Ballot Name: Approval of ANSI/ASB Standard 020

Ballot URL: https://workspace.aafs.org/higherlogic/ws/groups/DNA_CB/ballots/ballot?id=52 ASB

Standar

Document Number: d 020

Document Title: Standards for Validation Studies of DNA Mixtures, and Development and Verification of a Laboratory's Mixture Interpretation Protocol

 $Note: a \ specific \ Proposed \ Resolution \ must \ accompany \ each \ comment \ or \ it \ cannot \ be \ considered.$

		Type of			
#	Section	Comme nt	Comments	Proposed Resolution	Final Resolution
	13.2, 4.4	Т	The definition of consistency ("within an acceptable limited range of variation") could be widely interpreted and make this standard hard to enforce.		Reject: Statement 4.1 refers to supporting normative information in Annex B which states: "The laboratory shall define the acceptable range of variability in the interpretation of DNA mixtures for use in the evaluation of the consistency within the laboratory." According to the definition, "consistency" is to be "defined by the laboratory protocol and validation data." This means that the laboratory should have and be able to provide validation data to support its definition of consistency and the defined acceptable range of variation, if any, permitted. The range of variation acceptable will necessarily depend on the portion of the protocol being verified, but ultimately any statement of inclusion vs. exclusion of a known individual should not vary within the laboratory. Variation beyond the accepted defined range would constitute an inconsistency and require additional studies and/or revision of the draft protocol. Additional guidance regarding "consistency" is under development in another document at the time these responses were made.
			The definition of "consistency" (3.2) and its use in 4.4 ("generate reliable and consistent intepretations and conclusions") is too vague. It gives no guidance on howa lab is to determine consistency. One lab's estimation of consistency under this definition could be		
	2 3.2; 4.4; and 4.4.2	T	radically different than another.	Delineate methods, i.e. statistical or other, to determine consistency.	Reject: See response in Comment #1
	3 4.3.2	E	Size of font for "4.3.2" appears to be smaller than font for other numbers	verify and adjust font size if it is inconsistent with "4.3.1" and "4.3.3"	Accept
	4 Annex C	E	Confirm web address "https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/forensic-science-regulator" Does not work as a hyperlink. Copy-paste of the site gives a 404 error.	verify web address is correct, and include hyperlink	Reject: Link works fine in word and PDF version. Copy and paste method also worked fine.
	5 Annex C	E	Confirm web address "http://www.ifsa-forensics.org/wp- content/uploads/2016/09/DNA_MRD_English.pdf" Does not work as a hyperlink. Copy-paste of the site gives a 404 error.	verify web address is correct, and include hyperlink	Reject: Link works fine in word and PDF version. Copy and paste method also worked fine.
	6 Annex C	E	#7 does not include a hyperlink for the website address	Include hyperlink for "https://www.swgdam.org/publications" for #7.	Rejected: Hyperlink in PDF was tested and was shown to be functioning.
	7 Annex C	E	Confirm web address "https://www.fbi.gov/file-repository/quality-assurance-standards- for-forensic-dna-testing-laboratories.pdf" Does not work as a hyperlink. Copy-paste of the site gives a 404 error.	verify web address is correct, and include hyperlink	Accept: Will change link to https://www.swgdam.org/publications.
	8 4.4.3	т	why make this retroactive by including existing interpretation. These protocols are reviewed annually at a minimum and often changed based on current ideologiy/new guidelines.		Reject: No statement regarding retroactive is present in the document. The goal is for all interpretation protocols in use in a laboratory to meet this stated set of requirements. Laboratories should verify that their current existing protocols work appropriately and have the support of relevant validation studies. If the laboratory discovers that its existing protocol has deficiencies, it would be incumbent upon the laboratory to explore the extent of deficiencies and address resolution and amendment of any previously reported casework
	9 all	T	The FBI QAS document is being revised and the validation section is being changed. Has anyone looked at those standards to see if there are conflicts with these standards? Do we really need two agencies mandating standards for the same topic?	Confer with the committee revising the QAS document to see if there are conflicts and/or duplications since the QAS document is already used in accreditation standards. It would also be good to check with the SWGDAM minture interpretation guidelines for conflicts as well since that is not a "standard" but had been adopted as "good laboratory practice".	Noted. There are joint members on the OSAC, ASB and SWGDAM committees specifically tasked with ensuring that the standards issued from each group are compatible and complementary to each other.
	10 2 11 3	E F	The comma after "documents" should be a period 3.1, case-type samples. This term is not used anywhere in the document	Replace with period Delete the term and definition	Accept Accept
	12 3		5.1, case-type samples. This term is not used anywhere in the document if the document somewhere and this definition stays, the last sentence has nothing to do with a definition	Delete last sentence	Accept: Delete paragraph 3.1 since the definition is not used.
1	13 4	E	4.3.3-the statement ends with "including the following:", but there is only one parameter and not a list	Reword to "for samples containing mixtures of DNA, including criteria for establishing"	Accept
	14 Annex B	Т	There are a number of "shall" statements in Annex B. If they are important enough to be a "shall", perhaps they belong in the standards themselves rather than in the Annex.	Evaluate each "shall" statement in the Annex and consider whether they should be placed into the Requirements in the appropriate section.	Rejected. No revision made to the document after review. An Annex can be normative. The annex is specifically referenced in statement 4.1. The 'shall' statements have been included purposefully.
1	15 Annex C	t	reference 8 has the year, which ties that version of the QAS to the standards	Delete the year so that whatever version is current applies	Accept. Delete 2011 so the latest version is used. Link was updated.

This is a goard commence on the count and and and the commence of the count and and the count of		1		Printed and a second and a second and a second about 1 and 1		
with the state of a micro face of an expectate many care as to be a micro of an expectate many care as to be a secondary of the product of a micro of a mi			1			
the control of the control in an electric design and control of the control in an electric design and the control of the control of the place of the control						
publishes included to the econoparied layered after any earlier or surface. This is the first place after a could find a surface or surface and any earlier of the surface and any earlier or surf						
In the place where is opticity and contract the common designed complete method by year to the place of the p						
and the standard and the standard and the standard for th						
Advantages with critical source with critical source and provided in the company of the company						
Service of the control of the service of the control of the contro						
Sec. 12) Facing of multiple confidence to secure the page of a product of the control of the con			1			
Annex 8 should require evidation samples that recemble the types of samples serior converse, and may richald that in converse, the formation of the street of the process of samples serior converse, and may richald that in converse, the formation of the street of the s	16		E	interpretation guidelines.	No resolultion needed.	Noted.
