

technique due to its high sensitivity and ability to detect methylation in clinical samples with low concentrations of methylated DNA.

p16 promoter methylation offers promise as a predictive biomarker differentiating between stable and transforming OED. It is noteworthy that in the two NT patients demonstrating *p16* methylation, the change was detected only in the most recent sample. Attempts to compare our data with other published studies are difficult due to differences in methods and lack of clinical follow-up in the literature. Kresty et al²⁵ reported methylation of *p16* in 58% patients with severe dysplasia while Lopez noted relatively high rates of methylation at *p16* (44%) and *MGMT* (56%) in DNA extracted from mouthrinse¹⁴, and for *p16* this was slightly increased in patients with persistent leukoplakia and a history of OSCC. *p16* was shown to be methylated in 75% of OED patients enrolled in a chemopreventive trial¹³, with 38% demonstrating reversal during the course of the study. However, correlation of methylation with outcome was not specifically stated and an apparent association between methylation and increasing severity of dysplasia was noted, in contrast to our findings. More recently, Kato and colleagues¹² determined methylation status of *p16* and *MGMT* in OSCC, tumour adjacent mucosa, and mucosa from healthy volunteers. No methylation was found in the latter group, but it was present at high rates in OSCC (51% and 56% for *p16* and *MGMT* respectively). Clinically normal oral mucosa adjacent to tumour showed an intermediate frequency of methylation (27% and 40%). In our current study 26% of all patients demonstrated *p16* methylation, clearly at the lower end of the previously reported rates (27-75%). One explanation may be false positive MSP results in previous studies. The prevalence of *p16* methylation in our previous (unrelated) cohort of OSCC patients (27%)¹⁵ was lower than that of our transforming cohort of OED (57%). This might suggest that *p16* methylation may be more common in OED-derived OSCC, or perhaps

represents a transient stage in malignant transformation. However we are cautious in this conclusion because in our previous study the criteria for *p16* methylation in tumour tissue were significantly more stringent than in this study (>5% methylation using a quantitative assay [PMA] compared with a qualitative [yes/no] assay [MEP]).

To our knowledge, this is the first study that investigates *CCNA1* and *CYGB* in OED. Although methylation at the promoters of these genes was prevalent in OED, this did not predict malignant transformation. Our data for *MGMT* conflicts with that previously published in OED with very few samples showing methylation (3% and 4%). In a cohort of OSCC in which the same CpG islands were analysed¹⁵, 31% of patients were methylated at this gene. One possible explanation is that silencing of this gene occurs at a later stage and that methylation does not contribute to acquisition of dysplasia or early invasion. Alternatively, it is well recognised that a subset of OSCC may arise de-novo without any clinically or histologically detectable lesion, and abnormalities of *MGMT* may represent a subset of tumours with no clinically recognisable premalignant state.

In this study, the finding of methylation rates between 23-50% in clinically normal mucosa from OED patients (Table 3) is in keeping with concept of field change²⁶ and implies that molecular aberrations extend far beyond the limits of histological and clinical detection. As previously reported, the histological grade of dysplasia did not predict malignant transformation³ but notably there were a higher proportion of non-smokers amongst the T group. This is consistent with the findings that although smoking is a risk factor for development of OED, the habit appears not to be associated with additional cancer risk²⁷. This is also corroborated by our previous work, which demonstrated

methylation at the *p16* gene in only 4% of clinically/histologically normal mucosa from 70 patients, 57% of whom were heavy smokers¹⁵.

Limitations of the present study include the small number of genes selected for study and the relatively small size of the cohort. The 4 genes chosen for analysis were selected from 10 reported in the literature as most frequently methylated in OED and OSCC²⁸, and were subjected to validation as tumour specific by pyrosequencing¹⁵. In order to address the lack of sensitivity of a single methylation marker such as *p16* in predicting transformation, global methylation analysis may prove helpful in the selection of additional markers and such methods are rapidly evolving.

Confirmatory studies are now required in other cohorts to validate that *p16* methylation is seen specifically in transforming patients and additional methylation markers are required in order to form a clinically useful predictive panel. This study also suggests that there is some merit in investigating demethylating agents in OED, perhaps delivered topically. Methylation assay of mucosal scrapes would provide a surrogate endpoint, at least to demonstrate pharmacological effect. Our findings may also have generalised relevance in other upper aerodigestive tract malignancies such as laryngeal, oesophageal and bronchial squamous cell carcinoma which have common aetiological factors and similar histological appearances in both the premalignant and invasive stages.

In summary, this is the first study to apply sensitive methylation assays to serial OED scrape samples with corresponding clinical outcome data. Promoter methylation of *p16* is a promising biomarker for malignant transformation in OED.

