VGLL1-directed TEAD activation drives endocrine therapy resistance in

estrogen receptor positive breast cancer

Carolina Gemma[1,*], Anup K Singh[1], Antonino Belfiore[2], Chun-Fui Lai[1], Manikandan

Periyasamy[1], Sara Abuelmaaty[3, 4], Claire M Davies[5], Xiangyi Wang[1], Georgia M.

Simmons[1], Van T M Nguyen[1], Luca Magnani[1], Emad Rakha[3, 4], Lesley-Ann Martin[6],

R. Charles Coombes[1], Giancarlo Pruneri[2], Lakjaya Buluwela[1], Simak Ali[1,*]

[1]Department of Surgery and Cancer, Imperial College London, Hammersmith

Campus, London, W12 0NN, UK.

[2]Pathology Department, Fondazione IRCCS Istituto Nazionale Tumori and

University of Milan, School of Medicine.

[3]Division of Cancer and Stem Cells, Nottingham Breast Cancer Research Centre,

University of Nottingham Biodiscovery Institute, University Park, Nottingham, NG7

2RD, UK.

[4]Department of Histopathology, Nottingham University Hospital NHS Trust, City

Hospital Campus, Hucknall Road, Nottingham, NG5 1PB, UK.

[5]ECMC Imperial College. Department of Surgery and Cancer, Imperial College

London, Hammersmith Campus, London, W12 0NN, UK.

[6]Breast Cancer Now Toby Robins Research Centre, Institute of Cancer Research,

London, SW7 3RP, UK.

* To whom correspondence should be addressed: c.gemma@imperial.ac.uk;

simak.ali@imperial.ac.uk

Abstract

Endocrine therapies are standard-of-care treatments for estrogen receptor (ER) positive breast cancer. However, patients with ER+ breast cancer develop resistance to these therapies and most relapsed patients die with endocrine-resistant metastatic disease. Here we show that resistance to the ER degrader, fulvestrant, is accompanied by epigenetic activation of the transcriptional co-activator VGLL1. Rewiring of the epigenome in therapy resistant cells also results in increased binding of the transcription factor TEAD4. Through interaction with TEAD4, VGLL1 induces the expression of genes implicated in cell proliferation in the resistant cells. We demonstrate that VGLL1 is necessary for the growth of fulvestrant-resistant breast cancer cells. Pharmacological disruption of VGLL1/TEAD4 interaction blocked growth of fulvestrant-resistant cells, accompanied by inhibition of VGLL1/TEAD transcriptional programmes. Furthermore, we identify EGFR as an important downstream VGLL1 target, whereby VGLL1-directed EGFR upregulation sensitises fulvestrant-resistant breast cancer cells to EGFR inhibitors. Taken together, our findings identify VGLL1 as a key transcriptional driver in endocrine-resistant breast cancer and identify new therapeutic approaches for advanced breast cancer patients.

Introduction

ER is the key transcriptional driver of tumour growth in three-quarters of breast cancers[1]. As such, endocrine therapies are the main therapeutic options for ER positive (ER+) breast cancer. These drugs inhibit ER signalling through distinct mechanisms. Aromatase inhibitors (AI) block estrogen biosynthesis to prevent ER activation[2]. Selective estrogen receptor modulators (SERMs), typified by tamoxifen[3], bind to ER to inhibit its activity, while fulvestrant represents a class of anti-estrogens whose binding to ER promotes its degradation[4]. Despite the effectiveness of these treatments, many women will present with intrinsic or acquired resistance to these drugs[1-3,5], necessitating determination of mechanisms of resistance and the development of new therapies.

Cell identity is established through epigenetic activation of distal regulatory elements that drive cell-type-specific gene expression programs in development and differentiation[6,7]. Cancer cells are also characterised by specific transcriptional programmes, frequently defined by cancer-type-specific epigenetic states[8,9], while altered epigenetic landscapes are likely to signpost therapy resistance pathways[10]. Indeed, profiling isogenic ER+ breast cancer cell models of resistance to different endocrine therapies, for acetylation of the active transcription histone mark, histone 3-lysine 27 (H3K27ac)[11-15], has demonstrated extensive and drug-specific epigenetic reprogramming[16], resulting in sweeping enhancer landscape reorganization[17].

The TEA domain (TEAD) family of transcription factors have been implicated in cancer, by virtue of the fact that they are DNA binding partners for Yes-associated protein (YAP), and its paralog, transcriptional co-activator with PDZ-binding motif (TAZ)[18-21]. YAP/TAZ are downstream effectors of the Hippo pathway, required for organogenesis, tissue homeostasis and as important players in cancer initiation and progression, including resistance to cancer therapies[22,23]. Very little is known about the second family of TEAD co-activators, named vestigial-like (VGLL) due to their homology to the *Drosophila* co-activator *vestigial* (vg). *Vestigial* (vg) is a master regulator of wing development in *Drosophila*, regulating gene expression upon dimerization with *scalloped* (sd), the *Drosophila* homologue of mammalian TEAD[24-27]. There are four mammalian vg-like genes (VGLL1-4), all of which function through

interaction with TEADs[28,29]. Human VGLL1 can substitute for *Drosophila* vg in wing

formation[30], underlining the conserved role of VGLL1 in driving TEAD-directed gene

expression. Indeed, VGLL1 competes with YAP for binding to TEAD4 *in vitro*, and the

structural similarity between VGLL1-TEAD and YAP-TEAD complexes has suggested

that VGLL1 may have a function similar to that of YAP[28,31].

Fulvestrant is a key treatment for advanced ER+ breast cancer following relapse on

prior endocrine therapies[32,33], with particular utility in combination with drugs targeting

other pathways, e.g. CDK4/6 inhibitors[34] and for treating AI-resistance in metastatic

breast cancer due to activating ESR1 mutations[35-37]. Here, we show that VGLL1 is

greatly upregulated in fulvestrant-resistant breast cancer and reveal a dependency of

fulvestrant-resistant breast cancer cells on VGLL1. Indeed, overexpression of VGLL1

in endocrine-sensitive breast cancer cells was sufficient to promote resistance to

fulvestrant. With ChIP-seq for VGLL1 and TEAD4, together with RNA-seq following

VGLL1 knockdown, we demonstrate that VGLL1 drives resistance to fulvestrant

through induction of TEAD target genes and identify potential therapeutic approaches

for fulvestrant-resistant breast cancer.

Results

Epigenetic plasticity results in the induction of VGLL1 expression in endocrine

therapy resistant breast cancer. To discover genes that are activated following

epigenetic reprogramming with endocrine therapies, we analysed H3K27ac ChIP-seq

data from well-established endocrine therapy resistant breast cancer cell lines[16]. We

used H3K27ac ChIP-seq signal at gene promoters as a mark of active promoters, as

previously reported[38,39], to rank gene promoters according to the ratio of H3K27ac

signal in fulvestrant-resistant (FULVR) MCF7 breast cancer cells relative to the

isogenic fulvestrant-sensitive MCF7 cells. The *VGLL1* and *VGLL3* genes were ranked

third and fourth highest for H3K27ac gain in FULVR cells (Fig. 1a, b). By contrast,

H3K27ac was reduced at promoters of ER target genes, including *GREB1* and *PGR*

in FULVR cells. Epigenetic activation of *VGLL1* and *VGLL3* was accompanied by

strong increases in their expression in FULVR cells and reductions in ER target gene

expression in RNA-seq analysis (Supplementary Fig. 1a). Interestingly, *VGLL1* and

VGLL3 expression was also higher in tamoxifen resistant (TAMR) MCF7 cells, but not

in long-term estrogen-deprived (LTED) cells (mimicking AI resistance)

(Supplementary Fig. 1b), suggesting a mechanism for VGLL1/3 induction that requires

inhibition of ER activity. Indeed, our previous work revealed that in LTED cells

activation of cholesterol biosynthesis pathways, generate the ER ligand 27-

hydroxycholesterol[16]. Hence, ER is not inhibited in LTED cells. RT-qPCR and

immunoblotting confirmed the results of the H3K27ac ChIP-seq and RNA-seq

analyses (Fig. 1c, d). Expression of several TEADs was also increased in MCF7-

FULVR cells. YAP and TAZ, the best-known cofactors for TEADs, were expressed in

MCF7 cells, but levels of YAP were reduced in FULVR cells. Other genes implicated

in the HIPPO pathway, were unchanged in MCF7-FULVR cells (Fig. 1d and

Supplementary Fig. 1c). VGLL1 and VGLL3 were similarly over-expressed in

independently derived MCF7-FULVR cells (Supplementary Fig. 1d, e). Furthermore,

VGLL1, but not VGLL3, was induced in additional FULVR cells generated in other ER+

breast cancer cell lines. In these additional FULVR cell lines, expression of YAP, TAZ

and other HIPPO components was unchanged, or was reduced (Supplementary Fig.

1d, e).

We also measured VGLL1 expression in a cohort of patients with tumour biopsies

collected prior to and following progression on fulvestrant, using RNA *in situ*

hybridisation and immunohistochemical detection. In agreement with the results in

FULVR cell lines, patients with breast cancer relapse post-fulvestrant treatment had

substantially higher VGLL1 mRNA and protein (Fig. 1e and Supplementary Fig.1f).

Collectively, these data clearly show that upregulation of the TEAD coactivator VGLL1

is a frequent feature of fulvestrant-resistant breast cancer.

VGLL1 expression is induced upon ER downregulation. Since VGLL1 expression

emerges in fulvestrant resistance, we determined if anti-estrogen-directed ER

inhibition can induce VGLL1 expression. Indeed, 24 or 48 hours of fulvestrant

treatment stimulated VGLL1 expression in MCF7 cells (Fig. 1f and Supplementary Fig.

2a) and in other ER+ breast cancer cell lines (Fig. 1f and Supplementary Fig. 2c).

RNAi-mediated *ESR1* knockdown similarly promoted *VGLL1* expression in all cell

lines (Fig. 1g and Supplementary Fig. 2d, e). However, change in VGLL3 expression

by fulvestrant or ESR1 siRNA was less consistently observed, being stimulated in

MCF7 and BT474, but not in the other cell lines (Supplementary Fig. 2c, d, f). Other

HIPPO pathway genes were not affected by fulvestrant or ER knockdown, although

small increases in the expression of some TEADs and the LATS1/2 HIPPO pathway

kinases (which promote YAP/TAZ degradation[22]), were observed (Supplementary Fig.

2b, c, d, f). The important clinical activity of fulvestrant[32,33], has led to the development

of next generation SERDs, some of which have progressed through clinical testing[40-

42]. As seen for fulvestrant, *VGLL1* expression was increased by other SERDs (GDC-

0810, AZD9496, RAD1901), with accompanying inhibition of ER activity

(Supplementary Fig. 2g). Together, these data show clearly that downregulation of ER

is sufficient to induce VGLL1 expression in ER+ breast cancer cells.

VGLL1 is recruited to TEAD binding sites at active regulatory regions in

fulvestrant-resistant breast cancer cells. To investigate the mechanistic roles of

VGLL1 and TEADs in fulvestrant resistance, we performed ChIP-seq for VGLL1 in

MCF7-FULVR cells and for TEAD4, as it is the best characterized TEAD in cancers[43-

45] (Supplementary Fig. 3a). Remarkably, three times more TEAD4 binding events

were identified in FULVR cells than in the isogenic MCF7 cells (20,894 vs 6,968 peaks,

respectively) (Fig. 2a). Most (75%) of the TEAD4 binding events in MCF7 cells were

also present in FULVR cells. TEAD binding sites were by far the most strongly

enriched motifs identified with *de novo* motif analysis in MCF7 and FULVR cells (Fig.

2a and Supplementary Fig. 3b). These findings suggest that TEAD4 activity is

substantially elevated in FULVR cells. Also enriched at TEAD4 binding regions in

FULVR cells were activating protein-1 (AP-1) binding sequences (Supplementary Fig.

3b), consistent with a previous report showing that TEADs and AP-1 are part of a

multiprotein complex that regulates genes involved in proliferation and migration in

cancer cells[43].

The transcriptional activity of TEADs requires binding of co-activators[46], including

YAP/TAZ[18-20] and VGLLs[28,29]. ChIP-seq for VGLL1 in FULVR cells, identified 29,930

VGLL1 peaks (q-value < 0.01; Supplementary Table 1 and Supplementary Fig. 3c).

There was a strong positive correlation between VGLL1 and TEAD4 binding events

($p<2.2 \times 10^{-16}$; Fig. 2b, c). Moreover, the TEAD4 binding sequence was the most highly

enriched motif at VGLL1 binding regions (Supplementary Fig. 3d), indicative of VGLL1

recruitment to the TEAD DNA binding proteins. Indeed, VGLL1 peaks were highly

enriched at the TEAD4 binding sites in FULVR cells (p<0.0001, Fig. 2d), indicating

that VGLL1 recruitment to chromatin is mainly through interaction with TEADs.

Regions co-bound by VGLL1 and TEAD4 were present at active regulatory regions in

FULVR cells and were strongly associated with active chromatin, as revealed by

correlation with H3K27ac signal and reduced nucleosome occupancy at the peak

centre (Fig. 2e, f). Moreover, in MCF7 cells these regions were associated with an

inactive chromatin conformation (Supplementary Fig. 3f), indicating that the higher

TEAD4 occupancy observed in FULVR cells is associated with increased chromatin

accessibility at the TEAD4 binding regions. The vast majority of the VGLL1 and TEAD4

peaks were present at intergenic and intronic regions (Supplementary Fig. 3e),

suggesting that they are mainly present at distal enhancers, as also shown previously

for YAP/TEAD binding in other cell types[18,43,47]. In MCF7-FULVR cells, VGLL1 and

TEAD4 were commonly co-bound at known YAP and TEAD target genes, including

CTGF, AMOTL2 and ANKRD1[47,48], and was accompanied by increased H3K27ac at

these genes (Fig. 2g). Consistent with this, expression of these genes was greatly

elevated in MCF7-FULVR cells, compared to MCF7 cells. ChIP-qPCR confirmed that

VGLL1 was recruited to these binding sites in MCF7-FULVR cells, but not in MCF7

cells (Supplementary Fig. 3g). YAP and TAZ were largely absent at these genes in

FULVR cells, suggesting that VGLL1 is the main TEAD co-activator in driving

expression of these genes in MCF7-FULVR cells. Collectively, our data identify VGLL1

and TEAD4 as previously unknown core components of the regulatory landscape in

breast cancer cells resistant to fulvestrant.

