



Scientific & Technical Review Panel Final Report for 2022-S-0015

Standard Guide for Forensic Physical Fit Examination

Organization of Scientific Area Committees (OSAC) for Forensic Science





STRP Final Report 2022-S-0015

Standard Guide for Forensic Physical Fit Examination

Organization of Scientific Area Committees (OSAC) for Forensics Science
July 12, 2022

Disclaimer:

This report was produced by an independent Scientific and Technical Review Panel (STRP). The views expressed in the report do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the U.S. Government. Visit the OSAC website for more information on [OSAC's STRP process](#).

Scientific & Technical Review Panel Members

- Melanie Carson, North Carolina State Crime Laboratory
- Vincent Desiderio, U.S. Postal Inspection Laboratory
- Guy Nutter, Michigan State Police
- Larry Olson, Internal Revenue Service Forensic Laboratory
- Sandy Parent, Texas Department of Public Safety
- Adele Quigley-McBride, Duke University
- Christopher Saunders, South Dakota State University
- Raymond Valerio, Queens District Attorney's Office



Report Summary:

The STRP has reviewed and discussed this draft standard and has formed consensus that many sections below have been addressed, however, there remain notable weaknesses in the Human Factors, Quality Assurance, and Reporting Results sections. Ideally, these weaknesses should be addressed before this document moves forward as they will continue to be problematic as this document moves through the SDO process. If this is not possible, they should be addressed in future iterations of this document as additional data and supporting information becomes available.

The Scientific and Technical Review Panel (STRP) for “Standard Guide for Forensic Physical Fit Examination” is an independent panel appointed by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST). A STRP is established with a range of experts to consider how well a standard meets the needs of the forensic science, law enforcement, and legal communities, and to recommend improvements to the standards under review. The STRP appreciates the efforts of Tatiana Trejos, Trace Materials Subcommittee affiliate, while serving as the subcommittee liaison to this STRP during the review process.

The STRP began its review process with a kickoff meeting on December 8, 2021 and concluded with this STRP final report. The panel reviewed the draft standard and prepared comments for the [Trace Materials Subcommittee](#).

Report Components:

The STRP reviewed this draft standard against OSAC’s *STRP Instructions for Review* which include the following content areas: scientific and technical merit, human factors, quality assurance, scope and purpose, terminology, method description and reporting results. The details below contain a brief description of each reviewed content area and the STRP’s assessment of how that content was addressed in the Draft OSAC Proposed Standard.

1. Scientific and Technical Merit: OSAC-approved standards must have strong scientific foundations so that the methods practitioners employ are scientifically valid, and the resulting claims are trustworthy. In addition, standards for methods or interpretation of results must include the expression and communication of the uncertainties in measurements or other results.

1.1 Consensus View – Upon deliberation, the STRP reached a consensus that the document, in general, is technically sound. With respect to scientific and technical merit, the material presented is within the scope; the document is well cited with respect to the supporting scientific and technical literature; and the limitations of the guidance provided and the techniques are appropriately expressed.

1.2 Minority View – The references provided in support of the scientific and technical merit of the techniques do not rise to the level of validity desired and there is a lack of



empirical work to support the validity of the technique and the illustrative report examples presented in sections 14.1.1 and 14.1.2. To this end, the conclusions drawn from the workflows presented herein could be potentially misleading.

2. Human Factors: All forensic science methods rely on human performance in acquiring, examining, reporting, and testifying to the results. In the examination phase, some standards rely heavily on human judgment, whereas others rely more on properly maintained and calibrated instruments and statistical analysis of data.

2.1. Consensus View – There are two human factors issues that remain in the document after revisions were made in response to comments from the public and the STRP: 1) the verification procedures are insufficient to safeguard against error as a result of bias and/or human judgment; and 2) the section addressing precautions to minimize bias does not provide enough guidance to help examiners and laboratories implement these mitigation strategies.

