5th Annual Prescription for Criminal Justice Forensics June 6, 2014 Fordham University School of Law

MIX13: An interlaboratory study on the present state of DNA mixture interpretation in the U.S.

Michael D. Coble

National Institute of Standards and Technology





NIST and **NIJ** Disclaimer

<u>Past and Present Funding</u>: Interagency Agreement between the National Institute of Justice and NIST Office of Law Enforcement Standards

- **Points of view are mine** and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the US Department of Justice or the National Institute of Standards and Technology.
- Certain commercial equipment, instruments, software and materials are identified in order to specify experimental procedures as completely as possible. In no case does such identification imply a recommendation or endorsement by the National Institute of Standards and Technology nor does it imply that any of the materials, instruments or equipment identified are necessarily the best available for the purpose.

Why are Mixtures Difficult to Interpret?

1. We don't know *a priori* the relative contribution of each DNA component



2. STR kits are like "Goldilocks"

Input DNA

Data from Debbie Hobson (FBI) - LCN Workshop AAFS 2003



3. DNA Extraction/Recovery is about 20-30%



4. It can be difficult to determine the number of contributors in the mixture



5. We can't say "NO"



Slide courtesy of Sarah Chenoweth

Interlaboratory Studies

- The method by which multiple laboratories compare results and demonstrate that the methods used in one's own laboratory are reproducible in another laboratory.
- These tests are essential to demonstrate consistency in results from multiple laboratories.

(J.M. Butler, Forensic DNA Typing, p. 216)

Previous Interlaboratory Studies

- MSS 1 (1997) 22 labs participated
- MSS 2 (1999) 45 labs participated
- MSS 3 (2000-2001) 74 labs participated
- MIX05 (2005) 69 labs participated

MIX05 Poster Presentation at ISHI



Poster #56 at 16th International Symposium on Human Identification, Grapevine, TX, Sept 26-28, 2005

11.14 8.9 8.12

10.12 8.15 13,15

12,14

NIST Mixture Interpretation Interlaboratory Study 2005 (MIX05)

John M. Butler and Margaret C. Kline

Biotechnology Division, National Institute of Standards and Technology, 100 Bursau Drive MS 8311, Gathensburg, MD 20890-8311

The human identity project team within the Soldechnology Division of the National institute of Standards and Technology (NST) is funded by the National Institute of Justice (NU) to conduct research that benefits the human identity tealing community and to create tools that enable state and local DNA laboratories to be more effective in analyzing DNA. We have conducted a number of interfaboratory studies (see http://www.coll.nist.gov/biolech/st/states/nterfab.htm) over the years to assess consistency in results. from multiple laboratories with modure interpretation (1,2) and DNA quantitation methods (3). In early 2005 an intertatoratory challenge exercise was initiated involving only data interpretation. DNA mictures representing four different mock sexual assault case scenarios were generated at NIST with multiple STR kits and provided to laboratories as electrophonetic data (ABI 3100 flan files are available at http://www.csil.nist.gov/biotech/st/base/interlab/WX05 htm; in each case, we provided the "evidence" sample result, which was a mixture of at least one perpetitator and a victim, along with the "victim" reference sample. All data were generated on six different STR kits (Profiler Plus, COffer, SOM Plus, Mentfiller, PowerPlex 16, and PP16 BIO) from the same int of DNA.

Sanges A 10 27 0 7 15 0 3,8 12,13

Email: margaret.kline@nlat.gov Phone: 301-975-3134

Gamer CL. Silve W. Baimer M. Imagin No. Sealer CL (2001) HIST Man Sain Studen & and 62 blackbordery sergedues of State quantification produce and short series relation patient products and wild be unline series at a financial fact the FIGS COS

Sha, 6.5. Scarse Sci., Salvan, J.W., Salar J.M. (2003) 4187 when an analy 5 555 particular scarses are to inflation in short bridger space.

3034 4543

1741

Conclusions: Wide range of variation within and between laboratories

22,24

5,10 8,15

Anderes Department of Forenasis Indexone (Jetter agreen, AL) Advances State Laboratory (Jetter Rock, AP) Ban Depart Control (Jetter Rock, AP) Ban Depart Control (Jetter Department (Jetter Department Control Department of Audite ONLI Jetter (Jetter Department Control Bandward (Jetter Department) (Jetter Department Control Bandward (Jetter Department) (Jetter Department) (Jetter Department) Control Bandward (Jetter Department) (Jetter Departm Colondo Rumai at Investigation (Derver, CO) Connectour Forenaic Lab (Mettien, CO) Chick of Charl Medical Sciencer (Minington, DS) Fonds Department of Law Enforcement (Jacksonville, R.) Fonds Department of Law Enforcement (Drands, R.) Pain Seach County Strent Collide (West Fram Seach, R.) LB Army Crime Laboratory (Forest Park, GA) Indexegule Metor Courty (Indexegule, IN) Indexe State Face (Indexegule, IN) Sedgets Courty Register Forenat Science Center (Works Kenses Rules of Investigation (Topeles, Kth) Kensusky Role Police (Foundat, KY) Nessamusets State Police Crime Lat. (Suthury, MA) Satistical County Police (Season, MC) Natiscale (2) Police Department (Satiscue, MC) Marylanit State Police (Battroom, MD) Prince Georgeni County Police Department & andover, MD) Mitteecta Rurveu of Criticial Appretension (St. Paul, Mit) Noth Despise (Price of Adortey General Resmarks, ND) Hurvey DNA Identification Laboratory (Orisina, NE) New Mexico Decement of Public Services (Senta Fe 106) Webce Courts Reeff's Office Reno. NV. New Jersey Rote Police (Hamilton, NJ) Burton County Other Laboratory (Heupenge, NY) Office In Cost Medical Sciences Term, NY) Index Local works & documents prevailing in 10 Meet Today Control (2014) (2014) (2014) Meet Today Control (2014) (2014) (2014) Meet Today Control (2014) (2014) (2014) Meet Today Report Control (2014) (2014) Meet Today Control (2014) (2014) (2014) Meet Today Control (2014) (2014) (2014) Meet Today Control (2014) (2014) (2014) (2014) Meet Today Control (2014) (2014) (2014) (2014) (2014) Meet Today Control (2014) (2014) (2014) (2014) (2014) Meet Today Control (2014) (2014) (2014) (2014) (2014) (2014) Meet Today Control (2014) (Wearsen Department of Justice (Milwackee, W) Wearsein State Critine Lea (Hindson, W)

Ferries "Viden"

