

INVISIBLE WITNESS: INNOVATIONS IN THE COLLECTION OF TOUCH DNA AND THE RISK OF FORENSIC CROSS CONTAMINATION

Muhammad Irfan^{1*}, Syed Aftab Haider¹, Muhammad Yasir¹,
Muhammad Ammar Akram², Muhammad Adeel¹

¹Department of Forensic Science, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Punjab, Pakistan

²Glasgow Caledonian University (London Campus) England

Submitted: May 21, 2025; Revised: August 15, 2025; Accepted: August 22, 2024; Published: October 31, 2025

ABSTRACT

The increased use of touch DNA in forensic examinations is a classic instance of the opportunity and risk of the more sensitive molecular methods. As technologies improve to obtain DNA from low-contact—through improved swab materials, laser microdissection, and robotic sampling systems—the associated risk of forensic cross-contamination also increases with these technologies. This article presents advances that aim at maximizing the yield of DNA while reducing contamination, such as contamination-aware kits and robotic sample handling platforms. It also meets passive, active, and tertiary transfer mechanism interpretative requirements, especially for low-template samples. Based on international guidelines (SWGDM, ENFSI, ISO/IEC 17025) and high-profile court cases, the research emphasizes the importance of stringent contamination controls, contextual interpretation, and empirical studies. Finally, while touch DNA is a very effective "invisible witness," its weight of evidence is based on methodological transparency and scientific caution.

Keywords: Touch DNA, DNA persistence, Contamination control, Forensic evidence integrity, DNA trace optimization

*Corresponding Author. E-mail: muhammadirfan03303@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Touch DNA is the term used to refer to small quantities of deoxyribonucleic acid or DNA that are transferred from the body onto a surface or object via contact. The material is often present in skin cells and may be deposited by touching, holding, or bumping against an object. Unlike the usual sources of DNA like blood or saliva, touch DNA also does not need visible bodily fluids and may even provide exact genetic profiles with the prevailing forensic processes. Touch DNA is a highly vital aspect of forensic science. It enables examiners to eliminate or include an individual in criminal investigations even when there is no apparent biological evidence. This is especially helpful for crimes like theft, assault, or rape wherein the offender might not leave noticeable biological evidence. But its dependability relies on circumstances such as correct collection, danger of secondary transfer, and deterioration in the environment. As Sankhla and Kumar observe, touch DNA is now a potent weapon in the solution of such otherwise insoluble cases because of the absence of

traditional biological evidence [1]. Likewise, Pawar et al. observe that although touch DNA is worthwhile investigative leads, they need to be interpreted with care because of the intricate dynamics of DNA transfer and persistence on unlike surfaces [2].

The application of touch DNA in forensic research has significantly advanced due to the development of DNA extraction and amplification techniques. The evidence is particularly convenient in visible biological fluid-free cases to allow detectives to link suspects to crime scenes even with limited contact. Its increasing application is a testament to its ability to crack previously challenging cases. Its application, however, needs strict rules in order to avoid contamination and reading. The advancement in touch DNA technology has significantly bolstered forensic investigations by recovering DNA from casual contact. However, it carries a paradox that heightened sensitivity means both contamination and secondary transfer increase as well, potentially

FIHSB is published by AMMANIF Publisher. The authors retain the copyright without restriction. This article is an open access article published under the terms and conditions of [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



leading to miscarriages of justice. The fine balance between scientific progress and integrity of evidence calls for strict handling protocols and cautious interpretation to avoid miscarriages of justice.

The article discusses the recovery, analysis, and forensic use of touch DNA. It speaks about potential applications in terms of pitfalls like contamination and low recovery of DNA. Structured into introduction, methodology, results, discussion, and conclusion, it mentions improvements in methods of recovery and evidentiary value in criminal cases [3].

SCIENCE OF TOUCH DNA

Mechanisms of DNA deposition through skin contact

DNA is transferred by skin contact mainly as a result of spontaneous desquamation of the epithelial cells on the event of contact. Pressure, time of contact, and interpersonal biological variation—particularly shedder status—control the quantity of DNA that is transferred. These factors are key to forensic application when interpreting trace DNA evidence and separating direct from secondary transfer events [4, 5].

