



Open Access This file is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made. In the cases where the authors are anonymous, such as is the case for the reports of anonymous peer reviewers, author attribution should be to 'Anonymous Referee' followed by a clear attribution to the source work. The images or other third party material in this file are included in the article's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

Editorial Note: This manuscript has been previously reviewed at another journal that is not operating a transparent peer review scheme. This document only contains reviewer comments and rebuttal letters for versions considered at *Nature Communications*.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer #1:

Remarks to the Author:

The authors have addressed my minor concerns from the initial submission.

Reviewer #2:

Remarks to the Author:

This is an impressive and interesting study that goes well beyond previous screens of the effects of EGFR mutations on activity and inhibitor sensitivity, by using a deep mutational scanning library and thoroughly characterizing signaling and inhibitor sensitivity. It is a nice study, very well put together and presented, and should be published in *Nature Communications* in this reviewer's opinion – both because of the impressive use of the technology and because (as the authors state) they have 'significantly expanded the universe of known functional EGFR variants' with an excellent body of work.

There is one issue that the authors should discuss, though, that may influence interpretation of some of the results. There are old data (PMID 2783462) showing that PC9 cells express TGF α , which activates EGFR, suggesting that the PC9 experiments here are performed in the context of a degree of autocrine EGFR signaling. This is absolutely not a problem for the study, potentially making it even more interesting, with some mutations uncovered possibly sensitizing to ligand activation (which is very relevant) rather than just activating. The point should be discussed, though, in my opinion, and may provide an additional dimension to some of the interpretation of the data. Also, are there any similar data for the other cell lines used? Or might this explain some of the differences seen between cells?

Reviewer #3:

Remarks to the Author:

The authors have satisfactorily addressed all of the questions raised in my initial review. I believe this paper represents an important contribution to the literature and is appropriate for *Nature Communications*.