

Deadline of Submission of Comments: 8-Dec-25
Document Number: ASB Std 188
Document Title: Standard for Processing Evidence for the Detection of Friction Ridge Impressions

Comment #	Text Line # (s)	Document Section	Type of Comment E-Editorial T-Technical	Current Document Wording	Proposed Revision	Revision Justification	For Working Group and Consensus Body use only, not to be	
							Working Group Resolution	Final Resolution
1		forward	E	This document is the recommended broad class processing techniques to be applied when processing evidence for the detection of friction ridge impressions.	This document specifies (or establishes) broad-class processing techniques for the detection of friction ridge impressions.	I know 2nd round isn't open to sections already balloted, but....the comment is editorial to fix the awkward. Just a suggestion. The sentence construction is grammatically odd because its suggesting the document itself is the processing techniques. Also...this is listed as a standard so you shouldnt state in the forward that the document is full of recommendations.	Accept.	
2		4.2	E	"The FSP shall apply processing techniques in the sequences (i.e., sequential processing) from least destructive..."	"The FSP shall apply processing techniques in a sequence (i.e., sequential processing) from least destructive..."	Change the word "the sequences" to "a sequence." The phrase "the sequences" made sense in the original version of the doc when it said "the sequences prescribed in this document." Once that got taken out, "a sequence" makes more sense.	Accept.	
3		4.3	t	"... and communicate those concerns to the stakeholder."	Remove the need to communicate each potential negative impact (use of ALS, etc.)	Communicating these concerns in every case is not efficient and would create a large amount of communication for every case.	Accept with modification. 4.3 and 4.3.1 have been reworded to clarify communication policy.	
4		4.3 through 4.3.1	t	"shall assess the potential for negative implication to other types of examinations and communicate those concerns"	A standard needs to be written in order of tasks. 1) assess 2) document 3) communicate. Currently it lists items in order of 1) 3) and then 2). Change these requirements to	4.3.1 is listed as a subcategory of 4.3 yet it is not listed in 4.3.	Accept. 4.3 reworded.	
5		4.3.1	E	Communication with the stakeholder regarding negative implications shall be documented. Some potential negative implications to consider are as follows. a) Forensic light source(s), such as short-wave ultraviolet (UV) light source, and the potential negative impact on DNA examinations. b) Cyanoacrylate dye stains and the potential negative impact on adhesive side processing, questioned documents, drug chemistry, and trace evidence examinations. c) Porous chemical processing and the potential negative impact on thermal paper and	Consider separating out the first sentence of "Communication with the stakeholder regarding negative implications shall be documented" into a separate subsection as 4.3.2.	The primary section of 4.3 brings up the concept of assessing potential negative implications to other types of evidence. The sentence "Some potential negative implications to consider are as follows" and subsequent A through D list are the natural next thought. Inserting the requirement to document communication in between them sort of interrupts the flow. Putting it as 4.3.2 feels like a more natural place and concluding thought to the section.	Accept with modification. 4.3 and 4.3.1 have been reworded to clarify communication policy.	
6		4.4	t	"The appropriate method for digital capture...."	It is unclear what is meant by "the appropriate method for digital capture" - Remove as ambiguous and therefore has no meaning.		Reject with modification. 4.4 has been reworded to clarify.	
7		4.4	t	"The appropriate method for digital capture of the friction ridge impressions is up to the FSP."	"... is up to the FSP" is a requirement. Rewrite as a shall statement.		Accept.	
8		5.1.1 (has to do with the change in 5.2-5.6)	t	"The broad class of sequences to be applied are..."	What are 'broad class of sequences' compared to the sequences in sections 5.2-5.6? 5.1.1 is a recommendation (a should statement) while 5.2-5.6 are requirements (minimum requirements). However, the difference between these sections is confusing because they seem to be the same. Please clarify 'what is recommended' vs 'what is required'.	The change in 5.2 from a recommendation to a requirement effects section 5.1.1, as it now appears that 5.1.1 and 5.2 conflict (one says it is a recommendation while the other says it is a requirement).	Accept. Reworded 5.1.1 to "shall be used" to clarify it is a requirement. And added "an FSP shall perform" for 5.2 through 5.6.	
9		5.1.2	e	"In those situations..."	Change to "In these situations..."	The style guide recommends "use present tense predominantly minimizing the use of past and future tense"	Accept.	
10		5.1.2	e	"In those situations..."	Remove "in those situations" and Rewrite to state, "Processing techniques shall be chosen for the most relevant substrate.		Reject with modification. 5.1.2 has been reworded to "in these situations".	
