

#	Section	Section (updated)	Type of	Comments	Proposed Resolution	Final Resolution
173	Document	Document	T	I would have liked to see more specific instruction in this guide and explanation of how considerations mentioned impact examination, such as the Modular Method's flow chart. This standard is similar to the SWGDOC standard and doesn't provide much additional guidance.	For example, add specifics of how characteristics that can be attributable to distorted writing should be/can be considered when the examiner is trying to decide between simulation or intentional change, or genuine writing affected by an unusual writing condition.	Reject: This request pertains the training and is beyond the procedural processes of the handwriting examination and it is not within the scope of this document (see 3rd paragraph in section 1).
161	Foreword	Foreword	T	It is important not to omit the work of the Questioned Document section of the ASTM because it was a consensus body which the SWGDOCS were not. Omitting relevant information results in a bias that needs to be avoided in a standard or any scientific endeavor.	After (SWGDOC). <i>These standards were then revised and accepted by the ASTM, a consensus body....</i>	Reject: Text complies with the terms from ASTM. Additionally, this document is an ASB document that is going through the ANSI accredited procedures and process. Modifications may be made based on the comments received through the ASB public comment process and the ASB Consensus Body ballot process. ASTM requested that they not be cited in or referred to in any derivative work or document as a source or as the source document.
148	Foreword	Foreword	E	This foreword uses the phrase "generally accepted body of knowledge and experience." But general acceptance is a legal term of art, not to mention one that even States that retain the Frye test apply quite differently. This standard should not encourage a circular relationship between science and law by borrowing terminology from legal decisions that itself was developed only to approximate or act as a stand in for scientific consensus.	Remove the phrase "generally accepted" and replace with language that is not specific to the context of legal standards for the admissibility of expert testimony.	Reject with modification: The term was modified to "generally used"
30	Forward	Foreword	E	An "s" is needed after the word "indicate" after the term "shall"; The word "term" is single so the verb should be indicates	insert an "s"	Accept
31	Forward	Foreword	E	An "s" is needed after the word "indicate" after the term 'should'; The word "term" is single so the verb should be indicates	insert an "s"	Accept
32	Forward	Foreword	E	Delete the comma after "mandatory"; it is not needed plus it will be consistent with the statement below	Delete the comma	Accept
134	Forward	Foreword	E	If the sequence of the standard is to be accurate, then following the SWGDOC statement, a sentence should be included that reads: The SWGDOC document was submitted to the ASTM Questioned Document Subcommittee, revised and published as the first consensus standard for handwriting comparison. This is the actual sequence of events. It is misleading to leave out one of the publications.	Following the SWGDOC statement, add a sentence that reads: The SWGDOC document was submitted to the ASTM Questioned Document Subcommittee, revised and published as the first consensus standard for handwriting comparison. (OR) Previous handwriting standards have been published by the SWGDOC and ASTM. The SWGDOC standard was updated by the Forensic Document Examination Committee under the Organization of Scientific Area Committees (OSAC) for Forensic Science, who in turn revised and approved the draft document. Consideration was given to public comments from members of the profession prior to publication.	Reject: Text complies with the terms from ASTM. Additionally, this document is an ASB document that is going through the ANSI accredited procedures and process. Modifications may be made based on the comments received through the ASB public comment process and the ASB Consensus Body ballot process. ASTM requested that they not be cited in or referred to in any derivative work or document as a source or as the source document.
33	Scope	Scope	E	"This standard provides procedures <u>for</u> forensic document examiners <u>for</u> examinations..." The statement contains too many "for's".	Delete "for forensic document examiners" OR change the second "for" to "in"	Accept with modification: statement revised to: This standard provides procedures used by forensic document examiners for examinations
149	Scope	Scope	E	There are two distinct issues with the scope of this standard as written. First, the standard includes a massive caveat that it "might not cover all aspects of unusual or uncommon examinations of handwritten items." But it makes no attempt to define what those uncommon or unusual circumstances might look like. While later section partially undercut the danger of such a carve out by demanding that examiners document departures from the standard's procedures, this scope should still make some effort to define or limit the definition of "uncommon or unusual circumstances." Second, the standard suggests that examiners can properly develop their "knowledge, skills, or abilities" through "experience." Without diminishing the value of experience, it is vital to note that most circumstances where an examiner develops experience outside of training and education will occur during casework. Because ground truth is not known in casework, developing a sense of the levels of similarity or dissimilarity between questioned and known items can be fraught with dangers. Examiners might build up an incorrect sense of how much similarity should accompany documents written by the same person because of errors committed during casework and undetected because of a lack of ground truth. For this reason, the DOJ's uniform language documents prohibit examiners from relying on the number of comparisons performed during casework. If this standard is to retain this reference to experience it should include additional cautionary language regarding the limited value of experience based on comparisons performed without the benefit of ground truth.	Provide further clarification of "uncommon or unusual circumstances," and include languages underscoring the importance of ground truth and the attendant limits of on the job experience.	Reject with modification: 1) The scope of this document summarizes what is covered in this document and is not all encompassing and cannot address every uncommon or unusual circumstance. 2) The statement has been revised to "This standard cannot replace the requisite knowledge, skills, or abilities acquired through task-specific education, training, research, and experience." It is only through the combination of the listed "task-specific education, training, research, and experience" not only experience, that a forensic document examiner will have the knowledge, skills, and abilities to perform the procedures outlined in this standard.
179	2 Normative References	2 Normative References	T	I would like to see an addition to the Appendix A Bibliography, which is:  1. Found, B. J. & Bird, C. (2016). The Modular Forensic Handwriting Method. Journal of Forensic Document Examination. Vol. 26, PP. 7-83	The suggested article is a lengthy description of what is arguable the best and most widely used (world-wide) method for handwriting examination. My real preference would be to adopt it, but barring that I would like to see it referenced in this document.	Reject: The purpose of the bibliography is to provide documentation of material of direct use in creating this standard and it is not meant to be a comprehensive references of the discipline.

#	Section	Section (updated)	Type of	Comments	Proposed Resolution	Final Resolution
180	3 - Terms and Definitions	3 - Terms and Definitions	T	<p>This section states that "Refer to Section 3 of the SWGDOC Standard for Examination of Handwritten Items<sup>1</sup> and Section 3 of the SWGDOC Standard Terminology Relating to the Examination of Questioned Documents<sup>2</sup></p> <p>Comment: Words that need definition should be defined by the group promulgating the document. Relying on another document of another organization can introduce confusion if that document changes. Also, with regard to the SWGDOC standard I think there are revisions needed to some of those definitions. For example, one definition is: 3.3.7 <i>individualizing characteristics</i>, <i>n</i> — marks or properties that serve to uniquely characterize writing.</p> <p>This needs discussion because a current view is that words like "unique" do not belong in our vocabulary since "uniqueness" is not provable.</p>	I suggest that the reference to external documents be removed and a definitions section be developed for this document.	Reject: The ASB Consensus Body is currently working on a technical report that includes terms and definitions for forensic document examinations discipline, to include those associated with handwriting examinations. This section will be revisited in five years or soon after the ASB Technical Report 071: Forensic Document Examination Terms and Definitions, is published.
109	3	3	E	If the OSAC developed standards are intended to replace previously established SWGDOC records, this statement will be obsolete	Include terms and definitions in this standard	Reject: The ASB Consensus Body is currently working on a technical report that includes terms and definitions for forensic document examinations discipline, to include those associated with handwriting examinations. This section will be revisited in five years or soon after the ASB Technical Report 071: Forensic Document Examination Terms and Definitions, is published.
45	4.1	4.1	E	"trained" has no descriptor as later in the document	add descriptor "appropriately"	Reject: ASB manual provides guidance not to use descriptors such as "appropriate".
150	4.1	4.1	E	See above comment to foreword regarding the use of general acceptance language	See above resolution to foreword regarding the use of general acceptance language	Reject with modification: The term was modified to "generally used"
1	4.2	4.2	E	What do you mean by specimens may display a "cultivated" view? Do you mean biased?	Suggest something like: "Specimens may have been mined such that they do not represent the known writer's range of variation."	Accept with modification: the second sentence of the third paragraph revised to read: Stakeholder selected specimens may not reflect a writer's full range of variation.
2	4.2	4.2	E	This section initially defines interferences as limitations that impact procedures but later includes limitations that can affect the strength of the opinion. The latter should be included in the evaluation section. Re: "Consideration shall be given to the various forms of simulations, imitations, and duplications of handwriting which can be generated by computer and other means," disguise and other forms of unnatural writing should be included. I think this is essentially what the last 3 paragraphs in the section are saying, but it's not clear. This may be partly to do with the aversion to using the word "disguise." You can use "purposeful change," like in the current Modular Method, but the existence of this form of writing should be acknowledged. Disguised writing can be distorted but isn't always, depending on the skill and intention of the disguiser.	If all limitations must be included here, reword to indicate that any element of unnaturalness can be a limitation in the evaluation of handwriting.	Accept with modification: Section 4.2. was split in 4.2.1. and 4.2.2, with 4.2.2 specifically addressing limitation due to unnaturalness of any writings.
3	4.2	4.2	E	Everything from : "The drawn nature of most handwritten..." to the end of the section is more to do with the evaluation. A lot is left out as well, namely disguise.	It can be said instead that unnatural writing can be a limitation.	Accept with modification: Section 4.2. was split in 4.2.1. and 4.2.2, with 4.2.2 specifically addressing limitation due to unnaturalness of any writings.
46	4.2	4.2	T	denote the limitations listed are not all inclusive	Limitations can be due to <b>such factors as</b> the submission of non-original documents,	Accept
47	4.2	4.2	T	include distortion	Consideration shall be given to the various forms of <b>distortion</b> , simulations, imitations, and duplications of handwriting which can be generated by computer and other means.	Reject: See last paragraph in section 4.2.2. that covers distortion.
135	4.2	4.2	T	There are times when an agency laboratory will do TLC or other destructive testing and not first preserve an adequate image of the document for the opposing side. There should be a note addressing the quality of the preservation prior to destructive testing..	Add the following note. NOTE: The examiner must consider that the opposing side in a case is also entitled to examine the evidence. For this reason, when destructive testing must be performed, the evidence must be photographed or scanned at a high resolution (i.e., 2400 dpi) prior to any chemical processing or other testing that will change the evidence from its original condition. If a signature is at issue, the entire page may be scanned at a lower resolution, but the signature (or other item(s) at issue) shall be photographed or scanned full screen at high resolution.	Reject: This is outside the scope of this document.