VGLL1 promotes resistance of breast cancer cells to fulvestrant. To gain further

insights into the transcriptional program regulated by VGLL1, we performed functional

annotation of the VGLL1 binding regions in FULVR cells. Notably, genes associated

with VGLL1 peaks were highly enriched in gene sets linked to acquired resistance to

endocrine therapies in breast cancer cells (Supplementary Fig. 4a and Supplementary

Table 2). Moreover, siRNA-directed VGLL1 knockdown reduced growth of fulvestrant-

resistant MCF7 and T47D cells (Fig. 3a and Supplementary Fig. 4b), demonstrating

its functional importance in resistant cells.

We next asked whether activation of the endogenous VGLL1 gene is sufficient for

development of resistance to fulvestrant. Applying the CRISPR/Cas9 Synergistic

Activation Mediator (SAM) method[49], using a specific sgRNA targeted to the *VGLL1*

gene promoter (Fig. 3b), we successfully established VGLL1 expression in MCF7 cells

(Fig. 3c and Supplementary Fig. 4c). As reported previously, treatment of ER+ breast

cancer cells with fulvestrant results in rapid and near complete cell loss and resistant

cells only emerge after 3-6 months[50-52]. Culturing MCF7 cells with transcriptional

activation of endogenous *VGLL1* (MCF7 ActCas9-VGLL1) in the presence of 100 nM

fulvestrant showed an initial period of growth inhibition, as did the control (MCF7

ActCas9-Vector) cells (Fig. 3d). Remarkably, growth recovery of MCF7 ActCas9-

VGLL1 cells was observed after ~20 days, with no cell recovery evident in the control

cells even after 100 days (Fig. 3d and Supplementary Fig. 4d). We further evaluated

two of the independently generated ActCas9-VGLL1 fulvestrant-resistant lines, named

MCF7 ActCas9-VGLL1-FULVR-1 and -2. Interestingly, development of fulvestrant

resistance in these cells was accompanied by further upregulation of VGLL1, with a

concomitant downregulation in the mRNA and protein levels of ER and PR (Fig 3e, f

and Supplementary Fig. 4e), as noted for the acquired fulvestrant-resistant models

(Fig. 1c and Supplementary Fig. 1d). Moreover, comparison of global gene expression

profiles generated by RNA-seq between MCF7 ActCas9-VGLL1-FULVR cells and

other fulvestrant-resistant cell lines, revealed that similar transcriptional changes were

observed in the ActCas9-VGLL1-FULVR cells, as in the MCF7-FULVR cells

(Supplementary Fig. 4f). The growth dependence of MCF7 ActCas9-VGLL1-FULVR

cells on VGLL1 could be confirmed by siRNA-mediated VGLL1 knockdown (Fig. 3g),

indicating that MCF7 ActCas9-VGLL1-FULVR cells become dependent on VGLL1 for

survival, as we observed in the other fulvestrant resistance models. Moreover, not only

were MCF7 ActCas9-VGLL1-FULVR cells resistant to fulvestrant (Fig. 3h) but were

also insensitive to next generation SERDs (Supplementary Fig. 4h).

The above results suggest a switch in dependency from ER in the ER+, treatment-

naïve, breast cancer cells, to VGLL1 in the fulvestrant-resistant cells. Indeed, induction

of VGLL1 expression in the fulvestrant-naïve MCF7 cells was insufficient to induce a

shift in the transcriptional program (Supplementary Fig. 4g), which continued to be

dependent on ER, as evidenced by the maintained sensitivity to fulvestrant (Fig. 3h).

These data suggest that downregulation of ER and ER transcriptional activity following

fulvestrant treatment is a necessary first step for adaptation to VGLL1 dependence.

Taken together, our data show that fulvestrant-resistant breast cancer cells are

dependent on VGLL1 for their growth and that resistance to fulvestrant is rapidly
installed in a VGLL1-dependent manner.

VGLL1 transcriptional dependency in fulvestrant-resistant breast cancer. To
explore the role of VGLL1 as a coactivator in fulvestrant resistance, we next asked
whether FULVR cells rely on VGLL1 to activate their transcriptional programs. Indeed,
analysis of our VGLL1 ChIP-seq data revealed that genes predicted as VGLL1 targets
and associated with two or more VGLL1 peaks were significantly more highly
expressed in the fulvestrant-resistant than in the fulvestrant-sensitive MCF7 cells
compared to genes not associated with VGLL1 peaks (Fig. 4a), a finding confirmed in
the MCF7 ActCas9-VGLL1-FULVR cells (Supplementary Fig. 5a).

To confirm these findings using high confidence VGLL1 direct targets, we performed
RNA-seq following siRNA-mediated VGLL1 downregulation in FULVR cells. We
identified a set of direct VGLL1 targets as those genes that were downregulated upon
VGLL1 downregulation in FULVR cells, which we further filtered based on the
presence of at least one associated VGLL1 binding site, which generated a list of 762
genes (VGLL1-activated genes). Genes whose expression was not altered by siRNA-
mediated VGLL1 downregulation that were also further filtered based on the absence
of VGLL1 associated peaks were considered as not-VGLL1 targets (n=8,932 genes).
(Supplementary Fig. 5b, c). We found that VGLL1 activated genes were significantly
more highly expressed in MCF7-FULVR cells than the isogenic fulvestrant-sensitive
MCF7 cells, compared to not-VGLL1 targets (Fig. 4b). Moreover, VGLL1 activated
genes were highly enriched in VGLL1 and TEAD4 peaks (Supplementary Fig. 5d, e)
and were associated with higher levels of H3K27ac at gene promoters in FULVR cells
compared to MCF7 cells (Fig. 4c and Supplementary Fig. 5f), further supporting the
notion that VGLL1 regulates genes that become more active in the resistant cells. In
line with this, TEAD4 peaks associated with the VGLL1-activated genes were present
at regions with higher H3K27ac signal and TEAD4 recruitment in FULVR cells
compared to MCF7 cells (Supplementary Fig. 5g). Taken together, these data indicate
that VGLL1 drives expression of TEAD-target genes in FULVR cells. Interestingly, we
also found that genes whose expression depends on VGLL1 in FULVR cells were
significantly more expressed than not-VGLL1 targets (Fig. 4d). Functional annotation
of the VGLL1-activated genes revealed enrichment for pathways associated with

growth factor signalling, including growth factor binding and transmembrane receptor
protein kinase activity (Fig. 4e). Indeed, genes included in these functional categories,
e.g. IGFBP3, ITGB6, EGFR and TGFB2, were among the VGLL1 target genes most
highly upregulated in fulvestrant-resistant compared to fulvestrant-sensitive cells (Fig.
4f, g and Supplementary Fig. 5h). Collectively, these data indicate that VGLL1 acts as
an essential transcriptional co-factor in FULVR cells, driving the gene expression
programs that facilitate survival and growth of fulvestrant-resistant breast cancer cells.
315

VGLL1 drives EGFR expression in breast cancer cells resistant to fulvestrant.
Our findings link VGLL1 activity with genes associated with receptor tyrosine kinase
(RTK) signalling. High expression of the RTKs, EGFR and HER2, has been linked to
reduced therapeutic efficacy of anti-estrogens, including tamoxifen and fulvestrant[53]
and ectopic expression of EGFR promotes fulvestrant resistance in breast cancer
cells[54]. The TEAD4 ChIP-seq showed TEAD4 recruitment to the EGFR enhancer and
promoter region in MCF7-FULVR, but not in MCF7 cells (Fig. 5a). VGLL1 co-localised
with TEAD4 in MCF7-FULVR cells at the EGFR enhancer. Interestingly, *EGFR*,
together with *VGLL1*, were among the top genes with higher TEAD4 occupancy in
FULVR cells compared to MCF7 cells (Supplementary Fig. 6a). VGLL1 and TEAD4
co-binding at the *EGFR* enhancer, together with acquisition of H3K27ac, was also
evident in MCF7-ActCas9-VGLL1-FULVR cells (Fig. 5b), confirming the binding of
VGLL1 and TEAD4 to the regulatory regions of the *EGFR* gene in fulvestrant-resistant
cells. VGLL1 and TEAD4 co-binding at the *EGFR* enhancer was accompanied by a
large increase in EGFR expression in MCF7-ActCas9-VGLL1-FULVR cells (Fig. 5c,
d). Importantly, siRNA-mediated downregulation of Cas9 in these cells led to a
decrease in VGLL1 and EGFR expression (Fig. 5e). Similarly, EGFR expression was
significantly increased in several fulvestrant-resistant cells in which VGLL1 expression
was induced, compared to their isogenic fulvestrant-sensitive breast cancer cell lines
(Supplementary Fig. 6b). In agreement with these findings, VGLL1 knockdown was
sufficient to reduce the levels of EGFR in fulvestrant-resistant breast cancer cell lines
(Supplementary Fig. 6c, d, e).
338

339 VGLL1-induced EGFR expression in MCF7ActCas9-FULVR cells was accompanied
340 by a strong increase in AKT and ERK1/2 MAPK phosphorylation (Fig. 5d), while
341 VGLL1 knockdown also reduced AKT and ERK1/2 phosphorylation (Supplementary

Fig. 6d, e), indicating that VGLL1-directed EGFR over-expression in FULVR cells facilitates activation of downstream signalling pathways that promote cell survival and proliferation[55,56]. MCF7 cells are characterised by low EGFR and HER2 expression and insensitivity to EGFR inhibitors[57]. Consistent with high EGFR expression and activity, treatment of MCF7-ActCas9-VGLL1-FULVR cells with the EGFR inhibitor erlotinib[58], potently inhibited cell growth, whereas the parental fulvestrant sensitive cell lines (MCF7-ActCas9-Vector and MCF7-ActCas9-VGLL1) were largely insensitive to erlotinib (Fig. 5f). In line with this, erlotinib treatment led to reductions in EGFR phosphorylation and inactivation of the downstream signalling pathways in MCF7-ActCas9-VGLL1-FULVR cells (Fig. 5g). A similar result was obtained in additional fulvestrant resistant cell lines (Supplementary Fig.6f, g).

Our results provide a novel mechanism leading to increased EGFR signalling in breast cancer cells, in which VGLL1-TEAD4 co-binding at the EGFR enhancer induces EGFR expression. In agreement with this, *EGFR* expression was highly positively correlated with *VGLL1* expression in ER+ breast cancer patients from TCGA[59] and METABRIC[60] (Fig. 5h and Supplementary Fig. 6i). Remarkably, EGFR was the highest-ranked gene co-expressed with VGLL1 in breast cancer patients from METABRIC and the highest ranked protein significantly correlated with VGLL1 in breast cancer from TCGA (Supplementary Fig. 6h).

Collectively, these data identify EGFR as an important VGLL1 target gene in fulvestrant-resistant breast cancer cells, in which rewiring of the epigenome results in VGLL1 and TEAD4 binding to the EGFR enhancer, leading to induction in EGFR expression and activation of downstream EGFR signalling pathways (Fig. 6i).

Targeting VGLL1 transcriptional activity with verteporfin. Our findings identify VGLL1 as a new therapeutic target in metastatic, endocrine-resistant breast cancer. Verteporfin (VP), a drug used for photodynamic treatment of macular degeneration, has been identified as an inhibitor of YAP/TEAD. VP disrupts the physical interaction between YAP and TEADs, resulting in downregulation of YAP/TEAD target genes[61,62]. Given that the VGLL1-TEAD interaction is structurally similar to that of YAP-TEAD[28,31], we reasoned that VP would disrupt VGLL1-TEAD4 interaction and so inhibit expression of VGLL1-regulated genes. Indeed, VP treatment significantly reduced the

growth of fulvestrant-resistant breast cancer cells (Fig. 6a and Supplementary Fig. 7a,

b). Moreover, ChIP-qPCR for VGLL1 and TEAD4 in MCF7-FULVR cells treated with

VP for 24h revealed that VP reduced the binding of VGLL1 to the target genes,

including EGFR (Fig. 6b), whereas TEAD4 binding at target genes was either

unaffected or only moderately reduced by VP, indicating that VP prevents binding of

VGLL1 to TEAD4. To assess whether the VGLL1 co-transcriptional activity is inhibited

by VP, we performed RNA-seq in FULVR cells following treatment with VP.

Remarkably, we found that VP strongly and very significantly downregulated the

expression of VGLL1 activated genes including EGFR, and several other VGLL1

target genes associated with VGLL1 binding at the promoter or enhancer region,

including classical TEAD targets such as CTGF, as well as the previously described

VGLL1 target genes IGFBP5[28] and MMP9[63], which we also found to be VGLL1

activated genes in FULVR cells (Fig. 6c, d and Supplementary Fig. 7c, d). Importantly,

we found that the most significantly downregulated genes after treatment with VP were

highly enriched for VGLL1 peaks (Fig. 6e). Indeed, genes with 2 or more associated

VGLL1 peaks were preferentially downregulated by VP, compared to genes without

VGLL1 peaks (Supplementary Fig. 7e). The selectivity of VP in downregulating VGLL1

target genes was further confirmed by analysing all the high confidence VGLL1 targets

and not-VGLL1 targets, revealing that VGLL1 activated genes were significantly

downregulated by VP compared to not-VGLL1 targets (Fig. 6f, g). Indeed, the majority

of VGLL1 activated genes were downregulated by VP and displayed preferential

sensitivity to VP (Supplementary Fig. 7f). In line with this, we also found that genes

downregulated by VP were expressed at higher levels, compared to genes not

inhibited by VP, in FULVR cells (Supplementary Fig. 7g), consistent with VGLL1

activated genes being more highly expressed than not-VGLL1 targets in FULVR cells

(Fig. 4d). In agreement with the above results, we found that genes downregulated by

VP were significantly enriched in functional categories attributed to VGLL1 activated

genes such as growth factor binding, extracellular matrix binding and transmembrane

receptor protein kinase activity (Supplementary Fig. 7h and Supplementary Table 3).

