



(43) International Publication Date
21 June 2012 (21.06.2012)

(10) International Publication Number
WO 2012/083243 A1

(51) International Patent Classification:
C12Q 1/68 (2006.01)

(21) International Application Number:
PCT/US2011/065630

(22) International Filing Date:
16 December 2011 (16.12.2011)

(25) Filing Language: English

(26) Publication Language: English

(30) Priority Data:
61/423,975 16 December 2010 (16.12.2010) US

(71) Applicant (for all designated States except US): **MAS-
SACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY**
[US/US]; 77 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, MA
02139-4307 (US).

(72) Inventors; and

(75) Inventors/Applicants (for US only): **PRITCHARD,
Justin. LAUFFENBURGER, Douglas, A. HEMANN,
Michael.**

(74) Agents: **COLLINS, Anne, J.** et al.; Hamilton, Brook,
Smith & Reynolds, P.C., 530 Virginia Rd., P.O. Box 9133,
Concord, MA 01742-9133 (US).

(81) Designated States (unless otherwise indicated, for every
kind of national protection available): AE, AG, AL, AM,

AO, AT, AU, AZ, BA, BB, BG, BH, BR, BW, BY, BZ,
CA, CH, CL, CN, CO, CR, CU, CZ, DE, DK, DM, DO,
DZ, EC, EE, EG, ES, FI, GB, GD, GE, GH, GM, GT, HN,
HR, HU, ID, IL, IN, IS, JP, KE, KG, KM, KN, KP, KR,
KZ, LA, LC, LK, LR, LS, LT, LU, LY, MA, MD, ME,
MG, MK, MN, MW, MX, MY, MZ, NA, NG, NI, NO, NZ,
OM, PE, PG, PH, PL, PT, QA, RO, RS, RU, RW, SC, SD,
SE, SG, SK, SL, SM, ST, SV, SY, TH, TJ, TM, TN, TR,
TT, TZ, UA, UG, US, UZ, VC, VN, ZA, ZM, ZW.

(84) Designated States (unless otherwise indicated, for every
kind of regional protection available): ARIPO (BW, GH,
GM, KE, LR, LS, MW, MZ, NA, RW, SD, SL, SZ, TZ,
UG, ZM, ZW), Eurasian (AM, AZ, BY, KG, KZ, MD, RU,
TJ, TM), European (AL, AT, BE, BG, CH, CY, CZ, DE,
DK, EE, ES, FI, FR, GB, GR, HR, HU, IE, IS, IT, LT, LU,
LV, MC, MK, MT, NL, NO, PL, PT, RO, RS, SE, SI, SK,
SM, TR), OAPI (BF, BJ, CF, CG, CI, CM, GA, GN, GQ,
GW, ML, MR, NE, SN, TD, TG).

Published:

— with international search report (Art. 21(3))

— before the expiration of the time limit for amending the
claims and to be republished in the event of receipt of
amendments (Rule 48.2(h))

(54) Title: RNAI BASED METHOD OF SCREENING AND CHARACTERIZING DRUG COMBINATIONS

(57) Abstract: In one aspect, the invention is directed to a method of characterizing a mechanism of action of a combination of agents. The method comprises contacting a plurality of populations of cells with a combination of agents to be assessed, wherein each population of cells have one gene of interest targeted by a small hairpin RNA (shRNA) and wherein the gene of interest regulates cell death and a plurality of genes that regulate cell death are targeted in the plurality of populations of cells. A responsiveness of each population of cells to the combination of agents is determined, thereby obtaining an shRNA signature of the combination of agents so as to identify one or more genes that mediate a response to the combination of agents, thereby characterizing the mechanism of action of the combination of agents. In another aspect, the invention is directed to a method of determining whether a patient population treated with a first agent would benefit from a treatment using the first agent in combination with one or more additional agents. In yet another aspect, the invention is directed to method of determining whether a formulation of one or more agents maintains a mechanism of action of the one or more agents when unformulated.



WO 2012/083243 A1

RNAI BASED METHOD OF SCREENING AND CHARACTERIZING DRUG COMBINATIONS

RELATED APPLICATION(S)

This application claims the benefit of U.S. Provisional Application
5 No.61/423,975, filed on December 16, 2010.

The entire teachings of the above application(s) are incorporated herein by reference.

GOVERNMENT SUPPORT

This invention was made with government support under R01 CA128803-03,
10 R01 CA128803-04 and ICBP #U54-CA112967-06 awarded by the National Institutes of Health. The government has certain rights in the invention.

BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION

Combination chemotherapy is the standard of care for most disseminated
15 cancers. Yet, despite the widespread use of these drug regimens, the basic mechanisms of combinatorial efficacy remain poorly understood. A common rationale for multi-drug administration in cancer is to evade spontaneous resistance to single agents, a model borrowed from microbiology, whereby multiple independent mutations in distinct drug targets are necessary to develop resistance
20 (Luria, S. E. & Delbruck, M. Genetics 28, 491-511 (1943); Newcombe, H. B. & Nyholm, M. H. Genetics 35, 603-611 (1950); Law, L. W. Nature 169, 628-629 (1952); Law, L. W. Cancer Research 12, 871-878 (1952); Frei, E., 3rd et al. Blood 13, 1126-1148 (1958)). These arguments are well substantiated in drug resistant bacteria (Blanchard, J. S. Annual Review of Biochemistry 65, 215-239 (1996);
25 Telenti, A. et al. Lancet 341, 647-650 (1993); Brossier, F., et al., Journal of Clinical Microbiology 48, 1683-1689 (2010)), but insufficient to explain the frequency of single mutations conferring multi-drug resistance in human cancers (Mullighan, C.

G. et al. Science 322, 1377-1380 (2008); Chen, G., et al., Cancer Research 54, 4980-4987 (1994); Lau, D. H., et al. Cancer Research 51, 5181-5187 (1991); Chen, G. K., British Journal of Cancer 83, 892-898, (2000)). Synergistic cytotoxicity is also argued as a rationale for combination therapy (Goldin, A. & Mantel, N. Cancer Research 17, 635-654 (1957); Borisov, A. A. et al. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 100, 7977-7982 (2003); Lehar, J. et al. Nature Biotechnology 27, 659-666 (2009)), but cell-intrinsic drug synergy frequently fails to predict efficacy in clinical trials (Goldin, A. & Mantel, N. Cancer Research 17, 635-654 (1957); Greco, W. R., et al., Journal of the National Cancer Institute 88, 699-700 (1996); Ramalingam, S. S. et al. Clinical Cancer Research 14, 3456-3461 (2008); Goldin, A., et al., Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 76, 932-938 (1958)).

Thus a need exists for improved methods for understanding the mechanisms of combinatorial efficacy of drugs.

15 SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

In one aspect, the invention is directed to a method of characterizing a mechanism of action of a combination of agents. The method comprises contacting a plurality of populations of cells with a combination of agents to be assessed, wherein each population of cells have one gene of interest targeted by a small hairpin RNA (shRNA) and wherein said gene of interest regulates cell death and a plurality of genes that regulate cell death are targeted in the plurality of populations of cells. A responsiveness of each population of cells to the combination of agents is determined, thereby obtaining an shRNA signature of the combination of agents so as to identify one or more genes that mediate a response to the combination of agents, thereby characterizing the mechanism of action of the combination of agents.

In another aspect, the invention is directed to a method of determining whether a patient population treated with a first agent would benefit from a treatment using the first agent in combination with one or more additional agents. The method comprises contacting a plurality of populations of cells with a combination of agents to be assessed wherein the combination comprises the first agent and one or more additional agents, and wherein each population of cells have

one gene of interest targeted by a small hairpin RNA (shRNA), said gene of interest regulates cell death and a plurality of genes that regulate cell death are targeted in the plurality of populations of cells. A responsiveness of each population of cells to the combination of agents is determined, thereby obtaining an shRNA signature of
5 the agent so as to identify one or more genes that mediate a response to the combination of agents. The shRNA signature of the combination of agents is compared to the shRNA signature of the first agent, wherein if the shRNA signature of the combination of agents is similar to the shRNA signature of the first agent, then the patient population treated with the first agent would benefit from a
10 treatment using the first agent in combination with the one or more additional agents.

In yet another aspect, the invention is directed to method of determining whether a formulation of one or more agents maintains a mechanism of action of the one or more agents when unformulated. The method comprises contacting a
15 plurality of populations of cells with a formulation of the one or more agents to be assessed, wherein each population of cells have one gene of interest targeted by a small hairpin RNA (shRNA) and wherein said gene of interest regulates cell death and a plurality of genes that regulate cell death are targeted in the plurality of populations of cells. A responsiveness of each population of cells to the formulation
20 of the one or more agents is determined, thereby obtaining an shRNA signature of the formulation of the one or more agents so as to identify one or more genes that mediate a response to the formulation of the one or more agents. The shRNA signature of the formulation of the one or more agents is compared to the shRNA signature of the one or more agents when unformulated wherein if the shRNA
25 signature of the formulation of the one or more agents is similar to the shRNA signature of the one or more agents when unformulated, then the formulation maintains the mechanism of action of the one or more agents when unformulated.

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS

30 The patent or application file contains at least one drawing executed in color. Copies of this patent or patent application publication with color drawing(s) will be provided by the Office upon request and payment of the necessary fee.

Figures 1a-1d: A strategy to define combination mechanisms of drug action.

- (1a) An illustration of the competing hypotheses for single versus combination mechanisms. Squares denote a diagrammatic version of an shRNA signature with resistance shown in red and sensitivity in blue. A schematic of the potential results following the combinations of Drugs A and B is shown to the right. “Same mechanism” refers to the idea that a combination signature could look similar to the individual drugs used to create the combination. The different mechanism box gives examples of how combination signatures might differ from component signatures.
- (1b) An outline of our signature based methodology. shRNAs targeting the 8 genes in our signature are retrovirally transduced in a mixed pool. These pools are subsequently treated with combinations of drugs and compared to a high resolution single drug signature dataset. (1c) A description of the process of comparing drug categories in our reference set. (1) The initial drug category size in the reference set is defined. (2) Out of category drugs are used as negative controls. These drugs are forced to belong to the wrong category. Iteration through the all of the negative controls produces a background distribution of how unrelated drugs affect category size. (3) Given a category prediction by the nearest neighbors algorithm, the category size is calculated, and (4) compared to the background distribution from (2).
- (1d) Top: A heatmap of the dose response of Eμ- Myc;p19Arf/- to 5-FU with or without leucovorin. Bottom: an 8shRNA signature heatmap for 5-FU and 5-FU plus leucovorin measured concurrently at the indicated (starred) doses of cell killing. Linkage ratios and p-values are indicated below. 8-shRNA signatures for gemcitabine (Gem) and hydroxyurea (HU) are shown to aid interpretation.

