NPEPPS is a novel and druggable driver
of platinum resistance

Robert T. Jones[1,14], Mathijs Scholtes[2,14], Andrew Goodspeed[1,3,14], Maryam Akbarzadeh[2,5],
Saswat Mohapatra[4], Lily Elizabeth Feldman[1], Hedvig Vekony[1], Annie Jean[1], Charlene B. Tilton[1],
Michael V. Orman[1], Shahla Romal[5], Cailin Deiter[1], Tsung Wai Kan[2,6], Nathaniel Xander[1],
Stephanie Araki[1], Molishree Joshi[1,7], Mahmood Javaid[8], Ryan Layer[8,9], Teemu D. Laajala[1,10],
Sarah Parker[11], Tokameh Mahmoudi[2,5,6*], Tahlita Zuiverloon[2,*], Dan Theodorescu[4,12,13,*], and
James C. Costello[1,3,15,*]

[1]Department of Pharmacology, University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus, Aurora, CO,
USA
[2]Department of Urology, Erasmus MC Cancer Institute, Erasmus University Medical Center
Rotterdam, Rotterdam, The Netherlands
[3]University of Colorado Cancer Center, University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus,
Aurora, CO, USA
[4]Cedars-Sinai Samuel Oschin Comprehensive Cancer Institute, Los Angeles, CA, USA
[5]Department of Biochemistry, Erasmus University Medical Center Rotterdam, Rotterdam, The
Netherlands
[6]Department of Pathology, Erasmus University Medical Center Rotterdam, Rotterdam, The
Netherlands
[7]Functional Genomics Facility, University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus, Aurora, CO,
USA
[8]Computer Science Department, University of Colorado, Boulder
[9]BioFrontiers Institute, University of Colorado, Boulder
[10]Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Turku, Turku, Finland.
[11]Smidt Heart Institute & Advanced Clinical Biosystems Research Institute, Cedars Sinai
Medical Center, Los Angeles, California 90048, United States
[12]Department of Urology, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, Los Angeles, CA, USA
[13]Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, Los
Angeles, CA, USA
[14]Equal first authors
[15]Lead Contact
*Corresponding Authors

Corresponding Authors

Tokameh Mahmoudi, PhD
Departments of Pathology, Urology and Biochemistry
Erasmus University Medical Center
Dr. Molewaterplein 40, 3015GD, Rotterdam
The Netherlands
+31 6 53152973
t.mahmoudi@erasmusmc.nl

Tahlita Zuiverloon, MD, PhD
Department of Urology
Erasmus MC Cancer Institute, Erasmus University Medical Center
Dr. Molewaterplein 40, 3015GD, Rotterdam
The Netherlands

51 +31 6 26 41 90 87
52 t.zuiverloon@erasmusmc.nl
53
Dan Theodorescu, MD, PhD
Departments of Surgery and Pathology
Cedars-Sinai Medical Center
8700 Beverly Blvd. OCC Mezz C2002
7/3/23 11:05:00 PMLos Angeles, CA 90048
+1 (310) 423-8431
dan.theodorescu@cshs.org
61
James C Costello, PhD
Department of Pharmacology
University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus
Mail Stop 8303
12801 E. 17th Ave., Rm L18-6114
Aurora, CO 80045
+1 (303) 724-8619
james.costello@cuanschutz.edu
70

71 **RUNNING TITLE**
72 NPEPPS regulates platinum drug response
73
74 **KEY WORDS**
75 Puromycin-sensitive aminopeptidase; multi-omics; Synthetic Lethality; Chemoresistance;
76 Bladder Cancer
77

FINANCIAL SUPPORT
This work was generously supported by the Anschutz Foundation to J.C.C., CA180175 to D.T.,
CA268055 to D.T. and J.C.C., FICAN Cancer Researcher by the Finnish Cancer Institute to
T.D.L., Erasmus MC mRACE grant 111296 to T.Z., Erasmus MC fellowship project 107088 to
T.Z., and training grants GM007635 and GM008497 supported R.T.J. This work utilized the
Functional Genomics Facility, Biostatistics and Bioinformatics Shared Resource, Genomics
Shared Resource, and Flow Cytometry Shared Resource supported by CA046934.
85

86 **CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT**
87 A provisional patent 63/153,519 has been filed on the subject matter of this work. J.C.C. is co-
88 founder of PrecisionProfile and OncoRX Insight. All other authors declare no competing
89 interests.
90

ABSTRACT

There is an unmet need to improve efficacy of platinum-based cancer chemotherapy. Using multi-omic assessment of cisplatin-responsive and -resistant human bladder cancer cell lines and whole-genome CRISPR screens, we identified Puromycin-Sensitive Aminopeptidase, NPEPPS, as a novel driver of cisplatin resistance. NPEPPS depletion sensitizes resistant bladder cancer cells to cisplatin *in vitro* and *in vivo*. Conversely, overexpression of NPEPPS in sensitive cells increased cisplatin resistance. We show that NPEPPS affects treatment response by regulating intracellular cisplatin concentrations. Patient-derived organoids (PDOs) generated from bladder cancer samples before and after cisplatin-based treatment, and from patients who did not receive cisplatin, were evaluated for sensitivity to cisplatin and they were found to be concordant with clinical response. In PDOs, shRNA depletion or pharmacologic inhibition of NPEPPS led to increased cisplatin sensitivity, while NPEPPS overexpression had the opposite effect. Our data present NPEPPS as a novel and druggable driver of cisplatin resistance by regulating intracellular cisplatin concentrations, along with providing the preclinical data to support clinical trials combining NPEPPS inhibition with cisplatin.

INTRODUCTION

Platinum-based chemotherapy has been successful in testicular, ovarian, bladder, head and neck, and lung cancer and remains a standard of care for many patients despite the advent of immunotherapy (1,2). However, dose-dependent side effects and chemoresistance have reduced the suitability and effectiveness of these drugs. The discovery of more effective agents or the development of strategies that improve efficacy of platinum-based regimens are approaches that can address these issues. Here we describe results from the latter approach, using bladder cancer (BCa) as a clinically relevant, and translationally tractable tumor models.

Bladder cancer accounts for 430,000 new diagnoses and 170,000 deaths worldwide annually (3). Cisplatin-based combination chemotherapy remains the first-line, standard of care for metastatic BCa, providing a 5-10% cure rate. However, up to 30% of patients are ineligible for cisplatin-based treatment (4) and are commonly offered immune checkpoint therapies (ICT) (5). However, ICT requires a PD-L1 diagnostic test, for which only ~25% of patients meet eligibility (6). Cisplatin-based combination chemotherapy is also standard of care in the neoadjuvant (NAC) setting for the management of localized muscle-invasive BCa (MIBC) (7,8). However, NAC adoption has been slow due to cisplatin toxicity and eligibility, along with the relatively small survival benefit of 5-15% over immediate cystectomy (9). Importantly, in both the metastatic and NAC settings, patient selection and therapeutic efficacy remain critical unresolved challenges (10).

Large-scale efforts have performed whole genome loss-of-function screening across hundreds of cancer cell lines using CRISPR- and shRNA-based libraries to define pan-cancer and context-specific genetic dependencies (11–14). While these efforts defined genetic dependencies in cancer, a limitation is that cells were grown under basal growth conditions in the absence of any treatment. Those studies were also performed in cells that had not acquired resistance to any treatments. To better understand the functional drivers of therapeutic resistance in the context of platinum drug treatment, here we performed CRISPR screens in the presence and absence of the therapy of interest (15–18), and in cells that have acquired resistance to the treatment itself (**Figure 1A**). Complementing these results with multi-omic profiling of treatment-responsive and -resistant cells allowed us to prioritize gene candidates for the best potential future clinical utility. Using these data, which make available as a public resource (https://bioinformatics.cuanschutz.edu/BLCA_GC_Omics/), we identified Puromycin-Sensitive Aminopeptidase, NPEPPS, as a novel driver of cisplatin resistance and validated this finding *in vitro* and *in vivo*. We then show that NPEPPS has its effect by directly regulating the intracellular concentrations of cisplatin. To determine the translational relevance of this discovery, tumor-derived organoids generated from patients before and after cisplatin-based chemotherapy, were used to validate and strengthen our results from bladder cancer cells and xenografts. In cells, xenografts, and organoids, we show that pharmacological inhibition of NPEPPS by tosedostat, a clinically used small molecule that inhibits NPEPPS, phenocopies genetic depletion of NPEPPS. Taken together our data supports NPEPPS as a therapeutic target and provides a compelling rationale for combining NPEPPS inhibition with cisplatin to improve bladder cancer patient outcomes.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Cell Culture

All human BCa cell lines as reported in the Key Resource Table were obtained from the Resistant Cancer Cell Line (RCCL) Collection and were grown in Iscove's Modified Dulbecco's Medium (IMDM) with 10% Fetal Bovine Serum (FBS). Cells were passaged every two to three days. Resistance to gemcitabine and cisplatin was confirmed at the reported resistance doses from the RCCL (**Table S1** and **Figure S1**). Lentivirus production utilized 293FT cells (ThermoFisher), which were maintained in DMEM (high glucose) supplemented with 0.1mM non-essential amino acids (NEAA), 6mM L-glutamine, 1mM sodium pyruvate, and 500μg/mL geneticin (G418) with 10% FBS added. Cells were routinely monitored for mycoplasma and confirmed negative at multiple times during this study using MycoAlert (Lonza). All cells were grown at 37°C with 5% CO_2 in a humidified incubator.

All molecular characterization efforts (RNA sequencing, whole exome sequencing, and mass spectrometric proteomics) were performed on cells from independent passages and in drug-free, complete media to identify stable molecular changes rather than treatment-induced transient responses. Cells were routinely passaged through drug-containing media at the resistant doses (**Table S1**) to confirm resistance was maintained and early passage cells were utilized whenever possible.

RNA sequencing

Sample preparation

All cell lines were grown for several passages in the absence of antibiotics, gemcitabine or cisplatin. Cell pellets were snap frozen from sub-confluent dishes from 3 separate passages (replicates) for each of the 20 cell lines sequenced (5 cell lines, each with 4 derivatives: parental, G-resistant, C-resistant, GC-resistant). RNA was extracted using the RNAeasy Plus Kit (Qiagen). Cells were lysed and passed through QIAShredder column (Qiagen) according to the manufacturer's protocol. gDNA elimination columns (Qiagen) were used to remove any residual gDNA from the purified RNA. RNA integrity was assessed on the High Sensitivity ScreenTape Assay on the Tape Station2200 (Agilent) and only samples with an RIN score of 8 or higher were used for sequencing. RNA library preparation was performed using the Universal Plus mRNA –Seq +UDI kit (Nugen) according to the manufacturer's specification. Each library was sequenced to a minimum of 40 million clusters or 80 million 150bp paired-end reads on a NovaSeq 6000 instrument (Illumina) at the University of Colorado Cancer Center Genomics Shared Resource.

Data processing

Illumina adapters and the first 12 base pairs of each read were trimmed using BBDuk and reads <50bp post trimming were discarded. Reads were aligned and quantified using STAR (19) against the Ensembl human transcriptome (GRCh38.p12 genome (release 96)). Ensembl genes were mapped to HGNC gene symbols using HGNC and Ensembl BioMart. Gene counts were generated using the sum of counts for transcripts of the same gene. Lowly expressed genes were removed if mean raw count <1 or mean CPM (counts per million) <1 for the entire dataset. Reads were normalized to CPM using the edgeR R package (20). Differential expression was calculated using the voom function in the limma R package (21). In addition to two-group comparisons, single drug comparisons for all cell lines were generated with cell line as a covariate (**Table S9**).

197 *Alignment and transcript quantification*

```
198 STAR --runThreadN 12 --runMode genomeGenerate --sjdbGTFfile
199 Homo_sapiens.GRCh38.96.gtf --genomeFastaFiles
200 Homo_sapiens.GRCh38.dna_sm.primary_assembly.fa
201
202 STAR --readFilesIn Read1.fastq.gz Read2.fastq.gz --readFilesCommand zcat --runThreadN 6 --
203 alignEndsProtrude 13 ConcordantPair --outFilterScoreMinOverLread 0.66 --
204 outFilterMatchNminOverLread 0.66 --outSAMtype BAM SortedByCoordinate --quantMode
205 GeneCounts
206
```

Pathway analysis

208 Gene set enrichment analysis was performed using the full list of genes ranked by fold change
209 for the indicated comparison and the fgsea R package (22) using gene sets from the Molecular
210 Signatures Database (v7.0) (23). General plots were generated with the ggplot2 and ggpubr R
211 packages (24). Heatmaps were generated with the ComplexHeatmap R package following z-
212 score transformation (25).

