Published in final edited form as:

Cancer Cell. 2018 February 12; 33(2): 173–186.e5. doi:10.1016/j.ccell.2018.01.004.

Allele-specific chromatin recruitment and therapeutic vulnerabilities of ESR1 activating mutations

Rinath Jeselsohn^{1,2,3}, Johann S Bergholz^{4,5}, Matthew Pun^{1,2}, MacIntosh Cornwell^{1,2}, Weihan Liu^{1,2}, Agostina Nardone^{1,2}, Tengfei Xiao^{1,2}, Wei Li^{1,6}, Xintao Qiu¹, Gilles Buchwalter^{1,2}, Ariel Feiglin⁷, Kayley Abell-Hart^{4,5}, Teng Fei^{1,2}, Prakash Rao¹, Henry Long¹, Nicholas Kwiatkowski^{4,5}, Tinghu Zhang^{4,5}, Nathanael Gray^{4,5}, Diane Melchers⁸, Rene Houtman⁸, X. Shirley Liu^{1,6}, Ofir Cohen^{2,9}, Nikhil Wagle^{2,3,9}, Eric P. Winer^{2,3}, Jean Zhao^{4,5}, and Myles Brown^{1,2,3}

¹Center for Functional Cancer Epigenetics, Dana Farber Cancer Institute, Boston, MA. 02210

²Department of Medical Oncology, Dana Farber Cancer Institute, Boston, MA, 02210

³Department of Medicine, Brigham and Women's Hospital and Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA. 02210

⁴Department of Cancer Biology, Dana Farber Cancer Institute, Boston, MA. 02215

⁵Department of Biological Chemistry and Molecular Pharmacology, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA. 02215

⁶Department of Biostatistics and Computational Biology, Dana Farber Cancer Institute and Harvard School of Public Health, Boston, MA. 02215

⁷Department of Biomedical Informatics, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA. 02215

⁸PamGene International B.V, Hertogenbosch, Netherlands. 5211

⁹Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard, Cambridge, MA. 02142

Summary

Estrogen receptor α (ER) ligand-binding domain (LBD) mutations are found in a substantial number of endocrine treatment-resistant metastatic ER-positive (ER⁺) breast cancers. We investigated the chromatin recruitment, transcriptional network and genetic vulnerabilities in breast cancer models harboring the clinically relevant ER mutations. These mutants exhibit both ligand-independent functions that mimic estradiol bound wild type ER as well as allele-specific

Lead contact and corresponding author: Myles Brown, myles_brown@dfci.harvard.edu.

Declaration of interests: All other authors have no competing financial interests.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization: M.B. R.J. and G.B. Methodology: R.J., G.B., T.X., and J.S.B., Software: M.C., W.Li., A. F. X.Q. H.L. and X.S.L. Analysis: M.B., R.J., M.C., M.P., W.Li., A.F., N.W., O.C. and R.H. Investigation: R.J., M.P., M.C., J.S.B., T.X., W.Li., A.N., K.A.H., G.B., P.R., D.M. and R.H., Resources: J.S.B., N.G., T.Z., N.W., E.P.W. and J.Z. Data Curation: M.P. and M.C. Writing-original draft: R.J. and M.B. Writing-Review and Editing: all authors Visualization: R.J., M.C. M.P., W.Li. and A.F. Supervision: R.J., M.B. N.W., H.L., P.R., E.P.W. and J.Z.

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

neomorphic properties that promote a pro-metastatic phenotype. Analysis of the genome wide ER binding sites identified mutant ER unique recruitment mediating the allele-specific transcriptional program. Genetic screens identified genes that are essential for the ligand independent growth driven by the mutants. These studies provide insights into the mechanism of endocrine therapy resistance engendered by ER mutations and potential therapeutic targets.

Graphical abstract

Jeselsohn et al. show that estrogen receptor α (ER) mutations found in endocrine treatment-resistant metastatic breast cancers confer not only ligand-independent ER functions but also allele-specific neomorphic properties. Importantly, the authors identify potential approaches for treating these breast cancers.

Introduction

Estrogen receptor α (ER) plays a key role in normal breast development and breast cancer. Inhibition of ER function by reducing estrogen (E2) levels or by directly antagonizing E2 stimulation of ER is the mainstay treatment for ER⁺ breast cancer. These treatments reduce the risk of recurrence when given in the adjuvant setting and improve outcomes in metastatic disease, however, resistance to endocrine treatments remains a major clinical problem (Early Breast Cancer Trialists' Collaborative et al., 2012).

A number of studies reported recurrent mutations in *ESR1*, the gene encoding ER, in at least 20% of metastatic endocrine resistant ER⁺ breast cancers that are very rarely found in primary tumors (Jeselsohn et al., 2014; Merenbakh-Lamin et al., 2013; Robinson et al., 2013; Toy et al., 2013). The majority of the recurrent *ESR1* mutations were found to cluster in the ER ligand-binding domain (LBD). Cell line studies showed that the LBD mutations stimulate constitutive activity in the absence of E2 and decreased sensitivity to ER antagonists such as tamoxifen (TAM) and fulvestrant (FUL) indicating that these are gain of

function mutations and drivers of endocrine resistance (Harrod et al., 2016; Jeselson et al., 2014; Toy et al., 2017).

The two most commonly mutated amino acids are Y537 and D538, which are both within the C-terminal helix of the ER LBD, Helix 12 (H12). Several mutant alleles of Y537 including Y537S, Y537N and Y537C have been found in endocrine resistant breast cancers while only the D538G mutation appears to be a common resistance allele. H12 is a key structural component of the activating function-2 (AF2) domain of ER that dictates the agonist or antagonist state of the receptor. E2 binding to the LBD leads to stabilization of H12 in an active conformation enabling the binding of co-activators, such as NCOA3, and results in activation of the receptor. Biophysical studies showed that the Y537S mutation and to a lesser degree the D538G mutation, stabilize H12 in the agonist conformation, similar to wild type (WT)-ER bound to E2 (Nettles et al., 2008), (Fanning et al., 2016). In addition, affinity studies and the crystal structure of the mutant LBD indicate that these mutants have decreased affinity for TAM and E2 and confer an altered conformation facilitating resistance to antagonism. Finally, NCOA3 binding to mutant ER compared to WT-ER under ligand independent conditions or in the presence of TAM is enhanced (Fanning et al., 2016; Toy et al., 2013). These findings provide a mechanistic explanation for the ER mutant ligand independent constitutive-activity and relative resistance to ER antagonists.

The low frequency of the *ESR1* LBD mutations in primary treatment naive tumors, the correlation between tumor progression and mutation frequency and the variable allele frequencies support the clonal selection of these mutations under the selective pressure of endocrine treatment. Additionally, we showed that the D538G mutation induces an increased migratory capacity in MCF7 cell models in 2D cell culture (Merenbakh-Lamin et al., 2013). Moreover, the *ESR1* LBD mutations are prognostic of poor outcomes in patients with metastatic disease (Chandarlapaty et al., 2016; Spoerke et al., 2016). These findings imply that in addition to stimulating E2 independent growth, the *ESR1* LBD mutations may also promote a more aggressive phenotype. This led us to hypothesize that the functional consequences of ER LBD mutations are not restricted to their constitutive activity, but in addition, lead to changes in the ER transcriptional network that mediate cancer progression. In this study we tested this hypothesis and searched for potential therapeutic targets to overcome the drug resistance and poor outcomes associated with these mutations.

Results

The Mutant ER transcriptome

To study the global transcriptional changes induced by the ER-LBD mutations, we performed RNA sequencing (RNA-seq) of doxycycline (DOX)-inducible mutant ER expressing cell lines and parental WT-ER expressing cells, in full medium (FM), hormone depleted (HD) and HD after stimulation with 1 nM E2 (HD+E2) (Figure 1). These cells expressed the hemagglutinin (HA)-tagged ER-LBD mutants and included three of the most common clinical mutations (Y537S, Y537N and D538G) (Figure S1A). The protein expression of mutant ER was well controlled in these cells and the combined relative expression of WT and mutant ER protein after DOX induction was comparable to WT-ER in the parental cells prior to DOX induction (Table S1). Pairwise correlation analysis of the

RNA-seq in HD and HD+E2 clustered the Y537N and Y537S mutant cells in HD and HD +E2 conditions distinctly from the D538G mutant cells and the WT-ER cells. Although the D538G mutant cells clustered with the WT-ER cells, they formed a distinct subset. In addition, these data showed that all the WT-ER cells clustered together but clearly separated by the treatment conditions (HD versus HD +E2). In contrast, the mutant cells in HD and HD+E2 clustered together and the first sub-clustering was dictated by the specific mutation (Y537S versus Y537N) and not by the medium conditions (Figure 1A). When applying a principal components analysis to all the samples, principal component 1 (PC1) correlated with the ER mutational status segregating the WT, the D538G mutant and the Y537S or Y537N mutant cells. Again indicating that the D538G mutation is distinct from the mutations at residue Y537. The medium conditions resolved along PC2 and distinctly clustered the WT cells in FM, HD and HD+E2 conditions. In the mutant expressing cells, the HD and HD+E2 conditions, aggregated together and segregated away from the FM conditions, supporting the constitutive transcriptional activity of the mutants in the absence of E2 and the difference between FM conditions versus WM+E2 (Figure 1B). In line with the transcriptional data and prior studies, cell growth in HD and HD+E2 conditions showed that mutant expressing cells had a growth advantage in HD conditions compared to WT-ER expressing cells. In addition, while ER-WT cells displayed marked growth inhibition in HD compared to HD+E2, ER-mutant cell growth in HD was only mildly decreased compared to HD+E2 (Figure S1B). We next examined the efficacy of the ER antagonists TAM and FUL in inhibiting mutant ER cell proliferation. While the TAM IC₅₀ was significantly higher in the MCF7 and T47D cells expressing the Y537S mutant compared to the WT cells, the TAM IC₅₀ for D538G ER-mutant cells was in the same range as the WT-ER cells. Both the Y537S and D538G mutants displayed relative resistance to FUL compared to WT-ER cells, however, the resistance was more significant for Y537S compared to D538G. Likewise, the Y537S ER-mutant T47D cells had a 31-fold increase in the FUL IC₅₀ compared to ER-WT T47D cells (Figure S1C and Table S2). These results confirm the relative resistance of the ER-LBD mutants to ER antagonists and also indicate that the Y537S and D538G mutants may be different with respect to response to TAM and FUL.