Service de Ruelle Digitales Genetices (Ruence Alma, ARGE) Leger Medical Benice of Chile (Sertilia), CHLR) Paticity University, Ded Ricchender, Chanase, CERCH 458 Department of Potenzia Generatics (Construction, CERCH 458) MARING (Neuronaux, Status, CERCHARD) MARING (Neuronaux, Status, CERCHARD) Status, Consultation, Status, CERCHARD) Mate Orininal Office Reliancy (Dreader, SARMANY) Institute of Familias Medicine (Rudapest, HUMARY) trattute of Forenais Sciences (Rustapers; HUMARY) Department of Medicine and Public Health (Seargine, ITAL 1) Institute of Legel Healtonic (Pedices, ITAL 1) trattule of Legal Medicine (Madenia, ITAL Y) Department of Anatomy & Pharmacology (Yuth, ITAL Y) Chemistry Department of Makwala Geranger, MALAYSIA) Institute of Forenais Medicine (Solanda, POLAND) Institute transmittide Tostaciogia (Secondola, SPWh) Institute Nacional de Texcología (Madriz, GFR/N) Vatitute Nacional de Texcología (Nevita, GFR/N)

	AND PROPERTY	100 000000 (0)			1 10 1	1.1.1.1	1.00	20.04	1.04	4.14		10.41		1.00	4.94	11,14	. 14,14	14.11	. 17,58	14	distant.		16,10
	CASE #3	Scanded status	14	-		N	CSF1PO	FGA	THET	THEX	WK	109120	DOB1080	(25WETS	DEMOS	DEST179	Cr38017	D155538	Uniod 1	Draskett	(growth)	Pettell	Fetter
	1 patterie: 1 jatimae	Sample L	- 46	40 0	3 6 4	0 X.R.	10,95,43	11,22,28	8,7,6,9	8,9,11	453613	12,18,21,35	40.02.08	10.02	8,8,12	检查	61,12	10,12,12	123437	11,142,15,162	17,2626,36	8,11,12	A/(12/15
		Inclution banges	1.	N. N.		AME	CIRFIE	-694	THET	IPCX .	W/A	009130	12081360	1259818	02860	D091179	0138317	Crestal	(misist	Drawn 2	021911	Petell	Pettell
	Fecale "Viden"	Sangre H.	10	28 . 5	4 12 0	- 44	10,11	21,22	8.8	8,8	12,10	17,16	12,18	18.	8.11	. 1	11.63	4	12.17	11,15	28:30	8,11	44
	www.inschedungt	on without (v)		100	3 19 8			1000		- NO	1996	21.40	100.00	10.9		19			194.10	344,064	100	12.04	1,14
	CASE #4	Repeted Hoture	R.,	N. N	R. R. K.	N. 146	CISFIPO	F04	THE	TPCX	- WH	0.081308	1081356	LOBRIE .	009970	D891179	0138017	Drestor	childs.	07969432	(22:9711)	Perts D	Fette F
	7 pets tenaler 1 part male	Sanga G		6 0	3 7 4	* 3,3,3,	4 40.11.12.13	23,24,25	8,6,83	8,8.12,11,12	16.16.13	17,18,28,34	15.16	911.12	8,10,11	812,13	42,43	8,11	13,16,19,21	122,14,15	27,28,312,32	10,12,14	5,14,10
100	1000000	TOCHICLE Services	2.			-	CISF1PO	Fija	THE	1908	-444	11191-208	0.091.008	100818	Draws	20051179	0138317	D10650V	Cristen	Drisker	127911	Ferte D	Fields #
	Ferrare "Victor"	Saligie F	10	27 8	5 11 5	3,5	70,12	23.24	83	8,12	15,17	17.98	10,10	811	8.11	12.13	13		13,19	14	28,32	12.14	5,14
	NUM PROFILE	the second of					11.14	-		anan .	14,17		14.18		14,11		14,04		10,01	tag ta -		- Sector	14,14
	Activate software response of 2 Generative Mail Software Mail Software Mail Software Mail Software Software Software Mail Soft	In the requests IP Following to the IP Following	Anter PCR	All result in uturin Pris Bio Contribut South and All Addition Contribution All Addition	Fishic age	-Perj -'Bai -'Ed We supj for each for each a date for a date for a date for	settetor is me enced" ~1.1 s reme" ~1.10 r skied fermele ^ obse along w skieve skieve skieve us	jor contribune (Cr midure (Cr midure (C) widter and the stella and	dor (Case ese #3) ann #4) (minture ' Ster, pos. 4 and and and and and and and and and and	e 42) 'evidence' ineg controls as 83 "Augustab balan sing as an 'Second	the line of the li	The media. P In an appropriate the property of the Cathemate the Provide a co cluster water to AHE, 2 also approximate the Second Moture	and a survice also destination of station for an opport years of y	If we have a second sec	epartmetary ed by your I chaledow. P mand in the relative in the relative rela- matics rela-	f allererin aboretry wase train water train water train water train terpretati	acch Tana dentiart op dentiart op den webeit reliature o en guidedin dente o dente dente and dente	Can they making pro- mating pro- tion were as a match how this we and a to white of M es wate set a pergram. White of the statute golds where of et al.	right be presidentially and sectors) and sectors is a sector and the sectors is a sector sector index of the sector index from the to defend and to defend and to d	In the market in court- be market of the well's case. In determined. Ion as to why a constrained of the constraints of the cons	end -30 -30 -30 -30 -30 -30 -30 -30 -30 -30	lable endin isolar provi that can be a clarifie serve al to one an denotop he answer of toge	aded ratio ded state eacher voter adig other for the get national systematic
-UNIV TINU	cone	11.11					13			1	1	祥山		20	nda na		Some recom	of the print internetiation relation at	nary bene one for a r nd training	tis we hope to more uniform ploois to help	gain from 1 approach t educate the	o nistury commun	ndude Ity.
F	Sector distance	441.264	ert STR	kits		41.1		2	Commen -Tri ando head acco -Thank yo -Thank yo -Thank yo	nts from Se a tract to pay a condition gas to writing uses to writing uses to entropy use	everal N e att ave belies to dopes n s periope	AIXOS Par rotare na stil stoy	ticipants runodite id As alanys, 1 ucini, Walata	wang ib Na nyadi nya fasi ta	n tvitova Ingeluador In 1977 Idea		Acteor eter cart cart cart cart cart cart cart car	desilectmentia Ing Treis Desilect Indexes (1997) 1 Dennes (1997) Dennes (1997) Tomar (1997) Tomar (1997) Tomar (1997) Tomar (1997) Tomar (1997)	L March Institute of Marchael Date North Agent D Science (MARCA) Active Charles and Active Charles and Active Charles and Active Charles and Active Charles and	Lindia Boogh De N and trify of pelidie addition (die exclusion Patrice) to PRECO Rate Committies (Not Clark Department State provided as	art office of Level In and Aligning Constant of Second Second Internet Second Second part of Second Second	nine in 1 i to staty matter cost of their 1 faboratory o	handanin Innery diadiy

15,19 16.24 15.18

http://www.cstl.nist.gov/biotech/strbase/interlab/MIX05.htm For more inform http://www.csti.

