Targeting the dependence on PIK3C3-mTORC1 signaling in dormancy-prone breast cancer cells blunts metastasis initiation

Authors

Islam E. Elkholi[1,2,*], Amélie Robert[1], Hellen Kuasne[3], Stanislav Drapela[4], Graham Macleod[5,6], Steven Hébert[7], Alain Pacis[3,8], Virginie Calderon[1], Claudia L. Kleinman[7,9], Ana P. Gomes[4], Julio A. Aguirre-Ghiso[10-13], Morag Park[3,†], Stéphane Angers[5,6,14,†], Jean-François Côté[1,2,15,16,*]

Affiliations

[1]Montreal Clinical Research Institute, Montreal, Canada.
[2]Molecular Biology Programs, Université de Montréal, Canada.
[3]Rosalind and Morris Goodman Cancer Institute, McGill University, Canada.
[4]Department of Molecular Oncology, H. Lee Moffitt Cancer Center & Research Institute, Tampa, USA.
[5]Donnelly Centre for Cellular & Biomolecular Research, University of Toronto, Canada.
[6]Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy, University of Toronto, Canada.
[7]Lady Davis Institute for Medical Research, Jewish General Hospital, Montreal, Canada.
[8]Canadian Centre for Computational Genomics, McGill University, Montreal, Canada.
[9]Department of Human Genetics, McGill University, Canada.
[10]Department of Cell Biology, Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Bronx, USA.
[11]Cancer Dormancy and Tumor Microenvironment Institute, Albert Einstein Cancer Center, Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Bronx, USA.
[12]Ruth L. & David S. Gottesman Institute for Stem Cell Research & Regenerative Medicine, Albert Einstein Cancer Center, Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Bronx, USA.
[13]Institute for Aging Research, Albert Einstein Cancer Center, Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Bronx, USA.
[14]Department of Biochemistry, Temerty Faculty of Medicine, University of Toronto, Canada.
[15]Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Medicine, Université de Montréal, Canada.
[16]Department of Anatomy and Cell Biology, McGill University, Canada.

† denotes equal contribution.

* Corresponding authors:

Islam E. Elkholi, MD, PhD

Montreal Clinical Research Institute (IRCM),
110 Pine Ave West, Montreal,
Québec, H2W1R7 Canada.
Email : islam.elkholi@mail.mcgill.ca
Phone: 514 987-5656

Jean-François Côté, PhD

Montreal Clinical Research Institute (IRCM),
110 Pine Ave West, Montreal,
Québec, H2W1R7 Canada.
Email : jean-francois.cote@ircm.qc.ca
Phone: (514) 987-5647

Abstract

Halting breast cancer metastatic relapses following primary tumor removal and the clinical dormant phase, remains challenging, due to a lack of specific vulnerabilities to target during dormancy. To address this, we conducted genome-wide CRISPR screens on two breast cancer cell lines with distinct dormancy properties: 4T1 (short-term dormancy) and 4T07 (prolonged dormancy). We discovered that loss of class-III PI3K, Pik3c3, revealed a unique vulnerability in 4T07 cells. Surprisingly, dormancy-prone 4T07 cells exhibited higher mTORC1 activity than 4T1 cells, due to lysosome-dependent signaling occurring at the cell periphery. Pharmacological inhibition of Pik3c3 counteracted this phenotype in 4T07 cells, and selectively reduced metastasis burden only in the 4T07 dormancy prone model. This mechanism was also detected in xenografts from human breast cancer patients, supporting that it may be relevant in humans. Our findings suggest dormant cancer cell-initiated metastasis may be prevented in patients carrying tumor cells that display PIK3C3-peripheral lysosomal signaling to mTORC1.

Teaser

PIK3C3-mTORC1 signaling is a novel druggable pathway in breast cancer metastasis.

INTRODUCTION

Nearly one-quarter of breast cancer patients present with a metastatic relapse within months to as long as 20 years after the diagnosis and management of their primary tumors (*1-3*). This is attributed to the phenomenon of metastatic dormancy, whereby tumor cells homing to secondary sites within the body enter a state of quiescence (i.e., cellular dormancy) and/or balanced proliferation and apoptosis (i.e., micrometasatatic dormancy) that collectively lead to metastatic disease that is undetectable by current tests. Although this notion is well recognized, the molecular and biological dynamics underlying metastatic dormancy is still in its infancy (*4*). Understanding the molecular determinants behind the switch from dormancy to metastatic outgrowth in addition to the survival mechanisms of dormant disseminated tumor cells (DTCs) is needed to develop effective therapeutic approaches for preventing relapse. Currently such molecular determinants can be categorized into two independent, yet inseparable factors: cancer cell intrinsic factors and microenvironmental cues that can direct the fate and response of DTCs to therapies (*5-8*).

Different human and murine breast cancer cell line models that share an origin but differ in metastatic behavior have been leveraged to explore the determining factors of the fate of DTCs (reviewed in (*8*)). A widely used model is the 4T1 and 4T07 murine breast cancer cell line pair that originated from a spontaneous metastatic nodule in BALB/c mice (*9*). In immunocompetent BALB/c mice, spontaneously disseminated 4T1 cells can form overt metastases in the lungs with a short latency period, while 4T07 cells remain dormant and show ultra-low frequency of metastasis. Interestingly, implanting 4T07 cells in immunocompromised (i.e. T-cell deficient) mice allow them to escape dormancy and develop overt metastases, but at a notable lower magnitude than the 4T1 cells (*10*). This clearly supports the notion that the two cell lines are intrinsically different. Indeed, investigating the differentially expressed genes between 4T1- and 4T07-based primary tumors identified TWIST1 as a gene elevated in 4T1 cells mediating epithelial-mesenchymal transition and high metastatic burden (*11*). In addition, a gain-of-function screen using a 4T1-derived cDNA library identified Coco as a mediator of reactivation of dormant 4T07 cells in the lungs (*12*). A third study demonstrated that 4T1 tumors and cells *in vitro*, in comparison to 4T07 counterparts, express higher levels of Cxcl1 that enables the former to promote more neutrophil extracellular traps (NETs) and hence higher ability to generate overt metastases (*13*). Thus, studying these two cell lines in parallel offers an opportunity to explore new aspects of cancer cell intrinsic factors that contribute to metastatic progression and/or response to therapeutic intervention.

Here, we asked whether 4T1 and 4T07 cells exhibit differential activity in signaling pathways that could be exploited for therapeutic intervention *in vivo*. We harnessed a genome wide loss-of-function CRISPR screening-based framework (*14, 15*) to systematically reveal the fitness genes that 4T1 vs. 4T07 differentially depend on for growth. Identifying the fitness genes that contribute to a specific signaling pathway not only indicates the potential activity of the pathway but also suggests the sensitivity of cells to targeted inhibition of the pathway (*14, 16, 17*). We discovered that 4T1 cells, but not 4T07 cells, depend on and display higher activity of class I PI3K, and accordingly, are more sensitive to pharmacological inhibition of this pathway. However, counterintuitively, we discovered that the 4T07 cells demonstrate higher activity of the downstream mechanistic Target of Rapamycin complex 1 (mTORC1). Mechanistically, we show that 4T07 cells, but not 4T1 cells, depend on class III PI3K to mediate a constant peripheral lysosomal positioning that is linked to mTORC1 hyperactivity. This lysosome positioning-associated PIK3C3-mTORC1 signaling circuit is also observed in a patient-derived xenograft

104 (PDX) cell line originating from a patient diagnosed with breast cancer metastatic relapse.
105 Importantly, selective inhibition of PIK3C3 exclusively kills dormancy prone 4T07 cells.
106 Collectively, our data suggest that the PIK3C3-mTORC1 signaling axis may be a druggable target
107 to alleviate metastatic burden in breast cancer patients by eliminating disseminated cancer cells.

RESULTS

Genome-wide knockout CRISPR screens define differential fitness genes in 4T1-4T07 cells

We first aimed at characterizing the molecular subtype of breast cancer modeled by the 4T1-4T07 cells. We generated and correlated RNA-Seq transcriptomic data from these two cell lines with gene expression data from 47 human breast cancer cell lines. We conclude that 4T1-4T07 are closer to the human basal B molecular breast cancer subtype predominantly within the triple negative clinical breast cancer subtype, complementing a recent investigation of 4T1 cells (*18*) (Fig. S1; Table S1). The 4T07 cells also display features of the basal B subtype consistent with a common origin of the 4T1 and 4T07 cells (Fig. S1; Table S1).

Genome-wide loss-of-function CRISPR screens enable the identification of core and context-dependent fitness genes, revealing common and specific active signaling nodes (*14, 15, 19*). Fitness genes are those that when perturbed result in a proliferative or survival disadvantage for cells. Therefore, it is plausible that 4T1-specific fitness genes are candidate survival or metastatic progression mediators. Meanwhile, 4T07-specific fitness genes might be candidate regulators of survival during dormancy or proliferation when implanted in permissive hosts or microenvironments. To explore these gene categories, we applied a CRISPR screening pipeline to 4T1-4T07 cells to uncover their differential fitness genes, and by extension, their differentially active signaling pathways. To this end, 4T1 and 4T07 cells were independently infected with the mGeCKO library, encompassing ~70,000 gRNAs targeting ~21,000 murine genes (*20*). Following selection for cells with gRNA integration (T0), genomic DNA was extracted at 3 consecutive timepoints over 3 weeks (T1, T2, and T3) to map gRNAs representation relative to T0. The BAGEL algorithm was used to identify the fitness genes of each cell line (Fig. 1A). Prior to downstream analysis, we performed a series of quality control analyses (Fig. S2). An adequate library coverage was verified in all samples (Fig. S2A-B). In addition, a distance correlation analysis demonstrated clustering of the screens' biological replicates as expected (Fig. S2C-D). Next, as a measure for the screen sensitivity, we calculated precision-recall curves using previously annotated lists of gold-standard essential and non-essential genes (Fig. S2E-F). Both the 4T1 and 4T07 screens showed high performance, with the BAGEL algorithm being able to discriminate essential from nonessential genes with high precision. As a final indicator of the robustness, fold-change distributions of gRNAs targeting essential genes, over the course of the screens, were prominently shifted while those targeting nonessential genes showed minimal change (Fig. S2G-H). Collectively, these analyses provided confidence in the ability of the performed screens to reveal fitness genes of the two cell lines.

In total, we identified 2014 and 2038 fitness genes in the 4T1 and 4T07 cells, respectively (see Methods for details). Merging the 4T1 and 4T07 screens defined 1257 common fitness genes between these cell lines (Fig. 1B; Table S2), that had enrichment for the same biological functions of previously annotated core essential genes (*14, 21*) (Fig. S3). 757 and 781 specific fitness genes were identified in 4T1 and 4T07, respectively (Fig. 1B; Table S3-4). Next, we focused on our goal of revealing differential signaling pathways dependencies between the two cell lines. Among top ranking 4T1-specific fitness genes were *Pik3ca*, encoding the catalytic subunit of the class-I PI3K, and *Rictor*, the core component of mTOR complex 2 (mTORC2) (Fig. 1C). Both genes act as positive regulators of the PI3K pathway (Fig. 1D). In contrast, some of the pathway's negative regulators (*Pten*, *Tsc1*, *Tsc2*, and *Pras40*) were identified as proliferation suppressor genes, whose

gRNAs were enriched at the last timepoint (T3) in reference to T0, in 4T1 cells (Fig. 1D and Table S5). These data suggested that 4T1 cells may possess higher PI3K-AKT activity in comparison to 4T07 cells. To investigate whether this observation is reflected in the global transcriptome of the two cell lines, we leveraged the RNA-sequencing dataset to perform a GSEA analysis that indeed identified elevation of *AKT* and downregulation of *PTEN* gene signatures to be enriched in 4T1 in comparison to 4T07 cells (Fig. 1E-F). By analyzing the 4T07-specific fitness genes, we identified *Pik3c3*, encoding the catalytic subunit of the class-III PI3K, and its regulatory subunit *Pik3r4* (Fig. 1C). Given the clinical significance of the canonical class I PI3K pathway and the poorly explored class III PI3K pathway in breast cancer, we sought to further investigate the differential dependency on these PI3K classes.

Figure 1

Figure 1. Genome-wide knockout CRISPR screens define the common and differential fitness genes in the 4T1-4T07 cells. (A) Schematic outline for the performed screens' pipeline. **(B)** Enumeration of the revealed cell line-specific and common fitness genes. **(C)** Ranked differential gene fitness score between the 4T1 and 4T07 cells. Value > 0 denotes 4T1-specific fitness gene; value < 0 denotes 4T07-specific fitness gene. **(D)** Schematic representation integrating the 4T1-specific fitness (in green) and proliferation suppressor genes (positively selected genes; in grey) in the canonical PI3K-AKT pathway. **(E-F)** GSEA analysis comparing the enrichment of genes previously found to be induced by AKT upregulation **(E)** or PTEN downregulation in the two cell lines **(F)**.

Validation of *Pik3ca* and *Pik3c3* as differential fitness genes for 4T1 and 4T07 cells

To validate the essentiality of *Pik3ca* in 4T1 cells, we performed a two-color competition assay (*22*). 4T1 cells expressing Cas9 were generated and independently infected with either a vector expressing a *Pik3ca*-targeting gRNA and GFP, or a vector expressing a gRNA targeting the *Rosa26* locus and mCherry (Fig. 2A). The generated cell lines (green *Pik3ca* gRNA- and red *Rosa26* gRNA-expressing cells) were co-cultured in a 1:1 ratio and the percentage of the green population over total population was monitored for 10 passages (Fig. 2A). As predicted from the CRISPR screen results, cells expressing the *Pik3ca* gRNAs significantly dropped out in comparison to the control condition expressing the *Rosa26* gRNA (Fig. 2B-C). Next, a complementary pharmacological validation approach revealed that treating 4T1 and 4T07 cells with the PIK3CA-specific inhibitor BYL719 (*23*) significantly halted 4T1 cell proliferation without affecting that of 4T07 cells (Fig. 2D). Next, we investigated the effect of Akt inhibition on the two lines. As anticipated, the AKT inhibitor MK-2206 halted the proliferation of 4T1 cells in a more prominent manner than 4T07 cells (Fig. 2E).

