

Materials Design Analysis Reporting (MDAR) **Checklist for Authors**

The [MDAR framework](#) establishes a minimum set of requirements in transparent reporting mainly applicable to studies in the life sciences.

eLife asks authors to **provide detailed information within their article** to facilitate the interpretation and replication of their work. Authors can also upload supporting materials to comply with relevant reporting guidelines for health-related research (see [EQUATOR Network](#)), life science research (see the [BioSharing Information Resource](#)), or animal research (see the [ARRIVE Guidelines](#) and the [STRANGE Framework](#); for details, see *eLife's* [Journal Policies](#)). Where applicable, authors should refer to any relevant reporting standards materials in this form.

For all that apply, please note **where in the article** the information is provided. Please note that we also collect information about data availability and ethics in the submission form.

Materials:

Newly created materials	Indicate where provided: section/figure legend	N/A
The manuscript includes a dedicated "materials availability statement" providing transparent disclosure about availability of newly created materials including details on how materials can be accessed and describing any restrictions on access.		N/A

Antibodies	Indicate where provided: section/figure legend	N/A
For commercial reagents, provide supplier name, catalogue number and RRID , if available.		N/A

DNA and RNA sequences	Indicate where provided: section/figure legend	N/A
Short novel DNA or RNA including primers, probes: Sequences should be included or deposited in a public repository.		N/A

Cell materials	Indicate where provided: section/figure legend	N/A
Cell lines: Provide species information, strain. Provide accession number in repository OR supplier name, catalog number, clone number, OR RRID.		N/A
Primary cultures: Provide species, strain, sex of origin, genetic modification status.		

Experimental animals	Indicate where provided:	N/A

	section/figure legend	
Laboratory animals or Model organisms: Provide species, strain, sex, age, genetic modification status. Provide accession number in repository OR supplier name, catalog number, clone number, OR RRID.		N/A
Animal observed in or captured from the field: Provide species, sex, and age where possible.		N/A

Plants and microbes	Indicate where provided: section/figure legend	N/A
Plants: provide species and strain, ecotype and cultivar where relevant, unique accession number if available, and source (including location for collected wild specimens).		N/A
Microbes: provide species and strain, unique accession number if available, and source.		N/A

Human research participants	Indicate where provided: section/figure legend) or state if these demographics were not collected	N/A
If collected and within the bounds of privacy constraints report on age, sex, gender and ethnicity for all study participants.	A publicly available dataset of human research participants was analyzed in this study (King et al. 2019, Nature Neuroscience). Demographics are listed in the "Multi-Domain task battery" subsection of the Methods section. Race and ethnicity data were not collected.	

Design:

Study protocol	Indicate where provided: section/figure legend	N/A
If the study protocol has been pre-registered, provide DOI. For clinical trials, provide the trial registration number OR cite DOI.		N/A

Laboratory protocol	Indicate where provided: section/figure legend	N/A
Provide DOI OR other citation details if detailed step-by-step protocols are available.		N/A

Experimental study design (statistics details) *		
For in vivo studies: State whether and how the following have been done	Indicate where provided: section/figure legend. If it could have been done, but was not, write "not done"	N/A
Sample size determination	No formal power analysis was conducted in King et al. (2019). As stated in their reporting summary: <i>"the number of participants and the amount of data per participant was determined from prior experience. For the within-subject sample size, we acquired 5.5 hours of fMRI data for each participant.. This gave the authors enough power to reliably estimate activity patterns for the large number of tasks, as well as having enough data to perform out-of-sample prediction tests. A sample size of n=24 participants (after exclusions) was deemed sufficient to both estimate a representative mean organization, as well as obtaining reliable estimates of the between-subject variability. To test generalization of our results, we also utilized the task data from N=186 participants from the human connectome project (https://www.humanconnectome.org/)"</i>	
Randomisation	As stated in the reporting summary by King et al. (2019): <i>"The sequence of tasks was randomized across imaging runs. All of the participants performed the same sequence of tasks (and the same number / order of runs) to enable analysis on the timeseries across participants"</i>	
Blinding	As stated in the reporting summary by King et al. (2019): <i>"Blinding was not applicable. Participants were not sorted into control and / experimental groups."</i>	
Inclusion/exclusion criteria	As stated in the reporting summary by King et al. (2019): <i>"We originally recruited 31 participants. N=5 participants could not return to complete the second task set as they had moved. These data were not included in the final analyses. Two additional participants were excluded from the</i>	

	<i>analyses as they failed to complete all 32 scanning runs for technical reasons. Eye-tracking data from two participants in set A and three participants in set B were not obtained due to technical problems."</i>	
--	---	--