Factors influencing DNA transfer

DNA transfer is affected by several parameters, such as contact pressure, time, texture of the surface, moisture of the skin, and variation of DNA shedding from one individual to another. All these affect deposited quantity and DNA integrity, which are important for successful forensic examination of trace DNA evidence in criminal investigations.

Shedding status and individual variability

Shedding is a factor contributing to individual DNA variation. There are individuals who naturally lose more epithelial cells and, therefore, transfer more DNA when they come into contact. Biological heterogeneity is thus a contributing factor to the validity and interpretability of trace DNA evidence in forensic science [6].

Primary vs. secondary transfer phenomena

Direct contact transfer is primary DNA transfer, and DNA transfer through an intermediate surface or individual is secondary transfer. The two are to be distinguished in forensic analysis because secondary transfer has the potential to cause crime scene evidence to be misinterpreted [7].

Technological Advancements in touch DNA collection

Classic trace DNA collection techniques involve swabbing, tape-lifting, and cutting, which are individually appropriate to the nature of a surface and the forensic application. Swabbing is perhaps most popular because it is efficient and can be used on a variety of surfaces, including smooth, non-porous ones, where wet or dry swabs can harvest epithelial cells. Tape-lifting enables recovery of particulate matter such as skin cells from coarse and porous surfaces by sticking to cells, which can be recovered later in the lab. Cutting entails removal of segments of material, for instance, beddings or

clothing, suspected to contain DNA, most beneficial in porous materials that hold on to biological residue. Technique selection dictates DNA recovery, and surface texture, sample type, and environmental factors all play significant roles. Realization of the comparative merits and flaws of each technique improves recovery rates and minimizes opportunities for contamination in forensic analysis.

RECENT INNOVATIONS

Enhanced swab materials

Sophisticated swabbing materials such as foam-tipped and nylon-flocked swabs have significantly enhanced trace DNA recovery in forensic science. Cotton swabs trap cells in fibers, constraining DNA yield. Nylon-flocked swabs contain right-angled fibers that maximize surface contact and enable easy release of acquired cells in extraction. Foam-tipped swabs combine flexibility and increased porosity to be superior on rough or serrated surfaces. These swabs are particularly valuable in low-template or degraded DNA samples, where they maximize recovery of the sample without loss. Studies have confirmed that these new swabs provide higher numbers of units of recovered DNA and improve the quality of the resulting profiles from touch DNA samples. Their use in forensic practice maximizes sensitivity, minimizes contamination, and improves the validity of the resulting DNA analysis downstream [8].

Low copy number (LCN) amplification techniques

Low copy number (LCN) amplification methods are required to process forensic samples with low amounts of DNA, which is usually less than 100 picograms. LCN amplification methods increase the amount of PCR cycles more than standard procedures to increase sensitivity for trace or degraded DNA identification. LCN is applicable when there is a touch DNA case or cold evidence where standard procedures would not succeed. But it presents interpretative difficulties with stochastic events like allele drop-in/drop-out and greater risk of contamination. These issues are addressed by forensic laboratories by consensus profiling, duplicate testing, and rigid controls against contamination. As a caveat, despite limitations, LCN amplification has increased the probability of recovering probative profiles from difficult samples, aiding in solving hard or cold cases. The continuous refinement of LCN protocols, like the availability of improved reagents and analytical cut-offs, also adds to its reliability in forensic genetics.

Laser microdissection and microfluidic separation

Laser microdissection and microfluidic separation are high-tech forensic tools designed for the isolation of individual cell populations for focused DNA profiling, particularly in mixed or complicated samples. Laser microdissection enables accurate

visual selection and removal of a single cell from biological stains through targeted laser beams to avoid contamination and improve profile specificity. In contrast, microfluidic separation employs micro-scale fluidic channels to divide and segregate cells according to size, density, or biomarkers and is capable of doing high-throughput analysis of complex biological mixtures. These technologies are especially useful for sexual assault evidence or mixtures that include both epithelial and sperm cells, where separation by cell type is essential. Both technologies significantly increase DNA mixture resolution and background noise reduction, ultimately enhancing the reliability of forensic evidence interpretation.

