# 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.

*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 that is triggered by uncontrolled lipid peroxidation. Despite broad enthusiasm about

harnessing ferroptosis as a novel anti-cancer strategy, it remains unknown whether ferroptosis is a

barrier to tumorigenesis and if it can be leveraged therapeutically. 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*) and

*ferroptosis suppressor protein 1* (*Fsp1*), and observed increased lipid peroxidation, ferroptosis 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 selectively

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. Moreover,

given the critical role of GPX4 in multiple tissues, there is a greater therapeutic window for

targeting FSP1. 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 to improve disease outcome 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)[1,2]. 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[3,4]. In recent years, growing interest in ferroptosis has elucidated key

mechanisms of lipid peroxidation regulation. Cells depend on several enzymes to protect against

ferroptosis[5-11], 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[12] and biosynthesis by Long-chain Acyl-CoA Synthase

4 (ACSL4)[13-15]. 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[1,6,16-18].

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

adopted a mesenchymal state[19,20], 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[21,22], 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[7,8,23]. However, given the high toxicity, poor

selectivity, and low to limited bioavailability of GPX4 inhibitors *in vivo*[24,25] as well as the only

recent development of FSP1 inhibitors, the majority of which do not have *in vivo* efficacy[7,23,26-29],

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

for cancer[30].

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 further 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. Given the prevalence and mortality rates of *KRAS*-mutant LUAD, as well the lack of

tractable pre-clinical models to effectively investigate tumor ferroptosis, our work utilizes novel

*in vivo* models to characterize and harness ferroptosis induction, particularly via FSP1

perturbation, as a therapeutic approach for lung cancer.

**Lung tumors require Gpx4 to prevent ferroptosis**

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[5,25,36,37]. 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)[16], 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$_2$SeO$_3$) 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 and prognostic of outcome**

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 Fsp1$^{KO}$ and Fsp1$^{WT}$ tumors revealed

increased cell death upon Fsp1 loss (Fig. 3l), which suggests 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 only essential for *in vivo* cancer cell growth**

The discovery of FSP1 as a key regulator of ferroptosis arose from genetic screens to identify ferroptosis suppressors in the absence of functional GPX4[7,8]. 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 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). Collectively, these studies provide strong evidence that

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

KP LUAD cells exhibited no *in vitro* growth advantage (Extended Data Fig. 4j), 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 is required for the growth of multiple genetic subtypes of LUAD and pancreatic cancer**

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 restriction restores Fsp1$^{KO}$ tumors**

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 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$_2$/CoQ9 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*[7,8], 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). Taken together, 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*[13-15]. 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 Figure 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 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.

**Pharmacologic inhibition of FSP1 promotes ferroptosis and suppresses tumor growth**

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

inhibitors have been developed[7,27], 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[23]. 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 to improve 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[16,47,48], 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*

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. 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). 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*

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. 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, $\geq 4$ mice were

used for each experimental condition. $Kras^{LSL\text{-}G12D/+}$; $Tp53^{fl/fl}$; $Rosa26^{LSL\text{-}Cas9/LSL\text{-}Cas9}$ (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 KO (Conrad group[16]) or

C57BL/6J (JAX strain #000664) mice. 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 in the following list:

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). For the

PDX experiment, tumors were implanted subcutaneously in NSG mice as previously described[34].

Tumors were measured by caliper, and volume was calculated based on 0.5 x length x width$^2$. For

orthotopic lung tumor experiments, 100,000 luciferase-expressing cells in 200µl of PBS were

injected intravenously into tail vein of mice. 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$_2$O) by intraperitoneal injection for length

of time 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.

*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.

*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, $1.0 \times 10^7$ 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, $2 \times 10^5$; 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. [51] 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.[52] 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. [51]

Data were analyzed using Skyline (v24.1). [53] 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 [54]. 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, $1.0 \times 10^7$ 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, $1 \times 10^6$; and

maximum injection time, 100ms. By using EL–MAVEN (v0.12.0), the LC-MS peaks of CoQ$_9$,

CoQ$_9$H$_2$, D$_6$-CoQ$_{10}$H$_2$, D$_6$-CoQ$_{10}$, and D$_9$-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$_9$H$_2$ and CoQ$_9$, and used to calculate the concentrations of CoQ$_9$H$_2$

and CoQ$_9$ in the samples fallowing an algorithm described in a previous study[54]

*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[41,53]. 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 antibodies listed in Table 1. Samples were run on the BD

LSRFortessa and analyzed on FlowJo version 10.