We next validated the essentiality of *Pik3c3* in 4T07 cells using the same two-color competition assay (Fig. 2A). 4T07 cells expressing gRNAs targeting either *Pik3c3* or its binding partner *Pik3r4* (also revealed in the screen) robustly dropped out throughout consecutive timepoints of the assay (Fig. 2F-G). Meanwhile, a modest effect was noticed in the 4T1 cells (Fig. S4A-B). Indeed, comparing the representation of *Pik3c3* gRNA-expressing 4T1 and 4T07 populations after normalization to their respective control conditions (*Rosa26* gRNA-expressing cells) highlighted the differential dependence on *Pik3c3* (Fig. S4C), as predicted by the fitness screens (Fig. 1C). We then used a complementary pharmacological approach to directly assess whether inhibiting the catalytic activity of Pik3c3 affects the survival of the two cell lines differentially. 4T07 and 4T1 cells were seeded and cultured on basal membrane extract (BME) where they form spheroids, then VPS34IN1, a PIK3C3-specific inhibitor (*24*), was added at two different doses (5 uM and 10 uM) and cell death rates were assessed (Fig. 2H). VPS34IN1 treatments led to a 2- to 3-fold increase in death rate of 4T07 cells, with no significant effect on the 4T1 cells in reference to vehicle-treated conditions (Fig. 2I-J). These two approaches suggest that Pik3c3 is indispensable for 4T07 cells in contrast to the 4T1 counterpart.

Altogether, these data demonstrate the differential dependence on PI3K classes in 4T1 and 4T07 cells was further extended to differential vulnerability towards specific inhibitors for these PI3Ks. This prompted us to investigate whether these phenotypes are explained by differential signaling activity in the PI3K-AKT-mTORC1 pathway.

Figure 2

Figure 2. ***Pik3ca*** **and** ***Pik3c3*** **are differential fitness genes for the 4T1 and 4T07 cells. (A)** Schematic representation for the two-color competition assay. **(B)** Representative images showing either 4T1 cells expressing *Pik3ca*-gRNA or *Rosa26*-gRNA (both in green) co-cultured independently with 4T1 cells expressing *Rosa26*-gRNA in magenta, at passages zero (P0) and 10 (P10). **(C)** Graph showing representation of the green 4T1 cell populations over serial passages in reference to P0. **(D)** Proliferation assay comparing the 4T1-4T07 cells' response to BYL719. **(E)** Proliferation assay comparing the 4T1-4T07 cells' response to MK-2206. **(F)** Representative images showing either 4T07 cells expressing *Pik3c3*-gRNA, *Pik3r4*-gRNA, or *Rosa26*-gRNA (all

in green) co-cultured independently with cells expressing *Rosa26*-gRNA in magenta at passages zero (P0) and 10 (P10). **(G)** Graph showing representation of the green 4T07 cell populations over serial passages in reference to P0. **(H)** Schematic for the timeline of assessing the effect of VPS34IN1 on the 4T07 and 4T1 cells' survival in (I-J). **(I)** Representative images of 4T07 and 4T1 3D spheroids at the experimental endpoint after treatment with either the vehicle (DMSO) or VPS34IN1 at 5 uM and 10 uM. **(J)** Quantifications of cell death burden as indicated by positive staining for SYTOX^{TM}.

mTORC1 is differentially regulated in the 4T1 vs. 4T07 cells with higher activity in the 4T07 cells

We assessed the activity of canonical downstream components of the PI3K pathway. In line with the prediction from the genetic screens, 4T1 cells showed higher PI3K activity in untreated conditions, as assessed by phosphorylated Akt levels (Fig. 3A-C). Furthermore, short-term treatments with BYL719 (a selective PIK3CA inhibitor) inhibited the Pi3k-Akt-mTORC1 pathway to a similar extent in both cell lines, as demonstrated by reduced levels of phosphorylated Akt, S6k1, and S6 (Fig. 3A). Next, we investigated the effect of short-term Akt inhibition and found that it did not lead to the same effects as Pik3ca inhibition (Fig. 3B). In particular, mTORC1 activity, as assessed by phospho-S6k1 levels, was reduced upon inhibiting Akt only in 4T1 cells. Prominently in the untreated conditions in both experiments (Fig. 3A-B), 4T07 cells demonstrated two-fold higher mTORC1 activity than 4T1 cells (Fig. 3C), despite the dispensability and low activity of the class I Pi3k in 4T07 cells (Fig. 3A-C). Such an intriguing finding was of interest from a signaling and biological perspective for three reasons. First, the well-established feedback loop between mTORC1 activity and response to PI3K inhibition (25, 26). Notably, sustained, or reactivated, mTORC1 activity is a mechanism of resistance to the BYL719 (25, 26). Second, PIK3C3, that we validated as a 4T07-specific fitness gene (Fig. 2F-J), mediates mTORC1 activity specially when class I PI3K is inhibited for prolonged periods (27). Third, high mTORC1 activity is a survival mechanism for dormant cells *in vivo* (28), but the mechanisms behind this have not been resolved. Therefore, we set out to further dissect the previously unexplored mTORC1 activity regulation in the 4T1 and 4T07 cells considering these observations.

We investigated the extent of dependence of each cell line on the class I Pi3k in mediating mTORC1 activity. A low-dose of BYL719 (1 uM), under serum starvation or subsequent insulin stimulation, reduced mTORC1 activity preferentially in 4T1 over 4T07 cells (Fig. S5A-C), suggesting an incomplete dependence of 4T07 cells on class I Pi3k in regulating mTORC1. We then tested whether the mTORC1 hyperactivity observed in 4T07 cells contributes to their poor responsiveness to BYL719 treatment. 4T07 cells were treated with a high dose of BYL719 (10 uM) that did not affect their proliferation (Fig. 2D), and mTORC1 activity was measured after short-term (2 hours) or long-term (24, 48, and 72 hours) treatments to mimic the proliferation assay conditions (tested in Fig. 2D). We observed that mTORC1 activity started to increase after 48 hours of treatment (Fig. S5D). These findings suggested non-canonical regulation of mTORC1 in 4T07 cells.

Since gene essentiality and the mirrored activity of signaling pathways can be a consequence of genomic alterations in driver oncogenes or tumor suppressor genes, we asked whether the observed differences between the 4T1 and 4T07 cells could be explained by the genomic status of genes involved in the Pi3k-Akt-mTORC1 pathway. To this end, we performed whole-genome sequencing (WGS) on the 4T1 and 4T07 cell lines in reference to genomic DNA extracted from a mammary fat pad of a female BALB/c mouse. Despite the high sequencing coverage (see Supplementary Methods), no differential genomic alterations of established functional consequences in the Pi3k-Akt-mTORC1 pathway genes (29) were found between the two cell lines to explain the revealed differential dependence and signaling activity (Fig 3D). We noted two missense mutations in the coding regions of *Pik3ca* (p.A423S) and *Rictor* (p.R576S) in 4T07 cells (Fig. 3D; Table S6). Both mutations are in conserved residues and predicted to be of moderate impact (see Supplementary Methods). However, neither have been found in human tumors (n= 75,661 patients; see Supplementary Methods), arguing against potential functional relevance.

Differential copy number alterations were identified in *Pten*, *Inpp4b*, *Mtor*, *Prr5*, *Tsc1*, and *Akt1s1* (Fig. 3D). Only alterations in *Inpp4b, Tsc1,* and *Akt1s1* correlated with mRNA expression levels between the two lines (Tables S7-S8). Unexpectedly, 4T1 cell DNA demonstrated gain in and mRNA overexpression of *Inpp4b,* a tumor suppressor and a negative regulator of PI3K activity that is frequently lost in basal/triple negative breast cancer (*30, 31*) (Fig 3D; Table S8). On the other hand, 4T1 cells had loss in *Tsc1* and *Akt1s1,* in line with predicting these genes as proliferation suppressors for the 4T1 cells by our CRISPR screens (Fig. 1D). Although these results suggest that 4T1 cells are wired to restrict the negative regulators of the canonical Pi3k pathway, none of these could explain how mTORC1 activity is elevated in 4T07 cells.

mTORC1 is regulated by the availability of both growth factors and amino acids that feed into independent signaling circuits to collectively tune mTORC1 activity (*26*). Growth factors act through PIK3CA-AKT (*26*), meanwhile amino acids act through different key factors including PIK3C3 (*32*). Accordingly, we investigated mTORC1 activity under different nutritional conditions with the goal of being guided towards the key mTORC1 regulatory mechanisms in 4T07 cells. In comparison to 4T1 cells, 4T07 cells maintained higher basal and residual mTORC1 activity under serum-fed and starvation conditions, respectively (Fig. 3E). Only amino acid starvation, following overnight serum starvation, abrogated the sustained mTORC1 activity in 4T07 cells (Fig. 3E), while amino acid refeeding in serum-free conditions restored the activity back to basal levels (Fig. 3E). Similarly, amino acid refeeding induced the mTORC1 activity in 4T1 cells. Collectively, these observations support that mTORC1 is regulated differentially in the two cell lines and pointed out potential significance of the amino acid signaling axis in 4T07 cells.

Figure 3

Figure 3. **mTORC1 is differentially regulated in the 4T1 vs. 4T07 cells with higher activity in the 4T07 cells**. **(A-B)** Western blot analysis for the Pi3k-Akt-mTORC1 pathway readouts in the 4T1-4T07 cells upon treating with BYL719 **(A)** or MK-2206 **(B)**. **(C)** Quantification of the relative PI3K and mTORC1 activity in the two cell lines from the performed western blots in (A) and (B). **(D)** Oncoprints for somatic alterations in genes involved in the Pi3k-Akt-mtor pathway in 4T1 and 4T07 cells. **(E)** Western blot analysis assessing mTORC1 activity in the 4T1-4T07 cells under different nutritional conditions. AA; amino acids.

Differential mTORC1 activity is reflected by disparity in lysosomal positioning in 4T1 vs. 4T07 cells

Amino acids stimulate the tethering of mTOR on the lysosomal surface allowing consequent activation (*26*). Furthermore, amino acids activate PIK3C3 to mediate mTORC1 activity (*32, 33*) through different mechanisms such as mediating the peripheral positioning of the lysosomes where mTORC1 demonstrates high activity (*34*), in contrast to when the lysosomes localize at the perinuclear region (*35*). This prompted us to explore the levels of lysosomal mTORC1 in addition to lysosomal positioning in 4T1 and 4T07 cells.

We assessed the co-localization of Rptor (mTORC1-core component) and the S2448 phosphoresidue of the mTOR kinase (more specific to the Rptor-based mTORC1 than the Rictor-based mTORC2 (*36*)), with the lysosomal marker Lamp1 (Fig 4A-B). We observed a diffuse staining pattern for pMtor with a portion being co-localized with Lamp1-positive lysosomes in the two cell lines under basal conditions (Fig 4A-B, 1st row). The level of lysosomal mTORC1 was responsive to nutrient availability. Upon amino acid starvation, mTORC1 localized to small diffuse cytoplasmic puncta (Fig. 4A-B, 2nd row), as previously reported (*37*). Furthermore, this starvation decreased the lysosomal mTORC1 pool in both cell lines (Fig. 4A-C), which was rescued back to basal levels by amino acid refeeding (Fig. 4A-C, 3rd row). We also observed the existence of Rptor in both the cytoplasm, where it co-localizes with Lamp1, and the nucleus (Fig. 4A-B). However, the intact mTORC1 appears localized in the cytoplasm in both 4T1 and 4T07 cells based on the absence of a pMtor signal from the nucleus, in line with previous studies in different cell types (*38, 39*). We found that 4T07 cells demonstrate a 1.4-fold higher level of lysosomal mTORC1 than 4T1 cells under basal fed conditions (Fig. 4C). We also observed a notable differential lysosomal positioning between the two cell lines. In 4T07 cells, Lamp1-positive lysosomes accumulate at the very tip of cell extensions while in 4T1 they accumulate in the perinuclear region (Fig. 4A-B and 4D; Fig. S5E-G). Interestingly, this peripheral positioning did not change in 4T07 cells by manipulating the nutritional conditions that affected the mTORC1 lysosomal co-localization (Fig. 4D). Altogether, these results suggest that lysosomes in 4T07 cells are preferentially positioned at the cellular periphery in comparison to 4T1 cells. Such differences provide mechanistic insights into the differential mTORC1 activity observed between the two lines.

Figure 4

Figure 4. Differential lysosomal positioning between the 4T1 and 4T07 cells. (A-B)
Immunostaining for the lysosomal marker, Lamp1, and mTORC1 markers, Rptor and pMtor
(S2448) in the 4T1-4T07 cells under basal culture conditions or amino acid starvation or amino
acid refeeding. **(C)** Quantifications of the mean fluorescence intensity (MFI) of mTORC1 (pMtor
signal) on the lysosomes in the two cell lines under the 3 different conditions. **(D)** Graph
representing the peripheral lysosomes' percentage in the two cell lines under the 3 different
conditions.