Robotics and automated DNA retrieval systems

Automated DNA extraction platforms and robotics have greatly improved forensic processes by increasing throughput, reproducibility, and control of contamination. These platforms streamline critical steps like sample swabbing, DNA extraction, quantitation, and amplification with decreased risk of human error and variability. Robotic high-throughput platforms are the best options for handling large caseloads and backlog elimination in a forensic laboratory. Computerized systems also provide increased chain-of-custody tracking with data logging and barcoding integration, allowing transparency and legal integrity. Computerized systems also facilitate reduction of cross-contamination—especially important while analyzing low-template DNA samples. Along with new swab technologies and advanced profiling techniques such as LCN, computerized systems allow forensic experts to recover and analyze DNA from trace or deteriorated evidence with increased accuracy and reproducibility. In summary, robotics simplifies complex forensic processes while offering quality standards necessary for evidentiary integrity [8].

CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS

Low yield and stochastic effects in trace DNA analysis

Low-template trace DNA analysis is one of the biggest challenges that are brought about by stochastic effects that undermine results' reliability. They consist of allele drop-out, drop-in, and peak imbalance, which are optimally viewed in the samples of less than 100 picograms of DNA. Trace low-template samples may generate partial or deceptive profiles, which make forensic interpretation difficult. Extra PCR cycles applied in standard LCN analysis enhance sensitivity and stochastic noise risk. Surface type and environmental deterioration also affect variability and yield. To counter these, methods like probabilistic genotyping models, consensus profiling, and replicate amplifications are applied to improve accuracy. Technological innovations in sample recovery (i.e., better swabs), LCN

optimization, and experienced interpretation protocols are core to valid trace DNA application to forensic case work [9].

Sensitivity vs. specificity in modern techniques

Current forensic DNA methods have to reconcile sensitivity—the capacity to identify trace levels of DNA—with specificity—the precision in the identification of contributors without false inclusion. Greater sensitivity, gained by greater swabbing material, low copy number (LCN) amplification, and microfluidic partitioning, allows for analysis of profiles from degraded or trace samples. More sensitive methods, though, would tend to increase the possibility of stochastic effects, contamination, and second-hand transfer detection, which can undermine specificity. Specificity is more crucial in mixed samples, where specialized approaches such as laser microdissection and probabilistic genotyping aid in discriminator contributor. Automated platforms also make a contribution to specificity by minimizing human error and optimizing procedural uniformity. Forensic laboratories must therefore rigorously validate and optimize procedures for an optimal balance to provide both high detection and correct, reliable interpretations for judicial use [9].

Interpretation complexity in mixed DNA profiles

One of the most difficult forensic genetics issues is the analysis of mixed DNA profiles, which often comprises inputs from more than one individual with relative amounts of DNA. Some of the tough issues to resolve are overlap of alleles, peak imbalance, drop-out and drop-in, especially in degraded or low template samples. Stutter peaks and background noise also contribute to complexity in analysis. Probabilistic genotyping software has greatly enhanced interpretive precision by means of statistical models to estimate contributor probabilities and handle uncertainty. Methods like laser microdissection and cell separation microfluidics aid in the separation of single contributors prior to DNA profiling. Regardless of technology, knowledge of analysts, conservative cut-offs, and case context data are still important in order not to misinterpret or include spurious results. Ongoing improvement of interpretation guidelines and verification of probabilistic tools is imperative to guarantee the admissibility and credibility of mixed DNA evidence in courtrooms [10].

THE RISK OF CROSS-CONTAMINATION IN TOUCH DNA/SOURCES OF CONTAMINATION

During crime scene investigation

Contamination of the crime scene can be the result of direct contact by ungloved staff, cross-contamination of equipment, faulty packaging, and inadequate scene control. Typical contributors are investigators' DNA, secondary transfer from equipment or bags, and environmental contamination. In such cases, improper use of right

PPE or cleanliness procedures add to the risk. Adhering rigorously to contamination avoidance procedures, including DNA staff records and rigorous chain-of-custody procedures, is key to providing evidence integrity and good forensic conclusions [11, 12].

