2018-2019 Mid-Term Credibility Plan Review

PI: Elana Fertig

#	Ten Simple Rules	REVIEWER #1		REVIEWER #2	
		Considered in the Credibility Plan?	Comments	Considered in the Credibility Plan?	Comments
1	Define context clearly	sufficient	Progression of HCC and response to targeted therapies.	insufficient	
2	Use appropriate data	sufficient	In vitro and in vivo experimental data will be used.	sufficient	How is the considered data relevant and traceable?
3	Evaluate within context	sufficient		sufficient	
4	List limitations explicitly	insufficient	Limitations mentioned in Discussion section of papers. Should also consider including such information in the model documentation and description of simulations, etc.	sufficient	It may be a good idea to also publish limitations alongside the model and its docs
5	Use version control	sufficient		sufficient	What about version / control for docs / model runs?
6	Document adequately	sufficient	Details of model elements and guide on how to run the models are included.	insufficient	Define "well-documented"
7	Disseminate broadly	sufficient		sufficient	what about docs / guides / tutorials?
8	Get independent reviews	sufficient	What will the independent reviewers test? Reimplementation? code execution? etc.	sufficient	
9	Test competing implementations	sufficient	Different driver mechanisms will be considered.	insufficient	Description does not provided sufficient information for an assessment
10	Conform to standards	sufficient	SBML for models. Bioinformatics code as an R package.	insufficient	They discuss just the file standards, not operational standards

General Comments

Reviewer 1:

None Provided

Reviewer 2:
The report did not follow the suggested structure / template, increasing the difficulty of this review and any potential credibility assessment.