To further delineate the transcriptional changes induced by the ER LBD mutations, we performed differential gene expression analyses (Figures S1D and S1E). First, focusing on the WT expressing cells, comparison of the WT cells (D538G and Y537S DOX-inducible parental cells without DOX treatment) in the absence of E2 (HD) versus E2 stimulated conditions (HD+E2) identified 689 and 814 E2 regulated genes for the D538G and Y537S parental ER-WT cell line models, respectively (log₂ fold change (FC) of >0.5, FDR<0.01). As expected, the majority of the E2 regulated genes in the two WT-ER cell lines (parental to the D538G and Y537S mutants) overlapped and among these genes were known ER transcriptional target genes, such as *PGR*, *TFF1*, *GREB1*, *CA12*, *XBPI* and *MYC* (Figure S1Ea). We next identified the genes that were induced by the ER-LBD mutants in HD conditions. We found 308 and 954 genes induced by D538G and Y537S mutants, respectively. Comparison of the genes induced by the mutants in the absence of E2 with the E2 induced genes in WT-ER cells revealed that only 33% of the D538G induced genes and 18% of the Y537S induced genes overlapped with genes induced by E2 in WT-ER cells (Figure S1Eb). Thus, the majority of the genes induced by the ER mutants in E2 deprived

conditions was unique and did not overlap with the WT-ER E2 regulated genes. In addition, when we examined the E2 regulated genes in the ER mutant cells, only 12 genes were upregulated by E2 in the Y537S mutant cells, whereas, in the D538G mutant cells, 416 genes were E2 upregulated and 64% of these genes overlapped with the WT-ER E2 regulated genes (Figure S1Ec). Comparison of the D538G to the Y537S induced genes showed that 80% of the D538G induced genes overlapped with the Y537S. In contrast, 74% of the Y537S induced genes were unique to the Y537S mutation (Figure S1Ed). Taken together, these results support the E2 independent transcriptional activity of the Y537S and D538G mutants and indicate that these mutations, particularly Y537S, promote the transcription of a unique set of genes that are not induced by E2 stimulation of WT-ER. Notably, these results show that the Y537S and D538G mutations induce distinct transcriptional programs, with the D538G mutation driving a transcriptional profile that is more similar to the WT-ER E2 dependent transcription compared to the Y537S mutation. Like Y537S, the Y537N allele induced a high number of genes that were not induced by WT-ER stimulated by E2 (Figures S1F and S1G).

To address the relevance of these model cell line findings, we evaluated the transcriptome of 109 metastatic tumors from an ongoing study of ER⁺ metastatic breast cancer at the Dana-Farber Cancer Institute. In this study metastatic tissue biopsies are obtained from patients with ER⁺ disease for genomic and molecular analysis. Global analysis of the RNA-seq data revealed two large clusters of tumors that segregated primarily by the site of metastasis (mets) (Figure 2A). The first cluster of tumors consisted of 42 biopsies exclusively obtained from liver mets and the second cluster included tumor samples from a number of organ sites primarily consisting of tumors from breast, skin and lung. Hierarchical clustering and principal components analysis after exclusion of 2864 genes upregulated in normal liver and skin tissues compared to breast tissue determined by the RNA-seq analysis of healthy liver, skin and breast tissues from women obtained from the Genotype-Tissue Expression (GTEx) data set (Consortium, 2013) (90 breast, 41 liver and 217 skin samples, log₂ FC > 2 and adjusted p value < 0.001), resulted in the merging of the two clusters (Figure S2A and S2B). This supports the conclusion that these two clusters are driven primarily by gene expression of the normal tissue from the site of the metastatic lesion. We therefore analyzed these two clusters separately for the ensuing analyses. Cluster A was composed of 35 WT-ER tumors, 5 ER D538G mutant tumors, 1 ER Y537N mutant tumor and 1 ER E380Q mutant tumor. Consistent with our previous study, mets harboring the D538G were enriched in the liver mets compared with other metastatic sites (Merenbakh-Lamin et al., 2013). In a supervised analysis of this cluster, we detected a transcriptional profile upregulated in tumors harboring the D538G mutations. Furthermore, Gene set enrichment analysis (GSEA) showed that the gene sets of the 100 or 50 top ranked genes up-regulated after induction of the D538G mutation in the MCF7 cell line was enriched in the D538G metastatic tumors when compared to the WT-ER metastatic tumors in this cluster (NES= 1.44, p value <0.01 and NES =1.5, p value < 0.001 for the 100 and 50 top ranked genes, respectively) (Figure 2B). In contrast, the gene sets of the 100 or 50 top ranked genes up-regulated with the induction of the Y537S mutant in MCF7 cells was not enriched in the D538G metastatic tumor samples (Figure S2C). This is consistent with the cell model findings in which the majority of the Y537S induced genes did not overlap with the D538G induced genes (Figure S1Ed). The

second cluster of 67 cases included sites other than liver predominantly. Of these 67 cases, 63 were found to harbor WT ER and 4 patients harbored the Y537S mutation. Similar to the analysis of the first cluster, in a supervised analysis of this cluster we detected a transcriptional profile up-regulated in tumors harboring the Y537S mutations. GSEA utilizing custom gene sets of the 100 or 50 top ranked genes up-regulated after induction of the Y537S mutant in the MCF7 cell line were enriched in the Y537S metastatic tumors when compared to the WT-ER metastatic tumors in the second cluster (NES=1.4 p value<0.01 and NES=1.7 p value<0.001 for 100 and 50 top ranked genes, respectively) (Figure 2C). In addition, the gene sets of the 100 or 50 top ranked genes up-regulated with the induction of the D538G mutant in MCF7 cells were also enriched in the Y537S metastatic tumor samples (NES= 1.5 p value <0.01 and NES =1.7 p value <0.001 for 100 and 50 top ranked genes, respectively (Figure S2D). This is highly consistent with the cell line transcriptome analyses in which the majority of D538G induced genes were included within the Y537S induced genes. These clinical data strongly support the importance of findings in the cell line models harboring the ER mutants.

We also performed RNA-seq in a series of ER⁺ patient derived xenografts (PDXs) that were established from four ER⁺ metastatic breast cancer tissue samples. Two of these xenografts harbor a Y537S mutation, as detected by directed droplet digital PCR and RNA-seq. We confirmed ER expression in the xenografts (Figure S2E). In an unsupervised analysis of the RNA-seq of tumors harvested in the first and second passage of the PDX in the presence of E2 supplementation, the Y537S mutant PDX models clustered distinctly from the ER-WT PDX models (Figure S3F). GSEA showed that the gene signature of AKT1 activation was the top ranked enriched signature in the mutant PDXs compared to the WT-ER PDXs (NES=1.8, p value<0.01) (Figure S2G). To test for a correlation between the transcriptional changes in the mutant PDX tumor tissues and the ER Y537S mutant cell line models, we constructed a custom gene set for use in GSEA. This gene set consisted of the 100 top ranked genes induced by the Y537S mutant selected by FC and a FDR <0.01. Notably, there was a significant enrichment of 94 of these 100 genes in the Y537S mutant PDX tumors compared to the ER-WT tumors (NES=1.14, p value <0.01)(Figure S2H)

Mutant ER cistromes are E2 independent and distinct from the E2 dependent WT-ER cistrome

As we found that the transcriptional changes induced by the ER mutants were not restricted to E2 dependent genes, we hypothesized that the ER mutations lead to an altered ER cistrome and consequently to modulations in the ER transcriptional network. To test this hypothesis and discern which genes are directly regulated by the ER mutants we mapped ER binding globally by performing ER ChIP-sequencing (ChIP-seq) of the DOX induced mutant cells in HD conditions and the WT cells in HD conditions and after E2 stimulation. As expected from our prior work, the ER ChIP-seq for the WT cells in HD conditions yielded a very low number of binding sites and did not pass our quality control parameters (Carroll et al., 2005). In contrast, the mutant ER was recruited to DNA binding sites in the absence of E2 stimulation resulting in a total of 35,000 binding sites in MCF7-Y537S mutant cells, 23,676 in Y537N-mutant cells and 11,371 in D538G mutant cells. To confirm that we were detecting the recruitment of mutant ER, we performed HA-ChIP-seq in the

presence of DOX with and without E2 stimulation and saw a high correlation between the mutant ER cistromes with HA and ER antibodies (Figure S3A). We next performed a differential binding intensity analysis to define sites with upregulated or downregulated binding intensity. We found that the ER mutations led to the redistribution of ER binding profiles at 24% or more of all binding events. In the MCF7-Y537S cells, 15% of the binding events had increased binding intensity compared to WT-ER E2 stimulated cells and 9% had decreased binding intensity. In the MCF7-D538G cells, 33% of the binding events had increased binding intensity. The E2 independent recruitment and partial redistribution of ER binding events in the presence of the ER mutations were not cell-line specific, since the induction of the Y537S mutant in T47D cells, led to E2 independent recruitment and redistribution of 45% of all the ER binding events (Figure 3A). When we compared the Y537S and D538G differential binding sites, we saw that 50% of the sites with increased binding intensity and 20% of the binding sites with decreased intensity overlapped between the Y537S and D538G mutations. Thus, similar to the transcriptional differences between the Y537S and D538G mutations, the two mutations lead to distinct alterations in the ER cistrome (Figure 3B).