Interestingly, VGLL1 expression levels were associated with expression of VGLL1

activated genes also in breast cancer patients (METABRIC) (Fig 6h). Moreover, when

we stratified patients according to the expression of the combined VGLL1 activated

genes, we found that patients with higher expression levels of this signature had a

worse prognosis (Fig. 6i). A similar result was obtained when considering only ER+
breast cancer cases (Supplementary Fig. 7i), indicating that our VGLL1 transcriptional
signature of VGLL1 activated genes has useful prognostic value for breast cancer
patients treated with endocrine therapies. In summary, our results show that VGLL1
transcriptional activity is sensitive to VP and suggest that inhibition of VGLL1
recruitment to TEADs, as with VP, could provide an approach to treating VGLL1-
dependent, endocrine-resistant breast cancer.

Discussion

Fulvestrant is the main endocrine agent for advanced ER+ breast cancer following
relapse on prior endocrine therapies[32,33] and newer generation SERDs with improved
pharmacological properties are in advanced clinical development[41,42]. Understanding
resistance to SERDs is urgently needed for aiding patient selection and in identifying
therapeutic interventions for patients who progress on SERDs. Our work has identified
VGLL1/TEAD4, as previously unknown key transcriptional regulators and drivers of
resistance to fulvestrant and suggests new therapeutic opportunities for endocrine-
resistant breast cancer. We show that SERD inhibition of estrogen-regulated gene
expression is accompanied by induction of VGLL1 expression. The induction of
VGLL1 expression upon ER inhibition drives fulvestrant resistance through the
establishment of a VGLL1/TEAD directed transcriptional program that supports cell
survival and proliferation. Our work strongly supports the idea that VGLL1/TEAD4 act
as transcriptional master regulators in FULVR cells and that resistance to fulvestrant
emerges as a consequence of a switch in transcriptional dependencies from ER in
pre-treatment ER+ breast cancer, to VGLL1/TEAD in fulvestrant-resistant breast
cancer. The clinical significance of our findings is further emphasized by the validity of
the signature of VGLL1 activated genes as a prognostic tool in a large set of breast
cancer patients treated with endocrine therapies

The well-established oncogenic role of TEADs in different cancers has been closely
linked to the activity of YAP/TAZ as TEAD coactivators in the majority of studies[43,48].
However, it is increasingly clear that the canonical functions of TEADs as downstream
effectors of YAP and TAZ in the Hippo pathway are not the only mechanism by which

TEADs contribute to cancer progression in different cancers[44,64,65]. For instance, in
ER+ breast cancer, a non-canonical function of YAP and TEAD4, has recently been
reported, where they act as ER cofactors, thereby regulating ER target genes rather
than canonical TEAD target genes[44]. Our results are in agreement with these findings,
as we found that classical TEAD target genes were expressed at low levels in ER+
breast cancer cells and we did not observe enrichment of YAP/TAZ binding at these
target genes. Our work also revealed that many of the established YAP/TAZ/TEAD
target genes[47,66,67], are upregulated in FULVR cells, but YAP/TAZ are largely absent
at these genes. Instead, VGLL1 was co-bound with TEAD at these genes in FULVR
cells and the expression of these genes was regulated by VGLL1.

Several lines of evidence indicate that endocrine therapies are drivers of epigenetic
reprogramming[16,68]. Our results further show that reprograming of the epigenetic
landscape in breast cancer cells resistant to fulvestrant is associated with increased
TEAD4 recruitment to the chromatin and association of VGLL1/TEAD4 with active
enhancers in the resistant cells, and uncover a previously unrecognized role for
VGLL1/TEAD4 as transcriptional drivers in advanced ER+ breast cancer.

Additionally, our work identified EGFR as a VGLL1/TEAD activated gene in FULVR
cells. We show that instalment of fulvestrant resistance following VGLL1
overexpression was accompanied by VGLL1 and TEAD4 recruitment to the EGFR
enhancer, upregulation of EGFR, associated activation of EGFR downstream
effectors and sensitivity to EGFR inhibition. Recent studies show that EGFR and
HER2 amplification, as well as mutations in HER2 and genes in the MAPK pathway
are increased in metastatic, endocrine-resistant ER+ breast cancer, together
accounting for 10-15% of cases[54,69] and demonstrating the importance of elevated
EGFR and HER2 signalling in acquired resistance to endocrine treatments. Our
results evidence an alternate mechanism by which EGFR expression is induced in
endocrine-resistant breast cancer and thus advance a rationale for expanded clinical
utility for EGFR inhibitors.

Targeting transcription factors in cancer has proved to be challenging, yet it offers
great promise for cancer treatment as many cancers are driven by aberrant
transcription factor expression and/or activities[70]. As the importance of VGLL1 in

cancer has largely been unexplored, there are at present no reported VGLL1

inhibitors. Given the well-established functions of YAP/TAZ/TEAD as tumor promoters

in many cancers, there have been considerable efforts to identify inhibitors of their

activity[71]. Elucidation of the structure of the VGLL1/TEAD complex has revealed that

VGLL1-TEAD interaction is structurally similar to that of YAP-TEAD[28,31]. Indeed, we

show that verteporfin, a FDA approved photodynamic therapy drug for macular

degeneration, which disrupts YAP/TEAD interaction[61,62], also disrupts the binding of

VGLL1 to TEAD4 at the target genes, and selectively inhibits VGLL1 transcriptional

activity. Thus, our findings show that VGLL1 transcriptional and growth dependencies

could be exploited as a therapeutic vulnerability in advanced ER+ breast cancer and

so inhibiting VGLL1 interaction with TEAD, as well as inhibition of downstream VGLL1-

activated genes such as EGFR, could be a viable therapeutic approach for patients

who progress on endocrine therapies.

Collectively, our work uncovers multiple new insights into the biological function of the

TEAD coactivator VGLL1 in advanced therapy-resistant breast cancer. The biological

function and importance of VGLL1 in other cancers remains poorly understood.

However, because of the tissue-restricted expression of VGLL1 and its specific

upregulation in several cancers, it is tempting to speculate that VGLL1 could emerge

as a promising new therapeutic target in several cancers[72]. Thus, our findings and the

VGLL1-EGFR connection may be relevant in other cancers where VGLL1

upregulation is observed.

Methods

Methods, including statements of data availability and any associated accession

codes and references, are available online at XXX

Methods

Cell lines and treatments. Cells lines were originally purchased from ATCC, were

authenticated at the time of the studies by LGC Standards (Bury, UK) and were

regularly screened for mycoplasma infection. BT474, ZR-75-1 and T47D cells were

cultured in Dulbecco's modified Eagle's medium (DMEM) with 10% of fetal bovine

serum (FBS) and 100U penicillin/0.1 mg ml^{-1} streptomycin. MCF7 cells were cultured

in DMEM with 10% of fetal bovine serum (FBS) and 100U penicillin/0.1 mg ml^{-1}

streptomycin plus 10nM estradiol (SIGMA E8875). MCF7(2) cells were cultured in

RPMI 1640 with 10% of fetal bovine serum (FBS) and 100U penicillin/0.1 mg ml^{-1}

streptomycin plus 1nM estradiol. All fulvestrant resistant isogenic derivatives of ER+

breast cancer cell lines have been previously described [16,50,73,74], and were cultured

as the corresponding parental cells with the addition of 100nM fulvestrant (Sigma

I4409).

For VGLL1 overexpression, MCF7-ActCas9-VGLL1 cells were generated by

transducing MCF7 cells with lentiviral MS2-P65-HSF1_Hygro (Addgene plasmid

#61426), lentiviral dCAS-VP64_Blast (Addgene plasmid #61425) and sgRNA(MS2)

cloning backbone (Addgene plasmid #61424) using the following VGLL1 sgRNA:

ATTCCTGCAGGTGCCCAACCAGG, that was cloned into the sgRNA(MS2) cloning

backbone plasmid. The control MCF7-ActCas9-Vector cells were generated

simultaneously using the above mentioned plasmids, except that sgRNA(MS2) cloning

backbone empty vector was used instead. MCF7-ActCas9-Vector and MCF7-

ActCas9-VGLL1 cells were maintained in media containing 0.2 mg/ml hygromycin

(Corning 30-240-CR), 10 μg/ml blasticidin (Corning 30-100-RB) and 1μg/ml puromycin

(gibco A1113803).

MCF7-ActCas9-VGLL1-FULVR cells were generated by culturing MCF7-ActCas9-

VGLL1 cells in the appropriate media with the addition of 100nM or 1000nM

fulvestrant.

All drugs were solubilised in DMSO. Verteporfin (Sigma SML0534), was used at a final

concentration of 2μM for 24 h, unless otherwise specified. SERMs: tamoxifen (Sigma

H7904) and raloxifene (Tocris 2280), as well as SERDs: fulvestrant, GDC-0810

(Genentech), AZD9496 (Astra Zeneca) and RAD1901(MedChem Express HY-

19822A) were used at a final concentration of 100nM for 48 h, unless otherwise

specified. Erlotinib (VWR CAYM10483) was used at a final concentration of 3.1 uM for

24 h, unless otherwise specified.

Clinical samples. From the institutional database of the Fondazione IRCCS Istituto

Nazionale Tumori of Milan, we retrospectively identified 72 metastatic ER+, HER2

negative breast cancer patients diagnosed between 1997 and 2018, treated with

endocrine therapy, including at least one line of fulvestrant, and standard

chemotherapy. For the present study, we selected 15 patients for which breast cancer biopsies were available both prior to fulvestrant (including primary tumor samples and metastatic localizations) and post fulvestrant administration. All selected cases were carefully revised by an expert breast pathologist, including the evaluation of ER and PR receptor status, proliferative index and tumor cellularity. All patients included in this study gave their written consent to donate the tissue remaining after their diagnostic procedures to Istituto Nazionale Tumori of Milan.

siRNA transfections. siRNAs (25nM) were transfected with Lipofectamine RNAi-MAX (Life Technologies) in antibiotics-free medium according to the manufacturer's instructions. Cells were harvested 72 h after transfection. The following individual ON TARGETplus siRNAs (Horizon Discovery) were used for VGLL1: J-017939-06 (siVGLL1 #1), J-017939-08 (siVGLL1 #2) and J-017939-07 (siVGLL1 #3). For dCAS9 the following siRNAs were used: CCGAAGAGGUCGUGAAGAA (Cas9 siRNA#1) and GGGAAAAGAUCGAGAAGAU (Cas9 siRNA#2). ESR1 siRNA was purchased from Qiagen (SI03114979, FlexiTube siRNA). The negative control siRNA (siControl) was purchased from Horizon Discovery (ON TARGETplus Non-targeting control siRNA #2, D-001810-02)

RNA in situ hybridization. Formalin fixed, paraffin embedded breast cancer tissue sections (5 µm) from matched pre- and post-fulvestrant patient biopsies were processed for RNA in situ detection using the RNAscope Multiplex Fluorescent Reagent Kit v2 according to the manufacturer's instructions (Advanced Cell Diagnostics), using RNAscope probe Hs-VGLL1 446731. Nuclei were stained with DAPI and the RNAscope probe was detected using Cy5 fluorescent dye (PerkinElmer NEL745E001KT TSA Plus Cyanine 5). Data was analysed using Fiji and CellProfiler using custom macros, provided upon request.

Immunohistochemistry. Immunohistochemical staining was performed on formalin-fixed, paraffin embedded 4 µm tissue sections using VGLL1 polyclonal antibody (Proteintech, 10124-2-AP). Antigen retrieval was performed based on the manufacturer's recommendations (citrate buffer pH 6.0 at 1000 W for 20 min using microwave). Visualization was performed using the Novocastra Novolink Polymer Detection Systems kit (RE7280-K, Leica, Biosystems, UK).

Western blot. Cells were washed twice in ice-cold PBS and harvested in RIPA Buffer (10 mM Tris-HCl (pH 7.6), 1mM EDTA, 0.1% SDS, 0.1% sodium deoxycholate, 1% Triton X-100 and phosphatase and protease inhibitors) and lysed by sonication. Samples were centrifuged at 4 °C, maximum speed, for 10 min, then the supernatant was transferred to a clean Eppendorf tube. Extracts were quantified using the Pierce BCA Protein Assay Kit, according to the manufacturer's instructions (ThermoFisher Scientific, 23227). Samples were run on 10% polyacrylamide gels and transferred onto polyvinylidene difluoride (PVDF) membranes by wet electrophoretic transfer. Blots were blocked with either 5% non-fat dry milk (non-phosphoprotein) or 5% BSA (phosphoprotein) and incubated with primary antibodies overnight at 4°C. Secondary antibodies were incubated for 1 h at room temperature and then blots were developed with goat anti-mouse (Biorad, 1706516) and anti-rabbit (Biorad, 1706515) horseradish peroxidase (HRP) conjugated secondary antibodies. SuperSignal West Pico PLUS Chemiluminescent Substrate (ThermoFisher Scientific, 34577) or SuperSignal West Femto Maximum Sensitivity Substrate (ThermoFisher Scientific, 34095) was used for chemiluminescent imaging using a Fusion solo (Vilber) imager.

