Targeting FSP1 triggers ferroptosis in lung cancer

Katherine Wu[1,2*], Alec J Vaughan[1,2*], Jozef P Bossowski[1,3], Yuan Hao[1,3], Aikaterini Ziogou[1,3],

Seon Min Kim[4], Tae Ha Kim[4], Mari N Nakamura[1,3], Ray Pillai[1,5,6], Mariana Mancini[1,3], Sahith

Rajalingam[1,3], Mingqi Han[7,8], Toshitaka Nakamura[10], Lidong Wang[9], Suckwoo Chung[1,3], Diane

Simeone[9], David Shackelford[7,8], Yun Pyo Kang[4], Marcus Conrad[10, 11], Thales

Papagiannakopoulos[1,3#]

[1]Department of Pathology, New York University Grossman School of Medicine, New York, NY, USA.

[2]Vilcek Institute of Graduate Biomedical Sciences, New York University Grossman School of Medicine, New York,
NY, USA.

[3]Laura and Isaac Perlmutter Cancer Center, New York University Langone Health, New York, NY, USA.

[4]College of Pharmacy and Research Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea

[5]Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, Department of Medicine, VA New York Harbor Healthcare
System, New York, USA.

[6]Division of Pulmonary, Critical Care, and Sleep Medicine, Department of Medicine, New York University Grossman
School of Medicine, New York, USA.

[7]Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, David Geffen School of Medicine (DGSOM), University of California Los
Angeles (UCLA), Los Angeles, CA, USA.

[8]Jonsson Comprehensive Cancer Center, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA, USA.

[9]Moores Cancer Center, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA, USA

[10]Institute of Metabolism and Cell Death, Molecular Targets and Therapeutics Center, Helmholtz Munich,
Neuherberg, Germany.

[11]Translational Redox Biology, Technical University of Munich (TUM), TUM Natural School of Sciences, Garching,
Germany.

24
*These authors contributed equally

#Correspondence to:

Thales Papagiannakopoulos, PhD, thales.papagiannakopoulos@nyulangone.org

Key words: lung cancer, ferroptosis, FSP1, GPX4

ABSTRACT

Pre-clinical and clinical studies have demonstrated how dietary antioxidants or mutations

activating antioxidant metabolism promote cancer, highlighting a central role oxidative stress in

tumorigenesis. However, it is unclear if oxidative stress ultimately increases to a point of cell

death. Emerging evidence indicates that cancer cells are susceptible to ferroptosis, a form of cell

death triggered by uncontrolled lipid peroxidation[1-3]. Despite broad enthusiasm about harnessing

ferroptosis as a novel anti-cancer strategy, whether ferroptosis is a barrier to tumorigenesis and if

it can be leveraged therapeutically remains unknown[4,5]. Using genetically-engineered mouse

models (GEMMs) of lung adenocarcinoma (LUAD), we performed tumor specific loss-of-

function studies of the two key ferroptosis suppressors, *glutathione peroxidase 4* (*Gpx4*)[6,7] and

ferroptosis suppressor protein 1 (*Fsp1*)[8,9], and observed increased lipid peroxidation and robust

suppression of tumorigenesis, suggesting that lung tumors are highly sensitive to ferroptosis.

Furthermore, across multiple pre-clinical models, we found that FSP1 was required for ferroptosis

protection *in vivo*, but not *in vitro*, underscoring a heightened need to buffer lipid peroxidation

under physiological conditions. Lipidomic analyses revealed that Fsp1-knockout (Fsp1[KO]) tumors

had an accumulation of lipid peroxides, and inhibition of ferroptosis with genetic, dietary, or

pharmacological approaches effectively restored the growth of Fsp1[KO] tumors *in vivo*. Unlike

GPX4, *FSP1* expression was prognostic for disease progression and poorer survival in LUAD

patients, highlighting its potential as a viable therapeutic target. To this end, we demonstrated that

pharmacologic inhibition of FSP1 had significant therapeutic benefit in pre-clinical lung cancer

models. Our studies highlight the importance of ferroptosis suppression *in vivo* and pave the way

for FSP1 inhibition as a therapeutic strategy in lung cancer patients.

MAIN TEXT

Ferroptosis is a non-apoptotic, oxidative stress-dependent mechanism of cell death that is

uniquely distinguished by lipid peroxidation of polyunsaturated fatty acids of membrane

phospholipids (PUFA-PL)[1,10]. Lipid peroxidation involves the formation of lipid and lipid peroxyl

radicals which, in auto-oxidative propagation reactions, generate lipid hydroperoxides. Aberrant,

unrestricted lipid peroxidation results in altered membrane integrity, cell swelling, and ultimately

membrane rupture[11,12]. In recent years, growing interest in ferroptosis has elucidated that cells

depend on several enzymes to protect against ferroptosis[6-9,13-15], of which Glutathione Peroxidase

4 (GPX4) and Ferroptosis Suppressor Protein 1 (FSP1) are the most notable. GPX4 catalyzes the

reduction of PUFA-PL hydroperoxides to non-toxic alcohols. FSP1 catalyzes the reduction of

extramitochondrial Coenzyme Q_{10} (CoQ), a highly potent lipid radical-trapping antioxidant

(RTA). On the other hand, cells can be sensitized to ferroptosis through PUFA-PL composition[16]

and biosynthesis by Long-chain Acyl-CoA Synthase 4 (ACSL4)[17-19]. Apart from these cellular

pathways, exogenous lipid RTAs, such as liproxstatin-1 (LIP1), ferrostatin-1 (FER1), Vitamin E

(VitE), and Vitamin K (VitK), have also been shown to specifically inhibit ferroptosis[1,6,20-22].

Emerging evidence indicates that cancer cells, including drug-resistant cells that have

adopted a mesenchymal state[2,3], are highly sensitive to lipid peroxidation *in vitro*, garnering

excitement about harnessing ferroptosis as a novel anti-cancer strategy. Though there have been

extensive studies characterizing GPX4 and more recently FSP1 in various diseases[4,23], whether

ferroptosis constitutes a barrier to tumorigenesis and the functional roles of GPX4 and FSP1 in *in*

vivo cancer models remain poorly characterized. To date, FSP1 has been shown to be a critical

ferroptosis suppressor only in the absence of GPX4[8,9,24]. However, given the high toxicity, poor

selectivity, and low to limited bioavailability of GPX4 inhibitors *in vivo*[25,26] as well as the only

recent development of FSP1 inhibitors, the majority of which do not have *in vivo* efficacy[9,24,27-30],

much work remains to demonstrate that ferroptosis induction could indeed be a therapeutic strategy

for cancer[5].

Here we show that genetic knockout of either Gpx4 or Fsp1 in genetically-engineered

mouse models (GEMMs) of autochthonous Kras-driven lung adenocarcinoma (LUAD)[31-35] results

in dramatic restriction of lung tumorigenesis. We demonstrate that disruption of Fsp1, often

considered a backup axis of ferroptosis suppression, is unexpectedly sufficient to trigger exhibit

enhanced lipid peroxidation in lung tumors. We confirm that Fsp1 deletion across several human

cancer cell lines with various oncogenic drivers, co-mutations, and tissue lineages consistently

lead to *in vivo* tumor restriction. As ferroptosis can be functionally defined as a modality of cell

death resulting from elevated lipid peroxides and rescued only with inhibitors of lipid peroxidation,

we demonstrate that Fsp1-knockout (Fsp1^{KO}) tumors have increased oxidized PUFA-PLs and that

administration of lipid RTAs, as well as genetic loss of Acsl4, effectively restores lung

tumorigenesis. Finally, we report that FSP1 is upregulated as LUAD tumors progress and show

that FSP1 inhibition suppresses tumor growth and prolongs survival in multiple pre-clinical cancer

models. Thus, our work utilizes novel *in vivo* models to characterize and test ferroptosis induction,

particularly via FSP1 perturbation, as a therapeutic approach for lung cancer.

GPX4 prevents ferroptosis in lung tumors

GPX4 is considered the primary mediator of ferroptosis suppression that has been shown

to be essential across a plethora of murine and human cancer cells[7,26,36,37]. Therefore, we sought to

interrogate whether GPX4, and more broadly ferroptosis suppression, is a requirement for lung

tumorigenesis *in vivo*. Using a well-established GEMM of LUAD (*Kras$^{LSL-G12D/+}$, Tp53$^{fl/fl}$*,

Rosa26[LSL-Cas9/LSL-Cas9]), we initiated Kras[G12D/+], Tp53^{-/-} (KP) tumors by intratracheal delivery of

lentiviruses expressing CRE-recombinase and dual sgRNAs[38] against either Gpx4 (sg*Gpx4*) or

non-targeting control (sg*Neo*), enabling CRISPR/Cas9-mediated Gpx4-knockout (Gpx4[KO]) or

wildtype (WT) control tumors, respectively. Concurrently, we treated a cohort of animals with

each tumor genotype with Liproxstatin-1 (LIP1), a potent lipid RTA and ferroptosis inhibitor,

throughout the entire course of tumorigenic progression (Fig. 1a). Tumor-specific Gpx4 deletion

(sg*Gpx4*) led to a significant decrease in lung tumor burden that was not observed in sg*Gpx4*

tumor-bearing mice treated with LIP1 (Fig. 1b-d). Efficient Gpx4 deletion was verified by

immunohistochemistry (IHC), with less than 15% of tumors in the in sg*Gpx4* group still staining

positive for Gpx4 (Extended Data Fig. 1a). IHC for 4-hydroxy-2-noneal (4-HNE), a marker for

lipid peroxidation in tissues (Extended Data Fig. 1b)[20], revealed significantly higher levels of lipid

peroxidation in sg*Gpx4* tumors compared to control sg*Neo* lung tumors, which was blunted with

LIP1 treatment (Fig. 1e, f).

Similar to our *in vivo* observations, CRISPR/Cas9-mediated Gpx4[KO] in KP LUAD cells

resulted in a near complete loss of viability and clonogenicity that was fully rescued by the addition

of LIP1 (Extended Data Fig. 1c). Targeted lipidomics to profile oxidized phosphatidylcholine

(PCs) and phosphatidylethanolamine (PEs) species in KP LUAD cells treated with RSL3, a

covalent Gpx4 inhibitor and ferroptosis inducer, revealed a higher abundance of oxidized

phospholipids in RSL3-treated cells that again was decreased in cells treated with concomitant

LIP1 (Extended Data Fig. 1d). On the other hand, Gpx4 overexpression (Gpx4[OE]) in KP LUAD

cells had no impact on cell viability or clonogenicity basally (Extended Data Fig. 1e) but did confer

greater resistance to ferroptosis *in vitro* (Extended Data Fig. 1f). Similarly, supplementation of KP

LUAD cells with sodium selenite (Na_2SeO_3) to increase translation of Gpx4[39], a selenoprotein,

resulted in a corresponding boost in Gpx4 expression and enhanced ferroptosis resistance *in vitro*

(Extended Data Fig. 1g). Taken together, these results demonstrate that Gpx4 is essential for lung

tumors to evade ferroptosis and provide evidence that ferroptosis induction may be an effective

anti-cancer strategy.

Unlike GPX4, FSP1 is upregulated in LUAD

Given our observation that Gpx4 was required for lung tumorigenesis in a GEMM that

closely recapitulates human LUAD development and progression, we next asked whether there

was clinical evidence suggesting that ferroptosis regulators in general are altered in lung cancer[40].

Although GPX4 expression was modestly increased in *KRAS*-mutant LUAD tumors compared to

normal lung tissue, there was no correlation with patient tumor stage or overall patient survival

(Extended Data Fig. 1h, i). Concordantly, Gpx4 protein levels also did not change during

autochthonous LUAD progression in KP GEMM tumors (Extended Data Fig. 1j).

Since GPX4 expression did not appear to correlate with any clinical prognostic factors in

KRAS-mutant LUAD patients, we next investigated FSP1, a second axis of ferroptosis surveillance

(Fig. 2a). We found that FSP1 expression was robustly increased in *KRAS*-mutant LUAD patient

tumors compared to normal lung and exhibited a positive correlative trend with higher tumor

stages (Extended Data Fig. 2a). Additionally, high FSP1 expression correlated with poor survival

in *KRAS*-mutant LUAD patients (Fig. 2b). Unlike Gpx4, Fsp1 protein levels increased temporally

as lung tumors progressed from adenomas to adenocarcinomas in KP GEMMs (Figs. 2c, d).

Altogether, these findings suggest that FSP1 may constitute a major suppressor of ferroptosis in

LUAD and is potentially a more viable therapeutic target than GPX4 for lung cancer patients.

