## **Supplementary Methods**

The sequences of *IKKε* and *CHEK1* shRNAs used in validation experiments:

IKK $\varepsilon$  #1 (B6)(Hsu and Kim et al 2012): GAGAAGTTCGTCTCGGTCTAT

IKK $\varepsilon$  #2 (E1)(Hsu and Kim et al 2012): GAGGAGTGCGTGCAGAAGTAT CHEK1 #1: GAAGGCAATATCCAATATTTA

> CHEK1 #2: GCTGCTATGTTGACATTATTC CHEK1 #3: GCTCAGAGATTCTTCCATCAA

#### **shRNA library analysis algorithm**

### **Estimation when both experiments have at least one hit in one replicate**

We assume that the number of counts on a given shRNA *i* of a given replicate *j* is distributed according to Poisson distribution with mean itself a random variable coming from a Gamma distribution. This results in the negative binomial probability distribution (Lawless 1987).

$$
P(N_{ij} = k | a_i, \mu_{ij}) = \frac{\Gamma(k + a_i^{-1})}{k! \Gamma(a_i^{-1})} \left(\frac{a_i \mu_{ij}}{1 + a_i \mu_{ij}}\right)^k \left(\frac{1}{1 + a_i \mu_{ij}}\right)^{a_i^{-1}}(1)
$$

Where  $a_i > 0$  represents the degree of technical variability between the replicates of a given shRNA, and  $\mu_{ij}$  represents the expected mean.

We parameterize  $\mu_{ii}$  as

$$
\mu_{ij} \equiv T_{ij}e^{s_i}
$$

where  $T_{ij}$  is a normalization factor that represents the loading of a particular shRNA pool in a given replicate, and  $s_i$  represents the relative biological representation of the given shRNA on a log scale.

To estimate  $T_{ij}$  we begin by defining a set of well expressed shRNAs

$$
S \equiv \{i:\text{median}(N_{ij}) > 10\}
$$

Then for each shRNA in a given pool P, we fix.

$$
(T_{ij}|i \in P) = \text{mean}_{i \in S \text{ and } i \in P}(N_{ij})
$$

We propose estimating  $s_i$  via maximum likelihood, such that  $\mu_{ij} \equiv T_{ij} s_i$  satisfies

$$
\sum_j \frac{N_{ij} - \mu_{ij}}{1 + a_i \mu_{ij}} = 0,
$$

and estimating  $a_i$  by methods of moments such that

$$
\sum_{j} \frac{(N_{ij} - \mu_{ij})^2}{\mu_{ij}(1 + a_i \mu_{ij})} = n - 1
$$

where *n* is the number of replicates.

In practice solve these equations by performing alternating Newton Rhaphson approximations. Starting with setting

$$
\hat{s}_i^0 = \log \left( \frac{\sum_j N_{ij}}{\sum_j T_{ij}} \right), \qquad \hat{a}_i^0 = 0
$$

then iteratively defining

$$
\hat{a}_i^{k+1} = \hat{a}_i^k - \frac{\sum_j \left( \frac{(N_{ij} - \hat{\mu}_{ij}^k)^2}{\hat{\mu}_{ij}^k (1 + a_i \hat{\mu}_{ij}^k)} \right) - n + 1}{\sum_j \left( \frac{N_{ij} - \hat{\mu}_{ij}^k}{1 + \hat{a}_i^k \hat{\mu}_{ij}^k} \right)^2}
$$

and

$$
s_i^{k+1} = s_{ij}^k + \frac{\sum_j \left( \frac{(N_{ij} - \hat{\mu}_{ij}^k)}{(1 + \hat{\alpha}_i^k \hat{\mu}_{ij}^k)} \right)}{\sum_j \left( \frac{(1 + \hat{\alpha}_i^k \hat{\mu}_{ij}^k) \mu_{ij}^k + (N_{ij} - \hat{\mu}_{ij}^k) \hat{\alpha}_i^k \hat{\mu}_{ij}^k}{(1 + \hat{\alpha}_i^k \hat{\mu}_{ij}^k)^2} \right)}
$$

Where  $\hat{\mu}_{ij}^k = T_{ij} \exp(\hat{s}_i^k)$ . The exception to this rule is if  $a_i^{k+1}$  is negative we set  $a_i^{k+1} = a_i^{k+1}/10$ . We continue this iteration until successive estimates for  $s_i^k$  and  $a_i^k$  are within 0.001 of each other, or 500 iterations has elapsed. In the later case we flag the estimate as "Bad" and ignore it. Since we use a maximum likelihood estimate for  $s_i$  it should asymptotically be normally distributed with mean equal to the true  $s_i$  and variance error given by

$$
Var(\hat{s}_i) \approx \sum_j \frac{\hat{\mu}_{ij}}{1 - \hat{a}_i \hat{\mu}_{ij}} \tag{2}
$$

So then give two experiments if we take the difference between their estimates for  $s_i$  this will be the log ratio for the difference in presentation of the shRNA between the two experiments, and it should be normally distributed with variance equal to the sum of the variances of the individual estimates. From this we can derive *p*-values and Confidence intervals for this log ratio. Then the exponential of the confidence intervals becomes the confidence interval for the ratio.