PIK3C3 mediates peripheral lysosomal positioning and mTORC1 activity in murine and human breast cancer

We tested whether inhibiting the Pik3c3 catalytic activity would affect mTORC1 activity and/or lysosomal positioning in the 4T1-4T07 models. Treating 4T07 cells with 1 uM of the VPS34IN1 (the selective PIK3C3 inhibitor) for two hours led to 50% decrease in mTORC1 activity (Fig. 5A-B). Parallel treatments of 4T1 cells showed a similar trend, but with higher variability between different replicates given the low basal level of mTORC1 activity in these cells (Fig. 5A-B). Importantly, VPS34IN1 abrogated the response of 4T07 cells to amino acid refeeding after starvation (Fig. S6A), in line with the physiological functions of Pik3c3 (*32-34*). To test whether Pik3c3 regulates lysosomal positioning, 4T07 and 4T1 cells were treated under the same conditions (1 uM of VPS34IN1 for two hours) and then assessed for Lamp1 and pMtor localization. VPS34IN1 mediated a robust 10-fold shift of lysosomes from the periphery to the perinuclear area in 4T07 cells without affecting the tethering of mTORC1 to the lysosomes (Fig. 5C-D). Despite the low percentage of peripheral lysosomes in 4T1 cells under basal conditions, VPS34IN1 treatment further reduced it by ~3 fold in comparison to the DMSO-treated control condition (Fig. 5C-D). These results demonstrate that Pik3c3 mediates mTORC1 activity and lysosomal positioning in both cell lines but with differential magnitude given differential basal mTORC1 activity.

Next, we assessed whether the VPS34IN1-mediated mTORC1 activity suppression would sensitize 4T07 cells to BYL719 treatments. 4T07 cells were treated either with BYL719 alone or combined with 2 uM of VPS34IN1 and their proliferation was assessed for 72 hours. This combination led 4T07 cells to respond to BYL719 as demonstrated by a small, but significant, decrease in their proliferation rate under high doses of BYL719 (30% decrease at 40 uM) (Fig. S6B). We asked whether VPS34IN1 could sensitize 4T07 cells to Pik3ca inhibition that failed to completely abrogate the mTORC1 activity under serum starvation and insulin refeeding, as shown in Fig. S5A-C. Treating serum-starved 4T07 cells with 1 uM of each BYL719 and VPS34IN1 led to a more significant decrease in mTORC1 activity in contrast to single drug treatments that barely affected its activity (Fig. S6C-D). However, VPS34IN1 did not enhance the BYL719 inhibition of mTORC1 activity after stimulating 4T07 cells with insulin (Fig. S6C-D), suggesting that Pik3c3 mediates mTORC1 activity mainly via amino acid signalling (*32*).

We questioned whether the differential dependence and activity of Pik3c3 between the 4T1 and 4T07 can be attributed to specific genomic/genetic events. We mined the WGS data for the genomic status of the 3 PI3K classes. Besides carrying the Pik3ca p.A423S missense mutation, the 4T07 cells harbored a Pik3c3 missense mutation in a conserved residue (p.E562K) (Fig. S7A). This residue lies in a loop region of the PIK3C3 kinase domain (Fig. S7B-C) and is found to be mutated in 2 patients (E562A in malignant peripheral nerve sheath tumor, and E562K in penile carcinoma; total n= 75,661 patients) (see Supplementary Methods). However, these mutations are currently of unknown oncogenic potential. In our analysis, the E562K mutation is predicted to be of moderate effect (Table S6). To investigate whether this mutation mediates higher activity of PIK3C3 and hence higher mTORC1 activity, we generated HeLa Flp-In T-REx cells that express either wildtype or mutated PIK3C3 in a tetracycline inducible manner. Inducing the expression of the two forms of the PIK3C3 protein did not lead to a significant difference in mTORC1 activity (Fig. S7D). It is therefore unlikely that this mutation underlies the mTORC1 hyperactivity in 4T07 cells. Overall, we did not pinpoint any other notable differences between the two lines that can explain the revealed molecular and biological phenotypes (Fig. S7A). For instance, despite the

identified *Pik3c3* genomic deletion in 4T1 cells, there is no significant difference in the *Pik3c3* mRNA levels between the two lines (Table S8).

Next, we examined whether the observations we made in the 4T1-4T07 murine cells are present in human breast cancer. For this, we interrogated early passages of breast cancer patient-derived xenograft (PDX) derived cell lines (*40*) for mTORC1 activity (Fig. S8A-B). This identified 2 potential PDX cell lines (1915 and 1735) with high mTORC1 activity. We chose to focus on the PDX line 1915 since it originated from a patient with basal breast cancer (*40*), the same intrinsic subtype that the 4T1-4T07 cells recapitulated. In addition, the patient from which PDX 1915 was derived was diagnosed with a metastatic relapse 1.5 years after the surgical resection of the primary tumor, hence recapitulating the clinical problem of metastatic latency (Fig. S8C). The WGS of the patient tumor and the generated PDX suggested that the patient was free from *PIK3CA* activating hotspot mutations or a *PTEN* deletion (like 4T1-4T07 cells) which frequently underlies mTORC1 hyperactivity (Fig. S8C). PDX1915 harbored an amplification in the *PIK3CA* gene, without observed overexpression in its transcript in comparison with PDXs harboring a WT non-amplified or altered *PIK3CA* gene (Fig. S8D). We explored whether inhibiting PIK3C3 activity would dampen mTORC1 activity in PDX 1915 cells and found that VPS34IN1 decreased mTORC1 activity approximately 50% by western blot analysis (Fig. 5E-F). We asked whether this effect is paralleled with a shift in the lysosomal positioning towards the perinuclear region. VPS34IN1 significantly reduced the percentage of peripheral lysosomes (Fig. 5G-H). Notably, PDX 1915 cells under basal conditions showed a high level of heterogeneity in terms of the lysosomal position (Fig. 5G-H), hence recapitulating the characteristic heterogeneity of human tumors. Also, we noticed a significant increase in the percentage of cells with tubulated lysosomes in the VPS34IN1-treated condition (Fig. 5G and 5I), consistent with a previous report (*41*).

Altogether, these data support that inhibiting PIK3C3 activity in breast cancer cells leads to a perinuclear positioning of the lysosomes, hence reducing mTORC1 activity. However, this signaling circuit appears more profound in cells with preferential peripheral lysosomal positioning.

Figure 5

Figure 5. **PIK3C3 mediates peripheral lysosomal positioning and mTORC1 activity in murine and human breast cancer. (A)** Western blot analysis for the VPS34IN1 effect on 4T07 and 4T1 cells' mTORC1 activity. **(B)** Quantification for mTORC1 activity in panel (A). **(C)** Immunostaining for Lamp1 and pMtor in 4T07 and 4T1 cells under the effect of VPS34IN1 (2 hours). **(D)** Quantifications of the percentage of peripheral lysosomes in the VPS34IN1-treated cells in comparison to the control condition (DMSO-treated). **(E)** Western blot analysis for the VPS34IN1 effect on mTORC1 activity in the PDX-1915. **(F)** Quantification for the mTORC1 activity in panel (E). **(G)** Immunostaining for LAMP2 and pmTOR in the PDX-1915 cells under the effect of VPS34IN1 (2 uM) or DMSO (for 2 hours). **(H)** Quantifications of the percentage of peripheral lysosomes in (G). **(I)** Quantifications of the percentage of tubulated lysosomes in (G).

High mTORC1 activity in primary tumors correlates with worse clinical outcome in breast cancer patients

We next asked whether mTORC1 activity can predict relapse incidence and/or worse clinical outcome in breast cancer patients. The high expression of RPS6KB1, encoding the canonical mTORC1 effector S6K1, correlates with worse distant metastasis-free survival in patients with early breast cancer (*42*). Since the expression level does not necessarily correspond to high mTORC1 activity, we sought to complement this notion by investigating mTOR signaling-associated gene signatures as a surrogate for the pathway activity. Using a single-sample Gene Set Enrichment Analysis (ssGSEA), we generated an "mTORC1 score" for each patient's tumor in the METABRIC and TCGA-BRCA cohorts based on a previously annotated and well-curated mTORC1 signaling-mediated signature (*43*) (Fig. 6A). We observed that Basal and HER2 positive breast tumors tend to show a higher mTORC1 activity signature in comparison with the less aggressive luminal subtypes (*2*) (Fig. 6B). We also found that patients bearing tumors with high mTORC1 signature score tend to have worse prognosis in comparison to those with low scores in the METABRIC dataset ($p<0.0001$) with a trend towards a similar correlation in the TCGA dataset ($p=0.06$) (Fig. 6C). These results align with the established impact of mTORC1 activity in human cancer (*44*) and rationalize exploring novel therapeutic strategies to target this activity in breast cancer. Therefore, we wondered whether the therapeutic targeting of the revealed PIK3C3-mTORC1 circuit in animal models would have a beneficial outcome on breast cancer progression and metastasis burden.

Figure 6

Figure 6. High mTORC1 activity correlates with worse outcome in breast cancer patients.
(A) Heatmaps showing ssGSEA ranked by the Hallmark_mTORC1_Signaling signature score.
Breast cancer samples were stratified according to their intrinsic molecular subtype based on gene
expression profiling. **(B)** Comparing different breast cancer subtypes according to the
Hallmark_mTORC1_Signaling signature score in the METABRIC and TCGA datasets. **(C)**
Kaplan–Meier curves of disease-free survival and progression-free interval from the METABRIC
and TCGA datasets, respectively.

Inhibiting Pik3c3 decreases *in vivo* metastatic burden specifically in the 4T07 model

We performed spontaneous metastasis assays using the 4T07 and 4T1 models in the presence or absence of VPS34IN1. We implanted 4T07 cells expressing GFP and luciferase (hereafter 4T07-TGL (*12*)) in the mammary fat pad of nude mice to bypass the technical challenge of the immune system-mediated elimination of GFP-positive cells in an immunocompetent context (*45*) (Fig. 7A). One week after implanting cells, mice were randomized to receive either the vehicle or VPS34IN1 (50 mg/kg/day) (Fig. 7A). Six days after starting treatment, half of the mice were sacrificed for an early timepoint analysis (Fig 7A). Tumor weight did not differ between the two groups, suggesting no effect on the primary tumor burden (Fig. 7B). We then analyzed the burden of disseminated tumor cells (DTCs) by dissecting the lungs and quantifying the metastatic burden by bioluminescence imaging (BLI). The VPS34IN1-treated mice had significantly lower DTC burden than the control group (Fig. 7C-D). Next, we analyzed the second group of mice after 12 days of treatment by either the VPS34IN1 or the vehicle (3 weeks post implantation). No statistically different change in tumor weight between the two experimental groups was observed (Fig. 7B). However, the incidence of visible metastases in the treated group (1/5 mice) was 40% of that of the control group (3/6 mice) (Fig. 7E). Analyzing the digested lungs of mice that showed no visible lung metastases suggested that the VPS34IN1-treated mice demonstrated a trend towards lower DTC burden in comparison to the control group (p=0.06) (Fig. S9A). Next, we asked whether VPS34IN1 affected mTORC1 activity *in vivo*. Indeed, lower mTORC1 activity in the VPS34IN1-treated mice versus the control group was observed (Fig. S9B-C). Altogether, these data suggest that pharmacological targeting of the Pik3c3-mTORC1 signaling axis decreases the DTC burden, hence minimizing the incidence of metastasis.

To compare 4T07 and 4T1 models, we implanted 4T1-TGL cells in the mammary fat pad of nude mice (Fig. 7F). One week later, we started the treatment with either VPS34IN1 (50 mg/kg/day) or vehicle for two weeks before analyzing the primary tumor and metastasis burden. We did not observe significant differences between the two groups with respect to primary tumor burden (Fig. 7G), or incidence of metastasis (Fig. 7H), despite the trend towards a reduction in mTORC1 activity in the 4T1 primary tumors (Fig. S9D-E). Notably, the metastasis burden was higher in the 4T1-tumor bearing mice in comparison to 4T07-tumor bearing mice (see the BLI scale in Fig. 7E and 7H). This reinforces the proposal that 4T1 is a more aggressive subclone with higher ability of fulfilling the metastatic cascade than the 4T07, even in conditions permitting the latter to generate overt metastases (*10*).

To exclude the possibility that saturated BLI signals emitted by the 4T1 overt metastases precluded or masked the effect of VPS34IN1 on less developed lesions (i.e., micrometastases), we undertook a complementary approach in syngeneic mice. We implanted the parental 4T1 cells in the mammary fat pad of immunocompetent BALB/c mice and after two weeks, the generated primary tumors were surgically resected (Fig. 7I). After letting the mice recover from the surgical procedure, they were randomized either to receive VPS34IN1 (50 mg/kg/day) or vehicle for a week before analyzing the burden of lung metastasis by immunohistochemistry. Like the prior experiments, there was no difference in the incidence of metastasis since the two experimental groups demonstrated a 100% incidence rate (Fig. 7J). Moreover, there was no significant difference in the burden of metastasis with respect to the number or size of metastatic lesions (Fig. 7K-M). Collectively, these results demonstrate that pharmacological targeting of the revealed Pik3c3-mTORC1 circuit blunts breast cancer metastasis, preferentially in models with peripheral lysosomal positioning and high mTORC1 activity.