profession of the stream of the proposal continues and the proposal conti						Reject. (1) Testing of multiple contributor DNA mixtures is discussed in Annex B; (2) and (4)
Section 2 shaded regime validation samples that in examile the flyors of basel is require validation samples. Note that the surprise those controlled to the control of samples is sent in carebook. Therefore the samples is sold in the control of samples is sent in carebook. Therefore the samples is sold into the control of samples is sent in carebook. Therefore the samples is sent in carebook. The samples is sent in carebook in the samples is sent in carebook in the samples is sent in carebook. The samples is sent in carebook in the samples is sent in sample in carebook in the samples is sent in carebook in the samples is sent in sample in carebook in the samples in the samples is sent in sample in the samples in the samples in the samples in the samples is samples in the samp						This should not be relevant as no studies have shown that ethnicity affects the types of
Annex 8 should require velidation samples that resemble the types of samples seem in accord. The reference is the strong of the security of th						profiles generated. This may only be relevant for statistical analysis which is beyond the
Anche is a but despite well-attended regimes well account from a water of different period and security of account from a water of different period and security of account from a water of different period and security of account from a water of different period and security of account from a water of different period and security of account from a water of different period and security of account from a water of different period and security of account from a water of different period and security of account from a water of different period and security of account from a water of different period and security of account from a water of different period and security of account from the security of account from a water of different period and security of account from a water of different period and security of account from a water of different period and security of account from a water of different period and security of account from a water of the control and security of account from a water of great from a water of gr						scope of this document. The laboratories have the option of performing these types of
substitute analyses, 10, A restinctively will become to extract a ratio validity of samples from a number of different people and combination and committee of the first people and committee of the first people and committee of the first people and complete of the first people and complete of the first people and committee of the first people and complete of t						mixture studies or reviewing data generated by other laboratories, and may include this in
outstrictions based on the number of different propile and contribution. The been deconstructed a under surface of the first of the distriction of the three contributions. It is been deconstructed in the first of					Annex B should require validation samples that resemble the types of samples seen in	their verification step for this standard and/or in the evaluation of their protocols for
Lost actives encounter a wide vertice of samples from a number of affected storage is a sample designed in subject to the sample of inflictions. While blook storage is a sample designed in subject to the sample of inflictions. While blook storage is a sample of infliction in subject to the sample of inflictions of the sample of inflicitions of the sample of inflictions of the sample of inflictions of the sample of inflicitions					casework. Therefore the samples should include: (1) a variety of samples with multiple	statistical analyses; (3) A relationship validation is outside the scope of this document;
conditions. It has been demonstrated that there is a held datastic changes in a simple between supplication can account for all the valence that can be drawn account for all the valence that the condition of the properties of th					contributors based on the number of contributors the lab intends to interpret; (2) a pool of	however laboratories are not discouraged from performing those studies as part of their
International Control of the Control Security of all the variations that may occur. International Control of the Control of Segorated samples are specifically included in America. The generation of the security of the security of an international control of the security				Laboratories encounter a wide variety of samples from a number of different people and	participants that demonstrate the diversity of the United States; (3) mixtures created from	validation. An example of high allele sharing using DNA from close relatives has been added
International Control of the Control Security of all the variations that may occur. International Control of the Control of Segorated samples are specifically included in America. The generation of the security of the security of an international control of the security						
between transfer and the evaluation of the seal performance in the control of the production of the seal performance in the control of the production of multiple mice supprise from related to evaluate toxibasts (effects and evaluation of multiple mice superise from related and evaluation of the document were used information of the production of the possibility of the superise from related to covariate production of the document were used information of the production of the possibility of the production of the production of the possibility of the production of th						
## des courtemens who accounts and help inform decision making. There is limited value to a validation in controllation of amplies from alleted authorises of microllations of making and applies and supplies that were not repeated. ## 1 view and samples that w					****	
wide/atom constructed of amples from a limited number of contributors, a small sample, and samples that were not repeated. 10			1			· - · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
13 4.2.1 T use, and samples that were not repeated. The second of the segond to the comment. 14 4.2.1 E use and samples that were not repeated. The specific detection platform with the range of samples steed in the laboratory for the sue of the specific detection platform with the range of samples steed in the laboratory for the sue of the specific detection platform with the range of samples steed in the laboratory for the sue of the specific detection platform with the range of samples steed in the laboratory for the sue of the specific detection platform with the range of samples steed in the laboratory for the sue of the specific detection platform with the range of samples steed in the laboratory for the sue of the specific samples steed in the laboratory in the sample specific samples should not be relegated to Annes 8 and ommitted from section 4.2. If the use of degraded samples should not be relegated to Annes 8 and ommitted from section 4.2. If the use of degraded samples should not be relegated to Annes 8 and ommitted from section 4.2. If the use of degraded samples should not be relegated to Annes 8 and ommitted from section 4.2. If the use of degraded samples should not be relegated to Annes 8 and ommitted from section 4.2. If the use of degraded and separate in section 4.2 to emphasise their importance. Additionally, great description should be gained to amplies their importance. Additionally, great description should be gained to amplies specify important as its state in Annes 8, treems appropriate to include a statement of the samples should be used in response to the samples should be used in interpretation protocol for probabilistic genotyping spring and the street of the samples should be used in waldstoon or what considerations need to be accounted for in a minterpretation protocol or for probabilistic genotyping of probabilistic genotyping of probabilistic genotyping of probabilistic genotyping of probabilistic genotyping probabilistic genotyping of probabilistic genotyping of probabili						
Accept. This phrase is intended to cover all options permitted in the laboratory for the use of the specific dection platform." is this phrase is intended to cover all options permitted in the laboratory for the use of the specific dection platform." is this phrase is intended to cover all options permitted in the laboratory for the use of the specific dection platform." is this phrase in site indeed to accept the permitted of the specific dection platform." is this phrase is intended to cover all options permitted in the laboratory for the use of degraded samples should not be relegated to Annex 8 and ommitted from section 4.2. If the use of degraded samples is a important as is stated in Annex 8, it terms appropriate explaining to the specific platform in Annex 8. If the use of degraded samples is a important as is stated in Annex 8, it terms appropriate explaining to the specific platform in Annex 8. If the use of degraded samples is a important as is stated in Annex 8, it terms appropriate explaining to the specific platform in Annex 8. If the use of degraded samples is a important as is stated in Annex 8, it terms appropriate explaining to the specific platform in Annex 8. If the use of degraded samples is uniform the specific platform in Annex 8. If the use of the propriate platform in Annex 8, it terms appropriate explaining to the specific platform in Annex 8, it terms appropriate explaining to the platform in Annex 8, it terms appropriate explaining to the specific platform in Annex 8, it terms appropriate explaining to the specific platform in Annex 8, it terms appropriate explaining to the specific platform in Annex 8, it terms appropriate explaining to the specific platform in Annex 8, it terms appropriate to indicate platform in Annex 8, it terms appropriate to indicate the specific platform in Annex 8, it terms appropriate to the platform in Annex 8, it terms appropriate to indicate the platform in Annex 8, it terms appropriate to the platform in Annex 8, it terms appropriate to the platform in An	17	421	т	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	, ,	·
of the specific detection platform with the range of samples steated in the laboratory. For example, a laboratory using a plan yet extrophosis of detection of pulstrom "Is this provide clarity and examples of what is meant by the dynamic range of the detection platform "Is this provide clarity and examples of what is meant by the dynamic range of the detection of the provide clarity and examples of what is meant by the dynamic range of the detection of the provide clarity and examples of what is meant by the dynamic range of the detection of the provide clarity and examples of the detection of the provide clarity and examples of the detection of the provide clarity and examples of the detection of the provide clarity and examples of the detection of the provide clarity and examples of the detection of the provide clarity and examples of the detection of the provide clarity and examples of the detection of the provide clarity and examples of the detection of the provide clarity and examples of the detection of t		1	l '	one, and samples that were not repeated.	ensare were anothica mixture interpretation protocol.	
