

American Dental Association
Technical Report No. 1088

Human Identification by Comparative Dental Analysis

ADA American
Dental
Association®

Standards Committee on Dental Informatics

2017

AMERICAN DENTAL ASSOCIATION TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 1088 FOR HUMAN IDENTIFICATION BY COMPARATIVE DENTAL ANALYSIS

The ADA Standards Committee on Dental Informatics (SCDI) has approved American Dental Association Technical Report No. 1088 for Human Identification by Comparative Dental Analysis. Working Groups of the ADA SCDI formulate this and other specifications and technical reports for the application of information technology and other electronic technologies to dentistry's clinical and administrative operations. The ADA SCDI has representation from appropriate interests in the United States in the standardization of information technology and other electronic technologies used in dental practice. The ADA SCDI confirmed approval of ADA Technical Report No. 1088 on January 26, 2017.

This technical report was prepared by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) Crime Scene/Death Investigation Scientific Area Committee Forensic Odontology Subcommittee Dental Identification Task Force, in conjunction with the American Dental Association Standards Committee on Dental Informatics (SCDI) Joint Working Group 10.12 on Forensic Odontology Informatics, a joint working group with Working Group 11.1 on Standard Clinical Data Architecture at the request of Jonathan Knapp, chairman, SCDI Subcommittee on Information Exchange.

The ADA SCDI thanks the members of the NIST Crime Scene/Death Investigation Scientific Area Committee Forensic Odontology Subcommittee's Dental Identification Task Force and the organizations with which they were affiliated at the time the technical report was developed:

Robert Barsley (chairperson), Louisiana State University, New Orleans, LA;

Lawrence Dobrin, Office of the Chief Medical Examiner, New York City, NY;

Carla Evans, University of Illinois at Chicago, IL;

John Filippi; Individual Representative, Omaha, NE;

Peter W. Loomis, New Mexico Office of the Medical Investigator, Los Ranchos, NM;

Jim McGivney, Individual Representative, St. Louis, MO;

Roger Metcalf, Tarrant County Medical Examiner's District, Fort Worth, TX;

Calvin Shiroma, U.S. Department of Defense Joint POW/MIA Accounting Command, Hickam AFB, HI; and

Warren Tewes, Office of the Chief Medical Examiner, Baltimore, MD.

The ADA Standards Committee on Dental Informatics thanks the Voting Members of Joint Working Group 10.12 on Forensic Odontology Informatics and the organizations with which they were affiliated at the time the technical report was developed:

Kenneth W. Aschheim (chairperson), Office of the Chief Medical Examiner, New York City/ NYU College of Dentistry, NY;

Joe Adserias Garriga, Institute of Legal Medicine of Catalonia, Spain

Stuart Alexander, Individual Representative, Cranbury, NJ;

Bruce Bandini, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD;
Robert Barsley, Louisiana State University, New Orleans, LA;
Scott Benjamin, Benjamin Dental Group, Sidney, NY;
Stephen Bergen, American College of Prosthodontists, West Orange, NJ;
Mary Cimrmancic, Marquette University School of Dentistry, Milwaukee, WI;
Michael Colvard, University of Illinois at Chicago, ILL;
Thomas David, Individual Representative, Marietta, GA;
John Demas, Office of the Chief Medical Examiner, New York City, Brooklyn, NY;
Mark Diehl, Mark Diehl Consulting, Rensselaer, NY;
Lawrence Dobrin, Office of the Chief Medical Examiner, New York City, NY;
Robert Dorion, Laboratoire de sciences judiciaires et de medecin, Montreal, Canada;
Carla Evans, University of Illinois at Chicago, IL;
Adam Freeman, Individual Representative, Westport, CT;
Winnie Furnari, New York University, NY;
Gary Guest, University of Texas San Antonio, TX;
Phyllis Ho, Office of the Suffolk County Medical Examiner, New York, NY;
Shanon Kirchhoff, Individual Representative, Cape Girardeau, MO;
Jonathan Knapp, Individual Representative, Bethel, CT;
Peter Loomis, New Mexico Office of the Medical Investigator; Los Ranchos, NM;
Raymond Miller, Individual Representative; Lancaster, NY;
Jean Narcisi, American Dental Association, Chicago, IL;
Lillian Nawrocki, Office of the Medical Examiner; Mount Sinai, NY;
Pamela Porembski, American Dental Association, Chicago, IL;
Allan Raden, Gloucester County, NJ Medical Examiner; Glassboro, NJ;
Michelle Robinson, University of Alabama; Birmingham, AL;
James Schneider, Individual Representative; Olmsted Falls, OH;
David Senn, University of Texas; San Antonio, TX;
Warren Tewes, Office of the Chief Medical Examiner; Baltimore, MD;
Patrick Thevissen, Head of Forensic Dentistry KU, Leuven, Belgium;
Allan Warnick, Wayne County Medical Examiner Office, Detroit, MI;
Richard Weems, University of Alabamam, Birmingham, AL;
Bradford Wing, American Academy of Forensic Sciences, Washington, DC;

David Wold, Individual Representative, Bensenville, IL; and
Gregory Zeller, University of Kentucky College of Dentistry, Lexington.

