### Figure S1. Related to Figure 1. CRISPR screen hits and molecular profiles.

(A) Gene set enrichment analysis (GSEA) shows the association between top hit genes and ribosomal genes in SUM159 cells.

(B) Top co-dependencies of *BRD4* in TNBC in DepMap. Genes are ranked by co-dependency score between *BRD4* and every other gene. Co-dependent and anti-dependent hits (cutoff = 0.3) are marked in orange and cyan, respectively.

(C) Top hit genes between CRISPR screen of untreated vs. JQ1-treated SUM149/SUM159 (x-axis) and co-dependencies of *BRD4* in TNBC in DepMap (y-axis). x-axis: log10(p-values); y-axis: co-dependency score. Significant resistance and synthetic lethal hits (p-value cutoff: 0.001, co-dependency score cutoff: 0.3) are marked in red and blue, respectively.

(D) Top process networks enriched in JQ1 synergistic and resistance CRISPR screen hits in SUM149 and SUM149R cells.

(E) Mutated genes detected in BBDI-resistant but not in parental SUM149 and SUM159 cells. Red highlight indicates mutated genes detected in both resistant cell lines.

(F) DNA methylation of CpG islands in SUM149 and SUM159 parental and JQ1-resistant cells. The box indicates the IQR, the line inside the box shows the median, and whiskers show the locations of 1.5 x IQR above the third quartile and 1.5 x IQR below the first quartile.

(G) Correlation plot between differentially methylated and expressed genes in the indicated cell lines.(H) Heatmap of histone mass spectrometry data in the indicated cell lines with and without JQ1 treatment.

(I) Heatmap of top process networks enriched in genes that are upregulated (red) or downregulated (blue) by RNA-seq in treated vs. untreated parental and BBDI-resistant cell lines and in untreated and treated resistant vs. parental cell lines.



### Figure S2. Related to Figure 1. CRISPR screen hits and molecular profiles.

(A) Heatmap of proteins identified in RPPA data by k-means clustering (k = 12). (B) Heatmap of top differentially regulated pathways in RPPA data.

(C) Heatmap of proteins from RPPA assay highly expressed exclusively in SUM159R cells (cluster 2), SUM149R cells (clusters 6, 7, and 9) and in both SUM149R and SUM159R cells (cluster 12).

(D) Average expression of all cell cycle proteins by RPPA in SUM149 and SUM159 parental and resistant cells with or without JQ1 treatment.

(E) Heatmap of CRISPR screen hits and their gene expression changes in SUM149 and SUM149R cells. Hits with gene expression fold changes greater than 2 in any paired comparison are shown.

(F) Heatmap of CRISPR screen hits and their gene expression changes in SUM159 and SUM159R cells. Hits with gene expression fold changes greater than 2 in any paired comparison are shown.

(G) Heatmap of BRD4 RIME data in SUM159 and SUM159R cells with and without JQ1 treatment, compared to untreated SUM159. Grey shows the missing data.

(H) Immunoblot analysis of total cell lysates (input) and BRD4 immunoprecipitates (IP) from SUM149 and SUM149R cells with and without 3h JQ1 (2 μM) treatment.

(I) Top process networks enriched in proteins bound to BRD4, comparing JQ1 vs. DMSO treatment in SUM149 and SUM149R and comparing SUM149R vs. SUM149 cells during JQ1 and DMSO treatment. (J) Heatmap of top CRISPR screen hits and their BRD4-binding changes in SUM159 and SUM159R cells in JQ1 compared to DMSO and in SUM159R compared to SUM159. Red and blue bars represent significant resistant and synthetic lethal hits (p-value < 0.001) in the CRISPR screen of SUM159 cells, respectively.



# Figure S3. Related to Figures 1 and 2. Validation of CRISPR data and Small Molecule Inhibitor screens.

(A) Normalized read counts for all sgRNAs in the CRISPR screen targeting *BRD2* and *CDK4* in SUM159R and SUM149R cells and targeting *BRD7* in SUM159 cells, before and after 5 passages of selection. Each color represents a unique gRNA. The sequence for each gRNA is indicated. gRNAs selected for further validation are marked as g1 and g2.

(B) Immunoblot analysis of *CDK4*, *BRD2*, and *BRD7* knockout (KO) single cell clones derived from SUM159 and SUM159R cell lines.

(C) Growth curves of scramble sgRNA, CDK4, BRD2, and BRD7 knockout single cell clones derived from SUM159 and SUM159R cell lines treated with JQ1 at the indicated concentrations.

(D) Immunoblot analysis of endogenous *CDK4* knockout (KO) single cell clones derived from SUM159 cell line expressing a TET-inducible sgRNA-insensitive *CDK4* grown in the presence (+dox) or absence (-dox) of doxycycline.

(E) Growth curves of *CDK4* knockout single cell clones expressing a TET-inducible sgRNA-insensitive *CDK4*, treated with JQ1 at indicated concentrations and grown in the presence (+dox) or absence (-dox) of doxycycline.

(F) Pathways targeted by each compound library.

