

#	Section	Updated Section	Type of Comment (E-Editorial, T-Technical)	Comment	Proposed Resolution	Final Resolution
22				I agree with Allysha that a slight change in wording may be more inclusive. I don't always complete a biological profile if there is a tentative ID and/or the remains are not completely skeletonized while awaiting DNA.		Accept: Last sentence in section 4.1 deleted
23				I agree with Allysha's comments, as well. And I think that many practitioners are reacting unfavorably to the term "population affinity" so will be out of compliance even with just the name change.		Accept: Last sentence in section 4.1 deleted
24				I agree with previous comments. It is not very often that we have an individual with no tentative identity that we complete a full bio profile on.		Accept: Last sentence in section 4.1 deleted
26				I agree very much with Allysha's comment, and would echo her suggestion for a rewording.		Accept: Last sentence in section 4.1 deleted
27				As a "producer", I do not actively estimate population affinity. However, upon reviewing the document I support Allysha's suggestion.		Accept: Last sentence in section 4.1 deleted
28				My apologies to the WG, who are probably so sick of seeing this comment! I originally posted it on December's "Comment Resolutions" ballot, but per my correspondence with Linda and Teresa, this "Recirculation" ballot is the appropriate place to comment it. I'm copying it here: This is great overall, and I like the restructuring. However, there's one comment resolution that I have an issue with. It's in Section 4.1 General, where there's a statement that now reads: "Even if DNA or other samples will be taken, estimation of population affinity from skeletal remains shall be performed." This has been rephrased from a previous version, "Estimation of population affinity from skeletal remains shall be performed even if DNA or other samples will be taken." I know the difference is subtle, but to me, the new version sounds more forceful—like a mandate to do population affinity in every case—rather than just saying, "you should be doing an anthropological affinity estimate even if there's also going to be a genetic ancestry test done," which I think is the intention. I guess I'm just not comfortable with the "shall" here, because it seems to imply that population affinity must be estimated in every case. With some practitioners now abstaining from pop affinity altogether, this strong "shall" statement would put them out of compliance. I'm not certain that we want to do that. Could we instead say "If population affinity is to be estimated from skeletal remains in a particular case, that estimate shall be performed even if DNA or other samples will be taken." Or some such? Thoughts???		Accept: Last sentence in section 4.1 deleted
4	1		E	I don't think the comma between "remains" and "when" is necessary in the last sentence.	Remove comma	Accept: the comment is accepted as-is
11	3.5	3.4	T	The word "biological" limits the definition of "population," as the anthropological concept of human populations includes other distinguishing factors, such as sociocultural identifiers and geographic location. The argument that using the word "biological" limits the definition of "population" is further supported by a statement in Annex A: "...reference samples (i.e., populations) grouped in a variety of ways (social race, nationality, ethnicity, and others)."	Change "...that share biological characteristics" to "...that share observable characteristics."	Accept with modification: The word biological was deleted to solve the issue.
6	3.6	3.5	T	the definition of population affinity uses the word measure but throughout the document population affinity is described as an estimation - this definition would be more consistent with the document content by replacing measure with estimation and the definition could then be useable by microscopists who may estimate ancestry/population affinity from hair	change measure to estimation in the definition of population affinity	Reject: The WG group discussed this and determined measure was correct as you need a measure to make an estimation. The word biological was deleted.
1	4.1		T	The last line "...estimation of population affinity... shall be performed" indicates that this is a requirement in all cases, when it may not be relevant to all cases (such as a case of identified remains submitted for trauma analysis). I think I understand the sentiment (not rely on DNA?) but it is out of place. I do not think you can have a standard that requires this for all cases. Moreover, none of the other standards mandate that a biological parameter SHALL be estimated.	Delete sentence.	Accept
7	4.1		E	Awkward wording of first sentence: "shall be based on" ... ""which are based on"	delete comma and which after "methods" and replace with "that"	Accept with modification. The suggested wording/commenter's recommendation has been modified by the working group for better clarity.