Table 1:

| Antigen | Fluorophore | Brand | Cat # | Clone |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| CD45 | PerCP/cy5.5 | Biolegend | 103132 | 30-F11 |
| CD11b | PE.CY7 | Biolegend | 101216 | M1/70 |
| CD11c | APC.Cy7 | Biolegend | 117324 | N418 |
| Ly6G | A700 | Biolegend | 127622 | 1A8 |
| MHCII | BUV737 | BD | 748708 | 2G9 |
| CD103 | BV605 | Biolegend | 121433 | clone 2E7 |
| CD64 | BV421 | Biolegend | 139309 | X54-5/7.1 |
| SiglecF | BV786 | BD | 740956 | E50-2440 |
| MertK | Biotin | R&D | BAF591 | AF591 |
| Secondary (Streptavidin) | BUV395 | BD | 564176 | - |
| CD45 | BUV737 | BD | 748371 | 30-F11 |
| CD3e | BV786 | BD | 740854 | eBio500A2 (500A2) |
| CD4 | Pacific blue | Invitrogen | MCD0428 | RM4-5 |
| CD8a | BV605 | EBioscience | 563152 | 53-6.7 |

*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%) with the rest of the cohort (n=464

patients). All survival analyses were conducted using the survival curve analyses in GraphPad

Prism v9.

*Statistics*

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.

**Data Availability**

Data is available from the corresponding author upon request.

**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 and 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 S10 OD021747.  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).  T.P. received funding from Pfizer Medical Education

Group, Dracen Pharmaceuticals, Kymera Therapeutics, Bristol Myers Squibb, and Agios

Pharmaceuticals not related to the submitted work. 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). M.C. is a co-founder and shareholder of

ROSCUE Therapeutics GmbH. M.C. and T.N. have filed patents for some of the compounds

described herein.

### 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.

**REFERENCES**

1.   Dixon, S.J., *et al.* Ferroptosis: an iron-dependent form of nonapoptotic cell death. *Cell* **149**, 1060-1072 (2012).
2.   Wiernicki, B., *et al.* Excessive phospholipid peroxidation distinguishes ferroptosis from other cell death modes including pyroptosis. *Cell Death Dis* **11**, 922 (2020).
3.   Conrad, M. & Pratt, D.A. The chemical basis of ferroptosis. *Nat Chem Biol* **15**, 1137-1147 (2019).
4.   Dixon, S.J. & Olzmann, J.A. The cell biology of ferroptosis. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol* **25**, 424-442 (2024).
5.   Yang, W.S., *et al.* Regulation of ferroptotic cancer cell death by GPX4. *Cell* **156**, 317-331 (2014).
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.   Doll, S., *et al.* FSP1 is a glutathione-independent ferroptosis suppressor. *Nature* **575**, 693-698 (2019).
8.   Bersuker, K., *et al.* The CoQ oxidoreductase FSP1 acts parallel to GPX4 to inhibit ferroptosis. *Nature* **575**, 688-692 (2019).
9.   Kraft, V.A.N., *et al.* GTP Cyclohydrolase 1/Tetrahydrobiopterin Counteract Ferroptosis through Lipid Remodeling. *ACS Cent Sci* **6**, 41-53 (2020).
10.  Soula, M., *et al.* Metabolic determinants of cancer cell sensitivity to canonical ferroptosis inducers. *Nat Chem Biol* **16**, 1351-1360 (2020).
11.  Garcia-Bermudez, J., *et al.* Squalene accumulation in cholesterol auxotrophic lymphomas prevents oxidative cell death. *Nature* **567**, 118-122 (2019).
12.  Qiu, B., *et al.* Phospholipids with two polyunsaturated fatty acyl tails promote ferroptosis. *Cell* **187**, 1177-1190 e1118 (2024).
13.  Kagan, V.E., *et al.* Oxidized arachidonic and adrenic PEs navigate cells to ferroptosis. *Nat Chem Biol* **13**, 81-90 (2017).
14.  Doll, S., *et al.* ACSL4 dictates ferroptosis sensitivity by shaping cellular lipid composition. *Nat Chem Biol* **13**, 91-98 (2017).
15.  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).
16.  Mishima, E., *et al.* A non-canonical vitamin K cycle is a potent ferroptosis suppressor. *Nature* **608**, 778-783 (2022).
17.  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).
18.  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).
19.  Viswanathan, V.S., *et al.* Dependency of a therapy-resistant state of cancer cells on a lipid peroxidase pathway. *Nature* **547**, 453-457 (2017).
20.  Hangauer, M.J., *et al.* Drug-tolerant persister cancer cells are vulnerable to GPX4 inhibition. *Nature* **551**, 247-250 (2017).
21.  Berndt, C., *et al.* Ferroptosis in health and disease. *Redox Biol* **75**, 103211 (2024).
22.  Jiang, X., Stockwell, B.R. & Conrad, M. Ferroptosis: mechanisms, biology and role in disease. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol* **22**, 266-282 (2021).