Since prior studies have suggested that FSP1 may be regulated by KRAS signaling[41] to

further determine whether FSP1 upregulation was specific to *KRAS*-mutant LUAD, we stratified

LUAD patients by major oncogenic mutations. Again, *FSP1* was robustly increased in tumors

relative to normal lung, and this upregulation was observed irrespective of driver mutation or

KRAS variant (Extended Data Fig. 2b, c). Although *FSP1* expression was more robustly

upregulated in *KRAS*-mutant tumors compared to *EGFR*-mutant tumors, LUAD tumors with

neither mutation also exhibited upregulation of *FSP1* to the same extent as *KRAS*-mutant tumors.

Next, we investigated whether MAPK/ERK pathway regulates FSP1 expression. Both *in vitro*

pathway inhibition with RMC-042, a pan-RAS inhibitor, in a panel of *KRAS*-mutant LUAD cell

lines as well as multi-immunofluorescence (IF) for co-expression of Fsp1 and pErk in KP GEMM

tumors revealed a lack of correlation between FSP1 expression and ERK activation (Extended

Data Fig. 2d, e). Thus, these data indicate that *FSP1* expression, at least in the context of LUAD,

may not be exclusively dependent on KRAS-mediated oncogenic signaling.

Given that patients with *KRAS*-mutant LUAD tumors often have concomitant mutations in

STK11 and *KEAP1*, which portend more advanced disease and poorer prognosis[34,43], we also

wondered whether *FSP1* expression was impacted by these mutations. We observed that *FSP1*

was significantly increased in LUAD tumors with co-mutation of either *STK11* or *KEAP1*

(Extended Data Fig. 2f). Additionally, treatment of a panel of human LUAD cell lines with an

NRF2 activator, KI696, led to significantly increased *FSP1* gene expression (Extended Data Fig.

2g). Of note, these findings are in accordance with recent studies describing a role for NRF2, which

is activated by *KEAP1* mutations, in FSP1 upregulation[42].

Fsp1 is required for lung tumorigenesis

To systematically investigate the functional role of Fsp1 in lung cancer, we initiated

autochthonous KP LUAD tumors, this time with tumor-specific CRISPR/Cas9-mediated deletion

of either Fsp1 or Gpx4 (Fig. 2e). Strikingly, we found that genetic deletion of Fsp1 (sg*Fsp1*) in

KP LUAD tumors strongly suppressed lung tumorigenesis, resulting in significantly decreased

tumor burden to the same extent as Gpx4^{KO} (sg*Gpx4*) tumors (Fig. 2f, g). Efficient Fsp1 deletion

was verified by immunohistochemistry (IHC), with less than 5% of tumors in the in sg*Fsp1* group

still staining positive for Fsp1 (Extended Data Fig. 3a). We did not observe significant changes to

the total number or size of tumors formed across the three biological groups (Extended Data Fig.

3b, c), which suggested that loss of Fsp1 or Gpx4 primarily impacts tumor progression rather than

tumor initiation. We also observed that Fsp1 or Gpx4 deletion resulted in higher proportions of

adenomas to adenocarcinomas compared to control tumors (Fig. 2h), indicating that Fsp1 and

Gpx4 are functionally important for malignant disease progression. Additionally, there were no

notable changes to tumor cell proliferation or apoptotic cell death (Extended Data Figs. 3d, e) in

sg*Fsp1* or sg*Gpx4* tumors. In contrast, TUNEL staining of lung tumors demonstrated increased

cell death with Fsp1 loss (Fig. 3l), suggesting that the decreased lung tumor burden with Fsp1 or

Gpx4 genetic deletion is likely due to increased tumor cell ferroptosis. Perhaps most exciting

though is the extent to which Fsp1 deletion phenocopied Gpx4 loss *in viv*o, as this phenotype, to

our knowledge, has not yet been reported in any other cell lines, tissues, or disease models.

Fsp1 is required uniquely *in vivo*

The discovery of FSP1 as a key regulator of ferroptosis arose from genetic screens to

identify ferroptosis suppressors in the absence of functional GPX4[8,9]. Thus, FSP1 is generally

thought to control a secondary anti-ferroptotic axis whose function, at least *in vitro*, is masked

when GPX4 is intact. Accordingly, we observed that CRISPR/Cas9-mediated Fsp1 deletion in KP

LUAD cells had no impact on cell viability and clonogenicity *in vitro* (Fig. 2i, Extended Data Fig.

4a). As expected, Fsp1-knockout (Fsp1^{KO}) cells were more sensitive to RSL3 treatment than

isogenic Fsp1-wildtype (Fsp1^{WT}) cells and protected from RSL3-killing by LIP1 (Fig. 2j). Despite

the remarkable restriction of KP LUAD tumorigenesis by Fsp1 loss *in vivo*, our *in vitro* studies

indicated in contrast that Fsp1's anti-ferroptotic function was not required by KP LUAD cells in

the presence of Gpx4.

We sought to dissect this intriguing dichotomy and better understand the distinct *in vivo*

dependency of lung tumors on Fsp1. We first performed a series of syngeneic transplantation

experiments using isogenic KP, Fsp1^{KO} and Fsp1^{WT} cell lines with no proliferation differences *in*

vitro to systematically characterize the impact of Fsp1 loss on tumor growth and further interrogate

whether Fsp1-mediated tumor differences were specific to *in vivo* growth conditions (Fig. 2i,

Extended Data Fig. 4b). Consistently, we found that Fsp1^{KO} cells formed significantly smaller

tumors in both immunocompetent subcutaneous xenografts (Extended Data Fig. 4c, d) as well as

orthotopic lung tumors (Fig. 2k, Extended Data Fig. 4e, f). Robust suppression of Fsp1^{KO}

orthotopic lung tumor growth was similarly observed in immunodeficient athymic (NU/J) mice

(Extended Data Fig. 4g), as well as in an immunogenic mouse model[43] (Extended Data Fig. 4h).

We also observed the same phenotype in age- and sex-matched Fsp1 wildtype versus Fsp1

knockout mice (Extended Data Fig. 4i). These studies collectively provide strong evidence that

Fsp1's pro-tumorigenic effect is primarily cell-intrinsic. Fsp1 overexpression (Fsp1^{OE}) in KP

LUAD cells exhibited no *in vitro* growth advantage (Extended Data Fig. 4j) but had enhanced

resistance to RSL3-killing (Extended Data Fig. 4k) and accelerated growth of xenograft tumors *in*

vivo (Extended Data Fig. Fig. 4l, m). Altogether, these results suggest that Fsp1 is essential for

LUAD cells' survival *in vivo* and that increased Fsp1 expression is sufficient to promote *Kras*-

mutant tumorigenesis *in vivo*.

FSP1 dependency is not mutation-specific

To more thoroughly interrogate the functional importance of Fsp1 for tumorigenesis and

the translational potential for targeting Fsp1 in cancer, we assessed the requirement of FSP1 for

growth of xenograft tumors from human LUAD cell lines harboring a variety of driver mutations,

including *KRAS, NRAS, EGFR, TP53, STK11* and *KEAP1*. We found that CRISPR/Cas9-mediated

FSP1 genetic deletion consistently and markedly decreased tumor growth in all models tested.

Specifically, Fsp1^{KO} (sg*FSP1*) in H2009 (*KRAS*, *TP53* mutant), H1299 (*NRAS*, *TP53* mutant), PC9

and H1975 (*EGFR, TP53* mutant) LUAD cells led to robust suppression of subcutaneous tumor

growth (Fig. 3a-d), but, analogous to aforementioned studies, did not impact proliferation or

viability of cells *in vitro*, unless treated with RSL3 (Extended Data Fig. 5a-d). To assess whether

KRAS-mutant tumors with *STK11* (LKB1) and/or *KEAP1* mutation also depend on FSP1, we

performed CRISPR/Cas9-mediated FSP1 deletion in A549 (*KRAS, KEAP1, STK11* mutant) and

16645 (*Kras* mutant, *Stk11*-null) LUAD cells. Again, we observed a dependency for FSP1 *in vivo*

(Fig. 3e, f) but not *in vitro* (Extended Data Figure 5e-f). Together these data provide further

evidence that FSP1 is indeed required for *in vivo* LUAD tumor growth irrespective of driver and

co-mutations.

Finally, we asked if Kras-driven tumors of a different lineage also exhibited a requirement

for Fsp1 *in vivo*. Excitingly, transplantation of pancreatic adenocarcinoma (PDAC) *Kras*, *Tp53*

mutant (KPC7) cells with CRISPR/Cas9-mediated Fsp1 deletion also led to a robust tumor

suppression *in vivo* (Fig. 3g, Extended Data Fig. 5g), mirroring the phenotype observed

consistently in LUAD models and suggesting that FSP1 dependency *in vivo* may extend to other

tissue lineages.

Ferroptosis inhibition rescues Fsp1 loss

We hypothesized that defective regulation of lipid peroxidation and subsequent induction

of ferroptosis was the mechanism underlying FSP1^{KO} tumorigenic suppression. To assess this, we

first performed epilipidomic analysis of Fsp1^{WT} and Fsp1^{KO} orthotopic lung tumors and observed

that Fsp1^{KO} tumors exhibited increased abundance of oxidized and truncated PC/PE species,

indicative of increased cellular lipid peroxidation (Fig. 4a). We then asked whether ectopic

overexpression of Fsp1 or Gpx4 (Extended Data Fig. 6a, b) was sufficient to restore the growth of

Gpx4^{KO} or Fsp1^{KO} tumors, which would shed light about the capacity for each ferroptosis defense

arm to compensate for the loss of the other. Indeed, we found that Fsp1^{OE} and Gpx4^{OE} effectively

restored the growth of Gpx4^{KO} and Fsp1^{KO} tumors, respectively (Fig. 4b-c, Extended Data Fig. 6c,

d). These data implicated that tumors require extensive buffering capacity against lipid

peroxidation and that while Gpx4 and Fsp1 act through distinct pathways, each can compensate

for the loss of the other.

Mechanistically, Fsp1 has been shown to suppress ferroptosis by reducing CoQ, an

endogenous RTA, and this function is dependent on its localization to the plasma membrane. We

utilized a LC/MS-based, quantitative method to determine the abundance of CoQ in tumors, which

revealed that Fsp1^{KO} tumors had a significantly decreased ratio of reduced CoQ$_9$H$_2$ to oxidized

CoQ$_9$ (Fig. 4d). This decreased ratio was not present in genotypically matched cells at baseline *in*

vitro, but interestingly upon treatment with RSL3, Fsp1^{KO} cells mimicked the decreased

CoQ$_9$H$_2$/CoQ$_9$ observed in tumors. Prior studies have described that mutation of the myristoylation

sequence that targets FSP1 to the plasma membrane renders FSP1 unable to protect against lipid

peroxidation *in vitro*[8,9], which we also observed in KP LUAD cells (Extended Data Fig. 6e, f). We

anticipated that expression of this mutant Fsp1 (Fsp1^{mut}) would be similarly unable to restore

Fsp1^{KO} tumor growth. Indeed, while Fsp1^{WT}-restored tumors grew quickly, both Fsp1^{mut} and

Fsp1^{KO} tumors had decreased growth (Extended Data Fig. 6g). These data suggest that tumors

require Fsp1 enzymatic activity and subcellular localization *in vivo* to specifically buffer against

ferroptosis.

Next, we asked whether ferroptosis suppression, via several orthogonal approaches

including tumor-specific Acsl4 knockout (Acsl4^{KO}), dietary VitE supplementation, and LIP1

treatment would restore Fsp1^{KO} tumor growth. Loss or inhibition of Acsl4, which limits PUFA-PL

supply and restricts lipid peroxidation (Fig. 4e), has previously been shown to be protective against

ferroptosis in Gpx4^{KO} cells *in vitro*[17-19]. Therefore, we sought to determine whether genetic

deletion of Acsl4 would suppress ferroptosis and rescue the growth of Fsp1^{KO} tumors *in vivo*. We

performed CRISPR/Cas9-mediated genetic deletion of Acsl4 (sg*Acsl4*) in isogenic KP, Fsp1^{KO}

and Fsp1^{WT} cells. We observed that loss of Acsl4 did not impact cell viability but robustly rescued

RSL3-induced ferroptosis *in vitro*, in both Fsp1^{WT} and Fsp1^{KO} cells (Extended Data Fig. 6h).

Importantly, Acsl4 deletion significantly restored Fsp1^{KO} lung tumor growth *in vivo* (Extended

Data Fig. 6i) and mice with Acsl4, Fsp1-double knockout tumors were found to have increased

endpoint disease burden (Fig. 4f, Extended Data Fig. 6j) and decreased overall survival (Extended

Data Fig. 6k). Furthermore, tumor-specific Acsl4^{KO} led to a basal acceleration of tumor growth

(Extended Data Fig. 6i) and decreased overall survival (Extended Data Fig. 6k), suggesting that

decreased accumulation of PUFA-PL in lung tumors may also protect against ferroptosis *in vivo*.

