

Deadline of Submission of Comments: 13-Feb-23
Document Number: ANSI/ASB Std 147
Document Title: Standard for Analyzing Skeletal Trauma in Forensic Anthropology

#	Section	Type of Comment (E-Editorial, T-Technical)	Comments	Proposed Resolution	Final Resolution
1	4.1	T	Why "when possible"? If you are doing a skeletal trauma examination, these are the required steps.	Remove "when possible."	Accept with modification: "Skeletal trauma examination shall be based on gross, microscopic, radiographic, photographic and/or other observations, and analyzed using peer-reviewed published methods when these modalities/publications are applicable and available."
6	4.1	E	peer reviewed published methods"	should be "peer-reviewed, published methods"	Accept
4	4.1	T	The last version noted that only "scientifically validated" methods should be used but didn't explain what constitutes scientific validation. This version has been changed to say that "[w]hen possible, skeletal trauma examination shall be based on gross, microscopic, radiographic, photographic, and/or other observations and analyzed using peer reviewed published methods." Some LTG members' new concerns are that it's no longer required to use a scientifically validated or peer reviewed or published method. Are there times when this isn't possible? Such as, if the examiner wants to do an analysis but doesn't have access to such materials? Shouldn't the examiner just not do the analysis?	Change to: "Skeletal trauma examination shall be based on a validated method of using gross, microscopic, radiographic, photographic, and/or other observations and shall be analyzed using peer reviewed published methods. A validated method is one that has been shown through empirical study to accurately do what it purports to do, e.g., accurately identify the type of trauma it claims to identify."	Accept with modification: "Skeletal trauma examination shall be based on gross, microscopic, radiographic, photographic and/or other observations, and analyzed using peer-reviewed, published methods when these modalities/publications are applicable and available."
7	4.3.3	E	"(e.g. wedge, buckle)"	needs a comma: "(e.g., wedge, buckle)"	Accept
2	4.3.4	T	Should it be extremities and/or neck?	"particularly, if <u>regions around the</u> extremities and/or head are affected."	Accept with modification: "...particularly if the head, neck, and/or extremities are affected." deleted
3	5	T	Since blast trauma involves more than just the skeleton, I would hesitate to <u>require</u> forensic anthropologists to "classify" injuries as blast trauma, especially since they are only examining one organ. There are injuries to many organ systems which occur during blast trauma. In my opinion, a definitive classification should be done by the forensic pathologist. I think that stopping at "the injuries are consistent with blast trauma" is sufficient. In this way, if a practitioner is not comfortable with making a definitive statement about the injury mechanism, they are not bound to do so.	"When the trauma pattern is consistent with a blast event, the trauma mechanism <u>may</u> be classified as "blast trauma"."	Accept with modification: "Blast/explosive events often cause blunt (including concussive) and projectile trauma to the body--in these cases, the trauma mechanism should be described as being consistent with "blast trauma."
5	overall	E	Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of our past comments. We appreciate the time that goes into these redlined versions.		Accept: thanks for taking the time to comment on the document.