Proteomics

Sample preparation

All cell lines were grown for several passages in the absence of antibiotics, gemcitabine or
cisplatin, then seeded at 100,000 – 200,000 cells per well and grown for 48 hours in IMDM +
10% FBS. Approximately 48 hours after seeding cells the supernatant was aspirated and cells
were washed 3 times with cold phosphate-buffered saline (PBS). Cells were lysed in 100μl of
8M Urea, 50mM Tris-HCl, pH 8.0. Lysates were transferred to pre-chilled 1.5mL microcentrifuge
tubes and centrifuged at 15000 RCF for 10 minutes to pellet. The supernatant was then
transferred to a clean, pre-chilled tube and frozen. Lysate replicates were collected in triplicate
from different passages. Cell pellets were lysed in 8M Urea supplemented with 0.1% Rapigest
MS compatible detergent. DNA was sheared using probe sonication, and protein concentration
was estimated by BCA (Pierce, Thermo Scientific). A total of 30μg protein per sample was
aliquoted, and samples were diluted to <2M Urea concentration using 200mM ammonium
bicarbonate while also undergoing reduction with DTT (10mM) and then alkylation with IAA
(100mM). The pH of diluted protein lysates was verified as between 7-8, and samples were
digested with sequencing grade Trypsin/Lys-C enzyme (Promega) in the presence of 10%
Acetonitrile for 16 hours at 37$°$C. Samples were acidified adding formic acid to 1%, and speed
vac dehydration was used to evaporate acetonitrile. Peptides were desalted on C18 tips (Nest
group) and dried to completion. Prior to MS, peptides were resuspended in 0.1% Formic Acid
solution at 0.5μg/μL concentration with 1:40 synthetic iRT reference peptides (Biognosys).

Data acquisition

Peptides were analyzed by liquid chromatography coupled with mass spectrometry in data
independent acquisition (DIA) mode essentially as described previously (26). Briefly, 4μL of
digested sample were injected directly unto a 200 cm micro pillar array column (uPAC,
Pharmafluidics) and separated over 120 minutes reversed phase gradient at 1200 nL/min and
60$°$C. The gradient of aqueous 0.1% formic acid (A) and 0.1% formic acid in acetonitrile (B) was
implemented as follows: 2% B from 0 to 5 min, ramp to 4% B at 5.2 minutes, linear ramp to 28%
B at 95 minutes, and ramp to 46% B at 120 minutes. After each analytical run, the column was
flushed at 1200 nL/min and 60$°$C by injection of 50% Methanol at 95% B for 25 minutes followed

by a 10 minutes ramp down to 2% B and a 5 minute equilibration to 2% B. The eluting peptides
were electro sprayed through a 30 μm bore stainless steel emitter (EvoSep) and analyzed on an
Orbitrap Lumos using data independent acquisition (DIA) spanning the 400-1000 m/z range.
Each DIA scan isolated a 4 m/z window with no overlap between windows, accumulated the ion
current for a maximum of 54 seconds to a maximum AGC of 5E5, activated the selected ions by
HCD set at 30% normalized collision energy, and analyzed the fragments in the 200-2000m/z
range using 30,000 resolution (m/z = 200). After analysis of the full m/z range (150 DIA scans) a
precursor scan was acquired over the 400-1000 m/z range at 60,000 resolution.

Peptide library generation

To construct a comprehensive peptide ion library for the analysis of human BCa we combined
several datasets, both internally generated and external publicly available data resources were
utilized. First, we utilized a previously published (27) human bladder tumor proteomics
experiment by downloading raw files from the online data repository (ProteomeXchange,
PXD010260) and searching them through our internal pipeline for data dependent acquisition
MS analysis (28) against the UniProt human reviewed canonical sequence database,
downloaded July 2019, using internal peptides to perform retention time alignment (29). To this
library, we appended a sample specific library generated from DIA-Umpire extraction of pseudo-
spectra from one full set of replicates from the experimental bladder tumor cell lines. A final,
combined consensus spectrast library containing all peptide identifications made between the
internal and external dataset was compiled and decoy sequences were appended.

Data analysis

Peptide identification was performed as previously described in (28,29). Briefly, we extracted
chromatograms and assigned peak groups using openSWATH (30) against the custom BCa
peptide assay library described above. False discovery rate for peptide identification was
assigned using PyProphet (31) and the TRIC (32) algorithm was used to perform feature-
alignment across multiple runs of different samples to maximize data completeness and reduce
peak identification errors. Target peptides with a false discovery rate (FDR) of identification <1%
in at least one dataset file, and up to 5% across all dataset files were included in the final
results. We used SWATH2stats to convert our data into the correct format for use with
downstream software MSstats (33). Each individual data file was intensity normalized by
dividing the raw fragment intensities by the total MS2 signal. MSstats (33) was used to convert
fragment-level data into protein-level intensity estimates via the 'quantData' function, utilizing
default parameters with the exception of data normalization, which was set to 'FALSE'. For
plotting purposes, protein intensities were VSN normalized, log-transformed, and replicate batch
effects were removed using the removeBatchEffect function in the limma R package. The limma
package was also used to calculate differential protein expression (21). Multiple hypothesis
correction was performed using the Benjamin Hochberg method.

Whole exome sequencing

Sample preparation

All cell lines were grown for several passages in the absence of antibiotics, gemcitabine, or
cisplatin. Cell pellets were snap frozen from sub-confluent dishes for each of the 20 cell lines
sequenced (5 cell lines, each with 4 derivatives: parental, Gem-resistant, Cis-resistant, GemCis-
resistant). gDNA isolation was performed using the Puregene cell and tissue kit (Qiagen) with
the addition of RNase A Solution (Qiagen) according to manufacturer's instructions. gDNA was
quantified using a Qubit 4.0, then sheared using a Covaris S220 Sonicator to 200bp. Libraries
were constructed using the Sure Select All Exon v6 library kit (Agilent) following the XT library

preparation workflow. Completed libraries were run on the 4200 Tape Station (Agilent) using
D1000 screen tape. Libraries were quantitated using the Qubit, diluted to 4nM prior to
verification of cluster efficiency using qPCR, then sequenced on the NovaSeq 6000 instrument
(Illumina) (150bp, paired-end) at the University of Colorado Cancer Center Genomics Shared
Resource. Mean insert size across all cell lines was 177.8 bp and mean coverage was 193.7X
with > 96.8% at >30X. Individual call line quality control metrics are reported in **Table S11**.

Data processing

The analysis pipeline was developed using Nextflow. For the raw fastq files, Fastqc was used to
assess overall quality. For computational efficiency, raw sequence reads were partitioned using
BBMap (partition.sh) into 40 partitions. They then were aligned to the GRCh38 reference
genome (including decoy sequences from the GATK resource bundle) using the BWA-MEM
short read aligner (34), and merged back into single BAM files using Samtools. The resulting
BAM files were de-duplicated using Samblaster (35), and sorted using Samtools. These
duplicate-marked bams were further passed through the GATK Base Quality Score
Recalibration in order to detect systematic errors made by the sequencing machine when it
estimates the accuracy of base calls. The dbSNP (version 146) (36), the 1000 Genome Project
Phase 1 (37), and the Mills and 1000G gold standard sets (38) were used as databases of
known polymorphic sites to exclude regions around known polymorphisms from analysis. After
alignment, Samtools (39), Qualimap (40), and Picard tools (41) were run to acquire various
metrics to ensure there were no major anomalies in the aligned data.

Alignment

311   bwa mem -K 100000000 -R "read_group" -t 64 -M ref_fasta read_1 read_2

Marking duplicates

313   samtools sort -n -O SAM sample_bam | samblaster -M --ignoreUnmated

Base Quality Score Recalibration

315   gatk BaseRecalibrator -I sample_bam -O sample.recal.table -R ref_fasta --known-sites
316   known_sites

Whole exome sequencing variant calling

We used Mutect2 from the GATK toolkit for SNVs and short indels (42). Mutect2 is designed to
call somatic variants and makes no assumptions about the ploidy of samples. It was run in
tumor-only mode to maximize the sensitivity albeit at the risk of high false positives. We used
tumor-only mode to call variants for each cell line separately. Mutect2 workflow is a two steps
process. In the first step, it operates in high sensitivity mode to generate intermediate callsets
that are further subjected to filtering to generate the final variant calls. Annotation of variants
was performed using Annovar (43) with the following databases: refGene, cytoBand, exac03,
avsnp150, clinvar_20190305, gnomad211_exome, dbnsfp35c, cosmic90. Intergenic variants
were removed along with variants that were identified at greater than 0.001% of the population
according to ExAC or gnomAD, or had a depth < 20.

Mutect2 raw callset:

329   gatk Mutect2 -R ref_fasta -I bam_tumor -tumor Id_tumor --germline-resource germline_resource
330   -O raw_vcf

Mutect2 filtering:

332   gatk FilterMutectCalls -V raw_vcf --stats raw_vcf_stats -R ref_fasta -O filtered_mutect2_vcf

Copy number calling using GATK

Base quality score recalibrated bams were used as the input. The covered regions for the exome kit were converted into bins (defining the resolution of the analysis) for coverage collection. Read-counts, that form the basis of copy number variant detection, were collected for each bin. The read-counts then go through denoising, modelling segments, and calling the final copy ratios.

Preprocess intervals

gatk PreprocessIntervals --intervals intervals_bed_file --padding 0 --bin-length 0 -R ref_fasta --interval-merging-rule OVERLAPPING_ONLY -O preprocessed_intervals_list

Collect read counts

gatk CollectReadCounts -I sample_bam -L preprocessed_intervals} --interval-merging-rule OVERLAPPING_ONLY -O sample.counts.hdf5

Denoise read counts

gatk DenoiseReadCounts -I sample.counts.hdf5 --standardized-copy-ratios sample_std_copy_ratio --denoised-copy-ratios sample_denoised_copy_ratio

Model Segments

gatk ModelSegments --denoised-copy-ratios denoised_copy_ratio --output-prefix id_sample -O output_dir

Call copy ratio segments

gatk CallCopyRatioSegments -I sample.modelled_segments -O sampled.called.segments

Cell line authentication

Variant calls from the Mutect2 pipeline were filtered for each cell line to identify high confidence variants according to the filtering criteria above. These high confidence variants were then compared to the variants reported for all cell lines in the DepMap (https://depmap.org/portal/) for the Cancer Cell Line Encyclopedia (CCLE_mutations_hg38.csv, sample_info.csv) and COSMIC (CosmicCLP_MutantExport.tsv) as measured by the jaccard distance, the intersection of variants divided by the union of variants. Cells listed in CCLE or COSMIC were the rank ordered for each BCa cell line in this study according to the jaccard distance. Results are reported in **Table S12**.

Cell Line Drug Treatments

Gemcitabine (Sigma) and cisplatin (Sigma) stocks were resuspended in 0.9% PBS solution. All stock solutions were stored protected from light and kept frozen until use. For cell culture dose response, cells were seeded in 96-well tissue culture plates with 500-2000 cells per well depending on the growth rate and duration of the experiment. Cells were seeded and allowed to attach overnight followed by replacing the media with fresh, pre-warmed media just prior to treatment. Drug dilutions were performed serially and using complete media (IMDM + 10% FBS) and the associated drug treatments. Growth inhibition was measured using confluence estimates over time on the IncuCyte ZOOM (Essen Bioscience) over varying amounts of time depending on each experiment. Dose response curves were generated with Prism v9.3.1 using a variable slope, four parameter nonlinear regression model. Comparison between treatment groups was done between IC50 values using the sum-of-squares F test. Details for timing and replicates for each experiment are included in their respective figure legends.

Antibodies and Western Blotting

Whole cell lysates were prepared from cultured cells using RIPA lysis and extraction buffer (ThermoScientific). Lysates from xenograft tissues were prepared using tissue protein extraction reagent (T-PER) and glass tissue homogenizer. All lysates were prepared on ice and with the addition of Halt protease and phosphatase inhibitor cocktail and EDTA (ThermoFisher). Protein concentration of lysates were quantified with BCA protein assay (Pierce™, ThermoFisher). All lysates were prepared with 4X Licor Loading buffer with 50mM DTT added boiled for 10 minutes prior to gel loading. All western blots were run using PROTEAN TGX precast 4-15% or 4-20% gradient gels (Bio-Rad) and transferred to either 0.2μm or 0.44μm nitrocellulose membranes. Transfer was done for 1.5-2hrs in cold TrisGlycine buffer (Bio-Rad) with 20% methanol prior to blocking for 1hr at room temperature in 5% BSA in TBS-T. Primary antibodies were diluted and incubated overnight at 4°C on a rocker. Membranes were washed 3 or 4 times in fresh TBS-T prior a 1-hour room temperature incubation in an appropriate secondary antibody. Membranes were washed 3-4 times in TBS-T, developed with enhanced SuperSignal West Pico Plus or SuperSignal West Fempto (ThermoFisher), and imaged using Li-Cor Odyssey® Fc instrument. Densitometry was performed using LiCor Image Studio™ software. Statistical comparisons using densitometry measurements were done using a one-way ANOVA with Tukey post hoc to control for the experiment-wise error rate.

