



2018-2019 Mid-Term Credibility Plan Review

PI: Timothy Corcoran

#	Ten Simple Rules	REVIEWER #1		REVIEWER #2	
		Considered in the Credibility Plan?	Comments	Considered in the Credibility Plan?	Comments
1	Define context clearly	insufficient	No direct information provided. Can be inferred to some extent from different parts of the plan, but could be stated more directly for simpler communication.	insufficient	This was not provided in the credibility plan update, but some aspects were located in previous submissions by the investigators.
2	Use appropriate data	sufficient	Cell scale obtained from lung explants; Physiology from patients.	sufficient	Strong aspect of this work, significant effort to insure traceability of data reported.
3	Evaluate within context	insufficient	No information provided	insufficient	Although validation testing was discussed, the plan would be improved by including aspects of model verification and uncertainty quantification
4	List limitations explicitly	insufficient	No information provided	insufficient	Plan update infers aspects of model and data limitations. Improvement could be achieved by explicit descriptions of these or how testing might/did elucidate such.
5	Use version control	insufficient	No information provided	sufficient	Some discussion of quality(version) control of the data is discussed. Improvement could be achieved by defining and implementing specific activities related to the f version control with the model development and testing
6	Document adequately	insufficient	No information provided	insufficient	Description infers some documentation. Credibility would benefit from describing a more consistent approach to documenting the development, testing and results aspects of the model
7	Disseminate broadly	insufficient	No information provided	insufficient	Dissemination activities not discussed
8	Get independent reviews	insufficient	No information provided	insufficient	Independent review activities not discussed
9	Test competing implementations	insufficient	No information provided	insufficient	Discussion infers comparison of competing cell and organ based predictive models may be used, but not explicitly discussed
10	Conform to standards	insufficient	No information provided	insufficient	Data acquisition standards discussed. No indication of development or application standards that should be followed for the model.



2018-2019 Mid-Term Credibility Plan Review

General Comments

Reviewer 1:

None Provided.

Reviewer 2:

Thank you for providing a credibility plan update on this very interesting modeling activity. Despite providing a good deal of information regarding acquisition of validation data, there are several aspect of overall model credibility communication that have room for improvement as model development continues. Many of these are discussed more specifically in the comments above. It is likely that in the case of many of these aspects of credibility, the investigator team is already doing sufficient work and just need to be more definitively communicated in the future.