Contents

List of tables xiii

List of figures xix

Foreword xxii

Preface to the first edition xxv

Preface to the second edition xxviii

1 Uncertainty in forensic science 1

1.1 Introduction 1
1.2 Statistics and the law 2
1.3 Uncertainty in scientific evidence 5
1.3.1 The frequentist method 6
1.3.2 Stains of body fluids 7
1.3.3 Glass fragments 9
1.4 Terminology 12
1.5 Types of data 15
1.6 Probability 16
1.6.1 Introduction 16
1.6.2 A standard for uncertainty 18
1.6.3 Events 20
1.6.4 Subjective probability 21
1.6.5 Laws of probability 23
1.6.6 Dependent events and background information 25
1.6.7 Law of total probability 29
1.6.8 Updating of probabilities 32

2 Variation 35

2.1 Populations 35
2.2 Samples and estimates 37
2.3 Counts 40
2.3.1 Probabilities 40
2.3.2 Summary measures 41
2.3.3 Binomial distribution 43
2.3.4 Multinomial distribution 44
2.3.5 Hypergeometric distribution 45
2.3.6 Poisson distribution 48
2.3.7 Beta-binomial distribution 51
2.4 Measurements 52
2.4.1 Summary statistics 52
2.4.2 Normal distribution 53

2.4.3 Student's t-distribution 60
2.4.4 Beta distribution 62
2.4.5 Dirichlet distribution 63
2.4.6 Multivariate Normal and correlation 64

3 The evaluation of evidence 69

3.1 Odds 69
3.1.1 Complementary events 69
3.1.2 Examples 70
3.1.3 Definition 70
3.2 Bayes' Theorem 72
3.2.1 Statement of the theorem 72
3.2.2 Examples 73
3.3 Errors in interpretation 78
3.3.1 Fallacy of the transposed conditional 79
3.3.2 Source probability error 81
3.3.3 Ultimate issue error 82
3.3.4 Defender's fallacy 82
3.3.5 Probability (another match) error 83
3.3.6 Numerical conversion error 84
3.3.7 False positive fallacy 85
3.3.8 Uniqueness 86
3.3.9 Other difficulties 87
3.3.10 Empirical evidence of errors in interpretation 89
3.4 The odds form of Bayes' theorem 95
3.4.1 Likelihood ratio 95
3.4.2 Logarithm of the likelihood ratio 99
3.5 The value of evidence 101
3.5.1 Evaluation of forensic evidence 101
3.5.2 Summary of competing propositions 105
3.5.3 Qualitative scale for the value of the evidence 107
3.5.4 Misinterpretations 111
3.5.5 Explanation of transposed conditional and defence fallacies 112
3.5.6 The probability of guilt 116
3.6 Summary 118

4 Historical review 119

4.1 Early history 119
4.2 The Dreyfus case 122
4.3 Statistical arguments by early twentieth-century forensic scientists 125
4.4 People v. Collins 126
4.5 Discriminating power 129
4.5.1 Derivation 129
4.5.2 Evaluation of evidence by discriminating power 130
4.5.3 Finite samples 133
4.5.4 Combination of independent systems 135
4.5.5 Correlated attributes 136
4.6 Significance probabilities 141
4.6.1 Calculation of significance probabilities 141
4.6.2 Relationship to likelihood ratio 144
4.6.3 Combination of significance probabilities 147

