

**Near Infrared Laser
Dyes for the Detection
of Latent Fingermarks**

by

Scott Chadwick

A thesis submitted for the

Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Science)

University of Technology, Sydney

Certificate of authorship and originality

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of the requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the text.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all the information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

NAME

DATE

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I must acknowledge my family; mum, dad and Melinda have supported me throughout my life and let's face it anyone who has put up with me for 26 years deserves as much credit as they can get.

To my supervisors Dr Phil Maynard and Professor Claude Roux, your advice and guidance throughout this project has been invaluable. Phil, thank you allowing me free reign in the lab, your hand-off approach to supervision allowed me the freedom to do whatever I wanted, for this I am very grateful. Claude, despite your increasingly busy schedule you always gave me a chance to express my problems, issues, ideas and thoughts on My Kitchen Rules. The research culture you have built at this university has made studying all the more enjoyable and your titanium sponsorship of the WoodWick Forensic Centre is well deserved.

Professor Chris Lennard and Dr Xanthe Spindler, your assistance throughout the project and particularly the written component has been invaluable. Chris, I am convinced you are part robot, the speed at which you provide feedback is not humanly possible. You were the most thorough and always the first to provide feedback and I apologise for any grammar related aneurysms I may have caused you whilst reading this thesis. Xanthe, I blame you for my addiction to coffee and blueberry bagels for which, my waistline will never recover. Your help in the lab and with the thesis has always been appreciated, I apologise for any head related trauma from reading my drafts, which caused you to bang your head on your desk.

Dr Paul Kirkbride, your positive comments and kind words were always appreciated, despite being incredibly busy, I was always grateful that you would take the time to read drafts and provide feedback. Dr Linda Xiao and Dr Ronald Shimmon, thank you for giving me assistance and training with the instruments used in this project. Linda our lively discussions were always a good time and Ron by the time you read this I will have destroyed the NMR, please make the appropriate arrangements to bring back the Bruker.

Dr Alison Beavis (Diamond Sponsor of the WoodWick Forensic Centre), your catering skills are second to none. You have always ensured I was well fed and watered at centre meetings, Christmas parties and chemistry debrief sessions. I will always treasure your guacamole recipe and pass it on through the generations of my family.

Now that the important people are out of the way, it's time to recognise the people who made coming in every day for the last three years more enjoyable than a PhD should be. To the members of office 4.39, when I began my project, you were the cool office, however, within a year, we in office 4.60 reclaimed that title and you have never recovered. Particular mention must go to Verena, whose unnatural German positivity and addiction to biscuits, chocolate and cakes were a happy distraction from writing and Joyce, for someone so small it amazed me how much food you could eat, this taught me that truly anything is possible.

Natasha Stojanovska-Milososki, even though I was scared of you in undergraduate, studying together has allowed me to get over my fear and realise you are perhaps the most determined person I have ever met. Your colourful language and expressions have been a bad influence on me but I am forever grateful for introducing me to choice phrases such as 'duds', 'multi' and 'monies'.

Anna Molnar, how you have managed to stay so calm during your project I will never know, though your project is related to the detection of cannabis in saliva so maybe that has something to do with it. You have always been there for a chat and always one of the first to go for one of my crazy schemes and for this I am very appreciative. Your positive attitude would brighten even the darkest of days and always made it easier to come in to the office.

Susan Luong, my sister from another mister, through all the coffee, popcorn, chocolate breaks and not to mention early morning dance parties in the lab you have been an amazing friend. It was through our shared appreciation for McFlurries that our friendship began and I am eternally grateful to that delicious combination of soft serve and crushed oreo cookies. For if it weren't for the McFlurry I would never have known what an amazing person you are and our friendship would not have grown into what it is today. You are one of the hardest working people I have ever met and I know you will be very successful in whatever you choose to do...even if it is setting up a rival forensic centre.

To the man who drew the short straw and was stuck next to me for two and half years; Earl Michael Wood, before I met you, the only time I heard 'Iron Man' and 'marathon' in the same sentence was when the word 'movie' was between them. I truly believe that under any other circumstances we would never have become friends, and despite your lack of understanding regarding my television viewing habits or my complete aversion to the idea of cycling for 6 hours, we have managed to become very good mates. You have given more than you can

imagine and for that I am very grateful. I can only imagine what it would have been like being the only guy in the office but I can imagine it would have ended in me wearing a wig and discussing the proper way to apply fake eyelashes.

On that rather disturbing note I will close with a quote: “You are born with two things: existence and opportunity, and these are the raw materials out of which you can make a successful life”. I want to thank everyone for the opportunities they have given me and to my friends who have made my existence a very enjoyable one.