sample, a bibonatory using capillary electrophorasis for detection of results must validate all partners in American (and the standard of the validation of probabilistic genotyping software. With a november of an interpretation protocol for probabilistic genotyping software. With a personner to fail and the standard whole the validation of probabilistic genotyping software. With a personner to fail and the standard wild be a set understanding regregation protocol for probabilistic genotyping software. With a power-whelming number of indibutations and the standard soft in the standard of the validation of probabilistic genotyping software. With a power-whelming number of indibutations in the standard of the validation of probabilistic genotyping software. With a commoder of the standard wild be a set understanding regregation protocol for probabilistic genotyping software. With a commoder of the standard wild so a standard of the validation of probabilistic genotyping software. With a commoder of the standard wild so a standard of the validation of probabilistic genotyping software. With a commoder of the standard wild so a standard of the validation of probabilistic genotyping software. With a commoder of the standard wild so a standard of the validation of probabilistic genotyping software. With a commoder of the standard wild so a standard of the validation of probabilistic genotyping software. With a standard of the validation of probabilistic genotyping software will be a standard of the validation of probabilistic genotyping software. With a standard of the validation of probabilistic genotyping software will be a standard of the validation of probabilistic genotyping software. With a standard of the validation of probabilistic genotyping software, will be a standard of the validation of probabilistic genotyping software. With a standard of the validation of probabilistic genotyping software, will be a standard of the validation of probabilistic genotyping software, will be a standard of the validation of						
Is unclear what is meant by the phrase "dynamic range of the detection platform" is this phrase meant to address a range of mixture ratios only? It is unclear what is meant by the phrase "dynamic range of the detection platform" is this phrase meant to address a range of mixture ratios only? The use of degraded samples should not be relegated to Annex 8 and ommitted from section 42.1 ff the use of degraded samples should not be relegated to Annex 8 in search and the second of the secon						, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
Is it is unclear what is meant by the phrase "dynamic range of the detection platform." Is the phrase "dynamic range of the detection platform in Annex B. It has been been been been been been been bee						
E phrase meant to address a range of mixture ratios only? In the use of degraded samples should not be relegated to Annex B and ommitted from tectors 4.2. If the use of degraded samples is as important as is stated in Annex B, it seems appropriate to include a statement in section 4.2 to emphasize their importance. Additionally, greater description should be given to sample stypically encountered in the sample statement in section 4.2 to emphasize their importance. Additionally, greater description should be given to sample stypically encountered in casework, explicitly describing them would avoid confusion. It is fair to assume that the samples used and the development of an interpretation protocol outlined in this standard would be used to evaluate probabilistic genotyping software. Not were, the standard studied on probabilistic genotyping software. With an overwheiming number of absorations more of probabilistic genotyping software. With an overwheiming number of absorations more of probabilistic genotyping software. With an overwheiming number of absorations more of probabilistic genotyping software. With an overwheiming number of absorations in some of the violation of probabilistic genotyping software. With an overwheiming number of absorations in some of the violation of probabilistic genotyping software. With an overwheiming number of absorations in some of the violation of probabilistic genotyping software. With an overwheiming number of absorations in some of the violation of probabilistic genotyping software. With an overwheiming number of absorations in some of the violation of probabilistic genotyping software. With an overwheiming number of absorations of the violation of probabilistic genotyping software. With an overwheiming number of absoration of the absorati				It is unalong what is mount by the above "dynamic young of the detection aletterns" is this	Descride alexists and expenseles of what is proposed by the dispersion range of the detection	
The use of degraded samples should not be relegated to Annex 8 and ommitted from section 4.2. If the use of degraded samples is as important as is stated in Annex 8, it seems appropriate to include a statement in section 4.2 to emphasize their importance. Additionally, greater description should be given to samples synically encountered in casework. If there is a common undestraining regarding the types of samples commonly and casework. If there is a common undestraining regarding the types of samples (e.g. degraded etc.) that should be used to enclose the elementary of the interpretation and comparison protocol.") The requirement to perform validation studies with degraded samples would not be necessary for blanch studies with degraded samples would not be necessary for blanch studies with degraded samples would not be necessary for blanch studies with degraded samples would not be necessary for blanch studies with degraded samples would not be necessary for blanch studies with degraded samples would not be necessary for blanch studies with degraded samples would not be necessary for blanch studies with degraded samples would not be necessary for blanch studies with degraded samples would not be necessary for blanch studies with degraded samples would not be necessary for blanch studies with degraded samples would not be necessary for blanch studies with degraded samples would not be necessary for blanch studies with degraded samples would not be necessary for blanch studies with degraded samples would not be necessary for blanch studies with degraded samples would not be necessary for blanch studies with degraded samples would not be necessary for blanch studies with degraded samples would not be necessary for blanch studies with degraded with a degraded to not reporting results from degraded with a degraded to not reporting results from degraded with a degraded to not reporting results from degraded with a standard for the wild addition studies with additional contribution with a visible of the proposed stan	4.0	4.2.2	_			
The use of degraded samples should not be relegated to Annex B and ommitted from section 4.2. If the use of degraded samples is as important as is stated in Annex B, it seems appropriate to include a statement in section 4.2 to emphasize the importance. Additionally, greater description should be given to samples typically encountered in casework. If there is a common understanding regarding the typics of samples commonly encountered in casework, explicitly describing them would avoid confusion. 19 4.2 T/E To Fig. To To To	10	4.2.2	E	prirase meant to address a range of mixture ratios only?	piation in Annex B.	