4.7	Coincidence probabilities	149
4.7.1	Introduction	149
4.7.2	Comparison stage	151
4.7.3	Significance stage	151
4.8	Likelihood ratio	153
5	**Bayesian inference**	**157**
5.1	Introduction	157
5.2	Bayesian inference for a Bernoulli probability	160
5.3	Estimation with zero occurrences in a sample	162
5.4	Estimation of products in forensic identification	165
5.5	Bayesian inference for a Normal mean	166
5.6	Interval estimation	170
5.6.1	Confidence intervals	170
5.6.2	Highest posterior density intervals	172
5.6.3	Bootstrap intervals	172
5.6.4	Likelihood intervals	173
5.7	Odds ratios	175
6	**Sampling**	**179**
6.1	Introduction	179
6.2	Choice of sample size	182
6.2.1	Large consignments	182
6.2.2	Small consignments	186
6.3	Quantity estimation	190
6.3.1	Frequentist approach	190
6.3.2	Bayesian approach	191
6.4	Misleading evidence	197
7	**Interpretation**	**205**
7.1	Concepts and court cases	205
7.1.1	Relevant population	205
7.1.2	Consideration of odds	206
7.1.3	Combination of evidence	208
7.1.4	Specific cases	208
7.2	Pre-assessment and relevant propositions	214
7.2.1	Levels of proposition	214
7.2.2	Pre-assessment of the case	217
7.2.3	Pre-assessment of the evidence	220
7.3	Assessment of value of various evidential types	221
7.3.1	Earprints	221
7.3.2	Firearms and toolmarks	223
7.3.3	Fingerprints	226
7.3.4	Speaker recognition	228
7.3.5	Hair	229
7.3.6	Documents	231
7.3.7	Envelopes	233
7.3.8	Handwriting	235
7.3.9	Paint	239
7.4	Pre-data and post-data questions	239

8 Transfer evidence **245**

8.1 The likelihood ratio 245
8.1.1 Probability of guilt 245
8.1.2 Justification 246
8.1.3 Combination of evidence and comparison of more than two propositions 248
8.2 Correspondence probabilities 254
8.3 Direction of transfer 255
8.3.1 Transfer of evidence from the criminal to the scene 255
8.3.2 Transfer of evidence from the scene to the criminal 260
8.3.3 Transfer probabilities 261
8.3.4 Two-way transfer 270
8.3.5 Presence of non-matching evidence 271
8.4 Grouping 271
8.5 Relevant populations 274

9 Discrete data **283**

9.1 Notation 283
9.2 Single sample 283
9.2.1 Introduction 283
9.2.2 General population 286
9.2.3 Particular population 286
9.2.4 Examples 286
9.3 Two samples 288
9.3.1 Two stains, two offenders 288
9.3.2 DNA profiling 291
9.4 Many samples 292
9.4.1 Many different profiles 292
9.4.2 General cases 293
9.5 Relevance of evidence and relevant material 295
9.5.1 Introduction 295
9.5.2 Subjective probabilities 296
9.5.3 Association propositions 296
9.5.4 Intermediate association propositions 297
9.5.5 Examples 298
9.5.6 Two stains, one offender 302
9.6 Summary 304
9.6.1 Stain known to have been left by offenders 304
9.6.2 Relevance: stain may not have been left by offenders 305
9.6.3 Relevance and the crime level 307
9.7 Missing persons 308
9.7.1 Case 1 (Kuo, 1982) 309
9.7.2 Case 2 (Ogino and Gregonis,1981) 309
9.7.3 Calculation of the likelihood ratio 310
9.8 Paternity: combination of likelihood ratios 312
9.8.1 Likelihood of paternity 314
9.8.2 Probability of exclusion in paternity 317

10 Continuous data 319

10.1 The likelihood ratio 319
10.2 Normal distribution for between-source data 321
10.2.1 Sources of variation 322
10.2.2 Derivation of the marginal distribution 322
10.2.3 Approximate derivation of the likelihood ratio 324
10.2.4 Lindley's approach 326
10.2.5 Interpretation of result 327
10.2.6 Examples 328
10.3 Estimation of a probability density function 330
10.4 Kernel density estimation for between-source data 337
10.4.1 Application to medullary widths of cat hairs 339
10.4.2 Refractive index of glass 339
10.5 Probabilities of transfer 342
10.5.1 Introduction 342
10.5.2 Single fragment 342
10.5.3 Two fragments 345
10.5.4 A practical approach to glass evaluation 349
10.5.5 Graphical models for the assessment of transfer probabilities 352
10.6 Approach based on t-distribution 353
10.7 Appendix Derivation of V when the between-source measurements are assumed normally distributed 357

