

MOL Manuscript # 80697

**Writing and re-writing the epigenetic code of cancer cells: from
engineered proteins to small molecules**

Pilar Blancafort, Jian Jin and Stephen Frye

School of Anatomy, Physiology, and Human Biology, M309, the University of Western
Australia, Crawley, 6009, WA Australia (PB). Division Chemical Biology and Medicinal
Chemistry, and Center for Integrative Chemical Biology and Drug Discovery, The
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Chapel Hill, NC 27599 USA (JJ and SF).

MOL Manuscript # 80697

Running Title: Writing and re-writing the epigenetic code of cancer cells

Address correspondence to: School of Anatomy, Physiology, and Human Biology, M309, the University of Western Australia, 35 Stirling Highway, Crawley, 6009, WA, Australia. E-mail: pilar.blancafort@uwa.edu.au

Document statistics:

Text pages: 55

Tables: 1

Figures: 5

References: 206

Abstract: 119

Introduction: 566

Discussion: 7,100

Abbreviations: ZF, zinc finger; ATF, Artificial Transcription Factor; LTR, Long Terminal Repeats; DNAm, DNA methylation; PC2, polycomb 2; Mecp2, methyl CpG binding protein 2; MDB, methyl-CpG binding domain; MDB1, methyl-CpG binding domain protein 1; HATs, Histone Acetyltransferase; HDAC, histone deacetylase; MGMT, O-6-methylguanine-DNA methyltransferase; DNMT, DNA methyltransferase; TF, Transcription Factor; EMT, Epithelial to Mesenchymal Transition; PHDs, Plant Homeodomains; MBT, malignant brain tumor domains; PKMTs, protein lysine methyltransferases; HMTs, Histone methyltransferases. TET proteins, ten-eleven translocation family of proteins; AID, Activation-induced cytidine deaminase; 5hmC, 5 Hydroxymethylcytosine; 5mC, 5 methylcytosine; GLP, G9a-like protein; SUV39H1, suppressor of variegation 3-9 homolog 1 (Drosophila); SETDB1, SET domain, bifurcated 1; SETD7, SET domain containing (lysine methyltransferase) 7; HP1, heterochromatin protein 1.

MOL Manuscript # 80697

Abstract.

The epigenomic era has revealed a well-connected network of molecular processes that shape the chromatin landscape. These processes comprise abnormal methylomes, transcriptomes, genome-wide histone post-transcriptional modifications patterns, histone variants, and non-coding RNAs. The mapping of these processes in large scale by ChIP-Seq and other methodologies in both cancer and normal cells reveals novel therapeutic opportunities for anti-cancer intervention. The goal of this minireview is to summarize pharmacological strategies to modify the epigenetic landscape of cancer cells. These approaches include the use of novel small molecule inhibitors of epigenetic processes specifically deregulated in cancer cells and the design of engineered proteins able to stably reprogram the epigenetic code in cancer cells in a way that is similar to normal cells.

MOL Manuscript # 80697

Introduction.

The concept of “Epigenetics” was pioneered by Conrad H. Waddington in 1942 as “the branch of biology which studies the causal interactions between genes and their products, which bring the phenotype into being” (Goldberg et al., 2007; Waddington, 2012). “Epi” comes from the Greek word “over”, and thereby “Epigenetics” is the study of the molecular, cellular, and environmental aspects of heredity, which are not explained by simple changes in the underlying DNA sequence. Epigenetic processes influence the *chromatin structure*, not the gene sequence “*per se*” but the tridimensional folding and package of the DNA and associated proteins, referred as chromatin (Kouzarides, 2007; Strahl and Allis, 2000). Heterochromatin, comprising pericentromeric regions, satellite DNA, and retroviral long terminal repeats (LTRs) are condensed and silenced areas of the genome (Zakrzewski et al., 2011). In contrast, euchromatin comprises the loci being actively transcribed (Gilbert et al., 2004). There are two important characteristics of the epigenetic state of cells. First, unlike somatic mutations and other genetic alterations, which irreversibly alter the genes, epigenetic processes are reversible, and thus, provide environmental plasticity and cell adaptation to new microenvironments. Second, the chromatin structure is inherited, and in absence of perturbations, the chromatin state has an intrinsic memory and it is transmitted over cell generations (Lange and Schneider, 2010; Margueron and Reinberg, 2010).

In the last decade it has become clear that epigenetic disruptions play a critical role in tumor initiation and progression (Berdasco and Esteller, 2010). Recent research in cancer has focused on the prognosis value of epigenetic signatures in cancer, with the advent of

MOL Manuscript # 80697

genome-wide large scale profiling of tumor specimens. The emerging view of cancer epigenetics is that epimutations might affect early events of cancer, which could prime subsequent events in the progression of the disease (Carmona and Esteller, 2011; Rodriguez-Paredes and Esteller, 2011; Sandoval and Esteller, 2012). Epigenetic aberrations in cancer include both abnormal silencing (for example, silencing of tumor/metastasis suppressors) and re-activation of silenced regions (which leads to oncogenic activation). In many cases, epigenetic aberrations can collaborate with genetic changes, as for example in the case of silencing of a second allele of a tumor suppressor gene, such as BRCA (Lim et al., 2009; Liu et al., 2008a) and p16 (Arima et al.). Numerous examples involve mutations in chromatin modifiers themselves, which have a profound impact in neoplastic progression. In addition to epigenetic modifiers and chromatin remodelers, multiple molecular constituents impact chromatin structure, such as transcription factors (TFs), signal transduction proteins, histone variants, and non-coding RNA, outlining the complexity and molecular cross-talk that sculpts the epigenome (Baylin and Jones, 2011).

In light of the recognition of the importance of epigenetic disruptions in cancer cells, strategies to block or revert these changes are of growing interest in cancer therapeutics. This review will focus on novel pharmacological approaches to reprogram and remodel the epigenome of cancer cells into a pattern that is similar to normal somatic cells. Ideally, this reprogramming would entail hereditary changes in chromatin resulting in long-lasting phenotypic alterations of tumor cells, namely phenotypic memory. In the first part of this minireview we will summarize the language of chemical modifications in

MOL Manuscript # 80697

chromatin, and the main chromatin modifiers (“writers”) whose expression/and or activity is disrupted in cancer cells relative to normal tissue. Next, we will discuss novel state-of-the art approaches to revert or “re-write” those aberrant epigenetic processes in cancer cells using both small molecule inhibitors and targeted engineered proteins.

The “language” of chromatin modifications.

The genome-wide epigenetic status (“epigenetic landscape”) of cells is dictated by comprehensive sets of chemical modifications that occur both, at the DNA and in the histone tails. Methylation of the DNA (DNA_{me}) occurs in position 5 in Cytosine residues (**Figure 1**). In mammals, the vast majority (98%) of DNA_{me} occurs in CpG dinucleotides in somatic cells. In embryonic ES cells, however, about one-quarter of all DNA_{me} occurs in non-CpG context (Lister et al., 2009). In contrast to DNA_{me}, histones are subjected to several chemical modifications in their N-terminal tails (Strahl and Allis, 2000), which are rather unstructured and largely exposed in the context of the 3-D structure of the nucleosomes (Luger et al., 1997) (Dutnall and Ramakrishnan, 1997) (**Figure 2**). There is large chemical diversity and a great number of histone modifications, including methylation, acetylation, phosphorylation, ubiquitination, sumoylation, ADP-ribosylation, deamination, and protein isomerization. Some histone modifications, such as H3K9me, H3K27me, and H4K20me, are typically associated with repressive chromatin. In contrast, other modifications, such as H3K4me, H3K9Ac, H3K36me, and H3K79 are connected with actively expressed genes (Henikoff and Shilatifard, 2011; Kouzarides, 2007; Turner, 2012).

MOL Manuscript # 80697

Why is it the chemical language of histones so degenerate? In principle, chemical modifications can modulate chromatin structure by primarily altering the physical properties of the DNA and or/associated proteins. For example, among all the histone modifications, phosphorylation adds negative charges to the histones, whereas acetylation merely reduces the number of positive charges in chromatin. Since the DNA helix is negatively charged, chemical modifications could act to unravel the DNA from the histones, promoting chromatin relaxation. Secondly, chemical modifications act as binding platforms or epitopes for specific endogenous proteins (“binders” or “readers”). For example, DNA_{me} marks are recognized by methyl-binding proteins, such as MeCP1, histone methylation is recognized by chromo-like domains, acetylation by bromodomains, and phosphorylation by 14-3-3 proteins. “Readers” are selective proteins able to recognize specific histones and even different states of methylation, for example Heterochromatin Protein 1 (HP1) recognizes H3K9me3, Polycomb (PC2) proteins recognize the H3K27me3 (Kouzarides, 2007). In the cell, endogenous readers form specific complexes with chromatin modifiers possessing catalytic activity (“modifiers” or “writers”). The complexity of epigenetic regulation is further exemplified by the discovery of multiple enzymes able to erase specific epigenetic marks. These include histone deacetylases, lysine demethylases (Arrowsmith et al., 2012; Klose et al., 2006) and the more recently discovered DNA-demethylases, which are involved in excision-repair DNA pathways (Bhutani et al., 2010; Bhutani et al., 2011; Rai et al., 2008) erasing DNA methylation patterns during development, differentiation, and reprogramming.

MOL Manuscript # 80697

It has long been proposed that the chemical modifications in chromatin act in a combinatorial manner to define an “*epigenetic code*”, which coordinately shapes chromatin structure (Strahl and Allis, 2000). However, the large number of histone modifications and the possible combinations of all these primary modifications (many of them in the same histone tail) clearly add several layers of complexity and outline the plasticity of the epigenome. Among all the epigenetic modifications, DNAm and H3K9me are regarded as stable and inherited repressive marks (Han and Brunet, 2012; Margueron and Reinberg, 2010). Notably, DNAm is a key modification which has traditionally been thought to “irreversibly canalize” or “force cells” to engage into specific cell fates (Hochedlinger and Plath, 2009). In the following sections, the relationships and cross-talks between epigenetic modifications, particularly DNAm and histone modifications, will be outlined. Lastly, we will briefly describe some of the key mechanisms associated with DNA demethylation in mammalian cells.

Interconnections between DNA methylation and Histone methylation.

The interactions between “readers” and “writers” provide regulatory opportunities for the physical transmission of epigenetic marks along the chromosome (spreading) for the transmission of epigenetic marks from a mother cell to a daughter cell (inheritance of epigenetic information), and define cross-talks of multiple epigenetic constituents (Cheng and Blumenthal, 2010; Hashimoto et al., 2010). The interactions between readers and writers can be direct or indirect. Direct interactions include physical associations between epigenetic modulators. For example, the lysine methyltransferase G9a, which deposits

MOL Manuscript # 80697

H3K9me2 and H3K9me1 in euchromatin (Wu et al., 2010), interacts with DNA methyltransferases through ankyrin domains (Feldman et al., 2006). In self-renewal gene promoters, such as Oct4, this recruitment promotes an irreversible epigenetic switch, which forces stem cells to differentiate (Feldman et al., 2006; Tachibana et al., 2008). During DNA replication, the protein UHRF1 recognizes hemi-methylated DNA and forms a complex with several proteins, including DNA methyltransferase 1 (DNMT1) (which maintains DNAm patterns during replication) and lysine methyltransferase G9a. These physical interactions link DNAm with H3K9me in the replication fork, making sure that both DNAm and H3K9me are spatio-temporally coupled processes faithfully transmitted during replication (Bostick et al., 2007; Hashimoto et al., 2010; Kim et al., 2009; Sharif et al., 2007). Another cross-talk between DNAm and H3K9me during DNA replication is mediated by methyl-CpG-binding-proteins, such as the methyl-CpGbinding protein 1 (MBD1). In heterochromatin, methylated DNA is bound by MBD1, which recruits the H3K9 methyltransferase SETDB1 (Schultz et al., 2002), an enzyme that deposits H3K9me3 (Cheng and Blumenthal, 2010; Hashimoto et al., 2010; Ichimura et al., 2005; Uchimura et al., 2006). The latter mark is recognized by HP1 (Bannister et al., 2001; Lachner et al., 2001), which in turn recruits histone lysine methyltransferases, such as SUV39H1/2 (Krouwels et al., 2005). In addition, HP1 directly binds to the PhD-like domain of DNA methyltransferase 3A (DNMT3A) *in vitro*, which suggests that H3K9me could in turn influence DNAm (Fuks et al., 2003). The above suggest that DNAm and H3K9me are mutually reinforcing silencing marks, which might serve to synchronize these two processes during DNA replication, ensuring

MOL Manuscript # 80697

the inheritance of the epigenetic information (**Figure 3**). The cross-talk between DNAm and H3K9me has also been described in plants (Johnson et al., 2007).

A link between DNAm and histone deacetylation has been long demonstrated through the discovery of the Methyl-CpG-binding protein 2 (MeCP2) (Scarsdale et al., 2011). MeCP2 carries a transcriptional repressor domain, which recruits the co-repressor histone deacetylase (Singal et al., 2002). Reciprocally, histone acetylation is a mark associated with promoter activation and gene transcription. H3/H4 lysine acetylation is recognized by bromodomain-containing proteins, often physically linked to PHD fingers and catalytic domains of histone acetyltransferases (HATs), such as pCAF (Clements et al., 1999; Nagy and Tora, 2007) and p300 (Liu et al., 2008b; Wang et al., 2008a). Bromodomains in the subunits of chromatin remodeling enzymes, such as SWI/SNF family, interact with acetylated histones (Gao et al., 2008; Kizilyaprak et al., 2010; Kundu et al., 2007; Reinke and Horz, 2003), which anchor remodeling activities in the nucleosomes and serve to promote nucleosome eviction (Suganuma and Workman, 2011). In summary, direct physical interactions between readers and writers, and readers and erasers, could contribute to a quick spread of a given mark/s along the genome, leading to effective chromosomal condensation and gene silencing, or chromatin relaxation and gene activation.