MORE THAT IS NOT A REPORT OF THE STREET are those of the subtons and do not epartment of Justice Content peoply experimental pricedures as etment of Justice. Certain commercial V TAL MAY OF THE INSTALLER. IN AT UNKNOWN

How MIX13 differs from MIX05 study

	MIX13 (2013)	MIX05 (2005)
Response	107 labs	69 labs
Number of cases provided	5 cases	4 cases
Case types being mimicked	Sexual assault & touch evidence	Sexual assault evidence
Mixture complexity	2, 3, >3-person (potentially related, low-template, inclusion/exclusion)	all 2-person (all unrelated, male/female; various major/minor ratios)
Scenarios provided	Yes	No

MIX 13 – NIST Interlaboratory Study on Mixture Interpretation - Purpose

- MIX05 conducted in 2005. Since then a great deal of effort has been focused on improvements in DNA mixture interpretation.
- 2010 SWGDAM Guidelines approved in January 2010 – many labs have changed their protocols recently.
- MIX13 Interpretation challenge no samples to run.

MIX 13 – NIST Interlaboratory Study on Mixture Interpretation - Goals

- (1) To evaluate the current "lay of the land" regarding STR mixture interpretation across the community.
- (2) To measure consistency in mixture interpretation across the U.S. after the publication of the 2010 SWGDAM guidelines.
- (3) To learn where future training and research could help improve mixture interpretation and reporting.

MIX13 Participants from **107 Laboratories 46 states** had at least one lab participate



Due to the number of laboratories responding and the federal, state, and local coverage obtained, this MIX13 interlaboratory study can be assumed to provide a reasonable representation of current U.S. forensic DNA lab procedures across the community

MIX13 was also used an intra-lab study

Comments from TL of a MIX13 Lab

- Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this exercise! Some of these were very challenging and provoked a lot of conversation.
- I had a majority of the analysts in our Forensic Biology Unit interpret these profiles *independently in an effort to identify inconsistencies and areas where we need to improve.* It was very interesting how much the results varied! I've included two spreadsheets that demonstrate this – "MIX13 summary of allele calls" and "MIX13 summary of stats and conclusions."

16 different analysts examined the data in this particular lab

Purpose of MIX13 Cases

	Challenge provided to study responses
Case 1	~1:1 mixture (2-person)
Case 2	Low template profile with potential dropout (3-person)
Case 3	Potential relative involved (3-person)
Case 4	Minor component (2-person)
Case 5	Complex mixture (>3-person) with # of contributors ; inclusion/exclusion issues

According to German Stain Commission (2009) mixture types: 1 = A, 2 = C, 3 = ?, 4 = B, 5 = ?

Case 01 – Sexual Assault Evidence

~1:1 mixture (2-person) "German Type A"

Scenario

- Evidence: sperm fraction from a vaginal swab.
- A female meets a male acquaintance at a bar after work and they return to her apartment for a nightcap. She recalls the drink tasting funny and then wakes up 14 hours later after a co-worker has her landlord to open her apartment. She is confident that she did not have consensual sex and was probably drugged. She reports the incident to the police and goes to the hospital for an examination.
- The accused male gives a buccal swab for comparison.

Case 01 – PP16HS



Primary Goals

- Primary purpose will labs attempt to subtract the victim from the evidence and generate a mRMP/LR stat or simply use CPI.
- So far, about 50/50 breakdown for CPI/mRMP suspect is included in the mixture.



Case 02 – Handgun (Touch) Evidence

Low template profile with potential dropout (3-person) "German Type C"

Case 02 – IDFiler



Case 02 – Four Suspects



Total Input DNA = 300 pg

Primary Goals

- Primary purpose is this mixture too complex for interpretation due to the potential of dropout?
- Several labs CPI for Suspects A, B and C using a limited number of loci.
- So far, no lab has included suspect D (has been reported as inconclusive).



~ 1 in 35

Intra-Laboratory Results (n = 8)

Analyst	Suspect A	Suspect B	Suspect C	Suspect D
1	Inco	Excluded		
2	6.74 Quad	23.6	Excluded	Excluded
3	Inco	Excluded		
4	9	Excluded		
5	4.1 Quint	37	Excluded	Excluded
6	230 fc	or A, B	Inconclusive	Excluded
7	9.4 fo	r A, B	Excluded	Excluded
8	37.3 fo	or A, B	Excluded	Excluded

Case 03 – Sexual Assault Evidence

Potential relative involved (3-person)

Case 03 – Two Suspects

Individual	Inclusion?	Ratio	
Victim	Included	7	
Boyfriend (CP)	Included	2	
Suspect 3A (Brother)	Included	1	Drop-out Possible
Suspect 3B (Friend)	Excluded		

The Brothers

Markers	D8S1179	D21S11	D7S820	CSF1PO	D3S1358	TH01	D13S317	vWA	TPOX	D18S51	D5S818
Victim 03A	12, <mark>15</mark>	31.2,31.2	10,10	10,11	14,14	9.3,9.3	11,12	15,15	<mark>9</mark> ,11	12,13	11,12
Cons Partner	14,14	28,35	10,11	10, <mark>12</mark>	14,18	7,8	12,13	17,21	6, <mark>8</mark>	13,16	10,12
Suspect 03A	14,15	28,35	10,11	12,12	14,18	7,8	12,13	17,21	<mark>8,9</mark>	13,16	10,12

For 11 of the 13 CODIS loci – all of suspect 03A's alleles are masked by either his brother or the victim

The Brothers

For D16 and FGA – two alleles of the suspected brother are present in the epg



The Brothers

The kit-specific markers give some additional information



Primary Goals

- Primary purpose is this mixture too complex for interpretation due to the potential of drop-out in the low level suspect?
- Most labs including Suspect 3A and excluding Suspect 3B.
- Most labs are using *CPI stats* for this case...

An issue...

- Random Man Not Excluded (CPE/CPI) The probability that a *random person* (unrelated individual) would be excluded as a contributor to the observed DNA mixture.
- Only a few labs have stated this "Due to the relatedness of the exemplars submitted for comparison, a statistical analysis cannot be provided at this time."


Inconclusive

Case 04 – Bite Mark Evidence

Minor component (2-person) "German Type B"

Case 04 – IDPlus



X Y 1563 198

Case 04 – One Suspect

Individual	Inclusion?	Ratio
Victim	Included	~3.5
Suspect 4A	Included	1

Primary Goals

- Primary purpose will labs choose to deconvolve this mixture since the mixture ratio is close to the limit of deconvolution for many labs?
- All labs have included the suspect in the mixture.