Figure 7

Figure 7. Inhibiting the Pik3c3-mTORC1 axis decreases the metastatic burden in vivo preferentially in the 4T07 model. **(A)** Schematic of the experiment investigating the effect of Pik3c3 inhibition on the metastasis burden in the 4T07 model. **(B)** Graph showing tumor weight of mice treated with either VPS34IN1 or vehicle at the early and late experimental endpoints. **(C)** Representative images of the lung DTCs burden in 4T07-bearing mice treated with VPS34IN1 or vehicle at the early experimental endpoint (n=5/group). **(D)** Quantification of relative lung DTCs burden between the two groups in (C). **(E)** Representative ex-vivo lung images of 4T07-bearing

mice treated with VPS34IN1 or vehicle at the experimental late endpoint. **(F)** Schematic of the experiment investigating the effect of Pik3c3 inhibition on the metastasis burden in 4T1 tumors-bearing nude mice. **(G)** Graph showing tumor weight of mice treated with either VPS34IN1 or vehicle at the experimental endpoint. **(H)** Representative ex-vivo lung images of 4T1 tumors-bearing mice treated with VPS34IN1 or vehicle at the experimental endpoint. **(I)** Schematic of the experiment investigating the effect of Pik3c3 inhibition on the metastasis burden in 4T1 tumors-bearing BALB/c mice. **(J)** Representative H&E stainings of lungs obtained from mice in (I). **(K-M)** Quantifications of the metastasis burden: absolute number of lesions **(K)**, number of lesions normalized to lung area **(L)**, and percentage of different sizes of metastases **(M)** in the vehicle- and VPS34IN1-treated mice.

DISCUSSION

The landscape of the differential cancer cell-specific intrinsic factors contributing to their metastatic fate and response to therapies remains poorly outlined. Here, by comparing two related basal B like breast cancer models, 4T1 and 4T07 that display differential metastatic and dormancy capacity, as well as primary cells derived from basal breast cancer patient derived xenograft, we show that metastatic cells depend on high PI3K activity in comparison with dormancy-prone cells. These observations complement early reports demonstrating that bone marrow derived DTCs from breast cancer patients during the metastatic latency period had low PI3K activity (*28, 46*). Despite the observed lower PI3K-AKT activity in the dormancy-prone 4T07 cells (this study) and shown previously in D-HEp3 cells (a model of dormant human head and neck carcinoma (*28*)), these two cell lines showed higher mTORC1 activity than their metastatic counterparts, 4T1 and T-HEp3 (also shown previously (*28*)), respectively.

An unexpected finding in our study is that the peripheral lysosomal positioning contributes to high mTORC1 activity in the dormancy-prone cells despite low PI3K activity. Previous studies (*34, 35*) have established that peripheral localization of the lysosomes mediates mTORC1 activation, while perinuclear clustering dampens this activity and accordingly enhances the macroautophagic dynamics (*35*). Our results suggest that the 4T1-4T07 cell line pair potentially follows this binary model. Whether this is also reflected in a differential autophagic potential between the two lines would be worth exploring in future studies given the contradictory reports regarding the role of autophagy in regulating dormancy (*47, 48*).

Class-III PI3K, PIK3C3, activates mTORC1(*32*) through different mechanisms (*24, 27, 34, 49*), such as inducing the anterograde transport of the lysosomes to the cell periphery, where mTORC1 gets activated (*34*). Here, we found that inhibiting Pik3c3 activity reversed the constant peripheral lysosomal positioning and the ensuing high mTORC1 activity in dormancy-prone cells. This inhibition further limited the ability of these cells to colonize lung tissues and to generate overt metastases under permissive conditions, supporting a role for this molecular machinery in achieving successful metastasis. Consistent with a conserved role in human tumors, PIK3C3 inhibition mediated a similar molecular action in a line derived from a breast cancer metastatic relapse patient. Notably, there is also the possibility of mTORC1-independent mechanisms underlying the effects of PIK3C3 inhibition or alternative PIK3C3-independent mechanisms contributing to the lysosomal positioning and/or mTORC1 hyperactivity (*50*) in dormancy-prone cells. Extending knowledge in theses directions would guide future exploration of the genetic and signalling dependence of dormancy-prone cells.

mTORC1 and PIK3C3 have an entangled bilateral relationship. We focused on PIK3C3 acting upstream of mTORC1, but mTORC1 is also reported to act upstream of PIK3C3 to mediate lysosomal regeneration after starvation-induced autophagy to support cell survival (*41, 51*). These studies characterized the tubulated lysosomes as autophagy-induced transient structures that serve as proto-lysosomes during the lysosomes' regeneration (*51*). However, these structures were also found under basal nutrient-rich conditions (*41*). In both cases, their formation was dependent on mTORC1 activity. Here, in the PDX1915 primary cell line, under basal nutrient-rich conditions, we observed that existence of these structures was further augmented upon treatment with VPS34IN1, despite the reduction in mTORC1 activity. Whether this increased tubulation is a feedback mechanism induced by the mTORC1 activity reduction to secure a sufficient lysosomal

pool for mTORC1 activation is unclear. The potential connection between the lysosomal positioning, mTORC1 activity, autophagy, and the ability to form tubules should be further investigated.

From a therapeutic perspective, Gedatolisib, a dual Class-I PI3K/mTOR inhibitor, as a single agent or combined with standard-of-care chemotherapy, failed to impact the metastatic burden in two breast cancer models (*52*). Another study demonstrated that long term pharmacological inhibition of PI3K or AKT induces a PIK3C3-SGK3 signaling axis to activate mTORC1 and that targeting this axis can revert the induced resistance towards the PI3K-AKT inhibition (*27*). Our work demonstrating that dormancy-prone cells do not depend on the class-I PI3K and are resistant to its pharmacological inhibition meanwhile being dependent on the class-III PI3K complements these studies. Whether the combinatory inhibition of class-I and -III PI3K, and mTORC1 would be an effective method to minimize the metastatic burden in vivo should be explored in future studies.

While our CRISPR screening approach revealed novel insights into the intrinsic differences between cells of differential metastatic capacity, it has limitations. The screens were performed, for technical feasibility, in an *in vitro* setting that does not necessarily recapitulate the impact of the crosstalk with microenvironment on gene essentiality and signaling pathways' activity. Nonetheless, we extensively validated the PI3K(s)-mTORC1 signaling circuits in vitro and in vivo. Another limitation of our study is depending on one pair of cell lines with validations in a patient-derived xenograft. Whether these findings could be extended in other models would be worth addressing in future studies. Such a limitation goes back-to-back with the global challenge of scarce authentic cell line pairs that possess different metastatic potentials upon being implanted in syngeneic mice (*8*).

In summary, the work described here provides novel insights into the intrinsic differences between cells of differential metastatic capacity that can guide future explorations of the biology and therapeutic vulnerabilities of breast cancer metastatic relapses.

Materials and Methods

Cell lines, PDX lines, and reagents

Parental 4T07 cells (*9*) were obtained from the Karmanos Cancer Institute, Wayne State University. The 4T07-TGL cells (*12*) (Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, MSKCC) were obtained from Dr. Filippo Giancotti (Herbert Irving Comprehensive Cancer Center, HICCC). 4T1 cells were obtained from ATCC. To generate 4T1-TGL cells, HEK293T cells were seeded in 6 cm plates and transfected with 3 ug of TGL vector (*53*) (gift from Dr. Vladimir Ponomarev, MSKCC) and 3 ug of pCL-Ampho using $CaCl_2$ towards retroviral production. Then parental 4T1 cells were infected and stable 4T1-TGL cells were generated and established after sorting for GFP positive cells. All the 4T1 and 4T07 cell lines were cultured in Dulbecco's modified Eagle's medium (DMEM; Wisent #319-005-CL), supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum (FBS; Gibco), and 1% penicillin/streptomycin (P/S) antibiotics (Wisent).

For serum starvation, cells were cultured overnight (O/N) in serum-free DMEM supplemented with 1% P/S. For amino acids starvation, cells were first serum starved O/N, then rinsed with PBS and incubated in Earle's Balanced Salt Solution (EBSS; ThermoFisher Scientific #24010043)) for two hours at 37 °C. Refeeding with serum was done by replacing the serum-free DMEM with 10% FBS-supplied DMEM. To refeed with insulin, 100 nM insulin (Humulin R U-100) was added to the serum-free DMEM, and cells were incubated for 30 minutes at 37 °C. To refeed with amino acids, MEM Amino Acids solution (50x; Sigma-Aldrich M5550) was added to the EBSS (1:50), and cells were incubated for 30 minutes at 37 °C.

All Patient-derived xenograft (PDX) epithelial cell lines were derived from tissues obtained according to the ethical regulations of McGill University and after informed consents, as stated previously (*40*). PDX 1915 (*40*) was cultured in DMEM (Gibco - 11995-065) and F-12 Nutrient Mixture (Ham) (Gibco-11765-054) (1:4), 5% FBS (Life Technologies, #12483012), 0.4 ug/mL Hydrocortisone (Sigma-Aldrich #H0888-1G), 5 ug/mL Insulin (Gibco-12585-014), 8.4 ng/mL Cholera toxin (Sigma-Aldrich #C8052), 10 ng/mL Epidermal growth factor (BPS bioscience #90201-1), 10 umol/L Y-27632 (Abmole #M1817), 50 ug/mL Gentamicin (Gibco - 15710-072), 1% P/S (Thermo Fisher Scientific, #15140-122), Amphotericin B (1 ug/ml) (Thermo Fisher Scientific, #15290026).

The PIK3CA-inhibitor BYL719 (ChemieTek), AKT-inhibitor MK-2206 2HCl (Selleck Chemicals #S1078), and VPS34-IN1 (Cayman Chemical #17392) were dissolved in DMSO and used in different concentrations as indicated.

CRISPR-Cas9 Screening

The mouse Genome-Scale CRISPR Knock-Out (mGeCKO) library A (Addgene #1000000052), composed of ~68,000 gRNAs: 3 gRNAs/gene, 4 gRNAs/miRNA, and 1000 nontargeting sequence, was amplified and prepared for NGS (MiSeq Illumina) to assess the gRNA distribution and library quality, as previously described (*20*). In reference to the original library, the assessed parameters of the amplified library (percentage of undetected gRNAs and perfectly matching

gRNAs in addition to the skew ratio of the top 10% represented gRNAs to bottom 10%) were all within the recommended ranges for a reliable library (*20*).

Lentiviral production was performed as previously described (*20*). Briefly, low passage HEK 293FT cells were plated in Nunc EasYFlask cell culture flasks (Thermo Fisher Scientific) and transfected, using lipofectamine 2000 (Thermo Fisher Scientific), with psPAX2 (23.4 µg), pMD2.G (15.3 µg), and 30.6 µg of the lentiCRISPR V2 vector encompassing the Cas9 in addition to the amplified library. 48 hours later, the viruses-containing media was collected and filtered using 0.45 um sterile filters (Sarstedt #83.1826). A multiplicity of infection (MOI) test was performed to define the optimum volume of the viruses-containing media to be used for the screens.

The 4T1 and 4T07 cells were infected independently, as previously described (*20*). Briefly, the two cell lines were seeded in 12 well plates (1.5-2 x 10^6 cells/well) and then subjected to spinfection (MOI < 0.3) by centrifugation at 2,000 RPM for 2 hours at 33°C in the presence of polybrene (10 ug/ml). This method allowed ~1300-fold coverage of the mGeCKO library A. After 24 hours, cells were trypsinized, pooled, and seeded in 15 cm plates in media containing puromycin for selection (3 ug/ml for the 4T07 cells and 2 ug/ml for the 4T1 cells). Cells were propagated under selection for a week while maintaining a library coverage of at least 700-fold (50 x 10^6 cells). Then, the first time point (T0) was collected (50 x 10^6 cells/timepoint to keep the stated fold coverage). The cells were propagated in a similar manner while collecting the consequent timepoints (T1, T2, T3). The collected cells were spin down in 15 ml tubes and kept in -80 °C until they were processed. Every screen was repeated three independent times following the same procedure, where replicates were annotated A, B, and C (as shown in Fig. S2). The collected samples were then processed for genomic DNA (gDNA) extraction according to the manufacturer's protocol (Zymo Research Quick-gDNA MidiPrep Plus kit, #D4075) and prepared for NGS (HiSeq 4000 Illumina) as previously described (*20*).

CRISPR-Cas9 Screen Analysis

The count and test commands of MAGeCK (*54*) (Version 0.5.7) were used to generate read counts for each gRNA and to determine the positively selected genes in T3 in reference to T0, respectively. A range of 483-744 and 529-881 fold library coverage for 4T07 and 4T1 screens, respectively was defined by sequencing (recommended 100-300 fold coverage). The BAGEL software (*55, 56*) (v0.91) was then used to calculate the foldchange of gRNA representations in different timepoints in reference to T0. Consequently, using BAGEL, each gene was assigned a Bayes Factor (BF) as a confidence measure of fitness or essentiality. To execute this, BAGEL depends on a pre-set list of essential and non-essential genes (*14, 55, 57*). This analysis was performed for each timepoint individually and using the final 2 timepoints combined as has been previously described (*22*). For downstream analysis, we utilized BF scores from the final 2 timepoint analysis. A strict threshold of normalized BF > 6 was used to consider a gene essential in our screens (*57*). As stated in the main text, the generated BF scores were then used for the Precision-Recall analyses based on previously annotated gene lists (essential and non-essential) (results are demonstrated in Fig. S2E-F). To compare the essential genes' profile of the two cell lines, the difference between the BF scores of the two lines was calculated. Then, a Z-score for the difference in BF for each gene was calculated (Table S2-4). Positive Z-score denoted 4T1-specific essential gene and negative Z-score denoted 4T07-specific essential gene.

