**S Table 1 Clinical Characteristic of the NSCLC samples from TCGA Project**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **LUAD(%)** | **LUSC(%)** |
| **All cases** | 535 | 386 |
| **Gender** |  |  |
| Male | 178 (33.3) | 243 (62.9) |
| Female | 211 (39.4) | 83 (21.5) |
| **Age at diagnosis** |  |  |
| <=65 | 193 (32.1) | 199 (49.6) |
| >65 | 178 (49.7) | 119 (37.4) |
| **Median(Range)** | 65.3 (38-86) | 67.5 (39-85) |
| **Stage at diagnosis** |  |  |
| I | 3 (0.56) | 1 (0.25) |
| IA | 96 (17.9) | 55 (13.9) |
| IB | 112 (20.9) | 111 (28.0) |
| IIA | 32 (5.98) | 30 (7.58) |
| IIB | 53 (9.90) | 59 (14.9) |
| IIIA | 58 (10.8) | 41 (13.4) |
| IIIB | 11 (20.6) | 20 (5.05) |
| IV | 22 (4.11) | 4 (1.01) |

**S Table 2 Clinical Characteristic of the NSCLC samples from TCGA Project**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **LUAD(%)** |  |  | **LUSC(%)** |  |  |
| **All cases** | Case(%) | Control(%) | p-value | Case(%) | Control(%) | p-value |
| **Gender** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 178(33%) | 26(46%) |  | 243(63%) | 52(74%) |  |
| Female | 211(39%) | 30(54%) | 0.96 | 83(22%) | 17(24%) | 0.99 |
| **Age(SD)** | 65.3 (9.8) | 65.1 (9.8) | 0.8794 | 67.5 (8.6) | 68.3 (9.2) | 0.5235 |

**Age, age at diagnosis. SD, Standard Deviation**

**S Table 2 Clinical Characteristic of the NSCLC samples from TCGA Project**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Stage I | Stage IA | Stage IB | Stage II | Stage IIA | Stage IIB | Stage IIIA | Stage IIIB | Stage IV |
| Ad\_cancer | 3 | 96 | 112 | 0 | 32 | 53 | 58 | 11 | 22 |
| Ad\_normal | 0 | 16 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 12 | 1 | 4 |
| Sc\_cancer | 1 | 55 | 111 | 1 | 30 | 59 | 41 | 20 | 4 |
| Sc\_normal | 0 | 14 | 25 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 9 | 3 | 3 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | early | advanced | p-value |
| luad\_cancer | 211 | 176 |  |
| luad\_normal | 27 | 29 | 0.46 |
| lusc\_cancer | 167 | 155 |  |
| lusc\_normal | 39 | 29 | 0.49 |
|  |  |  |  |

**Early, stage IA,IB; advanced, stage II, III and IV**

**S Table 3 TCGA probe information in this study**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CpG ID | Chrosome | MapInfo | Strand | Accession | Distance to TSS | CpG Island |
| cg01240931 | Chr5 | 112101942 | + | NM\_000038.3 | -459 | FALSE |
| cg15020645 | Chr5 | 112101668 | + | NM\_000038.3 | -185 | FALSE |
| cg16970232 | Chr5 | 112101332 | + | NT\_034772.5 | 151 | TRUE |
| cg20311501 | Chr5 | 112101401 | + | NT\_034772.5 | 82 | TRUE |
| cg21634602 | Chr5 | 112101469 | + | NM\_000038.3 | 14 | TRUE |
| cg24332422 | Chr5 | 112101585 | + | NM\_000038.3 | -102 | TRUE |

CpG ID is from illumina microarray platform. MapInfo is the location of the CpG site based on **Human Genome Source Version 36.1**. Distance was negative when the site locates in the promoter region of the APC gene. TSS represent transcription start site. TSS coordination is Chr5: 112101483.