#	Section	Updated Section	Type of Comment (E-Editorial, T-Technical)	Comment	Proposed Resolution	Final Resolution
13	4.1		T	The phrase "methods, which are based on reference samples appropriate to the case (e.g., contemporaneous)" is obscure. A method may use reference samples, but how can it be <i>based</i> on them and nothing else? What is supposed to be "contemporaneous" to what? How can mere temporal propinquity make reference samples appropriate?	Explain what "makes reference samples appropriate to the case." Also, add a bibliography that gives examples of the "peer-reviewed, published, and validated methods" that would satisfy this section.	Reject with modification. It is outside of the scope of this document to address best practices regarding appropriate reference samples. Anthropology does not included a bibliography nor does it endorse particular methods in the standards.
14	4.1		T	"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." The phrase "treatments/parameters" is awkward. What is a complex parameter? The parameters in a statistical model are unknown quantities that are estimated from the data. How can a practitioner have a strong working knowledge of what is unknown?	Replace with "Methods often include statistical analysis of data on skeletal remains. Practitioners shall be knowledgeable about the statistical techniques and the theory that underlies them."	Accept
18	4.1		T	"Even if DNA or other samples will be taken, estimation of population affinity from skeletal remains shall be performed." This statement does not acknowledge practitioners who work at the pleasure of medical examiners/coroners that may request specific services (age estimation only, for example).	Make the mandate conditional. "should be performed". Add "for this purpose" after "taken"	Reject. Last sentence in section 4.1 was deleted.
20	4.1			I agree with the comments of Allysha and others about 4.1, and would suggest that the statement could include a "should" and "when appropriate" to allow more flexibility for individual agencies, practitioners, and case circumstances. Suggested wording: "In cases where an estimate of population affinity is required, estimates from skeletal remains should be performed when appropriate, even if DNA or other samples will be analyzed."		Reject. Last sentence in section 4.1 was deleted.
21	4.1			I agree with revising the wording in 4.1 as articulated by Allysha Winburn in the voter comments.		Reject. Last sentence in section 4.1 was deleted.
25	4.1			I also have big issue with that last sentence in 4.1. Similar to Julie's comment I only do a full bio profile when we dont have a tentative ID. The way it is currently worded suggests we do full write up regardless of the kind of case we are doing, and some of us do not have that kind of time.   I support Allysha's comment and I suggest she changes her vote to No so her Abstaining will be counted as such.		Reject. Last sentence in section 4.1 was deleted.
19	4.1 General		T	A statement in this revision reads: "Even if DNA or other samples will be taken, estimation of population affinity from skeletal remains shall be performed." This has been rephrased from a previous version, "Estimation of population affinity from skeletal remains shall be performed even if DNA or other samples will be taken." I know the difference is subtle, but to me, the new version sounds more forceful—like a mandate to do population affinity in every case—rather than just saying, "you should be doing an anthropological affinity estimate even if there's also going to be a genetic ancestry test done," which I think is the intention. I guess I'm just not comfortable with the "shall" here, because it seems to imply that population affinity must be estimated in every case. With some practitioners now abstaining from pop affinity altogether, this strong "shall" statement would put them out of compliance. I'm not certain that we want to do that.	Could we instead say "If population affinity is to be estimated from skeletal remains in a particular case, that estimate shall be performed even if DNA or other samples will be taken." Or merely replace the "shall" with "should."	Reject. Last sentence in section 4.1 was deleted.
2	4.2.4		T	The revised wording of the NOTE-1 is confusing (and I believe requires grammatical editing?). How does one "establish method selection"?	Revise. For example: "Factors potentially relevant to method selection include..."	Accept with modification. Deleted note. Modified first sentence of the Note and moved it to the last bullet point of section 4.2.4. Modified second sentence of the note was moved to section 4.2.5 reporting.