Western Blot Primary Antibodies:

Target	Vendor	Catalog number	Dilution	Type
GAPDH	Cell Signaling	5174S	1:1000	Rabbit polyclonal
H2AX	Thermofisher	MA1-2022	1:1000	Mouse monoclonal
NPEPPS	Thermofisher	PA5-83788	1:1000	Rabbit polyclonal

Western Blot Secondary Antibodies:

Target	Vendor	Catalog number	Dilution	Type
Goat-anti-Rabbit(HRP)	Abcam	ab97057	1:20,000	Goat polyclonal
Rabbit-anti-Mouse(HRP)	Sigma	A9044-2ML	1:10,000	Rabbit polyclonal

shRNA-mediated knockdown experiments

Lentiviral production and transduction were carried out by the University of Colorado Cancer Center Functional Genomics Shared Resources. Plasmids from The RNAi Consortium (TRC) collection (TRC construct numbers TRCN0000073838, TRCN0000073839 and TRCN0000073840) were used for targeting NPEPPS were selected based on predicted knockdown efficiency; non-targeting controls used were SHC002 and SHC016. 2μg of target shRNA construct and 2μg of 3:1 ratio of psPAX2 (Addgene) and pMD2.G (Addgene) were transfected into HEK293FT cells using 2 μg of Polyethylenimine (Polysciences). Lentiviral particle containing media was filtered using 0.45μm cellulose acetate syringe filter and used for transduction. Puromycin selection was performed at doses used for CRISPR library screening or in some cases, cells were re-selected with higher doses of puromycin (10μg/mL), in order to ensure the complete elimination of non-transduced cells. Selected cells were frozen at early passage and early passage cells were used for all experiments.

Intracellular cisplatin measurements using CyTOF

Cell lines were cultured for several passages in IMDM + 10% FBS. Prior to the experiment, cells
were cultured in IMDM10 to be 50-80% confluence overnight and then treated the next day with
10µM cisplatin or PBS and then dissociated after 4 hours of treatment. For dissociation, cells
were washed twice with room temperature PBS and then incubated with PBS + 0.05% Trypsin-
EDTA for 10-15 minutes. Cells were neutralized with IMDM10 and then fully dissociated into
single-cell suspension by gentle pipetting. After dissociation, cells were counted by Trypan blue
staining and then placed in separate tubes at 3×10^5 cells. Individual samples were then fixed,
permeabilized, and labeled using unique barcodes using the Cell-ID 20-plex Pd Barcoding kit
(Fluidigm) according to the manufacturer's protocol. Barcoded samples were pooled across cell
line conditions and cisplatin concentration, incubated with Cell-ID Intercalator-Ir, mixed with
equilibration beads, and acquired on a Helios mass cytometer (Fluidigm). Post-acquisition data
were normalized to equilibration beads and debarcoded, using the bead-normalization and
single-cell-debarcoder packages from the Nolan Laboratory GitHub page
(https://github.com/nolanlab). Relative cisplatin intensity (defined by [195]Platinum isotopic mass
intensity) was analyzed among nucleated [191]Iridium+ [193]Iridium+ events defined by Boolean
gating within FlowJo 10.7.1.
429

Whole Genome CRISPR Screening

Plasmid library expansion and quality control

Whole genome CRISPR Screening was performed using the Human CRISPR Knockout Pooled
Library (Brunello) - 1 vector system (Addgene and a gift from John Doench to the Functional
Genomics Facility at the University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus)(44). Two distinct
plasmid expansions were performed. And the library distribution was assessed using next
generation sequencing to determine the impact on overall library was modest following re-
expansion. Library width was calculated as previously described(45,46) by dividing the 10th
percentile of the library distribution by the 90th percentile using the log2 average expression of
all sgRNAs in the library and found to be 6.7 and 7.13 for batch 1 and 2 respectively. All quality
control metrics for each sample are reported in **Table S13**. Different screening parameters were
used based on the cell line screened these are summarized in **Table S4.**

Lentivirus Production and Titration

For the two plasmid batches, two distinct protocols for lentivirus production were utilized. The
first batch was generated by using Polyethylenimine, linear (PEI; Polysciences) and was used
for the T24-GemCis and TCCSUP-GemCis screens. The second used lipofectamine 3000 and
was applied for the 253J-GemCis, KU1919-GemCis, and 5637-GemCis screens. For the first
batch, 293FT cells were seeded at a density of 36,800 cells/cm^2 into a 4-layer CELLdisc
(Greiner) using DMEM + 10% FBS along with antibiotic and antimycotic solution. Transfection
mix consisting 47.6µg pMD2G (Addgene), 95.2µg of psPAX2 (Addgene), and 190.5µg of
Brunello Whole genome knockout library (Addgene) was mixed with 448µl PEI (1 mg/mL) and
3mL OptiMEM, vortexed for 30 seconds and allowed to incubate at room temperature for 20
minutes. Fresh media containing transfection mix were added to the CELLdisc using up to
270mL of media. The next day media was changed for 280mL fresh media followed by a 48-
hour incubation. After this 48-hour incubation the viral supernatant was harvested and filtered
through a cellulose acetate filter system (ThermoScientific) and frozen at -80°C.

The first method had low functional virus titer, so we implemented a different virus production
method for subsequent screens. In the second batch of virus production, we utilized
lipofectamine 3000 instead of PEI, eliminated use of multilayer flasks and centrifuged to remove
debris as opposed to filtering. Briefly, 293FT cells were plated in T225 flasks to be 80%
confluent after 24hrs. 2hrs before transfection, media was changed and 40mL of fresh media

was used per T225 flask. The lipofectamine 3000 protocol was followed according to
manufacturer's instructions and scaled based on the volume of virus being prepared. For each
T225 flask 2mLOptiMEM was mixed with 40μg Brunello whole genome library plasmid, 30μg of
psPAX2 and 20μg of pMD2.G and 180μl of P3000. This mix was added to a tube containing
2mL OptiMEM and 128μl Lipofectamine 3000, which was scaled according to the number of
T225 flasks being prepared. Transfection mix was mixed thoroughly by pipetting up and down
slowly, and allowed to incubate at room temperature for 15 minutes. Transfection mix was then
added dropwise to the plates of 293FT cells with gentle swirling and incubated overnight
(~16hr). The following morning, the media was changed and 60mL of fresh media was added to
each T225 flask. This was allowed to incubate overnight and replaced the following morning.
This first lentiviral supernatant was stored at 4°C to be pooled with a subsequent 48 hour
collection. Upon collection, viral supernatants had 1M HEPES added at 1%. Following the
second virus collection, supernatants were pooled and centrifuged at 1250rpm for 5 minutes to
pellet debris. Lentivirus was stored in polypropylene tubes as polystyrene is known to bind
lentivirus, and all tubes were flash frozen in liquid nitrogen and stored at -80°C. Despite the
changes to the lentiviral production protocols, functional lentiviral titers were not improved using
these changes to the methodology, but feel it is worth noting these changes in protocol to
account for any possible variability associated with this change.

Lentivirus was titered functionally based on protocols adapted from the Broad Institute's Genetic
Perturbation Platform's public web portal (https://portals.broadinstitute.org/gpp/public/).

Screening Parameter Optimization

483   All screening parameters for each cell line including cell polybrene and puromycin sensitivity,
484   screening coverage, technical and biological replicates performed, and gemcitabine and
485   cisplatin treatment concentrations are reported in **Table S4.**

DNA Isolation

Cell pellets of 2e7 were snap frozen in liquid nitrogen in 1.5mL tubes and stored at -80 prior to
extraction. When possible, at least 8e7 cell were used for 4 separate genomic DNA isolation
which were pooled to account for any variation with pellet size. DNA isolation was performed
using the Puregene cell and tissue kit (Qiagen) with the addition of RNase A Solution (Qiagen)
according to the manufacturer's instructions. DNA concentration was measured in quadruplicate
using either a nanodrop spectrophotometer (Thermo), Qubit® dsDNA assay (Life
Technologies), and the average DNA content per cell was determined.

Library preparation

The minimum number of cell equivalents of gDNA to maintain equal coverage was used for
library preparation. In all screens, the minimum coverage based on cell number was multiplied
by the average gDNA content per cell for each individual cell line to determine the minimum
number for 10μg PCR reactions needed to maintain coverage. A minimum coverage of 500-fold
per sgRNA in the library was targeted for each independent sample or replicate but this was
increased in some cases where screening was carried out with greater depth (see **Table S4** for
coverage and replicate information).

Library preparation was performed using primers sequences designed by the Broad Institute's
Genetic Perturbation Platform (https://portals.broadinstitute.org/gpp/public/) and utilized a pool
of eight P5 primers with to introduce a stagger in reads associated with each library and sample
specific P7 primer that contained a unique sample index sequence for each timepoint, replicate,

or treatment condition to be sequenced in the same pool (**Table S14**). All library preparation
primers were resuspended at 100μM.

Each library preparation PCR reaction contained the following components: 1μl Herculase II
Fusion Enzyme (Agilent), 2.5μl Deoxynucleotide (dNTP) Solution Mix (New England Biolabs),
0.5μl P5 primer pool, 0.5μl P7 index primer, 20μl 5X Reaction Buffer (Agilent), 10μg of gDNA
and nuclease-free water to bring the total reaction volume to 100μl. Samples underwent 23
cycles of thermal cycling followed by a quality assessment by electrophoresis on 2% agarose
gel to ensure consistent library amplification across multiple wells and samples for each plate.

Each unique library had 10μl pooled from all PCR reactions performed on that unique sample
and mixed thoroughly. $50\text{-}100\mu$l of the pooled library preparation reactions was used to perform
magnetic bead-based purification and elimination of any residual free primer using a 0.8X ratio
SPRIselect beads (Beckman Coulter) according to the manufacturer's instructions. Libraries
were then assessed for appropriate amplicon size and complete elimination of free primer peaks
using the High Sensitivity ScreenTape Assay on the Tape Station2200 (Agilent) and quantified
using the qPCR-based quantification in order to ensure only NGS-compatible amplicon was
quantified using the Library Quant ROX Low Kit (Kapa Biosystems) on a QuantStudio™ 6
Realtime PCR System (ThermoFisher). Following qPCR quantification, all libraries were
normalized to a standard concentration (typically 20-40nM) depending on the lowest
concentration library to be pooled, and then requantified by qPCR to ensure all samples were
within ~10-20% of the pool mean target concentration. After confirming accurate library
quantification and normalization, samples were pooled at an equimolar ratio and submitted for
sequencing. Libraries were sequenced on the NovaSeq 6000 instrument (Illumina) (150bp,
paired-end) at the University of Colorado Cancer Center Genomics Shared Resource.

529   *CRISPR screening bioinformatic pipeline and analysis*

sgRNA counts were extracted directly from R1 raw sequence reads using a custom perl script
that uses regular expression string matching to exactly match sgRNA sequence flanked by 10
bases of vector sequence. The vector sequence was allowed to have one error before and after
the sgRNA sequence. sgRNAs were tabulated for each sample based on the sgRNA sequence
(**Table S15**). The sgRNA IDs of the Brunello library were updated to current HGNC gene names
using the Total Approved Symbols download from HGNC, accessed on 9/1/2020
(https://www.genenames.org/download/statistics-and-files/). Transcript IDs were matched when
possible and when matches were not found, past symbols and aliases were updated to current
names. Finally, 5 sgRNAs with missing updated gene names were manually curated using
literature searches. Library distribution was calculated using the caRpools R package (47). The
DESeq2 R package (48) was used to calculate differential abundance of genes (**Table S5**).
Gene counts were generated using the sum of counts for sgRNAs of the same gene. Synthetic
lethality compared GemCis day 19 and GemCis day 25 vs. PBS day 19 and PBS day 25 with
the day as a covariate. In the comparison integrating all cell lines, cell line was additionally
modeled as a covariate. Gene essentiality was calculated by comparing PBS day 25 to PBS day
0 and in the integrated all cell lines comparison; cell line was modeled as a covariate. Common
synthetic lethal genes were defined as being statistically significantly differentially lost (FDR <
0.05 and Log2 FC < 0) in each of the 5 cell lines. Gene set enrichment analysis (GSEA) was
performed using the fgsea R package run with 10000 permutations (22) with the KEGG and
Reactome gene sets from MSigDB (23). Heatmaps were generated with the ComplexHeatmap
R package following z-score transformation (25). Other plots were generated using the ggplot2
R package.

Xenograft experiment

Six-week-old, female NU/J mice (Jackson Labs) were allowed to acclimate for at least one week prior to initiating any experiments. Mice had free access to food and water in pathogen-free housing and cared for in accordance NIH guidelines and all experiments were performed under protocols approved by the University of Colorado Denver Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC).

For KU1919-GC xenografts, cells that had been stably transduced with non-targeting control (shCtrl1, SHC002) and NPEPPS (shN39, TRCN0000073839) shRNA constructs. Mice were divided into groups of 22 and 23 for the non-targeting control and NPEPPS shRNA constructs respectively. Mice were injected with 4e6 cells in phenol red- and serum-free RPMI mixed with equal volume Matrigel Matrix (Corning) to total 100μl volume. Tumors were allowed to engraft for 9 days following injection and mice were randomized based on tumor volume within each shRNA condition into groups of 11 or 12 to be treated with combination gemcitabine plus cisplatin or DPBS. Treatment was initiated 13 days post-inoculation with dosing adjusted based on individual mouse weight.