**S Table 4 Simulation of the bias of the odds ratios for each CpG site**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Ad : Sc | 2:1 | | 4:3 | | 3:4 | | 1:2 | |
| CpG Site | OR | P-values | ORs | P-values | ORs | P-value | OR | P-value |
| cg01240931 | 1.3-68.4 | 0.59 | 1.64-23.91 | 0.83 | 0.71-3.54 | 1 | 0.37-2.27 | 0.9999 |
| cg15020645 | 7.8-173.4 | 0.001 | 11.64-56.37 | <10-4 | 4.86-25.90 | 0.02 | 3.84-16.44 | 0.572 |
| **cg16970232** | **17.2-186.4** | **<10-4** | **18.99-72.49** | **<10-4** | **14.24-50.49** | **<10-4** | **8.9-31.73** | **<10-4** |
| cg20311501 | 6.4-76.6 | <10-4 | 8.09-36.23 | <10-4 | 5.84-20.38 | <10-4 | 3.49-13.58 | 0.001 |
| cg21634602 | 3.3-31.14 | 0.014 | 3.72-12.78 | <10-4 | 2.78-8.30 | 0.022 | 1.74-6.33 | 0.582 |
| cg24332422 | 4.6-203.3 | 0.006 | 9.17-48.01 | <10-4 | 5.47-22.77 | 0.012 | 2.79-12.21 | 0.546 |

10000 random resampling were conducted to simulate the bias of the odds ratios of each CpG site. P-value was defined as

the probability of each simulation whose p-value>0.05. Sample sizes were 400:300,300:300,150:300,400:200 in above four vignettes, respectively. Here, cg20311501 was significantly associated with NSCLC in these four vignettes. However, the significant association will be disappeared when the proportion of the LUSC increase to certain threshold.

**S Table 5 Odds ratio difference between heterogeneous and autogenous samples**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Ad : Sc | 2:1 | | | 4:3 | | | 3:4 | | | 1:2 | | |
| CpG Site | ORa | ORh | P-value | ORa | ORh | P-value | ORa | ORh | P-value | ORa | ORh | P-value |
| cg01240931 | 258.50 | 16.88 | **<10-4** | 14.25 | 6.51 | **<10-4** | ORa | ORh | P-value | 0.06 | 1.70 | **<10-4** |
| cg15020645 | 572.36 | 43.36 | **<10-4** | 264.58 | 24.41 | **<10-4** | 0.27 | 3.07 | **<10-4** | 3.26 | 12.64 | **<10-4** |
| **cg16970232** | 149.19 | 59.40 | **<10-4** | 83.28 | 37.84 | **<10-4** | 14.06 | 16.25 | **<10-4** | 11.42 | 21.46 | **<10-4** |
| cg20311501 | 44.60 | 24.88 | **<10-4** | 24.41 | 17.61 | **<10-4** | 20.27 | 25.53 | **<10-4** | 3.31 | 10.09 | **<10-4** |
| cg21634602 | 23.76 | 9.80 | **<10-4** | 12.55 | 7.53 | **<10-4** | 6.06 | 12.59 | **<10-4** | 1.88 | 4.79 | **<10-4** |
| cg24332422 | 192.73 | 42.02 | **<10-4** | 64.69 | 24.46 | **<10-4** | 3.30 | 5.84 | **<10-4** | 2.42 | 11.14 | **<10-4** |

10000 random resampling were conducted to simulate the bias of the odds ratios of each CpG site. P-value was estimated by t-test. Sample sizes were 300:400,400:300, 560:280, 200:400 in above four vignettes, respectively. ORa, ORh represent odds ratio of each CpG site based on autogenous and heterogeneous samples.

