

Deadline of Submission of Comments: 3-Oct-22

Document Title: ASB Best Practice Recommendation 171, Best Practice Recommendations for the Management and Use of Quality Assurance DNA Elimination Databases in Forensic DNA Analysis

#	Section	Type of Comment (E-)	Comments	Proposed Resolution	Final Resolution
4	4.3	E	The "following" and the "in accordance with" make this difficult to read and the in accordance isn't really necessary as that implies a how will be described.	Simplify to wording similar to 4.7 "...comprised of profiles from the categories in 4.3.1 through 4.3.3.	Accept
5	4.3.1 e)	E	"and other" then "or other" gets wordy/confusing. Also not sure what this addition is trying to cover: other hospital personnel, other medical personnel, or just general other personnel.	Delete the extra "other": "... nurses, and other hospital staff <u>or personnel...</u> " OR Move the "and", delete the "or" and possibly add medical: "...nurses, <u>other hospital staff, and other [medical] personnel...</u> "	Accept with modification- "and other" was deleted. "or" was changed to "and"
6	4.4 f)	T	If destruction or expungement are not done, does there still need to be a policy to address all 3?	Change and to or: "f) <u>the policies for retention, destruction, or expungement of the samples, raw data, and the resultant profile.</u> " OR Separate destruction and expungement as examples in a retention policy: "f) the retention policy for the samples, raw data, and the resultant profile, <u>to include destruction and expungement if applicable "</u>	Reject- There needs to be a policy addressing each of the topics and the policy should be provided to those submitting samples to the database.
3	4.7.3	T	There should be a secondary review and approval step of all entries, modifications, and deletions made to the database, in order to prevent typos and other human errors.	Specific that the in addition to the tracking mechanism, there should be a review and approval step for all entries, modifications, and deletions made to the database.	Accept with modification- The suggestion was added to the document.
7	4.7.3	E	Reword addition. Possibly add version control back as an example.	"4.7.3 The laboratory should have a mechanism to track when samples <u>in the elimination database are entered, modified, or deleted.</u> " OR "4.7.3 The laboratory should have a mechanism, <u>such as version control, to track when samples in the elimination database are entered, modified, or deleted.</u> "	Accept
2	4.8.3	T	The results of the search (associaion or no association) should also be included in the case record, on the report summary page.	Add that labs should include a statement in the report summary about the results of search.	Reject. Recommendations to address reporting are already covered under 4.2, 4.9 and 4.10. Other documents on the OSAC Registry and in draft at OSAC also address this.
1	Bibliography		Annex A Bibliography, Reference 7 was published in 2010 not 2021 as currently listed Annex A Bibliography, Reference 8 was published in 2015 not 2017 as currently listed b Link not working	<i>CB Comment, resolution may be in comment</i>	Accepted date changes to 2010 and 2015, respectively.
8	Bibliography	Editorial	https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/249440/DNA_elimination_databases_consultation.pdf	An error in our search occurs	Link corrected.
9	Bibliography	Editorial	apointe. M. et al. "Leading-edge forensic DNA analyses and the necessity of including crime scene investigators, police officers and technicians in a DNA elimination database." <i>Forensic Science International: Genetics</i> . 2017. vol. 19. pp. 50–55.	year should be 2015	Accepted date change to 2015.