11 Multivariate analysis 359

11.1 Introduction 359
11.2 Description of example 360
11.3 Univariate t-tests 362
11.4 Hotelling's T^2 363
11.5 Univariate Normality, two sources of variation 365
11.6 Multivariate Normality, two sources of variation 366
11.7 Caveat lector 371
11.8 Summary 372
11.9 Appendix 373
11.9.1 Matrix terminology 373
11.9.2 Determination of a likelihood ratio with an assumption of Normality 377

12 Fibres 381

12.1 Introduction 381
12.2 Likelihood ratios in scenarios involving fibres 381
12.2.1 Fibres evidence left by an offender 382
12.2.2 Comments on the fibres scenario 387
12.2.3 Fibres evidence not left by the offender 388
12.2.4 Cross-transfer 389
12.3 Pre-assessment in fibres scenarios 392
12.3.1 The case history 392
12.3.2 Formulation of the pairs of propositions and events 392
12.3.3 Assessment of the expected value of the likelihood ratio 394
12.4 The relevant population of fibres 396

13 DNA profiling **399**

13.1 Introduction 399
13.2 Hardy–Weinberg equilibrium 401
13.3 DNA likelihood ratio 404
13.4 Uncertainity 405
13.5 Variation in sub-population allele frequencies 405
13.6 Related individuals 409
13.7 More than two propositions 412
13.8 Database searching 414
13.8.1 Search and selection effect (double counting error) 418
13.9 Island problem 419
13.10 Mixtures 421
13.11 Error rate 424

14 Bayesian networks **429**

14.1 Introduction 429
14.2 Bayesian networks 430
14.2.1 The construction of Bayesian networks 431
14.3 Evidence at the crime level 437
14.3.1 Preliminaries 437
14.3.2 Description of probabilities required 437
14.4 Missing evidence 439
14.4.1 Preliminaries 439
14.4.2 Determination of a structure for a Bayesian network 440
14.4.3 Comments 442
14.5 Error rates 442
14.5.1 Preliminaries 442
14.5.2 Determination of a structure for a Bayesian network 443
14.6 Transfer evidence 444
14.6.1 Preliminaries 444
14.6.2 Determination of a structure for a Bayesian network 444
14.6.3 Comment on the *transfer* node 446
14.7 Combination of evidence 447
14.8 Cross-transfer evidence 449
14.8.1 Description of nodes 451
14.8.2 Probabilities for nodes 452
14.9 Factors to consider 452
14.9.1 Parameter choice 453
14.10 Summary 453

References **455**

Notation **485**

Cases **489**

Author index **491**

Subject index **499**

List of Tables

1.1 Genotypic frequencies for locus *LDLR* amongst Caucasians in Chicago based on a sample of size 200 (from Johnson and Peterson, 1999). 8

1.2 Refractive index measurements. 10

1.3 Genotype probabilities, assuming Hardy–Weinberg equilibrium, for a diallelic system with allele probabilities p and q. 27

1.4 The proportion of people in a population who fall into the four possible categories of genetic markers. 29

2.1 Probabilities for the number of sixes, X, in four rolls of a fair six-sided die 41

2.2 Intermediate calculations for the variance of the number of sixes, x, in four rolls of a fair six-sided die 43

2.3 Probabilities that a random variable X with a Poisson distribution with mean 4 takes values 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 and greater than 4 50

2.4 Values of cumulative distribution function $\Phi(z)$ and its complement $1 - \Phi(z)$ for the standard Normal distribution for given values of z. 57

2.5 Probabilities for absolute values from the standard Normal distribution function 57

2.6 Percentage points $t_{(n-1)}(P)$ for the t-distribution for given values of sample size n, degrees of freedom $(n-1)$ and P, and the corresponding point $z(P)$ for the standard Normal distribution. 61

3.1 Two-by-two contingency table for frequencies for the tabulation of patients with or without a disease (S or $\bar{S}$) given a blood test positive or negative (R or $\bar{R}$). 74

