

In response to the *Scientific and Technical Review Panel Final Report for 2021-S-0011 Standards for the Technical Review of Bloodstain Pattern Analysis Reporting*, the BPA Subcommittee Quality Assurance Task Group, wishes to extend its appreciation for the input and collective effort provided through the STRP process. For clarification of modifications made to the document subsequent to this report, the Task Group would like to share the following to address specific STRP report components:

Component 2 – Human Factors

2.1 – The task group believes the refinement in language relating to the need for objectivity in selecting the reviewers is reflected in the wording modifications made to section 6 as suggested by the STRP under Component 6 – Method Description.

2.2 – The term “discrepancy” was defined as suggested.

Component 5 - Terminology

5.1 – The task group agrees with the STRP in the consistency of terms utilized in this standard with the OSAC Lexicon particularly regarding the employment of preferred OSAC terms, and has made every effort to do. However, the preferred definition for “administrative review” made reference to “laboratories” rather than the more comprehensive term of “forensic science service provider”. The task group has opted to deviate from the preferred definition and incorporate “forensic science service provider” into the term to address the inclusivity of the entire bloodstain pattern analysis scientific community.

5.2 – This correction was made

5.3 – Given the variety of terms currently listed in the OSAC lexicon, and in conjunction with the statement in 5.1, the task group has opted to not accept this addition at this time.

Component 6 – Method Description

6.2 – Modifications were made to the language in Section 5.2 regarding objectivity of the reviewer being essential which the task group believes reflects the guidance from the STRP.

6.3 – The suggested statement “Communications...of the review” was added to section 6 in the document; however, for clarity and continuity, was placed in a different location than suggested. Also, the suggestion to remove “and explained” was accepted.

Component 7 – Reporting Results

7.1 – The suggested modification to add “in the original case file” was accepted.

Respectfully submitted,

BPA Subcommittee Quality Assurance Task Group

LeeAnn Singley (chair), Rebecca Hooks, Peter Valentin, Jason Simser