The interaction or cross talk between epigenetic processes could be also indirect. A residue of a given histone can be substrate of multiple modifications. For example, the incorporation of H3K9me by histone lysine methyltransferases could indirectly block the

MOL Manuscript # 80697

acetylation of the same histone residues by histone acetyltransferases. Another indirect example of epigenetic cross talks is the incorporation of DNAm, which might negatively affect H3K4me. Methylated DNA is particularly refractory to binding of some DNA-binding proteins, including the zinc finger protein Cfp1, which preferentially binds unmethylated DNA. Cfp1 interacts and recruits H3K4 methyltransferase SETD1 and thereby, induction of DNAm might indirectly trigger a decrease on H3K9me (Xu et al., 2011), potentially explaining the dramatic reverse correlation between these two marks (Thomson et al., 2010). Reciprocally, high levels of Cfp1 in the genome could protect these regions from DNA methylation and gene silencing.

The relationship between DNAm and the silencing mark H3K27me3 is currently less well understood. Multiple groups had proposed that in cancer cells H3K27me3 could mark genes subsequently silenced by DNAm, although many developmentally regulated genes are marked H3K27me3 in the absence of DNAm (Ohm et al., 2007; Schlesinger et al., 2007; Widschwendter et al., 2007). The existence of a mutually reinforcing mechanism linking DNAm and H3K27me3 is a topic of intensive research (Hon et al., 2012).

Context-dependence of the epigenetic modifications.

The advent of genome-wide approaches for the mapping of chromatin modifications, such as ChIP-Seq, has established the relationships and context-dependence of epigenetic modifications, both in embryonic, induced pluripotent, and somatic cells (Chari et al., 2010; Zhou et al., 2011). For example in promoter regions, DNAm strongly correlates

MOL Manuscript # 80697

with some histone modifications, specifically with high levels of H3K9me and low levels of H3K4me. In fact, DNAm is a better predictor of H3K9me and H3K4me than the underlying genome context (Meissner et al., 2008; Mikkelsen et al., 2007). Unlike promoter regions, DNAm inside the gene bodies is not correlated with silencing. Widespread low-density of methylation has been proposed to serve as a mechanism to avoid inappropriate transcription initiation from cryptic promoters (Bird, 1993; Tran et al., 2005).

Genome-wide maps of histone modifications in stem and lineage-committed progenitor cells have revealed that H3K4me₃ marks the genes that are actively expressed. The “bivalent state” (H3K4me₃ and H3K27me₃) labels developmental genes poorly expressed that are poised for either expression or repression (Bernstein et al., 2006). In addition, the H3K27me₃ mark is retained in genes that are stably repressed. H3K9me₃ and H4K20me₃ are characteristic of satellite, telomeric, and long-terminal repeats. Finally, H3K36me₃ marks coding and non-coding transcripts (Meissner et al., 2008; Mikkelsen et al., 2007).

Mechanisms of DNA demethylation

The discovery of active and passive mechanisms to erase DNAm has opened the door to a new paradigm: DNAm and demethylation may not be “one-way” streets as initially thought, but highly dynamic and regulated processes (Bhutani et al., 2011). The current view of DNA demethylation involves the integration of multiple interconnected pathways. DNA demethylation can be the result of passive mechanisms, for example, by

MOL Manuscript # 80697

dilution during replication or inactivation of DNMTs. In addition to passive demethylation, several enzymatic activities have been recently associated with active demethylation and DNA repair. Much excitement has surfaced since the discovery of 5-Hydroxymethylcytosine (5hmC) in the mammalian genome in neuronal and ES cells (Kriaucionis and Heintz, 2009; Tahiliani et al., 2009) and its role as an intermediate and key player in DNA demethylation during DNA repair. The ten-eleven translocation (TET) protein family members catalyze the active modification of 5mC to give 5hmC. TET proteins are 2-oxoglutarate and Fe(II)-dependent dioxygenases which catalyze the conversion of 5mC in 5hC. TET1 was first identified in acute myeloid leukemia as a fusion protein with the MLL factor and was designated as Leukemia associated protein (LCX)(Ono et al., 2002). TET1 contains a CXXC zinc finger DNA-binding domain that binds preferentially CpG-rich sequences near the transcription start site of the targeted genes (Williams et al., 2011) (Wu et al., 2011). TET1 and TET2 are expressed in mouse ES cells and are necessary for cell lineage specification (Ficz et al., 2011; Koh et al., 2011). TET3 mediates the conversion of 5mC to 5hC in the paternal pronucleus after fertilization (Gu et al., 2011; Iqbal et al., 2011).

Recently, the Activation-induced cytidine deaminase (AID) has been recognized to participate in DNA demethylation. AID has a pivotal role in generating antibody diversity in lymphocytes. Unlike TET proteins, AID lacks of a DNA binding activity. IAD catalyzes deamination of cytosine residues to uracil. This step is followed by an excision repair or mismatch repair pathway, which is error prone. In addition this function to generate the antibody repertoire, the AID enzyme has been implicated in

MOL Manuscript # 80697

demethylation in zebrafish (Rai et al., 2008) and in mammals. Hence, mice lacking AID exhibit global DNA hypermethylation in the primordial germ cells (Popp et al., 2010). Active DNA demethylation is believed to be enzymatically coupled with the replacement of the modified cytosine via DNA repair. DNA Glycosylases, such as those belonging to the Base Excision Repair (BER) pathway have been involved in the removal of modified cytosine in plants (Gehring et al., 2009). In mammals, these enzymes could act in concert with TET and AID enzymes to promote demethylation. In this model, 5-methylcytosine and 5-hydroxymethylcytosine are first deaminated by AID to thymine and 5-hydroxymethyluracil, respectively, followed by glycoylase-mediated thymine and 5-hydroxymethyluracil excision repair (Cortellino et al., 2011).

Epigenetic alterations in cancer.

Tumor cells show multidimensional aberrations affecting many levels of regulation, including genetic changes, but also profound modifications in the epigenetic landscape. The “cancer methylome” is therefore distinct from normal, non-transformed tissue. Characteristic hallmarks of cancer include a global genome-wide hypo-methylation, and also hyper-methylation of CpG islands (which is typically associated with gene repression) (Berdasco and Esteller, 2010; Portela and Esteller, 2010; Rodriguez-Paredes and Esteller, 2011; Sandoval and Esteller, 2012). However, a substantial fraction of DNA methylation occurs in the cancer methylome away from the transcription start site (~2kb or more), comprising microRNAs and mirtrons (Dudziec et al., 2011) - these dinucleotides are named CpG shores (Irizarry et al., 2009; Sandoval et al., 2011).

MOL Manuscript # 80697

Global DNA hypomethylation and local hypermethylation has recently been confirmed by whole-genome shotgun sequencing of bisulfite-treated DNA (methyl-seq) of a low-passage breast cancer cell HCC1954 relative to normal epithelial cells (HUMEC cell line). This study revealed that the majority of hypomethylated regions in cancer cells correlated with partially methylated domains in normal cells. Surprisingly, in the tumor cells, these regions exhibited mono-allelic DNA methylation, one allele displaying DNAm and the other allele possessing the repressive histone marks H3K9me3 or H3K27me3. Thus, hypomethylated regions in cancer cells were correlated with silenced gene expression and repressed chromatin (Hon et al., 2012). In an independent study, differentially methylated regions have been mapped in colon cancer relative to normal tissue. These regions were associated with high gene expression variability. Whole-genome bisulfite sequencing has also confirmed hypomethylation in discrete blocks in about half of the cancer genome. These data suggest a model of neoplastic progression involving loss of epigenetic stability and tumor heterogeneity (Hansen et al., 2011). In another recent study in colon cancers versus matched normal tissue, focal CpG island hypermethylation was also detected within long-range (>100bp) hypomethylation regions. In this case, the widespread changes of DNA methylation in cancer was correlated with repressive chromatin and by the three-dimensional organization of the chromatin inside the nucleus (Berman et al., 2012)

In mammalian cells, DNA methylation outside promoter regions frequently occurs in long-terminal repeats (LTRs) of viral origin and other repetitive regions, named satellite regions. The methylation of these sequences in healthy cells could serve to protect the

MOL Manuscript # 80697

genomes by preventing the expression of exogenous promoters. Hypo-methylation of preferentially repetitive sequence classes including SINEs, LINEs (e.g LINE-1 elements), satellite, subtelomeric, and Alu repeats, has been associated with tumor progression in several cancer models, such as colon (Rodriguez et al., 2008; Sunami et al., 2011), squamous cell carcinomas of the lung (Pfeifer and Rauch, 2009), head, neck (Szpakowski et al., 2009) and mammary tumors (Costa et al., 2006). Hypo-methylation of repetitive regions could prime genomic instability and also reactivate potential oncogenes during transformation, tumor progression, and metastasis. Importantly, the use of global demethylating agents for the treatment of cancers (e.g 5-Aza-2'dC) in *in vitro* models has indicated that these inhibitors could prime tumor progression by re-expression of silenced oncogenes, such as Sox2 in chondrosarcoma cells (Hamm et al., 2009) and c-Met in colon carcinoma cell lines (Weber et al., 2010).

The genome-wide mapping of DNAm changes in tumor versus normal cells could help investigators to gain valuable prognosis information in cancer patients and help to not only identify single gene hits important for tumor progression, but also to define prognosis signatures. In 2000, Esteller *et al.* demonstrated that hyper-methylation of CpG islands in the promoter of the gene MGMT is a predictor of good response of glioma cancer patients to alkylating agents (Esteller et al., 2000). Since then, genomic approaches have identified groups of biomarkers associated with poor prognosis and responsiveness to therapeutic drugs, such as in pancreatic (Gupta et al., 2012) and colon cancers (Esteller et al., 2001). In glioblastoma multiforme (GBM), a genome wide study by Martinez *et al.* demonstrated that genes hyper-methylated in GBM were highly

MOL Manuscript # 80697

enriched for targets of the PRC2 (Polycomb repressive complex 2) in embryonic stem cells, and thus, these tumors exhibited a methylome with stem-cell like features (Martinez and Esteller, 2010),(Martinez et al., 2009).

During the process of immortalization, tumorigenesis, and tumor progression precancerous cells might acquire a “hyper-methylator phenotype”, affecting several tumor suppressor gene promoters (Sato et al., 2010). Methylation of p16 is a key gateway control for cells to overcome senescence barriers, and together with overexpression of telomerase these events might be crucial for the onset of the tumorigenic process (Beltran et al., 2011a; Gallardo et al., 2004). Another example in breast and ovarian cancers is the methylation of the BRCA1 tumor suppressor (Jacinto and Esteller, 2007; Stefansson et al., 2011), a gene associated with DNA repair, thereby promoting further genomic instability (Jacinto and Esteller, 2007). Mutations of BRCA genes have been associated with expansion of stem/progenitor cells and basal-like cancer (Liu et al., 2008a; Rakha et al., 2008). For these genes, methylation and genetic alterations can contribute to inactivate both copies of the tumor suppressor. Some tumor suppressors, namely class II tumor suppressor genes, are solely inactivated by epigenetic mechanisms. One classical example is the tumor suppressor *mammary serine protease inhibitor (maspin)*, in which the degree of promoter methylation clearly correlates with disease stage and metastatic behavior in multiple cancer models, such as breast, lung and prostate cancer (Futscher et al., 2004; Futscher et al., 2002; Zou et al., 1994). In the *maspin* promoter, DNAm clearly correlates with H3K9me2 (Wozniak et al., 2007), which could be explained by the

MOL Manuscript # 80697

tight epigenetic cross-talk established between DNA methyltransferases and the H3K9 methyltransferase G9a.

The era of cancer epigenomics has recently identified the extent of the histone modifications in the cancer genome relative to normal tissue, leading to aberrant gene activation or repression (Rodriguez-Paredes and Esteller, 2011; Sandoval and Esteller, 2012). In non-small lung cancer, high dimethyl-H3K4 and low acetyl-H3K9 has been associated with favorable prognosis (Song et al., 2012). As discussed earlier, aberrant H3K4me and H3K27me have also been detected in prostate cancer cells (Ke et al., 2009) and human colorectal cancer (Enroth et al., 2011).

What is the mechanistic basis of aberrant epigenetic regulation in cancer cells? In many cases, mutations or disruption in gene expression of the chromatin modifiers themselves have been identified. For example, the polycomb group of methyltransferases, such as EZH2, are often overexpressed in basal-like breast cancers, particularly in African-American women (Chase and Cross, 2011; Pang et al., 2012). The histone methyltransferase G9a (Chen et al., 2010) and other lysine methyltransferases have also been associated with tumorigenesis and targeted by screening and structure-based design for the identification of specific inhibitors (Unoki, 2011). Deregulation of TF gene expression might cause profound effects in the epigenetic landscape of cells. During reprogramming of somatic cells towards pluripotency, the exogenous delivery of Oct4, Sox2, Klf4 and c-Myc TFs is sufficient to change the epigenetic architecture of the genome in a way that is similar to embryonic ES cells (Takahashi et al., 2007; Takahashi

MOL Manuscript # 80697

and Yamanaka, 2006). Moreover, intensive research revealed that iPS cells are not identical to ES cells, retaining epigenetic features (epigenetic memory) from the cell of origin (Kim et al., 2010; Lister et al., 2011; Polo et al., 2010; Takahashi et al., 2007; Takahashi and Yamanaka, 2006; Ziller et al., 2011). The “pluripotency” TFs activate a cellular network involving many other self-renewal TFs and chromatin remodelers. An imbalance in normal gene expression due to changes in expression or activity of specific TFs could lead to dysregulation of the epigenome of cells, resulting in cancer predisposition. In the mammary gland, our laboratory has demonstrated that overexpression of the TF Oct4 leads to aberrant EMT and to the generation of clones possessing tumor initiation capabilities (Beltran et al., 2011a).

