

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
	Comment #	Comenter's Name	Commenter's Email	Text Line # (s)	Document Section	Type of Comment E-Editorial T-Technical	Current Document Wording	Proposed Revision	Revision Justification	Final Resolution
1	1	D. Eric Johnson	eric@forensicphotographyservices.com		Title	E	Terminology for a Suspected Pattern of Dental Origin	The title should read "Terminology for a Pattern of Suspected Dental Origin."	A mark on the skin is not a "suspected" mark, it IS a mark (which may or may not be a pattern - doesn't matter). A mark or marks believed to have been made by teeth (or other objects) MAY form a pattern. But it is still a pattern or marks - nothing suspect about having a pattern or marks. It is there. <b>What is suspect is if the marks or patterns is of dental origin or something else.</b> This is not symantics, it is an important distinction.	You are correct that marks are not "suspected" but rather present. However, according to term 3.1.3, our initial step is to determine if these marks constitute a pattern. Only after confirming the presence of a pattern do we proceed to ascertain whether it is of dental origin or attributable to another source. This procedural sequence—first identifying the pattern and then determining its origin—is precisely reflected in the title, which appropriately mirrors the analytical process involved.
2	2	Kelly Sauerwein	kelly.sauerwein@nist.gov	--	Forward	E	It is important to note that these definitions do not assert a scientific foundation for the terms.	This document should not go forward in ASB as there is no established scientific foundation for this practice.	It is stated in the Forward that the definitions do not assert a scientific foundation for the terms, but publishing a standard in ASB for terminology related to bitemarks/suspected patterns of dental origin DOES imply a scientific basis for the practice. ASB's stated purpose on their website is to provide "accessible, high quality SCIENCE-BASED consensus forensic standards." If this is not based in science, then it should not be an ASB standard. Also, a definition of evidentiary value includes the phrase "empirically significant scientific determination." The implication from this is that this document does assert a scientific foundation for these terms. This then does not "provide clear and unambiguous descriptions for effective communication" because the Forward says one thing while definitions say another.	<b>Accepted With Modification</b> The ASB FO CB acknowledges your concerns and reaffirms the ASB's commitment to science-based documents. This report aims to establish consistent bitemark terminology to improve communication, as noted in the disclaimer. It addresses NIST-identified issues, such as research gaps and examiner disagreements, while encouraging further study. Clear terminology is essential for consensus and challenging unsupported areas and allowing even critics to clearly delineate unsupported areas of concern. However, to address concerns a Preface has been added and the scope disclaimer strengthened to explicitly clarify what was already stated in the docuement since its inception at OSAC
3	3	Derek Draft	draftdds@gmail.com	30	3 Terms and Definitions	E	<b>3.1.3.2 patterned impression</b> surface alteration demonstrating the capacity to replicate the characteristics of the object causing the alteration	<b>3.1.3.2 patterned impression</b> surface alteration that may replicate the characteristics of the object causing the alteration	3.1.3.1 uses the "may reproduce" terminology so may replicate seems more appropriate	<b>Decline</b> The term is intended to convey that the surface alteration has the demonstrated ability to replicate the characteristics of the object, providing a clear and definitive description of their relationship. However, as clarified in the scope, simply defining the term does not imply that there is a scientific basis for its reliable application. Therefore, using the term as written ensures that if there is a lack of scientific validity, it will be unequivocally clear
4	4	Kelly Sauerwein	kelly.sauerwein@nist.gov	30-33	3.1.3.2	E	Definition of patterned impression: surface alteration demonstrating the capacity to replicate the characteristics of the object causing the alteration	Remove definition as this does not apply to "patterns of dental origin"	While this is a generic definition meant to apply to all pattern impressions, there is a lack of scientific evidence demonstrating that bitemarks accurately replicate the characteristics of the biting dentition. The term "patterned impressions" is used in other disciplines and the use of it in this document implies validity to bitemark analysis/suspected pattern of dental origin analysis that is not supported by scientific evidence. Therefore, this definition would NOT apply to bitemarks or "suspected patterns of dental origin."	<b>Accepted With Modification</b> The scope clearly states that defining a term does not imply scientific validity. Many previously accepted scientific terms and concepts have been disproven as part of the evolution of scientific thought, but they are still discussed using well defined terminology. The inclusion of terms like ""patterned impressions"" and ""suspected patterns of dental origin"" in this document serves to clarify the subject, not to validate the underlying practice. Defining these terms is essential to ensure that concerns, such as those raised in the NIST report, are clearly addressed without implying that they are scientifically supported. Clear definitions help focus the discussion on areas where evidence is lacking, rather than suggesting unwarranted credibility. However, to address concerns a Preface has been added and the scope disclaimer strengthened to explicitly clarify this issue
