



# 2018-2019 Mid-Term Credibility Plan Review

PI: Xiaobo Zhou

#	Ten Simple Rules	REVIEWER #1		REVIEWER #2	
		Considered in the Credibility Plan?	Comments	Considered in the Credibility Plan?	Comments
1	Define context clearly	sufficient	Context of use is clear: simulation of bone regeneration within a scaffold. While not explicitly mentioned, the likely end-users of these models and the modeling and simulation platform will be scaffold designers.	insufficient	No discussion of the intended use / audience
2	Use appropriate data	sufficient	The relevance of the data is not explicitly stated. It will be useful to note how the awardees will decide the sufficiency of resolution for model construction and evaluation.	insufficient	How is the considered data relevant and traceable?
3	Evaluate within context	insufficient	Evaluation of models at each scale is strong. It will be interesting to know the threshold levels for reliability and generalization. Descriptions on the relevance of these activities to the context of use will be helpful.	insufficient	What about V&V and UQ?
4	List limitations explicitly	insufficient	Noting limitations in publications is a workable strategy. However, it will require the linking of models to specific publications if these are not noted in model documentation. While pitfalls are described in the proposal, proposal is not accessible.	insufficient	How the limitations will be made available to users / reviewers?
5	Use version control	insufficient	It is important to describe the strategy for version control. Will it be manual or using existing version control systems?	N/A	
6	Document adequately	insufficient	What is meant by "well" documented"? Will there be any documentation on using the codes, models, etc.?	N/A	
7	Disseminate broadly	sufficient	The investigators adopted a dissemination strategy to make models available. This is supported with scholarly publications.	insufficient	Insufficient details provided to aid in credibility evaluation
8	Get independent reviews	insufficient	Peer review of papers will not necessarily be as intensive as independent review of modeling and simulation workflow and the models directly (rather than their explanation). A strategy to include a third-party reviewer for this purpose is needed.	N/A	
9	Test competing implementations	sufficient	The investigators may consider other models of similar processes, when and if they become available.	insufficient	



## 2018-2019 Mid-Term Credibility Plan Review

10	Conform to standards	insufficient	Are the awardees aware of any modeling guidance or standards in regard to tissue regeneration? If there is not, this should be stated. If there is, this reference may be useful for the broad modeling community.	insufficient	
----	----------------------	--------------	--	--------------	--

### General Comments

#### Reviewer 1:

Thank you for providing point by point correspondence of your activities to the Ten Simple Rules. Provided comments mainly ask for more information that will likely strengthen the perceived credibility of your efforts.

#### Reviewer 2:

Thank you for a putting together this report. It looks like interesting work and a promising plan, however a lot of details are missing. Majority of the TSRs are not addressed or not sufficiently considered / implemented.