

Figure S1. *DKO* mice develop hepatic steatosis, related to Figure 2. (A) Macroscopic view of representative livers. (B) Liver/body weight ratios and liver weight were compared (n=6). (C, D, E) Hepatic and serum triglycerides, free fatty acids and cholesterol levels were determined and compared among 2-month-old mice (n=6). (F) mRNA levels of key genes in lipid metabolism was determined using qPCR and compared among 1-month-old mice (n=5). (G) 1-month-old WT and DKO mice were fed high fat diet for 1 month. Hepatic triglycerides were measured and compared among normal chow (NC) and high fat diet (HFD) fed WT and DKO mice (n=5~6). Data are shown as means \pm S.D. (A-F) *, **, or *** indicates *SKO*, *PKO* or *DKO* vs. *WT*. \$, \$\$, or \$\$\$ indicates *DKO* vs. *SKO*. # or #### indicates *DKO* vs. *PKO*. *, \$ or # indicates p<0.05. ** or \$\$ indicates p<0.01. ***, \$\$\$ or #### indicates p<0.05.



Figure S2. Dual deletion of *Shp2* and *Pten* in hepatocytes leads to early-onset NASH, related to Figure 3. (A) Hepatic bile acid levels were determined and compared (n=6). (B) mRNA level of *Cyp7a1* was determined by qPCR and compared (n=5). (C) Cyp7a1 was determined by immunoblot in liver lysates. (D) mRNA levels of secretory factors and related receptors were determined by qPCR and compared (n=5). (E) Analysis of toxicogenomics changes in *DKO* livers. Bar chart was generated using IPA-Tox® with microarray data (*DKO* vs. *WT*). Toxicology changes related to liver were highlighted. All samples used in this figure were obtained from 2-month-old mice. (A, **B, D)** Data are shown as means \pm S.D. *, **, or *** indicates *SKO*, *PKO* or *DKO* vs. *WT*. \$ or \$\$\$\$ indicates *DKO* vs. *SKO*. ### indicates *DKO* vs. *PKO*. * or \$ indicates *p*<0.05. ** indicates *p*<0.01. ***, \$\$\$ or ### indicates *p*<0.001. (**F-J**) 2~3-month-old *WT* (*Pten2*^{fl/fl}:*Alb-Cre*⁻) were infected with AAV-GFP or AAV-Cre. One week after infection, mice were I.P. with olive oil or CCL4 twice a week for 4 weeks. (**F**) Expression of *Shp2* and *Pten* was examined by immunoblot analysis of liver lysates. (**G, H**) Right, Picro-Sirius Red staining (**G**) and F4/80 (**H**) immunostaining of liver sections. Left, quantification of percentage of positive Sirius Red and F4/80 staining area (n=3~4). (**I**) Serum ALT was measured and compared (n=3~ 4). (**J**) Spleen/body weight ratios were compared (n=3~ 4). Data are presented as Mean±SD. (**p*<0.05, ** *p*<0.01, *** *p*<0.001)



Figure S3. Microscopic view of representative tumors in *MUP-uPA* mice, related to Figure 4. Data are from *MUP-uPA* mice 5 months after transplantation with *DKO* hepatocytes. (A) Representative H&E and SOX9 staining on sections of tumors. (B) H&E and SOX9 immunostaining on lung sections.



Figure S4. Lenalidomide treatment reduces liver TIC population in *DKO* mice, related to Figure 5. Left, representative co-immunostaining of CD44v6/cJun on liver sections. Right, quantification of cJun, CD44v6 and cJun/CD44v6 positive cells (n=3). Lena: lenalidomide. Data are shown as means \pm S.D.. * indicates p<0.05. ** indicates p<0.01.



Figure S5. TAM67 overexpression does not suppress NASH in *DKO* mice, related to Figure 6. (A) mRNA levels of cJun, cFos, JunB and JunD downstream targets were determined by qPCR and compared between mice infected with AAV-GFP or AAV-TAM67 (n = 4). (B) Left, representative co-immunostaining of CD44v6/SOX9 on liver sections from *SKO*, *PKO* and *DKO* mice infected with AAV-GFP or AAV-TAM67. Right, quantification of CD44v6/SOX9 positive cells (n=4). (C, D) TAM67 expression was determined by immunoblot analysis of liver lysates. (E) Top, immunostaining for F4/80, Picro-Sirius Red and Oil-Red-O staining were performed on liver sections from mice infected with AAV-GFP or AAV-TAM67. Bottom, quantification of percentage of positive F4/80, Sirius Red, and Oil-Red-O staining area (n=5). (F, G) Liver triglyceride and serum ALT levels were determined and compared between mice infected with AAV-GFP or AAV-TAM67 (n=6). (H) Immunostaining for Survivin was performed on liver sections from mice infected with AAV-GFP or AAV-TAM67. Data are shown as means \pm S.D.. * indicates p < 0.05. ** indicates p < 0.01. *** indicates p < 0.001.



