



# The number of STR markers necessary to resolve relationships in deficiency paternity cases

Silvano Presciuttini<sup>a,\*</sup>, Chiara Toni<sup>b</sup>, Fabio Marroni<sup>a</sup>, Isabella Spinetti<sup>b</sup>, Joan E. Bailey-Wilson<sup>a</sup>, Ranieri Domenici<sup>b</sup>

> <sup>a</sup> Inherited Disease Research Branch, NHGRI, NIH, Baltimore MD, USA <sup>b</sup> Unit of Legal Medicine, School of Medicine, University of Pisa, Pisa, Italy

**Abstract.** The inference about the biological relationship between pairs of individuals using genetic markers plays a central role in many areas of human genetics. We investigated the number of markers (M) that are necessary to assign a given proportion of pairs (50%, 60%, 70%, 80%, 90%, 95%, and 99%) to their correct relationship at three predefined probability levels (99%, 99.9%, and 99.99%) against several alternative hypotheses. The following relationships were considered: (1) full sibs (FS), (2) second degree (2D, including half-sibs, grandparent–grandchild and avuncular pairs), (3) first cousins (FC), (4) unrelated individuals (UR). © 2003 Published by Elsevier B.V.

Keywords: STR; Familial relationships; DNA markers; Deficiency paternity

# 1. Introduction

Deficiency paternity cases are not unusual in the forensic practice. Typically, these situations arise when the alleged parent of a claimant is not available (in most cases this person is deceased), and one of his or her undisputed relatives acts as a defendant, i.e. s(he) denies claimant's contentions. Most of these cases reduce, at least at first examination, to determine the likelihood ratio of two alternative hypotheses about the relationship between a single pair of individuals. We have encountered instances in which the contrasting propositions about the two contenders were as follows: half-sibs vs. unrelated; full sibs vs. unrelated; full sibs vs. unrelated. Here, we addressed the question of the number of autosomal DNA markers needed to resolve common relationships at specified probability levels by computer simulations.

E-mail address: sprex@biomed.unipi.it (S. Presciuttini).

<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding author. Permanent address: Center of Statistical Genetics, c/o Centro Retrovirus, S.S. Abetone e Brennero 2, 56127 Pisa, Italy. Tel.: +39-50-2213797; fax: +39-50-2213524.

# 2. Materials and methods

#### 2.1. Computer simulations

The genotypes of 10 000 pairs of relatives were obtained by Monte Carlo simulations of pedigrees for the four considered relationships, FS, 2D, FC, and UR. Simulations were carried out separately for 25 commonly used markers, which were repeated a second time to reach a total number of 50 markers, thus representing a possible future expansion of validated markers. The markers were sorted by decreasing heterozygosity separately for the first set (including the 13 CODIS markers) and the second set (other 12 markers commonly used in the forensic practice). Genotype probabilities were obtained as provided [1,2], except for the FC relationship that required a elaborating new formulas.

#### 2.2. LR calculation

The probability of the correct relationship for all pairs of genotypes at each locus was divided by the probability of each of the other relationships, thus obtaining the likelihood ratio (LR) that a pair was correctly attributed to its true relationship rather than to any of the others. For instance, in the case of FS vs. UR, we simulated 40 000 individuals (10 000 true FS pairs and 10 000 UR pairs) and calculated the LR(FS/UR) for all pairs and for all loci. LRs were multiplied across increasing number of loci. We settled several probability levels (99%, 99.9%, and 99.99%) and several limits for the proportion of pairs that were correctly discriminated (50%, 60%, 70%, 80%, 90%, 95%, and 99%); then, we determined the number of markers that allowed reaching these limits for each pair of contrasting hypotheses.

	Probability	Percentage of pairs						
		50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	95%	99%
FS/2D	99%	13	16	18	24	33	41	>50
	99.9%	20	24	32	39	47	>50	>50
	99.99%	28	34	41	49	>50	>50	>50
FS/FC	99%	4	5	7	9	12	14	18
	99.9%	7	9	12	14	16	18	26
	99.99%	9	13	15	16	19	23	29
FS/UR	99%	4	5	6	8	11	14	17
	99.9%	7	8	10	14	15	18	24
	99.99%	9	10	14	16	19	20	28
2D/FC	99%	33	44	>50	>50	>50	>50	>50
	99.9%	>50	>50	>50	>50	>50	>50	>50
	99.99%	>50	>50	>50	>50	>50	>50	>50
2D/UR	99%	16	18	22	28	39	44	>50
	99.9%	28	31	39	45	>50	>50	>50
	99.99%	31	37	41	>50	>50	>50	>50
FC/UR	99%	>50	>50	>50	>50	>50	>50	>50
	99.9%	>50	>50	>50	>50	>50	>50	>50
	99.99%	>50	>50	>50	>50	>50	>50	>50

Table 1

## 3. Results

Table 1 shows the number of markers necessary to assign a given percentage of pairs (second row) to each of six possible relationships (first column) at the specified level of probability (second column).

### 4. Discussion

Full sibs (FS) are discriminated from nonrelatives (UR) and first cousins (FC) with a reasonable number of markers; for instance, 90% of FS pairs are discriminated from UR pairs with probability of 99.99% using 18 markers (which are easily found in commercial kits); the same number of markers allows discriminating more than 50% of FS from FC at the same probability level. Discrimination between full and half sibs (FS/HS) is more problematic, in accordance with published data [3,4]; 18 markers can solve more than 50% of cases but only with a probability of 99%. First cousins (FC) are poorly discriminated from second degree (2D) and nonrelatives (UR), even in the hypothesis of the availability of 50 validated markers. Future extensions of this work will include the use of X- or Y-chromosome markers, which can allow solving particular cases of disputed relationships (for instance, two males that share the same Y-haplotype have a very low probability of being non relatives [5,6], whereas X-chromosome markers provide paternity indexes higher than similar autosomal markers in the case of female pairs).

## References

- S. Presciuttini, C. Toni, E. Tempestini, S. Verdiani, L. Casarino, I. Spinetti, F. De Stefano, R. Domenici, J.E. Bailey-Wilson, Inferring relationships between pairs of individuals from locus heterozygosities, BMC Genet. 3 (1) (2002 Nov. 20) 23.
- [2] I.W. Evett, B.S. Weir, Interpreting DNA Evidence, Sinauer, Sunderland, MA, 1998.
- [3] M.G. Ehm, M. Wagner, A test statistic to detect errors in sib-pair relationships, Am. J. Hum. Genet. 62 (1998) 181–188.
- [4] M. Boehnke, N.J. Cox, Accurate inference of relationships in sib-pair linkage studies, Am. J. Hum. Genet. 61 (1997) 423-429.
- [5] L. Gusmao, M. Brion, A. Gonzalez-Neira, M. Lareu, A. Carracedo, Y chromosome specific polymorphisms in forensic analysis, Leg. Med. (Tokyo) 1 (2) (1999 Apr.) 55–60.
- [6] R. Szibor, M. Krawczak, S. Hering, J. Edelmann, E. Kuhlisch, D. Krause, Use of X-linked markers for forensic purposes, Int. J. Legal Med. 117 (2) (2003 Apr.) 67–74.