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.	Qualitative research- not experimental	X

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	Qualitative research- not experimental	x
Primary cultures: Provide species, strain, sex of origin, genetic modification status.	Qualitative research- not experimental	x

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	Qualitative research- not experimental	x
Animal observed in or captured from the field: Provide species, sex and age where possible	Qualitative research- not experimental	x
Model organisms: Provide Accession number in repository (where relevant) **OR** RRID	Qualitative research- not experimental	x

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)	Qualitative research- not experimental	x
Microbes: provide species and strain, unique accession number if available, and source	Qualitative research- not experimental	x

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.	Statement confirming Human Research Ethics Panel approval present on Page 14 row 18	
Provide statement confirming informed consent obtained from study participants.	Statement confirming informed consent present on page 14 row 19.	
Report on age and sex for all study participants.	Qualitative research- reporting on these details in a small cohort of clinicians may have revealed their identity and was not part of the selection criteria for participants.	x

Design

Study protocol	Yes (indicate where provided: section/paragraph)	n/a
For clinical trials, provide the trial registration number **OR** cite DOI in manuscript.	Qualitative research-Not clinical trial	X

Laboratory protocol	Yes (indicate where provided: section/paragraph)	n/a
Provide DOI or other citation details if detailed step-by-step protocols are available.	Qualitative research-Not clinical trial	x

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	Did not determine sample size for statistical significance as this was not experimental research. However Page 13 row 16 addresses rational for sample size.	
Randomisation	Qualitative research- not clinical trial	x
Blinding	Qualitative research- not clinical trial	x
Inclusion/exclusion criteria	Addressed on page 14 row 6	

Sample definition and in-laboratory replication	Yes (indicate where provided: section/paragraph)	n/a
State number of times the experiment was replicated in laboratory	Qualitative research- not clinical trial	x
Define whether data describe technical or biological replicates	Qualitative research- not clinical trial	x

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.	Statement confirming Human Research Ethics Panel approval present on Page 14 row 18	
Studies involving experimental animals: State details of authority granting ethics approval (IRB or equivalent committee(s), provide reference number for approval.	Qualitative research- Not experimental	x
Studies involving specimen and field samples: State if relevant permits obtained, provide details of authority approving study; if none were required, explain why.	Qualitative research- Not experimental	x

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	Study is not subject to dual use research of concern	x

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.	Qualitative research- Not experimental	x

Statistics	Yes (indicate where provided: section/paragraph)	n/a
Describe statistical tests used and justify choice of tests.	Qualitative research- Not experimental	x

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.	Addressed on Page 16, row 14	
If data are publicly available, provide accession number in repository or DOI or URL.	Data not publically available	x
If publicly available data are reused, provide accession number in repository or DOI or URL, where possible.	Data not publically available	x

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.	No code or software newly generated	x
If code is publicly available, provide accession number in repository, or DOI or URL.	No code or software newly generated	x

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.	The manuscript met the COREQ (Consolidated Criteria for Reporting in Qualitative research) guideline and a checklist was provided with the manuscript. ICMJE guidelines were followed, as the journal follows ICMJE recommendations for publication.	

Article information: http://dx.doi.org/10.21037/jhmhp-20-98

COREQ (COnsolidated criteria for REporting Qualitative research) Checklist

A checklist of items that should be included in reports of qualitative research. You must report the page number in your manuscript where you consider each of the items listed in this checklist. If you have not included this information, either revise your manuscript accordingly before submitting or note N/A.

Topic	Item No.	Guide Questions/Description	Reported on Page No.
Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity			
Personal characteristics			
Interviewer/facilitator	1	Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?	14/9
Credentials	2	What were the researcher's credentials? E.g. PhD, MD	12/11, 12/19,
Occupation	3	What was their occupation at the time of the study?	~~12/11, 12/19,~~
Gender	4	Was the researcher male or female?	~~12/11, 12/20,~~
Experience and training	5	What experience or training did the researcher have?	12/11, 12/19,
Relationship with participants			
Relationship established	6	Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?	14/11
Participant knowledge of the interviewer	7	What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research	14/10
Interviewer characteristics	8	What characteristics were reported about the inter viewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic	12/11, 12/19,
Domain 2: Study design			
Theoretical framework			
Methodological orientation and Theory	9	What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? e.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis	14/13
Participant selection			
Sampling	10	How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball	14/6
Method of approach	11	How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email	14/10
Sample size	12	How many participants were in the study?	15/8
Non-participation	13	How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?	15/10
Setting			
Setting of data collection	14	Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace	14/22
Presence of non-participants	15	Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?	15/1
Description of sample	16	What are the important characteristics of the sample? e.g. demographic data, date	15/11
Data collection			
Interview guide	17	Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?	14/22
Repeat interviews	18	Were repeat inter views carried out? If yes, how many?	15/4
Audio/visual recording	19	Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?	15/5
Field notes	20	Were field notes made during and/or after the inter view or focus group?	15/4
Duration	21	What was the duration of the inter views or focus group?	14/22
Data saturation	22	Was data saturation discussed?	
Transcripts returned	23	Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or	15/7

Topic	Item No.	Guide Questions/Description	Reported on Page No.
		correction?	
Domain 3: analysis and findings			
Data analysis			
Number of data coders	24	How many data coders coded the data?	15/18
Description of the coding tree	25	Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?	16/18
Derivation of themes	26	Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?	15/22
Software	27	What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?	15/18
Participant checking	28	Did participants provide feedback on the findings?	16/3
Reporting			
Quotations presented	29	Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes/findings? Was each quotation identified? e.g. participant number	15/6
Data and findings consistent	30	Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?	16/16-30/9
Clarity of major themes	31	Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?	16/20
Clarity of minor themes	32	Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?	16/16-30/9

Developed from: Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*. 2007. Volume 19, Number 6: pp. 349 – 357

Once you have completed this checklist, please save a copy and upload it as part of your submission. DO NOT include this checklist as part of the main manuscript document. It must be uploaded as a separate file.

Article information: http://dx.doi.org/10.21037/jhmhp-20-98
*As the checklist was provided upon initial submission, the page number reported may be changed due to copy editing and may not be referable in the published version.