Supplemental Figure 2. Comparison between FitCUT&RUN, CUT&RUN, FLAG-CUT&RUN, and ChIP-seq/CETCh-seq. *(A, B)* The heatmaps showing for ELF1 (A) and ATF1 (B) signal intensity of peaks in different approaches. The occupancy profiles were generally consistent from four methods, while

FitCUT&RUN displayed highest sensitivity. *(C, D)* Signal intensity was calculated separately around all ELF1 (C) and ATF1 (D) putative binding sites. Maximum signal intensity for ELF1 (C) was obtained with FitCUT&RUN, while maximum signal intensity for ATF1 (D) was obtained with CUT&RUN. *(E)* Bar plots showing the FRiP values for each approach. FitCUT&RUN displayed highest FRiP value for ELF1, while FLAG-CUT&RUN displayed highest FRiP value for ATF1. *(F)* Bar plots showing the NSC values for each approach. FitCUT&RUN displayed the highest NSC value for ELF1 and ATF1. *(G)* The heatmaps showing for ELF1 signal intensity of peaks in different approaches. Each data was sampled down to 5 M fragments. *(H)* Venn diagram showing the overlap status between ELF1 FitCUT&RUN, CUT&RUN, FLAG-CUT&RUN and ChIP-seq peaks. Each data was sampled down to 5 M fragments.