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In Brief
Using a bioinformatics analysis, Feng et al. identify FAK as a vulnerability of uveal melanoma (UM) with oncogenic Gαq and show that inhibition of FAK reduces UM growth. Gαq activates FAK via the non-canonical TRIO-RhoA pathway, and FAK in turn regulates YAP, known to be critical for UM, by phosphorylating MOB1.

Highlights
- Innovative bioinformatics pipeline reveals FAK as candidate synthetic lethal with Gαq
- FAK is a central mediator of the GNAQ-driven oncogenic signaling circuitry
- FAK activates YAP by MOB1 phosphorylation resulting in Hippo pathway inhibition
- FAK represents a potential precision therapeutic target for uveal melanoma treatment
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SUMMARY

Activating mutations in GNAQ/GNA11, encoding Gαq G proteins, are initiating oncogenic events in uveal melanoma (UM). However, there are no effective therapies for UM. Using an integrated bioinformatics pipeline, we found that PTK2, encoding focal adhesion kinase (FAK), represents a candidate synthetic lethal gene with GNAQ activation. We show that Gαq activates FAK through TRIO-RhoA non-canonical Gαq-signaling, and genetic ablation or pharmacological inhibition of FAK inhibits UM growth. Analysis of the FAK-regulated transcriptome demonstrated that GNAQ stimulates YAP through FAK. Dissection of the underlying mechanism revealed that FAK regulates YAP by tyrosine phosphorylation of MOB1, inhibiting core Hippo signaling. Our findings establish FAK as a potential therapeutic target for UM and other Gαq-driven pathophysologies that involve unrestrained YAP function.

INTRODUCTION

Recent advances in omics technologies have enabled the sequencing and characterization of cancers to an unprecedented depth, revealing mechanisms of growth and molecular drivers of disease. Bioinformatics analyses of these data have demonstrated a large heterogeneity in genetic drivers, highlighting complex biological networks toward the identification of therapeutic targets. These large-scale genomics efforts have revealed a small set of cancers that are driven by only a
select number of mutational events. One such cancer, uveal melanoma (UM), is characterized by a gain-of-function mutation in the heterotrimeric G protein, Gαq. A hotspot mutation in GNAQ or in GNA11 results in encoding constitutively active Gαq proteins rendering them as driver oncogenes in approximately 93% of UM (Van Raamsdonk et al., 2009, 2010). Another ~4% of UM harbor activating mutations in CYSLTR2, a Gαq-linked G protein-coupled receptor (GPCR) (Moore et al., 2016), firmly establishing UM as a Gαq-driven malignancy.

Aberrant activity of G proteins and GPCRs have been frequently associated with an oncogenic state and promotion of tumorigenesis (Dorsam and Gutkind, 2007; O’Hayre et al., 2013). However, the precise molecular mechanisms by which prolonged Gαq signaling controls cancer cell growth are still under investigation. We and others have previously shown that these mechanisms are in part due to unique signaling circuitries that lead to the activation of YAP, a transcriptional co-activator regulated by the Hippo pathway. In turn, YAP activation is necessary for UM growth (Feng et al., 2014b; Yu et al., 2014a). As a key downstream target of the tumor suppressive Hippo signaling cascade, YAP is over-activated in multiple cancers (Moroishi et al., 2015; Yu et al., 2015). Despite this, pharmacological targeting of YAP or the Hippo pathway has been challenging. Verteporfin, an ophthalmological drug, inhibits YAP-TEAD interaction, which is the major transcriptional factor regulated by YAP, in UM (Feng et al., 2014b; Yu et al., 2014a) with some anecdotal clinical success (Barbazetto et al., 2003; Soucek and Chihelková, 2006). However, the potential for verteporfin as a therapeutic has been hindered by its high systemic toxicities after prolonged use (Arnold et al., 2004; Azab et al., 2004). Currently, no effective therapeutic targets are available for UM, and no specific YAP inhibitors are currently in clinical use (Moroishi et al., 2015). A more complete understanding of Hippo/YAP-regulating mechanisms in cancer could identify urgently needed therapeutic opportunities to inhibit YAP-dependent tumors, including UM.

The highly distinctive and well-defined genetic landscape of UM provides a unique opportunity for the application of unbiased bioinformatics approaches to investigate the precise molecular mechanisms by which prolonged Gαq signaling controls cancer cell growth, and how these pathways can be targeted for precision therapies of Gαq-driven pathophysiology.

RESULTS

A Bioinformatics Pipeline Identifies PTK2 as a Druggable Candidate Synthetic Lethal Gene with GNAQ

To identify the specific vulnerabilities of GNAQ-driven tumors, we adapted our recently established bioinformatics pipeline that identifies clinically relevant synthetic lethal interactions (termed ISLE) (Lee et al., 2018). We denote a sample with mutations in or amplification of GNAQ, GNA11, or CYSLTR2 as Gαq+, and a sample without any of these genetic alterations as Gαq−. Adapting the rationale of the ISLE pipeline to our aim here, a candidate gene was determined to be a synthetic lethal (and thus a druggable vulnerability) of Gαq+ tumors if it satisfies the following four conditions (Figure 1A): (1) molecular condition: Gαq+ tumor should differentially overexpress the candidate gene versus Gαq− samples, (2) clinical condition: overexpression of the candidate gene should be associated with poor survival of patients with Gαq+ tumors, (3) phenotypic condition: the candidate gene is significantly more essential in Gαq+ than in Gαq− cell lines, and (4) druggable condition: targeting the candidate gene products with inhibitors is significantly more effective in Gαq+ than in Gαq− cell lines, i.e., Gαq+ cell lines are more sensitive to cell growth inhibition by the candidate inhibitors than Gαq− cell lines.

Our analysis therefore proceeded along four steps. First, taking advantage of the publicly available TCGA (The Cancer Genome Atlas (Cancer Genome Atlas Research Network et al., 2013) data, we extracted genes that are differentially overexpressed in Gαq+ UM (>96%). Since there are insufficient UM Gαq− samples, we used Gαq− skin cutaneous melanoma (SKCM) samples as a control. Indeed, we observed significant overlap in the overexpressed genes in Gαq− UM and Gαq+ SKCM samples (hypergeometric p < 4.83 × 10−198, see the STAR Methods) compared with Gαq− SKCM samples, justifying the use of Gαq− SKCM samples as a control for Gαq+ UM. We excluded genes overexpressed in UM compared with SKCM irrespective of Gαq status to control for cancer type-specific differential expression. Second, among the genes that pass the first filter, we identified those whose expression correlates with poor prognosis of UM patients. Third, we further selected those genes from in vitro functional screens that show significantly higher essentiality (or drug response) in Gαq+ cancer cell lines following

Figure 1. Bioinformatics Analysis Reveals FAK as Critical for UM Progression

(A) Pipeline to discover druggable therapeutic targets in UM: molecular screen, survival screen, in vitro screen, and druggable screen.

(B) Summary of the final seven gene hits. Molecular, clinical, phenotypic, and synthetic lethal (SL) scores were calculated as in Lee et al. (2018). Cell viability was assessed in vitro in UM cells (OMM1.3) following siRNA-mediated inhibition of each gene (cell viability normalized to OMM1.3 treated with non-targeting siRNA, siRNA-GNAQ used as positive control, mean, n = 3).