- Figures 2a-2d: A pairwise drug interaction screen identifies highly synergistic combinations whose mechanism resembles single drug action. (2a) A pairwise drug screen performed on the indicated drugs is quantified by maximum % excess PI over a control additive model and rank ordered. Synergy and antagonism are indicated. (2b) Response surface diagrams of 17AAG in combination with Taxol and CBL. Surface color corresponds to the level of synergy. Colored stars indicate equivalent single drug dosings that combine to produce LD80-90 of the combination doses (demarcated by black stars). (2c) Signatures of 17AAG, Taxol, and CBL action at low single drug doses that combine to produce synergistic LD80-90 signatures, compared with single drug LD 80-90s. (2d) PCA “scores” plots of

single and combination drug action allow for the visualization of the 8 shRNA signature predictions.

Figures 3a-3f: CHOP/CVAD components work via an averaging mechanism.

(3a) A scatter plot compares bliss independence values for the pairwise combinations of cytotoxic CVAD/CHOP components to the rest of the dataset. Significance was determined using a Mann-Whitney Utest. (3b) Top: A PCA scores plot generated using alkylating agents, topoisomerase II poisons, and four independent Dox-CBL replicates. Bottom: Average single drug mechanisms and the combination Dox-CBL drug shRNA signature are shown. (3c) Top: A PCA scores plot for a PCA performed on all four component drugs and the combinations of (CA,CVA, and CVAD). The dexamethasone signature is taken at an LD70. The average trajectories of the combinations are indicated with vectors. Bottom: A heatmap of the 8shRNA signatures contained in the PCA. (3d) A schematic showing the generation of distinct lymphomas in mice. (3e) Top: A heatmap of the relative (to untreated) PI negative (%) values in distinct primary cell lines following treatment with increasing levels of single drugs. Bottom: A PCA loadings plot for the PCA performed on the above data. The variance explained by the first two principal components is indicated below the plot. (3f) Top: A heatmap of the relative (to untreated) PI negative (%) values in distinct primary cell lines that results from increasing levels of combination (CVAD) dosings. To create the combination, the average LD50-60 of each of the individual drugs across all primary cell lines was combined and then the combination was serially diluted. Bottom: a PCA loadings plot for the PCA performed on the above data. The variance explained by the first two principal components is indicated below the plot. The significance of the variance explained is compared to permuted matrices to assess statistical significance.

Figures 4a-4d: An unbiased screen suggests that CHOP/CVAD averages the phenotypes conferred by a diverse set of shRNAs. (4a) A clustergram of 6819 shRNAs that were well represented (>700reads/sequencing lane) for biological replicates of cells treated with the indicated drugs. (4b) A scatter plot of the data contained in A showing the average log enrichment across all drug biological replicates, versus the coefficient of variation. Each dot corresponds to one shRNA in one drug condition. This data was filtered according to a reproducibility and strength

criterion (below), yielding 93 informative shRNAs. The CVAD shp53 data is indicated as a reference for the strength criterion in the distribution. (4c) A heatmap of the indicated enrichment or depletion data for the 93 shRNAs demonstrates the range of phenotypes and their similarity to an averaging model. (4d) Top: 7 of the 8 shRNAs in the 8-shRNA signature were contained among the filtered 6819 shRNAs. They are plotted as a scatter plot relative to the prediction of additivity. The line represents perfect model:data fit. Error bars depict the SEM. Bottom: The filtered 93 shRNAs are plotted as a scatter plot relative to the prediction of additivity. The line represents perfect model:data fit. The deviation from the model prediction (above) is used to produce a 0.05 significance threshold. The 15/93 that deviate are coded in red. Error bars depict the SEM.

Figures 5a-5b: Examining the fit of CVAD components to an averaging model. (5a) Measured 8 shRNA signatures for CVAD/CHOP combinations: chlorambucil/vincristine (CBL/Vin), doxorubicin/vincristine (Dox/Vin) and doxorubicin/chloroambucil (Dox/CBL) from Figure 3b for comparison, are plotted versus a 50%-50% average of their single drug signature. Points are color coded by dosings and the 45 degree line corresponds to a perfect averaging prediction. (5b) A comparison of the model fit. The goodness of fit to an average model is measured by squaring the deviation from the model and normalizing by the magnitude of the measurement. The average of this calculation is plotted on the Y axis. This measure is compared for the cytotoxic pairwise CVAD combinations, CVAD itself, and as a control, the synergistic 17AAG combinations that do not follow an averaging model.

Figure 6: Pooled Solexa sequencing measurements of 7 of the 8 shRNA (filtered >700 reads) signature hairpins are plotted relative to their 72 hour GFP enrichment scores for C, V, A, D, and CVAD dosings. r is the Pearson correlation coefficient between the two measurements.

Figure 7: The average fit to an averaging model for the solexa 8 shRNA signature data, the 78 hairpins that appear to be averages and the 15 hairpins that do not.

Figure 8: Illustration of a computer network or similar digital processing environment in which the present invention may be implemented.

Figure 9: Diagram of the internal structure of a computer (e.g., client processor/device 50 or server computers 60) in the computer system of Fig. 15.

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION

A description of example embodiments of the invention follows.

Described herein is use of RNAi-based functional signatures in mammalian
5 cells to test specific hypotheses underlying combination drug mechanisms. Shown
herein is that while potentially synergistic drug combinations reinforce the cytotoxic
action of one component in a manner that highlights drug-specific genetic
dependencies, clinically used multi-drug regimens minimize the effect of genetic
diversity and thus homogenize response across distinct subpopulations. This finding
10 was confirmed in spontaneously arising lymphomas, where standard combination
therapy reduced the variation in drug response between different tumors. Thus,
shown herein is that commonly used chemotherapeutic drug combinations are
intrinsically “de-personalized” and function by homogenizing therapeutic response
across randomized patient cohorts.

15 Accordingly, in one aspect, the invention is directed to a method of
characterizing a mechanism of action of a combination of agents. The method
comprises contacting a plurality of populations of cells with a combination of agents
to be assessed, wherein each population of cells have one gene of interest targeted
by a small hairpin RNA (shRNA) and wherein said gene of interest regulates cell
20 death and a plurality of genes that regulate cell death are targeted in the plurality of
populations of cells. A responsiveness of each population of cells to the combination
of agents is determined, thereby obtaining an shRNA signature of the combination
of agents so as to identify one or more genes that mediate a response to the
combination of agents, thereby characterizing the mechanism of action of the
25 combination of agents.

As will be appreciated by those of skill in the art, the mechanism of action of
a variety of combinations of agents can be characterized using the methods
described herein. For example, the agent can be a chemical compound, a nucleic
acid, a peptide (a protein), a lipid, a sugar (*e.g.*, polysaccharide), a
30 lipopolysaccharide and the like and combinations thereof. In one aspect, the
combination of agents is a combination of chemotherapeutic agents. In another
aspect, the agent is a combination of genotoxic agents. In yet other aspects, the

combination of agents is a combination of derivatives of one or more chemotherapeutic or genotoxic agents.

There are a variety of mechanisms of action by which agents (*e.g.*, chemotherapeutic agents) exert their effects. Examples of mechanisms of action of a chemotherapeutic agent include inhibition of a topoisomerase, cross linking of DNA, inducement of single stand break of DNA, inhibition of nucleic acid synthesis, inhibition of mitosis, inhibition of RNA transcription, inhibition of histone modification enzymes, inhibition of heat shock proteins (*e.g.*, Hsp90), alkylation of DNA, inhibition of proteasomes inducement of apoptosis or the like.

The methods described herein can further comprise classifying the agent within a group of agents having in common one or more mechanisms of action.

As described herein, the method of determining a mechanism of action of a combination of agents involves contacting a plurality of populations of cells with a combination of agents to be assessed wherein each population of cells has one gene of interest that is not functional (*e.g.*, not expressed). In a particular aspect, the method of determining a mechanism of action of a combination of agents involves contacting a plurality of populations of cells with a combination of agents to be assessed wherein each population of cells have one gene of interest targeted by a small hairpin (shRNA). As is known in the art, shRNA is a ribonucleic acid (RNA) polymer that is designed based on the study of naturally-occurring hairpin RNAs involved in RNA interference (RNAi). shRNA function in the cell is to drive the degradation of messenger RNAs (mRNAs) in a sequence-specific manner. More specifically, shRNA is a short sequence of RNA which makes a tight hairpin turn and can be used to silence gene expression via RNA interference (*e.g.*, Paddison, P., et al., *Genes Dev.* 16 (8): 948–958 (2002)). That is, in one aspect of the method described herein, each shRNA acts to knock down one gene.

In particular aspects, the method comprises introducing the plurality of shRNAs targeting the plurality of genes of interest into the plurality of populations of cells, wherein each shRNA targets one gene of interest that regulates cell death, wherein each population of cells have one gene of interest targeted. In other aspects, the method can comprise introducing the plurality of shRNAs which suppresses expression of the plurality of genes into the plurality of cells, wherein each shRNA

suppresses expression of one gene that regulates cell death, and one gene is suppressed in each cell.

As will be appreciated by those of skill in the art there are a number of genes that regulate cell death. In a particular aspect, the gene that regulates cell death is a gene in the Bcl2 family of genes, a p53 gene, or a p53-activating kinase gene. Examples of a gene in the Bcl2 family of genes includes a Bax gene, Bak gene, a Bok gene, a Bim gene, a Bid gene, a Puma gene, a Noxa gene, a Bad gene, a Bmf gene, a Bik gene, a Hrk gene, a Bclx gene, a Bclb gene, a Bclw gene, an A1 gene, a Bclg gene, a Mil1 gene, a Mule gene, a BPR gene, a BNIP gene, a Bcl2 gene, or a Mcl 1 gene. Examples of a p53 activating kinase gene include an ATM gene, an ATR gene, a Chk1 gene, a Chk2 gene, a DNAPKcs gene, a Smg-1 gene, a JNK1 gene or a p38 gene.

In the methods of the invention a plurality of genes that regulate cell death are targeted in the plurality of cell populations. In particular aspects, three genes, four genes, five genes, six genes, seven genes, eight genes, nine genes, ten genes, eleven genes, twelve genes, thirteen genes, fourteen genes, fifteen genes, sixteen genes, seventeen genes, eighteen genes, nineteen genes, twenty genes, twenty one genes, twenty two genes, twenty three genes, twenty four genes, twenty five genes, twenty six genes, twenty seven genes, twenty eight genes, twenty nine genes, thirty genes or more are targeted by the corresponding shRNAs. As will be appreciated by those of skill in the art, libraries encompassing hundreds and thousands of such genes can be used in the methods described herein.