3.2 Two-by-two contingency table for probabilities for the tabulation of patients with or without a disease (S or $\bar{S}$) given a blood test positive or negative (R or $\bar{R}$). 75

3.3 Hypothetical results for deaths amongst a population. 76

3.4 Probability θ of at least one match, given a frequency of the trace evidence of γ, in a population of size 1 million. 83

3.5 Evidence occurs with *RMP* γ. Smallest number ψ of people to be observed before a match with the evidence occurs with a given probability, $Pr(M) = 0.5, 0.9$; $\psi_5 = \log 0.5/\log(1-\gamma)$, $\psi_9 = \log 0.1/\log(1-\gamma)$, n_5 is the smallest integer greater than ψ_5, n_9 is the smallest integer greater than ψ_9. 85

3.6 The probability, θ', of at least one match with the evidence, which occurs with *RMP* γ, when $n' = 1/\gamma$ people are tested. 85

3.7 Frequency of Kell and Duffy types by colour in a hypothetical area. (Reproduced by permission of The Forensic Science Society.). 97

3.8 Effect on prior odds in favour of H_p relative to H_d of evidence E with value V of 1 000. Reference to background information I is omitted. 104

3.9 Value of the evidence for each genotype. 107

3.10 Qualitative scale for reporting the value of the support of the evidence for H_p against H_d (Evett *et al.*, 2000a). 107

3.11 The values of the logarithm of the posterior odds in favour of an issue determined from the values of the logarithm of the prior odds in favour of guilt (log(Prior odds)) and the logarithm of the likelihood ratio (Aitken and Taroni, 1998). The values in the body of the table are obtained by adding the appropriate row and column values. Logarithms are taken to base 10. The verbal description is taken from Calman and Royston (1997). (Reproduced by permission of The Forensic Science Society.). 110

3.12 Probability of guilt required for proof beyond reasonable doubt (Simon and Mahan, 1971). 116

4.1 Probabilities suggested by the prosecutor for various characteristics of the couple observed in the case of *People v. Collins*. 127

4.2 Allelic frequencies for *TPOX* locus for Swiss and NZ Caucasians and the probability Q_{TPOX} of a match. 136

4.3 Allelic frequencies for *TH01* locus for Swiss and NZ Caucasians and the probability Q_{TH01} of a match. 136

4.4 The calculation of discriminating power (*DP*) for Normal distributions of p dimensions. 139

4.5 Significance probabilities P for refractive index x of glass for mean $\theta_0 = 1.518\,458$ and standard deviation $\sigma = 4 \times 10^{-5}$ and decisions assuming a significance level of 5% 143

4.6 Variation in the likelihood ratio V, as given by (4.7), with sample size n, for a standardised distance $z_n = 2$, a result which is significant at the 5% level. 147

5.1 Probabilistic upper bounds θ_0 for the proportion θ of occurrences of an event in a population when there have been no occurrences in a sample of size n, for given values of $\epsilon = Pr(\theta > \theta_0)$, with a beta prior for which $\alpha = \beta = 1$. 164

5.2 Numbers of banknotes contaminated. 176

5.3 The value of evidence in comparing two binomial proportions for different values of sample size n and number of 'successes' z, where the samples are banknotes and a 'success' is a contaminated banknote. The binomial proportion in the numerator is 0.83, estimated from banknotes known to be used for drug dealing, and the binomial proportion in the denominator is 0.57, estimated from banknotes known to be from general circulation. 178

6.1 The probability that the proportion of drugs in a large consignment is greater than 50% for various sample sizes m and prior parameters α and β. (Reprinted with permission from ASTM International.) 184

6.2 The sample size required to be 100% certain that the proportion of units in the consignment which contain drugs is greater than θ, when all the units inspected are found to contain drugs. The prior parameters $\alpha = \beta = 1$. (Reprinted with permission from ASTM International.) 185