(C) Oncoprint depicting the genomic landscape of TCGA UM cohort (Robertson et al., 2017) downloaded from cBioPortal (Gao et al., 2013). Each bar represents one sample and their respective gene mutation or expression status. Percentage of gene alterations (in blue) and MutSig (in orange) or Gistic Q value (in purple) is assessed in vitro siRNA.

(D) Kaplan-Meier plot depicting overall survival for UM patients stratified against PTK2 expression in their tumors. PTK2-high and PTK2-low groups are defined as top and bottom 50% of PTK2 expression. p = 0.002.

(E) UM cell lines (Me270, 92.1, OMM1.3, OMM1.5, and MEL202 with GNAQ active mutation) cell viability assay after treatment with 1 µM FAK inhibitor (VS-4718), SKCM cells (SK-MEL-28) served as control. Data are the percent viability normalized to vehicle treatment (mean ± SEM, n = 3).

(F) Immunoblot of OMM1.3 cells showing pY397-FAK after treatment with VS-4718 (1 µM) (left) and cleaved PARP in response to 36 h VS-4718 (1–10 µM) treatment (right).

(G) Representative images (left) and quantification (right) of colony formation assay of OMM1.3 cells with VS-4718 treatment in semisolid media (mean ± SEM, n = 3; ***p < 0.001, DMSO treatment as control); scale bar, 1 mm.

See also Figure S1.
in genes encoding two RNA splicing factors, concentration (EC50) of around 1 μM for VS-4718 (Figure 1E). siRNA knockdown of FAK reduced cell viability in two representative UM cells nearly as potently as Gnaq (encoded by GNAQ) knockdown (Figures S1C–S1F). Gnaq knockdown reduced the accumulation of FAK in its active, tyrosine 397-phosphorylated form (pY397-FAK) (Sulzmaier et al., 2014) (Figure S1D), while FAK knockdown reduced total FAK and pY397-FAK protein levels, as expected (Figure S1E). FAKi inhibited FAK rapidly (Figures S1F and S1G), and resulted in UM apoptosis as judged by the accumulation of cleaved PARP (Figure 1F). We further assessed whether inhibition of FAK impacted the oncogenic potential of UM cells by measuring their clonogenic capacity in semisolid medium and found that FAK nearly abolished the colony formation ability of UM cells (Figure 1G). Together, these findings support that FAK may be required for GNAQ-driven UM cell proliferation, survival, and clonogenic growth, thereby representing a potential therapeutic target for the treatment of UM.

The Canonical Gnaq Signaling Pathway Is Dispensable but a TRIO-RhoA Non-canonical Signaling Mechanism Is Evident for FAK Activation

We next sought to investigate the mechanism by which Gnaq controls FAK. To understand the impact of GNAQ mutation on FAK activation, we express a hemagglutinin (HA)-tagged activated Gnaq mutant, Gnaq-Q209L (HA-GnaqQL) in UM and an empty vector control in HEK293 cells. Immunoblotting against total and phosphorylated forms of FAK revealed that phosphorylation of FAK at Y397 was significantly increased after expression of GnaqQL (Figure 2A). We next took advantage of a previously established synthetic Gnaq-coupled GPCR (Gnaq-DREADD) that can be activated by a synthetic ligand, clozapine N-oxide (CNO) (Armbuster et al., 2007; Vaque et al., 2013). We stimulated Gnaq-DREADD-expressing HEK293 cells with CNO over a time course and found increasingly elevated levels of pY397 FAK in response to CNO (Figure 2B). In UM cells, Gnaq knockdown by siRNA or inhibition by FR900359 (FR), a potent Gnaq inhibitor (Schrage et al., 2015), diminished FAK and extra-cellular signal-regulated kinase (ERK) activation (Figures 2C and S1D). Consistent with these data, Gnaq inhibition with FR in UM cells and SKCM cells showed inhibition of cell proliferation only in UM cells (Figure 2D). These results support the notion that FAK acts downstream of the Gnaq in UM. However, it is

Figure 2. Gnaq Regulates FAK Activation through a Non-canonical TRIO/RhoA-Mediated Signaling Circuitry

(A) Immunoblot depicting phosphorylation of FAK after transfection with HA-GnaqQL and control expression vectors in HEK293 cells.
(B) Immunoblot showing FAK phosphorylation in Gnaq-DREADD-expressing HEK293 cells stimulated with CNO (1 μM) over a time course analysis.
(C) Immunoblot depicting FAK and ERK phosphorylation after 2 h FR (1 μM) treatment in OMM1.3 cells.
(D) UM cell viability assay after 72 h treatment with FR, SK-MEL-28 BRAF SKCM served as control, percent viability is normalized to vehicle treatment (mean ± SEM, n = 3).
(E) Immunoblot showing phosphorylation of ERK and FAK after stimulation of Gnaq-DREADD-expressing HEK293 cells with CNO (1 μM) at 5 min in combination with 1 h U73122 (1 μM) pre-treatment.
(F) Immunoblot showing phosphorylation of ERK and FAK during a time course of treatment with GF109203X (1 μM) in OMM1.3 cells.
(G) Immunoblot showing FAK phosphorylation in Gnaq-DREADD-expressing HEK293 cells after 5 min of CNO stimulation (1 μM) in combination with siRNA-mediated TRIO, Rhoa, or Rac1 knockdown (top), and immunoblot to show efficiency of siRNA-mediated TRIO, Rhoa, or Rac1 knockdown (bottom).
(H) Immunoblot showing FAK phosphorylation after siRNA-mediated Rhoa knockdown in OMM1.3 cells.
(I) Immunoblot showing FAK phosphorylation in Gnaq-DREADD-expressing HEK293 cells after 5 min of CNO stimulation (1 μM) in combination with 1 h Y-27632 (10 μM) pre-treatment (top), and in combination with 1 h blebbistatin (20 μM) pre-treatment (bottom).
(J) Immunoblot showing FAK phosphorylation during a time course of treatment with Y-27632 (top) and blebbistatin (bottom) in OMM1.3 cells.
(K) Cartoon depicting the non-canonical signaling pathway regulating FAK activation by Gnaq. G protein βγ subunits are depicted in addition to Gnaq, DAG, diacylglycerol, MLC, myosin light chain.
### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gene set names</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>p value</th>
<th>FDR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PDGF down-regulated genes</td>
<td>-0.864</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRL-KO up-regulated genes</td>
<td>-0.863</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRAS dependency signature genes</td>
<td>-0.863</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRAS up-regulated genes</td>
<td>-0.851</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapa up-regulated genes</td>
<td>-0.818</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL21 up-regulated genes</td>
<td>-0.812</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAP conserved signature genes</td>
<td>-0.810</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGFR up-regulated genes</td>
<td>-0.800</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL15 up-regulated genes</td>
<td>-0.778</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTEN-KD up-regulated genes</td>
<td>-0.775</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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unclear which of the multiple Gαq or Gβγ-coupled receptor-initiated signaling pathways are responsible for regulating FAK activation.