VitE is nature's premier lipophilic antioxidant and is specifically able to scavenge lipid

radicals and protect against ferroptosis (Fig. 4e). Therefore, we decided to test whether dietary

VitE supplementation could rescue the growth of Fsp1^{KO} lung tumors. High versus low VitE diets

ad libitum was provided to animals either before or after tumor initiation (Fig. 4g), and we found

that increased dietary VitE accelerated Fsp1^{KO} tumor growth (Fig. 4h, i), with no impact on growth

of Fsp1^{WT} tumors (Extended Data Fig. 6l).

Lastly, since LIP1 suppressed tumor lipid peroxidation and entirely mitigated the impact

of Gpx4 loss on KP LUAD tumorigenesis (Fig. 1b-d), we conducted parallel studies to investigate

whether LIP1 also blunts ferroptosis in and restores Fsp1^{KO} tumorigenesis. In the orthotopic lung

tumor model, we observed a tendency for Fsp1^{KO} tumors to grow more quickly with daily LIP1

administration (Extended Data Fig. 6m). In the KP LUAD GEMM (Extended Data Fig. 6n), which

was conducted in accordance with experimental parameters for Gpx4^{KO} GEMM studies, LIP1

treatment significantly increased autochthonous Fsp1^{KO} (sg*Fsp1*) tumor burden (Extended Data

Fig. 6o). Moreover, sg*Fsp1* tumors stained positively for 4-HNE, which was effectively

suppressed by LIP1 treatment (Extended Data Fig. 6p). As observed with VitE supplementation,

timing of LIP1 treatment did not appear to have a differential impact, as LIP1 treatment after

tumors were already established was equally effective at restoring sg*Fsp1* lung tumorigenesis (Fig

4j-l). Altogether, these studies provide clear evidence that LUAD tumors require Fsp1 to protect

against ferroptosis *in vivo* and suggest that increased lipid peroxidation is a barrier for tumor

growth and progression.

FSP1 inhibition extends overall survival

With the growing interest in harnessing ferroptosis to kill tumor cells, several FSP1

inhibitors have been developed[9,28], though the majority are effective only *in vitro* against human

FSP1 (hFSP1) in the context of GPX4 loss or inhibition (Extended Data Fig. 7a-d). Recently,

icFSP1 was developed as the first human FSP1 (hFSP1) inhibitor with *in vivo* stability and

efficacy, albeit solely in tumors with concomitant GPX4 loss[24]. Accordingly, we also saw that

icFSP1 treatment *in vitro* did not impact cell viability (Extended Data Fig. 7e) unless RSL3 was

added (Extended Data Fig. 7f). Given that murine and human FSP1 are highly conserved in

sequence and structure, we generated a hybrid tumor model in which hFSP1 was expressed in

murine KP, $Fsp1^{KO}$ tumors. We observed that expression of either murine or human FSP1 resulted

in similar acceleration of tumor growth compared to $Fsp1^{KO}$ tumors (Extended Data Fig. 7g, h),

which indicated that hFSP1 can functionally compensate for mFsp1 *in vivo*.

Using this hybrid tumor model, we next tested whether icFSP1 had therapeutic benefit

against lung cancer. Excitingly, we found that FSP1 inhibition as a monotherapy improved overall

survival of lung tumor-bearing mice, nearly to the extent of genetic Fsp1 deletion (Fig. 5a). To

determine whether the therapeutic effect of icFSP1 was indeed due to the induction of ferroptosis,

we asked whether LIP1, which we expected to inhibit lipid peroxidation induced by FSP1

inhibition, rescued tumor suppression in icFSP1-treated animals. In correlation with the survival

data, we observed that icFSP1-treatment significantly decreased tumor growth when compared to

vehicle treated animals, and importantly, concomitant LIP1 treatment abrogated the tumor-

suppressive effect of icFSP1 treatment (Fig. 5b, Extended Data Fig. 7c). Further, to test whether

icFSP1 was exerting an on-target, tumor-specific effect, we repeated the treatment study with an

internal control— lung tumors expressing $FSP1^{Q319K}$, a mutant that is resistant to icFSP1 but

maintains anti-ferroptotic function (Extended Data Fig. 7a, b). We found that icFSP1 treatment

specifically extended overall survival of mice bearing tumors with $hFSP1^{WT}$ but not $hFSP1^{Q319K}$

(Fig. 5c), indicating that indeed the tumor suppression seen with icFSP1 treatment was due to

inhibitor activity directly on tumor cells.

We wondered whether icFSP1 treatment also impacted the tumor microenvironment

(TME), but we found no differences in the proportion of total T cells, neutrophils, alveolar, or

interstitial macrophages between the treatment groups (Extended Data Fig. 7j). These data further

suggest that icFSP1 primarily exerts on-target, tumor-specific effects, though more granular

immune profiling is needed to determine the potential impact, and thus potential side effects, of

FSP1 inhibition on TME. Finally, we utilized a PDX model (LX465; *KRAS*[G12D], *TP53*-mutant) to

further assess the therapeutic potential of FSP1 inhibition. Excitingly, we found that icFSP1

treatment significantly decreased PDX tumor growth (Fig. 5d), further bolstering the translational

potential of targeting FSP1 in LUAD patients. These pre-clinical studies with icFSP1 are the first

to demonstrate that FSP1 is a promising therapeutic target, and our work highlight FSP1 inhibition

as a novel therapeutic strategy for improving disease outcome in lung cancer patients.

DISCUSSION

Cancer is a disease of hyperproliferation, and cancer cells increase their metabolic output

to support sustained growth. This occurs at the cost of increased ROS production that can damage

macromolecules, such as lipids, and have deleterious effects[44,45]. One such effect is excessive lipid

peroxidation of membrane-associated PUFA-PLs, which can lead to ferroptosis, a unique non-

apoptotic mechanism of cell death. Through our systematic interrogation of the key mechanisms

that regulate aberrant lipid peroxidation *in vivo*, we demonstrated that ferroptosis constitutes a

barrier to lung cancer and that lung tumors rely on Gpx4 and uniquely, Fsp1 to overcome

ferroptosis and sustain tumorigenesis (Extended Data Fig. 7k, l).

Our work specifically highlights the dependence of lung tumors on Fsp1 *in vivo*, even in

the presence of functional Gpx4 (Extended Data Fig. 7k). This is the first report of a context where

Fsp1 and Gpx4 are independently required for ferroptosis suppression and therefore either can

impact disease outcome. Moreover, analysis of GEMM and human lung tumors demonstrated that

FSP1 levels increase during tumor progression and correlate with poor survival. In contrast, GPX4

levels are ubiquitous in tumors and most tissues. Given that germline Gpx4[KO] mice are not viable[46],

whereas Fsp1[KO] mice are with no notable physiological defects[20,47,48], the therapeutic window for

targeting FSP1 with fewer toxic side effects is expected to be much greater than for GPX4.

Furthermore, loss of GPX4 is toxic to T cells which would suppress any anti-tumor immune

responses[49,50]. Leveraging this unique requirement for Fsp1 in lung cancer, our studies demonstrate

the therapeutic benefit of FSP1 inhibition in promoting ferroptosis and suppressing tumor growth

and extending survival as a monotherapy in aggressive pre-clinical lung cancer models. Our

studies underscore the value of *in vivo* pre-clinical models in capturing physiologically relevant

metabolic dependencies that may be missed *in vitro* and pave the way for developing FSP1

inhibitors for clinical testing in lung cancer patients.

Methods

Cell lines

365
366

KP LUAD cell lines were obtained from the laboratory of Tyler Jacks. KP, Fsp1[KO] cell lines were

generated by transient transfection of PX458 (Addgene #48138) expressing an sgRNA targeting

Fsp1. Single GFP positive clones were selected and Fsp1 loss was validated by western blot. The

16645 cell line was developed from Kras[G12D] LKB1^{-/-} GEMM as previously described.[51] KPC7

cells were obtained from the laboratory of Diane Simeone. All cell lines were maintained in

DMEM or RPMI 160 (Corning) supplemented with 10% FBS (Sigma Aldrich) and gentamicin

(Invitrogen) and were tested for mycoplasma regularly (PlasmoTest, InvivoGen). All mouse cell

lines were authenticated by PCR genotyping. All human cell lines used were purchased from

ATCC and were authenticated by short-tandem-repeat profiling. Genetic manipulation of cell lines

was performed via lentiviral transduction of plasmids, detailed in next section, followed by either

puromycin (7ug/mL) or hygromycin (800ug/mL) selection for 1 week.

Cloning/lentivirus generation

379
CRISPR/Cas9-mediated knockout of target genes was achieved by cloning sgRNAs into pLenti-

USEC or lentiCRISPRv2-puro vectors, as previously described[31]. In short, backbones were

digested with Esp3I (New England Biosciences) and purified with a gel extraction kit (QIAGEN).

sgRNAs were designed using CRISPick (Broad Institute), obtained from Integrated DNA

Technologies (Coralville, IA), annealed, phosphorylated, Esp3I-digested, and ligated into the

purified digested backbones using Quick Ligase (New England Biosciences). Double sgRNA

ultramers were designed and generated as previously described[38]. Briefly, ultramers were Gibson

assembled to digested pDonor_sU6 (Addgene #69351), Esp3I-digested, and ligated to purified

digested backbones. Guide RNA sequences used to make gene knockouts can be found in

Supplementary Data 4. Gpx4, mFsp1, and hFSP1 expression plasmids were generated using

Gibson assembly of the respective cDNA into pLenti-v2-filler.

Lentivirus was generated by co-transfection of HEK293 cells with a viral vector and packaging

plasmids psPAX2 (Addgene #12260) and pMD2.G (Addgene #12259) using PEI transfection

reagent. Cell supernatant containing lentivirus was collected 72 hours after transfection and

filtered through 0.45 µM PVDF filters. For *in vivo* experiments, lentivirus was concentrated by

ultracentrifugation at 25,000rpm for 2 hours at 4°C. The viral pellet was resuspended in PBS and

stored at -80°C until use. Viral titer was quantified with the use of a Cre-dependent GreenGo

reporter cell line. For *in vitro* experiments, media containing virus was collected, filtered, and

added directly to recipient cells with polybrene at 8 µg/mL for 48 hours before selection.

Mouse models

All mouse experiments described in this study were approved by the NYU Institutional Animal

Care and Use Committee (IACUC). Animals were housed according to IACUC guidelines in

ventilated caging in a specific pathogen free animal facility. For all mouse studies, ≥ 4 mice were

used for each experimental condition. $Kras^{LSL-G12D/+}$; $Tp53^{fl/fl}$; $Rosa26^{LSL-Cas9/LSL-Cas9}$ (KPC

GEMMs) were bred as previously described[31-35]. C57BL/6J (JAX strain #000664) mice with the

appropriate genotype, aged 8 to 12 weeks were randomly selected to begin tumor initiation studies

with pUSEC lentivirus. Care was taken to ensure each experimental arm had an equal number of

male and female mice. Mice were intratracheally infected with lentiviruses as described and

monitored until experimental endpoint. Tumor burden was quantified by hematoxylin and eosin

(H&E) staining and analyzed using QuPath software as a measurement of total tumor area/total

lung lobe area. All quantifications were done with investigator blinded to the respective sample

genotypes. All transplantation experiments were performed using nude (JAX strain #002019),

NOD SCID Gamma (NSG; JAX strain #005557F), C57BL/6J Fsp1-knockout (Conrad group[16]) or

C57BL/6J wildtype (JAX strain #000664) mice aged 8 to 12 weeks old. For murine cell xenograft

experiments, 100,000 cells in 100µl of phosphate-buffered saline (PBS) were injected

subcutaneously into each flank of the mouse. For the xenograft studies in Figure 3 the number of

cells injected per flank and whether they were injected with 50:50 PBS and Matrigel (Corning) are

indicated as follows: H2009 (2 million cells +Matrigel), H1299 (1 million cells), PC9 (1 million

cells), H1975 (2 million cells +Matrigel), A549 (1 million cells), 16645 (500,000 cells), KPC7

(250,000 cells). All human cell line xenograft experiments were carried out in male NSG mice

unless specified. For the PDX experiment, tumors were implanted subcutaneously in male NSG

mice as previously described[34]. Tumors were measured by caliper, and volume was calculated

based on 0.5 x length x width^2. The maximum tumor diameter permitted by our IACUC protocol

was 2cm, and this was not exceeded in any experiment. For orthotopic lung tumor experiments,

100,000 luciferase-expressing cells in 200µl of PBS were injected intravenously into tail vein of

male mice unless specified in the legend. Tumor growth was measured by bioluminescence

(PerkinElmer IVIS Spectrum In Vivo Imaging System; D-luciferin, PerkinElmer #122799). Data

were analyzed using Living Image software.

