

## HUMAN GENETICS


# Finding Criminals Through DNA of Their Relatives

Frederick R. Bieber,<sup>1\*</sup> Charles H. Brenner,<sup>2</sup> David Lazer<sup>3</sup>

**D**NA methods are now widely used for many forensic purposes, including routine investigation of serious crimes and for identification of persons killed in mass disasters or wars (1–4). DNA databases of convicted offenders are maintained by every U.S. state and nearly every industrialized country, allowing comparison of crime scene DNA profiles to one another and to known offenders (5). The policy in the United Kingdom stipulates that almost any collision with law enforcement results in the collection of DNA (6). Following the U.K. lead, the United States has shifted steadily toward inclusion of all felons, and federal and six U.S. state laws now include some provision for those arrested or indicted. At present, there are over 3 million samples in the U.S. offender/arrestee state and federal DNA databases (7). Statutes governing the use of such samples and protection against misuse vary from state to state (8).

Although direct comparisons of DNA profiles of known individuals and unknown biological evidence are most common, indirect genetic kinship analyses, using the DNA of biological relatives, are often necessary for humanitarian mass disaster and missing person identifications (1, 2, 9). Such methods could potentially be applied to searches of the convicted offender/arrestee DNA databases. When crime scene samples do not match anyone in a search of forensic databases, the application of indirect methods could identify individuals in the database who are close relatives of the potential suspects. This raises compelling policy questions about the balance between collective security and individual privacy (10).

To date, searching DNA databases to identify close relatives of potential suspects has been used in only a small number of cases, if some-



times to dramatic effect. For example, the brutal 1988 murder of 16-year-old Lynette White, in Cardiff, Wales, was finally solved in 2003. A search of the U.K. National DNA Database for individuals with a specific single rare allele found in the crime scene evidence that identified a 14-year-old boy with a similar overall DNA profile. This led police to his paternal uncle, Jeffrey Gafoor (11). Investigation of the 1984 murder of Deborah Sykes revealed a close, but not perfect, match to a man in the North Carolina DNA offender database, which led investigators to his brother, Willard Brown (12). Both Gafoor and Brown matched the DNA from the respective crime scenes, confessed, and were convicted.

Although all individuals have some genetic similarity, close relatives have very similar DNA profiles because of shared ancestry. We demonstrate the potential value of kinship analysis for identifying promising leads in forensic investigations on a much wider scale than has been used to date.

Let us assume that a sample from a crime scene has been obtained that is not an exact match to the profile of anyone in current DNA databases. Using Monte Carlo simulations (13, 14), we investigated the chances of successfully identifying a biological relative of someone whose profile is in the DNA database as a possible source of crime scene evidence (15). Each Monte Carlo trial simulates a database of known offenders, a sample found

Analyses of the DNA databases maintained by criminal justice systems might enable criminals to be caught by recognizing their kin, but this raises civil liberties issues.

at a crime scene, and a search. The search compares the crime sample with each catalogued offender in turn by computing likelihood ratios (LRs) that assess the likelihood of parent-child or of sibling relationships (1, 16). We used published data on allele frequencies of the 13 short tandem repeat (STR) loci on which U.S. offender databases are based and basic genetic principles (17–19). A high LR is characteristic of related individuals and is an unusual but possible coincidence for unrelated individuals. The analysis of each simulation therefore assumes that investigators would follow these leads in priority order, starting with those in the offender database with the highest LR for being closely related to the owner of the

crime scene DNA sample.

Our simulations demonstrate that kinship analysis would be valuable now for detecting potential suspects who are the parents, children, or siblings of those whose profiles are in forensic databases. For example, assume that the unknown sample is from the biological child of one of the 50,000 offenders in a typical-sized state database. Of the 50,000 LRs comparing the “unknown” sample to each registered offender in the database, the child corresponds to the largest LR about half the time, and has a 99% chance of appearing among the 100 largest LRs (see chart). An analysis of potential sibling relationships produced a similar curve (13).

These results could be refined by additional data—for example, large numbers of single-nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs). Better and immediately practical, a seven-locus Y-STR haplotype analysis on the crime scene and the list of database leads would eliminate 99% of those not related by male lineage (20). Dating (vital records, genealogical and geographical data) for the existence of suitable suspects related to the leads can also help to refine the list.

The potential for improving effectiveness of DNA database searches is large. Consider a hypothetical state in which the “cold-hit” rate—the chance of finding a match between a crime scene sample and someone in the offender database—is 10%. Suppose that

<sup>1</sup>Department of Pathology, Brigham and Women’s Hospital and Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA 02115, USA. <sup>2</sup>DNA-VIEW, Oakland, CA 94611, and School of Public Health, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA. <sup>3</sup>John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA.

Authors are alphabetized to reflect equal contributions. Comments and ideas expressed herein are their own.

\*Author for correspondence. E-mail: fbieber@partners.org