Motif analysis revealed that the ER binding motif (ERE) was significantly enriched in all the binding sites indicative of direct ER binding. The ERE and ERE half site motifs were the only motifs enriched in the ER mutant gained binding sites. In addition to the ERE, motifs of transcription factors known to be important for ER action such as FOXA1, AP1 and GRHL2 were enriched in the binding sites common to the WT and mutants. The second most significantly enriched motif in ER-WT selective binding sites common to MCF7 and T47D was FOXA1 (Table S3). Additionally, we mapped the Y537S and D538G ER-mutant binding without E2 stimulation in cells expressing the mutant ER generated by gene knock-in (KI) in MCF7 cells and in the parental WT-MCF7 cells following E2 stimulation. Similar to the DOX-inducible cells, we detected E2 independent ER recruitment in the presence of the Y537S and D538G mutations with redistribution of 39% and 49% of the ER binding events for the Y537S and D538G mutations, respectively (Figure S3B). Furthermore, motif analysis showed that the mutant selective sites were enriched in ERE motifs for the Y537S and D538G mutant cells while the WT selective were enriched in FOXA1 motifs.

The FOXA1 motif was not significantly enriched in the mutant selective binding sites suggesting that FOXA1 may be less essential for mutant specific ER DNA binding. To test whether FOXA1 was indeed differentially recruited to the mutant selective ER binding sites, we performed FOXA1 ChIP-seq in WT-ER cells with E2 stimulation and in the Y537S mutant cell without E2 stimulation. Co-occupancy analyses showed a significant enrichment of FOXA1 binding events within the ER-WT specific cistrome and significantly lower FOXA1 binding events in the ER mutant specific cistrome ($p < 0.0005$) (Figure 3C). Nonetheless, FOXA1, which is enriched in the non-differential binding sites and is also upregulated by the induction of the ER mutants, remains essential for mutant and WT-ER cell proliferation as demonstrated by silencing of FOXA1 (figure S3C and S3D). Albeit, in the presence of the Y537S mutant in HD conditions the effect of FOXA1 silencing on cell proliferation was not statistically significant.

To gain insight into the chromatin modifications at the ER mutant gained binding sites, we performed ChIP-seq for the active histone mark H3K27ac in WT-ER MCF7 cells with E2 stimulation cells and mutant-ER cells in HD conditions. A substantial number of H3K27ac binding sites were gained in the mutant cells (2379 sites, Log2FC >0.5) and these sites were enriched in ERE motifs (p value=1e-8) in addition to E2F (p value=1e-16) and ETS (p value=1 e-9) motifs (Figure 3D). The latter two were the top motifs. Moreover, the ER binding sites gained in the presence of the mutations were more likely to be centered at regions of active chromatin in the Y537S mutant cells compared to the WT cells as indicated by the increased levels of H3K27ac at these sites in the mutant cells compared to the WT cells (Figure 3E). In addition, the ER binding sites gained in the Y537S mutant cells are more likely than those of the other categories to occur in promoter regions and >30% of the super enhancers detected in the Y537S mutant cells overlapped with the mutant gained binding sites (Figure 3F and 3G).

Our results indicate that the ER binding sites gained in the presence of the mutations occur at transcriptionally active regions. However, we did not identify co-occupancy of a specific pioneer factor in these sites. We therefore hypothesized that the altered conformation of the ER mutants and unique co-regulator binding might contribute to the enhanced mutant ER binding in these sites. To test this hypothesis we screened mutant-ER compared to WT-ER co-regulator interactions using the Microarray Assay for Realtime Co-regulator-Nuclear receptor Interaction (MARCONI) (Koppen et al., 2009). We identified 58 E2 dependent co-regulator peptides in the presence of WT-ER. The majority of these E2 dependent co-regulators peptides interacted with similar binding levels to the apo-mutant ER (55 for Y537S and 48 for D538G), consistent with constitutive binding of multiple co-regulators (Figure S3E). Among these co-regulators are known ER co-activators such as NCOA3. Comparison of apo-mutant to E2 stimulated WT-ER co-regulator interactions revealed a number of significantly enhanced apo-mutant interactions (24 for Y537S and 11 for D538G). These include among others the ER co-activators EP300, MED1 and NR1P1 (Rosell et al., 2014), (Kornberg, 2005; Yi et al., 2015) (Figure 3H and 3I and Table S4). Comparison of the apo-Y537S versus apo-D538G mutant revealed mutant selective co-regulator peptide interactions (Figure S3F). These results provide an indication that the co-regulator peptide-mutant ER interaction landscape is allele-selective and differs from that of WT-ER. However, studies to further investigate the effect of the mutant structure on multiple co-regulator interactions are needed to clarify whether this is simply an indication of subtle structural differences between the alleles or the mediator of the differences in cistromes and transcriptomes.

The mutant ER cistrome mediates transcriptional changes that promote a metastatic phenotype

We next applied the Binding and Expression Target Analysis (BETA) algorithm, which assigns a BETA score for each gene based on the distance between the transcription start site (TSS) of a gene and the peak of the transcription factor binding sites (Wang et al., 2013), to test for a correlation between the redistribution of the mutant ER recruitment and the transcriptional differences between mutant ER and WT-ER. We found a statistically significant correlation between the BETA scores for the Y537S selective and WT selective

binding sites and the differential gene expression between E2 stimulated WT-ER and non-stimulated Y537S-ER. Whereas, for the shared binding sites there was no significant correlation (Figure 4A). Similarly, we detected a positive correlation between the D538G mutant selective binding sites BETA scores and the differential gene expression between E2 stimulated WT-ER and non-stimulated D538G ER (Figure S4A). Since there was a limited number of WT selective binding sites in the D538G mutant cells we did not perform this analysis for these binding sites. Taken together, these correlations imply that the transcriptional changes induced by mutant ER in HD conditions are driven by the ligand independent redistribution of mutant ER cistromes.

By integrating the BETA scores of the ER mutant selective binding sites and the differential gene expression between the WT cells +E2 stimulation versus mutant cells in HD conditions and selecting genes that have a rank product of <0.01 , we identified the genes that are directly up-regulated by the ER mutants. We compared the genes up-regulated by the three mutants (Y537S, Y537N and D538G) and found 344 overlapping genes (Figure 4B)(genes listed in Table S5). GSEA identified genes up-regulated in metastases driven by ERBB2 (NES=2.3, q value=0.02) as the top ranked gene set enriched in the overlapping genes up-regulated by the ER mutants. Other gene sets that were significantly enriched consist of a number of gene sets important for the metastatic process, including: gene sets of inflammatory response (NES=2.3, q value=0.01), genes down regulated by CDH1 (NES=2, q value=0.04), genes up-regulated by BMP2 (NES=2, q value=0.04) and genes up-regulated in tamoxifen resistance (NES=1.9, q value=0.06). The gene set of ER targets via AKT1 up-regulation was also significantly enriched in the ER-mutant up-regulated genes and is in keeping with the top gene set enriched in the Y537S PDX models.

To functionally test the mutant pro-metastatic phenotype we generated orthotopic xenografts with the Y537S and D538G DOX-inducible cells stably infected with luciferase in ovariectomized mice treated with a DOX diet without E2 supplement. As controls we used MCF7 cells expressing WT-ER in ovariectomized mice with and without E2 pellets. The mice were monitored for mets before and after survival surgery to remove the primary tumor. The mammary tumor growth was significantly greater in the Y537S mutant cells compared to the D538G mutant cells. Growth of the WT ER expressing tumors in the presence of E2 was not significantly different from the mutant ER expressing tumors in the absence of E2 (Figure 4C), whereas, growth of WT ER expressing tumors in the absence of E2 was significantly lower compared to the ER mutant and WT+E2 tumor growth (Figure 4C). All 6 mice harboring the Y537S ER expressing xenografts grew primary tumors within 2 weeks and developed mets within 70 days from the injection of the cells and 25 days from the survival surgery. The mets were dependent on the Y537S mutant, as removal of the DOX diet led to rapid regression of the mets (Figure 4D, and 4E and S4B-D). The D538G tumors developed mets but with a longer latency (on day 147 from the injection of the cells 5 of the 8 mice were found to have metastases) (Figure 4D, and 4F). Although four of the eight mice injected with WT cells and treated with supplemental estrogen developed local recurrences after survival surgery, not one developed mets (WT versus Y537S p value=0.0002 and WT versus D538G p value=0.007, Chi-square test) (Figure 4G and 4H). Survival surgery was not performed in the mice with WT ER xenografts in the absence of E2 since the tumors did not reach the predefined threshold volume for surgery. Similar to the WT-ER cells with E2

supplement, these mice did not develop mets (Figure 4G and 4I). Collectively, these results demonstrate that the ER mutations lead to a reprogrammed transcriptional network that promotes metastases and this phenotype is more pronounced in the Y537S compared to the D538G mutation.