Cisplatin (Sigma) and gemcitabine hydrochloride (BOC Sciences) were both resuspended in 0.9% PBS and stored protected from light at -80°C as individual aliquots. Prior to treatment fresh aliquots of gemcitabine and cisplatin were thawed and diluted to their final concentration with 1X DPBS (Gibco). Mice were treated three times weekly on a Monday, Wednesday and Friday schedule for four weeks total. All mice in the gemcitabine plus cisplatin-treated groups were given 50mg/kg gemcitabine and 2mg/kg cisplatin that were mixed and administered as a single intraperitoneal injection, while control mice were administered an equivalent volume of DPBS.

Mouse health was monitored daily and all tumor volume measurements and weights were measured 3x weekly schedule. Tumor volume was calculated using the formula $(L \times W^2)/2$, for which *L is* the length of the long axis and *W* is the width of the axis perpendicular to the long axis measurement. All measurements were performed using digital calipers. Animals were humanely euthanized with CO_2 followed by cervical dislocation when tumors reached a predetermined endpoint of $2cm^3$ or when weight loss exceeded 15% body weight. Mice that were removed from the study due to weight loss were censored in the survival analyses.

Linear mixed-effects model of tumor growth

Linear mixed-effects models were used to model longitudinal observations of xenograft tumor growth volumes normalized by their corresponding baseline volume. Mixed-effects models from the R-package *lme4* (49) and Satterthwaite's approximation for degrees of freedom for the fixed effects from *lmerTest* (50) were used for model fitting and inspection in the R statistical software (4.0.3). Volume changes compared to baseline were log_2-transformed. The final model was structured as:

$$log_2\left(\frac{y_{i,t}}{y_{i,:}}\right) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{i,t} + \beta_2 x_{i,t}^2 + \beta_3 x_{i,t} KD_i + \beta_4 x_{i,t} GC_i + \beta_5 x_{i,t} KD_i\ GC_i + \gamma_{0,i} + \gamma_{1,i} x_{i,t} + \varepsilon_{i,t}$$

where β is the fixed effects capturing population-level trends, γ is the normally distributed random effects capturing individual-level variation, ε is the i.i.d. normally distributed residual term, i is the unique individual identifier, t notes the time points, $x_{i,t} \in$ $\{2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, 14, 16, 18, 21, 23, 25, 28\}$ depicted days since initiating interventions, $y_{i,:}$ is tumor volume at baseline prior to treatments upon randomization, and $y_{i,t}$ were the observed tumor volumes over the treatment period measured in mm^3. The model was fit using Restricted Maximum Likelihood and built iteratively until the underlying model assumptions and model

convergence criteria were met. To this end, a quadratic growth term (β_2) was added on top of
the linear growth term (β_1) and intercept (β_0), allowing slightly non-linear relative growth patterns
to be captured by the otherwise linear model. Binary indicators $KD_i \in \{0,1\}$ and $GC_i \in \{0,1\}$ were
used to model knockdown of NPEPPS, GemCis treatment, or the combination. The
corresponding model terms were captured in β_3, β_4 and β_5, respectively. Finally, the model
allows for individual-specific random effects for intercept ($\gamma_{0,i}$) and linear growth slope ($\gamma_{1,i}$).
Shapiro-Wilk test was used to examine the underlying normality assumption for $\gamma_{0,i}$ and $\gamma_{1,i}$ with
p=0.1373 and p=8901, respectively, indicating that these random effects followed underlying
assumptions of normality. After inspection of the residual plots (**Figure S7B**), this final model
was deemed suitable for population-level statistical inference via the fixed effects. This
population-level model fits are visualized in **Figure S7A**. These population-level estimates are
as follows:
610

Fixed effect	Estimate	Std. error	df	t	*p*-val
β_0 (intercept)	0.05054	0.08422	54.28	0.600	0.55091
β_1 (linear slope)	0.1236	0.01493	65.52	8.276	8.92e-12 ***
β_2 (quadratic slope)	0.00308	0.0002242	389	13.740	< 2e-16 ***
β_3 (knockdown)	-0.0605	0.01821	44.97	-3.322	0.00178 **
β_4 (GC)	-0.1063	0.01821	44.97	-5.837	5.49e-07 ***
β_5 (knockdown + GC)	-0.1233	0.01791	45.28	-6.884	1.47e-08 ***

Patient tumor-derived organoids (PDOs)

Culture of the PDOs

Human bladder tissue was obtained from the Erasmus MC Bladder Cancer Center, Rotterdam,
the Netherlands and the Amphia Ziekenhuis, Breda, the Netherlands. Bladder tumor-derived
organoids from biopsies obtained through TURBT or cystectomy were isolated and cultured
using methods developed by Mullenders et al. (51) with modifications (Akbarzadeh/Scholtes et
al. in prep). Briefly, bladder tissues were washed with Advanced DMEM/F12 (Gibco)
supplemented with 10mM HEPES (Gibco), 1% GlutaMax (Gibco) and 100 µg/ml primocin
(InvivoGen), henceforth Ad+++. Tissue was minced and incubated at 37°C with the digestion
solution (collagenase 2.5mg/ml in EBSS) and isolated cells were passed through 70µM strainer
(Falcon), washed with Ad+++ and seeded in 50 µl drops of BME (R&D system) containing
10000-15000 cells in 24 well suspension plates (Greiner). Bladder tumor organoids were
cultured in a culture medium containing Ad+++ supplemented with 1 × B-27 (Gibco), 1.25 mM
N-acetylcysteine (Sigma), 10 mM nicotinamide, 20µM TGFβ receptor inhibitor A83-01, 100ng/ml
recombinant human FGF10 (Peprotech), 25 ng/ml recombinant human FGF7 (Peprotech), 12.5
ng/ml recombinant human FGF2 (Peprotech), 10µM Y27632 Rho Kinase (ROCK) Inhibitor
(Sigma) and conditioned media for recombinant Rspondin (2.5% v/v), and Wnt3A (2.5% v/v).
The medium was changed every three days. Organoids were passaged at a 1:3 to 1:6 ratio
every 7 days using cell dissociation solution- non enzymatic (Sigma) and plated in fresh BME
matrix droplets.
632

Lentiviral transduction of bladder cancer PDOs
Lentiviral vectors containing the desired shRNA sequences were amplified from bacterial
glycerol stocks obtained in house from the Erasmus Center for Biomics and part of the
MISSION® shRNA library. The same shRNA constructs used for bladder cancer cell lines, and
described above, were used for PDOs. For overexpression, pLenti-C-Myc-DDK-P2A-Puro
Lentiviral Gene Expression Vectors were acquired from Origene (NPEPPS RC209037L3, empty

vector PS100092). For lentiviral particle generation, in total, 5e6 HEK293T cells were plated in a
10-cm dish and transfected with 12.5 µg of plasmids mix. In total, 4.5 µg of pCMVΔR8.9
(envelope), 2 µg of pCMV-VSV-G (packaging) and 6 µg of shRNA vector were mixed in 500 µl
serum-free Opti-MEM and combined with 500 µl Opti-MEM containing 125 µl of 10 mM
polyethyleneimine (PEI, Sigma). The resulting 1 ml mixture was added to HEK293T cells after
15 min incubation at room temperature. The transfection medium was removed after 12 h and
replaced with a fresh RPMI medium. Virus-containing medium was harvested and replaced with
fresh medium at 48, and 72 h post-transfection. After each harvest, the collected medium was
filtered through a cellulose acetate membrane (0.45 µm pore), viral particles were concentrated
by ultracentrifugation at 20.000 rounds per minute for 1 hour at 4 °C with pellets re-suspended
and pooled in a final volume of 2mL adv. DMEM for each condition. Medium containing viral
particles was used either directly or was stored at −80 °C. For lentiviral transduction of bladder
cancer organoid cells, organoids were harvested and dissociated to single cells using cell
dissociation solution. For each condition (shRNA control / shRNA NPEPPS / NPEPPS-OE /
empty vector), 1 × 106 cells were collected and gently re-suspended in 1mL of concentrated
lentivirus. Cell-virus mixture was then divided over two wells of a pre-warmed 24-well plate and
subsequently sealed with parafilm. Plates were spinoculated at 600 x g at 25 °C for 1 hour.
Parafilm was removed immediately after spinoculation, and plates were incubated for 6-8 hours
at 37 °C 5% CO2. Transduced cells were washed 1 time with 10mL advanced DMEM spinning
down at 200 x g for 10 minutes and seeded in domes at a density of 150 cells per µL BME.
Once matured, organoids were treated with 2 µg/ml puromycin for 72 hours. Puromycin-selected
organoids were then passaged and given 6 days of recovery time prior to experimental
procedures.
662

Ex vivo drug testing

Organoids were collected 4-7 days after passaging and dissociated to single cells using a cell
dissociation solution, assisted by mechanical dissociation. All assays were performed in 96 well
suspension plates (Greiner bio-one; 655 185), seeding 10,000 cells per well in 100 µl bladder
organoid medium containing 15% BME. Drugs were added when mature organoids formed after
two-three days, and drug treatment was performed in triplicate. For *ex vivo* cisplatin response:
cisplatin (Sigma; PHR1624; reconstituted in NaCl) was added in six doses in the range of 0.1 to
40 µM. Caspase-3 and -7 activity was measured following three days of treatment (Caspase-
Glo #G8093, Promega), while cell viability was obtained after six days of treatment (CellTiter-
Glo 3D #G9681). Plates were read on a SpectraMax I3 plate reader. Viability data was
normalized using organoid wells treated with vehicle control (1.2% PBS) (Medchemexpress;
HY-14807; reconstituted in DMSO). Organoids were harvested after six days of treatment and
dissociated into single cells using a cell dissociation solution, assisted by mechanical
dissociation. Three-quarters of the cells were used to obtain cell viability as previously described
(treatment), while one-quarter of the cells were reseeded in 200µL BOM + 15% BME. Following
reseeding, organoids were allowed to regrow for another six days after which cell viability
(reseeding) was again obtained. Cell viability was normalized using organoids treated with
vehicle control (0.02% DMSO, 1.2% PBS).

SNaPshot mutation analysis

Tumor and matched organoid DNA was isolated using with the QIAmp DNA Mini-Kit (Qiagen)
according to the manufacturer's protocol. Presence of hotspot mutations in the *TERT* promoter
sequence chr5:1,295,228C>T, chr5:1,295,248G>A and chr5:1,295,250C>T [GRCh37/hg19]),
FGFR3 (R248Q/E, S249C, G372C, Y375C, A393E, K652E/M) and *PIK3CA* (E542K, E545G/K
and H1047R) were assessed on tumor and organoid DNA by SNaPshot mutation analysis with

the same methods as previously described (52–54).
688

Organoid phenotyping and tumor histology

Tissue processing and H&E staining were performed using standard procedures. For
hematoxylin-eosin (H&E) staining of organoids, wells of BME-embedded organoids were fixated
with 4% formalin (Sigma) and 0.15% glutaraldehyde (produced in-house) at room temperature
for 2 hours. Fixated BME and organoids were washed with PBS and engulfed in 2.5% Low-
Melting Agarose (Sigma) prior to paraffin embedding. H&E staining was performed on 4µM
paraffin sections of both tumor and organoid tissue. Stained whole-slides, as well as prior 3D
organoid cultures, were imaged by bright-field microscopy (Olympus IX70).
697

Data availability

The mass spectrometry proteomics data have been deposited to the ProteomeXchange
Consortium via the PRIDE (55) partner repository with the dataset identifier PXD024742. The
whole exome sequencing data have been deposited in the BioProject database with project
identifier PRJNA714778. The RNA sequencing data have been deposited in the GEO database
with dataset identifier (GSE171537). The CRISPR screen sequencing data have been
deposited in the GEO database with dataset identifier (GSE179799). The copy number data
have been deposited in the ArrayExpress database with identified (E-MTAB-10353). All data are
made available through a custom build R Shiny app at:
https://bioinformatics.cuanschutz.edu/BLCA_GC_Omics/
708
709 *Reviewer Login Information*
710 **PRIDE**
711 Username: reviewer_pxd024742@ebi.ac.uk
712 Password: n70IwGNc
713
714 **SRA**
715 https://dataview.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/object/PRJNA714778?reviewer=50g24ej0558qj2dpr9v6pekgvl
716
717 **GEO (RNAseq)**
718 https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/geo/query/acc.cgi?acc=GSE171537
719 token: avkdyoiixnettod
720
721 **CRISPR Screen**
722 URL: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/geo/query/acc.cgi?acc=GSE179799
723 Reviewer token: elafaomerfarvsr
724
725 **ArrayExpress**
726 Username: Reviewer_E-MTAB-10353
727 Password: u3MpsspP
728
729

RESULTS

We acquired the five human BCa cell lines, KU1919, 5637, T24, TCCSUP, and 253J from the Resistant Cancer Cell Line (RCCL) collection (56,57). For each, we obtained the parental lines (-Par) and derivatives made resistant through dose escalation to cisplatin (-Cis), gemcitabine (-Gem), and the combination of gemcitabine plus cisplatin (-GemCis) (**Figure 1A, Table S1**). We confirmed resistance to the associated drugs for all resistant derivatives in comparison to the parental lines and found them to be consistent with those reported by the RCCL (**Figure S1**) (56,57). These cells represent features and alterations in putative BCa drivers as reported in TCGA (58) and variants reported in ClinVar (59) (**Tables 1**, **S2, S3**).