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

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

25. 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).

26. 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).

27. 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).

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

29. 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).

30. Nakamura, T. & Conrad, M. Exploiting ferroptosis vulnerabilities in cancer. *Nat Cell Biol* (2024).

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).

727    44.    Wu, K., El Zowalaty, A.E., Sayin, V.I. & Papagiannakopoulos, T. The pleiotropic
728           functions of reactive oxygen species in cancer. *Nat Cancer* **5**, 384-399 (2024).
729    45.    Cheung, E.C. & Vousden, K.H. The role of ROS in tumour development and progression.
730           *Nat Rev Cancer* **22**, 280-297 (2022).
731    46.    Yant, L.J.*, et al.* The selenoprotein GPX4 is essential for mouse development and protects
732           from radiation and oxidative damage insults. *Free Radic Biol Med* **34**, 496-502 (2003).
733    47.    Mei, J., Webb, S., Zhang, B. & Shu, H.B. The p53-inducible apoptotic protein AMID is
734           not required for normal development and tumor suppression. *Oncogene* **25**, 849-856
735           (2006).
736    48.    Nguyen, H.P.*, et al.* Aifm2, a NADH Oxidase, Supports Robust Glycolysis and Is Required
737           for Cold- and Diet-Induced Thermogenesis. *Mol Cell* **77**, 600-617 e604 (2020).
738    49.    Drijvers, J.M.*, et al.* Pharmacologic Screening Identifies Metabolic Vulnerabilities of
739           CD8(+) T Cells. *Cancer Immunol Res* **9**, 184-199 (2021).
740    50.    Matsushita, M.*, et al.* T cell lipid peroxidation induces ferroptosis and prevents immunity
741           to infection. *J Exp Med* **212**, 555-568 (2015).
742    51.    Criscuolo, A.*, et al.* Analytical and computational workflow for in-depth analysis of
743           oxidized complex lipids in blood plasma. *Nature Communications* **13**, 6547 (2022).
744    52.    Goracci, L.*, et al.* Lipostar, a Comprehensive Platform-Neutral Cheminformatics Tool for
745           Lipidomics. *Analytical Chemistry* **89**, 6257-6264 (2017).
746    53.    Adams, K.J.*, et al.* Skyline for Small Molecules: A Unifying Software Package for
747           Quantitative Metabolomics. *Journal of Proteome Research* **19**, 1447-1458 (2020).
748    54.    Kang, Y.P., Kim, T.H., Ngoc Nguyen, C.T., Kim, S.M. & Kwon, S.W. Robust
749           Determination of Coenzyme Q10 Redox Status Using Two Isotope-Labeled Internal
750           Standards. *Available at SSRN 4982487*.
751
752

**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=14) or Gpx4 (n=13). Mice were dosed with Liproxstatin-

1 (LIP1; n=7 per genotype) or Vehicle (Veh; n=6 sgNeo, n=7 sgGpx4) every other day starting

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

tumors with knockout of either control (sgNeo) or Gpx4 (sgGpx4) and treated with Veh or LIP1.