Immunostaining, confocal microscopy, and image analysis

Cells were plated on fibronectin-coated glass coverslips to desired confluence ~6 hrs. For amino acid starvation, cells were serum starved (O/N; for 16 hrs), then incubated with EBSS for 2hrs. For re-feeding, 50x MEM amino acids solution was diluted to 1X into EBSS and added to the cells for 30 minutes. Cells were fixed with 3.7% formaldehyde in CSK buffer (100mM NaCl, 300mM Sucrose, 3mM MgCl2, 10mM Pipes pH 6.8) for 15 min. Immunostaining was performed in saponin buffer (TBS supplemented with 1% BSA, 0.01% saponin) using the following antibodies: Rat anti-LAMP1 (Abcam #ab25245) at a concentration 1/400, Mouse anti-LAMP-2 (Developmental Studies Hybridoma Bank #H4B4) at a concentration 1:50, Mouse anti-phospho(Ser2448)-mTOR (Cell Signaling Technology #2971) at a concentration 1:200, and Rabbit anti-Rptor (14C4) (Bioss antibodies, #51285M) at a concentration 1:100. Images were collected from a Zeiss confocal LSM700 (Carl Zeiss, Jena, Germany) microscope with oil immersion objective lenses (Plan-Apochromat, 60×, 1.40 numerical aperture NA; Carl Zeiss).

Image analysis was performed using the FIJI software version 2.3. For measurement of pmTOR at the lysosomes, a region of interest corresponding to the lysosomes was created using the auto-threshold of the LAMP1 channel and was transferred to the corresponding background subtracted pmTOR channel to measure the mean fluorescence intensity (MFI) at the lysosomes. Data represent the mean with SD of at least 30 images from three independent experiments. Statistical significance was determined using one-way ANOVA test with a confidence interval of 95%. The lysosome distribution was measured from confocal images of LAMP1 and pmTOR co-staining captured as described above. For at least 75 cells per condition, a single line, five pixels in width, was traced manually from the center of the nucleus to the cell edge as delineated by pmTOR staining (See Fig. S5). The intensity values along this line were obtained using the "plot profile" plugin from FIJI. The mean fluorescence intensity and the positions along the line for each cell were normalized from 0 to 1 using Matlab as used in reference (*58*). The normalized data were transferred to Prism 9 software (GraphPad Prism, GraphPad Software, San Diego CA) for further analyses. The percentage of signal at the periphery was calculated by dividing the area under the curve (AUC) between positions 0.75 to 1 by the total AUC between positions 0 to 1. Data are representative of three independent experiments and are shown as the mean with SD (n>75). Statistical significance was determined using the non-parametric Mann-Whitney test with a confidence interval of 95% (****, p-value < 0.0001). This test analysis compares the distributions of two unpaired groups. Data are shown as the mean with SD. For tubulation quantification, the percentage of cells presenting at least one tubulated lysosome was determined among at least 220 cells per condition from three independent experiments. The percentages in the DMSO- and VPS34IN1-treated cells (PDX1915) were then compared by a two-tailed t-test to calculate the *p*-value as stated on the figure.

Animal Studies

All animal experiments were performed in accordance with the Canadian Council of Animal Care guidelines and approved by the Animal Care Committee of the Montreal Clinical Research Institute (IRCM).

Primary tumor and spontaneous metastasis assays. $1x10^5$ 4T07-TGL or 4T1-TGL cells were injected in the fat pad of the 4th mammary gland of 6-week-old NU/J mice (The Jackson laboratory #002019). For the 4T07 experiment, 1-week post-injection, the mice were randomized into two groups to receive either vehicle (5% DMSO in corn oil) or VPS34IN1 (50 mg/kg/day) by oral gavage daily for either 6 days or 12 days. For the 4T1 experiment (in nude mice), 1-week post-injection, mice were randomized to receive either vehicle or VPS34IN1 (50 mg/kg/day) for two weeks.

For experiments in (Fig. 7J-M), $5x10^5$ 4T1 cells were injected in the fat pad of the 4th mammary gland of 8–10-week-old BALB/c mice (The Jackson Laboratory #0651). Two weeks later, primary tumors were resected. Mice were left to recover for ~3-5 days, then randomized for treatments with either vehicle or VPS34IN1 for a week as described above. At the experimental endpoint, Mice with recurred primary tumors were excluded from the final analyses presented in Fig. 7. Otherwise, mice were sacrificed, and lungs were collected immediately, emersed in PBS then fixed in 4% PFA for 24 hr at 4°C. Lungs were then placed in 70% ethanol before being embedded in paraffin. Paraffin blocks were then sectioned at 4 μm thickness and processed for H&E staining and the 20X objective of the Aperio-XT slide scanner (Leica Biosystems) was used to scan slides. Fiji (ImageJ) was used to visualize the generated images and measure size of metastatic lesions. Given the irregularity between different lesions, the length of the longest dimension was considered as a measure to categorize micrometastases (< 100 um), macrometastases (> 200 um) and lesions scoring in between (100-200 um). The vehicle and VPS34IN1-treated groups were compared by a two-tailed t-test to calculate the *p*-value (n= 6 or 7 mice/group).

Lung Disseminated tumor cells (DTCs) burden in 4T07 (early timepoint). At the experimental endpoint, mice were euthanized, and lungs were processed as previously described (*6*). Briefly, lungs were dissected and immediately emersed in PBS and cut into small pieces. Then, the lung pieces were digested in PBS supplemented with 75 μg/ml TH Liberase (Roche 05401127001), 75 μg/ml TM Liberase (Roche #05401151001), and 12.5 μg/ml DNase. Samples were then incubated in the digestion buffer on a rotor in 37 °C. Samples were then centrifuged at 1,300 RPM for 5 minutes and supernatant was discarded. Pellets were resuspended in PBS, pipetted up and down multiple times and filtered through a 70 μm strainer to get rid of the undigested lung pieces. 1 ml of Red Blood Cells Lysis Solution (Sigma, R7757-100ML) was then added to each sample and the manufacturer protocol was followed. Cells were finally seeded in 15 cm plates in Thioguanine-containing DMEM Wisent media supplied with 10% FBS and 1 % P/S antibiotics. Plates were left 48 hours and d-luciferin (Promega #E1605; dissolved in PBS) was added to the DMEM media in a concentration (150 μg/mL). Plates were then imaged using the Xenogen IVIS 200 machine (PerkinElmer) and analyzed with Living Image 4.2 software.

The difference in the DTCs burden between the vehicle- and VPS34IN1-treated groups was quantified as a foldchange difference in bioluminescence emitted signal between the two groups. Foldchange values were represented in Log values and the two groups (control and drug treated) were compared by a two-tailed t-test to calculate the *p*-value. The resulting values are stated on the graph and in main text.

Ex vivo metastasis assay. Mice were injected intraperitoneally with 150 mg/kg d-luciferin (in PBS) solution and were euthanized 5-7 minutes later. Lungs were immediately collected and imaged using the Xenogen IVIS 200 machine (PerkinElmer).

Cell proliferation, death, and competition assays

Detailed protocols on executing these experiments in addition to their analysis and statistical tests are included in the Supplementary Methods section.

Protein extraction, western blotting, and mTORC1 activity analyses

Details of processing cell lysates and tumor samples for protein extraction and subsequent immunoblotting are included in the Supplementary Methods section.

RNA-Seq, Whole-genome Sequencing of 4T1-4T07 cells, and PDX15-related analyses

Procedure of generating these datasets in addition to their analysis (thresholds, software, etc.) are included in the Supplementary Methods section. Detailed description of investigating the PIK3C3 E562K mutation is also available in the same section.

Clinical datasets mining and bioinformatics analysis of clinical outcome

Details on the Single-sample Gene Set Enrichment Analysis (ssGSEA) and downstream analyses are indicated in the Supplementary Methods section.

REFERENCES

1. H. S. McKenzie, T. Maishman, P. Simmonds, L. Durcan, P. S. Group, D. Eccles, E. Copson, Survival and disease characteristics of de novo versus recurrent metastatic breast cancer in a cohort of young patients. *Br J Cancer* **122**, 1618-1629 (2020).

2. H. Kennecke, R. Yerushalmi, R. Woods, M. C. Cheang, D. Voduc, C. H. Speers, T. O. Nielsen, K. Gelmon, Metastatic behavior of breast cancer subtypes. *J Clin Oncol* **28**, 3271-3277 (2010).

3. T. G. Karrison, D. J. Ferguson, P. Meier, Dormancy of mammary carcinoma after mastectomy. *J Natl Cancer Inst* **91**, 80-85 (1999).

4. E. Risson, A. R. Nobre, V. Maguer-Satta, J. A. Aguirre-Ghiso, The current paradigm and challenges ahead for the dormancy of disseminated tumor cells. *Nat Cancer* **1**, 672-680 (2020).

5. P. Carlson, A. Dasgupta, C. A. Grzelak, J. Kim, A. Barrett, I. M. Coleman, R. E. Shor, E. T. Goddard, J. Dai, E. M. Schweitzer, A. R. Lim, S. B. Crist, D. A. Cheresh, P. S. Nelson, K. C. Hansen, C. M. Ghajar, Targeting the perivascular niche sensitizes disseminated tumour cells to chemotherapy. *Nat Cell Biol* **21**, 238-250 (2019).

6. M. Montagner, R. Bhome, S. Hooper, P. Chakravarty, X. Qin, J. Sufi, A. Bhargava, C. D. H. Ratcliffe, Y. Naito, A. Pocaterra, C. J. Tape, E. Sahai, Crosstalk with lung epithelial cells regulates Sfrp2-mediated latency in breast cancer dissemination. *Nat Cell Biol* **22**, 289-296 (2020).

7. A. R. Nobre, E. Risson, D. K. Singh, J. S. Di Martino, J. F. Cheung, J. Wang, J. Johnson, H. G. Russnes, J. J. Bravo-Cordero, A. Birbrair, B. Naume, M. Azhar, P. S. Frenette, J. A. Aguirre-Ghiso, Bone marrow NG2(+)/Nestin(+) mesenchymal stem cells drive DTC dormancy via TGFbeta2. *Nat Cancer* **2**, 327-339 (2021).

8. I. E. Elkholi, A. Lalonde, M. Park, J. F. Cote, Breast Cancer Metastatic Dormancy and Relapse: An Enigma of Microenvironment(s). *Cancer Res* **82**, 4497-4510 (2022).

9. C. J. Aslakson, F. R. Miller, Selective events in the metastatic process defined by analysis of the sequential dissemination of subpopulations of a mouse mammary tumor. *Cancer Res* **52**, 1399-1405 (1992).

10. P. Tallon de Lara, H. Castanon, M. Vermeer, N. Nunez, K. Silina, B. Sobottka, J. Urdinez, V. Cecconi, H. Yagita, F. Movahedian Attar, S. Hiltbrunner, I. Glarner, H. Moch, S. Tugues, B. Becher, M. van den Broek, CD39(+)PD-1(+)CD8(+) T cells mediate metastatic dormancy in breast cancer. *Nat Commun* **12**, 769 (2021).

11. J. Yang, S. A. Mani, J. L. Donaher, S. Ramaswamy, R. A. Itzykson, C. Come, P. Savagner, I. Gitelman, A. Richardson, R. A. Weinberg, Twist, a master regulator of morphogenesis, plays an essential role in tumor metastasis. *Cell* **117**, 927-939 (2004).

12. H. Gao, G. Chakraborty, A. P. Lee-Lim, Q. Mo, M. Decker, A. Vonica, R. Shen, E. Brogi, A. H. Brivanlou, F. G. Giancotti, The BMP inhibitor Coco reactivates breast cancer cells at lung metastatic sites. *Cell* **150**, 764-779 (2012).

13. J. Park, R. W. Wysocki, Z. Amoozgar, L. Maiorino, M. R. Fein, J. Jorns, A. F. Schott, Y. Kinugasa-Katayama, Y. Lee, N. H. Won, E. S. Nakasone, S. A. Hearn, V. Kuttner, J. Qiu, A. S. Almeida, N. Perurena, K. Kessenbrock, M. S. Goldberg, M. Egeblad, Cancer cells induce metastasis-supporting neutrophil extracellular DNA traps. *Sci Transl Med* **8**, 361ra138 (2016).

14. T. Hart, M. Chandrashekhar, M. Aregger, Z. Steinhart, K. R. Brown, G. MacLeod, M. Mis, M. Zimmermann, A. Fradet-Turcotte, S. Sun, P. Mero, P. Dirks, S. Sidhu, F. P. Roth, O. S. Rissland, D. Durocher, S. Angers, J. Moffat, High-Resolution CRISPR Screens Reveal Fitness Genes and Genotype-Specific Cancer Liabilities. *Cell* **163**, 1515-1526 (2015).

15. Z. Steinhart, Z. Pavlovic, M. Chandrashekhar, T. Hart, X. Wang, X. Zhang, M. Robitaille, K. R. Brown, S. Jaksani, R. Overmeer, S. F. Boj, J. Adams, J. Pan, H. Clevers, S. Sidhu, J. Moffat, S. Angers, Genome-wide CRISPR screens reveal a Wnt-FZD5 signaling circuit as a druggable vulnerability of RNF43-mutant pancreatic tumors. *Nat Med* **23**, 60-68 (2017).

16. T. Wang, H. Yu, N. W. Hughes, B. Liu, A. Kendirli, K. Klein, W. W. Chen, E. S. Lander, D. M. Sabatini, Gene Essentiality Profiling Reveals Gene Networks and Synthetic Lethal Interactions with Oncogenic Ras. *Cell* **168**, 890-903 e815 (2017).