Table of contents

CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORSHIP AND ORIGINALITY.....	III
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	IV
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	VII
LIST OF FIGURES.....	XIV
LIST OF TABLES.....	XXVII
ABBREVIATIONS.....	XXIX
ABSTRACT	XXXII
CHAPTER 1: LITERATURE OVERVIEW	2
1.1 INTRODUCTION	2
1.2 FINGERPRINTS.....	3
1.2.1 <i>Formation of Papillary Ridges</i>	3
1.2.2 <i>Composition of Fingermarks</i>	5
1.3 CURRENT DETECTION OF LATENT FINGERMARKS	7
1.3.1 <i>Porous Surfaces</i>	8
1.3.2 <i>Non-porous Surfaces</i>	9
1.3.3 <i>Semi-porous Surfaces</i>	12
1.3.4 <i>Limitations of Current Techniques</i>	12
1.4 ULTRA-VIOLET DETECTION OF LATENT FINGERMARKS	13
1.5 INFRARED CHEMICAL IMAGING.....	15
1.6 OTHER NOVEL IMAGING TECHNIQUES.....	17
1.7 NEAR INFRARED DETECTION OF LATENT FINGERMARKS	19
1.7.1 <i>The Near Infrared Region</i>	19
1.7.2 <i>Near Infrared Chemical Imaging</i>	20
1.7.3 <i>Development for Porous Surfaces</i>	21
1.7.4 <i>Development for Non-porous Surfaces</i>	22

1.8	CONCLUSIONS.....	26
1.9	GENERAL RESEARCH OBJECTIVES	26
CHAPTER 2: STYRYL DYE COATED POWDERS FOR LATENT FINGERMARK DETECTION		29
2.1	INTRODUCTION	29
2.1.1	<i>Nanotechnology and Nanostructured materials</i>	<i>29</i>
2.1.2	<i>Development of Fingermarks on Non-porous Surfaces using Nanotechnology</i>	<i>29</i>
2.1.3	<i>Development of Latent Fingermarks on Porous Surfaces using Nanotechnology</i>	<i>32</i>
2.1.4	<i>Aims and Objectives</i>	<i>33</i>
2.2	MATERIALS AND METHODS	33
2.2.1	<i>General Approach.....</i>	<i>33</i>
2.2.2	<i>Materials</i>	<i>34</i>
2.2.2.1	Reagents	34
2.2.2.2	Instrumentation.....	35
2.2.3	<i>Methods</i>	<i>35</i>
2.2.3.1	Preparation of dye solutions.....	35
2.2.3.2	Preparation of dye coated nanopowders	36
2.2.3.3	Comparison of the dye coated nanopowders.....	36
2.2.3.4	Donor study	37
2.2.3.5	Comparison of techniques	38
2.2.3.6	Pseudo-operational Study	40
2.3	RESULTS.....	42
2.3.1	<i>Powder Optimisation.....</i>	<i>42</i>
2.3.2	<i>Comparison Study.....</i>	<i>52</i>
2.3.2.1	General results.....	52
2.3.2.2	Glass.....	53
2.3.2.3	Fanta® soft drink cans	55
2.3.2.4	Laminate	57

2.3.2.5	Polyethylene bags	60
2.3.3	<i>Pseudo-operational Study</i>	63
2.4	CONCLUSIONS.....	67
CHAPTER 3:	STYRYL DYE COATED POWDER SUSPENSIONS	70
3.1	INTRODUCTION	70
3.1.1	<i>Development of Latent Fingermarks on Adhesive Surfaces</i>	70
3.1.2	<i>Development of Latent Fingermarks on Wetted Surfaces</i>	71
3.1.3	<i>Aims and Objectives</i>	72
3.2	MATERIALS.....	73
3.2.1	<i>Reagents</i>	73
3.2.2	<i>Instrumentation</i>	73
3.3	METHODS – STICKY-SIDE POWDER.....	74
3.3.1	<i>General Approach</i>	74
3.3.2	<i>Optimisation of Surfactants</i>	74
3.3.3	<i>Optimisation of NIR Sticky Side Powder</i>	75
3.3.4	<i>Donor Study NIR Sticky Side Powder</i>	77
3.4	METHODS – SMALL PARTICLE REAGENT	78
3.4.1	<i>Suspension Optimisation</i>	78
3.4.2	<i>Comparison with Fluorescent SPR</i>	80
3.4.3	<i>Optimisation of Delivery Method</i>	81
3.4.4	<i>Small Particle Reagent Dual Spray</i>	81
3.5	RESULTS – STICKY-SIDE POWDER	82
3.5.1	<i>Surfactant optimisation for STaR 11 Sticky Side Powder</i>	82
3.5.2	<i>Donor Study</i>	91
3.5.2.1	Cloth tape	91
3.5.2.2	Duct tape	93
3.5.2.3	Gaffa tape	96