6.3 Estimates of quantities q of drugs (in grams), in a consignment of $m+n$ units, according to various possible burdens of proof, expressed as percentages $P = 100 \times Pr(Q > q \mid m, z, n, \bar{x}, s)$ in 26 packages when 6 packages are examined ($m = 6, n = 20$) and $z = 6$, 5, or 4 are found to contain drugs. The mean ($\bar{x}$) and standard deviation (s) of the quantities found in the packages examined which contain drugs are 0.0425 g and 0.0073 g. The parameters for the beta prior are $\alpha = \beta = 1$. Numbers in brackets are the corresponding frequentist lower bounds using the fpc factor (6.2). (Reprinted with permission from ASTM International.) 194

6.4 Estimates of quantities q of drugs (in grams), in a consignment of $m+n$ units, according to various possible burdens of proof, expressed as percentages $P = 100 \times Pr(Q > q \mid m, z, n, \bar{x}, s)$ in 2600 packages when 6 packages are examined ($m = 6, n = 2594$) and $z = 6$, 5, or 4 are found to contain drugs. The mean ($\bar{x}$) and standard deviation (s) of the quantities found in the packages examined which contain drugs are 0.0425 g and 0.0073 g. The parameters for the beta prior are $\alpha = \beta = 1$. Numbers in brackets are the corresponding frequentist lower bounds without using the fpc factor (6.8). (Reprinted with permission from ASTM International.). 196

6.5 Probabilities of strong misleading evidence $M(n)$ and weak evidence $W(n)$ for boundary values k of 8 and 32 for strong evidence and sample sizes n of 5, 10 and 20. 203

7.1 Examples of the hierarchy of propositions. (Reproduced by permission of The Forensic Science Society.) 217

7.2 Hypothetical relative frequencies for the maximum CMS count y for bullets fired from the same gun $f(y \mid SG)$ and for bullets fired from different guns $f(y \mid DG)$, and likelihood ratios $V = f(y \mid SG)/f(y \mid DG)$. (Reprinted with permission from ASTM International.) 224

7.3 Poisson probabilities for the maximum CMS count y for bullets fired from the same gun $Pr(Y = y \mid SG)$ (7.1) with mean $\lambda_S = 3.91$ and for bullets fired from different guns $Pr(Y = y \mid DG)$ (7.2) with mean $\lambda_D = 1.325$ and likelihood ratio $V = Pr(Y = y \mid SG)/Pr(Y = y \mid DG)$. (Reprinted with permission from ASTM International.) 225

7.4 Values of a probabilistic γ upper bound for the probability ϕ_0 of a false match for different values of n and γ. 242

7.5 Values of a probabilistic γ lower bound for the likelihood ratio $1/\phi_0$ for different values of n and γ, with values rounded down. 242

8.1 Probability evidence in *State v. Klindt* (altered for illustrative purposes) from Lenth (1986). 249

8.2 Frequencies of Ruritanians and those of genotype Γ for locus *LDLR* in a hypothetical population. 256

8.3 Distribution of blood groups of innocently acquired bloodstains on clothing of people of type *O*, compared with the distribution in the general population. 268

8.4 Critical values $r(\alpha, n)$ for the range of a sample of size n from a standardised Normal distribution, from Owen (1962). 273

8.5 Critical values $\lambda(\alpha, n)$ for samples of size n for the divisive grouping algorithm from Triggs *et al.* (1997). 274

8.6 Probability that a criminal lived in a particular area, given the crime was committed in Auckland, New Zealand. 280

9.1 Gene frequencies for New Zealand in the *ABO* system. 287

9.2 Gene frequencies for Chinese in New Zealand in the *ABO* system. 287

9.3 Phenotypes for two cases of missing persons. 308

9.4 Gene frequencies and phenotypic incidences for Case 1 (Kuo, 1982). 309

9.5 Gene frequencies and phenotypic incidences for Case 2 (Ogino and Gregonis, 1981). 309

9.6 Frequencies for up to three codominant alleles. 310

9.7 Relative frequencies for *ABO* system. 310

9.8 Probabilities that the parents will pass the specified stain phenotype, Case 1. 311

9.9 Probabilities that the parents will pass the specified phenotypes, Case 2. 311

9.10 Two pieces of evidence on DNA markers. 312

9.11 Posterior probabilities of paternity for various prior probabilities for evidence for alleged father $E_1 = 11-13, E_2 = 18-18$. 316

