


Applying Algorithms to Forensic Science

Jeff Salyards, PhD, MFS
Forensic Research Scientist IV

Center for Statistics and Applications in
Forensic Evidence (CSAFE)
Iowa State University



Brogan, Jacob. “What’s the Deal With Algorithms? Your 101 guide to the computer codes that are shaping the ways we live. Slate Feb 02, 2016. <https://slate.com/technology/2016/02/whats-the-deal-with-algorithms.html>

Can I level with you? I’m not always sure I know what people are talking about when they say *algorithm*?

You’re not alone: Honestly, I haven’t always been sure what I meant when I said it either. But here’s the absolute simplest definition: *An algorithm is a set of guidelines that describe how to perform a task.*

THE *NEW YORK TIMES* BESTSELLER

THE **CHECKLIST** MANIFESTO

HOW TO GET THINGS RIGHT

PICADOR

ATUL GAWANDE

BESTSELLING AUTHOR OF *BETTER* AND *COMPLICATIONS*

Do they make everything
better?

Cooking
Aviation
Medicine
Forensic Science

CON. (LMP)

TRANSFER CAM

PREL CKS:

LM STATUS/PHOTO 3 GEAR

TERRAIN

LIGHTING/PHOTO SAM AREAS

PHOTO EGRESS

TV-CHANGE LENS(FAM)(SNC)

PHOTO SNC-CAM ON MESA

BULK SAMP (EVA & CIVIL)

WISTON BAG/SOOP/HAMMER

IMPACT SRC/COIL SAMP

SEAL SRC (WISTON ALSCC)

HOOK UP LEC

LM INSPECT-CLOSE UP PHOTOS

RECV STILL CAMERA-PHOTO

QUAD 117-Y GEAR

EASEP OFFLOAD/PANORAMA

EASEP DEPLOY & PHOTO

DOCUMENTED SAMPLE COIL

STEREO CORE TUBE

TETHER BAG/WISTON GNOMON

PHOTO & BAG SAMPLES

HOLD ENVIR/GSA SAM CONT

RETRY SNC-SOIL MICH

PACK/CLOSE SRC(INGRESS)


PHOTO LMP/CAM MAG TO LEC

TRANSFER BULK SRC

TRANSFER D.S. SRC

fore
nate
alt.
img
18

**Astronaut Neil
Armstrong – Apollo 11
July 16, 1969**



$$B^{-} = 1/2$$

$$B^2 = 1/6$$

$$B^4 = -1/30$$

$$B^6 = 1/42$$

$$B^8 = -1/30$$



$$B^{10} = 5/66$$

$$B^{12} = -691/2730$$



$$B^{14} = 7/6$$

Ada Lovelace, Charles Babbage, the Analytical Engine, Bernoulli numbers


Our perception and intuition ... exclusionary difference?







Our perception and intuition ... exclusionary difference




Our perception and intuition ... fingerprint minutia



Our perception and intuition ... land and groove impressions



A forensic scene is depicted with a light-colored floor. Numerous red bloodstains of varying sizes are scattered across the left side of the image. In the center, several evidence markers are visible: a green candlestick, a yellow key, a black knife, and a black handgun. A large, semi-transparent dark gray circle is overlaid on the right side of the image, containing white text. The text reads: "Professor Plum in the Library with the Gun? Knife? Candlestick?".

Professor Plum in the Library with the Gun? Knife? Candlestick?

Project BPA.I – Statistical Methods for Bloodstain Pattern Analysis

Forensic Science International 325 (2021) 110856



Accuracy and reproducibility of conclusions by forensic bloodstain pattern analysts



R. Austin Hicklin^{a,*}, Kevin R. Winer^b, Paul E. Kish^c, Connie L. Parks^a, William Chapman^a,
Kensley Dunagan^a, Nicole Richetelli^a, Eric G. Epstein^a, Madeline A. Ausdemore^a,
Thomas A. Busey^d

^a Noblis, Reston, VA, USA

^b Kansas City Police Department Crime Laboratory, Kansas City, MO, USA

^c Forensic Consultant, Corning, NY, USA

^d Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 1 February 2021

Received in revised form 28 April 2021

Accepted 27 May 2021

Available online 3 June 2021

Keywords:

Bloodstain pattern analysis

Forensic science

Forensic identification


ABSTRACT

Although the analysis of bloodstain pattern evidence left at crime scenes relies on the expert opinions of bloodstain pattern analysts, the accuracy and reproducibility of these conclusions have never been rigorously evaluated at a large scale. We investigated conclusions made by 75 practicing bloodstain pattern analysts on 192 bloodstain patterns selected to be broadly representative of operational casework, resulting in 33,005 responses to prompts and 1760 short text responses. Our results show that conclusions were often erroneous and often contradicted other analysts. On samples with known causes, 11.2% of responses were erroneous. The results show limited reproducibility of conclusions: 7.8% of responses contradicted other analysts. The disagreements with respect to the meaning and usage of BPA terminology and classifications suggest a need for improved standards. Both semantic differences and contradictory interpretations contributed to errors and disagreements, which could have serious implications if they occurred in casework.

© 2021 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier B.V.
CC BY 4.0

The process of scientific maturity – Evidence-based Medicine

Levels of Evidence



Haughom, J. "Reasons the practice of evidence-Based medicine is a hot topic." (5).



I'm practicing
"songwriting"
not acoustics.

Metrology?



I'm practicing
"soaring" not
aerodynamics

Metrology???

The process of scientific maturity – Forensic Science

United States Department of Justice Statement on the PCAST Report: *Forensic Science in Criminal Courts: Ensuring Scientific Validity of Feature-Comparison Methods*

In September 2016, the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology ("PCAST") released its report, *Forensic Science in Criminal Courts: Ensuring Scientific Validity of Feature-Comparison Methods*.¹ The stated purpose of the Report was to determine what additional scientific steps could be taken after publication of the 2009 National Research Council Report² to ensure the validity of forensic evidence used in the legal system.³ PCAST identified what it saw as two important gaps: 1) the need for clarity about scientific standards for the validity and reliability of forensic methods; and 2) the need to evaluate specific methods to determine whether they had been scientifically established as valid and reliable.⁴ The Report "aimed to close these gaps" for a number of what it described as "feature comparison methods."⁵ These are methods for comparing DNA samples, latent fingerprints, firearm marks, footwear patterns, hair, and bitmarks.⁶

Unfortunately, the PCAST Report contained several fundamentally incorrect claims. Among these are: 1) that traditional forensic pattern comparison disciplines, as currently practiced, are part of the scientific field of metrology; 2) that the validation of pattern comparison methods can *only* be accomplished by strict adherence to a non-severable set of experimental design criteria; and 3) that error rates for forensic pattern comparison methods can *only* be established through "appropriately designed" black box studies.

The purpose of this statement is to address these claims and to explain why each is incorrect. After the PCAST Report was released, the Department of Justice ("Department") announced that it would not follow PCAST's recommendations.⁷ The Report was criticized by a number of commentators and organizations outside of the Department for its analysis, conclusions, factual inaccuracies, and other mistakes.⁸ Formally addressing PCAST's incorrect claims has become

¹ PRESIDENT'S COUNCIL OF ADVISORS ON SCI. & TECH., EXEC. OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, *FORENSIC SCI. IN CRIM. COURTS: ENSURING SCI. VALIDITY OF FEATURE-COMPARISON METHODS* (2016), https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ostp/PCAST/pcast_forensic_science_report_final [https://perma.cc/VJB4-5JVQ] [hereinafter PCAST REPORT].

² NAT'L RES. COUNCIL, NAT'L ACAD.'S, *STRENGTHENING FORENSIC SCI. IN THE UNITED STATES: A PATH FORWARD* 122 (Nat'l Acad. Press 2009).

³ PCAST REPORT, *supra* note 1, at 1.

⁴ *Id.*

⁵ *Id.* In this statement, we use the term "pattern comparison," rather than PCAST's chosen term, "feature comparison" to describe the general nature of the methods discussed.

⁶ *Id.* Department of Justice laboratories do not practice what PCAST described as "bitmark analysis."

⁷ Gary Fields, *White House Advisory Council Is Critical of Forensics Used in Criminal Trials*, WALL ST. J. (Sept. 20, 2016, 4:25 PM), <https://www.wsj.com/articles/whitehouse-advisory-council-releases-report-critical-of-forensics-used-in-criminal-trials-a1474394743> [https://perma.cc/N9KM-NHJL].