Antibodies. The VGLL1 antibody was purchased from Proteintech (10124-2-AP). The ER antibody was from Leica Biosystem (NCL-L-ER-6F11). VGLL3 (ab68262), VGLL4 (ab140290), YAP1 (ab56701), TEAD4 (ab58310) and GAPDH (ab9484) antibodies were supplied by Abcam. Antibodies for PR (8757S), TEAD3 (13224S), EGFR (2232S), phospho-Tyr1068 EGFR (2234S), phospho-Tyr1148 EGFR (4404S), AKT (9272S), phospho-Ser473-AKT (9271S), p44/42 MAPK (4695S) and phospho-p44/p42 MAPK (Thr202/Tyr204) (9101S) were from Cell Signaling Technology. TEAD1 (sc-376113) and TEAD2 (sc-67115) antibodies were purchased from Santa Cruz Biotechnology and the TAZ antibody was obtained from BD (clone M2-616, 560235),

RT-qPCR. Total RNA was extracted from cells using RNeasy Mini Kit (Qiagen 74106). For cDNA synthesis 500 ng of total RNA was reverse transcribed using RevertAid First Strand cDNA Synthesis Kit (ThermoFisher Scientific, K1622). RT-qPCR reactions were carried out using Fast SYBR Green Master Mix (ThermoFisher Scientific,

4385616) in a StepOnePlus Real-Time PCR thermal cycler (ThermoFisher Scientific).

Gene expression levels were calculated relative to GAPDH. The following primers

were used:

VGLL1: CCCCTCGAGTCAGAGTGAAG, CAGGGACGGTGAGAACTGAT;

VGLL3: GCTGGTAAGAGCTGGTCCAA, CCATCCAGAATCTGCCATTT;

ESR1: CAGGTGCCCTACTACCTGGA, TCCTTGGCAGATTCCATAGC;

PGR: GATGCTTCATCCCCACAGAT, AGGTCTACCCGCCCTATCTC;

GREB1: AAGGAGGGCTGGAAACAAAT, CGTTGGAAATGGAGACAAGG;

GAPDH: TGGAAATCCCATCACCATCT, TTCACACCCATGACGAACAT;

YAP1: CAGCAACTGCAGATGGAGAA, TGGATTTTGAGTCCCACCAT;

TAZ: TCATCACCGTGTCCAATCAC, GTGGGAGTGTAGCTCCTTGG;

TEAD1: CAAGCCTTTTGTGCAGCAG, AAAATTCCACCAGGCGAAG;

TEAD2: CTTGGACTGGATTTCCCTTG, CCGCTACATCAAGCTGAGAA;

TEAD3: GAGGCAATGGTACGGTCCT, CTTTGCACAGCCAGCCTAC;

TEAD4: TCCACGAAGGTCTGCTCTTT, GTGCTTGAGCTTGTGGATGA;

LATS1: ACCTTTCCAGCTCTGTTTGC, AGATCCTCGACGAGAGCAGA;

LATS2: GTGGTAGGACGCAAACGAAT, CCGAGGAATGAGCAGATTGT;

BTRC: ACAGGATCATCGGATTCCAC, TTGAAACGCAAGTGCAGAAC;

SAV1: TGGCTGGTATGTGACAGGAG, ACTTCCTCCTGGATGGGAAC;

MOB1a: ACAGCTTGCTTCAGTGCAGA, TATGTTGCCTGAGGGAGAGG;

EGFR: GAGGGCAAATACAGCTTTGG, GCCCTTCGCACTTCTTACAC;

dCAS9: GAACCGGATCTGCTATCTGC, CGCTCGTGCTTCTTATCCTC;

CTGF: TGGAGATTTTGGGAGTACGG, CCTGGTCCAGACCACAGAGT;

TGFB2: ACAAGAGCAGAAGGCGAATG, TGCAGCAGGGACAGTGTAAG;

IGFBP5: AGGTGTGGCACTGAAAGTCC, ATTGTGACCGCAAAGGATTC;

IGFBP3: AGGCTGCCCATACTTATCCA, GGGGTGTACACATTCCCAAC;

AMOTL2: ACCACTGCCACTGCTACCAC, AGCAGGCCTATGTGGAGAAA;

APEX1: CCCCAGATCAGAAAACCTCA, TTTGGTCTCTTGAAGGCACA;

ANKRD1: CCAAATGTCCTTCCAAGCAT, TGAAGGCTGCTCTGGAGAAT.

ChIP-seq and ChIP-qPCR. ChIP was performed as previously described[75], with few

modifications. Briefly, cells were crosslinked with 1% formaldehyde in culture medium

without antibiotics for 10 min at room temperature. Chromatin extracts were sonicated

using a Bioruptor Pico sonication device (Diagenode, B01060001) using 15 cycles (30

s on and 30 s off) at maximum intensity. Chromatin was immunoprecipitated using 10

µg of antibodies for TEAD4 (Abcam, ab58310), VGLL1 (Proteintech, 10124-2-AP),

YAP1 (Abcam, ab56701), TAZ (BD, clone M2-616, 560235) and H3K27ac (Abcam,

ab4729). Non-immunoprecipitated chromatin was used as input control. After

chromatin de-crosslinking DNA was purified using the QIAquick PCR Purification Kit

(Qiagen, 28106). For all ChIP experiments the enrichment was determined by qPCR

relative to the input sample using positive and negative control primers. For TEAD4

and VGLL1 ChIP-seq two and three highly reproducible biological replicates were

generated, with Spearman's correlation values of 0.94-0.99 in all biological replicates

(Supplementary Fig. 2a). ChIP enrichment was assessed by ChIP-qPCR before library

construction using primers previously described for YAP/TEAD ChIP in other cell

types[47]. Libraries for ChIP-seq were prepared using the NEBNext Ultra DNA Library

Prep Kit for Illumina (New England Biolabs, E7370S) according to the manufacturer's

instructions. Sequencing was performed on an Illumina HiSeq 2500 platform using

50bp single end reads. The following primers were used:

ANKRD1 Promoter: GAGGGGAGGACAAGCTAACC,

AGCTGTCCCCTGACTCTTGA;

TGFβ2 Enhancer: AGCTTTGATCACACTGATTCCA,

TGCCTCTTCACATCTGTTCATT;

AMOTL2 3' Enhancer: ACAGCCCTCCAACTATGCTAAG,

CCAACAGCACATTTTCAGGATA;

CTGF Promoter: GAGCTGAATGGAGTCCTACACA,

GGAGGAATGCTGAGTGTCAAG;

LSAMP (negative): CTGAAATGAAAGTGGGGACA,

GATTTGGTCTTGGCAGGTGT;

CTGF -8.3kb (negative): TTGCTGGTGGTAGGGAAATACT,

TCACTGCACCTTTGCTTTTCTA;

TUBB Promoter (negative): TCCTGTACCCCCAAGAACTG,

ATTGTTGTCCATGCTGCAAA;

EGFR (enh): CACACCTGAGCATGTCCTTG, GCAATGGGATCGAGTTGTTT;

GAPDH (negative): TCGACAGTCAGCCGCATCT, CTAGCCTCCCGGGTTTCTCT.

RNA-seq. Total RNA was extracted from cells using RNeasy Mini Kit (Qiagen 74106).

RNA-seq libraries were prepared using NEBNext Ultra II RNA Library Prep Kit for

Illumina (New England Biolabs, E7775) and sequencing was performed on an Illumina

HiSeq 2500 platform. Raw reads were aligned to the human reference genome hg19

version using TopHat[76]. Redundant reads were removed using SAMtools[77]. HTSeq[78]

was used to count reads at UCSC annotated genes. Normalization and differential

expression analysis were carried out using DESeq2 package[79]. Integrated Genomics

Viewer (IGV, Broad Institute) was used to visualize the Z-score normalized coverage

tracks generated with R packages Rsamtools

(http://bioconductor.org/packages/Rsamtools) and rtracklayer[80]. Fold changes in gene

expression between two cell lines or two conditions were calculated as the ratio of

normalized read counts obtained with DESeq2. The 5th percentile, first quartile,

median, third quartile and 95th percentile are plotted in box-and-whiskers graphs.

GO analysis. GO analysis on the VGLL1 activated genes and genes downregulated

by VP was performed using g:Profiler (https://biit.cs.ut.ee/gprofiler/gost)[81]

Growth assays. Cell growth following siRNAs or drug treatments was assessed using

the sulphorhodamine B (SRB) assay[82]. Briefly, 2000-5000 cells were seeded per well

in 96-well plates. Cells were allowed to attach overnight before treatment with drugs

or transfection with siRNAs. Medium was changed every 3 days and cells were fixed

by adding 100 µl of cold 40% (wt/vol) trichloroacetic acid (TCA) to each well for at least

60 min. The plates were washed five times with distilled water, 100 µl of SRB reagent

(0.4% wt/vol SRB in 1% wt/vol acetic acid) was added to each well, and the plates

were allowed to incubate for 1h. The plates were then washed five times with 1%

(wt/vol) acetic acid and allowed to dry overnight. SRB solubilization was performed by

adding 100 µl of 10 mM Tris HCl per well to the plates, followed by shaking for 10 min.

Optical density (OD) was then measured using a Sunrise microplate reader (Tecan)

at λ=492 nm. Six wells were analysed for each experimental condition. Data are

presented as mean $\pm$ standard error of the mean (s.e.m.). Data are presented as

growth relative to control cells (treated with vehicle or transfected with control siRNA),

using the first day of treatment as baseline. For time-course experiments, multiple

plates were seeded and drugged in identical fashion, and at the indicated time points.

Each growth experiment was independently confirmed using three biological
replicates.
Live cell imaging. To follow the growth of cells over the course of three months in the
presence of drug containing media, we used the live cell imaging system Incucyte
Zoom (EssenBioscience). One million cells were seeded in a T75 flask and after 24h
the corresponding media was added to the cells with the addition of fulvestrant at the
indicated concentrations. Medium and drugs were replaced twice per week and cells
were imaged every 2 days. Analysis was performed using the Incucyte Zoom software
with parameters optimized for each cell line and using confluency (μm^2) as a measure
of cell growth. Raw data was extracted and plotted in GraphPad Prism. Each
experiment was independently confirmed using three biological replicates.
722
ChIP-seq analysis.
Raw reads were aligned to the human reference genome hg19 version using Bowtie[83].
Redundant reads were removed using SAMtools[77]. VGLL1 and TEAD4 peaks were
called using MACS2[84] using the input sample as a control, with default parameters
and q value less than 0.01. For each ChIP-seq target, peaks common to all the
biological replicates were kept for further analysis. Integrated Genomics Viewer (IGV,
Broad Institute) was used to visualize the Z-score normalized coverage tracks
generated with R packages Rsamtools (http://bioconductor.org/packages/Rsamtools)
and rtracklayer[80]. The overlap of peaks from different ChIP–seq experiments was
determined using the BEDTools2 suite[85]
733
Ratio of H3K27ac between FULVR vs MCF7 cells: ChIP-seq data for H3K27ac in
FULVR and MCF7 cells was obtained from[16]. A list of gene promoters was
downloaded from the Table Browser of UCSC genome browser[86] by selecting 3kb-
wide regions centred on each TSS annotated in the human genome version hg19. The
BEDTools2 suite was used to calculate the coverage of H3K37ac reads at gene
promoters. The H3K27ac coverage at promoters was normalized to the total number
of million mapped reads to generate normalized read counts in units of reads per
million mapped reads (RPM). For each gene promoter we calculated the ratio of
normalized H3K27ac coverage between FULVR and MCF7 cells to generate the plot
in Fig.1a.

ChIP-seq heatmaps and average profiles. Normalized coverage tracks were plotted as heatmaps and average signal profiles with SeqPlots[87] using a window of 2-3kb centred around the peak centre. Heatmap rows were sorted from high to low signal. Average profiles are presented as the mean of the normalized coverage $\pm$ s.e.m. and 95% confidence interval.

Peak annotation and Motif analysis. The HOMER suite[88] was used for *de novo* motif discovery analysis of the VGLL1 and TEAD4 peaks using the findMotifsGenome.pl script with default parameters. The annotatePeaks.pl script in the HOMER suite was used for peak annotation analysis to associate peaks with gene targets, and to annotate the location of peaks to different genomic features (see Supplementary Fig. 2f).

VGLL1-TEAD4 co-binding enrichment analysis. VGLL1/TEAD4 co-bound regions were defined with the bedtools intersect script from the BEDTools2 suite. To calculate VGLL1/TEAD4 co-binding enrichment, the TEAD4 binding regions were randomized in the hg19 version of the human reference genome using the bedtools shuffle script from the BEDTools2 suite. Chi-square test was applied to assess the co-binding enrichment based on the observed co-binding relative to the expected (random) co-binding, after performing ten permutations of the TEAD4 peaks.

Functional annotations. Functional annotation of the VGLL1 ChIP-seq peaks was performed using the MSigDB Perturbation annotation from GREAT version 3.0.0 [89]. Supplementary Table 2 shows the complete annotation. To visualize the top nine most significant terms from the annotation (according to binomial P value), we used ggplot2 (https://ggplot2.tidyverse.org) with R scripts adapted from REVIGO[90], scripts provided upon request (see Supplementary Fig. 3a).

Generation of the signature of VGLL1 activated genes and not VGLL1 targets. To identify the VGLL1 direct targets we performed RNA-seq in FULVR cells transfected with three different VGLL1 siRNAs (siVGLL1#1-3) and control siRNA (siControl) (three biological replicates for each treatment). To generate the signature

of VGLL1 activated genes we selected all the genes significantly downregulated

(adjusted $p < 0.05$, negative log2(fold change)) by at least two different VGLL1 siRNAs

compared to siControl. We further filtered these genes by those associated with at

least one VGLL1 binding site to define a more stringent set of direct VGLL1 targets

which we called VGLL1 activated genes. To define the set of not VGLL1 targets we

selected the genes whose expression was not significantly altered (adjusted $p > 0.05$),

by any of the VGLL1 siRNAs, and we further filtered these genes by those without any

VGLL1 associated binding site and by those with non-zero read counts among FULVR

and MCF7 cells.