Antioxidant/drug treatments

For LIP1 treatment, mice were dosed with 10 mg/kg Liproxstatin-1 (BOC Sciences) or Vehicle

(2% DMSO + 40%PEG300 + 2%Tween80 in sterile H_2O) by intraperitoneal injection for

frequency and duration indicated in figure schematics. For icFSP1 treatment, mice were dosed

with 50mg/kg icFSP1 (WuXi LabNetwork) or vehicle (45% PEG300 in sterile PBS) by

intraperitoneal injection twice daily. High (TD.2108412) and low (TD.210841) irradiated Vitamin

E diets were obtained from Inotivco and provided *ad libitum* for length of time indicated in figure

legends. In all experiments, mice were randomly assigned to treatment group.

Cell clonogenic and viability assays

Cell clonogenic assays were conducted by seeding 2000 cells per well into 12-well dishes

(BD/Falcon) in RPMI-1640 media. After 12-16hrs, media containing RSL3 and/or LIP1 were

added to wells. After 5 days of growth, plates were washed twice with PBS and stained with 0.5%

crystal violet (Fisher Scientific) solution in 20% methanol. Plates were dried, scanned, and crystal

violet was quantified by solubilization with 10% acetic acid and measurement of absorbance at

592nm by spectrometer (Molecular Devices). Cell viability assays were conducted by seeding

2000 cells per well into white-walled, clear-bottom, 96-well plates (Corning) in RPMI-1640

media. After 12-16hrs, media containing RSL3, LIP1, and/or FSEN1, iFSP1, or icFSP1 were

added. After 3 days, cell viability was assessed by CellTiter-Glo (Promega) and luminescence was

measured by spectrometer (Molecular Devices).

Immunoblotting

Cells were plated to 75% confluency in a 6-well dish, and the following day cells were lysed on

ice with Pierce RIPA buffer (ThermoScientific) containing 1x protease/phosphatase inhibitor

cocktail (Thermo Fisher Scientific). Samples were sonicated in cooled 4°C water (12 rounds, 30

seconds on and 30 seconds off) and then centrifuged at 14000 rpm at 4°C for 15 minutes. The

supernatant was collected, and protein was quantified using the DC Rad Protein Assay kit. Protein

was diluted to 1 ug/uL with water and 4x NuPage LDS sample buffer, then boiled at 95°C for 10

minutes. 20 ug protein per well was loaded into Invitrogen 4-12% Bis-Tris gels and then

transferred onto PVDF membranes using a standard protocol. PVDF membranes were then

blocked using 5% BSA in TBST for 60 minutes at room temperature and incubated with primary

antibodies in 5% BSA overnight at 4°C. Primary antibodies were obtained as follows: Gpx4

(Abcam), Fsp1 (Proteintech), Acsl4 (Santa Cruz Biotechnologies), pERK (Cell Signaling), ERK

(Cell Signaling), and Hsp90 (BD Bioscences). The following day, membranes were washed in

TBST and incubated with HRP-conjugated secondary antibodies for 1 hour at room temperature.

Enhanced chemiluminescent horseradish peroxidase substrate (ThermoScientific SuperSignal

West PICO Plus) was added to the membrane for 1 minute, and the resulting membrane was

imaged using the General Electric Amersham Imager 680. For gel source data, see Supplementary

Data 1.

Oxidized lipidomics

For the Gpx4 KO experiment, cells were plated to 75% confluency in 6-well dish. The following

day, cells were treated with DMSO, RSL3 (0.5uM), or RSL3(0.5µM) + LIP1(100nM). After 8hrs,

cells were collected and washed in an antioxidant solution (PBS containing dibutylhydroxytoluene

(BHT; 100 µM) and diethylenetriamine pentaacetate (DTPA; 100 µM)) and centrifuged.

Supernatent was discarded and cell pellets were immediately frozen in liquid nitrogen and stored

at –80 °C. Frozen samples were sent on dry ice to Wayne State Lipidomics Core for metabolite

extraction and LC-MS analysis.

Fsp1 WT and KO tumor and cell lipidomic analysis were performed in the lab of Pyo Kang. Fsp1

WT and KO cells were plated at 75% confluency in 10 cm plates and treated as stated above. After

euthanasia, animals were perfused with the antioxidant solution (+3.8% trisodium citrate),

orthotopic tumors were microdissected, frozen in liquid nitrogen and stored at –80 °C. Mouse lung

cancer tissues were cryopulverized and extracted with chloroform:methanol (2:1, v/v) at a tissue

concentration of 25 mg mL^{-1}. For the cells, 1.0×10^7 cells were extracted by one milliliter of

chloroform:methanol (2:1, v/v). EquiSPLASH LIPIDOMIX® internal standard (Avanti Polar

Lipids) was added to the extraction solvent at 0.1 µg mL^{-1} per lipid class. Samples were sonicated

on ice for 1 min using a VCX 130 probe sonicator (5 s on/off cycles), incubated for 30 min, and

centrifuged at 17,000 × g for 20 min at 4 °C. The supernatant was was dried under vacuum (EZ-2

Elite, Genevac), reconstituted in 10% of the original volume with isopropanol, and transferred to

glass autosampler vials for LC–MS analysis. Chromatographic separation was performed using a

Waters ACQUITY UPLC CSH C18 column (100 × 2.1 mm, 1.7 µm) with a VanGuard precolumn

(5 × 2.1 mm, 1.7 µm). Mobile phase A consisted of acetonitrile/water (60:40, v/v), and mobile

phase B of isopropanol/acetonitrile (90:10, v/v), both containing 5 mM ammonium formate and

0.1% formic acid. The column was maintained at 65 °C with a flow rate of 0.6 mL min^{-1}. The

gradient was as follows: 0–2 min, 15–30% B; 2–2.5 min, 30–48% B; 2.5–11 min, 48–82% B; 11–

11.5 min, 82–99% B; 11.5–12 min, 99% B; 12–12.1 min, 99–15% B; and 12.1–16 min, hold at

15% B for re-equilibration. Mass spectrometry was performed on a Q Exactive Plus Quadrupole-

Orbitrap (Thermo Fisher Scientific) equipped with a heated electrospray ionization (HESI) source

and operated in negative ion mode. Source settings were: sheath gas, 60 a.u.; auxiliary gas, 25 a.u.;

sweep gas, 2 a.u.; spray voltage, 3.0 kV; capillary temperature, 320 °C; S-lens RF level, 50%; and

auxiliary gas heater temperature, 370 °C. Parallel reaction monitoring (PRM) was carried out with

the following parameters: resolution, 17,500 at m/z 200; AGC target, 2×10^5; maximum injection

time, 50 ms; isolation window, m/z 1.2; and stepped normalized collision energies of 20, 30, and

40. The oxidized lipid analysis was adapted by previous PRM based analysis[52]. To generate the

PRM inclusion list, pooled sample extracts were first analyzed in DDA mode to identify the most

abundant polyunsaturated PC and PE species using Lipostar2[53]. These precursors were subjected

to in silico oxidation using LPPtiger2 to predict candidate oxidized lipids. A semi-targeted DDA

experiment was then conducted to confirm precursor detectability and finalize the inclusion list. [52]

Data were analyzed using Skyline (v24.1)[54]. Quantification was based on fragment anions derived

from oxidized fatty acyl chains, with peak areas normalized to PC(15:0/18:1(d7)) or

PE(15:0/18:1(d7)) internal standards from the EquiSPLASH LIPIDOMIX® mixture.

CoQ$_9$ and CoQ$_9$H$_2$ analysis

CoQ$_9$ and CoQ$_9$H$_2$ analysis was conducted by modification of previous study[55]. The D$_9$-CoQ$_{10}$

standard was purchased from IsoSciences (Ambler, PA, USA). The D$_6$-CoQ$_{10}$H$_2$ standard was

synthesized from D$_6$-CoQ$_{10}$, which was obtained from Good Laboratory Practice Bioscience

(Montclair, CA, USA). The CoQ$_9$ standard was purchased from Tokyo Chemical Industry (Tokyo,

Japan), and CoQ$_9$H$_2$ was synthesized from CoQ$_9$. D$_6$-CoQ$_{10}$H$_2$ and D$_9$-CoQ$_{10}$ were used as internal

standards for the CoQ$_9$H$_2$ and CoQ$_9$, respectively. Chloroform: methanol (2:1, v/v), containing

internal standards of 0.5 µM of D$_6$-CoQ$_{10}$H$_2$ and D$_6$-CoQ$_{10}$ was used to extract mouse lung cancer

tissue at a tissue concentration of 25 mg mL^{-1}. For the cells, 1.0×10^7 cells were extracted by one

milliliter of same extraction solvent. Samples were then sonicated on ice for 1 min using a VCX

130 probe sonicator (5 s on/off cycles), incubated for 30 min, and centrifuged at $17,000 \times g$ for

20 min at 4 °C. A 100 µL aliquot of the supernatant was transferred to glass autosampler vials for

LC–MS/MS analysis. The liquid chromatography conditions were identical to those used for

oxidized lipid analysis. Q Exactive Plus MS was operated in positive ion mode. Source settings

were as follows: sheath gas, 60 a.u.; auxiliary gas, 25 a.u.; sweep gas, 2 a.u.; spray voltage, 3.0 kV;

capillary temperature, 320 °C; S-lens RF level, 50%; and auxiliary gas heater temperature, 370 °C.

The mass range was m/z 120–1,200; resolution, 70,000 at m/z 200; AGC target, 1×10^6; and

maximum injection time, 100ms. By using EL–MAVEN (v0.12.0), the LC-MS peaks of CoQ_9,

CoQ_9H_2, $D_6\text{-}CoQ_{10}H_2$, $D_6\text{-}CoQ_{10}$, and $D_9\text{-}CoQ_{10}$ were identified by matching with standard library

and their peak areas were extracted with 10 ppm error range. Standard curves were generated using

known concentrations of CoQ_9H_2 and CoQ_9, and used to calculate the concentrations of CoQ_9H_2

and CoQ_9 in the samples fallowing an algorithm described in a previous study[55].

Immunohistochemistry

Tumor bearing mice were euthanized by carbon dioxide asphyxiation, after which the lungs were

dissected and fixed in 4% PFA solution overnight. Fixed lungs were washed with PBS 2x,

transferred, and stored in 70% ethanol, until cassette loading and paraffin embedding. Sections

were cut and stained with H&E. For immunohistochemistry with the exception of TUNEL

staining, sections were immunostained on a Leica BondRX automated stainer according to the

manufacturer's instructions. In brief, tissues underwent deparaffinization online, followed by

epitope retrieval for 20 minutes at 100º with Leica Biosystems ER2 solution (pH9, cat#AR9640),

endogenous peroxidase activity blocking with H2O2, and non-specific binding site blocking with

Rodent Block M (Biocare, cat# RBM961L) and Bond Primary Antibody Diluent (Leica

Biosystems, cat# AR9352). Sections were then incubated with primary antibodies against Gpx4

(Abcam), Fsp1 (courtesy of Dr. Marcus Conrad), 4-HNE (JaICA), Ki67, and Ccasp3 for 60

minutes at room temperature. Primary antibodies were detected with anti-rat HRP-conjugated

polymer (Biocare, cat# BRR4016H), 3,3'-diaminobenzidine (DAB) substrate (provided in the

Leica BOND Polymer Refine Detection System, cat# DS9800), and for 4-HNE staining Bond

DAB Enhancer (Leica Biosystems, cat# AR9432). Following counter-staining with hematoxylin,

slides were scanned at 40X on a Hamamatzu Nanozoomer (2.0HT). TUNEL staining was

performed by Histowiz Inc. (histowiz.com) according to their protocol.

For OPAL imaging, coronal 5 µm sections were immunostained on a Leica BondRx auto-stainer

according to the manufacturer's instructions. In brief, sections were deparaffiinized online and

then treated with 3% H_2O_2 to inhibit endogenous peroxidases, followed by antigen retrieval with

either ER1 (Leica, AR9961; pH6) or ER2 (Leica, AR9640; pH9) retrieval buffer at 100o for 20

minutes. After blocking with either Rodent Block M (Biocare, RBM961L) or Primary Antibody

Diluent (Leica, AR93520), slides were incubated with the first primary antibody (FSP1, courtesy

of Marcus Conrad, pERK1/2, CST, GPX4, Abcam) and secondary HRP polymer pair, followed

by HRP-mediated tyramide signal amplification with a specific Opal® fluorophore. Once the

Opal® fluorophore was covalently linked to the antigen, primary and secondary antibodies were

removed with a heat retrieval step. This sequence was repeated three more times with subsequent

primary and secondary antibody pairs, using a different Opal fluorophore with each primary

antibody (see table below for primary antibody sequence and reagent details). After antibody

staining, sections were counterstained with spectral DAPI (Akoya Biosciences, FP1490) and

mounted with ProLong Gold Antifade (ThermoFisher Scientific, P36935). Semi-automated image

acquisition was performed on an Akoya Vectra Polaris (PhenoImagerHT) multispectral imaging

system. Slides were scanned at 20X magnification using PhenoImagerHT 2.0 software in

conjunction with Phenochart 2.0 and InForm 3.0 to generate unmixed whole slide qptiff scans. All

image files were uploaded to the NYUGSoM's OMERO Plus image data management system

(Glencoe Software).