**(c)** Representative MRI of KP LUAD tumors with knockout of either control or Gpx4 and treated

with Veh or LIP1. **(d)** Representative H&E of KP LUAD tumors with knockout of either control

or Gpx4 and treated with Veh or LIP1. **(e)** Tumor 4-HNE IHC quantification of KP LUAD tumors

with knockout of either control or Gpx4 and treated with Veh or LIP1. **(f)** Representative 4-HNE

IHC of KP LUAD tumors with knockout of either control or Gpx4 and treated with Veh or LIP1.

Error bars represent SEM values, significance was determined via one-way ANOVA (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/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 (1215 days) versus FSP1 low (1498 days). **(c)** Representative IHC staining for Fsp1

and Gpx4 in adenoma versus adenocarcinoma KP LUAD GEMM tumors. **(d)** Tumor Fsp1 IHC

quantification 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 Neo (control; n=4), Fsp1 (n=6), or Gpx4 (n=6). **(f)** Tumor burden

quantification 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.

**(h)** Quantification of relative proportion of adenomas versus adenocarcinomas of KP LUAD

tumors with knockout of either control (Neo), Fsp1, or Gpx4. **(i)** Representative TUNEL staining

of KP, Fsp1KO and Fsp1WT orthotopic lung tumors **(j)** Schematic depicting generation of

isogenic Fsp1-wildtype (Fsp1WT) versus Fsp1-knockout (Fsp1KO) 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, Fsp1KO and Fsp1WT cells treated with

RSL3 (0.5µM) ± LIP1 (100nM). **(l)** Tumor burden quantification of KP, Fsp1KO (n=8) and

Fsp1WT (n=7) orthotopic lung tumors. **(m)** Representative H&E of KP, Fsp1KO and Fsp1WT

orthotopic lung tumors. Error bars represent SEM values, significance was determined via

student's t-test (panels d and l) or one-way ANOVA (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 growth and endpoint weights from indicated cell lines with CRISPR/Cas9-mediated

knockout of FSP1 or non-targeting controls, transplanted as subcutaneous (subQ) xenograft tumors

into NSG mice: **(a)** H2009, FSP1 (n=8) or control (n=8). **(b)** H1299, FSP1 (n=9) or control (n=9).

**(c)** PC9, FSP1 (n=9) or control (n=9). **(d)** H1975, FSP1 (n=8) or control (n=9). **(e)** A549, FSP1

(n=10) or control (n=9). **(f)** 16645, Fsp1(n=7) or control (n=9). **(g)** KPC7 (murine PDAC), Fsp1

(n=10) or control (n=10). Error bars represent SEM values, significance was determined via

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, Fsp1KO and Fsp1WT orthotopic tumors. **(b)** Longitudinal growth of KP, Gpx4KO or Fsp1OE subcutaneous (subQ) xenograft tumors transplanted in male C57BL/6J mice. (control, n=9, Fsp1OE, n=8) **(c)** Longitudinal growth of KP, Fsp1KO, Fsp1WT, or Gpx4OE subQ xenograft tumors transplanted in female C57BL/6J mice. (control, n=10, controlOE, n=9, Fsp1WT, n=9, Gpx4OE, n=8). **(d)** Ratio of CoQ9H2/CoQ9 detected via LC/MS from KP, Fsp1KO, Fsp1WT orthotopic tumors and cells treated with DMSO or RSL3 (0.5 μM) for 8 hours. **(e)** Schematic depicting Acsl4's pro-ferroptotic function, counteracted by ferroptosis suppressors like Fsp1 and lipid radical-trapping antioxidants (RTAs) such as Vitamin E (VitE) and Liproxstatin-1 (LIP1). **(f)** Tumor burden quantification of KP, Fsp1KO and Fsp1WT orthotopic lung tumors with CRISPR/Cas9-mediated knockout of Acsl4 or control (Neo). (WT, n=5; Acsl4KO, n=4; Fsp1KO, n=7; Fsp1KOAcsl4KO, n=7). **(g)** Schematic depicting dietary Vitamin E (VitE) manipulation studies. **(h)** Tumor bioluminescence signal normalized to first imaging timepoint of C57BL/6J mice orthotopically transplanted with KP, Fsp1KO cells and receiving high (n=8) or low (n=7) VitE diets *ad libitum* 5 days pre-tumor initiation. **(i)** Tumor bioluminescence signal of C57BL/6J mice orthotopically transplanted with KP, Fsp1KO cells and placed on high (n=6) or low (n=6) VitE diets *ad libitum* after lung 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) every other day starting 5 weeks post-tumor initiation until experiment endpoint. **(k)** Tumor burden quantification of KP LUAD tumors with knockout of either control or Fsp1 and treated with Veh or LIP1. **(l)** Representative H&E of KP LUAD tumors with knockout