Kaplan–Meier survival analysis. To evaluate the prognostic value of the VGLL1

activated genes signature we analysed the survival of patients from the METABRIC

breast cancer dataset[60] treated with endocrine therapies. We calculated the median

expression of the VGLL1 activated genes signature across all patients and used it as

a cut off to select patients with high expression of the VGLL1 activated genes signature

as those with median expression of the combined VGLL1 activated genes above the

median cut off and patients with low expression of the VGLL1 activated genes

signature as those with median expression of the combined VGLL1 activated genes

below the median cut off. The Kaplan–Meier plot was generated to compare the

survival curves of patients with high and low expression of the VGLL1 activated genes

signature. Survival analysis was performed in GraphPad Prism and p values were

calculated using the log-rank (Mantel–Cox) test.

Statistical analysis. All statistical analyses were performed in R or GraphPad Prism.

To perform pairwise comparisons between two groups we used the Mann-Whitney

test, two tailed and the Student's t-test, two tailed. One-tailed Wilcoxon signed rank

test was used to compare gene expression values in the same patients at two different

time points. Correlations were performed using the Spearman test. Chi-square test

was applied to assess the co-binding enrichment from ChIP-seq over expected co-

binding.

Data availability

The RNA-seq and ChIP-seq data generated in this study have been deposited in the

GEO database under accession XXXX.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Dr Chris Morrow (Astra Zeneca) for providing AZD9496 and to Dr Jun Liang (Genentech) for GDC-0810. This work was funded by Cancer Research UK (C37/A18784). Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust Tissue Bank provided tissue samples. Other investigators may have received samples from these same tissues. The research was supported by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Biomedical Research Centre, the Experimental Cancer Medicine Centre and the Cancer Research UK Centre at Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust, Imperial College, London. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR or the Department of Health

Author contributions

C.G. and S.A. conceived the study. C.G. performed the RNA-seq, ChIP-seq and RNA-FISH experiments and the bioinformatics analyses. C.G., A.K.S., C.F.L., M.P., X.W., G.M.S., L.B., and V.T.M.N performed all other experiments. A.B., G.P. and R.C.C. recruited patients and supplied tissues. S. Abuelmaaty, C.M.D. and E.R. performed IHC staining and scoring. L.A.M. and L.M. provided cell lines. C.G. and S.A. wrote the manuscript.

References

1.   Ali, S. & Coombes, R.C. Endocrine-responsive breast cancer and strategies for combating resistance. *Nat Rev Cancer* **2**, 101-112 (2002).
2.   Johnston, S.R. & Dowsett, M. Aromatase inhibitors for breast cancer: lessons from the laboratory. *Nat Rev Cancer* **3**, 821-831 (2003).
3.   Ali, S., Buluwela, L. & Coombes, R.C. Antiestrogens and their therapeutic applications in breast cancer and other diseases. *Annu Rev Med* **62**, 217-232 (2011).
4.   Long, X. & Nephew, K.P. Fulvestrant (ICI 182,780)-dependent interacting proteins mediate immobilization and degradation of estrogen receptor-alpha. *J Biol Chem* **281**, 9607-9615 (2006).
5.   Ma, C.X., Reinert, T., Chmielewska, I. & Ellis, M.J. Mechanisms of aromatase inhibitor resistance. *Nature reviews. Cancer* **15**, 261-275 (2015).
6.   Consortium, E.P. An integrated encyclopedia of DNA elements in the human genome. *Nature* **489**, 57-74 (2012).
7.   Xie, W.*, et al.* Epigenomic analysis of multilineage differentiation of human embryonic stem cells. *Cell* **153**, 1134-1148 (2013).

8.   Hnisz, D.*, et al.* Super-enhancers in the control of cell identity and disease. *Cell* **155**,
934-947 (2013).
9.   Bradner, J.E., Hnisz, D. & Young, R.A. Transcriptional Addiction in Cancer. *Cell* **168**,
629-643 (2017).
10.   Sharma, S.V.*, et al.* A chromatin-mediated reversible drug-tolerant state in cancer
cell subpopulations. *Cell* **141**, 69-80 (2010).
11.   Ernst, J. & Kellis, M. Discovery and characterization of chromatin states for
systematic annotation of the human genome. *Nat Biotechnol* **28**, 817-825 (2010).
12.   Whyte, W.A.*, et al.* Master transcription factors and mediator establish super-
enhancers at key cell identity genes. *Cell* **153**, 307-319 (2013).
13.   Heintzman, N.D.*, et al.* Histone modifications at human enhancers reflect global cell-
type-specific gene expression. *Nature* **459**, 108-112 (2009).
14.   Malik, A.N.*, et al.* Genome-wide identification and characterization of functional
neuronal activity-dependent enhancers. *Nat Neurosci* **17**, 1330-1339 (2014).
15.   Stasevich, T.J.*, et al.* Regulation of RNA polymerase II activation by histone
acetylation in single living cells. *Nature* **516**, 272-275 (2014).
16.   Nguyen, V.T.*, et al.* Differential epigenetic reprogramming in response to specific
endocrine therapies promotes cholesterol biosynthesis and cellular invasion. *Nat
Commun* **6**, 10044 (2015).
17.   Bi, M.*, et al.* Enhancer reprogramming driven by high-order assemblies of
transcription factors promotes phenotypic plasticity and breast cancer endocrine
resistance. *Nat Cell Biol* **22**, 701-715 (2020).
18.   Stein, C.*, et al.* YAP1 Exerts Its Transcriptional Control via TEAD-Mediated Activation
of Enhancers. *PLoS Genet* **11**, e1005465 (2015).
19.   Zhang, H.*, et al.* TEAD transcription factors mediate the function of TAZ in cell growth
and epithelial-mesenchymal transition. *J Biol Chem* **284**, 13355-13362 (2009).
20.   Lamar, J.M.*, et al.* The Hippo pathway target, YAP, promotes metastasis through its
TEAD-interaction domain. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **109**, E2441-2450 (2012).
21.   Ota, M. & Sasaki, H. Mammalian Tead proteins regulate cell proliferation and contact
inhibition as transcriptional mediators of Hippo signaling. *Development* **135**, 4059-
4069 (2008).
22.   Zanconato, F., Cordenonsi, M. & Piccolo, S. YAP/TAZ at the Roots of Cancer. *Cancer
Cell* **29**, 783-803 (2016).
23.   Nguyen, C.D.K. & Yi, C. YAP/TAZ Signaling and Resistance to Cancer Therapy. *Trends
Cancer* **5**, 283-296 (2019).
24.   Davidson, I., Xiao, J.H., Rosales, R., Staub, A. & Chambon, P. The HeLa cell protein
TEF-1 binds specifically and cooperatively to two SV40 enhancer motifs of unrelated
sequence. *Cell* **54**, 931-942 (1988).
25.   Jacquemin, P. & Davidson, I. The Role of the TEF Transcription Factors in
Cardiogenesis and Other Developmental Processes. *Trends Cardiovasc Med* **7**, 192-
197 (1997).
26.   Halder, G.*, et al.* The Vestigial and Scalloped proteins act together to directly
regulate wing-specific gene expression in Drosophila. *Genes & development* **12**,
3900-3909 (1998).
27.   Simmonds, A.J.*, et al.* Molecular interactions between Vestigial and Scalloped
promote wing formation in Drosophila. *Genes & development* **12**, 3815-3820 (1998).

28.   Pobbati, A.V., Chan, S.W., Lee, I., Song, H. & Hong, W. Structural and functional
895   similarity between the Vgll1-TEAD and the YAP-TEAD complexes. *Structure* **20**, 1135-
896   1140 (2012).
897   29.   Pobbati, A.V. & Hong, W. Emerging roles of TEAD transcription factors and its
898   coactivators in cancers. *Cancer Biol Ther* **14**, 390-398 (2013).
899   30.   Vaudin, P., Delanoue, R., Davidson, I., Silber, J. & Zider, A. TONDU (TDU), a novel
900   human protein related to the product of vestigial (vg) gene of Drosophila
901   melanogaster interacts with vertebrate TEF factors and substitutes for Vg function in
902   wing formation. *Development* **126**, 4807-4816 (1999).
903   31.   Mesrouze, Y.*, et al.* The surprising features of the TEAD4-Vgll1 protein-protein
904   interaction. *Chembiochem* **15**, 537-542 (2014).
905   32.   Buzdar, A.U. Fulvestrant--a novel estrogen receptor antagonist for the treatment of
906   advanced breast cancer. *Drugs Today (Barc)* **44**, 679-692 (2008).
907   33.   Howell, A.*, et al.* Comparison of fulvestrant versus tamoxifen for the treatment of
908   advanced breast cancer in postmenopausal women previously untreated with
909   endocrine therapy: a multinational, double-blind, randomized trial. *J Clin Oncol* **22**,
910   1605-1613 (2004).
911   34.   Turner, N.C.*, et al.* Overall Survival with Palbociclib and Fulvestrant in Advanced
912   Breast Cancer. *N Engl J Med* **379**, 1926-1936 (2018).
913   35.   Jeselsohn, R., Buchwalter, G., De Angelis, C., Brown, M. & Schiff, R. ESR1 mutations-a
914   mechanism for acquired endocrine resistance in breast cancer. *Nat Rev Clin Oncol*
915   **12**, 573-583 (2015).
916   36.   Katzenellenbogen, J.A., Mayne, C.G., Katzenellenbogen, B.S., Greene, G.L. &
917   Chandarlapaty, S. Structural underpinnings of oestrogen receptor mutations in
918   endocrine therapy resistance. *Nat Rev Cancer* **18**, 377-388 (2018).
919   37.   Pejerrey, S.M.*, et al.* The Impact of ESR1 Mutations on the Treatment of Metastatic
920   Breast Cancer. *Horm Cancer* **9**, 215-228 (2018).
921   38.   Heintzman, N.D.*, et al.* Distinct and predictive chromatin signatures of transcriptional
922   promoters and enhancers in the human genome. *Nat Genet* **39**, 311-318 (2007).
923   39.   Ernst, J.*, et al.* Mapping and analysis of chromatin state dynamics in nine human cell
924   types. *Nature* **473**, 43-49 (2011).
925   40.   Bardia, A.*, et al.* EMERALD: Phase III trial of elacestrant (RAD1901) vs endocrine
926   therapy for previously treated ER+ advanced breast cancer. *Future Oncol* **15**, 3209-
927   3218 (2019).
928   41.   Cheung, K.W.K.*, et al.* GDC-0810 Pharmacokinetics and Transporter-Mediated Drug
929   Interaction Evaluation with an Endogenous Biomarker in the First-in-Human, Dose
930   Escalation Study. *Drug Metab Dispos* **47**, 966-973 (2019).
931   42.   Hamilton, E.P.*, et al.* A First-in-Human Study of the New Oral Selective Estrogen
932   Receptor Degrader AZD9496 for ER(+)/HER2(-) Advanced Breast Cancer. *Clin Cancer*
933   *Res* **24**, 3510-3518 (2018).
934   43.   Zanconato, F.*, et al.* Genome-wide association between YAP/TAZ/TEAD and AP-1 at
935   enhancers drives oncogenic growth. *Nat Cell Biol* **17**, 1218-1227 (2015).
936   44.   Zhu, C.*, et al.* A Non-canonical Role of YAP/TEAD Is Required for Activation of
937   Estrogen-Regulated Enhancers in Breast Cancer. *Mol Cell* **75**, 791-806 e798 (2019).
938   45.   Liu, X.*, et al.* Tead and AP1 Coordinate Transcription and Motility. *Cell Rep* **14**, 1169-
939   1180 (2016).

46.   Xiao, J.H., Davidson, I., Matthes, H., Garnier, J.M. & Chambon, P. Cloning, expression,
and transcriptional properties of the human enhancer factor TEF-1. *Cell* **65**, 551-568
(1991).

47.   Galli, G.G., *et al.* YAP Drives Growth by Controlling Transcriptional Pause Release
from Dynamic Enhancers. *Mol Cell* **60**, 328-337 (2015).

48.   Zhao, B., *et al.* TEAD mediates YAP-dependent gene induction and growth control.
Genes Dev **22**, 1962-1971 (2008).

49.   Konermann, S., *et al.* Genome-scale transcriptional activation by an engineered
CRISPR-Cas9 complex. *Nature* **517**, 583-588 (2015).

50.   Shaw, L.E., Sadler, A.J., Pugazhendhi, D. & Darbre, P.D. Changes in oestrogen
receptor-alpha and -beta during progression to acquired resistance to tamoxifen and
fulvestrant (Faslodex, ICI 182,780) in MCF7 human breast cancer cells. *J Steroid*
Biochem Mol Biol **99**, 19-32 (2006).

51.   Larsen, S.S., Egeblad, M., Jaattela, M. & Lykkesfeldt, A.E. Acquired antiestrogen
resistance in MCF-7 human breast cancer sublines is not accomplished by altered
expression of receptors in the ErbB-family. *Breast Cancer Res Treat* **58**, 41-56 (1999).

52.   Kirkegaard, T., *et al.* T47D breast cancer cells switch from ER/HER to HER/c-Src
signaling upon acquiring resistance to the antiestrogen fulvestrant. *Cancer Lett* **344**,
90-100 (2014).

53.   Hanker, A.B., Sudhan, D.R. & Arteaga, C.L. Overcoming Endocrine Resistance in
Breast Cancer. *Cancer Cell* **37**, 496-513 (2020).

54.   Razavi, P., *et al.* The Genomic Landscape of Endocrine-Resistant Advanced Breast
Cancers. *Cancer Cell* **34**, 427-438 e426 (2018).

