

## **B33** A Comparison of DNA Typing Success in Compromised Blood and Touch Samples Based on Sampling Swab Composition

Ciara Rhodes, Mechanicsville, VA 23111; Memunatu J. Koroma, BS, Virginia Commonwealth University Department of Forensic Science, Richmond, VA 23284-3079; Brittany C. Hudson, MS, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA 23284; Nubaha Islam, BS, Virginia Commonwealth University Department of Forensic Science, Richmond, VA 23284; Haris Mukic, BS, Virginia Commonwealth University Department of Forensic Science, Richmond, VA 23284; Haris Mukic, BS, Virginia Commonwealth University Department of Forensic Science, Richmond, VA 23284; Tracey Dawson Cruz, PhD, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA 23284; Robert A. Bever, PhD, Bode Cellmark Forensics, Lorton, VA 22079; Sarah J. Seashols Williams, PhD\*, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA 23284-3079

**Learning Overview:** After attending this presentation, attendees will understand the impact of time and temperature on DNA analysis of samples using both cotton and a proprietary swab designed to minimize degradation of forensic samples.

**Impact on the Forensic Science Community:** This presentation will impact the forensic science community by providing an opportunity to evaluate a novel sampling product for forensic DNA evidence and promote more research about and awareness of preventing DNA degradation at sampling and during storage.

Sample collection at the crime scene can introduce variations in DNA recovery, both based upon the substrate or material used as well as the storage conditions after collection. Both the substrate and the body fluid deposited on the evidence can harbor microbial populations, which can be co-collected onto the swab and degrade the sample even during drying and storage, and before DNA extraction can be performed. The purpose of this study was to evaluate and compare standard cotton swab collection with the Bode BioSafe<sup>M</sup> swab, which includes both a desiccant at the swab head as well as proprietary bacteriostatic compounds included to prevent degradation of the sample.

Venous blood samples were collected from five donors into sodium heparin tubes, and contact samples from ten donors were deposited onto both porous (cotton fabric for both blood and touch) and non-porous (linoleum flooring and computer keyboards, respectively) surfaces and allowed to dry. The samples were then swabbed with a standard cotton swab or the BioSafe<sup>M</sup> swab and stored at room temperature, 37°C or 55°C for 30, 90, or 180 days. After the elapsed time, DNA was isolated and quantified from all samples, and DNA profiles developed from select samples.

DNA yields varied from 80–190ng and 10–200ng for blood samples deposited on linoleum and cotton, respectively, regardless of swab method used. While no trends were observed in comparing the DNA yields of samples extracted from blood collected with either swab type, degradation indices tended to be lower for BioSafe<sup>TM</sup> as compared to cotton swabs. Contact DNA samples yielded between 0.1–1.5ng and 0.5–5ng on T-shirt and keyboard samples, respectively, with higher yields found with samples swabbed using the BioSafe<sup>TM</sup> swabs on both substrates, and lower indications of degradation with the BioSafe<sup>TM</sup> swabs. Because touch or contact samples are known to harbor higher bacterial loads than blood in addition to the free DNase enzymes known to inhabit keratinized epithelium, the bacteriostatic, desiccating, and enzyme-inhibiting capability of the BioSafe<sup>TM</sup> swabs may prove to result in better DNA profile outcomes than the standard swabbing procedure.

Swab, Touch, LCN DNA

Copyright 2020 by the AAFS. Permission to reprint, publish, or otherwise reproduce such material in any form other than photocopying must be obtained by the AAFS.