

Deadline For Public Comments: May 16, 2022

ASB Std 123, Standard for Routine Internal Evaluation of a Laboratory's DNA Interpretation and Comparison Protocol

Section	Type of Comment (E-Editorial, T-Technical)	Comments	Proposed Resolution	Final Resolution
3.2	E	This is a very specific definition, as forensics has lots of comparisons that do not involve DNA (same with 3.4)	Better/less specific definitions	Reject. This is the definition from Standard 040.
3.5	E	In the note under number 3), there is a bracketed portion of the sentence [] while in numbers 2) and 4), the extra detail is in parenthesis ().	change brackets to parentheses	Reject. This is the correct formatting when multiple parentheses are in use.
4.1	Clarification	Would like to verify the TL must complete this evaluation only if currently taking PTs		Reject. This is the decision of the laboratory if the TL is not proficiency tested, to whether this evaluation needs to be done.
4.1	Technical	4.1 says a minimum of half, but the NOTE says it's ok if there's an odd number of examiners to have less than half one year and more than half the second year (e.g., 7 examiners, 3 test one year and 4 test the next). These statements are in direct conflict.	change a "minimum of half" to "approximately half" at 4.1	Reject with modification. The note is the exception. The 3 and 4 were switched in the sentence.
4.1.1	T	"4.1.1 The laboratory shall define, by written laboratory protocol, the overall goals of the evaluation program and the frequency with which each technology, kit and protocol used within the laboratory will be evaluated using this standard." does not provide sufficient specificity.	This standard should specify what should be included in the overall goals of the program. It should specify how often each kit and protocol needs to be evaluated.	Reject. This is up to the laboratory to define for flexibility depending on the technologies, kits and protocols used at the time of the evaluation.
4.1.1	E	missing comma	add comma after 'kit'	Accept.
4.1.2	T	"When the technical leader is participating in the internal evaluation, another person shall take on the administrator role." Should this other "person" be a "qualified analyst"? Or does it not matter?	change "person" to "qualified individual"	Accept with modification. Added "or equivalent" and added "the technical leader shall assign".
4.1.2	T	The current language requires that "When the technical leader is participating in the internal evaluation, another person shall take on administrator role." Some additional language is needed to ensure that the alternative person has the appropriate training, experience, and authority to perform the administrator role.	Specify who the other person should be or what that person's minimum qualifications should be.	Accept with modification. Added "or equivalent" and added "the technical leader shall assign".
4.1.3	E	scope' is confusing (scope of what?)	clarify scope of....	Accept. Added "of the evaluation".
4.1.3	E	missing comma	add comma after 'based'	Reject. A comma is not needed.
4.1.3	T	This section should specify the minimum number of profiles to be evaluated of each type.		Reject. Requirement 4.2 has specific requirements for each individual lab to have flexibility depending on the complexity of mixtures that they typically encounter in casework. Similar language is used in validation standards to not include a minimum number of samples.
4.2 f	E	In the last third of the paragraph "...including high quality and poorer quality profiles."	change to "...high quality and poor quality..."	Accept.
4.2b	E	Too many 'and's and missing comma	remove 'and' after kit; add comma after instrument	Accept.
4.2f	E	missing comma	add comma after 'contributor ratio'	Accept.

Section	Type of Comment (E-Editorial, T-Technical)	Comments	Proposed Resolution	Final Resolution
4.2f note	E	missing comma	add comma after 'types of samples'	Reject. Comma not needed.
4.4	E	use of 'technical leader'	Remove to be consistent? Also, if 'technical leader' is not used, remove from definitions	Accept with modification. Removed technical leader from sentence. Technical leader is used elsewhere in this document, so the definition will not be removed.
4.5	E	missing comma	add comma after 'discrepancy'	Accept.
5.2	E	missing comma	add comma after 'clarity'	Accept.
		<p>Reference #8 would benefit from URL to access it: [8] Kline, M.C. and Butler, J.M. "NIST Mixture Interpretation Interlaboratory Study 2005 (MIX05)" 16th International Symposium on Human Identification, 2005. Available at https://strbase.nist.gov/interlab/MIX05/MIX05poster.pdf</p> <p>Reference #11 was published in 2009 rather than 2008. The volume and page numbers are correct.</p> <p>Reference #13 is missing the volume number. It should be 37.</p>		Accept.