In addition to coding regions, many non-coding RNAs have been associated with tumor progression (Veeck and Esteller, 2010). An explosion of studies has demonstrated global changes in expression of micro-RNA signatures between normal and tumor cells in multiple tumor types, including a recent study in lung cancer (Guan et al., 2012). Interestingly, some microRNAs are epigenetically silenced and act as tumor suppressors, whereas many others act as oncogenes (Cho, 2012). The significance of the complex non-coding-RNA circuitry in cancer development is not well understood; microRNAs could fine-tune the threshold levels of critical targets involved in development and perhaps in cancer, illustrating the complexity of the regulatory network controlling cancer progression.

MOL Manuscript # 80697

Strategies to revert the epigenetic landscape of cancer cells using small molecules and engineered proteins.

The epigenetic deregulation of tumor cells comprising the aberrant silencing of tumor suppressors and the hypo-methylation of potential oncogenes creates the basis of novel therapeutic strategies to revert their chromatin state. The endogenous silencing of tumor suppressors can be reverted with epigenetic inhibitors, such as DNA methyltransferase, histone methyltransferase, and histone deacetylase inhibitors. An active area of research aims at developing chemical approaches to inhibit specific “writers” or “erasers”, some of which will be reviewed in the following sections below. Moreover, it is believed that these agents’ lack of locus selectivity may result in potential off targets and might cause adverse effects in cancer patients. Another approach is the design of artificial proteins or Artificial Transcription Factors (ATFs) able to recognize specific sequences in the genome, directing a chromatin modification or combinations of chromatin modifications, in specific loci.

Selective inhibitors of bromodomains and methyl-lysine readers.

The acetylation and methylation of lysine residues plays a central role in chromatin function, substantially through creation of binding sites for the readers of these marks (Taverna et al., 2007; Wang et al., 2008b). While acetylation of lysine eliminates the residue’s positive charge (akin to the significant change in chemical properties and charge upon phosphorylation of serine, threonine and tyrosine), methylation is a more subtle post-translational modification, simply shifting the chemical properties of lysine towards a more diffuse, polarizable positive charge as methylation proceeds from

MOL Manuscript # 80697

monomethyl (Kme1) to trimethyl (Kme3) (Hughes et al., 2007; Zacharias and Dougherty, 2002). Recently, small molecule probes of bromodomains, the readers of acetylated lysine, have been reported and their utilization has revealed bromodomain regulation of critical gene transcription events such as the regulation of the c-myc oncogene (Dawson et al., 2011; Delmore et al., 2011; Filippakopoulos et al., 2010). While the current repertoire of acetyl lysine readers in the human genome is limited primarily to the structurally homologous 57 bromodomains, and possibly a subset of plant homeodomains (PHDs) (Zeng et al., 2010), there are more than 200 methyl-lysine (Kme) reader domains described within several protein families: PHD; the so-called ‘royal family’ made up of Tudor, Agenet, chromo, PWWP and MBT domains; and the WD40 repeat proteins consisting of WDR5, and EED (Adams-Cioaba and Min, 2009; Margueron et al., 2009). This large Kme reader family seems destined to expand further as research in epigenetics continues (Kuo et al., 2012; Nakamura et al., 2012). A unifying feature of all of these domains is the presence of an “aromatic cage” that comprises the Kme binding pocket (Li et al., 2007b; Santiago et al., 2011). Computational analysis suggests that this target-class has significant druggability (Santiago et al., 2011), and progress towards chemical probes for Kme readers is summarized here (Frye et al., 2010b; Herold et al., 2011a).

In contrast to many protein target classes, such as GPCRs, nuclear receptors and protein kinases, where ligand discovery sometimes proceeded determination of high resolution protein structures by decades, Kme binding sites were relatively well explored structurally prior to any reports of potent, small molecule ligands (Adams-Cioaba and Min, 2009; Ruthenburg et al., 2007). As a consequence, approaches toward ligands have

MOL Manuscript # 80697

been based primarily upon computational and structural techniques (Campagna-Slater and Schapira, 2010; Campagna-Slater et al., 2010; Kireev et al., 2010). In the first report of experimentally confirmed Kme binding domain small molecule ligands (for malignant brain tumor [MBT] domains), Kireev and co-authors utilized both a 2D and 3D virtual screening approach to select ligands from a computationally curated and procurable set of 5.8 million small molecules. Of 51 compounds tested in a histone-peptide competitive dose response proximity assay (Wigle et al., 2009), 19 compounds produced a measurable IC₅₀ in the 5-100 μM range. All active compounds from this screen contained a mono- or dialkylamine that presumably satisfies the mono- and dimethyl-lysine histone peptide preference of the MBT domains (Kireev et al., 2010). Subsequently, Herold and co-authors described the structure and pharmacophore based design of UNC669 (**Figure 4**) which demonstrates a 5 μM Kd versus L3MBTL1 (Herold et al., 2011b). The conformationally rigid piperidino-pyrrolidine Kme mimic in UNC669 results in a ligand with 5-fold greater affinity for L3MBTL1 than the H4K20me1 peptide – a presumed endogenous binding partner. UNC669 demonstrated moderate to high selectivity as a ligand for L3MBTL1 versus a small panel of other Kme binders with the next highest affinity being for L3MBTL3 (Herold et al., 2011b). A subsequent structure-activity relationship (SAR) study of the UNC669 template revealed that pyrrolidine is an optimal size and shape for binding in the aromatic cage of L3MBTL1 that recognizes Kme and that an increase in ring size to piperidine was not tolerated (Herold et al., 2012).

While these first reports of antagonists of Kme binding domains have described ligands of modest potency, the functional conservation of the pi-cation Kme recognition motif

MOL Manuscript # 80697

across this large and structurally diverse domain family bodes well for improvements in affinity as further SAR is developed (Herold et al., 2011a).

Selective inhibitors of protein lysine methyltransferases (PKMTs).

Protein lysine methylation is increasingly recognized as an important type of post-translational modification. This modification has been heavily studied in the context of epigenetic regulation of gene expression through histone lysine methylation (Bernstein et al., 2007; Gelato and Fischle, 2008; Jenuwein and Allis, 2001; Kouzarides, 2007; Martin and Zhang, 2005; Strahl and Allis, 2000), but numerous non-histone substrates suggest that the impact of lysine methylation is not limited to chromatin biology (Huang et al., 2010; Huang et al., 2006; Huang et al., 2007; Rathert et al., 2008). Protein lysine methyltransferases (PKMTs, also known as histone methyltransferases (HMTs)) catalyze mono-, di-, and/or trimethylation of lysine residues of histone and non-histone proteins (Copeland et al., 2009; Kouzarides, 2007). Since the first PKMT was characterized over a decade ago (Rea et al., 2000), more than 50 PKMTs have been identified (Copeland et al., 2009; Kouzarides, 2007; Wu et al., 2010). Growing evidence suggests that PKMTs play critical roles in various human diseases including cancer (Bedford and Richard, 2005; Bissinger et al., 2010; Cole, 2008; Copeland et al., 2009; Esteller, 2008; Fog et al., 2007; Frye et al., 2010a; He et al., 2012; Martin and Zhang, 2005; Spannhoff et al., 2009a; Spannhoff et al., 2009b; Yost et al., 2011). Selective inhibitors of PKMTs are valuable tools for dissecting biological functions of these proteins and assessing their potential as therapeutic targets. In this part of the review, we briefly discuss the selective PKMT inhibitors discovered to date (**Figure 5**).

MOL Manuscript # 80697

The discovery of BIX01294, the first selective PKMT inhibitor by Jenuwein and colleagues (Kubicek et al., 2007) was a major milestone in the PKMT inhibitor field. BIX01294 has good *in vitro* potency against G9a and G9a-like protein (GLP) and is selective for G9a and GLP over SUV39H1 and SETDB1, and SETD7 (Chang et al., 2009; Kubicek et al., 2007). BIX01294 is also active in cells. However, it has a poor separation of functional potency and cell toxicity (Chang et al., 2010; Vedadi et al., 2011; Yuan et al., 2012). Optimization of this quinazoline scaffold via structure-based design and synthesis by Jin and coworkers led to the discovery of UNC0638 (Vedadi et al., 2011), a chemical probe of G9a and GLP, and several other potent and selective inhibitors of G9a and GLP (Liu et al., 2011; Liu et al., 2009; Liu et al., 2010). UNC0638 has balanced high *in vitro* potency versus G9a/GLP and desirable physicochemical properties and is > 100-fold selective for G9a and GLP over a broad range of epigenetic and non-epigenetic targets (Vedadi et al., 2011). Importantly, UNC0638 has robust on-target activities in cells and an excellent separation between functional potency and cell toxicity (Vedadi et al., 2011). Cheng and co-workers also discovered a potent G9a and GLP inhibitor E72 based on the quinazoline template via structure-based design and synthesis (Chang et al., 2010). E72 has high *in vitro* potency versus G9a and GLP and is inactive against SUV39H2 (Chang et al., 2010). E72 is also active in cells and shows reduced cell toxicity compared to BIX01294 (Chang et al., 2010). X-ray co-crystal structures of these G9a/GLP inhibitors in complex with GLP or G9a reveal that these quinazoline-based inhibitors occupy the substrate binding groove and do not occupy the cofactor binding site (Chang et al., 2010; Chang et al., 2009; Liu et al., 2009; Vedadi et

MOL Manuscript # 80697

al., 2011). These findings were confirmed by mechanism of action studies, which reveal that UNC0638 and its analog are competitive with the peptide substrate and non-competitive with the cofactor (Vedadi et al., 2011; Wigle et al., 2010). More recently, Schreiber and coworkers discovered a cofactor-competitive G9a inhibitor BRD9539 (Yuan et al., 2012), which is structurally distinct from quinazoline-based G9a/GLP inhibitors. BRD9539 has moderate *in vitro* potency versus G9a and EZH2 and is selective over SUV39H1, NSD2, DNMT1, 16 other chromatin-modifying enzymes and 100 kinases (Yuan et al., 2012). BRD4770, the methyl ester of BRD9539, is active in cells with a cellular potency similar to the *in vitro* potency of BRD9539 (Yuan et al., 2012).

The discovery of EPZ004777, the first highly selective, cofactor-competitive PKMT inhibitor by Pollock and co-workers (Daigle et al., 2011) was also a significant advancement in the PKMT inhibitor discovery field. EPZ004777, a nucleoside-based inhibitor, is highly potent versus DOT1L ($K_i = 0.3$ nM) and > 1,000-fold selective for DOT1L over other PKMTs and PRMTs (protein arginine methyltransferases) tested (Daigle et al., 2011). In addition, EPZ004777 selectively kills off cells bearing mixed lineage leukemia (MLL) translocation and continuous infusion of EPZ004777 via a mini-pump increases animal survival in a mouse MLL xenograft model (Daigle et al., 2011). Song and co-workers also discovered potent, selective, cofactor-competitive, nucleoside-based inhibitors of DOT1L and obtained an X-ray co-crystal structure of DOT1L in complex with one of their inhibitors (Yao et al., 2011). Compound **1**, the most potent and selective inhibitor in their series, was proposed to be capable of covalently modifying the enzyme (Yao et al., 2011).

MOL Manuscript # 80697

In 2011, Ferguson and co-workers reported the discovery of a potent SMYD2 inhibitor AZ505 ($IC_{50} = 120$ nM), which is selective for SMYD2 over a panel of PKMTs including SMYD3, DOT1L, EZH2, GLP, G9a and SETD7 (Ferguson et al., 2011). The X-ray co-crystal structure of AZ505 in complex with SMYD2 reveals that AZ505 occupies the peptide binding groove, which was confirmed by the findings from mechanism of action studies: AZ505 is competitive with the peptide substrate and uncompetitive with the cofactor (Ferguson et al., 2011). Most recently, an X-ray co-crystal structure of compound **2** in complex with SETD7 has been reported in the PDB (protein data bank) (PDB code: 4E47). Although the *in vitro* potency of this SETD7 inhibitor has not been reported, the X-ray co-crystal structure reveals that this inhibitor occupies the substrate-binding groove and does not occupy the cofactor binding site.

GSK-A was recently reported as the first selective, cofactor-competitive inhibitor of EZH2 by Diaz and coworkers (Diaz et al., 2012). GSK-A ($K_i = 700$ nM), which was identified via high throughput screening (HTS), is selective for EZH2 over a panel of PKMTs, PRMTs, and DNMTs. It is competitive with the cofactor and non-competitive with either the peptide or nucleosome substrate. GSK-A is cell permeable and reduces cellular levels of H3K27me3 with an IC_{50} of 8 μ M. Most recently, Knutson and coworkers discovered EPZ005687, a highly potent, selective, and cofactor-competitive inhibitor of EZH2, via HTS and subsequent optimization (Knutson et al., 2012). EPZ005687 ($K_i = 24$ nM) is 50-fold selective for EZH2 over EZH1, > 500-fold selective over 15 other PKMTs and PRMTs, and at least 60-fold selective over a broad panel of

MOL Manuscript # 80697

GPCRs and ion channels. Similar to GSK-A, EPZ005687 is competitive with the cofactor and non-competitive with the nucleosome substrate. It inhibits wild-type EZH2 and 6 Y641 or A677 EZH2 mutants with similar *in vitro* potencies and reduces H3K27 methylation in various lymphoma cells with high cellular potencies. Importantly, EPZ005687 selectively induces apoptotic cell killing in heterozygous Y641F or A677G mutant cells and has little effects on the proliferation of wild-type lymphoma cells.

Artificial Transcription Factors as locus-specific epigenetic modulators.