CRISPR knockout screen identifies genes essential for mutant ER growth

To investigate genes that are essential for mutant ER E2-independent growth, we performed genome-wide CRISPR/Cas9 knock-out screens in the T47D-Y537S cells in HD conditions and control parental WT-ER cells in FM conditions using two libraries targeting over 18,000 protein coding genes consisting of over 180,000 guide RNAs (gRNAs). The negatively and positively selected genes were identified by calculating the gene essentiality score, defined as the beta score, using MAGeCK-VISPR (Li et al., 2015). Similar to our screens in WT-ER breast cancer cells, the top genes that were positively selected in the ER-mutant library screen are tumor suppressors, such as *NF1*, *TSC1*, *TSC2*, *PTEN*, and *CSK*. In addition, *MYH9* and *CBFB*, 2 genes previously found as mutated in ER⁺ breast cancers, were also among the top ranked positively selected genes (Ellis et al., 2012). As expected, among the top negatively selected genes, i.e. the essential genes, were genes that are known driver genes of ER⁺ breast cancer, such as *GATA3* (beta=-2), *TFAP2C* (beta=-1.8), *MTOR* (beta=-1.7), *MYC* (beta=-1.3) and *ESR1* itself (beta=-1.1) (Figure 5A). These genes were also essential in the T47D WT cells in FM conditions (Figure 5B). Additionally, *CCND1* (beta=-1.6) and *CDK4* (beta=-1.8) remained essential genes in the mutant cells. This is consistent with a retrospective clinical study in which patients with ER mutations remained sensitive to CDK4/6 inhibitors (Fribbens et al, 2016). We confirmed that the ER mutant expressing cell lines retained sensitivity to palbociclib, a CDK4/6 inhibitor (Figure S5A). In addition a number of the ER co-regulators, such as NCOA3, EP300, MED1 and MEN1, which we found to interact with the apo-mutant ER, were essential in the mutant cells. Notably, we observed increased apo-ER-mutant binding to EP300 and NCOA3 compared to E2 stimulated WT-ER and both of these co-regulators were more essential in the Y537S mutant cells compared with the WT cells (EP300: WT beta=-0.1, mutant beta=-1, NCOA3: WT beta=-0.1, mutant beta=-0.5).

To prioritize essential genes that are selective or retained in cells expressing mutant ER and are directly upregulated by mutant ER, we used a rank-product algorithm to aggregate rankings of scores from the output of MAGeCK-VISPR and the geometric mean of the gene rankings from four of the BETA analysis results (D538G, Y537N and Y537S from MCF7 cells and Y537S from T47D cells) (Table S6 and Figure 5C). *TFAP2C* was found to be the top gene in this ranking (rank product FDR=0.036). *TFAP2C* was essential in the WT-ER CRISPR screen in FM conditions but the essentiality score was more significant in the presence of the Y537S mutant in HD conditions (WT-ER beta=-0.9 FDR=0.01, Y537S beta=-1.8 FDR<0.0001). In addition, the Y537S ER binding site in the promoter region of *TFAP2C* overlapped with a super enhancer region (Figure 5D). *TFAP2C* is a regulator of ER transcriptional activity and luminal differentiation (Cyr et al., 2015). Moreover, we recently showed that *TFAP2C* expression was highly associated with decreased progression free survival in metastatic ER⁺ breast cancer (Jeselsohn et al., 2016). To validate that *TFAP2C* is a ER-mutant transcriptional target and an essential gene for mutant cell growth in HD

conditions, we first confirmed mutant induced upregulation of TFAP2C mRNA and protein levels (Figure S5B-S5C). Next, we showed that silencing of TFAP2C by CRISPR-gRNAs decreased E2 independent proliferation of Y537S and D538G mutant cells (Figure 5E and 5F). We also showed that TFAP2C suppression did not affect ER expression (Figure S5D). Thus, TFAP2C is up-regulated by the ER mutants and is essential for E2 independent mutant ER cell growth.

We next turned to validate the effects of essential genes with available small molecule inhibitors as these are potential drug targets. CDK7 was essential in both ER mutant and ER-WT expressing cells (ER-WT beta score=-0.8 FDR=0.017, ER-Y537S beta score=-1.3 FDR<0.0001) and a CDK7 small molecule inhibitor, THZ1, was well characterized (Kwiatkowski et al., 2014). CDK7 is a component of the general transcription factor IIIH complex, which phosphorylates the C-terminal domain of RNAP polymerase II. In addition to its function in transcriptional regulation, CDK7 functions as a CDK activating kinase (CAK) for CDK1, 2, 4 and 6 and has also been shown to modulate ER activity through serine 118 (S118) phosphorylation (Chen et al., 2000; Fisher and Morgan, 1994; Glover-Cutter et al., 2009; Larochelle et al., 2007). S118 is a major phosphorylation site within the N-terminal domain transcription activation 1 (AF1) and mutations in this site were shown to impair transactivation by ER (Ali et al., 1993). CDK7 silencing with CRISPR-cas9 gRNAs resulted in suppressed proliferation in both WT ER cells in FM and mutant ER cells in HD conditions (Figure 6A, S6A and S6B).

We next tested the effect of THZ1 on cell growth. WT and ER mutant MCF7 and T47D cells were responsive to THZ1 treatment and the IC50s were comparable between WT and mutant ER cells (Figure S6C). THZ1 covalently modifies CDK7 at residue C312 outside of the kinase domain and previous studies have shown that THZ1 inhibits RNAPII CTD phosphorylation and CAK activity in leukemia cell lines (Kwiatkowski et al., 2014). More recently, THZ1 was shown to inhibit RNAPII CTD phosphorylation and ER phosphorylation at S118 in MCF7 cells with WT-ER and an ER Y537S knock-in allele (Harrod et al, 2016). Here, we examined the effect of THZ1 on E2-independent Y537S and D538G mutant-ER S118 phosphorylation. Since the mutant ER is HA-tagged in our cell line models we could differentiate between WT-ER and mutant ER in a western blot, which allowed us to discern selective E2 independent phosphorylation of the Y537S and D538G ER mutants. As expected, we did not detect WT-ER S118 phosphorylation in E2-deprived conditions. Interestingly, however, in the presence of the D538G mutant in E2 deprived conditions we detected S118 phosphorylation of the D538G mutant ER and WT-ER (Figure 6B). Phosphorylation of WT-ER was not seen with the Y537S mutant and may suggest that the D538G mutant has a higher propensity to heterodimerize with WT-ER. This could potentially explain some of the phenotypic differences between the Y537S and D538G mutations, though further studies are needed to validate this hypothesis. We next tested the effect of THZ1 on ER-mutant E2-independent S118 phosphorylation and found dose and time dependent inhibition of Y537S and D538G S118 phosphorylation (Figure 6C). Gene expression analysis of Y537S mutant cells treated with THZ1 at 24 hr showed that the key pathways that were inhibited were related to the ErbB/PI3K/MTOR pathway, which is in line with the key pathways enriched in the genes upregulated by the ER mutations, suggesting that THZ1 is targeting the ER mutant transcriptional network (Figure S6D).

We next studied the combination of THZ1 with FUL in cell culture and *in vivo*. We detected significant synergism of this combination in MCF7 and T47D WT-ER and mutant Y537S in the DOX-inducible cell lines as well as the Y537S KI cell line (Figure 6D and S6E). Orthotopic xenografts of MCF7 cells expressing the Y537S mutant demonstrated that the combination of THZ1 with fulvestrant had improved efficacy in inhibiting tumor growth compared to either single agent (Figure 6E). These results support the potential of this combination as a therapeutic strategy to overcome endocrine resistance caused by the ER mutants.

Discussion

Constitutively active somatic mutants in the ER LBD have emerged as a frequent mechanism of endocrine therapy resistance in patients with metastatic ER⁺ breast cancers. Whether these mutant alleles simply mimic the actions of estrogen-bound ER or express additional neomorphic or allele-specific properties could have important therapeutic implications for patients. We undertook a systematic approach to answer these questions and to identify potential targets for therapies in metastatic breast cancers driven by these ER mutants.

By integrating RNA-seq and ChIP-seq data we show that the ER mutants lead to E2 independent chromatin binding and distinct cistromes and allele-specific transcriptional programs compared with the E2 stimulated WT-ER. The mechanistic basis for the allele-selective chromatin recruitment is not well understood and we hypothesize that this may be due to allele-selective interactions with co-regulators or other transcription factors that ultimately mediate differences in chromatin binding. Additional biophysical studies will be needed to test this hypothesis.

Importantly, examination of the mutant allele-specific transcriptional programs reveals that these programs are enriched in genes and pathways that mediate growth factor signaling and promote metastases. These findings provide a mechanistic basis by which the ER mutants engender endocrine resistance and may explain the metastatic propensity and poor overall survival of patients with metastatic breast cancers harboring these mutants.

We were able to demonstrate the relevance of the allele specific mutant ER transcriptional signatures developed in model cell lines in patient-derived xenografts and a large set of ER⁺ metastatic tumor biopsies. In this metastatic biopsy cohort we also confirmed our previous findings from a smaller cohort (Merenbakh-Lamin et al., 2013) of enrichment of the D538G mutant allele specifically in liver metastases. The molecular mechanism of this organotropism is unknown and warrants further study. Consistent with our findings of ER mutant allele-specific programs, a recent analysis of the BOLERO2 clinical trial suggested that patients with the Y537S mutant allele may have worse outcomes compared with patients whose tumors harbor the D538G mutation (Chandralapaty et al., 2016). Additional studies with larger numbers of patients harboring these ER mutations will be needed to determine the clinical differences among the various mutant alleles, including responses to specific endocrine treatments and prognosis.

We used a highly efficient genome-wide CRISPR KO library to detect genes essential for the E2 independent growth of ER mutant expressing breast cancer cells. As these ER mutants are constitutively active, it is not surprising that many of the essential genes identified in the screen are known drivers of ER⁺ breast cancers. In addition, genes such as *TFAP2C* and a number of others that are directly up-regulated by the ER mutants were shown to be essential for the E2 independent growth driven by the mutations.

In summary, we have comprehensively profiled the epigenetic and transcriptional programs regulated by ER LBD mutations found in endocrine therapy resistant ER⁺ breast cancer and provide mechanistic insights into the allele-specific roles played by these mutations in promoting hormone-independent metastatic growth. Our ability to validate these findings from cell culture models in a large cohort of metastatic biopsies offers hope that the therapeutic targets identified in the models will be able to be translated to the clinic to improve outcomes for patients with metastatic ER⁺ breast cancers harboring these mutations.