11		5.2	E	The following is the minimum processing sequence for non-porous items.	The following is the minimum processing sequence an FSP shall perform for non-porous items.	Current wording doesn't contain an actual recommendation. Unsure if current wording qualifies as an "imperative sentence" as described by ASB style guidelines as an alternative to a "shall" statement. If not, consider the suggested reword to add a "shall"	Accept. Added "an FSP shall perform" for 5.2 through 5.6	
12		5.2	E	Processing evidence for the detection of friction ridge impressions	The following processing sequence shall be used for non-porous items. Deviations are permitted when justified and documented.	The word minimum is creating an issue in my mind. 1- It sounds a bit awkward. "Minimum" implies quantity. 2- The list consists of steps but those steps must be done in order since they go in order from least destructive to most destructive. Simply stating "minimum" doesn't convey order; just that it must be done. 3- "Minimum makes me wonder if these steps required or are the least I must do since "minimum" inherently means its the least that can be done, when more steps can be done (expected to be done). 4- "Minimum" can be interpreted like those steps all need to be done, even if not needed, because those are the minimum I need to do. 5Also, "minimum makes me wonder if these steps required or are the least I must do since "minimum" inherently means its the least that can be done, when more steps can be done (expected to be done). 5- "Minimum sequence" used together is also at odds because, "Sequence" refers to an order of operations but "Minimum" refers to the least amount required. So I ask, Minimum what? Minimum number of steps? Minimum order? Minimum requirement? The suggestion I made cuts through the ambiguity. The steps must be done in order, and if there is something that cant be done, you need to document why.	Accept with modification. Added "an FSP shall perform" for 5.2 through 5.6	

13		5.2 and 5.3	t	Does not list visual as part of the sequences, however, this is listed as a requirement in section 4.2.	If visual is needed between sequences, as stated in section 4.2, the need to be listed in sections 5,2 and 5,3		Reject with modification. We reworded the visual requirement from 4.2 and made a new bullet point 5.1.4.
14		5.2-5.6	t	"The following is the minimum processing sequence..."	Reword to be shall statements or move to an annex.	These are informative as written. If intended to be a requirement then write the entries as requirements.	Accept. Added "an FSP shall perform" for 5.2 through 5.6
15		5.2-5.6	t	"a) visual"	Remove the word 'processing' from the statement.	The step of performing a visual exam is not 'processing' an item. It is a required step prior to processing.	Reject. We reworded the visual requirement from 4.2 and made a new bullet point 5.1.4.
16		5.3	E	The following is the minimum processing sequence for porous items.	The following is the minimum processing sequence an FSP shall perform for porous items.	Current wording doesn't contain an actual recommendation. Unsure if current wording qualifies as an "imperative sentence" as described by ASB style guidelines as an alternative to a "shall" statement. If not, consider the suggested reword to add a "shall."	Accept.
17		5.3	E	The following is the minimum processing sequence for porous items	The following processing sequence shall be used for porous items. Deviations are permitted when justified and documented.	The word minimum is creating an issue in my mind. 1- It sounds a bit awkward. "Minimum" implies quantity. 2- The list consists of steps but those steps must be done in order since they go in order from least destructive to most destructive. Simply stating "minimum" doesn't convey order; just that it must be done. 3- "Minimum" makes me wonder if these steps required or are the least I must do since "minimum" inherently means its the least that can be done, when more steps can be done (expected to be done). 4- "Minimum" can be interpreted like those steps all need to be done, even if not needed, because those are the minimum I need to do. 5 Also, "minimum" makes me wonder if these steps required or are the least I must do since "minimum" inherently means its the least that can be done, when more steps can be done (expected to be done). 5- "Minimum sequence" used together is also at odds because, "Sequence" refers to an order of operations but "Minimum" refers to the least amount required. So I ask, Minimum what? Minimum number of steps? Minimum order? Minimum requirement? The suggestion I made cuts through the ambiguity. The steps must be done in order, and if there is something that can't be done, you need to document why.	Accept with modification. Added "an FSP shall perform" for 5.2 through 5.6
18		5.3 c	T	Amino acid reagents: 1,2-Indanedione followed by Ninhydrin.	Amino acid reagent: 1,2-Indanedione.	188_Std_Ballot01 stated "Amino acid reagent: 1,2-Indanedione." Then, 188_Std_Ballot02 added "followed by Ninhydrin." The only comment received for 5.3 c) requested that the requirement be made less specific (i.e., only state "amino acid reagent" and not a specific process.). The comment resolution does not provide justification as to why "followed by Ninhydrin" was added. Recommendation is to either revert back to the language from Ballot01 or to provide justification as to why "followed by Ninhydrin" was added as a minimum requirement.	Accept with modification. Section 5.3c and 5.4e have been reworded
19		5.4	E	The following is the minimum processing sequence for semi-porous items.	The following is the minimum processing sequence an FSP shall perform for semi-porous items.	Current wording doesn't contain an actual recommendation. Unsure if current wording qualifies as an "imperative sentence" as described by ASB style guidelines as an alternative to a "shall" statement. If not, consider the suggested reword to add a "shall."	Accept. Added "an FSP shall perform" for 5.2 through 5.6