Statistical Interpretation



CPI Analysis

• Stats ranged from 1 in 3,070 to 1 in 862,000 with a median of 1 in 14,380.

Alleles below ST (ID+)



7 Loci **D**8 D21 **D7** CSF D2 TPOX **FGA**

1 of 12 ID+ labs included all but D7

mRMP/LR Analysis

• Stats ranged from 1 in 358,000 to 1 in 412 Quintillion with a median of 1 in 2.58 Quadrillion

Focus on Uncertainty with D16 (stutter)



POI = 11, 12

If 10% stutter from the 12 allele (163 RFU) is part of the 11 allele, then the remaining peak (70 RFU) is below the ST

No CPI labs excluded D16 from the stat

Uncertainty with D16



POI = 11, 12







POI = 11, 12



POI = 11, 12

Statistics with D16 (mRMP/LR)



4.2. For calculating the CPE or RMP, any DNA typing results used for statistical analysis *must be* derived from **evidentiary items** and not known samples.

Probabilistic approaches to interpretation can be useful to reduce uncertainty and subjectivity

Summary

- Most labs have validated and implemented AT and STs since MIX05. However, there is still a great deal of variation in interpretation across the U.S.
- An Idea if everyone uses the same AT/ST, then one would expect to see similar results.
- Reality the results were all over the place, Some of this was to be expected since each lab's protocol is different (e.g. dropping a locus vs, 2p).
- Probabilistic approaches will also deconvolve the mixture (without dropping loci), and can do so without bias.

Case 05 – Ski Mask (Robbery Evidence)

Complex mixture (>3-person) with # of contributors; inclusion/exclusion issues

Scenario

- Evidence: Ski mask recovered at a bank robbery.
- A number of gang-related robberies have targeted several banks in the city. The robberies have typically involved 2-3 perpetrators. A ski mask was recovered in a trash can one block away from the latest bank robbery and is submitted for DNA testing.
- A confidential informant has implicated two suspects in at least three of the armed robberies. Police have obtained buccal swab references from the two suspects identified from the CI, and another known accomplice of the suspects.

Case 05 – IDPlus



No more than 4 alleles at a locus

• Suggests a 2 person mixture



Peak Height information does not agree

Case 05

- Is actually a 4 person mixture with no more than 4 alleles at any locus.
- Created with Virtual Mixture Maker (David Duewer, NIST) using 259 Caucasian samples from the NIST population data.

An overview of the mixture creation

4		and the			and the		2.		
1	SampleCode	CSF1PO	0135317	0165539	010553	0395433	021511	0251138	0451358
2	BC11352	11,13	13,18	4.12	18.15	18,18	28.30	17,20	14,17
1	OCE3294	10,12	11,11	12.15	15,17	14,15	90,31	17.28	15,18
4	GT26864	10,12	11,11	11.12	14,19	12,34	31.2,32.2	19,25	15,16
\$	UT36866	11.11	11.12	11.18	18.15	12,14	11.2,32,2	18.25	16,17
8	6130675	11,11	11,12	11.15	14,17	12,34	28,25	24,25	14,10
7.	6136877	11,11	11,11	9.11	16,18	12,16.2	28,30	18.72	35,18
÷	6736878	10.12	11.23	8.11	13,37	13.15	10.32.2	17,38	15,18
۲.	GT36884	10,11	11,11	8,12	14,15	12,15	28,30	17,24	14,18
10	6736885	10,11	11,52	11,13	14,17	13,13	38,29	21,33	18,18
Ħ	0736886	10.11	11,14	38.12	15.17	35.15	29,30	17.22	15,15
12	GT3BR85	10,12	33,34	11.14	15.18	14,14	29, 31, 2	19,25	14,18
ŧ1	6738006	12,18	8.8	10,11	13.15	12,14	10,30	16,39	16,18
14	6738067	12,33	11.57	8.14	18,38	15,14	23.30	23,26	16,18

65 samples (ID and Pentas)

	in the second			A						3.02
į,	SertpleCode	C32240	0135317	0105539	008151	D195433	013333	0251338	0351358	205833
£	ATTABIS9	10,18	8.31	9,12	11.17	\$2,2,18	28,00	18,33	16,17	11,13
1	MT194080	11,12	8.32	12,12	12,18	14,14	29.2,30	17,17	15.13	31,12
6	ATTRACES.	12.12	3.11	3,12	12.17	14,14	27,32,2	28.25	16,17	11,13
ŝ.	MT1940003	12,13	11.12	12,13	12.18	10,15	28,30	11.34	10.10	11,12
ŧ.	MT94875	3,10	11.12	12,11	14,18	14,15,2	25,92.2	18.23	18,18	11,12
2	ATTHET?	11.12	11,12	12,52	15,18	\$2,13	12.2, 32.3	12,38	18,18	\$1,12
Ξ.	ACT94080	12,12	11,12	11,17	18.18	12,18	28,29	38.35	14;14	11,12
ĸ	MTTHER?	13.32	33,34	333	15,18	34,34	93,30.2	25.25	15,16	11,12
14	ATTHEES	12,12	30,12	12,32	15.28	\$2,18	31,21	21.25	10.10	\$1,13
Ġ,	MT94084	ILU.	17.71	33,33	11.17	14,15	10,31.2	17.15	15,18	\$2,18
a	MT99085	12,13	12,13	9,12	12.15	13,13.2	21.2,21.2	26.34	15,15	8,12
ų	MT94088	10,11	8,9	32.28	12.17	15.2,10	29.2,30.7	17,28	15,18	11,13
14	MT54892	11,13	9,31	9.12	15.15	18.18	29,32.2	16,17	14,15	5.12
ß	MT\$405	11,11	8,32	15,52	14.14	13,18	28,12.2	17,34	14,17	\$2,53
íń.	80197121	10.12	10.11	15.14	15.18	14.14	\$3,90	17.37	18,17	31.57

65 samples (ID and Pentas)

