|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Section | Percentage  rhythmic (FFT-NLLS) | Percentage  rhythmic (SR) | Percentage rhythmic  (mFourFit) | Percentage rhythmic |
| Cotyledon | 95.69 | 92.24 | 94.83 | 86.21 |
| Hypocotyl (sect2) | 75.00 | 71.88 | 84.38 | 68.75 |
| Hypocotyl (sect1) | 93.94 | 93.94 | 93.94 | 93.94 |
| Root (sect 2-4) | 89.23 | 84.62 | 74.62 | 53.85 |
| Root (sect 1) | 90.00 | 77.50 | 82.50 | 62.50 |
| Root (up from tip) | 80.00 | 93.33 | 89.33 | 61.33 |
| Root tip | 91.53 | 93.22 | 91.86 | 67.80 |

**Figure 1-source data 2. The percentage of rhythmic cells for repeat WT experiment**. Columns 2-4 identify rhythmic cells using 3 different methods described in BioDare. Column 2 uses FFT-NLLS (Fast Fourier Transform Non Linear Least Squares), with Goodness of Fit (GOF) parameter of 0.9. Column 3 uses Spectrum Resampling (SR) with GOF of 1 and Column 4 uses mFourFit with GOF of 1. See Methods for details. Column 5 shows percentage of cell traces that were identified as rhythmic by all three methods and where periods from each method were within 2.5h of each other (as described in the Methods). This data was taken forward for further analysis.