Phospholipase Cβ (PLCβ)-dependent second messenger activation is among the best-known downstream events stimulated by Gαq (Griner and Kazanietz, 2007; Hubbard and Hepler, 2006), and is considered to be the canonical Gαq signaling pathway, causing transient ERK activation (Vaque et al., 2013). Inhibition of PLCβ by the use of a small-molecule PLC inhibitor (U73122) abolished the ERK activation, as we reported previously (Vaque et al., 2013), but did not have an impact on the activation of FAK (Figure 2E). Similarly, inhibition of protein kinase C (PKC) blocked ERK activation but not FAK in UM cells (Figure 2F), indicating that FAK may be activated independently of PLCβ. As Gαq activation of the AP1 and YAP transcriptional programs involves the stimulation of the TRIO guanine nucleotide exchange factor (GEF) for Rho GTPases (Feng et al., 2014b; Vaque et al., 2013), we next asked if this non-canonical Gαq signaling pathway is involved in FAK activation by Gαq. Knockdown of TRIO or RhoA prevented the activation of FAK by Gαq-DREADD in HEK293 cells and Gαq in UM cells (Figures 2G and 2H). In line with these findings, knockdown of Rac1 had no impact on FAK activation (Figure 2G). Further analysis showed that blocking actin polymerization by inhibiting ROCK or actomyosin contraction by Y-27632 (Ikeda et al., 2003; Narumiya et al., 2000) and blebbistatin (Kovacs et al., 2004), respectively, repressed FAK activation by Gαq-DREADD in HEK293 cells and Gαq in UM cells (Figures 2I and 2J). Together, these findings suggest that Gαq stimulates FAK independently of PLCβ and PKC, but instead through a non-canonical TRIO-dependent pathway resulting in RhoA activation and consequent cytoskeletal changes and actomyosin-initiated cell contraction and signaling (Figure 2K).

FAK Inhibition Represses the Transcriptional Activity of YAP
FAK is at the intersection of multiple signaling pathways that promote cancer progression (Sulzmaier et al., 2014), but it is not clear which downstream targets of FAK play a critical role in UM. As an approach to identify key downstream targets of the Gαq-FAK signaling axis, we performed transcriptomic RNA sequencing on UM cells treated with FAKi, and performed gene set enrichment analysis (Subramanian et al., 2005) to characterize the transcriptional effects of inhibiting Gαq and FAK at the pathway level using over 10,000 gene sets from the Molecular Signatures Database, including two sub-collections of oncogenic signatures and hallmark gene sets that we added to the database (Liberzon et al., 2015). Despite this large collection of transcriptional regulated genes, only 20 oncogenic signature gene sets were significantly repressed and 5 were activated by FAKi in UM cells (Figures 3A and S2A). These include the down-regulation of genes described as stimulated by KRAS and epidermal growth factor receptor and cytokines such as interleukin-21 (IL-21) and IL-15, consistent with the likely role in the activation of growth-promoting pathways by FAK (Sulzmaier et al., 2014). FAKi also reduced the expression of genes repressed by JAK2, p53, and BMI, suggesting that FAK inhibition may trigger a p53-response and stimulate BMI and JAK2, all of which may contribute to FAK-dependent cell growth and warrant further investigation. One intriguing observation was that FAKi treatment resulted in a significant downregulation of YAP-signature genes (Zhao et al., 2008) (Figures 3A–3D, S2A, and S2B). The involvement of Hippo/YAP signaling in cancer progression as well as previous work demonstrating the key role of YAP signaling in UM (Feng et al., 2014b; Yu et al., 2014a, 2014b) led us to pursue this specific gene signature. To validate these findings, we performed qPCR for the classical YAP-target genes CTGF and CYR61 in UM cells and found significant reduction in the presence of FAKi and knockdown of FAK or Gαq (Figures 3E, S2C, and S2D). We also found that FAKi clearly diminished YAP nuclear accumulation through quantification of anti-YAP staining and western blot analysis of nuclear and cytoplasmic cellular fractions (Figures 3F, 3G, and S2E). We further confirmed the functional impact of FAKi and FAK knockdown on YAP by performing YAP/TAZ luciferase reporter assays, and using Gαq inhibition and knockdown as a control (Figures 3H–3K, see Figures S1D and S1E for knockdown validation). Interestingly, inhibition of Gαq or FAK or siRNA-mediated FAK knockdown repressed YAP phosphorylation on tyrosine 357 (Y357) and increased phosphorylation on serine 127 (S127), which is one of the main repressive targets of Hippo signaling (Pan, 2010) (Figures 3I and 3K). We recapitulated these findings in heterologous systems, using HEK293 cells-expressing Gαq-DREADD stimulated with CNO and HEK293 cells expressing GαqQL. In both cases, FAK inhibition or knockdown reduced YAP pY357 and increased

Figure 3. FAK Inhibition Regulates the Hippo-YAP Pathway in UM
(A) The top 10 downregulated oncogenic signature gene sets of OMM1.3 cells treated with VS-4718 (1 μM, 2 h, vehicle treatment as control).
(B) Heatmap depicting the most downregulated genes by VS-4718 treatment as in (A), YAP signature genes.
(C) mRNA expression level of YAP signature genes from RNA sequencing data (mean ± SEM, n = 3).
(E) mRNA expression of CTGF and CYR61 measured by qPCR in OMM1.3 cells after 2 h VS-4718 treatment (1 μM, vehicle treatment as control, mean ± SEM, n = 3).
(F) Immunofluorescent staining of endogenous YAP (green) and Hoeschst staining for nuclear DNA (blue) in OMM1.3 cells after 4 h VS-4718 (1 μM) treatment, vehicle treatment as control; scale bar 10 μm.
(G) Immunoblot showing YAP nuclear and cytoplasmic localization after 2 h VS-4718 (1 μM) treatment in OMM1.3 cells, using lamin A/C and α-tubulin as nuclear and cytoplasmic markers, respectively.
(H) YAP/TAZ luciferase reporter assay after siRNA-mediated FAK and Gαq knockdown in OMM1.3 cells (mean ± SEM, n = 3).
(I) Immunoblot showing YAP phosphorylation after siRNA-mediated FAK knockdown in OMM1.3 cells.
(J) YAP/TAZ luciferase reporter assay after 2 h treatment with FR, VS-4718, or Dasatinib (all used at 1 μM) in OMM1.3 cells (mean ± SEM, n = 3).
(K) Immunoblot showing YAP phosphorylation after 2 h FR (1 μM), VS-4718 (1 μM), or Dasatinib (1 μM) treatment in OMM1.3 cells. In all cases **p < 0.01; ***p < 0.001.
See also Figures S2 and S3.
Figure 4. FAK Regulates YAP Activation through MOB-Y26 Phosphorylation, Disrupting the Core Hippo Kinase Signaling Pathway

(A) YAP/TAZ luciferase reporter assay after transient transfection of FAK and control expression vectors in HEK293 cells (mean ± SEM, n = 3; ***p < 0.001).