STAR Methods

Contact for reagent and resource sharing

Further information and requests for resources and reagents should be directed and will be fulfilled by the Lead Contact Myles Brown (myles_brown@dfci.harvard.edu)

Experimental model and subject details

Cell lines—MCF7 and T47D cells were purchased from ATCC. All the cells were authenticated and regularly tested for mycoplasma contamination. The MCF7 cells were maintained in DMEM and T47D cells in RPMI supplemented with 10% heat-inactivated fetal bovine serum (FBS) and 1% penicillin/streptomycin (P/S). For hormone-depleted (HD) conditions, cells were kept in phenol-red free medium supplemented with 10% heat-inactivated charcoal-stripped (CS)-FBS and 1% PS. All cells were incubated at 37°C in 5% CO₂.

In vivo animal studies—All mice were maintained in accordance with local guidelines and therapeutic interventions approved by the Animal Care and Use Committees of Dana-Farber Cancer Institute. For the PDX studies, patient consent for tumor implantation in nude mice was obtained under protocols approved by the IRB of the Dana-Farber/Harvard Cancer Center. ER⁺ metastatic tumor samples were implanted into the cleared fourth mammary fat pads of *NOD-SCID-IL2R γ ^{-/-}* mice (Jackson Laboratories) treated with an E2 pellet. Mice were all females and five weeks old. Similarly, for the orthotopic xenografts derived from cell lines, *NOD-SCID-IL2R γ ^{-/-}* mice female 5 weeks old mice (Jackson Laboratories) were used.

Human tissue studies—All patients provided written informed consent for research metastatic biopsies and genomic profiling of tumor RNA, as approved by the Dana-Farber/Harvard Cancer Center Institutional Review Board (DF/HCC Protocol 05-246). Core

biopsies were obtained from patients with metastatic ER+ breast cancer. After the core biopsy, samples were immediately snap frozen in OCT and stored in -80C freezer.

Method Details

Generation of DOX-inducible WT and mutant ER cells—For the DOX-inducible ER mutant and WT-ER cells, ER-HA tag cDNA (GeneCopoeia) was transferred to the pInducer 20 destination vector (Meerbrey et al., 2011) using the Gateway system (Invitrogen). Lentivirus was produced in 293T cells to infect cells in media containing polybrene (8μg/mL). Cells were selected after the infection with G418. The GeneArt Site-Directed mutagenesis system (Life Technologies) was used to generate Y537N, Y537S and D538G mutations within the ER ligand-binding domain. The following mutagenesis primers were used:

1. Y537N: Forward, 5' - AACGTGGTGGCCCTCAATGACCTGCTGCTGGAGAT -3' Reverse, 5' - ATCTCCAGCAGCAGGTCATTGAGGGGCACCACGTT -3'
2. Y537S: Forward, 5' - AACGTGGTGGCCCTCTCTGACCTGCTGCTGGAGAT -3' Reverse, 5' - ATCTCCAGCAGCAGGTCAGAGAGGGGCACCACGTT -3'
3. D538G: Forward, 5' - AACGTGGTGGCCCTCTATGGCCTGCTGCTGGAGAT -3' Reverse, 5' - ATCTCCAGCAGCAGGCGCATAGAGGGGCACCACGTT -3'. Sanger sequencing and RNA-sequencing confirmed the desired mutations.

Generation of Transcription Activator Like Nucleases (TALEN) mediated mutant cells—The *ESR1* Y537S and D538G knock-in mutant cells were generated in MCF7 cells. The TALENs were designed to target intron 7 and the TALEN recognition sequences were:

- XTN1: (bold=cut region, non-bold=TAL binding sites)
5'TCCCAGCTCCCATCCTAA**AGTGGGTCTTTAAACAGGAAGAAAGAA**
AGATT GCTA3'
- XTN2: (bold=cut region, non-bold=TAL binding sites)
5'TCAGCTTTCCCAGCTCCC**ATCCTAAAGTGGGTCTTTAAACAGGAAG**
AAAG AA3'

The sequences were synthesized and cloned into the SQT281 vector (Transposagen) that includes a FokI nuclease. For the homologous recombination we used a donor vector that contained the targeting constructs of *piggyBac* transposon and the puromycin-thymidine kinase (TK) selection cassette flanked by 500 bp of *ESR1* genomic sequence with the coding changes (TAT>TCT for Y537S and GAC>GGC for G538G) in the 3' end matching the exon 8 coding region. The MCF7 cells were transiently transfected with the TALEN vector and donor vector using Lipofectamine 2000 (Invitrogen). After puromycin selection, clones with the desired mutation were identified by Sanger sequencing and transiently transfected with transposase expression plasmids (Transposagen) for removal of the selection cassettes followed by gancyclovir treatment for negative selection to enable a "foot-print free" knock-in cell lines. We confirmed the mutations by Sanger sequencing and RNA-sequencing.

Proliferation assays

The breast cancer cells were plated in 24 well plates. At indicated time points, the cells were counted using the Celigo image Cytometer (Nexcelom). Hoescht was used for nuclear staining and propidium iodide was used for staining dead cells. For the dose response studies and determination of the IC50's 4-hydroxytamoxifen (Sigma-Aldrich, catalog # H7904), fulvestrant (Sigma catalog #I4409) and THZ1 (Nathanael Gray's lab, Dana Farber Cancer Institute) were used.

Western-blotting

For Western blot analysis, cells were lysed in 50mM Tris-HCl pH 7.5, 150mM NaCl, 1mM EDTA, 1mM EGTA, 0.5% NP-40, 1% Triton X-100 supplemented with protease inhibitors and subjected to SDS-PAGE. Antibodies used were: ER α (sc-543, Santa Cruz), TFAP2C (Santa Cruz), CDK7 (Cell Signaling, 2916), ER-S118 (Cell Signaling, 2511), Beta-Actin (Sigma), GAPDH (Santa Cruz), HA (Ab9110, Abcam).

Chromatin Immunoprecipitation (ChIP)-Sequencing

ChIP experiments were conducted as described previously (Wang et al., 2009) and were done in triplicates. Chromatin from approximately 1×10^7 fixed cells was sonicated to a size range of 200-300 bp. Solubilized chromatin was subjected to immunoprecipitation with the ER antibody, Ab10 (Lab Vision corporation) and SC-543 (Santa cruz), HA antibody (Ab9110, Abcam), H3K27Ac antibody (C15410196, Diagenode) or FOXA1 (ab5089, Abcam) bound to protein A and protein G beads (Life Technologies). A fraction of the sample was not exposed to antibody to be used as control (input). The samples were reversed crosslinked, treated with proteinase K, and DNA was extracted. DNA sequencing libraries were prepared using the ThruPLEX-FD Prep Kit (Rubicon Genomics). Libraries were sequenced using 50 bp reads on the Illumina Nextseq500 at the Dana-Farber Cancer Institute.

RNA sequencing

Total RNA was isolated using an RNeasy Mini Kit (Qiagen). For all cell line studies samples were done in triplicates. RNA-seq libraries were made using the TruSeq RNA Sample Preparation Kit (Illumina) adapted for use on the Sciclone (Perkin-Elmer) liquid handler. Samples were sequenced on an Illumina Nextseq500.

Co-regulator interaction profiling

This method has been described previously (Koppen et al, 2009). Cell lysates of each clone were prepared and ER α was quantified by ELISA (Active Motif, USA) to enable equimolar input. An array with a set of immobilized peptides representing coregulator-derived NR-binding motifs is incubated with a reaction mixture of crude lysate, vehicle (2% DMSO) with or without 1 μ M 17- β -estradiol (E2) and anti-HIS-Alexa488 (Qiagen, USA). Incubation was performed for 40 minutes at 20 °C, followed by removal of unbound receptor by washing and generation of a tiff image of each array using a PamStation96 (PamGene International). Image processing and quantification of ER α binding to each peptide on the

array was performed by Bionavigator software (PamGene International). The list of protein peptides evaluated detailed in table S8.

CRISPR knock-out library screen

To design an efficient genome-wide CRISPR-Cas9 library for screening, we first scanned human genome to select gRNAs with an “NGG” PAM sequence motif adjacent to its 3' end. Then we predicted efficiency score of each gRNA based on our Least Absolute Shrinkage and Selection Operator (LASSO) model (Xu et al., 2015). We further selected the putative 19bp sgRNA targets that are within the exons of the genes selected for screening, have the best predicted efficiency score and have no mutation relative to the reference genome in any cancer cell line (COSMIC). To minimize off-target effects, we aligned the 19bp sequences of the putative targets against all exons in the genome. The gRNAs with fewer than 2 mismatches in the secondary match outside the target gene were removed. In the library, we also included two types of negative controls: i) nonspecific sgRNAs that are not mappable to human genome; ii) sgRNAs targeting the AAVS1 integration locus where insertion or deletion does not affect cell function. Taken together, the lentivirus library consisted of 183128 gRNAs for 18313 protein-coding genes, 730 gRNAs for ribosomes, 385 gRNAs for non-targeting controls, and 136 gRNAs for AAVS1 controls. The sgRNA library synthesized at CustomArray and amplified by PCR as previously described (Shalem et al., 2014). The PCR products were subsequently ligated into lentiCRISPR V2 plasmid, followed by transformation to competent cells for amplification according to the online protocol GeCKO library Amplification Protocol from Addgene. After plasmid library was amplified, we isolated the plasmid and constructed a sequencing library for Miseq to ensure library diversity. The DOX-inducible cells were infected at a low MOI (0.2) to ensure that most cells receive only one viral construct with high probability. Large-scale infection of 2×10^8 cells was carried. After five days of puromycin selection, the surviving cells were divided into day 0 control cells and cells cultured for five weeks before genomic DNA extraction and library preparation. Each library was sequenced at 25 million reads to achieve $\sim 300\times$ average coverage over the CRISPR library. The 0 day sample library of each screen served as controls to identify positively or negatively selected genes or pathways.

