

TECHNICAL NOTE

Lucía O. Cifuentes,¹ M.D., M.Sc.; Eliseo H. Martínez,² Ph.D.; Mónica P. Acuña,¹ M. Stat.; and Hugo G. Jonquera,³ M.Sc.

Probability of Exclusion in Paternity Testing: Time to Reassess*

ABSTRACT: The average exclusion probability is a measure of efficiency in paternity testing; it refers to the *a priori* ability of a battery of tests to detect paternity inconsistencies. This parameter measures the capacity of the system to detect a false accusation of paternity. Traditionally, this average exclusion probability has been estimated as the probability of excluding a man who is not the father by an inconsistency in at least one of the studied loci. We suggest that this criterion should be corrected, as currently the presumed father is excluded when at least three genetic inconsistencies are found with the child being tested, not just one. This change of criterion has occurred because of the use of microsatellite loci, whose mutation rates are much greater than those of the coding genes used previously in paternity studies. We propose the use of the average probability of exclusion for at least three loci (not only one), as an honest measure of the combined probability of exclusion of several loci, and we propose an algebraic expression to calculate it.

KEYWORDS: forensic science, forensic genetics, paternity testing, exclusion probability, minisatellites, STRs, paternity exclusion

It is currently possible to attribute or exclude biological paternity with security, thanks to the analysis of the hypervariable regions of the genome. The most informative are the variable number of tandem repeat (VNTR) (minisatellites) and single tandem repeats (STR) (microsatellites), which have a large number of alleles and high levels of heterozygosity (1). However, these loci have high levels of mutation (from 0.0005 to 0.007 per generation) (2) compared with the coding genes (blood groups, HLA antigens, polymorphic proteins) that were previously utilized in parentage and forensic studies. When these expressed markers were used in paternity studies, the requirement to exclude an alleged father was that he had to be genetically inconsistent with the child at one or more of the analyzed genes. Today, however, taking into consideration the high mutation rates of mini- and microsatellites, no one would exclude an alleged father because he has only one genetic inconsistency with the child. Nowadays, for the exclusion of an alleged father he should not have the paternal obligate alleles found in the offspring in three or more independent locus tests (3). The American Association of Blood Banks

Report Summary for Testing in 2003 reports 67 cases with double mutations as paternity inclusions among the 352,632 paternity cases studied (0.019%); they observed similar figures in 2002 and 2001 (4).

The criterion to evaluate the efficiency of the genetic markers used in paternity studies is their *a priori* average exclusion probability (5,6). This is the probability that the chosen system is capable of excluding a man falsely indicated as the father. Traditionally, the joint *a priori* average exclusion probability (PEC) provided by a group of independent genetic markers was estimated as the probability of excluding a man who is not the father for at least one locus, using the formula (7):

$$PEC = 1 - \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - PE_i)$$

where PE_i is the specific exclusion probability of the i th genetic marker and $\prod_{i=1}^n (1 - PE_i)$ means $(1 - PE_1) \times (1 - PE_2) \times (1 - PE_3) \times \dots \times (1 - PE_n)$ from the locus $i = 1$ to the n th locus.

The above formula is no longer the correct way to calculate PEC, as now the requirement includes genetic inconsistencies for at least three independent loci. This joint average exclusion probability (PEC3) may be calculated by the following expression:

$$PEC3 = 1 - [PE(0) + PE(1) + PE(2)]$$

where $PE(0)$, $PE(1)$, and $PE(2)$ are the probabilities of excluding the presumed father for exactly 0, 1, or 2 loci respectively, when he is not the biological father.

¹ Programa de Genética Humana, ICBM, Facultad de Medicina, Universidad de Chile, Casilla 70061, Santiago 7, Chile.

² Depto. de Matemáticas, Facultad de Ciencias Básicas, Universidad de Antofagasta, Antofagasta, Chile.

³ Genética y Tecnología Ltda., Santiago, Chile.

