Oncogenic signals prime cancer cells for toxic cell overgrowth during a G1 cell cycle arrest
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Highlights

- CDK4/6 inhibition causes mTOR-dependent cell overgrowth during the G1 arrest
- G1 overgrowth causes DNA damage and cell cycle withdrawal when the cell cycle resumes
- These effects are exacerbated by oncogenes and rescued by mTOR inhibition
- Specific drug combinations can enhance oncogene-specific overgrowth and toxicity
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In brief

Cell growth and the cell cycle must be coordinated to preserve cell viability. Foy et al. demonstrate that CDK4/6 inhibitors uncouple these two processes to drive excessive cellular overgrowth, DNA damage, and cell cycle exit. Oncogenic signals exacerbate these effects, likely contributing to cancer cell sensitivity to CDK4/6 inhibitors.
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SUMMARY

CDK4/6 inhibitors are remarkable anti-cancer drugs that can arrest tumor cells in G1 and induce their senescence while causing only relatively mild toxicities in healthy tissues. How they achieve this mechanistically is unclear. We show here that tumor cells are specifically vulnerable to CDK4/6 inhibition because during the G1 arrest, oncogenic signals drive toxic cell overgrowth. This overgrowth causes permanent cell cycle withdrawal by either preventing progression from G1 or inducing genotoxic damage during the subsequent S-phase and mitosis. Inhibiting or reverting oncogenic signals that converge onto mTOR can rescue this excessive growth, DNA damage, and cell cycle exit in cancer cells. Conversely, inducing oncogenic signals in non-transformed cells can drive these toxic phenotypes and sensitize the cells to CDK4/6 inhibition. Together, this demonstrates that cell cycle arrest and oncogenic cell growth is a synthetic lethal combination that is exploited by CDK4/6 inhibitors to induce tumor-specific toxicity.

INTRODUCTION

Identifying cell cycle vulnerabilities that distinguish cancer cells from healthy cells has been a long-term goal in cancer research.1,2 A major breakthrough came with the development of CDK4/6 inhibitors, which have revolutionized the treatment of advanced hormone receptor-positive (HR+)/human epidermal growth factor receptor 2-negative (HER2−) breast cancer by increasing progression-free and overall survival when used in combination with hormone therapy.3 The rationale for this combination is that blocking hormone receptor signaling inhibits the transcription of Cyclin D, the regulatory subunit of CDK4/6, thus producing a “double-hit” on Cyclin D-CDK4/6 activity, specifically in breast cancer cells that overexpress hormone receptors. This leads to an efficient arrest in G1 phase of the cell cycle because Cyclin D-CDK4/6 is required to phosphorylate retinoblastoma protein (Rb) and thereby activate E2F family transcription factors, which induce the expression of many genes required for S-phase.4 Oncogenic signals also act to drive excessive Cyclin D production in many tumor types, and this has rationalized ongoing clinical trials to test whether inhibiting these signals alongside CDK4/6 can produce a similar double-hit to efficiently and specifically arrest tumor cell proliferation in breast and other tumor types.5,6

To facilitate wider use of these drugs, it is important to understand how they achieve specificity for tumor cells while only producing relatively mild toxicities in healthy tissues. This is thought to be due, at least in part, to the fact that tumor cells rely on the Cyclin D-CDK4/6 pathway for G1 progression more than some healthy cell types.6,7 This might be due to the constant stimulation of the pathway by oncogenic signals, overexpression of Cyclin D/CDK4/CDK6, or loss/inhibition of tumor suppressors that restrain CDK4/6 activity (e.g., p16INK4A and p53/p21).4 However, a crucial but poorly understood issue in the context of cancer therapy concerns not only how efficiently tumor cells arrest in G1 but also how these cells then respond to the arrest. A positive response is often associated with marked tumor regression that is sustained after chemotherapy has ceased, implying that tumor cells experience a cytotoxic response to these drugs and not simply a cytostatic G1 arrest. There are many ideas for why this could occur, including the notion that CDK4/6 inhibitors have intrinsic effects on tumor metabolism and extrinsic effects on the surrounding microenvironment to enhance anti-tumor immunity.8,9 However, a major gap in our understanding concerns the questions of when, why, and how a pause in G1 transitions into a state of irreversible cell cycle exit, known as senescence.10 It is critical to address these questions because they may help explain why tumors are more sensitive to these drugs than healthy cells, and this may ultimately help us better predict the most sensitive tumor types and/or the best drug combinations. We, therefore, set out to resolve these issues by building on our recent data demonstrating that a pause in G1, if held for
too long, downregulates various replisome components to cause DNA damage and long-term cell cycle withdrawal after release from the arrest. The crucial question we sought to address was what happens during the G1 arrest that causes such-wide scale proteomic changes, ultimately causing problems during the subsequent cell cycle?

RESULTS

Clostridial overgrowth following CDK4/6 inhibition causes genotoxic stress and cell cycle exit

One clear effect of pausing cells for long periods in G1 is that they become progressively enlarged in size, as the total cellular protein and RNA continue to increase despite the cell cycle arrest.

This occurs in non-transformed hTERT-RPE1 cells (RPE1) and HR+/HER2− breast cancer cells that are p53 proficient (MCF7) or p53 deficient (T47D) (Figures 1A–1C; see Crozier et al. 12). We sought to prevent this excessive growth during G1 so that we could test whether it was responsible for the downstream effects on DNA damage and long-term cell cycle exit. Excessive growth during G1 was phosphatidylinositol 3-kinase (PI3K)/mammalian target of rapamycin (mTOR) dependent because it was completely prevented by co-treatment with PF-05212384 (hereafter PF-05), a dual inhibitor of PI3K and mTOR (Figures 1C, 1D, S1A, and S1B; note that phospho-S6 ribosomal protein is a critical downstream effector of mTOR/PI3K that regulates protein translation and cell growth).

Figure 1. mTOR-dependent overgrowth during a G1 arrest drives DNA damage and cell cycle exit

(A and B) Immunofluorescence images (A) and protein/RNA concentration measurements (B) of MCF7 and T47D cells arrested in palbociclib for 0–7 days. Channel intensities in (A) are scaled differently between conditions to prevent tubulin saturation in small cells. Scale bars, 25 μm.

(C) Cell volume assays following 1–4-day palbociclib (palbo) treatment ± PF-05212384 (PF-05: 30 nM for RPE1, and 7.5 nM for MCF7/T47D; see Figures S1A and S1B for dose response). Graph shows mean data ± SD from three repeats.

(D) Western analysis of cells arrested in palbociclib for 1 day ± PF-05212384. Representative example of at least 3 repeats.

(E) Cell cycle profile of individual RPE1-FUCCI cells (each bar represents one cell) after washout from 1 or 7 days of palbociclib treatment ± PF-05212384. 150 cells analyzed at random from three experimental repeats.

(F) Quantifications of cell cycle defects from the single-cell profile plots displayed in (E). Bar graphs show mean ± SD.

(G) Colony-forming assays in RPE1 cells treated with palbociclib ± PF-05212384 for 1, 4, or 7 days and then grown at low density without inhibitor for 10 days. Each bar displays mean data ± SD from three experiments. Statistical significance was determined by Fisher’s exact test (***p < 0.0001).

(H and I) Quantification of γH2AX-positive foci (left) and nuclear morphologies (right) following palbociclib treatment in p53-KO RPE1 cells (H) or MCF7/T47D cells (I). Cells were treated with DMSO (asynch) or palbociclib for 1 or 7 days ± PF-05212384 and then analyzed after drug washout for 48 h (RPE1 cells) or 72 h (MCF7/T47D cells). Graphs show mean data ± SD from three experiments.
size\textsuperscript{19,20}). Single cell analysis with a FUCCI cell cycle reporter\textsuperscript{21} demonstrates that when RPE1 cells are released from a prolonged G1 arrest, they struggle to re-enter the cell cycle, and the cells that do enter S-phase frequently revert back into G1 before reaching mitosis (Figure 1E), as demonstrated recently.\textsuperscript{11} Importantly, both of these phenotypes were rescued when overgrowth was prevented with PF-05 (Figures 1E and 1F), which was associated with a dramatic improvement in long-term proliferation (Figure 1G). Cell cycle re-entry and progression were similarly improved in breast cancer cells following PF-05 treatment (Figures S1C and S1D).