#	Section	Section (updated)	Type of	Comments	Proposed Resolution	Final Resolution
151	4.2	4.2	E	There are three serious issues with this section. First the standard notes that "Items should be handled to avoid compromising subsequent examinations," but never supplies a process or other guidance for doing so. Given the importance of preserving evidence (especially given the constitutional rights of defendants to exculpatory information and independent testing) this standard must lay out specific procedures for preserving genetic, latent print, and other evidence. Second, the standard states that "Caution should be exercised when evaluating quantity and comparability of known materials collected by a stakeholder." But if stakeholders often provide known materials of insufficient quantity or quality to allow for reliable comparisons, this standard should not simply accept that reality but instead should attempt to provide for solutions to enable more scientific and accurate comparisons. To do so this standard must lay out rules governing how examiners should decide on whether to request additional known writings, and how they should engage with stakeholders to do so without exposing them to unnecessary and potentially biasing task irrelevant information.	Include procedures governing the preservation of evidence as well as interactions with stakeholders to obtain additional known writings, if necessary, without exposure to biasing task irrelevant information.	Reject: 1) This is outside the scope of this document. 2) This comment is addressed throughout the remainder of the document. See sections 6.3. and 6.4. 3) Context bias is outside the scope of this document.
162	4.2	4.2	E	<i>cultivated</i> needs to be defined	This is not a traditional term and I do not know what is meant here. Either define the word or give a couple of examples.	Accept with modification: the second sentence of the third paragraph revised to read: Stakeholder selected specimens may not reflect a writer's full range of variation.
163	4.2	4.2	E	change "most" to "many"	Most persons in white collar or higher level crimes are smart enough not to draw signatures, but write them quickly to pass muster. I have found drawn signatures mostly in criminal cases where the person has limited education.	Accept: Replaced "most" with "many".
166	4.2	4.2	T	Specify type of variation, that it is natural variation as opposed to unnatural	Change text to "...writer's full range of natural variation."	Accept with modification: the sentence referred to here was deleted. The second sentence was revised to read: Stakeholder selected specimens may not reflect a writer's full range of variation. The phrase "range of variation" refers to both natural and unnatural.
174	4.2	4.2	T	Complexity of the writing isn't mentioned in "Interferences" section.	Add complexity of the writing to section.	Accept: Added "complexity" to 4.2.1.
186	4.2	4.2	T	Word "cultivated" by itself seems a bit cryptic for the public	Change sent to "Furthermore, these specimens may intentionally display a cultivated view to bias the DE in a particular direction."	Accept with modification: the second sentence of the third paragraph revised to read: Stakeholder selected specimens may not reflect a writer's full range of variation.
191	4.2	4.2		Section 4.2 regarding known writings and variation, I understand the idea behind using the word "cultivated" and the risk of cherry-picked standards, however, is "prejudiced" a better adjective?		Accept with modification: the second sentence of the third paragraph revised to read: Stakeholder selected specimens may not reflect a writer's full range of variation.
81	4.2 para 4	4.2 para 4	E	delete "cultivated"	replace with "deceptively selective"	Accept with modification: the second sentence of the third paragraph revised to read: Stakeholder selected specimens may not reflect a writer's full range of variation.
82	4.2 para 5	4.2 para 5	E	delete "which"	replace with "that"	Accept: Replaced "which" with "that".
83	4.2 para 6	4.2 para 6	E	delete "the comparability of these entries"	use "their comparability with known writing."	Accept: Replaced "the comparability of these entries" with "their comparability with known writing."
84	4.2 para 6	4.2 para 6	E	delete "intrinsic or extrinsic factors."	use "internal or external" factors.	Reject: Statement as written is factually accurate.
152	5	5	E	This section provides insufficient guidance with regards to the use of magnification, imaging equipment, and software. It is simply not enough to use vague phrases like "magnification that allows pertinent fine detail," or "capable of resolution to reliably record pertinent details." Other fields define the level of resolution or magnification appropriate to specific tasks. The latent print discipline for example sets particular dpi thresholds for photos of known and latent prints. It is also vital to ensure that examiners are only using software that has been appropriately developed and validated.	Expand this section to specify the magnification and resolution minimally necessary for particular tasks, and specify that any software used must be subject to an appropriate developmental and internal validation process. The latter likely requires its own stand alone standard which the OSC/ ASB must develop if they wish to sanction the use of software by examiners.	Reject: This is outside the scope of this document.
48	5.2	5.2	T	include alt. lighting and filters	Light sources include those capable of producing transmitted lighting, oblique lighting, <del>and</del> vertical incident lighting, <del>and other alternative lighting and filter.</del>	Accept with modification: Added " and other alternative lighting and filters" to this section. Deleted "and" before "vertical".
164	5.2	5.2	E	What is vertical incident lighting?	Provide a couple of examples such as a magnifier, loop, or type of device or devices used.	Reject: This is outside the scope of this document.
85	5.3	5.3	E	delete "a range of magnification"	use "variable magnification"	Reject: This statement is accurate as written.
167	5.3	5.3	T	Give example of ranges of magnification for clarity	...low power hand lenses (eg. 4-10x) ... stereomicroscope (eg. 10x-100x), or digital microscope (e.g. up to 200x)	Reject: General reference to magnification as given is appropriate for this document.
143	5.5	5.5	T	Should give examples like other sections	The examiner should utilize other apparatus and software such as x,y,z as appropriate.	Reject: General reference to apparatus and software as given are appropriate for this document.
188	6	6	T	Many Des choose to study the knowns before the questioned or at the same time. This procedure implies that it might be wrong and that you must examine the Qs first or your methodology is wrong. SWGDOC made it clearer that procedures could be performed in any order	At the start of 6.3 state "It is permissible to perform steps 6.3. and 6.4 in either order."	Reject with Modification: A note was added to Section 6.1 to clarify the state of the field with respect to the order in which items are examined. The note reads: "NOTE: Although there is some support within forensic disciplines for the evaluation and documentation of the questioned material prior to the evaluation of the known material, there are currently limited studies specific to handwriting examinations that support requiring the evaluation of the questioned material first."
4	6.1	6.1	E	Re: "The documentation shall include any relevant fact(s),..." The examiner is assuming what they are told are "facts," so in reality they are assumptions.	Suggest instead of "relevant facts," "case information provided by the requester"	Accept with modification: "Facts(s)" was replaced by "information". Relevant information in not limited to that provided by the requester.
136	6.1	6.1	E	Regarding the first paragraph, there are instances when it is inappropriate or illegal to mark on evidence and this should be acknowledged.	At the end of the sentence add the following words: or violate any legal requirement.	Reject: The 1st paragraph does not require marking.

#	Section	Section (updated)	Type of	Comments	Proposed Resolution	Final Resolution
137	6.1	6.1	T	Add a new section regarding confidentiality of case material. If the proposed resolution should be more appropriate elsewhere in the standard, then place it elsewhere.	6.1.1 The examiner shall keep confidential case documents and information unless permission is given by the client to share same and with whom it is to be shared is specified.	Reject: This is outside the scope of this document.
144	6.1	6.1	T	Should expand on maintaining integrity	If permission is granted or required by the laboratory to label the document sets, it shall be done in a manner that does not affect the examination integrity of the document or interfere with other examinations.	Reject: See section 4.2.1 that covers this topic.
153	6.1	6.1	E	Although this section admirably requires contemporaneous documentation it suffers from two major flaws: (1) not further specifying that each step of the examination process should be documented before moving on to subsequent steps, and (2) failing to require documentation of specific features relied upon by the examiner. As to the first, the Mayfield misidentification in the latent print context highlights the dangers of circular reasoning from exposure to known samples. It is therefore vital for examiners to document their impressions of questioned documents and the features they believe are useful from said questioned document before moving on to examine any known or additional questioned documents. The latent print field often refers to this as Linear ACE-V, and has developed documentation systems like G.Y.R.O. to enable transparency in what the analyst observed before exposure. This standard should require the same. Additionally, while this section specifies a long list of categories that require documentation it does not specify that documentation should include the specific features of documents relied on by examiners when making writing comparisons. Because those features are the foundation of any examiner's opinions, documentation of those features in a linear, sequential fashion should be required.	Amend the documentation paragraph of this section to specify that each step of the examination process must be documented contemporaneously before moving on to subsequent steps, and that said documentation must clearly indicate at what point in the process the analyst observed specific features upon which they rely for their opinion.	Reject with Modification: A note was added to Section 6.1 to clarify the state of the field with respect to the order in which Items are examined. The note reads: "NOTE: Although there is some support within forensic disciplines for the evaluation and documentation of the questioned material prior to the evaluation of the known material, there are currently limited studies specific to handwriting examinations that support requiring the evaluation of the questioned material first."  Regardless, as stated in paragraph 3 of Section 6.1, the examiner shall contemporaneously document their examination.
177	6.1	6.1	T	Statement regarding discontinuation or limitation of procedure due to absence of an "important feature" and the following sentence. Not always need to discontinue procedure, would be a limitation.	When it may be appropriate to discontinue exam should be clarified/specified regarding "important feature" as someone might interpret that to mean the absence of one written character between Q/K samples.	Reject: Paragraph 4 of section 6.1. explicitly states that it is at the discretion of the examiner to discontinue the procedure. Limitations are further discussed in sections 4.2., and 6.2. through 6.6. It is expected that an FDE will have the knowledge, skills and abilities to be able to determine whether or not an important feature warrants a discontinuation or if it is just a limitation.
154	6.2	6.2	E	The NCFCS and other organizations have highlighted the danger from cognitive bias that may stem from exposure to task irrelevant information. The process for setting the scope of examination laid out in this section poses particular dangers in regards to such exposure by suggesting that examiners, among other things, communicate with the submitter. It should accordingly specify procedures for examiners to utilize to minimize exposure to task irrelevant information, as well as exposure to any knowns (per the comments above to section 6.1)	Address issues of cognitive bias, and include procedures to minimize exposure to task irrelevant information.	Accept with modification: Section 6.2.7 was added to address potentially biasing information. Procedures for the minimization of exposure to task irrelevant information are beyond the scope of this document and are based on laboratory policy.
