**Materials Design Analysis Reporting (MDAR)**

**Checklist for Authors**

The [MDAR framework](https://osf.io/xfpn4/) 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](http://www.equator-network.org/%20)), life science research (see the [BioSharing Information Resource](http://biosharing.org/)), or animal research (see the [ARRIVE Guidelines](http://www.plosbiology.org/article/info:doi/10.1371/journal.pbio.1000412) and the [STRANGE Framework](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-020-01751-5); for details, see *eLife*’s [Journal Policies](https://reviewer.elifesciences.org/author-guide/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. | No newly created materials | yes |
|  |  |  |
| **Antibodies** | **Indicate where provided: section/figure legend** | **N/A** |
| For commercial reagents, provide supplier name, catalogue number and [RRID](https://scicrunch.org/resources), if available. | Antibodies used in this study include:  anti-PRMT1 (Cat# 07404, Millipore), CPT1a (Cat# 66039, Proteintech), LDHA (Cat# MA5-17246, Invitrogen), p-LDHA (Cat# 8176, Cell Signaling) anti-HA (Cat# sc-57592, Santa Cruz), Tubulin ( Cat# sc-32293, Santa Cruz), and anti-β-actin (Cat# 4967, Cell Signaling). Full antibody information is provided in the "Western blotting" subsection of the Methods. |  |
|  |  |  |
| **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. | Primers used for RT-qPCR were designed using NCBI Primer-BLAST and include: Prmt1-F CCCGTGGAGAAGGTGGACAT  Prmt1-R CTCCCACCAGTGGATCTTGT  Cpt1a-F GGCATAAACGCAGAGCATTCCTG  Cpt1a-R CAGTGTCCATCCTCTGAGTAGC  Idha-F GAATTACGATGGGGATGTGC  Idha-R GACGTCTCTTGCCCTTTCTG  Fasn-F AAGTTCGACGCCTCCTTTTT  Fasn-R TGCCTCTGAACCACTCACAC  Murine cytochrome B forward: CTTCATGTCGGACGAGGCTTA  Murine cytochrome B reverse: TGTGGCTATGACTGCGAACA  Squences are available in "Quantitative Real-time PCR" subsection of the Methods. |  |
|  |  |  |
| **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. | 293T and 6133 cell lines were used. Cell lines were obtained from ATCC, as described in the “Cell Culture and metabolite measurement” section of the Methods. |  |
| Primary cultures: Provide species, strain, sex of origin, genetic modification status. |  | yes |
|  |  |  |
| **Experimental animals** | **Indicate where provided: section/figure legend** | **N/A** |
| 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. | 8- to 12-week-old C57BL/6J were used, as described in “Murine Leukemia Model and Treatments” Mice were bred in-house or obtained from Jackson Laboratory. |  |
| Animal observed in or captured from the field: Provide species, sex, and age where possible. |  | Yes |
|  |  |  |
| **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). |  | Not applicable |
| Microbes: provide species and strain, unique accession number if available, and source. |  | Not applicable |
|  |  |  |
| **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. |  | Not applicable |