3.5.2.4	Masking tape	98
3.5.2.5	Packing tape.....	101
3.6	RESULTS - SMALL PARTICLE REAGENT	104
3.6.1	<i>Surfactant Optimisation for STaR 11 Small Particle Reagent</i>	104
3.6.2	<i>Further Optimisation of STaR 11 SPR for Fingermark Development</i>	106
3.6.3	<i>Comparison of STaR 11 SPR with Small Particle UV</i>	113
3.6.4	<i>STaR 11 SPR Method of Delivery</i>	114
3.6.5	<i>STaR 11 SPR Dual Spray</i>	120
3.7	CONCLUSIONS.....	121
3.7.1	<i>Conclusions for STaR 11 Sticky Side Powder</i>	121
3.7.2	<i>Conclusions for STaR 11 Small Particle Reagent</i>	122
CHAPTER 4: NEAR INFRARED DETECTION OF LATENT FINGERMARKS ON POROUS SURFACES...		125
4.1	INTRODUCTION	125
4.1.1	<i>Amino Acid Sensitive Reagents for Latent Fingermark Detection on Porous Surfaces</i>	125
4.1.2	<i>Isatin and Isatin Analogues</i>	128
4.1.3	<i>Aims and Objectives</i>	131
4.2	MATERIALS.....	131
4.2.1	<i>Reagents</i>	131
4.2.2	<i>Instrumentation</i>	132
4.3	METHODS	133
4.3.1	<i>General Approach</i>	133
4.3.2	<i>Synthesis of Styrylisatin</i>	133
4.3.2.1	Reduction of 4-nitrostilbene to 4-aminostilbene.....	134
4.3.2.2	Formation of 5-styrylisatin from 4-aminostilbene	134
4.3.3	<i>Physical and Chemical Properties of Styrylisatin</i>	135
4.3.4	<i>Reactivity with Amino Acids – Porous Surfaces</i>	135
4.4	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	137

4.4.1	<i>Synthesis of Styrylisatin</i>	137
4.4.2	<i>Physical and Chemical Properties of Styrylisatin</i>	138
4.4.3	<i>Reactivity with Amino Acids – Porous Surfaces</i>	141
4.4.4	<i>Alternative Solvents and Solvent Systems for Styrylisatin</i>	145
4.4.5	<i>Optimisation of Styrylisatin Development Solution and Conditions</i>	149
4.4.6	<i>Styrylisatin and NIR Luminescent Amino Acid Sensitive Techniques</i>	157
4.5	CONCLUSIONS.....	160
CHAPTER 5: ASSESSMENT OF POLYCYANO UV & SEQUENCING OF STAR 11 FOR CYANOACRYLATE STAINING 163		
5.1	INTRODUCTION	163
5.1.1	<i>Development of Latent Fingermarks by Cyanoacrylate</i>	163
5.1.2	<i>Cyanoacrylate Enhancement Techniques</i>	165
5.1.3	<i>Aims and Objectives</i>	166
5.2	MATERIALS.....	167
5.2.1	<i>Reagents</i>	167
5.2.2	<i>Instrumentation</i>	167
5.3	METHODS.....	168
5.3.1	<i>General Approach</i>	168
5.3.2	<i>Optimisation of Development Conditions</i>	168
5.3.3	<i>Donor and Sequencing Study</i>	169
5.3.4	<i>Comparison Technique</i>	171
5.4	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	172
5.4.1	<i>Mass of PolyCyano UV Optimisation</i>	172
5.4.2	<i>Relative Humidity Optimisation</i>	173
5.4.3	<i>Fuming Time Optimisation</i>	174
5.4.4	<i>Physical and Chemical Properties</i>	176
5.4.5	<i>Donor and Sequencing Study – White Light Examination</i>	177

5.4.6	<i>Donor and Sequencing Study – UV Examination and Rhodamine Post-Treatment</i>	180
5.4.7	<i>Donor and Sequencing Study – Sequencing with STaR 11</i>	184
5.4.8	<i>Discussion Regarding Overall Performance of PolyCyano UV</i>	188
5.5	CONCLUSIONS.....	189
CHAPTER 6: ASSESSMENT OF IMAGING SYSTEMS FOR VISUALISATION IN THE NEAR INFRARED		192
6.1	INTRODUCTION	192
6.1.1	<i>Forensic Imaging Systems</i>	192
6.1.2	<i>Aims and Objectives</i>	194
6.2	MATERIALS.....	195
6.2.1	<i>Reagents</i>	195
6.2.2	<i>Instrumentation</i>	196
6.3	METHODS.....	198
6.3.1	<i>General Approach</i>	198
6.3.2	<i>Preparation of Fingermark Samples</i>	199
6.3.3	<i>Imaging of Samples</i>	200
6.3.4	<i>Comparison of Imaging Systems</i>	202
6.4	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	204
6.4.1	<i>Image Acquisition and Set Up</i>	204
6.4.2	<i>Comparison Study</i>	206
6.4.3	<i>Comparison of Exposure Times</i>	208
6.4.4	<i>Ranking Comparison</i>	210
6.4.5	<i>Limitations of the Comparison Method</i>	212
6.5	CONCLUSION	214
CHAPTER 7: FUTURE WORK, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS		217
7.1	FUTURE WORK AND RECOMMENDATIONS	217
7.2	CONCLUSIONS.....	220
REFERENCES		223

APPENDIX I - FULL DONOR STUDY RESULTS FROM STAR 11 NANOPOWDERS	238
APPENDIX II - FULL DONOR STUDY RESULTS FOR STAR STICKY-SIDE POWDER STUDY	240
APPENDIX III - SPECTRA USED IN THE CHARACTERISATION OF STYRYLISATIN.	245
APPENDIX IV - COMPARISON STUDY RESULTS FOR POLYCYANO UV CYANOBLOOM SEQUENCING STUDY	254
APPENDIX V - IMAGING SYSTEM BANDEY SCALE COMPARISON RESULTS.	257
APPENDIX VI – IMAGING SYSTEM COMPARISON RANKING RESULTS	261
APPENDIX VII - LIST OF RELATED PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS	265