Sample definition and in-laboratory replication	Indicate where provided: section/figure legend	N/A
State number of times the experiment was replicated in the laboratory.		N/A
Define whether data describe technical or biological replicates.		N/A

Ethics	Indicate where provided: section/submission form	N/A
Studies involving human participants: State details of authority granting ethics approval (IRB or equivalent committee(s), provide reference number for approval.	The Ethics committee at Western University approved all experimental protocols (Protocol number: 107293)	
Studies involving experimental animals: State details of authority granting ethics approval (IRB or equivalent committee(s), provide reference number for approval.		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.		N/A

Dual Use Research of Concern (DURC)	Indicate where provided: section/submission form	N/A
If study is subject to dual use research of concern regulations, state the authority granting approval and reference number for the regulatory approval.		N/A

Analysis:

Attrition	Indicate where provided: section/figure legend	N/A
Describe whether exclusion criteria were pre-established. Report if sample or data points were omitted from analysis. If yes, report if this was due to attrition or intentional exclusion and provide justification.	We excluded the first 3 volumes of each imaging run. Beyond that, no sample or data points (e.g., imaging and behavioral runs) were omitted from analysis for any of the 24 participants.	

Statistics	Indicate where provided: section/figure legend	N/A
Describe statistical tests used and justify choice of tests.	Predictive models were estimated, and evaluated in the current study. Model details are outlined in the methods section in the following subsections: "Connectivity Models", "Model Estimation", "Model Testing", "Noise Ceiling", "Generalization to New Participants". To test for any statistically significant differences between models, we ran F-tests and post-hoc tests (Fig 1A,B, Fig 3B,D - including supp. figures).	

Data availability	Indicate where provided: section/submission form	N/A
For newly created and reused datasets, the manuscript includes a data availability statement that provides details for access (or notes restrictions on access).	We have included a data availability statement that provides details for access for reused datasets.	
When newly created datasets are publicly available, provide accession number in repository OR DOI and licensing details where available.		
If reused data is publicly available provide accession number in repository OR DOI, OR URL, OR citation.		

Code availability	Indicate where provided: section/figure legend	N/A
For any computer code/software/mathematical algorithms essential for replicating the main findings of the study, whether newly generated or re-used, the manuscript includes a data availability statement that provides details for access or notes restrictions.	We have included a code availability statement in our manuscript.	
Where newly generated code is publicly available, provide accession number in repository, OR DOI OR URL and licensing details where available. State any restrictions on code availability or accessibility.		
If reused code is publicly available provide accession number in repository OR DOI OR URL, OR citation.		

Reporting:

The MDAR framework recommends adoption of discipline-specific guidelines, established and endorsed through community initiatives.

Adherence to community standards	Indicate where provided: section/figure legend	N/A
State if relevant guidelines (e.g., ICMJE, MIBBI, ARRIVE, STRANGE) have been followed, and whether a checklist (e.g., CONSORT, PRISMA, ARRIVE) is provided with the manuscript.		

* We provide the following guidance regarding transparent reporting and statistics; we also refer authors to [Ten common statistical mistakes to watch out for when writing or reviewing a manuscript.](#)

Sample-size estimation

- You should state whether an appropriate sample size was computed when the study was being designed
- You should state the statistical method of sample size computation and any required assumptions
- If no explicit power analysis was used, you should describe how you decided what sample (replicate) size (number) to use

Replicates

- You should report how often each experiment was performed
- You should include a definition of biological versus technical replication
- The data obtained should be provided and sufficient information should be provided to indicate the number of independent biological and/or technical replicates
- If you encountered any outliers, you should describe how these were handled
- Criteria for exclusion/inclusion of data should be clearly stated
- High-throughput sequence data should be uploaded before submission, with a private link for reviewers provided (these are available from both GEO and ArrayExpress)

Statistical reporting

- Statistical analysis methods should be described and justified
- Raw data should be presented in figures whenever informative to do so (typically when N per group is less than 10)
- For each experiment, you should identify the statistical tests used, exact values of N, definitions of center, methods of multiple test correction, and dispersion and precision measures (e.g., mean, median, SD, SEM, confidence intervals; and, for the major substantive results, a measure of effect size (e.g., Pearson's r, Cohen's d)
- Report exact p-values wherever possible alongside the summary statistics and 95% confidence intervals. These should be reported for all key questions and not only when the p-value is less than 0.05.

Group allocation

- Indicate how samples were allocated into experimental groups (in the case of clinical studies, please specify allocation to treatment method); if randomization was used, please also state if restricted randomization was applied
- Indicate if masking was used during group allocation, data collection and/or data analysis