Genome-wide CRISPR screens identify 46 common synthetic lethal genes

To study the connection between drug resistance and gene expression, we performed whole-genome loss-of-function screens in each of the five GemCis-resistant cell line derivatives. After transduction of the Brunello CRISPR-Cas9 knockout library (44), we passaged the cells for 10 days to clear essential genes, then split them into phosphate-buffered saline (PBS) or gemcitabine plus cisplatin treatment groups (**Figure 1A**). Each screen was performed at a drug concentration that allowed the GemCis-resistant cells to grow unrestricted, but significantly inhibited the growth of the parental lines (**Table S1**). Screening parameters for each cell line are reported in **Table S4**. We counted sgRNAs 9 and 15 days after the start of treatment (19 and 25 days after transduction). As expected, similar experimental conditions clustered together when correlations were measured across treatment conditions and cell lines (**Figure S2**).

We defined genes as "synthetic lethal" with gemcitabine plus cisplatin treatment as those for which the combined cognate sgRNA counts were significantly lower (moderated t-test, FDR < 0.05) in the gemcitabine plus cisplatin-treated arm compared to the PBS arm when including both days 19 and 25 in the statistical model (**Table S5**). We identified 235 synthetic lethal genes that were statistically significant in KU1919-GemCis, 888 for T24-GemCis, 2099 for TCCSUP-GemCis, 2369 for 253J-GemCis, and 511 for 5637-GemCis. Next, we performed gene set enrichment analysis (60) on the full ranked list of genes according to their synthetic lethality. For this analysis, we created one ranked gene list by including each of the five cell types in the statistical model directly. As expected, and as a validation of the screen itself, we found that the top-ranked pathways were dominated by processes such as DNA repair, Fanconi Anemia, nucleotide excision repair, double-stranded break repair, base-excision repair, and DNA damage bypass mechanisms (**Figure 1B, Table S6**). These results are consistent with the known roles of DNA damage detection and repair in cisplatin resistance (61,62). In addition, the overall ranking of genes from our CRISPR screen showed enrichment for manually curated genes associated with platinum resistance in cancer (63) (**Table S5**).

From these results, we identified 46 genes that were commonly synthetic lethal across all five cell lines (**Figure 1C, S3**). Consistent with the overall findings (**Figure 1B**), 41 of the 46 common synthetic lethal genes fell into one or more putative DNA damage response and repair pathways, including homologous recombination, double-stranded break repair, nuclear excision repair, and Fanconi anemia (**Figure S3B**, **Table S7**). These genes showed a range of growth patterns over the full length of the CRISPR screen. As illustrated in **Figure 1D**, some genes showed patterns of increased cell growth in PBS treatment, then reduced growth in gemcitabine plus cisplatin treatment. Other genes had very little impact on cell growth in PBS treatment, but then reduced growth when treated with gemcitabine plus cisplatin. Finally, some genes reduced cell growth in PBS treatment and further reduced growth with gemcitabine plus cisplatin

treatment. Overall, these results provide a robust list of known and novel genes involved in chemotherapy resistance that can potentially be targeted therapeutically to improve treatment response.

Figure 1. Project overview and synthetic lethal screen results. (**A**) Human bladder cancer cell lines were made resistant to cisplatin, gemcitabine, or gemcitabine plus cisplatin through dose escalation. All cell lines were profiled using -omic technologies. The gemcitabine plus cisplatin-resistant cells were subjected to a pooled CRISPR screen to identify synthetic lethal gene-to-drug relationships. (**B**) Aggregate gene set enrichment results for the synthetic lethal screen ranked by $\log_2$ fold change across all cell lines reveal DNA damage response and repair pathways. Each tick mark represents a gene in the associated pathway. The bars at the right are normalized enrichment scores (NES) with the FDR corrected p-values reported in the bars. (**C**) The intersection across the CRISPR screen results identified 46 common synthetic lethal genes; all counts and gene annotations are reported in **Figure S2**. (**D**) The percentage change in the aggregate of the sgRNAs targeting the 46 commonly synthetic lethal genes are reported across phosphate-buffered saline (PBS) or gemcitabine plus cisplatin treatment arms of the CRISPR screen. Cell lines are coded with the same colors throughout all figures.

Feature	KU1919	T24	TCCSUP	5637	253J
Sex	Male	Female	Female	Male	Male
Stage	T3	Ta	N/A	N/A	T4
Grade	G3	G3	G4	G2	G4
Base47 Subtype	N/A	Basal	Basal	Luminal	Basal
TP53		Y126X	E349X		
HRAS		G12V			
NRAS	Q61R				
PIK3CA			E545K		E545G
TERT					
ARID1A	Y1052X				
KMT2D	T2441Pfs*44			Q2813X	
KDM6A	Q915X				
FAT1		S2682X	D1536N		
KMT2C		R4225X; A3559T			
ERBB2				S310F	
ERBB3		E1219K			
EP300		C1201Y			
FBXW7			S66X		
ASXL2			E330Q		
ATM				H1876Q	
AKT1	E17K				
RYR2		R2401H			
NFE2L2					G81S
RB1			LOSS	Y325X	
E2F3			AMP	AMP	
PPARG				AMP	
CCND1	AMP				
CDKN2A	LOSS				LOSS

798   **Table 1.** Clinicopathologic characteristics and genetic drivers for five cell lines.

Complementary multi-omic profiling prioritizes NPEPPS as the top driver of treatment resistance.

Pre-treatment multi-omic profiling has been shown to reveal the biological impact of synthetic lethal hits (64). Accordingly, we performed RNA sequencing and mass spectrometry-based proteomic profiling on cell lysates of all cell lines grown in drug-free media (**Figure 1A**). We leveraged transcriptome and proteome profiles from parental to matched drug-resistant derivative lines (-Gem, -Cis, and -GemCis) to prioritize the 46 common synthetic lethal genes that drive resistance in the context of gemcitabine plus cisplatin treatment resistance.

Taking this approach, the transcriptomics data revealed 1557 significantly upregulated genes across the Gem-resistant lines, 1897 in the Cis-resistant lines, and 1530 in the GemCis-resistant lines (moderated t-test, FDR < 0.05; **Table S9**). The proteomics data revealed 9 significantly upregulated proteins across the Gem-resistant cell lines, 1 in the Cis-resistant cell lines, and 10 in the GemCis-resistant cell lines (moderated t-test, FDR < 0.25; **Table S10**). Given the lower number of significant proteins and the relevance of transcript expression in predicting genetic dependency (64), we first investigated the overlap between the CRISPR screen results and the transcriptomes from each of the resistant cell line derivatives compared to the parental cells. Few genes were significantly and consistently upregulated across the resistant derivatives in the list of 46 commonly synthetic lethal genes (**Figure 2A**), but the most significantly and consistently upregulated genes were involved in DNA damage response and repair mechanisms, including ERCC6, XPA, REV1, POLH, ERRC8, PRIMPOL, NBN, and members of the Fanconi Anemia pathway. We identified Puromycin-Sensitive Aminopeptidase, NPEPPS, to be the most consistently upregulated gene across the resistant derivatives at the RNA level (**Figure 2A,B**). Similarly, we found NPEPPS to be consistently and significantly upregulated at the protein level (**Figure 2C**). NPEPPS was also a top synthetic lethal hit (**Figure 2D, Table S5**). Consistent with the proteomics results, immunoblotting for NPEPPS revealed that it was upregulated in the Cis-resistant and GemCis-resistant lines, with the Gem-resistant lines showing variable upregulation (**Figure 2E**).

Figure 2. NPEPPS is identified as a commonly upregulated and synthetic lethal hit. (**A**) Differential gene expression of 43 common synthetic lethal genes as measured by RNAseq across all cell lines (43 of 46 genes mapped between RNAseq and the CRISPR screen), comparing the treatment-resistant derivative (Gem-, Cis-, GemCis-resistant) to the associated parental cell line. Asterisks indicate a statistically significant result (moderated t-test, *FDR < 0.05). The bar plot on top is the aggregate count of significant results across all 15 comparisons. Genes are ranked by the count of statistically significant upregulated hits. (**B**) RNAseq (moderated t-test compared to parentals; *FDR < 0.05), (**C**) mass spectrometry proteomics (moderated t-test compared to parentals, *FDR < 0.25), and (**D**) CRISPR screen results for NPEPPS (mean ± SD; moderated t-test; *FDR < 0.05). (**E**) Representative immunoblots and densitometry quantification for independent triplicates (mean ± SEM) for NPEPPS in all cell lines (*FDR < 0.05).

NPEPPS drives cisplatin resistance *in vitro* and *in vivo*

To test our prioritization that NPEPPS regulates sensitivity to gemcitabine plus cisplatin treatment in GemCis-resistant BCa cells, and to parse its role in both cisplatin and gemcitabine resistance, we generated stable NPEPPS shRNA knockdowns in the KU1919-GemCis and T24-GemCis cell lines. We found that NPEPPS knockdown preferentially increased cisplatin, but not gemcitabine sensitivity (**Figure 3A, C**). Knockdown of NPEPPS did delay the growth of cells but did not have major effects on cell growth rates (**Figure S4A**). siRNA targeting of NPEPPS in the KU1919-GemCis cell line and shRNA and/or siRNA in T24-GemCis and 253J-GemCis cells confirmed our results that NPEPPS loss preferentially sensitizes cells to cisplatin (**Figure S4B,C**). Additionally, we used a gRNA from the CRISPR screen library to show that knockout of NPEPPS and the associated dose response matches our findings from shRNA and siRNA-mediated depletion of NPEPPS (**Figure S4D**). Conversely, overexpression of NPEPPS in KU1919 and T24 parental lines increased resistance to cisplatin, but not gemcitabine (**Figure 3B,D**). These results support NPEPPS as a regulator of sensitivity to gemcitabine plus cisplatin through its effect on regulating the cellular response to cisplatin.

To evaluate NPEPPS impact on intracellular cisplatin concentrations, we directly measured intracellular cisplatin using the metal ion detection capabilities of cytometry by time-of-flight, CyTOF (65). We measured intracellular cisplatin after 4 hours of treatment at $10\mu M$ in the same KU1919 and T24 cells evaluated for dose response. Using KU1919 as the illustrative example, KU1919-GemCis cells (median Pt 195 = 102) showed lower cisplatin concentration compared to KU1919 parental cells (median Pt 195 = 565). Control knockdown had little effect (median Pt 195 = 121), but NPEPPS knockdown shifted the intracellular levels of cisplatin to the parent lines (median Pt 195 = 375), suggesting that NPEPPS depletion increased intracellular cisplatin (**Figure 3E** and **S5**). These findings were replicated in the T24 cell lines (**Figure 3E** and **S5**)**.** In the overexpression setting, and using KU1919 as the example, KU1919-GemCis cells (median Pt 195 = 763) again showed lower cisplatin concentration compared to KU1919 parental cells (median Pt 195 = 1706) with the overexpression control cells (median Pt 195 = 1738) showing little difference, but the NPEPPS overexpressing cells (median Pt 195 = 1203) showing a decrease in intracellular cisplatin (**Figure 3F** and **S6**). We found similar results with T24 cells (**Figure 3F** and **S6**). These data are consistent with the dose response results reported in **Figure 3A-D**.

To test if NPEPPS depletion sensitizes tumor cells to cisplatin-based chemotherapy *in vivo*, we established subcutaneous xenografts using the KU1919-GemCis cells with either NPEPPS shRNA knockdown or non-targeting shRNA control. When tumors reached roughly 200mm^3, mice were randomized into four groups: shCtrl1 with PBS (n=11), shCtrl1 with gemcitabine plus cisplatin (n=11), shN39 with PBS (n=11), and shN39 with gemcitabine plus cisplatin (n=12). Treatment was delivered through intraperitoneal injection, with PBS or gemcitabine plus cisplatin administered three times weekly for four weeks. Tumor volumes were monitored until they reached the predetermined endpoint of 2cm^3. NPEPPS knockdown alone and gemcitabine plus cisplatin treatment alone had a significant impact on tumor growth compared to vehicle-treated, shRNA controls. The combination of NPEPPS knockdown and gemcitabine plus cisplatin treatment led to a stronger and more significant impact on tumor growth (**Figure 3G**). We further analyzed tumor growth using linear mixed-effects models aimed at capturing trends in tumor volume change in relation to pre-treatment baseline tumor volume across the four groups (**Figure S7A,B**). According to this model, tumor growth inhibition by NPEPPS knockdown (*p*=0.00178), GemCis treatment (*p*=5.49e-7), or the combination of NPEPPS knockdown and gemcitabine plus cisplatin treatment (*p*=1.47e-8) were all consistent effects over the treatment period (**Figure 3G,H**). We validated NPEPPS knockdown in the pre-

xenograft inoculate cells and after tumors were removed from mice upon reaching the 2cm³ endpoint (**Figure S7C**). Survival analysis using tumor volume as the endpoint showed that mice treated with gemcitabine plus cisplatin had a 14-day survival advantage. Similarly, the knockdown of NPEPPS resulted in a 14-day survival advantage. Mice treated with gemcitabine plus cisplatin and with NPEPPS knockdown tumors had a 25-day survival advantage, a statistically significant improvement (Logrank test, p<0.0001) (**Figure 3H**).

