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# Would you attempt to interpret the mixture in the previous slide? 

1. Yes, definitely
2. No, definitely not
3. Only if I knew the profile for one contributor
4. Yes, but only with help from my technical reviewer

Data from 104 responses ISHI Mixture Workshop (Oct 2012)


## Two-Person Mixtures

> Lots of experience and familiarity with twoperson mixtures, literature, validation studies, training samples
> Published guidelines for interpretation
$>$ Well developed SOPs for interpretation
> Routine amount of input DNA in amplification generally leads to nice profiles

## Two-Person Mixtures

High Certainty Leads to High Confidence
> Only two contributors present
$>$ Distinguishing stutter/artifacts from true alleles
$>$ Use stochastic threshold to assess if all alleles are likely present vs. LT DNA with stochastic effects
$>$ Assessing mixture ratio (distinguishable/ major:minor or indistinguishable mixture)
$>$ Deducing second contributor if one contributor is known

## Two-Person Mixtures

Assume number of contributors is two:

- Aids in allele association at each locus based on peak height ratios
- May aid in genotype association for full profile based on mixture ratio
- Statistics calculations often straight forward



## Complex Mixtures

$>$ Multiple contributors
>3- \& 4- person (or more!)
$>$ Relatives in Mixtures

## Complex Mixture Interpretation

Is hard because the parameters used to interpret two-person mixtures often may not be directly applicable to complex mixtures



## How many contributors assumed for interpretation?



## Complex Mixture - Allele Summary

- 6 alleles at 2 loci
- 5 alleles at 3 loci
- 4 alleles at 7 loci
- 3 alleles at 2 loci
- 2 alleles at 1 locus
- 1 allele at 0 loci
- 63 total alleles



# Would you attempt to interpret the mixture in the previous slide? 

1. Yes, definitely
2. No, definitely not
3. Only if I knew the profile for one contributor
4. Yes, but only the major contributor
5. Yes, but only the minor contributor

Data from 91 responses
ISHI Mixture Workshop (Oct 2012)


## How many contributors should be assumed for interpretation?

1. 1
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6 or more
7. Use several assumptions


## Can alleles for a major contributor be determined for this profile?

1. Yes, definitely

Data from 91 responses
2. No, definitely not
3. Only if I knew the profile for one contributor
4. Only if the suspect $23 \%$ is included


## Two-Person Mixtures

Observed profile MHA M At ^ـ $\Lambda$ A A ^ـ

## 14 total combinations

## 4 alleles

All heterozygotes and non-overlapping alleles

## 3 alleles

Heterozygote + heterozygote, one overlapping allele Heterozygote + homozygote, no overlapping alleles

## 2 alleles

Heterozygote + heterozygote, two overlapping alleles
Heterozygote + homozygote, one overlapping allele
Homozygote + homozygote, no overlapping alleles

## 1 allele

Homozygote + homozygote, overlapping allele

## Observed profile

## 6 alleles

## 150 total combinations

All heterozygotes and non-overlapping alleles

## 5 alleles

Two heterozygotes and one homozygote
Three heterozygotes, one overlapping allele

## 4 alleles

Six combinations of heterozygotes, homozygotes and overlapping alleles

## 3 alleles

Eight combinations of heterozygotes, homozygotes, and overlapping alleles

## 2 alleles

Five combinations of heterozygotes, homozygotes, and overlapping alleles

## 1 allele

All homozygotes, overlapping allele

## Observed profile <br> Four-Person Mixtures

8 alleles
MANY combinations

## ALALALA



」 $\_$


All heterozygotes and non-overlapping alleles
7 alleles
Several combinations of heterozygotes, homozygotes, and overlapping alleles
6 alleles
Many combinations

## 5 alleles

Many combinations

## 4 alleles

Many combinations

## 3 alleles

Many combinations
2 alleles
Many combinations
1 allele
All homozygotes, overlapping allele

# Towards understanding the effect of uncertainty in the number of contributors to DNA stains 
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#### Abstract

DNA evidence recovered from a scene or collected in relation to a case is generally declared as a mixture when more than two alleles are observed at several loci. However, in principle, all DNA profiles may be considered to be potentially mixtures, even those that show not more than two alleles at any locus. When using a likelihood ratio approach to the interpretation of mixed DNA profiles it is necessary to postulate the number of potential contributors. However, this number is never known with certainty. The possibility of a, say three-person mixture, presenting four or fewer peaks at each locus of the CODIS set was explored by Paoletti et al. [D.R. Paoletti, T.E. Doom, C.M. Krane, M.L. Raymer, D.E. Krane, Empirical analysis of the STR profiles resulting from conceptual mixtures, J. Forensic Sci. 50 (2005) 1361-1366]. In this work we extend this analysis to consider the profiler plus and SGM plus multiplices. We begin the assessment of the risk associated with current practice in the calculation of LR's. We open the discussion of possible ways to surmount this ambiguity.


