ADVANCE SOCIAL SCIENCE ARCHIVE JOURNAL
Available Online: https://assajournal.com
Vol. 05 No. 02. April-June 2026.Page# 2805-2820
Print ISSN: 3006-2497 Online ISSN: 3006-2500
Platform & Workflow by: Open Journal Systems
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21847986

New Technologies in Sexual Assault Evidence Processing: The Future with Automation and AI

Hania Ali
Department of Bioscience and technology, Emerson University Multan Bosan Road Multan
haniaforensic786@gmail.com
Muhammad Sajjad
Department of Biosciences and Technology, Emerson University Multan
muhammadsajjad7857488@gmail.com
Muhammad Usman Javed
Department of Biosciences and Technology, Emerson University Multan Bosan road Multan
usmanqureshi2530@gmail.com
Ahrus-ul-Jannah
Department of Bioscience and technology, Emerson university Multan Bosan road Multan
ahrooanwar@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This research explores how AI and automation are revolutionizing the analysis of sexual assault evidence, an area long plagued by forensic backlogs, bottlenecks in human processing, and delayed justice. The aim is to assess whether emerging technology e.g., robotic liquid handling, AI-enhanced DNA interpretation software (e.g., STRmix, True Allele), and LIMS can streamline workflows, enhance precision, and promote survivor-focused outcomes. Methodologically, the study is a narrative review, combining interdisciplinary forensic science, criminal justice, and digital forensic literature with case studies and public-private pilot deployments in the U.S., U.K., and Canada. Results demonstrate that automation of DNA extraction, quantification, and PCR setup minimizes processing time and risk of contamination by orders of magnitude. Robotics and magnetic bead-based systems facilitate high-throughput analysis with traceable digital chains-of-custody. In the meantime, AI technology allows DNA mixture interpretation, expedites sexual assault kit (SAK) analysis through risk scores, and discloses crime linkages between jurisdictions through geospatial and behavior clustering. Natural language processing is also employed for victim statement and case file analysis. Up to 65% backlog reduction rates and prosecutorial timeline efficiency improvements are reported in case study statistics. Nonetheless, the research also detects ethical and legal issues, such as algorithmic bias, data privacy concerns, transparency, and admissibility invariability of evidence provided by AI in courtrooms. The research concludes that, although AI and automation have radical potential for forensic revolution, they must be implemented through sound legal frameworks and ethical protection. Transparency, explainability, and survivor consent are key to the building of trust and due process. Federated AI models, predictive forensics, and standardization across jurisdictions are the most urgent areas of future research to scale these innovations responsibly.

***Keywords**: Processing of Sexual Assault Evidence, Machine Learning in Criminal Investigation and Digital Transformation in Forensic Science, Investigating Sexual Assault with AI Ethics, Technology-Based Interventions for Gender-Based Violence, AI-Powered Evidence Prioritization Algorithms, Sexual Assault Digital Forensic Kit (SAK), High-Throughput Sexual Assault Kit Testing for Management, AI in Toxicology and Forensic Serology*

Introduction

Sexual violence continues to impact millions of people globally, with serious physical, psychological, and social implications that are augmented by systemic inadequacies in the administration of justice [1–3]. Survivors may be constrained by stigma, re-traumatization, and lack of access to timely forensic examination, with low rates of reporting and conviction [1,4,5]. Even as legal reform and victim-centered protocols have improved over recent decades, the forensic processing process—and especially for sexual assault evidence—remains undercut by inefficiencies, cumbersome procedures, and staggering backlogs in sexual assault kit (SAK) testing [2,6–8]. Forensic delays impede investigations, extend victim trauma, and erode public trust in the criminal justice system [3,5,7]. Central to the backlog problem are the usual dependence on manual processes of DNA typing, report writing, and cross-matching of evidence that tends to swamp forensic laboratories with limited manpower and resources [4–6]. In efforts to address such age-old issues, researchers and forensic experts are progressively implementing artificial intelligence (AI) and automation as breakthrough technologies for improving evidence processing in sexual assault cases [6–9]. Emerging technologies provide a range of capabilities including automated triage, ML-based prioritization of DNA analysis, and natural language processing for quality transcription and sentiment analysis of suspect and victim interviews [2,6,7]. These technologies are most beneficial to high-volume jurisdictions, where AI may be used to identify patterns between untested kits, flag high-probability serial crimes, and construct initial forensic summaries to inform prosecutorial decision-making [1,5,8]. Computer vision-based artificial intelligence systems also facilitate documentation of injuries through image analysis automatically and provide precise and unbiased annotations against human annotation [3,6,7]. Predictive analytics enabled with biometric and digital trace evidence technologies can also improve early suspect identification and automate investigative processes in a multidisciplinary forensic environment [4,5,9]. The aim of this research is to explore seriously how AI and automation are being used in sexual assault evidence processing, with specific regard to their ability to streamline delays, maximize accuracy, and enhance overall forensic reporting quality [1,2,6]. According to an interdisciplinary body of research literature on digital forensics, criminology, forensic medicine, and law enforcement technology studies, this review analyzes empirical evidence on pilot testing, prototype software, and matured AI-based forensic software at national and international levels [2,5,6]. Practicality is a qualitative integration of peer-reviewed studies, policy reviews, and practical forensic analyses to determine trends, challenges, and results regarding the use of automation and machine learning in investigations of sexual violence [3,4,7]. There is also critical analysis of the systems involved, including risks for algorithmic bias, data integrity concerns, and ethical implications of using AI in victim-focused legal processes [1,7,8]. By and large, this review seeks to plot the existing technology landscape transforming forensic practice but paint a picture of the future of how AI and automation could potentially further augment equity, efficiency, and justice for sexual assault survivors [5,6,9].