of either control or Fsp1 and treated with Veh or LIP1. Error bars represent SEM values,

significance was determined via student's t test (panel b), one-way ANOVA (panels c, d, f, k), or

Tukey's multiple comparison (panel h, i).

**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 Fsp1KO (n=7) or hFSP1

re-expression, treated with icFSP1 (n=8) or Vehicle (n=7). **(b)** Tumor bioluminescence signal of

C57BL/6J mice orthotopically transplanted with hFsp1WT 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 Fsp1KO (n=5), hFSP1WT, or hFSP1Q319K-expressing tumors, treated with icFSP1

(hFSP1WT, n=6; hFSP1Q319K, n=7) or Vehicle (hFSP1WT, n=7; hFSP1Q319K, n=7). **(d)**

Longitudinal growth of PDX LX465 tumors treated with icFSP1 (n=10) or Vehicle (n=10) in NSG

mice. Error bars represent SEM values, significance was determined via one-way ANOVA (panel

b), student's t-test (panel d), or Kaplan-Meier simple survival analysis (panels a and 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 (sgNeo, n=11) or Gpx4 (n=12). (b) Representative 4-HNE IHC of liver

tissue from conditional Gpx4-knockout mice. (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 (sgNeo) 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 OE cells upon increasing

concentrations of RSL3. (g) Western blot of KP LUAD cells treated with 20nM Na2SeO3 or

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

Na2SeO3 or DMSO with increasing RSL3 addition. (h) GPX4 expression of *KRAS*-mutant

primary LUAD tumors from TCGA, divided into early and late tumor stages. (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 wks (n=4) vs

14 wks (n=4) post-tumor initiation. Error bars represent SEM values, significance was determined

via one-way ANOVA (panel h) or student's t-test (panel j) or Kaplain-Meier simple survival

analysis (panel i). Box plots indicate median (middle line), 25th, 75th percentile (box) and 5th and

95th percentile (whiskers).

**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. **(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 KRAS 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 human cells treated with 50 nm RMC-042 for indicated time

periods. **(e)** Representative multi-IF images of KP tumors using indicated antibodies. Panels are

10X and insets are 20X. **(f)** FSP1 (AIFM2) expression of KRAS-mutant primary LUAD tumors

from TCGA, separated by the co-mutation status of the tumor (KEAP1/STK11 WT n=88, STK11

mutant n=20, KEAP1 mutant n=16, KEAP1/STK11 mutant n=11). **(g)** QPCR of FSP1 (AIFM2)

expression from indicated human cell lines treated with KI696 for 5 days. Error bars represent

SEM values, significance was determined by one-way ANOVA (panels a, b, c, f, g). Box plots

indicate median (middle line), 25th, 75th percentile (box) and 5th and 95th percentile (whiskers).

**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 GEMM tumors

with knockout of either control (sgNeo, n=11) or Fsp1 (n=14). **(b)** Tumor number quantification

in KP LUAD GEMMs with tumor-specific knockout of either control (sgNeo, n=4), Fsp1 (n=7),

or Gpx4 (n=6). **(c)** Tumor burden quantification of KP LUAD tumors with knockout of either

control (Neo), Fsp1, or Gpx4. Data is plotted with the area of individual tumors as each data point.