9.12 Hummel's likelihood of paternity. 317

10.1 Likelihood ratio values for varying values of $(y-\bar{x})/\sigma$ and $(y-\mu)/\tau$. 326

10.2 Value of $\tau(2^{1/2}\sigma)^{-1}\exp(-\frac{1}{2}\lambda^2+\frac{1}{2}\delta^2)$ (10.7) as a function of $\lambda = |\bar{x}-\bar{y}|/(2^{1/2}\sigma)$ and $\delta = |z-\mu|/\tau$ for $\tau/\sigma = 100$. 329

10.3 Medullary widths in microns of 220 cat hairs (Peabody *et al.*, 1983). 332

10.4 Value of the evidence for various values of $\bar{x}$ and $\bar{y}$, the smoothing parameter λ and the within-cat standard deviation σ; $m = n = 10$ throughout; $s = 23$ microns. 339

10.5 Refractive index of 2269 fragments of float glass from buildings, Lambert and Evett (1984). 340

10.6 Coincidence probability and value of the evidence (kernel and Lindley approaches) for various values of $\bar{x}$ and $\bar{y}$ and the smoothing parameter λ (for the kernel approach); $m = 10$, $n = 5$; within-window standard deviation $\sigma = 0.000\,04$, between-window standard deviation $\tau = 0.004$; overall mean $\mu = 1.5182$. 341

10.7 Distributional parameters for glass problems. 344

10.8 Transfer probabilities for glass problems. 344

10.9 Some values for the likelihood ratio V for the single-fragment case, from Evett (1986). 345

10.10 Possible sources of two fragments. 345

10.11 Refractive indices of glass fragments for Johnston, recovered, and a control set with means, separate and pooled standard deviations (s.d). The number of recovered fragments $n_y = 11$ and the number of control fragments $n_x = 10$. Example presented in Walsh *et al.* (1996). 355

10.12 Summary statistics for concentration of dye *CI* 14720 in illicit pills (Goldmann *et al.*, 2004). 356

12.1 Findings from the analysis of the hair combings. 394

12.2 Events and probabilities relating to findings under H_p and H_d. 395

12.3 Likelihood ratios for the outcomes from Table 12.1 with $t_0 = 0.01$, $t_s = 0.04$, $t_l = 0.95$; $p_0 = 0.78$, $p_1 = 0.22$; $s_s = 0.92$, $s_l = 0.08$; $m = 0.05$, as proposed by Champod and Jackson (2000). 396

13.1 Hardy–Weinberg proportions for a locus with two alleles, A and a, with frequencies p and q such that $p+q = 1$. 402

13.2 Observed and expected frequencies of *HumTH01* genotypes based on 95 unrelated Turkish individuals (from Çakir *et al.*, 2001). 403

13.3 Effects of population structure, as represented by F_{ST}, on the likelihood ratio, the reciprocal of the conditional match probability (13.8) for heterozygotes between alleles with equal frequency p. 408

13.4 Match probability $Pr(G \mid G, H_d, I)$ that a relative has the same genotype as the suspect and the corresponding value for V assuming allelic frequencies of 0.1, from Weir and Hill (1993). (Reproduced by permission of The Forensic Science Society.) 410

13.5 Effects of family relatedness on match probability, $Pr(G_c \mid G_s, H_d, I)$, from Weir (2001a). Note the use of θ for F_{ST} for clarity. ©2001. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. Reproduced with permission. 411

13.6 General match probability values recommended for use when reporting full SGM-plus profile matches,with an F_{ST} value of 0 in situation 6 and a value of 0.02 for situations 1–5, from Foreman and Evett (2001). (Reproduced by permission of Springer-Verlag.) 411