**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. |  | Not applicable |
|  |  |  |
| **Laboratory protocol** | **Indicate where provided: section/figure legend** | **N/A** |
| Provide DOI OR other citation details if detailed step-by-step protocols are available. |  | Not applicable |
|  |  |  |
| **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 | Figure1B. n=15  Figure1C. n=13  Figure1F. n=7  Figure2C. n=5  Figure2D. n=12  Figure2E. n=8  Figure2H. n=7  Figure2I. n=10  Figure5AB. n=10  Figure6D. n=16  Figure6E. n=13  Figure6F. n=16 |  |
| Randomisation |  | Not applicable |
| Blinding |  | Not applicable |
| Inclusion/exclusion criteria |  | Not applicable |
|  |  |  |
| **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. | Figure1B. n=15 (Biological replicates)  Figure1C. n=13 (Biological replicates)  Figure1D. n=3 Functional comparisons. Experiments were independently repeated 3 times with technical triplicates for each condition.  Figure1F. n=7 (Biological replicates)  Figure2A. n=2 Functional comparisons. Experiments were independently repeated 3 times with technical triplicates for each condition.  Figure2C. n=5 (Biological replicates)  Figure2D. n=12 (Biological replicates)  Figure2E. n=8 (Biological replicates)  Figure2F. n=2 Functional comparisons. Experiments were independently repeated 3 times with technical triplicates for each condition.  Figure2H. n=7 (Biological replicates)  Figure2I. n=10 (Biological replicates)  Figure3A. n=2 Functional comparisons. Experiments were independently repeated 3 times with technical triplicates for each condition.  Figure3B. n=2 Functional comparisons. Experiments were independently repeated 3 times with technical triplicates for each condition.  Figure3D. n=4 Functional comparisons. Experiments were independently repeated 3 times with technical triplicates for each condition.  Figure4A. n=2 Functional comparisons. Experiments were independently repeated 3 times with technical triplicates for each condition.  Figure4B. n=2 Functional comparisons. Experiments were independently repeated 3 times with technical triplicates for each condition.  Figure4C. n=3 Functional comparisons. Experiments were independently repeated 3 times with technical triplicates for each condition.  Figure4D. n=2 Functional comparisons. Experiments were independently repeated 3 times with technical triplicates for each condition.  Figure4E. n=3 Functional comparisons. Experiments were independently repeated 3 times with technical triplicates for each condition.  Figure4F. n=3 Functional comparisons. Experiments were independently repeated 3 times with technical triplicates for each condition.  Figure4G. n=3 Functional comparisons. Experiments were independently repeated 3 times with technical triplicates for each condition.  Figure4H. n=2 Functional comparisons. Experiments were independently repeated 3 times with technical triplicates for each condition.  Figure5AB. n=10 (Biological replicates)  Figure6A. n=4 Functional comparisons. Experiments were independently repeated 3 times with technical triplicates for each condition.  Figure6B. n=4 Functional comparisons. Experiments were independently repeated 3 times with technical triplicates for each condition.  Figure6C. n=4 Functional comparisons. Experiments were independently repeated 3 times with technical triplicates for each condition.  Figure6D. n=16 (Biological replicates)  Figure6E. n=13 (Biological replicates)  Figure6F. n=16 (Biological replicates)  Figure7A. n=3 Functional comparisons. Experiments were independently repeated 3 times with technical triplicates for each condition.  Figure7C. n=3 Functional comparisons. Experiments were independently repeated 3 times with technical triplicates for each condition.  Figure7D. n=3 Functional comparisons. Experiments were independently repeated 3 times with technical triplicates for each condition.  Figure7E. n=3 Functional comparisons. Experiments were independently repeated 3 times with technical triplicates for each condition.  Figure7F. n=12 Functional comparisons. Experiments were independently repeated 3 times with technical triplicates for each condition.  Figure7G. n=5 Functional comparisons. Experiments were independently repeated 3 times with technical triplicates for each condition.  FigureS1B. n=8 Functional comparisons. Experiments were independently repeated 3 times with technical triplicates for each condition.  Figure3. n=2 Functional comparisons. Experiments were independently repeated 3 times with technical triplicates for each condition. |  |
| Define whether data describe technical or biological replicates. | As above |  |
|  |  |  |
| **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. |  | Not applicable |
| Studies involving experimental animals: State details of authority granting ethics approval (IRB or equivalent committee(s), provide reference number for approval. |  | Not applicable |
| Studies involving specimen and field samples: State if relevant permits obtained, provide details of authority approving study; if none were required, explain why. |  | Not applicable |
|  |  |  |
| **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. |  | Not applicable |

**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. |  | Not applicable |
|  |  |  |
| **Statistics** | **Indicate where provided: section/figure legend** | **N/A** |
| Describe statistical tests used and justify choice of tests. | Statistical analyses were performed using GraphPad Prism 9. Differences between two groups were assessed using unpaired two-tailed Student’s *t*-test. For comparisons among more than two groups, one-way ANOVA followed by post hoc tests (Tukey’s or Dunnett’s) was applied. All tests assume normal distribution and equal variance unless otherwise stated. The choice of tests was based on standard practices for analyzing continuous variables in biomedical experiments. Data distribution was assumed to be normal, but this was not formally tested due to limited sample size. |  |
|  |  |  |
| **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). |  | Not applicable |
| When newly created datasets are publicly available, provide accession number in repository OR DOI and licensing details where available. |  | Not applicable |
| If reused data is publicly available provide accession number in repository OR DOI, OR URL, OR citation. |  | Not applicable |
|  |  |  |
| **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. |  | Not applicable |
| 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. |  | Not applicable |
| If reused code is publicly available provide accession number in repository OR DOI OR URL, OR citation. |  | Not applicable |

**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. |  | Not applicable |

\* 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](https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.48175).

**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