**To the author:** Please provide your responses to the reviewers’ comments in the table below. Highlighted text simply points out when specific requests are made by reviewers that we want to make sure are not missed. Editorial comments may be used to draw attention to specific points that we feel are especially important or that we do not feel are necessary in a revision. They may also be used to note when a comment is related to another comment by the same or another reviewer. However, we ask that you respond to all reviewer comments as thoroughly as possible. The referees’ comments have been reproduced in full and entered into the below tables by the editor, though the order in which they are presented may have changed. Please feel free to modify this table as needed, but please do not edit the referee comments column in any way.

**Reviewer #1**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Comment** | **Editorial comment** | **Author Response** | **Modification made in manuscript (give quotes and page numbers)** |
| 1 | Guo et al. conducted a comprehensive and systematic analysis of the human genome to identify regions with highly coordinated methylation. To this end, they extended the linkage disequilibrium concept, which is commonly applied in population genetics. The authors used public data sets and newly generated whole genome bisulfite sequencing (WGBS) data to establish a map of tightly coupled CpG sites, which they named Methylation Haplotype Blocks (MHBs) and made tremendous efforts to identify tissue-specific methylation haplotype blocks. Finally, they generated a metric, termed Methylation Haplotype Load (MHL), for tissue-specific methylation analysis. They then used this metric to estimate the tumor load in the circulation of patients with cancer and to map the tissue-of-origin in these patients.  The idea to use co-methylated sites has recently been proposed -as noted by the authors- by Lehmann-Werman et al. in a landmark PNAS paper. However, the study by Guo et al. is much more comprehensive and provides extensive data with a superior resolution. It is convincingly demonstrated that MHBs represent a distinct class of genomic feature and the tissue specific index (TSI) and the set of tissue-specific MHBs represent novel achievements, which should be of great interest for the community.  Yet there are several issues, which need to be addressed: | **Many of the comments below ask for additional details or clarification. Please be sure to address all comments in full.** | Reviewer #1 had identified a few important omissions in the manuscript so we have corrected them in the revision as well as improved the figure legends.  Furthermore, in this revision, we performed analyses to answer the questions regarding the behavior of MHBs in tumor tissues. |  |
| 2 | The authors explain the 61 sample sets used to characterize the global pattern and distribution of MHBs (i.e. 51 sets of published WGBS data, H1 human embryonic stem cells, and 10 adult tissues of 1 donor). In Fig. 1c they describe a reduction of perfectly coupled CpG pairs in primary tumor tissue. To which primary tumor tissue are the authors referring? The origin of the tumor tissues is not explained. When checking the references of the papers describing the 51 published WGBS data sets and the embryonic stem cells, no tumor samples could be found. |  | We used a colon primary tissue sample from Ziller et al. Nature 2013, and primary colon and lung cancers from Heyn et al. Genome Biology 2016 for the analysis in Figure 1C.  These references have been listed in the Supplementary Table S12d. We have corrected the references in the main-text to line 95 in page 3. | Page 3, line 95 |
| 3 | Page 3, lines 123-124: It should made clear that these methylation blocks relate to those established by WGBS, as the previous paragraph dealt with data generated by RRBS or the HM450K array. |  | Thanks for the suggestion. Yes, we have make it clear to show these MHB was established by 61 WGBS dataset. | Page 3, lines 122-123 |
