

Table S1 Mouse Tumor Samples - Related to Figure 6

Type of Sample	Protocol	Area	Time from EP	Cell Line Created*	ChIP-Seq	pDonor variant
K27M-1	10X 3' scRNA-seq	Disseminated	150 days	X	X	pDonor-H3F3A-K27M-EGFP pTV1 Pdgfra D842V COTv1 Trp53-V5 WPRE
K27M-2	10X 3' scRNA-seq	Striatal	106 days	X	X	pDonor-smFP-mycBRIGHT- pTV1 Pdgfra D842V COTv1 Trp53 270h-P2ACO3-H3F3A K27M WPRE
K27M-3	10X 3' scRNA-seq	Striatal	149 days	X	X	pDonor-H3F3A-K27M-EGFP pTV1 Pdgfra D842V COTv1 Trp53-V5 WPRE
K27M-4	10X snATACseq	Disseminated	222 days†			pDonor-smFP-mycBRIGHT- pTV1 Pdgfra D842V COTv1 Trp53 270h-P2ACO3-H3F3A K27M WPRE
K27M-5	10X snATACseq	Striatal	251 days†			pDonor-smFP-mycBRIGHT- pTV1 Pdgfra D842V COTv1 Trp53 270h-P2ACO3-H3F3A K27M WPRE

*-Cell lines created from parallel processing of additional GFP+ cells. All 10X scRNA- or snATAC-sequencing was done acutely from the dissociated brain tissue.

†-Initial EPed population size was decreased compared with typical results in this group leading to increased tumor formation span

Table S3. Comparison of approaches for in vivo genetic manipulation - Related to STAR METHODS

Method	GEMM	Standard EP	Transposition-mediated EP	Virus	CRISPR Cas9/Cpf1	HITI	SLENDR	Base writing	MADR
Time for engineering and generation	Months	~2 weeks per plasmid	~2 weeks per plasmid	>4-6 weeks	~2 weeks per plasmid	~2 weeks (plasmid); months (virus)	~2 weeks (plasmid); months (virus)	~2 weeks per plasmid	~2 weeks per plasmid
Copy number	1-2 per knock-in	Highly Variable	Highly Variable (up to hundreds)	Variable but likely less than EP	1-2 but not readily controllable	1-2 but not readily controllable	1-2 but not readily controllable	1-2 but not readily controllable	1-2 depending on zygosity of recipient
Breeding	More complex for conditional alleles	Not necessary	Not necessary	Only necessary for RCAS/Tva	Not necessary	Not necessary	Not necessary	Not necessary	1 line per targeted stain
Stability of Expression	Generally stable depending on locus silencing	Prone to dilution and/or silencing	Prone to silencing and insertional effects	Prone to silencing and insertional effects	Expression dependent on mutation site	Expression dependent on insertion site or fusion partner	Expression dependent on insertion site or fusion partner	Expression dependent on mutation site	Generally stable depending on locus silencing
Payload	Limited by targeting construct*	Typically governed by plasmid limits*	Typically governed by plasmid limits*	Limited to viral payloads	Typically governed by plasmid limits but viral variant is subject to viral payloads*	Typically governed by plasmid limits but viral variant is subject to viral payloads*	Typically governed by plasmid limits but viral variant is subject to viral payloads*	Typically governed by plasmid limits but viral variant is subject to viral payloads*	Typically governed by plasmid limits*
Focality	Depends on cis regulatory elements	Focality depends on electrode orientation	Focality depends on electrode orientation	Diffusion pattern unidirectional from injection site	Focality depends on electrode orientation (plasmid version) or viral spread (AAV/LV)	Focality depends on electrode orientation (plasmid version) or viral spread (AAV)	Focality depends on electrode orientation (plasmid version) or viral spread (AAV)	Focality depends on electrode orientation (plasmid version) or viral spread (AAV/LV)	Focality depends on electrode orientation
Efficiency	Typically 100%	100%	100%	100%	approaching 100% but off-targets and heterogeneity unclear; largely LOF	Typically <20% but requires minicircle DNA production to reach this	Typically <5%	up to 80% but off-targets and heterogeneity unclear especially when multiplexing	Can be titered to approach 100% insertion**

Other notes	Least amenable to mixing and matching mutations	Plasmids rarely integrate or integrate unpredictably	Random insertions, supraphysiological expression, can be silenced, in and out hopping of transgenes	Random insertions, potential supraphysiological expression, can be silenced, can incite cellular immunity, RCAS/Tva models often use injection of >50,000 avian virus producing cells--causing potential immune interactions and trauma	immunogenic, hard to definitively lineage trace, low HDR efficiency	Multiplexing mutant alleles challenging	Multiplexing mutant alleles challenging	immunogenicity unclear, challenging to definitively lineage trace mutant cells	Transgenes can potentially hop in and out before Flp/Cre dilution; potentially compatible/complementary with virtually all methods (Orthogonal to CRISPR/Cas variants; HITI; Slendr; Base writers)
-------------	---	--	---	---	---	---	---	--	--

*-BAC DNA can be utilized

**-this decreases total cell yields

See text for further details