References

- (1) Kramer IR, Lucas RB, Pindborg JJ, Sobin LH. Definition of leukoplakia and related lesions: an aid to studies on oral precancer. *Oral Surgery Oral Medicine Oral Pathology* 1978;46:518-539.
- (2) Reichart PA, Philipsen HP. Oral erythroplakia--a review. *Oral Oncology* 2005;41:551-561.
- (3) Holmstrup P, Vedtofte P, Reibel J, Stoltze K. Long-term treatment outcome of oral premalignant lesions. *Oral Oncology* 2006;42:461-474.
- (4) Reibel J. Prognosis of oral pre-malignant lesions: significance of clinical, histopathological, and molecular biological characteristics. *Critical Reviews in Oral and Biological Medicine* 2003;14:47-62.
- (5) Saito T, Sugiura C, Hirai A, et al. Development of squamous cell carcinoma from pre-existent oral leukoplakia: with respect to treatment modality. *International Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery* 2001;30:49-53.
- (6) Abbey LM, Kaugars GE, Gunsolley JC, et al. Intraexaminer and interexaminer reliability in the diagnosis of oral epithelial dysplasia. *Oral Surgery Oral Medicine Oral Pathology Oral Radiology and Endodontics* 1995;80:188-191.
- (7) Rosin MP, Cheng X, Poh C, et al. Use of allelic loss to predict malignant risk for low-grade oral epithelial dysplasia. *Clinical Cancer Research* 2000;6:357-362.
- (8) Tabor MP, Braakhuis BJ, van der Wal JE, et al. Comparative molecular and histological grading of epithelial dysplasia of the oral cavity and the oropharynx. *Journal of Pathology* 2003;199:354-360.
- (9) Curfman GD, Morrissey S, Drazen JM. Retraction: Sudbo J et al. DNA content as a prognostic marker in patients with oral leukoplakia. *N Engl J Med* 2001;344:1270-8 and Sudbo J et al. The influence of resection and aneuploidy on mortality in oral leukoplakia. *N Engl J Med* 2004;350:1405-13. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2006; 355:1927.
- (10) Sudbo J, Ried T, Bryne M, Kildal W, Danielsen H, Reith A. Retraction notice to 'Abnormal DNA content predicts the occurrence of carcinomas in non-dysplastic oral white patches' [*Oral Oncol.* 37 (2001) 558-565]. *Oral Oncology* 2007;43:418.
- (11) Mithani SK, Mydlarz WK, Grumbine FL, Smith IM, Califano JA. Molecular genetics of premalignant oral lesions. *Oral Diseases* 2007;13:126-133.
- (12) Kato K, Hara A, Kuno T, et al. Aberrant promoter hypermethylation of p16 and MGMT genes in oral squamous cell carcinomas and the surrounding normal mucosa. *Journal of Cancer Research and Clinical Oncology* 2006;132:735-743.
- (13) Papadimitrakopoulou VA, Izzo J, Mao L, et al. Cyclin D1 and p16 alterations in advanced premalignant lesions of the upper aerodigestive tract: role in response to chemoprevention and cancer development. *Clinical Cancer Research* 2001;7:3127-3134.

- (14) Lopez M, Aguirre JM, Cuevas N, et al. Gene promoter hypermethylation in oral rinses of leukoplakia patients--a diagnostic and/or prognostic tool? *European Journal of Cancer* 2003;39:2306-2309.
- (15) Shaw RJ, Liloglou T, Rogers SN, et al. Promoter methylation of P16, RARbeta, E-cadherin, cyclin A1 and cytoglobin in oral cancer: quantitative evaluation using pyrosequencing. *British Journal of Cancer* 2006;94:561-568.
- (16) Baylin SB, Ohm JE. Epigenetic gene silencing in cancer - a mechanism for early oncogenic pathway addiction? *Nature Reviews Cancer* 2006;6:107-116.
- (17) Crawford YG, Gauthier ML, Joubel A, et al. Histologically normal human mammary epithelia with silenced p16(INK4a) overexpress COX-2, promoting a premalignant program. *Cancer Cell* 2004;5:263-273.
- (18) Yan L, McFaul C, Howes N, et al. Molecular analysis to detect pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma in high-risk groups. *Gastroenterology* 2005;128:2124-2130.
- (19) Clement G, Braunschweig R, Pasquier N, Bosman FT, Benhattar J. Methylation of APC, TIMP3, and TERT: a new predictive marker to distinguish Barrett's oesophagus patients at risk for malignant transformation. *Journal of Pathology* 2006;208:100-107.
- (20) Sun Y, Deng D, You WC, et al. Methylation of p16 CpG islands associated with malignant transformation of gastric dysplasia in a population-based study. *Clinical Cancer Research* 2004;10:5087-5093.
- (21) McGregor F, Muntoni A, Fleming J, et al. Molecular changes associated with oral dysplasia progression and acquisition of immortality: potential for its reversal by 5-azacytidine. *Cancer Research* 2002;62:4757-4766.
- (22) Shaw RJ, Akufu-Tetteh EK, Risk JM, Field JK, Liloglou T. Methylation enrichment pyrosequencing: combining the specificity of MSP with validation by pyrosequencing. *Nucleic Acids Research* 2006;34:e78.
- (23) Spafford MF, Koch WM, Reed AL, et al. Detection of head and neck squamous cell carcinoma among exfoliated oral mucosal cells by microsatellite analysis. *Clinical Cancer Research* 2001;7:607-612.
- (24) Cao W, Hashibe M, Rao JY, Morgenstern H, Zhang ZF. Comparison of methods for DNA extraction from paraffin-embedded tissues and buccal cells. *Cancer Detection and Prevention* 2003;27:397-404.
- (25) Kresty LA, Mallery SR, Knobloch TJ, et al. Alterations of p16(INK4a) and p14(ARF) in patients with severe oral epithelial dysplasia. *Cancer Research* 2002;62:5295-5300.
- (26) Slaughter DP, Southwick HW, Smejkal W. Field cancerization in oral stratified squamous epithelium; clinical implications of multicentric origin. *Cancer* 1953;6:963-968.
- (27) Lee JJ, Hong WK, Hittelman WN, et al. Predicting cancer development in oral leukoplakia: ten years of translational research. *Clinical Cancer Research* 2000;6:1702-1710.