•	3	GT36866	MT97199	11	11,12	11,12,13	13,15	12,14	28,30,31.2,32.2
	4	MT94818	MT97165	10,11,12	8,9,11,12	11	13,17,20	14,16	29,30
	5	MT94803	MT97199	11,13	11,12	11,12	14,15,18	13,14	28,30,32.2
	6	JM28315	MT97187	10,12	9,11,12	9,12,13	12,15,16	12,14,15	28,30
	7	MT94846	MT97179	11,12	9,10,11	9,11,12	14,16,21	12,14	30,32.2
	8	GT38081	MT97166	11,12,13	11,12	11,12	14,17	14	28,29,30,31.2
	9	GC03394	MT97180	10,12	9,11	9,12,13	14,15,17	14,15	30,31
	10	MT94846	MT97180	10,11,12	9,11	9,12	14, 16, 17, 2	14	30
	11	MT94833	MT94866	11,12	8,11,12	12,13	12,16	14	29.2,30,31
	12	BC11352	MT97199	11,13	11,12,13	8,11,12	13,15	13,14	28,30
	13	GT36877	OT07785	11,12	11	9,11	12,16,18	13,14,16.2	28,30,30.2
	14	GT38069	MT94882	11,12	8,13,14	9,13	12,15,16	14,15	28,30,30.2
7	15	GT38073	MT97199	11,12	11,12,13	10,11,12	15,17	12,14	28,30,32.2
	16	GT38097	OT07785	11,12	11,13	9,11	12,15,16	13,14	29,30,30.2
	17	GT38108	PT83538	10,12	8,11,12	11,12	15,16,17	13,14	29,30,32.2

Groups 1 and 2

An overview of the mixture creation

4		and the			and the		2.		
1	SampleCode	CSF1PO	0135317	0165539	010553	0395433	021511	0251138	0351358
2	BC11352	11,13	13,18	4.12	18.15	18,18	28.30	17,20	14,17
1	OCE3294	10,12	11,11	12.15	15,17	14,15	90,31	17.28	15,18
4	GT26864	10,12	11,11	11.12	14,19	12,34	31.2,32.2	19,25	15,16
\$	UT36866	11.11	11.12	11.18	18.15	12,14	11.2,32,2	18.25	16,17
8	6130675	11,11	11,12	11.15	14,17	12,34	28,25	24,25	14,10
7.	6136877	11,11	11,11	9.11	16,18	12,16.2	28,30	18.72	35,18
÷	6736878	10.12	11.83	8.11	13,37	13.15	10.32.2	17,38	15,18
۲.	GT36884	10,11	11,11	8,12	14,15	12,15	28,30	17,24	14,18
10	6736885	10,11	11,52	11,13	14,17	13,13	38,29	21,33	18,18
Ħ	0736886	10.11	11,14	38.12	15.17	35.15	29,30	17.22	15,15
12	GT3BR85	10,12	33,34	11.14	15.18	14,14	29, 31, 2	19,25	14,18
ŧ1	6738006	12,18	6.8	10,11	13.15	12,14	10,30	16,39	16,18
14	6738067	12,33	11.57	8.14	18,38	15,14	23.30	23,26	16,18

65 samples (ID and Pentas)

	1. Martine	. Aller	mation	. Ain	Bin	the state of the s			Jun Mary	
1	SempleCode	C32340	0135317	0166589	008151	D195433	013333	0251358	0351358	1055331
£	ATTABIS9	10,13	8.31	9,12	11.17	\$2,2,18	29,30	18,33	16,17	13,43
1	MT194080	11,12	8.32	12,12	12,18	14,14	29.2,30	17,17	15.13	31,12
6	ATTRACES.	12.12	3.11	3,12	12.17	14,14	22,32,2	28.25	16,17	11,13
ŝ.	MT1940003	12,13	11.12	12,13	12.18	10,12	28,30	11.34	10.10	11,12
ŧ.	MT94875	3,10	11.12	12,11	14,18	14,15,2	25,92.2	18.23	18,18	11,12
2	ATTHET?	11.12	11,12	12,52	15,18	\$2,18	12.2, 32.3	12,38	18,18	\$1,12
Ξ.	ATT94080	12,12	11,17	11,11	18.18	12,18	25,29	38.35	14;14	13,12
ĸ	MTTHER?	13.32	33,34	333	15,18	14,14	93,30.2	25.25	15,16	11,12
14	ATTHEES	12,12	30,12	12,32	15.28	12,18	20,24	21.25	10.10	\$1,13
Ġ,	M194884	ILU.	1771	33.15	11.17	16.15	10,31.7	17,19	15,18	\$2,18
a	MT99085	12,13	12,13	9,12	12.15	\$3,53.2	21.2, 21.2	26.34	15,15	8,12
ų	MT94088	10,13	8,9	32.28	12.17	15.2,10	29.2,30.7	17,28	15,18	11,13
14	MT54892	11,13	9,31	9.12	15.15	18.18	29,32.2	16,17	14,15	5.12
ß	MTS485	11,11	3,32	15,52	14.14	13,18	28,12.2	17,34	14,17	\$2,53
íń.	87197121	10.12	10.11	11.14	15.18	14.14	83,90	17.12	18.17	31.52

64 samples (ID and Pentas)

•	3	GT36866	MT97199	11	11,12	11,12,13	13,15	12,14	28,30,31.2,32.2
	4	MT94818	MT97165	10,11,12	8,9,11,12	11	13,17,20	14,16	29,30
	5	MT94803	MT97199	11,13	11,12	11,12	14,15,18	13,14	28,30,32.2
	6	JM28315	MT97187	10,12	9,11,12	9,12,13	12,15,16	12,14,15	28,30
	7	MT94846	MT97179	11,12	9,10,11	9,11,12	14,16,21	12,14	30,32.2
	8	GT38081	MT97166	11,12,13	11,12	11,12	14,17	14	28,29,30,31.2
	9	GC03394	MT97180	10,12	9,11	9,12,13	14,15,17	14,15	30,31
	10	MT94846	MT97180	10,11,12	9,11	9,12	14,16,17,2	14	30
	11	MT94833	MT94866	11,12	8,11,12	12,13	12,16	14	29.2,30,31
	12	BC11352	MT97199	11,13	11,12,13	8,11,12	13,15	13,14	28,30
	13	GT36877	OT07785	11,12	11	9,11	12,16,18	13,14,16.2	28,30,30.2
	14	GT38069	MT94882	11,12	8,13,14	9,13	12,15,16	14,15	28,30,30.2
7	15	GT38073	MT97199	11,12	11,12,13	10,11,12	15,17	12,14	28,30,32.2
	16	GT38097	OT07785	11,12	11,13	9,11	12,15,16	13,14	29,30,30.2
	17	GT38108	PT83538	10,12	8,11,12	11,12	15,16,17	13,14	29,30,32.2