(B) Immunoblot showing phosphorylation status of YAP after transfection of HA-GsQQL and control expression vectors in HEK293 cells.
pS127, and reduced mRNA levels of YAP targets and YAP activity measured by luciferase reporter assay (Figures S3A–S3E), similar to UM cells. Inhibition of SRC in UM cells had no impact on YAP activity, measured by YAP/TAZ luciferase reporter assay, and failed to promote changes in YAP phosphorylation status (Figures 3J and 3K). Together, these results suggest that Gzx and FAK regulate YAP activation in UM, and that this process is likely independent of SRC.

**FAK Regulates YAP Activation through YAP Tyrosine Phosphorylation and Inhibition of Hippo Core Kinases**

We sought to further investigate the impact of FAK on YAP activity and found that overexpression of FAK in HEK293 cells leads to a significant increase of YAP activity (Figure 4A). It is well established that YAP activity and stability is tightly controlled by its phosphorylation on a number of residues (Moroishi et al., 2015; Yu et al., 2015). To define the phosphorylation state of YAP in the context of aberrant Gzx signaling, we expressed GzxQL and active FAK in HEK293 cells. Overexpression of GzxQL or FAK led to increased YAP protein level, diminished YAP pS127, and increased YAP pY357 (Figures 4B and 4C).

Regarding the changes in YAP pS127 levels, we hypothesized that FAK may also repress inhibitory signals to YAP from the Hippo pathway through direct phosphorylation on the core kinases of the Hippo pathway. In the canonical Hippo pathway, MST1/2 kinases bind to their regulatory protein SAV1 to activate the LATS1/2 kinases (collectively referred to as LATS) as part of a complex with MOB1A/B. LATS in turn phosphorylates YAP (or in certain cells TAZ) at multiple serine residues, including S127, leading to YAP inactivation by cytoplasmic retention and subsequent degradation (Moroishi et al., 2015; Pan, 2010; Yu et al., 2015). By a systematic analysis of the tyrosine phosphorylation status of each Hippo core kinase cascade component after co-transfection with FAK, we found only MOB1A to be tyrosine phosphorylated, as judged by its detection with anti-phosphotyrosine antibodies in tagged MOB1A immune precipitates (Figure 4D). MOB1 plays a critical regulatory role in the Hippo signaling cascade by transferring the upstream signal from the kinase complex of MST1/SAV1 to LATS (Meng et al., 2016). Consistent with our findings, scanning through large phospho-protein databases (PhosphositePlus PTM Resource), we found that Y26 on MOB1A/B is conserved among mammals, and that this particular residue is phosphorylated in numerous high-throughput phosphoproteomic datasets (n = 161) (Figure S4A).

To interrogate the functional impact of this phosphorylation on MOB1, we transfected HEK293 cells with HA-MOB1 and performed anti-HA and anti-pY immunoprecipitation assays. We found that an anti-pY26 MOB1 antibody recognized MOB1 only when co-transfected with FAK, which was abolished upon mutation of Y26 on MOB1 to Y26F (Figures 4E and 4F), thus serving as a specificity control. We further verified that FAK was able to directly phosphorylate MOB1 on its Y26 by in vitro kinase reaction using purified recombinant proteins (Figure S4B). When exploring the consequences of this post-translational modification in the assembly of Hippo kinase complexes, we found that phosphorylation on Y26-MOB1 by FAK dissociates the MOB1/LATS complex (Figure 4E). Strikingly, mutation of Y26 of MOB1 to Y26F rescued FAK-induced dissociation from LATS1 (Figure 4F) and abolished YAP activation by FAK (Figure S4C). Together, these data suggest that FAK regulates MOB1 Y26 phosphorylation, resulting in the dissociation of the functional MOB1/LATS complex, preventing Hippo-dependent inhibition of YAP and thereby promoting YAP activity.

**FAK Inhibition Results in Increased MOB1/LATS Association and Signaling and Reduced YAP Protein Stability in UM**

To study the effect of FAK inhibition on the Hippo pathway in UM cells, we examined the phosphorylation status of key Hippo pathway components after being treated with FAKi. We observed an increase of pS127-YAP, p909-LATS1, p1079-LATS1, a dose-dependent decrease in pY26 MOB1, and, in line with our previous data, enhanced MOB1/LATS interaction (Figures 5A, 5B, and S5A). In contrast, the MOB1-Y26F mutant demonstrated constitutively strong interaction with LATS independent of FAKi treatment (Figures S5B and S5C). Expression of MOB1-Y26F in UM cells phenocopied FAKi treatment as it diminished cell proliferation that could not be further reduced by FAKi (Figure S5D). Of interest, however, we did not observe an increase in p-MST1 in response to FAK inhibition (Figure 5A), nor a change in phosphorylation of MOB1 at T35, the main target of MST1 on MOB1 (Meng et al., 2016) with FAKi or knockdown of FAK (Figures S5B and S5C). This suggests that in UM, FAK regulates the link between LATS1 and YAP through MOB1, acting downstream of MST1 rather than controlling MST1 (Hippo) activity. In conjunction, we found FAK was able to phosphorylate YAP at Y357 in vitro (Figure S5E), a post-translational modification that has been shown to regulate YAP stability and activity (Li et al., 2016; Taniguchi et al., 2015), and, aligned with this finding, that FAK inhibition also caused diminished phosphorylation of Y357-YAP in UM cells (Figure 5A). Indeed, we confirmed that long-term (up to 36 h) FAK inhibition caused YAP protein downregulation (Figure 5C). Furthermore, LATS1/2 knockdown was sufficient to rescue from the growth inhibition by FAKi in UM cells (Figure 5D), supporting that YAP signaling plays a key role in growth promotion downstream of FAK in UM cells. Altogether, our data suggest that FAK drives UM cell growth through promotion of YAP activity by coordinating the previously described process.
F-actin-mediated release of YAP from AMOT, which enhances the pool of cytosolic YAP and enables its nuclear translocation (Feng et al., 2014b), with the release of the inhibitory Hippo kinase cascade through the FAK-mediated phosphorylation of MOB1 and the concomitant tyrosine phosphorylation and stabilization of YAP (Figure 5E).

**FAK Represents a Therapeutic Target in UM**

We next tested the potential of FAK inhibition for UM treatment. For these studies, we first used lentiviral-delivered Cas9-sgPTK2 to knock out (KO) PTK2 in UM cells (Figure 6A). Most UM cells did not survive after genome editing of PTK2 (not shown), only mass cultures of Mel270 targeted for PTK2 grew in culture after puromycin selection, displaying nearly abolished FAK protein levels (Figure 6A). Re-expression of FAK under control of a doxycycline-inducible promoter was sufficient to rescue cell viability in UM cells in which FAK expression was reduced (Figure S6). We observed that PTK2 KO cells developed only very small tumors (Figure 6B), suggesting that FAK activation is important for UM tumor growth in vivo. These observations further support the therapeutic potential of targeting FAK for UM. While there are multiple FAK inhibitors under clinical evaluation (Sulzmaier et al., 2014), VS-4718, chosen for our studies, was specifically designed for oral administration. We found that VS-4718 treatment reduces both UM tumor size and cell proliferation in two different UM tumor models (Figures 6C–6F). We observed clearly increased cytoplasmic retention of YAP in VS-4718-treated tumors, consistent with our previous findings that FAK controls YAP activity in UM cells (Figures 6G and 6H). These results suggest that the pharmacological inhibition of FAK may represent a viable therapeutic approach for the treatment of patients with UM harboring increased YAP activity.