Figure 3. Genetic inhibition of NPEPPS resensitizes GemCis-resistant cells *in vitro* and *in vivo*. (**A,** **B**) KU1919-GemCis or T24-GemCis cells with knockdown of NPEPPS treated with increasing doses of cisplatin or gemcitabine. A total of 3 technical replicates per dose (mean ± SEM). (**C, D**). KU1919 or T24 parental cells with overexpression of NPEPPS treated with increasing doses of cisplatin or gemcitabine. A total of 3 technical replicates per dose (mean ± SEM). Independent experiments are reported in **Figure S4**. p-values comparing IC50 values using sum-of-squares F test. (**E,F**) Intracellular cisplatin levels in KU1919 T24 cells were measured after 4 hours of 10μM cisplatin treatment using CyTOF, with the number of live cells analyzed as indicated. (**G**) Tumor volume (mean ± SEM) of KU1919-GemCis xenografts measured over time and across 4 treatment groups considering non-targeting shRNA controls (shCtrl1), shRNA targeting NPEPPS (shN39), PBS vehicle control (PBS), or gemcitabine plus cisplatin treatment (GemCis). (**H**) Survival analysis of xenograft models with a defined endpoint of a tumor volume > 2cm³. Logrank test was applied to test significance.

NPEPPS regulates cisplatin response in MIBC patient-derived organoids

We next evaluated the role of NPEPPS in regulating cisplatin response in *ex vivo* expanded 3D primary cultures of MIBC tissue as patient-derived organoids (PDOs). PDOs are commonly used as an intermediate step to the clinical investigation of novel therapeutics as they more closely recapitulate the human tumor as supported by a high degree of clinical reliability and predictability of drug response in validation trials (66–69). As shown in **Figure 4A**, PDOs were generated from MIBC patients undergoing transurethral resection of a bladder tumor (T, n=3) or radical cystectomy (C, n=2). Three PDOs were generated prior to cisplatin-based chemotherapy (preChemo), one PDO was generated after patients received cisplatin-based chemotherapy (postChemo), and one PDO was generated from patients that did not receive cisplatin-based chemotherapy (noChemo). The tumor for patient 4 showed pathological complete response (pCR), while the tumors for the remaining chemotherapy-treated patients were pathological non-responders (pNR).

The tumor origin of the PDOs was confirmed by the detection of matching bladder cancer-specific mutations in tumor-organoid pairs (**Figure 4A**). As expected with this patient-derived platform, PDOs displayed distinct and tumor-specific phenotypes with notable variations in cell density and roundness (**Figure 4B**). We performed dose response with cisplatin to determine patient-specific *ex vivo* responses. PDOs displayed a range of responses to cisplatin, with a median cisplatin IC50 value of 6.1 µM, a minimum of 2.9 µM, and a maximum of 37.4 µM **(Figure 4C**).

To investigate the effect of NPEPPS depletion on cisplatin resistance, we selected two PDO lines from patients with clinical neoadjuvant chemotherapy (NAC)-resistance and intermediate *ex vivo* cisplatin resistance (1C-postChemo-pNR and 2T-preChemo-pNR), and performed shRNA-mediated knockdown of NPEPPS (**Figure 4D-E**) followed by their treatment with cisplatin for six days (**Figure 4F,I**). NPEPPS depletion lowered the cisplatin IC50 values by approximately 5µM in both of the tested PDOs (**Figure 4G,J**). Furthermore, significantly increased caspase-3 and -7 activity was observed following three days of cisplatin treatment in shRNA-mediated NPEPPS depletion compared to control PDOs, suggesting that NPEPPS depletion increases cisplatin-mediated apoptosis (**Figure 4H,K**). Finally, we show that intracellular cisplatin levels in the shRNA control organoids (median Pt 195 = 113) are increased with the knockdown of NPEPPS (median Pt 195 = 213; **Figure 4L**). Collectively, these results demonstrate that genetic inhibition of NPEPPS sensitizes PDOs to cisplatin, which is consistent with our findings in the bladder cancer cell lines.

Next, we tested whether NPEPPS independently increases cisplatin resistance. We selected treatment-naïve (5C-noChemo) and post-NAC (1C-postChemo-pNR) PDO lines to represent treatment-naïve and cisplatin-treated patients with exogenously expressed NPEPPS via lentiviral transduction (**Figure 5A**). NPEPPS overexpression was confirmed by RT-qPCR, showing a 10-fold overexpression for 5C-noChemo and 3-fold overexpression for 1C-postChemo-pNR (**Figure 5B**). Cisplatin dose response was measured and we observed a decrease in cisplatin-mediated apoptotic blebbing and loss of structure in NPEPPS-overexpressing PDOs compared to empty vector control PDOs (**Figure 5C,G**). Furthermore, from the estimated IC50 values, we observed an increase in resistance to cisplatin associated with increased NPEPPS expression (**Figure 5D,H**). Moreover, less apoptosis was observed in NPEPPS-overexpressed PDOs treated with 15 µM and 25 µM cisplatin, as measured by caspase-3 and -7 (**Figure 5E,I**). Again, we found that NPEPPS controlled intracellular cisplatin concentrations, with the NPEPPS overexpressing cells (median Pt 195 = 682) showing decreased levels of cisplatin compared to the empty vector control cells (median Pt 195 = 996;

Figure 5F). Taken together, these results suggest that NPEPPS regulates cisplatin response in treatment naïve and post-NAC treatment PDOs, highlighting NPEPPS as an attractive therapeutic target across cisplatin-based chemotherapy settings.

Figure 4. NPEPPS depletion sensitizes *ex vivo* models of bladder cancer to cisplatin. (A) Clinical course of muscle-invasive bladder cancer (MIBC) for patients including the point at which the patient

tumor-derived organoid lines (PDO) were generated (indicated by the black arrow). Notation is the patient
number followed by the tumor source, either T = TURBT = transurethral resection of bladder tumor, or C
= radical cystectomy. (**B**) Representative bright-field images of organoids together with H&E staining of
patient tumor-PDO pairs illustrating patient-specific growth patterns. Most PDOs exhibited round and
dense structures, as represented by 1C-postChemo-pNR (Chemo = cisplatin-based chemotherapy
regimen, pNR = pathological non-responder), although there was notable variation in growth and
morphology. Scale bar = 100µm. (**C**) *Ex vivo* response of all nine PDOs treated with increasing
concentrations of cisplatin. Cell viability, as a percentage of untreated control, was measured using
CellTiter-Glo. The fitted dose-response curves represent viability corresponding to three biological
replicate experiments and data are represented as mean ± SEM. pCR= pathological complete response.
(**D**) Experimental workflow for lentiviral, shRNA-mediated NPEPPS-depletion in PDOs and representative
images after puromycin selection. Scale bar = 400µm. (**E**) NPEPPS expression was evaluated by RT-
PCR in shNPEPPS and shCtrl PDO lines normalized to cyclophilin. Error bars represent mean ± SD. (**F,I**)
Representative bright-field images of control and NPEPPS-depleted PDOs, (**F**) 1C-postChemo-pNR or (**I**)
2T-preChemo-pNR,treated with the indicated cisplatin concentrations. Scale bar = 200µm. (**G,J**) IC50
values estimated from dose curves for cell viability measured through CellTiter-Glo (biological triplicates;
mean ± SEM). (**H,K**) Relative caspase-3 and -7 activity in cisplatin-treated shCtrl and shNPEPPS PDOs.
Caspase activity was measured by Caspase-Glo and normalized to untreated PDOs. (biological
triplicates; mean ± SEM). (**L**) Intracellular cisplatin levels were measured after 24 hours of 5µM cisplatin
treatment using CyTOF, with the number of live cells analyzed as indicated.
990

Figure 5. *Ex vivo* NPEPPS overexpression enhances cisplatin resistance. (**A**) Schematic representation of the experimental procedure for NPEPPS overexpression in PDOs and representative images after puromycin selection. Scale bar = 400μm. **B)** NPEPPS expression was evaluated by RT-PCR in shNPEPPS and shCtrl PDO lines normalized to cyclophillin. Error bars represent mean ± SD. (**C,G**) Representative bright-field images of empty vector control and NPEPPS-overexpressing PDOs, (**C**) 1C-postChemo-pNR or (**G**) 5C-noChemo, treated with the indicated cisplatin concentrations. Scale bar = 400μm. (**D,H**) IC50 values estimated from dose curves for cell viability measured through CellTiter-Glo (biological triplicates; mean ± SEM). (**E,I**) Relative caspase-3 and -7 activity in cisplatin-treated empty vector control and NPEPPS-overexpressing PDOs. Caspase activity was measured by Caspase-Glo and normalized to untreated PDOs. (biological triplicates; mean ± SEM). (**F**) Intracellular cisplatin levels were measured after 24 hours of 5μM cisplatin treatment using CyTOF, with the number of livecells analyzed as indicated.

Pharmacological inhibition of NPEPPS improves cisplatin response in MIBC organoids

To assess the pharmacological efficacy of targeting NPEPPS, we tested cisplatin treatment combined with the NPEPPS inhibitor, tosedostat (70). We focused on the three preChemo, TURBT-derived PDOs to test the efficacy of cisplatin-based chemotherapy in combination with tosedostat in treatment naïve MIBC patients that will subsequently receive pre-operative chemotherapy. From our initial evaluation of cisplatin sensitivity (**Figure 4C**), we found the most sensitive PDO in this group to be 4T-preChemo-pCR (IC50=7.1µM), followed by 2T-preChemo-pNR (IC50=10.5µM), and the most resistant to be 3T-preChemo-pNR (IC50=37.4µM). This range of sensitivities matches with the clinical response of patient tumors, where patient 4 had a pathological complete response (ypT0N0), patient 2 had residual disease following NAC (ypT3aN0), and patient 3 progressed to metastatic disease during pre-operative chemotherapy (ypTxNxM+) (**Figure 6A**).

Given that these PDOs are representative molecular (**Figure 4A**), morphological (**Figure 4B**), and pharmacological (**Figure 4C**) models of patient tumors, we treated the three PDOs with cisplatin, tosedostat, or the combination of cisplatin plus tosedostat (**Figure 6B**) based on previously identified plasma concentrations (70–75). Response to 2µM and 5µM cisplatin were consistent with our previous results (**Figure 4C**), with 4T-preChemo-pCR being the most sensitive to cisplatin (**Figure 6C, Figure S6A**). Tosedostat alone did not result in significant changes in viability for the 4T-preChemo-pCR and 2T-preChemo-pNR PDOs, but did result in a significant reduction in cell viability for 3T-preChemo-pNR, potentially highlighting a role for tosedostat as a monotherapy in some contexts (**Figure 6C, Figure S6A**). Significant reductions in cell viability were observed for all PDOs when cisplatin and tosedostat were combined after 6 days of treatment (**Figure 6C**, **Figure S6A**). Importantly, cisplatin response of 4T-preChemo-pCR was not compromised, but was further enhanced with the addition of tosedostat.

Next, we assessed the ability of drug-treated PDOs to re-establish, which is analogous to a clonogenic assay, and tests for cellular potential to outgrow following treatment (**Figure 6B,D**). After reseeding PDOs treated with 5µM cisplatin, 4T-preChemo-pCR showed an absence of organoid formation or outgrowth, while robust re-growth was observed for PDOs derived from tumors with residual or progressive disease (2T-preChemo-pNR and 3-preChemo-pNR) (**Figure 6D,E, Figure S6B**). Cisplatin plus tosedostat combination treatment eliminated PDO re-growth for all lines (**Figure 6E**). We additionally tested if tosedostat affected intracellular cisplatin concentrations similar to NPEPPS depletion. We found that priming bladder cancer cells with 1µM tosedostat for 72 hours followed by 10µM of cisplatin for 4 hours phenocopied NPEPPS depletion. Intracellular cisplatin in the KU1919-GemCis cells (median Pt 195 = 114) shifted to the same level as the KU1919-parental (media Pt 195 = 304) when pre-treated with tosedostat (median Pt 195 = 298). The parental lines also showed increased intracellular cisplatin after tosedostat pre-treatment (median Pt 195 = 410) (**Figure 3F**). Taken together, these findings provide strong evidence that tosedostat enhances cisplatin activity in clinically relevant and translatable experimental models of human bladder cancer, most likely by regulating intracellular cisplatin concentrations.

1048

1049
Figure 6. NPEPPS-inhibitor tosedostat overcomes cisplatin resistance ex vivo. (A) Clinical response
to cisplatin-based chemotherapy in three MIBC patients. Pathological pre-operative chemotherapy
response is annotated according to pathological stage following radical cystectomy or metastatic biopsy.
Response is illustrated by pre- (top) and post-treatment (bottom) computerized tomography (CT) scans.
Red arrows indicate bladder wall thickening and subsequence response. **(B)** Experimental design for
treating PDOs with cisplatin and tosedostat alone or in combination. PDOs were withdrawn from
treatment, dissociated to single cells and reseeded after 6 days. Cell viability was measured using
CellTiter-Glo at day 6 and day 12. **(C)** *Ex vivo* response of PDOs treated with the indicated concentrations
of cisplatin with or without the addition of tosedostat. After 6 days viability was measured by CellTiter-Glo.
(biological triplicates; mean ± SEM). one-way ANOVA; *P<0.05, **P<0.005. **(D)** Representative bright-field
images of reseeded organoids treated with cisplatin or cisplatin + tosedostat as indicated. Scale bar =
400μm. **(E)** Cisplatin response in reseeded organoids treated at the indicated concentrations of drug with
viability measured by CellTiter-Glo. (biological triplicates; mean ± SEM). one-way ANOVA; *P<0.05,
P<0.005. **(F) CyTOF results for KU1919-Parental or -GemCis cells treated with 1μM tosedostat or
DMSO for 72 hours, followed by 10μM cisplatin for 4 hours.