The particular genes chosen for targeting can thereby provide a particular shRNA signature of the combination of agents when assessed using the methods provided herein. For example, in a particular aspect, the plurality of genes targeted by the corresponding shRNAs are ATM, Chk2 and p53 genes, thereby allowing one to characterize the mechanism of action of a combination of agents as a *shATM-Chk2-p53* 'resistance signature'. In another aspect, the plurality of genes targeted by the corresponding shRNAs are p53, ATR, Chk1, Chk2, Smg-1, DNA-PKcs, Bok and Bim genes, thereby allowing one to characterize the mechanism of action of a combination of agents as a *shp53, ATR, Chk1, Chk2, Smg-1, DNA-PKcs, Bok, Bim* 'resistance signature'. As will be appreciated by those of skill in the art, other resistant signatures can be determined as described herein.

In the methods of the invention, the shRNAs can be introduced into the cells using a variety of methods. For example, as described herein a viral vector is used. Numerous viral vectors that can be used in the methods are known to those of skill in the art. Specific examples include a retroviral vector, an adenoviral vector and the like.

As will be appreciated by those of skill in the art, the vector can include other components. In a particular aspect, the viral vector further expresses a marker gene. Any variety of marker genes can be incorporated into the viral vector. In one aspect, the marker gene is a fluorescent marker gene. In a particular aspect, the marker gene is green fluorescent protein (GFP) gene.

Marker genes and the expression thereof can be measured in the cell populations using a variety of techniques known in the art. Thus, the methods described herein can further comprise measuring the marker gene (*e.g.*, a fluorescent marker gene or GFP gene) expression level in each population of cells. In one aspect, flow cytometry is used to measure the marker gene or expression thereof.

As described herein a responsiveness of each population of cells to the combination of agents is determined, thereby obtaining the shRNA signature of the agent so as to identify one or more genes that mediate a response to the agent. Examples of a type of responsiveness that can be determined include resistance or sensitivity to the combination of agents. In one aspect, the responsiveness of each population of cells to the combination of agents is a relative level of chemoresistance and sensitization conferred by each shRNA. In a particular aspect, the responsiveness is a relative survival rate of each population of cells compared to control cells that do not contain said shRNA targeting the gene of interest.

The determination of responsiveness can be determined using a variety of methods. In one aspect, the determination of the responsiveness is accomplished using cell flow cytometry, hybridization techniques or sequencing techniques.

In the methods of the invention the plurality of populations of cells can be contacted with the combination of agents for any suitable amount of time. In some aspects, the plurality of populations of cells are contacted once with the combination of agents. In other aspects, the plurality of populations of cells are contacted repeatedly (more than once) with the combination of agents. In addition, the plurality of populations of cells can be contacted with the combination of agents for

about 1 hour, 4 hours, 8 hours, 12 hours, 16 hours, 20 hours, 24 hours, 28 hours, 32 hours, 36 hours, 40 hours, 44 hours, 48 hours, 52 hours, 56 hours, 60 hours, 64 hours, 68 hours, 72 hours, 76 hours, 80 hours, 84 hours, 88 hours, 92 hours, 96 hours, 100 hours or longer.

5 In the methods described herein, the concentration (*e.g.*, amount) of the combination of agents that is contacted with the plurality of populations of cells will vary and will depend on a variety of factors (*e.g.*, the type of combination of agents being assessed; the type of response being sought, etc). For example, the concentration of the combination of agents that is contacted with the populations of
10 cells can be based on the lethal dose (LD) of the combination of agents or one or more agents within the combination of agents, if known. The LD of the combination of agents that can be used in the methods includes the lethal dose that is sufficient to kill 50% of a cell population (LD50), 60% of a cell population (LD60), 70% of a cell population (LD70), 80% of a cell population (LD80), 90% of a cell population
15 (LD90), or 100% of a cell population (LD100). In particular aspects, the agent is used in an effective amount to induce a response in cells that do not contain said shRNA targeting said gene of interest.

Any of a variety of cells can be used in the methods of the invention. In one aspect, the cells are mammalian cells. Examples of mammalian cells include primate
20 cells (*e.g.*, human cells), murine cells (*e.g.*, mouse cells, rat cells), feline cells, canine cells, bovine cells and the like. In a particular aspect, the cells are from a pathological or diseased source. For example, the cells can be tumor cells. Examples of tumor cells include lymphoma cells, acute lymphocytic leukemia cells and the like.

25 As will be appreciated by those of skill in the art, the methods described herein can further comprise comparing the responsiveness of each population of cells to the combination of agents to a control. As will be apparent to those of skill in the art, a variety of suitable controls can be used. In one aspect, the control is a population of cells into which the shRNA targeting the gene of interest has not been
30 introduced.

As will also be appreciated by those of skill in the art, the methods of the invention can be performed *in vitro*, as described herein. Alternatively, or additionally, the methods described herein can be performed *in vivo*. An example of

an in vivo method involves the use of a pooled shRNA format. In this aspect, shRNAs are pooled and transduced into a target cell population and the population is then engrafted into a recipient non-human mammal such as a rodent (e.g., a mouse or a rat). A pretreatment baseline is established by sequencing or hybridization. The
5 non-human mammals are dosed with the combination of agents and following treatment, reassessed for the shRNA pool composition.

As shown herein, the methods of the invention can also be automated. In one aspect, the methods can further comprise using an algorithm to cluster a plurality of agents into groups based on the responsiveness of each population of cells to each
10 agent.

Figure 8 illustrates a computer network or similar digital processing environment in which the present invention may be implemented. For example, a computer(s)/devices 50 and server computer(s) 60 provide processing, storage, and input/output devices executing application programs and the like. The
15 computer(s)/devices 50 can also be linked through communications network 70 to other computing devices, including other client devices/processes 50 and server computer(s) 60. A communications network 70 can be part of a remote access network, a global network (e.g., the Internet), a worldwide collection of computers, Local area or Wide area networks, and gateways that currently use respective
20 protocols (TCP/IP, Bluetooth, etc.) to communicate with one another. Other electronic device/computer network architectures are suitable.

Fig. 9 is a diagram of the internal structure of a computer (e.g., processor/device 50 or server computers 60) in the computer system of Fig. 8. Each computer 50, 60 contains system bus 79, where a bus is a set of hardware lines used
25 for data transfer among the components of a computer or processing system. Bus 79 is essentially a shared conduit that connects different elements of a computer system (e.g., processor, disk storage, memory, input/output ports, network ports, etc.) that enables the transfer of information between the elements. Attached to system bus 79 is I/O device interface 82 for connecting various input and output devices (e.g.,
30 keyboard, mouse, displays, printers, speakers, etc.) to the computer 50, 60. Network interface 86 allows the computer to connect to various other devices attached to a network (e.g., network 70 of Fig. 8). Memory 90 provides volatile storage for computer software instructions 92 and data 94 used to implement an embodiment of

the present invention. Disk storage 95 provides non-volatile storage for computer software instructions 92 and data 94 used to implement an embodiment of the present invention. Central processor unit 84 is also attached to system bus 79 and provides for the execution of computer instructions.

5 In one embodiment, the processor routines 92 and data 94 are a computer program product (generally referenced 92), including a computer readable medium (e.g., a removable storage medium such as one or more DVD-ROM's, CD-ROM's, diskettes, tapes, etc.) that provides at least a portion of the software instructions for the invention system. Computer program product 92 can be installed by any suitable
10 software installation procedure, as is well known in the art. In another embodiment, at least a portion of the software instructions may also be downloaded over a cable, communication and/or wireless connection. In other embodiments, the invention programs are a computer program propagated signal product 107 embodied on a propagated signal on a propagation medium (e.g., a radio wave, an infrared wave, a
15 laser wave, a sound wave, or an electrical wave propagated over a global network such as the Internet, or other network(s)). Such carrier medium or signals provide at least a portion of the software instructions for the present invention routines/program 92.

 In alternate embodiments, the propagated signal is an analog carrier wave or
20 digital signal carried on the propagated medium. For example, the propagated signal may be a digitized signal propagated over a global network (e.g., the Internet), a telecommunications network, or other network. In one embodiment, the propagated signal is a signal that is transmitted over the propagation medium over a period of time, such as the instructions for a software application sent in packets over a
25 network over a period of milliseconds, seconds, minutes, or longer. In another embodiment, the computer readable medium of computer program product 92 is a propagation medium that the computer system 50 may receive and read, such as by receiving the propagation medium and identifying a propagated signal embodied in the propagation medium, as described above for computer program propagated
30 signal product.

 Generally speaking, the term "carrier medium" or transient carrier encompasses the foregoing transient signals, propagated signals, propagated medium, storage medium and the like.

The method of characterizing a mechanism of action of a combination of agents described herein has other useful applications. For example, the methods described herein can be used to assess whether a drug that is currently being used to treat a patient or patient populations (*e.g.*, a cancer patient or cancer patient
5 populations) can be combined with one or more agents (*e.g.*, drugs) to treat that patient or patient population. In addition, the methods described herein can be used to assess whether one or more drug formulations alter the mechanism of action of a drug or drugs.

Accordingly, in another aspect, the invention is directed to a method of
10 determining whether a patient population treated with a first agent would benefit from a treatment using the first agent in combination with one or more additional agents. The method comprises contacting a plurality of populations of cells with a combination of agents to be assessed wherein the combination comprises the first agent and one or more additional agents, and wherein each population of cells have
15 one gene of interest targeted by a small hairpin RNA (shRNA), said gene of interest regulates cell death and a plurality of genes that regulate cell death are targeted in the plurality of populations of cells. A responsiveness of each population of cells to the combination of agents is determined, thereby obtaining an shRNA signature of the agent so as to identify one or more genes that mediate a response to the
20 combination of agents. The shRNA signature of the combination of agents is compared to the shRNA signature of the first agent, wherein if the shRNA signature of the combination of agents is the same, substantially the same or similar, to the shRNA signature of the first agent, then the patient population treated with the first agent would benefit from a treatment using the first agent in combination with the
25 one or more additional agents.

In yet another aspect, the invention is directed to method of determining whether a formulation of one or more agents maintains a mechanism of action of the one or more agents when unformulated. The method comprises contacting a
30 plurality of populations of cells with a formulation of the one or more agents to be assessed, wherein each population of cells have one gene of interest targeted by a small hairpin RNA (shRNA) and wherein said gene of interest regulates cell death and a plurality of genes that regulate cell death are targeted in the plurality of populations of cells. A responsiveness of each population of cells to the formulation

of the one or more agents is determined, thereby obtaining an shRNA signature of the formulation of the one or more agents so as to identify one or more genes that mediate a response to the formulation of the one or more agents. The shRNA signature of the formulation of the one or more agents is compared to the shRNA signature of the one or more agents when unformulated wherein if the shRNA signature of the formulation of the one or more agents is similar to the shRNA signature of the one or more agents when unformulated, then the formulation maintains the mechanism of action of the one or more agents when unformulated.