**DISCUSSION**

The generation of massive quantities of genomic, epigenomic, and proteome data has greatly enhanced our understanding of oncogenesis and cancer as a cellular state. The development of bioinformatics pipelines to predict nodes of connectivity between transcriptional and signaling networks can expedite efforts to identify and exploit molecular vulnerabilities for the treatment of cancer. We thus hypothesized that focusing on a cancer type specifically driven by few activating (Gαq) mutations may serve as a good testbed for studying such an approach, harnessing an SL-based integrated bioinformatics analysis to uncover potential oncogenic signaling mechanisms controlled by Gαq and target them. In this study, we demonstrate that FAK acts as a critical oncogenic signaling node in UM—mediating Gαq-driven regulation of the Hippo/YAP pathway and enabling the promotion of an oncogenic state. We provide evidence that FAK destabilizes interactions between key core Hippo pathway members thereby activating YAP in an MST1 (Hippo)-independent manner. Furthermore, we show that the oncogenic activity of YAP in UM is targetable by clinically relevant therapeutic agents.

The transformative potential of Gαq signaling was established in the early 1990s (Gutkind et al., 1991; Kalinec et al., 1992); however, the precise signaling events by which Gαq and its linked receptors transduce sustained proliferative signals is not yet well defined. This is due in part to the large number of second-messenger generating systems and signaling events that can be perturbed upon Gαq activation. The activation of these second-messenger systems and their direct targets, including ion channels and kinases such as PKC, calcium/calmodulin-dependent protein kinases, and mitogen-activated protein kinase (MAPK), are responsible for most of the rapid physiological responses elicited by GPCRs (Griner and Kazanietz, 2007; Howe, 2011; Julius and Nathans, 2012; Newton, 2010; Prevaskaya et al., 2011; Rozengurt, 2007; Sassone-Corsi, 2012). Recent studies have identified additional members of this network for UM, highlighting the role of GEFs such as RasGRP3 in MAPK activation (Chen et al., 2017). Despite this link, therapeutic strategies targeting MAPK networks have yet to be successful. Clinical trials demonstrated that MEK inhibition with selumetinib or trametinib, as single agents or in combination with dacarbazine, has little impact on the overall survival of UM patients (Carvajal et al., 2014, 2018). This suggests that, although MEK/MAPK networks activated by PLCβ may contribute to UM initiation, they may not be critical for the maintenance of tumorigenic potential in UM.

Contrary to the transient nature of signal transmission through PLCβ, genome-wide RNAi screens revealed that the signaling events driven by Gαq that result in aberrant cell proliferation depends on highly specific protein-protein interactions, rather than solely on diffusible second messenger systems. Specifically, prior systems biology approaches have identified the RhoGEF TRIO as critical for activating Gαq-driven AP-1-regulated transcriptional networks independently of PLCβ to achieve sustained stimulation of proliferative pathways (Vaqué et al., 2013). Further work has shown that this pathway converges in the activation of YAP and that YAP activation is critical for the oncogenic potential of UM (Feng et al., 2014a, 2014b; Yu et al., 2014a). The Hippo/YAP cascade is a key growth-regulating pathway in normal cellular physiology (Bhatt et al., 2010; Moroishi et al., 2015; Yu et al., 2015). Unsurprisingly, dysregulation of the Hippo pathway is seen frequently in cancer; however,
Figure 6. FAKi in UM Inhibits YAP-Dependent UM Tumor Growth

(A) Immunoblot showing CRISPR/Cas9-mediated PTK2 knockout in Mel270 cells (wild-type as control).

(B) Tumor volume of PTK2 knockout Mel270 cells in vivo (wild-type as control) at the end of the study (mean ± SEM, n = 4) (left) and H&E-stained sections of representative tumors from each group (right); scale bar, 2 mm.

(C) Tumor volume of Mel270 cells in vivo with or without VS-4718 treatment at the end of the study (mean ± SEM, n = 8) (left) and H&E-stained sections of representative tumors from each group (right); scale bar, 2 mm.

(D) Ki67 immunohistochemistry staining in Mel270 tumors with or without VS-4718 treatment; scale bar, 50 μm.

(legend continued on next page)
its core components are rarely mutated (Martin et al., 2018; Moroishi et al., 2015). Rather, external pressures from upstream oncogenes typically drive YAP-dependent cell proliferation. Identifying the key molecular players that facilitate oncogenic signaling through Hippo/YAP pathway may also uncover potential network vulnerabilities. Interestingly, inhibition of PLCβ does not impact the activation of YAP after Gq stimulation (Feng et al., 2014b). Together, these findings suggest that the canonical Gq-PLCβ-MAPK signaling axis may be critical for tumor initiation rather than tumor maintenance, and that opportunities for intervention may lie within the distinct signaling circuitry transduced through TRIO.

FAK is a non-receptor tyrosine kinase whose role as a downstream target of Gq has been well established by biochemical studies (Gutkind and Robbins, 1992); however, the contribution of FAK as a mediator of oncogenic Gq signaling has not been previously explored. Our finding that FAK is rapidly activated by Gq-linked GPCRs and the oncogenic mutant Gq through TRIO and Rhoa, rather than PLCβ, prompted us to focus on the possibility that FAK may represent an integral component of the non-canonical pathway by which Gq regulates aberrant cell growth. We found that inhibition of FAK was sufficient to reduce UM cell proliferation and, if prolonged, to trigger apoptotic cell death. This response was unanticipated as FAK inhibitors often have limited activity in most cancers as single agents but instead synergize with cytotoxic agents, as we have shown for ovarian cancer, which overexpresses FAK as a typical example (Sulzmaier et al., 2014). We hypothesized that, compared with other cancer types with FAK overexpression, the compounding impact of PTK2 copy-number gain and overexpression together with Gq-driven FAK activity in UM creates a unique cellular state that may be highly dependent on the activity of FAK and therefore highly sensitive to FAK inhibition. This convergence of computational predictions, and biochemical and genetic information, enabled the discovery of the therapeutic potential of inhibiting FAK for UM treatment.

