On the threshold of injustice: manipulating DNA evidence
American Academy of Forensic Sciences
Jurisprudence Section
February, 2017
New Orleans, LA
Mark W Perlin, PhD, MD, PhD
& William P Allan, MS
Cybergenetics
Pittsburgh, PA
Clinton Hughes, JD
The Legal Aid Society
Cybergenetics New York, NY
Cybergenetics © 2003-2017



Probabilistic genotyping				
Noise Much data Low data Stutter Variation	Bayesian Model baseline Use all peaks All genotypes Mine the data More variables			

Objective computer operation

Less math, less capability					
	Bayesian	Incomplete			
Noise	Model baseline	Thresholds			
Much data	Use all peaks	Discard peaks			
Low data	All genotypes	Set dropout			
Stutter	Mine the data	Calibrate lab			
Variation	More variables	Give up			
Subjective human operator					

Choices and consequences

Objective probability can be fair



Human choices introduce bias

Subjectivity leads to unfair outcomes

Gambling with justice

DNA evidence and results

Death by strangulation of 12 year old boy

150 biological **evidence** items, with focus on DNA under victim's **fingernails**

with focus on DNA under victim's fingernal

Software finds match statistic of ten million, connecting fingernails to defendant DNA

Unknown **minor** contributor is 0.4% or 1:250













Applying thresholds				
RFU	Data choices	All stutters		
80	0	9		
70	30	51		
60	250	1,660		
50	15,500,000	69,200	include	
40	0	0	exclude	
30	0	0		
Different choices, different answers Software does not agree with itself				













introduction of evidence that had not been internally validated.





Recommendations

Discovery for Software

- validation studies (internal & other)
- user, procedure and training manuals
- papers, reports, math description
- data choices, parameter settings
- all electronic DNA Data in the case
- demand working Software program
- run Software on Data to replicate results
- run different Software on Data to confirm

