Materials Design Analysis Reporting (MDAR) Checklist for Authors

The MDAR framework establishes a minimum set of requirements in transparent reporting applicable to studies in the life sciences (see Statement of Task: doi:10.31222/osf.io/9sm4x.). The MDAR checklist is a tool for authors, editors and others seeking to adopt the MDAR framework for transparent reporting in manuscripts and other outputs. Please refer to the MDAR Elaboration Document for additional context for the MDAR framework.

Materials

Antibodies	Yes (indicate where provided: section/paragraph)	n/a
For commercial reagents, provide supplier name, catalogue number and RRID, if available.	This review did not involve antibodies.	n/a

Cell materials	Yes (indicate where provided: section/paragraph)	n/a
Cell lines: Provide species information, strain. Provide accession number in repository **OR** supplier name, catalog number, clone number, **OR** RRID	This review did not involve cell lines.	n/a
Primary cultures: Provide species, strain, sex of origin, genetic modification status.	This review did not involve primary cultures.	n/a

Experimental animals	Yes (indicate where provided: section/paragraph)	n/a
Laboratory animals: Provide species, strain, sex, age, genetic modification status. Provide accession number in repository **OR** supplier name, catalog number, clone number, **OR** RRID	This review did not involve experimental animals.	n/a
Animal observed in or captured from the field: Provide species, sex and age where possible	This review did not involve experimental animals.	n/a
Model organisms: Provide Accession number in repository (where relevant) **OR** RRID	This review did not involve model organisms.	n/a

Plants and microbes	Yes (indicate where provided: section/paragraph)	n/a
Plants: provide species and strain, unique accession number if available, and source (including location for collected wild specimens)	This review did not involve plants.	n/a
Microbes: provide species and strain, unique accession number if available, and source	This review did not involve microbes.	n/a

Human research participants	Yes (indicate where provided: section/paragraph)	n/a
Identify authority granting ethics approval (IRB or equivalent committee(s), provide reference number for approval.	This review did not involve ethics approval.	n/a
Provide statement confirming informed consent obtained from study participants.	This review did not involve informed consent.	n/a
Report on age and sex for all study participants.	Results/paragraph 1-2	

Design

Study protocol	Yes (indicate where provided: section/paragraph)	n/a
For clinical trials, provide the trial registration number **OR** cite DOI in manuscript.	This review is not a clinical trail.	n/a

Laboratory protocol	Yes (indicate where provided: section/paragraph)	n/a
Provide DOI or other citation details if detailed step-by-step protocols are available.	This study is a review.	n/a

Experimental study design (statistics details)	Yes (indicate where provided: section/paragraph)	n/a
State whether and how the following have been done**, or** if they were not carried out.		
Sample size determination	This study is a review.	n/a
Randomisation	This study is a review.	n/a
Blinding	This study is a review.	n/a
Inclusion/exclusion criteria	Methods/paragraph 1	

Sample definition and in-laboratory replication	Yes (indicate where provided: section/paragraph)	n/a
State number of times the experiment was replicated in laboratory	This study did not involve experiment.	n/a
Define whether data describe technical or biological replicates	This study did not involve experiment.	n/a

Ethics	Yes (indicate where provided: section/paragraph)	n/a
Studies involving human participants: State details of authority granting ethics approval (IRB or equivalent committee(s), provide reference number for approval.	This study did not involve ethics.	n/a
Studies involving experimental animals: State details of authority granting ethics approval (IRB or equivalent committee(s), provide reference number for approval.	This study did not involve experimental animals.	n/a
Studies involving specimen and field samples: State if relevant permits obtained, provide details of authority approving study; if none were required, explain why.	This study did not involve specimen and field samples.	n/a

Dual Use Research of Concern (DURC)	Yes (indicate where provided: section/paragraph)	n/a
If study is subject to dual use research of concern, state the authority granting approval and reference number for the regulatory approval	This was not a dual use research.	n/a

Analysis

Attrition	Yes (indicate where provided: section/paragraph)	n/a
State if sample or data point from the analysis is excluded, and whether the criteria for exclusion were determined and specified in advance.	All data extracted from included case reports was analyzed.	n/a

Statistics	Yes (indicate where provided: section/paragraph)	n/a
Describe statistical tests used and justify choice of tests.	Statistical tests are not suitable for this review.	n/a

Data Availability	Yes (indicate where provided: section/paragraph)	n/a
State whether newly created datasets are available, including protocols for access or restriction on access.	The datasets generated during and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.	n/a
If data are publicly available, provide accession number in repository or DOI or URL.	The datasets generated during and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the	n/a
If publicly available data are reused, provide accession number in repository or DOI or URL, where possible.	This study did not involve the publicly available data.	n/a

Code Availability	Yes (indicate where provided: section/paragraph)	n/a
For all newly generated code and software essential for replicating the main findings of the study:		
State whether the code or software is available.	This study did not involve the newly generated code.	n/a
If code is publicly available, provide accession number in repository, or DOI or URL.	This study did not involve the newly generated code and software.	n/a

Reporting

Adherence to community standards	Yes (indicate where provided: section/paragraph)	n/a
MDAR framework recommends adoption of discipline-specific guidelines, established and endorsed through community initiatives. Journals have their own policy about requiring specific guidelines and recommendations to complement MDAR.		
State if relevant guidelines (eg., ICMJE, MIBBI, ARRIVE) have been followed, and whether a checklist (eg., CONSORT, PRISMA, ARRIVE) is provided with the manuscript.	ICMJE guidelines were followed as the journal follows ICMJE guidelines for publication.	

Article information: http://dx.doi.org/10.21037/atm-20-6998