Figure S6. Analysis of SHP2 and PTEN expression in HCC patients, related to Figure 7. (A) Expression of SHP2 and PTEN was analyzed by immunostaining and compared in 45 pairs of human HCC and tumor-surrounding tissuearray samples. Liver cancer tissue array (LV1504) was purchased from US Biomax (T: tumor; S: tumor-surrounding tissue). (B) Tissue microarray (TMA) of paired human HCC tumor and tumor-surrounding tissue were stained for SHP2 or PTEN and scanned with Hamamatsu Slide Scanner (Microscopy Core, UCSD) (20X objective was used). Representative TMA images are shown here. Score: 0: negative staining; 1: weak staining; 2: moderate staining; 3: strong staining. (C) 3x3 matrix representation of PTEN and SHP2 status in tumor and tumor surrounding tissues.



Figure S7. Analysis of SHP2, PTEN and SOX9 expression in NASH or HCC patients, correlated to Figure 7. (A-B) Expression of PTEN (A) and SHP2 (B) was analyzed by immunostaining and compared in NAFL, NASH12 (less severe NASH patients) and NASH34 (more severe NASH patients) human patients (n=5). Representative images are shown here. Scores from 0 to 3 were given to each sample with 0: negative staining; 1: weak staining; 2: moderate staining; 3: strong staining. Data are shown as means \pm S.D.. p-value was calculated using one-way ANOVA. (C)Expression of SOX9 was analyzed by immunostaining and compared in NAFL, NASH12 and

NASH34 (NAFL: simple steatosis; NASH12 with stage 1-2 fibrosis; and NASH34: NASH with stage 3-4 fibrosis) human patients (n=4~5). Data are shown as means \pm S.D.. *, p<0.05. **, p<0.01. (**D**) Expression of SHP2, PTEN and SOX9 was analyzed by immunostaining and compared in 350 pairs of human HCC samples.

See also Table S6.

Table S1, related to Figure 1, Tumor incidences in mice of various genotypes						
Genotype Age (mo) of NO. of mice Tumor			Tumor			
WT	1-18	60	Not observed			
ѕко	1-11	37	Not observed			
	12	6	HCA (2)			
	18	7	HCA (6)			
	1-3	13	Not observed			
	4-6	15	Not observed			
PKO	7	12	Bile ductal hyperplasia (6);HCA (3); ICC (1)			
PKU	9	7	HCA (4);ICC (4)			
	12	11	HCA (11);ICC (11)			
	13-16	7	HCA (7); ICC (7); HCC (3);HCC/ICC (2)			
DKO	1-2	11	Not observed			
	4-5	9	HCA (6); HCC (2)			
	7	10	HCA (10); ICC (2); HCC (6);HCC/ICC (2)			
	12	11	HCA (11);ICC (9); HCC (9);HCC/ICC (9);lung metastasis (3)			

Table S2 , related to Figure 5, Oncogene with altered expression						
ILMN_Gene	Fold change	P-value				
cJun	2.55	0.005				
Kras	1.33	0.009				
Nras	1.58	0.009				
Lmo2	3.83	0.018				
Tpr	1.74	0.021				
Bcl2	1.32	0.042				
Pparg	1.16	0.043				
Mdm2	1.06	0.047				
Ccnd1	2.29	0.047				

