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Kinship testing (standard paternity testing)


## Probability of mutually exclusive events



## Probability of independent events



$$
\operatorname{Pr}(5) * \operatorname{Pr}(6)=1 / 36
$$

# Conditional probabilty: events are dependent 

or

The frequency of individuals with a blue right eye is
 $25 \% \operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{dx})=0.25$
The frequency of individuals with a blue left eye is $25 \% \operatorname{Pr}(s x)=0.25$

Probability of having two blue eyes?

- $0.25 \times 0.25=0.06$
$\operatorname{Pr}(l e f t$ eye is blue / right eye is blue) ~ 1
- Pr (both left and right eye are blue) $=1 \times 0.25$


Thomas Bayes

And now ladies and gentlemen, the Monty Hall problem*

*Go to last two slides for solution information that is later obtained.
$\checkmark$ B1 and B2 are two mutually exclusive and exhaustive events
$\checkmark$ A is the conditioning element

|  | $\operatorname{Pr}\left(\mathrm{B} 1_{\text {and }} \mathrm{A}\right)$ | $\operatorname{Pr}\left(\mathrm{B} 1{ }_{\text {and }} \mathrm{A}\right)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{Bl} 1 / \mathrm{A})=$ | $\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{A})^{*}$ | ndA) $+\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{B} 2$ |

Imagine you are blindfolded and then asked to pick a ball from a bag...
$\left.\begin{array}{ll}\checkmark & =\text { p of picking a black ball from the bag } \\ \checkmark & =p \text { of picking a white ball from the bag }\end{array}\right\}$
$\checkmark$ Each ball carries a number (1 or 2)

- of black balls, $3 / 4$ carry number 1 :
- of white balls, $1 / 4$ carry number 1 :
$\checkmark \quad=$ the ball you picked carries number 1!
* $\quad$ = $p$ of picking a number 1 ball is the sum of ps of picking a black number 1 ball or a white number 1 ball

For B2 we'll have:

$$
\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{B} 2 / \mathrm{A})=\frac{\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{B} 2)}{*} \operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{~B} 2)
$$

We can also calculate the ratio of $\operatorname{Pr} \mathrm{B} 1$ and B 2 given A :

| $\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{B} 1 / \mathrm{A})$ | $\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{B} 1) * \operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{~B} 1)$ |
| :--- | :--- | $\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{B} 2)^{*} \operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{~B} 2)+\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{B} 1) * \operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{~B} 1)$



In our "bag \& balls" example,

In DNA identity testing the two mutually exclusive and exhaustive hypotheses are:
the tested subject is the donor of the stain; the tested subject is not the donor of the stain.

Additional information comes from genetic data


In paternity testing the two mutually exclusive and exhaustive hypotheses are :
the tested subject is the biological father; the tested subject is not the biological father.

Additional information comes from genetic data


## (A) Mendelian Inheritance


(B) Example


## PATERNITY INDEX, PI

Consider a biallelic locus with alleles P and Q Let's assume the child is "PQ", mother "QQ" and alleged father "PQ"

$$
=\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{Pr}(\mathbf{G} / \mathbf{P}) \quad \operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{P}) \\
= & \operatorname{Pr}(\mathbf{G} / \mathbf{N}) \quad \operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{N})
\end{aligned}
$$

$\operatorname{Pr}(G / P)=? ? ?$
$\operatorname{Pr}\left(F_{P Q} / M_{Q Q} \& P_{P Q}\right)=\operatorname{Pr}\left(F_{P Q}\right.$ and $\left.M_{Q Q} \& P_{P Q}\right) / \operatorname{Pr}\left(M_{Q Q} \& P_{P Q}\right)$

| Possibile <br> couples | Freq. <br> Possibile <br> couples | Freq. of <br> children <br> PP | Freq. of <br> children <br> PQ | Freq. of <br> children <br> QQ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PPXPP | $p^{4}$ | $p^{4}$ | - | - |
| PPXPQ | $2^{2} p^{3} q$ | $2 p^{3} q$ | $2 p^{3} q$ | - |
| PPXQQ | $2 p^{2} q^{2}$ | - | $2 p^{2} q^{2}$ | - |
| PQXPQ | $2^{2} p^{2} q^{2}$ | $p^{2} q^{2}$ | $2 p^{2} q^{2}$ | $p^{2} q^{2}$ |
| PQXQQ | 2 | - | $2 p q^{3}$ | $2 p q^{3}$ |
| QQXQQ | $q^{4}$ | - | - | $q^{4}$ |

