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Comment on Section 5.5.1

The panel agrees with the adjudication of this comment as non-persuasive and that there is a misunderstanding of the language and an issue with the term being used in the document. The document references ASTM E1732 – Standard Terminology Relating to Forensic Science where the terms “sample” and “sampling” are defined. Although the terminology may not be clear, there is a reference to the terms used in the document. It is suggested that in the next revision of the document that these key (primary) terms are clearly defined in the body of the document. However, this does not reverse the previous determination of this comment as non-persuasive, and, consequently, the appeal of this comment is denied.

Comment on Figure 1

Comment 1: The panel agrees with the adjudication of this comment as non-persuasive. The panel commented that a drug chemist would know what is depicted in this figure and supports that this would be a management decision based on jurisdiction. The appeal to this comment is denied.

Comment 2: The panel agrees with the adjudication of this comment as non-persuasive. Sampling is defined in the referenced terminology document.

Comments on Need for Complete Reporting

The panel affirms the appeal on the two editorial comments referencing that the subject of reporting will be the subject of another document. The panel determined that the comment is not editorial and should be re-adjudicated. Referring to a document that does not currently exist is not addressing the comment or concern that the reporting is incomplete. As a possible solution, the panel suggests the option of removing the reference to reporting if there will be a subsequent document that will address reporting.