| 4 | This reviewer applied the formula provided for MHL on page 9; however, different values were obtained for methylation frequencies of 50% than shown in Figure 2. The parameter P(MHi) should be explained in more detail. | **Please check and clarify this formula and the parameter P(MHi).** | The introduction to the formula was updated. We decompose the calculate as the following diagram to help the reviewer figure out the process of the MHL calculation. (Figure 2, the fourth and fifth panel). In addition, we attached the raw code (R) for the Figure 2 so that readers could make further extensive research.   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Allele | SMA | TA | Value | | C | 32 | 64 | 1/2x1 | | CC | 12 | 48 | 1/4x2 | | CCC | 4 | 32 | 1/8x3 | | CCCC | 1 | 16 | 1/16x4 |   \*For figure 2, the fourth panel  SMA: Successive Methylated Allele  TA: Total Allele  MHL=(1/2x1+1/4x2+1/8x3+1/16x4)/10 = 0.1625   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Allele | SMA | TA | Value | | C | 32 | 64 | 1/2x1 | | CC | 16 | 48 | 1/3x2 | | CCC | 0 | 32 | 0x3 | | CCCC | 0 | 16 | 0x4 |   \*For figure 2, most right panel  SMA: Successive Methylated Allele  TA: Total Allele  MHL=(0.5x1+1/3x2+0x3+0.5x4)/10 = 0.12 | Page 9, Lines 395-396 |
| 5 | Page 4, line 162: “65 WGBS data (including 4 additional cancer WGBS sets)”: Again, it is not clear what cancer sets are obtained in the first 61 samples (see above) and which 4 additional cancer sets were added. |  | Actually, these four cancer methylomes from Ziller et al. 2013 Nature and Heyn et al. 2016 have been listed in Supplementary Table S12d, including one colon cancer(GSM1279521) and three lung cancer dataset (GSM1279522, GSM1279523, GSM1279524). | Page 4, Lines 167 |
| 6 | Plasma samples from 59 patients with cancer were analyzed. What stage were these patients in (were these metastasized patients and are there estimates about tumor burden) and which tumor entities (e.g. how many CRCs and LCs; were the LCs small-cell lung cancer (SCLC) or non-small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC))? |  | We are lacking enough TNM stage information for these cancer patient samples. We noticed that colorectal cancer samples include primary and metastatic colon cancers. For the lung cancer samples, they are subtyped as non-small cell lung cancer, lung adenocarcinoma, and squamous cell carcinoma with or without metastasis. We don’t have other measurement for the estimation of tumor burden. As we known, till now, there is no gold standard for evaluation of tumor burden. Therefore, we did the estimation the tumor burden in our study using non-negative decomposition with quadratic programming based on our MHL metric (**Supplementary Fig. 8**). |  |
| 7 | The methylation-haplotype based analysis was started with analyses of 5 LCs and 5 CRCs with matched primary tumors. In order to identify “cancer-specific highly methylated haplotypes (csHMH)” the authors focused on MHBs with low MHL in the blood, but haplotypes present in primary tumor and plasma and found csHMH in all cancer plasma samples (average=36; associated with 183 genes). What was the range? They then extended their analyses to 49 other cancer plasma samples without matched tumor sample using 65 normal plasmas as background; here on average 60 csHMH were found. Again, a range would be needed; were csHMH found in all samples? In fact, the term “csHMH” is somewhat misleading: as detailed further below in the text, these csHMHs were also found in considerable percentages of normal plasma samples (13% and 26% of normal plasmas had low tumor contribution from CRC and LC). Thus, they are not really “cancer specific” but rather “cancer associated”. Later the authors describe additional steps to improve sensitivity and specificity. They could consider using “csHMH” later, e.g. for “group II MHBs”. | **We agree that a more precise term should be used (see highlighted portion). Please address all other comments here.** | We agree with the reviewer’s suggestion, the term of “csHMH” would be better to be replaced with “caHMH” cancer associated HMH. In the matched primary tumors and plasma methylation haplotype analysis, the range of the cancer associated haplotype is from 15 to 97. And then in the further extend analysis in all the samples, the range of the cancer associated haplotype is from 10 to 327. This information has been showed in Supplementary Table 5a.  No. these csHMH could only be found in parts of samples. the most frequency csHMH occurred in 53% (16/30, chr18:4455202-4455210, DLGAP1) CRC plasmas while in 62% (18/29, chr4:47034461-47034488, GABRB1) lung cancer plasma samples. We added another **Supplementary Figure 7** to show the distribution of the incidence in cancer plasma samples (CRC and LC).  13% and 26% of normal plasmas had low tumor contribution from CRC and LC. it is estimated by MHL and these methylation haplotype load could be formed with any methylation haplotype, rather than these caHMH. caHMH represent haplotype, it is hard to apply corresponding quantitative analysis, therefore, in our study, we didn’t consider any further investigation. | Page 5, Lines 233 to 247  Supplementary Fig. 7 |