Irreversible cell cycle withdrawal following CDK4/6 inhibition has recently been linked to replication stress as a result of impaired origin licensing and the progressive downregulation of replisome components during the G1 arrest.\textsuperscript{11} This replication stress induces p53-dependent cell cycle withdrawal from G2 or, in the absence of p53, excessive DNA damage during mitosis, as the chromosomes are mis-segregated to produce γH2AX foci and gross nuclear abnormalities. In agreement with a crucial role for cell overgrowth in these phenotypes, combining PF-05 with CDK4/6 inhibitor rescued the increase in γH2AX foci and nuclear abnormalities following drug washout in p53-KO RPE1 cells (Figure 1H), which typically have the highest rates of damage,\textsuperscript{11} and in breast cancer cells that are p53 proficient (MCF7) or deficient (T47D) (Figure 1).

In summary, excessive cell growth during a G1 arrest drives permanent cell cycle withdrawal by restricting progression from G1 and causing DNA damage in the cells that do re-enter the cell cycle. Inhibiting PI3K/mTOR signaling can completely prevent this growth, DNA damage, and long-term cell cycle exit, thus explaining why mTOR activity is crucial to drive quiescent G1-arrested cells into senescence.\textsuperscript{22–24} Therefore, mTOR status critically determines whether the arrest following CDK4/6 inhibition is cytotoxic or cytostatic. Accompanying papers by Crozier et al.\textsuperscript{12} and Manohar et al.\textsuperscript{25} in this issue of \textit{Molecular Cell} report similar findings with distinct mTOR inhibitors and explain mechanistically how overgrowth causes proteome remodeling, osmotic stress, replication stress, and defective DNA damage repair to cause permanent cell cycle exit. Here, we seek to examine the upstream signals that drive this overgrowth and explore whether these vary between cell types, since this would be predicted to have a crucial effect on outcome following CDK4/6 inhibition.

Cancer cells are sensitized to overgrowth and cell cycle withdrawal following CDK4/6 inhibition

The levels of cell growth and mTOR activity are determined by the balance of growth promoting and growth repressing signals, which, importantly, depends on both cell context and cell type. In non-transformed epithelial cells, growth factor
signaling stimulates mTOR to drive cell growth and proliferation; however, upon cell-cell contact, these signals are rapidly shut down by contact inhibition of proliferation.20,21 Figures 2A–2E demonstrate that both serum withdrawal and cell-cell contact can inhibit mTOR and protect RPE1 cells from toxic overgrowth during a G1 arrest, thereby limiting cell cycle exit and restoring long-term proliferation following release from the arrest. This is in sharp contrast to breast cancer cells, which continue to activate mTOR and grow during a G1 arrest, despite culturing in low serum or at high confluence (Figures 2F and 2G). Therefore, two pervasive hallmarks of cancer—loss of contact inhibition and growth factor independence—facilitate the overgrowth of cancer cells following CDK4/6 inhibition. We hypothesized that the persistent mTOR-dependent growth in cancer lines was driven by oncogenic mutations, which in the case of HR+/-HER2– breast cancer cells, are often activating PI3K mutations (PI3K-E545K in MCF7 or PI3K-H1047R in T47D), which signal to mTOR via AKT kinase (also known as protein kinase B). In agreement with this hypothesis, inhibiting AKT with the allosteric inhibitor MK220627 deactivated AKT in all cell types but only prevented mTOR activity and growth in the breast cancer lines (Figures 3A and 3B). This could also be achieved by reverting the oncogenic PI3K-E545K mutation in MCF7s back to wild type28 (Figures 3C and 3D), which was associated with better cell cycle progression, decreased DNA damage following drug release, and enhanced long-term proliferation (Figures 3E–3H). Note that most of the replication stress-induced DNA damage occurs after mitosis when chromosomes are incorrectly segregated.11 Therefore, the fact that oncogene reversion almost doubles the number of cells reaching mitosis (Figure 3F) but still reduces the overall DNA damage (Figure 3G) implies that replication stress is markedly reduced in these cells, most likely because of their restricted growth during G1. In agreement, in an accompanying manuscript by Crozier et al.,12 we demonstrate that replication fork speed is slowed when enlarged CDK4/6-inhibitor-treated cells are released into S-phase but not when mTOR inhibitor is used to prevent overgrowth during the G1 arrest. Interestingly, although growth could not be prevented in RPE1 cells by AKT inhibition, it could be fully suppressed by combined inhibition of mitogen-activated protein kinase kinase (MEK) and AKT, and this was associated with improved cell cycle progression following drug washout (Figure S2). This could reflect the dependence on upstream growth factors that stimulate both MEK/PI3K pathways and/or on the oncogenic KRAS mutation present in RPE1 cells.29,30 In summary, oncogenic signals drive excessive growth during a G1 arrest, and this leads to DNA damage and long-term cell cycle withdrawal when cells are released from the arrest.
Figure 4. Oncogenes sensitize MCF10A cells to CDK4/6 inhibition

(A and B) MCF10As, with/without indicated oncogenes, treated with DMSO or palbociclib (palbo) for 4 days and analyzed by holographic microscopy to quantify (A) cell cycle duration and (B) single-cell optical volume. Data in (A) are from 100 cells from 2 experiments. Horizontal bars show median, and vertical bars show 95% confidence intervals. In (B), a typical single-cell volume trace is shown in blue (vehicle treated) or red (palbociclib treated). Random cell volume traces from 10 cells from 2 experiments are shown in light blue/red.

(C) Indicated MCF10A cells treated with palbociclib and EdU added for indicated time periods to calculate the percentage of S-phase cells during these time periods. pRb (S807/811) staining (pRb) indicates the percentage of G1 cells during the same time periods. Graphs show means ± SEM from 3 repeats (EdU) or 2 repeats (Rb-pSer807/811). Statistical significance was determined by unpaired t tests (**p < 0.0001).
Oncogenic mutations sensitize non-transformed breast epithelial cells to CDK4/6 inhibition

We next addressed whether non-transformed breast epithelium could be sensitized to CDK4/6 inhibition by introducing oncogenic mutations. We used MCF10A with an endogenous PI3K-E545K or PI3K-H1047R knockin mutation31 or MCF10A with a tamoxifen-inducible hRAS-G12V mutant (hRAS V12).32 Growth following CDK4/6 inhibition was enhanced in the presence of the oncogene; however, this growth plateaued after 2 days in all cells except the MCF10A-hRAS V12 cell line, which experienced significant overgrowth during the 4-day treatment (Figure S3A; note that tamoxifen was added at 250 nM for all experiments involving the hRAS V12 line). The plateau in net growth was likely related to an inefficient cell cycle arrest because all cells, except MCF10A-hRAS V12, were able to continue to proliferate to different extents over the 4-day period of CDK4/6 inhibition (Figure S3B).

