



2018-2019 Mid-Term Credibility Plan Review

PI: Belle Suki

#	Ten Simple Rules	REVIEWER #1		REVIEWER #2	
		Considered in the Credibility Plan?	Comments	Considered in the Credibility Plan?	Comments
1	Define context clearly	insufficient	insufficient detail provided		
2	Use appropriate data	insufficient	The plan only describes the use of literature data during model development		
3	Evaluate within context	insufficient	Model outputs will be compared to literature data, there is no mention of verification		
4	List limitations explicitly	insufficient	not described		
5	Use version control	insufficient	not described		
6	Document adequately	insufficient	not described		
7	Disseminate broadly	insufficient	not described		
8	Get independent reviews	sufficient	SMEs in lung mechanics will be consulted as results become available		
9	Test competing implementations	sufficient	Two competing alveolar wall mechanical models are being developed and compared		
10	Conform to standards	insufficient	not described		

General Comments

Reviewer 1:

The use of subject matter experts and competing implementations is to be commended. The investigators should consider allocating more time Verification, Validation, and Uncertainty Quantification activities.

These will provide documented justification for users who want to rely on the pathophysiological predictions made by the model.