| 8 | Page 6, lines 242-246: Upon quantification of tumor load in plasma samples they found 72.0% DNA contribution from white blood cells in both cancer and normal plasma samples, and 2.3% from the primary tumor; 3.0% from normal tissue of origin. This does not add up to 100% and contradicts previous papers from the Dennis Lo group, e.g. the paper by Sun et al. (cited by the authors) where the contribution by WBC (neutrophils, T cells, B cells) was well above 80% in the majority of the cases and often in the range of 90%. The 72% appear to be too low and in order to judge whether the contribution of 2.3% tumor DNA to the plasma is reasonable information about the tumor entities, tumor stage, and tumor burden would be needed. |  | In the deconvolution, non-negative decomposition with quadratic programming would assign the weight (estimated proportion) to each reference (tissues). In our model, we do have 12 different reference/tissues and therefore, the sum of the contribution from blood and normal/cancer tissue is less than 100%.  On the other side, the study of Sun et al. PNAS 2015 originally claimed that ‘One of the key observations from this work is that DNA derived from white blood cells (i.e., neutrophils and lymphocytes) typically contributes more than 70% of the circulating DNA pool, sometimes even to more than 90%’. In addition, we also notice in Sun et al. PNAS 2015, the variation of the deconvolution is also high variated (Figure 7 in Sun et al. PNAS 2015), which the liver contribution in the blood ranges from about 15% to 70%. Considering that the diversity of the cancer samples, disease progress and some other confounders, such kinds of difference should be understandable. We speculated these high variation is caused by the mixture characteristic of features in the deconvolution analysis, such as for lung tissues, there are including about 40 different type of cells. In order to provide high accurate deconvolution might be helpful to introduce the single-cell methylome reference which is our next plan for the solution in the next step. | Page 6, Lines 251 to 256 |
| 9 | They then identified a “small subset of MHBs that have significantly higher levels of MHL in cancer plasma than in normal plasma”. 81 CRC MHBs and 94 LC MHBs, which increased the diagnostic sensitivity and specificity, were found. In the 10 patients with matched plasma samples how many of these markers were present in both plasma and primary tumor? Are they located in regions with frequent copy number gain, which may explain their significant increase? What is the variability of their level, i.e. are they always significantly increased or only in a subset? How many of these MHBs will be detected in an average plasma sample of a patient with cancer? To understand the improvement in distinguishing plasma from cancer patients from normal plasma samples, a Figure like Supp. Fig. 5 should be added (also for later comparisons with Supp. Fig. 6). |  | We downloaded the frequent copy number gains of colon cancer and lung cancer from Pan-cancer project ([Travis](http://www.nature.com/ng/journal/v45/n10/full/ng.2760.html#auth-1) et al. Nature Genetics 2013). 98 colon cancer and lung cancer frequent copy number variations (gain) was collected and they are covered 351.2Mb in human genome. Only 17 (8 CRC and 9 LC) of 176 differential MHL regions (17.5K bp) were overlapped with these frequently CNVs (Gain) and demonstrated CNV gain is not the reason to caused hyper-MHL in cancer plasma.  The variability of MHL in case are quite high, majority of the MHLs only with hyper-MHL in subset of the samples with parts of samples are low-MHL. The most frequent MHB occurred in 30% (9 in 30) and 38% (11 in 29) CRC and LC, respectively, which be caused by complicate reasons, such as heterogeneity of cancers and stochastic release process of cancer DNA to the circulating system.  The characteristic of MHL compared with average methylation level is quite clear when the cancer fragment level is low in the plasma. We provided with another **Supplementary Fig. 11** analysis to show the flowchart of our analysis. | Page 6, lines 259 to 261  Page 10, lines 432 to 433 |