17. M. R. Schlabach, J. Luo, N. L. Solimini, G. Hu, Q. Xu, M. Z. Li, Z. Zhao, A. Smogorzewska, M. E. Sowa, X. L. Ang, T. F. Westbrook, A. C. Liang, K. Chang, J. A. Hackett, J. W. Harper, G. J. Hannon, S. J. Elledge, Cancer proliferation gene discovery through functional genomics. *Science* **319**, 620-624 (2008).

18. B. Schrors, S. Boegel, C. Albrecht, T. Bukur, V. Bukur, C. Holtstrater, C. Ritzel, K. Manninen, A. D. Tadmor, M. Vormehr, U. Sahin, M. Lower, Multi-Omics Characterization of the 4T1 Murine Mammary Gland Tumor Model. *Front Oncol* **10**, 1195 (2020).

19. E. H. Yau, I. R. Kummetha, G. Lichinchi, R. Tang, Y. Zhang, T. M. Rana, Genome-Wide CRISPR Screen for Essential Cell Growth Mediators in Mutant KRAS Colorectal Cancers. *Cancer Res* **77**, 6330-6339 (2017).

20. J. Joung, S. Konermann, J. S. Gootenberg, O. O. Abudayyeh, R. J. Platt, M. D. Brigham, N. E. Sanjana, F. Zhang, Genome-scale CRISPR-Cas9 knockout and transcriptional activation screening. *Nat Protoc* **12**, 828-863 (2017).

21. T. Bertomeu, J. Coulombe-Huntington, A. Chatr-Aryamontri, K. G. Bourdages, E. Coyaud, B. Raught, Y. Xia, M. Tyers, A High-Resolution Genome-Wide CRISPR/Cas9 Viability Screen Reveals Structural Features and Contextual Diversity of the Human Cell-Essential Proteome. *Mol Cell Biol* **38**, (2018).

22. G. MacLeod, D. A. Bozek, N. Rajakulendran, V. Monteiro, M. Ahmadi, Z. Steinhart, M. M. Kushida, H. Yu, F. J. Coutinho, F. M. G. Cavalli, I. Restall, X. Hao, T. Hart, H. A. Luchman, S. Weiss, P. B. Dirks, S. Angers, Genome-Wide CRISPR-Cas9 Screens Expose Genetic Vulnerabilities and Mechanisms of Temozolomide Sensitivity in Glioblastoma Stem Cells. *Cell Rep* **27**, 971-986 e979 (2019).

23. C. Fritsch, A. Huang, C. Chatenay-Rivauday, C. Schnell, A. Reddy, M. Liu, A. Kauffmann, D. Guthy, D. Erdmann, A. De Pover, P. Furet, H. Gao, S. Ferretti, Y. Wang, J. Trappe, S. M. Brachmann, S. M. Maira, C. Wilson, M. Boehm, C. Garcia-Echeverria, P. Chene, M. Wiesmann, R. Cozens, J. Lehar, R. Schlegel, G. Caravatti, F. Hofmann, W. R. Sellers, Characterization of the novel and specific PI3Kalpha inhibitor NVP-BYL719 and development of the patient stratification strategy for clinical trials. *Mol Cancer Ther* **13**, 1117-1129 (2014).

24. R. Bago, N. Malik, M. J. Munson, A. R. Prescott, P. Davies, E. Sommer, N. Shpiro, R. Ward, D. Cross, I. G. Ganley, D. R. Alessi, Characterization of VPS34-IN1, a selective inhibitor of Vps34, reveals that the phosphatidylinositol 3-phosphate-binding SGK3 protein kinase is a downstream target of class III phosphoinositide 3-kinase. *Biochem J* **463**, 413-427 (2014).

25. M. Elkabets, S. Vora, D. Juric, N. Morse, M. Mino-Kenudson, T. Muranen, J. Tao, A. B. Campos, J. Rodon, Y. H. Ibrahim, V. Serra, V. Rodrik-Outmezguine, S. Hazra, S. Singh, P. Kim, C. Quadt, M. Liu, A. Huang, N. Rosen, J. A. Engelman, M. Scaltriti, J. Baselga, mTORC1 inhibition is required for sensitivity to PI3K p110alpha inhibitors in PIK3CA-mutant breast cancer. *Sci Transl Med* **5**, 196ra199 (2013).

26. R. A. Saxton, D. M. Sabatini, mTOR Signaling in Growth, Metabolism, and Disease. *Cell* **169**, 361-371 (2017).

27. R. Bago, E. Sommer, P. Castel, C. Crafter, F. P. Bailey, N. Shpiro, J. Baselga, D. Cross, P. A. Eyers, D. R. Alessi, The hVps34-SGK3 pathway alleviates sustained PI3K/Akt inhibition by stimulating mTORC1 and tumour growth. *EMBO J* **35**, 2263 (2016).

28. D. M. Schewe, J. A. Aguirre-Ghiso, ATF6alpha-Rheb-mTOR signaling promotes survival of dormant tumor cells in vivo. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **105**, 10519-10524 (2008).

29. Y. Zhang, P. Kwok-Shing Ng, M. Kucherlapati, F. Chen, Y. Liu, Y. H. Tsang, G. de Velasco, K. J. Jeong, R. Akbani, A. Hadjipanayis, A. Pantazi, C. A. Bristow, E. Lee, H. S. Mahadeshwar, J. Tang, J. Zhang, L. Yang, S. Seth, S. Lee, X. Ren, X. Song, H. Sun, J. Seidman, L. J. Luquette, R. Xi, L. Chin, A. Protopopov, T. F. Westbrook, C. S. Shelley, T. K. Choueiri, M. Ittmann, C. Van Waes, J. N. Weinstein, H. Liang, E. P. Henske, A. K. Godwin, P. J. Park, R. Kucherlapati, K. L. Scott, G. B. Mills, D. J. Kwiatkowski, C. J. Creighton, A Pan-Cancer Proteogenomic Atlas of PI3K/AKT/mTOR Pathway Alterations. *Cancer Cell* **31**, 820-832 e823 (2017).

30. C. G. Fedele, L. M. Ooms, M. Ho, J. Vieusseux, S. A. O'Toole, E. K. Millar, E. Lopez-Knowles, A. Sriratana, R. Gurung, L. Baglietto, G. G. Giles, C. G. Bailey, J. E. Rasko, B. J. Shields, J. T. Price, P. W. Majerus, R. L. Sutherland, T. Tiganis, C. A. McLean, C. A. Mitchell, Inositol polyphosphate 4-phosphatase II regulates PI3K/Akt signaling and is lost in human basal-like breast cancers. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **107**, 22231-22236 (2010).

31. H. Liu, M. N. Paddock, H. Wang, C. J. Murphy, R. C. Geck, A. J. Navarro, G. M. Wulf, O. Elemento, V. Haucke, L. C. Cantley, A. Toker, The INPP4B Tumor Suppressor Modulates EGFR Trafficking and Promotes Triple-Negative Breast Cancer. *Cancer Discov* **10**, 1226-1239 (2020).

32. T. Nobukuni, M. Joaquin, M. Roccio, S. G. Dann, S. Y. Kim, P. Gulati, M. P. Byfield, J. M. Backer, F. Natt, J. L. Bos, F. J. Zwartkruis, G. Thomas, Amino acids mediate mTOR/raptor signaling through activation of class 3 phosphatidylinositol 3OH-kinase. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **102**, 14238-14243 (2005).

33. M. P. Byfield, J. T. Murray, J. M. Backer, hVps34 is a nutrient-regulated lipid kinase required for activation of p70 S6 kinase. *J Biol Chem* **280**, 33076-33082 (2005).

34. Z. Hong, N. M. Pedersen, L. Wang, M. L. Torgersen, H. Stenmark, C. Raiborg, PtdIns3P controls mTORC1 signaling through lysosomal positioning. *J Cell Biol* **216**, 4217-4233 (2017).

35. V. I. Korolchuk, S. Saiki, M. Lichtenberg, F. H. Siddiqi, E. A. Roberts, S. Imarisio, L. Jahreiss, S. Sarkar, M. Futter, F. M. Menzies, C. J. O'Kane, V. Deretic, D. C. Rubinsztein, Lysosomal positioning coordinates cellular nutrient responses. *Nat Cell Biol* **13**, 453-460 (2011).

36. J. Copp, G. Manning, T. Hunter, TORC-specific phosphorylation of mammalian target of rapamycin (mTOR): phospho-Ser2481 is a marker for intact mTOR signaling complex 2. *Cancer Res* **69**, 1821-1827 (2009).

37. Y. Sancak, T. R. Peterson, Y. D. Shaul, R. A. Lindquist, C. C. Thoreen, L. Bar-Peled, D. M. Sabatini, The Rag GTPases bind raptor and mediate amino acid signaling to mTORC1. *Science* **320**, 1496-1501 (2008).

38. C. Betz, M. N. Hall, Where is mTOR and what is it doing there? *J Cell Biol* **203**, 563-574 (2013).

39. M. Rosner, M. Hengstschlager, Cytoplasmic and nuclear distribution of the protein complexes mTORC1 and mTORC2: rapamycin triggers dephosphorylation and delocalization of the mTORC2 components rictor and sin1. *Hum Mol Genet* **17**, 2934-2948 (2008).

40. P. Savage, A. Pacis, H. Kuasne, L. Liu, D. Lai, A. Wan, M. Dankner, C. Martinez, V. Munoz-Ramos, V. Pilon, A. Monast, H. Zhao, M. Souleimanova, M. G. Annis, A. Aguilar-Mahecha, J. Lafleur, N. R. Bertos, J. Asselah, N. Bouganim, K. Petrecca, P. M. Siegel, A.

Omeroglu, S. P. Shah, S. Aparicio, M. Basik, S. Meterissian, M. Park, Chemogenomic profiling of breast cancer patient-derived xenografts reveals targetable vulnerabilities for difficult-to-treat tumors. *Commun Biol* **3**, 310 (2020).

41. M. J. Munson, G. F. Allen, R. Toth, D. G. Campbell, J. M. Lucocq, I. G. Ganley, mTOR activates the VPS34-UVRAG complex to regulate autolysosomal tubulation and cell survival. *EMBO J* **34**, 2272-2290 (2015).

42. J. A. van der Hage, L. J. van den Broek, C. Legrand, P. C. Clahsen, C. J. Bosch, E. C. Robanus-Maandag, C. J. van de Velde, M. J. van de Vijver, Overexpression of P70 S6 kinase protein is associated with increased risk of locoregional recurrence in node-negative premenopausal early breast cancer patients. *Br J Cancer* **90**, 1543-1550 (2004).

43. A. Liberzon, C. Birger, H. Thorvaldsdottir, M. Ghandi, J. P. Mesirov, P. Tamayo, The Molecular Signatures Database (MSigDB) hallmark gene set collection. *Cell Syst* **1**, 417-425 (2015).

44. T. Tian, X. Li, J. Zhang, mTOR Signaling in Cancer and mTOR Inhibitors in Solid Tumor Targeting Therapy. *Int J Mol Sci* **20**, (2019).

45. C. A. Grzelak, E. T. Goddard, E. E. Lederer, K. Rajaram, J. Dai, R. E. Shor, A. R. Lim, J. Kim, S. Beronja, A. P. W. Funnell, C. M. Ghajar, Elimination of fluorescent protein immunogenicity permits modeling of metastasis in immune-competent settings. *Cancer Cell*, (2021).

46. L. M. Balz, K. Bartkowiak, A. Andreas, K. Pantel, B. Niggemann, K. S. Zanker, B. H. Brandt, T. Dittmar, The interplay of HER2/HER3/PI3K and EGFR/HER2/PLC-gamma1 signalling in breast cancer cell migration and dissemination. *J Pathol* **227**, 234-244 (2012).

47. L. Vera-Ramirez, S. K. Vodnala, R. Nini, K. W. Hunter, J. E. Green, Autophagy promotes the survival of dormant breast cancer cells and metastatic tumour recurrence. *Nat Commun* **9**, 1944 (2018).

48. A. La Belle Flynn, B. C. Calhoun, A. Sharma, J. C. Chang, A. Almasan, W. P. Schiemann, Autophagy inhibition elicits emergence from metastatic dormancy by inducing and stabilizing Pfkfb3 expression. *Nat Commun* **10**, 3668 (2019).

49. M. S. Yoon, G. Du, J. M. Backer, M. A. Frohman, J. Chen, Class III PI-3-kinase activates phospholipase D in an amino acid-sensing mTORC1 pathway. *J Cell Biol* **195**, 435-447 (2011).

50. A. P. Mutvei, M. J. Nagiec, J. C. Hamann, S. G. Kim, C. T. Vincent, J. Blenis, Rap1-GTPases control mTORC1 activity by coordinating lysosome organization with amino acid availability. *Nat Commun* **11**, 1416 (2020).

51. L. Yu, C. K. McPhee, L. Zheng, G. A. Mardones, Y. Rong, J. Peng, N. Mi, Y. Zhao, Z. Liu, F. Wan, D. W. Hailey, V. Oorschot, J. Klumperman, E. H. Baehrecke, M. J. Lenardo, Termination of autophagy and reformation of lysosomes regulated by mTOR. *Nature* **465**, 942-946 (2010).

52. R. E. Shor, J. Dai, S. Y. Lee, L. Pisarsky, I. Matei, S. Lucotti, D. Lyden, M. J. Bissell, C. M. Ghajar, The PI3K/mTOR inhibitor Gedatolisib eliminates dormant breast cancer cells in organotypic culture, but fails to prevent metastasis in preclinical settings. *Mol Oncol* **16**, 130-147 (2022).