$\operatorname{Pr}\left(F_{P Q} / M_{Q Q} \& P_{P Q}\right)=\operatorname{Pr}\left(F_{P Q}\right.$ and $\left.M_{Q Q} \& P_{P Q}\right) /$

## PATERNITY INDEX, PI

Consider a biallelic locus with alleles P and Q Let's assume the child is "PQ", mother " $Q Q$ " and alleged father "PQ"

$\operatorname{Pr}(\mathbf{G} / \mathbf{N}) \quad \operatorname{Pr}(\mathbf{N})$
$\operatorname{Pr}(G / P)=? ? ?$
$\operatorname{Pr}\left(F_{P Q} / M_{Q Q} \& P_{P Q}\right)=\operatorname{Pr}\left(F_{P Q}\right.$ and $\left.M_{Q Q} \& P_{P Q}\right) / \operatorname{Pr}\left(M_{Q Q} \& P_{P Q}\right)$
$\operatorname{Pr}(G / N)=? ? ?$
$\operatorname{Pr}\left(F_{P Q} / M_{Q Q}\right)=\operatorname{Pr}\left(F_{P Q}\right.$ and $\left.M_{Q Q}\right) / \operatorname{Pr}\left(M_{Q Q}\right)$

| Possibile <br> couples | Freq. <br> Possibile <br> couples | Freq. of <br> children <br> PP | Freq. of <br> children <br> PQ | Freq. of <br> children <br> QQ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PPXPP | $p^{4}$ | $p^{4}$ | - | - |
| PPXPQ | $4 p^{3} q$ | $2 p^{3} q$ | $2 p^{3} q$ | - |
| PPXQQ | $2 p^{2} q^{2}$ | - | 2 | - |
| PQXPQ | $4 p^{2} q^{2}$ | $p^{2} q^{2}$ | $2 p^{2} q^{2}$ | $p^{2} q^{2}$ |
| PQXQQ | $4 p q^{3}$ | - | 2 | $2 p q^{3}$ |
| QQXQQ | $q^{4}$ | - | - | $q^{4}$ |

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{G} / \mathrm{P}) \quad \operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{P}) \quad 1 / 2 \quad \operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{P}) \\
& \text { = ------------- X ------------------------ } \\
& \operatorname{Pr}(\mathbf{G} / \mathbf{N}) \quad \operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{N}) \quad \mathrm{p} \quad \operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{~N})
\end{aligned}
$$

$\operatorname{Pr}(G / P)=\operatorname{Pr}\left(F_{P Q} / M_{Q Q} \& P_{P Q}\right)=\operatorname{Pr}\left(F_{P Q}\right.$ and $\left.M_{Q Q} \& P_{P Q}\right) / \operatorname{Pr}\left(M_{Q Q} \& P_{P Q}\right)=$ $p q^{3} / 2 \mathrm{pq}^{3}=1 / 2$
$\operatorname{Pr}(G / N)=\operatorname{Pr}\left(F_{P Q} / M_{Q Q}\right)=\operatorname{Pr}\left(F_{P Q}\right.$ and $\left.M_{Q Q}\right) / \operatorname{Pr}\left(M_{Q Q}\right)=\left(p^{2} q^{2}+p q^{3}\right) / q^{2}=$ $p^{2} X(p+q) / q^{2}=p$

If $\mathrm{p}=0.2(1 / 5)$ then $\mathrm{PI}=5 / 2=2.5$. The observed genotypes are 2.5 times more likely according to the hypothesis of paternity.
PI values obtained with a standard set of 16 independent STRs can be freely multiplied, reaching, on average, PI combined values of $\sim 5 \times 10^{10}$

It is reasonable to assume that, a priori, the probability of paternity and non paternity are equal (Essen-Moeller transformation), consequently:

```
1/2
--- * }
```

p

If $\mathrm{p}=0.2, \mathrm{PI}=5 / 2$ given the observed genotypes: it means that in 5 cases out of 7 ( $71 \%$ ) paternity is true, whereas in 2 cases out of 7 the observed genetic compatibility is adventitiuos. 5/7 = 5/2 / (5/2+1)

W is then calculated according to the general formula:

What PI/W to enough paternity?