| 10 | Further improvement was achieved by clustering MHBs with high MHL (>0.5) in primary tumors and low MHL (<0.1) in both whole blood and normal tissue. The thus identified “group II MHBs” also showed high MHL in cancer plasma. This may represent a strategy to identify suitable MHBs for these analyses. Do the authors have an explanation why MHL yield an additional gain of signal-to-noise ratio if the tumor fraction decreases below 10%? The authors observed a “significantly higher” average MHL in cancer plasma than in normal plasma. How was the improvement compared to the previous step, i.e. when a “small subset of MHBs that have significantly higher levels of MHL in cancer plasma than in normal plasma” was selected? |  | Methylation haplotype load was designed to favor long continuous methylation CpG fragment (derived from cancer/dead tissues) compared with same methylation level stochastic methylated fragment (plasma background). As the concentration of cancer fragment decrease, the signal of MHL didn’t decrease too much while the standard deviation become smaller and smaller which is quite different from average 5mC which is stochastically distributed. Therefore, the signal-vs-noise (mean/SD) increased in our sampling analysis.  We tried to applied the estimation of the cancer fragment in the cancer plasma (Figure 4d) to distinguish cancer plasma from normal plasma, however, although there is significant difference between cancer and normal plasma group, the distinguish ability is quite limited since the variation is high, especially, for some cases the estimated cancer fragment is quite low. Feature selection in the cancer distinguish and tissue-of-origin mapping is important. | Page 6, lines 259 to 261 |
| 11 | The reduction of perfectly coupled CpG pairs in primary tumors (Fig. 1c) is intriguing. At the same time, there must be genes, which maintain a high MHL in tumors (otherwise, this approach would not work). Is there a certain pattern among genes with loss or maintenance of their methylation patterns (e.g. in terms of involved pathways, function, regulatory networks)? Is loss or maintenance a random process so that csHMHs have to be newly established for each individual patient for a liquid biopsy approach? What is known about the stability of csHMHs if one wants to use them for longitudinal tumor genome monitoring purposes? |  | We appreciated the reviewer’s suggestion. In the Fig. 1c, we were randomly sampling 500,000 adjacent CpG loci in MHB regions and the distance between the CpG sites as well as the r2 were recorded to investigate the relationship between distance and corresponding r2. it is interesting to find the significant decreasing of the linkage (r2) in cancer genomes. We filtered out the cancer lost and maintenance linkage regions. 35,626 linkage regions are maintained both in normal tissue and cancers, no significant Gene Ontology were identified. However, 22,649 cancer specifically lost linkage MHB regions were identified and large number of significant Gene Ontologies were found, including different cancer related functions such as [focal adhesion](http://bejerano.stanford.edu/great/public/cgi-bin/showTermDetails.php?termId=GO:0005925&ontoName=GOCellularComponent&species=hg19&ontoUiName=GO%20Cellular%20Component&foreName=user-provided%20data&backName=&sessionName=20161124-public-3.0.0-LGU1Mx) (FDR<5.7x10-3), [cell-substrate adherent junction](http://bejerano.stanford.edu/great/public/cgi-bin/showTermDetails.php?termId=GO:0005924&ontoName=GOCellularComponent&species=hg19&ontoUiName=GO%20Cellular%20Component&foreName=user-provided%20data&backName=&sessionName=20161124-public-3.0.0-LGU1Mx)(FDR <7.3x10-3), [Cell Cycle: G1/S Check Point](http://bejerano.stanford.edu/great/public/cgi-bin/showTermDetails.php?termId=BIOCARTA_G1_PATHWAY&ontoName=MSigDBGeneSetsCanonicalPathway&species=hg19&ontoUiName=MSigDB%20Pathway&foreName=user-provided%20data&backName=&sessionName=20161124-public-3.0.0-LGU1Mx) (FDR<0.012). We have attached these enrichment analysis as the **Supplementary Table 1b**.  We could not agree with you more. In our opinion, csHMH would be more useful for longitudinal tumor genome monitoring. In our dataset, we found several csHMH have quite high incidence in cancer plasma, meanwhile, the detection depths are as high as 18 which would be quite creditable. | Page 3, Lines 93 to 96  Page 6, Lines 245 to 245  Supplementary Table 1b |
| 12 | The tissue-of-origin part appears to be very nice and represents an advance over previous studies! |  | We are thank the reviewer for this comment. | Not applicable |
| 13 | General remark: the Figure legends are too short and not informative. For example, the percentages in Figure 1c are not explained (they are explained in the text, e.g. on page 3, lines 91-92, but not in the legend), or the legend to Figure 4c is missing. | **Please be sure that all necessary information is included to interpret the figure legend. Figure legends should be no more than 250 words.** | We have updated the figure legends with more details. | Pages 12. Lines 489 to 537 |

