Supplementary Information

Dataset 1 and Dataset 2 are provided as separate file folders

Table of Contents

- Pages 1-6: Supplementary Experimental Procedures
- Page 7: Supplementary Table 1; Leaf expansion rates
- Page 8: Supplementary Table 2; Leaf cell densities
- Page 9: Supplementary Table 3; The number of transcripts and proteins in SOW and SWD populating the different patterns
- Dataset 1: Supplementary Table 4; Grouping of SOW transcript data, gene annotation and marker transcripts
- Dataset 1: Supplementary Table 5; Grouping of SOW protein data, gene annotation and marker proteins
- Dataset 1: Supplementary Table 6; Grouping of SWD transcript data and gene annotation
- Dataset 1: Supplementary Table 7; Grouping of SWD protein data and gene annotation
- Page 10: Supplementary Table 8; Transcript and protein changes between stages and stage markers
- Page 11: Supplementary Table 9; Expansion stage markers
- Dataset 1: Supplementary Table 10; Transcripts changing between end-of-day and end-of-night in the individual stages and in SOW and SWD conditions as in Figure 7
- Page 12: Supplementary Table 11; Response to abiotic stimulus and gravity
- Page 13: Supplementary Table 12; Growth-stage specific changes between EON and EOD
- Page 14: Supplementary Table 13; Increasing protein and decreasing transcript levels
- Page 15: Supplementary Table 14; Exceptional transcript patterns of ribosomal proteins
- Page 16: Supplementary Table 15; Promoter motifs of ribosomal proteins
- Page 17: Supplementary Table 16; Patterns of autophagy related transcripts
- Page 18: Supplementary Table 17; Cell wall
- Pages 19-20: Supplementary Table 18; Plastid gene expression

Dataset 1: Supplementary Table 19; Direct comparison of transcript data in SOW and SWD leaves

- Page 21: Supplementary Table 20; Defence response to fungus
- Dataset 1: Supplementary Table 21; Reported water deficit markers in SOW and SWD
- Dataset 1: Supplementary Table 22; Direct comparison of protein data in SOW and SWD leaves
- Page 22: Supplementary Table 23; Proteins with significant differences between SOW and SWD
- Page 23: Supplementary Table 24; SOW iTRAQ labelling scheme
- Page 24: Supplementary Table 25; SWD iTRAQ labelling scheme
- Dataset 1: Supplementary Table 26; Proteomics results of the SOW experiment with ratios, the standard deviation and the number of spectra that contributed to the ratios
- Dataset 1: Supplementary Table 27; Proteomics results of the SWD experiment with ratios, the standard deviation and the number of spectra that contributed to the ratios
- Dataset 1: Supplementary Table 28; Results from the Pearson correlation of the SOW and SWD proteomics data
- Dataset 1: Supplementary Table 29; Results from the statistical analyses and fold changes for transcripts and proteins in SOW and SWD
- Dataset 1: Supplementary Table 30: Proteins not included in the clustering
- Page 25: Supplementary Figure 1; Stage-specific ploidy levels
- Page 26: Supplementary Figure 2; Technical variability of protein quantification by iTRAQ
- Page 27: Supplementary Figure 3; Full decision tree
- Dataset 2: Supplementary Figure 4; Transcript patterns in SOW
- Dataset 2: Supplementary Figure 5; Protein patterns in SOW
- Dataset 2: Supplementary Figure 6; Transcript patterns in SWD
- Dataset 2: Supplementary Figure 7; Protein patterns in SWD
- Page 28: Supplementary Figure 8; Example transcripts with EON and EOD changes
- Page 29: Supplementary Figure 9; Functional categories over-represented in transcripts higher at EOD or EON
- Page 30: Supplementary Figure 10; Results of the PCA analysis after combination of the transcript data from the SOW and SWD experiments
- Page 31: Supplementary Figure 11; Histograms of the standard deviations of the replicate means for the microarray and plastid transcript data
- Page 32: Supplementary Figure 12; Histograms of the log2-transformed sample/reference protein ratios
- Page 33: Supplementary Figure 13; Comparison of AGRONOMICS1 tiling array and qRT-PCR data
- Page 34: Supplementary Figure 14; Comparison of iTRAQ proteomics and Western blot data