*This work was presented during the annual meeting of the Sociedad de Genética de Chile, in Antofagasta, Chile, 2004. This work was partially financed by Grant FEBA 157, Facultad de Medicina, Universidad de Chile.

Received 21 May 2005; and in revised form 4 Aug. 2005; accepted 17 Aug. 2005; published 13 Feb. 2006.

The value of $PE(0)$ is obtained by the above expression (PEC), while the other components may be estimated by

$$PE(1) = \sum_{i=1}^m PE_i \prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^m (1 - PE_j)$$

$$PE(2) = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j < i}^m PE_i PE_j \prod_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq i \\ k \neq j}}^m (1 - PE_k)$$

Here PE_i , PE_j , and PE_k are the exclusion probabilities of the i th, j th, and k th loci, respectively and ΣPE_i refers to $(PE_1) + (PE_2) + (PE_3) + \dots + (PE_m)$ where PE_i to PE_m are the specific probability of exclusion of each of the m independent loci analyzed.

The probability of excluding a falsely accused father for at least three independent loci ($PEC3$) is less than the probability of excluding him for one locus, and the difference is not trivial. For example, using the allele frequencies estimated in the Chilean population (8–10), an exclusion probability of 99.9% for at least one locus is obtained by analyzing 9 or 10 independent STRs, while it requires 14 or 15 STRs to obtain a 99.9% exclusion probability for at least three loci. We propose the use of $PEC3$, the average probability of exclusion for at least three loci, as an honest measure of the *a priori* ability of a battery of tests to detect paternity inconsistencies that is to detect a false accusation of paternity.

References

1. Budowle B, Monson KL. The forensic significance of various reference population databases for estimating the rarity of variable number of tandem repeat (VNTR) loci profiles. In: Pena SDJ, Chakraborty R, Eplen JT, Jeffreys AJ, editors. DNA fingerprinting: state of the science. Germany: Birkhäuser Verlag; 1993:177–92.
2. Brinkmann B, Klitsch M, Neuhuber F, Hübner J, Rolf B. Mutation rate in human microsatellites: influence of the structure and length of the tandem repeat. *Am J Hum Genet* 1998;62:108–15.
3. Fang JX, Cheng DL. Evaluation on the number and value of STR loci applied in paternity identification. *Fa Yi Xue Za Zhi* 2002;18(1):19–21.
4. The American Association of Blood Banks. Annual Report Summary in www.aabb.org/about_the_aabb/stds_and_accr/stdsandaccr.htm 2004.
5. Selvin S. Probability of nonpaternity determined by multiple allele co-dominant systems. *Am J Hum Genet* 1980;32:276–8.
6. De Nise S, Johnston E, Halverson J, Marshall K, Rosenfeld D, McKenna S., et al. Power of exclusion for parentage verification and probability of match for identity in American kennel club breeds using 17 canine microsatellite markers. *Anim Genet* 2004;35:14–8.
7. Chakraborty R, Meagher TR, Smouse PE. Parentage analysis with genetic markers in natural populations. I. The expected proportion of offspring with unambiguous paternity. *Genetics* 1988;118:527–36.
8. Acuña M, Jorquera H, Armanet L, Cifuentes L. Gene frequencies for four hypervariable DNA loci in a Chilean population of mixed ancestry. *J Forensic Sci* 2000;45(5):1160–1.
9. Figueroa C, Acuña M, Cifuentes L. Gene frequencies for six STR loci in a Chilean Population of mixed ancestry. *J Forensic Sci* 2000;45(3):742–3.
10. Novoa MR, Labbé C, Jorquera H, Moreno F, Aguirre ME, Cifuentes L. Estudio de tres loci hipervariables en población mixta chilena. *Rev Méd Chile* 2002;129:75–9.

Additional information and reprint request:
 Lucía O. Cifuentes, M.D., M.Sc.
 Programa de Genética Humana, ICBM
 Facultad de Medicina, Universidad de Chile
 Casilla 70061
 Santiago 7
 Chile
 E-mail: lcifuent@med.uchile.cl