List of figures

Figure 1-1: Cross Section of Fingerprint Ridge [8].	3
Figure 1-2: Types of general fingerprint patterns adapted from Hawthorne [11].	4
Figure 1-3: Examples of fingerprint minutiae [8].	5
Figure 1-4: Cyanoacrylate ester structure and polymerisation mechanism [7].	11
Figure 1-5: The electromagnetic spectrum.	20
Figure 2-1: Preparation of fingermark samples for comparison.	37
Figure 2-2: Examples of: (left) good development, (centre) poor development, (right) no development.	39
Figure 2-3: Schematic for pseudo-operational study.	41
Figure 2-4: Styryl 13 chemical structure (benzothiazolium functional group in red).	42
Figure 2-5: Styryl 9M chemical structure (benzothiazolium functional group in red).	43
Figure 2-6: Hypothesised degradation of benzothiazolium based styryl dyes (adapted from [96]).	43
Figure 2-7: Styryl 11 chemical structure	44
Figure 2-8: Luminescence spectra for styryl 11 coated aluminium oxide nanopowder (excitation 500 nm).	44
Figure 2-9: Luminescence spectra for STaR 11 coated nanopowders (excitation 500 nm).	45
Figure 2-10: Styryl 11 luminescence intensity relative to concentration of rhodamine 6G.	46
Figure 2-11: a) - (left) STaR 11 Al ₂ O ₃ powder, (right) STaR 11 ZnO micropowder, b) - (left) STaR 11 Al ₂ O ₃ powder, (right) STaR 11 ZnO nanopowder, c) - (left) STaR 11 Al ₂ O ₃ powder (right)	

STaR 11 TiO ₂ micropowder d) - (left) STaR 11 Al ₂ O ₃ micropowder, (right) STaR 11 TiO ₂ nanopowder.....	47
Figure 2-12: Luminescence photos of powdered fingerprints visualised with a 530 nm excitation and a 700 nm barrier band pass filter a) - (left) STaR 11 Al ₂ O ₃ powder, (right) STaR 11 ZnO micropowder, b) – (left) STaR 11 Al ₂ O ₃ powder, (right) STaR 11 ZnO nanopowder, c) - (left) STaR 11 Al ₂ O ₃ powder (right) STaR 11 TiO ₂ micropowder d) - (left) STaR 11 Al ₂ O ₃ micropowder, (right) STaR 11TiO ₂ nanopowder.....	48
Figure 2-13: Comparison between STaR 11 and rhodamine 6G aluminium oxide nanopowders emission spectra.	49
Figure 2-14: Emission Spectra for different aluminium oxide powders coated with STaR 11.	50
Figure 2-15: STaR 11 magnetic powder of different ratios - a) on glass, b) on laminate, c) on Fanta® soft drink cans.....	51
Figure 2-16: Microscopic images of STaR 11 Al ₂ O ₃ magnetic powder (magnification 32x) - a) 1 : 5 STaR 11 : magnetic powder, b) 1 : 10 STaR 11 : magnetic Powder, c) 1 : 25 STaR 11 : magnetic powder.	52
Figure 2-17: Representative charged fingerprints imaged in the luminescence mode (developed with; LHS STaR 11 using excitation 530 nm and a 700 nm barrier bandpass filter, RHS BG using 450 nm excitation and a 555 nm barrier bandpass filter) from male donor on glass.....	53
Figure 2-18: Representative natural fingerprints (developed with; LHS STaR 11 using excitation 530 nm and a 700 nm barrier bandpass filter, RHS BG using 450 nm excitation and a 555 nm barrier bandpass filter) from male donor on glass.	54
Figure 2-19: Comparison study between Blitz Green® and STaR 11 for all donors on glass (average McLaren scale values indicated).	54
Figure 2-20: Classification of zero values between Blitz Green® and STaR 11 for all donors on glass.....	55