FAK has been recently linked to YAP activity in mechanotransduction and in the coordination of cell proliferation and differentiation in mouse incisors during development (Hu et al., 2017; Lachowski et al., 2018). However, the underlying cell context-specific and developmental mechanisms are still not fully understood. We provide evidence that in UM the role of FAK converges on promoting YAP activity through the tandem inhibition of Hippo pathway signals by phosphorylation of Y26 of MOB1 and Y357 of YAP. In the case of YAP phosphorylation, these observations extend prior studies indicating the role of JAK2 and SRC in Y357 phosphorylation (Li et al., 2016; Taniguchi et al., 2015). However, downstream of FAK, we observed both tyrosine-phosphorylated YAP and a decrease in pS127 YAP, the latter a direct target of the Hippo signaling pathway. In this regard, there is increasing evidence suggesting that Hippo signaling is tightly regulated by the assembly and dissociation of key signaling complexes. Our interrogation of these complexes in response to FAK activation led to the finding that FAK phosphorylates MOB1 on Y26, resulting in the disassembly of the MOB1/LATS complex and disruption of the Hippo pathway downstream of MST1, effectively rewiring the molecular mechanisms controlling YAP activity. Mutation of Y26 of MOB1 is sufficient to abolish the effect of FAK. Whereas further work may be required to establish the structural basis for this inhibition, as well as alternative FAK-driven pathways in mechanotransduction and development, our findings support that disruption of the MOB1/LATS signaling complex by FAK is a key regulatory step resulting in YAP activation by Gq. Ultimately, this mechanism may coordinate the Gq-induced increase in cytosolic free YAP, which is mediated by Rho-induced actin polymerization (Feng et al., 2014b), with Hippo kinase cascade inhibition through the FAK-mediated phosphorylation of MOB1, resulting in the YAP-dependent UM cell growth.

The current lack of effective treatments for primary or metastatic UM leaves a large therapeutic gap for patients and clinicians underscoring an urgent need for the identification of additional pharmacological targets for therapeutic intervention. As YAP-targeting strategies have remained elusive thus far, the success of FAK inhibition in our in vivo models in the context of previously established success and safety of FAK inhibitors in human clinical trials highlights the translational potential of our findings and establishes FAK as a therapeutic target for the treatment of UM. Toward this end, the application of systems-level and bioinformatics investigation will be a powerful strategy to identify precision treatment options for UM and a myriad of Gq-driven diseases.
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Detailed methods are provided in the online version of this paper and include the following:
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(E) Tumor volume of OMM1.3 cells in vivo with or without VS-4718 treatment at the end of the study (mean ± SEM, n = 4) (left) and H&E-stained sections of representative tumors from each group (right), scale bar, 2 mm.
(F) Ki67 immunohistochemistry staining of OMM1.3 tumors with or without VS-4718 treatment; scale bar, 50 μm.
(G) Representative YAP immunohistochemistry staining of Mel270 tumors with or without VS-4718 treatment; scale bar, 50 μm.
(H) Quantification of (G), showing fraction of cells with nuclear YAP localization (mean ± SEM, n = 3). In all cases ***p < 0.001. See also Figure S6.


## 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>YAP</td>
<td>Cell Signaling Technology, MA</td>
<td>Cat# 14074; RRID: AB_2650491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pS127-YAP</td>
<td>Cell Signaling Technology, MA</td>
<td>Cat# 4911; RRID: AB_2218913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pS909-LATS1</td>
<td>Cell Signaling Technology, MA</td>
<td>Cat# 9157; RRID: AB_2133515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pT1079-LATS1</td>
<td>Cell Signaling Technology, MA</td>
<td>Cat# 8654; RRID: AB_10971635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATS1</td>
<td>Cell Signaling Technology, MA</td>
<td>Cat# 3477; RRID: AB_2133513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-MST1/MST2</td>
<td>Cell Signaling Technology, MA</td>
<td>Cat# 3681; RRID: AB_330269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MST1</td>
<td>Cell Signaling Technology, MA</td>
<td>Cat# 3682; RRID: AB_2144632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAPDH(14C10)</td>
<td>Cell Signaling Technology, MA</td>
<td>Cat# 2118; RRID: AB_561053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α-Tubulin</td>
<td>Cell Signaling Technology, MA</td>
<td>Cat# 3873; RRID: AB_1904178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pY</td>
<td>Cell Signaling Technology, MA</td>
<td>Cat# 9411; RRID: AB_331228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA-tag-HRP</td>
<td>Cell Signaling Technology, MA</td>
<td>Cat# 2999; RRID: AB_1264166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA-tag</td>
<td>Cell Signaling Technology, MA</td>
<td>Cat# 3724; RRID: AB_1549585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>myc-tag</td>
<td>Cell Signaling Technology, MA</td>
<td>Cat# 2278; RRID: AB_490778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pY397-FAK</td>
<td>Cell Signaling Technology, MA</td>
<td>Cat# 8556; RRID: AB_10891442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAK</td>
<td>Cell Signaling Technology, MA</td>
<td>Cat# 3285; RRID: AB_2269034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cleaved PARP</td>
<td>Cell Signaling Technology, MA</td>
<td>Cat# 9541; RRID: AB_331426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-ERK1/2</td>
<td>Cell Signaling Technology, MA</td>
<td>Cat# 4370; RRID: AB_2315112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERK1/2</td>
<td>Cell Signaling Technology, MA</td>
<td>Cat# 4696; RRID: AB_390780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOB1</td>
<td>Cell Signaling Technology, MA</td>
<td>Cat# 13730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pT35-MOB1</td>
<td>Cell Signaling Technology, MA</td>
<td>Cat# 8699; RRID: AB_11139998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gαq(E-17)</td>
<td>Santa Cruz Biotech., CA</td>
<td>Cat# sc-393; RRID: AB_631536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAK(C-20)</td>
<td>Santa Cruz Biotech., CA</td>
<td>Cat# sc-558; RRID: AB_2300502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RhoA</td>
<td>Cell Signaling Technology, MA</td>
<td>Cat# 2117; RRID: AB_10693922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIO(H120)</td>
<td>Santa Cruz Biotech., CA</td>
<td>Cat# sc-28564; RRID: AB_2272362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rac1</td>
<td>BD Biosciences, CA</td>
<td>Cat# 610651; RRID: AB_397978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pY357-YAP</td>
<td>Abcam, MA</td>
<td>Cat# ab62751; RRID: AB_956486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATS2</td>
<td>Bethyl Laboratories, TX</td>
<td>Cat# A300-479A; RRID: AB_2133375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pY26-MOB1A</td>
<td>Signalway Antibody, MA</td>
<td>Cat# 12878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flag-tag-HRP</td>
<td>Sigma-Aldrich, MO</td>
<td>Cat# A8592; RRID: AB_.439702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K67</td>
<td>DAKO, CA</td>
<td>Cat# M724029-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bacterial and Virus Strains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strains</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Catalog number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DH5alpha Competent E. coli</td>
<td>BioPioneer, CA</td>
<td>Cat# GACC-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stbl3 Competent E. coli</td>
<td>Thermo Fisher</td>
<td>Cat# C737303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>siRNA</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Catalog number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-targeting</td>
<td>Dharmaco, CO</td>
<td>Cat# D-001810-0X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gαq</td>
<td>Sigma-Aldrich, MO</td>
<td>Cat# SASI_Hs01_00231793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAK</td>
<td>Thermo Fisher, MA</td>
<td>Cat# s11485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AKT1</td>
<td>Thermo Fisher, MA</td>
<td>Cat# s659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MG53</td>
<td>Thermo Fisher, MA</td>
<td>Cat# s22380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTHFD1</td>
<td>Thermo Fisher, MA</td>
<td>Cat# s9032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDK1</td>
<td>Thermo Fisher, MA</td>
<td>Cat# s464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIRT1</td>
<td>Thermo Fisher, MA</td>
<td>Cat# s223591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSMB5</td>
<td>Thermo Fisher, MA</td>
<td>Cat# s11354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIO</td>
<td>Dharmaco, CO</td>
<td>Cat# L-005047-00-0005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued on next page)
CONTACT FOR REAGENT AND RESOURCE SHARING