Flow Cytometry

Lung tissue was processed into a single cell suspension for flow cytometry as previously

described[43,56]. Briefly, prior to euthanasia, mice were injected with 2 ug of Anti-mouse CD45-

APC conjugated antibody (Biolegend, Clone 30-F11, 103111) retro-orbitally. Lungs were

harvested and digested with Collagenase (Sigma-Aldrich, C5138) and deoxyribonuclease I

(Sigma-Aldrich, DN25) followed by red blood cell lysis. Single cells were then resuspended in

FACS buffer and stained using the following antibodies: CD45 (Biolegend, 103132), CD11b

(Biolegend, 101216), CD11c (Biolegend, 117324), Ly6G (Biolegend, 127622), MHCII (BD,

748708), CD103 (Biolegend, 121433), CD64 (Biolegend, 139309), SiglecF (BD, 740956),

MertK (R&D, BAF591), CD45 (BD, 748371), CD3e (BD, 740854), CD4 (Invitrogen,

MCD0428), CD8a (EBioscience, 563152), Secondary (Streptavidin) (BD, 564176). Samples

were run on the BD LSRFortessa and analyzed on FlowJo version 10. Gating strategy can be

accessed in Supplementary Data 2.

TCGA analyses

Gene expression profiles of primary tumors and relevant clinical data of 515 LUAD patients were

obtained from The Cancer Genome Atlas6 (TCGute.org). GPX4 and FSP1 (AIFM2) mutational

status of TCGA tumor samples was retrieved from cBioPortal151 using the TCGA PanCancer

Atlas collection (gdc.cancer.gov/about- data/publications/pancanatlas). For survival data, patients

were stratified based on GPX4 or FSP1 expression and overall survival rates were plotted to

compare high-GPX4/FSP1 expressing patients (top 50% above median expression) with the rest

of the cohort (n=464 patients). All survival analyses were conducted using the survival curve

analyses in GraphPad Prism v9.

Statistics and Reproducibility

Statistical analysis was performed using GraphPad Prism v9. All data is expressed as mean plus standard error of the mean, unless otherwise specified. Data was analyzed by statistical test indicated in figure legends. All tests were two-tailed and replicates are biological unless otherwise stated. All western blots were replicated at least 3 times with results reproducible of data shown in figures. All *in vitro* assays were replicated at least 3 times with a minimum of n=3 biological replicates per group for statistical power. For all *in vivo* experiments, the minimum sample size was 4 independent mice/tumors and respective sample size per genotype/condition is further specified in the figure legend. Sample size was not calculated but was chosen in each experiment based on previous experience with various models and to ensure that there were enough samples for statistical power. All *in vivo* experiments were replicated at least twice with results reproducible of data shown in figures. When representative images are shown, a minimum of 3 samples from the larger cohort were stained from each group. In the case of representative MRI images, all animals from the cohort were imaged. During sample processing and analysis for the lipidomic the samples were given numeric IDs which after analysis, were unblinded and graphed. For histological and immunohistochemistry analysis, researcher was blinded to the sample condition. The investigators were not blinded during most other data collection or analysis. Biorender[57] was used to make the schematics and diagrams.

Methods References

51   Winslow, M.M*., et al.* Suppression of lung adenocarcinoma progression by Nkx2-1. *Nature* **473**, 101-104 (2011).

52.   Criscuolo, A*., et al.* Analytical and computational workflow for in-depth analysis of oxidized complex lipids in blood plasma. *Nature Communications* **13**, 6547 (2022).

53.   Goracci, L*., et al.* Lipostar, a Comprehensive Platform-Neutral Cheminformatics Tool for Lipidomics. *Analytical Chemistry* **89**, 6257-6264 (2017).

54.   Adams, K.J*., et al.* Skyline for Small Molecules: A Unifying Software Package for Quantitative Metabolomics. *Journal of Proteome Research* **19**, 1447-1458 (2020).

55.   Kang, Y.P., Kim, T.H., Ngoc Nguyen, C.T., Kim, S.M. & Kwon, S.W. Robust Determination of Coenzyme Q10 Redox Status Using Two Isotope-Labeled Internal Standards. *Available at SSRN 4982487.*

56.   Pillai, R*., et al.* Glutamine antagonist DRP-104 suppresses tumor growth and enhances response to checkpoint blockade in KEAP1 mutant lung cancer. *Sci Adv* **10**, eadm9859 (2024).

57.   Created in BioRender. Vaughan, A. (2025) https://BioRender.com/99qhixq

Data Availability

All data and raw gel images are included with the paper. Raw lipidomic data have been deposited in the MassIVE data base (https://massive.ucsd.edu/) under accession number MSV000098883. Analyzed lipidomic data are available in Supplementary Data 3. Gene expression profiles of primary tumors and relevant clinical data of 515 LUAD patients were obtained from The Cancer Genome Atlas6 (TCGute.org). GPX4, FSP1 (AIFM2), KRAS, EGFR, KEAP1, and STK11 mutational status of TCGA tumor samples was retrieved from cBioPortal151 using the TCGA PanCancer Atlas collection (gdc.cancer.gov/about- data/publications/pancanatlas). All other materials are available upon request from the corresponding author (T.P.). Source data are provided with this paper.

Acknowledgements

We dedicate this work to Judy Teixeira, whose love, strength, and spirit continue to inspire us. We thank Gyles Ward and Cynthia Loomis from the Experimental Pathology Core [RRID:SCR_017928] at NYU Langone Health, which is partially supported by the Cancer Center Support Grant P30CA016087 at NYU Langone's Laura and Isaac Perlmutter Cancer Center, for support with IHC staining and imaging. The PhenoImagerHT Mutlispectral imaging system was initially purchased through a Shared Instrumentation Grant S10OD021747. We thank the Wayne State University School of Medicine Lipidomics Core Facility, which is supported in part by National Center for Research Resources, National Institutes of Health Grants S10RR027926 and S10OD032292, for support with LC-MS. We also recognize that the analysis of Fsp1 oxidized lipids and CoQ_9 were conducted by the Proteomics and Metabolomics Core at the College of Pharmacy, Seoul National University, South Korea. We thank R. Possemato and S. Kotschi for critical reading of this manuscript. T. P. is supported by NIH grants (R37CA222504, R01CA227649, R01CA283049, R01CA262562) and an American Cancer Society Research Scholar Grant (RSG-17-20001–TBE). K.W. is supported by the Ruth L. Kirschstein Individual Predoctoral NRSA fellowship (F30CA275258) and NIH training grants (T32GM136573, T32GM136542). A.J.V. is supported by the NIH training grant (T32GM136542). M.C. received funding from the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) (CO 291/7-1, the Priority Program SPP 2306 [CO 291/9-1, #461385412; CO 291/10-1, #461507177] and the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program (grant agreement No. GA 884754).

Author contributions

T.P., K.W., A.J.V. designed and directed the study. K.W., A.J.V., J.P.B., A.Z., M.N.N., M.M., and

S.C. performed various *in vitro* and *in vivo* experiments reported in the study. R.P. performed

FACS. Y.H. performed TCGA patient data analyses. S.M.K. performed Fsp1 epilipidomics and

COQ measurement, T.H.K assisted with data analysis, and was supervised by Y.P.K. S.C.

performed unbiased tumor burden quantification. S.R. maintained and genotyped all experimental

mice. M.C., T.N., D.S., M.H., provided conceptual advice. T.P., K.W., and A.J.V. wrote the

manuscript with comments and input from all authors.

Competing Interests

680 T.P. received funding from Pfizer Medical Education Group, Dracen Pharmaceuticals, Kymera

681 Therapeutics, Bristol Myers Squibb, and Agios Pharmaceuticals not related to the submitted work.

682 M.C. is a co-founder and shareholder of ROSCUE Therapeutics GmbH. M.C. and T.N. have filed

683 a patent (WO2024115673A1) for some of the FSP1 inhibitor compounds described herein. All

684 other authors declare no competing interests.

REFERENCES

1. Dixon, S.J., *et al.* Ferroptosis: an iron-dependent form of nonapoptotic cell death. *Cell* **149**, 1060-1072 (2012).
2. Viswanathan, V.S., *et al.* Dependency of a therapy-resistant state of cancer cells on a lipid peroxidase pathway. *Nature* **547**, 453-457 (2017).
3. Hangauer, M.J., *et al.* Drug-tolerant persister cancer cells are vulnerable to GPX4 inhibition. *Nature* **551**, 247-250 (2017).
4. Berndt, C., *et al.* Ferroptosis in health and disease. *Redox Biol* **75**, 103211 (2024).
5. Nakamura, T. & Conrad, M. Exploiting ferroptosis vulnerabilities in cancer. *Nat Cell Biol* (2024).
6. Friedmann Angeli, J.P., *et al.* Inactivation of the ferroptosis regulator Gpx4 triggers acute renal failure in mice. *Nat Cell Biol* **16**, 1180-1191 (2014).
7. Yang, W.S., *et al.* Regulation of ferroptotic cancer cell death by GPX4. *Cell* **156**, 317-331 (2014).
8. Bersuker, K., *et al.* The CoQ oxidoreductase FSP1 acts parallel to GPX4 to inhibit ferroptosis. *Nature* **575**, 688-692 (2019).
9. Doll, S., *et al.* FSP1 is a glutathione-independent ferroptosis suppressor. *Nature* **575**, 693-698 (2019).
10. Wiernicki, B., *et al.* Excessive phospholipid peroxidation distinguishes ferroptosis from other cell death modes including pyroptosis. *Cell Death Dis* **11**, 922 (2020).
11. Conrad, M. & Pratt, D.A. The chemical basis of ferroptosis. *Nat Chem Biol* **15**, 1137-1147 (2019).
12. Dixon, S.J. & Olzmann, J.A. The cell biology of ferroptosis. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol* **25**, 424-442 (2024).
13. Kraft, V.A.N., *et al.* GTP Cyclohydrolase 1/Tetrahydrobiopterin Counteract Ferroptosis through Lipid Remodeling. *ACS Cent Sci* **6**, 41-53 (2020).
14. Soula, M., *et al.* Metabolic determinants of cancer cell sensitivity to canonical ferroptosis inducers. *Nat Chem Biol* **16**, 1351-1360 (2020).
15. Garcia-Bermudez, J., *et al.* Squalene accumulation in cholesterol auxotrophic lymphomas prevents oxidative cell death. *Nature* **567**, 118-122 (2019).
16. Qiu, B., *et al.* Phospholipids with two polyunsaturated fatty acyl tails promote ferroptosis. *Cell* **187**, 1177-1190 e1118 (2024).
17. Kagan, V.E., *et al.* Oxidized arachidonic and adrenic PEs navigate cells to ferroptosis. *Nat Chem Biol* **13**, 81-90 (2017).
18. Doll, S., *et al.* ACSL4 dictates ferroptosis sensitivity by shaping cellular lipid composition. *Nat Chem Biol* **13**, 91-98 (2017).
19. Dixon, S.J., *et al.* Human Haploid Cell Genetics Reveals Roles for Lipid Metabolism Genes in Nonapoptotic Cell Death. *ACS Chem Biol* **10**, 1604-1609 (2015).
20. Mishima, E., *et al.* A non-canonical vitamin K cycle is a potent ferroptosis suppressor. *Nature* **608**, 778-783 (2022).
21. Seiler, A., *et al.* Glutathione peroxidase 4 senses and translates oxidative stress into 12/15-lipoxygenase dependent- and AIF-mediated cell death. *Cell Metab* **8**, 237-248 (2008).
22. Zilka, O., *et al.* On the Mechanism of Cytoprotection by Ferrostatin-1 and Liproxstatin-1 and the Role of Lipid Peroxidation in Ferroptotic Cell Death. *ACS Cent Sci* **3**, 232-243 (2017).

23. Jiang, X., Stockwell, B.R. & Conrad, M. Ferroptosis: mechanisms, biology and role in
disease. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol* **22**, 266-282 (2021).

24. Nakamura, T.*, et al.* Phase separation of FSP1 promotes ferroptosis. *Nature* **619**, 371-377
(2023).

25. Eaton, J.K.*, et al.* Selective covalent targeting of GPX4 using masked nitrile-oxide
electrophiles. *Nat Chem Biol* **16**, 497-506 (2020).