To determine whether this reflected cell cycle delays in all cells or a penetrant G1 arrest in only a subset of cells, we turned to single-cell assays to simultaneously measure cell cycle length (time from one mitosis to the next mitosis) and cell volume. Figure 4A demonstrates that all vehicle-treated MCF10A cell lines had a 12-h cell cycle length, during which time cell volume increased linearly (Figure 4B; blue lines). The average mitotic volumes and growth rates were not significantly different between cell types (Figures S3C and S3D). Following CDK4/6 inhibition, cell cycle length was extended in all cells, but this extension was longer in cells expressing oncogenic mutants (Figure 4A). The longest cell cycles were observed in hRAS V12-expressing cells, which of 90% failed to complete a full cell cycle within the 4-day imaging window. A striking effect of these cell cycle delays was that they allowed cells to continue to grow in size (Figure 4B; red lines). This growth occurred linearly throughout the period of delay, and growth rates were not significantly different between the oncogenic mutant lines (Figures 4B and S3C). The net effect was that when cells entered mitosis following a cell cycle delay, they did so with a larger cell volume (Figure S3D).

We next used EdU pulse assays to mark S-phase cells33 and therefore determine at what stage the cell cycle was delayed following CDK4/6 inhibitor treatment. A 2-h pulse of EdU in asynchronous parental MCF10A cells demonstrated that 57% of the cells were in S-phase during the pulse, and only 5% of the cells were phospho-Rb (S807/811) negative (pRB-ve), indicating very short G1 phases (Figure 4C). Following palbociclib treatment, the percentage of S-phase cells decreased over time, and this was mirrored by an increase in the pRB-ve G1 population, which persisted for 14 h. After this time, cells started to accumulate again in S-phase, demonstrating that palbociclib treatment can delay MCF10A cells in G1 for up to 14 h. Importantly, oncogenic expression elevated the proportion of untreated MCF10A cells in G1, and palbociclib treatment induced longer G1 delays in these cells, with most hRAS V12- and PI3K-H1047R-expressing cells remaining arrested in G1 for the 4-day period. This correlated well with the extended cell cycle duration observed in these cells (Figure 4A). In summary, CDK4/6 inhibition delays G1 progression in MCF10A cells, and this allows cells to reach a larger size. The oncogene-expressing cells experience longer G1 delays and, therefore, reach larger overall sizes.

We hypothesized that the overgrowth in oncogenic MCF10A cells would lead to DNA damage and p53/p21-dependent cell cycle withdrawal. In agreement, p21 intensity was elevated in cells treated with CDK4/6 inhibitor for 7 days, this was higher in oncogene-expressing cells, and this was associated with an inhibition of proliferation over 3 weeks of treatment (Figures 4D, 4E, and S3E). To examine this further, we generated p53 or p21 knockout (KO) MCF10A cells using CRISPR-Cas9 (Figure S3F). In p53-KO cells, p21 induction was suppressed, and cells proliferated better over this treatment period (Figures 4D, 4E, S3F, and S3G). However, cells that continued to proliferate in this situation experienced high levels of DNA damage after only 1 week of treatment, most likely due to catastrophic mitoses in enlarged cells (Figures 4F and S3H).11 Strikingly, MCF10A cells that exhibited slower proliferation in the presence of CDK4/6 inhibitor for up to 1 week could fully recover long-term proliferation when the drug was removed (Figure 4G). This indicates that the cell cycle delays and modest increase in size observed in wild-type MCF10A cells do not cause permanent cell cycle exit in this non-transformed epithelial line. This was in sharp contrast to all oncogene-expressing MCF10A cells, which dramatically lose long-term proliferative potential after as little as 3 days of CDK4/6 inhibitor treatment (Figure 4G). Long-term proliferation was partially rescued by p53 knockout (Figure 4H), implying that oncogene-dependent cell overgrowth causes p53-dependent cell cycle withdrawal.

Oncogenic mutations elevate p21 levels during G1 to improve a CDK4/6 inhibitor arrest in MCF10A cells

The ability of oncogenes to extend the G1 arrest following CDK4/6 inhibition is surprising, given the established role of oncogenic signals in driving cell growth, Cyclin D production, and G1 progression. To understand this better, we performed quantitative proteomics to analyze how the concentration of G1 regulators changed as MCF10A cells grew during a G1 arrest (see STAR Methods). To analyze G1 protein concentration in all MCF10A lines, we required a method that would hold wild-type MCF10A cells in G1 for longer. Therefore, we treated MCF10A lines with CDK4/6 inhibitor for 24 h and then switched to the CDK2/4/6

---

(1) p21 intensities in indicated p53-WT/KO MCF10A cells ± palbociclib for 1 week. A total of 50 cells per condition per experiment from 2–3 experimental repeats. Horizontal bars show median, and vertical bars show 95% confidence intervals.

(B) Mean fold change in cell count (±SEM) after 3-week palbociclib treatment in indicated p53-WT/KO MCF10A cells. Data from 3–4 experimental repeats. Statistical significance was determined by unpaired t tests (**p < 0.005; ***p < 0.0001).

(D) p21 intensities in indicated p53-WT/KO MCF10A cells ± palbociclib for 1 week. A total of 50 cells per condition per experiment from 2–3 experimental repeats. Horizontal bars show median, and vertical bars show 95% confidence intervals.

(E) Quantification of γH2AX-positive foci (left) and nuclear morphologies (right) in indicated MCF10A cells treated with DMSO (0 days) or palbociclib for 7 days and then analyzed 72 h after drug washout. 50 cells were analyzed per condition per experiment. Graphs show means ± SD from three experiments.

(F) Statistical significance between each palbociclib time point and the asynchronous 0-day control was determined using Fisher’s exact test (**p < 0.05; ***p < 0.0001). The thick vertical lines in the violin plots in (A) and (D) represent a 95% CI around the median (horizontal lines), which can be used for statistical comparison of multiple time points/treatments by eye (see STAR Methods).
inhibitor PF-06873600 at 1 μM to additionally block CDK2 activity and restrict S-phase entry. This strategy improved the G1 arrest, inhibited proliferation over 4 days, and allowed cells to become enlarged (Figures 5A, 5B, and S4A). We analyzed protein copy numbers per cell during 1 to 4 days of this arrest, and the entire data are presented in Table S1. Total protein content per cell (as measured by mass spectrometry) was higher in oncogenic cells, and this increased during the 4-day period of growth, as expected (Figure 5C). The majority of established G1 regulators were detected, and the estimated protein concentrations (in parts per million [ppm]) for these regulators are displayed in Figures S4B–S4D. Compared with wild type, oncogenic growth reduced the concentrations of the cell cycle activators CDK2, CDK4, and CDK6, which could contribute to the enhanced G1 delays in oncogenic cells. Perhaps more importantly, however, the concentration of the CDK inhibitor p21 was increased in oncogenic cells by day 1 of treatment and then increased further during the arrest. These effects were also confirmed by western blot analysis (Figures 5D and 5E).

Progression through G1 is determined by the balance of G1 activators and inhibitors, and this balance shifts toward the activators as cells grow in size. This ability to “grow through” a G1 arrest is thought to form the basis of a cell-size checkpoint that ensures that cells reach an optimal size before progressing into S-phase.14,36–39 A prediction of this model is that by inhibiting G1>S activators, such as CDK4/6, cells must then grow larger to overcome the G1/S inhibitors. In support of this hypothesis, increasing concentrations of palbociclib lead to progressively longer G1 delays in RPE1-FUCCI cells, and this is associated with progressive increases in cell volume when these cells reach mitosis (Figures S5A and S5B). Similar data were recently reported by others.13,17 Growth is facilitating the G1>S transition in this situation because PF-05 treatment prevented cells from progressing from G1 in the presence of low-dose palbociclib (Figure S5C). Cell growth is similarly important for MCF10A cells to bypass a CDK4/6-inhibitor-induced arrest in G1 because PF-05 treatment produced an efficient palbociclib arrest for up to 4 days (Figure S5D). Therefore, we hypothesized that the elevated p21 induction in oncogenic MCF10A cells arrested in palbociclib could restrain the capacity of these cells to bypass a G1 arrest through cell growth because p21 also scales during that growth phase.
In agreement, EdU pulse experiments in p21-KO MCF10A cells demonstrate improved S-phase entry following palbociclib treatment, especially in the oncogenic MCF10A cells (Figures 5F and S4E). In summary, palbociclib can delay G1 progression in MCF10A cells, and this delay is extended by oncogenic signals as a result of enhanced p21 induction during the G1 arrest. We propose that growth is able to overcome a G1 arrest by producing an excess of G1/S activators, but if p21 levels rise too highly during this growth phase, then cell cycle progression is still effectively prevented. It is unclear why oncogenic MCF10A cells have higher p21 levels and, therefore, are unable to grow and efficiently bypass a palbociclib-induced G1 arrest. In an accompanying paper by Crozier et al., oncogene-induced replication stress could elevate basal p21 transcription, leading to enhanced p21 protein production during G1-phase growth.