Requests for further information or resources and reagents should be directed to and will be fulfilled by the Lead Contact, Dr. J. Silvio Gutkind (sgutkind@ucsd.edu). Plasmids used and generated in this study are subject to restrictions under a simple material transfer agreement (MTA) with UCSD.
EXPERIMENTAL MODEL AND SUBJECT DETAILS

Human Tumors Xenografts and VS-4718 In Vivo Treatment

All animal studies were carried out according the University of California San Diego (UCSD) Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC)-approved protocol (S15195). Female NOD.Cg-Prkdcsid Il2rgtm1wjl/SzJ mice (commonly known as NOD scid gamma, Jackson Laboratory, Maine), 6 to 8 weeks of age and weighing 18 to 20 g, were used in the study of UM cells, housed in appropriate sterile filter-capped cages, and provided food and water ad libitum. All procedures were essentially as previously described (Feng et al., 2014b; Schrage et al., 2015; Vaque et al., 2013). Briefly, exponentially growing cultures were harvested, washed, resuspended in RPMI 1640, and 2 x 10⁶ viable cells were transplanted subcutaneously into the flanks of mice. For tumor growth analysis, tumor volume was assessed as [LW²/2]; where L and W represent the length and the width of the tumor. The animals were monitored twice weekly for tumor development. Results of animal experiments were expressed as mean ± SEM of a total of tumors analyzed. To administer VS-4718 (Verastem Oncology; Needham, MA) to mice, 10 mg/ml VS-4718 was prepared in 0.5% carboxymethyl cellulose (CMC) (C5678, Sigma-Aldrich; St. Louis, MO) 0.1% Tween 80 (P17574, Sigma Aldrich; St. Louis, MO) in sterile water, 100 mg/kg administered via oral gavage twice daily, control group was treated with vehicle.

Cell Lines, Culture Procedures and Chemicals

HEK293 and HEK293T cells were cultured in DMEM (Sigma-Aldrich Inc., MO) and containing 10% FBS (Sigma-Aldrich Inc., MO) and 1 x antibiotic/antimycotic solution (Sigma-Aldrich Inc., MO). Culture conditions for UM cells (OMM1.3, OMM1.5, MEL202, Mel270 and 92.1) have been described elsewhere (Zuidervaart et al., 2005). SK-MEL-28 cells were purchased from ATCC and cultured following ATCC recommendations in EMEM containing 10% FBS. VS-4718 (PND-1186) was purchased from MedChemExpress (MCE) pre-prepared as a 10mM solution in DMSO. FR900359 (FR) was prepared in the lab of Dr. Evi Kostenis. Clozapine N-oxide (CNO), GF109203X, U73122, Blebbistatin, and Y-27632 were all purchased from Sigma-Aldrich Inc. (MO) and used at concentrations indicated in figure legends.

DNA Constructs

Plasmids pCEFL-HA, pCEFL-HA-GαqQL, pCEFL-HA-Gαq-DREADD, pCEFL-3x-Flag-Renilla-luciferase were described previously (Marinissen et al., 2003; Teramoto et al., 2003). pCEFL-myF-FAK was described previously (Chikumi et al., 2002; Iigishi et al., 1999). Plasmids pCMV-myc-MST1 (Addgene #8847, originally from Joseph Avruch’s lab), pCMV2-FLAG-SAV1 (Addgene #18970, originally from Marius Sudol’ lab), pcDNA3-HA-MOB1 (Addgene #32835, originally from Kunliang Guan’s lab), p2xFLAG-CMV2-LATS1 (Addgene #18971, originally from Marius Sudol’s lab) and 8xGIIIC-luciferase (Addgene #34615, originally from Stefano Piccolo’s Lab).

METHOD DETAILS

Bioinformatic Analysis (Identifying Clinically-Relevant Gαq-Specific Vulnerabilities of UM)

To identify the clinically-relevant vulnerabilities for UM, we performed an analysis that follows the main concepts of our previous work, ISLE (Lee et al., 2018) with modifications for Gαq-driven UM. We analyzed the cancer genome atlas (TCGA) (Cancer Genome Atlas Research Network et al., 2013) UM samples with skin cutaneous melanoma (SKCM) samples as control together with the large-scale functional (Cheung et al., 2011; Cowley et al., 2014; Marcotte et al., 2012, 2016) and drug response (Barretina et al., 2012; Friedman et al., 2015; Iorio et al., 2016) screens. We downloaded the gene expression, copy number alteration, and patient survival and other clinical characteristics of TCGA UM and SKCM cohort from cBioPortal (Gao et al., 2013) on Feb 1, 2017. We used 80 UM samples and 287 SKCM samples for our analysis. We obtained the data from cBioPortal as it integrates the mutation analysis from different TCGA centers to avoid center specific bias in mutation calls.

We denoted a tumor sample as Gαq“ if any of the Gαq-family genes (GNAQ, GNA11 and CYSLTR2) are either mutated or amplified in the given sample (amplification, if the Gistic score is greater than 0.35), and as Gαq” if the sample lacks GNAQ, GNA11 and CYSLTR2 genes mutation and amplification. First, we selected important genes in UM, that are (i) highly over expressed in Gαq+ UM (n=77, excluding 3 Gαq− cases with respect to control Gαq− SKCM TCGA samples (n=209) using Wilcoxon rank sum test (p<0.05). We filtered out (ii) those genes that are overexpressed in UM compared to all SKCM samples irrespective of Gαq status (Wilcoxon rank sum p<0.05), leading to 1,146 out of total 18,087 satisfying both conditions. We tested whether these genes show significant overlap with the genes overexpressed in Gαq+ skin melanoma TCGA samples (n=78, mutation=16, amplification=65, overlap=13) compared to Gαq− SKCM samples using hypergeometric test, truncating the hypergeometric p values to 10⁻¹⁰.

Second, we further selected the genes whose inactivation leads to better patient survival in UM, thus potential target of a therapy. We used a stratified Cox proportional hazard model to evaluate the association, while controlling for available potential confounders in the dataset including patients’ sex and tumor stage (Theurau and Grambsch, 2000). The inactivation of 293 genes (out of 1,146 genes that passed the previous screen) show significant association with improved patient survival.

Third, we used gene essentiality (Cheung et al., 2011; Cowley et al., 2014; Marcotte et al., 2012, 2016) and drug response screens (Barretina et al., 2012; Friedman et al., 2015; Iorio et al., 2016) in a wide panel of cancer cell lines to identify the genes whose knockdown/inhibition specifically reduces Gαq− cell viability. We used the mutation and copy number data from the measurements on the cell lines in CCLE collection (Barretina et al., 2012) to determine the status of Gαq-family genes in these cell lines. We performed
Wilcoxon rank sum test between the essentiality or drug response values of the cell lines that are Gαq+ vs. Gαq-. The essentiality or the drug inhibition identified 72 genes out of 293 genes (that passed the 2nd filter) that satisfy this condition.