Verification Procedures

- i. The first “Discussion” piece under 3.2.8 should be edited to reflect that the second examiner analyzes the same materials independently and their analyses can corroborate the initial examiner’s judgment if they agree, or lead to a correction if they do *not* agree. The STRP suggests: “The process through which the analyses of the initial forensic examiner for a particular set of materials or evidence are compared to analyses completed by a second, independent examiner so that the findings of the first examiner are corroborated when there is agreement or can be corrected in situations where there is disagreement.”
- ii. The second “Discussion” piece under 3.2.8 states that verifications can be “open or blind”. If the verifications are open, then they are not independent, which contradicts the first discussion point. Open verification permits the second examiner access to information about the

judgments and thought processes of the first examiner, which prevents a truly independent evaluation of the evidence.

iii. Similar to the previous point, in 15.2 of the Standard Guide for Physical Fit Examination, the document states that a “review and examination of the actual evidentiary material or by reviewing the documentation of the physical fit” are both acceptable methods of verification, but the latter form of verification is not independent. In addition, the language in 15.2.1 suggests that the default is for verifiers to work with the documentation rather than the actual material. The default should be another, independent analyses of the actual evidence without access to other information unless that is not possible for some reason (e.g., the evidence had to be altered or manipulated to perform the first analysis).

1. Suggested Alternative Wording:

Remove 15.2.1 and replace 15.2 with:

4



Verification should be in the form of review and examination of the actual evidentiary material. If the actual evidence cannot be observed by the verifier (e.g., the evidence had to be altered or manipulated to perform the analysis), then documentation which clearly and objectively depicts the physical fit may be used.

2. Potential Alternative Solution: If open verification is something that the SAC and Physical Fit analyses community wishes to continue using, then an information management procedure should be used. First, the second analyst (who has not yet been involved in the case) should evaluate the original evidence or documentation that is as close to the original evidence as possible and make an independent determination about physical fit based on those materials only. Once that decision and any associated reasoning is recorded, the second examiner can get access to the other documentation produced by the first examiner when they made their decision about physical fit. If this information changes the judgment made by the first examiner, this should be documented, and the change should be explained and justified so that there is transparency regarding what information influenced each determination by the verifier.

Mitigating Bias Effects

i. In 9.1.4.1 and 9.1.4.2, it would be helpful to provide some citations that could serve as resources to help examiners learn about procedures and tools to help mitigate bias. Otherwise, this section does not provide enough guidance about what should be done to help reduce the effect of

biasing information. Some examples of citations are provided below, however, the SAC can also refer to the internal Human Factors Task Group guidance document available to OSAC members:

- a. Quigley-McBride, A., Dror, I.E., Roy, T., Garrett, B.L., & Kukucka, J. (2022). A practical tool for information management in forensic decisions: User Linear Sequential Unmasking Expanded (LSU-E) in casework. *Forensic Science International: Synergy*, 4, e100216.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fsisyn.2022.100216> [Easy to access materials available here too: <https://osf.io/xm3ru>]
- b. Spellman, B.A., Eldridge, H., & Bieber, P. (2022). Challenges to reasoning in forensic science decisions. *Forensic Science international: Synergy*, 4, e100200.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fsisyn.2021.100200>
- c. Dror, I. E. (2020). Cognitive and human factors in expert decision making: Six fallacies and the eight sources of bias. *Analytical Chemistry*, 92(12), 7998-8004.
<https://dx.doi.org/10.1021/acs.analchem.0c00704>



ii. In 9.1.4.3, the wording is a bit confusing. The STRP suggests: “Assessing questioned samples separately prior to comparing those samples to the known samples.” Note that assessing the questioned samples in this way first is not the same as “sample handling”. It should also involve an assessment of the value and quality of the evidence, an evaluation of its features and whether they are particularly distinctive or useful in a physical fit analysis context, etc.

iii. In 9.1.4.5, the SAC should specify when/how often they expect technical review and verification to occur to mitigate bias effects. In addition, they are presenting verification as a solution to bias, but are permitting open verification. Because bias is difficult to spot and often occurs outside awareness, blind verification is the best way to protect against bias using verification procedures.