(C) 2006 Elsevier Ireland Ltd. All rights reserved.

## Two-Person Simulated Mixtures - SGM ${ }^{+}$ Number of Alleles at each Locus

Table 1
The probability of observing a given number of alleles in a two-person mixtures for simulated profiles at the $\mathrm{SGM}^{+\mathrm{TM}}$ loci

| Loci | No. of alleles |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| D3 | 0.011 | 0.240 | 0.559 | 0.190 |
| vWA | 0.008 | 0.194 | 0.548 | 0.250 |
| D16 | 0.016 | 0.287 | 0.533 | 0.164 |
| D2 | 0.003 | 0.094 | 0.462 | 0.441 |
| D8 | 0.011 | 0.194 | 0.521 | 0.274 |
| D21 | 0.007 | 0.147 | 0.505 | 0.341 |
| D18 | 0.003 | 0.095 | 0.472 | 0.430 |
| D19 | 0.020 | 0.261 | 0.516 | 0.203 |
| THO | 0.016 | 0.271 | 0.547 | 0.166 |
| FGA | 0.003 | 0.116 | 0.500 | 0.381 |
| Buckleton et al. Forensic Science International: Genetics 1 (2007) 20-28 |  |  |  |  |

## Three-Person Simulated Mixtures - SGM ${ }^{+}$ Number of Alleles at each Locus

Table 2
The probability of observing a given number of alleles in a three-person mixtures for simulated profiles at the $\mathrm{SGM}^{+\mathrm{TM}}$ loci

| Loci | No. of alleles showing |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |  | 5 |  |
| D3 | 0.000 | 0.053 | 0.366 | 0.463 | 0.115 | 0.002 |  |
| vWA | 0.000 | 0.037 | 0.285 | 0.468 |  | 0.194 |  |
| D16 | 0.001 | 0.086 | 0.397 | 0.411 | 0.100 | 0.005 |  |
| D2 | 0.000 | 0.008 | 0.104 | 0.385 | 0.393 | 0.110 |  |
| D8 | 0.001 | 0.041 | 0.258 | 0.436 | 0.236 | 0.029 |  |
| D21 | 0.000 | 0.023 | 0.192 | 0.428 | 0.302 | 0.055 |  |
| D18 | 0.000 | 0.007 | 0.109 | 0.392 | 0.396 | 0.096 |  |
| D19 | 0.003 | 0.078 | 0.352 | 0.401 | 0.152 | 0.014 |  |
| THO | 0.001 | 0.074 | 0.395 | 0.439 | 0.088 | 0.002 |  |
| FGA | 0.000 | 0.012 | 0.144 | 0.424 | 0.346 | 0.074 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Buckleton et al. Forensic Science International: Genetics 1 (2007) 20-28

# 2, 3, 4-Person Simulated Mixtures - CODIS Loci Number of Alleles at each Locus 

J Forensic Sci, Nov. 2005, Vol. 50, No. 6

David R. Paoletti, ${ }^{1}$ M.S.; Travis E. Doom, ${ }^{1,2}$ Ph.D.; Carissa M. Krane, ${ }^{3}$ Ph.D.; Michael L. Raymer, ${ }^{1,2}$ Ph.D.; and Dan E. Krane, ${ }^{4}$ Ph.D.

## Empirical Analysis of the STR Profiles Resulting from Conceptual Mixtures


#### Abstract

Samples containing DNA from two or more individuals can be difficult to interpret. Even ascertaining the number of contributors can be challenging and associated uncertainties can have dramatic effects on the interpretation of testing results. Using an FBI genotypes dataset, containing complete genotype information from the 13 Combined DNA Index System (CODIS) loci for 959 individuals, all possible mixtures of three individuals were exhaustively and empirically computed. Allele sharing between pairs of individuals in the original dataset, a randomized dataset and datasets of generated cousins and siblings was evaluated as were the number of loci that were necessary to reliably deduce the number of contributors present in simulated mixtures of four or less contributors. The relatively small number of alleles detectable at most CODIS loci and the fact that some alleles are likely to be shared between individuals within a population can make the maximum number of different alleles observed at any tested loci an unreliable indicator of the maximum number of contributors to a mixed DNA sample. This analysis does not use other data available from the electropherograms (such as peak height or peak area) to estimate the number of contributors to each mixture. As a result, the study represents a worst case analysis of mixture characterization. Within this dataset, approximately $3 \%$ of three-person mixtures would be mischaracterized as two-person mixtures and more than $70 \%$ of four-person mixtures would be mischaracterized as two- or three-person mixtures using only the maximum number of alleles observed at any tested locus.