(G) Dose-response curves for JQ1 in SUM149 and SUM159 parental and JQ1-resistant cells.

(H) The differential drug sensitivity was calculated as the difference between parental and JQ1-resistant cell lines in area under the dose-response curves (AUC) across 10 dilution points after 72 hours of treatment.

(I) Individual dose-response curves for the combination treatments of top hit drugs with JQ1 (2  $\mu$ M) in SUM149 and SUM149R cells. Statistical analysis of dose-curves was completed in GraphPad Prism 8 (nonlinear regression, variable slope, four parameters, bottom constant equal to 0, top constant equal to 1). LogIC50 values were compared with an extra sum-of-squares F Test.

(J) Immunoblot analysis of the indicated proteins in parental SUM149 and SUM159 and JQ1-resistant SUM149R and SUM159R cell lines following 24 hours treatment with flavopiridol (CDK inhibitor) or barasertib (HDAC inhibitor). The drug concentrations were IC80 values based on IC50 curves (flavopiridol: SUM149 and SUM149R cell lines 1 $\mu$ M, SUM159 0.1  $\mu$ M and SUM159R 0.2  $\mu$ M,

Barasertib: SUM149 and SUM149R cell lines  $1\mu$ M, SUM159 and SUM159R cell lines  $2\mu$ M).



# Figure S4. Related to Figures 3 and 4. Validation of synergy hits and BET6 BET bromodomain protein degrader.

(A) Synergy studies of JQ1 with palbociclib in a panel of TNBC cell lines in culture. Points represent paired values of drug concentrations assessed for synergism. The diagonal line signifies drug additivity. Points above and below the line represent antagonistic and synergistic drug combinations, respectively.
(B) Hematoxylin and eosin staining of SUM149R and SUM159R xenografts from mice treated with various compounds alone or combined with JQ1. Scale bars represent 50 μm.

(C) Immunofluorescence analysis of cleaved caspase-3 in SUM149R xenografts from mice treated with the indicated compounds alone or combined with JQ1. Scale bars show 50 µm.

(D) Immunofluorescence analysis of phospho-STAT3 levels in SUM150R xenografts.

(E) Tumor volumes of xenografts from mice treated with JQ1 and palbociclib alone and in combination. None of the differences were statistically significant.

(F) Hematoxylin and eosin staining of SUM159R xenografts and patient-derived xenografts IDC50 from mice treated with JQ1 and palbociclib, alone and in combination. Scale bars represent 50 µm.

(G) Immunofluorescence analysis of phospho-RB levels in SUM150R xenografts.

(H) Immunoblot analysis of BRD2, BRD4, BRD7, CDK4, CCND1, phospho-RB, and RB in SUM159 and SUM159R cells at different time points after JQ1 (2μM), palbociclib (1μM), and combination treatment.

(I) Chemical structures of JQ1, phthalimide, dBET1, and dBET6.

(J) Immunoblot analysis of BRD4 protein levels in SUM149R cells treated with 250 nM of dBET6.

(K) Heatmap of log<sub>2</sub> fold changes in gene expression after 2 and 6 hours of treatment with 250 nM of dBET6. Expression values were normalized to ERCC spike-ins to allow for cell count normalized quantification.

(L) Immunoblot analysis of RNA polymerase II phosphorylation levels at the indicated time points after treatment with 250 nM of dBET6.

(M) Tumor weights of SUM149R and SUM159R xenografts treated with JQ1 (50 mg/kg, daily) or dBET6 [10 mg/kg, once (qd) or twice (bid) daily].

(N) Hematoxylin-eosin and Ki67 staining of SUM149R and SUM159R xenografts from mice treated with JQ1 or dBET6. Scale bars represent 50 μm.



#### Figure S5. Related to Figure 5. Chromatin binding patterns of BRD2, BRD4, and BRD7.

(A) BRD4, BRD2 and H3K27ac chromatin binding peaks in promoter and enhancer regions in SUM149 cells. Enhancers were identified based on SUM149 H3K27ac ChIP-seq using the ROSE pipeline.

(B) Changes in BRD4, BRD2, and H3K27ac ChIP-seq chromatin binding peaks between JQ1-treated and untreated SUM149 cells (left panel) and between JQ1-treated resistant SUM149R and parental SUM149 cells (right panel). Outer violin indicates the entire distribution, inner violin (white) indicates the IQR, and "." and "+" indicate the median and mean, respectively.

(C) Pairwise correlations of changes of BRD4, BRD2, and H3K27ac chromatin binding peaks in promoter and enhancer regions, between treated (+JQ1) and untreated (-JQ1) SUM149 cells (left panel) and between JQ1 treated SUM149R and SUM149 cells (right panel).

(D) Correlation of CTCF binding with BRD2, BRD4, BRD7, and H3K27ac peaks in enhancer and promoter regions.

(E) Correlations of BRD4 chromatin binding peaks in promoter, enhancer, and super-enhancer (SE) regions and their gene expression changes, between treated (+JQ1) and untreated (-JQ1) SUM149 cells and between JQ1 treated SUM149R and SUM149 cells.

