



2018-2019 Mid-Term Credibility Plan Review

PI: Mark Alber

#	Ten Simple Rules	REVIEWER #1		REVIEWER #2	
		Considered in the Credibility Plan?	Comments	Considered in the Credibility Plan?	Comments
1	Define context clearly	sufficient	Good complete definition of the context of the model. Scope of use is broad.		
2	Use appropriate data	sufficient	Data is derived specifically for training the models within the investigators group. Note: data published for a measure of quality evaluation.		
3	Evaluate within context	insufficient	The description has excellent content regarding validation, and by some measure uncertainty quantification via the calibration activities. Model verification activities should be discussed as well.		
4	List limitations explicitly	sufficient	Limitations discussed. Should include indication of where these are communicated to the user community		
5	Use version control	sufficient	Use of Git and CVS for version controlled noted. More indication of a consistent plan between the contributors for maintaining version control is recommended.		
6	Document adequately	sufficient	Documentation is noted and location is provided, Level is sufficient to evaluate contribution to credibility.		
7	Disseminate broadly	sufficient	Plan for dissemination is in place. Does not discuss process for receiving, documenting, processing and implementing feedback.		
8	Get independent reviews	sufficient	Excellent third party evaluation planned. How feedback will be captured and used to improve the model should be communicated.		
9	Test competing implementations	sufficient	Alternative platforms tested, Would comparison to other conceptual implementations also be possible to improve this aspect of credibility?		
10	Conform to standards	insufficient	Does not define which standards have been adopted.		

General Comments

Reviewer 1:

Thank you for submitting this well thought out credibility plan. Generally the plan and update represent good adoption and communication of credibility factors (see comments in the above table). The extensive use of third party evaluations is noted and we look forward to more detail on how this will be carried out in the future. A few areas could be improved, such as communication of verification activities (both coding and algorithm development). Some clarification on the standards adhered to in the model development and the improvements to the version control activities would help with communicating the credibility aspects of the mechanisms of model development. The dissemination plan is good, however, it is recommended that some thought be given to how user feedback would be received and assessed.