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.	Line 88-90 (Methods Paragraph 2). Ventana PD-L1 (SP-263) assay (Ventana/Roche, Tuscon, Arizona)	

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		**N/A**
Primary cultures: Provide species, strain, sex of origin, genetic modification status.		**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		**N/A**
Animal observed in or captured from the field: Provide species, sex and age where possible		**N/A**
Model organisms: Provide Accession number in repository (where relevant) **OR** RRID		**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)		**N/A**
Microbes: provide species and strain, unique accession number if available, and source		**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.	Line 75-78 (Methods, paragraph 1)	
Provide statement confirming informed consent obtained from study participants.	Line 75-78 (Methods, paragraph 1)	
Report on age and sex for all study participants.	Table 1. Line 178-179	

Design

Study protocol	Yes (indicate where provided: section/paragraph)	n/a
For clinical trials, provide the trial registration number **OR** cite DOI in manuscript.	Line 75. Study registered with clinicaltrials.org (NCT03198468)	

Laboratory protocol	Yes (indicate where provided: section/paragraph)	n/a
Provide DOI or other citation details if detailed step-by-step protocols are available.	Protocol to determine areas of viable, injured and necrotic tumour was based on light microscopy description of tissue as described in detail in methods, paragraph 2 (line 81-86) and Figure 1 (line 183-191). PD-L1 tumour proportion score (TPS) was performed as per protocol described by Garon et al(Methods paragraph 2): Pembrolizumab for the Treatment of Non–Small-Cell Lung Cancer List of authors. Edward B. Garon, M.D., Naiyer A. Rizvi, M.D., Rina Hui, M.B., B.S., Natasha Leighl, M.D., Ani S. Balmanoukian, M.D., Joseph Paul Eder, M.D., Amita Patnaik, M.D., Charu Aggarwal, M.D., Matthew Gubens, M.D., Leora Horn, M.D., Enric Carcereny, M.D., Myung-Ju Ahn, M.D., et al., for the KEYNOTE-001 Investigators* May 21, 2015 N Engl J Med 2015; 372:2018-2028 DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa1501824	

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		**N/A**
Randomisation		**N/A**
Blinding		**N/A**
Inclusion/exclusion criteria		**N/A**

Sample definition and in-laboratory replication	Yes (indicate where provided: section/paragraph)	n/a
State number of times the experiment was replicated in laboratory		**N/A**
Define whether data describe technical or biological replicates		**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.	Line 75-78 (Methods, paragraph 1)	
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.	Line 75-78 (Methods, paragraph 1)	

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		**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.	Methods paragraph 1	N/A

Statistics	Yes (indicate where provided: section/paragraph)	n/a
Describe statistical tests used and justify choice of tests.	Line 96-97 (Methods paragraph 3)	

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.		N/A
If data are publicly available, provide accession number in repository or DOI or URL.		N/A
If publicly available data are reused, provide accession number in repository or DOI or URL, where possible.		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.		N/A
If code is publicly available, provide accession number in repository, or DOI or URL.		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 recommendations for publication. Safety/Feasibility study was performed as per consort guidelines and checklist can be available on request.	

Article information: http://dx.doi.org/10.21037/tlcr-21-76