Deadline of Submission of Comments:	**17-Jun-24**
Document Number:	**ANSI/ASB BPR 193**
Document Title:	**Best Practice Recommendations for Determining What Scene and Death Locations a Medicolegal Death Investigation Authority Responds to for an Investigation**

Comment #	Text Line # (s)	Document Section	Type of Comment E-Editorial T-Technical	Current Document Wording	Proposed Revision	Revision Justification	Final Resolution
1		Whole document	E		In these situations, we would ask that the BPR require them to put in place strategies that can minimize the effects of bias: 1) Disclose the information they used in their report of their findings and any associated testimony (could include a list of boxes to check for ease. 2) Ideally, aim for a stepwise/sequential unmasking approach to getting and evaluating information and documenting decision/thoughts after each exposure (see Dror & Kukucka, 2021: https://doi.org/10.1016%2Fj.fsisyn.2021.100161; and Quigley-McBride et al. (2022): https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fsisyn.2022.100216 for detailed guidance on how to do this in practice), culminating in a final conclusion.	Given the potential for bias in many of the situations MDIs might find themselves in, through no fault of their own, there should be some mitigation strategies in place that can manage this biasing potential when exposure to theories about what happened cannot be prevented/if MDIs must implicitly or explicitly know that there was an unnatural death/homicide or the way in which that homicide occurred (e.g., they may miss something important that they wouldn't know to look for without contextual information).	Reject: The requested revision is out of scope for this document. The scope of this document specifically states that "Details on how to conduct scene investigations are not addressed in this document."
2				Ballot Comment	A couple terms are out of alphabetical order: 3.1 should be switched with 3.2; 3.6 should be switched with 3.7.		Accept.
3		*4.3.2.5*	E		We suggest that the standard should broaden the situations in which they will be called, both to avoid bias and to avoid missing unnatural deaths for which MDI expertise could be useful. This could involve changing language to: "based on the suspicion that the death was sudden and unexpected, and not the end result of a disease process (i.e., natural), given the nature of the death and circumstances in which it occurred." or similar.	The language "The recommendations in 4.3.2.1 through 4.3.2.4 would include anytime investigating agencies express a concern that the death might have been related to homicidal violence." suggests that MDIs are only called to investigate only when there is already a suspicion that a death was unnatural/caused by another person – at a crime scene or at the ER. This could result in implicit or explicit bias effects to make conclusions consistent with that manner/cause of death.	Reject with modification: The requested revision is out of scope for this document, but the following change was made: "**In addition to** the recommendations in 4.3.2.1 through 4.3.2.4, **response should include** anytime investigating agencies express a concern that the death might have been related to homicidal violence."

Deadline of Submission of Comments: **17-Feb-25**
Document Number: **ASB BPR 193**
Document Title: **Best Practice Recommendations for Determining What Scene and Death Locations a Medicolegal Death Investigation Authority Responds**

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 completed by commenter.* **Final Resolution**
1	N/A	4	E	Currently, the document is missing a section on bias mitigation. We recommended this in the first round of comments for this document and the author's response to the comment was that it was beyond the scope of the document.	We disagree that a short bias mitigation section is beyond the scope of this document. We recommend a short section explaining why there is a risk of bias here and suggesting bias mitigation techniques (e.g., LSU-E; considering and documenting engagement with alternative hypotheses; blind second opinion) that would work in this situation. This would probably work well immediately before current section 4.3, or at the start of 4.3.	Addressing the potential for bias and bias mitigation is not beyond the scope of this document. Decision-makers are not only vulnerable to bias effects when considering how to examine a scene. There are also important decisions with potentially serious consequences when people are decisions whether to examine a scene at all, and MDIs should be required to document any information that guided that decision (e.g., what they were told about the scene before they saw it for themselves; could be really simply such as "Officer X reported a suspected overdose and...").	Accept. A section has been added to 4.1 that reads: "Because all human decision-making-including decisions such as whether or not to respond to a scene-are vulnerable to the effects of human factors, MDIs making the site-response decision should be aware of the risks that such factors can pose to decision-making."
3		3.11	Ballot Comment	Section 3.11 under terms and definitions for manner is not consistent with manner from our T/D document. i see the categories of suicide, homicide, etc are not defined so I think important to include the full MOD definition.			Accept. Manner of death definition updated to match the approved ASB 151 Technical Report.
2	14-15	2	E	Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice. Death investigation: A guide for the scene investigator (technical update). Washington, DC. 2011a.	Update the citation for the DOJ/OJP/NIJ guide, "Death investigation: A guide for the scene investigator" under normative references - a revision was finalized in 2024 - and the web address in the footnote.	Citation needs to be the most up to date citation.	Accept. Citation updated.