DISCUSSION

NPEPPS has been suggested to play a role in a range of cellular processes including promoting autophagy, regulating cell cycle progression, and antigen processing (76–79). The majority of what is known about NPEPPS has been from studies in the brain, where it targets the degradation of polyglutamine sequences and misfolded protein aggregates associated with a number of neurodegenerative diseases, including Alzheimer's disease, Huntington's disease, and Parkinson's disease (77,80–83). As reported in gnomAD, NPEPPS is a highly conserved gene and is constrained based on several metrics of intolerance to genetic variation in the population (84). NPEPPS is also ubiquitously expressed across human tissues (85). However, despite these features, genetic modification in mice is tolerable, though mice are slower growing, more sickly, and sterile (79,86), and as we have shown from our CRISPR screen results and follow-up experiments, knockout is not essential for growth in bladder cancer cells (**Figure 2D, S4**).

This work is not without its limitations. NPEPPS could have effects on treatment response outside of platinum drugs. For example, NPEPPS is upregulated in the Gem-resistant cell lines (**Figure 2**), and while we show that genetic NPEPPS loss is specific to cisplatin response (**Figure 3, S4**), NPEPPS upregulation could be part of broader cellular stress responses. Further studies will be needed to test other NPEPPS-mediated mechanisms of stress response. We note that all of our data support a cell autonomous effect of NPEPPS. As we indicated above, NPEPPS has been linked to mechanisms of immune response and non-cell autonomous effects of NEPPS were not tested here. Finally, we show that NPEPPS changes intracellular platinum drug concentrations. The mechanism by which NPEPPS regulates these intracellular levels requires future studies.

Despite these limitations, all of our data suggest that NPEPPS is a viable therapeutic target. Broadly, aminopeptidases have been therapeutically targeted as potential cancer treatments (87). More specifically, NPEPPS is a zinc-containing M1 aminopeptidase. Tosedostat was developed as a target of M1 aminopeptidases and the intracellular metabolized product CHR-79888 is the most potent inhibitor of NPEPPS reported (70,88). There have been a total of 11 clinical trials with tosedostat as reported in *clinicaltrials.gov* (73,74,88–90). The focus of its application has been in leukemias and myelomas, with several applications in solid tumors. The few clinical trials completed have reported tosedostat as being well tolerated by patients, but with modest effect as a single agent cancer treatment. A few examples of tosedostat in combination with cytarabine, azacitidine, capecitabine or paclitaxel have been tried, but there are no reports of tosedostat being tested in combination with platinum-based chemotherapy. This idea can also extend to the many patients that are ineligible for cisplatin-based chemotherapies by allowing a cisplatin dose reduction in the context of a cisplatin plus tosedostat combination. Furthermore, future determination of whether NPEPPS inhibition enhances carboplatin sensitivity may offer these patients an even more effective and less toxic drug combination option.

In conclusion, our finding that NPEPPS regulates cisplatin-based chemoresistance is both novel and actionable. Patient tumor-derived organoids (PDOs) have shown predictive value supporting personalized medicine in several tumor types (66–69,91,92). Our data with PDOs provides a strong preclinical rationale for the development of clinical trials evaluating tosedostat in combination with cisplatin (2).

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Megan Tu, Colin Sempeck, Ana Chauca-Diaz, Jason Duex, and Charles Owens for their help throughout this project. We would also like to thank Dania Manalo-Mae and the Cedars-Sinai Proteomics and Metabolomics Core Facility for the technical handling of the proteomic experiments.

References

1. Dilruba S, Kalayda GV. Platinum-based drugs: past, present and future. Cancer Chemother Pharmacol. 2016;77:1103–24.

2. Rottenberg S, Disler C, Perego P. The rediscovery of platinum-based cancer therapy. Nat Rev Cancer. Nature Publishing Group; 2021;21:37–50.

3. Bray F, Ferlay J, Soerjomataram I, Siegel RL, Torre LA, Jemal A. Global cancer statistics 2018: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. CA Cancer J Clin. 2018;68:394–424.

4. Galsky MD, Pal SK, Lin S-W, Ogale S, Zivkovic M, Simpson J, et al. Real-World Effectiveness of Chemotherapy in Elderly Patients With Metastatic Bladder Cancer in the United States. Bladder Cancer Amst Neth. 2018;4:227–38.

5. Galsky MD, Arija JÁA, Bamias A, Davis ID, De Santis M, Kikuchi E, et al. Atezolizumab with or without chemotherapy in metastatic urothelial cancer (IMvigor130): a multicentre, randomised, placebo-controlled phase 3 trial. Lancet Lond Engl. 2020;395:1547–57.

6. Nadal R, Bellmunt J. Management of metastatic bladder cancer. Cancer Treat Rev. 2019;76:10–21.

7. Grossman HB, Natale RB, Tangen CM, Speights VO, Vogelzang NJ, Trump DL, et al. Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy plus Cystectomy Compared with Cystectomy Alone for Locally Advanced Bladder Cancer. N Engl J Med. Massachusetts Medical Society; 2003;349:859–66.

8. Vale CL. Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy in Invasive Bladder Cancer: Update of a Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Individual Patient Data: Advanced Bladder Cancer (ABC) Meta-analysis Collaboration. Eur Urol. 2005;48:202–6.

9. Witjes JA, Bruins HM, Cathomas R, Compérat EM, Cowan NC, Gakis G, et al. European Association of Urology Guidelines on Muscle-invasive and Metastatic Bladder Cancer: Summary of the 2020 Guidelines. Eur Urol. 2020;

10. Patel VG, Oh WK, Galsky MD. Treatment of muscle-invasive and advanced bladder cancer in 2020. CA Cancer J Clin. 2020;

11. Cowley GS, Weir BA, Vazquez F, Tamayo P, Scott JA, Rusin S, et al. Parallel genome-scale
loss of function screens in 216 cancer cell lines for the identification of context-specific
genetic dependencies. Sci Data. Nature Publishing Group; 2014;1:140035.

12. McDonald ER, de Weck A, Schlabach MR, Billy E, Mavrakis KJ, Hoffman GR, et al. Project
DRIVE: A Compendium of Cancer Dependencies and Synthetic Lethal Relationships
Uncovered by Large-Scale, Deep RNAi Screening. Cell. 2017;170:577-592.e10.

13. Tsherniak A, Vazquez F, Montgomery PG, Weir BA, Kryukov G, Cowley GS, et al. Defining a
Cancer Dependency Map. Cell. Elsevier; 2017;170:564-576.e16.

14. Behan FM, Iorio F, Picco G, Gonçalves E, Beaver CM, Migliardi G, et al. Prioritization of
cancer therapeutic targets using CRISPR–Cas9 screens. Nature. Nature Publishing Group;
2019;568:511–6.

15. Goodspeed A, Jean A, Costello JC. A Whole-genome CRISPR Screen Identifies a Role of
MSH2 in Cisplatin-mediated Cell Death in Muscle-invasive Bladder Cancer. Eur Urol.
2019;75:242–50.

16. Huang A, Garraway LA, Ashworth A, Weber B. Synthetic lethality as an engine for cancer
drug target discovery. Nat Rev Drug Discov. Nature Publishing Group; 2020;19:23–38.

17. Jost M, Weissman JS. CRISPR Approaches to Small Molecule Target Identification. ACS Chem
Biol. 2018;13:366–75.

18. Olivieri M, Cho T, Álvarez-Quilón A, Li K, Schellenberg MJ, Zimmermann M, et al. A Genetic
Map of the Response to DNA Damage in Human Cells. Cell. 2020;182:481-496.e21.

19. Dobin A, Davis CA, Schlesinger F, Drenkow J, Zaleski C, Jha S, et al. STAR: ultrafast universal
RNA-seq aligner. Bioinforma Oxf Engl. 2013;29:15–21.

20. Robinson MD, McCarthy DJ, Smyth GK. edgeR: a Bioconductor package for differential
expression analysis of digital gene expression data. Bioinforma Oxf Engl. 2010;26:139–40.

21. Ritchie ME, Phipson B, Wu D, Hu Y, Law CW, Shi W, et al. limma powers differential
expression analyses for RNA-sequencing and microarray studies. Nucleic Acids Res.
2015;43:e47.

22. Sergushichev AA. An algorithm for fast preranked gene set enrichment analysis using
cumulative statistic calculation. bioRxiv. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory; 2016;060012.

23. Liberzon A, Subramanian A, Pinchback R, Thorvaldsdóttir H, Tamayo P, Mesirov JP.
Molecular signatures database (MSigDB) 3.0. Bioinformatics. Oxford Academic;
2011;27:1739–40.

24. Wickham H. Ggplot2: elegant graphics for data analysis. New York: Springer; 2009.

25. Gu Z, Eils R, Schlesner M. Complex heatmaps reveal patterns and correlations in
multidimensional genomic data. Bioinformatics. 2016;32:2847–9.

26. Robinson AE, Binek A, Venkatraman V, Searle BC, Holewinski RJ, Rosenberger G, et al. Lysine
and Arginine Protein Post-translational Modifications by Enhanced DIA Libraries:
Quantification in Murine Liver Disease. J Proteome Res. 2020;19:4163–78.

27. Berle M, Ghila L, Vethe H, Chaudhry A, Garberg H, Beisland C, et al. Novel protein signatures
suggest progression to muscular invasiveness in bladder cancer. PloS One.
2018;13:e0206475.

28. Parker SJ, Venkatraman V, Van Eyk JE. Effect of peptide assay library size and composition in
targeted data-independent acquisition-MS analyses. Proteomics. 2016;16:2221–37.

29. Parker SJ, Rost H, Rosenberger G, Collins BC, Malmström L, Amodei D, et al. Identification of
a Set of Conserved Eukaryotic Internal Retention Time Standards for Data-independent
Acquisition Mass Spectrometry. Mol Cell Proteomics MCP. 2015;14:2800–13.

30. Röst HL, Rosenberger G, Navarro P, Gillet L, Miladinović SM, Schubert OT, et al.
OpenSWATH enables automated, targeted analysis of data-independent acquisition MS
data. Nat Biotechnol. 2014;32:219–23.

31. Teleman J, Röst HL, Rosenberger G, Schmitt U, Malmström L, Malmström J, et al. DIANA--
algorithmic improvements for analysis of data-independent acquisition MS data.
Bioinforma Oxf Engl. 2015;31:555–62.

32. Röst HL, Liu Y, D'Agostino G, Zanella M, Navarro P, Rosenberger G, et al. TRIC: an
automated alignment strategy for reproducible protein quantification in targeted
proteomics. Nat Methods. 2016;13:777–83.

33. Choi M, Chang C-Y, Clough T, Broudy D, Killeen T, MacLean B, et al. MSstats: an R package
for statistical analysis of quantitative mass spectrometry-based proteomic experiments.
Bioinforma Oxf Engl. 2014;30:2524–6.

34. Li H. Aligning sequence reads, clone sequences and assembly contigs with BWA-MEM.
ArXiv13033997 Q-Bio [Internet]. 2013 [cited 2020 Oct 27]; Available from:
http://arxiv.org/abs/1303.3997

35. Faust GG, Hall IM. SAMBLASTER: fast duplicate marking and structural variant read
extraction. Bioinforma Oxf Engl. 2014;30:2503–5.

36. Sherry ST, Ward MH, Kholodov M, Baker J, Phan L, Smigielski EM, et al. dbSNP: the NCBI
database of genetic variation. Nucleic Acids Res. 2001;29:308–11.

37. 1000 Genomes Project Consortium, Auton A, Brooks LD, Durbin RM, Garrison EP, Kang HM,
et al. A global reference for human genetic variation. Nature. 2015;526:68–74.

38. Mills RE, Pittard WS, Mullaney JM, Farooq U, Creasy TH, Mahurkar AA, et al. Natural genetic
variation caused by small insertions and deletions in the human genome. Genome Res.
2011;21:830–9.

39. Li H, Handsaker B, Wysoker A, Fennell T, Ruan J, Homer N, et al. The Sequence
Alignment/Map format and SAMtools. Bioinformatics. 2009;25:2078–9.

40. Okonechnikov K, Conesa A, García-Alcalde F. Qualimap 2: advanced multi-sample quality
control for high-throughput sequencing data. Bioinforma Oxf Engl. 2016;32:292–4.

41. Picard toolkit [Internet]. Broad Inst. GitHub Repos. Broad Institute; 2018. Available from:
http://broadinstitute.github.io/picard/

42. Benjamin D, Sato T, Cibulskis K, Getz G, Stewart C, Lichtenstein L. Calling Somatic SNVs and
Indels with Mutect2. bioRxiv. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory; 2019;861054.