Groups 3 and 4

3	GT36866 MT97199	11	11,12	11,12,13	13,15	12,14	28,30,31.2,32.2	,
4	MT94818 MT97165	10,11,12	8,9,11,12	11	13,17,20	14,16	29,30	
5	MT94803 MT97199	11 13	11 12	11 12	14 15 18	13 14	28,30,32.2	1
6	JM28315 M	~				4,15	28,30	·
7	MT94846 M	inor	ins 1	an	C h	4	30,32.2	1
8	GT38081 M		i Cqi				28,29,30,31.2	
9	GC03394 M			4	$\sim -$	5	30,31	
10	MT94846 M	nlv	the	ton	25		30	
11	MT94833 M			υp	20		29.2,30,31	
12	BC11352 M (4	II C			4	28,30	
13	GT36877 O	toRe	$\# \cap f$	Sha	ares	4,16.3	2 28,30,30.2	
14	GT38069 M					/ 5	28,30,30.2	
15	GT38073 Mi 97199	11,12	11,12,13	10,11,12	15,17	12,14	28,30,32.2	
16	GT38097 OT07785	11,12	11,13	9,11	12,15,16	13,14	29,30,30.2	
17	GT38108 PT83538	10,12	8,11,12	11,12	15,16,17	13,14	29,30,32.2	Salact combinations
		···	· · · -					
								141 41

with no more than 4 alleles at any locus

3	GT36866 MT97199	11	11,12	11,12,13	13,15	12,14	28,30,31.2,32.2	1
4	MT94818 MT97165	10,11,12	8,9,11,12	11	13,17,20	14,16	29,30	:
5	MT94803 MT97199	11,13	11,12	11,12	14,15,18	13,14	28,30,32.2	•
6	JM28315 MT	_				I,15	28,30	
7	MT94846 MT	rou	nc ?	2 nn		ţ.	30,32.2	1
8	GT38081 MT	JUUU	h2 r) ai	IU 4		28,29,30,31.2	
9	GC03394 MT		•			j –	30,31	
10	MT94846 MT	h h	tha	ton	って		30	
11	MT94833 MT	лпу		ιυμ	ZŨ		29.2,30,31	•
12	BC11352 MT	<u> </u>				Ļ	28,30	•
13	GT36877 OT 44	act .	# ~f	ch	rnc	I,16.2	28,30,30.2	•
14	GT38069 MT	αδι		SIIC	コモこ) ;	28,30,30.2	•
15	GT38073 MT	, . –	· · · , · - , · -	, ,	·-,··		28,30,32.2	
16	GT38097 OT07785	11,12	11,13	9,11	12,15,16	13,14	29,30,30.2	
17	GT38108 PT83538	10,12	8,11,12	11,12	15,16,17	13,14	29,30,32.2	

		#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6
GT36866_MT97199	UT58299_Y12	0	3	9	4	0	0
MT94803_MT97199	UT57301_TT50705	0	3	7	6	0	0
GT36866_OT07776	UT58299_TT50705	0	2	8	6	0	0
GT36885_MT97192	WT51386_TT50705	0	2	8	6	0	0
GT38069_GT38119	UT58299_MT94884	0	2	8	6	0	0
GT38098_MT97199	UT57301_TT50705	0	2	8	6	0	0
MT94803_MT97199	UT58299_Y12	0	3	6	7	0	0
MT97126_MT97173	UT58318_UT57299	0	3	6	7	0	0
MT97126_MT97173	UT58318_TT50705	0	3	6	7	0	0

Note: All samples are unrelated (relative testing, mtDNA, Y-STRs, X-STRs, etc...)

Case 05 – 3 Suspects



D8S1179 Result with Case 5 Mixture

Provided Reference Suspect Profiles <u>at D8S1179</u>

> 5A : 10,15 5B : 14,14 5C : 10,14

Allele 12 is in the evidence profiles but not in three provided reference samples

Is there another contributor not represented by the supplied suspects?





D19S433 Result with Case 5 Mixture

Provided Reference Suspect Profiles at xxxx 5A:13,14 5B:14,15 5C:14,14 Allele 12 is in the evidence profiles but not in three provided reference samples

Is there another contributor not represented by the supplied suspects?



The D19S433 peak height imbalance created concern among __ labs

Case 5: conclusion reached is **exclusion** of all three suspects

Requestor's Case #: NIST MIX13 case 5

Laboratory File #: xxxx

DNA from DNA from three individuals was obtained from the ski mask (#Q). The Amelogenin Y type obtained from this exhibit indicates at least one of the sources of this profile is male. Suspect A (#05A), Suspect B (#05B), and Suspect C (#05C) are excluded as sources of the DNA profile obtained from this exhibit.

Provides a 20-page detailed analysis and evaluation on a locus-by-locus basis

Case 5: conclusion of **inconclusive** (not suitable for comparison)

Case 05

Evidence: Ski mask recovered at a bank robbery.

A number of gang-related robberies have targeted several banks in the city. The robberies have typically involved 2-3 perpetrators. A ski mask was recovered in a trash can one block away from the latest bank robbery and is submitted for DNA testing. A confidential informant has implicated two suspects in at least three of the armed robberies. Police have obtained buccal swab references from the two suspects identified from the CI, and another known accomplice of the suspects.

Assumptions:

Mixed DNA profile of at least 3 contributors, no loci qualify for CPI stats due to not all contributors possibly being represented, no major or majors per our guidelines

Conclusions for report:

Due to the complexity of this mixed DNA profile, it is not suitable for comparison purposes.

Case 5: lab manually examines PHRs **no major, no conclusion** – "not interpretable due to the complexity of the genetic information"



A mixture of at least three individuals was detected Evidence Item 1 in which a major contributor could not be determined.

Evidence Item 1 is not interpretable due the complexity of the genetic information; therefore no conclusions will be drawn.

Case 05

Case 5: all suspects **included** (cannot be eliminated as possible contributors)

DNA RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS:

A DNA mixture of three or more individuals was obtained from the ski mask. Suspects A, B and C cannot be eliminated as possible contributors to this DNA mixture.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS:

The DNA mixture identified on the ski mask occurs with the following probability of inclusion frequencies (at 15 of 15 loci):



Summary of interpretation:

All 3 standards can be included in the mixture. No attempt made at distinguishing ratios of contributors. However, some additional alleles were observed not belonging to any of the 3 standards provided:

D8 - 12, D7 - 11, Tho1 - 9.3, D13 - 12, D2 - 20, D19 - 12

Recognize that something unusual is going on **yet CPI stats are reported**

Stats database used – Popstats (allele frequencies: JFS 1999; 44(6): 1277-1286 & JFS 2001; 46(3): 453-489)

Thresholds used = NIST, but using our thresholds would have given the same results

ANALYSIS

Common response to MIX 13 Case 5

Identifiler Plus data was analyzed and NIST thresholds were used for allele calls. Based on heterozygote peak height ratios, it appears that DNA from more than two individuals is present and no major contributor can be determined. Statistical analysis was performed using the FBI database and POPSTATS. <u>A CPI statistic was generated using all loci.</u>

Recognition that the suspects are not a perfect fit for the data butCONCLUSIONSIab SOP permits going forward with CPI statistical calculation

The DNA obtained from the ski mask contains DNA from a male. The data indicate that DNA from more than two individuals was obtained from the ski mask. Suspects A, B and C cannot be excluded as sources of the DNA obtained from this sample. The DNA obtained from the ski mask also contains types which could not have originated from Suspect A, B or C.

