2018-2019 Mid-Term Credibility Plan Review

PI: Kenneth Campbell

#	Ten Simple Rules	REVIEWER #1		REVIEWER #2	
		Considered in the Credibility Plan?	**Comments**	**Considered in the Credibility Plan?**	**Comments**
1	Define context clearly	sufficient		sufficient	No discussion of the intended use / audience
2	Use appropriate data	sufficient	The provided table is a very nice summary	sufficient	
3	Evaluate within context	sufficient	Clear, appropriate verification and validation. Would be good to include sensitivity analysis.	sufficient	
4	List limitations explicitly	insufficient	Plan mentions including these in the publication. One example provided in update, but no additional details	sufficient	
5	Use version control	sufficient	GitHub for post-processing code, finite element code, cellular level code	sufficient	what about docs/protocols version control?
6	Document adequately	sufficient	Great idea to have a day each month for all personnel to get together and work on documentation together	sufficient	
7	Disseminate broadly	sufficient		sufficient	
8	Get independent reviews	sufficient	Funding allocated for third-party evaluation on-site, but process for finding the evaluators not described	insufficient	
9	Test competing implementations	sufficient		insufficient	
10	Conform to standards	insufficient	Mentions converting to a standard input file format like XML but lacking in details about other standards. The article "Considerations for reporting finite element analysis studies in biomechanics" by Erdemir, et al may be a useful resource	insufficient	They discuss just the file standards, not operational standards

General Comments

Reviewer 1:

A well-thought out plan with just a few areas to pay more attention to. The idea of dedicating a day each month for joint documentation sounds useful, and I am curious to know how it is working out in practice.

Reviewer 2:

Thank you for a detailed report with great level of detail. It looks like there is minor miscommunication regarding what is "model context", "independent review", "competing implementations" and what is meant by by "conform to standards", but overall this looks great. Also, do you use version control for the documentation/experimental journals/protocols? This is an integral part of consistent version control.