53. V. Ponomarev, M. Doubrovin, I. Serganova, J. Vider, A. Shavrin, T. Beresten, A. Ivanova, L. Ageyeva, V. Tourkova, J. Balatoni, W. Bornmann, R. Blasberg, J. Gelovani Tjuvajev, A novel triple-modality reporter gene for whole-body fluorescent, bioluminescent, and nuclear noninvasive imaging. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging* **31**, 740-751 (2004).

54. W. Li, J. Koster, H. Xu, C. H. Chen, T. Xiao, J. S. Liu, M. Brown, X. S. Liu, Quality control, modeling, and visualization of CRISPR screens with MAGeCK-VISPR. *Genome Biol* **16**, 281 (2015).

55. T. Hart, K. R. Brown, F. Sircoulomb, R. Rottapel, J. Moffat, Measuring error rates in genomic perturbation screens: gold standards for human functional genomics. *Mol Syst Biol* **10**, 733 (2014).

56. T. Hart, J. Moffat, BAGEL: a computational framework for identifying essential genes from pooled library screens. *BMC Bioinformatics* **17**, 164 (2016).

57. T. Hart, A. H. Y. Tong, K. Chan, J. Van Leeuwen, A. Seetharaman, M. Aregger, M. Chandrashekhar, N. Hustedt, S. Seth, A. Noonan, A. Habsid, O. Sizova, L. Nedyalkova, R. Climie, L. Tworzyanski, K. Lawson, M. A. Sartori, S. Alibeh, D. Tieu, S. Masud, P. Mero, A. Weiss, K. R. Brown, M. Usaj, M. Billmann, M. Rahman, M. Constanzo, C. L. Myers, B. J. Andrews, C. Boone, D. Durocher, J. Moffat, Evaluation and Design of Genome-Wide CRISPR/SpCas9 Knockout Screens. *G3 (Bethesda)* **7**, 2719-2727 (2017).

58. A. Robert, P. Tian, S. A. Adam, M. Kittisopikul, K. Jaqaman, R. D. Goldman, V. I. Gelfand, Kinesin-dependent transport of keratin filaments: a unified mechanism for intermediate filament transport. *FASEB J* **33**, 388-399 (2019).

59. https://www.bioinformatics.babraham.ac.uk/projects/fastqc/.

60. C. Trapnell, A. Roberts, L. Goff, G. Pertea, D. Kim, D. R. Kelley, H. Pimentel, S. L. Salzberg, J. L. Rinn, L. Pachter, Differential gene and transcript expression analysis of RNA-seq experiments with TopHat and Cufflinks. *Nat Protoc* **7**, 562-578 (2012).

61. Y. Liao, G. K. Smyth, W. Shi, featureCounts: an efficient general purpose program for assigning sequence reads to genomic features. *Bioinformatics* **30**, 923-930 (2014).

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

63. M. Ashburner, C. A. Ball, J. A. Blake, D. Botstein, H. Butler, J. M. Cherry, A. P. Davis, K. Dolinski, S. S. Dwight, J. T. Eppig, M. A. Harris, D. P. Hill, L. Issel-Tarver, A. Kasarskis, S. Lewis, J. C. Matese, J. E. Richardson, M. Ringwald, G. M. Rubin, G. Sherlock, Gene ontology: tool for the unification of biology. The Gene Ontology Consortium. *Nat Genet* **25**, 25-29 (2000).

64. C. Gene Ontology, The Gene Ontology resource: enriching a GOld mine. *Nucleic Acids Res* **49**, D325-D334 (2021).

65. V. K. Mootha, C. M. Lindgren, K. F. Eriksson, A. Subramanian, S. Sihag, J. Lehar, P. Puigserver, E. Carlsson, M. Ridderstrale, E. Laurila, N. Houstis, M. J. Daly, N. Patterson, J. P. Mesirov, T. R. Golub, P. Tamayo, B. Spiegelman, E. S. Lander, J. N. Hirschhorn, D. Altshuler, L. C. Groop, PGC-1alpha-responsive genes involved in oxidative phosphorylation are coordinately downregulated in human diabetes. *Nat Genet* **34**, 267-273 (2003).

66. A. Subramanian, P. Tamayo, V. K. Mootha, S. Mukherjee, B. L. Ebert, M. A. Gillette, A. Paulovich, S. L. Pomeroy, T. R. Golub, E. S. Lander, J. P. Mesirov, Gene set enrichment analysis: a knowledge-based approach for interpreting genome-wide expression profiles. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **102**, 15545-15550 (2005).

67. C. Klijn, S. Durinck, E. W. Stawiski, P. M. Haverty, Z. Jiang, H. Liu, J. Degenhardt, O. Mayba, F. Gnad, J. Liu, G. Pau, J. Reeder, Y. Cao, K. Mukhyala, S. K. Selvaraj, M. Yu, G. J. Zynda, M. J. Brauer, T. D. Wu, R. C. Gentleman, G. Manning, R. L. Yauch, R. Bourgon, D. Stokoe, Z. Modrusan, R. M. Neve, F. J. de Sauvage, J. Settleman, S. Seshagiri, Z. Zhang, A comprehensive transcriptional portrait of human cancer cell lines. *Nat Biotechnol* **33**, 306-312 (2015).

68. S. Durinck, P. T. Spellman, E. Birney, W. Huber, Mapping identifiers for the integration of genomic datasets with the R/Bioconductor package biomaRt. *Nat Protoc* **4**, 1184-1191 (2009).

69. M. Ghandi, F. W. Huang, J. Jane-Valbuena, G. V. Kryukov, C. C. Lo, E. R. McDonald, 3rd, J. Barretina, E. T. Gelfand, C. M. Bielski, H. Li, K. Hu, A. Y. Andreev-Drakhlin, J.

Kim, J. M. Hess, B. J. Haas, F. Aguet, B. A. Weir, M. V. Rothberg, B. R. Paolella, M. S. Lawrence, R. Akbani, Y. Lu, H. L. Tiv, P. C. Gokhale, A. de Weck, A. A. Mansour, C. Oh, J. Shih, K. Hadi, Y. Rosen, J. Bistline, K. Venkatesan, A. Reddy, D. Sonkin, M. Liu, J. Lehar, J. M. Korn, D. A. Porter, M. D. Jones, J. Golji, G. Caponigro, J. E. Taylor, C. M. Dunning, A. L. Creech, A. C. Warren, J. M. McFarland, M. Zamanighomi, A. Kauffmann, N. Stransky, M. Imielinski, Y. E. Maruvka, A. D. Cherniack, A. Tsherniak, F. Vazquez, J. D. Jaffe, A. A. Lane, D. M. Weinstock, C. M. Johannessen, M. P. Morrissey, F. Stegmeier, R. Schlegel, W. C. Hahn, G. Getz, G. B. Mills, J. S. Boehm, T. R. Golub, L. A. Garraway, W. R. Sellers, Next-generation characterization of the Cancer Cell Line Encyclopedia. *Nature* **569**, 503-508 (2019).

70. R. M. Neve, K. Chin, J. Fridlyand, J. Yeh, F. L. Baehner, T. Fevr, L. Clark, N. Bayani, J. P. Coppe, F. Tong, T. Speed, P. T. Spellman, S. DeVries, A. Lapuk, N. J. Wang, W. L. Kuo, J. L. Stilwell, D. Pinkel, D. G. Albertson, F. M. Waldman, F. McCormick, R. B. Dickson, M. D. Johnson, M. Lippman, S. Ethier, A. Gazdar, J. W. Gray, A collection of breast cancer cell lines for the study of functionally distinct cancer subtypes. *Cancer Cell* **10**, 515-527 (2006).

71. H. Jiang, R. Lei, S. W. Ding, S. Zhu, Skewer: a fast and accurate adapter trimmer for next-generation sequencing paired-end reads. *BMC Bioinformatics* **15**, 182 (2014).

72. H. Li, R. Durbin, Fast and accurate short read alignment with Burrows-Wheeler transform. *Bioinformatics* **25**, 1754-1760 (2009).

73. F. Favero, T. Joshi, A. M. Marquard, N. J. Birkbak, M. Krzystanek, Q. Li, Z. Szallasi, A. C. Eklund, Sequenza: allele-specific copy number and mutation profiles from tumor sequencing data. *Ann Oncol* **26**, 64-70 (2015).

74. K. Cibulskis, M. S. Lawrence, S. L. Carter, A. Sivachenko, D. Jaffe, C. Sougnez, S. Gabriel, M. Meyerson, E. S. Lander, G. Getz, Sensitive detection of somatic point mutations in impure and heterogeneous cancer samples. *Nat Biotechnol* **31**, 213-219 (2013).

75. R. M. Layer, C. Chiang, A. R. Quinlan, I. M. Hall, LUMPY: a probabilistic framework for structural variant discovery. *Genome Biol* **15**, R84 (2014).

76. P. Cingolani, A. Platts, L. Wang le, M. Coon, T. Nguyen, L. Wang, S. J. Land, X. Lu, D. M. Ruden, A program for annotating and predicting the effects of single nucleotide polymorphisms, SnpEff: SNPs in the genome of Drosophila melanogaster strain w1118; iso-2; iso-3. *Fly (Austin)* **6**, 80-92 (2012).

77. A. M. Bolger, M. Lohse, B. Usadel, Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina sequence data. *Bioinformatics* **30**, 2114-2120 (2014).

78. A. Dobin, C. A. Davis, F. Schlesinger, J. Drenkow, C. Zaleski, S. Jha, P. Batut, M. Chaisson, T. R. Gingeras, STAR: ultrafast universal RNA-seq aligner. *Bioinformatics* **29**, 15-21 (2013).

79. M. I. Love, W. Huber, S. Anders, Moderated estimation of fold change and dispersion for RNA-seq data with DESeq2. *Genome Biol* **15**, 550 (2014).

80. H. Li, B. Handsaker, A. Wysoker, T. Fennell, J. Ruan, N. Homer, G. Marth, G. Abecasis, R. Durbin, S. Genome Project Data Processing, The Sequence Alignment/Map format and SAMtools. *Bioinformatics* **25**, 2078-2079 (2009).

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

82. S. Nahle, L. Quirion, J. Boulais, H. Bagci, D. Faubert, A. C. Gingras, J. F. Cote, Defining the interactomes of proteins involved in cytoskeletal dynamics using high-throughput proximity-dependent biotinylation in cellulo. *STAR Protoc* **3**, 101075 (2022).

83. K. L. Bolton, R. N. Ptashkin, T. Gao, L. Braunstein, S. M. Devlin, D. Kelly, M. Patel, A. Berthon, A. Syed, M. Yabe, C. C. Coombs, N. M. Caltabellotta, M. Walsh, K. Offit, Z.

Stadler, D. Mandelker, J. Schulman, A. Patel, J. Philip, E. Bernard, G. Gundem, J. E. A. Ossa, M. Levine, J. S. M. Martinez, N. Farnoud, D. Glodzik, S. Li, M. E. Robson, C. Lee, P. D. P. Pharoah, K. H. Stopsack, B. Spitzer, S. Mantha, J. Fagin, L. Boucai, C. J. Gibson, B. L. Ebert, A. L. Young, T. Druley, K. Takahashi, N. Gillis, M. Ball, E. Padron, D. M. Hyman, J. Baselga, L. Norton, S. Gardos, V. M. Klimek, H. Scher, D. Bajorin, E. Paraiso, R. Benayed, M. E. Arcila, M. Ladanyi, D. B. Solit, M. F. Berger, M. Tallman, M. Garcia-Closas, N. Chatterjee, L. A. Diaz, Jr., R. L. Levine, L. M. Morton, A. Zehir, E. Papaemmanuil, Cancer therapy shapes the fitness landscape of clonal hematopoiesis. *Nat Genet* **52**, 1219-1226 (2020).

84. I. T. P.-C. A. o. W. G. Consortium, Pan-cancer analysis of whole genomes. *Nature* **578**, 82-93 (2020).

85. D. M. Hyman, S. A. Piha-Paul, H. Won, J. Rodon, C. Saura, G. I. Shapiro, D. Juric, D. I. Quinn, V. Moreno, B. Doger, I. A. Mayer, V. Boni, E. Calvo, S. Loi, A. C. Lockhart, J. P. Erinjeri, M. Scaltriti, G. A. Ulaner, J. Patel, J. Tang, H. Beer, S. D. Selcuklu, A. J. Hanrahan, N. Bouvier, M. Melcer, R. Murali, A. M. Schram, L. M. Smyth, K. Jhaveri, B. T. Li, A. Drilon, J. J. Harding, G. Iyer, B. S. Taylor, M. F. Berger, R. E. Cutler, Jr., F. Xu, A. Butturini, L. D. Eli, G. Mann, C. Farrell, A. S. Lalani, R. P. Bryce, C. L. Arteaga, F. Meric-Bernstam, J. Baselga, D. B. Solit, HER kinase inhibition in patients with HER2- and HER3-mutant cancers. *Nature* **554**, 189-194 (2018).

86. D. Miao, C. A. Margolis, N. I. Vokes, D. Liu, A. Taylor-Weiner, S. M. Wankowicz, D. Adeegbe, D. Keliher, B. Schilling, A. Tracy, M. Manos, N. G. Chau, G. J. Hanna, P. Polak, S. J. Rodig, S. Signoretti, L. M. Sholl, J. A. Engelman, G. Getz, P. A. Janne, R. I. Haddad, T. K. Choueiri, D. A. Barbie, R. Haq, M. M. Awad, D. Schadendorf, F. S. Hodi, J. Bellmunt, K. K. Wong, P. Hammerman, E. M. Van Allen, Genomic correlates of response to immune checkpoint blockade in microsatellite-stable solid tumors. *Nat Genet* **50**, 1271-1281 (2018).