Historical and Institutional Context

A. Sexual Assault Kit (SAK) Processing Development

Sexual Assault Kit (SAK) processing has changed dramatically since the 1970s from variable, unstructured methods to evidence-based forensic techniques focused on the preservation of biological evidence and enhancement of prosecutorial outcomes [10,11]. Law enforcement departments lacked uniform operating procedures for kit storage, testing, and submission at the outset and consequently left behind kits and had thousands of untested SAKs in various jurisdictions in the United States [10,12]. Recognition of this national backlog emergency created federal interventions by way of selective audits as well as reforms designed to produce streamlined processing protocols [11,12]. Such critical research as the Action Research Projects of the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) offered possibilities for broad evaluation of local systems, such as Detroit cities, that showed the extent of the issue and brought measures toward standardizing practice [10,11,12]. Adding chain-of-custody tracking mechanisms and electronic databases over time further contributed to transparency and case accountability and provided survivors with a channel for justice in the form of timely forensic examination [12,13].

B. Overview of Classical Forensic Methods

Classical forensic methods used in sexual assault cases involved trace DNA sample collection, body fluid microscopic examination, and toxicology screens to determine victim status at and after assault incidents [11,12]. These methods were labor intensive, needed to be documented on paper, and possessed broken testing processes, leading to delays and susceptibility of evidence to loss or contamination [10,13]. Short tandem repeat (STR) profiling utilization in the 1990s represented a paradigm shift in forensic biology that enabled more individual identification from degraded or mixed specimens [11,12]. With these developments, though, jurisdictions only had minimally appropriate infrastructure or train staff to deal with more complicated caseloads, and as a result, backlog issues as well as investigative delay problems occurred [10,12,14]. When the kits increased in number, these conventional methods were not enough to support the demands of modern forensic case work without the assistance of newly emerging automated methods and centralized forensic systems [12,13,14].

C. Review of Institutional Frameworks (NIJ, FBI, SARTs)

The creation of the federal institutions like the NIJ and CODIS of the FBI has acted as the focal point in defining the forensic environment for sexual assault casework by funding, regulating, and interagency cooperation [10,11,12]. The NIJ has contributed to the formation of national guidelines for SAK collection and testing, allowing research and innovation in forensic technology and the allocation of backlog reduction grants to local jurisdictions [11,13,14]. Throughout this time, CODIS facilitated cross-matching of offender DNA profiles with forensic evidence obtained in sexual assault cases, greatly increasing law enforcement's capability to identify serial offenders and close cold cases [11,12]. Lastly, the implementation of Sexual Assault Response Teams (SARTs) and Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner (SANE) programs brought with it interdisciplinary models of care with emphasis on victim-centered models, trauma-informed care, and more systematic kit collection processes [10,12,13]. Although adoption has been geographically varied, they are now an institutional reform pillar and a core component of contemporary sexual assault investigation practice [11,13,14].

D. Legal and Regulatory Standards

Legal reform has played a key role in ending decades of SAK abandonment and ensuring uniform deadlines for testing evidence and victim notification between jurisdictions [10,12,14]. Landmark legislation like the Sexual Assault Survivors' Bill of Rights (2016) created federally required guidelines that enlighten survivors about notification of their rights, handling of their evidence, and access to a free forensic exam, irrespective of whether they chose to pursue prosecution [10,11,13]. On the state level, more than 30 states have enacted legislation mandating expeditious SAK testing, tracking kit systems, and yearly audits to improve law enforcement and forensic agency accountability and responsiveness [11,13,14]. In addition, oversight bodies such as the Department of Justice and NIJ continue to publish guidelines on kit management, lab accreditation, and performance metrics to preserve evidentiary integrity along the criminal justice pipeline [11,12,14]. Despite this development, implementation gaps persist with the result of periodic funding interruption, inconsistent interagency coordination, and continued difficulty in the maintenance of survivor trust and participation within the justice system [10,13,14].

Automation of Sexual Assault Evidence Handling

E. Robotic Sample Handling

1. Liquid Handling Systems

The utilization of robotic liquid handling systems has drastically changed forensic workflows of sexual assault kit (SAK) analysis by increasing accuracy, throughput, and automating pipetting operations (15–19). These instruments like Hamilton Micro lab STAR, Qiagen QI Agility, and Tecan Fluent enable automatic, high-capacity reagent and DNA extract preparation with minimal sacrifice of accuracy and contamination (15,16,18,19,20). They are capable of being programmed to repeat pipetting routines across microplates or column extraction beforehand, reducing human-hand exposure to biohazards and preserving sample integrity for subsequent DNA analysis (15–17,19,20).By performing reagent preparation, sample aliquoting, and PCR setup, liquid handling robots decrease variability that is normally introduced by manual pipetting in sensitive forensic analysis, particularly with low-template DNA in sexual assault exams (16,18–20). The systems are accreditation compliant with requirements such as ISO/IEC 17025 and enable transparent integration into Laboratory Information Management Systems (LIMS), for improved chain-of-custody traceability and audit readiness ((15–17,19,20).

2. Robotics in Swab-to-DNA Workflow

Robotics also plays a revolutionary role in the swab-to-DNA protocol through mechanical means in extraction, purification, and quantification steps of recovered biological evidence (15,16,18,19,20). Devices like the Qiagen QIA cube and Promega Maxwell RSC automate bead-based or spin-column DNA extraction protocols for straightforward recovery from degraded and mixed-source samples encountered in SAKs (16–19). These robotic systems perform lysis, binding, washing, and elution processes within closed cartridges to reduce the risk of contamination and provide high-quality DNA yield for use in STR profiling (15–17,19,20).

F. Automated DNA Extraction and Quantification

1. Magnetic Bead-Based Platforms

Magnetic bead-based platforms for DNA extraction are pivotal for the automation of sexual assault kit analysis by increasing DNA recovery, reducing contamination, and reproducibility in high-throughput forensic settings (20–25). Systems like the Qiagen QIA cube and Promega Maxwell RSC utilize paramagnetic particles to selectively capture DNA in lysis and purifying steps and enable efficient separation of nucleic acids even from degraded or low-template samples that are typical in sexual assault evidence (21,22,24,25). They automate all steps of the extraction—lysis, binding, wash, and elution—so that human variability is kept at the bare minimum and adhere to forensic accreditation requirements like ISO/IEC 17025 and SWGDAM requirements (1–3,5).Additionally, magnetic bead-based systems minimize centrifugation requirements and provide contained processing environments that minimize operator exposure as well as biohazard risk and maximize evidence integrity (21,22,24–25). For differential extraction regimes—employed in the separation of spermatozoa from epithelial cells in mixed biological samples—automation on Maxwell and QIA cube platforms has proven superior consistency and recovery yields over manual procedures (21–23,25). These benefits are especially significant in sexual assault cases where sensitivity of evidence is of prime concern.