10

Exemplification: Genetic Mechanisms of Combination Chemistry

Methods

Cell culture

E μ -Mycp19^{Arf^{-/-}} lymphoma cells and primary isolates from spontaneous E μ -Myc primary tumor cells were cultured using established protocols (Burgess, D. J. et al. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 105, 9053-9058 (2008)).

shRNA signatures

All shRNAs were expressed in the MLS retroviral vector³⁹ and were previously validated for knockdown and single agent phenotypes and off target effects³⁴. Informatics is performed as in Jiang, H., et al., Nature Chemical Biology 7, 92-100 (2011) which is incorporated herein by reference.

Combination dosings

All combination dosings are performed at LD80-90s and single drug contributions are dosed at equivalently single drug killing (to within 10% single drug cell death). Principal Components analysis was performed with the princomp.m function.

Primary lymphomas

C57/BL6 E μ -Myc transgenic mice were obtained from Jackson Labs (Bar Harbor, Maine) and were monitored for the spontaneous development of lymphoid tumors. Three doses of single drugs that encompassed the LD50 for the control E μ -

Mycp19arf^{-/-} were used to dose the primary lines. The relative PI-negative percentages were averaged across all cell lines. The across cell line averages were used to dose the four drug combination. The LD50-60 for each single drug dose across all of the cell lines was combined to form the CVAD dosing.

5

Partial genome scale screen

The large scale 10k library was a gift of Johannes Zuber and Scott Lowe, the 8 shRNA signature was spiked in at 1:10000. Library infected cells were dosed with single and CVAD/CHOP combinations at an LD70-80 to preserve representation and prevent bottlenecks. Hairpin representation was assessed using a barcoded half-hairpin solexa sequencing approach. For more information see the supplementary methods.

10

shRNAs

All shRNAs were expressed in the MLS retroviral vector (Dickins, R. A. et al. Nat Genet 37, 1289-1295 (2005)) and were previously validated for knockdown and single agent phenotypes (Jiang, H., et al., Nature Chemical Biology 7, 92-100 (2011)). shRNA plasmids were packaged in phoenix cells, and viral supernatants were concentrated using co-polymer precipitation method. 5×10^4 initial cells were infected to between 10 and 20% of the total population. All signatures include replicates from at least two distinct infections. Combination vector control dosings were performed to rule out combination specific effects of the vector alone.

20

Pairwise Drug Interactions

Cytotoxic agents from distinct functional categories³⁴ were dosed in a pairwise fashion. Dosing was done in two dimensional dose response matrices. At least one compound from each category was tested against all other functional categories. Cell death was normalized to 100% and the relative PI negative measurement was reported. Every point in the dosing matrix that contained a combination of drugs was used to estimate Bliss Independence at that point. A Mann-Whitney U-test was used to compare the pairwise drug interactions for combinations that came from a CHOP/CVAD functional category (Dox-CBL, Dox-

25

30

Vin, CBL-Vin, Dox-Taxol, Etoposide-Taxol, Dox-Mitomycin C (MMC), Tax-MMC) with the remainder of the dataset.

Combination dosings

5 All drug dosings were normalized by LD numbers, and were monitored after every independent dosing to ensure accuracy and reproducibility. Combination dosings for shRNA signature measurements were performed in a dose response matrix form. The matrix was assessed for the %PI negative population at 48 hours after treatment. Signatures were measured at 72 hours after treatment. The matrix
10 position for the combination signature measurements was determined in the same manner as in Fig. 2b. Drug doses producing similar levels of toxicity (within 10%PI negative of each other), and combining to produce an LD80-90, were used. PI negative values were plotted relative to shRNA-GFP hairpin enrichment values and significant ($r^2 > 0.6$) dose-response trends are accounted for with a linear model and
15 normalized to an LD85 to eliminate dosing as a variable.

Primary tumor dosings

C57/BL6 E μ -Myc transgenic mice were obtained from Jackson Labs (Bar Harbor, Maine) were monitored for the spontaneous development of lymphoid
20 tumors. Upon the onset of morbidity, mice were euthanized according to established MIT veterinary protocols. Tumors were harvested dissociated, and grown in culture. The fraction of primary tumors that were capable of growing in tissue culture was used to assess drug response. Three doses of single drugs that encompassed the LD50 for the control E μ -Myc;p19^{Arf}^{-/-} were used to dose the
25 primary lines. The relative PI-negative percentages were averaged across all cell lines. The across cell line averages were used to dose the four drug combination. The LD50-60 for each single drug dose across all of the cell lines was combined to form the CVAD dosing.

30 Combination probKNN analysis

The Taxol/17AAG reference set included all reference set drug categories from the pairwise synergy screen. The Taxol/CBL prediction was obtained by grouping topoisomerase II poisons, crosslinking agents, and single strand break

inducing agents together into one DNA damage category. The Dox-CBL prediction included the entire reference set as well.

Combination PCA analysis

5 Rows of the PCA input were individual drug experiments and the 8 columns correspond to the 8-shRNA signature genes. PCA was performed using the Matlab princomp.m function. Scores plots indicate the projection of drug observations onto the latent variable projections. All matrices used as the input for PCA contained only the observations that were plotted.

10

Cell Line PCA analysis

 Matrices were organized as shown in Figs. 3e and f. Different drugs and drug dosings constituted experimental observations. Different cell lines were treated as variables. As such, the loadings plots show the contribution of each cell line
15 “variable” to the meta-variable or principal component. The percent of the variance explained by the model is calculated by totaling the latent vector and dividing each PC’s value by the sum of the vector components. This tells how much of the total model fit is from each component. The significance of the percent of the variance explained by the principle components was determined by comparing the
20 experimental results to 1,000 randomized matrices. These matrices were assembled by randomly drawing values for each column from the corresponding column of the experimental data, effectively reshuffling the rows of data within each column. PCA was executed on the 1000 randomized matrices and the percent of data explained by each principle component was determined. The mean and standard
25 deviation of the percent of data explained by the 1st or the 2nd principle components for the 1,000 matrices was then used to execute z-tests.

10k-pooled screen

 Dosings: The second-generation shRNAmir30 partial genome-scale library
30 (pool11) was obtained courtesy of Scott Lowe and Johannes Zuber. The 8-shRNA set was added to the library at 1:10000. Phoenix cells were used to package a mixed pool of retrovirus containing the 10k library. 3 million Eμ-Myc;p19Arf-/- were infected to 50% GFP+ (MOI=1) and expanded in vitro for 2 days. Cells were then

treated with an LD70-80 of single and combination drugs. A slightly lower drug dose was used to preserve pool representation. Cells were diluted 1:2 at 24 hours, %PI negativity was assessed at 48 hours and dosings with the desired amount of cell killing were resuspended in fresh media. Cells were allowed 2-3 days to recover to
5 80-90% viability, and frozen down for analysis.

Sequencing

Half hairpin barcodes were PCR amplified from genomic DNA. Distinct mutations in the 5' primer were used to barcode distinct drug treatments. The PCR
10 products were then processed using the solexa genomic DNA preparation kit. Gel purified solexa input product was submitted to the Koch Institute genome analyzer.

Data Analysis

Raw read numbers (for exact matches only) between lanes were normalized
15 by the number of total reads per lane. Raw read numbers for all barcodes in a lane were normalized across all lanes. These normalized reads were then filtered for further analysis. A threshold of >700 reads per hairpin in all three lanes sequenced was used to filter out low abundance reads. This yielded 6819 shRNAs. Of these 6819 shRNAs, 7 shRNAs from our 8-shRNA signature were represented.
20 Hierarchical clustering on this data set was done using a correlation based metric and complete linkage. Averages, standard deviations and coefficients of variation were calculated. An absolute value of the $\text{Log}_2(\text{Treated reads}/\text{Control reads})$ greater than 2.5 (the CVAD shp53 value) for any drug/combination treatment was used as a filter for hairpins with high potency. This set was again filtered for reproducibility.
25 A CV of 0.8 (a conservative estimate of 8-shRNA signature variability at high levels of enrichment or depletion) was used. This yielded a reproducible set of 93 hairpins for further analysis. In order to assess whether or not these 93 hairpins followed an averaging model, we used the 7 abundant shRNAs from the 8-shRNA signature as a set of positive controls. These 7 shRNAs are known to show an averaging effect in
30 a GFP competition based experiment, so we used them to threshold our 93 shRNAs. shRNAs had to be two standard deviations different from the average deviation of the 8-shRNA signature set to be considered distinct from the averaging model.

Example code for use in quantifying what percentage of a combination of drugs is coming from each drug in the combination

```

function [x,y] = Druglincomb(Dosemat)
% This function takes two dose responses and calculates each combination
5 % in the matx as a linear combination on the input singlets entry i,j=1 is
% the control
[m,n]=size(Dosemat);
%Normalize to the control
nmat=zeros(3,3)
10 xmat=zeros(3,3)
    ymat=zeros(3,3)
    Dosematnorm=Dosemat./Dosemat(1,1);
    i=2;
    while i<m+1
15 j=2;
        while j<n+1
            nmat(i-1,j-1)=Dosematnorm(1,j)./Dosematnorm(i,1);
            ymat(i-1,j-1)=((-1/(1+nmat(i-1,j-1))))+1;
            xmat(i-1,j-1)=1-ymat(i-1,j-1)
20 j=j+1;
        end
        i=i+1;
    end
    x=xmat
25 y=ymat;
end

```

Results

30 A commonly argued principal of combination therapy is that by combining agents with independent dose limiting toxicities, the cumulative dose of drugs can be greatly enhanced. While this is certainly a critical aspect of combinatorial efficacy (DeVita, V. T. & Schein, P. S. NEJM 288, 998-1006 (1973); Frei, E., 3rd. Cancer research 45, 6523-6537 (1985); Frei, E., 3rd, et al., Clinical Cancer Research