Locus-specific targeting of epigenetic domains in chromatin requires minimally two modules: a DNA-recognition domain, which has sequence selectivity, and an effector domain, which is engineered to modify chromatin (Beltran and Blancafort, 2010). Most engineered proteins were constructed using zinc finger (ZF) scaffolds, and more recently, transcription activator-like effectors (TALEs), which are bacterial proteins of the genus *Xanthomonas*, that are injected into infected plants (Mussolino and Cathomen, 2012). The DNA-binding specificity of a TALE is a tandem array of ~15.5-19.5 single repeats, each repeat containing ~34 conserved residues. The binding specificity is dictated by positions 12 and 13 of the repeats, known as repeat variable residues. Thereby, the TALE code is a simple 1:1 interaction, 1 repeat unit to one nucleotide (Deng et al., 2012; Moscou and Bogdanove, 2009). Recently, several laboratories have designed artificial TALEs for gene regulation and genome editing using nuclease technology (Bogdanove and Voytas, 2011; Bultmann et al., 2012). The on and potential off targets of these emerging technologies are still under investigation.

MOL Manuscript # 80697

Sequence specific Cys2-His2 Zinc fingers (ZFs) have been engineered by several approaches, including “helix grafting” (directed mutations in the α -helical recognition sequence), and by *in vitro* as well as *in vivo* selection experiments, both in bacteria and yeast (Beltran et al., 2006)). These selection experiments have overcome the context dependence of the assembly of the ZF units, generating proteins with potentially improved specificity for the target DNA. Each ZF module recognizes primarily three base pairs of DNA, and most studies have engineered polydactyl proteins consisting of 3 or more ZF proteins. Thereby, 6ZF proteins will recognize an 18-base pair recognition site in the DNA with potentially unique specificity in the genome (Tan et al., 2003), although potential off-targets might also occur in the cell due to the binding of the engineered protein to closely related binding sites. ZF proteins have been linked to several activator or repressor domains, promoting specific activation or repression of the targeted gene by recruiting specific co-activator or co-repressors (Sera, 2009; Stolzenburg et al., 2010). However, such first generation of effector domains does not possess intrinsic catalytic activity to modify either the histones or the DNA. Consequently, these effectors are expected to have a transient effect in the target cell, and are not capable of inducing epigenetic memory (transmission of epigenetic modifications over the cell progeny). In contrast, the linkage of ZFs with epigenetic modifiers possessing enzymatic activity, it is expected to directly modify the histones or the DNA. Thus, some of these effectors are potentially able to promote heritable changes in chromatin (Ashley G. Rivenbark, 2012).

MOL Manuscript # 80697

Among all epigenetic marks, DNAm and H3K9me are recognized as being heritable marks, or transmitted over the cell progeny. Several studies have demonstrated that linkage of a catalytic domain of bacterial methyltransferases with designer ZFs leads to targeted DNAm in plasmid-based assays or integrated reporters (Carvin et al., 2003; Li et al., 2007a; Minczuk et al., 2006; Smith and Ford, 2007; Smith et al., 2008). To avoid untargeted methylation, programmable DNA methyltransferases have been constructed, in which the expression of two independent ZF proteins can complement or restore the activity of a functional DNA methyltransferase enzyme (Meister et al., 2010; Nomura and Barbas, 2007). Interestingly, triple-helix forming oligonucleotides have been coupled with a DNA methyltransferase M.SssI to promote targeted methylation of the EpCAM oncogenic promoter (van der Gun et al., 2010). Our laboratory has recently reported the first endogenous targeted DNA methyltransferase activity in a cancer genome, by tethering 6ZF domains with the catalytic domain of human Dnmt3a, an enzyme that catalyzes the *de novo* DNAm (**Figure 6**). When linked with a 6ZF promoting homing to a tumor suppressor gene promoter, such as *Maspin*, the ZFs-Dnmt3a fusions promoted targeted DNAm, which was accompanied by an increased tumorigenic ability of the breast cancer cells *in vitro*. In contrast, in the context of an oncogene, such as *Sox2*, 6ZF linked to Dnmt3a promoted cancer cell growth arrest. Importantly, these studies suggested that the silencing initiated by the ZFs-Dnmt3a fusions was maintained over more than 50 cell generations. In fact, DNAm patterns were faithfully transmitted over cell generations even when after the ZF protein was not longer expressed in the tumor cells (Ashley G. Rivenbark, 2012). Overall, these studies suggested that ZFs-Dnmt3a constructs were able to stably reprogram the epigenetic state of the targeted promoters. In

MOL Manuscript # 80697

addition to DNA methyltransferases, ZF proteins have been linked to histone methyltransferase domains, such as SUV39H1 and G9a, targeting H3K9me marks in the context of the VEGF-A gene. These chimeras were sufficient to target silencing of the endogenous gene (Snowden et al., 2002).

Reactivation of epigenetically silenced genes has also been achieved with ZF proteins. Gene activation, however, appears to be fundamentally more challenging than targeted silencing due to the decreased accessibility of the targeted region. Reactivation of silenced and pro-apoptotic genes has been reported for *Maspin* (Beltran, 2011), Bax (Falke et al., 2003), and p53-dependent pathways using ZF library screenings (Blancafort et al., 2008). Highly methylated promoters, for example tumor suppressors, are associated with condensed chromatin, which could impede TFs to find their targets in chromatin. In the case of the *maspin* tumor suppressor, for example, the degree or extent of transactivation by ZF proteins is highly dependent on the targeted region of the promoter, and in the DNA methylation level of the cell line examined (Beltran et al., 2011b). We have characterized an activator ATF able to re-activate silenced *maspin* in breast and lung cancer lines having high degree of promoter methylation. When delivered in these cell lines, the ATF suppressed breast cancer growth and totally abolished metastatic colonization (Beltran, 2011; Beltran et al., 2011b; Lund et al., 2004)). Moreover, the effect of the ATF in re-activating endogenous *maspin* was highly synergistic with small molecule inhibitors of DNA methyltransferases and histone deacetylases (Beltran et al., 2008). Similarly, in the context of an epigenetically silenced oncogene, such as Oct4, TALE activators designed against the promoter were able to reactivate Oct4 only in

MOL Manuscript # 80697

presence of epigenetic inhibitors, such as 5-Aza-dC and TSA (Bultmann et al., 2012). These experiments indicated that compact chromatin represented a partial blockade for ZFs and TALE technologies, and generally TFs, to reach high levels of regulation of silenced genes. Future engineering of both, ZFs and TALEs, might benefit from linkage of the DNA binding domains with chromatin remodelers, which might help to unravel the silenced chromatin. The discovery of novel DNA demethylases able to erase the 5meC of DNA represents a powerful new engineering avenue.

ATFs versus small molecule inhibitors.

The “pros” and “cons” for the use of ATFs and small molecules for anti-cancer treatment are summarized in **Table 1**. The design and optimization of DNA-binding domains in ATF backbones opens the possibility to regulate single genes in the cancer genome. Nevertheless, the spectrum of targets regulated by the ATF highly depends on the choice and primary selectivity of the DNA-binding domains used for the construction of the proteins. Investigators can now take advantage of genome-wide approaches to map the ATF-binding events in the cell and to study the specificity of regulation by ChIP-seq and RNA-seq (or gene expression microarrays), respectively. Nevertheless, work done in our laboratories and others demonstrate that the genomic context of the host cell type, for example, target site selectivity and promoter context, are key factors defining the specificity of action of ZF proteins (Beltran, 2011; Beltran and Blancafort, 2010). As is often observed with siRNA technology, several ATF proteins need to be constructed to effectively regulate the desired gene (Beltran et al., 2007).

MOL Manuscript # 80697

Genomic and functional studies have defined critical target genes deregulated in cancer cells relative to normal tissue, providing investigators with “*ad hoc*” information regarding which genes are the most important to correct, and in which subtypes of cancers. For example, investigators can selectively down-regulate specific oncogenes overexpressed in cancer tissues without altering the behavior of normal cells. In contrast, the inhibition of endogenous epigenetic enzymes using small molecules potentially yields toxicity or undesired pharmacology due to the lack of locus selectivity of these chemical-based approaches. Since both the biological consequence of chromatin regulator inhibition and the potential off-target profile of small molecules are not predictable, experimental data, not debate, will reveal the magnitude of this challenge. By analogy to the selectivity issues often debated for protein kinase inhibitors, we anticipate clinically useful levels of efficacy and selectivity to be obtainable in the epigenetics field with progress driven by thoughtful experimentation. The potency of transcriptional regulation using ATFs is highly enhanced by using transactivator or repressor domains. In our hands, the degree of up-regulation of tumor suppressors genes is considerably stronger using ATFs as compared with small molecule inhibitors. This result could be explained by the effective recruitment of RNA polymerase II complex and associated factors by ATFs, which results in enhanced transactivation and strong anti-cancer effects (Lara et al., 2012). A linkage of multiple epigenetic effectors (e.g methyltransferase and HDAC functions) in the same ATF could improve the effect of the engineered protein. Similarly, small molecules targeting different epigenetic processes have been shown to be highly synergistic in up-regulating endogenous genes.

MOL Manuscript # 80697

Certainly the strongest known limitation of the ATF technology is effective delivery into the target tissue. Targeted delivery for gene therapy has been historically addressed with the use of tissue-specific viral vectors (e.g adeno- and adeno-associated vectors). In addition, targeted nanoparticles encapsulating a more stable and modified ATF mRNA have been used in animal models of metastatic ovarian cancer (Lara et al., 2012). These nanoparticles were able to accumulate with high doses in the tumor site and were able to inhibit tumor growth when administered i.v. In addition to delivering the ATF in the tumor compartment, another fundamental problem of the ATFs is the high cost associated with the bulk production of ATF-containing nanoparticles required for treatment. Moreover, the ultimate hope of these ATF approaches is the generation of more stable epigenetic treatments for aggressive cancers, which might increase the longevity of the therapeutic approach, while providing a window of opportunity to combat incurable and highly drug-resistant tumors. Chimeric nanoparticles containing multiple ATFs and other anti-cancer agents, could be envisioned in the future to enhance therapeutic outcome.

Summary

In conclusion, the Epigenomics era has provided a multi-layer view of fundamental processes disrupted in cancer cells, which include changes in DNA and histone-methylation in many different loci. The development of small molecule inhibitors for specific methyltransferases and methyl-readers (bromodomains) has provided novel strategies to target the epigenetic processes that are disrupted in malignant cells. Sequence-specific, engineered proteins attached to chromatin remodeling enzymes have the pivotal advantage to target specific locus associated with malignant progression.

MOL Manuscript # 80697

Combinatorial treatments of cancer cells with several distinct pharmacological approaches, for example small molecules and artificial chromatin remodeling enzymes, represent attractive approaches to stably reprogram the epigenetic landscape of cancer cells.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Dr. Foteini Hassiotou for critically reading the manuscript and Drs. Brenda Temple and Adriana S. Beltran for providing assistance in formatting the Figures of this manuscript.

Authorship contributions.

Wrote or contributed to the writing of the manuscript: Pilar Blancafort, Jian Jin, and Stephen Frye.

MOL Manuscript # 80697

References

Adams-Cioaba, M.A., and Min, J. (2009). Structure and function of histone methylation binding proteins. *Biochem Cell Biol* 87, 93-105.

Arima, Y., Hayashi, N., Hayashi, H., Sasaki, M., Kai, K., Sugihara, E., Abe, E., Yoshida, A., Mikami, S., Nakamura, S., *et al.* (2012). Loss of p16 expression is associated with the stem cell characteristics of surface markers and therapeutic resistance in estrogen receptor-negative breast cancer. *Int J Cancer* 130, 2568-79.

Arrowsmith, C.H., Bountra, C., Fish, P.V., Lee, K., and Schapira, M. (2012). Epigenetic protein families: a new frontier for drug discovery. *Nature reviews Drug discovery* 11, 384-400.

Ashley G. Rivenbark, S.S., Adriana S. Beltran, Xinni Yuan, Marianne G. Rots, Brian D. Strahl and Pilar Blancafort (2012). Epigenetic Reprogramming of Cancer Cells via Targeted DNA Methylation. *Epigenetics* 7, 350-60.

Bannister, A.J., Zegerman, P., Partridge, J.F., Miska, E.A., Thomas, J.O., Allshire, R.C., and Kouzarides, T. (2001). Selective recognition of methylated lysine 9 on histone H3 by the HP1 chromo domain. *Nature* 410, 120-124.

Baylin, S.B., and Jones, P.A. (2011). A decade of exploring the cancer epigenome - biological and translational implications. *Nature reviews* 11, 726-734.

Bedford, M.T., and Richard, S. (2005). Arginine methylation an emerging regulator of protein function. *Mol Cell* 18, 263-272.

Beltran (2011). Reactivation of MASPIN in non-small cell lung carcinoma (NSCLC) cells by artificial transcription factors (ATFs). *Epigenetics* 6, 224-35

Beltran, A., Liu, Y., Parikh, S., Temple, B., and Blancafort, P. (2006). Interrogating genomes with combinatorial artificial transcription factor libraries: asking zinc finger questions. *Assay Drug Dev Technol* 4, 317-331.

Beltran, A., Parikh, S., Liu, Y., Cuevas, B.D., Johnson, G.L., Futscher, B.W., and Blancafort, P. (2007). Re-activation of a dormant tumor suppressor gene maspin by designed transcription factors. *Oncogene* 26, 2791-2798.

Beltran, A.S., and Blancafort, P. (2010). Remodeling genomes with artificial transcription factors (ATFs). *Methods in molecular biology (Clifton, NJ)* 649, 163-182.

Beltran, A.S., Rivenbark, A.G., Richardson, B.T., Yuan, X., Quian, H., Hunt, J.P., Zimmerman, E., Graves, L.M., and Blancafort, P. (2011a). Generation of tumor initiating cells by exogenous delivery of OCT4 Transcription Factor. *Breast cancer research : BCR* 13, R94.