20		5.4	E	The following is the minimum processing sequence for semi-porous items	The following processing sequence shall be used for semi-porous items. Deviations are permitted when justified and documented.	The word minimum is creating an issue in my mind. 1- It sounds a bit awkward. "Minimum" implies quantity. 2- The list consists of steps but those steps must be done in order since they go in order from least destructive to most destructive. Simply stating "minimum" doesn't convey order; just that it must be done. 3- "Minimum" makes me wonder if these steps required or are the least I must do since "minimum" inherently means its the least that can be done, when more steps can be done (expected to be done). 4- "Minimum" can be interpreted like those steps all need to be done, even if not needed, because those are the minimum I need to do. 5 Also, "minimum" makes me wonder if these steps required or are the least I must do since "minimum" inherently means its the least that can be done, when more steps can be done (expected to be done). 5- "Minimum sequence" used together is also at odds because, "Sequence" refers to an order of operations but "Minimum" refers to the least amount required. So I ask, Minimum what? Minimum number of steps? Minimum order? Minimum requirement? The suggestion I made cuts through the ambiguity. The steps must be done in order, and if there is something that can't be done, you need to document why.	Accept with modification. Added "an FSP shall perform" for 5.2 through 5.6
21		5.5	E	The following is the minimum processing sequence for adhesive surfaces.	The following is the minimum processing sequence an FSP shall perform for adhesive surfaces.	Current wording doesn't contain an actual recommendation. Unsure if current wording qualifies as an "imperative sentence" as described by ASB style guidelines as an alternative to a "shall" statement. If not, consider the suggested reword to add a "shall."	Accept. Added "an FSP shall perform" for 5.2 through 5.6
22		5.5	E	The following is the minimum processing sequence for adhesive items	The following processing sequence shall be used for adhesive items. Deviations are permitted when justified and documented.	The word minimum is creating an issue in my mind. 1- It sounds a bit awkward. "Minimum" implies quantity. 2- The list consists of steps but those steps must be done in order since they go in order from least destructive to most destructive. Simply stating "minimum" doesn't convey order; just that it must be done. 3- "Minimum" makes me wonder if these steps required or are the least I must do since "minimum" inherently means its the least that can be done, when more steps can be done (expected to be done). 4- "Minimum" can be interpreted like those steps all need to be done, even if not needed, because those are the minimum I need to do. 5 Also, "minimum" makes me wonder if these steps required or are the least I must do since "minimum" inherently means its the least that can be done, when more steps can be done (expected to be done). 5- "Minimum sequence" used together is also at odds because, "Sequence" refers to an order of operations but "Minimum" refers to the least amount required. So I ask, Minimum what? Minimum number of steps? Minimum order? Minimum requirement? The suggestion I made cuts through the ambiguity. The steps must be done in order, and if there is something that can't be done, you need to document why.	Accept with modification. Added "an FSP shall perform" for 5.2 through 5.6

23		5.6.1	E	The bloody surface/item should be dried prior to processing.	Insert a "shall" statement before the "should" statement, as there isn't supposed to be standalone "should" statements in a standard.	Per ASB style guidelines, "should" statements "are only allowed when their use is necessary to explain a secondary aspect of a requirement..." Therefore a "should" statement needs something like a "shall" to precede it.	Accept. Reworded 5.6.1 to "shall"	
24		5.6.1	t	"The bloody surface/item should be dried prior to processing."	Remove as unnecessary. This is true for all sections of 5.2-5.6 but was not added to the other sections.	This is already stated in 5.1.3	Reject with modification. 5.6.1 reworded to "shall"	
25		5.6.2	E	Depending on the blood process used, a blood fixative may be needed prior to processing	Make this a note or similar to the preceding section, as it doesn't fit with ASB style guidelines as a standalone statement. Alternatively, insert a "shall" statement before it.	Per ASB style guidelines, the requirements in a Std are expressed as imperative sentences or stated in 'shall' language. The use of other verb forms, such as 'should', 'may', or 'can', are only allowed when their use is necessary to explain a secondary aspect of a requirement, such as an option.	Reject. Statement uses a "may" as it is permitted and depends on the processing technique used.	
26		5.6.3	E	The following is the minimum processing sequence for bloody surfaces/items.	The following is the minimum processing sequence an FSP shall perform for bloody surfaces/items.	Current wording doesn't contain an actual recommendation. Unsure if current wording qualifies as an "imperative sentence" as described by ASB style guidelines as an alternative to a "shall" statement. If not, consider the suggested reword to add a "shall."	Accept. Added "an FSP shall perform" for 5.2 through 5.6	
27		5.6.3	E	Examination by other forensic disciplines, such as DNA or trace evidence, should be completed prior to blood processing.	Make this a note or similar to the preceding section, as it doesn't fit with ASB style guidelines as a standalone statement. Alternatively, insert a "shall" statement before it.	Per ASB style guidelines, the requirements in a Std are expressed as imperative sentences or stated in 'shall' language. The use of other verb forms, such as 'should', 'may', or 'can', are only allowed when their use is necessary to explain a secondary aspect of a requirement, such as an option. (P.S. I know this section wasn't redline so not open to comment, just posing it for consideration)	Accept. 5.6.3 converted to a note and reworded.	
28			Ballot Comment	Not written as a standard. Phrases such as 'up to the FSP' and 'minimum requirements' are used instead of using shall statements.			Accept with modification. Added "an FSP shall perform" for 5.2 through 5.6	