4, 2027-2037 (1998); Budman, D. R. et al. *Journal of the National Cancer Institute* 90, 1205-1211 (1998); Skipper, H. E., et al., *Cancer Chemotherapy Reports. Part 1* 35, 1-111 (1964)), it is difficult to separate dose effects from other variables in clinical trials. This lack of mechanistic resolution has limited the direct
5 experimental interrogation of a variety of additional provocative hypotheses (Hucl, T., et al., *Cell Cycle* 6, 1336-1341 (2007)). In contrast with combination therapy, numerous biochemical and genetic approaches have been developed to examine the mechanisms by which individual small molecules exert their effects. Some of the most effective, and generalizable, methods have been based on
10 phenotypic/molecular signatures of drug action (Hughes, T. R. et al. *Cell* 102, 109-126 (2000); Parsons, A. B. et al. *Cell* 126, 611-625 (2006); Ho, C. H. et al. *Nature Biotechnology* 27, 369-377 (2009); Rihel, J. et al. *Science* 327, 348-351 (2010); Perlman, Z. E. et al. *Science* 306, 1194-1198, (2004); Krutzik, P. O., et al., *Nature Chemical Biology* 4, 132-142, (2008)). Signatures are an attractive methodology to
15 characterize combination mechanisms due to their validated resolution across drug categories of interest, and their relative position in cellular response networks (i.e., downstream of typical drug targets). In several landmark studies using *S. cerevisiae*, gene expression compendia ((Hughes, T. R. et al. *Cell* 102, 109-126 (2000)), and later barcoded loss of function/ORF libraries (Parsons, A. B. et al. *Cell*
20 126, 611-625 (2006); Ho, C. H. et al. *Nature Biotechnology* 27, 369-377 (2009)) were used to effectively characterize individual small molecule mechanisms of action. Similar work done utilizing the NCI-60 cell lines (Weinstein, J. N. et al. *Science* 275, 343-349 (1997)) showed that signatures of inhibitory concentrations of cytotoxic drugs across diverse cancer cell lines can provide enough resolution to
25 predict a novel small molecule's mechanism of action. Finally, mammalian transcriptional data has also been used to determine the mechanisms of small molecule action (Lamb, J. et al. *Science* 313, 1929-1935 (2006); Hieronymus, H. et al. *Cancer Cell* 10, 321-330 (2006)). However, despite the disseminated use of signatures for drug mechanism studies in diverse systems, none have examined
30 mechanistic signatures of combination drugs.

Recently, it has been demonstrated that an 8 shRNA signature (shp53, shChk2, shChk1, shATR, shATX, shDNAPKcs, shBok and shBim) provides high quantitative resolution across diverse drug categories that include most established

cytotoxic agents, as well as newer agents like HSP90 inhibitors, HDAC inhibitors, and categories of kinase inhibitors. This signature-based approach to the prediction of drug mechanisms of action compares the signature of a test compound to a reference set of single drug signatures possessing known mechanisms of action.

5 Shown herein is that a signature-based platform with validated resolution over a breadth of drug categories shows similar resolution in the context of multi-drug combinations.

Combination therapies might be hypothesized to interact in two general ways: [a] one agent may simply reinforce the action of another agent; or [b] the two

10 drugs may combine to exert effects that are distinct from either individual compound. Correspondingly, the combination drug shRNA signature would either [a] resemble that of one individual drug, or [b] exhibit distinct genetic dependencies. With respect to the latter possibility, a combination signature could be distinct from that of the individual component drugs in one of at least three ways: [i] it could

15 average, or “homogenize”, individual drug signatures; [ii] it could mimic a compound not present in the combination; or [iii] it could adopt an entirely novel signature (Fig. 1a). To extend the functional genetic signature-based framework to combination drug dosings, shRNA signatures of resistance or sensitivity in response to combinations of drugs that were controlled for dose level effects were created. All

20 signatures in the single drug reference set were obtained at concentrations of drug that induce 80-90% cell death (LD80-90) in E μ -Myc;p19^{Arf}^{-/-} lymphoma cells, a well characterized model of human Burkitt’s lymphoma (Adams, J. M. et al. Nature 318, 533-538 (1985)). To allow for reference set comparisons, combination dosings at 80-90% cell death were achieved by dosing single drugs at equivalent levels of

25 single agent killing such that each drug contributed equally to the total cell death (Fig. 1b). These combinations were then quantitatively compared using probabilistic nearest neighbors analysis (Fig. 1c).

While combination therapies are the standard of care for nearly all disseminated human cancers, only the interaction of 5-fluorouracil (5-FU) and

30 leucovorin has a well-characterized combination mechanism of action. Leucovorin exerts a synergistic effect indirectly, by enhancing the inhibition of thymidylate synthase by the nucleoside analog 5-FU (Longley, D. B., et al., Nature Reviews. Cancer 3, 330-338 (2003)); this inhibition depletes cellular nucleotide levels and

induces cytotoxicity. Thus, it was reasoned that this drug combination could be used as a proof of principal. Specifically, a signature of leucovorin plus 5-FU should resemble the single drug 5-FU signature but at a lower 5-FU concentration. It was observed that dosing lymphoma cells with leucovorin elicited no cell death at 1 μ M but the addition of 1 μ M leucovorin potentiated 5-FU action (Fig. 1d). Moreover, the 8 shRNA signature for 5-FU plus leucovorin closely resembled 5-FU and was significantly ($p < 0.0001$) predicted by probabilistic nearest neighbors analysis to be a nucleotide depletion agent. This indicated that the known biochemical mechanism of 5-FU and leucovorin is the relevant mechanism of cell death induction in Myc;p19^{Arf} lymphoma cells, and indicates that the signature-based approach offers resolution for combination drug mechanisms.

In order to take a non-biased approach to study combination drug mechanisms, all pairwise interactions between distinct functional categories of cytotoxic agents upon which the 8-shRNA signature has established resolution were examined (Fig. 2a). Initially, the two most synergistic combinations from our pairwise interaction screen were examined: 17AAG (an Hsp90 inhibitor) combined with Taxol (a spindle poison), and 17AAG combined with Chlorambucil (abbreviated CBL, a DNA alkylating agent) (Figs. 2a and 2b). Specifically, concentrations of single drugs that individually induced single drug cell death in ~15% (for both 17AAG and Taxol) and ~20% (for both 17AAG and CBL) of the population were sufficient to elicit a combination LD of 80-90% (Figure 2b). Consistent with this high level of synergy, control signatures taken at the respective single drug LD15s or LD20s exhibited little to no shRNA-mediated resistance or sensitivity (Fig. 2c). However, upon combination, the LD80-90s of 17AAG-Taxol and 17AAG-CBL elicited robust phenotypic signatures. Comparison of 17AAG-Taxol's signature to our single drug reference set indicated that this combination exhibited a spindle poison-like mechanism of action ($p = 0.004$) (Fig. 2c). This evidence favored a model whereby 17AAG acts to strengthen taxol-induced cytotoxicity. Similarly, the signature for the 17AAG and CBL combination matched a DNA damage-like mechanism of action ($p = 0.0001$), indicating that 17AAG synergized with CBL by promoting CBL's genotoxic activity (Fig. 2c).

To examine these mechanistic predictions, Principal Components Analysis (PCA) was performed. In PCA, large dimensional datasets with many variables

(here 8 variables, 1 for each shRNA in the signature) are collapsed onto composite variables, termed principal components, which represent a weighted combination of the 8 original primary variables. Consequently, observations of single drugs and drug combination behaviors can be replotted in 1, 2, or 3 dimensions to facilitate visual analysis and further interpretation of the statistical predictions. Replotting of Hsp90 inhibitors and spindle poisons alongside the 17AAG-Taxol combination revealed a clear separation of Hsp90 inhibitors from spindle poisons along a single composite variable: principal component 1 (PC1) (Fig. 2d, top). Furthermore, 17AAG-Taxol clearly mapped adjacent to the spindle poisons, supporting the prediction that 17AAG reinforces a taxol-like mechanism of action. A similar separation along the first principal component was seen with Hsp90 inhibitors in relation to DNA damaging agents (Fig. 2d, bottom). Plotting 17AAG-CBL, the closer proximity of the 17AAG-CBL to other DNA damaging agents indicates a genotoxic mechanism for this combination. Taken together, these data indicated that highly synergistic combinations act by potentiating an individual drug's mechanism of action.

Surprisingly, while drug synergy might be expected to translate into combination efficacy, the 17AAG-Tax and 17AAG-CBL drug combinations are not currently in clinical use – despite the inclusion of 17AAG-Tax in clinical trials (Ramalingam, S. S. et al. *Clinical Cancer Research* 14, 3456-3461 (2008)). Thus, combination regimens that are now the standard of care for B cell malignancies were examined. Given that the Myc;p19^{Arf} lymphoma cells are a well-established mouse model of Burkitt's lymphoma (a high grade Non-Hodgkin's lymphoma), combinations of commonly used therapeutics that comprise drug regimens for Non-Hodgkin's lymphoma (referred to as CHOP) or, more specifically, for Burkitt's lymphoma (referred to as CVAD) were reexamined. The induction arm of both regimens utilizes cyclophosphamide, Vincristine (Vin), doxorubicin (Dox), and a glucocorticoid receptor agonist (dexamethasone or prednisone). However, since cyclophosphamide requires activation in vivo, another nitrogen mustard, CBL, which has shown similar in vivo efficacy in clinical trials of lymphoma chemotherapy, was utilized (Carbone, P. P. et al. *Cancer Research* 28, 811-822 (1968)). Surprisingly, in the pairwise synergy screen, drugs from the cytotoxic functional categories of CHOP/CVAD exhibited significantly less pairwise in vitro

synergy than the rest of the dataset ($p=.018$) (Fig. 3a). Thus CHOP/CVAD efficacy cannot be attributed to component drug synergy.

To investigate CHOP/CVAD components, Dox and CBL were combined to obtain a combination LD80-90. Notably, unlike the synergistic drug combinations examined previously, the shRNA signature for this drug combination indicated a mechanism of action distinct from both component drugs (Fig. 3b). PCA visualization clearly separated topoisomerase II poisons like Dox from DNA alkylating-like agents along PC1 (Fig. 3b). Furthermore, the Dox-CBL combination dosings clustered around the origin of the PCA plot, indicating a relative averaging of the individual drug signatures – i.e., the remarkable elimination of contrasting shRNA-conferred behaviors exhibited for the individual drugs. For example, the diminution of DNAPKcs levels yielded sensitivity to Dox and resistance to CBL, but had no consequence in the face of a combination drug dosing. Thus, drug combinations can average single drug genetic dependencies, even to the point of essential neutrality.

To test whether this averaging effect extended to the other cytotoxic components of CVAD/CHOP, signatures of CBL-Vin and Dox-Vin were examined and compared to what would be predicted by taking the mean of their single drug effects (Fig. 5a). It was found that these other combinations of CVAD components similarly demonstrated effective homogenization (Fig. 5b). Since drug half lives and dosing protocols for these combination therapies can generate concurrent presence of all four drugs in patients, a three drug CVA/CHO and a four-drug CVAD/CHOP signature were examined. Whereas a PCA plot with two principal components separated the four individual drugs into distinct quadrants (Fig. 3c), the sequential plotting of signatures resulting from increasing combination complexity pushed the combination projections toward the loci of the respective drug substituents until the four-drug combination of CVAD reached the origin – i.e., an essentially average signature. This four drug combination fit an averaging model, as did the two drug and three drug components of CVAD tested (Fig. 5b). Taken together, these data suggest that combination therapies can homogenize extant single-agent genetic dependencies.