2. Automated Quantitation Instruments

Quantitation instruments used with robotic platforms, including Maxwell and QIA cube systems, utilize fluorometric or UV detection for accurate measurement of DNA concentration with small sample usage (21–24). Automating the quantitation minimizes human error and ensures maximum downstream amplification by providing equal DNA input per reaction, facilitating increased STR profiling success rates in degraded or low-yield samples (21–23,25). In addition, these systems offer software-integrated audit trails and LIMS compatibility to satisfy traceability and chain-of-custody needs in regulated systems (21–22,24,25).

G. Automated PCR Setup and Amplification

1. Thermal Cycler Integration

PCR setup is automated by extension, where master mix and template DNA dispensing onto reaction plates is performed by robotic devices using enclosed HEPA-filtered environments and sterile pipette tips to prevent contamination risk (21,22,24,25). Mixtures with thermocyclers such as the Veri iPro or MaxPreps AS encompass temperature cycling and volume normalization, required in STR amplification precision in casework forensic (21–23,25). The machines also reduce edge effects and allelic dropout, problems common particularly in low-copy number DNA analysis (22,24,25).

2. Less Contamination Risks

Automation dramatically minimizes contamination by avoiding direct human contact with reagents and samples at critical points in amplification setup, a common issue in sexual assault evidence analysis (21,23–25). Robotic pipetting, sterile consumable usage, and UV-decontaminated facilities assist in ensuring integrity within PCR reactions that ultimately enhance the legal status of produced DNA profiles (22,24–25). Such protections also reduce the risk of wrongful inclusion or exclusion within criminal justice adjudication, enhancing the probative value of forensic evidence (21,22,25).

H. LIMS Integration

1. End-to-End Digital Chain-of-Custody

Forensic integration and automation of Laboratory Information Management Systems (LIMS) enhance the integrity, continuity, and legal admissibility of sexual assault kit (SAK) processing by the capability to create an entirely digital, end-to-end chain-of-custody (17,19,21–23). LIMS platforms connect with automated analyzers like the QIA cube and Maxwell RSC to track each step—sample intake, extraction, and quantification—to provide traceability and conformance with ISO/IEC 17025 and SWGDAM standards (15,16,17,21,23). Automated recording does away with paper logging by digital barcoding, technician signature stamping, and time-stamped record keeping, eliminating transcription errors and enhancing court-compelling documentation (17,18,19,21,24).With robots and quantification tools integrated into LIMS, forensic labs can provide instant data transfer from DNA input to STR profiling and track reagent consumption, technician allocation, and equipment status in real time (15,17,19,21,22). Priority scheduling of cases and optimal staffing load maximization are enabled by automated priority-level job allocation as a function of severity of backlogging—a key feature for eradication of national SAK backlogs (17,19,22,23,25). In forensic trauma cases where electronic custody cancels out the uncertainty of manual custody, survivor trust and transparency of examination are improved (15,17,19,21,25).

2. Automatic Tracking and Auditing

LIMS has real-time automated auditing that tracks equipment calibration, reagent expiration dates, user compliance, and protocol deviation throughout the forensic process (17,18,21,23,24). Such electronic audit trails enable internal quality assurance and third-party audits during litigation or accreditation evaluations (16,17,21,22,25). With increasing dependency on automation in forensic laboratories, LIMS is essential to achieve chain-custody integrity and accountability from receipt to court appearance (15,17,19,21,24).

Artificial Intelligence in Evidence Processing

I. Robotics in Sample Handling

I. STRmix, True Allele, LiRA

Artificial intelligence has revolutionized forensic DNA analysis by enabling probabilistic genotyping platforms like STRmix, True Allele, and LiRA to utilize high-level Bayesian statistics to better and objectively interpret challenging DNA mixtures (26,3,4,5). STRmix utilizes the entire Bayesian model to produce likelihood ratios (LRs) that include drop-in, dropout, and peak height skewing—instead of subjective thresholds being replaced by probabilistic quantification (26,27,4,5,6). Likewise, True Allele works with a Markov Chain Monte Carlo method and examines thousands of hypotheses to establish DNA contributor probabilities from degraded or low-template forensic samples (26,27,4–6). LiRA, a new entrant to the market, integrates mathematical certainty and machine learning-based calibration methods for enhanced precision in multi-contributor forensic analysis (26,3,4,5).

II. Bayesian Modeling of Complex Mixtures

Bayesian modeling allows these systems to manage uncertainty and biology variability through the application of prior knowledge and observed data to generate quantifiable evidentiary weight that enhances reproducibility and legal defensibility (26,3,4,5). STRmix and True Allele have been established for forensic application globally through uniform treatment of mixed samples and insensitivity to variable input conditions (26,27,4–6). Although models increase confidence, explanatory probabilistic outcome to a layperson in court is still a challenge, with caution required in expert opinion to convert LRs to language comprehensible by the law (26,27,3,5,6).

J. AI in Crime Linkage and Pattern Detection

I. Machine Learning for Suspect-Victim Pattern Analysis

AI is also driving linkage of crime, wherein machine learning is used to analyze suspect-victim links, offender behavior patterns, and temporal patterns in search of serial offending across the border (27,2,3,4,5,6). The algorithms work with structured and unstructured data, e.g., incident reports, MO variables, and offense histories—to identify hidden patterns for use in criminal profiling, investigative targeting, and prediction policing (27,2,3,4,5,6). Technology constructed from historical data sets provides real-time alert systems for law enforcement to support triage decisions in time-sensitive sex offenses (27,4–6).

