



# 2018-2019 Mid-Term Credibility Plan Review

PI: Julius Guccione

#	Ten Simple Rules	REVIEWER #1		REVIEWER #2	
		Considered in the Credibility Plan?	Comments	Considered in the Credibility Plan?	Comments
1	Define context clearly	sufficient	COU statements align with aims of the project; looking for a bit more specificity on model outputs.	sufficient	Context of the model application is defined in specific aim 3
2	Use appropriate data	sufficient	Strong emphasis on gathering the relevant data; traceability is missing.	sufficient	Good description of where data originates and how it is acquired to achieve specifically informed model development.
3	Evaluate within context	sufficient	Rigorous approach with bottom up and top down assessments of model predictions.	insufficient	Validation is well described and by virtue of the model calibration activity inference of UQ is made and explicitly discussed in supplemental material. Verification is not described, nor is sensitivity analysis. .
4	List limitations explicitly	sufficient	They stated limitations are provided in publications. Lack of transparency before publications.	insufficient	Investigators describe limitations of the study and not the model. Should be expanded to include modeling limitations unless none exist.
5	Use version control	sufficient	Software versioning control, but nothing about assumptions or limitations	sufficient	Version control process is briefly described.
6	Document adequately	sufficient	Documentation on github, mainly on code. Not typical record keeping about development.	sufficient	Documentation control process is adequately described.
7	Disseminate broadly	sufficient	Publications, conferences and github	sufficient	Dissemination is primarily through publications. Indications that more broad dissemination will occur via Git. Improvement could be realized via describing how feedback will be acquired and assessed after broad dissemination.
8	Get independent reviews	sufficient	Third party reviews and peer review	sufficient	Internal project and external collaborator reviews are described. Does lack specifics that would improve ability to assess credibility of the activity.
9	Test competing implementations	sufficient	Incredible to see they perform simulation on different platforms!	sufficient	Good description of alternative implementations
10	Conform to standards	sufficient	While it's clear there are limited standards in this place, the team is trying to share and promote reproducibility of work.	insufficient	Specific standards are not described for documentation, programming and modeling activities



# 2018-2019 Mid-Term Credibility Plan Review

## **General Comments**

### **Reviewer 1:**

Excellent summary of credibility plan, teamwork and thinking of the critical ways to ensure shareability and reproducibility of results. It's also incredible that you're testing different software platforms for the model.

### **Reviewer 2:**

Thank you for providing a credibility plan update for our review. Generally the investigator team is to be applauded for how they are instituting their credibility plan, as evidenced to how well it maps to the CPMS TSR (see tabulated comments). Areas of improvement can be found in communicating verification activities, limitations of the modeling aspects of the investigation and in addressing if standards are applicable and need followed.