Supplementary Experimental Procedures

Calculation of relative and absolute expansion rates

For each stage, the absolute rate (AR) of leaf processes (P, leaf area expansion, leaf thickness expansion, cell division and cell expansion) were calculated as the local slope of the relationship between the value of the variable (leaf area, leaf thickness, cell number or cell area, respectively) and time t:

$$
ARj = [dP/dt]j. \t\t (Eq. 1)
$$

AR is calculated on the sigmoid fitting by linear regression on three values of P and t corresponding to sampling dates $j-1$, j and $j+1$.

The relative rate (RR) was also calculated for each process as followed:

 $RRj = [d(LnP)/dt]j$ (Eq. 2)

Transcript profiling with AGRONOMICS1 microarrays

RNA extraction was done using a Qiagen (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany) QiaCube robot and the Qiagen RNA plant extraction kit. RNA was amplified and labelled with the GeneChip® IVT Express Labelling kit (Affymetrix, Santa Clara, CA). Labelled RNA was hybridized to AGRONOMICS1 microarrays. The AGRONOMICS1 array is a custom-made *Arabidopsis thaliana* Col-0 tiling array that contains the complete paths of both genome strands with on average one 25mer probe per 35bp genome sequence window. The microarray enables reliable expression profiling of more than 30,000 Arabidopsis genes and gives very similar results to the widely used ATH1 microarray for the set of common probes (Rehrauer *et al.,* 2010). The arrays were scanned using an Affymetrix 3000 7G confocal scanner. All data processing was performed using R (R Development Core Team, 2010). Background correction, normalisation, and calculation of probe set summaries were based on custommade CDF files and RMA (Irizarry *et al.,* 2003) implemented in the Aroma.Affymetrix package (Bengtsson *et al.,* 2008). Nonperforming probes were dynamically masked during the analysis as described previously (Rehrauer *et al.,* 2010).

Transcript profiling with RT-qPCR

Plastid transcripts were measured by RT-qPCR from the same RNA samples as used for microarray profiling. cDNA synthesis and qPCR using a Roche Lightcycler 480 followed the same protocols and employed the same sets of primers as in (Chateigner-Boutin *et al.,* 2008). Standard curves were established for each primer pair using PCR product templates of known concentration such that the final values obtained are proportional to the quantity of template in the sample, allowing relative quantification of transcripts to each other. Values were normalised assuming equal total amounts of plastid RNA (including rRNAs) in each sample; i.e. the value for each plastid transcript was divided by the sum of values for all plastid transcripts in the same sample.

