

Public Comments Deadline: September 12, 2022

ASB Standard 132, *Standard for Population Affinity Estimation in Forensic Anthropology*

#	Section	Type of Comment	Comment	Proposed Resolution	Editor or Working Group Review	Final Resolution
6	3.2	E		replace the word 'incorporates'	replace with 'describes' or 'captures'	Reject: comment made on non-redline portion
7	3.3	T	definition of non-metric data does not provide a clear picture of what is meant by 'non-metric' data (unless this is a technical term within the field of Anthropology)	Possibly replace with qualitative data or give an example for 'discrete or macromorphoscopic trait'	Reject: comment made on non-redline portion and it is specific to anthropology	Reject: comment made on non-redline portion and it is specific to anthropology
1	3.4	T	The deletion of "biological" from this definition would appear to render it nonsensical.	Rewrite to specify what characteristics (linguistic and/or cultural and/or geographical and/or biological etc.) matter for determining population.	Accept: Individuals grouped by shared factors such as geography, biology, culture, language, etc.	Accept: Individuals grouped by shared factors such as geography, biology, culture, language, etc.
8	3.6	T		Definition of reference group is unclear	possibly add an example	Reject: comment made on non-redline portion
2	4.1	T	Asserting that practitioners "shall be knowledgeable" does not provide any basis for standardization as there is no means specified for establishing and demonstrating knowledge. And it is not clear what statistical techniques they should be knowledgeable about--all of them? The ones being used in analysis? There are often multiple theories that undergird statistics methods so which one(s) are the practitioners responsible for knowing and why?	Revisions should clarify all of this, and should especially make clear what is meant by "knowledgeable."	Accept with modification for clarification: Practitioners shall be knowledgeable about the statistical techniques employed (e.g., discriminant function analysis), including underlying theories (e.g., limitations and results interpretation).	Accept with modification for clarification: Practitioners shall be knowledgeable about the statistical techniques employed (e.g., discriminant function analysis), including underlying theories (e.g., limitations and results interpretation).
9	4.1	E		the term 'well-defined' data is unclear	possibly replace with 'quantifiable'	Reject: comment made on non-redline portion.
10	4.1	E		analysis of data on skeletal remains'	possibly replace with 'analyses of data on skeletal remains'	Accept
11	4.1	E		'...about the statistical techniques and the theory that underlies them'	possibly replace with '...about the statistical techniques and their underlying theories'	Accept with modification for clarification: Practitioners shall be knowledgeable about the statistical techniques employed (e.g., discriminant function analysis), including underlying theories (e.g., limitations and results interpretation).
12	4.1	E		...and recovered skeletal elements, the methods applied are..."	possibly replace with '...and recovered skeletal elements, the specific methods applied are...'	Reject: comment made on non-redline portion.
13	4.1	T	Population affinity should be estimated independently of suspected or presumptive identification to minimize bias." What type of bias?	possibly specify the type of bias (cognitive/contextual/confirmation/all types of cognitive biases). See HF guidance document on biases	Accept with modification: Population affinity should be estimated independently of suspected or presumptive identification to minimize confirmation bias.	Accept with modification: Population affinity should be estimated independently of suspected or presumptive identification to minimize confirmation bias.
14	4.2.2	T	related to comment 2: what exactly is non-metric data (is it for example categorical data?) and how would quantitative analyses (c) be conducted on non-metric data?	Clarify 'non-metric' data	Reject: comment made on non-redline portion.	Reject: comment made on non-redline portion.
15	4.2.4	T	When considering potentially confounding factors in method selection could other outside information, such as case information be considered a potentially confounding factor in method selection?	possibly add outside/case information to the list of confounding factors	Reject. The list is not meant to be all inclusive.	Reject. The list is not meant to be all inclusive.
3	Annex A	E	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 is manner that forensic anthropology addresses this	Reject: This is manner that forensic anthropology addresses this