2018-2019 Mid-Term Credibility Plan Review

PI: Denise Kirschner

#	Ten Simple Rules	REVIEWER #1		REVIEWER #2	
		Considered in the Credibility Plan?	Comments	Considered in the Credibility Plan?	Comments
1	Define context clearly	sufficient	It would be good for the researchers to also mention if the work is intended to mainly impact research or clinical practice..	sufficient	A concise description of the context of the model development and application is provided..
2	Use appropriate data	insufficient	There is general description of the type of data to be used, but no details about how the data will be acquired and why it is adequate.	insufficient	The investigators indicate details are in the original credibility plan
3	Evaluate within context	insufficient	The submitted plan does not adequately detail their model evaluation plan.	insufficient	Investigators describe interactions with independent researchers that include inference to this factor, but description o status is insufficient to evaluate credibility
4	List limitations explicitly	insufficient		insufficient	Investigators describe interactions with independent researchers that include inference to this factor, but description or status is insufficient to evaluate credibility
5	Use version control	insufficient		insufficient	Indications that there are multiple version control activities within the project that need to be combined., Idea of documenting how VC issue is resolved is good and will be appreciated..
6	Document adequately	sufficient	There is sufficient documentation strategy that will at least lead to publications.	sufficient	Multiple documentation activities are mentioned, and an intention to reach consensus on this practice is mentioned. Current status of documentation, not related publications is unclear. It is noted that the aspect of journalling the experience in an effort is an excellent aspect of the documentation activity
7	Disseminate broadly	insufficient		insufficient	Dissemination is briefly mentioned in the context of publications, Discussion of broad availability of the model code is not discussed
8	Get independent reviews	sufficient	There is a good plan in place	sufficient	Strongest aspect of this update is the status of independent review and collaboration
9	Test competing implementations	insufficient		insufficient	An intention to reach consensus on this practice is mentioned. Current status of competing implementation factor unclear

10	Conform to standards	insufficient		insufficient	.Inference from the description is that the team is creating standards of operation. No discussion or description of currently applied modeling, data handling, or programming standards

General Comments

Reviewer 1:

I am highly confident that the researchers actually satisfy many of the credibility rules. However, based on what is currently submitted, I was not able to find clear and compelling descriptions of how credibility within the context of the Ten Simple Rules are being addressed. I recommend in future credibility communications the researchers provide a brief write up that explicitly discuss if and how each of the rules are being addressed.

Reviewer 2:

Thank you for submitting a midterm update to this very interesting project's credibility plan.   In a general sense the intent of the credibility plan update was to give the interested user an indication of the overall credibility status of the project with respect to the TSR. In this case, it is reasonably obvious that the investigators have invested much time in almost all aspects of the TSR, however, the update format did not adequately illustrate evidence of this (see tabaulated comments). A laudable aspect of this update is the investigator's continued investment in independent review process and tying it to many aspects of model evaluation.