176	6.2	6.2	T	Complexity of the writing isn't mentioned as something that the examiner should note. Not sure if it's implied in "sufficiency" but should be mentioned.	Add complexity of the writing to section.	Reject: Complexity is included in section 6.3. Section 6.2 is solely focusing on the scope of examination.
34	6.2.1	6.2.1	T	"These procedures need not be performed in the order given." ANAB requires that the questioned items be examined first.	Add at the end of the sentence, "however, the questioned items shall be examined first." So it reads, "These procedures need not be performed in the order given; however, the questioned items shall be examined first."	Reject with Modification: A note was added to Section 6.1 to clarify the state of the field with respect to the order in which Items are examined. The note reads: "NOTE: Although there is some support within forensic disciplines for the evaluation and documentation of the questioned material prior to the evaluation of the known material, there are currently limited studies specific to handwriting examinations that support requiring the evaluation of the questioned material first."
49	6.2.2	6.2.2	T	remove	Does this really need to be documented? typically inferred by the item description	Reject: This section states an important point and it is not always inferred by the item description as submitted.
53	6.2.3	6.2.3	T	remove shall and soften to should...if applicable. Maybe already be clear or previously determined.	the examiner shall should clarify the examination(s) to be undertaken or question(s) to be evaluated if applicable.	Reject with modification. Sentence modified for clarity, but "shall" was maintained.
110	6.2.3	6.2.3	T	Our submitters do not routinely know the full range of examination types possible on the evidence item. Often times, the scientists may observe data that supports additional testing methods (i.e. observed indented writing discovered during a handwriting comparison may lead to ESDA processing)	Remove	Reject with modification. Section updated for clarity.
5	6.2.4	6.2.4	T	In the Notes section, "explanations" should not be considered synonymous with "propositions" or "hypotheses." In the paradigm this note refers to, an explanation is technically something that is proposed or considered if the examiner is in the role of an investigator, not as an evaluator. For example, there are not yet two competing propositions, but the investigator wants some information on how the evidence could have arisen. The examiner may offer various explanations as part of an investigative report.	Change to "...competing hypotheses or propositions."	Accept with modification: "Explanation" is being reworded to "hypotheses and propositions". Reject: The phrase "for each set of comparisons" addresses the potential need for multiple hypotheses sets addressing different aspects of different examinations conducted with the submission.
6	6.2.4	6.2.4	T	"...for each set of comparisons" should be removed. This appears to include instances when there are multiple known writers. The submitter wants to know, for example, whether writer A, writer B, or some other writer wrote Q. So the evaluation and conclusion should address all proposed writers to help answer the question. You can examine the knowns separately, and you can do a partial evaluation (between each K and Q) separately, but the full evaluation would have to include the relative comparisons of Q to Ks as well. The examiner can often opine that there is a higher probability/likelihood of the evidence if writer A wrote Q than if writer B wrote Q. That would go in the evaluation section.	Change to "...competing hypotheses or propositions."	Accept with modification: "Explanation" is being reworded to "hypotheses and propositions". Reject: The phrase "for each set of comparisons" addresses the potential need for multiple hypotheses sets addressing different aspects of different examinations conducted with the submission.

#	Section	Section (updated)	Type of	Comments	Proposed Resolution	Final Resolution
7	6.2.4	6.2.4	T	Also in the Notes section, the examples given are not helpful for the purposes of describing why we would set propositions for evaluative reporting using a construct similar in theory to a likelihood ratio, for which you would need 2 main propositions (to form the ratio). The majority of the time, the main propositions will be 'The known writer wrote the questioned document' and 'Someone other than the known writer wrote the questioned document.' The idea is that you are evaluating the evidence in terms of the _relative_ likelihood/probability of the evidence given the propositions. So you should give examples for the main propositions in pairs.	Remove a through f. I'm not sure if you should give examples without more explanation on what a proposition is, by whom the propositions are set, what mutually-exclusive means, etc., but you may want to use something like this example: •Proposition 1: John Doe wrote the questioned item •Proposition 2: Someone other than John Doe wrote the questioned item	Reject: The list (a-f) it is not meant to all be included in one mathematical likelihood ratio. There are typically two competing hypotheses for each set of comparisons. This list (a-f) provides representative examples of some possible hypotheses that the examiner may have to consider.
75	6.2.4	6.2.4	T	the sub-hypotheses in d), e), and f) are impossible to prove as written.	Remove "by the writer of the known material" in d) and f) and "by another writer in a relevant alternative population" in e); the subhypotheses here could read: "d) the questioned material was simulated/traced e) the questioned material was not simulated/traced f) the questioned material was written in a distorted manner g) the questioned material was not written in a distorted manner"	Accept: In f "disguised" was replaced by "distorted". Reject: The recommendation to change d and e as these two items have to be considered by the examiner. The recommendation to add g is not relevant for this note as it is part of the evaluation.
76	6.2.4	6.2.4	T	the sub-hypothesis f) uses the term "disguised manner". FDEs should not make hypotheses regarding intent of the writer.	Change this sub-hypothesis to "the questioned material was written in a distorted manner"	Accept with modification: In f "disguised" was replaced by "distorted".
155	6.2.4	6.2.4	E	This section suggests that examiners should frame the scope of their inquiry by setting mutually exclusive competing propositions. By doing so it clearly dips its toes in Bayes theorem waters, which is ultimately a mistake. The LR framework of Bayes introduces more problems than it solves. It is more difficult for juries to understand, and difficult to utilize appropriately even for experts. There is a substantial risk that adopting such an approach will confused jurors and cause examiners to misstate the value of evidence. Additionally, Bayes theorem requires propositions to be both mutually exclusive and exhaustive. If this document 1 to adopt a proposition framework derivative of Bayes it must require the same.	Abandon a proposition framework derived from Bayes Theorum and the likelihood ratio approach.	Reject: While the comments made are valid, the standard does not explicitly state any particular manner of defining the scope of an examination. The language here states that an examiner may decide to define the scope as two or more mutually competing hypotheses however this is not a requirement. This does not require using a likelihood ratio.
50	6.2.4 Note	6.2.4 Note	T	remove last line - "There are typically two competing hypotheses for each set of comparisons. Sub-hypotheses may also arise."	Not needed.... too specific. Makes it sound as if you are "atypical" if not following this guidance.	Reject with modification: Regarding "typical" please refer to the second sentence of section 6.2.4 which reads " the scope can be as simple as a statement of the initial relevant question(s) to be answered." The note is an example of one method of stating the scope. The last two sentences are modified to read "there are typically two competing hypotheses for each set of comparisons; however, sub-hypotheses may also arise" to clarify the intended meaning of these sentences.
111	6.2.4 Note	6.2.4 Note	T	Documentation of a hypothesis prior to evaluation of the questioned writing is too time consuming given the high number of hypothetical theories involved with each evidence submission	Documentation of which questioned writing is being compared to known writing should accomplish what is intended here.	Reject: Please refer to the second sentence of section 6.2.4 which reads " the scope can be as simple as a statement of the initial relevant question(s) to be answered." The note is an example of one method of stating the scope.
181	6.4 Note	6.2.4 NOTE	T	Comment: After the body of the Note there is a list of "Commonly encountered hypotheses " which might be combined for use in a pair of mutually exclusive hypotheses. I think that the statement of these hypotheses is confusing, and they are not clearly paired which is also confusion.	I suggest removing the second paragraph of the note and the list, and in its place substitute the following: An example of two mutually exclusive propositions would be: 1. The questioned signature on questioned document Q1 was written by John Doe. 2. The questioned signature on questioned document Q1 was written by someone other than John Doe.	Reject: The note and list are more comprehensive than the suggested change and are designed to illustrate the complexities that may arise when describing the scope of an examination.
86	6.2.4 b)	6.2.4 b)	E	delete "random and unspecified"	replace with "different, unknown"	Reject: Please refer to the second sentence of section 6.2.4 which reads " the scope can be as simple as a statement of the initial relevant question(s) to be answered." The note is an example of one method of stating the scope and the wording here is provided merely as an example. The individual hypotheses may be phrased accordingly by the examiner on a case by case basis.
87	6.2.4 b)	6.2.4 b)	E	delete "in a relevant alternative population"	end the sentence after "writer."	Reject: Please refer to the second sentence of section 6.2.4 which reads " the scope can be as simple as a statement of the initial relevant question(s) to be answered." The note is an example of one method of stating the scope and the wording here is provided merely as an example. The individual hypotheses may be phrased accordingly by the examiner on a case by case basis.
88	6.2.4 e)	6.2.4 e)	E	delete "writer in a relevant alternative population"	use "another unknown writer."	Reject with modification: Item d) deleted
187	6.2.4d	6.2.4d	T	Couldn't this be consider a disguise? Do we need to list it as a separate hypothesis?	eliminate 6.2.4d	Accept.
51	6.2.5	6.2.5	T	The examiner shall analyze the submitted item(s) to determine sufficiency relative to the scope - maybe clarify only document if insufficient	If sufficient the exam would continue...don't see a need to record "items sufficient" inferred by continuation of the process and/or documentation of any limitations.	Reject. Section 6.1 requires that a sufficiency examination be documented.
112	6.2.5	6.2.5	T	In order to ensure the sufficiency of the handwriting to be compared and prevent circular reasoning, the questioned items must be evaluated prior to understaking any comparisons to known writing	Update to " The examiner shall analyze the submitted item(s) to determine sufficiency relative to the scope prior to undertaking any comparisons to known writing"	Reject with Modification: A note was added to Section 6.1 to clarify the state of the field with respect to the order in which items are examined. The note reads: "NOTE: Although there is some support within forensic disciplines for the evaluation and documentation of the questioned material prior to the evaluation of the known material, there are currently limited studies specific to handwriting examinations that support requiring the evaluation of the questioned material first."
52	6.2.6	6.2.6	E	information regarding not needed	remove information regarding before factors	Accept with modification: " information regarding" was deleted and a second sentence "The examiner may consider information regarding intrinsic or extrinsic factors that might affect the writing. " was added to clarify the intended meaning.

#	Section	Section (updated)	Type of	Comments	Proposed Resolution	Final Resolution
113	6.2.6	6.2.6	E	Use of the word "information" implies that it is externally provided and not supported by the data in the evidence	Replace "information" with "characteristics observed"	Reject with modification: "information regarding" was deleted and a second sentence "The examiner may consider information regarding intrinsic or extrinsic factors that might affect the writing." was added to clarify the intended meaning.