Finally, we prioritized the druggable targets. We collected the druggable genome using the drug-to-target mapping curated in DrugBank database (Law et al., 2014) and the literature including (Barretina et al., 2012; Basu et al., 2013; Friedman et al., 2015; Gao et al., 2013; Garnett et al., 2012; Iorio et al., 2016). Our collection encompasses 756 targetable genes, including 273 targets of FDA-approved drugs, 10 targets of drugs under clinical trials, and 473 experimental drugs. We further removed the genes that belong to the same chromosomes to the Gαq-family genes to avoid the confounding effect of genomic linkage. This step led to the final set of 7 targets. The strength of the SL interactions (termed SL-score) of the 7 pairs was calculated as defined in (Lee et al., 2018).

**Immunoblot Assay**

Western blot assays were performed as described previously (Feng et al., 2014b). Western blots were developed using Immobilon Western Chemiluminescent HRP substrate (Millipore, MA) according to the manufacturer’s instructions.

**CRISPR-Cas9-Knockout**

PTK2-sgRNA-CRISPR/Cas9-all-in-one-lentivector vector was purchased from Applied Biological Materials Inc. (Cat. K1752206). Lentivirus were prepared with HEK293T cells as the packaging cells as previously reported (Basile et al., 2004). To establish PTK2-knock out, cells were infected with the corresponding lentiviral supernatants for 16 hours, after which the media was changed to normal growth medium containing puromycin (Sigma-Aldrich Inc., MO) selection.

**siRNAs Transfection**

All cells were transfected using Lipofectamine® RNAiMAX Reagent (Thermo Fisher Scientific) according to manufacturer’s instructions.

**MOB1-Y26F Point Mutation**

MOB1-Y26F point mutant was generated using the Quickchange Site-Directed Mutagenesis kit following manufacturer’s instructions (Agilent Genomics, CA). pcDNA3-HA-MOB1 was used as the template and see the primers in the Key Resources Table.

**Immunofluorescence**

Cells cultured on coverslips were washed with PBS, fixed with 3.7% formaldehyde in phosphate-buffered saline (PBS) for 30 min, and permeabilized using 0.05% Triton X-100 for 10 min. Fixed cells were blocked with 3% FBS-containing PBS for 30 min, and incubated with YAP (Cell signaling technology, MI) antibody (in 3% FBS-PBS otherwise stated) for 1 hr at room temperature. The reaction was visualized with Alexa-labeled secondary antibodies (Invitrogen, CA). Samples were mounted in PBS buffer containing puromycin (Sigma-Aldrich Inc., MO) selection.

**Luciferase Assays**

Cells were co-transfected with pCEFL-3x-Flag-Renilla-luciferase and 8xGTIIC-luciferase (Addgene 34615) in 6-well plates overnight to the detection of the luciferase activity, using a Dual-Glo Luciferase Assay Kit (Promega, WI) and a Microtiter plate luminometer (Dynex Tech., VA).

**Immunohistochemistry**

The following antibodies were used for immunohistochemistry anti-Ki67 (DAKO) and anti-YAP (CST). Unstained 5 μm paraffin sections were dewaxed in Safeclear II (Fisher Scientific, PA), hydrated through graded alcohols and distilled water, and washed three times with PBS. Antigens were retrieved using or 10 mM citrate buffer boiled in a microwave for 20 min (2 min at 100% power and 18 min at 10% power). The slides were allowed to cool down for 30 min at room temperature, rinsed twice with PBS, incubated in 3% hydrogen peroxide in PBS for 10 min to quench the endogenous peroxidase. The sections were then sequentially washed in distilled water and PBS, incubated in blocking solution (2.5% bovine serum albumin in PBS) for 30 min at room temperature. Excess solution was discarded and the primary antibodies were applied diluted in blocking solution at 4 °C overnight. After washing with PBS, the slides were sequentially incubated with the biotinylated secondary antibody (1:400) (Vector Laboratories, CA) for 30 min and with the avidin-biotin complex, reconstituted according to the instruction of the manufacturer in PBS (Vector Stain Elite, ABC kit) (Vector Laboratories, CA), for 30 min at room temperature. The slides were developed in 3,3-diaminobenzidine (Sigma FASTDAB tablet) (Sigma Chemical, MO) diluted in distilled water under a microscope.

**Immunoprecipitation**

Cells were lysed with IP lysis buffer [10 mM Tris-Cl (pH 8.0), 150 mM NaCl, 1 mM EDTA, 0.3% CHAPS, 50 mM NaF, 1.5 mM Na3VO4, protease inhibitor (Thermo Scientific, CO), 1 mM DTT, 1 mM PMSF], and centrifuged at 16,000 g for 5 min at 4 °C. Supernatants were incubated with first antibody for 1 hr at 4 °C, and protein G or protein A conjugated resin for another 1 hr. Resins were then washed 3 times with lysis buffer and boiled in SDS-loading buffer.
**Cell Growth Assays**
Cell growth assays were performed as described previously (Yamaguchi et al., 2016). Cells were cultured in 96-well-plate and treated with drugs for 72 hr. The manufacturer’s instructions of Alamar Blue Cell Viability Reagent were followed to complete the assay.

**3D Cell Culture**
3-dimensional cultures were performed as described previously (Tancioni et al., 2015). Briefly, 10,000 cells were embedded in 1% methylcellulose diluted in growth media and plated onto 6-well poly-hydroxyethyl methacrylic acid (poly-HEMA)-coated plates.

**Generation of GST-MOB Fusion Proteins**
GST fusion proteins were prepared engineered, expressed in bacteria, and purified as previously described in (Martin et al., 2018) using standard procedures.

**In vitro FAK Kinase Assay**
Kinase reactions were performed as previously described in Bernard-Trifilo et al. Briefly, 1.5 µg of substrate (MOB1-GST, MOB1-Y26F-GST, GST-only control, or recombinant YAP) was resuspended in 40uL FAK Kinase buffer (20 mM HEPES pH 7.4, 10% glycerol, 10 mM MgCl₂, 10 mM MnCl₂, and 150 mM NaCl). 5 µL magnesium/ATP cocktail (75 mM MgCl₂, 20 mM MOPS pH 7.2, 25 mM β-glycerol phosphate, 5 mM EGTA, 1 mM sodium orthovanadate, 1 mM dithiothreitol) with or without 50 µM ATP was added to appropriate tubes, and placed in 32°C water bath for 15 min. Samples were boiled in sample buffer and processed on SDS-PAGE.

**Nuclear and Cytoplasm Extraction**
Subcellular fractionated lysates were generated using NE-PER Nuclear and Cytoplasmic Extraction Reagents (Thermo Scientific, CO) following manufacturer instructions.

**Statistical Analysis**
All data analysis was performed using GraphPad Prism version 7.03 for Windows (GraphPad Software, CA). The data were analyzed by ANOVA test or t-test (* p<0.05, **p<0.01, *** p< 0.001).

**DATA AND SOFTWARE AVAILABILITY**
RNAseq data have been deposited in GEO under ID code GEO: GSE126007.