The use of degraded samples should not be relegated to Annex B and ommitted from section 4.2 If the use of degraded samples is a important as its assimptant and its assimptant as its assimptant assimpt						
section 4.2. If the use of degraded samples is a simportant as is stated in Annex 8, it seems appropriate to include a statement insection 4.2 to emphasize their importance. Additionally, greater description should be given to samples typically encountered in casework, explicitly describing them would avoid confusion. 15 4.2 T/E 16 1 A 2. T/E 17						
appropriate to include a statement in section 4.2 to emphasize their importance. Additionally, greater description should be given to samples typically encountered in casework. If there is a common understanding regarding the types of samples commonly accountered in casework, explicitly describing them would avoid confusion. It is fair to assume that the samples used and the development of an interpretation protocol outlined in this standard would be used to evaluate probabilistic genotyping software. However, the standard alsa's a statement ded development of an interpretation protocol outlined in this standard would be used to evaluate probabilistic genotyping software. When we relevance of this standard will also as statement addes as statement added to address the development of a mixture relevance of this standard will also as statement added to address the development of a mixture specification and the probabilistic genotyping software. While the counted for in an interpretation protocol for probabilistic genotyping software. While the counted for in an interpretation protocol for probabilistic genotyping software. While information of the validation of probabilistic genotyping software. While incommend in the protocol of protocol for probabilistic genotyping software. While information of the validation of protocol for probabilistic genotyping software. While incommend in the protocol for probabilistic genotyping software. While allocation of probabilistic genotyping software. While indication as an editorial revision and a felled to be added in Annex A regarding the validation of probabilistic genotyping software. While allocation of probabilistic genotyping software. While interpretation protocol for probabilistic genotyping software. While allocation of probabilistic genotyping software. While allocation of probab						
Additionally, greater description should be given to samples typically encountered in casework. If there is a common understanding regarding the types of samples (see gegraded etc.) that should be used in validation studies with degraded samples would not be necessary for laboratories not accepting and testing samples likely to be degraded or not reporting results from degraded samples. It is fair to a summe that the samples used and the development of an interpretation protocol outside in this standard would be used to evaluate probabilistic genotyping software. However, the standard lacks a statement that addresses the development of an interpretation protocol probabilistic genotyping software of the samples that should be used in a validation of probabilistic genotyping software. With an overwhelming number of laboratories moving towards the use of software of fores no guidance on the samples that should be used in a validation or what considerations needs to be made between this standard and the probabilistic genotyping software of the validation or what considerations needs to be made between this standard and the probabilistic genotyping software of the validation or what considerations needs to be made between this standard and the probabilistic genotyping software. While accurate for in an interpretation protocol. A stronger, explicit connection needs to be made between this standard and the probabilistic genotyping software. While accurate for in an interpretation protocol has to accept and and testing and testing samples would not be necessary for laboratories with from degraded samples would not be necessary for laboratories would be used in validation testing. **Software of this standard would be used in validation of probabilistic genotyping software.** **Accept with modification as an Editorial revision. A statement has been added in Annex A regarding the validation of probabilistic genotyping software.** **Accept with modification as an Editorial revision not a Techcical revision. A statement						,, , , ,
accepting and testing samples likely to be degraded or not reporting results from degraded or not reporting results from degraded anaples. It is fair to assume that the samples used and the development of an interpretation protocol outlined in this standard lack a statement that addresses the development of an interpretation protocol outlined in this standard lack a statement that addresses the development of an interpretation protocol or probabilistic genotyping software. However, the standard lack a statement that addresses the development of an interpretation protocol or probabilistic genotyping software. With no overwhelming number of laboratories moving towards the use of software for interpretation become less common. The proposed standard or the validation of probabilistic software offers on guidance on the samples that should be used in a validation or what considerations need to be accounted for in an interpretation protocol. A stronger, explicit connection needs to be involvable protocol for probabilistic genotyping software. While because the standard and the probabilistic genotyping software. While be mentioned in second in the probabilistic genotyping software. While be mentioned in second the standard and the great addition of probabilistic genotyping software. While be mentioned in second the standard should be a form of information on this and related topics. 20 4.3 T/E Verification is an essential step to add to the validation of probabilistic genotyping software. While the process. 21 4.4.2 T process. 22 T minimal quality. Several examples are listed below. The should additional requirements with sufficient specificity to ensure minimal quality. Several examples are listed below. The should additional requirements with sufficient specificity to ensure minimal quality. Several examples are listed below. The should additional requirements of contributors seet, e.g., Down of probabilistic genotyping software. While aboratories, especially if routinely interpreting complex mixtures, are en						
15 4.2 T/E encountered in casework, explicitly describing them would avoid confusion. be used in validation testing. It is fair to assume that the samples used and the development of an interpretation protocol outlined in this standard would be used to evaluate probabilistic genotyping software. However, the standard lacks a statement that addresses the development of an interpretation protocol for probabilistic genotyping software. With an overwhelming number of laboratories moving towards the use of software offers on guidance on the samples that should be used in a validation or what considerations need to be secondon. The proposed standard for the validation of probabilistic genotyping software. Should be used in a validation or what considerations need to be a cocounted for in an interpretation protocol. A stronger, explicit connection needs to be a cocounted for in an interpretation protocol of the samples that should be used in a validation or what considerations needs to be a cocounted for in an interpretation protocol. A stronger, explicit connection needs to be a decounted for in an interpretation protocol of the validation of probabilistic genotyping software. While a because of the validation of probabilistic genotyping software. While a because of the validation of probabilistic genotyping software. While a because of the validation of probabilistic genotyping software. See ASS on the samples are listed below. 21 4.4.2 To process. 22 To minimal quality. Several examples are listed below. The reshould additional requirements with sufficient specificity to ensure infinimal quality. Several examples are listed below. There should additional requirements concerning the number of contributors testing, Given the substantial and well-documented difficulties in accurately specifying the number of contributors testing, Given the substantial and well-documented difficulties in accurately specifying the number of contributors see, e.g., Boylor Political Political Political Political Political Political P						
It is fair to assume that the samples used and the development of an interpretation protocol outlined in this standard would be used to evaluate probabilistic genotyping software. However, the standard alkars asteriment that addresses the development of an interpretation protocol for probabilistic genotyping software. With an overwhelming number of laboratories monity (awards the use of software for interpretation, the relevance of this standard will fade as traditional methods of manual interpretation become less common. The proposed standard for the validation of probabilistic software offers no guidance on the samples that should be used in a validation or what considerations need to be accounted for in an interpretation protocol. A stronger, explicit connection needs to be accounted for in an interpretation protocol. A stronger, explicit connection needs to be accounted for in an interpretation protocol. A stronger, explicit connection needs to be accounted for in an interpretation protocol. A stronger, explicit connection needs to be accounted for in an interpretation protocol. A stronger, explicit connection needs to be accounted for in an interpretation protocol. A stronger, explicit connection needs to be accounted for in an interpretation protocol. A stronger, explicit connection needs to be accounted for in an interpretation protocol. A stronger, explicit connection needs to be accounted for in an interpretation protocol. A stronger, explicit connection needs to be a connection of the analysis of the STR of the standard. Verification is an essential step to add to the validation of probabilistic genotyping software. While this standard should be a normalized protocol shall be a normalized protocol shall be an interpretation protocol for probabilistic genotyping software. While this standard should be a normalized for Probabilistic genotyping software. While this standard should be a normalized for Probabilistic genotyping software. While this standard should be an interpretation of probabilistic geno			١.			