MOL Manuscript # 80697

Beltran, A.S., Russo, A., Lara, H., Fan, C., Lizardi, P.M., and Blancafort, P. (2011b). Suppression of breast tumor growth and metastasis by an engineered transcription factor. *PLoS One* 6, e24595.

Beltran, A.S., Sun, X., Lizardi, P.M., and Blancafort, P. (2008). Reprogramming epigenetic silencing: artificial transcription factors synergize with chromatin remodeling drugs to reactivate the tumor suppressor mammary serine protease inhibitor. *Mol Cancer Ther* 7, 1080-1090.

Berdasco, M., and Esteller, M. (2010). Aberrant epigenetic landscape in cancer: how cellular identity goes awry. *Dev Cell* 19, 698-711.

Berman, B.P., Weisenberger, D.J., Aman, J.F., Hinoue, T., Ramjan, Z., Liu, Y., Noushmehr, H., Lange, C.P., van Dijk, C.M., Tollenaar, R.A., *et al.* (2012). Regions of focal DNA hypermethylation and long-range hypomethylation in colorectal cancer coincide with nuclear lamina-associated domains. *Nat Genet* 44, 40-46.

Bernstein, B.E., Meissner, A., and Lander, E.S. (2007). The mammalian epigenome. *Cell* 128, 669-681.

Bernstein, B.E., Mikkelsen, T.S., Xie, X., Kamal, M., Huebert, D.J., Cuff, J., Fry, B., Meissner, A., Wernig, M., Plath, K., *et al.* (2006). A bivalent chromatin structure marks key developmental genes in embryonic stem cells. *Cell* 125, 315-326.

Bhutani, N., Brady, J.J., Damian, M., Sacco, A., Corbel, S.Y., and Blau, H.M. (2010). Reprogramming towards pluripotency requires AID-dependent DNA demethylation. *Nature* 463, 1042-1047.

Bhutani, N., Burns, D.M., and Blau, H.M. (2011). DNA demethylation dynamics. *Cell* 146, 866-872.

Bird, A.P. (1993). Functions for DNA methylation in vertebrates. *Cold Spring Harbor symposia on quantitative biology* 58, 281-285.

Bissinger, E.-M., Heinke, R., Sippl, W., and Jung, M. (2010). Targeting epigenetic modifiers: Inhibitors of histone methyltransferases. *MedChemComm* 1, 114-124.

Blancafort, P., Tschan, M.P., Bergquist, S., Guthy, D., Brachat, A., Sheeter, D.A., Torbett, B.E., Erdmann, D., and Barbas, C.F., 3rd (2008). Modulation of drug resistance by artificial transcription factors. *Mol Cancer Ther* 7, 688-697.

Bogdanove, A.J., and Voytas, D.F. (2011). TAL effectors: customizable proteins for DNA targeting. *Science* 333, 1843-1846.

MOL Manuscript # 80697

Bostick, M., Kim, J.K., Esteve, P.O., Clark, A., Pradhan, S., and Jacobsen, S.E. (2007). UHRF1 plays a role in maintaining DNA methylation in mammalian cells. *Science* 317, 1760-1764.

Bultmann, S., Morbitzer, R., Schmidt, C.S., Thanisch, K., Spada, F., Elsaesser, J., Lahaye, T., and Leonhardt, H. (2012). Targeted transcriptional activation of silent oct4 pluripotency gene by combining designer TALEs and inhibition of epigenetic modifiers. *Nucleic Acids Res* 40, 5368-77.

Campagna-Slater, V., and Schapira, M. (2010). Finding Inspiration in the Protein Data Bank to Chemically Antagonize Readers of the Histone Code. *Molecular Informatics* 29, 322-331.

Campagna-Slater, V.r., Arrowsmith, A.G., Zhao, Y., and Schapira, M. (2010). Pharmacophore Screening of the Protein Data Bank for Specific Binding Site Chemistry. *J Chem Inf Model* 50, 358-367.

Carmona, F.J., and Esteller, M. (2011). DNA methylation in early neoplasia. *Cancer biomarkers : section A of Disease markers* 9, 101-111.

Carvin, C.D., Parr, R.D., and Kladde, M.P. (2003). Site-selective in vivo targeting of cytosine-5 DNA methylation by zinc-finger proteins. *Nucleic Acids Res* 31, 6493-6501.

Chang, Y., Ganesh, T., Horton, J.R., Spannhoff, A., Liu, J., Sun, A., Zhang, X., Bedford, M.T., Shinkai, Y., Snyder, J.P., *et al.* (2010). Adding a lysine mimic in the design of potent inhibitors of histone lysine methyltransferases. *J Mol Biol* 400, 1-7.

Chang, Y., Zhang, X., Horton, J.R., Upadhyay, A.K., Spannhoff, A., Liu, J., Snyder, J.P., Bedford, M.T., and Cheng, X. (2009). Structural basis for G9a-like protein lysine methyltransferase inhibition by BIX-01294. *Nat Struct Mol Biol* 16, 312-317.

Chari, R., Thu, K.L., Wilson, I.M., Lockwood, W.W., Lonergan, K.M., Coe, B.P., Malloff, C.A., Gazdar, A.F., Lam, S., Garnis, C., *et al.* (2010). Integrating the multiple dimensions of genomic and epigenomic landscapes of cancer. *Cancer metastasis reviews* 29, 73-93.

Chase, A., and Cross, N.C. (2011). Aberrations of EZH2 in cancer. *Clinical cancer research : an official journal of the American Association for Cancer Research* 17, 2613-2618.

Chen, M.W., Hua, K.T., Kao, H.J., Chi, C.C., Wei, L.H., Johansson, G., Shiah, S.G., Chen, P.S., Jeng, Y.M., Cheng, T.Y., *et al.* (2010). H3K9 histone methyltransferase G9a promotes lung cancer invasion and metastasis by silencing the cell adhesion molecule Ep-CAM. *Cancer research* 70, 7830-7840.

MOL Manuscript # 80697

Cheng, X., and Blumenthal, R.M. (2010). Coordinated chromatin control: structural and functional linkage of DNA and histone methylation. *Biochemistry* 49, 2999-3008.

Cho, W.C. (2012). MicroRNAs as therapeutic targets and their potential applications in cancer therapy. *Expert opinion on therapeutic targets* 16, 747-59.

Clements, A., Rojas, J.R., Trievel, R.C., Wang, L., Berger, S.L., and Marmorstein, R. (1999). Crystal structure of the histone acetyltransferase domain of the human PCAF transcriptional regulator bound to coenzyme A. *EMBO J* 18, 3521-3532.

Cole, P.A. (2008). Chemical probes for histone-modifying enzymes. *Nat Chem Biol* 4, 590-597.

Copeland, R.A., Solomon, M.E., and Richon, V.M. (2009). Protein methyltransferases as a target class for drug discovery. *Nat Rev Drug Discov* 8, 724-732.

Cortellino, S., Xu, J., Sannai, M., Moore, R., Caretti, E., Cigliano, A., Le Coz, M., Devarajan, K., Wessels, A., Soprano, D., *et al.* (2011). Thymine DNA glycosylase is essential for active DNA demethylation by linked deamination-base excision repair. *Cell* 146, 67-79.

Costa, F.F., Paixao, V.A., Cavalher, F.P., Ribeiro, K.B., Cunha, I.W., Rinck, J.A., Jr., O'Hare, M., Mackay, A., Soares, F.A., Brentani, R.R., *et al.* (2006). SATR-1 hypomethylation is a common and early event in breast cancer. *Cancer genetics and cytogenetics* 165, 135-143.

Daigle, S.R., Olhava, E.J., Therkelsen, C.A., Majer, C.R., Sneeringer, C.J., Song, J., Johnston, L.D., Scott, M.P., Smith, J.J., Xiao, Y., *et al.* (2011). Selective killing of mixed lineage leukemia cells by a potent small-molecule DOT1L inhibitor. *Cancer cell* 20, 53-65.

Dawson, M.A., Prinjha, R.K., Dittmann, A., Giotopoulos, G., Bantscheff, M., Chan, W.-I., Robson, S.C., Chung, C.-w., Hopf, C., Savitski, M.M., *et al.* (2011). Inhibition of BET recruitment to chromatin as an effective treatment for MLL-fusion leukaemia. *Nature* 478, 529-533.

Delmore, Jake E., Issa, Ghayas C., Lemieux, Madeleine E., Rahl, Peter B., Shi, J., Jacobs, Hannah M., Kastiris, E., Gilpatrick, T., Paranal, Ronald M., Qi, J., *et al.* (2011). BET Bromodomain Inhibition as a Therapeutic Strategy to Target c-Myc. *Cell* 146, 904-917.

Deng, D., Yan, C., Pan, X., Mahfouz, M., Wang, J., Zhu, J.K., Shi, Y., and Yan, N. (2012). Structural basis for sequence-specific recognition of DNA by TAL effectors. *Science* 335, 720-723.

Diaz, E., Machutta, C.A., Chen, S., Jiang, Y., Nixon, C., Hofmann, G., Key, D., Sweitzer, S., Patel, M., Wu, Z., *et al.* (2012). Development and Validation of Reagents and Assays

MOL Manuscript # 80697

for EZH2 Peptide and Nucleosome High-Throughput Screens. *Journal of Biomolecular Screening*.

Dudziec, E., Miah, S., Choudhry, H.M., Owen, H.C., Blizard, S., Glover, M., Hamdy, F.C., and Catto, J.W. (2011). Hypermethylation of CpG islands and shores around specific microRNAs and mirtrons is associated with the phenotype and presence of bladder cancer. *Clinical cancer research : an official journal of the American Association for Cancer Research* *17*, 1287-1296.

Dutnall, R.N., and Ramakrishnan, V. (1997). Twists and turns of the nucleosome: tails without ends. *Structure* *5*, 1255-1259.

Enroth, S., Rada-Iglesias, A., Andersson, R., Wallerman, O., Wanders, A., Pahlman, L., Komorowski, J., and Wadelius, C. (2011). Cancer associated epigenetic transitions identified by genome-wide histone methylation binding profiles in human colorectal cancer samples and paired normal mucosa. *BMC cancer* *11*, 450.

Esteller, M. (2008). Epigenetics in cancer. *N Engl J Med* *358*, 1148-1159.

Esteller, M., Garcia-Foncillas, J., Andion, E., Goodman, S.N., Hidalgo, O.F., Vanaclocha, V., Baylin, S.B., and Herman, J.G. (2000). Inactivation of the DNA-repair gene MGMT and the clinical response of gliomas to alkylating agents. *The New England journal of medicine* *343*, 1350-1354.

Esteller, M., Risques, R.A., Toyota, M., Capella, G., Moreno, V., Peinado, M.A., Baylin, S.B., and Herman, J.G. (2001). Promoter hypermethylation of the DNA repair gene O(6)-methylguanine-DNA methyltransferase is associated with the presence of G:C to A:T transition mutations in p53 in human colorectal tumorigenesis. *Cancer research* *61*, 4689-4692.

Falke, D., Fisher, M., Ye, D., and Juliano, R.L. (2003). Design of artificial transcription factors to selectively regulate the pro-apoptotic bax gene. *Nucleic Acids Res* *31*, e10.

Feldman, N., Gerson, A., Fang, J., Li, E., Zhang, Y., Shinkai, Y., Cedar, H., and Bergman, Y. (2006). G9a-mediated irreversible epigenetic inactivation of Oct-3/4 during early embryogenesis. *Nat Cell Biol* *8*, 188-194.

Ferguson, A.D., Larsen, N.A., Howard, T., Pollard, H., Green, I., Grande, C., Cheung, T., Garcia-Arenas, R., Cowen, S., Wu, J., *et al.* (2011). Structural Basis of Substrate Methylation and Inhibition of SMYD2. *Structure* *19*, 1262-1273.

Ficz, G., Branco, M.R., Seisenberger, S., Santos, F., Krueger, F., Hore, T.A., Marques, C.J., Andrews, S., and Reik, W. (2011). Dynamic regulation of 5-hydroxymethylcytosine in mouse ES cells and during differentiation. *Nature* *473*, 398-402.

MOL Manuscript # 80697

Filippakopoulos, P., Qi, J., Picaud, S., Shen, Y., Smith, W.B., Fedorov, O., Morse, E.M., Keates, T., Hickman, T.T., Felletar, I., *et al.* (2010). Selective inhibition of BET bromodomains. *Nature* *468*, 1067-1073.

Fog, C.K., Jensen, K.T., and Lund, A.H. (2007). Chromatin-modifying proteins in cancer. *APMIS* *115*, 1060-1089.

Frye, S.V., Heightman, T., and Jin, J. (2010a). Targeting Methyl Lysine. *Annual Reports in Medicinal Chemistry* *45*, 329-343.

Frye, S.V., Heightman, T., Jin, J., and John, E.M. (2010b). Targeting Methyl Lysine. In *Annual Reports in Medicinal Chemistry* (Academic Press), pp. 329-343.

Fuks, F., Hurd, P.J., Deplus, R., and Kouzarides, T. (2003). The DNA methyltransferases associate with HP1 and the SUV39H1 histone methyltransferase. *Nucleic Acids Res* *31*, 2305-2312.

Futscher, B.W., O'Meara, M.M., Kim, C.J., Rennels, M.A., Lu, D., Gruman, L.M., Seftor, R.E., Hendrix, M.J., and Domann, F.E. (2004). Aberrant methylation of the maspin promoter is an early event in human breast cancer. *Neoplasia* *6*, 380-389.

