2018-2019 Mid-Term Credibility Plan Review

PI: Reinhard Laubenbacher

#	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 discussion of the intended use / audience	sufficient	Context for the prototype application, is specified. If the intent of the credibility plan is to include the application context outside the prototype, the context statement needs to be expanded.
2	Use appropriate data	insufficient	How is the considered data relevant and traceable?	sufficient	All data appears to be from the investigator's team.
3	Evaluate within context	N/A	What about V&V and UQ?	insufficient	Although the a brief indication of validation activities is described, the description does not indicate aspects of model verification and uncertainty quantification. It is possible they are not planned, and that should be stated.
4	List limitations explicitly	N/A	Insufficient detail to evaluate credibility	insufficient	The location of the model assumptions is unclear. Inferred that it would be within the dissemination workflow, but it is unclear how it is communicated. .
5	Use version control	sufficient		sufficient	Use of the automated GitHub versioning process is made, other than that a strategy for the contributors is not detailed.
6	Document adequately	sufficient		sufficient	The description of ongoing documentation specified in the addendum of the TSR table does communicate a well controlled process.
7	Disseminate broadly	insufficient		sufficient	Concept of a dissemination plan are provided,with details sufficient to assess credibility of the activity, with the exception of understanding how feedback is obtained and evaluated.
8	Get independent reviews	insufficient		insufficient	Concept of an independent review plan are provided, but lacks details sufficient to assess credibility of the activity.
9	Test competing implementations	N/A	Insufficient detail to evaluate credibility	insufficient	Existence of a plan for identifying competing implementations and performing evaluations is not provided, or are reasons why this may not be applicable (which is suspected)

10	Conform to standards	insufficient	What about file/software/operational standards? Something similar to ODD for other parts of the project?	sufficient	Indicates standards are applicable and provides one suitable example. Stronger if link or specified document location to documented list of all applicable standards would be indicated as part of the extensive document and dissemination activity.

General Comments

Reviewer 1:

Thank you for putting together a comprehensive report. Please note that this report did not fully follow the suggested structure / template. The discussion of TSR implementation missed a lot of details/specifics.

Reviewer 2:

Thank you for providing this mid-term update to your credibility plan implementation process.   The comprehensiveness of the dissemination and documentation activities is admirable. There is room for improvement in the nature of the verification, validation and uncertainty quantification activities within in this project in order to communicate credibility to the potential user watching this products developments (see tabulated comments). As a side comment, as an extensible platform, the understanding of model robustness (sensitivity), as related to model uncertainty quantification, is likely a significant factor in a user's decision to utilize this model architecture, Consider communicating this on a module and global basis to strengthen the credibility assessment.