

Comment Deadline: November 14, 2022

ASB 172, Standard for Examination of Mechanical Checkwriters and Their Impressions

#	Type of Comment (E-Editorial T-Technical)	Comments	Proposed Resolution	Final Resolutions
1	T	The HFTG strongly supports the added statement that "The FDE should strive to avoid exposure to task irrelevant information." However, the statement alone does not give FDEs any guidance on what they can do identify task irrelevant information and specific steps they can take to either avoid exposure or minimize the task irrelevant information on their analysis. We suggest some additional text to provide more concrete guidance.	Examiners should keep in mind that the interpretation of impressions has the potential to be influenced by contextual information provided by the submitter. In communications with the submitter, the FDE should define as clearly as possible the specific question(s) to be answered and the alternative hypotheses or conclusions to be distinguished. The FDE should then design the examination to determine whether the features of the checkwriter impressions are sufficient to distinguish between those alternatives, independent of contextual information provided by the submitter. FDEs should fully document the information they received and communications they had prior to conducting their analysis.	Reject: We agree that this is an important topic that is applicable to all forensic applications and while worthy of consideration is too broad to address here. This topic has been addressed to the extent appropriate to this standard in Section 4.4.1.
2	T	same as above	Useful tool for identifying potential sources of bias in an examination and ways to mitigate the effects of biasing information: Quigley-McBride, A., Dror, I.E., Roy, T., Garrett, B.L., & Kukucka, J. (2022) A practical tool for information management in forensic decisions: Using Linear Sequential Unmasking-Expanded (LSU-E) in casework. Forensic Science International: Synergy, 4, 1100216. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fsisyn.2022.100216 ; worksheet available Quigley-McBride, A., Dror, I., Roy, T., Garrett, B. L., & Kukucka, J. (2022, May 4). A Practical Tool for Information Management in Forensic Decisions: Using Linear Sequential Unmasking-Expanded (LSU-E) in Casework. Retrieved from osf.io/xm3ru	Reject: We agree that this is an important topic that is applicable to all forensic applications and while worthy of consideration is too broad to address here. This topic has been addressed to the extent appropriate to this standard in Section 4.4.1.
3	T	The proposed revision is not accurate and can be highly misleading in some circumstances. Where the available information or features are not sufficient to differentiate the alternative hypotheses, the results are indeterminate. That is different from evidence that sufficient to actually tests the likelihood of each hypothesis and conclude that they are equally likely.	When the evidence is limited and cannot resolve the alternative hypotheses, the appropriate summary of the evidence is "indeterminate" or "inconclusive". No affirmative conclusions can be made, including an assertion that the hypotheses are equally supported.	Reject: This is a minor differentiation in wording that is addressed in the required limitation statements.
4	T	same as above (4.9.2.5)	same as above (4.9.2.5)	Reject: This is a minor differentiation in wording that is addressed in the required limitation statements.