



2018-2019 Mid-Term Credibility Plan Review

PI: Victor Barocas

#	Ten Simple Rules	REVIEWER #1		REVIEWER #2	
		Considered in the Credibility Plan?	Comments	Considered in the Credibility Plan?	Comments
1	Define context clearly	insufficient	little detail provided	N/A	
2	Use appropriate data	sufficient	The PI plans to use experimental data for model development and consult expert opinion throughout the project	insufficient	few details provided
3	Evaluate within context	insufficient	UA and Sensitivity Analyses are not discussed	sufficient	This is majority of the text in the report
4	List limitations explicitly	insufficient	not described	N/A	
5	Use version control	insufficient	not described	N/A	
6	Document adequately	insufficient	not described	N/A	
7	Disseminate broadly	insufficient	not described	insufficient	briefly mention that they will engage experts
8	Get independent reviews	sufficient	The PI plans to continually engage (external) SMEs	insufficient	briefly mention that they will engage experts
9	Test competing implementations	insufficient	not described, although it also is not known if a competing implementation exists	insufficient	Briefly mention that they will engage experts
10	Conform to standards	insufficient	not described	insufficient	Briefly mention that they will engage experts, but nothing regarding established or best practices

General Comments

Reviewer 1:

Please provide additional details about all 10 elements of credibility so that more meaningful feedback can be provided. Also consider the value of UQ and sensitivity analyses to evaluate your model framework.

Reviewer 2:

The report did not follow the suggested structure / template. The focus was on V&V which, although important, covers just one out of 10 TSR credibility definitions. We recommend the PI's team to review TSR and incorporate the suggestions / best practices to increase the level of model credibility and overall impact. Please submit the next report with more attention to the provided instructions