**Reviewer #2**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Comment** | **Editorial comment** | **Author Response** | **Modification made in manuscript (give quotes and/or page numbers)** |
|  | In this paper, Guo et al. analyze public and new data (including WGBS, RRBS, array) to define ~150,000 blocks of CpG sites that appear to exhibit tight coupling with respect to methylation status (‘Methylation Haplotype Blocks’ or MHBs). They define a metric termed ‘Methylation Haplotype Load’ (MHL) which they use to identify tissue-specific subsets of MHBs. They further apply this framework in the context of methylation analyses of cell-free DNA, i.e. investigating whether MHL facilitates the estimation of tumor load and tissue-of-origin mapping in cancer patients. The results show considerable promise for methylation markers for cell-free DNA analysis of cancer including for tissue-of-origin detection.  Overall, I enjoyed reading the manuscript quite a bit and found it to be a very interesting piece of work. I do think that it would be a more effective presentation if the key take-homes were more crisply articulated for a general audience. The first part of the paper focuses on MHBs – a clearer argument and more forcefully stated case for the value of MHBs over CGIs in how we think about methylation would improve the manuscript. The second part of the paper focuses on cfDNA – clearer articulation of both the promise and limits of methylation in this context could be made in the abstract as well as the paper itself. But I think that those pieces are there and are potentially at the level of Nature Genetics. There are a number of specific points on which I have suggestions or request clarifications. | **Many of the comments below ask for additional details/clarification, but the referee has also made helpful suggestions to improve the clarity of the paper and its main points.** | We thank Reviewer #2 for these positive comments. In the time that we had, we were able to perform most of the suggested analyses which resulted in **three** additional supplementary figures and **one** additional supplementary table. We believe these new analyses have strengthened the argument for MHBs over CGIs, especially as genomic targets for methylation biomarkers. |  |
| 1 | It seems likely that the dominant source of correlated CpGs are CpG islands (CGIs) which are of course a well-documented phenomenon. So to me where this gets most interesting are both correlated CpG blocks that are not parts of CGIs), as well as places where correlation between nearby CpGs breakdown. | **See next comment** |  | Not applicable |
| 2 | For the former (correlated CpG blocks), it would be nice to see more breakdowns about the ~150K MHBs. What is the full size distribution (histogram)? What is the distribution of CpG densities? (ideally visualized for separately for CGI and non-CGI, as well as overall). Fig 1E lacks nuance beyond CGI vs. non-CGI (which is more of a continuum than is usually let on rather than a dichotomy). If you instead (or additionally) break it down several CpG density bins (rather than CGI vs. non-CGI), how does it look? For example, it looks like non-CGI MHBs are enriched for enhancers – how does this enrichment look if you break MHBs down into a series of CpG density bins (more bins than just CGI vs non-CGI)? | **Please include these data. You can present the histograms and any other visualizations in the supplementary materials.** | We performed the analysis to look at the breakdown of the 150k MHBs in different CpG densities as suggested. Full size distribution and CpG density information was provided as Supplementary Fig. 1a and b. Meanwhile, we agree with the reviewer that breaking down MHBs into different levels of CpG densities would tell us how much of the enrichment for different features can be attributed to being parts of CpG islands. Thus, we broke the MHBs into quartiles where the CpGs/bp of each quantiles are as follows: (0,0.046414], (0.046414,0.096774], (0.096774, 0.15508], and (0.15508,0.6]. We found that while the 1st bin are only 3% of the total number of CpG island overlapping MHBs, it was 50% of CpG shelf MHBs, and contributed the  most to Fantom enhancers, LAD, and LOCK elements. Notably, the number of Super-enhancer and TAD overlapping MHBs were similarly distributed across the bins which is probably a reflection of these features having no known CpG density specificity. | Supplementary Fig. 1 |
