2018-2019 Mid-Term Credibility Plan Review

PI: Ching-long Lin

#	Ten Simple Rules	REVIEWER #1		REVIEWER #2	
		Considered in the Credibility Plan?	Comments	Considered in the Credibility Plan?	Comments
1	Define context clearly	sufficient		insufficient	No discussion of the intended use / audience
2	Use appropriate data	insufficient	It's useful to know which trials are providing data. However, there are several levels to the model, and it is not clear what data is informing the parameters at each level (i.e., what experimental data is tied to which parameters for the CFD analysis)	sufficient	How is the considered data relevant? Is all of it traceable?
3	Evaluate within context	N/A - insufficient	I am not familiar with whether sensitivity analysis, etc. are applicable to some of the methods being used here. If not, it would be helpful to mention that. If they are applicable, their inclusion in this project should be described.	insufficient	What about verification and UQ?
4	List limitations explicitly	insufficient	One limitation listed, but likely others(i.e., related to CFD) which were not described	sufficient	any edge cases / parameter windows that should be considered?
5	Use version control	insufficient	Peer-reviewed journal publications do not adequately capture versions of the model. Consider a version control system like Git or Bitbucket.	N/A	
6	Document adequately	insufficient	Documentation limited to supplementary materials in publications. It is unclear what type of documentation this includes and whether that is adequate.	N/A	
7	Disseminate broadly	insufficient	Not described	N/A	It is unclear when a model is sufficiently completed (i.e. Done) for dissemination to commence
8	Get independent reviews	insufficient	Done via broad collaborations and publications. Model credibility could be increased if external users tested the model.	N/A	Not described
9	Test competing implementations	insufficient	Not described	insufficient	specifics are missing
10	Conform to standards	insufficient	Not described	N/A	

General Comments

Reviewer 1:

I would like to thank the awardees for taking the time to address the applicability of the Ten Simple Rules to their project. Given the brevity of the descriptions, though, it is difficult to provide an in-depth review. One suggestion is to look for additional ways to document and disseminate the model beyond traditional publications, as these are limited in providing the information needed to assess and re-use a model.

Reviewer 2:

The report did not fully follow the suggested structure / template. Please keep in mind that peer review is not a substitute for the comprehensive documentation and version control. The discussion of TSR implementation missed a lot of details/specifics that are expected by the community when communicating model credibility status. .