**Supplementary Table 6 Interaction estimation between CpG methylation and age, gender, TNM in LUAD and LUSC**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CpG Site | LUAD | | | | | | LUSC | | | | | |
| Age | | Gender | | TNM | | Age | | Gender | | TNM | |
| β | pvalue | β | pvalue | β | pvalue | β | pvalue | β | pvalue | β | pvalue |
| cg01240931 | 0.19 | 0.17 | -0.34 | 0.90 | -16.79 | 0.99 | 0.03 | 0.81 | -4.42 | 0.08 | -0.49 | 0.34 |
| cg15020645 | 0.06 | 0.61 | 0.90 | 0.69 | -14.24 | 0.83 | 0.02 | 0.91 | -1.36 | 0.70 | -0.47 | 0.46 |
| cg16970232 | 0.07 | 0.47 | -0.26 | 0.90 | -14.05 | 0.98 | 0.04 | 0.71 | -1.48 | 0.56 | 0.32 | 0.50 |
| cg20311501 | 0.04 | 0.63 | -0.39 | 0.83 | -14.07 | 0.96 | 0.03 | 0.77 | -0.56 | 0.77 | 0.37 | 0.35 |
| cg21634602 | 0.04 | 0.59 | 0.34 | 0.82 | -13.92 | 0.83 | 0.04 | 0.60 | -0.17 | 0.92 | 0.36 | 0.29 |
| cg24332422 | 0.07 | 0.56 | 0.66 | 0.79 | -14.29 | 0.89 | 0.01 | 0.93 | -2.96 | 0.28 | -0.09 | 0.86 |

Betas were based on logistic regression with the function: Y~CpG +age\*CpG, or Y~CpG + gender\*CpG, or Y~CpG + TNM\*CpG, respectively.

**S Table 7, three kinds of primers of 17 studies**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Study | Forward | Reverse | Type |
| Pan et al (2009,China) | ACTGCCATCAACTTCCTTGCTTGCT\* | GACATGTGGCTGTATTGGTGCAGCCCG | chr5:112073311-112073571 |
| Zhang et al (2011,China)b | CACTGCGGAGTGCGGGTC | CCGTCGGGAGCCCGCCGA | chr5:112073421+112073518 |
| Virmani et al (2001, USA) | CACTGCGGAGTGCGGGTC | CCGTCGGGAGCCCGCCGA | chr5:112073421+112073518 |
| Kim et al (2007, Korea) | CACTGCGGAGTGCGGGTC | CCGTCGGGAGCCCGCCGA | chr5:112073421+112073518 |
| Lin et al (2009, China) | CACTGCGGAGTGCGGGTC | CCGTCGGGAGCCCGCCGA | chr5:112073421+112073518 |
| Shivapurkar et al (2007, USA) | CACTGCGGAGTGCGGGTC | CCGTCGGGAGCCCGCCGA | chr5:112073421+112073518 |
| Suzuki et al (2006, Japan) | CACTGCGGAGTGCGGGTC | CCGTCGGGAGCCCGCCGA | chr5:112073421+112073518 |
| Zhang et al (2011, China)b | CACTGCGGAGTGCGGGTC | CCGTCGGGAGCCCGCCGA | chr5:112073421+112073518 |
| Rykova et al (2004, Russia) | CACTGCGGAGTGCGGGTC | CCGTCGGGAGCCCGCCGA | chr5:112073421+112073518 |
| **Begum et al (2011, USA)** | **GGACCAGGGCGCTCCCCAT** | **GTGTGGGCGCACGTGACCGACATGTGG** | **chr5:112101379+112101452** |
| **Usadel et al (2002, USA)** | **GGACCAGGGCGCTCCCCAT** | **GTGTGGGCGCACGTGACCGACATGTGG** | **chr5:112101379+112101452** |
| **Jin et al (2009, Japan)** | **GGACCAGGGCGCTCCCCAT** | **GTGTGGGCGCACGTGACCGACATGTGG** | **chr5:112101379+112101452** |
| **Feng et al (2008, USA)** | **GGACCAGGGCGCTCCCCAT** | **GTGTGGGCGCACGTGACCGACATGTGG** | **chr5:112101379+112101452** |
| **Brabender et al (2001, USA)** | **GGACCAGGGCGCTCCCCAT** | **GTGTGGGCGCACGTGACCGACATGTGG** | **chr5:112101379+112101452** |
| **Vallbohmer et al (2006, USA)** | **GGACCAGGGCGCTCCCCAT** | **GTGTGGGCGCACGTGACCGACATGTGG** | **chr5:112101379+112101452** |

The primers of the study of Wang et al (2008, China), Topaloglu et al (2004, USA) and Yanagawa et al (2003, Japan) can't be located.