Generation of single CRISPR/Cas9 knock-out cells

Construction of lenti-CRISPR/Cas9 vectors targeting transcriptional CDK was performed following the protocol associated with the backbone vector (49535, Addgene). The following sgRNA sequences were used:

TFAP2C guides

gRNA1:F:5' CACCGCGAATTCCTAGTAAACCAG3'
 gRNA1 R: 5' AAACCTGGTTTACTAGGAAATTCG3'
 gRNA2:F:5' CACCGCAGCTCCTTCTGACAGGGG3'
 gRNA2 R: 5' AAACCCCTGTCAGAAGGAGCTGC 3'

CDK7 guides

gRNA1:F:5' CACCGGAAGCTGGACTTCCTTGGGG3'
 gRNA1:R:5' AAACCCCAAGGAAGTCCAGCTTCC3'
 gRNA2:F:5' CACCGATCTCTGGCCTTGTAACGG3'
 gRNA2:R:5' AAACCCGTTTACAAGGCCAGAGATC3'
 gRNA3:F:5' CACCGATGTGTATAAGCTCTATTG3' rv:
 gRNA3:R:5' AAACCAATAGAGCTTATACACATC3'

FOXA1 guides

gRNA1: F:5' CACTACTACGCAGACACGCAGG3'
 gRNA1: R: 5' AAA ATGATGCGTCTGTGCGTCC3'
 gRNA2: F 5' CACGACATGTTGAAGGACGCCG3'
 gRNA2: R: 5' AAAGTGTACAACCTTCCTGCGGC3'

Drug Synergy studies—Cells were plated in 96 wells and treated with vehicle and 2 fold serial dilutions for 6 doses of THZ1(2.5, 5, 10, 20, 40 and 80 nM) and fulvestrant(1.2, 2.5, 5, 10, 20 and 40 nM) in a matrix format to include 49 different dose combinations. Viable cells were counted on day 5 with the Celigo image Cytometer (Nexcelom).

Quantification and Statistical analysis

Statistical analyses for cell proliferation studies were performed using two sided Student's t-tests, and p values less than 0.05 were considered statistically significant. Error bars represent the $\pm$ SEM. Cell line experiments testing cell proliferation were all performed in triplicates.

RNA sequencing analysis—Alignment to the hg19 human genome was done using STAR v2.5.1(Dobin et al., 2013) followed by Transcript assembly using cufflinks v2.2.1(Trapnell et al., 2010) and quality control steps were done using STAR v2.5.1 and RseQC v2.6.2(Wang et al., 2012). We assessed each sample on metrics of mappable reads, percentage of rRNA reads, gene body coverage, and junction saturation and insert_size for paired end, to determine samples that were of adequate quality. Differential Expression Analysis was done using DEseq2 v1.1(Wang et al., 2012). GSEA analysis was performed using the Broad GSEA Application (Subramanian et al., 2005)

ChIP sequencing analysis—ChIP-seq reads were aligned to the hg19 genome assembly using Bowtie(Langmead et al., 2009) and ChIP-seq peaks were called using MACS 2.0 (Feng et al., 2012; Zhang et al., 2008). For differential binding analysis, bedfiles were merged using bedops (Neph et al., 2012) and then Bamliquidator (<https://github.com/BradnerLab/pipeline/wiki/bamliquidator>) was used to assign a binding intensity score to each region of the merged bed file. Differential binding was determined by filtering out insignificantly binding peaks (Bamliquidator score < 0.1) and then determining log2FC

values between samples for each region using a $\log_2$ FC >1 or <-1 . For the Binding and Expression Target Analysis (BETA) correlative analysis with RNA-seq differential expression the peaks were defined into region bed files including upbound peaks ($\log_2$ FC >1), downbound peaks ($\log_2$ FC <-1), and nodiff peaks ($\log_2$ FC <1 and >-1). Each of these bed files was paired with the associated differential gene expression including only the differential genes with an adjusted p-value of <0.1 . We took the outputted BETA bed files, added up the BETA scores for each gene and normalized each BETA score by dividing by the original number of peaks entered into BETA. Then for each of the three files, we binned the genes by $\log_2$ FC into bins of 100, and plotted out the average $\log_2$ FC of gene expression, and the average normalized BETA score for each bin.

The motif analysis was done using the MEME suite tool AME (Analysis of Motif Enrichment)(Bailey et al., 2015).

To identify super-enhancers, we employed the ROSE algorithm to rank the enhancers that were identified using MACS in which peaks from H3K27ac ChIP within 12.5 kb of one another were stitched together (Loven et al., 2013; Whyte et al., 2013). These stitched enhancers were ranked by their difference in H3K27ac signal versus input signal.

A threshold separating super-enhancers from typical enhancers was identified by finding the point at which the line $Y=X$ was tangent to the curve formed by plotting the stitched enhancer rank versus H3K27ac signal subtracting the input signal.

CRISPR/CAS9 library screen analysis—The CRISPR/Cas9 screening data was processed and analyzed using the MAGeCK and MAGeCK-VISPR algorithms previously published(Li et al., 2015). MAGeCK-VISPR uses a metric, “ β score”, to measure gene selections. The definition of β score is similar to the term of ‘log FC’ in differential expression analysis, and $\beta>0$ (or <0) means the corresponding gene is positively (or negatively) selected, respectively. We considered a β score of >0.5 or <-0.5 as significant. MAGeCK-VISPR models the gRNA read counts as a negative binomial variable, whose mean value is determined by the sequencing depth of the sample, the efficiency of the gRNA, and a linear combination of β scores of the genes. MAGeCK-VISPR then builds a maximum likelihood (MLE) model to model all gRNA read counts of all samples, and iteratively estimate the gRNA efficiency and gene β scores using the Expectation-Maximization algorithm.

Drug synergy analysis—Drug synergy was calculated based on the Bliss independence model using the SynergyFinder R package(Aleksandr et al., 2017).

Data availability

The RNA-seq and ChIP-seq data have been deposited in the Gene Expression Omnibus database under GSE94493 and GSE106552.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported in part by grant from the NIH K08 CA191058-03 (to R.J.), Claudia Adams Barr Program for Innovative Cancer Research (to R.J.), NIH Breast Cancer SPORE Career Development Award (to R.J.), Susan Komen Leadership Grant (to M.B.), NIH P01CA080111 (to M.B.).

G.B is an employee and shareholder of Celgene. R.H. is an employee of Pamgene International B.V. N.S.G, T.Z., N.K. are inventors on a patent application covering THZ1 which is licensed to a company co-founded by N.S.G. N.W. is a shareholder of Foundation Medicine, is a consultant for Novartis and receives research support from Novartis and Merck.

References

- Aleksandr I, He L, Aittokallio T, Tang J. SynergyFinder: a web application for analyzing drug combination dose-response matrix data. *Bioinformatics*. 2017
- Ali S, Metzger D, Bornert JM, Chambon P. Modulation of transcriptional activation by ligand-dependent phosphorylation of the human oestrogen receptor A/B region. *EMBO J*. 1993; 12:1153–1160. [PubMed: 8458328]
- Bailey TL, Johnson J, Grant CE, Noble WS. The MEME Suite. *Nucleic Acids Res*. 2015; 43:W39–49. [PubMed: 25953851]
- Carroll JS, Liu XS, Brodsky AS, Li W, Meyer CA, Szary AJ, Eeckhoutte J, Shao W, Hestermann EV, Geistlinger TR, et al. Chromosome-wide mapping of estrogen receptor binding reveals long-range regulation requiring the forkhead protein FoxA1. *Cell*. 2005; 122:33–43. [PubMed: 16009131]
- Chandarlapaty S, Chen D, He W, Sung P, Samoila A, You D, Bhatt T, Patel P, Voi M, Gnant M, et al. Prevalence of ESR1 Mutations in Cell-Free DNA and Outcomes in Metastatic Breast Cancer: A Secondary Analysis of the BOLERO-2 Clinical Trial. *JAMA oncology*. 2016; 2:1310–1315. [PubMed: 27532364]
- Chen D, Riedl T, Washbrook E, Pace PE, Coombes RC, Egly JM, Ali S. Activation of estrogen receptor alpha by S118 phosphorylation involves a ligand-dependent interaction with TFIID and participation of CDK7. *Mol Cell*. 2000; 6:127–137. [PubMed: 10949034]
- Consortium, G. T. The Genotype-Tissue Expression (GTEx) project. *Nature genetics*. 2013; 45:580–585. [PubMed: 23715323]
- Cyr AR, Kulak MV, Park JM, Bogachek MV, Spanheimer PM, Woodfield GW, White-Baer LS, O'Malley YQ, Sugg SL, Olivier AK, et al. TFAP2C governs the luminal epithelial phenotype in mammary development and carcinogenesis. *Oncogene*. 2015; 34:436–444. [PubMed: 24469049]
- Dobin A, Davis CA, Schlesinger F, Drenkow J, Zaleski C, Jha S, Batut P, Chaisson M, Gingeras TR. STAR: ultrafast universal RNA-seq aligner. *Bioinformatics*. 2013; 29:15–21. [PubMed: 23104886]
- Peto R, Davies C, Godwin J, Gray R, Pan HC, Clarke M, Cutter D, Darby S, McGale P, et al. Early Breast Cancer Trialists' Collaborative, G. Comparisons between different polychemotherapy regimens for early breast cancer: meta-analyses of long-term outcome among 100,000 women in 123 randomised trials. *Lancet*. 2012; 379:432–444. [PubMed: 22152853]
- Ellis MJ, Ding L, Shen D, Luo J, Suman VJ, Wallis JW, Van Tine BA, Hoog J, Goiffon RJ, Goldstein TC, et al. Whole-genome analysis informs breast cancer response to aromatase inhibition. *Nature*. 2012; 486:353–360. [PubMed: 22722193]
- Fanning SW, Mayne CG, Dharmarajan V, Carlson KE, Martin TA, Novick SJ, Toy W, Green B, Panchamukhi S, Katzenellenbogen BS, et al. Estrogen receptor alpha somatic mutations Y537S and D538G confer breast cancer endocrine resistance by stabilizing the activating function-2 binding conformation. *Elife*. 2016; 5
- Feng J, Liu T, Qin B, Zhang Y, Liu XS. Identifying ChIP-seq enrichment using MACS. *Nat Protoc*. 2012; 7:1728–1740. [PubMed: 22936215]
- Fisher RP, Morgan DO. A novel cyclin associates with MO15/CDK7 to form the CDK-activating kinase. *Cell*. 1994; 78:713–724. [PubMed: 8069918]
- Glover-Cutter K, Larochelle S, Erickson B, Zhang C, Shokat K, Fisher RP, Bentley DL. TFIID-associated Cdk7 kinase functions in phosphorylation of C-terminal domain Ser7 residues,

promoter-proximal pausing, and termination by RNA polymerase II. *Molecular and cellular biology*. 2009; 29:5455–5464. [PubMed: 19667075]