- Gendiagnostikgesetz (new German law regulating human genetics as well as paternity analyses, 2013): W > 99.9\% (PI > 1000)
- Italian Society for Human Genetics (SIGU, 2013): PI > 10000
- Italian working group of the International Society for Forensic Genetics (GeFI, 2018): W > 99.99\% (PI > 10000)


Gc = child Gm = mother Gtm = alleged father

$$
\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{PP} \mid \mathrm{PP})=\frac{[p(1-\theta)+2 \theta][p(1-\theta)+3 \theta]}{(1+\theta)(1+2 \theta)}
$$

$$
\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{PQ} \mid \mathrm{PQ})=\frac{2[p(1-\theta)+\theta][q(1-\theta)+\theta]}{(1+\theta)(1+2 \theta)}
$$

$\theta / F_{S T}=$ the probability that two alleles, one taaken at random from each of two individuals are identical by descent (0.01-0.03)

| \# | Gc | $\mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{M}}$ | $\mathrm{G}_{\text {tM }}$ | Numerator (X) | Denominator (Y) | Paternity Index (PI) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | PP | PP | PP | 1 | p | 1/p |
| 2 |  |  | PQ | 1/2 | p | 1/2p |
| 3 |  |  | QR | 0 | p | 0 |
| 4 |  | PQ | PP | 1/2 | $\mathrm{p} / 2$ | 1/p |
| 5 |  |  | PO | 1/4 | $\mathrm{p} / 2$ | 1/2p |
| 6 |  |  | PR | 1/4 | $\mathrm{p} / 2$ | 1/2p |
| 7 |  |  | QR | 0 | $\mathrm{p} / 2$ | 0 |
| 8 | PQ | pp | 00 | 1 | , | 1/q |
| 9 |  |  | PO | 1/2 | q | 1/2q |
| 10 |  |  | QR | 1/2 | q | 1/2q |
| 11 |  |  | RS | 0 | q | 0 |
| 12 |  | PQ | PP | 1/2 | (p+q)/2 | 1/(p+q) |
| 13 |  |  | PQ | 1/2 | (p+q)/2 | 1/(p+q) |
| 14 |  |  | PR | 1/4 | (p+q)/2 | 1/[2(p+q)] |
| 15 |  |  | QR | 1/4 | (p+q)/2 | 1/[2(p+q)] |
| 16 |  |  | RS | 0 | (p+q)/2 | 0 |
| 17 |  | QR | Q0 | 0 | $\mathrm{p} / 2$ | 0 |
| 18 |  |  | PQ | 1/4 | $\mathrm{p} / 2$ | 1/2p |
| 19 |  |  | QR | 0 | $\mathrm{p} / 2$ | 0 |
| 20 |  |  | QS | 0 | $\mathrm{p} / 2$ | 0 |
| 21 |  |  | RS | 0 | $\mathrm{p} / 2$ | 0 |

Formulas can be modified in order to accomodate:

- Coancestry


## Mutations

Mutation rate of standard forensic STRs ( $\mu$ ) is on average 2 out of 1000 meiosis (i.e. $3 \%$ chance of mutation whit a 15 STRs panel).
$\mu$ varies according to:

- parent's sex (higher in males than females depending on gametogeneis)
- Father's age (higher in older fathers)
-STR molecular structure (higher for more complex STRs)
Dedicated software treat mutation according to mutation models of different complexity. Easiest way:
$\mathrm{PI}_{\mu}=\mathrm{Pl}$ at a locus showing a mismatch
$\mu=$ locus specific mutation rate
$P E_{x}=$ locus specific average probability
of exclusion

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{PI}_{\mu}= & \mu / P \mathrm{PE}_{\mathrm{X}} \\
& H^{2}\left(1-2 \mathrm{H}^{\left.(1-H)^{2}\right)}\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

H = locus heterozygosity
$H=1-\Sigma p^{2}$
$p=$ frequency of each allele for that STR