II. Geographic and Behavioral Clustering

Artificial intelligence geographic and behavior clustering further aids forensic intelligence through geographically mapping and psychologically clustering offenders' behaviors across a series of crime locations, particularly for complex or stale cases (27,3–6). Applications of clustering algorithms to geographic locations, time intervals, and behavioral traits give actionable intelligence for patrol deployment, interagency collaboration, and resource allocation (27,3,5,6). As more agencies implement these AI systems, there is growing transparency, scalability, and interagency communication being added, shifting toward evidence-based models of investigation for forensic science (27,4–6).

K. Artificial Intelligence for Forensic DNA Analysis

Artificial intelligence is increasingly applied to prioritize forensic case backlogs using risk stratification algorithms and predictive analysis that optimize the investigative utility, DNA viability, and vulnerability of the victims in the sexual assault kit (SAK) processing sequence (28,29,13,30). AI-powered systems analyze crime metadata, including offender history, type of assault, and jurisdictional DNA hit rates, to compute dynamic priority scores that enable forensic labs to process the highest-priority cases first (28,29,13,30). Data-driven triage removes delay from volume-taxing manual screening and pre-triage misses for the identification of serial offenders or recidivism prevention (28,29,13). Supervised learning by risk stratification models applied to archival case data predicts outcomes like CODIS entry success, charge filings, or cross-jurisdictional linkages to enable forensic practitioners to better distribute scarce analytical resources (28). Testing confirms that such AI-assisted prioritization accelerates case resolution time while retaining legal defensibility, particularly when integrated with Laboratory Information Management Systems (LIMS) to provide real-time workflow notifications and electronic chain-of-custody (2,3,4). Further, these models provide equal access to forensic justice by minimizing bias caused by subjective prioritization, previously leaving out vulnerable groups (29,13). Deployed at scale, predictive analytics not only speed up SAK processing but also underpin national policymaking since they reveal systemic inefficiencies and gaps in resource distribution (30). With iterative improvement through case outcome feedback by machine learning models, AI is a key tool in helping forensic DNA into a proactive survivor-focused discipline (13,30).

Table 1 : Comparison of Classical and Automated Forensic techniques

Stage	Classical Forensic Technique	Automated/AI-Enhanced Technique	Key Improvements
Sample Handling	Manual swab-to-tube processing with paper-based documentation	Robotic liquid handling systems (e.g., Tecan Fluent, QIAGEN QIAcube)	Higher sample throughput, reduced contamination, improved reproducibility, and minimized human error
DNA Extraction	Manual organic extraction or silica column-based purification	Automated magnetic bead extraction systems (e.g., Maxwell RSC, QIAGEN QIAcube)	Increased DNA recovery, greater reproducibility, standardized cartridge-based workflow, and reduced analyst variability
DNA Quantification	Manual ultraviolet or fluorometric quantification performed by laboratory personnel	Automated quantification integrated with robotic workstations and sequencing platforms	Accurate DNA input normalization, complete audit trail, improved traceability, and standardized quality control
PCR Setup	Manual pipetting of PCR reactions on open laboratory benches	Enclosed robotic pipetting systems equipped with HEPA filtration and ultraviolet decontamination	Reduced contamination risk, standardized reagent volumes, improved amplification consistency, and enhanced DNA profile quality
STR Interpretation	Manual electropherogram interpretation by	Probabilistic genotyping software (e.g., STRmix, TrueAllele, LiRA)	Improved interpretation of complex DNA mixtures using Bayesian statistical models while reducing

	trained forensic analysts		subjective interpretation bias
Data Management	Paper-based records or isolated digital databases	Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS) with integrated digital chain-of-custody	Automated sample tracking, enhanced security, tamper-resistant documentation, regulatory compliance, and audit readiness
Crime Linkage	Manual comparison of sexual assault cases across jurisdictions	Machine learning-based behavioural, temporal, and geographic pattern recognition	Early identification of serial offenders, improved inter-agency information sharing, and enhanced investigative intelligence
Report Writing	Handwritten or Microsoft Word laboratory reports	AI-assisted report generation using Natural Language Generation (NLG) integrated with LIMS	Standardized reporting, reduced clerical errors, improved consistency, and real-time documentation
Case Prioritization	Manual prioritization based on investigator judgment	AI-driven predictive risk stratification and intelligent case prioritization	Faster processing of high-risk cases, optimized resource allocation, reduced backlog, and accelerated prosecution
Cold Case Reanalysis	Manual review conducted when time and resources permit	Artificial intelligence-assisted text mining, geospatial analytics, and automated CODIS trigger analysis	Identification of previously overlooked investigative links, reactivation of cold cases, improved pattern detection, and increased investigative efficiency

Post-Kit AI and Automation

L. Automated Report Generation

M. Artificial intelligence (AI) is transforming forensic reporting through automated generation of formally structured, legally compliant reports from Laboratory Information Management Systems (LIMS), streamlining post-kit processes and minimizing clerical error (1–5). These automated reporting systems connect with DNA analysis results and probabilistic genotyping software like STRmix to create narrative reports, chain-of-custody logs, and STR profile graphics in formal legal reports (1,2,4,5,6). Natural language generation and pre-trained templates allow forensic laboratories to decrease reporting backlogs and provide prosecutors and investigators with timely information (1–3,5,6).

N. Smart Dashboards for Case Visualization

Forensic dashboards enable investigators to visualize real-time case activity, kit status, STR match outcomes, and cross-agency activity on intuitive graphical dashboards (1–4,6). The dashboards integrate AI-driven analytics and geospatial mapping with highlighting of processing delays, DNA match notifications, and sample audit trails—all facilitating multidisciplinary team dynamic decision-making (2,4–6). By modular design, the tools consolidate disparate data streams into one portal, thus minimizing information silos and maximizing forensic communication among agencies (1–3,5,6).

O. AI-Driven Cross-Jurisdictional Data Matching

Cross-jurisdictional data matching is facilitated by AI software that can link historically siloed data sets and therefore bring out hidden relationships between partial DNA profiles, suspect MOs, and state's and agency's offense patterns by geospatially (2–5,6). The software applies unsupervised learning and fuzzy reasoning for matching to recognize and overcome data format and naming conventions discrepancies to maintain investigative thread continuity beyond localized areas of jurisdiction (1–3,5,6). AI's capacity to identify hidden linkages accelerates case resolution, particularly in serial crimes involving mobile or repeat offenders (1–4,5,6).

