#### **Supplementary Figure Legends**

**Figure S1.** (A-F) Optimization of the CD3-bispecific antibody CRISPR screens. *CD123* was knocked out in MOLM13 cells (CD123<sup>KO</sup>) to mimic antigen loss induced resistance. RTCC assay (n=3) of Scramble and CD123<sup>KO</sup> MOLM13 cells in response to CD123-DART (left panel) and Isotype CD3-bispecific antibody (right panel) was conducted (A). A companion qPCR assay was developed to quantify sgRNA transduced cells with high specificity. This assay was used to quantify Scramble and CD123 targeting guides in the genomic DNA using guide specific PrimeTime qPCR probe sets (n=3) (B). In a pilot test, CD123<sup>KO</sup> cells were mixed 1:9 with wild-type Scramble cells followed by RTCC assay using the CD123-DART antibody. The relative ratio between CD123<sup>KO</sup> and Scramble cells was quantified used the qPCR assay, and the best differential was achieved at 1pM of CD123-DART treatment and a T-cell to target cell ratio (E:T) of 1:1 (n=4) (C). Actual CRISPR screen with CD123-DART treatment at 1pM and 10pM. Note that the10pM group performed significantly worse than1pM group (D), which echoed the results in the qPCR-based optimization (C). The same qPCR optimization steps were performed for SEM (n=5) and HCC827 cells (n=4) using the CD123-DART and PCAD-DART antibodies (E and F). (G) Gene ontology analysis of the resistance hits and sensitizing hits from the CRISPR screens in all three cell lines. (H) Pathway map of the highest enriched resistance hit pathway "Inflammation Interferon Signaling".

**Figure S2.** (A) Western blot validation of *JAK1* and *STAT1* knockout in MOLM13, SEM, and HCC827 cells. The JAK1 blot in MOLM13 cells was omitted due to no detectable signal. (B) Sanger sequencing validation of *JAK1* knockout in MOLM13 cells. The validation was performed by mapping the sequencing data with the sgRNA targeting reference sequence using the TIDE tool (2). (C) Western blot validation of *PTPN2* knockout in MOLM13 cells. (D) Quantification of IFNγ in the supernatant of the RTCC assay in MOLM13, SEM and HCC827 cells (n=5). (E) RTCC assay (n=4) of B2M knockout MOLM13, SEM and HCC827 cells. (F) Volcano plot of the gene expression from the cells following IFNγ treatment (n=3). The CRISPR screen overlapping hits were highlighted in boxes. (G) FACS analysis of the ICAM1 expression in Scramble and JAK1<sup>KO</sup> MOLM13 cells treated by titrated doses of IFNγ. (H) RTCC assay (n=4) of ICAM1 overexpressed Scramble or JAK1<sup>KO</sup> MOLM13 cells at 1pM of CD123-DART antibody. (I) Killing of SEM cells (n=3) with combination treatment of IFNg (10ng/ml) and FasL (6ng/ml).

**Figure S3.** (A) LCA staining of the MOLM13 and SEM cells 4 days post indicated doses of L-fucose treatment. (B) RTCC assay of MOLM13 and SEM cells post L-fucose treatment (n=4). (C) FUT8 overexpression in MOLM13 and SEM cells (upper panel) and LCA staining (low panel). (D) RTCC assay of FUT8 overexpressed MOLM13 and SEM cells compared to the parental groups (n=3). (E) Western blot validation of FUT8 knockout by two guides (left panel) and silver staining of LCA pull down products from the 3 groups (right panel). (F) RTCC assay of FUT8<sup>KO</sup> MM1S, HCC827 and HCC1954 cells using the BCMAxCD3 and PCAD-DART CD3-bispecific antibodies (n=4).

**Figure S4.** (A) Quantification of the afucosylation status of CD123His-Scramble and CD123His-FUT8<sup>KO</sup> protein samples. The proteins were treated with PNGase and the released glycan species were analyzed by capillary electrophoresis. Peaks indicate different glycan structures according to selected glycan standards. Two sipping were performed for each sample. (B) SPR analysis of CD123-Scramble and CD123-FUT8<sup>KO</sup> binding to 6H6 and CD123-DART<sub>IgG</sub>, and original CD123-DART. The proteins were captured on the chips and the antibodies were subsequently flowed through. (C) Schematics of CD123 protein, highlighting the NTD, D2, D3 domains in the ECD, as well as 3 putative N-glycosylation sites (left panel). Antibody staining of human-mouse CD123 domain chimeras as indicated by their names (right panel). (D) Binding competition assay of 6H6 and CD123-DART<sub>IgG</sub> antibodies. MOLM13 and SEM cells were stained with AF647 labeled 6H6, CD123-DART<sub>IgG</sub> or isotype antibodies in the presence of unlabeled forms. Inhibition% of binding was calculated by normalizing to the Isotype group, and presented in the heatmap. (E) Pair distance distribution functions calculated using GNOM for CD123His-Scramble (black) and CD123His-FUT8<sup>KO</sup> (red). (F) Guinier approximations for CD123His-Scramble (black) and CD123His-FUT8<sup>KO</sup> (red).

**Figure S5.** (A) SPR analysis of human IL-3 binding to the CD123-Scramble and CD123-FUT8<sup>KO</sup> proteins. (B) FACS validation of FUT8 and CD123 knockout in TF-1 cells. (C) Growth of FUT8<sup>KO</sup> and CD123<sup>KO</sup> TF-1 cells with titrated doses of GM-CSF treatment (n=4). (D) Western blot of phospho-STAT5 and total STAT5 in FUT8<sup>KO</sup> and CD123<sup>KO</sup> TF-1 cells treated with 10ng/ml IL-3. (E) Western blot and FACS validation of FUT8 knockout in CD34+

stem cells by two guides. (F) Growth of Scramble and IL3RA-g3 CD34+ stem cells in different cytokine cocktails at day 5 (n=3). \*P<0.05, \*\*P<0.01.

**Figure S6.** (A) Illustration of the mixed killing RTCC assay setup. Cells of different genotypes were labeled with different fluorescent proteins and spiked in wild-type (Scramble) cells. Each cell population can be tracked by FACS. The right panel shows the analysis of MOLM13 Scramble-BFP/FUT8<sup>KO</sup>-RFP/JAK1<sup>KO</sup>-GFP cells at Day 0 of the assay. (B) Tumor volumes of each group at Day 14 and Day 16 from the *in vivo* study described in Figure 6E (n=5). \*P<0.05, \*\*P<0.01, n.s. not significant.

- 1. Paulo JA, O'Connell JD, Gaun A, and Gygi SP. Proteome-wide quantitative multiplexed profiling of protein expression: carbon-source dependency in Saccharomyces cerevisiae. *Mol Biol Cell.* 2015;26(22):4063-74.
- 2. Brinkman EK, Chen T, Amendola M, and van Steensel B. Easy quantitative assessment of genome editing by sequence trace decomposition. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 2014;42(22):e168.