55.   Engelman, J.A. Targeting PI3K signalling in cancer: opportunities, challenges and
limitations. *Nat Rev Cancer* **9**, 550-562 (2009).

56.   Downward, J. Targeting RAS signalling pathways in cancer therapy. *Nat Rev Cancer* **3**,
11-22 (2003).

57.   Stanley, A., Ashrafi, G.H., Seddon, A.M. & Modjtahedi, H. Synergistic effects of
various Her inhibitors in combination with IGF-1R, C-MET and Src targeting agents in
breast cancer cell lines. *Sci Rep* **7**, 3964 (2017).

58.   Dowell, J., Minna, J.D. & Kirkpatrick, P. Erlotinib hydrochloride. *Nat Rev Drug Discov*
4, 13-14 (2005).

59.   Ciriello, G., *et al.* Comprehensive Molecular Portraits of Invasive Lobular Breast
Cancer. *Cell* **163**, 506-519 (2015).

60.   Curtis, C., *et al.* The genomic and transcriptomic architecture of 2,000 breast
tumours reveals novel subgroups. *Nature* **486**, 346-352 (2012).

61.   Liu-Chittenden, Y., *et al.* Genetic and pharmacological disruption of the TEAD-YAP
complex suppresses the oncogenic activity of YAP. *Genes Dev* **26**, 1300-1305 (2012).

62.   Gibault, F., Sturbaut, M., Bailly, F., Melnyk, P. & Cotelle, P. Targeting Transcriptional
Enhanced Associate Domains (TEADs). *J Med Chem* **61**, 5057-5072 (2018).

63.   Kim, B.K., *et al.* PI3K/AKT/beta-Catenin Signaling Regulates Vestigial-Like 1 Which
Predicts Poor Prognosis and Enhances Malignant Phenotype in Gastric Cancer.
Cancers (Basel) **11**(2019).

64.   Liu, Y., *et al.* Increased TEAD4 expression and nuclear localization in colorectal cancer
promote epithelial-mesenchymal transition and metastasis in a YAP-independent
manner. *Oncogene* **35**, 2789-2800 (2016).

65. Lin, K.C., *et al.* Regulation of Hippo pathway transcription factor TEAD by p38 MAPK-
induced cytoplasmic translocation. *Nat Cell Biol* **19**, 996-1002 (2017).

66. Song, S., *et al.* The Hippo Coactivator YAP1 Mediates EGFR Overexpression and
Confers Chemoresistance in Esophageal Cancer. *Clin Cancer Res* **21**, 2580-2590
(2015).

67. Lee, D.H., *et al.* LATS-YAP/TAZ controls lineage specification by regulating TGFbeta
signaling and Hnf4alpha expression during liver development. *Nat Commun* **7**, 11961
(2016).

68. Patten, D.K., *et al.* Enhancer mapping uncovers phenotypic heterogeneity and
evolution in patients with luminal breast cancer. *Nat Med* **24**, 1469-1480 (2018).

69. Nayar, U., *et al.* Acquired HER2 mutations in ER(+) metastatic breast cancer confer
resistance to estrogen receptor-directed therapies. *Nat Genet* **51**, 207-216 (2019).

70. Bushweller, J.H. Targeting transcription factors in cancer - from undruggable to
reality. *Nat Rev Cancer* **19**, 611-624 (2019).

71. Elisi, G.M., *et al.* Repurposing of Drugs Targeting YAP-TEAD Functions. *Cancers*
(Basel) **10**(2018).

72. Bradley, S.D., *et al.* Vestigial-like 1 is a shared targetable cancer-placenta antigen
expressed by pancreatic and basal-like breast cancers. *Nat Commun* **11**, 5332 (2020).

73. Martin, L.A., *et al.* Discovery of naturally occurring ESR1 mutations in breast cancer
cell lines modelling endocrine resistance. *Nat Commun* **8**, 1865 (2017).

74. Pancholi, S., *et al.* Combination of mTORC1/2 inhibitor vistusertib plus fulvestrant in
vitro and in vivo targets oestrogen receptor-positive endocrine-resistant breast
cancer. *Breast Cancer Res* **21**, 135 (2019).

75. Schmidt, D., *et al.* ChIP-seq: using high-throughput sequencing to discover protein-
DNA interactions. *Methods* **48**, 240-248 (2009).

76. Kim, D., *et al.* TopHat2: accurate alignment of transcriptomes in the presence of
insertions, deletions and gene fusions. *Genome Biol* **14**, R36 (2013).

77. Li, H., *et al.* The Sequence Alignment/Map format and SAMtools. *Bioinformatics* **25**,
2078-2079 (2009).

78. Anders, S., Pyl, P.T. & Huber, W. HTSeq--a Python framework to work with high-
throughput sequencing data. *Bioinformatics* **31**, 166-169 (2015).

79. Anders, S. & Huber, W. Differential expression analysis for sequence count data.
Genome Biol **11**, R106 (2010).

80. Lawrence, M., Gentleman, R. & Carey, V. rtracklayer: an R package for interfacing
with genome browsers. *Bioinformatics* **25**, 1841-1842 (2009).

81. Raudvere, U., *et al.* g:Profiler: a web server for functional enrichment analysis and
conversions of gene lists (2019 update). *Nucleic Acids Res* **47**, W191-W198 (2019).

82. Skehan, P., *et al.* New colorimetric cytotoxicity assay for anticancer-drug screening. *J*
Natl Cancer Inst **82**, 1107-1112 (1990).

83. Langmead, B., Trapnell, C., Pop, M. & Salzberg, S.L. Ultrafast and memory-efficient
alignment of short DNA sequences to the human genome. *Genome Biol* **10**, R25
(2009).

84. Zhang, Y., *et al.* Model-based analysis of ChIP-Seq (MACS). *Genome Biol* **9**, R137
(2008).

85. Quinlan, A.R. & Hall, I.M. BEDTools: a flexible suite of utilities for comparing genomic
features. *Bioinformatics* **26**, 841-842 (2010).

86.   Karolchik, D.*, et al.* The UCSC Table Browser data retrieval tool. *Nucleic Acids Res* **32**,
D493-496 (2004).
87.   Stempor, P. & Ahringer, J. SeqPlots - Interactive software for exploratory data
analyses, pattern discovery and visualization in genomics. *Wellcome Open Res* **1**, 14
(2016).
88.   Heinz, S.*, et al.* Simple combinations of lineage-determining transcription factors
prime cis-regulatory elements required for macrophage and B cell identities. *Mol Cell*
38, 576-589 (2010).
89.   McLean, C.Y.*, et al.* GREAT improves functional interpretation of cis-regulatory
regions. *Nat Biotechnol* **28**, 495-501 (2010).
90.   Supek, F., Bosnjak, M., Skunca, N. & Smuc, T. REVIGO summarizes and visualizes long
lists of gene ontology terms. *PLoS One* **6**, e21800 (2011).

1044

1045

1046

1047

1048

1049

1050

1051

1052

1053

1054

1055

1056

1057

1058

1059

1060

1061

1062

1063

1064

1065

1066

1067

1068

1069 **Figure Legends**

1070

Fig. 1 VGLL1 expression is induced in fulvestrant-resistant breast cancer. a,

Ratio of H3K27ac in FULVR/MCF7 cells at gene promoters in a window of $\pm$ 1.5 kb

centred on the transcriptional start site. H3K27ac is highly enriched at the promoters

of the *VGLL1* and *VGLL3* genes in FULVR cells relative to MCF7 cells, whereas ER

target genes (including *PGR*, *GREB1* and *TFF1*) show H3K27ac loss in FULVR cells.

b, Genome browser view of H3K27ac ChIP-seq signal at the promoter region of the

VGLL1 and VGLL3 genes in MCF7-FULVR and MCF7 cells. **c**, RT-qPCR showing

VGLL1 and *VGLL3* upregulation in FULVR cells and loss of ESR1 and PGR

expression. Data are presented as mean + s.e.m of *n*=3 experiments. **P*<0.05

(Student's t-test, two-tailed). **d**, Immunoblotting of VGLL1, VGLL3 and proteins in the

YAP/TEAD pathway in MCF7 and FULVR cells **e**, RNA-FISH showing increased

VGLL1 mRNA levels in breast cancer patients after fulvestrant treatment and relapse

compared to matched pre-treatment samples. Representative images show the

results for matched samples from one patient. Nuclei are labelled with DAPI, and

individual *VGLL1* mRNA molecules detected with Cy5-labelled probes. *P*=0.0177

(one-tailed Wilcoxon signed rank test). Scale bar, 10μm. **f**, RT-qPCR for *ESR1* and

VGLL1 after treatment of ER+ breast cancer cell lines with fulvestrant (100nM, 24 h).

g, RT-qPCR for *ESR1* and *VGLL1* after ESR1 siRNA. Data in **f** and **g** are presented

as in **c**. **P*<0.05 (Student's t-test, two-tailed).

1090

Fig. 2 VGLL1 is recruited to TEAD4 binding regions in fulvestrant-resistant

MCF7 cells. a, Overlap between TEAD4 ChIP-seq peaks in MCF7 and FULVR cells

showing increased TEAD4 binding in FULVR cells. Top-most enriched motifs in each

cell line are shown. More detailed motif analysis is shown in Supplementary Fig. 3b.

b, Correlation between VGLL1 and TEAD4 occupancy at TEAD4 peaks in FULVR

cells. *P-value* was calculated using the Spearman test; r$_s$, Spearman's correlation

coefficient. **c**, Heatmap showing TEAD4 and VGLL1 binding at shared and unique

TEAD4 peaks in each cell line, in a window of $\pm$ 2kb centred on the peak centre. **d**,

VGLL1 binding is enriched at TEAD4 peaks in FULVR cells. Binding enrichment was

calculated as VGLL1-TEAD4 co-binding over the mean expected value after

generating random permutations of the TEAD4 peaks (Chi-squared test p-value
<0.0001). **e**, Average normalized ChIP-seq signal of TEAD4, VGLL1 and H3K27ac at
TEAD4 peaks in FULVR cells, in a window of ± 3 kb from the peak centre. **f**, Average
ChIP-seq signal of H3K27ac on VGLL1 peaks divided in quantiles based on the peak
coverage in FULVR cells. **g**, Genome browser view of VGLL1, TEAD4 and H3K27ac
ChIP-seq signal, together with the RNA-seq signal in MCF7 and FULVR cells at
YAP/TEAD target genes described in other cell lines.

1108

Fig. 3 VGLL1 mediates resistance to fulvestrant. a, VGLL1 is required for the
growth of MCF7-FULVR cells. Cells were transfected with two independent siRNAs
for VGLL1. Growth was determined with the SRB assay five days after transfection.
Data are mean ± s.e.m of n=6 independent wells. One representative experiment is
shown; similar results were obtained in two additional independent experiments. *
P<0.05 (Mann-Whitney test, two tailed). Also shown are expression levels of VGLL1
following siVGLL1 transfection (*n*=3, *p*<0.05 (Student's t-test, two-tailed)). **b**, The
synergistic activation mediators (SAM) technique using a catalytically dead Cas9
(dCas9) for transcriptional activation of endogenous genes[49], with a sgRNA for the
region -156 to -134 of the VGLL1 gene, was used to activate VGLL1 expression in
MCF7 cells. **c,** RT-qPCR of VGLL1 in MCF7 cells overexpressing VGLL1 (MCF7
ActCas9-VGLL1) generated as described in **b** and control cells (MCF7 ActCas9-
Vector). **d,** Transcriptional activation of endogenous VGLL1 in MCF7 cells promotes
fulvestrant resistance. Growth of MCF7 ActCas9-VGLL1 cells and MCF7 ActCas9-
Vector cells was monitored using live cell imaging in the presence of 100 nM
fulvestrant. Shown are the results of one of three independent experiments. Data are
mean ± s.e.m of n=9 representative images from one experiment. **e,** Immunoblotting
for VGLL1, ER and PR in the indicated cell lines. VGLL1-FULVR-1 and VGLL1-
FULVR-2 correspond to two independent fulvestrant resistant cell lines derived from
the parental MCF7 ActCas9-VGLL1 cell line after continuous culturing in the presence
of 100 nM or 1μM fulvestrant, respectively. **f,** Normalized RNA-seq read counts of
VGLL1, *ESR1* and *PGR* in the indicated cell lines showing strong increase in VGLL1
expression in the resistant cells, with a concurrent downregulation of ER and PGR. **g,**
MCF7 ActCas9-VGLL1-FULVR cells were transfected with siVGLL1 and growth
assessed as in **a.** Data are mean ± s.e.m of n=6. One representative experiment is

shown; similar results were obtained in two additional independent experiments. *

$P<0.05$ (Mann-Whitney test, two tailed). RT-qPCR for VGLL1 is also shown (n=3,

*$p<0.05$ (Student's t-test, two-tailed)). **h,** Growth of the indicated cell lines treated with

increasing concentrations of fulvestrant to a maximum of 1 µM, for five days. Cell

growth was estimated using the SRB assay and is shown as percentage relative to

vehicle (n=6). Half maximum inhibitory concentration (IC_{50}) is also shown for each line.

1140

Fig. 4 Genes upregulated in fulvestrant-resistant breast cancer cells depend on

VGLL1 transcriptional activity. a, Genes predicted as VGLL1 targets in FULVR cells

are more highly expressed in FULVR cells than MCF7 cells. Genes were segregated

into those with no VGLL1 peaks, and those with 2 or more and 5 or more VGLL1

peaks. The y-axis shows the log2 fold change in gene expression determined from

RNA-seq in FULVR cells versus the parental MCF7 cells. Data are presented as box-

and-whiskers plots (whiskers extend from the 5th to the 95th percentile; the box

extends from the 25th to the 75th percentile; the line within the box represents the

median). ****$P<0.0001$ (Mann-Whitney test, two tailed). **b,** Genes activated by VGLL1

(n = 762) are over-expressed in FULVR cells relative to MCF7 cells, compared to not-

VGLL1 targets (n = 8,932). VGLL1-activated genes and not-VGLL1 targets were

determined by RNA-seq in FULVR cells transfected with VGLL1 siRNAs. The VGLL1-

activated genes were defined as genes downregulated by VGLL1 siRNAs (see

Methods, and Supplementary Fig. 4b). Data are presented as in **a**. $P<0.0001$ (Mann-

Whitney test, two tailed). **c,** Normalized average H3K27ac signal on the promoters of

VGLL1 activated genes in FULVR cells and MCF7 cells. **d,** VGLL1-activated genes (n

= 762) display higher expression levels in FULVR cells than not-VGLL1 targets (n =

8,932). The y-axis shows normalized gene expression values from RNA-seq.