138	6.2.6	6.2.6	E	There are other factors that can affect handwriting. In private practice, civil cases, a writer may have a medical condition that affects his or her writing.	In the parenthesis add the words medical condition	Reject with modification: A second sentence "The examiner may consider information regarding intrinsic or extrinsic factors that might affect the writing." was added to clarify the intended meaning. Medical condition would be an extrinsic factor.
114	6.2.7	NOW 6.2.8	T	Recording of revised scope or hypothesis are not practical in routine case documentation	Remove	Reject: Modification of the scope changes the nature of the examination and therefore shall be documented.
115	6.3.1	6.3.1	T	It is unclear what minimum documentation is required by this standard. Does this only require reference to the procedure? Or Documentation of all characteristics observed?	Clarify intended required documentation	Reject: Section 6.3.1 last sentence includes that deviations from the procedures shall be documented. This sentence does not intend to provide minimum documentation required for each individual procedure.
156	6.3.1	6.3.1	E	Per the above comment to section 6.1, this section should specify that documentation should occur BEFORE moving on to subsequent steps.	Change the language to read: "The examiner shall perform and document all applicable procedures in sections 6.3.2 through 6.3.11, before moving on to the procedures laid out in the remainder of this standard."	Reject: Section 6.1, 3rd paragraph states: "The examiner shall contemporaneously document the examinations performed, relevant observations, and basis for results, in detail to allow for an internal or external review and assessment of the utilized examination processes by a forensic document examiner. The documentation shall include any relevant information, method(s), interpretation(s), evaluation(s), and conclusion(s), opinion(s), or other finding(s)."
8	6.3.2	6.3.2	E	"If the writing has not been reproduced with sufficient clarity for any analysis or comparison purposes, ..."	Anything can be compared or analyzed; it's a matter whether that analysis or comparison would be meaningful. Suggested: "If the writing has not been reproduced with sufficient clarity for meaningful analysis or comparison purposes..."	Accept
116	6.3.2	6.3.2	E	Evaluation of the questioned writing for sufficiency should be first, not left to be performed "in any order"	Re-order to 6.3.1, indicating that this must be performed first	Reject with Modification: A note was added to Section 6.1 to clarify the state of the field with respect to the order in which items are examined. The note reads: "NOTE: Although there is some support within forensic disciplines for the evaluation and documentation of the questioned material prior to the evaluation of the known material, there are currently limited studies specific to handwriting examinations that support requiring the evaluation of the questioned material first."
117	6.3.2	6.3.2	T	The laboratory does not have control over what is being submitted and whether it is the "best available"	Remove this paragraph from standard, as it is often outside the control of the scientist	Reject with modification: Paragraph was reworded to clarify the intended meaning "best available" was replaced by "submitted".
182	6.3.2 Note	6.3.2 Note	T	Comment: The first line of the Note reads: "NOTE The absence of original writing does not preclude the examinations in this standard; however examination of the original writing is preferable." I think this needs to be stated differently less absolutely as suggested in my proposal.	Replace the first line of the NOTE with:  NOTE. While examination of the original writing is preferable, the absence of original writing may or may not preclude some of the examinations in this standard.	Reject: Suggested change is not consistent with the intended meaning of this note. Absoluteness here does no preclude an examiner from addressing and acknowledging any limitations. However the procedures herein can be followed regardless.
35	Note of 6.3.2	Note of 6.3.2	E	This note should be moved and placed under Interferences since that is what it is stating; in addition, it will only need to be stated once instead of under both the Examination of the Questioned Writing and the Examination of the Known Writing	Move note under Interferences	Reject: Statements in sections 4.2.1, 6.3.2 and 6.4.2 are made for two different reasons. In section 4.2.1 the statement lists the matter as a limitation only. In sections 6.3.2 and 6.4.2 the statements are made as part of a more comprehensive procedural aspect.
9	6.3.3	6.3.3	E	I'm not sure what this sentence means. I'm guessing it might have to do with simulation or copy & paste. It's my understanding that there is an assumption that the examiner has the KSAs needed to do the work, so I don't think these types of statements need to be included in the standard. The examiner should know to do this.	Remove, or provide more explanation.	Accept with modification: Added "such as those of cut and paste manipulation" to clarify the intended meaning.
54	6.3.3	6.3.3	T	needs qualifier at beginning and confusing overall	If the document contains non-original writing, the examiner shall examine the questioned writing for characteristics of duplication by electronic or other means. I actually find this entire requirement confusing. What are you looking for? Characteristics of printing process?	Accept with modification: Added "such as those of cut and paste manipulation" to clarify the intended meaning.
55	6.3.4	6.3.4	T	must be documented?	according to 6.1 this must be documented. Don't think this is necessary as it is easily determined by looking at the images	Reject: This standard does not specify the type and extent of documentation. However, documentation is dictated by laboratory policy and may change on a case by case basis.
118	6.3.4	6.3.4	E	It is unclear how the division into groups is intended. Physical separation? Documented groups in the notes? Types of writing is impractical to document on large cases but could be difficult on smaller cases as well (i.e. a single check can have numbers, print, cursive, running cursive, symbols, and scrawled writing)	Clarify intended required actions/documentation or alternatively, remove the standard	Reject: The conduct of the examination would be determined on a case by case basis for division into groups. This standard does not specify the type and extent of documentation. However, documentation is dictated by laboratory policy and may change on a case by case basis.
89	6.3.4 c)	6.3.4 c)	E	delete "the questioned writing for the perceived"	use "Assess the relative ease or difficulty with which"	Accept with modification: Reworded to clarify the intended meaning of this section. Reject use of word "relative" because this is discussing what the examiner initially perceives.
90	6.3.4 c)	6.3.4 c)	E	delete "overall rarity or generic nature"	use "overall common or unique nature"	Reject: The suggested recommendation is not a substantive change. The word "unique" is not appropriate in this section.
10	6.3.4 c	6.3.4 c	T	Re: "Assess the questioned writing for the perceived ease or difficulty of which the questioned writing could be duplicated by another writer." When you say "duplicated," it sounds like you mean just simulation. Complexity also impacts the likelihood of a "chance match" with another writer.	Suggested: "Assess the questioned writing for (1) the perceived ease or difficulty of which the questioned writing could be simulated by another person or (2) how likely the combination of features would coincide with another writer's"	Accept with modification: "duplicated" was replaced by "simulated". Regarding recommendation #2, this is covered by the last sentence in this paragraph "This includes the examiners assessment of overall rarity or generic nature of the characteristics."
11	6.3.4 c	6.3.4 c	T	Re the factors of complexity, I think they can be better delimited. For example, I would think "construction" refers to the ease of simulation, where there could be difficulty in determining how a signature is constructed, as well as reproducing that construction. I'm not sure that is clear to the reader. Similarly, "length of writing" could refer to length of the trace or length of a stroke. The one factor that is always supported as an indicator of complexity is amount of writing, which is essentially the number of strokes or the number of turning points.	Suggested: "Factors to be considered include amount of writing (or number of strokes), speed, skill, fluency, legibility, retracings, and connectedness of strokes.	Reject with modification. "length of writing" removed.
119	6.3.4 c	6.3.4 c		The "ease" would be dependent on the skill level of the person trying to duplicate it	Remove "perceived ease in which it could be duplicated"; there is sufficient guidance provided within the standard	Reject with modification: Section 6.4.3-c was revised and updated. The sentence is needed as the lead-in to this paragraph.

#	Section	Section (updated)	Type of	Comments	Proposed Resolution	Final Resolution
77	6.3.4 c)	6.3.4 c)	T	The assessment of the "overall rarity or generic nature of the characteristics" would be difficult to quantify or express in regards to their frequency	Change the ending sentence of c) to "This includes the examiners' assessment of the overall presence or absence of writing characteristics and cumulative range of variations."	Reject: The suggested change is not in keeping with the subject of this paragraph.
78	6.3.4 c)	6.3.4 c)	E	In the last line of the paragraph, "examiners" needs an apostrophe	examiners'	Reject with modification: Sentence was updated to include "examiner's assessment".
36	6.3.4(c)	6.3.4(c)	E	The last sentence, the word "examiners" needs an apostrophe due to it being a possessive noun	examiners'	Reject with modification: Sentence was updated to include "examiner's assessment".
37	6.3.4(c)	6.3.4(c)	T	The last sentence, "This includes the examiners assessment of overall rarity or generic nature of the characteristics." We could be asked on the stand 'how rare or generic is this characteristic' which is moving us to quantifying our replies.	Change the wording so it reads, "This includes the examiners' assessment of the overall presence or absence of identifiable characteristics."	Reject with modification: The suggested change is not in keeping with the subject of this paragraph. Sentence was updated to include "examiner's assessment".
183	6.3.4.c	6.3.4.c	E	In the last line, "examiners" needs to be a possessive (examiner's).	Add apostrophe to "examiners."	Accept
56	6.3.4c	6.3.4c	T	clarify or qualify statement concerning suitability of simple or easily duplicated writing	6.3.4c section implies if it is simple or easily duplicated it is not suitable for comparison. But one could still compare if it were copy book - though an ID or elimination would not be possible, some investigative assistance could be provided. This can often be the case in school threat scenarios.	Reject: This section merely instructs to assess the questioned writing with no implications that it would not be suitable for comparison.
57	6.3.5	6.3.5	T	peh hold/pen position??	remove-very difficult to determine or assess if at all..not needed	Reject: Although the characteristic is infrequent, it does not preclude a situation that will not call for assessment of said characteristic.
120	6.3.5	6.3.5	E	Evaluation of the questioned writing for sufficiency should be first, not left to be performed "in any order"	Consider re-order of standard	Reject: A note was added to Section 6.1 to clarify the state of the field with respect to the order in which items are examined. The note reads: "NOTE: Although there is some support within forensic disciplines for the evaluation and documentation of the questioned material prior to the evaluation of the known material, there are currently limited studies specific to handwriting examinations that support requiring the evaluation of the questioned material first."
