NIST panel on quantifying the weight of evidence

Doug Armstrong

South Dakota State University

Subjective probability and the SLR

- If one is subjective in choice of construction of LR/BF, it should be assumed he/she is coherent and follows the axioms of probability

- Assumptions are made with any model choice and must be valid and upheld

- If/when those model assumptions are found to be invalid, the model is wrong, and the subjective "justification" is wrong and the individual is incoherent

  - Some violations are more/less severe

- Some SLRs do not satisfy basic principles

South Dakota State University

Subjective probability and the SLR
-Principles of a well-constructed SLR

Not an exclusive list!

- Coherency Principle
  - In Bayesian decision theory, the coherency principle assumes degrees of belief obey to the axioms of probability and that consistent decisions can be made based on personal probabilities

- Sufficiency Principle
  - All Sufficient statistics based on data x for a given model $p_\theta(x)$ should lead to the same conclusion
  - Also provides that choice in score is a sufficient statistic

- Likelihood Principle
  - Two datasets that produce equal/proportional likelihoods should lead to the same conclusion

Subjective probability and the SLR
-An example of the Coherency principle

- Let H_A, H_B be two mutually exclusive propositions for a population of 2 sources A, B with a set of observations made on a trace e_u and control objects e_A, e_B. The LR should not be influenced by the order of proposition.

- Under coherency we get:

$$LR_{A,B} = \frac{\Pr(e_u|H_A)}{\Pr(e_u|H_B)} = \frac{1}{LR_{B,A}} = \frac{1}{\frac{\Pr(e_u|H_B)}{\Pr(e_u|H_A)}}$$

Subjective probability and the SLR
-An example of the Coherency principle

- However, with some SLRs:

$$LR_{H_A} = \frac{\Pr(e_u|H_A)}{\Pr(e_u|H_B)} \approx \frac{\Pr(\delta(e_u, e_A)|H_A)}{\Pr(\delta(e_u, e_A)|H_B)} \neq \frac{1}{\frac{\Pr(\delta(e_u, e_B)|H_B)}{\Pr(\delta(e_u, e_B)|H_A)}}$$

- None of the SLRs we have studied uphold this principle!

Subjective probability and the SLR
-Lack of convergence

Subjective probability and the SLR
-SLRs do not consistently meet all principles

- By using some basic principles, we can objectify the selection of a score-based model

- At the end of the day, the courts need to trust that models used to estimate the LR/BF are valid!

Calibration of the LR

- It is acceptable to calibrate a LR, as long as the resulting calibrated-LR is not reported as a LR
  - When used in this manner, the LR behaves as a metric, and a system is optimized to reduce error rates.
  - A form of supervised training
- These are great in decision engines (speech for instance)

South Dakota State University

Calibration of the LR

- Some methods calibrate the LR via the posterior odds
  - These methods suggest prior odds to obtain optimized posteriors
- Calibrated LRs are not appropriate in court-room settings
  - If reported in court, they need to be made clear what they are
  - Any reported LR still needs to follow the first rule of LRs:
    - If LR > 1, support the prosecution (numerator) hypothesis
    - If LR < 1, support the defense (denominator) hypothesis

South Dakota State University

Future of the SLR

- We still want to use the data reduction techniques that make SLRs attractive in the first place.

- A method which takes into consideration the relationships and dependencies between the objects in the population of potential sources.

- A method which has similar theoretical properties as the LR

South Dakota State University

Future of the SLR

- A method has been suggested by Gantz & Saunders to estimate the numerator of a LR. The method makes use of kernel-based methods, prevalent in pattern recognition

- My current research is focused on extending this method to the denominator and suggesting a set of conditions necessary to ensure convergence to the ideal LR

South Dakota State University

Acknowledgement

South Dakota State University

SDSU