$P<0.0001$ (Mann-Whitney test, two tailed). **e,** GO molecular function sets enriched in

VGLL1-activated genes. **f,** RNA-seq data represented as a volcano plot for the

comparison between FULVR vs MCF7 cells showing the VGLL1-activated genes as

red dots. Four VGLL1 targets highly upregulated in FULVR cells and associated with

growth functional categories enriched in VGLL1-activated genes are highlighted. **g,**

RT-qPCR in the indicated MCF7-ActCas9 cells represented as a heatmap. Gene

expression values were normalized to *GAPDH* expression and are shown as log2 fold

change relative to MCF7 ActCas9-Vector cells.

1167

Fig. 5 VGLL1 promotes EGFR expression in FULVR cells. a, Genome browser view of VGLL1 and TEAD4 ChIP-seq signal at the EGFR gene and EGFR enhancer (highlighted). **b,** ChIP-qPCR for TEAD4, VGLL1 and H3K27ac in MCF7 ActCas9-Vector, MCF7 ActCas9-VGLL1 and MCF7 ActCas9-VGLL1-FULVR cells showing VGLL1 and TEAD4 binding at the EGFR enhancer together with EGFR enhancer activation exclusively in FULVR cells. The CTGF -8.3kb region was used as a negative control for VGLL1/TEAD4 binding. **c,** RT-qPCR for EGFR in the indicated MCF7-ActCas9 cells (n=3, *p<0.05 (Student's t-test, two-tailed)). **d,** Immunoblotting for EGFR and downstream EGFR signalling proteins showing EGFR up-regulation and activation of the EGFR pathway in MCF7 ActCas9-VGLL1-FULVR cells **e,** RT-qPCR for dCAS9, *VGLL1* and *EGFR* in MCF7 ActCas9-VGLL1-FULVR cells transfected with dCAS9 siRNAs showing reduction in *VGLL1* and *EGFR* expression. **f,** Growth of the indicated MCF7 ActCas9 cell lines treated with increasing concentrations of the EGFR inhibitor erlotinib (0.05 μM to 12.5 μM) for 5 days. Growth is shown as percentage relative to vehicle treatment for one representative experiment (n=6 replicates) of two independent experiments. **g,** Western blot of EGFR and the downstream EGFR signalling proteins in the indicated MCF7 ActCas9 cell lines treated with erlotinib at the indicated concentrations (24 h). **h,** Correlation between *EGFR* and *VGLL1* gene expression in ER + breast cancers from TCGA (n = 609 samples). **i,** The mechanism by which VGLL1/TEAD4 activate the expression of EGFR in fulvestrant-resistant breast cancer cells.

Fig. 6 Verteporfin inhibits VGLL1 transcriptional activity. a, VP impairs the growth of FULVR cells. Growth in the indicated FULVR cells treated with increasing concentrations of VP is shown as percentage of growth relative to vehicle. **b,** ChIP-qPCR for VGLL1 and TEAD4 in MCF7-FULVR cells showing reduced VGLL1 binding at the target genes in the presence of VP (2μM, 24 h). The y axis shows DNA enrichment calculated as the percentage of input. **c,** RNA-seq data represented as a volcano plot showing upregulated genes (red, adjusted P < 0.01, log2 (fold change) > 1) and downregulated genes (blue, adjusted P < 0.01, log2 (fold change) < -1) in MCF7-FULVR cells treated with VP, (2μM, 24 h) compared to vehicle (DMSO), n=4 biological replicates. VGLL1 target genes such as IGFBP5, EGFR and TGFB2 are strongly downregulated by VP. **d,** RT-qPCR in MCF7-FULVR cells treated with VP

(2μM, 24 h) showing that VP selectively downregulates the expression VGLL1 targets,

while the expression of not VGLL1 targets (APEX1 and URI1) is not affected by VP.

e, Genes downregulated by VP are highly enriched in VGLL1 peaks. The y axis shows

the number of VGLL1 peaks over the expected value after generating random

permutations of the VGLL1 peaks showing that the top most highly downregulated

genes after VP treatment in FULVR cells (n = 631) have significantly higher number

of VGLL1 peaks compared to the bottom genes not differentially expressed by VP (n

= 631). Data are presented as box-and-whiskers plots (whiskers extend from the 5th

to the 95th percentile; the box extends from the 25th to the 75th percentile; the line

within the box represents the median). **** P<0.0001 (Mann-Whitney test, two tailed).

f, Genome browser view of VGLL1 and TEAD4 normalized ChIP-seq signal and

normalized RNA-seq signal in FULVR cells showing representative examples of

VGLL1 activated genes (direct VGLL1 targets) and not-VGLL1 targets. VGLL1

activated genes are downregulated by VGLL1 siRNA and are also selectively

downregulated by VP (2μM, 24 h) compared to not-VGLL1 targets. **g,** VGLL1 activated

genes (n = 762) are preferentially downregulated by VP compared to not-VGLL1

targets (n = 8,932). The y axis shows fold change in gene expression from RNA-seq

between VP versus DMSO treatment in MCF7-FULVR cells. Data are presented as in

e. ****P<0.0001 (Mann-Whitney test, two tailed). **h,** Breast cancer patients with higher

VGLL1 expression display increased levels of expression of the VGLL1 activated

genes compared to patients with lower VGLL1 expression. Patients from the

METABRIC breast cancer dataset were stratified according to high (top quantile,

n=495) or low (bottom quantile, n=495) *VGLL1* expression levels. Data are presented

as in **e**. ****P<0.0001 (Mann-Whitney test, two tailed). **i,** Kaplan–Meier plot

representing the percentage of metastasis-free survival in patients with breast cancer

treated with endocrine therapies showing that patients with higher expression of the

VGLL1 activated genes signature display lower survival rates (log-rank Mantel-Cox

test).

1229

Supplementary Figure Legends

Supplementary Figure 1.

a, RNA-seq data represented as a volcano plot showing upregulated genes (red,

adjusted P < 0.01, log2 (fold change) > 2.5) and downregulated genes (blue, adjusted

P < 0.01, log2 (fold change) < -2.5) in FULVR cells compared to MCF7 cells. VGLL1
and VGLL3 expression is strongly increased in FULVR cells. Classical ER target
genes (TFF1, PGR and GREB1) are shown as controls for ER signaling
downregulation in FULVR cells. **b,** Normalized gene expression of TEAD coactivators
determined by RNA-seq. VGLL1 and VGLL3 are the only TEAD coactivators that show
the strongest upregulation in FULVR cells, as well as being up-regulated in tamoxifen-
resistant MCF7 (TAMR) cells. Data are presented as box-and-whiskers plots showing
the median of two independent biological RNA-seq replicates (whiskers extend to
minimum and maximum values). LTED, long term estradiol deprived. RNA-seq data
were obtained from ref[16]. **c,** RT-qPCR for genes in the YAP/TEAD pathway in MCF7
and FULVR cells. Data are presented as mean + s.e.m of three independent
experiments. *P<0.05 (Student's t-test, two-tailed)). **d,** Heatmap showing the
expression of genes in the YAP/TEAD pathway in FULVR cell lines derived from the
ER positive breast cancer cell lines MCF7, T47D or ZR-75-1. Upregulation of VGLL1
expression is common to all the FULVR cell lines. The expression values are
represented as log2 (fold change) relative to the corresponding parental cell lines and
normalized to GAPDH. **e,** Immunoblotting showing VGLL1 expression in different
FULVR cell lines, accompanied by reductions in ER and PR levels. ER, estrogen
receptor; PR-A, progesterone receptor isoform A; PR-B, progesterone receptor
isoform B. **f,** Immunohistochemistry of VGLL1 performed in sections from matched
breast cancer samples prior to fulvestrant treatment and after fulvestrant treatment
and relapse. VGLL1 staining is significantly higher after relapse on fulvestrant
treatment, *p*=0.0098 (one-tailed Wilcoxon signed rank test). Representative images of
matched breast cancer tissue pre and post fulvestrant, show increased VGLL1
staining after fulvestrant treatment and relapse. Scale bar, 100µm.
1259
Supplementary Figure 2.
a, Immunoblotting of VGLL1, ER and PR after treatment with vehicle or fulvestrant at
the indicated concentrations (48 h) in MCF7 cells. Increased levels of VGLL1 are
observed after ER inhibition by fulvestrant. **b,** RT-qPCR for genes in the YAP/TEAD
pathway in MCF7 cells after treatment with vehicle or fulvestrant (100nM, 24 h). Data
are presented as mean + s.e.m of three independent experiments. *P<0.05 (Student's
t-test, two-tailed)). **c,** Heatmap showing the expression of genes in the YAP/TEAD
pathway in the ER positive breast cancer cell lines T47D, ZR-75-1 and BT474 after

treatment with vehicle or fulvestrant (100nM, 24 h). The expression values are

represented as log2 (fold change) relative to the vehicle control and normalized to

GAPDH. **d,** Heatmap showing the expression of genes in the YAP/TEAD pathway

after *ESR1* siRNA in the ER positive breast cancer cell lines T47D, ZR-75-1 and

BT474. A strong upregulation of *VGLL1* after *ESR1* downregulation is common to all

cell lines. The expression values are represented as log2 (fold change) relative to the

control siRNA (siControl) and normalized to *GAPDH*. **e,** Western blot of VGLL1 and

ER showing VGLL1 upregulation following ER downregulation by ESR1 siRNA in

MCF7 cells. **f**, RT-qPCR for genes in the YAP/TEAD pathway in MCF7 cells

transfected with ESR1 siRNA. Data are presented as mean + s.e.m of two

independent experiments. *$P<0.05$ (Student's t-test, two-tailed)). **g,** RT-qPCR for

VGLL1 and the ER target genes *PGR* and *GREB1* in MCF7 cells showing

downregulation of ER transcriptional activity and *VGLL1* upregulation after treatment

with different SERDs (GDC-0810, AZD9496 and RAD1901, 100nM, 48 h). Data are

presented as mean + s.e.m of two independent experiments.

1283

Supplementary Figure 3.

a, Correlation between two biological replicates of TEAD4 ChIP-seq generated in

MCF7 cells and FULVR cells. *P-value* was calculated using Spearman test, r_s,

Spearman's correlation coefficient. **b,** *De novo* motif analysis of TEAD4 peaks in

MCF7 cells and FULVR cells. **c,** Correlation between three biological replicates of

VGLL1 ChIP-seq in FULVR cells. *P-value* was calculated using Spearman test, r_s,

Spearman's correlation coefficient. **d,** *De novo* motif analysis of VGLL1 peaks in

FULVR cells. **e,** Fraction of VGLL1 and TEAD4 peaks present at the indicated genomic

features showing that the majority of VGLL1 and TEAD4 peaks are present at intronic

and intergenic regions. **f,** Normalized H3K27ac signal at TEAD4/VGLL1 co-bound

regions from FULVR cells showing lower H3K27ac signal at these sites in MCF7 cells

compared to FULVR cells. **g,** ChIP-qPCR showing preferential VGLL1 binding

compared to YAP/TAZ binding on promoters and enhancers of known YAP/TEAD

target genes from other cell lines[47], in FULVR cells but not in MCF7 cells. Negative

control regions are indicated which were previously reported as non-YAP/TAZ targets

in other cell types[47]. Binding enrichment was calculated as percentage of input.

*$P<0.05$ (Student's t-test, two-tailed).

1301

Supplementary Figure 4.

a, Functional annotation of the VGLL1 ChIP-seq peaks in FULVR cells was performed using GREAT[89]. REVIGO[90] was used to visualize the top nine most significant categories (see Supplementary Table 2 for the complete list). **b,** Left: Growth of T47D-FULVR cells and MCF7-FULVR(2) determined with the SRB assay five days after VGLL1 siRNA transfection. Growth was calculated relative to the siRNA control (siControl). Data are mean + s.e.m of n=6. *$P < 0.05$ (Mann-Whitney test, two tailed). Right: VGLL1 gene expression after VGLL1 siRNA transfection in the indicated cell lines (*n*=3, *$p<0.05$ (Student's t-test, two-tailed)). **c,** Western blot of VGLL1 in MCF7 cells with stable expression of dCAS9 fused to transcriptional activators[49] targeted to the VGLL1 promoter (MCF7 ActCas9-VGLL1) and control cells (MCF7 ActCas9-Vector). **d,** Growth of MCF7 ActCas9-VGLL1 cells and control MCF7 ActCas9-Vector cells monitored using live cell imaging over a period of 100 days in the presence of fulvestrant (100nM, similar results were obtained with 1μM). **e,** RT-qPCR of *VGLL1*, *ESR1* and *PGR* in the indicated MCF7 ActCas9 cell lines. **f,** Comparison of genes differentially expressed in MCF7 ActCas9-VGLL1-FULVR-1 cells across independently generated fulvestrant resistant breast cancer cell line models show similar transcriptional perturbations across the different models. The y axis shows the fold change in gene expression from RNA-seq data between each FULVR cell line and the corresponding parental cells for genes upregulated (adjusted $p<0.05$, fold change > 2) and downregulated (adjusted $p<0.05$, fold change < 0.5) in MCF7 ActCas9-VGLL1-FULVR-1 cells compared to the parental MCF7 ActCas9-VGLL1 cells. Data are presented as box-and-whiskers plots (whiskers extend from the 5th to the 95th percentile; the box extends from the 25th to the 75th percentile; the line within the box represents the median). ****$P<0.0001$ (Mann-Whitney test, two tailed). **g,** RNA-seq data represented as a volcano plot for the comparison between MCF7 ActCas9-VGLL1 vs MCF7 ActCas9-Vector cells, showing that MCF7 cells overexpressing VGLL1 which have not been exposed to fulvestrant show almost identical transcriptional profiles compared to the control cells. **h,** Growth of the indicated MCF7 ActCas9 cells following five days of treatment with increasing doses (0.025 nM to 1μM) of three different SERDs (AZD9496, RAD1901, GDC-0810). Data are plotted as the mean ± s.e.m of n=6.