Futscher, B.W., Oshiro, M.M., Wozniak, R.J., Holtan, N., Hanigan, C.L., Duan, H., and Domann, F.E. (2002). Role for DNA methylation in the control of cell type specific maspin expression. *Nat Genet* *31*, 175-179.

Gallardo, F., Esteller, M., Pujol, R.M., Costa, C., Estrach, T., and Servitje, O. (2004). Methylation status of the p15, p16 and MGMT promoter genes in primary cutaneous T-cell lymphomas. *Haematologica* *89*, 1401-1403.

Gao, X., Tate, P., Hu, P., Tjian, R., Skarnes, W.C., and Wang, Z. (2008). ES cell pluripotency and germ-layer formation require the SWI/SNF chromatin remodeling component BAF250a. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* *105*, 6656-6661.

Gehring, M., Reik, W., and Henikoff, S. (2009). DNA demethylation by DNA repair. *Trends in genetics* : *TIG* *25*, 82-90.

Gelato, K.A., and Fischle, W. (2008). Role of histone modifications in defining chromatin structure and function. *Biol Chem* *389*, 353-363.

Gilbert, N., Boyle, S., Fiegler, H., Woodfine, K., Carter, N.P., and Bickmore, W.A. (2004). Chromatin architecture of the human genome: gene-rich domains are enriched in open chromatin fibers. *Cell* *118*, 555-566.

Goldberg, A.D., Allis, C.D., and Bernstein, E. (2007). Epigenetics: a landscape takes shape. *Cell* *128*, 635-638.

MOL Manuscript # 80697

Gu, T.P., Guo, F., Yang, H., Wu, H.P., Xu, G.F., Liu, W., Xie, Z.G., Shi, L., He, X., Jin, S.G., *et al.* (2011). The role of Tet3 DNA dioxygenase in epigenetic reprogramming by oocytes. *Nature* 477, 606-610.

Guan, P., Yin, Z., Li, X., Wu, W., and Zhou, B. (2012). Meta-analysis of human lung cancer microRNA expression profiling studies comparing cancer tissues with normal tissues. *Journal of experimental & clinical cancer research : CR* 31, 54.

Gupta, S., Pramanik, D., Mukherjee, R., Campbell, N.R., Elumalai, S., de Wilde, R.F., Hong, S.M., Goggins, M.G., De Jesus-Acosta, A., Laheru, D., *et al.* (2012). Molecular determinants of retinoic acid sensitivity in pancreatic cancer. *Clinical cancer research : an official journal of the American Association for Cancer Research* 18, 280-289.

Hamm, C.A., Xie, H., Costa, F.F., Vanin, E.F., Seftor, E.A., Sredni, S.T., Bischof, J., Wang, D., Bonaldo, M.F., Hendrix, M.J., *et al.* (2009). Global demethylation of rat chondrosarcoma cells after treatment with 5-aza-2'-deoxycytidine results in increased tumorigenicity. *PLoS One* 4, e8340.

Han, S., and Brunet, A. (2012). Histone methylation makes its mark on longevity. *Trends in cell biology* 22, 42-49.

Hansen, K.D., Timp, W., Bravo, H.C., Sabunciyan, S., Langmead, B., McDonald, O.G., Wen, B., Wu, H., Liu, Y., Diep, D., *et al.* (2011). Increased methylation variation in epigenetic domains across cancer types. *Nat Genet* 43, 768-775.

Hashimoto, H., Vertino, P.M., and Cheng, X. (2010). Molecular coupling of DNA methylation and histone methylation. *Epigenomics* 2, 657-669.

He, Y., Korboukh, I., Jin, J., and Huang, J. (2012). Targeting protein lysine methylation and demethylation in cancers. *Acta biochimica et biophysica Sinica* 44, 70-79.

Henikoff, S., and Shilatifard, A. (2011). Histone modification: cause or cog? *Trends in genetics : TIG* 27, 389-396.

Herold, J.M., Ingerman, L.A., Gao, C., and Frye, S.V. (2011a). Drug discovery toward antagonists of methyl-lysine binding proteins. *Curr Chem Genomics* 5, 51-61.

Herold, J.M., James, L.I., Korboukh, V.K., Gao, C., Coil, K.E., Bua, D.J., Norris, J.L., Kireev, D.B., Brown, P.J., Jin, J., *et al.* (2012). Structure-activity relationships of methyl-lysine reader antagonists. *MedChemComm* 3, 45-51.

Herold, J.M., Wigle, T.J., Norris, J.L., Lam, R., Korboukh, V.K., Gao, C., Ingerman, L.A., Kireev, D.B., Senisterra, G., Vedadi, M., *et al.* (2011b). Small-Molecule Ligands of Methyl-Lysine Binding Proteins. *Journal of Medicinal Chemistry* 54, 2504-2511.

MOL Manuscript # 80697

Hochedlinger, K., and Plath, K. (2009). Epigenetic reprogramming and induced pluripotency. *Development (Cambridge, England)* *136*, 509-523.

Hon, G.C., Hawkins, R.D., Caballero, O.L., Lo, C., Lister, R., Pelizzola, M., Valsesia, A., Ye, Z., Kuan, S., Edsall, L.E., *et al.* (2012). Global DNA hypomethylation coupled to repressive chromatin domain formation and gene silencing in breast cancer. *Genome research* *22*, 246-258.

Huang, J., Dorsey, J., Chuikov, S., Zhang, X., Jenuwein, T., Reinberg, D., and Berger, S.L. (2010). G9A and GLP methylate lysine 373 in the tumor suppressor p53. *J Biol Chem* *285*, 9636-9641.

Huang, J., Perez-Burgos, L., Placek, B.J., Sengupta, R., Richter, M., Dorsey, J.A., Kubicek, S., Opravil, S., Jenuwein, T., and Berger, S.L. (2006). Repression of p53 activity by Smyd2-mediated methylation. *Nature* *444*, 629-632.

Huang, J., Sengupta, R., Espejo, A.B., Lee, M.G., Dorsey, J.A., Richter, M., Opravil, S., Shiekhhattar, R., Bedford, M.T., Jenuwein, T., *et al.* (2007). p53 is regulated by the lysine demethylase LSD1. *Nature* *449*, 105-108.

Hughes, R.M., Wiggins, K.R., Khorasanizadeh, S., and Waters, M.L. (2007). Recognition of trimethyllysine by a chromodomain is not driven by the hydrophobic effect. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* *104*, 11184-11188.

Ichimura, T., Watanabe, S., Sakamoto, Y., Aoto, T., Fujita, N., and Nakao, M. (2005). Transcriptional repression and heterochromatin formation by MBD1 and MCAF/AM family proteins. *J Biol Chem* *280*, 13928-13935.

Iqbal, K., Jin, S.G., Pfeifer, G.P., and Szabo, P.E. (2011). Reprogramming of the paternal genome upon fertilization involves genome-wide oxidation of 5-methylcytosine. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* *108*, 3642-3647.

Irizarry, R.A., Ladd-Acosta, C., Wen, B., Wu, Z., Montano, C., Onyango, P., Cui, H., Gabo, K., Rongione, M., Webster, M., *et al.* (2009). The human colon cancer methylome shows similar hypo- and hypermethylation at conserved tissue-specific CpG island shores. *Nat Genet* *41*, 178-186.

Jacinto, F.V., and Esteller, M. (2007). Mutator pathways unleashed by epigenetic silencing in human cancer. *Mutagenesis* *22*, 247-253.

Jenuwein, T., and Allis, C.D. (2001). Translating the histone code. *Science* *293*, 1074-1080.

MOL Manuscript # 80697

Johnson, L.M., Bostick, M., Zhang, X., Kraft, E., Henderson, I., Callis, J., and Jacobsen, S.E. (2007). The SRA methyl-cytosine-binding domain links DNA and histone methylation. *Current biology* : CB 17, 379-384.

Ke, X.S., Qu, Y., Rostad, K., Li, W.C., Lin, B., Halvorsen, O.J., Haukaas, S.A., Jonassen, I., Petersen, K., Goldfinger, N., *et al.* (2009). Genome-wide profiling of histone h3 lysine 4 and lysine 27 trimethylation reveals an epigenetic signature in prostate carcinogenesis. *PLoS One* 4, e4687.

Kim, J.K., Esteve, P.O., Jacobsen, S.E., and Pradhan, S. (2009). UHRF1 binds G9a and participates in p21 transcriptional regulation in mammalian cells. *Nucleic Acids Res* 37, 493-505.

Kim, K., Doi, A., Wen, B., Ng, K., Zhao, R., Cahan, P., Kim, J., Aryee, M.J., Ji, H., Ehrlich, L.I., *et al.* (2010). Epigenetic memory in induced pluripotent stem cells. *Nature* 467, 285-290.

Kireev, D., Wigle, T.J., Norris-Drouin, J., Herold, J.M., Janzen, W.P., and Frye, S.V. (2010). Identification of Non-Peptide Malignant Brain Tumor (MBT) Repeat Antagonists by Virtual Screening of Commercially Available Compounds. *J Med Chem* 53, 7625-7631.

Kizilyaprak, C., Spehner, D., Devys, D., and Schultz, P. (2010). In vivo chromatin organization of mouse rod photoreceptors correlates with histone modifications. *PLoS One* 5, e11039.

Klose, R.J., Kallin, E.M., and Zhang, Y. (2006). JmjC-domain-containing proteins and histone demethylation. *Nature reviews Genetics* 7, 715-727.

Knutson, S.K., Wigle, T.J., Warholic, N.M., Sneeringer, C.J., Allain, C.J., Klaus, C.R., Sacks, J.D., Raimondi, A., Majer, C.R., Song, J., *et al.* (2012). A selective inhibitor of EZH2 blocks H3K27 methylation and kills mutant lymphoma cells. *Nat Chem Biol. In Press.*

Koh, K.P., Yabuuchi, A., Rao, S., Huang, Y., Cunniff, K., Nardone, J., Laiho, A., Tahiliani, M., Sommer, C.A., Mostoslavsky, G., *et al.* (2011). Tet1 and Tet2 regulate 5-hydroxymethylcytosine production and cell lineage specification in mouse embryonic stem cells. *Cell Stem Cell* 8, 200-213.

Kouzarides, T. (2007). Chromatin modifications and their function. *Cell* 128, 693-705.

Kriaucionis, S., and Heintz, N. (2009). The nuclear DNA base 5-hydroxymethylcytosine is present in Purkinje neurons and the brain. *Science* 324, 929-930.

Krouwels, I.M., Wiesmeijer, K., Abraham, T.E., Molenaar, C., Verwoerd, N.P., Tanke, H.J., and Dirks, R.W. (2005). A glue for heterochromatin maintenance: stable SUV39H1

MOL Manuscript # 80697

binding to heterochromatin is reinforced by the SET domain. *The Journal of cell biology* 170, 537-549.

Kubicek, S., O'Sullivan, R.J., August, E.M., Hickey, E.R., Zhang, Q., Teodoro, M.L., Rea, S., Mechtler, K., Kowalski, J.A., Homon, C.A., *et al.* (2007). Reversal of H3K9me2 by a small-molecule inhibitor for the G9a histone methyltransferase. *Mol Cell* 25, 473-481.

Kundu, S., Horn, P.J., and Peterson, C.L. (2007). SWI/SNF is required for transcriptional memory at the yeast GAL gene cluster. *Genes & development* 21, 997-1004.

Kuo, A.J., Song, J., Cheung, P., Ishibe-Murakami, S., Yamazoe, S., Chen, J.K., Patel, D.J., and Gozani, O. (2012). The BAH domain of ORC1 links H4K20me2 to DNA replication licensing and Meier-Gorlin syndrome. *Nature* 484, 115-119.

Lachner, M., O'Carroll, D., Rea, S., Mechtler, K., and Jenuwein, T. (2001). Methylation of histone H3 lysine 9 creates a binding site for HP1 proteins. *Nature* 410, 116-120.

Lange, U.C., and Schneider, R. (2010). What an epigenome remembers. *Bioessays* 32, 659-668.

Lara, H., Wang, Y., Beltran, A.S., Juarez-Moreno, K., Yuan, X., Kato, S., Leisewitz, A.V., Cuello Fredes, M., Licea, A.F., Connolly, D.C., *et al.* (2012). Targeting serous epithelial ovarian cancer with designer zinc finger transcription factors. *The Journal of biological chemistry* 287, 29873-29886.

Li, F., Papworth, M., Minczuk, M., Rohde, C., Zhang, Y., Ragozin, S., and Jeltsch, A. (2007a). Chimeric DNA methyltransferases target DNA methylation to specific DNA sequences and repress expression of target genes. *Nucleic Acids Res* 35, 100-112.

Li, H., Fischle, W., Wang, W., Duncan, E.M., Liang, L., Murakami-Ishibe, S., Allis, C.D., and Patel, D.J. (2007b). Structural basis for lower lysine methylation state-specific readout by MBT repeats of L3MBTL1 and an engineered PHD finger. *Mol Cell* 28, 677-691.

Lim, E., Vaillant, F., Wu, D., Forrest, N.C., Pal, B., Hart, A.H., Asselin-Labat, M.L., Gyorki, D.E., Ward, T., Partanen, A., *et al.* (2009). Aberrant luminal progenitors as the candidate target population for basal tumor development in BRCA1 mutation carriers. *Nat Med* 15, 907-913.

Lister, R., Pelizzola, M., Downen, R.H., Hawkins, R.D., Hon, G., Tonti-Filippini, J., Nery, J.R., Lee, L., Ye, Z., Ngo, Q.M., *et al.* (2009). Human DNA methylomes at base resolution show widespread epigenomic differences. *Nature* 462, 315-322.

Lister, R., Pelizzola, M., Kida, Y.S., Hawkins, R.D., Nery, J.R., Hon, G., Antosiewicz-Bourget, J., O'Malley, R., Castanon, R., Klugman, S., *et al.* (2011). Hotspots of aberrant epigenomic reprogramming in human induced pluripotent stem cells. *Nature* 471, 68-73.