outlined in this standard would be used to evaluate probabilistic genotyping software. However, the standard lacks a statement that addresses the development of an interpretation protocol for probabilistic genotyping software. With an overwhelming number of laboratories moving towards the use of software for interpretation, the relevance of this standard will date as traditional interpretation become less common. The prosposed standard for the validation or probabilistic software offers no guidance on the samples that should be used in a validation or what considerations nationally interpretation protocol. A stronger, explicit connection needs to be accounted for in an interpretation protocol. A stronger, explicit connection needs to be made between this standard and the probabilistic genotyping software. See SB made between this standard and the probabilistic genotyping software, see ASB made between this standard and the probabilistic genotyping software, while individuals performing the validation process and it is important that the individuals performing the validation are not the only ones involved in the excitable and the probabilistic genotyping software. While a boraction of probabilistic genotyping software, while a horaction of probabilistic genotyping software. While interpretation protocol for probabilistic genotyping software. While a horaction of probabilistic genotyping software, see ASB MDA-related standards for more information on this and related topics. 20	19	4.2	T/E	encountered in casework, explicitly describing them would avoid confusion.	be used in validation testing.	samples.
outlined in this standard would be used to evaluate probabilistic genotyping software. However, the standard lacks a statement that addresses the development of an interpretation protocol for probabilistic genotyping software. With an overwhelming number of laboratories moving towards the use of software for interpretation, the relevance of this standard will date as traditional interpretation become less common. The prosposed standard for the validation or probabilistic software offers no guidance on the samples that should be used in a validation or what considerations nationally interpretation protocol. A stronger, explicit connection needs to be accounted for in an interpretation protocol. A stronger, explicit connection needs to be made between this standard and the probabilistic genotyping software. See SB made between this standard and the probabilistic genotyping software, see ASB made between this standard and the probabilistic genotyping software, while individuals performing the validation process and it is important that the individuals performing the validation are not the only ones involved in the excitable and the probabilistic genotyping software. While a boraction of probabilistic genotyping software, while a horaction of probabilistic genotyping software. While interpretation protocol for probabilistic genotyping software. While a horaction of probabilistic genotyping software, see ASB MDA-related standards for more information on this and related topics. 20						
However, the standard lacks a statement that addresses the development of an interpretation protocol for probabilistic genotyping software. With an overwhelming number of laboratories moving towards the use of software for interpretation, the relevance of this standard will fade as traditional methods of manual interpretation become less common. The proposed standard for the validation of probabilistic software offers no guidance on the samples that should be used in a validation or what considerations need to be accounted for in an interpretation protocol. A stronger, explicit connection needs to be accounted for in an interpretation protocol. A stronger, explicit connection needs to be accounted for in an interpretation protocol. A stronger, explicit connection needs to be accounted for in an interpretation protocol. Stronger, explicit connection needs to be accounted for in an interpretation protocol. A stronger, explicit connection needs to be accounted for in an interpretation protocol. A stronger, explicit connection needs to be accounted for in an interpretation protocol for probabilistic genotyping software. This standard should be a normative reference for the Validation protoces and its important that the individuals performing the validation are not the only ones involved in the verification of the validation process. 21 4.4.2 T process. This proposed standard falls to lay out requirements with sufficient specificity to ensure minimal quality. Several examples are listed below. Further revision and drafting of the standard with additional, detailed requirements in necessary. Further revision and drafting of the standard with additional, detailed requirements to appropriate requirement for all laboratories. While become the expected results. Further revision and artificiant seed to exceed the limit which will necessary. Further revision and drafting of the standard with additional, detailed requirements in necessary or appropriate requirement for all laboratories. While become the expected resul						
Interpretation protocol for probabilistic genotyping software. With an overwhelming number of faboratories moving towards the use of software for interpretation, the relevance of this standard will fade as traditional methods of manual interpretation become less common. The proposed standard for the validation of probabilistic software offers no guidance on the samples that should be used in a validation or what consideration send to be accounted for in an interpretation protocol. A stronger, explicit connection needs to be anded between this standard and the probabilistic genotyping software. While this standard may be used for the validation of probabilistic genotyping software. While this standard may be used for the validation of probabilistic genotyping software, see ASB of made between this standard and the probabilistic genotyping software, see ASB of the validation is an essential step to add to the validation process and it is important that the individuals performing the validation are not the only ones involved in the verification of process. This proposed standard falls to lay out requirements with sufficient specificity to ensure than the process of the validation process and it is important that the individuals performing the validation are not the only ones involved in the verification of the validation. This proposed standard falls to lay out requirements with sufficient specificity to ensure than the process of the validation process and it is important that the individuals performing the validation process and it is important that the individuals performed by individuals other than those involved in the actual validation. This proposed standard falls to lay out requirements with sufficient specificity to ensure than the process of the validation of probabilistic genotyping software. This standard should be a formative reference for the Validation Standards of Probabilistic Genotyping Systems and should be reformed by individuals other than the verification of the validation. This proposed				1 - 1 - 1 - 1		
number of laboratories moving towards the use of software for interpretation, the relevance of this standard will flade as traditional methods of manual interpretation become less common. The proposed standard for the validation of probabilists of probabilists of the validation of probabilists of probabilists of the validation of probabilists of the validation of probabilists of the validation						
relevance of this standard will fade as traditional methods of manual interpretation become less common. The proposed standard for the validation of probabilistic software offers no guidance on the samples that should be used in a validation or what considerations need to be accounted for in an interpretation protocol. A stronger, explicit connection needs to be made between this standard and the probabilistic genotyping software. While this standard and the probabilistic genotyping software, while one made between this standard and the probabilistic genotyping software, see ASB of the validation of probabilistic genotyping software, while one made between this standard and the probabilistic genotyping software, see ASB of the validation of probabilistic genotyping software. While this standard and the probabilistic genotyping software, see ASB of the validation of probabilistic genotyping software. While this standard and the probabilistic genotyping software, see ASB of the validation of probabilistic genotyping software, see ASB of the validation of probabilistic genotyping software. While this standard and the probabilistic genotyping software, see ASB of the validation of probabilistic genotyping software. While this standards for Probabilistic Genotyping Systems and should be a normative reference for the Validation standards for Probabilistic Genotyping Systems and should be performed by individuals of the interpretated standards for the validation of probabilistic genotyping software. While this standards and we used for the validation of probabilistic genotyping software, see ASB DNA-related standards for the validation of probabilistic genotyping software. While this standards for Probabilistic Genotyping Systems and should be performed by individuals other individuals performing by used for the validation of probabilistic genotyping software. While the normative reference for the Validation of probabilistic genotyping software. This standard for probabilistic genotyping software. This standard softwa						