Sample preparation for proteomics

Proteins were solubilized by adding extraction buffer (20 mM Tris base, 5 mM $MgCl₂$, 8 M urea, 1x protease inhibitor cocktail (Roche, Basel, Switzerland)) and incubation for 30 min at room temperature. The supernatant fraction obtained after centrifugation at 16,100 x g for 10 min at 25°C was ultracentrifuged at 100,000 x g for 45 min at 25°C. Protein concentrations in the supernatants of the ultracentrifugation step were determined with the Pierce BCA Protein Assay Kit (Pierce Biotechnology, Rockford, USA). For each sample, 100 µg protein were subjected to an in-solution tryptic digest according to a modified protocol from Kinter and Sherman (Kinter and Sherman, 2000). For this, the volumes of the different samples were first adjusted, and the urea concentration was lowered to 6 M by adding 50 mM Tris-HCl pH 8.0. Disulfide bridges were reduced by adding 200 mM DTT in 50 mM Tris-HCl pH 8.0 to a DTT concentration of 9.5 mM and incubation for 1 h at room temperature. The thiol groups were then derivatised by the addition of 200 mM iodoacetamide in 50 mM Tris-HCl pH 8.0 to a final concentration of 32 mM iodoacetamide and incubation for 1 h at room temperature in the dark. Excess iodoacetamide was then reacted by anew addition of 200 mM DTT in 50 mM Tris-HCl to a total final concentration of 37 mM DTT and incubation for 1 h at room temperature in the dark. The urea concentration was then reduced to 0.6 M with 1 mM CaCl₂ in 50 mM Tris-HCl pH 8.0 before the addition of trypsin in a trypsin: protein ratio of 1:25 (w/w) and incubation at 30°C for at least 16 h. After tryptic digest, the peptides were purified using Sep-Pak reverse-phase cartridges (Waters, Milford, USA). Extraction, tryptic digest and Sep-Pak purification were performed in parallel for all samples in a reaction. Peptides were then labeled with 8-plex iTRAQ tags (Applied Biosystems, Foster City, USA) according to the labeling schemes in Supplementary Tables 24, 25 following the manufacturer's instructions. The labeled peptides were then combined and afterwards fractionated with strong cation-exchange (SCX) chromatography. For this, 1.5 ml buffer A (10 mM KH_2PO_4 , pH 2.8, 25% v/v acetonitrile) were added to the peptides, the pH was adjusted with phosphoric acid to below pH 2.8, and the solution was loaded onto a Polysulfoethyl A (200 X 2.1 mm, 5 µm) column (PolyLC, Columbia, USA) connected to an Agilent HP1100 HPLC system. Peptides were eluted at a flow rate of 0.3 ml/min with an increasing KCl gradient (0-10 min 0% buffer B (0.35 M KCl, 10 mM KH2PO4, pH 2.8, 25% v/v acetonitrile), 10-15 min 0-10% buffer B, 15-50 min 10-40% buffer B, 50-60 min 40-100% B, 60-80 min 100% buffer B). Fractions of 0.8 ml were collected, combined into 8 pools (pool I: fractions 1-10, pool II: fraction 11, pool III: fraction 12, pool IV: fraction 13, pool V: fraction 14, pool VI: fraction 15, pool VII: fraction 16, pool VIII: fractions 17-30) and desalted with Sep-Pak reverse-phase cartridges (Waters, Milford, USA).

Mass spectrometry measurements

iTRAQ experiments were performed on a hybrid LTQ Orbitrap XL mass spectrometer (Thermo Scientific, Bremen, Germany) coupled to an Eksigent nanoLC system (Eksigent Technologies) and

analysed by reversed-phase liquid chromatography nanospray tandem mass spectrometry (nanoLC-MS/MS). Peptides were resuspended in 3% ACN and 0.2% formic acid, loaded from a cooled (10°C) Spark Holland autosampler (Emmen, Holland) and separated using an ACN/water solvent system containing 0.2% formic acid with a flow rate of 200 nl/min. Separation of the peptides was performed on a 10 cm long fused silica column (75 µm i.d.; BGB Analytik) in-house packed with 3 μm, 200 Å pore size C¹⁸ resin (MichromBioResources, CA). Elution was achieved using a gradient of 3−48% ACN in 50 min, 48−80% ACN in 3 min and 80% ACN for 7 min.

iTRAQ labelled peptides were analysed by applying spectral merging of CID and HCD of two consecutive scans from the same precursor. One scan cycle was comprised of a survey full MS scan of spectra from m/z 300 to m/z 2000 acquired in the FT-Orbitrap with a resolution of $R = 60,000$ at m/z 400, followed by up to six sequential data- dependent CID and HCD MS/MS scans. CID was done with a target value of 1e4 in the linear trap. Collision energy was set to 35%, Q value to 0.25 and activation time to 30 ms. HCD fragmentation ions including reporter ions were detected in the Orbitrap with a target value of 5e5, a collision energy of 43%. For all experiments dynamic exclusion was used with one repeat count, 30 s repeat duration and 90 s exclusion duration. The instrument was calibrated externally according to the manufacturer's instructions. The samples were acquired using internal lock mass calibration on m/z 429.088735 and 445.120025.