MOL Manuscript # 80697

Liu, F., Barsyte-Lovejoy, D., Allali-Hassani, A., He, Y., Herold, J.M., Chen, X., Yates, C.M., Frye, S.V., Brown, P.J., Huang, J., *et al.* (2011). Optimization of Cellular Activity of G9a Inhibitors 7-Aminoalkoxy-quinazolines. *J Med Chem* 54, 6139-6150.

Liu, F., Chen, X., Allali-Hassani, A., Quinn, A.M., Wasney, G.A., Dong, A., Barsyte, D., Kozieradzki, I., Senisterra, G., Chau, I., *et al.* (2009). Discovery of a 2,4-diamino-7-aminoalkoxyquinazoline as a potent and selective inhibitor of histone lysine methyltransferase G9a. *J Med Chem* 52, 7950-7953.

Liu, F., Chen, X., Allali-Hassani, A., Quinn, A.M., Wagle, T.J., Wasney, G.A., Dong, A., Senisterra, G., Chau, I., Siarheyeva, A., *et al.* (2010). Protein Lysine Methyltransferase G9a Inhibitors: Design, Synthesis, and Structure Activity Relationships of 2,4-Diamino-7-aminoalkoxy-quinazolines. *J Med Chem* 53, 5844-5857.

Liu, S., Ginestier, C., Charafe-Jauffret, E., Foco, H., Kleer, C.G., Merajver, S.D., Dontu, G., and Wicha, M.S. (2008a). BRCA1 regulates human mammary stem/progenitor cell fate. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 105, 1680-1685.

Liu, X., Wang, L., Zhao, K., Thompson, P.R., Hwang, Y., Marmorstein, R., and Cole, P.A. (2008b). The structural basis of protein acetylation by the p300/CBP transcriptional coactivator. *Nature* 451, 846-850.

Luger, K., Mader, A.W., Richmond, R.K., Sargent, D.F., and Richmond, T.J. (1997). Crystal structure of the nucleosome core particle at 2.8 Å resolution. *Nature* 389, 251-260.

Lund, C.V., Blancafort, P., Popkov, M., and Barbas, C.F., 3rd (2004). Promoter-targeted phage display selections with preassembled synthetic zinc finger libraries for endogenous gene regulation. *J Mol Biol* 340, 599-613.

Margueron, R., Justin, N., Ohno, K., Sharpe, M.L., Son, J., Drury Iii, W.J., Voigt, P., Martin, S.R., Taylor, W.R., De Marco, V., *et al.* (2009). Role of the polycomb protein EED in the propagation of repressive histone marks. *Nature* 461, 762-767.

Margueron, R., and Reinberg, D. (2010). Chromatin structure and the inheritance of epigenetic information. *Nature reviews Genetics* 11, 285-296.

Martin, C., and Zhang, Y. (2005). The diverse functions of histone lysine methylation. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol* 6, 838-849.

Martinez, R., and Esteller, M. (2010). The DNA methylome of glioblastoma multiforme. *Neurobiology of disease* 39, 40-46.

MOL Manuscript # 80697

Martinez, R., Martin-Subero, J.I., Rohde, V., Kirsch, M., Alaminos, M., Fernandez, A.F., Ropero, S., Schackert, G., and Esteller, M. (2009). A microarray-based DNA methylation study of glioblastoma multiforme. *Epigenetics* 4, 255-264.

Meissner, A., Mikkelsen, T.S., Gu, H., Wernig, M., Hanna, J., Sivachenko, A., Zhang, X., Bernstein, B.E., Nusbaum, C., Jaffe, D.B., *et al.* (2008). Genome-scale DNA methylation maps of pluripotent and differentiated cells. *Nature* 454, 766-770.

Meister, G.E., Chandrasegaran, S., and Ostermeier, M. (2010). Heterodimeric DNA methyltransferases as a platform for creating designer zinc finger methyltransferases for targeted DNA methylation in cells. *Nucleic Acids Res* 38, 1749-1759.

Mikkelsen, T.S., Ku, M., Jaffe, D.B., Issac, B., Lieberman, E., Giannoukos, G., Alvarez, P., Brockman, W., Kim, T.K., Koche, R.P., *et al.* (2007). Genome-wide maps of chromatin state in pluripotent and lineage-committed cells. *Nature* 448, 553-560.

Minczuk, M., Papworth, M.A., Kolasinska, P., Murphy, M.P., and Klug, A. (2006). Sequence-specific modification of mitochondrial DNA using a chimeric zinc finger methylase. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 103, 19689-19694.

Moscou, M.J., and Bogdanove, A.J. (2009). A simple cipher governs DNA recognition by TAL effectors. *Science* 326, 1501.

Mussolino, C., and Cathomen, T. (2012). TALE nucleases: tailored genome engineering made easy. *Current opinion in biotechnology* 23, 644-50.

Nagy, Z., and Tora, L. (2007). Distinct GCN5/PCAF-containing complexes function as co-activators and are involved in transcription factor and global histone acetylation. *Oncogene* 26, 5341-5357.

Nakamura, T., Liu, Y.-J., Nakashima, H., Umehara, H., Inoue, K., Matoba, S., Tachibana, M., Ogura, A., Shinkai, Y., and Nakano, T. (2012). PGC7 binds histone H3K9me2 to protect against conversion of 5mC to 5hmC in early embryos. *Nature advance online publication*.

Nomura, W., and Barbas, C.F., 3rd (2007). In vivo site-specific DNA methylation with a designed sequence-enabled DNA methylase. *Journal of the American Chemical Society* 129, 8676-8677.

Ohm, J.E., McGarvey, K.M., Yu, X., Cheng, L., Schuebel, K.E., Cope, L., Mohammad, H.P., Chen, W., Daniel, V.C., Yu, W., *et al.* (2007). A stem cell-like chromatin pattern may predispose tumor suppressor genes to DNA hypermethylation and heritable silencing. *Nat Genet* 39, 237-242.

MOL Manuscript # 80697

Ono, R., Taki, T., Taketani, T., Taniwaki, M., Kobayashi, H., and Hayashi, Y. (2002). LCX, leukemia-associated protein with a CXXC domain, is fused to MLL in acute myeloid leukemia with trilineage dysplasia having t(10;11)(q22;q23). *Cancer research* 62, 4075-4080.

Pang, J., Toy, K.A., Griffith, K.A., Awuah, B., Quayson, S., Newman, L.A., and Kleer, C.G. (2012). Invasive breast carcinomas in Ghana: high frequency of high grade, basal-like histology and high EZH2 expression. *Breast cancer research and treatment*.
Pfeifer, G.P., and Rauch, T.A. (2009). DNA methylation patterns in lung carcinomas. *Seminars in cancer biology* 19, 181-187.

Polo, J.M., Liu, S., Figueroa, M.E., Kulalert, W., Eminli, S., Tan, K.Y., Apostolou, E., Stadtfeld, M., Li, Y., Shioda, T., *et al.* (2010). Cell type of origin influences the molecular and functional properties of mouse induced pluripotent stem cells. *Nature biotechnology* 28, 848-855.

Popp, C., Dean, W., Feng, S., Cokus, S.J., Andrews, S., Pellegrini, M., Jacobsen, S.E., and Reik, W. (2010). Genome-wide erasure of DNA methylation in mouse primordial germ cells is affected by AID deficiency. *Nature* 463, 1101-1105.

Portela, A., and Esteller, M. (2010). Epigenetic modifications and human disease. *Nature biotechnology* 28, 1057-1068.

Rai, K., Huggins, I.J., James, S.R., Karpf, A.R., Jones, D.A., and Cairns, B.R. (2008). DNA demethylation in zebrafish involves the coupling of a deaminase, a glycosylase, and gadd45. *Cell* 135, 1201-1212.

Rakha, E.A., Reis-Filho, J.S., and Ellis, I.O. (2008). Basal-like breast cancer: a critical review. *J Clin Oncol* 26, 2568-2581.

Rathert, P., Dhayalan, A., Murakami, M., Zhang, X., Tamas, R., Jurkowska, R., Komatsu, Y., Shinkai, Y., Cheng, X., and Jeltsch, A. (2008). Protein lysine methyltransferase G9a acts on non-histone targets. *Nat Chem Biol* 4, 344-346.

Rea, S., Eisenhaber, F., O'Carroll, D., Strahl, B.D., Sun, Z.W., Schmid, M., Opravil, S., Mechtler, K., Ponting, C.P., Allis, C.D., *et al.* (2000). Regulation of chromatin structure by site-specific histone H3 methyltransferases. *Nature* 406, 593-599.

Reinke, H., and Horz, W. (2003). Histones are first hyperacetylated and then lose contact with the activated PHO5 promoter. *Molecular cell* 11, 1599-1607.

Rodriguez-Paredes, M., and Esteller, M. (2011). Cancer epigenetics reaches mainstream oncology. *Nat Med* 17, 330-339.

MOL Manuscript # 80697

Rodriguez, J., Vives, L., Jorda, M., Morales, C., Munoz, M., Vendrell, E., and Peinado, M.A. (2008). Genome-wide tracking of unmethylated DNA Alu repeats in normal and cancer cells. *Nucleic Acids Res* 36, 770-784.

Ruthenburg, A.J., Li, H., Patel, D.J., and David Allis, C. (2007). Multivalent engagement of chromatin modifications by linked binding modules. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol* 8, 983-994.

Sandoval, J., and Esteller, M. (2012). Cancer epigenomics: beyond genomics. *Current opinion in genetics & development* 22, 50-55.

Sandoval, J., Heyn, H., Moran, S., Serra-Musach, J., Pujana, M.A., Bibikova, M., and Esteller, M. (2011). Validation of a DNA methylation microarray for 450,000 CpG sites in the human genome. *Epigenetics* 6, 692-702.

Santiago, C., Nguyen, K., and Schapira, M. (2011). Druggability of methyl-lysine binding sites. *Journal of computer-aided molecular design* 25, 1171-1178.

Sato, H., Oka, T., Shinnou, Y., Kondo, T., Washio, K., Takano, M., Takata, K., Morito, T., Huang, X., Tamura, M., *et al.* (2010). Multi-step aberrant CpG island hypermethylation is associated with the progression of adult T-cell leukemia/lymphoma. *The American journal of pathology* 176, 402-415.

Scarsdale, J.N., Webb, H.D., Ginder, G.D., and Williams, D.C., Jr. (2011). Solution structure and dynamic analysis of chicken MBD2 methyl binding domain bound to a target-methylated DNA sequence. *Nucleic Acids Res* 39, 6741-6752.

Schlesinger, Y., Straussman, R., Keshet, I., Farkash, S., Hecht, M., Zimmerman, J., Eden, E., Yakhini, Z., Ben-Shushan, E., Reubinoff, B.E., *et al.* (2007). Polycomb-mediated methylation on Lys27 of histone H3 pre-marks genes for de novo methylation in cancer. *Nat Genet* 39, 232-236.

Schultz, D.C., Ayyanathan, K., Negorev, D., Maul, G.G., and Rauscher, F.J., 3rd (2002). SETDB1: a novel KAP-1-associated histone H3, lysine 9-specific methyltransferase that contributes to HP1-mediated silencing of euchromatic genes by KRAB zinc-finger proteins. *Genes & development* 16, 919-932.

Sera, T. (2009). Zinc-finger-based artificial transcription factors and their applications. *Advanced drug delivery reviews* 61, 513-526.

Sharif, J., Muto, M., Takebayashi, S., Suetake, I., Iwamatsu, A., Endo, T.A., Shinga, J., Mizutani-Koseki, Y., Toyoda, T., Okamura, K., *et al.* (2007). The SRA protein Np95 mediates epigenetic inheritance by recruiting Dnmt1 to methylated DNA. *Nature* 450, 908-912.

MOL Manuscript # 80697

Singal, R., Wang, S.Z., Sargent, T., Zhu, S.Z., and Ginder, G.D. (2002). Methylation of promoter proximal-transcribed sequences of an embryonic globin gene inhibits transcription in primary erythroid cells and promotes formation of a cell type-specific methyl cytosine binding complex. *The Journal of biological chemistry* 277, 1897-1905.

Smith, A.E., and Ford, K.G. (2007). Specific targeting of cytosine methylation to DNA sequences in vivo. *Nucleic Acids Res* 35, 740-754.

Smith, A.E., Hurd, P.J., Bannister, A.J., Kouzarides, T., and Ford, K.G. (2008). Heritable gene repression through the action of a directed DNA methyltransferase at a chromosomal locus. *The Journal of biological chemistry* 283, 9878-9885.

Snowden, A.W., Gregory, P.D., Case, C.C., and Pabo, C.O. (2002). Gene-specific targeting of H3K9 methylation is sufficient for initiating repression in vivo. *Curr Biol* 12, 2159-2166.

Song, J.S., Kim, Y.S., Kim, D.K., Park, S.I., and Jang, S.J. (2012). Global histone modification pattern associated with recurrence and disease-free survival in non-small cell lung cancer patients. *Pathology international* 62, 182-190.

Spannhoff, A., Hauser, A.T., Heinke, R., Sippl, W., and Jung, M. (2009a). The emerging therapeutic potential of histone methyltransferase and demethylase inhibitors. *ChemMedChem* 4, 1568-1582.

Spannhoff, A., Sippl, W., and Jung, M. (2009b). Cancer treatment of the future: inhibitors of histone methyltransferases. *Int J Biochem Cell Biol* 41, 4-11.

Stefansson, O.A., Jonasson, J.G., Olafsdottir, K., Hilmarsdottir, H., Olafsdottir, G., Esteller, M., Johannsson, O.T., and Eyfjord, J.E. (2011). CpG island hypermethylation of BRCA1 and loss of pRb as co-occurring events in basal/triple-negative breast cancer. *Epigenetics* 6, 638-649.