In laboratory processing

In the laboratory, contamination during processing can be caused by airborne DNA, dirty equipment, reagent contamination, and sample-to-sample contact. Shared equipment, PCR carryover, non-DNA-free consumables, and human handling error are common causes. Poor workplace segregation and poor decontamination also increase these risks. Staff elimination databases, negative controls, and automatic systems can minimize occurrence of contamination. Proper laboratory design, regular audits, and strict controls for reducing contamination are critical in maintaining DNA integrity throughout analysis [13, 14].

High-profile cases affected by cross-contamination

There have been several high-profile cases that have been invalidated because of DNA cross-contamination. A few such cases are the Earl Washington Jr. case of wrongful conviction, involving laboratory mishandling and reporting errors, and the O.J. Simpson case, where there were claims of mislabeling errors and contamination. Cold hit database matches have also been attacked on the basis of possible contamination when working with samples. These figures highlight the paramount significance of effective contamination control, transparency, and strict validation in the effort to uphold forensic integrity in criminal justice systems [15, 16].

Transfer mechanisms: passive, active, tertiary

Modes of DNA transfer are classified into passive, active, and tertiary. Passive transfer has a low-level interaction like fortuitous contact or aerosol deposition. Active transfer involves forceful or intentional interaction like pulling, hitting, or rough handling, which resulted in high DNA deposition by pressure and friction. Tertiary transfer is DNA transferred through one or more intermediates, thereby making it difficult to attribute the source. These mechanisms have profound effects on forensic interpretation of trace DNA evidence and should be evaluated with respect to context, shedding propensity, and environmental persistence in order to prevent misidentification and enhance evidentiary reliability [17, 18].

FORENSIC STANDARDS AND MITIGATION STRATEGIES

Guidelines from SWGDAM, ENFSI, and ISO standards

SWGDAM, ENFSI, and ISO/IEC 17025:2017 are the core directives of forensic DNA typing. SWGDAM is strong on validation, control of contamination, and statistical interpretation. ENFSI

guidance standardizes European practice with an emphasis on quality assurance. ISO/IEC 17025 lays down international requirements for laboratory proficiency and method verification. All three support homogeneity, traceability, and evidence credibility. Adherence to these requirements provides scientifically reasonable results in legal proceedings, most notably in transborder databases such as Prüm. Periodic revision accommodates nascent technologies like NGS, and usage must be present for accreditation, legal defensibility, and public trust in forensic science [19, 20].

Chain-of-custody protocols and contamination control

Chain-of-custody procedures are paramount to admissibility and integrity of forensic DNA evidence. Chain-of-custody procedures provide documented, uninterrupted control over handling evidence from collection through analysis to prevent unauthorized access and tampering. Control of contamination supports this through stringent procedures: application of PPE, separation of samples, staff removal databases, and regular decontamination. Employment of these practices prevents DNA transfer, misidentification, and evidentiary compromise. SWGDAM, ENFSI, and ISO/IEC 17025 recommendations both espouse procedural uniformity and traceability and underscore their importance in maintaining forensic reliability and judicial validity [11, 21].

Advances in contamination-aware collection kits

The latest breakthroughs in contamination-sensitive DNA sampling kits are geared towards minimizing DNA cross-transfer risks when handling evidence. DNA-free packaging, integrated gloves, tamper-evident seals, and pre-treated swabs preventing microbial growth are some of the technologies created. Pre-printed containers and barcoding procedures have also become routine components of kits to ensure better traceability. Biochip integration and contamination-sensitive indexing also ensure sample integrity. These advances minimize human error and cross-sample contamination, conforming to ISO/IEC 17025 and SWGDAM quality controls. Such a progression guarantees greater reliability of DNA evidence obtained, especially in trace or low-template samples where sensitivity to contamination is maximized [22, 23].

ETHICAL AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Evidentiary weight of touch DNA in court

Touch DNA's quality as evidence in court is questioned by secondary transfer sensitivity and low yield. Although courts agree DNA is powerful evidence, touch DNA without corroborative evidence is insufficient. State v. Carver cases warn of its abuse without corroboration. Probabilistic genotyping and expert witness are critical in such a case. Full-disclosure presentation is the first choice by courts such that collection, analysis, and probability of transfer are presented openly [24, 25].