The ADA Standards Committee on Dental Informatics thanks the Observer Members of Joint Working Group 10.12 on Forensic Odontology Informatics and the organizations with which they were affiliated at the time the technical report was developed:

Manjunath Achar, Manipal University, Abu Dhabi, UAE;
Shankar Bakkannavar, Manipal University, Karnataka, India;
Gary Bell, American Board of Forensic Odontology, Seattle, WA;
Gary Berman, Individual Representative, Belleville, MI;
Michael Fiorenza, Individual Representative, New York, NY;
Donna A Fontana, New Jersey State Police, Hamilton, NJ;
Gyle Gale, Henry Schein Practice Solutions, American Fork, UT;
Eliezer Ganon, The Design The Technology The Gizmo, Beverly Hills, CA;
Zeno Geradts, Netherlands Forensic Institute, The Hague;
Stephen Glenn, Individual Representative, Tulsa, OK;
Douglas Gordon, Individual Representative, Pinole, CA;
Robert Kamansky, InfraGardLA , Upland, CA;
Ashwini Kumar, Manipal University, Karnataka, India;
G Kumar, Manipal University, Karnataka, India;
James Lewis, AL Department of Forensic Sciences, Madison, AL;
Venkataramanareddy Nalla, Individual Representative, Hobbs, NM;
William Oliver, East Carolina University, Greenville, NC;
Terry O'Toole, Department of Veteran Affairs, San Diego, CA;
Frank Pokorny, American Dental Association, Chicago, IL;
Robert Reed, Individual Representative, Bakersfield, CA;
Douglas Sanders, Maryland State Dental Association, Columbia, MD;
Ricardo Henrique da Silva, University of São Paulo, Brazil;
William Silver, Miami Dade Medical Examiner Department, Miami, FL; and
Scott Trapp, Individual Representative, St. Louis, MO.

The ADA Standards Committee on Dental Informatics thanks Mark Diehl, chairperson, Working Group 11.1 on Standard Clinical Data Architecture, who contributed to the development of ANSI/ADA Technical Report No. 1088.

**AMERICAN DENTAL ASSOCIATION TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 1088 FOR HUMAN IDENTIFICATION BY
COMPARATIVE DENTAL ANALYSIS**

FOREWORD

(This Foreword does not form a part of ADA Technical Report No. 1088 for Human Identification by Comparative Dental Analysis).

In 1992, there was interest in the standardization of clinical information systems related to electronic technology in the dental environment. After evaluating current informatics activities, a Task Group of the ANSI Accredited Standards Committee MD156 (ASC MD156) was created by the ADA to initiate the development of technical reports, guidelines, and standards on electronic technologies used in dental practice. In 1999, the ADA established the ADA Standards Committee on Dental Informatics (SCDI). The ADA SCDI is currently the group that reviews and approves proposed American National Standards (ANSI approved) and technical reports developed by the standards committee's working groups. The ADA became an ANSI accredited standards organization in 2000.

The scope of the ADA SCDI is:

"The ADA SCDI shall develop informatics standards, technical reports and guidelines and interact with other entities involved in the development of health informatics standards aimed at implementation across the dental profession.

AMERICAN DENTAL ASSOCIATION TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 1088 FOR HUMAN IDENTIFICATION BY COMPARATIVE DENTAL ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION

The establishment of a positive identification of unknown human remains or an unidentified living individual by comparative dental analysis requires both the submission of supporting documentation from the dental provider (s) who treated the patient as well as careful documentation of the unidentified remains or an unidentified living individual. Human Identification by dental analysis is the comparison of oral maxillofacial structures. The procedures to reconcile this information (e.g., radiographs, charts, and progress notes) have been outlined by numerous forensic organizations including the American Board of Forensic Odontology (ABFO), American Society of Forensic Odontology (ASFO), British Association of Forensic Odontology (BAFO), Disaster Mortuary Operational Response Team (DMORT), Interpol's DVI Steering Committee Forensic Odontology Subcommittee as well as many others.

The goal of this technical report is to provide the best available current information to forensic odontologists, forensic pathologists, medical examiners and coroners, law enforcement personnel, dental schools, emergency planners and others on the best practices recommended by the forensic odontology community. It includes guidelines on how to obtain comparative forensic dental data as well as the recommended methodologies to reconcile that data in order to establish an identification by comparative dental analysis.

1 BACKGROUND

In the United States, the identification of unidentified living individuals is the responsibility of local, state or federal law enforcement agencies. The Medical Examiner or Coroner (ME/C) has the statutory responsibility and judicial authority to identify the deceased. Although it is ultimately these agencies that certify the identification it is the responsibility of the forensic odontologist to provide their opinion on the identity as it relates to forensic odontology. Those opinions are based on a standardized set of guidelines established by the forensic odontology community and are based on scientific best practices.

The positive identification of an individual is of critical importance for multiple reasons that include:

For unidentified living individuals:

- A positive identification is vital to reunite an unidentified living individual with their family members.

For the human remains:

A positive identification is vital to help family members progress through the grieving process, providing some sense of relief in knowing that their loved one has been found.

- A positive identification and subsequent death certificate is necessary in order to settle business and personal affairs.
Disbursement of life insurance proceeds, estate transfer, settlement of probate, and execution of wills, remarriage of spouse and child custody issues can be delayed for years by legal proceedings if a positive identification cannot be rendered.
Criminal investigation and potential prosecution in a homicide case may not proceed without a positive identification of the victim.