⁸ See, e.g., I.W. Evett et al., *Finding a Way Forward for Forensic Science in the US—A Commentary on the PCAST Report*, 278 *FORENSIC SCI. INT'L* 16, 22–23 (2017); Letter from Michael A. Ramos, President, Nat'l Dist. Attorneys Ass'n, to President Barack Obama (Nov. 16, 2016), <http://tinyurl.com/hezk3k>; Ass'n of Firearms and Toolmark Examiners (AFTE) Response to PCAST Report on Forensic Sci. (October 31, 2016), <https://afte.org/uploads/documents/AFTE-PCAST-Response.pdf>; Org. of Sci. Area Committees (OSAC) Firearms and Toolmarks Subcommittee Response to the President's Council of Advisors on Sci. and Tech. (PCAST) Call for Additional References Regarding its Rep. "Forensic Sci. in Crim. Courts: Ensuring Sci. Validity of Feature-

PERSPECTIVE

The US Department of Justice stumbles on visual perception

Thomas D. Albright¹

Edited by Henry L. Roediger III, Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis, MO, and approved April 15, 2021 (received for review March 3, 2021)

A large and highly valuable category of forensic evidence consists of patterned impressions created during the perpetration of a crime. These crime scene artifacts, such as fingerprints or tire tracks, offer visual sensory information that is assessed by trained human observers and compared to sensory experiences elicited by model patterns that would have been produced under a hypothesized set of conditions. By means of this "forensic feature comparison," the observer makes a judgment about whether the evidence and the model are sufficiently similar to support common origin. In light of documented failures of this approach, significant concerns have been raised about its scientific validity. In response to these concerns, the US Department of Justice has made assertions about how forensic examiners perform feature comparison tasks that are not consistent with modern scientific understanding of the processes of sensation and perception. Clarification of these processes highlights new ways of thinking about and improving the accuracy of forensic feature comparison and underscores the vital role of science in achieving justice.

forensic science | sensory measurement | feature comparison

Forensic science is the bread and butter of criminal investigation and prosecution. On the surface of things, it is an incredibly compelling discipline. Artifacts of human activity left without intent or awareness suggest specific action scenarios, implicate specific actors, and sometimes support inferences regarding an actor's motivation or intent. Indeed, much of the genuine public fascination with—and trust in—forensic science stems from the sense of eavesdropping, from the feeling that we might learn some raw truth that is infinitely more candid simply because the actor was unaware of being watched. All of these fuel righteous indignation against those who would cause criminal offense and gives us the satisfying impression that we have a leg up on the bad guys.

Despite this fanciful optimism and longstanding public support, it has become increasingly clear that forensic practices that rely on human judgment often implicate the wrong people. This form of error frequently has tragic personal and societal consequences, including wrongful conviction and imprisonment. Indeed, thousands of innocent person-years have been spent behind bars for this reason, the majority of these quashed lives being men of color (1).

Many of the problems with this discipline were considered in a landmark 2009 report from the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) (2). This congressionally mandated study identified numerous weaknesses associated with validation, training, and reporting procedures in forensic practice and included detailed recommendations for science-based reform. These recommendations led, most notably, to creation of the short-lived National Commission on Forensic Science, and the National Institute of Standards and Technologies operation known as the Organization of Scientific Area Committees for Forensic Science, and to a variety of grass-roots efforts to improve and standardize forensic practice. In 2015, President Obama asked the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST) to further evaluate needs within the forensic science community, the product of which was a 2016 report focusing on a specific subset of forensic practices known as "feature comparison" methods (3).

Forensic Feature Comparison

Feature comparisons are among the oldest and most commonly employed of forensic methods and are familiar to most by their use for evaluation of visually patterned

¹The Salk Institute for Biological Studies, La Jolla, CA 92037

Author contributions: T.D.A. wrote the paper.

The author declares no competing interest.

This article is a PNAS Direct Submission.

This open access article is distributed under Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (CC BY).

Email: tdalb@ucsd.edu.

Published May 26, 2021.

Applying Algorithms to Forensic Science

Jeff Salyards, PhD, MFS
Forensic Research Scientist IV

Center for Statistics and Applications in
Forensic Evidence (CSAFE)
Iowa State University

