

а

Supplementary Figure 1. Drug screening details.

(a) Detailed schematic of CRISPR-drug screens.

(b) Scatterplots showing the correlation of IC50 values obtained for each of our 8 drugs plotted against IC50 values reported in the public GDSC/CCLE/CTD² screening datasets from the Sanger/Broad Institutes. P value and r were calculated by Pearson correlation.

(c) A table with all IC20-30 used across all screens (the pink lines show known Cmax values, note in resistant cells we generally capped our screening concentrations approximately at these Cmax values)

UMAP in -Log[RRA|neg]



а









>5

-Log 10 (P-value)

Num drugs (of 8 total)



Num drugs (of 8 total)



Num drugs (of 8 total)



f

Supplementary Figure 2: Details of systematic behaviors in screen.

(a, b) Extra UMAP plots of all RRA scores for sensitization (a) and resistance (b) in screen.

(c, d) tSNE plots of all RRA scores for sensitization (c) and resistance (d) in screen.

(e) Scatterplot showing the number of cell lines (x axis) that are sensitized to some gene knockout (RRA < 0.05; y axis) for 8 drugs screened.

(f) Scatterplot showing the number of drugs (x axis) that are sensitized to some gene knockout (RRA <

0.05; y axis) for all 18 cell lines screened. P-values (colors) were calculated by permutation.

Supplementary Figure 3. Drug responses in selected parental and associated shRNA knockdown cell lines.

(a) Knockdown efficiency of individual shRNAs per gene. shPRKDC #1, shHDAC2 #1, shKEAP1 #2, and shMET #2 were used for subsequent drug response profiling (c), (d), (e), and (f), respectively. Uncroppbed blots are provided as a Source file.

(b) Knockdown of individual genes in individual cell lines. PRKDC (top left, corresponding (c)), HDAC2 (top right, corresponding to (d)), KEPA1 (bottom left, corresponding to (e)), MET (bottom right, corresponding to (f)). Uncropped blots are provided as a Source Data file. Confirmed knockdown cell lines were directly used for subsequent drug response profiling.

(c) The response of 10 parental lines (grey) and associated PRKDC knockdown cell lines (blue) to doxorubicin (~IC50). Six knockdown cell lines were sensitized to doxorubicin, suggesting synergy. AC16: P=0.034, BE2C: P=0.00016, CHP212: P=0.033, HCT116: P=0.0033, MHHNB11: P=0.0032, SKNSH: P=0.00065 (Data presented as mean \pm SEM, unpaired t-test (two-side), n=3 per group, two independent. *** P < 0.001, ** P < 0.01, * P < 0.05).

(d) The response of 11 parental lines (grey) and associated HDAC2 knockdown cell lines (blue) to JQAD1 (~IC50 or capped 10 μ M). Three knockdown cell lines were sensitized JQAD1, suggesting synergy. GIMEN: P=0.0033, HCT116: P=0.0096, SKNSH: P=0.00028 (Data presented as mean \pm SEM, unpaired t-test (two-side), n=3 per group, two independent. *** P < 0.001, ** P < 0.01, * P < 0.05).

(e) The response of 11 parental lines (grey) and associated KEAP1 knockdown cell lines (blue) to topotecan (~IC50). Three knockdown cell lines were sensitized to topotecan, suggesting synergy. CHP212: P=0.011, GIMEN: P=0.0054, RH30: P=0.04 (Data presented as mean \pm SEM, unpaired t-test (two-side), n=3 per group, two independent. ** P < 0.01, * P < 0.05).

(f) The response of 11 parental lines (grey) and associated MET knockdown cell lines (blue) to cisplatin (~IC50 or capped 10 μ M). One knockdown cell line was sensitized to cisplatin, suggesting synergy. NGP: P=0.0048 (Data presented as mean ±SEM, unpaired t-test (two-side), n=3 per group, two independent.** P < 0.01). In (c-f) x-axis indicates cell lines and y-axis indicates % of cell death obtained by Cell-Titer Glo assay.

Supplementary Figure 4. Comparison of the effect of knockout in pooled CRISPR screen to synergy scores in drug combinations

Pearson correlation between -Log10(RRA|neg) and median ZIP in PRKDCi (a), KEAP1i (b), HDAC2i (c), and METi (d). Associated data sets are "Extended Data Table 11 for F5k and others". Green line was plotted based on Pearson correlation. Shade bands are pointwise 95% CI.

С

m

Supplementary Figure 5. Summary of dense cisplatin-cabozantinib combinations in all cell lines.

(a - r) 18 panels for combination of cisplatin and cabozantinib in all 18 cell lines. a) AC16, b) BE2C, c) BJ-TERT, d) CHP212, e) GIMEN, f) GM12878, g) HCT116, h) HKE293T, i) KELLY, j) MHHNB11, k) NGP, l) RH30, m) SKES1, n) SKMEL2, o) SKNAS, p) SKNFI, q) SKNSH, r) TGW. Dose-response curves for each single-agent (top left), normalized cell death matrix (top middle), synergy matrix (top right; Note: units are δ ZIP), IC₅₀ values of each single-agent (lower left), barplots corresponding to maximum synergy (lower middle; Note: dashed lines indicate expected values under additivity (black) or Bliss independence (red)), and scatterplot of cell death vs. synergy (lower right) for all 18 cell lines used in dense drug-drug screens.

е

Supplementary Figure 6. Summary of dense doxorubicin-AZD7648 combinations in all cell lines.