Oncogenic mutations sensitize non-transformed breast epithelial cells to CDK2/4/6 inhibition

We next wondered whether oncogenes sensitized MCF10A cells mainly by improving the cell cycle arrest to enhance overgrowth. To address this, we asked whether oncogenes would also sensitize MCF10A cells to a more prolonged CDK2/4/6 inhibitor arrest, which allowed wild-type MCF10A cells to arrest and become enlarged (Figures 5A and 5B). This is important because this drug is in clinical development to help overcome CDK4/6 resistance.34,40 We performed the sequential CDK4/6 inhibition (24 h), followed by CDK2/4/6 inhibition, to arrest MCF10As in G1 for up to 4 days, before releasing cells into S-phase. Figures 6A–6E and S6 demonstrate that oncogenes do not significantly enhance the level of growth under these conditions, but they do enhance the level of DNA damage observed 48 h after drug release, and, importantly, they also cause a reduction in cell volume (Figures 6A–6E). In summary, palbociclib can delay G1 progression in MCF10A cells, and this delay is extended by oncogenic signals as a result of enhanced p21 induction during the G1 arrest. We propose that growth is able to overcome a G1 arrest by producing an excess of G1/S activators, but if p21 levels rise too highly during this growth phase, then cell cycle progression is still effectively prevented. It is unclear why oncogenic MCF10A cells have higher p21 levels and, therefore, are unable to grow and efficiently bypass a palbociclib-induced G1 arrest. In an accompanying paper by Crozier et al., oncogene-induced replication stress could elevate basal p21 transcription, leading to enhanced p21 protein production during G1-phase growth.
long-term proliferation. The enhanced cell cycle withdrawal is fully growth-dependent because it is prevented by the addition of PF-05 to inhibit overgrowth during the arrest (Figure 6F). Therefore, oncogenes can sensitize non-immortalized MCF10A cells to overgrowth-mediated DNA damage and cell cycle exit following CDK2/4/6 inhibition. This could be due to abnormal proteome scaling causing enhanced toxicity during the G1 growth phase and/or oncogene-induce replication stress, exacerbating the problems experienced by large cells during S-phase.

Rationalizing drug combinations that enhance oncogene-specific toxicity

We hypothesized that oncogenes would drive mTOR activity via different routes, either via MEK/ERK or PI3K/AKT or via both pathways. This could provide an opportunity to use combination treatments that specifically prevent overgrowth and toxicity in healthy cells but not cancer cells. To explore these concepts, we chose to use a non-transformed retinal pigment epithelial cell line, ARPE19, which has been retrovirally transduced to express different dominant oncogenic mutants (AKTmyr, MEKDD, or hRASV12 in a p53 mutant background; see STAR Methods for full details of oncogenes). We specifically chose these cells because they had previously been transduced with TERT, mTP53DD, CCND1, and CDK4R24C, which promotes CyclinD1/CDK4-dependent G1 progression to inhibit oncogene-induced senescence. Therefore, we hypothesized that this would lead to strong CDK4/6 dependence. ARPE19 cells were sensitive to CDK4/6 inhibition because they stopped proliferating within 12 h of palbociclib treatment, and the subsequent G1 arrest was well maintained for up to 4 days (Figures 7A and S7A). Oncogenes enhanced the level of overgrowth during the G1 arrest to different extents, and this was MTOR dependent since it was blocked by PF-05 treatment (Figures 7B and 7B). The overgrowth enhanced DNA damage following CDK4/6 inhibitor washout in all cell lines, but this damage was highest following p53 mutation in the presence of oncogenes, especially AKTmyr and hRASV12 (Figures 7C and S7C−S7E). The overgrowth caused long-term cell cycle exit, but this was attenuated in p53 mutant cells (Figure S7F). This is consistent with similar effects in MCF10A (Figure 4) and RPE1 cells, demonstrating that overgrowth commonly leads to DNA damage and p53-dependent cell cycle withdrawal.

MEK inhibition reduced mTOR activity and growth in all lines, implying that this pathway is commonly needed for growth in ARPE19 cells (Figures 7D and 7E). In contrast, AKT inhibition with the allosteric inhibitor MK2206 (labeled AKTi(Allo)) inhibited growth and mTOR activation in most cell lines, except the AKTmyr line (Figures 7D and 7E). This was expected since AKTmyr lacks the pleckstrin homology (PH) domain to which MK2206 binds to inhibit membrane binding and is instead constitutively bound to the plasma membrane. This insensitivity to MK2206 can be exploited to enhance oncogene-specific DNA damage because MK2206 combined with CDK4/6 inhibitor protected parental cells from DNA damage, but not AKTmyr cells (Figures 7F and S7G). This effect was not observed with the ATP-competitive AKT inhibitor capivasertib (labeled AKTi(ATP)), which protected both cell lines. Interestingly, however, capivasertib was unable to prevent growth or mTOR activity in hRASV12 cells (Figures 7D and 7E); therefore, combining it with CDK4/6 inhibitor could protect parental, but not hRASV12, cells (Figure S7H). Together, these data illustrate how knowledge of the specific coupling between oncogenes and mTOR can be harnessed to rationalize drug combinations that enhance oncogene-specific toxicity following a G1-arrest.

DISCUSSION

Cell growth must be tightly coupled to cell cycle progression to preserve cell and organismal viability. We demonstrate here that CDK4/6 inhibitors uncouple these two key processes to induce cancer cells to withdraw from the cell cycle. The reason for this is that oncogenic signals stimulate both cell growth and cell cycle entry, but when the cell cycle is halted in G1 by CDK4/6 inhibition, these oncogenic signals induce excessive cell overgrowth that soon becomes toxic. An accompanying article in this issue of Molecular Cell reports similar findings with CDK7 inhibition, implying that different cell cycle drugs may drive senescence via similar mechanisms. The concept that hyper-mitogenic signals can drive overgrowth and senescence in arrested cells was proposed nearly 2 decades ago but has received little attention since. This is especially surprising since it could explain how general cell cycle inhibitors can produce tumor-specific effects, an age-old problem in cancer research that has, in contrast, received considerable attention over the years. If oncogenes make tumor cells more vulnerable to a G1 cell cycle arrest, then efficiently arresting all cells in G1, for defined periods of time, may lead to cancer-specific overgrowth, DNA damage, and senescence. It will be important to compare the rates of growth in different G1-arrested cell types in vivo because if these differ, then modified dosing schedules may help optimize cancer-specific cell overgrowth, toxicity, and DNA damage.