Since the shRNA signatures revealed an averaging mechanism in response to CVAD, genetic dependencies were modeled even more explicitly. It was asked

whether spontaneous heterogeneity in drug effectiveness evolving in individual mice during tumorigenesis (characterizing patient-to-patient variability) is diminished by combination therapy (Fig.3d). When independent E μ -Myc primary tumor lines were examined for single versus combination drug effects in vitro, different primary
5 lymphomas displayed distinct patterns of sensitivity or resistance to CVAD component drugs (Figs. 3e and 3f, top). PCA analysis was again employed, now considering the tumor lines as variables analogously to the shRNAs previously. Examining each cell line's contribution to principal components 1 and 2 (Figs. 3e and f), it was found that individual cell line behaviors were more diverse following
10 treatment with single agents, as evidenced by the higher variance requiring multiple principal components to explain. This complexity was diminished in the combination case, where principal component 1 could explain more than 93% of the cumulative variance. Thus, tumor-specific variation in the response to single agent treatment was homogenized in the presence of combination therapy.

15 Given the extraordinary number of genetic and epigenetic changes typically present in human tumors, the broader relevance of this averaging effect was further validated. A pooled, partial genome scale screen of a randomly selected set of 10,000 shRNAs, in which the 8 shRNA signature was added at a 1:10,000 ratio as an internal control, was preformed. Single agent C, V, A, D were compared to
20 combination CVAD/CHOP for each shRNA in the pooled set. Of the initial pool, 6819 shRNAs (including 7 out of 8 of the 8 shRNA signature) were present at high enough abundance (>700 sequencing reads per shRNA) to be included in further analysis. To examine the robustness of this data set, it was first confirmed that the 3
biological replicates of drug treatments clustered together (Fig.4a). Furthermore,
25 representation of the 7/8 shRNAs from the 8-shRNA signature that were above the read number cutoff strongly correlated with single hairpin measurements (Fig. 6). As a more stringent data threshold, shRNAs were further filtered based on the magnitude of shRNA enrichment and the reproducibility of the sequencing data (Fig. 4b). This filter reduced the set of 6819 shRNAs to 93 putative shRNA "hits"
30 that exhibited large and reproducible phenotypes (Fig. 4c). Whether these 93 shRNAs exhibited a genetic averaging mechanism following treatment with combination therapy was next examined. Using a cutoff of 2 standard deviations away from the control shRNAs, it was found that 78/93 shRNAs produced an

average of individual drug phenotypes when treated with CVAD (Fig. 4d and Fig. 7). Moreover, the majority of shRNAs that deviated from this average (12/15) were “over-neutralized”, meaning that these RNAs affected the response to combination therapy even less than the averaging mechanism predicts. Therefore most shRNA phenotypes were homogenized by the combination of CHOP/CVAD. This indicates that the vast majority of genetic dependencies (as modeled by shRNAs) are averaged in response to combination therapy.

Combination therapies are typically assumed to work by enhancing the tolerated cumulative drug dose or providing cell-intrinsic drug synergy. However, as shown herein, the most synergistic drug combinations examined are not widely used, and the standard cytotoxic chemotherapies used in lymphomas are not particularly synergistic. Therefore, while tolerable dose escalation (with non-overlapping toxicity) is certainly one important rationale for combination therapy (Frei, E., 3rd. *Cancer research* 45, 6523-6537 (1985); Frei, E., 3rd, et al., *Clinical Cancer Research* 4, 2027-2037 (1998)), the broad use of these combinations likely relate to their propensity to neutralize heterogeneity in response across patient populations rather than to achieve maximal response in any individual. This basic mechanism of neutralization of both introduced and spontaneous variation likely represent an unintended consequence of clinical trial design. Genetically unstratified cohorts that are randomly assigned to experimental or control groups are often used to iteratively define combinations that perform better than the previous generation of treatment. While these regimens manifest some of the greatest success stories in decades of cancer research, the lack of relevant molecular information during their inception has served to shape regimens that are broadly useful across myriad diverse patients rather than tailored to “driving” cancer lesions. An unintended consequence of population-based drug optimization is that the response to highly synergistic combinations that act to promote single drug mechanisms of action would vary significantly among patients. Thus, synergistic combinations might fail in clinical trials using unstratified patient cohorts. These data indicate that current and future efforts to improve combination regimens, for broadly effective coverage as well as for personalized cohorts, will require a greater understanding of the genetic determinants of combination drug response.

Gene	Gene Function	Gene ID	shRNA Target Sequences *
	sequence-specific transcription factor, pro-apoptotic		CCACTACAAGTACATGTGTAA (SEQ ID NO: 1)
p53		22059	TGGAGAGTATTTCCACCCTCAA (18%) (SEQ ID NO: 2)
ATM	DNA damage response, checkpoint signaling, DNA repair, phosphorylation of p53	11920	CACGAAAGTCCTCAATAATCTA (SEQ ID NO: 3)
	DNA damage response, checkpoint signaling,		CAGAAACACATAATCAATTAAA (SEQ ID NO: 4)
Chk2	DNA repair, phosphorylation of p53	50883	CACTTTCACTATGTAGAAATA (SEQ ID NO: 5)
	DNA repair, DNA replication, phosphorylation of		ACCCATGTTCTTGACATTGAA (SEQ ID NO: 6)
ATR	p53	245000	ACCTTTAATGAGTGTCTTAAA (SEQ ID NO: 7)
	DNA repair, DNA replication, phosphorylation of		CAGGAATATTCTGATTGGAAA (SEQ ID NO: 8)
Chk1	p53	12649	AAGGGCTTGACCAATTATATAA (SEQ ID NO: 9)
	nonsense-mediated mRNA decay, DNA damage response, checkpoint signaling, phosphorylation of p53		CAGGATAGCAAATAAAGATGAA CAGGCTGCATTCAATAACTTA (SEQ ID NO: 10)
Smg1		233789	CAGGCCTTACTTACAGTTAA
DNA-PKcs	DNA damage response, DNA repair phosphorylation of p53	19090	CTCCAACATGTAGAGAACAAA (SEQ ID NO: 11)
	DNA damage response, stress signaling, phosphorylation of p53	26419	TCAGAGCATAAACAACTTAAA (SEQ ID NO: 12)
JNK1			CAGGTCITGTGTTTAGGTCAA (SEQ ID NO: 3)
p38	DNA damage response, checkpoint signaling, stress signaling, phosphorylation of p53	26416	
A1	Bcl-2 family gene, anti-apoptotic	12044	GGAAGATGGCTTCATAAAGAA (SEQ ID NO: 14)
Bclb	Bcl-2 family gene, anti-apoptotic	12049	AAGGAATCCCTTGAAACCTAA (SEQ ID NO: 15)

Gene	Gene Function	Gene ID	shRNA Target Sequences *
Bclw	Bcl-2 family gene, anti-apoptotic	12050	GGCTATAAGCTGAGGCAGAAG (SEQ ID NO: 16)
	Bcl-2 family gene, anti-apoptotic (long form), pro-		GGAGAGCGTTCAGTGATCTAA (SEQ ID NO: 17) (targets
Bclx	apoptotic (short form)	12048	both long and short forms of Bclx)
Bad	Bcl-2 family gene, pro-apoptotic	12015	CGCGAGAAACGTGCTTTTATAA (SEQ ID NO: 18)
Bak	Bcl-2 family gene, pro-apoptotic	12018	CCGGAACCTATGATTACTTGA (SEQ ID NO: 19)
Bax	Bcl-2 family gene, pro-apoptotic	12028	CCGCGTGGTTGCCCTCTTCTA (SEQ ID NO: 20)
Bid	Bcl-2 family gene, pro-apoptotic	12122	CACAGAAGATTCCATATCAAA (SEQ ID NO: 21)
Bik	Bcl-2 family gene, pro-apoptotic	12124	CCGGACAGGGTGTACAGAGGTAT (SEQ ID NO: 22)
			TAGGAACAGAGAAATATGCCAA (SEQ ID NO: 23)
Bim	Bcl-2 family gene, pro-apoptotic	12125	CACCTCAAAATGGTTATCTTA (22%) (SEQ ID NO: 24)
Bmf	Bcl-2 family gene, pro-apoptotic	171543	CGCAGAGCCCTGGCATCACAA (SEQ ID NO: 25)
Bnip3l	Bcl-2 family gene, pro-apoptotic	12177	GGTATCAGACTGGTCCAGTAG (SEQ ID NO: 26)
Bclg	Bcl-2 family gene, less defined	66813	TCCAAACAGCATAGAGTTCAA (SEQ ID NO: 27)
			CTGGCCCTCTGTGACTGCTCTA (SEQ ID NO: 28)
Bok	Bcl-2 family gene, less defined	51800	TCGGTGTCCAGCCCTAGAGAA (25%) (SEQ ID NO: 29)
BPR	Bcl-2 family gene, less defined	75736	CCGAGCCCTCTCCGAGTTCTA (SEQ ID NO: 30)
Hrk	Bcl-2 family gene, pro-apoptotic	12123	CAGCAGGGAGTGTCTACTTTA (SEQ ID NO: 31)

			ID NO: 31)
Mil1	Bcl-2 family gene, pro-apoptotic	94044	CCTGAAGAAGTGAAGAGCTTA (SEQ ID NO: 32)
Gene	Gene Function	Gene ID	shRNA Target Sequences *
Mule	Bcl-2 family gene, E3 ligase for Mcl-1 and p53	59026	CCACCTCAGCTACTTCAAGTT (SEQ ID NO: 33)
Noxa	Bcl-2 family gene, pro-apoptotic	58801	CAGATTGAATAGTATGTGATA (SEQ ID NO: 34)
Puma	Bcl-2 family gene, pro-apoptotic	170770	CTGTAGATATACTGGAATGAA (SEQ ID NO: 35)

The teachings of all patents, published applications and references cited herein are incorporated by reference in their entirety.

While this invention has been particularly shown and described with references to example embodiments thereof, it will be understood by those skilled in the art that various changes in form and details may be made therein without
5 departing from the scope of the invention encompassed by the appended claims.

