

#	Section	Type of Comment (Editorial, Technical)	Comment	Proposed Resolution	Editor or Working Group Review
1	CB Ballot Comment		This document has changed a bit from what I recall working on at OSAC. I am voting yes because I want to see this go for public comment but I do not agree that population affinity is widely accepted terminology (as others have stated).		Reject with modification: Population affinity is increasingly replacing the term ancestry in the scientific literature. This standard reflects this contemporary change in terminology. This spreadsheet includes comments and resolutions based on the first public circulation of this document. Annex A provides information on the use of these terms.
2	CB Ballot Comment		...- while I am voting yes for this document - I am perplexed with the statement that states the discipline is moving away from ancestry assessment or estimation. But this does tie more into bioanthropology and population studies/genetics.		Reject with modification: Population affinity is increasingly replacing the term ancestry in the scientific literature. This standard reflects this contemporary change in terminology. Annex A provides information on the use of these terms.
3	CB Ballot Comment		Perhaps a statement could be added to the Forward, per Diana's comment, saying that while we are putting forward this terminology (population affinity) and arguing for its relevance, we acknowledge that the term ancestry is still widely used. This would address many of the others' issues as well.		Reject with modification: Population affinity is increasingly replacing the term ancestry in the scientific literature. This standard reflects this contemporary change in terminology. The updated forward provides information on the use of these terms and does show that ancestry is still in use. (Foreword content moved to Annex A)
4	CB Ballot Comment		The term "population affinity" is not a widely used nor recognized substitution for "ancestry."		Reject with modification: Population affinity is increasingly replacing the term ancestry in the scientific literature. This standard reflects this contemporary change in terminology. Annex A provides information on the use of these terms.
5	CB Ballot Comment		I agree with others that adopting the term "population affinity" needs to be more thoroughly discussed within the field before it becomes part of a standard. Perhaps this is the direction we are moving, but I don't think we are there yet. I propose the document reverts to "ancestry."		Reject: Population affinity is increasingly replacing the term ancestry in the scientific literature. This standard reflects this contemporary change in terminology. Annex A provides information on the use of these terms.
6	CB Ballot Comment		I agree with the folks that have voted no or have abstained, population affinity is not sufficiently used in practice to be used as the term to be considered standard. I am not opposed to the term, but it is not our current standard of practice.		Reject with modification: Population affinity is increasingly replacing the term ancestry in the scientific literature. This standard reflects this contemporary change in terminology. The updated forward provides information on the use of these terms. (Foreword content moved to Annex A)
7	CB Ballot Comment		I agree with others that the use of population affinity over ancestry estimation is not yet widely used in the field, therefore establishing a standard that uses population affinity in its title seems a tad premature. I'm not opposed to the term but this seems to be trying to establish its use as standard when it isn't yet in the field.		Reject: Population affinity is increasingly replacing the term ancestry in the scientific literature. This standard reflects this contemporary change in terminology. Annex A provides information on the use of these terms. (Foreword content moved to Annex A)
8	CB Ballot Comment		I agree with xxx in that I don't oppose the term "population affinity," but I don't think it should be the title of a professional standard at the moment.		Reject: Population affinity is increasingly replacing the term ancestry in the scientific literature. This standard reflects this contemporary change in terminology. Annex A provides information on the use of these terms.
9	CB Ballot Comment	4.2.5	Section 4.2.5 Reporting refers to "Reports and/or case files". It is not clear if this is only referred to police/forensic case reports (as should be assumed considering that the document is a forensic standard). In this case, it should be beneficial to include in this section a recommendation to the practitioner to explain in their reports how the population affinity can be translated and/or compared with the obsolete classification (e.g. race). It should be considered that the reports will be used by police enforcement and other practitioners that could be less used to the anthropology definitions. It is important to consider that the reports need to help to find a match with missing person data and database, where the "population affinity" is actually expressed with different terminology.		Reject: This comment is outside of the scope of this document.

#	Section	Type of Comment (Editorial, Technical)	Comment	Proposed Resolution	Editor or Working Group Review
10	CB Ballot Comment		There is a statement which says "This shift away from the estimation of ancestry was chosen to reflect current practices in forensic anthropology and to distance this process from other disciplines'™ estimates such as DNA-based ancestry estimation." Like others have mentioned, I do not think this term reflects current practice in FA and, as such, it doesn't make sense to me to have a document that uses a term not widely adopted by the discipline. While I am not opposed to the term, I don't feel that it is widely accepted at this point.		Reject with modification: Population affinity is increasingly replacing the term ancestry in the scientific literature. This standard reflects this contemporary change in terminology. Annex A provides information on the use of these terms.