26. Yang, W.S. & Stockwell, B.R. Synthetic lethal screening identifies compounds activating
iron-dependent, nonapoptotic cell death in oncogenic-RAS-harboring cancer cells. *Chem*
Biol **15**, 234-245 (2008).

27. Xavier da Silva, T.N., Schulte, C., Alves, A.N., Maric, H.M. & Friedmann Angeli, J.P.
Molecular characterization of AIFM2/FSP1 inhibition by iFSP1-like molecules. *Cell*
Death Dis **14**, 281 (2023).

28. Hendricks, J.M.*, et al.* Identification of structurally diverse FSP1 inhibitors that sensitize
cancer cells to ferroptosis. *Cell Chem Biol* **30**, 1090-1103 e1097 (2023).

29. Nakamura, T.*, et al.* Integrated chemical and genetic screens unveil FSP1 mechanisms of
ferroptosis regulation. *Nat Struct Mol Biol* **30**, 1806-1815 (2023).

30. Yoshioka, H.*, et al.* Identification of a Small Molecule That Enhances Ferroptosis via
Inhibition of Ferroptosis Suppressor Protein 1 (FSP1). *ACS Chem Biol* **17**, 483-491 (2022).

31. Sanchez-Rivera, F.J.*, et al.* Rapid modelling of cooperating genetic events in cancer
through somatic genome editing. *Nature* **516**, 428-431 (2014).

32. Ding, H.*, et al.* Activation of the NRF2 antioxidant program sensitizes tumors to G6PD
inhibition. *Sci Adv* **7**, eabk1023 (2021).

33. Lignitto, L.*, et al.* Nrf2 Activation Promotes Lung Cancer Metastasis by Inhibiting the
Degradation of Bach1. *Cell* **178**, 316-329.e318 (2019).

34. Romero, R.*, et al.* Keap1 loss promotes Kras-driven lung cancer and results in dependence
on glutaminolysis. *Nat Med* **23**, 1362-1368 (2017).

35. Best, S.A.*, et al.* Distinct initiating events underpin the immune and metabolic
heterogeneity of KRAS-mutant lung adenocarcinoma. *Nat Commun* **10**, 4190 (2019).

36. Takahashi, N.*, et al.* 3D Culture Models with CRISPR Screens Reveal Hyperactive NRF2
as a Prerequisite for Spheroid Formation via Regulation of Proliferation and Ferroptosis.
Mol Cell **80**, 828-844 e826 (2020).

37. Zou, Y.*, et al.* A GPX4-dependent cancer cell state underlies the clear-cell morphology and
confers sensitivity to ferroptosis. *Nat Commun* **10**, 1617 (2019).

38. Vidigal, J.A. & Ventura, A. Rapid and efficient one-step generation of paired gRNA
CRISPR-Cas9 libraries. *Nat Commun* **6**, 8083 (2015).

39. Ingold, I.*, et al.* Selenium Utilization by GPX4 Is Required to Prevent Hydroperoxide-
Induced Ferroptosis. *Cell* **172**, 409-422 e421 (2018).

40. Cancer Genome Atlas Research, N. Comprehensive molecular profiling of lung
adenocarcinoma. *Nature* **511**, 543-550 (2014).

41. Muller, F.*, et al.* Elevated FSP1 protects KRAS-mutated cells from ferroptosis during
tumor initiation. *Cell Death Differ* **30**, 442-456 (2023).

42. Koppula, P.*, et al.* A targetable CoQ-FSP1 axis drives ferroptosis- and radiation-resistance
in KEAP1 inactive lung cancers. *Nat Commun* **13**, 2206 (2022).

43. Zavitsanou, A.M.*, et al.* KEAP1 mutation in lung adenocarcinoma promotes immune
evasion and immunotherapy resistance. *Cell Rep* **42**, 113295 (2023).

775 44. Wu, K., El Zowalaty, A.E., Sayin, V.I. & Papagiannakopoulos, T. The pleiotropic
776   functions of reactive oxygen species in cancer. *Nat Cancer* **5**, 384-399 (2024).
777 45. Cheung, E.C. & Vousden, K.H. The role of ROS in tumour development and progression.
778   *Nat Rev Cancer* **22**, 280-297 (2022).
779 46. Yant, L.J.*, et al.* The selenoprotein GPX4 is essential for mouse development and protects
780   from radiation and oxidative damage insults. *Free Radic Biol Med* **34**, 496-502 (2003).
781 47. Mei, J., Webb, S., Zhang, B. & Shu, H.B. The p53-inducible apoptotic protein AMID is
782   not required for normal development and tumor suppression. *Oncogene* **25**, 849-856
783   (2006).
784 48. Nguyen, H.P.*, et al.* Aifm2, a NADH Oxidase, Supports Robust Glycolysis and Is Required
785   for Cold- and Diet-Induced Thermogenesis. *Mol Cell* **77**, 600-617 e604 (2020).
786 49. Drijvers, J.M.*, et al.* Pharmacologic Screening Identifies Metabolic Vulnerabilities of
787   CD8(+) T Cells. *Cancer Immunol Res* **9**, 184-199 (2021).
788 50. Matsushita, M.*, et al.* T cell lipid peroxidation induces ferroptosis and prevents immunity
789   to infection. *J Exp Med* **212**, 555-568 (2015).
790

 Main Figure Legends

Fig. 1: Gpx4 loss triggers ferroptosis in lung tumors

(a) Schematic of KP LUAD GEMMs intratracheally infected with pUSEC lentiviruses containing

dual sgRNAs targeting Neo (control; n=13) or Gpx4 (n=13). Mice were dosed with Liproxstatin-

1 (LIP1; sg*Neo* n=6, sg*Gpx4* n=7) or Vehicle (Veh; sg*Neo* n=6, sg*Gpx4* n=7) every other day

starting from tumor initiation to experiment endpoint. **(b)** Tumor burden of KP LUAD tumors with

control (sg*Neo*) or Gpx4 (sg*Gpx4*) knockout, treated with either Veh or LIP1. **(c)** Representative

MRI of KP LUAD tumors with control (sg*Neo*) or Gpx4 (sg*Gpx4*) knockout, treated with either

Veh or LIP1. **(d)** Representative H&E of KP LUAD tumors with control (sg*Neo*) or Gpx4

(sg*Gpx4*) knockout, treated with either Veh or LIP1. Scale bars: 2000μm. **(e)** Tumor 4-HNE

expression by IHC of KP LUAD tumors with control (sg*Neo*) or Gpx4 (sg*Gpx4*) knockout, treated

with either Veh or LIP1. **(f)** Representative 4-HNE IHC staining from (e). Scale bars: 20μm. Data

are represented as mean values, error bars represent SEM, significance determined via one-way

ANOVA with multiple comparisons (panels b, e).

Fig. 2: Fsp1 knockout robustly restricts lung tumorigenesis

(a) Schematic depicting mechanisms of Fsp1- and Gpx4-mediated buffering against cellular lipid

peroxidation and ferroptosis. **(b)** Overall survival of *KRAS*-mutant LUAD patients (n=280) from

TCGA, stratified by high versus low primary tumor *FSP1* (*AIFM2*) expression. Median survival

for FSP1 high versus low was 1215 days and 1498 days, respectively (hazard ratio 1.51 [1.01-

2.25]). **(c)** Representative IHC for Fsp1 and Gpx4 in KP LUAD GEMM adenomas versus

adenocarcinomas. Scale bars: 100μm. **(d)** Tumor Fsp1 expression by IHC of KP LUAD GEMM

tumors at 10- versus 14-weeks post tumor initiation. **(e)** Schematic of KP LUAD GEMMs

intratracheally infected with pUSEC lentiviruses containing double sgRNAs targeting control

(Neo; n=4), Fsp1 (n=6), or Gpx4 (n=6). **(f)** Tumor burden of KP LUAD tumors with knockout of

either control (Neo), Fsp1, or Gpx4. **(g)** Representative H&E of KP LUAD tumors with knockout

of either control (Neo), Fsp1, or Gpx4. Scale bars: 2000μm. **(h)** Relative proportion of KP

adenomas versus adenocarcinomas with knockout of either control (Neo), Fsp1, or Gpx4. **(i)**

Representative TUNEL staining of KP, Fsp1^{KO} and Fsp1^{WT} orthotopic lung tumors. Scale bars:

50μm **(j)** Schematic depicting generation of isogenic Fsp1-wildtype (Fsp1^{WT}) versus Fsp1-

knockout (Fsp1^{KO}) cells for paralleled *in vitro* assays and *in vivo* syngeneic orthotopic

transplantation studies. **(k)** Representative images of crystal violet clonogenic growth assay in

isogenic KP, Fsp1^{KO} and Fsp1^{WT} cells treated with RSL3 (0.5μM) ± LIP1 (100nM). **(l)** Tumor

burden of KP, Fsp1^{KO} (n=8) and Fsp1^{WT} (n=7) orthotopic lung tumors. **(m)** Representative H&E

of KP, Fsp1^{KO} and Fsp1^{WT} orthotopic lung tumors. Scale bars: 2000μm. Data are represented as

mean values, error bars represent SEM, significance determined via two-sided student's t-test

(panels d and l), one-way ANOVA with multiple comparisons (panel f) or Kaplan-Meier simple

survival analysis (panel b).

Fig. 3: Sensitivity to FSP1 loss is not dependent on tumor mutations or lineage

Longitudinal tumor growth and endpoint tumor weights from indicated cell lines with

CRISPR/Cas9-mediated knockout of FSP1 (sg*FSP1*) or control (sg*TOM*, sg*Neo*), transplanted as

subcutaneous (subQ) xenograft tumors into NSG mice: **(a)** H2009, sg*FSP1* (n=8) or control (n=8).

(b) H1299, sg*FSP1* (n=9) or control (n=9). **(c)** PC9, sg*FSP1* (n=9) or control (n=9). **(d)** H1975,

sg*FSP1* (n=8) or control (n=9). **(e)** A549, sg*FSP1* (n=9) or control (n=10). **(f)** 16645, sg*Fsp1*(n=7)

or control (n=9). **(g)** KPC7 (murine PDAC), sg*Fsp1* (n=9) or control (n=10). Data are represented

as mean values, error bars represent SEM, significance determined via two-sided student's t test

(panels a-g)

Fig. 4: FSP1 is required for the suppression of ferroptosis *in vivo*

(a) Heatmap of indicated oxidized PE/PC lipid species detected via LC/MS from KP, Fsp1^{KO} and

Fsp1^{WT} orthotopic lung tumors. **(b)** Longitudinal growth of KP, Gpx4^{KO} subQ xenograft tumors

with Fsp1^{OE} (n=10) versus control (empty^{OE}, n=9) in C57BL/6J mice. **(c)** Longitudinal growth of

KP, Fsp1^{KO} subQ xenograft tumors with either Fsp1 restoration (Fsp1^{WT}, n=9), Gpx4

overexpression (Gpx4^{OE}, n=8), or controls (empty^{OE}, n=9; Fsp1^{KO} n=8) in C57BL/6J mice. **(d)**

Ratio of CoQ$_9$H$_2$/CoQ$_9$ detected via LC/MS in KP, Fsp1^{KO} and Fsp1^{WT} orthotopic lung tumors

versus cells treated with DMSO or RSL3 (0.5 μM) for 8 hours. **(e)** Schematic depicting Acsl4's

pro-ferroptotic function. **(f)** Tumor burden in C57BL/6J mice with KP, Fsp1^{KO} and Fsp1^{WT}

orthotopic lung tumors with CRISPR/Cas9-mediated Acsl4 or control (Neo) deletion (WT n=5,

Acsl4^{KO} n=4, Fsp1^{KO} n=7, Fsp1^{KO}Acsl4^{KO} n=7). **(g)** Schematic depicting dietary Vitamin E (VitE)

manipulation studies in (h) and (i). **(h)** Longitudinal lung tumor growth (measured via

bioluminescence normalized to first timepoint) in C57BL/6J mice orthotopically transplanted with

KP, Fsp1^{KO} cells and receiving high (n=8) or low (n=7) VitE diets *ad libitum* 5 days pre-tumor

initiation. **(i)** Longitudinal lung tumor growth (measured via bioluminescence) in C57BL/6J mice

orthotopically transplanted with KP, Fsp1^{KO} cells and placed on high (n=6) or low (n=6) VitE diets

ad libitum after tumor establishment (day18). **(j)** Schematic of KP LUAD GEMMs intratracheally

infected with pUSEC lentiviruses containing double sgRNAs targeting Neo (control, n=12) or

Fsp1 (n=12). Mice were dosed with Liproxstatin-1 (LIP1, n=6 per genotype) or Vehicle (Veh, n=6

per genotype) daily starting 5 weeks post-tumor initiation. **(k)** Tumor burden of experiment in (j).