- (28) Shaw R. The epigenetics of oral cancer. International Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery 2006;35:101-108.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by grants from BAOMS and the UK NHS R&D Fund.

Gene	Forward primer	Reverse primer	Pyrosequencing primer	Annealing Temperature
<i>CCNA1</i>	Biotin- TTTGCGTAGTTTCGAGGATTC	CCGTTCTCCAACAACCG	CTAACAACCCCTCTA	60°C
<i>CYGB</i>	Biotin-TCGATCGTTAGTTCGTTTC	ACTAACTCGAAAACGCG	ACCCAATAAATCCAC	56°C
<i>P16</i>	CGGAGGGGGTTTTTCGTTAGTATC	Biotin- TCCCCCTCTCCGCAACCG	GGTTGGTTATTAGAGGGT	62°C
<i>MGMT</i>	CGGTTTCGTTTCGCGTTTC	Biotin- ACCGCGAAAACCTACGAACG	GGATATGTTGGGATAGT	62°C

Table 1

Gene PCR and pyrosequencing primers and PCR annealing temperature.

CCNA1: cyclin A1; *CYGB*: cytoglobin; *MGMT*: 6-O-methylguanine DNA methyltransferase.

Biotin: the indicated primers were 5' biotin labelled to enable preparation of the appropriate single stranded DNA for subsequent pyrosequencing reactions.

	CCNA1		CYGB		p16		MGMT	
	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T	NT	T
Samples	22/184 (12%)	22/100 (22%)	18/184 (10%)	25/100 (25%)	2/184 (1%)	26/100 (26%)	6/184 (3%)	4/100 (4%)
Patients	14/24 (58%)	7/14 (50%)	11/24 (46%)	8/14 (57%)	2/24 (8%)	8/14 (57%)	5/24 (21%)	4/14 (29%)
Fishers Exact test*	P=0.74		P=0.74		P=0.002		P=0.70	

Table 2

Frequency of gene promoter methylation in the non-transforming (NT) and transforming (T) cohorts. Results are summarised for total samples and for individual patients in separate rows.

CCNA1: cyclin A1; *CYGB*: cytoglobin; *MGMT*: 6-O- methylguanine-DNA methyltransferase

*: Fishers Exact test relates to patient data (see materials and methods).

	CCNA1		CYGB		p16		MGMT	
	N	D	N	D	N	D	N	D
NT	5/22 (23%)	17/22 (77%)	9/18 (50%)	9/18 (50%)	1/2 (50%)	1/2 (50%)	3/6 (50%)	3/6 (50%)
T	5/22 (23%)	17/22 (77%)	5/25 (20%)	20/25 (80%)	9/26 (35%)	17/26 (65%)	2/4 (50%)	2/4 (50%)
NT + T	10/44 (23%)	24/44 (55%)	14/43 (33%)	29/43 (67%)	10/28 (36%)	18/28 (64%)	5/10 (50%)	5/10 (50%)

Table 3

Distribution of gene promoter methylation in normal (N) and dysplastic (D) lesions in the non-transforming (NT) and transforming (T) cohorts

	Methylation -ve	1 gene +ve	2 genes +ve	3 genes +ve	4 genes +ve
NT (n=24)	3 (13%)	12 (50%)	8 (33%)	1(4%)	0 (0%)
T (n=12)	4 (29%)	3 (21%)	1 (7%)	2 (14%)	4 (29%)

Table 4

Frequency of multiple gene promoter methylation in the non-transforming (NT) and transforming (T) cohorts