12	6.3.5	6.3.5	T	This section is vague: "Perform an analysis" and consider numerous elements. From my understanding, the purpose of examining the questioned document(s) first is to note our observations about the important elements (like complexity, range of variation, naturalness/distortion), including distinctive features we would expect to see if a known sample is written by that same person. So later, when we do look at the knowns, we can assess how well those knowns "fit" with the writing elements we have already observed and declared as significant in terms of natural writing, or alternatively, how well other "propositions" like unusual writing circumstances, disguise, simulation, etc. are supported.	Suggested: "Examine the questioned document(s) and note observations regarding naturalness and distortion, complexity, speed and fluency of execution, consistency, and distinctive writing elements such as construction, alignment, ..." (These can be bulleted for better readability.)	Reject: The note covers those topics and is more extensive than recommendation provided. Additionally, a note was added to Section 6.1 to clarify the state of the field with respect to the order in which items are examined. The note reads: "NOTE: Although there is some support within forensic disciplines for the evaluation and documentation of the questioned material prior to the evaluation of the known material, there are currently limited studies specific to handwriting examinations that support requiring the evaluation of the questioned material first."
13	6.3.5 - 6.3.10	6.3.5 - 6.3.10	T	These sections go into too much detail about what the examiner considers during the exam, without giving any information about how the considerations impact the evaluation when we get to the evaluation section. When you start trying to delimit all the features an examiner considers, you are bound to miss something. By going into this much detail and directing with "shall," it can be taken as forcing examiners to note features that may not even be important in the case at hand. At the same time, by not giving any information about how the "considerations" affect the evaluation (later in the standard), these points become more of a checklist that could go on a worksheet, maybe, but should not be part of the standard. The purpose of the standard is for examiners to follow a particular method, but I don't think you need to try to list every single feature that is considered as part of that method.	Remove and just use something like the simply stated suggestion in the row above: "Examine the questioned document(s) and note observations regarding naturalness and distortion, complexity, speed and fluency of execution, consistency, and distinctive writing elements such as construction, alignment, ..."	Reject: This standard is intended to be thorough by directing the examiner to examine the writing for these features and it is not intended to replace training. Section 6.3 is strictly about the examination of the questioned writing and not evaluation. Regarding evaluation, that is discussed later in this standard.
58	6.3.6	6.3.6	T	clarify what the examiner is actually assessing to determine speed	The examiner shall examine the questioned writing for <del>characteristics indicative for</del> speed of execution.	Accept
38	Note of 6.3.6	Note of 6.3.6	E	Remove the "s" after beginnings and endings and delete the word "of"; the words "beginning" and "ending" are adjectives to the noun "strokes" which is plural.	...; tapered beginning and ending strokes; ...	Accept
59	6.3.7	6.3.6	T	Is noting free and natural necessary?	<del>according to 6.1 this must always be documented. Is it necessary to always notate if it appears free/natural? More appropriate to note when it appears slow or distorted since free/natural is more the norm.</del>	Reject: Section 6.1 requires the examiner to document relevant observations. It is up to examiner and laboratory policy to determine exactly what information must be documented. Original note in 6.3.6 was merged with the original note of 6.3.7. The notes were re-worded to clarify rapid and slow execution.
60	6.3.7	6.3.6	T	clarify/reword note concerning slowness	<del>the note states that these are characteristics of slowness - but that may not always be true. For example, I have seen retouching in a pattern that indicates speed of those strokes. Suggest change to "when present are characteristics that may indicate slowness" It's really when they are present in combination that indicates slowness.</del>	Accept with modification: 6.3.7 was consolidated with 6.3.6 and existing notes were merged and reworded into one note. The manner in which the features are considered or impact one another is up to the examiner to determine on a case by case basis.
121	6.3.7	6.3.6	E	This concept falls under the guidance given in the Note related to 6.3.6	Remove standard to avoid redundancy	Accept with modification: 6.3.7 was consolidated with 6.3.6 and existing notes were merged and reworded into one note.
168	6.3.6 and 6.3.7	6.3.6 and 6.3.7	E	Slowness IS a speed, and fast and slow features are ascertained at the same time, not one before another	Collapse 6.3.6 and 6.3.7 into one paragraph (use term "speed") and have two Notes as written	Accept with modification: 6.3.7 was consolidated with 6.3.6 and existing notes were merged and reworded into one note.
61	6.3.8	6.3.7	T	add unintentional to note	NOTE Distortion can be attributable to internal or external factors and can be intentional or unintentional.	Reject: The phrase "can be" highlights the potential of distortion being intentional and implies the alternative is also possible.
145	6.3.8	6.3.7	T	Should give an example to be consistent. In this section, the "reason" for distortion is explained rather than an example of distortions. In 5.2, 5.4, 6.3.6, 6.3.7, 6.3.10, etc., examples are given	NOTE Distortion such as x,y,z can be attributable to internal or external factors and can be intentional.	Accept with modification: Examples were added.
14	6.3.9	6.3.8	T	Re: "...determine whether these characteristics are specifically indicative of an attempt to simulate or to trace" The writer's intention is not something we can say for certain. Determining whether what we observed is indicative of simulation and to what extent should be in the evaluation section.	Remove	Reject: A basic aspect of this comparison process is to determine the potential that multiple questioned signatures are based on a common model.
15	6.3.9	6.3.8	E	What does this mean: "whether there is artificial similarity when multiple questioned items are submitted"? I think you may mean the Q are distorted and too alike to be written naturally at different times?	Remove (because the examiner should have the KSAs to know to do this), or at least clarify what is meant.	Accept with modification: The sentence was reworded to better convey the intended meaning.

#	Section	Section (updated)	Type of	Comments	Proposed Resolution	Final Resolution
175	6.3.9	6.3.8	T	Examine for indicia of simulation/tracing. But doesn't expand on what the indicia are or what you'd expect to see in simulation vs. tracing.	Add the specific indicia.	Reject: The bulleted list does discuss the details or the indicia.
92	6.3.9	6.3.8	E	delete both uses of "indicia"	replace both uses of "indicia" with "indications"	Reject: The word "indicia" is the correctly used in this section.
79	6.3.9	6.3.8	T	The term "artificial similarity" is vague and lacks clarification	define the following term, "artificial similarity"	Reject with modification: The sentence was reworded to better convey the intended meaning.
91	6.3.9 para 5	6.3.8	E	delete "artificial"	replace with "unnatural"	Accept with modification: The sentence was reworded to better convey the intended meaning.
62	6.3.10	6.3.9	E & T	change "take into account" and add writing instrument/medium since you mention substrate	The examiner shall <del>take into account</del> consider additional features such as date, nature of the substrate, <b>writing instrument/medium</b> , document type, margins, and the area available for writing.	Accept with modification: The sentence was reworded as following: "The examiner shall consider additional features such as date, nature of the substrate, writing instrument, document type, margins, and the area available for writing."
122	6.4.1	6.4.1	E	It is unclear what minimum documentation is required by this standard. Does this only require reference to the procedure? Or Documentation of all characteristics observed or simply those evaluated?	Clarify intended required documentation	Reject: This standard does not specify the type and extent of documentation. However, documentation is dictated by laboratory policy and may change on a case by case basis.
157	6.4.1	6.4.1	E	Per the above comment to section 6.1, this section should specify that documentation should occur BEFORE moving on to subsequent steps.	Change the language to read: "The examiner shall perform and document all applicable procedures in sections 6.4.2 through 6.4.7 before moving on to the procedures laid out in the remainder of this standard."	Reject: Contemporaneous documentation is covered in paragraph 3 of section 6.1. The standard explicitly states that the steps need not be performed in the order given because in a complex handwriting case it may be necessary to further evaluate any set of submitted writing. Regardless, as stated in paragraph 3 of section 6.1, the examiner shall contemporaneously document their examinations.
125	6.4.1-6.4.5	6.4.1-6.4.5	T	In order to ensure the sufficiency of the handwriting to be compared and prevent circular reasoning, the questioned items must be evaluated prior to undertaking any comparisons to known writing	Consider re-order of standards	Reject with Modification: A note was added to Section 6.1 to clarify the state of the field with respect to the order in which Items are examined. The note reads: "NOTE: Although there is some support within forensic disciplines for the evaluation and documentation of the questioned material prior to the evaluation of the known material, there are currently limited studies specific to handwriting examinations that support requiring the evaluation of the questioned material first."
63	6.4.2	6.4.2	T	add if applicable/if needed to the end of the sentence	Not always necessary to have original K for comparison or definite opinions provided copied K is adequate clarity/detail.	Reject with modification. Section was reworded. Last sentence of first paragraph now reads: "If it is not original writing, the examiner may request the original." First sentence of second paragraph now reads: "If no original known writing is submitted, the examiner shall evaluate the quality of the submitted reproduction..." Last sentence of second paragraph now reads: "If the writing has not been reproduced with sufficient clarity for any analysis or comparison purposes, and neither the original nor better copies are available, the examiner may discontinue these procedures and report accordingly."
93	6.4.2 para 2	6.4.2 para 2	E	move the last sentence up to be the third sentence; as it now appears, a set of original knowns with very poor knowns could halt the procedures and report, etc		Reject: 2nd paragraph was updated for clarity. The final sentence is in the correct place in this paragraph.
94	6.4.2 end NOTE	6.4.2 end NOTE	E	examination results shall include a statement to the effect that results/opinions for examinations of copies are contingent upon the absence of significant differences between copies examined and the original documents they depict.		Reject: The comment is inapplicable to section.
39	Note of 6.4.2	Note of 6.4.2	E	This note should be moved and placed under Interferences since that is what it is stating; in addition, it will only need to be stated once instead of under both the Examination of the Questioned Writing and the Examination of the Known Writing	Same as Note of 6.3.2, move note under Interferences	Reject: Statements in sections 4.2.1, 6.3.2 and 6.4.2 are made for two different reasons. In section 4.2.1 the statement lists the matter as a limitation only. In sections 6.3.2 and 6.4.2 the statements are made as part of a more comprehensive procedural aspect.
123	6.4.3	6.4.3	E	It is unclear how the division into groups is intended. Physical separation? Documented groups in the notes?	Clarify intended required actions/documentation or alternatively, remove the standard	Reject: Section 6.4.3 is designed to describe the initial process for evaluating the known writing, however, the specific manner in which this is carried out may vary on a case by case basis or due to laboratory policy.
189	6.4.3	6.4.3	T	Word "cultivated" by itself seems a bit cryptic for the public	Put the word "intentionally" before "cultivated".	Reject with modification. Item c) was modified to read: "Known specimens may include both those written in the normal course of business and those that were written specifically at request for comparison purposes. Known specimens solely collected by a stakeholder may not reflect a writer's full range of variation."