The danger of over-reliance on DNA in the absence of contextual evidence

Over-reliance on DNA evidence without supporting contextual information can lead to wrongful convictions. DNA alone cannot establish how, when, or why it was deposited. Courts have cautioned against assuming guilt based solely on DNA presence, especially in trace or touch DNA cases susceptible to secondary transfer. The absence of corroborating evidence such as motive, opportunity, or eyewitness accounts weakens probative value and risks misinterpretation of coincidental or innocent presence [26, 27].

Future directions and research needs

The future of forensic DNA analysis will demand attention to quantifying risk in tertiary and secondary transfer, enhancing trace DNA interpretation, and enhanced contamination-resistant sampling techniques. Probabilistic genotyping, NGS, and microfluidics can increase sensitivity. Empirical research will be necessary to compare environmental persistence and human variation in DNA shedding. Standardized validation protocols and contamination modeling in representative systems will be necessary. Integration of contextual information in forensic assessments and ongoing global collaboration will propel scientifically and legally sound DNA analysis protocols.

CONCLUSION

Development of touch DNA analysis has promoted

forensic science immensely, which enables identification and interpretation of infinitesimal biological residues remnant from contact. This is accompanied by greater sensitivity to contamination, transfer indeterminacy, and uncertainty in interpretation. These are accompanied by higher accuracy and sample integrity through technology improvement in swab material development, contamination-sensitive collection kits, and probabilistic genotyping. But with the technology increasing in power, so should the obligation to apply strict contamination control, open chain-of-custody procedures, and situational analysis. The quiet witness—trace DNA—can be a persuasive voice, but only when it is collected, analyzed, and interpreted properly with scientific care and ethical vision. Continuing studies, interdisciplinary research, and strict compliance with international standards must be ensured to see that the probative value of touch DNA remains a sure friend of justice, and not a tool for arbitrariness in forensics.

Authors Contribution: methodology, M. A. Ammar; analysis, M. Irfan; supervision and resources, S. H. Aftab; review and editing, M. Yasir; proofreading, M. Adeel.

Funding: No funding involved.

Ethical Approval: Not applicable

Conflict of Interest: Nil.

Consent for Publication: All authors approved the manuscript for publication.

REFERENCES

1. Sankhla MS, Kumar R. Identification of criminal by using touch DNA: A new tool for investigation in forensic science . 2017 [cited 2025 May 18]. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/316910810>
2. Pawar SG, Mahajan KD, Harel VS. Touch DNA: An Important Clue in Criminal Cases [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2025 May 18]. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/340088847>
3. van Oorschot RA, Jones MK. DNA fingerprints from fingerprints. *Nature*. 1997;387(6635):767.
4. Burrill J, Daniel B, Frascione N. A review of trace “Touch DNA” deposits: Variability factors and an exploration of cellular composition. *Forensic Sci Int Genet*. 2019;39:8–18. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1872497318302746>
5. Tobias SHA, Jacques GS, Morgan RM. The effect of pressure on DNA deposition by touch. *Forensic Sci Int Genet*. 2017;29:e14–e18. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1875176817300641>
6. Jansson L, Swensson M, Gifvars E, Hedell R. Individual shedder status and the origin of touch DNA. *Forensic Sci Int Genet*. 2022;58:102681. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1872497321001629>
7. Goray M, Mitchell RJ, van Oorschot RAH. Investigation of secondary DNA transfer of skin cells under controlled test conditions. *Legal Med*. 2010;12(3):117–120. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1344622310000076>
8. Meakin G, Jamieson A. DNA transfer: review and implications for casework. *Forensic Sci Int Genet*. 2013;7(4):434–443. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1872497313000926>
9. Taylor D, Biedermann A, Samie L, Pun KM. Helping to distinguish primary from secondary transfer events for trace DNA. *Forensic Sci Int Genet*. 2018;33:145–156. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1872497317300376>
10. Wickenheiser RA. Trace DNA: a review, discussion of theory, and application of the transfer of trace quantities of DNA through skin contact. *Forensic Sci Commun*. 2002;4(3). <https://asmedigitalcollection.asme.org/forensic-sciences/article/47/3/442/1185215>