Harrod A, Fulton J, Nguyen VT, Periyasamy M, Ramos-Garcia L, Lai CF, Metodieva G, de Giorgio A, Williams RL, Santos DB, et al. Genomic modelling of the ESR1 Y537S mutation for evaluating function and new therapeutic approaches for metastatic breast cancer. *Oncogene*. 2016

Jeselsohn R, Barry WT, Migliaccio I, Biagioni C, Zhao J, De Tribolet-Hardy J, Guarducci C, Bonechi M, Laing N, Winer EP, et al. TransCONFIRM: Identification of a Genetic Signature of Response to Fulvestrant in Advanced Hormone Receptor-Positive Breast Cancer. *Clinical cancer research : an official journal of the American Association for Cancer Research*. 2016; 22:5755–5764. [PubMed: 27185372]

Jeselsohn R, Yelensky R, Buchwalter G, Frampton G, Meric-Bernstam F, Gonzalez-Angulo AM, Ferrer-Lozano J, Perez-Fidalgo JA, Cristofanilli M, Gomez H, et al. Emergence of constitutively active estrogen receptor- α mutations in pretreated advanced estrogen receptor-positive breast cancer. *Clinical cancer research : an official journal of the American Association for Cancer Research*. 2014; 20:1757–1767. [PubMed: 24398047]

Koppen A, Houtman R, Pijnenburg D, Jenning EH, Ruijtenbeek R, Kalkhoven E. Nuclear receptor-coregulator interaction profiling identifies TRIP3 as a novel peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor gamma cofactor. *Mol Cell Proteomics*. 2009; 8:2212–2226. [PubMed: 19596656]

Kornberg RD. Mediator and the mechanism of transcriptional activation. *Trends Biochem Sci*. 2005; 30:235–239. [PubMed: 15896740]

Kwiatkowski N, Zhang T, Rahl PB, Abraham BJ, Reddy J, Ficarro SB, Dastur A, Amzallag A, Ramaswamy S, Tesar B, et al. Targeting transcription regulation in cancer with a covalent CDK7 inhibitor. *Nature*. 2014; 511:616–620. [PubMed: 25043025]

Langmead B, Trapnell C, Pop M, Salzberg SL. Ultrafast and memory-efficient alignment of short DNA sequences to the human genome. *Genome biology*. 2009; 10:R25. [PubMed: 19261174]

Larochelle S, Merrick KA, Terret ME, Wohlbold L, Barboza NM, Zhang C, Shokat KM, Jallepalli PV, Fisher RP. Requirements for Cdk7 in the assembly of Cdk1/cyclin B and activation of Cdk2 revealed by chemical genetics in human cells. *Mol Cell*. 2007; 25:839–850. [PubMed: 17386261]

Li W, Koster J, Xu H, Chen CH, Xiao T, Liu JS, Brown M, Liu XS. Quality control, modeling, and visualization of CRISPR screens with MAGECK-VISPR. *Genome biology*. 2015; 16:281. [PubMed: 26673418]

Loven J, Hoke HA, Lin CY, Lau A, Orlando DA, Vakoc CR, Bradner JE, Lee TI, Young RA. Selective inhibition of tumor oncogenes by disruption of super-enhancers. *Cell*. 2013; 153:320–334. [PubMed: 23582323]

Meerbrey KL, Hu G, Kessler JD, Roarty K, Li MZ, Fang JE, Herschkowitz JI, Burrows AE, Ciccio A, Sun T, et al. The pINDUCER lentiviral toolkit for inducible RNA interference in vitro and in vivo. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. 2011; 108:3665–3670. [PubMed: 21307310]

Merenbakh-Lamin K, Ben-Baruch N, Yeheskel A, Dvir A, Soussan-Gutman L, Jeselsohn R, Yelensky R, Brown M, Miller VA, Sarid D, et al. D538G mutation in estrogen receptor- α : A novel mechanism for acquired endocrine resistance in breast cancer. *Cancer Res*. 2013; 73:6856–6864. [PubMed: 24217577]

Neph S, Kuehn MS, Reynolds AP, Haugen E, Thurman RE, Johnson AK, Rynes E, Maurano MT, Vierstra J, Thomas S, et al. BEDOPS: high-performance genomic feature operations. *Bioinformatics*. 2012; 28:1919–1920. [PubMed: 22576172]

Nettles KW, Bruning JB, Gil G, Nowak J, Sharma SK, Hahn JB, Kulp K, Hochberg RB, Zhou H, Katzenellenbogen JA, et al. NF κ B selectivity of estrogen receptor ligands revealed by comparative crystallographic analyses. *Nat Chem Biol*. 2008; 4:241–247. [PubMed: 18344977]

Robinson DR, Wu YM, Vats P, Su F, Lonigro RJ, Cao X, Kalyana-Sundaram S, Wang R, Ning Y, Hodges L, et al. Activating ESR1 mutations in hormone-resistant metastatic breast cancer. *Nat Genet*. 2013; 45:1446–1451. [PubMed: 24185510]

Rosell M, Nevedomskaya E, Stelloo S, Nautiyal J, Poliandri A, Steel JH, Wessels LF, Carroll JS, Parker MG, Zwart W. Complex formation and function of estrogen receptor α in transcription requires RIP140. *Cancer research*. 2014; 74:5469–5479. [PubMed: 25145671]

- Shalem O, Sanjana NE, Hartenian E, Shi X, Scott DA, Mikkelsen TS, Heckl D, Ebert BL, Root DE, Doench JG, Zhang F. Genome-scale CRISPR-Cas9 knockout screening in human cells. *Science*. 2014; 343:84–87. [PubMed: 24336571]
- Spoerke JM, Gendreau S, Walter K, Qiu J, Wilson TR, Savage H, Aimi J, Derynck MK, Chen M, Chan IT, et al. Heterogeneity and clinical significance of ESR1 mutations in ER-positive metastatic breast cancer patients receiving fulvestrant. *Nature communications*. 2016; 7:11579.
- Subramanian A, Tamayo P, Mootha VK, Mukherjee S, Ebert BL, Gillette MA, Paulovich A, Pomeroy SL, Golub TR, Lander ES, Mesirov JP. Gene set enrichment analysis: a knowledge-based approach for interpreting genome-wide expression profiles. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. 2005; 102:15545–15550. [PubMed: 16199517]
- Toy W, Shen Y, Won H, Green B, Sakr RA, Will M, Li Z, Gala K, Fanning S, King TA, et al. ESR1 ligand-binding domain mutations in hormone-resistant breast cancer. *Nat Genet*. 2013; 45:1439–1445. [PubMed: 24185512]
- Toy W, Weir H, Razavi P, Lawson M, Goeppert AU, Mazzola AM, Smith A, Wilson J, Morrow C, Wong WL, et al. Activating ESR1 Mutations Differentially Affect the Efficacy of ER Antagonists. *Cancer discovery*. 2017; 7:277–287. [PubMed: 27986707]
- Trapnell C, Williams BA, Pertea G, Mortazavi A, Kwan G, van Baren MJ, Salzberg SL, Wold BJ, Pachter L. Transcript assembly and quantification by RNA-Seq reveals unannotated transcripts and isoform switching during cell differentiation. *Nat Biotechnol*. 2010; 28:511–515. [PubMed: 20436464]
- Wang L, Wang S, Li W. RSeQC: quality control of RNA-seq experiments. *Bioinformatics*. 2012; 28:2184–2185. [PubMed: 22743226]
- Wang Q, Li W, Zhang Y, Yuan X, Xu K, Yu J, Chen Z, Beroukheim R, Wang H, Lupien M, et al. Androgen receptor regulates a distinct transcription program in androgen-independent prostate cancer. *Cell*. 2009; 138:245–256. [PubMed: 19632176]
- Wang S, Sun H, Ma J, Zang C, Wang C, Wang J, Tang Q, Meyer CA, Zhang Y, Liu XS. Target analysis by integration of transcriptome and ChIP-seq data with BETA. *Nat Protoc*. 2013; 8:2502–2515. [PubMed: 24263090]
- Whyte WA, Orlando DA, Hnisz D, Abraham BJ, Lin CY, Kagey MH, Rahl PB, Lee TI, Young RA. Master transcription factors and mediator establish super-enhancers at key cell identity genes. *Cell*. 2013; 153:307–319. [PubMed: 23582322]
- Xu H, Xiao T, Chen CH, Li W, Meyer CA, Wu Q, Wu D, Cong L, Zhang F, Liu JS, et al. Sequence determinants of improved CRISPR sgRNA design. *Genome research*. 2015; 25:1147–1157. [PubMed: 26063738]
- Yi P, Wang Z, Feng Q, Pintilie GD, Foulds CE, Lanz RB, Ludtke SJ, Schmid MF, Chiu W, O'Malley BW. Structure of a biologically active estrogen receptor-coactivator complex on DNA. *Mol Cell*. 2015; 57:1047–1058. [PubMed: 25728767]
- Zhang Y, Liu T, Meyer CA, Eeckhoutte J, Johnson DS, Bernstein BE, Nusbaum C, Myers RM, Brown M, Li W, Liu XS. Model-based analysis of ChIP-Seq (MACS). *Genome biology*. 2008; 9:R137. [PubMed: 18798982]

Significance

Metastatic ER⁺ breast cancer is the leading cause of breast cancer mortality in the developed world. Mutations in the ER LBD confer endocrine therapy resistance and poor outcomes in patients with metastatic disease. Prior studies have shown that these mutations engender constitutive ER activity to promote estrogen independent growth. Here we show that these mutations also have allele-specific neomorphic properties that in addition to supporting estrogen-independent growth promote a metastatic phenotype. Using genetic screens we have identified vulnerabilities in breast cancer cells expressing the ER mutants and wild type ER. We used these results to develop a therapeutic combination to overcome ER mutant-driven endocrine therapy resistance.