CLAIMS

What is claimed is:

1. A method of characterizing a mechanism of action of a combination of agents comprising
 - 5 a) contacting a plurality of populations of cells with a combination of agents to be assessed, wherein each population of cells have one gene of interest targeted by a small hairpin RNA (shRNA) and wherein said gene of interest regulates cell death and a plurality of genes that regulate cell death are
10 targeted in the plurality of populations of cells; and
 - b) determining a responsiveness of each population of cells to the combination of agents, thereby obtaining an shRNA signature of the combination of agents so as to identify one or more genes that mediate a
15 response to the combination of agents,thereby characterizing the mechanism of action of the combination of agents.
2. The method of Claim 1 wherein the mechanism of action indicates that the
20 combination of agents has a neutralizing effect, a synergistic effect, a novel effect or a similar effect when compared to effects of individual agents of the combination.
3. The method of Claims 1 or 2 wherein the mechanism of action of the combination of agents comprises inhibition of a topoisomerase, cross linking of
25 DNA, inducement of single stand break of DNA, inhibition of nucleic acid synthesis, inhibition of mitosis, inhibition of RNA transcription, inhibition of histone modification enzymes, inhibition of heat shock proteins, alkylation of DNA, or inhibition of proteasomes inducement of apoptosis.

4. The method of Claim 1 further comprising classifying the combination of agents within a group of one or more agents or a combination of agents having in common one or more mechanisms of action.
5. The method of Claim 1 wherein each shRNA acts to knock down one gene.
6. The method of Claim 1 wherein the combination of agents is used in an effective amount to induce a response in cells that do not contain said shRNA targeting said gene of interest.
7. The method of any one of Claims 1-6 wherein a gene that regulates cell death is a gene in the Bcl2 family of genes, a p53 gene, or a p53-activating kinase gene.
8. The method of Claim 7 wherein the gene in the Bcl2 family of genes is a Bax gene, Bak gene, a Bok gene, a Bim gene, a Bid gene, a Puma gene, a Noxa gene, a Bad gene, a Bmf gene, a Bik gene, a Hrk gene, a Bclx gene, a Bclb gene, a Bclw gene, an A1 gene, a Bclg gene, a Mil1 gene, a Mule gene, a BPR gene, a BNIP gene, a Bcl2 gene, or a Mcl 1 gene.
9. The method of Claim 7 wherein the p53 activating kinase gene is an ATM gene, an ATR gene, a Chk1 gene, a Chk2 gene, a DNAPKcs gene, a Smg-1 gene, a JNK1 gene or a p38 gene.
10. The method of any one of Claims 1-9 wherein the cells are mammalian cells.
11. The method of any one of Claims 1-10 wherein the responsiveness of each population of cells to the combination of agents is a relative level of chemo-resistance and sensitization conferred by each shRNA.
12. The method of any one of Claims 1-11 wherein the responsiveness is a relative survival rate of each population of cells compared to control cells that do not contain said shRNA targeting the gene of interest.

13. The method of any one of Claims 1-12 wherein each population of cells further express a marker gene.
- 5 14. The method of any one of Claims 1-13 wherein the shRNAs are introduced into the cells using a viral vector.
15. The method of Claim 14 wherein the shRNAs are introduced into the cells using a retroviral vector.
- 10 16. The method of Claim 14 or 15 wherein the vector further expresses a marker gene.
17. The method of Claim 13 or 16 wherein the marker gene is a fluorescent
15 marker gene.
18. The method of Claim 13 or 16 wherein the marker gene is green fluorescent protein (GFP) gene.
- 20 19. The method of Claim 17 or 18 further comprising measuring the fluorescent marker gene or GFP gene expression level in each population of cells using cell flow cytometry.
20. The method of any one of Claims 1-19 further comprising comparing the
25 responsiveness of each population of cells to the combination of agents to a control.
21. The method of Claim 20 wherein the control is a population of cells into which the shRNA targeting the gene of interest has not been introduced.
- 30 22. The method of any one of Claims 1-21 wherein the determination of the responsiveness is accomplished using cell flow cytometry, hybridization techniques or sequencing techniques.

23. The method of any one of Claims 1-22 wherein three genes, four genes, five genes, six genes, seven genes, eight genes, nine genes, ten genes, eleven genes, twelve genes, thirteen genes, fourteen genes, fifteen genes, sixteen genes, seventeen genes, eighteen genes, nineteen genes, twenty genes, twenty one genes, twenty two
5 genes, twenty three genes, twenty four genes, twenty five genes, twenty six genes, twenty seven genes, twenty eight genes, twenty nine genes, or thirty genes are suppressed by the shRNAs.
24. The method of any one of Claims 1-23 wherein the plurality of genes are
10 ATM, Chk2 and p53.
25. The method of any one of Claims 1-24 wherein the plurality of genes are p53, ATR, Chk1, Chk2, Smg-1, DNA-PKcs, Bok and Bim.
- 15 26. The method of any one of Claims 1-25 wherein the plurality of cells are contacted with the combination of agents for about 1 hour, 4 hours, 8 hours, 12 hours, 16 hours, 20 hours, 24 hours, 28 hours, 32 hours, 36 hours, 40 hours, 44 hours, 48 hours, 52 hours, 56 hours, 60 hours, 64 hours, 68 hours, 72 hours, 76 hours, 80 hours, 84 hours, 88 hours, 92 hours, 96 hours, 100
20 hours or longer.
27. The method of Claim 1 wherein the plurality of cells are contacted repeatedly with the combination of agents.
- 25 28. The method of any of Claims 1-27 further comprising introducing the plurality of shRNAs targeting the plurality of genes of interest into the plurality of populations of cells, wherein each shRNA targets one gene of interest that regulates cell death, wherein each population of cells have one gene of interest targeted.
30
29. The method of any one of Claims 1-28 further comprising using an algorithm to cluster a plurality of a combination of agents into groups based on the responsiveness of each population of cells to each combination of agents.

30. A method of determining whether a patient population treated with a first agent would benefit from a treatment using the first agent in combination with one or more additional agents comprising
- 5
- a) contacting a plurality of populations of cells with a combination of agents to be assessed wherein the combination of agents comprises the first agent and one or more additional agents, and wherein each population of cells have one gene of interest targeted by a small hairpin RNA (shRNA), said gene of
- 10 interest regulates cell death and a plurality of genes that regulate cell death are targeted in the plurality of populations of cells;
- b) determining a responsiveness of each population of cells to the combination of agents, thereby obtaining an shRNA signature of the
- 15 combination of agents so as to identify one or more genes that mediate a response to the combination of agents; and
- c) comparing the shRNA signature of the combination of agents to the shRNA signature of the first agent,
- 20
- wherein if the shRNA signature of the combination of agents is similar to the shRNA signature of the first agent, then the patient population treated with the first agent would benefit from a treatment using the first agent in combination with the one or more additional agents.
- 25
31. The method of Claim 30 wherein the mechanism of action of the combination of agents comprises inhibition of a topoisomerase, cross linking of DNA, inducement of single stand break of DNA, inhibition of nucleic acid synthesis, inhibition of mitosis, inhibition of RNA transcription, inhibition of
- 30 histone modification enzymes, inhibition of heat shock proteins, alkylation of DNA, or inhibition of proteasomes inducement of apoptosis.
32. The method of Claim 30 wherein each shRNA acts to knock down one gene.

33. The method of any one of Claims 30-32 wherein a gene that regulates cell death is a gene in the Bcl2 family of genes, a p53 gene, or a p53-activating kinase gene.
- 5
34. The method of Claim 33 wherein the gene in the Bcl2 family of genes is a Bax gene, Bak gene, a Bok gene, a Bim gene, a Bid gene, a Puma gene, a Noxa gene, a Bad gene, a Bmf gene, a Bik gene, a Hrk gene, a Bclx gene, a Bclb gene, a Bclw gene, an A1 gene, a Bclg gene, a Mil1 gene, a Mule gene, a BPR gene, a
- 10 BNIP gene, a Bcl2 gene, or a Mcl 1 gene.
35. The method of Claim 33 wherein the p53 activating kinase gene is an ATM gene, an ATR gene, a Chk1 gene, a Chk2 gene, a DNAPKcs gene, a Smg-1 gene, a JNK1 gene or a p38 gene.
- 15
36. The method of any one of Claims 30-35 wherein the cells are mammalian cells.
37. The method of any one of Claims 30-36 wherein the responsiveness of each
- 20 population of cells to the combination of agents is a relative level of chemo-resistance and sensitization conferred by each shRNA.
38. The method of any one of Claims 30-37 wherein the responsiveness is a relative survival rate of each population of cells compared to control cells that do not
- 25 contain said shRNA targeting the gene of interest.
39. The method of any one of Claims 30-38 wherein each population of cells further express a marker gene.
- 30 40. The method of any one of Claims 30-39 wherein the shRNAs are introduced into the cells using a viral vector.

41. The method of Claim 40 wherein the shRNAs are introduced into the cells using a retroviral vector.
42. The method of Claim 40 or 41 wherein the vector further expresses a marker gene.
43. The method of Claim 39 or 42 wherein the marker gene is a fluorescent marker gene.
44. The method of Claim 39 or 43 wherein the marker gene is green fluorescent protein (GFP) gene.
45. The method of Claim 43 or 44 further comprising measuring the fluorescent marker gene or GFP gene expression level in each population of cells using cell flow cytometry.
46. The method of any one of Claims 30-45 further comprising comparing the responsiveness of each population of cells to the combination of agents to a control.
47. The method of Claim 46 wherein the control is a population of cells into which the shRNA targeting the gene of interest has not been introduced.
48. The method of any one of Claims 30-47 wherein the determination of the responsiveness is accomplished using cell flow cytometry, hybridization techniques or sequencing techniques.
49. The method of any one of Claims 30-38 wherein three genes, four genes, five genes, six genes, seven genes, eight genes, nine genes, ten genes, eleven genes, twelve genes, thirteen genes, fourteen genes, fifteen genes, sixteen genes, seventeen genes, eighteen genes, nineteen genes, twenty genes, twenty one genes, twenty two genes, twenty three genes, twenty four genes, twenty five genes, twenty six genes, twenty seven genes, twenty eight genes, twenty nine genes, or thirty genes are suppressed by the shRNAs.