less common. The proposed standard for the validation of probabilistic software offers no guidance on the samples that should be used in a validation or what considerations need to be accounted for in an interpretation protocol. A stronger, explicit connection needs to be accounted for in an interpretation protocol. A stronger, explicit connection needs to be a cocunted for in an interpretation protocol. A stronger, explicit connection needs to be a cocunted for in an interpretation protocol. A stronger, explicit connection needs to be a cocunted for in an interpretation protocol. A stronger, explicit connection needs to be a cocunted for in an interpretation protocol. A stronger, explicit connection needs to be a cocunted for in an interpretation protocol. A stronger, explicit connection needs to be a cocunted for in an interpretation protocol. A stronger, explicit connection needs to be a cocunted for in an interpretation protocol. A stronger, explicit connection needs to be a cocunted for in an interpretation protocol. A stronger, explicit connection needs to be a cocunted for in an interpretation protocol. A stronger, explicit connection needs to be interpretation protocol shad of the validation or what consideration is protocol shall the protocol shall be performed by individuals performed by individuals performed by individuals orther than those involved in the actual validation. The proposed standard for the validation or what consideration of the validation or probabilistic genotyping software. While a control interpret, the following statement has been added in Annex A regarding the validation or probabilistic genotyping software. While this standard on the validation of probabilistic genotyping software. While interpretation probabilistic genotyping software. While interpretation probabilistic genotyping software. While interpretation probabilistic genotyping software. While this standard for the validation or the validation or the literature of the validation or the validation or the literature of t				=		
guidance on the samples that should be used in a validation or what considerations need to be accounted for in an interpretation protocol. A stronger, explicit connection needs to be made between this standard and the probabilistic genotyping software, See ASB wade between this standard and the probabilistic genotyping software, see ASB Verification is an essential step to add to the validation process and it is important that the individuals performing the validation are not the only ones involved in the verification process. 21 4.4.2 To process. 22 To minimal quality. Several examples are listed below. 33 This proposed standard falls to lay out requirements with sufficient specificity to ensure minimal quality. Several examples are listed below. 43 This proposed standard falls to lay out requirements with sufficient specificity to ensure minimal quality. Several examples are listed below. 44.2. To process. 45 This proposed standard falls to lay out requirements with sufficient specificity to ensure minimal quality. Several examples are listed below. 55 Further revisision and drafting of the standard with additional, detailed requirements is necessary. 56 Reject. The requirement to test n+2 number of contributors may not be a necessary or appropriate requirement to interpret, this standard may be used for the validation of probabilistic genotyping software, see ASB DNA related standards for Probabilistic genotyping software, see ASB DNA related standards for more information on this and related topics. 4.2. To process data and the only ones involved in the verification step should be performed by individuals on the protocol shall be performed by individuals			1			
be accounted for in an interpretation protocol. A stronger, explicit connection needs to be made between this standard and the probabilistic genotyping standard. Verification is an essential step to add to the validation process and it is important that the individuals performing the validation are not the only ones involved in the verification of the individuals performing the validation are not the only ones involved in the verification of the process. To process. To process. To process. To process. To process and it is important that the individuals performing the validation are not the only ones involved in the verification of the process. To process. To process. To process and it is important that the individuals performing the validation are not the only ones involved in the verification of the process. To process. To process and it is important that the individuals performing the validation are not the only ones involved in the verification of the expected results. Further revisision and drafting of the standard with additional, detailed requirements is necessary. Noted. Reject. The requirement to test n+2 number of contributors may not be a necessary or appropriate requirement for all laboratories. While laboratories, especially if routined difficulties in accurately specifying the number of contributors, see, e.g., David Paoletti et al. Empirical Analysis of the STR Profesis Resulting from Conceptual Mixtures, J. Forensic Sci., Nov. 2005, Vol. 50, No. 50, No. 6, the lab should be required to test mixtures with a number of contributors which exceeds the limit which will engine the stronger of the validation of the protocol shall be performed by individuals other protocol shall be performed by individuals other protocol shall be performed by individuals other expected results. Further revision and affiliation. Further revision and affiliation. Further revision and affiliation are protocol shall be performed by individuals of the substantial and requirements of contributors which exceeds				less common. The proposed standard for the validation of probabilistic software offers no		Accept with modification as an Editorial revision not a Techcnical revision. A statement has
20 4.3 T/E made between this standard and the probabilistic genotyping standard. Should be mentioned in section 4.3 of said standard. DNA-related standards for more information on this and related topics. Accept. The following statement has been added to section 4.4. "Verification of the protocol shall be performed by individuals or than those involved in the actual validation. This proposed standard fails to lay out requirements with sufficient specificity to ensure minimal quality. Several examples are listed below. There should additional requirements concerning the number of contributors testing. Given the substantial and well-documented difficulties in accurately specifying the number of contributors testing. Given form Conceptual Mixtures, J. Forenisc Sci., Nov. 2005, Vol. 50, No. 6, the lab should be performed with additional in section 4.3 of said standard. DNA-related standards for more information on this and related topics. Accept. The following statement has been added to section 4.4. "Verification of the protocol shall be performed by individuals orther protoco				guidance on the samples that should be used in a validation or what considerations need to		
Verification is an essential step to add to the validation process and it is important that the individuals performing the validation are not the only ones involved in the verification process. This proposed standard fails to lay out requirements with sufficient specificity to ensure minimal quality. Several examples are listed below. Purther revisision and drafting of the standard with additional, detailed requirements is necessary. Recommend in Annex B that the verification step should be performed by individuals other than those involved in the actual validation. Further revisision and drafting of the standard with additional, detailed requirements is necessary. Reject. The requirement to test n+2 number of contributors may not be a necessary or appropriate requirement for all laboratories, especially if routinely interpreting complex mixtures, are encouraged to perform validation studies with additional contributors beyond what they intend to interpret, this knowledge may be sufficiently gained by some laboratories with limited testing situations from the literature or by contributors, see, e.g., David Paoletti et al. Empirical Analysis of the STR Profiles Resulting required to test mixtures, with a number of contributors which exceeds the limit which will						, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
individuals performing the validation are not the only ones involved in the verification process. This proposed standard fails to lay out requirements with sufficient specificity to ensure minimal quality. Several examples are listed below. The proposed standard fails to lay out requirements with sufficient specificity to ensure minimal quality. Several examples are listed below. Further revision and drafting of the standard with additional, detailed requirements is necessary. Reject. The requirement to test n+2 number of contributors may not be a necessary or appropriate requirement for all laboratories. While laboratories, especially if routinely interpreting complex mixtures, are encouraged to leptore or by contributors, see, e.g., David Paoletti et al. Empirical Analysis of the STR Profiles Resulting from Conceptual Mixtures, J. Forensic Sci., Nov. 2005, Vol. 50, No. 6, the lab should be required to test mixtures with a number of contributors which exceeds the limit which will	20	4.3	T/E	made between this standard and the probabilistic genotyping standard.	should be mentioned in section 4.3 of said standard.	DNA-related standards for more information on this and related topics.