13.7 Likelihood ratio for three-allele mixed sample, heterozygous victim and homozygous suspect. The victim has alleles a, b, the suspect has allele c. There are three ethnic groups under consideration, labelled 1, 2 and 3. The co-ancestry coefficient F_{ST} for the ethnic group, 1, of the unknown donor is labelled θ_1 for clarity. The allelic frequencies are p_{a1}, p_{b1} and p_{c1} in ethnic group 1. Ethnicities of the unknown donor, the victim and the suspect are considered. From Fung and Hu (2002). (Reproduced by permission of Springer-Verlag.) 423

13.8 Posterior odds that a suspect is the source of a sample that reportedly has a matching DNA profile, as a function of prior odds, random match probability, and false positive probability. Extracted from Thompson *et al.* (2003). (Reprinted with permission from ASTM international.) 426

14.1 Conditional probabilities for transfer with one group. The features of the control object are X, and the features of the recovered fibres are Y, which may be from 0, 1 or 2 groups. These recovered fibres may be present by chance alone (b_1) or not (b_0), or have been transferred from the victim (t_1) or not (t_0). 445

14.2 Conditional probabilities for transfer with many groups, as illustrated in Section 12.3.3. The transfer may be of no fibres (t_0), a small amount (t_s) or a large amount (t_l). A group may be present (p_1) or not (p_0), and the group may be small (s_s) or large (s_l). The outcome O has five categories: no groups, one not-matching group, one small matching group, one large matching group and two groups. 447

List of Figures

2.1 Probability density function for a Normal distribution, with mean 0.7 and variance 0.005. 55

2.2 Selected tail area probabilities for a standard Normal random variable Z: (a) $Pr(Z > 1)$, (b) $Pr(Z > 2)$, (c) $Pr(|Z| < 2)$, (d) $Pr(Z > 2.5)$. 58

4.1 Discrimination between two groups, identified by Δ and by $\bigcirc$, with two perfectly correlated variables. 140

5.1 Prior density function $f(\theta \mid \alpha, \beta)$ with $\alpha = 61$, $\beta = 44$, likelihood function $L(\theta \mid n, x)$ with $n = 372$, $x = 201$, and posterior density function $f(\theta \mid x + \alpha, n - x + \beta)$ for a Bernoulli parameter. (Reproduced from Weir, 1996a, by permission of Sinauer Associates, Inc.) 162

5.2 Standardised likelihood function for the proportion of people of blood group Γ, from a sample of size 30 in which 6 were of group Γ. A likelihood interval, derived from the observed data, of fairly strong support for the values of γ included within it is indicated with the dotted lines: (0.081, 0.372). 174

6.1 The prior probability $1 - F(\theta)$ that the proportion of units in a consignment is greater than θ, for various choices of α and β: $\alpha = \beta = 1$(dot-dashed curve), $\alpha = \beta = 0.5$(solid), $\alpha = 0.065$, $\beta = 0.935$(dotted). (Reprinted with permission from ASTM International.) 186

6.2 The posterior probability $1 - F(\theta)$ that the proportion of units in a consignment is greater than θ, for various choices of α and β: $\alpha = \beta = 1$(dot-dashed curve), $\alpha = \beta = 0.5$(solid), $\alpha = 0.065, \beta = 0.935$(dotted), after observation of four units, all found to be illegal. The corresponding probabilities that at least 50% of the consignment contains illegal units are marked as 0.985 ($\alpha = \beta = 0.5$), 0.970 ($\alpha = \beta = 1$), 0.950 ($\alpha = 0.065, \beta = 0.935$). (Reprinted with permission from ASTM International.) 187

6.3 The probability that the total quantity Q of drugs (in grams) in a consignment of 26 packages is greater than q when 6 packages are examined and 6 (solid curve), 5 (dashed), or 4 (dot-dashed) are found to contain drugs. The mean and standard deviation of the quantities found in the packages examined which contain drugs are 0.0425 g and 0.0073 g. The parameters for the beta prior are $\alpha = \beta = 1$. (Reprinted with permission from ASTM International.) 195

