A strawman with machine learning for a brain: A response to Biedermann (2022) the strange persistence of (source) “identification” claims in forensic literature

Letter to Editor:

Biedermann [1] is critical of research publications that treat forensic inference in source attribution as an “identification” or “individualization” task. Biedermann [1] argues that such publications condone unscientific attitudes and practices, foster unrealistic expectations among consumers of forensic science, and undermine trust in peer-reviewed publications because so-called “original research papers” are not, in fact, well grounded. With respect to these points, we agree wholeheartedly with Biedermann [1].

With respect to criticism of machine learning, however, we feel that Biedermann [1] makes a strawman argument. It defines “standard” machine learning as outputting categorical decisions and then criticizes the use of “standard” machine learning for forensic inference because it outputs categorical decisions. There are indeed research publications that misapply machine learning to forensic-inference problems, including using algorithms that output categorical decisions, e.g. [2]. But we fear that many readers will get the impression from Biedermann [1] that this is the only way (or at least the primary way) that machine learning is applied to forensic inference. There is in fact a growing body of literature on the calculation of well-calibrated likelihood ratios using machine-learning methods and relevant data, and on the validation under casework conditions of such machine-learning-based systems. Recent examples include [3–11].
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