Deadline of Submission of Comments: 6-Aug-25
Document Number: ASB BPR 193
Document Title: Best Practice Recommendations for Determining What Scene and Death Locations a Medicolegal Death Investigation Authority Responds to for an Investigation

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 completed by commenter.* Final Resolution
1		Title	E	Best Practice Recommendations for Determining What Scene and Death Locations a Medicolegal Death Investigation Authority Responds to for an Investigaiton	Best Practice Receommendations for Determining Scene Investigation Response in Medicolegal Death Investigations	Conciseness	Accept with modification: Best Practice Recommendations for Determining Scene and Death Location Response in Medicolegal Death Investigations
2		Overall	E	n/a	Might consider adding law enforcement as a definition.	Law enforcement (city police, campus police, county deputies, state police/troppers, federal agents, etc.) are certainly part of this process so there may be benefit in addressing them directly and explicitly.	Reject. This is considered a common term that the definition can be found in any standard dictionary, therefor does not need to be added.
3		4.1	T	Because all human decision-making-including decisions such as whether or not to respond to a scene-are vulnerable to the effects of human factors, MDIs making the site-response decision should be aware of the risks that such factors can pose to decision-making.	remove section	this is out of scope of the document, and too broad to add anything.	Reject with modification. "site" revised to "scene" for consistency within the document. During the meeting on May 21, 2025 the ASB MDI consensus body discussed this section and voted to keep it in the document as it is appropriate for the document.
4		4.1	T	Because all human decision-making-including decisions such as whether or not to respond to a scene-are vulnerable to the effects of human factors, MDIs making the site-response decision should be aware of the risks that such factors can pose to decision-making.	remove section	this is out of scope of the document, and too broad to add anything. (note: this is an identical comment, but was received independently from a second separate commenter)	Reject with modification. "site" revised to "scene" for consistency within the document. During the meeting on May 21, 2025 the ASB MDI consensus body discussed this section and voted to keep it in the document as it is appropriate for the document.
5		4.1	T	Because all human decision-making-including decisions such as whether or not to respond to a scene-are vulnerable to the effects of human factors, MDIs making the site-response decision should be aware of the risks that such factors can pose to decision-making.	remove section	this is out of scope of the document, and too broad to add anything. (note: this is an identical comment, but was received independently from a third separate commenter)	Reject with modification. "site" revised to "scene" for consistency within the document. During the meeting on May 21, 2025 the ASB MDI consensus body discussed this section and voted to keep it in the document as it is appropriate for the document.
6		4.1	T	Because all human decision-making-including decisions such as whether or not to respond to a scene-are vulnerable to the effects of human factors, MDIs making the site-response decision should be aware of the risks that such factors can pose to decision-making.	remove section	Agree with new edition	Reject with modification. "site" revised to "scene" for consistency within the document. During the meeting on May 21, 2025 the ASB MDI consensus body discussed this section and voted to keep it in the document as it is appropriate for the document.