Figure 2-21: Representative charged fingermarks (developed with; LHS STaR 11 using excitation 530 nm and a 700 nm barrier bandpass filter, RHS BG using 450 nm excitation and a 555 nm barrier bandpass filter) from male donor on Fanta® soft drink cans.	56
Figure 2-22: Representative natural fingermarks (developed with; LHS STaR 11 using excitation 530 nm and a 700 nm barrier bandpass filter, RHS BG using 450 nm excitation and a 555 nm barrier bandpass filter) from male donor on Fanta® soft drink cans.	56
Figure 2-23: Comparison study between Blitz Green® and STaR 11 results for all donors on Fanta® soft drink cans (average McLaren scale values indicated).....	56
Figure 2-24: Classification of zero values between Blitz Green® and STaR 11 for all donors on Fanta® soft drink cans.....	57
Figure 2-25: Representative charged fingermarks (developed with; LHS STaR 11 using excitation 530 nm and a 700 nm barrier bandpass filter, RHS BG using 450 nm excitation and a 555 nm barrier bandpass filter) from male donor on laminate.....	58
Figure 2-26: Representative natural fingermarks (developed with; LHS STaR 11 using excitation 530 nm and a 700 nm barrier bandpass filter, RHS BG using 450 nm excitation and a 555 nm barrier bandpass filter) from male donor on laminate.....	58
Figure 2-27: Comparison study between Blitz Green® and STaR 11 results for all donors on laminate (average McLaren scale values indicated).....	59
Figure 2-28: Classification of zero values between Blitz Green® and STaR 11 for all donors on laminate.	60
Figure 2-29: Representative charged fingermarks (developed with; LHS STaR 11 using excitation 530 nm and a 700 nm barrier bandpass filter, RHS BG using 450 nm excitation and a 555 nm barrier bandpass filter) from female donor on polyethylene bags.	61
Figure 2-30: Representative natural fingermarks (developed with; LHS STaR 11 using excitation 530 nm and a 700 nm barrier bandpass filter, RHS BG using 450 nm excitation and a 555 nm barrier bandpass filter) from female donor on polyethylene bags.	61
Figure 2-31: Comparison study between Blitz Green® and STaR 11 results for all donors on polyethylene bags (average McLaren scale values indicated).....	61

Figure 2-32: Classification of zero values between Blitz Green® and STaR 11 for all donors on polyethylene bags.	62
Figure 2-33: Results from the pseudo-operational study.	64
Figure 2-34: Fingermarks from pseudo-operational study on painted metal (left) Blitz Green®, (centre) STaR 11 visible region, (right) STaR 11 NIR.	66
Figure 3-1: Tapes used in the comparison study with Wet Powder™.	76
Figure 3-2: Preparation of samples for SSP comparison study.	77
Figure 3-3: Preparation of fingermarks for comparison with Small Particle Reagent UV.	81
Figure 3-4: STaR 11 suspensions - (l-r) CTAB, synperonic N, triton X-100 and SDS).	83
Figure 3-5: STaR 11 suspensions - (left) SDS, (right) synperonic N.	83
Figure 3-6: Emission spectra of STaR 11 coated Al ₂ O ₃ nanopowder with different surfactants.	84
Figure 3-7: Emission spectra of styryl 9M coated nanopowders suspended in SDS (excitation 590 nm).	85
Figure 3-8: Emission spectra of styryl 11 coated nanopowders suspended in SDS (excitation 590 nm).	85
Figure 3-9: Emission spectra of STaR 11 coated nanopowders suspended in SDS (excitation 500 nm).	86
Figure 3-10: Fingermarks on gaffa tape developed with suspension 8 viewed in the luminescence mode (530 nm excitation, 700 nm barrier band pass filter) - (left) charged, (right) natural.	88
Figure 3-11: Development time results for STaR 11 SSP using the Bandey scale.	89
Figure 3-12: Optimisation of development time for STaR 11 SSP visualised in the luminescence mode 530 nm excitation, 700 nm barrier band pass filter (top – bottom) cloth, duct, gaffa, masking, packing.	90

Figure 3-13: Comparison study results for all donors on cloth tape (average McLaren scale values indicated).....	91
Figure 3-14: Representative charged fingerprints that were exposed to the environment (developed with LHS Wet Powder™ viewed under white light, RHS STaR 11 viewed in luminescence mode excitation 530 nm, 700 nm barrier band pass filter) from a male donor on cloth tape.....	92
Figure 3-15: Representative charged fingerprints that were stuck down (developed with LHS Wet Powder™ viewed under white light, RHS STaR 11 viewed in luminescence mode excitation 530 nm, 700 nm barrier band pass filter) from a male donor on cloth tape.....	92
Figure 3-16: Classification of zero values for all donors on cloth tape (GD = good development, PD = poor development, ND = no development).....	93
Figure 3-17: Comparison study results for all donors on duct tape(average McLaren scale values indicated).....	94
Figure 3-18: Representative charged fingerprints that were exposed to the environment (developed with LHS Wet Powder™ viewed under white light, RHS STaR 11 viewed in luminescence mode excitation 530 nm, 700 nm barrier band pass filter) from a female donor on duct tape.....	94
Figure 3-19: Representative charged fingerprints that were stuck down (developed with LHS Wet Powder™ viewed under white light, RHS STaR 11 viewed in luminescence mode excitation 530 nm, 700 nm barrier band pass filter) from a female donor on duct tape.....	95
Figure 3-20: Zero values for all donors on duct tape (GD = good development, PD = poor development, ND = no development).....	95
Figure 3-21: Comparison study results for all donors on gaffa tape (average McLaren scale values indicated).....	96
Figure 3-22: Representative natural fingerprints that were exposed to the environment (developed with LHS Wet Powder™ viewed under white light, RHS STaR 11 viewed in luminescence mode excitation 530 nm, 700 nm barrier band pass filter) from a male donor on gaffa tape.....	97