Paoletti et al. J Forensic Sci, Nov. 2005, Vol. 50, No. 6

## 2- to 5-Person Simulated Mixtures - Identifiler Number of Alleles vs. Likelihood Estimator

## PAPER

J Forensic Sci, January 2011, Vol. 56, No. 1
doi: $10.1111 / \mathrm{j} .1556-4029.2010 .01550 . \mathrm{x}$
Available online at: interscience.wiley.com

## CRIMINALISTICS

Hinda Haned, ${ }^{1}$ M.S.; Laurent Pène, ${ }^{2}$ M.S.; Jean R. Lobry, ${ }^{1}$ Ph.D.; Anne B. Dufour, ${ }^{1}$ Ph.D.; and Dominique Pontier, ${ }^{1}$ Ph.D.

Estimating the Number of Contributors to
Forensic DNA Mixtures: Does Maximum
Likelihood Perform Better Than Maximum
Allele Count?

Haned et al. J Forensic Sci, January 2011, Vol. 56, No. 1

## Number of Contributors - Total Number of Alleles

Estimating the number of contributors to two-, three-, and four-person mixtures containing DNA in high
template and low template amounts

Jaheida Perez, Adele A.
Mitchell, Nubia Ducasse, Jeannie Tamariz, Theresa
Caragine
Office of Chief Medical Examiner of the City of New York, The
Department of Forensic Biology,
New York, NY, USA

Perez et al., Croat Med J. 2011; 52:314-26


Figure 1. Expected \# of different alleles from mixtures.
Estimating the number of contributors to two-, three-, and four-person mixtures containing DNA in high template and low template amounts

Perez et al., Croat Med J. 2011; 52:314-26

## Two-Person Mixture Studies Summary

## Based on Allele Counts Alone:

- Always recognized as a mixture - no risk of confusing as a single-source
- Loci with 3 or 4 alleles
- Peak height ratio imbalance at loci with 2 alleles
- Observe more loci with 2 or 3 alleles than 4 alleles - even when DNA from two heterozygous individuals were mixed
- 49 or fewer total alleles


## Three-Person Mixture Studies Summary

- No risk of confusing as a single-source
- Small risk of confusing with two-person mixture
- Observe at least one locus with 5 or 6 alleles in $\sim 97 \%$ of profiles ( $3 \%$ have $\leq 4$ alleles)
- Maximum allele count works most of time
- 3\% profiles look like 2-person mixture
- Risk if LT-DNA, degradation, inhibition, primer mutation to look like 2-person mixture
- Most loci have 3 or 4 alleles
- 52-59 total alleles


## Four-Person Mixture Studies Summary

- No risk of confusing as a single-source
- Very small risk of confusing with two-person mixture
- Likely to have peak height imbalance
- Very small number of loci with 8 alleles and very few with 7 alleles
- High risk of confusing with three-person mixture
- Risk if LT-DNA, degradation, inhibition, primer mutation
- $\geq 65$ total alleles


## Four-Person Mixture Studies Summary

## >70\% of 4-person mixtures would NOT be recognized as 4-person mixtures based on maximum number allele count at a locus

## Five-, Six- Person Mixture Studies Summary

- >99\% of 5 person mixtures would look like 4 person mixtures ( $\sim 60 \%$ ) or 3-person mixtures (~40\%)
- Most 6 person mixtures would look like 5 person mixture (6\%), 4-person mixtures ( $80 \%$ ) or 3person mixtures (14\%)

> | Wang, T.W., Kalet, P., Pendleton, J., Gilbert, K., Lucas, L. and Birdwell, J.D. 2005 The |
| :--- |
| probable number of contributors to a STR DNA mixture. |
| http://www.promega.com/products/pm/genetic-identity/ishi-conference- |
| proceedings/16th-ishi-poster-abstracts/; Haned et al. J Forensic Sci, January 2011, |
| Vol. $56,(1), 23-28$ |

## Complex Mixture - Allele Summary

- 6 alleles at 2 loci
- 5 alleles at 3 loci
- 4 alleles at 7 loci
- 3 alleles at 2 loci
- 2 alleles at 1 locus
- 1 allele at 0 loci
- 63 total alleles


A 4-person mixture @ 1.6:3:1:2 ratio!!