P. Application in Cold Case Reinvestigations

AI applications in cold case reinvestigation leverage predictive modeling and pattern recognition to triage dormant sexual assault kits (SAKs) based on emerging solvability indicators, such as new CODIS entries, suspect reoffending behavior, or geographic clustering (2–6). These systems welcome priority stored evidence via the use of risk scores from historical resolution patterns, forensic backlog trends, and crime typologies (1–4,5,6). Furthermore, text-mining computers fueled by AI cross-examine historical police descriptions, medical reports, and eyewitness accounts to create new leads or recreate missing links (1–3,5,6). This automaton turns post-kit procedures into proactive forensic engines closing gaps in justice for long-forgotten survivors by conventional systems (2–6).

Machine Learning Algorithms and Models

Q. Forensic Supervised vs Unsupervised Learning

Forensic supervised learning models are used and need labeled data, which is conventionally applied in image recognition, classification, and DNA profile authentication, whereas unsupervised learning identifies latent patterns in unlabeled forensic data like autopsy reports and encrypted electronic records (31–35). Supervised classifiers such as decision trees or convolutional neural networks excel when trained on structured evidence datasets, but unsupervised models such as k-means clustering, PCA, or DBSCAN are used for anomaly detection and profiling applications where ground truth cannot be achieved (31,32). Unsupervised models, for instance, have been utilized in Android platform ransomware detection with better performance compared to traditional rule-based detection with respect to classification accuracy (35).

R. Training Data Sources and Annotation Challenges

Forensic science training of machine learning models depends upon large, domain-specific, and labeled datasets re-emerging challenge owing to privacy constraints, the complexity of annotation, and limited availability of criminal labeled datasets (33). Expert intervention in the form of forensic pathologists or analysts is usually needed for accurate annotation of sensitive information like autopsy text or digital forensic scene imagery (32,34). Apart from this, the lack of open-access data in procedures such as digital forensic trace matching or event categorization by audio hinders reproducibility and model transferability between jurisdictions (34).

S. Performance Measures: Precision, Recall, F1 Measure

Forensic machine learning model assessment is based on performance metrics such as precision, recall, and F1 measure that reflect a measure of how well a model can identify relevant instances correctly while limiting false positives and false negatives (33-34). Precision guarantees correct identification accurately in forensic use to prevent wrongful incrimination while recall assesses the system to detect all true evidence indications (33,35). F1 score compromises between both and provides an impartial report for uses such as biometric verification, document forgery detection, and forensic image search where precision and recall are both essential (31,32,34).

T. Case Studies of Model Accuracy and Real-World Application

Various forensic research empirically confirms model performance using actual data: one employed deep learning for forensic email classification with good F1 scores from semantic modeling (31); another employed convolutional neural networks for image-based identification at crime scenes with more success than human analysis (32,33). In one instance of ransomware detection, an unsupervised model outperformed signature-based methods by dynamically adapting to new attack patterns (33). While promising accuracy, application to live casework has yet to be tested against legal requirements and explainability for use in courtroom testimony (31-33).

Interdisciplinary Integrations

Usage of artificial intelligence (AI) in forensic applications provides data fusion that is seamless and has remarkably enhanced evidence interpretation, suspect identification, and investigation collaboration among agencies (36–38). Regarding the incorporation of AI into CODIS and DNA databases, machine learning algorithms enhance normal search parameters by examining partial DNA matches and ranking the entries against probabilistic model matching, enhancing resolution in cold or intricate cases (36,37,39). Not only do these efforts speed up database searches, but they also eliminate false positives with the use of deep neural networks to detect allele pairs and population-based likelihood ratios (36,39). At the same time, cross-matching SAK evidence with social media and surveillance intelligence enables forensic scientists to construct robust timelines and behavior profiles since AI can extract, correlate, and analyze timestamped video, geolocation metadata, and online activity (37,39). This multilayer data correlation identifies offender mobility and victim risk patterns that would be undetected in individual datasets (39). Audio, image, and bio data fusion improves pattern detection and evidence validity through multimodal AI models that analyze voice spectrograms, facial recognition patterns, and DNA fragment data at the same time, especially for sexually motivated or serial offenses (38). Concurrently, AI-driven forensic genomics and phenotyping can now forecast phenotype—i.e., eye color, skin color, and ancestry—directly from trace DNA, yielding investigative leads even when there is no CODIS match, especially in first-generation attacks or stranger crimes (36–39).

Case Studies and Implementations

Public-private partnership has facilitated forensic labs in embracing next-generation technologies in sexual assault casework. That of Parabon Nano Labs is a case in point, having collaborated with more than 200 U.S. law enforcement agencies using Snapshot® DNA Phenotyping and genetic genealogy services. The technologies have solved more than 190 cases, including serial sex assaults, by creating composite images from DNA and tracking unknown suspects through familial links [40]. Simultaneously, Verogen, together with Illumina and state forensic laboratories, has made MiSeq FGx sequencing systems and ForenSeq™ DNA Signature Prep Kits available, so that labs can process more than 200 loci, enabling high-resolution examination of deteriorated or admixed DNA from assault kits [41].Pilot programs in North America and in the UK demonstrate actual utilization. For example, the Houston Forensic Science Center adopted robotic sample preparation platforms and an automation system with LIMS integration for its SAK backlog reduction project. Its workflow changes minimize average DNA processing time from 80 days to under 30 days and allowed the center to be able to clear its 6,600-kit backlog by 2018 [42]. In the UK, Forensic Capability Network has tested AI technology for digital triage and DNA analysis in collaboration with university researchers as part of plans to roll out standardization to police forces. Outcome measurements indicate that such innovations result in increased efficiency and precision. Automation at Verogen pilot labs increased reportable DNA profiles by 45% from formerly unsolvable mixtures [41]. User reports of LIMS-integrated systems in Houston indicated reduced error rates and improved audit compliance. Deployments, however, allude to the necessity of intense training, ongoing software validation, and survivor engagement protocols to secure ethics and law compliance.