11	CB Ballot Comment		The document is currently out for public comment until next week - given the changes in terminology, I feel the need to review the comments provided by the broader discipline before voting to move on to the next step. I will echo others in saying that I do not oppose the change but also am not sure that a standard should predate general acceptance or use by the discipline.		Reject with modification: Population affinity is increasingly replacing the term ancestry in the scientific literature. This standard reflects this contemporary change in terminology. This spreadsheet includes comments and resolutions based on the first public circulation of this document. Annex A provides information on the use of these terms.
12	CB Ballot Comment		I would have raised objections about not providing a bibliography (among other things).		Reject: References are seen as an endorsement of a particular method therefore excluded from this document.
13	CB Ballot Comment		As with others, I don't oppose use of the term "population affinity," but I think a standard should recognize that it is not a widely used terminology in the field to date.		Reject with modification: Population affinity is increasingly replacing the term ancestry in the scientific literature. This standard reflects this contemporary change in terminology. Annex A provides information on the use of these terms.
23	Title/document	T	Adopting the term "population affinity" needs to be more thoroughly discussed within the field before it becomes part of a standard. I propose the document reverts to "ancestry."	Revert the document from "population affinity" back to "ancestry"	Reject: The title reflects the terminology used in this document.
25	Foreword/Entire Document	T	I am not opposed to the term "population affinity" but I'm not sure it is widely accepted in the field at this point in time. A Standard should be the current minimum requirement, and this seems to impose a shift in terminology onto practitioners without their participation in the discussion; a small group of people at ASB does not necessarily represent the entire discipline.	I think there should be a Standard for estimating ancestry (current practice), and a Best Practices Recommendation for estimating population affinity (aspired). This will signal a desired change in terminology/scope and hopefully spur more discussion and input from forensic anthropologists beyond the ASB working group	Reject with modification: Population affinity is increasingly replacing the term ancestry in the scientific literature. This standard reflects this contemporary change in terminology. This spreadsheet includes comments and resolutions based on the first public circulation of this document. Annex A provides information on the use of these terms.
24	Foreword	E	I believe the parenthetical should lead readers to definition of 'population affinity' which is 3.6 not 3.5	Change "(see 3.5)" to "(see 3.6)"	Reject: The reference is correct as it refers to the definition for population. (Foreword content moved to Annex A)
26	Foreword	E	"deep" is an odd word choice to modify time	replace "deep" with "remote"	Accept (Foreword content moved to Annex A)
27	Foreword	T	There should be clarification that in that the document is intended to assist forensic anthropologists in estimating population affinity, it does so only by providing very broad procedural guidelines., reaffirmed later in the Scope section.	State that the document only provides broad procedural guidelines. Add language from the scope section - Specific methods and techniques are not included.	Reject: This information is included in the scope. Annex A (previously the content from the Foreword) is provided for background information.
22	Forward	T	"The dynamic nature of research and consensus in this area precludes listing specific methods and techniques." see above comment about an annex. Is this sentence really necessary?	Tone this sentence down and include a references section. Science without references is not science.	Accept with modification: This sentence was revised. (Foreword content moved to Annex A)
32	3.2	T	Specify as "Quantitative" data to clearly differentiate that these data are actually measured (vs. a relative assessment of size/shape)	modify definition	Accept
28	4.1 General	T	Too general to simply allude to the valid methods that estimation should be based on, does not provide meaningful guidance.	Provide at least examples of the leading peer-reviewed, published and validated methods that contain the procedures for recording data and are based on reference samples.	Reject: Based on not endorsing any particular method.
29	4.2.1 General	T	Not enough to say that there should be an associated degree of certainty for each method.	Suggest whether or not there is a preferred quantitative analysis or what guidance there is for a preferred quantitative analysis. Interobserver and intraobserver error rates must be reported with citations to applicable studies. A statement of acknowledgement must be reported where the error rates are unknown	Reject: This recommendation is outside of the scope of this document. This suggestion is appropriate for a reporting document.