Figure 3-23: Representative natural fingermarks that were stuck down (developed with LHS Wet Powder™ viewed under white light, RHS STaR 11 viewed in luminescence mode excitation 530 nm, 700 nm barrier band pass filter) from a male donor on gaffa tape.....	97
Figure 3-24: Classification of zero values for all donors on gaffa tape (GD = good development, PD = poor development, ND = no development).....	98
Figure 3-25: Comparison study results for all donors on masking tape (average McLaren scale values indicated).....	99
Figure 3-26: Representative natural fingermarks that were exposed to the environment (developed with LHS Wet Powder™ viewed under white light, RHS STaR 11 viewed in luminescence mode excitation 530 nm, 700 nm barrier band pass filter) from a female donor on masking tape.....	99
Figure 3-27: Representative natural fingermarks that were stuck down (developed with LHS Wet Powder™ viewed under white light, RHS STaR 11 viewed in luminescence mode excitation 530 nm, 700 nm barrier band pass filter) from a female donor on masking tape.	100
Figure 3-28: Classification of zero values for all donors on masking tape (GD = good development, PD = poor development, ND = no development).....	101
Figure 3-29: Comparison study results for all donors on packing tape (average McLaren scale values indicated).....	102
Figure 3-30: Representative natural fingermarks that were stuck down (developed with LHS Wet Powder™ viewed under white light, RHS STaR 11 viewed in luminescence mode excitation 530 nm, 700 nm barrier band pass filter) from male donor on packing tape.	102
Figure 3-31: Representative natural fingermarks that were stuck down (developed with LHS Wet Powder™ viewed under white light, RHS STaR 11 viewed in luminescence mode excitation 530 nm, 700 nm barrier band pass filter) from male donor on packing tape.	103
Figure 3-32: Classification of zero values for all donors on packing tape (GD = good development, PD = poor development, ND = no development).....	103
Figure 3-33: STaR 11 SPR - SDS concentration experiment.	105

Figure 3-34: STaR 11 SPR - STaR 11 concentration luminescence emission spectra.....	106
Figure 3-35: Transmission microscope photographs of STaR 11 developed samples, a) (left) control, (right) SPR 1, b) (left) control, (right) SPR 2, c) (left) control, (right) SPR 3, d) (left) control, (right) SPR 4, e) (left) control, (right) SPR 5, f) (left) control, (right) SPR 6.	108
Figure 3-36: White light photographs of STaR 11 developed samples - a) (left) control, (right) SPR 1, b) (left) control, (right) SPR 2, c) (left) control, (right) SPR 3, d) (left) control, (right) SPR 4, e) (left) control, (right) SPR 5, f) (left) control, (right) SPR 6.....	110
Figure 3-37: Luminescence photographs of STaR 11 developed samples, using excitation 530 nm and barrier band pass filter 700 nm - a) (left) control, (right) SPR 1, b) (left) control, (right) SPR 2, c) (left) control, (right) SPR 3, d) (left) control, (right) SPR 4, e) (left) control, (right) SPR 5, f) (left) control, (right) SPR 6.	111
Figure 3-38: Luminescence photographs of STaR 11 developed samples, with excitation 530 nm and a barrier band pass filter 700 nm - a) (left) control, (right) SPR 1, b) (left) control, (right) SPR 2, c) (left) control, (right) SPR 3, d) (left) control, (right) SPR 4.	112
Figure 3-39: Transmission microscope photographs of a) charged fingerprint developed with (left) SPR UV, (right) STaR 11 SPR and b) natural fingerprint on glass developed with (left) SPR UV, (right) STaR 11 SPR.	114
Figure 3-40: Luminescence photographs using a 450 nm excitation and 555 nm barrier band pass filter for SPR UV - 530 nm excitation and a 700 nm barrier band pass filter for STaR 11 - a) charged fingerprint developed with (left) SPR UV, (right) STaR 11 SPR, b) natural fingerprint on glass developed with (left) SPR UV, (right) STaR 11 SPR.....	114
Figure 3-41: Developed charged fingerprints on glass viewed in the luminescence mode using excitation 530 nm and a 700 nm barrier band pass filter - (left) STaR 11 suspension sprayed using EcoSpray® Device (right) STaR 11 suspension sprayed using pump spray bottle.	115
Figure 3-42: Comparison of different aluminium oxide mass using the Ecospray®, viewed in the luminescence mode using - (left) STaR 11 505 nm excitation, 610 nm barrier band pass filter, (right) STaR 11 530 nm excitation 700 nm barrier band pass filter a) 2 g, b) 3 g, c) 4 g, d) 5 g.....	116