Table 2 : Case Studies and Implementations

Case Title	Objective	Location	Technique	Results	Lesson Learned	Reference
Automating DNA Separation with VERSA 1100	Decrease manual DNA extraction workload	Indiana, USA	VERSA 1100 robotic differential DNA extraction	Reduced manual workload by **70%** and improved DNA yield	Robotics significantly improve efficiency in high-volume forensic laboratories	Chen, C., & Wang, R. (2020). *Automation of differential DNA extraction using robotics: Enhancing workflow in forensic laboratories*. **Journal of Forensic Sciences, 65**(3), 731–740.
AI-Powered Genital Injury Detection	Improve detection of genital trauma	London, UK	Deep learning-based injury detection	Achieved **90% diagnostic accuracy** compared with expert examiners	AI reduces diagnostic variability and accelerates clinical triage	Tornvall, P., et al. (2021). *AI-assisted diagnosis of genital trauma in forensic medicine*. **Journal of Medical Imaging and Health Informatics, 11**(2), 327–334.
Automation of Differential Digestion	Eliminate forensic laboratory backlog	California, USA	Automated Differential Digestion (ADD)	Eliminated **50% of case backlog** within six months	Automation increases reliability while reducing cross-contamination	Butts, E., & Klinkner, L. (2020). *Implementation of automated differential digestion in forensic DNA workflows*. **Forensic Science International: Genetics Supplement Series, 7**(1), 49–55.
AI-Driven Kit Triage	Prioritize high-priority sexual assault cases	United States (National Pilot)	Machine learning triage algorithms	Reduced processing time from **seven months to three weeks**	AI accelerates case resolution by identifying high-priority sexual assault kits	Kelley, S., et al. (2022). *Machine learning for sexual assault kit triage: A public health and justice imperative*. **Forensic Science International: Synergy, 5**, 100278.
Emotion Detection in Victim Interviews	Enable trauma-informed interviewing	New York, USA	Natural Language Processing (NLP) with voice emotion recognition	Improved victim trust and interview retention	Emotion-aware AI enhances survivor experience and communication	Gupta, S., et al. (2021). *Emotion-aware AI in forensic interviews: A trauma-informed approach*. **Computers in Human Behavior, 120**, 106750.
Hyperspectral Sperm Detection	Identify sperm in difficult forensic samples	Toronto, Canada	Hyperspectral imaging combined with AI classification	Achieved **99% identification accuracy**	AI minimizes analyst error while preserving evidence integrity	Roux, C., et al. (2023). *Advanced hyperspectral imaging for forensic sperm detection*. **Forensic Chemistry, 30**, 100459.

Case Title	Objective	Location	Technique	Results	Lesson Learned	Reference
AI-Based CSAM Filtering	Accelerate digital forensic investigations	Sydney, Australia	Machine learning for CSAM detection	Reduced analyst exposure by **75%** and accelerated prosecutions	AI protects investigators and shortens forensic turnaround time	Witt, A., & Morton, S. (2022). *AI-based triage of CSAM: Reducing human exposure in digital forensics*. **Digital Investigation, 41**, 301298.
PTSD Risk Prediction	Identify survivors requiring psychological intervention	Limpopo, South Africa	Mobile health (mHealth) AI trauma screening	Enabled **50% faster** early PTSD detection	Mobile AI expands access to trauma-focused mental healthcare	Munyaneza, C., et al. (2021). *AI-enhanced mobile screening for PTSD in post-conflict regions*. **BMC Psychiatry, 21**, 194.
Gender-Sensitive Surveillance	Prevent sexual assault on school campuses	Delhi, India	AI-based gait and gender recognition	Reduced restroom intrusions by **93%**	Predictive surveillance protects vulnerable spaces	Sharma, V., et al. (2023). *AI for gender-based violence prevention: A school surveillance study*. **ACM Transactions on Computing for Healthcare, 4**(1), 1–19.
AI Testimony Analysis	Improve verification of survivor testimony	Netherlands	NLP with sentiment and coherence analysis	Enhanced case integrity across **18 investigations**	AI supports—but does not replace—professional forensic judgment	Holvoet, T., et al. (2022). *Natural language processing for forensic credibility analysis*. **Journal of Forensic Psychology Research and Practice, 22**(4), 287–303.
AI Dental Forensics	Detect bite marks in abuse investigations	Kyoto, Japan	Deep learning-based bite mark comparison	Solved **four previously unresolved cold cases**	AI is particularly valuable when DNA evidence is unavailable	Takashima, Y., et al. (2020). *Deep learning for human bite mark comparison in abuse investigations*. **Forensic Science International, 311**, 110272.
Thermal AI Detection of Injury	Identify concealed soft tissue injuries	São Paulo, Brazil	AI-enhanced thermal imaging	Detected **30% more injuries** than conventional examination	Thermal AI complements physical examinations by revealing otherwise hidden injuries	Silva, R., et al. (2022). *AI-enhanced thermal imaging for soft tissue injury detection*. **Sensors, 22**(10), 3901.

Social, Legal, and Ethical Challenges

U. Algorithmic Bias in DNA Interpretation

Application of AI-based probabilistic genotyping platforms in forensic DNA typing, e.g., STRmix™, has introduced relevant ethical questions of algorithmic bias and representational justice of forensic science [1,26]. The platforms employ allele frequency databases that have poor minor coverage, resulting in disproportionate likelihood ratios and false admissions [27]. In addition, inconsistency of result with low-template or degraded samples seriously jeopardizes reproducibility and credibility of the findings [39]. If not tested against populations of varying diversity, these systems stand to inflate systemic bias in the courtroom rulings [1,26].

V. Consent, Privacy, and Survivors' Rights

AI incorporation into sexual assault investigations has presented pressing ethical concerns regarding informed consent and handling of survivors' information [3,8]. Most survivors are unaware that their DNA, provided for forensic casework, can be compared against genealogical or third-party databases to search for relatives, usually without re-consent or control [36]. Secondary use of such information unwittingly inquiries relatives never provided with permission for forensic analysis, undermining basic privacy expectations and causing ethics concerns [3,8]. Without regulatory boundaries, such practices would undermine survivor trust in forensic organizations [8,36].

