



2018-2019 Mid-Term Credibility Plan Review

PI: Colleen Clancy

#	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	Would be helpful to know if this data is being collected by the investigators or drawn from the literature, or is a combination depending on the data type.	insufficient	How is the considered data relevant and traceable?
3	Evaluate within context	sufficient	Only in vitro data is mentioned in the verification and validation.	sufficient	very thorough and well-organized
4	List limitations explicitly	insufficient	Too generic a description. It would be useful to lay out a plan for listing specific limitations of the model, and the appropriate uses.	insufficient	what about use case limitations?
5	Use version control	sufficient		sufficient	What about version / control for docs / model runs?
6	Document adequately	insufficient	Jupyter and Kepler are enabling tools. How are they being used to ensure adequate documentation? Is there a cross-check or oversight?	insufficient	
7	Disseminate broadly	insufficient	The models will be available via Github. It would be useful to know if the dissemination plan goes beyond availability of model files, and extends into the "M&S activities" including simulation scenarios, shortcomings, what works and what does not, etc., particularly information that may not be readily available in the manuscripts.	insufficient	Description only includes effort to passively have models available online, without providing details as to how his represents dissemination
8	Get independent reviews	insufficient	Successful execution is only part of the review. For example, is there a cross-check that the model formulation and the code match with each other? Or, if the stated assumptions are coded correctly? etc.	insufficient	Description only suggests independent review will arise from having models available online. Lacks details as to how such reviews will be achieved or independence assured.
9	Test competing implementations	insufficient	Competing implementations may also need alternative model formulations that refine/relax the assumptions or executed via different approaches (e.g., stochastic versus deterministic).	sufficient	
10	Conform to standards	sufficient		sufficient	



2018-2019 Mid-Term Credibility Plan Review

General Comments

Reviewer 1:

None Provided

Reviewer 2:

This is a great report, thank you! When we talk about dissemination, we mean not only publishing the data/models online, we encourage authors to promote their work at conferences and invite others to use and review the invaluable contributions of this group. Regarding the progress and short-term plans, we intend this to represent plans for implementing a credibility plan, not published work resulting from this project.