Interpretation of MS/MS spectra and quantification

MS/MS spectra were searched with Mascot (Matrix Science, London, UK) version 2.3.02 against TAIR10 (The Arabidopsis Information Resource) protein database (download on January17th, 2011) with concatenated decoy database supplemented with contaminants (71,032 entries). The search parameters were: mass = monoisotopic, requirement for tryptic ends, 2 missed cleavages allowed, precursor ion tolerance $= +/- 10$ ppm, fragment ion tolerance $= +/- 0.8$ Da, variable modifications of methionine (M, PSI-MOD name: oxidation, mono $\Delta = 15.994919$) and tyrosine (Y, PSI-MOD name: iTRAQ8plex reporter+balance reagent derivatised residue, mono $\Delta = 304.2053539$, and static modifications of cysteine (C, PSI-MOD name: iodoacetamide derivative, mono $\Delta = 57.021464$), lysine and the N-terminus (K and N-term, PSI-MOD name: iTRAQ8plex reporter+balance reagent derivatised residue, mono $\Delta = 304.205360$. Peptide spectrum assignments with ionscore > 24 and expect value < 0.05, except those of known contaminants, were filtered for ambiguity. Peptides matching to several proteins were excluded from further analyses. This does not apply to different splice variants of the same protein or to different loci sharing exactly the same amino acid sequence. All remaining spectrum assignments were inserted into the pep2pro database (Baerenfaller *et al.,* 2011). Mascot quantification parameters were: protein ratio type = average, normalization = median ratio, outlier removal = none, report peptide ratios = 1, min. # of peptides = 1, min. precursor charge = 2, peptide threshold = minimum score of 10. Ratios were calculated with reporter ion 121 as base, and ratios were corrected as specified by the supplier. From the resulting quantification .xml file, the

reporter ion ratios of those spectrum assignments that had been entered into the database were read out. If all 7 ratios had a positive value (neither ####, nor --, nor negative value) they were written into the pep2pro database, if not, the ratios in that spectrum were given a value of NULL. In addition, the ion intensity values of the reporter ions of those spectrum assignments that had been entered into the database were read from the .mgf files. Including only peptide spectrum assignments into the quantitative analysis that had an expect value < 0.05 , an ion score > 24 , and for which all seven ratios had a positive value excluded a considerable amount of low signal data. This solved the issue of high variability in the low signal range (Supplementary Figure 2).

As in each reaction two reference samples were included (Supplementary Tables 24, 25) the spectrum ratio is calculated by averaging the two sample/reference ratios (e.g. the spectrum ratio for sample PE48₁ labeled with reporter ion 113 in reaction ae1₅ is determined by calculating (113/121 $*$ $(118/121)^{-1}$ + 113/121 * $(119/121)^{-1}$) / 2, which is the same as calculating $(113/118 + 113/119)$ / 2). The protein sample/reference ratio is then calculated by averaging all the spectrum ratios of that protein in a sample.

Statistical analysis and grouping of the protein and transcript data

In the statistical analysis of the individual datasets the log2-transformed sample/reference ratios of each dataset were subjected to an analysis of variance (ANOVA) treating stage (S) and day-time (ND) as main effects. The corresponding formula is $Y_{ijk} = \mu + S_i + ND_j + \varepsilon_{ijk}$, where Y_{ijk} is the expression of the k-th replicate of a gene or protein in stage i and at daytime j, µ the mean expression of the gene or protein and ε_{ijk} the corresponding normal distributed error. This formula was chosen because preanalysis had shown that the interaction between the main effects was not significant and therefore was not considered in the presented model. The resulting p-values for the global F-test, the stage dependent level changes and the day-time dependent level changes were adjusted for multiple testing with the Benjamini-Hochberg method (Benjamini *et al.,* 1995) controlling the false discovery rate to give pGlobal (p-value for an overall global change), pS (p-value for a change between stages) and pND (pvalue for the diurnal change). The effect size of the individual stages and the significance of the level changes were computed with the Tukey Honest Significant Differences (TukeyHSD) post-hoc test followed by correction with the Benjamini-Hochberg method. In addition to the significance testing we also included a minimum fold-change cut-off to exclude significant but spurious small changes from further analyses. The approach of combining significance testing with a fold-change cut-off has been recommended in a recent article validating differential gene expression algorithms (Yanofsky and Bickel, 2010). Especially for the proteomics data the technical variance in the measurements does not allow for the reliable detection of very small abundance changes. For that purpose the maximum difference in the mean values for each of the eight time points was computed. Only proteins and transcripts passing the p-value and fold-change cut-offs were used in the classification. For proteins we additionally required that they had at least one value in each of the eight time points leaving 1673

proteins in the SOW dataset and 1184 in the SWD dataset. For the SOW experiment, the RT-qPCR data for 80 transcripts of plastid genes were added to the transcript data. In total, 11,341 transcripts and 569 proteins in SOW, and 12,153 transcripts and 370 proteins in SWD had a global p-value < 0.05 and a fold change > 1.5 and were subjected to clustering by a decision tree.