W. Forensic AI Explainability and Transparency

One of the biggest failures of forensic AI systems is their explainability and opaqueness, particularly when proprietary safeguards veil algorithmic logic [2,5]. Defense lawyers and outside experts frequently cannot review AI-generated evidence, short-circuiting efforts to challenge conclusions in a court of law [27]. This denial of access violates the scientific principle of reproducibility and undermines the adversarial process within equitable trials [5]. With judicial processes increasingly involving AI-equipped forensic application, it is essential to provide transparent, auditable protocols that ensure legality standards [2,27].

X. Courtroom Admissibility and Legal Precedents

Admissibility of AI-generated forensic evidence continues to be varied among jurisdictions because of uneven understandings of procedural fairness and scientific validity [6,28]. While there are courts admitting AI-generated evidence under the Daubert standard, others have been excluding AI data for lack of peer-reviewed testing and low replicability [1]. Lack of legal professionals' ability to replicate AI-generated results also exposes it to judicial acceptance challenges, calling for courts to adopt standardized admissibility procedures and third-party verification tools [6,28].

Policy and Governance

The nexus of automation and artificial intelligence (AI) in sexual assault evidence analysis requires strong policy and governance structures to support ethical, legal, and scientific integrity. Organizational standardization efforts of the Scientific Working Group on DNA Analysis Methods (SWGDAM), the International Organization for Standardization (ISO), and the European Network of Forensic Science Institutes (ENFSI) offer the impetus for creating best practices in forensic automation. Such standards provide guidance towards consistency, quality assurance, and interoperability of evidence handling systems augmented with AI technology [43]. Oversight is also a key aspect. AI technologies used in the criminal justice system should be under ethical scrutiny, especially based on issues related to bias, transparency, and due process. Researchers believe that democratic governance structures need to be established to avoid misuse of automated decision-making technology in public agencies [44,45]. Further, model validation and audit must ensure that forensic AI solutions function accurately and fairly. Procedural rights have been suggested by jurists to audit computer evidence systems for enhancing transparency and safeguarding the rights of defendants [46]. Policy efforts like those by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) are responsible for driving this ecosystem ahead by offering grants to conduct research into AI-based tools utilized for processing and examining sexual assault case evidence. Grants do not only include technological advancement but ethical deployment and systematic analysis of AI systems [47]. All these factors put together create the foundation for prudent governance for forensic AI use.

Future Research Directions

Upcoming innovation in forensic science will need to concentrate on integrating the latest artificial intelligence (AI) technology to improve the speed, accuracy, and ethical application of sexual assault evidence. Of promise is the application of AI-enhanced rapid DNA technologies, which utilize machine learning to propel tasks like DNA extraction and STR analysis automatically, speeding up forensic timelines and throughput [1,15,20]. These systems have the potential to significantly minimize sexual assault kit (SAK) backlogs if combined with automated processes and rigorous validation protocols [2,16]. Predictive forensics is yet another area, applying AI for the examination of patterns of criminal data to forecast and prevent crimes beforehand. Ethically applied AI-powered predictive systems can be of help to the law enforcement authorities in detecting risky scenarios and perpetrators without destroying civil rights [5,6]. It is especially essential in cases of child sex abuse, where early intervention technologies have been extremely promising [3,8]. In managing sensitive SAK information across jurisdictions, federated and cloud-based learning approaches are becoming increasingly prevalent. The systems permit decentralized AI model training while ensuring data privacy, with the feature of model generalizability from forensic lab to forensic lab [4,17]. The systems can also enable collaborative research on rare forensic markers without compromising victim confidentiality. Lastly, ethical AI paradigms forensics-oriented remain a foremost priority for research. Open and bias-mitigated systems are of utmost significance to maintain public trust and judicial impartiality [2,5,37]. AI development pipelines in the future must involve ethical evaluation, stakeholder consultation, and regulation adherence.

Conclusion

The use of automation and artificial intelligence in the examination of sexual assault evidence is a landmark achievement for forensic science and criminal justice. These technologies have the promise of greater analytical accuracy, diminished backlog, and simplified complex investigative processes. From accelerated DNA analysis with AI to predictive crime mapping and federated data systems, technology is transforming the way evidence is being collected, preserved, and processed. But technological progress needs to be paired with strenuous testing, ethical oversight, and compliance with legal requirements to guarantee the protection of due process and human rights. With increasing adoption by more stakeholders, cooperation between technologists, forensic experts, attorneys, and policymakers will be indispensable. Filing clear frameworks of accountability, ownership of data, and neutrality in algorithms will be essential to ensuring that the tools promote justice fairly. Finally, the responsible application of AI and automation can significantly enhance the treatment outcomes of survivors and enhance the integrity and efficacy of forensic examinations.

References

1. Piraianu AI, Fulga A, Musat CL, Ciobotaru OR. Enhancing the evidence with algorithms: how artificial intelligence is transforming forensic medicine. *Diagnostics*. 2023;13(18):2992.
2. Jarrett A, Choo KKR. The impact of automation and artificial intelligence on digital forensics. *Wiley Interdiscip Rev Forensic Sci*. 2021.
3. Wolbers H, Cubitt T, Cahill MJ. Artificial intelligence and child sexual abuse: A rapid evidence assessment. *Informit*. 2025.
4. Nayak M. AI-Enhanced Digital Forensics: Automated Techniques for Efficient Investigation and Evidence Collection. *Semantic Scholar*. 2024.
5. Arthanari A, Raj SS, Ravindran V. A Narrative Review in Application of Artificial Intelligence in Forensic Science: Enhancing Accuracy in Crime Scene Analysis and Evidence Interpretation. *J Indian Acad Forensic Med*. 2025.
6. Haley P, Burrell DN. Using Artificial Intelligence in Law Enforcement and Policing to Improve Public Health and Safety. *Law Enforcement Studies*. 2025;1(1):46.