5	5	Derek Draft	draftdds@gmail.com	34	3 Terms and Definitions	E	<b>3.1.4 bitemark/bite mrk</b> physical alteration in a substrate caused by the contact of the biting surface of a tooth or teeth as a result of a closure of the mouth	<b>3.1.4 bitemark/bite mark</b> physical alteration in a substrate caused by the contact of the biting surface of a tooth or teeth	The teeth rarely close completely (closure)during human on human biting. An exception is avulsibe bites. Also, the mark is made by the contact with teeth and does not have to be the result of closure of the mouth. Marks can be made with contact of only one arch	<b>Accepted With Modification</b> This modification was implemented to differentiate it from a toothmark, which occurs when a tooth makes contact, and to better reflect the commentator's intent. 3.1.4 bitemark/bite mark physical alteration in a substrate caused by the contact of the biting surface of opposing teeth
6	6	Kelly Sauerwein	kelly.sauerwein@nist.gov	43-45	3.1.6	E	Definition of evidentiary value: information of sufficient usefulness to serve as the basis for making an empirically significant scientific determination	Remove definition as this does not apply to "patterns of dental origin"	This does not apply to bitemarks or "suspected patterns of dental origin" as there is no "empirically significant scientific" basis to the practice. Therefore, based on this definition, this information cannot be of evidentiary value. There is also no definition of what constitutes "sufficient usefulness" or "significant scientific determination" so the definition is too vague to be used in practice.	<b>Accepted With Modification</b> The scope clearly states that defining a term does not imply scientific validity. Many previously accepted scientific terms and concepts have been disproven as part of the evolution of scientific thought, but they are still discussed using well defined terminology. The inclusion of terms like ""patterned impressions"" and ""suspected patterns of dental origin"" in this document serves to clarify the subject, not to validate the underlying practice. Defining these terms is essential to ensure that concerns, such as those raised in the NIST report, are clearly addressed without implying that they are scientifically supported. Clear definitions help focus the discussion on areas where evidence is lacking, rather than suggesting unwarranted credibility. However, to address concerns a Preface has been added and the scope disclaimer strengthened to explicitly clarify this issue
7	7	Derek Draft	draftdds@gmail.com	46	3 Terms and Definitions	E	<b>3.1.7 Artifact</b> spurious observationanomaly not intrinsically present feature not related to the source	<b>3.1.7 Artifact</b> spurious observation; feature may not be related to the purported source	Punctuation and acceptance of possibility of uncertainty	<b>Accepted</b>

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
1	Comment #	Comenter's Name	Commenter's Email	Text Line # (s)	Document Section	Type of Comment E-Editorial T-Technical	Current Document Wording	Proposed Revision	Revision Justification	Final Resolution
9	8	Kelly Sauerwein	kelly.sauerwein@nist.gov	50-51	3.1.8	E	Definition of suspected pattern of dental origin analysis: forensic examination, analysis, and determination of the pattern for potential links to dental origin	Remove definition as it does not accurately reflect the abilities of examiners and the actual conclusions that can be drawn.	This definition states that "determination" is a step in the analysis process. Dental origin or even "potential links" to origin cannot be determined as there is no scientific evidence to support that claim. "Determination" connotes a strength of conclusion that is not supported in bitemark analysis/suspected pattern of dental origin analysis.	<b>Accepted With Modification</b> The scope clearly states that defining a term does not imply scientific validity. Many previously accepted scientific terms and concepts have been disproven as part of the evolution of scientific thought, but they are still discussed using well defined terminology. The inclusion of terms like ""patterned impressions"" and ""suspected patterns of dental origin"" in this document serves to clarify the subject, not to validate the underlying practice. Defining these terms is essential to ensure that concerns, such as those raised in the NIST report, are clearly addressed without implying that they are scientifically supported. Clear definitions help focus the discussion on areas where evidence is lacking, rather than suggesting unwarranted credibility. However, to address concerns a Preface has been added and the scope disclaimer strengthened to explicitly clarify this issue
10	9	Derek Draft	draftdds@gmail.com	52	3 Terms and Definitions	E	<b>3.1.8.1 bitemark assessment analysis</b> forensic examination that a pattern is a bitemark based on the class characteristics of a dentition	<b>3.1.8.1 bitemark assessment analysis</b> forensic examination investigating whether a pattern is a bitemark based on the class characteristics of a dentitions	possibility of uncertainty	<b>Decline</b> As stated in the disclaimer of the scope this document does not provide criteria for using these terms or suggest that they have a scientific basis for reliable application. ISO rules clearly state that terminology documents cannot not prescriptive. Since all analysis have a possibility of uncertainty this inclusion would be part of the reporting standard not the term itself.
11	10	Derek Draft	draftdds@gmail.com	57	3 Terms and Definitions	E	<b>3.1.8.1.1 bitemark analysis</b> forensic examination of class and individual characteristics of a bitemark	<b>3.1.8.1.1 bitemark analysis</b> forensic examination of class and individual characteristics of a bitemark, including metric analysis	size matters	<b>Decline</b> Metric analysis is redundant as it falls under class characteristics.