124	6.4.3 c	6.4.3 c	T	There are pros/cons to both requested and non-requested writing, of which no discussion or distinguishment is had here. Specimens are collected by the stakeholder (submitter), scientist doesn't have the opportunity to collect additional samples first hand; a con of requested writing is that it is a snapshot of a person's writing and doesn't always show their range	Add a Note for guidance	Reject with modification. Item c) was modified to read: "Known specimens may include both those written in the normal course of business and those that were written specifically at request for comparison purposes. Known specimens solely collected by a stakeholder may not reflect a writer's full range of variation." Discussion of the pros and cons of each is beyond the scope of this document.
16	6.4.4	6.4.4	T	I'm not understanding the necessity of this section as it is described. I think you're meaning in terms of sufficiency for comparison. Since the examiner has already seen the Q, it seems okay to have the full sufficiency and comparability of K section here and move 6.5.2 up to this section.	If the known writing appears to be distorted and only requested known writing is available, the examiner should ask for non-request writing. If the known writing is not contemporaneous with the questioned, contemporaneous K should be requested. If all the known writing is requested and was written after the questioned writing, the examiner should ask for known writing done before the questioned writing (because the suspected writer could have disguised their writing to avoid detection as the writer of the Q). If only part of the K appears distorted, maybe it would entail a conversation with the investigator as to whether it should be included with the rest of the K. If additional exemplars are not submitted, the examination will/may be limited.	Reject: The commenter's suggested changes are already discussed in section 6.4.4. Section 6.4.4. is part of the evaluation of known writing and the comparison process is not being discussed yet in this section.
95	6.4.4	6.4.4	E	delete "writing appears to be distorted"	replace with "writing is distorted".	Reject: The appearance of distortion is used because it may actually be natural writing.
96	6.4.4	6.4.4	E	delete "If it appears to be distorted,"	and Capitalize "The"	Reject: The appearance of distortion is used because it may actually be natural writing.
97	6.4.4 para 2	6.4.4 para 2	E	delete the first sentence	use "If it is not possible to establish that the distorted writing is natural, the examiner shall determine whether it is suitable for analysis and comparison and proceed to the extent possible."	Accept with modification: Second paragraph is now edited for clarity to read: " If it is not possible to establish whether apparently distorted writing is natural writing, the examiner shall determine whether the writing is suitable for analysis and comparison and proceed to the extent possible. ".



#	Section	Section (updated)	Type of	Comments	Proposed Resolution	Final Resolution
17	6.4.5	6.4.5	E	Similar to 6.3.5, this is vague, and much of what we've done in previous sections under 6.4 and will do in later sections is a part of the analysis of the K.	Remove and add as part of 6.4.3. The evaluation/analysis of the known has to do with all of the things in this section, including observing the writer's range of variation, distinctive elements in their writing, etc.	Reject: Section 6.4.3 documents initial evaluations of the known writing and section 6.4.5 is a more detailed level of observations about the known writings.
64	6.4.6	6.4.6	E	shouldn't this parallel the format of 6.3.6 and 6.3.7?	format accordingly	Accept: See updated section 6.4.6.
18	6.4.7	6.4.7	T	As with much of the draft, there is a lot of detail on what should be accounted for or considered, but no direction on how those considerations affect the evaluation. I don't think the detail is necessary; it makes the standard unwieldy and difficult to follow. If an examiner doesn't know to do these things, it will just force them to add to the notes that it was done, not necessarily know why it's done or do it properly. As stated earlier, the standard should assume the examiner has the KSAs to do the work. If the reader does not have the full understanding of what we do (and when), this type of detail will more likely be misinterpreted or misunderstood.	Remove	Reject: Section 6.4.7 is necessary as part of a complete evaluation of all submitted writings.
65	6.4.7	6.4.7	E & T	change "take into account" and add writing instrument/medium since you mention substrate	The examiner shall <b>take into account consider</b> additional features such as date, nature of the substrate, <b>writing instrument/medium</b> , document type, margins, and the area available for writing.	Accept with modification: Section was updated and it reads: "The examiner shall consider additional features such as date, nature of the substrate, writing instrument, document type, margins, and the area available for writing."
126	6.5.1	6.5.1	E	The language in this standard says "note", whereas the previously standards say "document"	For consistency, replace "note" with "document"	Reject: "Note" is a more generic terms that offers the examiner greater flexibility in their specific procedures.
158	6.5.1	6.5.1	E	This section omits a documentation requirement. Per the comments to section 6.1, it must require documentation generally, and specifically of the features relied upon by the examiner. The examiner must be required to note both observed similarities and dissimilarities.	Impose the documentation requirement suggested in the comment to section 6.5.1	Reject: "Note" is a more generic terms that offers the examiner greater flexibility in their specific procedures. Regarding the specifics of the documentation please refer to the 3rd paragraph of section 6.1 that reads: "The examiner shall contemporaneously document the examinations performed, relevant observations, and basis for results, in detail to allow for an internal or external review and assessment of the utilized examination processes by a forensic document examiner. The documentation shall include any relevant information, method(s), interpretation(s), evaluation(s), and conclusion(s), opinion(s), or other finding(s)."
19	6.5.2	6.5.2	T	See comment on 6.4.4. I would streamline this and add to 6.4.4.	Something like: "The examiner should determine the sufficiency of the known writing in terms of the amount submitted, comparability with Q, and contemporaneousness of the known writing submitted..."	Reject: Section 6.5 is the comparison of bodies of writing whereas section 6.4. was strictly about the evaluation of known writing. This standards covers the examination and comparison of both questioned to known writing and exclusively questioned writing and as such the evaluation of comparability applies to more than just section 6.4.
66	6.5.2	6.5.2	T	Shall? This should be done immediately or at least prior to this point. If the Q and K are not comparable and a discontinuation is in order...no need to do an in-depth independent analysis of the K.	Move to earlier in document-make this determination earlier. Still may be pertinent to do the independent analysis of the Q, just not the K as it's not comparable. But the analysis of the Q would enable to FDE to say what is needed. Would save time and effort to consider this earlier.	Reject: Comparability can only be accomplished after a full evaluation of the questioned and the known writings.
127	6.5.2	6.5.2	T	This can be included during the evaluation of the known writing	Remove	Reject: Comparability can only be accomplished after a full evaluation of the questioned and the known writings.
20	6.5.2.1	6.5.2.1	E	I don't understand the need for this: "Consideration of factors in 6.5.4 shall be taken into account regardless of whether contemporary writings are available." 6.5.4 is a "shall." For the rest of 6.5.2.1, it only serves to instruct. It would be more useful in the evaluation portion, where it should be stated what the limitations could be and how they may lessen the strength of the opinion.	Remove the last sentence of 6.5.2.1. Move the rest to the evaluation portion of the standard.	Reject: The lack of contemporaneous specimens may not be a limiting factor.
98	6.5.2.1	6.5.2.1	E	delete the first sentence	use "Features limiting comparability may include the type of writing, non-contemporaneousness, dissimilarities in text content, capture methods , writing instruments, and writing surfaces.	Accept: First sentence replaced and reworded as suggested.
21	6.5.2.2	6.5.2.2	E	If the subject is beyond the scope, I don't think this needs to be mentioned. The limitations would follow from any type of writing.	Remove	Reject: Consideration of the pictorial images from digitally captured signatures is relevant to the examination of handwritten items however the examination of the dynamic features that are also captured is beyond the scope of this document.
128	6.5.2.2	6.5.2.2	T	Our laboratory does not consider these types of writing to be of sufficient quality for comparisons	Remove	Reject: Consideration of the pictorial images from digitally captured signatures is relevant to the examination of handwritten items however the examination of the dynamic features that are also captured is beyond the scope of this document. Individual laboratory policy may dictate other procedures.
139	6.5.2.2	6.5.2.2	T	There is a difference between a digitally captured biometric signature and an online signature. A biometric signature is captured on a tablet or other surface that records data to recreate the signature, whereas an online signature can be your own signature using a mouse to write your signature (as in one program), a scan of your signature that can be stored and "dropped" onto a document, or a signature you design using screen fonts that does not resemble your true signature.	Separate biometric signatures from online signatures. If speaking of any signature image captured digitally, including jpeg, pdf or other types of signature images submitted for examination, send back to WG for definitions of various kinds of digital captures.	Accept with modification: Section 6.5.2.2 was reworded to remove "online" and rephrased to "electronically captured" to clarify the intended meaning of this section. The definitions of various digital captures is beyond the scope of this document.
99	6.5.2.2.	6.5.2.2.	E	last sentence, insert a comma before "but"		Accept
67	6.5.2.3	6.5.2.3	T	This section needs more detail and should consider outside factors such as the need to move items to other forensic disciplines in "immediate" "high priority" cases. In addition, the examiner needs to request additional "comparable" known since that was the initial issue. Need to clearly request comparable and what that means.	In questioned to known examinations, if the bodies of writing are not comparable, the examiner shall <b>pause exams and request additional comparable known writing or after capturing images of the items, discontinue and report accordingly including a request for additional comparable known writing. (sometimes evidence needs to move immediately or no response from contributor. Known writing can be submitted at a later date and compared to retained images of the questioned items...again the word "shall" is very restrictive...consider using "should" or "when possible/if necessary" more often throughout the SOP)</b>	Reject: Purpose of proposed edit is already covered. Specific laboratory policy is not part of this document.
100	6.5.2.3	6.5.2.3	E	last sentence, begin with: If bodies of questioned and known writings are not comparable, the examiner..."		Reject: The first phrase of each sentence delineates the type of examination and the consequences of the limitations differ.
169	6.5.2.3	6.5.2.3	T	Some labs may report at the stage and not seek additional known writing	Change text to "... the examiner may request ..."	Reject with modification: Section updated by adding "per laboratory policy" to both sentences.

#	Section	Section (updated)	Type of	Comments	Proposed Resolution	Final Resolution
170	6.5.2.4	6.5.2.4	E	What is the "appropriate" next step?	Remove paragraph	Reject: It is up to the examiner to decide what is the appropriate next step on a case by case basis that cannot be codified in writing.