There are many different factors that contribute to toxicity and DNA damage in enlarged G1-arrested cells. First, the overgrowth itself causes gross remodeling of the proteome. Some compartments scale with size, whereas others subscale or superscale. Second, this atypical scaling induces stress responses that impact subsequent cell cycle progression. In yeast, G1-arrested cells overgrow, and this induces an environmental stress response that is associated with cytoplasmic dilution. In human cells, cytoplasmic dilution may also occur following CDK4/6 inhibition, leading to decreased macromolecular crowding. Consistent with this model, Crozier et al. demonstrate that overgrowth triggers an osmotic stress response that is associated with increased intracellular osmolyte concentrations. This osmotic stress response causes p21 induction via a p38-mediated pathway, resulting in delayed and attenuated exit from G1 when CDK4/6 inhibitors are removed. Third, enlarged cells can escape the G1 arrest, but these cells experience significant replication stress during the proceeding S-phase. Fourth, the DNA damage response is also impaired in enlarged cells, and the DNA itself may be prone to damage. As a result of these replication-associated problems, p21 protein is induced again as cells enter G2, causing further cell cycle withdrawals. Finally, cells that fail to exit the cell cycle from G2, in particular p53-deficient cells that cannot induce p21, enter mitosis and...
experience even further DNA damage due to catastrophic chromosome segregation errors, promoting permanent exit from the cell cycle.11,12,25,48 Future research will be important to determine how much these various routes to genotoxic stress contribute to cell cycle exit in cancer cells with different oncogenic mutations.

It is now crucial to validate these findings in animal models and patient samples because if oncogene-dependent cell overgrowth is important to drive DNA damage and cell cycle withdrawal in vivo, then this would have important clinical implications. Most importantly, it would rationalize effective combination therapies that converge to inhibit Cyclin D-CDK4/6 activity without affecting global mTOR-dependent translation. Interestingly, this is the predicted effect of hormone therapy in combination with CDK4/6 inhibitors, which is the current standard of care treatment in HR+/HER2− breast cancer.3 This is

Figure 7. Enhancing oncogene-specific overgrowth and toxicity using tailored drug combinations
(A) Indicated ARPE19 cells were treated with palbociclib, and EdU added at day 1 for 3 further days to calculate the percentage of S-phase cells during the CDK4/6 inhibitor arrest. Data show mean ± SD from three repeats, and at least 500 cells were analyzed per condition. (B) Cell volumes of indicated ARPE19 cells treated with palbociclib for 1 day, 4 days, or 4 days + PF-05212384. Graph shows means ± SD from three repeats. (C) Quantification of γH2AX-positive foci (left) and nuclear morphologies (right) in indicated ARPE19 cells treated with DMSO or palbociclib for 7 days ± PF-05212384 and then analyzed 72 h after drug washout. Graphs show means – SD from three repeats. (D) Cell volume of indicated ARPE19 cells after 1–4 days of palbociclib treatment ± indicated growth inhibitors (MEKi, PD-0325901; AKTi(allo), MK2206; capivasertib, AKTi(atp)). Graph shows mean data ± SD from three repeats. (E) Western analysis of indicated cell lines arrested in palbociclib for 1 day in the presence/absence of the indicated growth inhibitor (MEKi, PD-0325901; AKTi(allo), MK2206; AKTi(atp), capivasertib). Western blot is representatives of 2 repeats. (F) Quantification of γH2AX-positive foci and nuclear morphologies in indicated ARPE19 cells treated with DMSO or palbociclib for 7 days ± MK2206 (AKTi(allo)) or capivasertib (AKTi(atp)) and then analyzed 72 h after drug washout. Graphs show means - SD from three repeats.
because steroid hormones such as estrogen and progesterone stimulate their receptors to translocate to the nucleus and enhance the transcription of Cyclin D. 49–52 Analogous synthetic lethal combinations have been proposed in clear cell renal cell carcinoma, where HIF2A stimulates Cyclin D transcription. 53 Furthermore, other combinations that act via similar principles have been identified, such as CK1ε inhibition, which represses SP1-mediated CDK6 transcription following CDK4/6 inhibition in breast cancer. 54 The ability of cancer cells to transcriptionally upregulate Cyclin D-CDK4/6 activity via various different routes suggests that similar effective combinations await discovery in other tumor types.

Many ongoing clinical trials are testing inhibitors of growth factor signaling pathways, such as PI3K, MEK, AKT, and mTOR, together with CDK4/6 inhibitors. 55,56 The fact that these combinations improve the G1 arrest has been extensively demonstrated in preclinical models; therefore, it is logical to assume that a similar sensitized G1 arrest may also be beneficial for treating patient tumors. 55,56,57 Nevertheless, the question of whether the resulting G1 arrest is cytostatic or cytotoxic is still likely to be important for the overall response, and this will depend on the mechanism(s) used to clear G1-arrested tumor cells in vivo. If this is via overgrowth-mediated cell cycle withdrawal, as we demonstrate, then the response will likely depend on the extent of overgrowth and how proteins scale, which will be defined by the oncogene(s) driving that growth and the particular drug combination used to arrest cells in G1. The concept is explained in Figures 7 and S7, which show that overgrowth and DNA damage depend on both inhibitor type and oncogenic context. Some combinations enhance oncogene-specific damage, whereas others reduce it. It is important to point out, however, that these drug combinations can lead to either senescence or apoptosis in preclinical models, 10 and it is debatable which endpoint is more clinically relevant, since some studies mainly report apoptosis, 57–59 whereas others predominantly show senescence. 60–63 It can be challenging to monitor senescence in clinical samples, but this is an important future goal, as discussed here. 64 At this stage, we would simply urge the monitoring of cell size and DNA damage in proliferating tumor cells, before and during treatment, to assess whether these properties change and, if so, whether the change is predictive of the overall response.

A major reason why drug combinations are needed to efficiently inhibit G1 progression is that cell growth itself acts to promote S-phase entry by producing Cyclin D and, thereby, elevating CDK4/6 activity. This is why mutations that enhance growth factor signaling have been associated with resistance to CDK4/6 inhibition in patients. 62,65,66 which begs the questions of how growth signals can drive both sensitivity and resistance. We propose that they can cause sensitivity to CDK4/6 inhibition if the G1 arrest is efficient, and overgrowth rises to intolerable levels, as we observe in different cell lines. However, growth signals can also drive resistance if the growth they produce is sufficient to bypass the G1 arrest and, crucially, if the resulting DNA damage and chromosome segregation errors experienced by large cells in S/M-phases are tolerable. In this case, the continued proliferation of these overgrown and damaged cells could facilitate the acquisition of resistant genotypes or karyotypes, such as the loss/mutation of p53, which allows CDK4/6 inhibitor-treated cells to proliferate despite extensive DNA damage (see Figures 4E–4H and S7F and Crozier et al. 11), and is frequently associated with resistance in patients. 66,67 In fact, we previously observed that many p53-deficient cancer types continue to proliferate following CDK4/6 inhibition, albeit at a slower rate, and these cells gradually accrue DNA damage over time, 68 most probably because they proliferate while enlarged.

How then might we use this information to help tackle the crucial issue of drug resistance? We propose that if resistant cells in vivo become enlarged and damaged, then they should be vulnerable to secondary agents, such as chemotherapeutics that either enhance DNA damage or inhibit DNA damage repair. This may help explain the surprising finding that the CDK4/6 inhibitor trilaciclib improves the overall survival in triple-negative breast cancer when given prior to chemotherapy with the genotoxic combination of gemcitabine and carboplatin. 69 It could also help explain the well-established radio-sensitizing effects of CDK4/6 inhibition. 69 It will be important in future to screen for and test predicted vulnerabilities in enlarged CDK4/6-inhibitor-treated cells.

In summary, we demonstrate here that CDK4/6 inhibitors allow oncogenic signals to drive toxic cell overgrowth and cell cycle exit, which holds great promise for the long-term goal of achieving tumor selectivity with general cell cycle inhibitors. It is now crucial to validate these findings in animal models and patient samples because if these are also observed in vivo, then the ability of CDK4/6 inhibitors to switch pro-proliferative oncogenic signals into toxic anti-proliferative responses would represent a new paradigm for anti-cancer treatment. Tumors may be addicted to oncogenes for survival, but if this addiction could be turned into a liability by inhibiting the cell cycle, then oncogenes could prove to be cancer’s Achilles heel.