This proposed standard fails to lay out requirements with sufficient specificity to ensure minimal quality. Several examples are listed below. There should additional requirements concerning the number of contributors testing. Given the substantial and well-documented difficulties in accurately specifying the number of contributors the STR Profiles Resulting from Conceptual Mixtures, J. Forensic Sci., Nov. 2005, Vol. 50, No. 6, the lab should be required to test mixtures with a number of contributors which exceeds the limit which will				Verification is an essential step to add to the validation process and it is important that the		Accept. The following statement has been added to section 4.4: "Verification of the
This proposed standard fails to lay out requirements with sufficient specificity to ensure minimal quality. Several examples are listed below. Further revisision and drafting of the standard with additional, detailed requirements is necessary. Reject. The requirement to test n+2 number of contributors may not be a necessary or appropriate requirement for all laboratories. While laboratories, especially if routinely interpreting complex mixtures, are encouraged to perform validation studies with additional contributors beyond what they intend to interpret, this knowledge may be sufficiently the substantial and well-documented difficulties in accurately specifying the number of contributors, see, e.g., David Paoletti et al. Empirical Analysis of the STR Profiles Resulting from Conceptual Mixtures, J. Forensic Sci., Nov. 2005, Vol. 50, No. 6, the lab should be required to test mixtures with a number of contributors which exceeds the limit which will				individuals performing the validation are not the only ones involved in the verification	Recommend in Annex B that the verification step should be performed by individuals other	protocol shall be performed by individuals in a blinded manner without knowledge of the
T minimal quality. Several examples are listed below. Reject. The requirement to test n+2 number of contributors may not be a necessary or appropriate requirement for all laboratories. While laboratories, especially if routinely interpreting complex mixtures, are encouraged to perform validation studies with additional contributors beyond what they intend to interpret, this knowledge may be sufficiently the substantial and well-documented difficulties in accurately specifying the number of contributors, see, e.g., David Paoletti et al. Empirical Analysis of the STR Profiles Resulting from Conceptual Mixtures, J. Forensic Sci., Nov. 2005, Vol. 50, No. 6, the lab should be required to test mixtures with a number of contributors which exceeds the limit which will	21	4.4.2	Т	process.	thanthose involved in the actual validation.	expected results."
Reject. The requirement to test n+2 number of contributors may not be a necessary or appropriate requirement for all laboratories. While laboratories, especially if routinely interpreting complex mixtures, are encouraged to perform validation studies with additional There should additional requirements concerning the number of contributors testing. Given the substantial and well-documented difficulties in accurately specifying the number of gained by some laboratories with limited testing situations from the literature or by contributors, see, e.g., David Paoletti et al. Empirical Analysis of the STR Profiles Resulting from Conceptual Mixtures, J. Forensic Sci., Nov. 2005, Vol. 50, No. 6, the lab should be required to test mixtures with a number of contributors which exceeds the limit which will assault samples as their only mixed samples would not likely benefit from performing					Further revisision and drafting of the standard with additional, detailed requirements is	
Reject. The requirement to test n+2 number of contributors may not be a necessary or appropriate requirement for all laboratories. While laboratories, especially if routinely interpreting complex mixtures, are encouraged to perform validation studies with additional There should additional requirements concerning the number of contributors testing. Given the substantial and well-documented difficulties in accurately specifying the number of gained by some laboratories with limited testing situations from the literature or by contributors, see, e.g., David Paoletti et al. Empirical Analysis of the STR Profiles Resulting from Conceptual Mixtures, J. Forensic Sci., Nov. 2005, Vol. 50, No. 6, the lab should be required to test mixtures with a number of contributors which exceeds the limit which will assault samples as their only mixed samples would not likely benefit from performing	22		T	minimal quality. Several examples are listed below.	necessary.	Noted.
appropriate requirement for all laboratories. While laboratories, especially if routinely interpreting complex mixtures, are encouraged to perform validation studies with additional There should additional requirements concerning the number of contributors testing. Given the substantial and well-documented difficulties in accurately specifying the number of contributors, see, e.g., David Paoletti et al. Empirical Analysis of the STR Profiles Resulting from Conceptual Mixtures, J. Forensic Sci., Nov. 2005, Vol. 50, No. 6, the lab should be interpreted. For example, a laboratory testing primarily bones, blood stains and sexual required to test mixtures with a number of contributors which exceeds the limit which will						Reject. The requirement to test n+2 number of contributors may not be a necessary or
interpreting complex mixtures, are encouraged to perform validation studies with additional There should additional requirements concerning the number of contributors testing. Given the substantial and well-documented difficulties in accurately specifying the number of contributors testing the number of contributors, see, e.g., David Paoletti et al. Empirical Analysis of the STR Profiles Resulting from Conceptual Mixtures, J. Forensic Sci., Nov. 2005, Vol. 50, No. 6, the lab should be required to test mixtures with a number of contributors which exceeds the limit which will						
There should additional requirements concerning the number of contributors testing. Given the substantial and well-documented difficulties in accurately specifying the number of gained by some laboratories with limited testing situations from the literature or by contributors, see, e.g., David Paoletti et al. Empirical Analysis of the STR Profiles Resulting from Conceptual Mixtures, J. Forensic Sci., Nov. 2005, Vol. 50, No. 6, the lab should be interpreted. For example, a laboratory extensity bones, blood stains and sexual required to test mixtures with a number of contributors which exceeds the limit which will						
the substantial and well-documented difficulties in accurately specifying the number of contributors, see, e.g., David Paoletti et al. Empirical Analysis of the STR Profiles Resulting from Conceptual Mixtures, J. Forensic Sci., Nov. 2005, Vol. 50, No. 6, the lab should be required to test mixtures with a number of contributors which exceeds the limit which will				There should additional requirements concerning the number of contributors testing. Given		
contributors, see, e.g., David Paoletti et al. Empirical Analysis of the STR Profiles Resulting from Conceptual Mixtures, J. Forensic Sci., Nov. 2005, Vol. 50, No. 6, the lab should be required to test mixtures with a number of contributors which exceeds the limit which will assault samples as their only mixed samples would not likely benefit from performing			l			
from Conceptual Mixtures, J. Forensic Sci., Nov. 2005, Vol. 50, No. 6, the lab should be required to test mixtures with a number of contributors which exceeds the limit which will assault samples as their only mixed samples would not likely benefit from performing						
required to test mixtures with a number of contributors which exceeds the limit which will assault samples as their only mixed samples would not likely benefit from performing						
To per dependent on the person mixtures with rounding valuations of tested during valuations.	22	423.433	т		Create a requirement that n + 2 contributors be tested during validation	
		, 4.3.3	ı 	as applied in substituting in 12 or in 12 j.	Secret a regamement that it is a contributors se tested during validation.	remotion steades with rour or live person mixtures.