43. Wang K, Li M, Hakonarson H. ANNOVAR: functional annotation of genetic variants from
high-throughput sequencing data. Nucleic Acids Res. 2010;38:e164–e164.

44. Doench JG, Fusi N, Sullender M, Hegde M, Vaimberg EW, Donovan KF, et al. Optimized
sgRNA design to maximize activity and minimize off-target effects of CRISPR-Cas9. Nat
Biotechnol. 2016;34:184–91.

45. Imkeller K, Ambrosi G, Boutros M, Huber W. gscreend: modelling asymmetric count ratios in
CRISPR screens to decrease experiment size and improve phenotype detection. Genome
Biol. 2020;21:53.

46. Joung J, Konermann S, Gootenberg JS, Abudayyeh OO, Platt RJ, Brigham MD, et al. Genome-
scale CRISPR-Cas9 knockout and transcriptional activation screening. Nat Protoc.
2017;12:828–63.

47. Winter J, Breinig M, Heigwer F, Brügemann D, Leible S, Pelz O, et al. caRpools: an R package
for exploratory data analysis and documentation of pooled CRISPR/Cas9 screens.
Bioinforma Oxf Engl. 2016;32:632–4.

48. Love MI, Huber W, Anders S. Moderated estimation of fold change and dispersion for RNA-
seq data with DESeq2. Genome Biol. 2014;15:550.

49. Bates D, Mächler M, Bolker B, Walker S. Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using lme4. J
Stat Softw. 2015;67:1–48.

50. Kuznetsova A, Brockhoff PB, Christensen RHB. lmerTest Package: Tests in Linear Mixed
Effects Models. J Stat Softw. 2017;82:1–26.

51. Mullenders J, de Jongh E, Brousali A, Roosen M, Blom JPA, Begthel H, et al. Mouse and
human urothelial cancer organoids: A tool for bladder cancer research. Proc Natl Acad Sci
U S A. 2019;116:4567–74.

52. Allory Y, Beukers W, Sagrera A, Flández M, Marqués M, Márquez M, et al. Telomerase
reverse transcriptase promoter mutations in bladder cancer: high frequency across stages,
detection in urine, and lack of association with outcome. Eur Urol. 2014;65:360–6.

53. Hurst CD, Zuiverloon TCM, Hafner C, Zwarthoff EC, Knowles MA. A SNaPshot assay for the
rapid and simple detection of four common hotspot codon mutations in the PIK3CA gene.
BMC Res Notes. 2009;2:66.

54. Junker K, van Oers JMM, Zwarthoff EC, Kania I, Schubert J, Hartmann A. Fibroblast growth
factor receptor 3 mutations in bladder tumors correlate with low frequency of
chromosome alterations. Neoplasia N Y N. 2008;10:1–7.

55. Perez-Riverol Y, Csordas A, Bai J, Bernal-Llinares M, Hewapathirana S, Kundu DJ, et al. The
PRIDE database and related tools and resources in 2019: improving support for
quantification data. Nucleic Acids Res. 2019;47:D442–50.

56. Vallo S, Michaelis M, Rothweiler F, Bartsch G, Gust KM, Limbart DM, et al. Drug-Resistant
Urothelial Cancer Cell Lines Display Diverse Sensitivity Profiles to Potential Second-Line
Therapeutics. Transl Oncol. 2015;8:210–6.

57. Vallo S, Köpp R, Michaelis M, Rothweiler F, Bartsch G, Brandt MP, et al. Resistance to
nanoparticle albumin-bound paclitaxel is mediated by ABCB1 in urothelial cancer cells.
Oncol Lett. Spandidos Publications; 2017;13:4085–92.

58. Robertson AG, Kim J, Al-Ahmadie H, Bellmunt J, Guo G, Cherniack AD, et al. Comprehensive
Molecular Characterization of Muscle-Invasive Bladder Cancer. Cell. Elsevier;
2017;171:540-556.e25.

59. Landrum MJ, Lee JM, Benson M, Brown GR, Chao C, Chitipiralla S, et al. ClinVar: improving
access to variant interpretations and supporting evidence. Nucleic Acids Res.
2018;46:D1062–7.

60. Korotkevich G, Sukhov V, Sergushichev A. Fast gene set enrichment analysis. bioRxiv. Cold
Spring Harbor Laboratory; 2019;060012.

61. Drayton RM, Catto JW. Molecular mechanisms of cisplatin resistance in bladder cancer.
Expert Rev Anticancer Ther. Taylor & Francis; 2012;12:271–81.

62. Galluzzi L, Senovilla L, Vitale I, Michels J, Martins I, Kepp O, et al. Molecular mechanisms of
cisplatin resistance. Oncogene. 2012;31:1869–83.

63. Huang D, Savage SR, Calinawan AP, Lin C, Zhang B, Wang P, et al. A highly annotated
database of genes associated with platinum resistance in cancer. Oncogene.
2021;40:6395–405.

64. Dempster JM, Krill-Burger J, Warren A, McFarland JM, Golub TR, Tsherniak A. Gene
expression has more power for predicting in vitro cancer cell vulnerabilities than
genomics. bioRxiv. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory; 2020;2020.02.21.959627.

65. Chang Q, Ornatsky OI, Koch CJ, Chaudary N, Marie-Egyptienne DT, Hill RP, et al. Single-cell
measurement of the uptake, intratumoral distribution and cell cycle effects of cisplatin
using mass cytometry. Int J Cancer. 2015;136:1202–9.

66. Tiriac H, Belleau P, Engle DD, Plenker D, Deschênes A, Somerville TDD, et al. Organoid
Profiling Identifies Common Responders to Chemotherapy in Pancreatic Cancer. Cancer
Discov. 2018;8:1112–29.

67. Ooft SN, Weeber F, Dijkstra KK, McLean CM, Kaing S, van Werkhoven E, et al. Patient-
derived organoids can predict response to chemotherapy in metastatic colorectal cancer
patients. Sci Transl Med. 2019;11:eaay2574.

68. Yao Y, Xu X, Yang L, Zhu J, Wan J, Shen L, et al. Patient-Derived Organoids Predict
Chemoradiation Responses of Locally Advanced Rectal Cancer. Cell Stem Cell. 2020;26:17-
26.e6.

69. de Witte CJ, Espejo Valle-Inclan J, Hami N, Lõhmussaar K, Kopper O, Vreuls CPH, et al.
Patient-Derived Ovarian Cancer Organoids Mimic Clinical Response and Exhibit
Heterogeneous Inter- and Intrapatient Drug Responses. Cell Rep. 2020;31:107762.

70. Reid AHM, Protheroe A, Attard G, Hayward N, Vidal L, Spicer J, et al. A First-in-Man Phase I
and Pharmacokinetic Study on CHR-2797 (Tosedostat), an Inhibitor of M1
Aminopeptidases, in Patients with Advanced Solid Tumors. Clin Cancer Res. 2009;15:4978–
85.

71. Chargi N, Molenaar-Kuijsten L, Huiskamp LFJ, Devriese LA, de Bree R, Huitema ADR. The
association of cisplatin pharmacokinetics and skeletal muscle mass in patients with head
and neck cancer: The prospective PLATISMA study. Eur J Cancer Oxf Engl 1990.
2022;160:92–9.

72. Urien S, Lokiec F. Population pharmacokinetics of total and unbound plasma cisplatin in
adult patients. Br J Clin Pharmacol. 2004;57:756–63.

73. Cortes J, Feldman E, Yee K, Rizzieri D, Advani AS, Charman A, et al. Two dosing regimens of
tosedostat in elderly patients with relapsed or refractory acute myeloid leukaemia (OPAL):
a randomised open-label phase 2 study. Lancet Oncol. 2013;14:354–62.

74. Löwenberg B, Morgan G, Ossenkoppele GJ, Burnett AK, Zachée P, Dührsen U, et al. Phase
I/II clinical study of Tosedostat, an inhibitor of aminopeptidases, in patients with acute
myeloid leukemia and myelodysplasia. J Clin Oncol Off J Am Soc Clin Oncol. 2010;28:4333–
8.

75. Hanada K, Nishijima K, Ogata H, Atagi S, Kawahara M. Population pharmacokinetic analysis
of cisplatin and its metabolites in cancer patients: possible misinterpretation of covariates
for pharmacokinetic parameters calculated from the concentrations of unchanged
cisplatin, ultrafiltered platinum and total platinum. Jpn J Clin Oncol. 2001;31:179–84.

76. Constam DB, Tobler AR, Rensing-Ehl A, Kemler I, Hersh LB, Fontana A. Puromycin-sensitive
aminopeptidase. Sequence analysis, expression, and functional characterization. J Biol
Chem. 1995;270:26931–9.

77. Menzies FM, Hourez R, Imarisio S, Raspe M, Sadiq O, Chandraratna D, et al. Puromycin-
sensitive aminopeptidase protects against aggregation-prone proteins via autophagy. Hum
Mol Genet. 2010;19:4573–86.

78. Saric T, Graef CI, Goldberg AL. Pathway for degradation of peptides generated by
proteasomes: a key role for thimet oligopeptidase and other metallopeptidases. J Biol
Chem. 2004;279:46723–32.

79. Towne CF, York IA, Neijssen J, Karow ML, Murphy AJ, Valenzuela DM, et al. Puromycin-
Sensitive Aminopeptidase Limits MHC Class I Presentation in Dendritic Cells but Does Not
Affect CD8 T Cell Responses during Viral Infections. J Immunol. 2008;180:1704–12.

80. Karsten SL, Sang T-K, Gehman LT, Chatterjee S, Liu J, Lawless GM, et al. A genomic screen
for modifiers of tauopathy identifies puromycin-sensitive aminopeptidase as an inhibitor
of tau-induced neurodegeneration. Neuron. 2006;51:549–60.

81. Kudo LC, Parfenova L, Ren G, Vi N, Hui M, Ma Z, et al. Puromycin-sensitive aminopeptidase
(PSA/NPEPPS) impedes development of neuropathology in hPSA/TAU(P301L) double-
transgenic mice. Hum Mol Genet. 2011;20:1820–33.

82. Schönlein C, Löffler J, Huber G. Purification and characterization of a novel metalloprotease
from human brain with the ability to cleave substrates derived from the N-terminus of
beta-amyloid protein. Biochem Biophys Res Commun. 1994;201:45–53.

83. Yanagi K, Tanaka T, Kato K, Sadik G, Morihara T, Kudo T, et al. Involvement of puromycin-
sensitive aminopeptidase in proteolysis of tau protein in cultured cells, and attenuated
proteolysis of frontotemporal dementia and parkinsonism linked to chromosome 17
(FTDP-17) mutant tau. Psychogeriatrics. 2009;9:157–66.

84. Karczewski KJ, Francioli LC, Tiao G, Cummings BB, Alföldi J, Wang Q, et al. The mutational
constraint spectrum quantified from variation in 141,456 humans. Nature. 2020;581:434–
43.

85. Uhlen M, Zhang C, Lee S, Sjöstedt E, Fagerberg L, Bidkhori G, et al. A pathology atlas of the
human cancer transcriptome. Science. 2017;357.

86. Osada T, Ikegami S, Takiguchi-Hayashi K, Yamazaki Y, Katoh-Fukui Y, Higashinakagawa T, et
al. Increased anxiety and impaired pain response in puromycin-sensitive aminopeptidase
gene-deficient mice obtained by a mouse gene-trap method. J Neurosci Off J Soc Neurosci.
1999;19:6068–78.

87. Hitzerd SM, Verbrugge SE, Ossenkoppele G, Jansen G, Peters GJ. Positioning of
aminopeptidase inhibitors in next generation cancer therapy. Amino Acids. 2014;46:793–
808.

88. Krige D, Needham LA, Bawden LJ, Flores N, Farmer H, Miles LEC, et al. CHR-2797: an
antiproliferative aminopeptidase inhibitor that leads to amino acid deprivation in human
leukemic cells. Cancer Res. 2008;68:6669–79.

89. van Herpen CML, Eskens F a. LM, de Jonge M, Desar I, Hooftman L, Bone EA, et al. A Phase
Ib dose-escalation study to evaluate safety and tolerability of the addition of the
aminopeptidase inhibitor tosedostat (CHR-2797) to paclitaxel in patients with advanced
solid tumours. Br J Cancer. 2010;103:1362–8.

90. Mawad R, Becker PS, Hendrie P, Scott B, Wood BL, Dean C, et al. Phase II study of
tosedostat with cytarabine or decitabine in newly diagnosed older patients with acute
myeloid leukaemia or high-risk MDS. Br J Haematol. 2016;172:238–45.

91. Sachs N, de Ligt J, Kopper O, Gogola E, Bounova G, Weeber F, et al. A Living Biobank of
Breast Cancer Organoids Captures Disease Heterogeneity. Cell. 2018;172:373-386.e10.

92. Lee SH, Hu W, Matulay JT, Silva MV, Owczarek TB, Kim K, et al. Tumor Evolution and Drug
Response in Patient-Derived Organoid Models of Bladder Cancer. Cell. 2018;173:515-
528.e17.

1374