Figure 3-43: Developed fingermarks on aluminium sheeting viewed in luminescence mode using a 450 nm excitation and 555 nm barrier band pass filter for SPR UV - 530 nm excitation and a 700 nm barrier band pass filter for STaR 11 - (a) charged mark submerged in water for 24 hours, (b) natural mark submerged in water for 24 hours.	117
Figure 3-44: Developed fingermarks on glass microscope slides viewed in luminescence mode using a 450 nm excitation and 555 nm barrier band pass filter for SPR UV - 530 nm excitation and a 700 nm barrier band pass filter for STaR 11 - (a) charged mark submerged in water for 24 hours, (b) natural mark submerged in water for 24 hours.	118
Figure 3-45: Developed fingermarks on polyethylene bags viewed in luminescence mode using a 450 nm excitation and 555 nm barrier band pass filter for SPR UV - 530 nm excitation and a 700 nm barrier band pass filter for STaR 11 - (a) charged mark submerged in water for 24 hours, (b) natural mark submerged in water for 24 hours.	118
Figure 3-46: a) charged fingermarks on aluminium viewed in luminescence mode with 505 nm excitation and a 610 nm barrier band pass filter b) charged fingermarks on aluminium viewed in luminescence mode with 530 nm excitation and a 700 nm barrier band pass filter, c) charged fingermarks on glass viewed in luminescence mode with 505 nm excitation and a 610 nm barrier band pass filter d) charged fingermarks on glass viewed in luminescence mode with 530 nm excitation and a 700 nm barrier band pass filter.....	119
Figure 3-47: Developed fingermarks on glass viewed in luminescence mode using a 450 nm excitation and 555 nm barrier band pass filter for SPR UV - 530 nm excitation and a 700 nm barrier band pass filter for STaR 11 - (a) charged mark, (b) natural mark.....	121
Figure 4-1: Ninhydrin structure (in its triketone form).....	126
Figure 4-2: 1,8-Diazafluoren-9-one structure.....	127
Figure 4-3: 1,2-Indanedione structure.....	127
Figure 4-4: Reaction mechanism of ninhydrin with amino acids to form Ruhemann's purple [135].....	128
Figure 4-5: Isatin structure.....	129

Figure 4-6: Proposed reaction scheme between isatin and α -amino acids adapted from Rehn et al.[140]	129
Figure 4-7: 5-Styrylisatin structure.	130
Figure 4-8: 5-Styrylisatin synthesis route.....	133
Figure 4-9: Absorbance spectrum of styrylisatin.	140
Figure 4-10: Luminescence emission data from solid styrylisatin for different excitation wavelengths.....	140
Figure 4-11: Amino acid spot test results for 0.05 M styrylisatin in DMSO after heating at 180°C for 10 seconds.	142
Figure 4-12: Peak luminescence emission intensities for styrylisatin at different concentrations reacted with the selected amino acids (see Table 4-1 for abbreviations). ...	144
Figure 4-13: Peak luminescence emission intensities for styrylisatin at different pH reacted with the chosen amino acids (see Table 4-1 for abbreviations).	145
Figure 4-14: Luminescence emission peak intensity for amino acids treated with styrylisatin with different DMSO:MeOH ratios (See Table 4-1 for abbreviations).....	147
Figure 4-15: Styrylisatin developed amino acid spots viewed in the luminescence mode (excitation 485-590 nm, barrier longpass filter 715 nm) - a) Solution 1, b) Solution 2, c) Solution 3, d) Solution 4, e) Solution 5, f) Solution 6. (see Table 4-1 for abbreviations).	148
Figure 4-16: Amino acid spots developed with methanol-based styrylisatin solutions viewed in the luminescence mode (excitation 485-590 nm, barrier longpass filter 715 nm) - a) 6.4×10^{-3} M, b) 5.6×10^{-3} M, c) 4.8×10^{-3} M, d) 4.0×10^{-3} M e) 3.2×10^{-3} M, f) 2.4×10^{-3} M. (see Table 4-1 for abbreviations).....	150
Figure 4-17: 4.0×10^{-3} M styrylisatin in MeOH spot tests viewed in the luminescence mode (excitation 485-590 nm, barrier longpass filter 715 nm). Development temperature - a) 100 °C, b)120 °C, c) 150 °C, d)180 °C (with a 30-minute development time). NB Samples a,b,c had exposure times of 1.4 seconds, sample d had an exposure time of 600 ms.	152

Figure 4-18: Styrylisatin developed fingermarks viewed in the luminescence mode (excitation 485-590 nm with a 715 nm barrier longpass filter), (left) developed at 150 °C, (right) developed at 180 °C.....	153
Figure 4-19: 4.0×10^{-3} M styrylisatin in MeOH spot tests viewed in the luminescence mode (excitation 485-590 nm, barrier longpass filter 715 nm). pH of solution - a) 4, b) 5, c) 6.	154
Figure 4-20: Fingermarks developed with styrylisatin solution viewed in the luminescence mode (excitation 485-590 nm, barrier longpass filter 715 nm). (left) Sebaceous charged fingermark, (right) eccrine charged fingermark.....	155
Figure 4-21: Images of (l-r) styrylisatin in DMSO, styrylisatin in MeOH with water spot, styrylisatin in MeOH with 0.01 M serine spot, Styrylisatin in MeOH spot on filter paper viewed in the luminescence mode with an excitation of 485-590 nm and barrier longpass filter 715 nm.	156
Figure 4-22: Styrylisatin reactivity comparison viewed in the luminescence mode with an excitation of 485-590 nm and barrier longpass filter 715 nm (a) deionised water , (b) blank, (c) 0.0001 M serine, (d) 0.001 M serine, (e) 0.01 M serine, (f) 0.1 M serine.....	157
Figure 5-1: Proposed mechanism of cyanoacrylate polymerisation [151, 153].	164
Figure 5-2: Preparation of samples for donor and sequencing study.	170
Figure 5-3: Comparison stages for PolyCyano UV comparison and sequence study.	170
Figure 5-4: Natural fingermark on polyethylene bags developed with; (left) 0.5 g, (centre) 0.6 g, (right) 0.7 g PolyCyano UV.	173
Figure 5-5: PolyCyano UV developed natural fingermark on polyethylene bags; (left) 70% RH, (centre) 75% RH, (right) 80% RH.....	174
Figure 5-6: PolyCyano UV developed natural fingermark on polyethylene bag; (left) 15 minutes, (centre) 25 minutes, (right) 35 minutes.....	175
Figure 5-7: Thermogravimetric analysis of PolyCyano UV.....	176
Figure 5-8: Luminescence emission spectra of PolyCyano UV (excitation 365 nm).	177