#	Section	Type of Comment (Editorial, Technical)	Comment	Proposed Resolution	Editor or Working Group Review
14	4.1	T	Define, "well-defined" when discussing "objectively recording well-defined data (cranial and dental measurements, coordinate data, and non-metric data, etc.) measurements, coordinate data, and non-metric data, etc.),	this could be as simple as stating "well-defined traits or measurements" should have written descriptions assisted with line drawings or photographs. I would argue that it should minimally have a written description with another exemplar (photo, line drawing) with it be well defined	Accept: 3rd sentence added to 1st paragraph for clarity.
15	4.1	T	"The estimation of population affinity shall be based on peer-reviewed, published, and validated methods that have procedures for objectively recording well-defined data (cranial and dental measurements, coordinate data, and non-metric data, etc.), which are based on reference samples appropriate to the case (e.g., contemporaneous)." This sentence does not necessarily make sense. are the methods that have procedures based on reference samples, or contain appropriate reference samples?	Wordsmith the sentence to indicate that the selected methods should have clear cut (well-defined") objective recording standards, and that those standards have been applied to a series of reference populations contained therein. Might be best to break the sentence into two ideas.	Accept: 1st paragraph was updated for clarity.
16	4.1	T	"Appreciation of the statistical foundations of the methods used provides an understanding of their advantages and limitations' This sentence suggests that you might want to understand what you are doing before doing it. But perhaps that should be said in plain english with either a "should" or a "shall"?"	"Methods often use a variety of statistical treatments/parameters, from simple to complex. The practitioner should have a strong working knowledge of the statistical parameters used in a method prior to employing it."	Accept
17	4.1	T	Given that ancestry estimates get better when other biological estimates are known, should that be noted in this general section? E.g. Estimating ancestry after sex is almost always preferable.	Add a line in 4.1 that indicates that other biological parameters should be taken into account if/when estimating ancestry, if possible.	Accept with modification: Last sentence added to 1st paragraph in response to this recommendation.
18	4.2.4	T	"As with any other single parameter of the biological profile, population affinity should not be used as the sole basis for exclusion." This seems to be outside of the "jurisdiction" of the anthropologist. Suggest removing the statement.	remove or qualify this statement.	Accept: Last sentence revised for clarity.
30	4.2.4	T	Vague to say practitioner shall have certain considerations without giving any guidance about what is involved in these considerations.	Provide examples of what considerations should be made.	Reject: adding examples will narrow the scope of this section.
19	4.2.5	T	The Reporting section is problematic. There are no directions on how and where things are reported, who keeps the raw notes/data, how long these things are kept, whether or not it should be digital or hard copy, how things are authenticated, etc. It should indicate the process of identifying the repository of record/agency of record, and that should be decided in advance of closing the process.	This section really needs to be fleshed out appropriately, OR it needs to call to another Standard on "Reporting Requirements" for Anthropology. Since this has no teeth, there is nothing anyone can say if they didn't retain notes, file notes, etc. In general, the reporting section needs work, and I think the WG should examine this in detail.	Reject: This recommendation is outside of the scope of this document. This suggestion is appropriate for a reporting document.
20	4.2.5	T	"Current methods do not include global forensic samples;" This statement is not true and should be qualified. Current methods DO include global forensic samples, just not many of them.	Statement should reflect something of a nature that not "all" populations can be in a single analysis or method, and therefore, caution should be extended to the reporting of the population affinity.	Accept with modification: 2nd paragraph was edited for clarity.
31	4.2.5	T	Include reporting requirements consistent with NFS recommendations	Records should be created contemporaneous with the examination of evidence and the technical review that, along with the FSSPs' [Forensic Science Service Provider] quality management system documents relating to the forensic work performed, would allow another analyst or scientist, with proper training and experience, to understand and evaluate all the work performed and independently analyze and interpret the data and draw conclusions. See National Commission on Forensic Science, Recommendation to the Attorney General, Documentation, Case Record and Report Contents. Adopted 2016. Reference the ASTM E620 report on Standard Practice for Reporting Opinions of Scientific or Technical Experts. See ASTM Committee Report E620-18, Published April 2018	Reject: This recommendation is outside of the scope of this document. This suggestion is appropriate for a reporting document.
21	Annex A	T	there is no annex A, and there could be. I see no reason why some possible references for computer based programs couldn't be listed in an annex for method choice. While these are not "normative" leaving them out seems shortsighted.	I'm pretty certain the primary ones are well known to the WG -- Fordisc, 3d-id, cranID, hu(MAN)id, rASUDAS, etc.	Reject: References are seen as an endorsement of a particular method therefore excluded from this document.