The reported relative mean is

Realative mean = median<sub>j</sub>(T<sub>ij</sub>)exp(
$$
\hat{s}_i
$$
),

where the median is taken over all replicates in all experiments in the study.

### **Estimation when one of the experiments has 0 counts**

The above analysis breaks down when one of the experiments has no counts in any of the replicates for a given experiment. If both experiments have 0 counts, then there is clearly no significant effect and we set the *p*-value to 1. However in the case that one of the experiments has positive number of counts and the other has zero counts in all replicates we need to estimate the significance and magnitude of this effect since this may indicate a strongly active RNAI.

For simplicity of exposition let us assume the that first experiment resulted in a model with estimated parameters  $\hat{s}_i$  and  $\hat{a}_i$ . Under the null hypothesis we assume that the second experiment has the same parameterization. We calculate the *p*-value for the difference between the two experiments as the probability that a model with the values  $\hat{s}_i$  and  $\hat{a}_i$  would produce no counts in the second experiment. So that for  $\hat{\mu}_{ij} = T_{ij} \exp(\hat{s}_i)$  with  $T_{ij}$  estimated as above within experiment 2 we obtain the following estimate of the *p*-value from equation (1).

$$
p_i = \prod_{j=1}^n P(N_{ij} = 0 | \hat{a}_i, \hat{\mu}_{ij}) = \prod_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{1 + \hat{a}_i \hat{\mu}_{ij}}\right)^{\hat{a}_i^{-1}} \tag{3}
$$

From this we work backwards to come up with approximations for the fold change, confidence interval and prevalence within experiment 2. We start by assuming that we have a situation similar to the one we had when calculating the *p*-value for the case in which both experiments had positive numbers of counts, and denoting the unknown prevalence in experiment 2 by  $t_i$ . The test statistic would be

$$
Z_i = \frac{\hat{s}_i - \hat{t}_i}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(\hat{s}_i) + \text{Var}(\hat{t}_i)}}
$$

Which would be asymptotically distributed as a standard normal. Since we estimated the *p*-value in equation 3, we can write,

$$
Z_i \approx \Phi^{-1}(p_i)
$$

If we make the additional assumption that  $Var(\hat{s}_i) = Var(\hat{t}_i)$ , we calculate that

$$
\hat{t}_i \approx \hat{s}_i - \Phi^{-1}(p_i) \sqrt{2 \text{Var}(\hat{s}_i)}
$$

From this we can calculate all of the remaining statistics as in the previous case.

#### **Reference**

**Quantitative PCR** One microgram of total RNA was converted to cDNA using iScript cDNA Synthesis Kit (Bio-Rad, 170-8890) in a 20 µl reaction. cDNA was then diluted to 1:5 in  $H_2O$  and 2  $\mu$ l was used in each 20  $\mu$ l real-time PCR reaction (QuantiTect SYBR Green PCR Kit, Qiagen, 204143). Quantification was performed in triplicates by ViiA7 Real-Time PCR System (Applied Biosystems). Each mRNA expression level was normalized by that of GAPDH. The QuantiTect primers IKBKE (QT00040201), CHEK1 (QT00006734), GAPDH (QT00079247) were purchased from Qiagen.

**P53 sequencing** Total RNAs were isolated from A2780, HeyA8, Ovcar8, and Igorv1 using RNeasy mini kit (QIagen). cDNA was synthesized as described above. p53 gene was amplified using TaKaRa LA Taq kit with p53 specific primers;

> Forward: CTTCCCTGGATTGGCAGCCAGACTG Reverse: CCCAAAATGGCAGGGGAGGGAGAG.