50. The method of any one of Claims 30-49 wherein the plurality of genes are ATM, Chk2 and p53.
- 5 51. The method of any one of Claims 30-49 wherein the plurality of genes are p53, ATR, Chk1, Chk2, Smg-1, DNA-PKcs, Bok and Bim.
52. The method of any one of Claims 30-51 wherein the plurality of cells are contacted with the combination of agents for about 1 hour, 4 hours, 8 hours,
10 12 hours, 16 hours, 20 hours, 24 hours, 28 hours, 32 hours, 36 hours, 40 hours, 44 hours, 48 hours, 52 hours, 56 hours, 60 hours, 64 hours, 68 hours, 72 hours, 76 hours, 80 hours, 84 hours, 88 hours, 92 hours, 96 hours, 100 hours or longer.
- 15 53. The method of Claim 30 wherein the plurality of cells are contacted repeatedly with the combination of agents.
54. The method of any of Claims 30-53 further comprising introducing the plurality of shRNAs targeting the plurality of genes of interest into the
20 plurality of populations of cells, wherein each shRNA targets one gene of interest that regulates cell death, wherein each population of cells have one gene of interest targeted.
55. The method of any one of Claims 30-54 further comprising using an
25 algorithm to cluster the combination of agents into one or more groups based on the responsiveness of each population of cells to the combination of agents.
56. A method of determining whether a formulation of one or more agents
30 maintains a mechanism of action of the one or more agents when unformulated comprising

5 a) contacting a plurality of populations of cells with a formulation of one or more agents to be assessed, wherein each population of cells have one gene of interest targeted by a small hairpin RNA (shRNA) and wherein said gene of interest regulates cell death and a plurality of genes that regulate cell death are targeted in the plurality of populations of cells; and

10 b) determining a responsiveness of each population of cells to the formulation of the one or more agents, thereby obtaining an shRNA signature of the formulation of the one or more agents so as to identify one or more genes that mediate a response to the formulation of the one or more agents,

15 c) comparing the shRNA signature of the formulation of the one or more agents to the shRNA signature of the one or more agents when unformulated;

wherein if the shRNA signature of the formulation of the one or more agents is similar to the shRNA signature of the one or more agents when unformulated, then the formulation maintains the mechanism of action of the one or more agents when unformulated.

20

57. The method of Claim 56 wherein the mechanism of action of the formulation of the one or more agents comprises inhibition of a topoisomerase, cross linking of DNA, inducement of single stand break of DNA, inhibition of nucleic acid synthesis, inhibition of mitosis, inhibition of RNA transcription, inhibition of histone modification enzymes, inhibition of heat shock proteins, alkylation of DNA, or inhibition of proteasomes inducement of apoptosis.

58. The method of Claim 56 further comprising classifying the formulation of the one or more agents within a group of one or more agents or a combination of agents having in common one or more mechanisms of action.

30

59. The method of Claim 56 wherein each shRNA acts to knock down one gene.

60. The method of Claim 56 wherein the formulation of the or more agents is used in an effective amount to induce a response in cells that do not contain said shRNA targeting said gene of interest.
- 5 61. The method of any one of Claims 56-60 wherein a gene that regulates cell death is a gene in the Bcl2 family of genes, a p53 gene, or a p53-activating kinase gene.
62. The method of Claim 61 wherein the gene in the Bcl2 family of genes is a
10 Bax gene, Bak gene, a Bok gene, a Bim gene, a Bid gene, a Puma gene, a Noxa gene, a Bad gene, a Bmf gene, a Bik gene, a Hrk gene, a Bclx gene, a Bclb gene, a Bclw gene, an A1 gene, a Bclg gene, a Mil1 gene, a Mule gene, a BPR gene, a BNIP gene, a Bcl2 gene, or a Mcl 1 gene.
- 15 63. The method of Claim 61 wherein the p53 activating kinase gene is an ATM gene, an ATR gene, a Chk1 gene, a Chk2 gene, a DNAPKcs gene, a Smg-1 gene, a JNK1 gene or a p38 gene.
64. The method of any one of Claims 56-63 wherein the cells are mammalian
20 cells.
65. The method of any one of Claims 56-64 wherein the responsiveness of each population of cells to the formulation of the one or more agents is a relative level of chemo-resistance and sensitization conferred by each shRNA.
- 25 66. The method of any one of Claims 56-65 wherein the responsiveness is a relative survival rate of each population of cells compared to control cells that do not contain said shRNA targeting the gene of interest.
- 30 67. The method of any one of Claims 56-66 wherein each population of cells further express a marker gene.

68. The method of any one of Claims 56-67 wherein the shRNAs are introduced into the cells using a viral vector.
69. The method of Claim 68 wherein the shRNAs are introduced into the cells
5 using a retroviral vector.
70. The method of Claim 68 or 69 wherein the vector further expresses a marker gene.
- 10 71. The method of Claim 67 or 70 wherein the marker gene is a fluorescent marker gene.
72. The method of Claim 67 or 71 wherein the marker gene is green fluorescent protein (GFP) gene.
15
73. The method of Claim 72 or 73 further comprising measuring the fluorescent marker gene or GFP gene expression level in each population of cells using cell flow cytometry.
- 20 74. The method of any one of Claims 56-73 further comprising comparing the responsiveness of each population of cells to the combination of agents to a control.
75. The method of Claim 74 wherein the control is a population of cells into which the shRNA targeting the gene of interest has not been introduced.
25
76. The method of any one of Claims 56-75 wherein the determination of the responsiveness is accomplished using cell flow cytometry, hybridization techniques or sequencing techniques.
- 30 77. The method of any one of Claims 56-76 wherein three genes, four genes, five genes, six genes, seven genes, eight genes, nine genes, ten genes, eleven genes, twelve genes, thirteen genes, fourteen genes, fifteen genes, sixteen genes, seventeen genes, eighteen genes, nineteen genes, twenty genes, twenty one genes, twenty two

genes, twenty three genes, twenty four genes, twenty five genes, twenty six genes, twenty seven genes, twenty eight genes, twenty nine genes, or thirty genes are suppressed by the shRNAs.

5 78. The method of any one of Claims 56-77 wherein the plurality of genes are ATM, Chk2 and p53.

79. The method of any one of Claims 56-77 wherein the plurality of genes are p53, ATR, Chk1, Chk2, Smg-1, DNA-PKcs, Bok and Bim.

10

80. The method of any one of Claims 56-79 wherein the plurality of cells are contacted with the formulation of one or more agents for about 1 hour, 4 hours, 8 hours, 12 hours, 16 hours, 20 hours, 24 hours, 28 hours, 32 hours, 36 hours, 40 hours, 44 hours, 48 hours, 52 hours, 56 hours, 60 hours, 64
15 hours, 68 hours, 72 hours, 76 hours, 80 hours, 84 hours, 88 hours, 92 hours, 96 hours, 100 hours or longer.

81. The method of Claim 56 wherein the plurality of cells are contacted repeatedly with the formulation of one or more agents.

20

82. The method of any of Claims 56-81 further comprising introducing the plurality of shRNAs targeting the plurality of genes of interest into the plurality of populations of cells, wherein each shRNA targets one gene of interest that regulates cell death, wherein each population of cells have one
25 gene of interest targeted.

83. The method of any one of Claims 56-82 further comprising using an algorithm to cluster the formulation of one or more agents into groups based on the responsiveness of each population of cells to each formulation of one
30 or more agents.

Figures 1a-1b



1a**1b**

Figure 1c




Figure 1d





Figure 2a






Figure 2b

Figure 2c




Figure 2d




Figure 3a




Figure 3b




Figure 3c






Figure 3d



Figures 3e-3f






Figure 4a

Figure 4b






Figure 4d



Figures 5a-5b

5a



5b




Figure 6





Figure 7

Figure 8





Figure 9



INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

International application No
PCT/US2011/065630A. CLASSIFICATION OF SUBJECT MATTER
INV. C12Q1/68
ADD.

According to International Patent Classification (IPC) or to both national classification and IPC

B. FIELDS SEARCHED

Minimum documentation searched (classification system followed by classification symbols)
C12Q

Documentation searched other than minimum documentation to the extent that such documents are included in the fields searched

Electronic data base consulted during the international search (name of data base and, where practicable, search terms used)

EPO-Internal, EMBASE, BIOSIS

C. DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT

Category*	Citation of document, with indication, where appropriate, of the relevant passages	Relevant to claim No.
A	BRUMMELKAMP THIJN R ET AL: "An shRNA barcode screen provides insight into cancer cell vulnerability to MDM2 inhibitors.", NATURE CHEMICAL BIOLOGY APR 2006 LNKD-PUBMED:16474381, vol. 2, no. 4, April 2006 (2006-04), pages 202-206, XP002675206, ISSN: 1552-4450 the whole document ----- -/--	1-83



Further documents are listed in the continuation of Box C.



See patent family annex.

* Special categories of cited documents :

"A" document defining the general state of the art which is not considered to be of particular relevance

"E" earlier application or patent but published on or after the international filing date

"L" document which may throw doubts on priority claim(s) or which is cited to establish the publication date of another citation or other special reason (as specified)

"O" document referring to an oral disclosure, use, exhibition or other means

"P" document published prior to the international filing date but later than the priority date claimed

"T" later document published after the international filing date or priority date and not in conflict with the application but cited to understand the principle or theory underlying the invention

"X" document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered novel or cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is taken alone

"Y" document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is combined with one or more other such documents, such combination being obvious to a person skilled in the art

"&" document member of the same patent family

Date of the actual completion of the international search

10 May 2012

Date of mailing of the international search report

23/05/2012

Name and mailing address of the ISA/

European Patent Office, P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2
NL - 2280 HV Rijswijk
Tel. (+31-70) 340-2040,
Fax: (+31-70) 340-3016

Authorized officer

Nurmi, Jussi

INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

International application No
PCT/US2011/065630

C(Continuation). DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT		
Category*	Citation of document, with indication, where appropriate, of the relevant passages	Relevant to claim No.
A	IORNS ELIZABETH ET AL: "Utilizing RNA interference to enhance cancer drug discovery.", NATURE REVIEWS. DRUG DISCOVERY JUL 2007 LNKD- PUBMED:17599085, vol. 6, no. 7, July 2007 (2007-07), pages 556-568, XP002675209, ISSN: 1474-1776 page 562, column 2, paragraph 2 - page 563, column 2, paragraph 2 -----	1-83
A	JIANG HAI ET AL: "The combined status of ATM and p53 link tumor development with therapeutic response.", GENES & DEVELOPMENT 15 AUG 2009 LNKD- PUBMED:19608766, vol. 23, no. 16, 15 August 2009 (2009-08-15), pages 1895-1909, XP002675205, ISSN: 1549-5477 page 1903, column 1, paragraph 2 - column 2, paragraph 1; figure 6 -----	1-83
A	WHITEHURST ANGELIQUE W ET AL: "Synthetic lethal screen identification of chemosensitizer loci in cancer cells", NATURE (LONDON), vol. 446, no. 7137, April 2007 (2007-04), pages 815-819, XP002675678, ISSN: 0028-0836 page 818, column 2, paragraph 3 -----	1-83
A,P	JIANG HAI ET AL: "A mammalian functional-genetic approach to characterizing cancer therapeutics", NATURE CHEMICAL BIOLOGY, vol. 7, no. 2, February 2011 (2011-02), pages 92-100, XP002675210, cited in the application the whole document -----	1-83