| 3 | For the latter (‘breaks’ between blocks, i.e. where nearby CpGs not correlated), Fig 1B is fascinating in showing groups of CpGs with what appears to be a sharp boundary in terms of their correlation structure. Is this the exception or the rule? What features correlate with such boundaries? Have you confirmed this is not a power issue (e.g. if you are lacking reads that traverse the boundary, for example). Additional browser shots (or a browser track) of the haplotype structures would be helpful in this regard. | **Please address the question about power by including the details of any power analysis.** | Figure 1b is an example of 1 MHB where smaller adjacent MHBs have been merged together to form one large one despite the lack of reads coverage across the ‘breaks’. These breaks or regions with lack of reads coverage do not define MHB boundaries. To show that our MHB boundaries were not defined by lack of coverage, we calculated the total depth of coverage for CpGs which are within a MHB and for CpGs within 100 bp of a MHB. Both sets of CpGs have very high depth of coverages. In fact, we intentionally avoided calling MHBs in regions with low mappability by pre-defining genomic windows with minimum 10 depth of coverage.  Thanks for the suggestion, it is a good idea. However, we hope to prepare an independent bioinformatics tools to provide further extension to methylation haplotype blocks. | Not applicable  OFR-Figure 1 (Only For Reviewer) |
| 4 | Why are only 58.2% of autosomal CpGs covered despite >2,000x coverage? Is that because of mappability issues or the non-covered CpGs being isolated and therefore unable/unlikely to contribute to an MHB? Could be clearer in text. | **We agree that this should be explicitly addressed in the main text.** | Yes, this is mainly due to non-covered CpGs being isolated and the determination cannot be made for it as being a part of an MHB. Non-covered CpGs could have low mappability (~20% of autosomal CpGs were not covered in the pre-defined genomic windows with minimum 10 depth of coverage). They could also be isolated (~13% of CpGs with > 100 bp distance to the closest neighboring site). The distance between a pair of CpGs with 99 bp between them are expected to be observed at 1/100 probability using reads of 100 bp in length. Since 2000X is the average coverage, we are likely to miss some more CpG pairs due to random sampling as well. | Page 2, Lines 84 |
| 5 | I worry about whether systematic/technical factors (i.e. the numbers of samples falling into stem vs. normal vs. cancer categories; where and how these samples were processed and sequenced) influence the analysis of differences between MHB length and/or correlation strength. Did the authors check that such factors were not contributing? The same question could be asked about Fig S3. Do the cancer and stem cell samples come from the same source/pipeline as at least some of the adult tissues? |  | We thank the reviewer for the great remind. However, while the cancer, stem cells, and adult tissues were not from the same laboratories, we performed all the analysis starting from raw fastq files using the same pipeline in order to minimize technical factors. Thus, only the factors influenced by the library construction and the sequencing of each sample by the different laboratories could be contributing. All of the libraries were generated using standard WGBS procedures which included random shearing of the genomic DNA and shotgun sequencing using the Illumina platform. Thus, variabilities in genomic coverages are completely random. This leaves just the bisulfite conversion efficiencies as a non-random technical factor which we’ve found to vary just slightly among the 65 WGBS libraries (OFR-Figure 2 and Supplementary Table S12h). Even in Fig. S3, we see that while not all colon tumor samples were from the same laboratory, they clustered together. Similarly, the adult tissues were from 2 different groups but they also clustered together. | Supplementary Figure 12h  OFR-Figure 2 (Only For Reviewer) |
| 6 | The statement that “the presence of such correlated methylation blocks is a necessary but not sufficient condition for MHBs” would benefit from more explanation. |  | Determination of a linkage equilibrium statistic for a pair of CpGs requires the presence of both a methylated and unmethylated allele for both CpGs. This is met for all pairs with correlated methylation. However, not all pairs of correlated CpGs will obtain a high linkage equilibrium statistic. For example, a set of 10 MM, 10 MU, and 10 UU haplotypes (for CpG#1 and CpG#2) are found from three different samples which have an LD-R2 value of 0.250. If sample 1 contributed 5 MM and 5 MU haplotypes, sample 2 contributed 5 MM and 5 MU haplotypes, and sample 3 contributed 10 UU haplotypes, their average methylation levels are 1, 1, and 0 for CpG #1, and 0.5, 0.5, 0 for CpG #2. These CpGs will have perfect correlation but a low LD-R2. | Not applicable |