87. B. Nguyen, C. Fong, A. Luthra, S. A. Smith, R. G. DiNatale, S. Nandakumar, H. Walch, W. K. Chatila, R. Madupuri, R. Kundra, C. M. Bielski, B. Mastrogiacomo, M. T. A. Donoghue, A. Boire, S. Chandarlapaty, K. Ganesh, J. J. Harding, C. A. Iacobuzio-Donahue, P. Razavi, E. Reznik, C. M. Rudin, D. Zamarin, W. Abida, G. K. Abou-Alfa, C. Aghajanian, A. Cercek, P. Chi, D. Feldman, A. L. Ho, G. Iyer, Y. Y. Janjigian, M. Morris, R. J. Motzer, E. M. O'Reilly, M. A. Postow, N. P. Raj, G. J. Riely, M. E. Robson, J. E. Rosenberg, A. Safonov, A. N. Shoushtari, W. Tap, M. Y. Teo, A. M. Varghese, M. Voss, R. Yaeger, M. G. Zauderer, N. Abu-Rustum, J. Garcia-Aguilar, B. Bochner, A. Hakimi, W. R. Jarnagin, D. R. Jones, D. Molena, L. Morris, E. Rios-Doria, P. Russo, S. Singer, V. E. Strong, D. Chakravarty, L. H. Ellenson, A. Gopalan, J. S. Reis-Filho, B. Weigelt, M. Ladanyi, M. Gonen, S. P. Shah, J. Massague, J. Gao, A. Zehir, M. F. Berger, D. B. Solit, S. F. Bakhoum, F. Sanchez-Vega, N. Schultz, Genomic characterization of metastatic patterns from prospective clinical sequencing of 25,000 patients. *Cell* **185**, 563-575 e511 (2022).

88. D. R. Robinson, Y. M. Wu, R. J. Lonigro, P. Vats, E. Cobain, J. Everett, X. Cao, E. Rabban, C. Kumar-Sinha, V. Raymond, S. Schuetze, A. Alva, J. Siddiqui, R. Chugh, F. Worden, M. M. Zalupski, J. Innis, R. J. Mody, S. A. Tomlins, D. Lucas, L. H. Baker, N. Ramnath, A. F. Schott, D. F. Hayes, J. Vijai, K. Offit, E. M. Stoffel, J. S. Roberts, D. C. Smith, L. P. Kunju, M. Talpaz, M. Cieslik, A. M. Chinnaiyan, Integrative clinical genomics of metastatic cancer. *Nature* **548**, 297-303 (2017).

89. E. Y. Rosen, D. A. Goldman, J. F. Hechtman, R. Benayed, A. M. Schram, E. Cocco, S. Shifman, Y. Gong, R. Kundra, J. P. Solomon, A. Bardelli, M. Scaltriti, A. Drilon, A. Iasonos, B. S. Taylor, D. M. Hyman, TRK Fusions Are Enriched in Cancers with

Uncommon Histologies and the Absence of Canonical Driver Mutations. *Clin Cancer Res* **26**, 1624-1632 (2020).

90. R. M. Samstein, C. H. Lee, A. N. Shoushtari, M. D. Hellmann, R. Shen, Y. Y. Janjigian, D. A. Barron, A. Zehir, E. J. Jordan, A. Omuro, T. J. Kaley, S. M. Kendall, R. J. Motzer, A. A. Hakimi, M. H. Voss, P. Russo, J. Rosenberg, G. Iyer, B. H. Bochner, D. F. Bajorin, H. A. Al-Ahmadie, J. E. Chaft, C. M. Rudin, G. J. Riely, S. Baxi, A. L. Ho, R. J. Wong, D. G. Pfister, J. D. Wolchok, C. A. Barker, P. H. Gutin, C. W. Brennan, V. Tabar, I. K. Mellinghoff, L. M. DeAngelis, C. E. Ariyan, N. Lee, W. D. Tap, M. M. Gounder, S. P. D'Angelo, L. Saltz, Z. K. Stadler, H. I. Scher, J. Baselga, P. Razavi, C. A. Klebanoff, R. Yaeger, N. H. Segal, G. Y. Ku, R. P. DeMatteo, M. Ladanyi, N. A. Rizvi, M. F. Berger, N. Riaz, D. B. Solit, T. A. Chan, L. G. T. Morris, Tumor mutational load predicts survival after immunotherapy across multiple cancer types. *Nat Genet* **51**, 202-206 (2019).

91. L. Wu, H. Yao, H. Chen, A. Wang, K. Guo, W. Gou, Y. Yu, X. Li, M. Yao, S. Yuan, F. Pang, J. Hu, L. Chen, W. Liu, J. Yao, S. Zhang, X. Dong, W. Wang, J. Hu, Q. Ling, S. Ding, Y. Wei, Q. Li, W. Cao, S. Wang, Y. Di, F. Feng, G. Zhao, J. Zhang, L. Huang, J. Xu, W. Yan, Z. Tong, D. Jiang, T. Ji, Q. Li, L. Xu, H. He, L. Shang, J. Liu, K. Wang, D. Wu, J. Shen, Y. Liu, T. Zhang, C. Liang, Y. Wang, Y. Shang, J. Guo, G. Liang, S. Xu, J. Liu, K. Wang, M. Wang, Landscape of somatic alterations in large-scale solid tumors from an Asian population. *Nat Commun* **13**, 4264 (2022).

92. A. Zehir, R. Benayed, R. H. Shah, A. Syed, S. Middha, H. R. Kim, P. Srinivasan, J. Gao, D. Chakravarty, S. M. Devlin, M. D. Hellmann, D. A. Barron, A. M. Schram, M. Hameed, S. Dogan, D. S. Ross, J. F. Hechtman, D. F. DeLair, J. Yao, D. L. Mandelker, D. T. Cheng, R. Chandramohan, A. S. Mohanty, R. N. Ptashkin, G. Jayakumaran, M. Prasad, M. H. Syed, A. B. Rema, Z. Y. Liu, K. Nafa, L. Borsu, J. Sadowska, J. Casanova, R. Bacares, I. J. Kiecka, A. Razumova, J. B. Son, L. Stewart, T. Baldi, K. A. Mullaney, H. Al-Ahmadie, E. Vakiani, A. A. Abeshouse, A. V. Penson, P. Jonsson, N. Camacho, M. T. Chang, H. H. Won, B. E. Gross, R. Kundra, Z. J. Heins, H. W. Chen, S. Phillips, H. Zhang, J. Wang, A. Ochoa, J. Wills, M. Eubank, S. B. Thomas, S. M. Gardos, D. N. Reales, J. Galle, R. Durany, R. Cambria, W. Abida, A. Cercek, D. R. Feldman, M. M. Gounder, A. A. Hakimi, J. J. Harding, G. Iyer, Y. Y. Janjigian, E. J. Jordan, C. M. Kelly, M. A. Lowery, L. G. T. Morris, A. M. Omuro, N. Raj, P. Razavi, A. N. Shoushtari, N. Shukla, T. E. Soumerai, A. M. Varghese, R. Yaeger, J. Coleman, B. Bochner, G. J. Riely, L. B. Saltz, H. I. Scher, P. J. Sabbatini, M. E. Robson, D. S. Klimstra, B. S. Taylor, J. Baselga, N. Schultz, D. M. Hyman, M. E. Arcila, D. B. Solit, M. Ladanyi, M. F. Berger, Mutational landscape of metastatic cancer revealed from prospective clinical sequencing of 10,000 patients. *Nat Med* **23**, 703-713 (2017).

93. E. Cerami, J. Gao, U. Dogrusoz, B. E. Gross, S. O. Sumer, B. A. Aksoy, A. Jacobsen, C. J. Byrne, M. L. Heuer, E. Larsson, Y. Antipin, B. Reva, A. P. Goldberg, C. Sander, N. Schultz, The cBio cancer genomics portal: an open platform for exploring multidimensional cancer genomics data. *Cancer Discov* **2**, 401-404 (2012).

94. J. Gao, B. A. Aksoy, U. Dogrusoz, G. Dresdner, B. Gross, S. O. Sumer, Y. Sun, A. Jacobsen, R. Sinha, E. Larsson, E. Cerami, C. Sander, N. Schultz, Integrative analysis of complex cancer genomics and clinical profiles using the cBioPortal. *Sci Signal* **6**, pl1 (2013).

95. D. A. Barbie, P. Tamayo, J. S. Boehm, S. Y. Kim, S. E. Moody, I. F. Dunn, A. C. Schinzel, P. Sandy, E. Meylan, C. Scholl, S. Frohling, E. M. Chan, M. L. Sos, K. Michel, C. Mermel, S. J. Silver, B. A. Weir, J. H. Reiling, Q. Sheng, P. B. Gupta, R. C. Wadlow, H. Le, S. Hoersch, B. S. Wittner, S. Ramaswamy, D. M. Livingston, D. M. Sabatini, M. Meyerson, R. K. Thomas, E. S. Lander, J. P. Mesirov, D. E. Root, D. G. Gilliland, T. Jacks, W. C.

Hahn, Systematic RNA interference reveals that oncogenic KRAS-driven cancers require
TBK1. *Nature* **462**, 108-112 (2009).
96. M. Reich, T. Liefeld, J. Gould, J. Lerner, P. Tamayo, J. P. Mesirov, GenePattern 2.0. *Nat*
Genet **38**, 500-501 (2006).
97. N. Cancer Genome Atlas, Comprehensive molecular portraits of human breast tumours.
Nature **490**, 61-70 (2012).
98. C. Curtis, S. P. Shah, S. F. Chin, G. Turashvili, O. M. Rueda, M. J. Dunning, D. Speed, A.
G. Lynch, S. Samarajiwa, Y. Yuan, S. Graf, G. Ha, G. Haffari, A. Bashashati, R. Russell,
S. McKinney, M. Group, A. Langerod, A. Green, E. Provenzano, G. Wishart, S. Pinder, P.
Watson, F. Markowetz, L. Murphy, I. Ellis, A. Purushotham, A. L. Borresen-Dale, J. D.
Brenton, S. Tavare, C. Caldas, S. Aparicio, The genomic and transcriptomic architecture
of 2,000 breast tumours reveals novel subgroups. *Nature* **486**, 346-352 (2012).
99. E. R. Paquet, M. T. Hallett, Absolute assignment of breast cancer intrinsic molecular
subtype. *J Natl Cancer Inst* **107**, 357 (2015).
226

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank Dr. Marie-Anne Goyette for providing feedbacks on the manuscript. We thank Dr. Filippo Giancotti for providing the 4T07-TGL cell line and Dr. Vladimir Ponomarev for providing the TGL reporter. We thank Drs. Sandra Turcotte, Philippe Roux, and Matthew Smith for fruitful discussions, Drs Anne-Marie Fortier and Deepak Singh for expert advice. We acknowledge the "Genome Engineering using CRISPR/Cas Systems" Google discussion group, Dr. Julia Joung, and Dr. Jonathan Boulais for helpful discussions on technical steps or the bioinformatic analysis of the CRISPR screens. We express our gratitude to the IRCM facilities staff (Dr. Dominic Filion, Manon Laprise, and Dr. Odile Neyret) for their critical technical help involved in this work.

FUNDING

This work was supported by operating grants from the Cancer Research Society (operating grant #25244 to J.-F.C), Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) (Foundation grant #FDN-143281 to M.P. and operating grant #PJT-156086 to C.L.K), Canadian Cancer Society and Oncopole grants (to M.P.) and an American Cancer Society Research Scholar Award (RSG-22-164-01-MM to A.P.G.). PDX cell lines were obtained from the breast tissue bank at McGill University, supported by grants to the Reseau Cancer banque de tumeurs from the Fonds de la Recherche du Québec- en Santé (FRQS) and the Quebec Breast Cancer Foundation (to M.P). Data computational analyses were enabled by compute and storage resources provided by Compute Canada and Calcul Québec. I.E.E. was a recipient of an FRQS Doctoral Scholarship and an IRCM Foundation-TD scholarship. S.D. is a recipient of a Miles for Moffitt postdoctoral fellowship. C.L.K. is the recipient of an FRQS Salary Award. M.P. is a Distinguished James McGill Professor and holds the Diane and Sal Guerrera Chair in Cancer Genetics. J.-F.C. holds the Canada Research Chair Tier 1 in Signalling in Cancer and Metastasis, the Alain Fontaine Chair in Cancer Research, and the Transat Chair in Breast Cancer from the IRCM Foundation.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Conceptualization, Supervision, Writing-Finalizing the manuscript: IEE and J-FC
Methodology & Investigation: IEE, AR, HK, SD, GM, SH, AP, VC
Formal analysis & Writing - Review & Editing: all authors
Writing—original draft: IEE

COMPETING INTEREST:

Julio Aguirre-Ghiso is a scientific co-founder, scientific advisory board member and equity owner in HiberCell and receives financial compensation as a consultant for HiberCell, a Mount Sinai spin-off company focused on the research and development of therapeutics that prevent or delay the recurrence of cancer. The remaining authors declare no competing interests.

DATA AND MATERIALS AVAILABILITY

All data are available in the main text or the supplementary materials. RNA-Seq related datasets/analyses (e.g., 4T1-4T07 differentially expressed genes and correlation with human breast cancer cell lines) are included in tables S1 and S8. Moreover, the raw data of the RNA-Seq dataset is deposited online (GSE203296) and will be publicly available starting December 1st, 2023. CRISPR screens' data are provided in tables S2-5. WGS datasets are provided in tables S6-7.