The approximate frequencies of individuals in the Caucasian, African American and Hispanic populations who would not be excluded as possible donors of the DNA obtained from the ski mask are as follows:

Population data base:	Frequency
Caucasian	1 in 230,000
African American	1 in 2.4 million
Hispanic	1 in 870,000

A fundamental misunderstanding due to overuse of CPI statistics

Case 05

A mixture of DNA profiles from at least three individuals was obtained from the ski mask. Suspects 05A, 05B, and 05C cannot be excluded as possible contributors to the mixture profile obtained. For the loci D8S1179, D21S11, D7S820, CSF1PO, D3S1358, TH01, D13S317, D16S539, D2S1338, D19S433, vWA, TPOX, D18S51, D5S818, and FGA, the probability that a randomly chosen, unrelated individual would be included as a possible contributor to this mixture is 1 in 142,600 using a Southeastern Hispanic database. In addition, there were alleles at six loci which can not be attributed to any of the individuals compared to this mixture profile.

Should be consistent genotypes rather than alleles!

This was an indistinguishable mixture, meaning that no genotypes could be determined. This conclusion was based on the fact that although no locus contained more than four alleles, there were peak height imbalances that occurred at multiple loci when trying to determine a major and minor component. Each suspect's profile was compared to the evidence mixture locus-by-locus to determine if alleles consistent with the Suspect were present in the mixture sample. All three Suspects cannot be excluded as possible contributors because "their" alleles are present at all 15 loci of the mixture profile. The Southeastern Hispanic database was used to report the CPI statistic because it yielded the most common statistic of the three population groups.

MIX13 Case 5 Outcomes with Suspect C

(whose genotypes were not present in the mixture)

# Labs	Report Conclusions	Reasons given
6	Exclude Suspect C	detailed genotype checks (ID+); TrueAllele negative LR (ID+); assumed major/minor and suspects did not fit (ID+); 3 labs noted Penta E missing allele 15 (PP16HS)
3	Inconclusive with C only (A & B included)	All these labs used PP16HS
21	Inconclusive for A, B, and C	
70	Include & provide CPI statistics	All over the road

Range of CPI stats for Caucasian population: FBI allele frequencies: **1 in 9** (Labs 12 & 54) to **1 in 344,000** (Lab 107)
Case 05

"Couldn't help but note the need for mix deconvolution software tools for case 05"

(a) Deconvolution as 3p mixture



PROBABILITY	DISTRIBUTION	
[18,20]	[17,17]	3.1435619345160034E-4
[18,23]	[17,17]	0.013779123510160775
[18,23]	[17,17]	0.0025562385293281887
[18,23]	[17,17]	3.5330685147076245E-4
[18,23]	[17,17]	0.09463609425559072
[20,23]	[17,17]	1.3307620480543583E-4
[23,23]	[17,17]	2.2360678716779012E-4
[17,20]	[17,18]	1.860003332375718E-5
[17,23]	[17,18]	0.011194437871043312
[17,23]	[17,18]	0.0022887419156283734
[18,23]	[17,18]	0.0025434216996429106
[18,23]	[17,18]	4.670327695074493E-5
[20,23]	[17,18]	5.917624047373503E-5
[20,23]	[17,18]	2.2663906150796565E-5
[20,23]	[17,18]	1.1378843915710276E-5
[23,23]	[17,18]	4.217987388864801E-4
[23,23]	[17,18]	3.3877069097404465E-4
	PROBABILITY [18,20] [18,23] [18,23] [18,23] [18,23] [20,23] [23,23] [17,23] [17,23] [17,23] [17,23] [18,23] [18,23] [18,23] [20,23] [20,23] [20,23] [20,23] [20,23] [23,23] [23,23]	PROBABILITY DISTRIBUTION [18,20] [17,17] [18,23] [17,17] [18,23] [17,17] [18,23] [17,17] [18,23] [17,17] [18,23] [17,17] [18,23] [17,17] [18,23] [17,17] [20,23] [17,17] [23,23] [17,17] [17,20] [17,17] [17,23] [17,17] [17,23] [17,18] [17,23] [17,18] [17,23] [17,18] [18,23] [17,18] [20,23] [17,18] [20,23] [17,18] [20,23] [17,18] [20,23] [17,18] [20,23] [17,18] [20,23] [17,18] [20,23] [17,18] [20,23] [17,18] [20,23] [17,18] [20,23] [17,18] [23,23] [17,18] [23,23] [17,18]

[20,23]	[23,23]	[17,18]	5.689421957855138E-6
[23,23]	[17,20]	[18,18]	2.0319364135196922E-6
[17,20]	[17,23]	[18,18]	0.012963941881616883
[18,20]	[17,23]	[18,18]	0.004694742192596937
[20,20]	[17,23]	[18,18]	5.370564243733586E-5
[20,23]	[17,23]	[18,18]	0.07806365212748431
[17,17]	[20,23]	[18,18]	4.020108042748191E-5
[17,23]	[20,23]	[18,18]	2.1225920381228785E-5
[17,20]	[23,23]	[18,18]	7.19930701590131E-5
[18,23]	[17,18]	[17,20]	2.5571138250140126E-5
[23,23]	[17,18]	[17,20]	0.01846580047822405
[23,23]	[18,18]	[17,20]	1.8006082679805273E-5
[18,18]	[17,23]	[17,20]	0.012773252464348113
[18,23]	[17,23]	[17,20]	0.0017543426388726942
[17,17]	[18,23]	[17,20]	0.015332554528576684
[17,18]	[18,23]	[17,20]	0.0027471155099582077
[17,20]	[18,23]	[17,20]	3.0322743401755406E-5
[17,23]	[18,23]	[17,20]	0.07381384148832777
[18,23]	[18,23]	[17,20]	2.3154696946062092E-4
[17,18]	[23,23]	[17,20]	1.6071054002930366E-4
[18,18]	[23,23]	[17,20]	1.5758448400850412E-4
[18,23]	[17,17]	[18,20]	1.1128759434046313E-5