Alternative experimental validation of a subset of the transcript and protein patterns

For DPE2 (AT2G40840), GSTF2 (AT4G02520), PORB (AT4G27440) and PORC (AT1G03630) we quantified transcript levels with qRT-PCR and assessed the protein levels qualitatively with western blotting. qRT-PCR analyses were done using cDNA generated from RNA from the SWD samples and for data analysis the relative mRNA abundance was determined using the formula

$Efficiency_{Ref}^{avg(CT)}/Efficiency_{GOI}^{avg(CT)}$

where GOI is the gene of interest, Ref the internal control and $avg(CT)$ the average CT over two technical replicates (Ruijter *et al.* 2009). As internal control AT3G13530 was used, which displayed very small fold-changes and high pGlobal-values in the SOW and SWD tiling array data. The qRT-PCR data were log-transformed, subjected to statistical testing as described above, except for the correction for multiple testing, and afterwards clustered. The results in Supplementary Figure 13 show that the variation patterns between EOD and EON were consistent in the tiling array and qRT-PCR datasets. The variation over the developmental stages was identical for PORC and generally corresponded for DPE2, PORB and GSTF2.

For Western blotting we used the antibodies for POR (Agrisera), GSTF2 (Agrisera) and DPE2 (kindly provided by Sam Zeeman) to probe plots derived from 14% SDS-PAGE gels loaded with 20 µg of each SWD sample (Supplementary Figure 14). Probing the membrane with the antibody detecting the POR protein (PORA, 43.9 kDa; PORB, 43.4 kDa; PORC, 43.8 kDa) we detected three bands. In agreement with the iTRAQ data for PORB and PORC (PORA was not detected) these bands are decreasing across developmental stages. Also the signal for GSTF2 corresponds well with the iTRAQ data as it is increasing across developmental stages. Less clear, but still visible, also the signal for DPE2 is stronger in stage 4 as compared to stage 1.

References

- Baerenfaller K, Hirsch-Hoffmann M, Svozil J, Hull R, Russenberger D, Bischof S, Lu Q, Gruissem W, Baginsky S (2011) pep2pro: a new tool for comprehensive proteome data analysis to reveal information about organ-specific proteomes in Arabidopsis thaliana. Integr Biol Camb 3: 225– 237
- Bengtsson H, Irizarry R, Carvalho B, Speed TP (2008) Estimation and assessment of raw copy numbers at the single locus level. Bioinformatics 24: 759–767
- Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y (1995) Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B 57: 289–300
- Chateigner-Boutin AL, Ramos-Vega M, Guevara-García A, Andrés C, de la Luz Gutiérrez-Nava M, Cantero A, Delannoy E, Jiménez LF, Lurin C, Small I, León P (2008) CLB19, a pentatricopeptide repeat protein required for editing of rpoA and clpP chloroplast transcripts. Plant J 56: 590–602
- Irizarry RA, Hobbs B, Collin F, Beazer-Barclay YD, Antonellis KJ, Scherf U, Speed TP (2003) Exploration, normalization, and summaries of high density oligonucleotide array probe level data. Biostatistics 4: 249–264
- Kinter M, Sherman NE (2000) Protein sequencing and identification using tandem mass spectrometry. John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- R Development Core Team (2010) R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, ISBN 3-900051-07-0
- Rehrauer H, Aquino C, Gruissem W, Henz SR, Hilson P, Laubinger S, Naouar N, Patrignani A, Rombauts S, Shu H, de Peer YV, Vuylsteke M, Weigel D, Zeller G, Hennig L (2010) AGRONOMICS1: a new resource for Arabidopsis transcriptome profiling. Plant Physiol 152: 487–499
- Ruijter JM, Ramakers C, Hoogaars WMH, Karlen Y, Bakker O, van den Hoff MJB, Moorman AFM (2009) Amplification efficiency: linking baseline and bias in the analysis of quantitative PCR data. Nucleic Acids Res 37: e45
- Yanofsky CM, Bickel DR (2010) Validation of differential gene expression algorithms: application comparing fold-change estimation to hypothesis testing. BMC Bioinformatics 11: 63 2

