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.	Methods (page 2,Para 6/line 119-136) Plasma collected using heparin containing tubes (Cat NO: 367878 Becton Dickinson, New Jersey, USA). U-PA was utilized using ELISA assays (Cat NO: DUPA00, R&D Systems, Minneapolis, USA).	

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	No cell lines were used in this study.	N/A
Primary cultures: Provide species, strain, sex of origin, genetic modification	No cell lines or strains were used in this study.	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	No laboratory animals were used in this study.	N/A
Animal observed in or captured from the field: Provide species, sex and age where possible	No laboratory animals were used in this study.	N/A
Model organisms: Provide Accession number in repository (where relevant)	No laboratory animals were used in this study.	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	No plants were used in this study.	N/A
Microbes: provide species and strain, unique accession number if available,	No microbes were used in this study.	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.	Methods (page 6,Para 1/line 117-123) ,(page 16,para 3, line 359-366) and (page 17,para 1, line 368-370) Institutional Review Board of the Mount Sinai School of Medicine, New York; IRB reference NO: GCO1: 16-2619 and Institutional Review Board of the Columbia university medical center, New York; IRB reference NO: AAAA4473.	
Provide statement confirming informed consent obtained from study participants.	(page 6,Para 1/line 117-123)and page 16,para 3 ,line 359-366) Informed written consent was obtained from all colorectal cancer patients who were enrolled in an IRB approved data/plasma bank and all patients assented to analysis, present and to publish the paper.	
Report on age and sex for all study participants.	Results (page 8,Para 2/line 183-184-and Table 1 A total of 93 eligible CRC patients who underwent MICR were selected for the study. There were 46 males and 47 females with a mean age of 65.6± 13.9 years.	

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 study is not a clinical trail	

Laboratory protocol	Yes (indicate where provided: section/paragraph)	n/a
Provide DOI or other citation details if detailed step-by-step protocols are available.	Method (page 6 Para 4/line 135-138)and(page 7 Para 1-3/line 139-160) Analysis protocol described in method section	

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	Results (Page8,Para 2/line 183-184 and table 1)	
Randomisation	The study was a retrospective study.	
Blinding	The study was a retrospective study.	
Inclusion/exclusion criteria	Method (page 6 Para 3/line 131-133)	

Sample definition and in-laboratory replication	Yes (indicate where provided: section/paragraph)	n/a
State number of times the experiment was replicated in laboratory	Method(page 7 ,Para 3/line 148-156) Plasma uPA levels were determined in duplicate and 8 serial dilution standard curve samples were included on each 96 well plate; the results are reported as ng/ml.	
Define whether data describe technical or biological replicates	Method(page 7 ,Para 3/line 148-156) The date use is mean vale of duplicated biological sample vales	

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.	**Ethics approval and consent to participate** (page 16 ,Para 3/line 360-366) and (page 17 ,Para 1/line 368-370)	
Studies involving experimental animals: State details of authority granting ethics approval (IRB or equivalent committee(s), provide reference number for approval.	No animal or animal tissues used in this study	
Studies involving specimen and field samples: State if relevant permits obtained, provide details of authority approving study; if none were required, explain why.	No animal or animal tissues used in this study	

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	Not applicable- This study is not subject to dual use research	

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.	No samples or data points were excluded	

Statistics	Yes (indicate where provided: section/paragraph)	n/a
Describe statistical tests used and justify choice of tests.	Method(page 8 ,Para 1/line 162-182)	

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.	No newly created datasets are available.	
If data are publicly available, provide accession number in repository or DOI or URL.	Not applicable	
If publicly available data are reused, provide accession number in repository or DOI or URL, where possible.	Not applicable	

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:	Not applicable No codes were generated.	
State whether the code or software is available.	Not applicable	
If code is publicly available, provide accession number in repository, or DOI or URL.	Not applicable	

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 recommendations for publication.	

Article Information: https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/jgo-22-113