(l) Representative H&E of tumors of experiment in (j). Scale bars: 100µm. Data are represented as mean values, error bars represent SEM, significance determined via two-sided student's t test (panel b, d, f, h, i, k) or two-way ANOVA with Tukey's multiple comparison test (panel c).

Fig. 5: FSP1 is a viable therapeutic target for *KRAS*-mutant lung adenocarcinoma

(a) Overall survival of C57BL/6J mice with orthotopic lung tumors with Fsp1^{KO} (n=7) or hFSP1 re-expression, treated with either icFSP1 (n=8) or Vehicle (n=7). **(b)** Longitudinal lung tumor growth (measured via bioluminescence) in C57BL/6J mice orthotopically transplanted with hFSP1^{WT} cells and treated with either Vehicle (n=8), LIP1 (n=7), icFSP1 (n=8), or icFSP1+LIP1 (n=8). **(c)** Overall survival of C57BL/6J mice with Fsp1^{KO} (n=5), hFSP1^{WT}, or hFSP1^{Q319K}-expressing tumors, treated with icFSP1 (hFSP1^{WT}, n=5; hFSP1^{Q319K}, n=7) or Vehicle (hFSP1^{WT}, n=7; hFSP1^{Q319K}, n=7). **(d)** Longitudinal growth of PDX LX465 tumors treated with icFSP1 (n=10) or Vehicle (n=10) in NSG mice. Data are represented as mean values, error bars represent SEM, significance determined via two-way ANOVA with Tukey's multiple comparisons test (panel b), two-sided student's t-test (panel d), or Kaplan-Meier simple survival analysis (panels a, c).

Extended Data Figure Legends

Extended Data Fig. 1: Gpx4 is required by lung cancer cells

(a) Quantification and representative images of Gpx4 IHC in KP LUAD GEMM tumors with

knockout of either control (Neo, n=11) or Gpx4 (n=12). Scale bars: 200μm. **(b)** Representative 4-

hydroxy-2-noneal (4-HNE) IHC of liver tissue from conditional *Gpx4*-knockout mice. Scale bars:

100μm. **(c)** Top: Western blot of KP LUAD cells with CRISPR/Cas9-mediated genetic deletion

of Gpx4 with either two individual or duplexed sgRNAs. Bottom: Representative images of crystal

violet clonogenic assay of KP LUAD cells with knockout of either control (Neo) or Gpx4. Cells

were treated with 100nM LIP1. **(d)** Heatmap of LC-MS detection of oxidized phospholipids in KP

LUAD cells treated with DMSO control, RSL3 (0.5μM), and RSL3 (0.5μM) + LIP1 (100nM) for

8 hours. **(e)** Schematic of Gpx4 ectopic overexpression (OE) method in KP LUAD cells. Western

blot and representative images of crystal violet clonogenic assay of KP LUAD cells with wildtype

(WT) or OE of Gpx4. **(f)** CellTiter-Glo Luminescence viability assay of KP, Gpx4^{WT} or Gpx4^{OE}

cells upon increasing concentrations of RSL3 (n=5 per group). **(g)** Western blot of KP LUAD cells

treated with 20nM Na_2SeO_3 or DMSO. CellTiter-Glo Luminescence viability assay of KP LUAD

cells treated with 20nM Na_2SeO_3 or DMSO with increasing RSL3 addition (n=5 per group). **(h)**

GPX4 expression in *KRAS*-mutant primary LUAD tumors from TCGA, divided into early and late

tumor stages (normal lung, n=54; stage I/II, n=354; stage III/IV, n=98). **(i)** Overall survival of

KRAS-mutant LUAD patients (n=464) from TCGA, stratified by high vs low tumor *GPX4*

expression. **(j)** Tumor Gpx4 IHC quantification of KP LUAD GEMM tumors at 10 weeks (n=4)

vs 14 weeks (n=4) post-tumor initiation. Box plots indicate median (middle line), 25th, 75th

percentile (box) and 5th and 95th percentile (whiskers). Data are represented as mean values, error

bars represent SEM, significance determined via one-way ANOVA with multiple comparisons

(panel h), two-sided student's t-test (panel j) or Kaplan-Meier simple survival analysis (panel i).

For gel source data, see Supplementary Data 1.

Extended Data Fig. 2: FSP1's anti-ferroptotic function is not dependent on oncogenic

signaling

(a) *FSP1* (*AIFM2*) expression of *KRAS*-mutant primary LUAD tumors from TCGA, divided into

early and late tumor stages (normal lung, n=54; stage I/II, n=354; III/IV, n=98). **(b)** *FSP1* (*AIFM2*)

expression of *KRAS*-mutant primary LUAD tumors from TCGA, separated by the *KRAS* mutation

(G12C n=51; G12V n=32; G12D n=17; G12A n=16; other n=20). **(c)** *FSP1* (*AIFM2*) expression

of primary LUAD tumors from TCGA, separated by oncogenic driver mutation (normal lung,

n=59; EGFR, n=71; KRAS, n=135; other n=307). **(d)** Western blot of KP LUAD human cell lines

treated with 50nM RMC-042 for indicated durations. **(e)** Representative multi-IF images of KP

tumors for markers indicated. Panels are 10X, scale bars: 50μm; insets are 20X, scale bars: 20μm.

(f) *FSP1* (*AIFM2*) expression of *KRAS*-mutant primary LUAD tumors from TCGA, separated by

tumor co-mutation status (*KEAP1/STK11* WT n=88; *STK11* mutant n=20; *KEAP1* mutant n=16;

KEAP1/STK11 mutant n=11). **(g)** *FSP1* (*AIFM2*) expression in KP LUAD human cell lines treated

with an Nrf2 activator, KI696, for 5 days (n=3 per group). Box plots indicate median (middle line),

25th, 75th percentile (box) and 5th and 95th percentile (whiskers). Data are represented as mean

values, error bars represent SEM, significance determined via one-way ANOVA with multiple

comparisons (panels a, b, c, f, g). For gel source data, see Supplementary Data 1.

Extended Data Fig. 3: Neither Fsp1 nor Gpx4 have an impact on tumor initiation,

proliferation, or apoptosis

(a) Quantification and representative images of tumor Fsp1 IHC in KP LUAD GEMMs with knockout of either control (Neo, n=11) or Fsp1 (n=14). Scale bars: 100μm. **(b)** Tumor number quantification in KP LUAD GEMMs with tumor-specific knockout of either control (Neo, n=4), Fsp1 (n=7), or Gpx4 (n=6). **(c)** Individual area of KP LUAD GEMM tumors with knockout of either control (Neo, n=465), Fsp1 (n=453), or Gpx4 (n=384). **(d)** Quantification of Ki67 IHC of KP LUAD GEMM tumors with knockout of either control (Neo, n=355), Fsp1 (n=268), or Gpx4 (n=291). **(e)** Quantification of cleaved caspase-3 IHC of KP LUAD GEMM tumors with knockout of either control (Neo, n=46), Fsp1 (n=22), or Gpx4 (n=52). Data are represented as mean values, error bars represent SEM, significance determined via one-way ANOVA with multiple comparisons (panels b-e).

Extended Data Fig. 4: Fsp1 is required for cell-autonomous tumor growth *in vivo*

(a) Top: Western blot of KP LUAD cells with CRISPR/Cas9-mediated genetic deletion of Fsp1 with either two individual or duplexed sgRNAs. Bottom: Representative images of crystal violet clonogenic assay of KP LUAD cells with knockout of either control (Neo) or Fsp1. Cells were treated with 100nM LIP1. **(b)** Schematic depicting all transplantation models performed using isogenic KP, Fsp1^{KO} and Fsp1^{WT}. **(c, d)** Longitudinal growth and endpoint tumor weights of KP sg*Fsp1* (n=8) versus control (sg*Neo* n=10) subcutaneous (subQ) xenograft tumor transplanted into C57BL/6J male mice. **(e)** Longitudinal lung tumor growth (measured via bioluminescence) in C57BL/6J male mice orthotopically transplanted with KP LUAD cells with CRISPR/Cas9-mediated knockout of Fsp1 (n=8) or control (n=7). **(f)** Longitudinal lung tumor growth (measured via bioluminescence normalized to first timepoint (day 7)) in C57BL/6J male mice orthotopically transplanted with isogenic KP, Fsp1^{KO} (n=6) and Fsp1^{WT} (n=7) cells. **(g)** Longitudinal lung tumor

growth (measured via absolute bioluminescence) in NU/J immunocompromised mice

orthotopically transplanted with isogenic KP, Fsp1^{KO} (n=6) and Fsp1^{WT} (n=7) cells. **(h)**

Longitudinal lung tumor growth (measured via absolute bioluminescence) in C57BL/6J female

mice with orthotopic transplantation of isogenic KP, Fsp1^{KO} (n=8) and Fsp1^{WT} (n=8) cells. **(i)**

Longitudinal tumor growth and endpoint tumor weights of either isogenic KP, Fsp1^{KO} or Fsp1^{WT}

subcutaneous (subQ) xenograft tumors transplanted in either C57BL/6J WT (Fsp1^{KO}, male n=10

female n=10; Fsp1^{WT}, male n=8, female n=10) or C57BL/6J *Fsp1*-knockout mice (Fsp1^{KO}, males

n=12, females n=12; Fsp1^{WT}, male n=10, female n=10). **(j)** Western blot of KP LUAD cells with

wildtype (WT) or overexpression (OE) of Fsp1. Representative images of crystal violet clonogenic

assay of KP LUAD cells with Fsp1^{WT} or Fsp1^{OE}. **(k)** CellTiter-Glo Luminescence viability assay

of KP, Fsp1^{WT} or Fsp1^{OE} cells (5 biological replicates per group) with increasing concentrations

of RSL3. **(l, m)** Longitudinal growth and endpoint weights of KP Fsp1^{WT} (n=10) or Fsp1^{OE} (n=10)

subcutaneous (subQ) xenograft tumor transplanted into C57BL/6J male mice. Data are represented

as mean values, error bars represent SEM, significance determined via one-way ANOVA with

multiple comparisons (panel i), two-way ANOVA with Tukey's multiple comparisons test (panels

c, e, f, g, h, l), or two-sided student's t-test (panels d, m). For gel source data, see Supplementary

Data 1.

Extended Data Fig. 5: FSP1 loss *in vitro* does not induce ferroptosis without RSL3

(a) Top: Western blot; Bottom: baseline growth (normalized to control); and Right: CellTiter-Glo

Luminescence viability assay of H2009 cells with the lentiviral addition of Cas9 and guide RNAs

targeting FSP1 or a non-targeting control (TOM) (at least 4 biological replicates per group).

Viability assay is upon increasing concentrations of RSL3. **(b)** As in (a), but with H1299 cells. **(c)**

As in (a), but with PC9 cells. **(d)** As in (a), but with H1975 cells. **(e)** As in (a), but with A549 cells.

(f) As in (a), but with 16645 cells. **(g)** As in (a), but with KPC7 cells. Data are represented as mean

values, error bars represent SEM, significance determined via two-sided student's t-test (panels a-

g). For gel source data, see Supplementary Data 1.

Extended Data Fig. 6: Fsp1 loss promotes tumor cell ferroptosis

(a) Western blot of KP, Gpx4^{KO} LUAD cells with either empty vector (—) or Fsp1^{OE}. **(b)** Western

blot of KP, Fsp1^{KO} LUAD cells with re-expression of either empty vector (—), Fsp1^{WT}, Gpx4^{OE}.