Limitations of the study
This study demonstrates the importance of cell overgrowth for driving DNA damage and cell cycle exit in a range of cultured cell lines treated with CDK4/6 inhibitors. Future work will need to investigate whether these effects are also observed in vivo, in both animal models and clinical samples, following CDK4/6 inhibition with or without additional hormonal therapy. In these situations, it will also be important to examine cell size and DNA damage in drug-resistant cells that emerge during or following treatment. The situation in vivo is likely to be far more complex, especially since the clearance of senescence cells via the immune system will also be important for the overall response, and CDK4/6 inhibitors can affect immune clearance in many different ways. 9
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### STAR★METHODS

#### KEY RESOURCES TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REAGENT or RESOURCE</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>IDENTIFIER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Antibodies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouse anti-phospho-H2A.X, clone JBW301</td>
<td>Sigma</td>
<td>Cat# 05-636, RRID:AB_309864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouse anti-tubulin (clone B-5-1-2)</td>
<td>Sigma</td>
<td>Cat# T5168-2ML, RRID: AB_477579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbit anti-p21 Waf1/Cip1 (12D1)</td>
<td>Cell Signaling Technology</td>
<td>Cat# 2947, RRID: AB_823586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbit anti-phospho-Rb (Ser807/811) (D020B12)</td>
<td>Cell Signaling Technology</td>
<td>Cat# 8516S, RRID: AB_11178658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbit anti-phospho-S6 ribosomal protein (Ser235/236)</td>
<td>Cell Signaling Technology</td>
<td>Cat# 4858, RRID: AB_916156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbit anti-actin</td>
<td>Sigma</td>
<td>Cat# A2066, RRID: AB_476693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbit anti-phospho-AKT (Ser473) (D9E)</td>
<td>Cell Signaling Technology</td>
<td>Cat# 4060S, RRID: AB_2315049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbit anti-AKT</td>
<td>Cell Signaling Technology</td>
<td>Cat# 9272, RRID: AB_329827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbit anti-ERK1/2</td>
<td>Upstate</td>
<td>Cat# 06-182, RRID:AB_310068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouse anti-phospho-p44/42 MAPK (ERK1/2) (Thr202/Thr204) (E10)</td>
<td>Cell Signaling Technology</td>
<td>Cat# 9106S, RRID: AB_331768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouse anti-p53 (DO-1)</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Cat# sc-126, RRID: AB_628082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goat anti- Mouse Alexa Fluor 488</td>
<td>Thermo Fisher</td>
<td>Cat# A-11029, RRID: AB_2534088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goat anti-Rabbit Alexa Fluor 568</td>
<td>Thermo Fisher</td>
<td>Cat# A-11036, RRID: AB_10563566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRDye 800CW Goat anti-mouse IgG</td>
<td>LI-COR</td>
<td>Cat# 926-32210, RRID: AB_621842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRDye 800CW Donkey anti-rabbit IgG</td>
<td>LI-COR</td>
<td>Cat# 926-32213, RRID: AB_621848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRDye 680RD Goat anti-mouse IgG</td>
<td>LI-COR</td>
<td>Cat# 925-68070, RRID: AB_2651128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRDye 680RD Goat anti-rabbit IgG</td>
<td>LI-COR</td>
<td>Cat# 925-68071, RRID: AB_2721181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chemicals, peptides, and recombinant proteins</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palbociclib</td>
<td>MedChemExpress</td>
<td>Cat# HY-50767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF-05212384 (Gedatolisib)</td>
<td>Sigma</td>
<td>Cat# PZ0281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD0325901 (Mirdamentinib)</td>
<td>Selleckchem</td>
<td>Cat# S1036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MK-2206 (AKT\textsuperscript{\textit{\textblacksquare}}}</td>
<td>MedChemExpress</td>
<td>Cat# HY-108232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutlin-3a</td>
<td>Sigma</td>
<td>Cat# SML0580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF-06873600 (CDK2/4/6i)</td>
<td>Cayman Chemical</td>
<td>Cat# 35502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)-4-Hydroxytamoxifen</td>
<td>Sigma</td>
<td>Cat# H7904-5MG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capivasertib (AKT\textsuperscript{\textit{T171}}}</td>
<td>Insight Biotech</td>
<td>Cat# HY-15431-1ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-Trityl-L-cysteine</td>
<td>Sigma</td>
<td>Cat# 164739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAPI (4',6-Diamidino-2-Phenylindole, Dihydrochloride)</td>
<td>Thermo Fisher Scientific</td>
<td>Cat# D1306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penicillin/Streptomycin</td>
<td>Thermo Fisher Scientific, Gibco</td>
<td>Cat# 15070-063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrocortisone</td>
<td>Sigma</td>
<td>Cat# H0888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholera Toxin</td>
<td>Sigma</td>
<td>Cat# C8052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGF</td>
<td>Sigma</td>
<td>Cat# E9644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulin</td>
<td>Sigma</td>
<td>Cat# I9278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etoposide</td>
<td>MedChemExpress</td>
<td>Cat# HY-13629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical commercial assays</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Click EdU Staining kit</td>
<td>Sigma</td>
<td>Cat# BCK-EdU488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deposited data</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass spec proteomics data</td>
<td>PRIDE\textsuperscript{[\textdagger]}</td>
<td>PRIDE: PXD043792</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued on next page)
## RESOURCE AVAILABILITY

### Lead contact
Further information and requests for resources and reagents should be directed to and will be fulfilled by the lead contact, Adrian Saurin (a.saurin@dundee.ac.uk).

### Materials availability
Cell lines generated in this study can be provided by the lead contact upon request.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REAGENT or RESOURCE</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>IDENTIFIER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experimental models: Cell lines</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hTERT-RPE1</td>
<td>ATCC</td>
<td>Cat# CRL-4000; RRID: CVCL_4388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hTERT-RPE1 p53 KO</td>
<td>Crozier et al.(^{11,12})</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPE1-FUCCI</td>
<td>Krenning et al.(^71)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCF7</td>
<td>ATCC</td>
<td>Cat# HTB-22; RRID: CVCL_0031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T47D</td>
<td>ATCC</td>
<td>Cat# HTB-133, RRID:CVCL_0553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCF7 parental (PI3KA-E545K)</td>
<td>Beaver et al.(^28)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCF7 corrected (PI3KA-WT-K545E)</td>
<td>Beaver et al.(^28)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCF10A parental</td>
<td>ATCC</td>
<td>Cat# CRL-10317, RRID: CVCL_0598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCF10A PI3K-E545K</td>
<td>Gustin et al.(^31)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCF10A PI3K-H1047R</td>
<td>Gustin et al.(^31)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCF10A -ER-hRAS-G12V</td>
<td>Molina-Arcas et al.(^32)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCF10A parental p53 KO</td>
<td>This study</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCF10A PI3K-E545K p53 KO</td>
<td>This study</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCF10A PI3K-H1047R p53 KO</td>
<td>This study</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCF10A -ER-hRAS-G12V p53 KO</td>
<td>This study</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCF10A parental p21 KO</td>
<td>This study</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCF10A PI3K-E545K p21 KO</td>
<td>This study</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCF10A PI3K-H1047R p21 KO</td>
<td>This study</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCF10A -ER-hRAS-G12V p21 KO</td>
<td>This study</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARPE19</td>
<td>Herman et al.(^42)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARPE19 mut-p53</td>
<td>Herman et al.(^42)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARPE19 Tp53 Akt(^{myr})</td>
<td>Herman et al.(^42)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARPE19 Tp53 MEK(^{DD})</td>
<td>Herman et al.(^42)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARPE19 Tp53 hRAS(^{V12})</td>
<td>Herman et al.(^42)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oligonucleotides</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeting sequence for p53 KO gRNA: ACCAGCAGCTCCTACACCGGCGG</td>
<td>Crozier et al.(^{11,12})</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeting sequence for p21 KO gRNA: CCACCGTGATGCGCTAATGG</td>
<td>McKinley et al.(^72)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recombinant DNA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pcDNA5-Cas9</td>
<td>MRCPPU reagents DU48261</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Software and algorithms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GraphPad Prism 6</td>
<td>GraphPad Software</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Schindelin et al.(^73)</td>
<td><a href="https://imagej.net/Fiji">https://imagej.net/Fiji</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flowing software</td>
<td>Turku Bioscience</td>
<td><a href="https://biosciences.fi/services/cell-imaging/flowing-software/">https://biosciences.fi/services/cell-imaging/flowing-software/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holomonitor software</td>
<td>Holomonitor App Suite v3.4.0.158</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plotsofdata</td>
<td>Postma and Goedhart(^74)</td>
<td><a href="https://huygens.science.uva.nl/PlotsOfData/">https://huygens.science.uva.nl/PlotsOfData/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro-Manager</td>
<td>Edelstein et al.(^75)</td>
<td><a href="https://micro-manager.org/">https://micro-manager.org/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data and code availability