(F) Gene tracks depicting BRD4, BRD2, and H3K27ac signal at the *BRD2* and *CCND1* locus. *X*-axis shows position along the chromosome with gene structure below. *Y*-axis shows genomic occupancy in reads per million reads (RPM).

(G) Gene set enrichment analysis (GSEA) depicting the relationship between expression of genes in *BRD7* knockout (KO) cells and JQ1-resistant SUM159R cells, treated with DMSO. Genes are ranked by expression change between SUM159R and SUM159 cells, with upregulated genes in SUM159R cells on the left and downregulated genes in SUM159R cells on the right.

(H) Top process networks enriched in differentially expressed genes between *BRD7* knockout and scramble sgRNA in SUM159 cells. Red and blue indicates upregulated and downregulated pathways, respectively.

(I) Basal, luminal, and mesenchymal signature scores for SUM159 (WT) and SUM159 *BRD7* knockout (KO) cells.

(J) Association between chromatin changes based on ATAC-seq and gene expression changes in two *BRD7* KO clones compared with WT SUM159 cells. Upregulated and downregulated genes are shown in red and blue, respectively.

(K) Heatmap depicting correlation of ATAC-seq peaks between the indicated samples (SUM159 and SUM159R, BRD7 KO and WT cells) treated with DMSO (-) or JQ1 (+).

(L) TEAD motif enriched in ATAC-seq peaks gained in BRD7 KO cells compared to parental SUM159 WT cells associated with genes upregulated in BRD7 KO cells.



# Figure S6. Related to Figures 5 and 6. Changes in BRD4 chromatin binding and histone modification patterns in BRD7 KO SUM159 cells and crelevance of BRD4 and BRD7 expression in human breast tumor samples.

(A) Heatmap showing the correlation of fold changes in BRD4, H3K27ac, H3K4me3, H3K27me3 ChIPseq, ATAC-seq, and mRNA expression between BRD7 knockout and scramble control SUM159 cells (top left), and compared to the correlation of fold changes in BRD4 binding upon JQ1-treatment and JQ1-resistance in SUM159 cells (bottom right).

(B) Log2 fold change of ChIP-seq, ATAC-seq and mRNA expression between BRD7 KO/WT in BRD4 binding increased (red) and decreased (blue) peaks in SUM159. The union of BRD7 peaks in SUM159 +/- JQ1 (q<1e-6) were used as anchor. The 1.2 fold change was used to identify an increased or decreased BRD4 binding change. P-values indicate statistical significant by Wilcoxon test.

(C) Line plot showing the smoothed signal of BRD4, H3K27ac, H3K4me3, and H3K27me3 ChIP-seq and ATAC-seq in BRD7 knockout and scramble SUM159 cells at promoters, and comparison to that of BRD4 ChIP-seq signal in DMSO, JQ1-treated and JQ1-resistant SUM159 cells (bottom two tracks). Promoters are ranked by the fold change of BRD4 signal between +/- JQ1 from high (left) to low (right). (D) Box plots depicting the expression of *BRD4*, *BRD7*, and *ARID1A* in major breast tumor subtypes in the TCGA cohort. Major breast tumor subtypes: basal (n=171), HER2 (n=78), LumA: Luminal A (n=499), LumB: Luminal B (n=197), normal (n=36). Wilcoxon test p values are shown.

(E) Box plots depicting the expression of *BRD4*, *BRD7*, and *ARID1A* in three different subtypes of TNBC in the TCGA cohort. Subtypes of TNBC: basal (n=60), Lum: luminal (n=45), Mes: mesenchymal (n=66). Wilcoxon test p values are shown.

(F) Associations between *BRD4* and *BRD7* expression levels and overall survival among TNBC cases in the TCGA cohort. Patients were divided by the median expression of *BRD4* or *BRD7* across all patients to stratify patients into the low and high groups in the upper panel. The bottom panel shows the clinical associations of the interaction between the two genes. Patients were first divided into low and high *BRD4* groups by the median expression of *BRD4* across all patients; then patients in each group were further divided into two equal sized sub-groups by the median expression of *BRD7* across patients in the corresponding group. The logrank test p values are shown.

(G) Association between *BRD4* and *BRD7* mRNA levels and expression of JQ1 resistance signature (JQ1 resistance score) in TNBC cases in the TCGA cohort. Wilcoxon test p values are shown.



### Figure S7. Related to Figure 7. scRNA-seq data.

(A) *t*-SNE plots depicting relative expression levels of selected genes in single cells of populations indicated in Figure 7A.

(B) Fraction of cells in different phases of cell cycle in each cell line.

(C) Basal, luminal, and mesenchymal signature scores for single cells in SUM149, SUM149R, SUM159, and SUM159R cell lines, with or without JQ1 (left) and indicated clusters in SUM159R cells (right).

(D) Heatmap depicting correlation of ATAC-seq peaks between bulk and scATAC-seq data.

(E) Graph depicts cumulative frequencies of barcodes ranked by abundance in pre-treatment, DMSO, and JQ1-treated SUM149 and SUM159 cells.