11. Alketbi SK. DNA contamination in crime scene investigations: Common errors, best practices, and insights from a survey study. 2024. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4979243
12. Fonneløp AE, Johannessen H, Egeland T. Contamination during criminal investigation: Detecting police contamination and secondary DNA transfer from evidence bags. *Forensic Sci Int Genet.* 2016;25:89–96. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S187249731630059X>
13. Ghulam Shabbir 2024. A mini review on adolescent identity development and impact of social media on it. *Integration of Mankind and Society.* 1, 1 (Feb. 2024), 31–42. <https://doi.org/10.56770/ims2024115>
14. Sara Gul 2025. Forensic science education an emerging field to develop skills for identifying crimes. *Ammanif Bulletin of Social Sciences.* 2, 1 (Mar. 2025), 13–21. <https://doi.org/10.56770/aboss2025213>
15. Gall JAM, Court DS. DNA contamination—a pragmatic clinical view. In: *Forensic DNA Analysis.* Wiley; 2016. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/9781118456026.ch1>
16. Thompson WC. Forensic DNA Evidence: The Myth of Infallibility. In: *Contested Science.* Harvard Univ Press; 2012. <https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.4159/harvard.9780674067769.c19/html>
17. Sessa F, Pomara C, Esposito M, Grassi P, Cocimano G. Indirect DNA transfer and forensic implications: A literature review. *Genes.* 2023;14(12):2153. <https://www.mdpi.com/2073-4425/14/12/2153>
18. Reither JB, van Oorschot RAH, Durdle A. DNA transfer to placed, stored, and handled drug packaging and knives. *Forensic Sci Int Genet.* 2023;65:102902. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1872497323000637>
19. Hares DR, Kneppers A, Onorato AJ. An agreed position statement by ENFSI, SWGDAM and the Rapid DNA community. *Forensic Sci Int Genet.* 2020. [https://www.fsigenetics.com/article/S1872-4973\(20\)30122-8/abstract](https://www.fsigenetics.com/article/S1872-4973(20)30122-8/abstract)
20. Bastisch I. Quality Assurance, Recommendations and Standards. In: *World Scientific Handbook of Forensic Science.* 2017. https://www.worldscientific.com/doi/abs/10.1142/9781786340788_0024
21. Lapointe M, Rogic A, Bourgoïn S, Jolicoeur C. Necessity of DNA elimination databases. *Forensic Sci Int Genet.* 2015;17:33–37. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1872497315300235>
22. Abbas, H.M., Erum, F. and Gillani, A.H. 2023. Significance and challenges of DNA profiling in medicolegal setup of Pakistan. *Forensic Insights and Health Sciences Bulletin.* 1, 2 (Oct. 2023), 33–37. <https://doi.org/10.56770/fi2023111>
23. Brochado-Kith O, Rava M, Berenguer J. Contamination-aware sequencing in HCV cirrhosis studies. *MedRxiv.* 2024. <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2024.05.06.24306779>
24. Phillips D. State v. Carver: A cautionary tale about the use of touch DNA as inculpatory evidence in North Carolina. *West Fla Law Rev.* 2014;49. https://heinonline.org/hol-cgi-bin/get_pdf.cgi?handle=hein.journals/wflr49§ion=59
25. Balding DJ, Steele CD. *Weight-of-evidence for Forensic DNA Profiles.* Wiley; 2015. <https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&id=Te1yCQAAQBAJ&pg=PA165>
26. Stiffelman B. No longer the gold standard: probabilistic genotyping is changing the nature of DNA evidence in criminal trials. *Berkeley J Crim Law.* 2019;24. https://heinonline.org/hol-cgibin/get_pdf.cgi?handle=hein.journals/bjcl24§ion=6
27. Butler JM. Strengthening forensic science with DNA technology. *Forensic Sci Int Genet.* 2015;18:4–20. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1872497315300284>