PCR products were purified by QIAquick PCR purification kit (Qiagen) and the entire p53 was sequenced at both directions using 4 primers including forward, middle forward, middle reverse, and reverse. The sequences of the middle primers are following;

middle-forward: GTCTGGCCCCTCCTCAGCAT **CTTAT** 

middle-reverse: GTGATGATGGTGAGGATGGGC **CTCCG** 

# **Supplementary Figures and Tables**



by bar-code sequencing after 4, 8 doublings

**Supplementary Figure S1: Human Kinome shRNA screening in shRNA-mediated IKKε matched ovarian cancer cells A.** Schematic diagrams of dual shRNA screening steps and time frames are shown. Either IKKε #1 shRNA or negative control shRNA ( $E_{1/2}$ ) of pRSM-LYT2 (CD-8 $\alpha$ ) was stably infected to establish IKK $\epsilon$  isogenic cell lines.  $E_{1/2}$  shRNA contains IKK $\epsilon$  E1 shRNA sequences without its complementary sequences. pRSMX-PG contains a puromycin resistant gene fused to GFP. This vector is utilized to express shRNA library. Experiments were conducted in 4 replicates. To create a matched cell line pair of IKKε, a bicistronic vector containing either IKKε or negative control shRNA, co-expressed with the transmembrane and extracellular domains of the mouse T-cell surface glycoprotein CD8α, was stably introduced to model IKKε deficiency in ovarian cancer cells. The cell surface expression of mouse CD8α allowed for physical selection of transduced cells, without altering native signaling pathways due to its lack of intracellular signaling domain. Positively transduced cells were isolated using MACS separation columns with mouse CD8α-specific microbeads. In the matched pair of Ovcar5 cells, greater than 94% purity for CD8α positive cells was achieved. After recovery from beads purification, the bicistronic shRNA library containing a puromycin selectable marker fused with GFP was introduced. After second transduction, cells were selected under puromycin allowing approximately two doublings. The purity was 96–99% based on GFP signal at the end of puromycin selection.



**Supplementary Figure S2: Expression levels of p53, IKKε, and CHEK1 among 6 ovarian cancer cell lines.** The status of p53 was confirmed by sequencing the mRNAs from each cell line. HeyA8 and Ovcar8 carry P72R mutation and 7 amino acids deletions of Y126-132K, respectively, while A2780 and Igrov1 have p53wt and p53Y126C, respectively, as reported previously. Of note, Igrov1 is reported to have CHEK1 (E223fs) mutation although the full length protein was detected. GAPDH was used as a loading control.



**Supplementary Figure S3: Determination of CI values of IKKε and CHEK1 co-inhibition.** CI values for actual experimental points were calculated by CompuSyn from the data as shown in figure 4B.



**Supplementary Figure S4: Cell cycle analysis after treatment with chemical inhibitors and shRNA knockdowns. (A)**  Cell cycle was analyzed after treatment with IKK $\epsilon$  and CHEK1 inhibitors in ovarian cancer cell lines. Cells were seeded at  $4-5 \times 10^5$  per 60 mm plate, 24 hours prior to addition of indicated inhibitors, and treated for 16 hours at final concentration of 2 μM (BX795) and/or 0.5 μM (PF477736) prepared in fresh medium.  $G_0/G_1$ , S, and  $G_2/M$  phases were measured based on staining of APC-BrdU and 7-AAD by flow cytometry. (*Continued*)





**Supplementary Figure S4: (***Continued***) Cell cycle analysis after treatment with chemical inhibitors and shRNA knockdowns. (B)** IKKε and CHEK1 double knock-downed cells were selected and maintained in the presence of 25 μg/ml of mycophenolic acid and 2 μg/ml of puromycin. Upon completion of double selection, cells were recovered for 4 days and then seeded 24 hours prior to addition of BrdU. No visible difference among samples in cellular morphology was observed when cells were processed for cell cycle analysis.  $G_0/G_1$ , S, and  $G_2/M$  phases were measured based on staining of APC-BrdU and 7-AAD by flow cytometry.



**Supplementary Figure S5: Expression of IKKε and p21 in ovarian cancer cells and p21 knockdown in Ovcar5 cells. (A)**  The ovarian cancer cells were harvested for cytosolic and nuclear fractionation. GAPDH and H2B were used as cytosolic and nuclear markers, respectively. Samples equivalent to  $2 \times 10^5$  cells were loaded per lane. (B) The total lysates were prepared at 48 hour posttransfection in 2 independent experiments.

**Supplementary Table S1.** Sixty five shRNA targets identified by a cut-off with a fold change of  $\leq 0.7$ with a *p*-value of  $\leq 0.05$  in Ovcar5



(*Continued*)



**Supplementary Table S2.** Primer sequences to PCR-amplify bar-code sequences in shRNA library



(*Continued*)