Supplementary Table 1

Leaf expansion rates. Leaf absolute expansion rate (AR) and relative expansion rate (RR) calculated from the data presented in Figure 1 at the four key stages of leaf development in SOW and SWD conditions and for leaf area, leaf thickness, cell number and cell area.

Units are: (1) mm² day⁻¹, (2) µm day⁻¹, (3) number of cell day⁻¹, (4) µm² day⁻¹, (5) day⁻¹

Supplementary Table 2:

Leaf cell densities. Cell density in each tissue of the leaf during the four stages of leaf growth in SOW **A)** and SWD **B)**. Data are mean and SD values.

Supplementary Table 3: The number of transcripts and proteins in SOW and SWD populating the different patterns

Supplementary Table 8:

Transcript and protein changes between stages and stage markers. A) The number of transcripts and proteins that are changing between two adjacent stages with the direction of change, and **B)** the number of stage-specific marker transcripts and proteins with their respective patterns not taking into account the diurnal changes (X indicates 'EN', 'ED' or 'E' for the differences between EOD and EON). A stage-specific marker is significantly different in one specific stage compared to all other stages while it is not significantly different between the other stages. A stage 2 – stage 3 marker is different in stage 2 and stage 3 compared to stage 1 and stage 4, but not different between stage 1 and stage 4.

Supplementary Table 9:

Expansion stage markers. A) Transcript expansion stage markers in GO categories *positive regulation of catalytic activity* and *photosynthetic electron transport in photosystem I* **B)** Protein expansion stage markers in pattern U-E-D-E.

AT5G38430 | U-E-D-E RBCS Ribulose bisphosphate carboxylase (small chain) family protein

AT3G03780 U-E-D-E ATMS2 methionine synthase 2

Supplementary Table 11:

 \blacksquare

Response to abiotic stimulus and gravity. The transcripts in GO categories *cellular response to abiotic stimulus* and *response to gravity* that lead to the over-representation of these categories in the different sub-groups of diurnally regulated transcripts.

5

Supplementary Table 12:

Growth-stage specific changes between EON and EOD. The number of transcripts that change significantly in a pair-wise comparison of the EON and EOD samples are given for each growth stage and for SOW and SWD conditions. The number of transcripts repressed or induced by sugar as reported by Usadel et al. (2008) is given for each subset together with the p-value for overrepresentation as assessed with Fisher's exact test.

Supplementary Table 13:

Increasing protein and decreasing transcript levels. Transcript-protein pairs with decreasing transcript and increasing protein accumulation and their localisation.

Supplementary Table 14:

Exceptional transcript patterns of ribosomal proteins. Transcript patterns for ribosomal components increasing across the stages and for L18a ribosomal proteins.

Supplementary Table 15:

Promoter motifs of ribosomal proteins. The motifs over-represented with p-value < 1e-10 in the promoter elements of the nuclear-encoded transcripts of ribosomal proteins.

Supplementary Table 16:

Patterns of autophagy related transcripts

Supplementary Table 17:

Cell wall. Transcripts associated with cell wall organisation, biogenesis and loosening, as well as cell wall thickening.

Supplementary Table 18:

Plastid gene expression. Transcript and protein expression patterns of plastid encoded genes and the sigma factors regulating plastid gene expression. In blue, patterns with a downward trend across stages, in yellow patterns with an upward trend, and in green an intermediate pattern. Pattern '0' indicates that the transcript or protein was detected, but was not considered to change significantly.