[23,23]	[17,18]	[18,20]
[17,18]	[17,23]	[18,20]
[18,18]	[17,23]	[18,20]
[18,20]	[17,23]	[18,20]
[17,23]	[17,23]	[18,20]
[18,23]	[17,23]	[18,20]
[23,23]	[17,23]	[18,20]
[17,17]	[18,23]	[18,20]
[17,23]	[18,23]	[18,20]
[17,17]	[23,23]	[18,20]
[17,18]	[23,23]	[18,20]
[18,18]	[17,23]	[20,20]
[17,17]	[18,23]	[20,20]
[17,23]	[18,23]	[20,20]
[18,20]	[17,18]	[17,23]
[20,23]	[17,18]	[17,23]
[18,23]	[17,20]	[17,23]
[17,23]	[18,20]	[17,23]
[18,20]	[17,23]	[17,23]
[17,20]	[18,23]	[17,23]
[18,20]	[18,23]	[17,23]
[20,23]	[18,23]	[17,23]
[18,20]	[17,17]	[18,23]
[20,23]	[17,17]	[18,23]

0.006032975514541006 0.00808063598984532 0.006747373096974322 2.341415959578845E-5 0.0024700844253949536 0.07586022028066357 5.9645148876854965E-5 0.0031901401692259164 2.420817782507153E-4 8.84705114446474E-4 4.2464344986540767E-4 3.0313365233693005E-4 2.3336008195268463E-4 1.5036329460045721E-5 1.0003379266558484E-5 0.013604189415236835 3.238594037548309E-5 8.277796343077145E-5 0.0015531184128138287 0.07913420127236732 3.572144214967619E-4 3.1072996846747295E-5 2.3320377915164468E-5 5.867607151040711E-5

[17,20]	[17,18]	[18,23]	5.501858596607167E-6
[20,23]	[17,18]	[18,23]	0.00291845464045823
[17,23]	[17,20]	[18,23]	6.170834585058266E-5
[18,23]	[17,20]	[18,23]	8.221527334702755E-5
[17,20]	[17,23]	[18,23]	0.0026107882068911402
[18,20]	[17,23]	[18,23]	0.07008842674666035
[20,20]	[17,23]	[18,23]	1.2254139601534142E-5
[20,23]	[17,23]	[18,23]	3.1291820768203256E-5
[17,20]	[18,23]	[18,23]	2.1735467512619107E-4
[17,17]	[20,23]	[18,23]	3.532443303503465E-6
[18,18]	[17,17]	[20,23]	1.0253463748222446E-5
[18,23]	[17,17]	[20,23]	4.68908403119929E-6
[17,18]	[17,18]	[20,23]	1.419229433442985E-5
[17,23]	[17,18]	[20,23]	0.017445580835275917
[18,23]	[17,18]	[20,23]	0.003605405451028926
[20,23]	[17,18]	[20,23]	5.6269008374391474E-6
[23,23]	[17,18]	[20,23]	0.07682076351417463
[17,18]	[17,23]	[20,23]	0.0022137165711291844
[18,18]	[17,23]	[20,23]	0.10066731917876008
[18,23]	[17,23]	[20,23]	8.346569575534735E-5
[17,17]	[18,23]	[20,23]	0.07069522548085776
[17,18]	[18,23]	[20,23]	1.3617100026602736E-4
[17,23]	[18,23]	[20,23]	2.654021561658798E-5
[17,20]	[17,18]	[23,23]	0.020532436113574616

[18,20]	[17,18]	[23,23]	0.006249798760143661
[20,20]	[17,18]	[23,23]	1.1363213635606278E-4
[20,23]	[17,18]	[23,23]	0.07546711873604803
[18,18]	[17,20]	[23,23]	1.5942885706077583E-5
[18,23]	[17,20]	[23,23]	4.0638728270393845E-6
[17,17]	[18,20]	[23,23]	2.1663568224140716E-5

93 !! Possible Genotype Combinations

Number of known contributors under Hp: 3 , Suspect_05A_ref.csv, Suspect_05B_ref.csv, Suspect_05C_ref.csv Number of known contributors under Hd: 0

```
Locus 1(D8S1179): Pr(E|Hp) = 0.0, Pr(E|Hd) = 8.0E-5, LR = 0.0
Locus 2(D21S11): Pr(E|Hp) = 0.01875, Pr(E|Hd) = 3.0E-5, LR = 603.86846
Locus 3(D7S820): Pr(E|Hp) = 0.0, Pr(E|Hd) = 4.6E-4, LR = 0.0
Locus 4(CSF1PO): Pr(E|Hp) = 3.4E-4, Pr(E|Hd) = 0.00108, LR = 0.31407
Locus 5(D3S1358): Pr(E|Hp) = 0.19148, Pr(E|Hd) = 8.6E-4, LR = 222.85716
Locus 6(TH01): Pr(E|Hp) = 0.0, Pr(E|Hd) = 9.8E-4, LR = 0.0
Locus 7(D13S317): Pr(E|Hp) = 0.0, Pr(E|Hd) = 4.5E-4, LR = 0.0
Locus 8(D16S539): Pr(E|Hp) = 0.19217, Pr(E|Hd) = 0.00211, LR = 91.11187
Locus 9(D2S1338): Pr(E|Hp) = 0.0, Pr(E|Hd) = 5.0E-5, LR = 0.0
Locus 10 (D19S433): Pr(E|Hp) = 0.0, Pr(E|Hd) = 5.3E-4, LR = 0.0
Locus 11 (vWA): Pr(E|Hp) = 0.0, Pr(E|Hd) = 4.7E-4, LR = 0.0
Locus 12 (TPOX): Pr(E|Hp) = 3.3E-4, Pr(E|Hd) = 0.00526, LR = 0.06341
Locus 13 (D18S51): Pr(E|Hp) = 0.01176, Pr(E|Hd) = 7.0E-5, LR = 176.38643
Locus 14 (D5S818): Pr(E|Hp) = 4.9E-4, Pr(E|Hd) = 0.00243, LR = 0.19993
Locus 15 (FGA): Pr(E|Hp) = 0.0, Pr(E|Hd) = 1.8E-4, LR = 0.0
LR total = 0.0
```

LR Total = 0.0

Case 05

- Similar results when sample was analyzed as a 4 person mixture. True Allele results from one of the labs gave a negative logLR for Suspect C.
- Interpretation of this complex mixture (real or otherwise) requires an analysis of the genotypes, not the number of alleles above ST.
- CPI is not a substitute for interpretation with complex mixtures.

Eric Buel's thoughts on this example (shared with John Butler)



"We should embrace this information and find a way to make the changes necessary to try to prevent this in the future. We must understand it is not about "us" but about how to make sure we as a community provide the best possible services to those we serve both victims and suspects."

Thank You!

John Butler Robin Cotton Charlotte Word Margaret Kline Becky Hill Dave Duewer

Jill Spriggs

mcoble@nist.gov 301-975-4330

Outside funding agencies:

NIJ – Interagency Agreement with the Office of Law Enforcement Standards