Table S3, related to Figure 7, HCC patients information							
Characteristics	Parameters	Number		P-Value	Statistical Method		
		SHP2 ^{Low}	SHP2 ^{High}				
SHP2 staining score	Mean (SD)	0.65 (0.42)	1.73 (0.40)	1.94E-72	Two-tailed Student's t test		
Overall Survival Time (Months)	Mean (SD)	34.3 (14.4)	38.2 (12.8)	0.0126			
Disease-Free Survival Time (Months)	Mean (SD)	29.3 (19.8)	34.2 (19.6)	0.0301			
Sov distribution	Male	193	104	0.5005			
Sex distribution	Female	37	16	0.3993			
	Range	1078	1679				
Age (years)	Median	53	53	0.4949			
	Mean (SD)	52.28 (11.29)	53.17 (12.00)				
	N/A	6	3				
HBV	HBV (-)	33	18	0.9996			
	HBV (+)	191	99				
Cirrhosis	Cirrhosis (-)	24	16	0.5274			
011110313	Cirrhosis (+)	206	104	0.0214	v2 tests		
	T1	151	91				
TNM stage	T2	73	27	0.1463	A2 10010		
	T3	6	2				
	N/A	1	0				
	Grade1	3	3				
Differentiation stage	Grade2	162	92	0.3876			
	Grade3	63	24				
	Grade4	1	1				
	N/A	4	1				
Tumor Number	Single	201	105	0.9864			
	Multiple	25	14				
Tumor Size (cm)	Mean (SD)	5.6 (3.7)	4.6 (3.2)	0.0072			
AFP (ng/ml)	Mean (SD)	6773 (16409)	2672 (10421)	0.0133	Two-tailed Student's t test		
ALT(UI/L)	Mean (SD)	65.6 (110.7)	45.9 (38.4)	0.06			

Table S4, related to Figure 7, HCC patients information						
Characteristics	Characteristics Parameters Number			P-Value	Statistical Method	
		PTENLow	PTENHigh			
PTEN staining score	Mean (SD)	0.16 (0.24)	1.34 (0.50)	3.52E-93	Two-tailed Student's t test	
Overall Survival Time (Months)	Mean (SD)	33.6 (14.5)	40.2 (11.3)	6.79E-05		
Disease-Free Survival Time (Months)	Mean (SD)	28.8 (17.9)	36.3 (23.6)	0.0013		
Sex distribution	Male	193	91	0 1061		
	Female	41	10	0.1001		
	Range	1379	1679			
Age (years)	Median	53	52	0.3112		
	Mean (SD)	53.1 (11.1)	51.7 (11.6)			
	N/A	8	1			
HBV	HBV (-)	35	15] 1		
	HBV (+)	191	85			
Cirrhosis	Cirrhosis (-)	26	14	0.5960		
Cirriosis	Cirrhosis (+)	208	87	0.5009		
	T1	157	75		χ2 tests	
TNM stage	T2	71	25	0.345		
	T3	6	1			
	N/A	1	0			
	Grade1	1	5			
Differentiation stage	Grade2	170	74	0.0251		
	Grade3	60	22]		
	Grade4	2	0			
	N/A	3	2			
Tumor Number	Single	207	87	0.7973		
	Multiple	24	12			
Tumor Size (cm)	Mean (SD)	5.4 (3.7)	5.0 (3.3)	0.407		
AFP (ng/ml)	Mean (SD)	6020 (15584)	2957 (10817)	0.0733	Two-tailed Student's t test	
ALT (UI/L)	Mean (SD)	63.5 (104.6)	49.1 (66.2)	0.2		

Table S5, related to Figure 7, HCC patients information

Table S6, related to Figure S7, NAFL and NASH patients information						
Characteristics	Parameters	Number			P-Value	Statistical Method
		NAFL	NASH12	NASH34		
Sev distribution	Male	3	2	0	0 1225	χ2 tests
Sex distribution	Female	2	3	5	0.1225	
	Range	3365	3566	5365	0.3462	
Age (years)	Median	47	61	60		
	Mean (SD)	48.4 (12.5)	52 (15.2)	59.4 (4.4)		
BMI	Mean (SD)	30.8 (4.1)	31.6 (4.0)	29.5 (5.8)	0.785	
ALT (UI/L)	Mean (SD)	41.8 (19.5)	39.4 (22.1)	45 (21.45)	0.9155	One-way ANOVA
Serum glucose (mg/dL)	Mean (SD)	94.8 (13.8)	100.2 (24.4)	152 (77.9)	0.1551	
Serum insulin (mIU/L)	Mean (SD)	17.4 (6.3)	23.6 (6.5)	27.2 (15.3)	0.3447	
Serum triglycerides (mg/dL)	Mean (SD)	183.6 (74.6)	149.4 (55.8)	142.5 (91.2)	0.6665	

h

 Table S7, List of primers and antibodies