6.4 The probability that the total quantity Q of drugs (in grams) in a consignment of 2600 packages is greater than q when 6 packages are examined and 6 (solid curve), 5 (dashed), or 4 (dot-dashed) are found to contain drugs. The mean and standard deviation of the quantities found in the packages examined which contain drugs are 0.0425 g and 0.0073 g. The parameters for the beta prior are $\alpha = \beta = 1$. (Reprinted with permission from ASTM International.) 196

6.5 Bump function for the probability of misleading evidence $Pr_1\left(\frac{f_{2n}}{f_{1n}} > k\right)$ for $k = 8$ and $k = 32$ as a function of c, the distance from the true mean to the alternative, in standard errors. (Royall, 2000; reprinted with permission from the *Journal of the American Statistical Association*. Copyright 2000 by the American Statistical Association. All rights reserved.) 201

9.1 Variation in the logarithm to base 10 of the likelihood ratio V of the evidence with p, the probability that the stain would have been left by the suspect even though he was innocent of the offence, for various values of r, the probability that the stain would have been left by one of the offenders. The number of offenders, k, equals 4 and the relative frequency of the profile γ is 0.001. Adapted from Evett (1993a), with the inclusion of a curve for $r = 0$. The dotted line at $\log(V) = 0$ indicates where the evidence is equally likely under both propositions. 301

10.1 Refractive index measurements from 2269 fragments of float glass from buildings (from Lambert and Evett, 1984). 323

10.2 Medullary width (in microns) of 220 cat hairs (from Peabody *et al.*, 1983). 331

10.3 Examples of kernel density estimates showing individual kernels. Smoothing parameter values are (a) $\lambda = 0.5$ and (b) $\lambda = 1$. 333

10.4 Medullary widths, in microns, of cat hairs (Peabody *et al.*, 1983) and associated kernel density estimate with smoothing parameter equal to 0.09. 335

10.5 Medullary widths, in microns, of cat hairs (Peabody *et al.*, 1983) and associated kernel density estimate with smoothing parameter equal to 0.50. 335

10.6 Kernel density estimate with smoothing parameter 0.025 of refractive index measurements from 2269 fragments of float glass from buildings (Lambert and Evett, 1984). 336

10.7 Kernel density estimate with smoothing parameter 0.25 of refractive index measurements from 2269 fragments of float glass from buildings (Lambert and Evett, 1984). 337

10.8 The difference in refractive index measurements (higher − lower) for each pair of fragments for individuals who had two fragments of glass on their clothing, from Harrison *et al.* (1985). (Reproduced from Evett, 1986, by permission of The Forensic Science Society.) 347

10.9 Graphs of $\log_{10}\phi(1)$, $\log_{10}\phi(2)$ and $\log_{10}V = \log_{10}(\phi(1)+\phi(2))$ against $|\bar{y}-\bar{x}|/\sigma$ for $\bar{y}=\mu$, for the transfer of two fragments of glass from the scene of the crime to the criminal: (a) $|y_1-y_2|=\sigma$, (b) $|y_1-y_2|=4\sigma$. The value of the evidence is $V=\phi(1)+\phi(2)$. The dotted line is $\log_{10}V$. (Adapted from Evett, 1986.) 348

14.1 Basic connections in Bayesian networks: (a) serial, (b) diverging and (c) converging. 432

14.2 Bayesian network for evidence E and proposition H. 435

14.3 Bayesian network for a serial connection for a reported match RM in a DNA profile, where M denotes a match and H a proposition. 436

14.4 Four-node network for evaluation of evidence at the crime level. 437

14.5 Bayesian network fragments representing the relation between (a) the variables E and H, and (b) the variables M and E; (c) Bayesian network for missing evidence. 441

14.6 Bayesian network for error rates. The probabilistic dependencies are indicated on the right-hand side of each node. 443

14.7 Five-node network: no outcome. 445

14.8 Five-node network: outcome, converging and serial in Bayesian networks. 446

14.9 Complete network for evaluation of cross-transfer evidence in DNA profiles. (Reprinted from Aitken *et al.*, 2003, with permission from Elsevier.) 451