# 2018-2019 Mid-Term Credibility Plan Review

**PI: David Basanta-Gutierrez**

| # | Ten Simple Rules | REVIEWER #1 | | REVIEWER #2 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Considered in the Credibility Plan?** | **Comments** | **Considered in the Credibility Plan?** | **Comments** |
| 1 | Define context clearly | sufficient | No discussion of the intended use / audience | sufficient | Good concise context statement. |
| 2 | Use appropriate data | insufficient | How is the considered data relevant and traceable? | sufficient | Excellent concise description of using appropriately designed experiments with informing the model in mind. |
| 3 | Evaluate within context | insufficient | What about V&V and UQ? | insufficient | This is very nearly sufficient test within context statement. Verification activities should be explicitly added as opposed to inferred. |
| 4 | List limitations explicitly | insufficient | quite vague, how the limitations will be made available to users / reviewers? | sufficient | Statement made regarding assumptions, but not indicated how those are maintained and communicated. |
| 5 | Use version control | insufficient | | sufficient | Acknowledge they are starting shifting the version control strategy and will have more extensive update |
| 6 | Document adequately | insufficient | | insufficient | Documentenation is limited to manuscripts for publication, although important and necessary, may not completely communicate model credibility.  Future plan not specified. |
| 7 | Disseminate broadly | insufficient | What about sharing model / data / case studies? | sufficient | Some dissemination via conference etc. Primary is through GitHub repository and websites.  Suggest investigators expand how dissemination activity receives, documents, and processes community feedback. |
| 8 | Get independent reviews | insufficient | the reviews should be preferably from 3rd parties | insufficient | Internal reviews via presentation to subject matter experts within the awarded institution are reported. However no systematic plan of review and feedback from independent testing or application of the model is described. |
| 9 | Test competing implementations | sufficient | | sufficient | A competing model  testing strategy is described.  Utilizing referent experimental data across both implementation is a plus in this description. |
| 10 | Conform to standards | insufficient | What about file standards? operational standards? | insufficient | It is possible that standards outside of standard programming practices are not applicable to this particular application. Evidence for or against not provided. |

**General Comments**

**Reviewer 1:**

The report did not fully follow the suggested structure / template. The discussion of TSR implementation missed a lot of details/specifics.

**Reviewer 2:**

Thank you for providing an update on progress on this year's credibility plan.  This is a very interesting subject area and the investigator's do a nice job of assessing and communicating their models credibility as indicated in the comments above.  There remain areas that could be improved such as, to include more thought toward independent reviews outside of the parent institutions so that such reviews have more appearance of independence, including communicating verification activities in the evaluation of the model performance to communicate applicable development and programming practices and review if programming, data maintenance, documentation standards are applicable from either the parent institutions or the user community.    The dissemination activity appears strong, but passively practiced.  A workflow for receiving feedback and evaluating it incontext of future model development ae recommended.