## Mixtures

DNA Statistics Workshop

ISFG

2007





Methods used in the interpretation of mixtures.



|  |                           | Number of alleles showing |              |          |         |             |
|--|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|----------|---------|-------------|
|  | 1                         | 2                         | 3            | 4        | 5       | 6           |
| D3                                     | 0.00                      | 0.05                      | 0.37         | 0.46     | 0.12    | 0.00        |
| <b>1 /1 1</b> / A                      | $\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{M}}$ | 0.04                      | ∩ <b>^</b> ∩ | 0 /7     | Λ 10    | $^{\rm nm}$ |
| a major issue in some Australian cases |                           |                           |              |          |         |             |
|  |                           |                           |              |          |         |             |
| D18                                    | 0.00                      | 0.01                      | 0.11         | 0.39     | 0.40    | 0.10        |
| D19                                    | 0.00                      | 0.08                      | 0.35         | 0.40     | 0.15    | 0.01        |
| THO                                    | 0.00                      | 0.07                      | 0.40         | 0.44     | 0.09    | 0.00        |
| FGA                                    | 0.00                      | 0.01                      | 0.14         | 0.42     | 0.35    | 0.07        |
| e proj                                 | oortion (                 | of three<br>for the S     | person r     | nixtures | that wo | uld pres    |

The result for the Profiler Plus  $^{TM}$  loci was 0.062



Simon Walsh AFP





## "Exclusion" type approaches

- Random man not excluded/included
- Conditional random man not excluded
- One of the preferred choices in the US
- DAB draft
- "PE provides an estimate of the portion of the population that has a genotype comprising of an allele or alleles not observed in the mixed profile"



#### Probability of exclusion

• the exclusion probability at this locus  $(PE_1)$  is

$$PE_l = 1 - \left(\sum_{i=1}^n p(A_i)\right)^2$$

- assuming Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium
- The PE across multiple loci (PE) is calculated as

$$PE = 1 - \prod_{l} (1 - PE_{l})$$



| Locus 1 | Locus 2 |
|---------|---------|
| abc     | de      |

| Allele | Allele<br>probability |
|--------|-----------------------|
| a      | 0.10                  |
| b      | 0.12                  |
| С      | 0.08                  |
| d      | 0.13                  |
| e      | 0.10                  |



|  | Locus 1 | Locus 2   |                  |
|--|---------|-----------|------------------|
|  | abc     | de        |                  |
| $\sum_{i} \Pr(A_i)$                    | 0.30    | 0.23      |                  |
| $1 - \left(\sum_{i} \Pr(A_i)\right)^2$ | 0.91    | 0.9471    | 0.995239<br>=CPE |
| 1 - PE = PI                            | 0.09 —  | - 0.0529→ | 0.004761=<br>CPI |



| Allele | Allele<br>probability |   |
|--------|-----------------------|---|
| а      | 0.10                  |   |
| b      | 0.12                  |   |
| С      | 0.08                  |   |
| d      | 0.13                  |   |
| e      | 0.10                  |   |
| f      | 0.12                  |   |
| g      | 0.25                  |   |
|        | (ES                   | R |

| Locus 1 | Locus 2 |
|---------|---------|
| abcd    | efg     |

### Probability of exclusion

- "Not as powerful as LR"
- Bruce Budowle 2001
- Some people like the idea that it does not assume the number of contributors in the mixture
- What is the proper place for it in mixture analysis? Has it still got a place?



# Probability of exclusion – Brenner's point

- A Alleles in mixture
- B Genotype of suspect
- C Suspect is not excluded
- Can you work out C from A & B?
- Can you work out B from A & C?





## Parameters heterozygous balance and stutter

- Two definitions
- Consider the total area of the allelic products, φA, associated with an allele at a locus. We sum the areas for the n+1 and n bands and (n-4) stutter allele (φS). n-8 and other stutter bands are ignored.

$$Hb = \frac{\phi_A^{HMW}}{\phi_A^{LMW}} \qquad Hb = \frac{\phi_A^{smaller}}{\phi_A^{l \arg er}}$$





Forens. Sci. Int. 108 (2000) 1-29



Difference (repeats)



## Typical heterozygote imbalance

• General guideline -  $0.6 \le \frac{\phi_{N\&N+1}^{HMW}}{\phi_{N\&N+1}^{LMW}} \le 1.66$ 





# Stepwise implementation of the binary approach

- Hypothesis formation and # of contributors
- Is there a conditioning profile (take care with the word "conditioning")
- Assignment of possible combinations
- Determination of "who is behind the bar"
- Calculation of the LR



### Consider

- Victim(V) AB
- Suspect(S) CC
- Stain is ABC

Victim states that she was raped by one man and has no consentual partners. Intimate sample.