12	11	Derek Draft	draftdds@gmail.com	82	3 Terms and Definitions	E	<b>3.2.1.1. cusp mark</b> Pattern left by the most protruding portion of the tooth	<b>3.2.1.1. cusp mark</b> Pattern or patterns left by cusps, the variably protruding portion of the tooth Note to entry: a tooth may have 1,2,3,4,5, or more cusps	[patterns may be left by multiple cusps, not just the most protruding cusp	<b>Accepted With Modification</b> Pattern left by the most protruding portion(s) of the tooth
13	12	Robin Ainsworth	Robin.a.ainsworth@gmail.com	82	3	E	3.2.1.1	either delete or move to number 3.3.1	it relates to an individual characteristic	<b>Decline</b> The term "3.2.1.1. cusp mark" typically describes the pattern of cusp marks across an arch, not as an individual characteristic of a single tooth, which is why it is classified as a class characteristic.
14	13	Robin Ainsworth	Robin.a.ainsworth@gmail.com	117-118	3	E	dental midline-line drawn between the central incisors of a dental arch	dental midline-line drawn between the central incisors each dental arch (maxillary and mandibular) and to each other	max/mand midline relative to face and each other	<b>Accepted</b>
15	14	Robin Ainsworth	Robin.a.ainsworth@gmail.com	140	3	E	3.3.3.1	3.3.4	independent of 'metric' 3.3.3	<b>Decline</b> is seems to be the appropriate place for this term as a child of metric.
16	15	David Williams	davewdds@gmail.com	147	3.4.1	E	147 <b>3.4.1 biological substrate</b> tissue upon which the pattern was impressed inanimate object upon which the pattern was impressed 159 <b>3.4.2 non-biological substrate</b>	If the definition for non-biologic substrate includes "inanimate object" then the definition for "biological substrate" should include "object that is living or has lived" or similar wording		<b>Decline</b> The term tissue is a self defining term which means a group of cells with a similar structure and function that work together to perform specific tasks in an organism. The general definition includes both living and non living tissue and is already inclusive.
17	16	Robin Ainsworth	Robin.a.ainsworth@gmail.com	218	Annex A	E	violet' is listed two times	only list violet once		<b>Accepted</b>
18	17	Kelly Sauerwein	kelly.sauerwein@nist.gov	25,28, 31,51,54, 80, 81, 84, 86, 87, 90, 91, 95, 96, 127, 146, 149, 161, 167, 203, 209, 211, 218, 221, 223,	3.1.3, 3.1.3.1, 3.1.3.2, 3.1.8, 3.1.8.1, 3.2.1, 3.2.1.1, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.4, 3.3, 3.4, 3.4.1, 3.4.2, 3.5.1, 3.5.2, Annex A	E	"pattern"	Change instances of "pattern" to "suspected pattern" because what is perceived as a "pattern of dental origin" may not actually be of dental origin.	The use of pattern refers to "patterns of dental origin." As these are suspected patterns and may not actually be of dental origin, then "suspected" needs to be added to all cases of "pattern."	<b>Decline</b> The term "pattern" is used correctly as a noun, representing a specific entity. Adding the adjective "suspected" would merely describe a subset of patterns. Furthermore, "suspected" is inherently clear and does not need extra clarification when modifying "pattern" where appropriate in the document.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
1	Comment #	Comenter's Name	Commenter's Email	Text Line # (s)	Document Section	Type of Comment E-Editorial T-Technical	Current Document Wording	Proposed Revision	Revision Justification	Final Resolution
19	18	Chris Fabricant	cfabricant@innocenceproject.org			Ballot Comment	Bite mark "analysis" and "comparison" lacks any basis in science, as concluded by NIST, PCAST, the TX Forensic Science Comm and the NAS. This effort to define terms is, at best, pointless as it relates to so-called bite mark evidence, and could despite the disclaimers be misunderstood as to suggest there is research supporting the validity of the proposed definitions. I believe this consensus body should be focused on ensuring nothing it produces suggests that there is a scientific basis for this technique, which had led to dozens of wrongful convictions.			<p><b>Accepted With Modification</b></p> <p>The scope clearly states that defining a term does not imply scientific validity. Many previously accepted scientific terms and concepts have been disproven as part of the evolution of scientific thought, but they are still discussed using well defined terminology. The inclusion of terms like ""patterned impressions"" and ""suspected patterns of dental origin"" in this document serves to clarify the subject, not to validate the underlying practice. Defining these terms is essential to ensure that concerns, such as those raised in the NIST report, are clearly addressed without implying that they are scientifically supported. Clear definitions help focus the discussion on areas where evidence is lacking, rather than suggesting unwarranted credibility. However, to address concerns a Preface has been added and the scope disclaimer strengthened to explicitly clarify this issue</p>