**(d)** Ki67 IHC quantification of KP LUAD GEMM tumors with knockout of either control, Fsp1,

or Gpx4. **(e)** Cleaved caspase-3 IHC quantification of KP LUAD GEMM tumors with knockout

of either control, Fsp1, or Gpx4. Error bars represent SEM values, significance was determined by

one-way ANOVA (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 (sgNeo) or Fsp1. Cells were

treated with 100nM LIP1. **(b)** Schematic depicting all transplantation models performed using

isogenic KP, Fsp1KO and Fsp1WT **(c, d)** Longitudinal growth and endpoint weights of KP LUAD

cells with CRISPR/Cas9-mediated knockout of Fsp1 (n=8) or control (n=10) subcutaneous (subQ)

xenograft tumor transplanted into C57BL/6J male mice. **(e)** Tumor bioluminescence signal of

C57BL/6J male mice with orthotopic transplantation of KP LUAD cells with CRISPR/Cas9-

mediated knockout of Fsp1 (n=8) or control (n=7). **(f)** Tumor bioluminescence signal normalized

to initial IVIS timepoint (day 7) of C57BL/6J male mice with orthotopic transplantation of isogenic

KP, Fsp1KO (n=6) and Fsp1WT (n=7) cells. **(g)** Tumor bioluminescence signal of NU/J

immunocompromised mice with orthotopic transplantation of isogenic KP, Fsp1KO (n=6) and

Fsp1WT (n=7) cells. **(h)** Tumor bioluminescence signal of C57BL/6J female mice with orthotopic

transplantation of isogenic KP, Fsp1KO (n=8) and Fsp1WT (n=8) cells. **(i)** Longitudinal growth

and endpoint tumor weight of either Fsp1KO or Fsp1WT subcutaneous (subQ) xenograft tumors

transplanted in C57BL/6J WT (KO, male n=10, female n=10, WT, male n=8, female n=10) or

C57BL/6J Fsp1 KO mice (males and females, KO, n=12, WT, 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 WT or OE of Fsp1. **(k)** CellTiter-Glo

Luminescence viability assay of KP, Fsp1 WT or OE cells with increasing concentrations of RSL3.

**(l, m)** Longitudinal growth and endpoint weights of KP LUAD cells with OE (n=10) or WT (n=10)

Fsp1-expressing subcutaneous (subQ) xenograft tumor transplanted into C57BL/6J male mice.

Error bars represent SEM values, significance determined via one-way ANOVA (panel i), Tukeys

multiple comparisons test (panels c, e, f, g, h, l), or student's t-test (panel d, m).

**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). 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. Error bars represent SEM values, significance was determined via

student's t-test (panels a-g).

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

**(a)** Western blot of KP, Gpx4KO LUAD cells with either empty vector (—), Fsp1OE. **(b)** Western

blot of KP, Fsp1KO LUAD cells with re-expression of either empty vector (—), Fsp1WT,

Gpx4OE. **(c)** CellTiter-Glo Luminescence viability assay of KP, Fsp1KO LUAD cells in (b) upon

increasing concentrations of RSL3. **(d)** Endpoint tumor weights from indicated cell lines

transplanted as subcutaneous (subQ) xenograft tumors in C57BL/6J female mice. **(e)** Top: Western

blot of KP, Fsp1KO 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, Fsp1KO LUAD cells with re-expression of

either empty vector (Fsp1KO), Fsp1WT, or Fsp1mut upon increasing concentrations of RSL3.

LIP1 was used at 100nM. **(g)** Tumor bioluminescence signal normalized to initial imaging

timepoint (day14) of C57BL/6J male mice with orthotopic transplantation of isogenic KP, Fsp1KO

LUAD cells with re-expression of either empty vector (Fsp1KO), Fsp1WT, or Fsp1mut. **(h)**

Representative images of crystal violet clonogenic assay of KP, Fsp1WT or Fsp1KO LUAD cells

with CRISPR/Cas9- mediated knockout of control (Neo) or Acsl4. **(i)** Tumor bioluminescence

signal of C57BL/6J male mice with orthotopic transplantation of isogenic KP, Fsp1KO and

Fsp1WT cells with CRISPR/Cas9-mediated knockout of control (Neo) or Acsl4. (WT, n=5;