Stolzenburg, S., Bilslund, A., Keith, W.N., and Rots, M.G. (2010). Modulation of gene expression using zinc finger-based artificial transcription factors. *Methods in molecular biology (Clifton, NJ)* 649, 117-132.

Strahl, B.D., and Allis, C.D. (2000). The language of covalent histone modifications. *Nature* 403, 41-45.

Suganuma, T., and Workman, J.L. (2011). Signals and combinatorial functions of histone modifications. *Annu Rev Biochem* 80, 473-499.

Sunami, E., de Maat, M., Vu, A., Turner, R.R., and Hoon, D.S. (2011). LINE-1 hypomethylation during primary colon cancer progression. *PLoS One* 6, e18884.

MOL Manuscript # 80697

Szpakowski, S., Sun, X., Lage, J.M., Dyer, A., Rubinstein, J., Kowalski, D., Sasaki, C., Costa, J., and Lizardi, P.M. (2009). Loss of epigenetic silencing in tumors preferentially affects primate-specific retroelements. *Gene* 448, 151-167.

Tachibana, M., Matsumura, Y., Fukuda, M., Kimura, H., and Shinkai, Y. (2008). G9a/GLP complexes independently mediate H3K9 and DNA methylation to silence transcription. *EMBO J* 27, 2681-2690.

Tahiliani, M., Koh, K.P., Shen, Y., Pastor, W.A., Bandukwala, H., Brudno, Y., Agarwal, S., Iyer, L.M., Liu, D.R., Aravind, L., *et al.* (2009). Conversion of 5-methylcytosine to 5-hydroxymethylcytosine in mammalian DNA by MLL partner TET1. *Science* 324, 930-935.

Takahashi, K., Tanabe, K., Ohnuki, M., Narita, M., Ichisaka, T., Tomoda, K., and Yamanaka, S. (2007). Induction of pluripotent stem cells from adult human fibroblasts by defined factors. *Cell* 131, 861-872.

Takahashi, K., and Yamanaka, S. (2006). Induction of pluripotent stem cells from mouse embryonic and adult fibroblast cultures by defined factors. *Cell* 126, 663-676.

Tan, S., Guschin, D., Davalos, A., Lee, Y.L., Snowden, A.W., Jouvenot, Y., Zhang, H.S., Howes, K., McNamara, A.R., Lai, A., *et al.* (2003). Zinc-finger protein-targeted gene regulation: genomewide single-gene specificity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 100, 11997-12002.

Taverna, S.D., Li, H., Ruthenburg, A.J., Allis, C.D., and Patel, D.J. (2007). How chromatin-binding modules interpret histone modifications: lessons from professional pocket pickers. *Nat Struct Mol Biol* 14, 1025-1040.

Thomson, J.P., Skene, P.J., Selfridge, J., Clouaire, T., Guy, J., Webb, S., Kerr, A.R., Deaton, A., Andrews, R., James, K.D., *et al.* (2010). CpG islands influence chromatin structure via the CpG-binding protein Cfp1. *Nature* 464, 1082-1086.

Tran, R.K., Henikoff, J.G., Zilberman, D., Ditt, R.F., Jacobsen, S.E., and Henikoff, S. (2005). DNA methylation profiling identifies CG methylation clusters in Arabidopsis genes. *Current biology : CB* 15, 154-159.

Turner, B.M. (2012). The adjustable nucleosome: an epigenetic signaling module. *Trends in genetics : TIG* 28, 436-44

Uchimura, Y., Ichimura, T., Uwada, J., Tachibana, T., Sugahara, S., Nakao, M., and Saitoh, H. (2006). Involvement of SUMO modification in MBD1- and MCAF1-mediated heterochromatin formation. *J Biol Chem* 281, 23180-23190.

MOL Manuscript # 80697

Unoki, M. (2011). Current and potential anticancer drugs targeting members of the UHRF1 complex including epigenetic modifiers. *Recent patents on anti-cancer drug discovery* 6, 116-130.

van der Gun, B.T., Maluszynska-Hoffman, M., Kiss, A., Arendzen, A.J., Ruiters, M.H., McLaughlin, P.M., Weinhold, E., and Rots, M.G. (2010). Targeted DNA methylation by a DNA methyltransferase coupled to a triple helix forming oligonucleotide to down-regulate the epithelial cell adhesion molecule. *Bioconjugate chemistry* 21, 1239-1245.

Vedadi, M., Barsyte-Lovejoy, D., Liu, F., Rival-Gervier, S., Allali-Hassani, A., Labrie, V., Wigle, T.J., DiMaggio, P.A., Wasney, G.A., Siarheyeva, A., *et al.* (2011). A Chemical Probe Selectively Inhibits G9a and GLP Methyltransferase Activity in Cells. *Nature Chemical Biology* 7, 566-574.

Veeck, J., and Esteller, M. (2010). Breast cancer epigenetics: from DNA methylation to microRNAs. *Journal of mammary gland biology and neoplasia* 15, 5-17.

Waddington, C.H. (2012). The epigenotype. 1942. *International journal of epidemiology* 41, 10-13.

Wang, L., Tang, Y., Cole, P.A., and Marmorstein, R. (2008a). Structure and chemistry of the p300/CBP and Rtt109 histone acetyltransferases: implications for histone acetyltransferase evolution and function. *Curr Opin Struct Biol* 18, 741-747.

Wang, Z., Zang, C., Rosenfeld, J.A., Schones, D.E., Barski, A., Cuddapah, S., Cui, K., Roh, T.Y., Peng, W., Zhang, M.Q., *et al.* (2008b). Combinatorial patterns of histone acetylations and methylations in the human genome. *Nat Genet* 40, 897-903.

Weber, B., Kimhi, S., Howard, G., Eden, A., and Lyko, F. (2010). Demethylation of a LINE-1 antisense promoter in the cMet locus impairs Met signalling through induction of illegitimate transcription. *Oncogene* 29, 5775-5784.

Widschwendter, M., Fiegl, H., Egle, D., Mueller-Holzner, E., Spizzo, G., Marth, C., Weisenberger, D.J., Campan, M., Young, J., Jacobs, I., *et al.* (2007). Epigenetic stem cell signature in cancer. *Nat Genet* 39, 157-158.

Wigle, T.J., Herold, J.M., Senisterra, G.A., Vedadi, M., Kireev, D.B., Arrowsmith, C.H., Frye, S.V., and Janzen, W.P. (2009). Screening for Inhibitors of Low-Affinity Epigenetic Peptide-Protein Interactions: An AlphaScreen™-Based Assay for Antagonists of Methyl-Lysine Binding Proteins. *J Biomol Screen* 15, 62-71.

Wigle, T.J., Provencher, L.M., Norris, J.L., Jin, J., Brown, P.J., Frye, S.V., and Janzen, W.P. (2010). Accessing Protein Methyltransferase and Demethylase Enzymology Using Microfluidic Capillary Electrophoresis. *Chemistry & Biology* 17, 695-704.

MOL Manuscript # 80697

Williams, K., Christensen, J., Pedersen, M.T., Johansen, J.V., Cloos, P.A., Rappsilber, J., and Helin, K. (2011). TET1 and hydroxymethylcytosine in transcription and DNA methylation fidelity. *Nature* 473, 343-348.

Wozniak, R.J., Klimecki, W.T., Lau, S.S., Feinstein, Y., and Futscher, B.W. (2007). 5-Aza-2'-deoxycytidine-mediated reductions in G9A histone methyltransferase and histone H3 K9 di-methylation levels are linked to tumor suppressor gene reactivation. *Oncogene* 26, 77-90.

Wu, H., D'Alessio, A.C., Ito, S., Xia, K., Wang, Z., Cui, K., Zhao, K., Sun, Y.E., and Zhang, Y. (2011). Dual functions of Tet1 in transcriptional regulation in mouse embryonic stem cells. *Nature* 473, 389-393.

Wu, H., Min, J., Lunin, V.V., Antoshenko, T., Dombrowski, L., Zeng, H., Allali-Hassani, A., Campagna-Slater, V., Vedadi, M., Arrowsmith, C.H., *et al.* (2010). Structural biology of human H3K9 methyltransferases. *PLoS ONE* 5, e8570.

Xu, C., Bian, C., Lam, R., Dong, A., and Min, J. (2011). The structural basis for selective binding of non-methylated CpG islands by the CFP1 CXXC domain. *Nature communications* 2, 227.

Yao, Y., Chen, P., Diao, J., Cheng, G., Deng, L., Anglin, J.L., Prasad, B.V.V., and Song, Y. (2011). Selective Inhibitors of Histone Methyltransferase DOT1L: Design, Synthesis and Crystallographic Studies. *Journal of the American Chemical Society* 133, 16746-16749.

Yost, J.M., Korboukh, I., Liu, F., Gao, C., and Jin, J. (2011). Targets in Epigenetics: Inhibiting the Methyl Writers of the Histone Code. *Current Chemical Genomics* 5, 72-84.

Yuan, Y., Wang, Q., Paulk, J., Kubicek, S., Kemp, M.M., Adams, D.J., Shamji, A.F., Wagner, B.K., and Schreiber, S.L. (2012). A Small-Molecule Probe of the Histone Methyltransferase G9a Induces Cellular Senescence in Pancreatic Adenocarcinoma. *ACS Chemical Biology* 7, 1152-7

Zacharias, N., and Dougherty, D.A. (2002). Cation-pi interactions in ligand recognition and catalysis. *Trends Pharmacol Sci* 23, 281-287.

Zakrzewski, F., Weisshaar, B., Fuchs, J., Bannack, E., Minoche, A.E., Dohm, J.C., Himmelbauer, H., and Schmidt, T. (2011). Epigenetic profiling of heterochromatic satellite DNA. *Chromosoma* 120, 409-422.

Zeng, L., Zhang, Q., Li, S., Plotnikov, A.N., Walsh, M.J., and Zhou, M.-M. (2010). Mechanism and regulation of acetylated histone binding by the tandem PHD finger of DPF3b. *Nature* 466, 258-262.

MOL Manuscript # 80697

Zhou, V.W., Goren, A., and Bernstein, B.E. (2011). Charting histone modifications and the functional organization of mammalian genomes. *Nature reviews Genetics* 12, 7-18.

Ziller, M.J., Muller, F., Liao, J., Zhang, Y., Gu, H., Bock, C., Boyle, P., Epstein, C.B., Bernstein, B.E., Lengauer, T., *et al.* (2011). Genomic distribution and inter-sample variation of non-CpG methylation across human cell types. *PLoS genetics* 7, e1002389.

Zou, Z., Anisowicz, A., Hendrix, M.J., Thor, A., Neveu, M., Sheng, S., Rafidi, K., Seftor, E., and Sager, R. (1994). Maspin, a serpin with tumor-suppressing activity in human mammary epithelial cells. *Science* 263, 526-529.

MOL Manuscript # 80697

Legends for Figures.

Figure 1. Structure of a double stranded DNA duplex containing meCpG (PDB ID 383D).

Figure 2. Structure of a nucleosome, showing the core histones H3 in green, and the histone tail protruding out of the nucleosome, outlining H3K9me2 mark in yellow (PDB ID 1KX5), and superimposed with the H3K9 lysine methyltransferase (PDB ID 2RFI).

Figure 3. A model outlining the cross-talk of some epigenetic modifications during replication and after the replication fork.

Figure 4. Structure of UNC669. See PDB 3P8H for structure of UNC669 bound to L3MBTL1.

Figure 5. Selective Inhibitors of PKMTs.

Figure 6. Schematic structure of the catalytic domain of Dnmt3a (PDB ID 2QRV) linked to a 6ZF-DNA complex.

MOL Manuscript # 80697

TABLE I

Comparison between Artificial Transcription Factors (ATFs) and small molecule epigenetic inhibitors for anti-cancer intervention

Features	Artificial Transcription Factors (ATFs)	Epigenetic molecules
<i>Genomic/functional (e.g cell type) specificity</i>	Design of sequence-specific DNA-binding domains can provide high selectivity for the target	Broad spectrum of cellular targets, some specificity depending on the compound
	Selective targeting for cancer cells by regulation of genes differentially expressed in cancer cells	Potentially high toxicity due to undesirable targeting of normal cells
<i>Transcriptional/regulatory potency</i>	Coupling the DNA-binding domain with transactivators/repressors can result in potent regulation	Can result in transcriptional regulation of targeted promoters
	Combinatorial delivery of effector functions, diversity of epigenetic domains	Combinatorial delivery of small molecules results in potent synergisms
<i>Delivery in cells/tumors/tissues</i>	Viral/non-viral (targeted nanoparticles)	Intravenous delivery, targeted nanoparticle delivery
<i>Probability of acquired resistance mechanisms</i>	Potentially diminished by using epigenetic effector domains (e.g methyltransferase enzymes)	Drug resistance/disease recurrence is often observed during treatment
<i>Cost of synthesis/delivery</i>	Potentially very high cost	Large spectrum of small molecules available for treatment or in clinical trials

Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3




Figure 4






Figure 5




BIX01294

G9a: IC_{50} = 1900 nM
GLP: IC_{50} = 700 nM




UNC0638

G9a: K_i = 3.0 nM
GLP: IC_{50} = 19 nM
Cellular IC_{50} = 81 nM




E72

G9a: K_d = 164 nM
GLP: K_d = 136 nM




BRD9539

G9a: IC_{50} = 6300 nM




EPZ004777

DOT1L: K_i = 0.3 nM




1

DOT1L: IC_{50} = 110 nM




AZ505

SMYD2: IC_{50} = 120 nM




2

SETD7 inhibitor



GSK-A

EZH2: K_i = 700 nM



EPZ005687

EZH2: K_i = 24 nM

Figure 6