## Uncertainty in the Potential Number of Contributors with this Result

- Several of the peaks are barely


5 alleles observed above the analytical threshold of 30 RFU

In fact, with an analytical threshold of 50 RFU or even 35 RFU, there would only be three detected alleles at D18S51

- Stochastic effects could result in a high degree of stutter off of the 17 allele making alleles 16 and 18 potential stutter products
- No other loci have >4 alleles detected


# All Detected Alleles Are Above the Stochastic Threshold - Or Are They? 



Stochastic threshold = 150 RFU

Does this result guarantee no allele drop-out?
We have assumed three contributors. If result is from an equal contribution of 3 individuals...

Then some alleles from individual contributors would be below the stochastic threshold and we could not assume that all alleles are being observed!

## Assuming Three Contributors...

## Some Possible Contributions to This Result



## Complex Mixtures

## Mixtures with Relatives

## Parent-Child Sibling-Sibling



## Parent + Child

## Mixture DNA Profile Pattern



Maximum: 3 alleles
Both heterozygote, one shared allele


2 alleles
Heterozygote + heterozygote, two shared alleles

Heterozygote + homozygote, one shared allele

$\stackrel{\text { A }}{\perp} \quad \stackrel{A}{1} \begin{aligned} & \text { allele } \\ & \text { Homozygote }+ \text { homozygote, one shared allele }\end{aligned}$
$\quad$ ALLELE SHARE AT EACH LOCUS

$P 1+P 2$
$\begin{array}{ll}A B & C D \\ ـ & \Lambda L\end{array}$
AB BC
M 1
${ }^{A B}{ }^{A B} \Lambda^{B}$ $\Lambda^{A B} \AA^{C}$ $\wedge^{A B}{ }^{A}$ $\perp \Lambda^{A}$ A $\AA$

Genotypes of Children
$A C$ or $A D$ or $B C$ or $B D$
$A B$ or $A C$ or $B B$ or $B C$
$A B / B A$ or $A A$ or $B B$
$A C$ or $B C$

AA or BA

AB

AA
P1 = Parent 1; P2 = Parent 2
\% Sibling Allele Sharing

```
                                    0%,50% or 100%
```

$0 \%, 50 \%$ or $100 \%$
$0 \%, 50 \%$ or $100 \%$
$50 \%$ or $100 \%$
$50 \%$ or $100 \%$

100\%

100\%

If I suspected the perpetrator in a case was related to one of the known contributors based on their DNA profiles, I would...

1. State it in a report
2. Tell the investigator
3. Tell the technical leader or lab director
4. Do nothing
5. Do Y STR testing (if males)
6. Do mtDNA testing


## Allele Sharing in Relatives



Allele sharing in first-degree and unrelated pairs of individuals in the Ge.F.I. AmpFISTR ${ }^{\circledR}$ Profiler Plus ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ database

Silvano Presciuttini ${ }^{\mathrm{a}, 1,{ }^{*}}$, Francesca Ciampini ${ }^{\mathrm{a}}$, Milena Alù ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$, Nicoletta Cerri ${ }^{\mathrm{c}}$,

Marina Dobosz ${ }^{\mathrm{d}}$, Ranieri Domenici ${ }^{\mathrm{e}}$, Gabriella Peloso ${ }^{\mathrm{f}}$, Susi Pelotti ${ }^{\mathrm{g}}$,
Andrea Piccinini ${ }^{\text {h }}$, Elena Ponzano ${ }^{\mathrm{i}}$, Ugo Ricci ${ }^{\mathrm{j}}$, Adriano Tagliabracci ${ }^{\mathrm{k}}$,
J.E. Baley-Wilson ${ }^{1}$, Francesco De Stefano ${ }^{m}$, Vincenzo Pascali ${ }^{\text {d,1 }}$

## Presciuttini et al. Forensic Science International 131 (2003) 85-89



Forensic Science International 131 (2003) 85-89


Ge et al. Comparisons of the familial DNA databases searching policies. J. Forensic Sci. 2011;56(6):1448-56.