3	4.2.4		T	Is "population allocation" (in NOTE-2) the same as "population affinity"? Should be clarified.	If they are the same, then replace "allocation" with "affinity." If they are different, define "population allocation."	Accept with modification. Deleted note. Modified first sentence of the Note and moved it to the last bullet point of section 4.2.4. Modified second sentence of the note was moved to section 4.2.5 reporting.
5	4.2.4		E	Insert colon after both "NOTE"s	Insert colons	Reject. The "Note" was deleted. ASB format does not use a colon after notes.
8	4.2.4		T	first sentence is extraordinarily broad and does not appear to be informative. What should method selection be prioritized over?	clarify. Perhaps merge this with the first NOTE and state that the practitioner shall consider potentially confounding factors when selecting a method	Accept. Deleted first note and modified first sentence.

#	Section	Updated Section	Type of Comment (E-Editorial, T-Technical)	Comment	Proposed Resolution	Final Resolution
9	4.2.4		E	first sentence of first NOTE is awkwardly written	see above comment about merging with ambiguous first sentence of 4.2.4, or, split the first sentence of the first NOTE into two sentences. "Many factors may potentially confound method selection. Socio-economic status, secular change, pathological conditions, trauma, taphonomy, and biomechanical demands on the skeleton should be considered."	Accept with modification. Deleted first note and modified first sentence.
10	4.2.4		E	Not all bullet points are specific to reporting levels of specificity	reword: "The practitioner shall consider the following when reporting population affinity estimates:"	Accept with modification: Deleted first note and modified first sentence.
15	4.2.4		E	The sentence "The practitioner shall prioritize method selection" is obscure. "Prioritize" means to list or rate in order of priority. The selection of a method should receive priority over what? Or is the sentence intended to say that when several methods are available, all of them should be ranked in some way?	State the things that are to be prioritized.	Accept with modification: Deleted first note and modified first sentence.
12	Annex A		T	Statements that population affinity "can include both social and/or biological groupings" and that "this document does not endorse races as valid biological categories" are contradicted by other statements, such as "population affinity estimation is a component of the biological profile typically developed for comparison to the physical description of a missing person," that population affinity is estimated from "complete or partial adult skeletal material," and that "the estimation of population affinity is based on skeletal phenotypic variation...which results from microevolutionary mechanisms."	Change "...a component of the biological profile..." to "a component of an anthropological assessment." Change "...the physical description of a missing person" to "the description of a missing person." Change "...from complete or partial adult skeletal material" to "...from complete or partial adult human remains." Remove or revise for consistency "the estimation of population affinity is based on skeletal phenotypic variation (see 3.4) which results from microevolutionary mechanisms over time (both recent and remote) and space (from broad to microregional)."	Reject with modification. Replaced skeletal remains with human remains. Deleted phenotypic, which addressed the comment.
16	Annex A		E/T	The appendix offers a rationale for using the phrase "population affinity" (basically that "population affinity" is a more palatable or broader term than a phrase such as "biogeographic ancestry"). Whether or not membership in purely social groups can be discerned from skeletal remains, the appendix does not clarify statements in the body of this standard, but it hints at why this very short and abstract standard was drafted. That explanation is not an afterthought for an appendix. It belongs in § 4.1 ("general").	Place the rationale for changing from earlier terms in the general section (4.1) and eliminate the appendix. Provide a citation there (or in the appendix if this recommendation is rejected) to a bibliography that supports the "shift away from the estimation of ancestry ... to reflect publication trends and practices."	Reject: This comment is outside of the scope of this document.
17	Annex A		E/T	The appendix explicitly states "This document does not address races as valid biological categories." This is an important assertion. A slight edit to shift plural to singular makes this more reflective of common parlance, and changing "does not address" to "does not endorse" makes the meaning clearer. (The standard seems to be more than just an observation about what the document does; it seems to be an assertion that one should not read in any endorsement of race as a biological category.) It would also be helpful to expand this caveat to include "ethnicity," which often gets conflated with race.	Rewrite to say "This document does not endorse race or ethnicity as valid biological categories."	Reject: This comment is outside of the scope of this document.