24	4.2.	Т	No specification of minimum number of mixed samples to be used in the validation.	Add a requirement for the minimum number of samples in the validation, to be categorized as necessary, e.g., how many samples for each set of 3-person contributors, 4-person contributors, etc.	Rejected with modification. It is not possible to establish a minimum number of samples to test as this will be dependent on the DNA test used, the testing parameters used by the laboratory, the types of samples tested, etc. For example, a laboratory may choose to test only a small number of four person contributor mixtures to decide that they do not intend to interpret profiles likely to contain four or more contributors, whereas laboratories planning to interpret profiles from four or more contributors should have a large sample set of multi-contributor mixtures in their validation studies sufficient to develop and appropriately verify robust protocols. New text added to Annex B: "Repeated testing and data analysis are critical to the understanding of variability. While specific requirements for the minimum number of studies and sample sets used for the validation studies and the verification process are not detailed in this standard, the laboratory shall perform sufficient replicate studies to address the variability inherent to the various aspects of DNA testing, data generation and the analysis and interpretation of the data."
				mixture protocols, categorized as necessary, e.g., how many samples for each set of 3-	
25	4.4.	Т	No specification of minimum number of mixed samples to be used in the verification.	person contributors, 4-person contributors, etc.	Reject with modification. See comment for #24
				Define stochastic effects; specify Alleleic drop-out, peak height imbalance, exaggerated	
26	4.3.2	E	Need to define stochastic effects.	stutter, and drop in.	Accept. Definition added.
27	4.3.2	т	Include mixture ratios as a limitation.	Add "ratio of the contributors".	Reject but noted. The list provided is not exhaustive. Samples with varying ratios of DNA from contributors would necessarily be a part of the validation studies required to address this standard and particularly when assessing stochastic effects with DNA mixtures, which is listed as a limitation. If estimated mixture ratios are used in the interpretation of mixed DNA profiles according to the laboratory protocol, then validation studies would need to be available to support how the mixture ratios are used and that process verified according to other requirements in this standard. Refer to 4.2.4, 4.3, and Annex B.
28		Т	The language of the standard coupled with Annex B provides little concrete guidance for lab's attempting to design mixture validations studies and interpretation protocols. Given the lack of such guidance including I foresee that lab's will be able to satisfy this standard while conducting inadequate validation studies. One example is not requiring labs to conduct validation on mixtures with "n+1" number of contributors which the lab intends to interpret.		Rejected; no resolution suggested. We would like to reiterate that this standard applies to any type of DNA testing technology and methodology used, including but not limited to, STR testing, DNA sequencing, SNP testing, haplotype testing, traditional and rapid protocols, etc., where mixtures of DNA may be encountered, analyzed and interpreted. It is recognized that each laboratory performing DNA testing has individual case- and sample-acceptance policies and uses different technologies, methods, and protocols to generate DNA data. Specific studies conducted and approaches used, the type of data evaluated, and the details of the protocols will vary between laboratories. It is the responsibility of the individual laboratory to perform the range of studies appropriate to cover the breadth of samples accepted and tested for the technologies and methodologies used. These studies should be maintained and available for review. It is anticipated that accrediting or other agencies that adopt these requirements may provide more specific clarification as it applies to a specific technology or use. Also see response to #23 above.
20	4& Annex B	т	The proposed standard fails to set forth requirements with enough specificity to guarantee minimal quality. A lab could check off each of these requirements, yet still have failed to adequately tested sufficient mixtures to ensure reproducible, accurate results.	Add additional requirements, see below	Noted. The goal of a well written, detailed protocol and an adequately performed verification check is to provide support that the interpretation and comparison protocol in use in a laboratory results in reproducible and correct interpretations and comparisons. Please see response to #28.
23	TO THICK D		Lack of mandatory compliance for labs which have already conducted a mixture validation	, as distribution requirements, see selow	i leade see response to #20.
30	1	Т	study, e.g., labs "are advised to review their previous validation"	Substitute "shall" for "are advised to review"	Reject. Please see response to #8 above.
31	Annex B	т	One of the most continuously studied, yet unresolved issues is the accurate estimation of the number of contributors to a mixture. Because underestimating the number of contributors is so prevalent due to allele sharing and stochastic effects, the lab should be required to test mixtures containing at least one contributor more than the maximum that will be interpreted in case work (n +1). There should be a requirement concerning minimum number of samples to be used during	Require n+ 1 contributors in the mixture validation	Reject. Please see response to #23 above.
32	4.2 & 4.4	Т	both the validation and verification	Insert requirement of minimum number of samples	Reject with modification. See comment for #24
	4.3.2	т	insufficient requirements concerning testing of mixtures exhibit stochastic effects, even when read in conjunction with the note to §4.3.2	Add requirements concerning stochastic effects.	Rejected but noted. Stochastic effects result from the amplification of small amounts of DNA. Therefore sufficient data to address the issues of stochastic effects and the interpretation of DNA profile data likely impacted by stochastic effects should be obtained under requirement 4.2 of Annex B if the laboratory interprets any profiles generated from small amounts of DNA. Verification of the robustness of the laboratory protocol to address stochastic effects is mandatory under requirement 4.4 of Annex B.
34	4.4, 4.4.2	Т	Too much latitude/not enough guidance is provided in how a laboratory is to determine what an acceptable range of variability is during the verification process	Include requirements about minimum tests a lab must conduct in determining what an acceptable range of variation is	Noted with modification. Please see response to #1 above. Discussed with submitter to resolve comment. Resolution was to add additional clarification to Annex B requiring inconclusive determinations to also be consistent. This is a clarification, not a technical change.

			The requirement for validation in high-shared allele and low-shared allele situations as expressed with no guidance for what constitutes high or low. The requirement for low-		mixtures with limited allele shares (or other "easy" situations) for their validation and verification studies. The word "low" was deleted and an example of a familial relationship
					generated from a variety of mixtures, and not, for example, to specifically construct "easy"
					of contributors is intended to ensure that the laboratory collects and reviews data
					Accept with modification. The requirement to use mixtures with "high vs. low allele sharing"
35 4	4.2/4.4	T	complex touch mixtures are among the most challenging for labs to interpret	Add requriement for touch mixtures	to support its interpretation protocol and provide verification of the protocol.
			Touch samples need to be explicitly required during the validation/verification process as		laboratory testing these types of samples would need to have appropriate validation studies
					samples, it is not appropriate to make this a specific requirement at this time. Any
					suitable for validating protocols for interpreting profiles resulting from these types of
					"touch DNA" samples in their validation studies; however, since other options may be
					Reject. Laboratories choosing to test handled items certainly have the option to include