Rhys Parry

From: Kylie Rika
Sent: Monday, 9 July 2018 3:54 PM
To: Rhys Parry
Subject: RE: follow up

Hi Rhys

Thanks for meeting with me today to discuss your email below. As mentioned I will dot point the key points from our discussion as follows:

- Discussed nature and tone of your below email (we all need to remember Code of Conduct)
- Discussed how you have been having ongoing discussions on the subject with Justin and Paula for some time now and that it was last left with you waiting for Justin to get back to you
- Further to the above point; this is a matter that I can't solve in my time acting HP6 and it is Justin's responsibility to follow up with you further and on the way forward (I will brief him on our discussions)
- I advised that you could plan for your next discussion with Justin by having your concerns clearly and constructively dot pointed with examples

Let me know if you have any edits to the above. Otherwise I will go ahead with organising for Justin to chat with you on his return to work.

Thanks

Kylie Rika Dip Mgt BSc PGrad Dip (Forensic)
Acting Team Leader (Forensic Reporting and Intelligence Team) - Forensic DNA Analysis
Police Services Stream | Forensic & Scientific Services | Health Support Queensland
Department of Health | Queensland Government
[redacted]

HealthSupport Queensland

From: Rhys Parry
Sent: Friday, 6 July 2018 3:07 PM
To: Kylie Rika
Subject: RE: follow up

Hi Kylie

Thanks for your consideration of this matter, but I would like to add:

With regard to Point 2. – Incorrect mathematical techniques are still incorrect irrespective of what purpose the study is for. As such, we do NOT produce work that is sufficient. I'm not talking about full validations. Call it a verification or a trial or pilot run if you like….the maths is still wrong. For example: you cannot compare three groups with t-tests, you cannot compare samples from non-similar populations using t-tests, there is a misunderstanding of which t-test to use in which situation, doing comparisons based on averages without also considering the standard error is meaningless, designing experiments where n=1 is meaningless, using percentage changes as a means of comparison between groups is not a valid technique and there is a clear misunderstanding in a number of verification/validations of what the actual experimental unit is, there is a misunderstanding of what "significantly different" means (at the 0.05 level for example) – I can point to reports that contain these errors (in some cases several of them in the one report). These erroneous mathematical processes are then used to guide management decision making. If you haven't got the correct data and results, how can you possibly be expected to make the right decisions.

With regard to point 3 – the additional stats for QS B were done to try and fix a poor study design. Those stats aren't ideally correct but it was the best I could do with poor data (this arises because there is no consultation about design before the experiment is done) – in retrospect I would not do that analysis again. With regards to the QS Bone project – that was a massive waste of time and money that could have been prevented with a bit more consultation because NO valid conclusions could be drawn from it in its final form (despite the fact that conclusions were drawn and recommendations made).

And while Paula might state that changes have been made based on my feedback, it is only because I have gone out of my way to check these projects for errors. If I hadn't sought them out, these projects would be passed (as the QS Bone one was) without question. It is evident that at least some of my feedback does get passed on. I have seen some things I've raised subsequently introduced into some studies. Unfortunately, it would seem that the application of the feedback is not understood by those running the projects and techniques are being used incorrectly or blindly in situations where they don't apply. You cannot come up with a one size fits all for stats and experimental design. Each problem is unique and must be treated that way. As such, I do feel nothing significant has come of my feedback because I am constantly reiterating that the design has to be done with the final analysis in mind and I have yet to be consulted on the design of a project prior to it being done. I also get the impression (based particularly on one written response I received from the project management team) that there is an unwillingness or reluctance to engage in dialogue about my feedback and many of my suggestions were dismissed out of hand (and in my opinion without an adequate understanding of what the suggestions actually meant – for example dismissing an aspect of my design that controlled for additional variation by stating that it introduced too much variation). Me discussing aspects of design or stats with Paula or Justin and them passing on the information assumes 1) they have fully understood what I've said 2) that they have then communicated it correctly 3) that the third party has understood it and 4) it has been applied correctly (which, as stated, hasn't worked). This seems inefficient and convoluted…what is the reluctance to have me involved as a reviewer in the first place?

Thanks

From: Kylie Rika
Sent: Friday, 6 July 2018 1:49 PM
To: Rhys Parry
Cc: Adrian Pippia
Subject: follow up

Hi Rhys

I just wanted to touch base with you with regards to the concerns you expressed to me yesterday

1. Your concerns regarding QS5 project 185
2. Your concerns regarding all projects are done sub standardly
3. Your concerns that nothing seems to come of your feedback

1. Adrian and I will be meeting again next week to discuss your feedback for Proj 185
2. My personal feeling is that as a laboratory we produce project plans and reports that are more than sufficient in their aim of verifying new kits, instruments and methods. Whilst there is always room for improvement in everything we do, as part of the mgmt. team I get the opportunity to sign off on plans and reports and I only do so when I feel satisfied with the product. One thing I have had to remind myself over the years is that there is a difference between what is sufficient for forensic work (given that the true validations have already been done by the biotech companies) versus what is required for novel research work. Coming from another forensic lab, and knowing what work goes into verifying all of our forensic "non-novel" equipment, kits, processes and methods, I know that Queensland compared to ESR for example, goes above and beyond what is required. In saying that, I take on board your feedback, and, as I mentioned earlier, there is always room for improvement. To that end I am still gathering information and considering actions. Part of this requires me to talk with Justin when he is back.
3. I want to assure you that you are listened to and upon conversations that I have previously had with Paula, there have indeed been some notable actions based on your feedback such as: QIAsymphony bone project, where additional work will be performed. QIAsymphony B verification, where additional statistical assessment was included in the report.

I will touch base with you again as soon as I have more information

thanks

Kylie Rika Dip Mgt BSc PGrad Dip (Forensic)
Acting Team Leader (Forensic Reporting and Intelligence Team) - Forensic DNA Analysis
Police Services Stream | Forensic & Scientific Services | Health Support Queensland
Department of Health | Queensland Government
[redacted]