| Apparent Mutations Observed at STR Locl in the Couree of Paternity Teating* |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STR <br> Systom | Maternal Maicses (\%) | Fatsomal Moicocs <br> (\%) | N.mber from ather | Total Number of M.tations | Mutation Rata |
| C3F1PO | 95304,307 (0.03) | 9825643,118 (0.15) | 410 | 1,487/947,425 | 0.19\% |
| FGA | $\begin{gathered} 205.408 .230 \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.210682,775 \\ (0.32) \end{gathered}$ | 710 | 3,1251,101,005 | 0.23\% |
| TH01 | 31,327,172 (0.009) | 41452,392 (0.009) | 28 | 100779,554 | 0.01\% |
| TPOX | 18400,061 (0.004) | $\begin{aligned} & 54457,420 \\ & (0.012) \end{aligned}$ | 28 | 1001857,481 | 0.01\% |
| vwa | $\begin{gathered} 184554,398 \\ (0.03) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1,4228873,547 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ | 814 | 2,4801,437,985 | 0.17\% |
| D381358 | 60405,452 <br> (0.015) | $\begin{gathered} 71315588355 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | 379 | 1,152,964,288 | 0.12\% |
| D68813 | 111/451,736 (0.025) | $\begin{gathered} 763655,603 \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | 385 | 1,25501,107,339 | 0.11\% |
| D73820 | 54,440,562 <br> (0.013) | $\begin{gathered} 745644,743 \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | 285 | 1,089 1, ,085,305 | 0.10\% |
| D881178 | 96/409,869 (0.02) | $\begin{gathered} 779499.968 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | 354 | 1,2391090,837 | 0.14\% |
| D133317 | $\begin{gathered} 1924482,135 \\ (0.04) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 881,621,145 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | 435 | 1,55811,103,282 | 0.14\% |
| D183638 | $\begin{gathered} 1291467,774 \\ (0.03) \end{gathered}$ | 5401494,4E5 (0.11) | 372 | 1,0411962,239 | 0.11\% |
| D18851 | $\begin{gathered} 185 / 295.244 \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1,094 / 494,098 \\ (0.22) \end{gathered}$ | 456 | 1,746/790,342 | 0.22\% |
| D21811 | 46,4435.388 <br> (0.11) | 7721526,708 <br> (0.15) | 550 | 1,816/962,096 | 0.19\% |
| Fonta D | 12,18,701 (0.05) | 2122.501 (0.09) | 24 | 57741,202 | 0.14\% |
| Panta E | 29144,311 (0.065) | 75:55,719 (0.136) | 5 | 163/400,030 | 0.19\% |
| D231383 | 1572,830 (0.021) | $\begin{gathered} 157 / 152.310 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | 90 | 252/225,140 | 0.12\% |
| D183433 | 3870,001 (0.05) | 78/103,489 <br> (0.075) | 71 | 1877173,490 | 0.11\% |
| $\begin{gathered} 8 E 82 \\ (\mathrm{ACTEP2}) \end{gathered}$ | 20330 ( $<$ D.30) | 330151,610 (1.54) | None reportod | 33051,940 | 0.84\% |

Data usod with permission from Amarican Aasodation of Blood Barks (AMBS) 2003 Ann.al Roport.

How many mismatches are enough to exclude paternity?

- Gendiagnostikgesetz (new German law regulating human genetics as well as paternity analyses, 2013): at least 15 STR need to be typed and >3 mismatches need to be observed to declare paternity exclusion
- Italian Society for Human Genetics (SIGU, 2013): Formally regardless of the number of observed mismatches, it is $\rightarrow$ always necessary to perform LR (PI) calculations and paternity can be excluded when Pl is $<0.0001$
- Italian working group of the International Society for Forensic Genetics (GeFI, 2018): at least 15 STR need to be typed and $>2$ mismatches need to be observed to declare paternity exclusion (PI calculation optional)

And now Iadies and gentlemen, the Monty Hall problem...solved


A priori
$\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{N})=\operatorname{Pr}($ car not changing door) $=\operatorname{Pr}(c a r)=$
$\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{C})=\operatorname{Pr}(c a r$ changing door) $=\operatorname{Pr}($ door chosen does not hide car) * Pr(new door picked doesn't hide goat) =
...to change or not to change is irrelevant
Additional information (A)
Monty (who knows where the car is) shows that, behind one of the doors which was not chosen, there's a goat

Conditional probability
$\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{N})=\operatorname{Pr}($ Monty shows that goat, given that the door initially chosen hides the car) =
$\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{C})=\operatorname{Pr}(\operatorname{Pr}($ Monty shows that goat, given that the door initially chosen hides a goat) =

A posteriori
$\frac{\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A})}{\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{A})}=\frac{\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{N})}{\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{C})} * \frac{(\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{~N})}{\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{C})}=\frac{1 / 2}{1} * \frac{1 / 3}{1 / 3}=$
...twice more likely to win the car if changing door!!!