Highlights

- The mutant ER cistromes are different from the E2 stimulated WT-ER cistrome.
- The ER mutant-selective cistromes drive endocrine resistance and metastases.
- The ER Y537S and D538G mutants have distinct cistromes and transcriptomes.
- THZ1 blocks mutant ER phosphorylation at S118 and inhibits mutant ER cell growth.

Figure 1. Global transcriptomic analysis of the ER-mutant cell lines

(A) Pairwise Spearman correlation of RNAseq between the ER-WT parental and mutant cell lines in hormone depleted (HD) conditions with vehicle (veh) treatment and HD conditions with estradiol (E2) treatment. Hierarchical clustering shows the relatedness of each sample. (B) Principal components analysis of the transcriptomes of WT-ER parental cell lines and mutant cell lines in full medium (FM), HD, and HD+E2 conditions. See also Figure S1 and Table S1-S2.

Figure 2. Transcriptomic analysis of metastatic tumors harboring the *ESR1* LBD mutations (A) Pairwise spearman correlation of RNAseq between ER⁺ metastatic tumors. (B) Heat map of the top 1,000 genes differentially expressed between D538G-mutant and WT-ER metastatic samples and gene set enrichment (GSEA) plot of the top ranked 100 genes upregulated with the induction of the D538G mutation in MCF7 cells testing for enrichment in the D538G metastatic tumor samples compared to the WT-ER metastatic samples within cluster A. (C). Heat map of the top 1,000 genes differentially expressed between Y537S-mutant and WT-ER metastatic samples and gene set enrichment plot testing the enrichment of the top ranked 100 genes upregulated with the induction of the Y537S mutation in MCF7 cells in the Y537S mutant metastatic tumor samples compared to the WT-ER metastatic samples within cluster B. See also Figure S2.

Figure 3. Distinct ER-mutant cistromes drive a unique transcriptional network

(A) Heat maps of WT-ER binding events after estradiol (E2) stimulation compared to ER-mutant binding sites in hormone depleted (HD) conditions for the Y537S, Y537N and D538G mutations in MCF7 cells and Y537S in T47D cells shown in a horizontal window of ± 0.5 kb from the peak center. Heat maps depict the sites that are gained in the mutant, not different between the ER mutant and WT-ER after estradiol stimulation, and sites lost in the mutant. (B) Heat map of the ER binding intensity ratios of Y537S-mutant in HD conditions over WT-mutant after E2 stimulation and D538G-mutant in HD conditions over WT-mutant after E2 stimulation in the sites gained and lost in Y537S and D538G. (C) Heat maps of WT-ER and Y537S mutant ER binding events and corresponding FOXA1 binding in MCF7 cells showing the ER binding sites selective to the Y537S, shared with WT-ER and selective to WT-ER, shown in a horizontal window of ± 0.5 kb from the peak center. (D) Heat maps of the differential H3K27ac binding sites comparing WT cells with E2 stimulation and ER-mutant binding sites in HD conditions for the Y537S MCF7 cells. Shown in a horizontal window of ± 2 kb from the peak center. (E) Each box in the box plot is the cumulative H3K27ac binding overlapping with the Y537S mutant gained ER binding sites in the WT and Y537S mutant MCF7 cells. The Y axis represents the reads per kilobase per million (RPKM) reads of DNA. The line in the box represents the median, box limits indicate the

first and third quartile, whiskers extend 1.5 the interquartile range from the first and third quartiles, the dots represent outliers. (F) The distribution of the regions of the ER binding sites per category, including the ER binding sites gained in the Y537S cells, sites that are not different from WT-ER and the sites lost in the Y537S cells. (G) Venn diagram showing the overlap between the super enhancer (SE) regions in Y537S MCF7 cells and the Y537S gained ER binding sites. (H) Heat map of ER mutant co-regulator binding in HD conditions compared to WT-ER co-regulator binding after E2 treatment. * $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.005$. (I) Bar graphs show binding affinity levels for peptides of the ER co-regulators EP300, MAPE, MED1 and NRIP1 in WT-ER +E2 stimulation and Y537S and D538G mutant ER in HD conditions in MCF7 cells. Error bars represent SEM, $n=3$. See also Figure S3 and Tables S3 and S4.

Figure 4. The mutant specific transcriptional program promotes a metastatic phenotype
 (A) Correlation of the Y537S-mutant specific cisrome and differential gene expression. The red line represents the genes (2598 genes) that have Y537S-mutant unique peaks ($\log_2FC > 1$; 3,491 peaks). The blue line represents the genes (966 genes) that have peaks associated with them that were unique to WT-ER ($\log_2FC < -1$; 2180 peaks). The black line represents the genes (5250 genes) associated with peaks common to mutant and WT-ER ($-1 < |\log_2FC| < 1$). The X-axis is the $\log_2FC$ of the genes in mutant condition vs WT condition. The Y-axis is the average normalized BETA score per gene bin. (B) Overlap of the genes with a ranked product < 0.001 determined by BETA using the mutant (Y537S, Y537N and D538G) unique binding sites and gene sets significantly enriched in the 344 overlapping genes using ranked gene set enrichment analysis (GSEA). The red line in the graph represents the q value and the blue bars represent the normalized enrichment score (NES). (C) Tumor growth of orthotopic xenografts of MCF7 cells expressing the indicated ER mutants or WT MCF7 cells with estradiol (E2) pellets and without E2 supplements prior to the survival surgery. The Y-axis represents the tumor volume measured by calipers. Comparison of Y537S to D538G mutant cells was statistically significant * p value < 0.05 for this comparison. ** p value < 0.005 in the comparison of the WT xenografts without E2 to all other conditions. (D) Tumor growth of the orthotopic xenografts of MCF7 cells expressing the Y537S or D538G

mutation from the time of the intra-mammary injections of the cells through the survival surgery and monitoring of local recurrence and distant metastases (mets). (E) Representative pictures of the mice with the Y537S xenografts. Survival surgery was performed on day 35 and the DOX diet was discontinued on day 98. (F) Representative pictures of the mice with the D538G xenografts. The survival surgery was performed on day 70. (G) Tumor growth of the orthotopic xenografts of WT-MCF7 cells with E2 (WT+E2) or without E2 (WT) supplements from the time of the intra-mammary injections of the cells through the survival surgery and monitoring of local recurrence and distant metastases. (H) Representative pictures of the mice with WT MCF7 cells +E2 pellets. The survival surgery performed on day 63. (I) Representative pictures of the mice with WT MCF7 cells without E2 pellets. Survival surgery was not performed in these mice. Error bars in (C-E) represent SEM, 6-8 mice were included in each arm. See also Figure S4 and Table S5.

Figure 5. CRISPR screen identifies ER-mutant essential genes

(A) Essentiality scores from the CRISPR screen in T47D-Y537S mutant cells grown in HD conditions. (B) Comparison of beta scores of CRISPR-CAS9 library screens in Y537S-ER mutant cells in HD conditions versus library screen in ER-WT cells in FM conditions. Dark gray dots=genes that are essential for both WT-ER and Mutant-ER, green= uniquely essential for mutant ER, orange= uniquely positively selected in mutant ER and light gray= not significant in the mutant cells (FDR<0.05). (C) $-\log$ rank product values integrating the beta essentiality scores and the geometric mean of the gene rankings from at least 3 of 4 BETA analysis results from the Y537S, D538G and Y537N MCF7 cells and T47D Y537S cells. (D) ChIP-seq tracks showing ER, HA and H3K27 acetylation binding at the *TFAP2C* promoter region in WT cells with E2 treatment and mutant cells in HD conditions. (E) Immunoblotting for AP2γ in control (CON) cells and cells with CRISPR/Cas9 suppression of TFAP2C (KO) (F) Cell proliferation studies in HD conditions of WT and Y537S or D538G mutant (DOX treated) control cells and after suppression of TFAP2C using CRISPR-Cas9. Error bars represent $\pm$ SEM, n=3. See also Figure S5 and Table S6.

Figure 6. CDK7 is essential for mutant ER constitutive activity

(A) Immunoblotting for CDK7 in AAV1-control (AAV1-con) cells, and cells with CDK7 silencing with 3 different CRISPR/cas9 gRNAs. Cell proliferation studies of T47D ER-WT cells with AAV1-con and CDK7 silencing in FM and Y537S mutant cells in HD conditions. (B) Immunoblotting for ER and phospho-ER at serine 118 (S118) in WT cells (-DOX) in HD and E2 stimulated conditions and Y537 or D538G mutant (+DOX) ER in HD conditions. (C) ER and pS118 levels by immunoblotting after vehicle (VEH) and THZ1 treatment at 4 hr and 24 hr with increasing doses. (D) 2D and 3D synergy maps of THZ1 and fulvestrant (FUL) treatment combination in MCF7 (left) and T47D (right) cells expressing the Y537S mutation. (E) Growth curves of orthotopic xenografts of the MCF7 – Y537S cells after treatment with vehicle (VEH), FUL, THZ1 or the combination of FUL and THZ1. Error bars represent $\pm$ SEM, n=8. See also Figure S6.