



Supplemental Figure 5. Nanog profiling by FitCUT&RUN during zebrafish ZGA. (A) Comparison of Nanog FitCUT&RUN at dome stage using 20 embryos and 50 embryos. Venn diagram showing the overlap between Nanog binding sites derived from 20 embryos and 50 embryos. (B) Scatterplot presenting the high correlation of the Nanog FitCUT&RUN peak signals between experiments with different input embryos (x-axis: 50 embryos; y-axis: 20 embryos). (C) Boxplots showing the normalized 256-cell (left) and 1k-cell (right) wild-type ATAC-seq signals (Supplemental Table S3) (Liu et al. 2018) on promoters. Nanog target promoters show a higher ATAC-seq signal, indicating that Nanog plays a role in the establishment of accessible chromatin at these promoters. (D) Boxplots showing the ATAC-seq signal (Supplemental Table S2) change after *nanog-rFc* mRNA microinjection into embryos in the 256-cell (left) and 1k-cell (right) stages. No obvious difference between oblong accessible regions (Supplemental Table S3) (Liu et al. 2018) that overlap or not with Nanog 256-cell FitCUT&RUN peaks, proving that the microinjection is not likely to generate artificial FitCUT&RUN peaks. (E) PCA analysis of RNA-seq data at 256-cell, 1k-cell and dome stages for WT, H₂O injection and *nanog-rFc* injection embryos. Circle: WT sample; square: H₂O injection sample; triangle: *nanog-rFc* injection sample; red: 256-cell stage; blue: 1k-cell stage; yellow: dome stage. (F) Expression of *nanog* and genes in Fig 4F in WT, H₂O injection and *nanog-rFc* injection sample. (G) Numbers of differentially expressed genes between *nanog-rFc* injection samples and WT/H₂O injection samples.