- The mass spectrometry proteomics data have been deposited to the ProteomeXchange Consortium via the PRIDE partner repository with the dataset identifier PXD043792 Accession numbers are listed in the key resources table.
- This paper does not report original code.
- Any additional information required to reanalyze the data reported in this paper is available from the lead contact upon request.

EXPERIMENTAL MODEL AND STUDY PARTICIPANT DETAILS

hTERT-RPE1 (RPE1 sex=male) cells were purchased from ATCC and the RPE1-FUCCI were published previously. The human ER+/HER2- breast cancer lines, MCF7 and T47D, were purchased from ATCC (sex=female). The MCF7 parental (PI3KA-E545K) and corrected (PI3KA-WT) cell lines are described in Weaver et al. (sex=female). The MCF10A PI3K-E545K and H1047R knock-in lines are described in Gustin et al. (sex=female). Tamoxifen was added at 250 nM for all experiments with the MCF10A- hRASV12 line. The ARPE19 parental and oncogenic lines were published previously (sex=male). We specifically chose these cells because they had previously been transduced with TERT, mTP53DD, CCDN1 and CDK4R24, which promotes CyclinD1/CDK4-dependent G1 progression to inhibit oncogene-induced senescence. Therefore, we hypothesised this would lead to strong CDK4/6 dependence. The AKTmyr contains a 14aa myristylation sequence from src in place of the PH domain at the N-terminus of AKT. MEKDD is MEK1 from Chinese hamster lung fibroblasts cells in which S218 and S222 have phosphomimetic aspartate substitutions, resulting in 5-fold higher activity than following serum stimulation.

Drug concentrations

The following drugs were used at the indicated concentration: Palbociclib (CDK4/6i: PD-0332991: 1.25 μM in RPE1/RPE1-FUCCI/ARPE19, 1 μM in MCF7/T47D/MCF10A), EdU (used at 1 μM), PF-05212384 (PF05: 30nM in RPE1/RPE1-FUCCI/ARPE19/MCF10A, 7.5nM in MCF7/T47D, unless stated otherwise), PD-0325901 (MEKi: Mirdametinib: 1.25 μM), MK2206 (AKTi (allo): 1 μM), nutlin-3a (5 μM), PF-06873600 (CDK2/4/6i: 1 μM), (Z)-4-Hydroxytamoxifen (250nM), capivasertib (AKTi (atp): 1 μM), S-Trityl-L-cysteine (STLC: 10 μM), etoposide (50 μM).
**Determining protein and RNA concentration**

For protein and RNA concentration measurements, cells were plated in 10cm dishes with 1μM palbociclib for 1-7 days, after which cells were harvested and protein concentration calculated with a detergent compatible (DC) assay (BioRad), or RNA concentration determined using a Trizol-based method (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Invitrogen 15596018).

**FUCCI experiments**

For all FUCCI experiments, STLC was added to prevent progression past the first mitosis. The single-cell FUCCI profiles were generated manually by analysing RPE1-FUCCI movies. A total of 50 red cells were randomly selected and marked at the beginning of the movie. The time points in which the FUCCI cells change colour was recorded to determine the time spent in each phase of the first cell cycle following release from CDK4/6 inhibition. RPE-FUCCI cells were always imaged with the same illumination settings and all images were placed on the same scale prior to analysis to ensure that the red/yellow/green cut-offs were reproducibly calculated between experiments. Mitotic entry was timed based on the visualization of typical mitotic cell rounding and loss of nuclear mAG-geminin.

**Immunofluorescence**

Cells were plated at low density on High Precision 1.5H 12-mm coverslips (Marienfeld) and fixed for 10 min with 4% paraformalde-hyde dissolved in PBS. Once fixed, coverslips were then incubated with primary antibodies at 4°C overnight, prior to washing with PBS and incubation with secondary antibodies and DAPI (1 μg/ml) for 2-4 h at room temperature. After further washing, coverslips were mounted onto slides with ProLong Gold Antifade (Thermo Fisher Scientific, P10144). Coverslips were imaged on either a Zeiss Axio Observer using a Plan-apochromat 20 x/0.8 M27 Air objective or a Deltavision with a 100 x/1.40 NA U Plan S Apochromat objective. The primary antibodies used were as follows: mouse anti-phospho-Histone H2A.X (Ser139; clone JBW301; Sigma, 05-636; 1/1,000), mouse anti-tubulin (clone B-5-1-2, Sigma, TS168-.2ML; 1/5000), and rabbit p21 Waf1/Cip1 (clone 12D1, Cell Signalling Technology, #2947, 1:1000), rabbit phospho-Rb (Ser807/811;clone D20812, Cell Signalling Technology. #8516S, 1:1000). The sec-

**Time-lapse imaging**

For FUCCI time-lapse imaging, cells were plated at low density (approximately 15,000 cells per well) and imaged in 24-well plates in DMEM inside a heated 37°C chamber with 5% CO2. Images were taken every 10 mins with a 10x/0.5 NA air objective using a Zeiss Axio Observer 7 with a CMOS ORCA flash 4.0 camera at 4 x 4 binning. For bright-field imaging, cells were imaged in a 24-well plate in DMEM in a heated chamber (37°C and 5% CO2). Images were taken every 10 mins with a 10x/0.5 NA air objective using a Hama-matsu ORCA-ER camera at 2 x 2 binning on a Zeiss Axiovert 200 M, controlled by Micro-manager software (open source; https://micro-manager.org/) or with a 20x/0.4 NA air objective using a Zeiss Axio Observer 7 (details above). Holographic imaging movies were captured using a Holomonitor M4 microscope to quantify single-cell mitotic volumes, which were calculated using the Holomo-

**Image analysis, quantification, and statistics**

For single cell volume traces, 5 cells were randomly selected in the first frame then followed by eye with volume measurements calculated every 2 hours for the duration of the first full cell cycle (mitosis to mitosis) or until the 48hr mark. For population analysis of mitotic volumes, 50 mitotic cells were randomly selected in the first 12 hours following palbociclib treatment. The volume of these mitotic cells was calculated and the resulting daughter cells were followed by eye until they entered mitosis, or the movie ended. The volume of the cell in this second mitosis was calculated and this along with the time between the first and second mitosis was used to deter-
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were treated with the indicated range of doses of palbociclib and imaging began immediately, with images being collected every 10 minutes for a total of 48hrs. For analysis 50 G1 (red) cells were selected at random in the first frame of the movie, and these cells were then tracked by eye and the point at which the nucleus changed colour to yellow was taken as the time point of G1 exit. 