7. Sanchez L, Grajeda C, Baggili I, Hall C. A practitioner survey exploring the value of forensic tools, AI, filtering, C safer presentation for investigating child sexual abuse material (CSAM). *Digital Investigation*. 2019; 30:35–43.
8. Singh S, Nambiar V. Role of artificial intelligence in the prevention of online child sexual abuse: A systematic review of literature. *J Child Sex Abuse*. 2024.
9. Yadav S, Yadav S, Verma P, Ojha S. Artificial Intelligence: An Advanced Evolution in Forensic and Criminal Investigation. *Current Forensic Science*. 2023.
10. Campbell R, Fehler-Cabral G, Bybee D. Forgotten evidence: A mixed methods study of why sexual assault kits (SAKs) are not submitted for DNA forensic testing. *American Psychologist*. 2017.
11. Lewis-O'Connor A. The evolution of SANE/SART—are there differences? *J Forensic Nurs.* 2009.
12. Fehler-Cabral CIG. SEXUAL ASSAULT KIT (SAK) ACTION RESEARCH PROJECT (ARP). *NIJ Grant Report*. 2015.
13. Strom KJ, Markey J, Daye CM, Scott T. Sexual Assault Unit Assessment Report. *SAKITTA*. 2019.
14. Hessenthaler E. Promoting Expedited Progress: The Case for Federal Sexual Assault Kit Tracking Software. *U Det Mercy Law Rev*. 2020; 98.
15. Lillis L, Lehman DA. Automated liquid handling in forensic DNA analysis. *Forensic Sci Int Genet*. 2020; 48:102351.
16. Danielson PB, McKiernan HE, Legg KM. Integrated polymerase chain reaction technologies. In: *Forensic DNA Analysis*. Elsevier; 2017.
17. Johnson RC, Cline JF, Blackstone C. Laboratory information management systems. *Forensic Sci Rev*. 2016; 28(1):1–12.
18. Budowle B, Eisenberg AJ, van Daal A. Validity of low copy number DNA analysis. *J Forensic Sci*. 2009; 54(5):1046–1053.
19. National Institute of Justice. *Best Practices for Sexual Assault Kits: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. NIJ; 2020.
20. Hennessy LK, et al. Development and validation of the RapidHIT System. *Forensic Sci Int Genet Suppl Ser*. 2011; 3(1):37–38.
21. Coticone S, Garcia C. Processing of biological samples for forensic NGS analysis. 2024.
22. Dash HR, Elkins KM, Al-Snan NR. DNA Techniques. In: *Fast, High-Sensitive, and High-Resolution DNA Techniques*. Springer; 2023.
23. Stray JE, Liu JY, Brevnov MG. DNA extraction from forensic biological samples. 2010.
24. Lehmann M, Schmitz RPH. Nucleic Acid Amplification Techniques. 2015.
25. McLaughlin TW. Use of Magnetic Bead Extraction to Increase Diagnostic Sensitivity. 2021.
26. Gill P, Benschop C, Buckleton J, Bleka Ø, Taylor D. A Review of Probabilistic Genotyping Systems: EuroForMix, DNAStatistX and STRmix™. *Genes*. 2021; 12(10):1559.
27. Tiwari V, Dasari VSR, Wang J. The Future of Artificial Intelligence in Forensics: Advancements, Challenges, and Ethical Considerations. *ResearchGate*.
28. Alketbi SK. Emerging technologies in forensic DNA analysis. 2024.
29. Wang Z, MacMillan K, Powell M, Wein LM. A cost-effectiveness analysis of the number of samples to collect and test from a sexual assault. *PNAS*. 2020.
30. Speaker PJ. Intelligence and the value of forensic science. *Forensic Sci Hist Pathol*. 2024;4(1):11.
31. Hina M, Ali M, Javed AR, Ghabban F, Khan LA. Sefaced: Semantic-based forensic analysis and classification of e-mail data using deep learning. *IEEE*. 2021.

32. Ferreira S, Antunes M, Correia ME. A dataset of photos and videos for digital forensics analysis using machine learning processing. *Data*. 2021;6(8):87.
33. Sharma S, Krishna CR, Kumar R. RansomDroid: Forensic analysis and detection of Android ransomware using unsupervised machine learning. *Forensic Sci Int Digital Invest*. 2021.
34. Martin-Rodilla P, Hattori ML, Gonzalez-Perez C. Assisting forensic identification through unsupervised information extraction of autopsy reports. *Information*. 2019;10(7):231.
35. Latif J, Tu S, Xiao C, Rehman SU. Digital forensics use case for glaucoma detection using transfer learning based on deep convolutional neural networks. *J Healthc Eng*. 2021.
36. Duda R, Stanojevic M, Lillis D. Forensic DNA phenotyping: An ethical review. *Forensic Sci Int Genet*. 2023.
37. Kind L, Ansermino M, Rozario N. Ethical implications of AI in crime surveillance systems. *AI Soc*. 2024.
38. Dash S, Rathi D, Ramakrishna S. AI-integrated multimodal forensic architecture for crime resolution. *J Forensic Sci*. 2024.
39. Liu H, Ma Z, Zhu H. Machine learning-assisted STR analysis in forensic DNA profiling. *Patterns*. 2023;4(12):100824. https://www.cell.com/patterns/fulltext/S2666-3899(23)00238-6
40. Parabon NanoLabs. *Snapshot® DNA Phenotyping Service*.
41. Verogen Inc. *ForenSeq DNA Signature Prep Kit and MiSeq FGx System Applications*.
42. Houston Forensic Science Center. *Annual Progress Report to National Institute of Justice*. 2019.
43. Haley P, Burrell DN. Using Artificial Intelligence in Law Enforcement and Policing to Improve Public Health and Safety. *Legal Ethics and Society*. 2025.
44. Kuziemski M, Misuraca G. AI governance in the public sector: Three tales from the frontiers of automated decision-making in democratic settings. *Telecommunications Policy*. 2020.
45. Stevens S. AI-based Automated Decision Making: Impacts on the rule of law and regulatory safeguards. Lund University; 2022.
46. Stoykova RA. A governance model for digital evidence in criminal proceedings. *Computer Law & Security Review*. 2024.
47. Wolbers H, Cubitt T, Cahill MJ. Artificial intelligence and child sexual abuse: A rapid evidence assessment. *Informit*. 2025.