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Background information:

1. Description of research need:

   A foundational and critical need in the bitemark analysis discipline is validation of reliability of the methods used in current practice. A number of such studies have been done in the past, but several of these have been criticized as poorly designed and/or poorly executed. A re-assessment of several of these previous studies in this area is warranted in order to determine whether or not the conclusions were valid, as they form a core group of documents that are referred to often. Further research is needed in order to assess the reliability and validity of the methods currently used in the field, and to help identify new methods that might be used in the future.

2. Key bibliographic references relating to this research need:

   2011_multiple_bitemarks_single_dent Match Rates-2D_She
   2011_Dental Shape
   2010_The application of Affine
   2010_Similarity and match rates-human
   2010_Reconst of Deformed BM using Matching-Affine me
   2010_Inquiry into Sc. Basis for BM Proofs
   2009_Uniqueness
   2009_Skin-Stress-Bitemark Distortion_B
   2009_ Response of Skin-Stress-Bitemark
   2011_Statistical Evidence for the Similarity of the Hur
   2011_Stat Ev

3a. In what ways would the research results improve current laboratory capabilities?

   This threshold research is needed to help provide the statistical foundation for the bitemark discipline, a foundation which is currently absent.
3b. In what ways would the research results improve understanding of the scientific basis for the subcommittee(s)?

This is threshold research that is needed regarding the very foundation of bitemark analysis.

3c. In what ways would the research results improve services to the criminal justice system?

This research deals with the basic issue of reliability and credibility of proffered scientific evidence.

4. Status assessment (I, II, III, or IV):  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major gap in current knowledge</th>
<th>Minor gap in current knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No or limited current research is being conducted</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing current research is being conducted</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This research need has been identified by one or more subcommittees of OSAC and is being provided as an informational resource to the community.
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