γH2AX foci were counted by eye in the first 50 cells (per condition) selected using the DAPI channel. For scoring of nuclear abnormalities, the first 100 cells within the image were counted and scored based on their nuclear morphology. Both p21 and EdU intensities were calculated by first using the DAPI channel to generate an ROI overlay in ImageJ. This overlay was then applied to the EdU or p21 channels and used to measure the mean grey value of each individual ROI. An area outside any ROI was then designated as background and its mean grey value in either channel was also calculated. This background value was then subtracted from all ROI values from the corresponding channel.

Statistical significance was determined by Fisher’s exact test, unpaired t tests, or Mann-Whitney tests, as indicated in legends. The graphs in Figures 4, S3, and S4A are plotted as violin plots using PlotsOfData 74; https://huygens.science.uva.nl/PlotsOfData. This allows the spread of data to be accurately visualized along with the 95% confidence intervals (thick vertical bars) calculated around the median (thin horizontal lines). Statistical comparison can then be made by eye between any treatment and time points, because when the vertical bar of one condition does not overlap with one in another condition, the difference between the medians is statistically significant (P < 0.05).

Western blotting
Total protein lysates for immunoblot were prepared by scraping cells into 4X protein loading buffer (250mM Tris, 10% SDS, 40% Glycerol, 0.1% Bromophenol Blue) and then sonicating with a Cole-Parmer ultrasonic processor (20% Amp, 15 sec pulse). Samples were briefly boiled and centrifuged followed by a DC assay to determine protein concentration, after which 2-mercaptoethanol was added at a final concentration of 10%. Equal concentrations of protein were loaded and then separated on SDS—PAGE gels and transferred to 0.45μ nitrocellulose membranes (Amersham Protran Premium). After transfer, blots were blocked in 5% milk in TBS with 0.1% Tween 20 (TBS-T) and incubated overnight at 4°C in primary antibody in TBS-T. Membranes were then washed three times in TBS-T, incubated in IRDye secondary antibody for 2h, and washed 3 further times prior to visualisation on a LI-COR Odyssey CLx system. The primary antibodies used were rabbit pS6 (Phospho-S6 Ribosomal Protein; Ser235/236, Cell Signalling, 4858, 1/1000), rabbit actin (Sigma, A2066, 1/5000) rabbit pAKT (Ser473, Cell Signalling, 4060S, 1/1000), rabbit ERK1/2 (Upstate, 06-182, 1/1000), mouse p-p44/42 (pERK1/2 Thr202/Tyr204, Cell Signalling, 9272, 1/1000), rabbit ERK1/2 (Upstate, 06-182, 1/1000), mouse p-p21 (WhIs1/Cip1 (clone 12D1, Cell Signaling Technology, #2947, 1/1000), mouse p53 (Clone DO-1, Santa Cruz, sc-126, 1/1000). Secondary antibodies used were: IRDye 800CW Goat anti-Mouse IgG (LI-COR, 926-32210), IRDye 800CW Donkey anti-Rabbit IgG (LI-COR, 926-32213)., IRDye 680RD Goat anti-rabbit IgG (LI-COR, 925-68071), IRDye 680RD Goat anti-mouse IgG (LI-COR, 925-68070). All LI-COR secondary antibodies were used at a 1/15,000 dilution.

Colony-forming assays
For the colony-forming assays, cells were treated with palbociclib at 60,000 cells per 10 cm dish for different lengths of time (1–7 days) prior to drug washout (6 x 1 h washes). Following washing and trypsinization, RPE1 and MCF10A were plated in triplicate at 250 cells into 10 cm dishes and left to grow for 10 days, whereas MCF7 and T47Ds were plated at 500 cells in triplicate in 6-well plates and allowed to grow for 14–21 days. ARPE19 cells were plated at 250 cells in triplicate in 6-well plates and allowed to grow for 10 days. At the end of the assay, cells were washed twice in PBS and then fixed at 100% ethanol for 5 min. Developing solution (1:1 ratio of 2% Borax:2% Toluene-D in water) was added to the fixed cells for 5 min and the plates were then rinsed thoroughly with water and left to dry overnight. The plates were then scanned, and the number of colonies were quantified using ImageJ. This was performed by cropping to an individual plate and converting to a binary image. The fill holes, watershed and analyse particles functions were then used to count colonies.

Weekly fold increase in cell count
A total of 60,000 cells from each MCF10A line were plated into 10 cm dishes and treated with palbociclib (1 μM) or DMSO (control). After 7 days of treatment, cells were trypsinized, and counted using an NC-3000 Nucleocounter to calculate the 7-day fold increase in cell number. From the cell suspension, 60,000 cells were returned to palbociclib treatment, and this process was repeated two more times for a total of 3 weeks. At each time point, excess cells were transferred to coverslips and taken for immunofluorescence with γH2AX antibodies to assess DNA damage.

Proteomics
Cells were scraped in 2% SDS lysis buffer containing phosphatase inhibitors (PhosStop, Roche) and protease inhibitors (Complete EDTA-free, Roche). Extracts were heated to 95 °C, cooled to room temperature, and treated with benzonase (Millipore, 70664) for 30 min at 37 °C. The benzonase treatment was repeated until the extract was free flowing. The protein concentration was determined and 50 μg protein aliquots were precipitated using acetone–ethanol. Precipitated protein was then digested with trypsin (1:100), once for 16 hours before another aliquot of trypsin is added (1:100) and incubated for an additional 4 hours. Peptides were then desalted using SepPak cartridges (Waters).
Peptides were analyzed by LC-MS/MS using a data-independent acquisition (DIA) approach implemented on a RSLCnano HPLC (Dionex) coupled to an Orbitrap Exploris 480 mass spectrometer (Thermo) using DIA windows reported previously. Peptides were separated on a 50-cm (2-µm particle size) EASY-Spray column (Thermo Fisher Scientific), which was assembled on an EASY-Spray source (Thermo Fisher Scientific) and operated constantly at 50 °C. Mobile phase A consisted of 0.1% formic acid in LC–MS-grade water and mobile phase B consisted of 80% acetonitrile and 0.1% formic acid. Peptides were loaded on to the column at a flow rate of 0.3 µl min⁻¹ and eluted at a flow rate of 0.25 µl min⁻¹ according to the following gradient: 2–40% mobile phase B in 120 min and then to 95% in 11 min. Mobile phase B was retained at 95% for 5 min and returned back to 2% a minute after until the end of the run (160 min in total).

The spray voltage was set at 2.2 kV and the ion capillary temperature at 280 °C. Survey scans were performed at 15,000 resolution, with a scan range of 350–1,500 m/z, maximum injection time 50 ms and AGC target 4.5 × 10⁵. MS/MS DIA was performed in the Orbitrap at 30,000 resolution with a scan range of 200–2,000 m/z. The mass range was set to “normal”, the maximum injection time to 54 ms and the AGC target to 2.0 × 10⁵. An inclusion mass list with the corresponding isolation windows was used as previously reported. Data for both survey and MS/MS scans were acquired in profile mode. A blank sample (0.1% TFA, 80% MeCN, 1:1 v:v) was run between each sample to avoid carryover.

**Proteomics Data Analysis**

Raw files were analyzed using Spectronaut 16.2.220903.53000 (Biognosys) by directDIA using a 0.01 cutoff value for Precursor Qvalue, Precusor Posterior Error Probability (PEP) and Protein Qvalue. Carbamidomethyl was set as a fixed modification and Acetyl (N-term), Deamidation (NQ), Dioxidation (MW), Gln->pyroGlu and Oxidation (M) were set as variable modifications. No imputation was performed and the LFQ method was set to “QUANT 2.0 (SN Standard)”. The data were searched against the UniProt human reference proteome (accessed May 11th, 2021).

Protein-level intensities were then normalized two ways: 1) to protein copies using the proteomic ruler³¹ and 2) to concentrations by dividing intensities for individual proteins against the total intensity and multiplying by 1e6 (parts per million, ppm).³²