Supplementary Figure 5.

a, MCF7 ActCas9-VGLL1-FULVR cells display higher levels of expression of predicted

VGLL1 targets from the independent FULVR cells. Genes with 2 or more and 5 or

more VGLL1 associated peaks were considered as VGLL1 targets for this analysis

together with genes without VGLL1 associated peaks. The y axis shows the fold

change in gene expression determined by RNA-seq between MCF7 ActCas9-VGLL1-

FULVR-1 and the parental MCF7 ActCas9-VGLL1 cells. Data are presented as box-

and-whiskers plots (whiskers extend from the 5th to the 95th percentile; the box

extends from the 25th to the 75th percentile; the line within the box represents the

median). ****P<0.0001 (Mann-Whitney test, two tailed); **P = 0.0056 (Mann-Whitney

test, two tailed). **b,** VGLL1 activated genes are defined as genes downregulated by

VGLL1 siRNAs. Fold change in gene expression between FULVR cells transfected

with VGLL1 siRNAs versus control siRNA for VGLL1 activated genes (n = 762) and

not-VGLL1 targets (n = 8,932). Gene expression was determined by RNA-seq in

FULVR cells transfected with three different VGLL1 siRNAs, n=3 biological replicates

(see Methods). Data are presented as box-and-whiskers plots, as in **a**. ****P<0.0001

(Mann-Whitney test, two tailed). **c,** *VGLL1* gene expression determined by RNA-seq

in FULVR cells transfected with three different VGLL1 siRNAs from the same RNA-

seq experiment as in **b**. The y axis shows normalized read counts from RNA-seq data,

n=3 biological replicates. **d,** VGLL1 binding is enriched at VGLL1 activated genes in

FULVR cells. The y axis shows the number of VGLL1 peaks associated with VGLL1

activated genes and not-VGLL1 targets over the mean expected value after

generating random permutations of the VGLL1 peaks. P<0.0001 (Mann-Whitney test,

two tailed). **e,** TEAD4 binding is enriched at VGLL1 activated genes in FULVR cells.

The y axis shows the number of TEAD4 peaks associated with VGLL1 activated genes

and not-VGLL1 targets over the mean expected value after generating random

permutations of the TEAD4 peaks. P<0.0001 (Mann-Whitney test, two tailed). **f,** Fold

change in H3K27ac signal between FULVR versus MCF7 cells at the promoters of

VGLL1 activated genes (n = 762) and not-VGLL1 targets (n = 8,932). Data are

presented as box-and-whiskers plots, as in **a**. P<0.0001 (Mann-Whitney test, two

tailed). **g,** Increased H3K27ac and TEAD4 recruitment in FULVR cells compared to

MCF7 cells at regulatory elements associated with VGLL1 activated genes. Data are

presented as average normalized ChIP-seq signal of VGLL1, TEAD4 and H3K27ac in

FULVR cells together with TEAD4 and H3K27ac signal in MCF7 cells, in a window of

± 2.5 kb centred on the VGLL1/TEAD4 peaks associated with VGLL1 activated genes

in FULVR cells. **h,** Heatmap showing a strong upregulation of *VGLL1* gene expression

and upregulation of VGLL1 activated genes, with a concurrent downregulation of ER

transcriptional activity as evidenced by a significant reduction in *PGR* expression, in

MCF7 ActCas9-VGLL1-FULVR cells. The expression values are shown as normalized

read counts from RNA-seq and are represented as log2 fold change relative to MCF7

ActCas9-Vector cells.

1376

Supplementary Figure 6.

a, Ratio of TEAD4 ChIP-seq signal in FULVR versus MCF7 cells at TEAD4 peaks from

FULVR and MCF7 cells. The position of the VGLL1 promoter and EGFR enhancer are

shown in this plot and are among the top genes with high TEAD4 signal in FULVR

cells and absence of TEAD4 binding in MCF7 cells. VGLL1 is recruited to the TEAD4

binding sites at the VGLL1 promoter and EGFR enhancer in FULVR cells (see also

Fig. 5a). **b,** RT-qPCR for EGFR showing EGFR upregulation in different fulvestrant

resistant cell lines which also upregulate VGLL1 (see Fig. 1c and Supplementary Fig.

1d, e for VGLL1 expression in these cell lines). **c,** RT-qPCR for *EGFR* and *VGLL1* in

MCF7 ActCas9-VGLL1-FULVR cells transfected with VGLL1 siRNA, showing reduced

EGFR expression following VGLL1 downregulation. **d,** Western blot of VGLL1, EGFR

and downstream EGFR targets in MCF7-FULVR cells transfected with VGLL1 siRNAs

showing reduced EGFR and downstream EGFR signalling following VGLL1

downregulation. **e,** Western blot of VGLL1, EGFR and downstream EGFR targets in

T47D-FULVR cells transfected with VGLL1 siRNAs showing reduced EGFR and

downstream EGFR signalling following VGLL1 downregulation. **f,** Growth of the

indicated FULVR cells and the corresponding isogenic fulvestrant-sensitive cells

treated with increasing concentrations of the EGFR inhibitor erlotinib for 5 days.

Growth is shown as percentage relative to vehicle (n=6 replicates). **g,** Western blot of

EGFR and downstream EGFR targets in MCF7-FULVR cells and the isogenic

fulvestrant-sensitive MCF7 cells, treated with erlotinib at the indicated concentrations

(24 h). **h,** EGFR ranks first as the most significantly co-expressed gene with VGLL1 in

breast cancer patients from METABRIC and is also the highest ranked protein

significantly correlated with VGLL1 in breast cancer from TCGA. **i,** *EGFR* expression

in ER+ breast cancer patients with high (top 10%) and low (bottom 10%) *VGLL1*

expression from TCGA and METABRIC datasets. ****P<2.2x10^{-16} (Mann-Whitney test,

two tailed).

1404

Supplementary Figure 7.

a, Growth of MCF7 ActCas9-VGLL1-FULVR cells is reduced following treatment with

increasing concentrations of VP. Data is shown as percentage growth relative to

vehicle (n=6 replicates). **b,** Fold growth relative to day 0 of MCF7-FULVR(2) cells

treated with the indicated concentrations of VP over 9 days. **c,** Heatmap showing the

expression of representative VGLL1 activated genes (direct VGLL1 targets) and not

VGLL1 targets in FULVR cells after downregulation of VGLL1 with two different VGLL1

siRNAs. The expression values were determined by RNA-seq and are represented as

fold change relative to siControl. **d,** RT-qPCR for *VGLL1*, representative VGLL1

activated genes, and not-VGLL1 targets (APEX1 and URI1) in FULVR cells after

downregulation of VGLL1 with two different VGLL1 siRNAs. Expression values are

represented as fold change relative to siControl and normalized to *GAPDH*. **e,** Genes

associated with VGLL1 peaks are preferentially downregulated by VP compared to

genes without VGLL1 associated peaks. Genes with 2 or more and 5 or more VGLL1

associated peaks were considered as VGLL1 targets for this analysis. The y axis

shows the fold change in gene expression determined by RNA-seq between VP

versus DMSO. Data are presented as box-and-whiskers plots (whiskers extend from

the 5th to the 95th percentile; the box extends from the 25th to the 75th percentile; the

line within the box represents the median). ****P<0.0001 (Mann-Whitney test, two

tailed); ** P = 0.0056 (Mann-Whitney test, two tailed). **f,** VGLL1 activated genes

display high sensitivity to VP downregulation. Pie charts showing that the proportion

of VGLL1 activated genes downregulated by VP is larger than the proportion of not

VGLL1 targets downregulated by the same treatment.

g, Box-and-whiskers plot showing that genes downregulated by VP in FULVR cells

(*adjusted P* < 0.01, log2(fold change) < -1) display higher expression levels than genes

not inhibited by VP (*adjusted P* > 0.05, log2(fold change) > -1). The y axis shows

normalized gene expression values determined by RNA-seq. Data are presented as

box-and-whiskers plots, as in **e**. ****P<0.0001 (Mann-Whitney test, two tailed). **h,**

Genes downregulated by VP are associated with growth functional categories

enriched in the VGLL1 activated genes. The y axis shows the fold change in gene

expression determined by RNA-seq between VP versus DMSO for genes included in

the following GO terms: Growth factor binding (GO:0019838), extracellular matrix

binding (GO:0050840) and transmembrane receptor protein kinase activity

(GO:0019199), showing that genes included in these categories are significantly

downregulated by VP. + P_{adj} = 2.39×10^{-25}, # P_{adj} = 2.76×10^{-9}, ^ P_{adj} = 1.34×10^{-22}

(Adjusted *p-values* from the pathway enrichment analysis of VP downregulated genes,

see also Supplementary Table 3). **i,** Kaplan–Meier plot representing the percentage

of metastasis-free survival in ER+ breast cancer patients from METABRIC showing

that patients with higher expression of the VGLL1 activated genes signature display

lower survival rates in response to endocrine therapies treatment (log-rank Mantel-

Cox test).

Figure 1

Figure 2

Figure 3

Figure 4

Figure 5

Figure 6

Supplementary Figure 1

Supplementary Figure 2

a

TEAD4 - MCF7

Sample 2 coverage (log2)

Sample 1 coverage (log2)

p < 2.2x10⁻¹⁶
rₛ = 0.94

TEAD4 - FULVR

Sample 2 coverage (log2)

Sample 1 coverage (log2)

p < 2.2x10⁻¹⁶
rₛ = 0.94

b

TEAD4 Binding Regions (MCF7)

Motif	Rank	TF	p-value
	1	TEAD4	1e-1479
	2	TEAD2	1e-1439
	3	TEAD	1e-1188
	4	FOXA1	1e-107
	5	FOXA1	1e-105
	6	AP2γ	1e-104
	7	FOXM1	1e-102
	8	AP2α	1e-101
	9	FOXA2	1e-88
	10	FOX:E BOX	1e-65

TEAD4 Binding Regions (FULVR)

Motif	Rank	TF	p-value
	1	TEAD4	1e-4752
	2	TEAD2	1e-4374
	3	TEAD	1e-3699
	4	FOSL2	1e-314
	5	JUN-AP1	1e-312
	6	FRA1	1e-296
	7	BATF	1e-277
	8	ATF3	1e-276
	9	AP1	1e-247
	10	GRHL2	1e-241

c

VGLL1 - FULVR

Sample 2 coverage (log2)

Sample 1 coverage (log2)

p < 2.2x10⁻¹⁶
rₛ = 0.94

Sample 3 coverage (log2)

Sample 1 coverage (log2)

p < 2.2x10⁻¹⁶
rₛ = 0.94

Sample 3 coverage (log2)

Sample 2 coverage (log2)

p < 2.2x10⁻¹⁶
rₛ = 0.99

d

VGLL1 Binding Regions (FULVR)

Motif	Rank	TF	p-value
	1	TEAD4	1e-1581
	2	GRHL2	1e-1546
	3	TEAD	1e-1432
	4	FOXA1	1e-1346
	5	FOXA1	1e-1323
	6	FOXM1	1e-1319
	7	TEAD2	1e-1267
	8	FRA1	1e-1172
	9	JUN-AP1	1e-1130
	10	FOSL2	1e-1125

e

TEAD4 MCF7: 11%, 43%, 38%

TEAD4 FULVR: 6%, 46%, 42%

VGLL1 FULVR: 3%, 49%, 44%

■ TTS ■ Exon ■ Intron ■ Intergenic ■ Promoter

f

H3K27ac signal at TEAD4/VGLL1 co-bound regions in FULVR cells

-1.5kb — 0bp — 1.5kb

■ H3K27ac–FULVR
■ H3K27ac–MCF7

g

% of INPUT

■ VGLL1 (MCF7) ■ YAP1 (MCF7) ■ TAZ (MCF7)
■ VGLL1 (FULVR) ■ YAP1 (FULVR) ■ TAZ (FULVR)

CTGF Promoter, AMOTL2 3' Enhancer, ANKRD1 Promoter, TGFB2 Enhancer, LSAMP Intron 1, CTGF -8.3kb, TUBB Promoter

YAP/TAZ Negative Regions

Supplementary Figure 3

a Functional annotation of VGLL1 peaks

b

c MCF7 ActCas9

d

e RT-qPCR

f RNA-seq

g RNA-seq

h

Supplementary Figure 4

a MCF7-ActCas9 cells
VGLL1-FULVR : VGLL1

b FULVR Cells
siVGLL1 #1/siControl
siVGLL1 #2/siControl
siVGLL1 #3/siControl

c VGLL1 expression
RNA-seq

d Enrichment of VGLL1 peaks at
VGLL1 activated genes

e Enrichment of TEAD4 peaks at
VGLL1 activated genes

f H3K27ac
FULVR : MCF7

g VGLL1/TEAD4 peaks associated
with VGLL1 activated genes

VGLL1-FULVR
TEAD4-FULVR
TEAD4-MCF7
H3K27ac-FULVR
H3K27ac-MCF7

h RNA-seq
Log2 FC

Supplementary Figure 5

Supplementary Figure 6

Supplementary Figure 7