2.2. Minority View – The Human Factors elements of the techniques discussed in the guide are adequately addressed in the document.

3. **Quality Assurance:** Quality assurance covers a broad range of topics. For example, a method must include quality assurance procedures to ensure that sufficiently similar results will be obtained when the methodology is properly followed by different users in different facilities.

3.1. Consensus View – Quality assurance procedures should be well defined to minimize risk and to ensure consistency amongst laboratories. As written, the requirement for verification (15.1 – 15.3) is vague, which prevents consistent application of the requirement as well as introduces risk by allowing

verifications to be performed with sketches and/or case documentation. Instead, it should require an independent examiner to evaluate the evidence, either through physical comparisons or with photographs that clearly and objectively depict the physical fit. In addition, review of the case documentation should be considered part of the technical review process and is not adequate for a verification.

3.2. **Minority View** – The Quality Assurance aspects provided in the document are sufficient for the purpose of this guide.

4. **Scope and Purpose:** Standards should have a short statement of their scope and purpose. They should list the topics that they address and the related topics that they do not address. Requirements, recommendations, or statements of what is permitted or prohibited do not belong in this section.

4.1. **Consensus View** – The STRP finds that the information presented within the document is within the well-defined scope and conforms to the overall purpose of the guide.

4.2. **Minority View** – None.



5. **Terminology:** Standards should define terms that have specialized meanings. Only rarely should they give a highly restricted or specialized meaning to a term in common use among the general public.

5.1. **Consensus View** – The STRP finds that the draft standard defines appropriate terms with specialized meaning consistent with ASTM E1732 Standard Terminology Relating to Forensic Science and C1256: Standard Practice for Interpreting Glass Fracture Surface Features. The draft standard's reference to the OSAC Lexicon and ISO 17025:2017 provides consistency to relevant terms. The document balances the need for definitions while avoiding defining commonly used terminology. Examples are appropriately added to the various terminology such as in Section 3.2.

5.2. **Minority View** – None.

6. **Method Description:** There is no rule as to the necessary level of detail in the description of the method. Some parts of the method may be performed in alternative ways without affecting the quality and consistency of the results. Standards should focus on standardizing steps that must be performed consistently across organizations to ensure equivalent results. Alternatively, standards can define specific performance criteria that are required to be demonstrated and met rather than specifying the exact way a task must be done. For example, it may be enough to specify the lower limit for detecting a substance without specifying the equipment or method for achieving this limit of detection.

6.1. Consensus View – The STRP considers the method description provided in the guide to be fit for purpose and, despite some notable weaknesses in the area of Human Factors, would generally lead to sound conclusions if followed.

6.2. Minority View – None.

7. Reporting Results: Methods must not only be well described, scientifically sound, and comprehensive but also lead to reported results that are within the scope of the standard, appropriately caveated, and not overreaching.

7.1. Consensus View – Upon deliberation of the STRP, it is the consensus of the group that the Reporting Results section needs clarification to resolve some ambiguities. Most specifically, exclusions based on the examinations performed through the guidance of this document should be explicitly stated.

The response to the feedback stated that there is a binary decision of “Physical Fit” or “No Physical Fit” in order to leave the door open for further analysis.

Although this is a required option when class characteristics concur and no physical fit could be made, there will be situations in which an exclusion occurs based on observations made during the physical fit examination. In such



instances, the door of ambiguity should be closed here and the exclusion should be reported at this point.

Additionally, the Report Wording Examples section needs better examples supported by empirical data. The examples provided here are somewhat ambiguous and could be problematic based on range of interpretations. To this end, and based on the comment on exclusions outlined above, there should be at least one example of an exclusionary conclusion presented in the document.

7.2. Minority View – The Reporting Results section is sufficient and fit for purpose.