## Set up the Hypotheses

- $H_p$ : The stain contains the DNA of the suspect and the victim
- $H_d$ : The stain contains the DNA of the the victim and a random person



#### Mixtures

- $p(E|H_p)=1$
- Given  $H_d$
- the true offender could be AC, BC, or CC







- Please write out all the combinations for a two person mixture.
- Assume allelic dropout is not an issue.
- Four peak locus
- Three peak locus
- Two peak locus
- One peak locus



- Four peak locus
- ABCD
- 6 combinations
- 3 pairs

| RM1 | RM2 |
|-----|-----|
| AB  | CD  |
| AC  | BD  |
| AD  | BC  |
| BC  | AD  |
| BD  | AC  |
| CD  | AB  |



- Three peak locus ABC
- 12 combinations

| RM1 | RM2 | I | RM1 | RM2 |
|-----|-----|---|-----|-----|
| AA  | BC  |   | BC  | AA  |
| BB  | AC  |   | AC  | BB  |
| CC  | AB  |   | AB  | CC  |
| AB  | AC  |   | AC  | AB  |
| AB  | BC  |   | BC  | AB  |
| AC  | BC  |   | BC  | AC  |



- Two peak locus AB
- 7 combinations

| RM1 | RM2 |
|-----|-----|
| AA  | BB  |
| AB  | BB  |
| AB  | AA  |
| AB  | AB  |
|     |     |
|     |     |

| RM1 | RM2 |
|-----|-----|
| BB  | AA  |
| BB  | AB  |
| AA  | AB  |
|     |     |
|     |     |
|     |     |



| RM1 | RM2 |
|-----|-----|
| AA  | AA  |
|     |     |
|     |     |
|     |     |
|     |     |
|     |     |

- One peak locus A
- 1 combination





## Eliminating Combinations with area

- Provisional rules
- Four peak locus
- ABCD
- For each het
- Simple het guideline

$$0.6 \le \frac{\phi_1}{\phi_2} \le 1.66$$

| RM1 | RM2 |
|-----|-----|
| AB  | CD  |
| AC  | BD  |
| AD  | BC  |
| BC  | AD  |
| BD  | AC  |
| CD  | AB  |



### Eliminating Combinations with area





## Eliminating Combinations with area

| <ul> <li>Two peak locus AB</li> </ul>     | RM1  | RM2 |
|---|------|-----|
| <ul> <li>7 combinations</li> </ul>        | AA   | BB  |
| Hat Hom guidaling                         | → AB | BB  |
| $\int 6^* \phi < \phi$                    | → AB | AA  |
| 0.0 $\varphi_1 \simeq \varphi_s$          | AB   | AB  |
| Simple het guideline                      |      |     |
| л с<br>ф                                  |      |     |
| $0.6 \le \frac{\varphi_1}{1.66} \le 1.66$ |      |     |



### Eliminating combinations

- What is left?
- Calculate Mx for each combination



## Eliminating Combinations with area 4 peak loci RM1 RM2

 $\hat{M}x = \frac{\phi_1 + \phi_2}{\phi_1 + \phi_2 + \phi_3 + \phi_4}$ 

$$1 - \hat{M}x = \frac{\phi_3 + \phi_4}{\phi_1 + \phi_2 + \phi_3 + \phi_4}$$

| RM1 | RM2 |
|-----|-----|
| AB  | CD  |
| AC  | BD  |
| AD  | BC  |
| BC  | AD  |
| BD  | AC  |
| CD  | AB  |



## Eliminating Combinations with area 3 peak loci





# Eliminating Combinations with area 2 peak loci





## Eliminating combinations

- What is left?
- Calculate Mx for each combination
- Are any combinations inconsistent on the basis of Mx?
- At the moment this relies on the judgement and experience of the RO
- We may be able to make a guideline from further data analysis being planned currently  $\pm 0.35$  Amanda Kirkham



| Number of alleles showing |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|---------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
|                           | 1    | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    |
| D3                        | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.37 | 0.46 | 0.12 | 0.00 |
| VWA                       | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.29 | 0.47 | 0.19 | 0.02 |
| D16                       | 0.00 | 0.09 | 0.40 | 0.41 | 0.10 | 0.01 |
| D2                        | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.10 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.11 |
| D8                        | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.26 | 0.44 | 0.24 | 0.03 |
| D21                       | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.19 | 0.43 | 0.30 | 0.06 |
| D18                       | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.11 | 0.39 | 0.40 | 0.10 |
| D19                       | 0.00 | 0.08 | 0.35 | 0.40 | 0.15 | 0.01 |
| THO                       | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.40 | 0.44 | 0.09 | 0.00 |
| FGA                       | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.14 | 0.42 | 0.35 | 0.07 |
|                           |      |      |      |      |      |      |

The proportion of three person mixtures that would present four or fewer alleles for the SGM<sup>+</sup>  $^{TM}$  is 0.033.

The result for the Profiler Plus <sup>TM</sup> loci was 0.062



Simon Walsh AFP





#### "conclusion"

- Dear colleagues I just had not written this bit when they printed the handouts. Actually perhaps that is something we could work on developing together. This probably is the "cutting edge" of mixtures
- *#* of contributors
- 3 or more persons
- Uncertainty in the #



#### End

