



# 2018-2019 Mid-Term Credibility Plan Review

PI: Mounya Elhilali

#	Ten Simple Rules	REVIEWER #1		REVIEWER #2	
		Considered in the Credibility Plan?	Comments	Considered in the Credibility Plan?	Comments
1	Define context clearly	insufficient	Unclear if model is for human or animal, which scales are included in the model, who the intended users of the model are, etc.	sufficient	Context is concise. Not clear the extent of interactions that will be evaluable.
2	Use appropriate data	insufficient	Sounds like specific experiments are planned to gather data for tuning model parameters but no details provided	insufficient	Lack of some detail impedes assessment.
3	Evaluate within context	insufficient	Mentions validating with experimental data in adults and aging individuals, but no specifics. No mention of verification process, sensitivity analysis, etc.	insufficient	Only validation mentioned. How does referent differ from data used to inform the model. Needs to mention the aspects of verification and uncertainty quantification.
4	List limitations explicitly	insufficient	2 simplifications provided, but list seems incomplete	insufficient	Mentions limitations exist and gives one example would be stronger if impact on model performance was mentioned or description of where limitations and their impact are documented.
5	Use version control	insufficient	Mentions following best practices but no details given	insufficient	Insufficient information to assess credibility. Suggest detailing implementation tools or plans.
6	Document adequately	insufficient	Mentions following best practices but no details given	insufficient	Insufficient information to assess credibility. Suggest detailing implementation tools or plans.
7	Disseminate broadly	insufficient	Mentions intent to disseminate but no details given	insufficient -	Insufficient information to assess credibility. Suggest detailing implementation tools or plans.
8	Get independent reviews	insufficient	Mentions validation by collaborators and peer review but no details given	insufficient	It's good a plan is intended, details to allow the user community to assess the contribution of these plans is needed. ,
9	Test competing implementations	insufficient	Description lacks details needed fro assessment	insufficient	Comparing implementation on different platforms is an interesting approach. Alos consider comparing algorithm comparison implementations.
10	Conform to standards	insufficient	Mentions following best practices but no details given	insufficient	Suggest the best practices mentioned be specified and some indication how they are to be implemented be given.



# 2018-2019 Mid-Term Credibility Plan Review

## General Comments

### Reviewer 1:

Given the brevity of the descriptions, it is difficult to review the credibility plan. The project plans to follow best practices, but as that can vary from field to field, it would be very helpful to reference specific guidelines or links in the report itself.

### Reviewer 2:

Thank you for submitting this overview of the current state of the credibility plan. It shows that some good amount of consideration has gone into achieving several aspects of credibility. The presentation of the plan status suffers from lack of detail. This would likely impede assessment by someone considering the credibility of the model for future use as indicated in the tabulated comments. We encourage the investigator team to utilize the credibility factor comments to help guide linking their ongoing development to communicating status of model credibility.