7		4.1	T	Because all human decision-making-including decisions such as whether or not to respond to a scene-are vulnerable to the effects of human factors, MDIs making the site-response decision should be aware of the risks that such factors can pose to decision-making.	The current addition to the section starts to make an important point, but is missing key information and solutions to the effects referred to. Awareness of human factors and cognitive bias effects can be an important starting point for addressing such issues in practice, but are alone insufficient to prevent or mitigate them. Providing a list of procedural safeguards and/or encouraging detailed documentation of the basis for the decision made and any communication with investigators would be more helpful to readers/users of the standard.	MDIs should be aware that the decision of whether or not to respond to a scene, like all human decision-making, is vulnerable to the effects of human factors. For example, different decision makers may reach different conclusions on the basis of identical information, and an initial impression based on limited information can dictate how the decision maker perceives subsequent information (i.e., confirmation bias). Adhering to guidelines, such as this document, can reduce subjectivity in decision-making. Additional ways to mitigate the effects of human factors are peer review and calibration meetings. Documenting the basis for the decision (including any communications with investigators) will make it clear what was known to the MDI and when.	Reject with modification. "site" revised to "scene" for consistency within the document. During the meeting on May 21, 2025 the ASB MDI consensus body discussed this section and voted to keep it in the document as it is appropriate for the document.
8		4.1	E	This document specifics when personnel should respond to the location of death or to the incident scene (if it has not been cleared).	Remove the wording in parentheses.	Unless the document explains the concept of a scene being cleared, this may cause confusion. Also, to those that understand the concept, this will be apparent and not require mentioning.	Reject with modification. "site" revised to "scene" for consistency within the document. During the meeting on May 21, 2025 the ASB MDI consensus body discussed this section and voted to keep it in the document as it is appropriate for the document.
9		4.1	E	Because all human decision-making-including decisions… factors can pose to decision-making.	Remove or expand.	This reads as a nod to cognitive biases, but does not provide anything concrete such as specific soutions or measurable outcomes and therefore seems out of step with the rest of the document. Perhaps a line encouraging written policies or protocols to minimize the human factors might be more actionable.	Reject with modification. "site" revised to "scene" for consistency within the document. During the meeting on May 21, 2025 the ASB MDI consensus body discussed this section and voted to keep it in the document as it is appropriate for the document.
10		4.1	E	n/a	I propose addition of a line explicity stating something along the lines of: whenever possible, a scene should be examined directly by MDI authorities/MDIs. [The wording used in the 2024 NIJ Scene Guide can be found on page 6 at this link https://www.ojp.gov/pdffiles1/nij/308955.pdf]	This line cuts right to the point that medicolegal death scene investigation is important and should be prioritized. This could be used by local offices to strengthen policies and structural support. It not only points to an ideal state, but makes clear the distinction between MDI and law enforcement investigation of the scenes. I might even argue that it be placed at the beginning of the section.That way you present the ideal first, then follow it up with the explanations of why, why not, and triage decisions that are detailed throughout the rest of the document.	Reject with modification. "site" revised to "scene" for consistency within the document. During the meeting on May 21, 2025 the ASB MDI consensus body discussed this section and voted to keep it in the document as it is appropriate for the document.
11			Ballot Comment	I continue to feel that the new addition is out of scope and really just muddies thet water nad feels liek a lecture within this otherwise measurable BPR.			Reject with modification. "site" revised to "scene" for consistency within the document. During the meeting on May 21, 2025 the ASB MDI consensus body discussed this section and voted to keep it in the document as it is appropriate for the document.

12			Ballot Comment	I do not have a concern with the addition under 3.11 Regarding the addition under 4.1: This best practice recommendation states in the last sentence of the paragraph under 1. Scope "This document addresses which types of decedents, locations, and cases should be examined at the location of death, and at the incident scene." The purpose of the document is to provide best practices, which should guide scene response. The addition in 4.1 is not necessary if the guidelines are being followed, which have been carefully and clearly detailed. If you follow the guidelines, you will respond to the appropriate scenes and do not need this additional language.	Reject with modification. "site" revised to "scene" for consistency within the document. During the meeting on May 21, 2025 the ASB MDI consensus body discussed this section and voted to keep it in the document as it is appropriate for the document.