| 7 | I’m confused why MHBs are enriched in enhancers (Fig 1E) but then don’t correlate coherently with enhancers (Fig S2)? |  | In Figure 1D & E we show that MHBs have significant overlap with enhancers, although only about 6% (~9000) of MHBs are overlapping with enhancers. This led us to look further into whether MHBs are also marked by histones which demarcate active enhancers (H3K4me1 and H3K27ac), and not too surprisingly, they do not correlate. This is due both to the weak overlap and the differences in enhancer definitions. | Not applicable |
| 8 | I think that greater emphasis on the cfDNA results in the overall paper would be warranted (although as per my comments 1-3 above, I think that more could be done to show that MHBs are a more powerful concept than CGIs for investigating methylation-based genomic regulation). However, there are a number of details that would be helpful to add (see below). For example, more details on what stage cancer these patients are at (i.e. are these mostly or all late stage?) should be provided in the main text. | **Additional discussion on the relative utility of MHBs compared to CGIs could be added; however, we are not asking for additional experiments or analyses at this time, except where an analysis is needed to respond to specific requests for clarification (as in comment 10 below).** | We obtained only limited amount of information about the cancer patients which we included in Supplementary Table 12a. They are not all late stage cancer patients, and include some metastatic ones. | Not applicable |
| 9 | The paragraph of text at (lines 240-254) needs some tweaks. For example, not sure what the 95% Cis are referring to – these seem like they should be ranges, not confidence intervals (e.g. I imagine estimated tumor contribution varies by patient). Where is the other 28% assigned? Fig S5 (box plots of % cancer fragment proportion) (and perhaps Fig 6B) should really be moved to main text if possible (this is a really important figure for the field – and illustrates both the potential and the noise). Can the dots be colored by stage? Other places in this paragraph need ranges, the 0.17% and 1% figures. |  | Yes, we assume the contribution of the WBC DNA in the plasma would follow the Gaussian distribution, therefore, 95% confidence interval of the contribution were estimated based the variation among the different samples (cancer plasma and normal plasma, respectively, Supplementary Table S6). We didn’t apply the range to show variance since it would be strongly influenced by the outlier of clinical samples in which the contribution from WBC <10%, which might be caused by different reasons (sample DNA quality, sequencing coverage, unexpected clinical situations, et.al). We appreciate the reviewer comments and we replace the 95% CI with interquartile range (IQR) to show the estimation to the contribution of WBC and cancer DNAs. As to other 28% assigned contribution, it is different among different samples, major contribution is from cancers, liver and stomach. In our next step, we would collect more samples with comprehensive demographic and clinical information, therefore, we could estimate the variation and explain the reason of outlier samples clearly. We obtained only limited amount of information about the cancer patients which we included in Supplementary Figure 12a. They are not all late stage cancer patients, and include some metastatic ones.  We provided IQR to show the variation of the deconvolution and the contribution from lung and colon for normal plasma, please check page 6, lines 252. | Page 6. Lines 251 to 256 |
| 10 | In general, the authors appear to take care to validate their classifiers on a test set that is entirely independent of the data on which they trained. However, this could/should be made even more explicit for each analysis, as it’s obviously really important. For example, at lines 256-266, are you measuring diagnostic sensitivity on a set of test samples that is entirely independent of the set that was used to pick those diagnostic MHBs? | **Please include details on validation as requested.** | Yes, we’ve performed cross validation using completely independent test and training data. A description was added in the method section to be more explicit. | Page 10, Lines 437 to 442 |