22	6.5.3	6.5.3	T	The note regarding screening doesn't give enough information as to what it is, why it's mentioned, or what one would do for screening. Could it be done for K as well as for Q? Does the screening process follow the same procedures outlined in this standard? If not, how is it different?	Remove or explain.	Accept with modification: Note was modified for clarification and additional explanation.
101	6.5.3 Note	6.5.3 Note	E	delete the NOTE as is	use: Screening for significant features can provide efficiency when large numbers of questioned or known writings are involved.	Reject with modification: "significant" was added. Remainder of note was modified for clarification and additional explanation.
185	6.5.3 NOTE	6.5.3 NOTE	E	Remove "screening".	In some cases, the volume of material may require a methodical assessment of characteristics for comparability. This process is used to denote certain characteristics that tend to be obvious, particularly uncommon, or in some other way may allow for comparisons of limited characteristics in a timely manner and may include questioned and known material.	Reject with modification: Based on comments 22, 40, and 101, note was modified for clarification and additional explanation
40	Note of 6.5.3	Note of 6.5.3	T	This note should be clarified. I can see an examiner doing a screening only in lieu of a full exam.	Add at the end of the note, "Once the screening process is complete, the selected items will be fully examined."	Accept
23	6.5.3.1	6.5.3.1	E	There may be subjectivity involved in whether a character or formation is "absent." The "shall" part may also be unduly burdensome in some cases.	This can be part of the direction in 6.5.3. Conduct a side-by-side comparison, observing similarities, differences, and limitations. Limitations may include absent characters, lack of complexity of the questioned writing, lack of sufficient known writing, etc.	Reject with modification: Section modified for clarification and additional explanation
68	6.5.3.1	6.5.3.1	T	Assess absent characters? Isn't this already done to some extent when assessing comparability?	maybe move to assessing comparability/suitability section	Reject. This section is further into the comparison process than the requirement in 6.5.2
102	6.5.3.1	6.5.3.1	E	delete as written	use: The examiner shall note any features in a questioned writing group that are absent in the other writings being compared.	Reject with modification. Section modified for clarification and additional explanation
129	6.5.3.1	6.5.3.1	E	The language in this standard says "note", whereas the previously standards say "document"	For consistency, replace "note" with "document"	Reject: "Note" is a more generic terms that offers the examiner greater flexibility in their specific procedures.
130	6.5.3.1	6.5.3.1	T	Absent characters-could be difficult if the writing is not very comparable and would this include common letter combinations or unique letter combinations		Accept with modification. Section modified for clarification and additional explanation
24	6.5.4	6.5.4	E	Reading ahead to later in the standard, I'm assuming "other affects" means other conditions that may affect natural writing. Distortion has already been noted, so it's confusing that it's mentioned again here.	Remove. What I think you're referring to should go in the evaluation section.	Reject with modification: This section (the original section 6.5.4. was merged with the original section 6.5.4.1 and it is now section 6.5.4) was updated for clarification. The previous evaluation for distortion is important and it is a part of the comparison process.
41	6.5.4	6.5.4	E	This is conducted and evaluated during the examination of the Q (6.3.8) and K (6.4.4) and is not needed under the comparison portion of this standard. The word "evaluate" means "to determine".	Delete	Reject with modification: This section (the original section 6.5.4. was merged with the original section 6.5.4.1 and it is now section 6.5.4) was updated for clarification. The previous evaluation for distortion is important and it is a part of the comparison process.
69	6.5.4	6.5.4	T	Evaluate for distortion? - Again this probably has already been completed during the analysis phase of the Q and K items. In addition, 6.5.4 section is confusing. It starts with comments regarding distortion, then further expands on this in 6.5.4.1, then 6.5.4.2 seems to back out of the distortion/affects and initiates the between the bodies.	Move to appropriate section. 6.5.4.2 should be changed to 6.5.5	Reject with modification: This section (the original section 6.5.4. was merged with the original section 6.5.4.1 and it is now section 6.5.4) was updated for clarification. The previous evaluation for distortion is important and it is a part of the comparison process.
103	6.5.4	6.5.4	E	delete "affects" at the end of th sentence	replace it with "effects".	Reject: "Affect" is the correct word. (NOTE: the original section 6.5.4. was merged with the original section 6.5.4.1 and it is now section 6.5.4).
42	6.5.4.1	is now part of 6.5.4	E	Move to under 6.1 General, these are potential factors that should be considered when evaluating and examining the Q and K. So, this should be up front prior to beginning the examination	Move under 6.1	Reject with modification: This section (the original section 6.5.4. was merged with the original section 6.5.4.1 and it is now section 6.5.4) was updated for clarification. The previous evaluation for distortion is important and it is a part of the comparison process.
43	6.5.4.1	is now part of 6.5.4	E	On the last line, change the word "disguise" to "distortion", DE's do not determine intent. The word "disguise" should not be in our standards.	Change "disguise" to "distortion"	Reject: "Disguise" is often a consideration in the assessment and comparison processes even though intent is not within the realm of determination by an FDE.
70	6.5.4.1	is now part of 6.5.4	T	This should be much earlier in the SOP when the examiner assesses the Q and K items for distortion.	Move to appropriate earlier section	Reject with modification: 6.5.4 was modified for clarification which better explains the placement within the standard.
104	6.5.4.1	is now part of 6.5.4	E	delete "Potential"; redundant to use of "might" affect	or keep Potential and remove "might"	Accept: "Potential" was deleted.
105	6.5.4.1	is now part of 6.5.4	E	delete "deliberate" from the last sentence	use "attempts to disguise should be considered."	Accept: Edit made "attempts to disguise should be considered".
146	6.5.4.1	is now part of 6.5.4	E	The examples of factors potentially affecting writing stated in 6.5.4.1 could serve the document better if placed under 6.3.5. In 6.3.5 the document begins to discuss the analysis and it under the "NOTE" where distortion and "other affects" are first noted. The document then continues for several sections, several pages later, before describing what the distortions and other affects are in section 6.5.4.1	Move 6.5.4.1. to 6.3.5.1 (before or after "NOTE")	Reject with modification: 6.5.4 was modified for clarification which better explains the placement within the standard.
25	6.5.4.2	6.5.5	E	I don't think this is meant to be under the subheading of 6.5.4, which deals with distortion.	Include under 6.5.3	Accept with modification: This section was renumbered and section 6.5.4.2 is now 6.5.5.
71	6.5.4.2	6.5.5	T	Needs consideration of other characteristics and limitations added.	Include: "The significance of other characteristics (variations, explained or unexplained, accidental characteristics, absent characteristics, indicia of simulation, tracing, alteration, distortion) as well as any limitations that might be present should also be evaluated". Should also be some further discussion of the significance – for example repetition of a characteristic in common or not in common, variation of characters, class and individual characteristics, etc.	Reject: Information is covered in the section 6.3.5 note. Further discussion of the significance of various characteristics is beyond the scope of the standard as it is not designed to replace the knowledge, skills and abilities required to utilize it.
		6.5.5		WG added a note to provide clarity on section 6.5.5		Accept
26	6.5.4.3	6.5.6	E	After reading this a few times, I'm assuming the authors mean that you should always check to see if the simulation model is among the knows. It says to "report accordingly" if a model is not located, which doesn't make much sense. I have to report if there is no model? Or does this mean that the evaluation is finished and to go ahead and give a conclusion?	Remove (because the examiner should have the KSAs to know to do this)	Reject with modification: This section was updated for clarification.
106	6.5.4.3	6.5.6	E	delete the first line	use "If simulation or tracing is indicated in the questioned writing,"	Reject: "If indicia" is more specific to this process than using the words "is indicated".

#	Section	Section (updated)	Type of	Comments	Proposed Resolution	Final Resolution
44	6.5.4.4	6.5.6	E	I would recommend removing the term "artificial" or defining it so there is no confusion as to which meaning is being used.	Either delete or define the term artificial	Reject with modification: Section was deleted, modified, and consolidated with section 6.5.6 for clarification of the intended meaning.
72	6.5.4.4	6.5.6	E & T	"Artificial level of pictorial similarity" is awkward.	What about "If comparison of the bodies of writing reveals little to no natural variation between the two or more bodies..."	Reject with modification: Section was deleted, modified, and consolidated with section 6.5.6 for clarification of the intended meaning.
80	6.5.4.4	6.5.6	T	The phrase "artificial level of pictorial similarity" is vague and lacks clarification	define the phrase, "artificial level of pictorial similarity"	Reject with modification: Section was deleted, modified, and consolidated with section 6.5.6 for clarification of the intended meaning.
107	6.5.4.4	6.5.6	E	delete the first line	use "When a comparison reveals an unnatural pictorial similarity between two or more...."	Reject with modification: Section was deleted, modified, and consolidated with section 6.5.6 for clarification of the intended meaning.
131	6.5.4.4	6.5.6	T	It is unclear what "artificial level" is referring to	include in terms and definitions	Reject with modification: Section was deleted, modified, and consolidated with section 6.5.6 for clarification of the intended meaning.
27	6.5.4.4 and subsections	6.5.6	T	We are directed to do an overlay, but this begs the question as to how much agreement there needs to be in order to determine if there is a model. By going into detail about the obvious or straightforward procedures (conduct an overlay, check for a model), it highlights the vagueness of the rest of this section and the standard in general. It is very rare that the evaluation is so straightforward that an overlay or some simple part of the procedure will result in a clear opinion that is unlikely to be disputed. The examiner and other readers of the standard will want to know what procedures will allow an accurate and reliable conclusion to be reached in general. Also, when you make a determination that the Q is a simulation or tracing, that involves evaluation and so should come later in the process.	Parts of this belong in the evaluation section, or there should be a rewording that makes it clear that the examiner is observing features that may indicate simulation, disguise, or other unnatural writing forms and that is what may prompt further examination with overlays. I would remove all of 6.5.4.4.1, but at least the "shall" should be changed to a "should" or "may."	Reject with modification: Section 6.5.6. was rewritten for clarity. "Shall" related to conducting an overlay comparison is no longer present.
73	6.5.4.4.2	6.5.6.2	T	Very unlikely that enough characteristics of the "forger" will be present to opine (especially in a tracing ) unless it is a freehand simulation. In addition, this implies the simulation/tracing is not an auto forgery.	Need to qualify/clarify this statement. In addition, remove "...(or a tracing)..." after simulation. Address autoforgery.	Reject with modification: Section was updated for clarification.