Acsl4KO, n=4; Fsp1KO, n=7; Fsp1KOAcsl4KO, n=7). **(j)** Representative H&E of experiment in

(i). **(k)** Overall survival of C57BL/6J male mice with orthotopic transplantation of isogenic KP,

Fsp1KO and Fsp1WT cells with CRISPR/Cas9-mediated knockout of control (Neo) or Acsl4

(n=5). **(l)** Tumor bioluminescence signal normalized to first imaging timepoint (day7) of

C57BL/6J mice orthotopically transplanted with KP, Fsp1WT 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, Fsp1KO cells and receiving Liproxstatin-1 (LIP1, n=7) or Vehicle (n=6) 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=7) every other day starting from tumor initiation. **(o)** Tumor burden quantification of KP

LUAD GEMM tumors with 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. Error bars represent SEM values, significance was determined via one-way ANOVA

(panel d), Tukey's multiple comparisons test (g, i, l, m) or student's t-test (panel o) or Kaplain-

Meier simple survival analysis (panel k).

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

**(a)** Top: Western blot of KP, Fsp1KO LUAD cells with re-expression of either empty vector (—),

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

clonogenic assay. **(b)** Cell-TiterGlo Luminescence viability assay of KP, Fsp1KO 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 Fsp1WT-expressing cells upon RSL3

(0.2µM) plus increasing concentrations of iFSP1. **(d)** CellTiter-Glo Luminescence viability assay

as in (h) but with FSEN1. **(e)** CellTiter-Glo Luminescence viability assay of human or mouse

Fsp1WT-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)** Tumor bioluminescence signal normalized

to first imaging timepoint (day7) of C57BL/6J mice orthotopically transplanted with isogenic KP,

Fsp1KO cells with re-expression of either human (hFSP1, n=5) or mouse FSP1 (mFsp1, n=6)

cDNA or control (ctrl, n=6) vector. **(h)** Tumor burden quantification and representative H&E of

KP, Fsp1KO and hFSP1WT orthotopic lung tumors. **(i)** Representative H&E of KP, hFSP1WT

orthotopic lung tumors from indicated treatment groups. **(j)** Percent of T-cells, alveolar, interstitial

macrophages, and neutrophils of total CD45+ cells from tumor bearing lungs 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)** Table of the respective

mutations and tumor type of the cell lines used in this work. Error bars represent SEM values,

significance was determined via one-way ANOVA (panels g, j) or student's t test (panel h).

# 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 (%)

0.0024
0.0961      0.0007

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

**a**

α-TOH — CoQ$_{10}$(H) — FSP1 — CoQ$_{10}$H$_2$ — α-TOH•

PUFA-OH — GSSG / GSH — GPX4

PUFA• / PUFA-OO• — Auto-oxidation — PUFA-OOH

**Ferroptosis**

**b** Overall survival (%) vs Days elapsed. FSP1 high, FSP1 low. 0.0429

**c** IHC: Fsp1 / IHC: Gpx4 — Adenoma / AdenoCA

**d** Tumor Fsp1 expression (positive cells per mm²). <0.0001. Post-initiation: 10wks, 14wks

**e** U6-sgNeo$_1$-U6-sgNeo$_2$-EFS-Cre or U6-sgGpx4$_1$-U6-sgGpx4$_2$-EFS-Cre or U6-sgFsp1$_1$-U6-sgFsp1$_2$-EFS-Cre. Tumor Initiation (d0). GEMM: Kras$^{LSL-G12D/+}$; Tp53$^{fl/fl}$; Rosa26$^{LSL-Cas9-P2A-GFP}$. Endpoint (d112) tumor burden and immunostaining analyses

**f** Tumor burden (%). 0.0002, 0.0001. sgRNA: Neo, Fsp1, Gpx4

**g** GEMM: Kras$^{G12D/+}$; Tp53$^{-/-}$; Rosa26$^{Cas9GFP}$. sgRNA: Neo, Fsp1, Gpx4. H&E

**h** % of total tumors. Adenoma / AdenoCA. sgRNA: Neo, Fsp1, Gpx4

**i** TUNEL. Fsp1$^{KO}$, Fsp1$^{WT}$

**j** pGK-Fsp1$^{WT}$ cDNA-EFS-Hygro$^R$ or EFS-Hygro$^R$. Kras$^{G12D/+}$ Tp53$^{-/-}$ Fsp1$^{KO}$. in vitro / in vivo C57Bl/6