(a - r) 18 panels for combination of doxorubicin and AZD7648 in all 18 cell lines. a) AC16, b) BE2C, c) BJ-TERT, d) CHP212, e) GIMEN, f) GM12878, g) HCT116, h) HKE293T, i) KELLY, j) MHHNB11, k) NGP, l) RH30, m) SKES1, n) SKMEL2, o) SKNAS, p) SKNFI, q) SKNSH, r) TGW. Dose-response curves for each single-agent (top left), normalized cell death matrix (top middle), synergy matrix (top right; Note: units are δ ZIP), IC₅₀ values of each single-agent (lower left), barplots corresponding to maximum synergy (lower middle; Note: dashed lines indicate expected values under additivity (black) or Bliss independence (red)), and scatterplot of cell death vs. synergy (lower right) for all 18 cell lines used in dense drug-drug screens.

С

е

Supplementary Figure 7. Summary of dense JQAD1-panobinostat combinations in all cell lines.

(a - r) 18 panels for combination of JQAD1 and panobinostat in all 18 cell lines. a) AC16, b) BE2C, c) BJ-TERT, d) CHP212, e) GIMEN, f) GM12878, g) HCT116, h) HKE293T, i) KELLY, j) MHHNB11, k) NGP, l) RH30, m) SKES1, n) SKMEL2, o) SKNAS, p) SKNFI, q) SKNSH, r) TGW. Dose-response curves for each single-agent (top left), normalized cell death matrix (top middle), synergy matrix (top right; Note: units are δ ZIP), IC₅₀ values of each single-agent (lower left), barplots corresponding to maximum synergy (lower middle; Note: dashed lines indicate expected values under additivity (black) or Bliss independence (red)), and scatterplot of cell death vs. synergy (lower right) for all 18 cell lines used in dense drug-drug screens.

Supplementary Figure 8. Summary of dense topotecan-dimethly fumarate combinations in all cell lines.

(a - r) 18 panels for combination of topotecan and dimethyl fumarate in all 18 cell lines. a) AC16, b) BE2C, c) BJ-TERT, d) CHP212, e) GIMEN, f) GM12878, g) HCT116, h) HKE293T, i) KELLY, j) MHHNB11, k) NGP, l) RH30, m) SKES1, n) SKMEL2, o) SKNAS, p) SKNFI, q) SKNSH, r) TGW. Dose-response curves for each single-agent (top left), normalized cell death matrix (top middle), synergy matrix (top right; Note: units are δ ZIP), IC₅₀ values of each single-agent (lower left), barplots corresponding to maximum synergy (lower middle; Note: dashed lines indicate expected values under additivity (black) or Bliss independence (red)), and scatterplot of cell death vs. synergy (lower right) for all 18 cell lines used in dense drug-drug screens. BE2C

GIMEN

| Nuclei | γH2AX | _pPRKDC |
|--------|-------|---------|
| | | |
| | _ | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

GIMEN

b

Supplementary Figure 9. DNA damages in BE2C and GIMEN

After 72 hr vehicle or drug treatment, γ H2AX and phosphorylated PRKDC were visualized by the representatives (a, 3 imgaes per vehicle or treatment, two independent, scale bar 100µm) and tail moment was visualized by the representatives (b, 5 images per vehile or treatment, two independent, scale bar 20µm).

Supplementary Figure 10. Cell cycle analysis in BE2C and GIMEN

After 48 hr serum starvation, the cells were arrested at G0/G1 (a) and without cell synchronization (b), followed by vehicle or drug treatment for 72 hr (n=3 per group (veh or drug treatment)). After 72 hr, the cells were analyzed by FACS.

b

Supplementary Figure 11. NHEJ activity in BE2C and GIMEN

(a) Line plot showing the results of a cell-based assay for NHEJ using i-GFP quantifying the activity of NHEJ (y axis) in BE2C and GIMEN cells over 72h (x axis) at 12h intervals (Data presented as mean \pm SEM, n=25 of relative intensity of green per group (vehicle, doxorubicin, AZD7648, and combo), two independent).

(b) Images showing the changes in i-GFP, an indicator of NHEJ 72 hr after vehicle or drug treatment.

Supplementary Figure 12. Flow cytometry of GFP negative cells in Cas9 expressing cell lines

Comparing cell population with GFP low or negative in CT-A and CT-B directly provides Cas9 activity (see Methods). Associated data sets are "Extended Data Table 15 Cas9 activity.xlsx"

а

b

Supplementary Figure 13. Dose response of 8 drugs in 18 Cas9 expressing cell lines

(a-c) Dose dependent curves of 8 drugs and 18 Cas9 expressing cell lines to determine IC_{20} - IC_{30} for CRISPR screen.

Supplementary Figure 14. Cisplatin-DNA adduct

а

(a) Dot blot of cisplatin-DNA adduct. (b) Measured intensity of each dot. DMSO-HCl overcomes instability of cisplatin in normal saline and activity loss of cisplatin in DMSO alone.

Supplementary Figure 15. FACS strategies

(a) FACS strategy for figure 6e and supplementary figure 7. Single cells were isolated by gating PI_dead cells-W vs. PI_dead cells-A (left). % of cell cycle phase was measured in PI_dead-A vs. count (right).

(b, c) FACS strategy for supplementary figure 9. RFP positive cells were isolated by gating RFP-A vs. SSC-A (left). GFP-low area was measured in RFP-A vs. GFP-A (right). (b) and (c) are CT-Active (CT-A, see Methods) and CT-background (CT-B, see Methods), respectively.