(c) CellTiter-Glo Luminescence viability assay of KP, Fsp1^{KO} LUAD cells in (b) upon increasing

concentrations of RSL3. **(d)** Endpoint tumor weights of subcutaneous (subQ) xenograft tumors

from indicated cell lines transplanted in C57BL/6J female mice (control n=10; Fsp1^{WT}, n=9;

Gpx4^{OE}; n=8). **(e)** Top: Western blot of KP, Fsp1^{KO} LUAD cells with re-expression of either

empty vector (—), wildtype (WT) Fsp1, or mutant (mut) Fsp1. Bottom: Representative images of

crystal violet clonogenic assay. **(f)** CellTiter-Glo Luminescence viability assay of KP, Fsp1^{KO}

LUAD cells with re-expression of either empty vector (Fsp1^{KO}), Fsp1^{WT}, or Fsp1^{mut} upon

increasing concentrations of RSL3. LIP1 used at 100nM. **(g)** Longitudinal tumor growth

(measured via bioluminescence normalized to initial imaging timepoint (day14)) in C57BL/6J

male mice orthotopically transplanted with isogenic KP, Fsp1^{KO} LUAD cells with re-expression

of either empty control vector (Fsp1^{KO}, n=7), Fsp1^{WT} (n=7), or Fsp1^{mut} (n=7). **(h)** Representative

images of crystal violet clonogenic assay of KP, Fsp1^{WT} or Fsp1^{KO} LUAD cells with

CRISPR/Cas9- mediated knockout of control (Neo) or Acsl4. **(i)** Longitudinal tumor growth

(measured by bioluminescence) of C57BL/6J male mice with orthotopic transplantation of

isogenic KP, Fsp1^{KO} and Fsp1^{WT} cells with CRISPR/Cas9-mediated knockout of control (Neo) or

Acsl4 (WT, n=5; Acsl4^{KO}, n=4; Fsp1^{KO}, n=7; Fsp1^{KO}Acsl4^{KO}, n=7). **(j)** Representative H&E of

experiment in (i). Scale bars: 1000µm. **(k)** Overall survival of C57BL/6J male mice with orthotopic

transplantation of isogenic KP, Fsp1^{KO} and Fsp1^{WT} cells with CRISPR/Cas9-mediated knockout

of control (Neo) or Acsl4 (n=5 per group). **(l)** Longitudinal tumor growth (measured via

bioluminescence normalized to first imaging timepoint (day7)) of C57BL/6J mice orthotopically

transplanted with KP, Fsp1^{WT} cells and receiving high (n=6) or low (n=5) VitE diets *ad libitum* 5

days pre-tumor initiation. **(m)** Tumor bioluminescence signal normalized to first imaging

timepoint (day7) of C57BL/6J mice orthotopically transplanted with KP, Fsp1^{KO} cells and

receiving Liproxstatin-1 (LIP1, n=7) or Vehicle (Veh, n=5) daily after tumor establishment. **(n)**

Schematic of KP LUAD GEMMs intratracheally infected with pUSEC lentiviruses containing dual

sgRNAs targeting Fsp1. Mice were dosed with LIP1 (n=6) or Vehicle (Veh, n=6) every other day

starting from tumor initiation. **(o)** Tumor burden of KP LUAD GEMMs with CRISPR/Cas9-

mediated knockout of Fsp1 and treated with Veh or LIP1. **(p)** Representative H&E and 4-HNE

IHC of KP LUAD GEMM tumors with knockout of Fsp1 and treated with Veh or LIP1. Scale

bars: 1000µm. Data are represented as mean values, error bars represent SEM, significance

determined via one-way ANOVA (panel d), two-way ANOVA with Tukey's multiple comparisons

(panels g, i, l, m), two-sided student's t-test (panel o), or Kaplain-Meier simple survival analysis

(panel k). For gel source data, see Supplementary Data 1.

1016

1017   **Extended Data Fig. 7: icFSP1 exerts on-target tumor-suppressive effect**

1018   **(a)** Top: Western blot of KP, Fsp1^{KO} LUAD cells with re-expression of either empty vector (—),

1019   wildtype (WT) hFSP1, or Q319K-mutant hFSP1. Bottom: Representative images of crystal violet

1020   clonogenic assay. **(b)** Cell-TiterGlo Luminescence viability assay of KP, Fsp1^{KO} LUAD cells with

re-expression of either empty vector (—), WT hFSP1, or Q319K-mutant hFSP1. **(c)** CellTiter-Glo Luminescence viability assay of human or mouse Fsp1^{WT}-expressing cells upon RSL3 (0.2μM) plus increasing concentrations of iFSP1. **(d)** CellTiter-Glo Luminescence viability assay as in (c) but with FSEN1. **(e)** CellTiter-Glo Luminescence viability assay of human or mouse Fsp1^{WT}-expressing cells upon increasing concentrations of icFSP1. **(f)** CellTiter-Glo Luminescence viability assay of WT or Q319K-mutant hFSP1-expressing cells upon RSL3 (0.2μM) plus increasing concentrations of icFSP1. **(g)** Longitudinal tumor growth (measured via bioluminescence normalized to first imaging timepoint (day7)) in C57BL/6J mice orthotopically transplanted with isogenic KP, Fsp1^{KO} cells with re-expression of either human FSP1 (hFSP1, n=5), mouse Fsp1 (mFsp1, n=6), or control (n=6) vector. **(h)** Tumor burden and representative H&E of KP, Fsp1^{KO} (n=4) and hFSP1^{WT} (n=4) orthotopic lung tumors. Scale bars: 1000μm. **(i)** Representative H&E of KP, hFSP1^{WT} orthotopic lung tumors from indicated treatment groups. Scale bar: 2000μm. **(j)** Percent of T cells, alveolar macrophages, interstitial macrophages, and neutrophils of total CD45+ cells in tumor bearing lungs from mice treated with the indicated compounds for two weeks (Veh, n=7; LIP1, n=7; icFSP1, n=9; icFSP1+LIP1, n=6). **(k)** Graphical summary depicting ferroptosis as a barrier to lung cancer, as loss of either Fsp1 or Gpx4 induces tumor cell ferroptosis and restricts disease progression. **(l)** Summary table of cell lines, their respective tumor lineage, and mutations where Fsp1 loss resulted in tumor suppression *in vivo*. For all Cell-TiterGlo assays, n=5 biological replicates per group. Data are represented as mean values, error bars represent SEM, significance determined via one-way ANOVA with multiple comparisons (panels g, j) or student's t test (panel h). For gel source data, see Supplementary Data 1.

Fig. 1: Gpx4 loss triggers ferroptosis in lung tumors

a

U6 → sgNeo$_1$ → U6 → sgNeo$_2$ → EFS → Cre

or

U6 → sgGpx4$_1$ → U6 → sgGpx4$_2$ → EFS → Cre

GEMM:
Kras$^{LSL-G12D/+}$; Tp53$^{fl/fl}$;
Rosa26$^{LSL-Cas9-P2A-GFP}$

LIP1 or Vehicle

day: 0 2 4 6 112

Tumor initiation

Endpoint
tumor burden and
lipid peroxidation analyses

b

Tumor burden (%)

0.0033
0.1587
0.0012

Veh LIP1 Veh LIP1
sg*Neo*   sg*Gpx4*

c Kras$^{G12D/+}$; Tp53$^{-/-}$; Rosa26^{Cas9GFP}

sg*Neo* | sg*Neo*+LIP1

sg*Gpx4* | sg*Gpx4*+LIP1

d Kras$^{G12D/+}$; Tp53$^{-/-}$; Rosa26^{Cas9GFP}

sg*Neo* | sg*Neo*+LIP1

H&E

sg*Gpx4* | sg*Gpx4*+LIP1

e

Tumor 4-HNE staining
(% positive cells per tumor)

<0.0001
<0.0001
<0.0001

Veh LIP1 Veh LIP1
sg*Neo*   sg*Gpx4*

f Kras$^{G12D/+}$; Tp53$^{-/-}$; Rosa26^{Cas9GFP}

sg*Neo* | sg*Neo*+LIP1

IHC:4-HNE

sg*Gpx4* | sg*Gpx4*+LIP1

Fig. 2: Fsp1 knockout robustly restricts lung tumorigenesis

Fig. 3: Sensitivity to FSP1 loss is not dependent on tumor mutations or lineage

Fig. 4: FSP1 is required for the suppression of ferroptosis *in vivo*

a Truncated oxPC, Truncated oxPE, oxPC oxPE heatmap comparing Fsp1^WT and Fsp1^KO, z-score scale from -2 to 2.

b Gpx4^KO tumor volume (mm³) vs Days post-injection, +Fsp1^OE and +empty^OE, p = 0.015.

c Fsp1^KO tumor volume (mm³) vs Days post-injection, +Gpx4^OE, +empty^OE, +Fsp1^WT, +control. p-values: 0.9386, <0.0001, 0.0002, <0.0001, 0.6191.

d [CoQ₉H₂]/[CoQ] for Fsp1^WT/Fsp1^KO Tumors (0.0487), Fsp1^KO cells DMSO/RSL3 (0.0094, >0.9999), Fsp1^WT cells DMSO/RSL3 (0.8540).

e Pathway diagram: PUFA, ACSL4, PUFA-CoA, LPCAT3, PUFA-PL, α-TOH, CoQ₁₀(H), FSP1, CoQ₁₀H₂, α-TOH•, VitE or LIP1 lipid RTAs, PUFA•, PUFA-OO•, PUFA-OOH, Ferroptosis & restricted tumorigenesis.

f Tumor burden (%) for Fsp1/Acsl4 WT/WT, WT/KO, KO/WT, KO/KO. p-values: 0.752, <0.0001, 0.059, 0.001.

g High Vitamin E diet or Low Vitamin E diet, 5 days, Tumor initiation, Tumors established, 18 days, Normal chow, High VitE diet or Low VitE diet.

h Relative tumor growth (luminescence fold change) vs Days post-injection, High VitE and Low VitE, Fsp1^KO, p = 0.010.

i Tumor growth (luminescence (p/s)) vs Days post-injection, High VitE and Low VitE, Fsp1^KO, Diet swap, p = 0.041.

j U6-sgNeo₁-U6-sgNeo₂-EFS-Cre or U6-sgFsp1₁-U6-sgFsp1₂-EFS-Cre, GEMM: Kras^LSL-G12D/+; Tp53^fl/fl; Rosa26^LSL-Cas9-P2A-GFP. LIP1 (10 mg/kg), day: 0 Tumor initiation, 36, 40, 95 Endpoint tumor burden and lipid peroxidation analyses.

k Tumor burden (%) for Veh/LIP1 sgNeo and Veh/LIP1 sgFsp1. p-values: 0.1752, 0.0023, 0.0391.

l Kras^G12D/+; Tp53^-/-; Rosa26^Cas9GFP, H&E, sgNeo, sgNeo+LIP1, sgFsp1, sgFsp1+LIP1.

Fig. 5: FSP1 is a viable therapeutic target for *KRAS*-mutant lung adenocarcinoma

Extended Data Fig. 1: Gpx4 is required by lung cancer cells

Extended Data Fig. 2: FSP1's anti-ferroptotic function is not dependent on oncogenic signaling

Extended Data Fig. 3: Neither Fsp1 nor Gpx4 have an impact on tumor initiation, proliferation, or apoptosis

Extended Data Fig. 4: Fsp1 is required for cell-autonomous tumor growth *in vivo*

Extended Data Fig. 5: FSP1 loss *in vitro* does not induce ferroptosis without RSL3

a H2009

sg*TOM*: + —
sg*FSP1*: — +

90kDa— HSP90
41kDa— FSP1

Relative Viability 0.7319

H2009:
KRAS[G12A]
TP53[R273L]   IC50 (μM)
— sg*TOM*   1.433
— sg*FSP1*   0.114

Relative viability (%) vs [RSL3] μM

b H1299

sg*TOM*: + —
sg*FSP1*: — +

90kDa— HSP90
41kDa— FSP1

Relative Viability 0.6961

H1299:
NRAS[Q61L]
TP53[del]   IC50 (μM)
— sg*TOM*   0.4963
— sg*FSP1*   0.0003

Relative viability (%) vs [RSL3] μM

c PC9

sg*TOM*: + —
sg*FSP1*: — +

90kDa— HSP90
41kDa— FSP1

Relative Viability 0.9603

PC9:
EGFR[Exon19Del]
TP53[R258Q]   IC50 (μM)
— sg*TOM*   0.809
— sg*FSP1*   0.001

Relative viability (%) vs [RSL3] μM

d H1975

sg*TOM*: + —
sg*FSP1*: — +

90kDa— HSP90
41kDa— FSP1

0.6398

H1975:
EGFR[L858H,T790M]
TP53[R273H]
PI3KCA[G118D]   IC50 (μM)
— sg*TOM*   0.4310
— sg*FSP1*   0.0298

Relative viability (%) vs [RSL3] μM

e A549

sg*TOM*: + —
sg*FSP1*: — +

90kDa— HSP90
41kDa— FSP1

Relative Viability 0.9804

A549:
KRAS[G12S]
KEAP1[G333C]
STK11[Q37*]   IC50 (μM)
— sg*TOM*   0.510
— sg*FSP1*   0.006

Relative viability (%) vs [RSL3] μM

f 16645

sg*Neo*: + —
sg*Fsp1*: — +

90kDa— HSP90
41kDa— FSP1

Relative Viability 0.3016

16645:
Kras[G12D]
Stk11^{-/-}   IC50 (μM)
— sg*Neo*   0.353
— sg*Fsp1*   0.124

Relative viability (%) vs [RSL3] μM

g KPC7

sg*Neo*: + —
sg*Fsp1*: — +

90kDa— HSP90
41kDa— FSP1

Relative Viability 0.3622

KPC7:
Kras[G12D]
TP53^{-/-}
PDAC   IC50 (μM)
— sg*Neo*   1.073
— sg*Fsp1*   0.169

Relative viability (%) vs [RSL3] μM

Extended Data Fig. 6: Fsp1 loss promotes tumor cell ferroptosis

Extended Data Fig. 7: icFSP1 exerts on-target tumor-suppressive effect