## Mixtures with Relatives - Summary

## Parent-Child

- Expect at least $50 \%$ allele share
- Expect at least one shared allele at each locus
- Maximum 3 alleles per locus (in absence of mutation)
- If test $X$ loci, expect $>X$ allele shares (9-14 Profiler Plus; 13-20 CODIS)


## Mixtures with Relatives - Summary

## Sibling-Sibling

- Expect at least $50 \%$ allele share overall, but variable: 7-16 Profiler Plus; 12-22 CODIS ( $\geq$ X-1)
- Expect 0,50 or $100 \%$ allele share at each locus
- Expect at least one allele share at 9-13 loci (CODIS data)


Are the contributors to this profile related?


## The contributors to the previous profile are most likely....

1. Related as parentoffspring

Data from 72 responses
ISHI Mixture Workshop (Oct 2012)
2. Related as siblings
3. Related as cousins or other non-first degree relatives
4. Related but mutations occurred
5. Unrelated
6. Insufficient information


## Mixtures with Relatives Working Backwards from Mixed DNA Profile

- With mixed DNA profile from unknowns, may not know if alleles are shared
- Data in the graphs are not helpful



## Relative? Parent-Child? Sibs?

## Relative?

 Sibs?
## True Known Contributors to Previous Profile

- Share 14 alleles over 15 Identifiler loci
- 8 alleles at 9 Profiler Plus loci
- 13 alleles at 13 CODIS loci
- 15 alleles 17 loci (Identifiler + PowerPlex 16 HS)
- One allele in common at each locus, except D2, FGA and Penta E
- Likely not parent, unless mutations occurred
- Sibs?
- Using known contributors' profiles : Inconclusive from allele \#; Ge locus data suggests sibs
- Provided as DNA from non-relatives


## INCREASED COMPLEXITY

 $\downarrow$
## HIGH UNCERTAINTY

## !

LACK OF CONFIDENCE

## Complex Mixtures

## More Uncertainty and Lack of Confidence

$>$ Peak vs. Artifacts
>Stutter?
$>$ Pull-up?
$>$ True Allelle?


## Complex Mixtures

More Uncertainty and Lack of Confidence >High likelihood that DNA from one or more contributors is below optimal range
>LT DNA = stochastic effects
$>$ Missing alleles? (allele drop out)
>Elevated Stutter? True allele vs. Stutter?
> Allele drop-in?


## Complex Mixtures

## More Uncertainty and Lack of Confidence

$>$ Stochastic threshold
> Only meaningful for the peaks below the value may be missing sister allele
>Only helps with assessing if ALL alleles are likely present


## Complex Mixtures

## More Uncertainty and Lack of Confidence

> Stochastic threshold
$>$ NO meaning for peaks above the value -
$>$ Major contributor?
>Shared alleles? How many shares? Relatives or unrelated


## Complex Mixtures

## More Uncertainty and Lack of Confidence

>Peak height ratios have no meaning at most or all loci
>Cannot use to associate alleles into genotypes > Ability to deduce other contributors decreased even if you know one contributor


## Complex Mixtures

## More Uncertainty and Lack of Confidence

 $>$ Mixture ratio cannot be calculated> Different amount from each contributor likely with no way to determine
>Cannot use to associate genotypes into profiles


## Complex Mixtures

More Uncertainty and Lack of Confidence $>$ Number of contributors - maximum allele count/minimum number often an underestimate
$>$ What number to assume?
$>$ May need to interpret under multiple assumptions (especially if the conclusion changes)

## Complex Mixtures

## More Uncertainty and Lack of Confidence

>"Inclusion" based on alleles NOT based on genotypes $\rightarrow$ may not be correct inclusion
$>$ False Inclusions
>Increased risk as \# of alleles increase
$>$ How calculate statistical frequency?

## Complex Mixtures

Exclusions less likely
$>$ Can anyone be excluded if LT DNA present?
>Partial "inclusions"
Inconclusive reporting increased

## Should we be interpreting mixtures with 3 or more contributors?

1. Always
2. Never
3. Just in high profile cases
4. Only when one or more contributors are known
5. Maybe - depending on the profile


## Conclusions

- Criteria routinely used in crime laboratories for the interpretation of two-person mixtures may not apply for most complex mixtures
- LT-DNA, degradation, inhibition play more significant role
- Additional complex mixtures need to be generated and evaluated for establishment of scientifically supported interpretation guidelines


## Thank you!