AT5G24120 U-E-E-EN SIG5 sigma factor E

Supplementary Table 20:

Defence response to fungus. Transcripts that account for the overrepresentation of the GO category *defence response to fungus* in the transcripts that are more abundant in SOW than in SWD leaves. Pattern '0' indicates that the transcript levels were not changing significantly and were therefore not subjected to the clustering. maxDiff referes to the maximum difference between EOD and EON in the four stages and meanDiff the average difference.

Supplementary Table 23:

Proteins with significant differences between SOW and SWD.

Supplementary Table 24:

SOW iTRAQ labelling scheme. 8plex iTRAQ labelling scheme for the short day optimal watering experiment; Reference = mixed rosette sample, $EN = end-of-night$, $ED = end-of-day$. In each field the mass of the reporter ion of the 8-plex iTRAQ reagent is given at the top, and the sample aliquot at the bottom.

Supplementary Table 25:

SWD iTRAQ labelling scheme 8plex iTRAQ labelling scheme for the short day water deficit experiment; Reference = mixed rosette sample, $EN = end-of-night$, $ED = end-of-day$. In each field the mass of the reporter ion of the 8-plex iTRAQ reagent is given at the top, and the sample aliquot at the bottom.

Supplementary Figure 1:

Stage-specific ploidy levels. Percentage of leaf cells at each ploidy level for the four stages as defined in Figure 3 in SOW (blue bars) and SWD (red bars) conditions. The four stages (1, 2, 3, 4) are represented in A, B, C and D, respectively. Data are mean and SD values with $n \ge 5$.

Supplementary Figure 2:

Technical variability of protein quantification by iTRAQ. As two reference samples were included in each of the 12 iTRAQ labelling experiments (see Supplementary Table 24), the reference/reference log-transformed ratios, which should ideally be 0, were used to assess the technical variability in the data and the validity of the cut-off criteria to find significantly changing proteins. The cut-off criteria are a combination of a significance test (p-value < 0.05) and a fold-change threshold (fold-change $>$ 1.5), and when applying these to the reference/reference protein ratios no protein passed both criteria. For visualisation we plotted the mean log-transformed reference/reference protein ratios versus the mean intensity of the reference peaks. The data is presented for the 1639 proteins with a reference/reference ratio in at least two of the three biological replicates in the SOW experiment. In blue are the proteins with fold-change > 1.5 and in green those with p-value < 0.05 in a one-sample two-sided Student's t-Test. The dashed blue lines indicate the fold-change cut-off.

Supplementary Figure 3:

27

Supplementary Figure 8:

Example transcripts with EON and EOD changes. Plots of the mean transcript sample/reference ratios and their standard deviations in the 8 time points for the central clock components LHY, CCA1 and TOC1, GIGANTEA, ACD6 and PHT4;2. For each transcript, the pattern into which it was clustered is given in the header line.

Supplementary Figure 9:

Functional categories over-represented in transcripts higher at EOD or EON. The lists with transcripts for each group were subjected to an assessment of over-representation of GO categories. The categories with p-value < 0.01 were assigned to higher-order GO categories in protein and nucleic acid metabolism and response to stimulus. The numbers inside the cells indicate the number of overrepresented GO categories for each group that fall into the higher-order GO categories.

Supplementary Figure 10:

Results of the PCA analysis after combination of the transcript data from the SOW and SWD experiments.

Histograms of the standard deviations of the replicate means for the microarray (left) and RT-PCR (right) plastid transcript data. The mean values indicated at the upper right of each panel indicate that the RT-PCR data have a smaller mean standard deviation.

Histograms of the log2-transformed sample/reference protein ratios in biological replicate 1 with the mean and the variance of the ratios. The theoretical normal distribution is plotted in red.

Supplementary Figure 13:

Comparison of the transcript variation patterns in the AGRONOMICS1 tiling array data for SOW and SWD (left panels) and the qRT-PCR data for SWD (right panels).

Supplementary Figure 14:

Comparison of the protein variation patterns in the iTRAQ data for SOW and SWD (upper panels) and a qualitative Western blot for DPE2, POR and GSTF2 in SWD (lowest panel).The membrane sections probed with the α -POR and α -GSTF2 antibodies were generated from the same gel, the signals therefore serve as mutual loading controls. At the left, the molecular weight is indicated.