108	6.5.4.4.2	6.5.6.2	E	delete as written	use "The examiner shall evaluate features of a questioned simulation or tracing that differ from the writing model, to determine whether they include natural writing features of the person making the simulation or tracing."	Accept with modification: Section was updated for clarification.
132	6.5.4.4.2	6.5.6.2	E	For any tracing, the writing would be void of natural characteristics, specially of those of the preparer	Remove "or a tracing"	Reject: Section was updated for clarification. Tracing may contain natural characteristics of the writer when deviations occur.
28	6.6	6.6	T	There is a lot of information in this draft about what the examiner should consider and nothing about how the examiner forms the conclusion. As such, there is no information to help avoid errors or achieve reliability among examiners. My thought is that the intra-comparison and inter-comparison processes involve observing all the features of the writing. (That doesn't require so much detail because it's in the literature and the examiner should know to do these things.) The evaluation process is determining what the observations mean in terms of the question for the case at hand, and that is the part where the standard can give some direction. One clear directive should be in terms of limitations. The draft says they should be documented, but shouldn't there be more to it than that? Limitations, depending on their nature and degree, should lessen the strength of the opinion because they mean more uncertainty.	One way to clarify the evaluation process is to delimit what would need to be observed when the same writer wrote K and Q and for when a different writer wrote K and Q. For example, in ideal circumstances when 2 natural writing samples are by the same person, the writing is fluent and there are numerous similarities and no meaningful differences. To determine common authorship, the writing would be complex, sufficiently comparable, and there would be no limitations. (These characteristics are supported by the literature and research.) By comparing the case at hand with the "ideal" circumstances, the examiner can determine how well the current case fits this ideal. If it fits very well, the opinion might be strong in favor of common authorship. If it doesn't, another explanation may be better supported. For unnatural writing, it would be more difficult to delimit these writing characteristics and would entail discussing common vs. infrequent features of simulation, disguise, etc. As an alternative, something like the flowchart in the Modular Method gives some information on how an examiner reaches a conclusion.	Reject: Specific conclusions, and the degree to which individual limitations affect them, are beyond the scope of this document.
29	6.6	6.6	T	Re "The examiner shall form a conclusion for each set of comparisons..." It reads that the draft is directing the examiner to give a separate opinion for each known writer when there are multiple known writers. Using the current conclusion scale, if the examiner opines it is highly probable writer A wrote Q, it will likely be interpreted that it is also highly improbable someone else wrote Q. What if there is limited K from writer B? Giving a highly probable for one writer and inconclusive for another writer doesn't seem like it would make sense to the reader of the report. The examiner should _compare_ each K with Q separately, but to help answer the question of did writer A, B, or some other person write Q, the evaluation includes weighing the probabilities/likelihoods of the evidence given each of those options. Often times, the examiner can opine the probability/likelihood of observing the evidence is higher if one writer wrote Q than the other.	Maybe, "The examiner shall evaluate each set of comparisons relative to each of the other sets and form a conclusion(s)." (This is vague, but it's a topic that would need more consideration to address in a useful way.)	Reject: The standard neither requires nor prohibits cross comparison because cross comparisons may not be practical.
159	6.6	6.6	E	Per the comments to the Foreword, examiners cannot be permitted to rely on experience where ground truth was not available when reaching their conclusions. This section should specify the dangers of relying on past comparisons that may have been made in error.	Clarify that examiners must utilize caution when relying on past experience given the lack of ground truth known in casework.	Reject: Experience does provide foundational information from which the examiner assesses data in the comparative process.
160	6.7	6.7	E	While an examiner should obviously review their own work, it is also vital that said work be verified by a second examiner. That is the case for essentially every other pattern matching field. If verification is tackled in another standard then this section should reference out to that standard. If not this section must include procedures for verification which at minimum require: blind review by a second examiner, and documentation by that verifier that is equal to that of the primary examiner.	Address verification or clarify that other asb standards will do so.	Reject: Verification and peer review are beyond the scope of this document and are based on laboratory policy.
171	6.7	6.7	T	Does this section refer to a review by the primary examiner of their own work, or a secondary examiner conducting a technical or administrative review	Add wording to describe that peer review by a second examiner is necessary	Reject: Verification and peer review are beyond the scope of this document and are based on laboratory policy.
190	6.7	6.7	T	There is no mention of Peer Review.	Add : "When possible or if mandatory, a peer review should be performed - after the initial review of the case - by another examiner."	Reject: Verification and peer review are beyond the scope of this document and are based on laboratory policy.

#	Section	Section (updated)	Type of	Comments	Proposed Resolution	Final Resolution
192	6.8	6.8	t	in the Note of 6.2.4, it says that the examiner MAY define the scope of the examination by "writing" sets of opposing hypotheses for each comparison. If the examiner chooses to do that, shouldn't there be a section under 6.8 that shows whether the hypotheses were supported or not?	Somewhere in 6.8, a mention should be made regarding the support for or against the scope hypotheses if they have written them into their examination.	Reject: In section 6.2.4 it is stated that the examiner shall document the scope of examination to be conducted, however, this standard does not dictate that the scope needs to be written in any particular manner, to include competing hypothesis. In section 6.8 individual conclusions are beyond the scope of this document and may vary depending on how the examiner defines their scope.
74	6.8.1	6.8.1	T	Need to consider the significance/weight of any limitations when rendering a conclusion	Conclusion(s), or opinion(s), or observation(s) may be reached after following the appropriate procedures outlined in this standard. A conclusion is not based solely upon any one characteristic, but rather on the cumulative combination of characteristics within the set of writing in conjunction with any significant limitations that may be present. The number and nature of the examination results are dependent on the question(s) at hand.	Accept with modification: "in conjunction with any limitations that may be present." was added to the second sentence.
172	6.8.1	6.8.1	E	cumulative combination is redundant	Remove "cumulative"	Accept
193	6.8.2 and 6.8.3	6.8.2 and 6.8.3	t	Many of the generally-accepted phrases do not align with the others (i.e. "identification" vs. "strong probability for" or a 3 point "probable" vs. a 9 point "probable"). This can lead to confusion. People may also wonder why there are so many conclusions in FDE and why there isn't just one set. If multiple conclusions that can cause confusion and show we don't appear to be using the same method are used, then this should not be a Standard but should be a Guide.	Replace 6.8.3 with a set of conclusions that everyone should use. At this point maybe a 9 point, or a 5 point, or even a 3 point scale could be inserted. Probability statements seem to ask for specific numeric probabilities which we don't have right now and makes them difficult to use.	Reject: Conclusions are beyond the scope of this document.
133	6.8.3	6.8.3	T	Earlier the SWGDOC was referenced, however those records do no address conclusion guidance	Refer to another published OSAC standard, if it exists; or alternatively, add a range of report conclusions to this ASB standard	Reject: Conclusions are beyond the scope of this document.
147	6.8.3	6.8.3	E	Suggests that readers should refer to other organizations. I suggest listing some		Reject: This standard is not intended to endorse any organization or provide an exhaustive list of organizations.
184	6.8.4	6.8.4	E	The sentence ends with a dangling phrase that needs to be resolved.	I suggest adding a few words to the end so that the past phrase reads: "or whether the method of simulation or tracing was identified." (or revealed, or discovered.....)	Accept with modification: Section 6.8.4 was deleted.
165	Annex A	Annex A	E	Add the NIST report	Adding the NIST report reinforces much of the handwriting standard and is the most current and scientifically grounded publication to date.	Reject: The purpose of the bibliography is to provide documentation of material of direct use in creating this standard and it is not meant to be a comprehensive references of the discipline.
140	Bibliography	Bibliography	T	The stated goal of the Bibliography is to provide references related to the subject of the standard. Some standards have proposed over 25 references. Handwriting is the most common type of examination, so it is strange there is nothing listed in the Bibliography related to handwriting. Since there are hundreds of articles on handwriting comparison and it would be difficult to choose which to list. However, there are only two journals devoted exclusively to publishing articles on document examination and these journals should be listed. (I can provide the web site address for the Journal of Forensic Document Examination). It would be appropriate to list recognized books written by document examiners that have chapters on handwriting.	Add: The following are recognized reference books in the profession and have chapters on handwriting examination. Add books by the following authors: William Harrison, Ordway Hilton, Kelly & Lindblom (update on Hilton), David Ellen, J.Newton Baker, Huber & Headrick, Harralson & Miller (update on Huber & Headrick), Hanna Sulner, Edna Robertson. Add: The following two journals publish articles related to handwriting comparison and question document examination. Journal of Forensic Document Examination, Journal of the American Society of Questioned Document Examiners.	Reject: The purpose of the bibliography is to provide documentation of material of direct use in creating this standard and it is not meant to be a comprehensive references of the discipline.
141	Bibliography	Bibliography	T	Referencing the SWGDOC handwriting standard implies there are two different standard on handwriting examination. Once the ASB standard is published, the SWGDOC standard becomes obsolete, the same as the ASTM standard. The ASB standard will supercede the SWGDOC standard so there is no merit to referencing. It will simply confuse the public since it will appear there are two different standards on handwriting.	Eliminate reference to the SWGDOC handwriting standard.	Reject: See revised introductory paragraph of Annex A. It is specifically referenced for the terminology section.
142	Bibliography	Bibliography		The SWGDOC standard on terminology makes references to only 25 terms used to describe handwriting features. This is an incomplete list of terminology used in the profession and for this reason this standard should not be referenced. There are many terms missing in the SWGDOC standard, for example the term "descender" is mentioned, but not "ascender". The ASB standard references "distorted writing" numerous times, but this term is not defined in the SWGDOC standard. Other missing common terms are stroke, fluency, rhythm, slope or slant, variation, blunt ending, feathering, tapered stroke, etc. An ASB WG is working on defining terms used within the profession and that standard can be added to the Bibliography once it is published. Further, based on the title of the SWGDOC standard it claims to provide terminology related to the examination of questioned documents which implies the entire range of subjects within forensic document examination, not just handwriting. Based on the title there are many more definitions missing related to altered documents, paper, ink, etc. The SWGDOC standard serves no purpose.	Eliminate reference to the SWGDOC terminology standard.	Reject: See revised introductory paragraph of Annex A. It is specifically referenced for the terminology section.
178				OVERALL COMMENT: This is a much improved document. I appreciate the efforts of the committee.		Enthusiastically THANK YOU!!!