**k** Kras$^{G12D/+}$; Tp53$^{-/-}$. Fsp1: KO, WT. DMSO, RSL3, RSL3+LIP1

**l** Tumor burden (%). <0.001. Fsp1: KO, WT

**m** H&E. Fsp1$^{KO}$, Fsp1$^{WT}$

**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*

**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**

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

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

a

Kras^G12D/+, Tp53^-/-, Fsp1^KO
+hFsp1: — WT Q319K

90kDa — Hsp90
41kDa — FSP1
21kDa — Gpx4

b

| Fsp1^KO | IC50 (μM) |
|---|---|
| ctrl+DMSO | <0.01 |
| ctrl+LIP1 | 7.51 |
| hFSP1^WT | 3.87 |
| hFSP1^Q319K | 4.80 |

Relative viability (%)
[RSL3] μM

c

| Fsp1^KO | IC50 (μM) |
|---|---|
| mFsp1^WT | 255 |
| hFSP1^WT | 5.26 |

Relative viability (%)
RSL3+[iFSP1] μM

d

| Fsp1^KO | IC50 (μM) |
|---|---|
| mFsp1^WT | Undefined |
| hFSP1^WT | 6.57 |

Relative viability (%)
RSL3+[FSEN1] μM

e

| Fsp1^KO | IC50 (μM) |
|---|---|
| mFsp1^WT | 135 |
| hFSP1^WT | 474 |

Relative viability (%)
[icFSP1] μM

f

| Fsp1^KO | IC50 (μM) |
|---|---|
| hFSP1^WT | 2.96 |
| hFSP1^Q319K | 7.48 |

Relative viability (%)
RSL3+[icFSP1] μM

g

Fsp1^KO
+hFSP1
+mFsp1
+ctrl

Relative tumor growth (luminescence fold change)
Days post-injection
<0.001  <0.001

h

Tumor burden (%)
0.0052
Fsp1: KO    KO +hFSP1

H&E
Fsp1^KO
Fsp1^KO +hFsp1

i

H&E
Veh    icFSP1
LIP1    icFSP1 +LIP1

j

T-Cells
0.9470
0.7158    0.7547
% of CD45+ cells
icFSP1: − + − +
LIP1: − − + +

AMs
0.9219
0.8433    0.8470
% of CD45+ cells
icFSP1: − + − +
LIP1: − − + +

IMs
0.9996
0.8833    0.6361
% of CD45+ cells
icFSP1: − + − +
LIP1: − − + +

Neutrophils
0.1206
0.9997    0.1559
% of CD45+ cells
icFSP1: − + − +
LIP1: − − + +

k

adenoma → adenocarcinoma
PUFA-OOH
GPX4  FSP1
buffered lipid peroxidation
Sustained tumor growth & disease progression

adenoma → adenocarcinoma
PUFA-OOH
GX4 or F1
unrestrained lipid peroxidation
Tumor cell ferroptosis & restricted disease

l

| Cell Line | Oncogenic driver | Co-mutations | Tumor type |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1234 | Kras G12D | Tp53^-/- | mouse LUAD |
| H2009 | KRAS G12A | TP53^R273L | Human LUAD |
| H1299 | NRAS Q61L | TP53^del | Human LUAD |
| PC9 | EGFR Exon19Del | TP53^R248Q | Human LUAD |
| H1975 | EGFR L858R/ T790M | TP53^R273H PI3KCA^G118D | Human LUAD |
| A549 | KRAS G12S | KEAP1^G333C STK11^Q37C* | Human LUAD |
| 16645 | Kras G12D | Stk11^-/- | mouse LUAD |
| KPC7 | Kras G12D | Tp53^-/- | mouse PDAC |
| (PDX) LX465 | KRAS G12D | TP53 L35fs8* | Human LUAD |