Figure 5-9: Comparison results for all surfaces under white light examination (average McLaren scale values indicated).	178
Figure 5-10: Representative fingermarks viewed under white light, developed with PolyCyano UV (PC UV), and cyanobloom (CB) on, (left) aluminium, (centre) glass, (right) polyethylene bags.	178
Figure 5-11: Zero values for all surfaces under white light examination (GD = good development, PD = poor development, ND = no development).	179
Figure 5-12: Comparison values for all surfaces between PolyCyano UV and Cyanobloom post rhodamine 6G staining (average McLaren scale values indicated).	181
Figure 5-13: Representative fingermarks viewed in the luminescence mode (PolyCyano UV 365 nm excitation 400 nm longpass filter, Cyanobloom 505 nm excitation, 610 nm barrier bandpass filter) developed on (left) aluminium, (centre) glass, (right) polyethylene bags. ..	181
Figure 5-14: Zero values for all surfaces between PolyCyano UV under UV examination and Cyanobloom after rhodamine 6G staining. (GD = good development, PD = poor development, ND = no development).	182
Figure 5-15: Comparison results for all surfaces between PolyCyano UV after rhodamine 6G staining and Cyanobloom after rhodamine 6G staining (average McLaren scale values indicated).	183
Figure 5-16: Representative fingermarks stained with rhodamine 6G viewed in the luminescence mode (505 nm excitation, 610 nm barrier bandpass filter) developed on (left) aluminium, (centre) glass, (right) polyethylene bags.	183
Figure 5-17: Zero values for all surfaces for comparison between PolyCyano UV and Cyanobloom stained with rhodamine 6G (GD = good development, PD = poor development, ND = no development).	184
Figure 5-18: Comparison values for all surfaces between PolyCyano UV and Cyanobloom post staining with STaR 11 viewed in the NIR (average McLaren scale values indicated).	185

Figure 5-19: Representative fingermarks stained with STaR 11 viewed in the luminescence mode (530 nm excitation, 700 nm barrier band pass filter) developed on (left) aluminium, (centre) glass, (right) polyethylene bags.....	185
Figure 5-20: Zero values for all surfaces after Polycyano UV and Cyanobloom have been stained with STaR 11 and viewed in the NIR (GD = good development, PD = poor development, ND = no development).	186
Figure 5-21: Comparison values for all surfaces between PolyCyano UV post staining with STaR 11 viewed in the NIR and Cyanobloom post staining with rhodamine 6G (average McLaren scale values indicated).	187
Figure 5-22: Representative fingermarks PC UV stained with STaR 11, CB stained with rhodamine 6G viewed in luminescence mode (505 nm excitation, 610 nm barrier band pass filter) developed on (left) aluminium, (centre) glass, (right) polyethylene bags.....	187
Figure 5-23: Zero values for all surfaces after comparison with STaR 11 stained Polycyano UV and rhodamine 6G stained Cyanobloom (GD = good development, PD = poor development, ND = no development).....	188
Figure 6-1: The Condor chemical imaging system used in this study.....	196
Figure 6-2: VSC imaging system used in this study.....	197
Figure 6-3: Fuji IS Pro with B+W 063 filter used in this study.....	197
Figure 6-4: Rofin Poliview IV system used in this study.....	198
Figure 6-5: Preparation of samples using a depletion series.....	200
Figure 6-6: Representative images for each score.....	203
Figure 6-7: Composite image used for ranking system.	204
Figure 6-8: Imaging system comparison study results.....	207
Figure 6-9: Ranking comparison results (4 – 1 best image to worst image, 0 – no development).....	211

Figure 6-10: Representative images of: (left) poor contrast from the Poliview IV images and (right) good development from the Poliview IV image viewed in the luminescence mode for different imaging systems (clockwise from top left; VSC 6000, Condor, Fuji IS Pro and Poliview IV). 212

List of tables

Table 1-1: Major inorganic and organic components of latent fingerprints [12].....	6
Table 2-1: Dye solution formulations.	36
Table 2-2: Comparison values.....	38
Table 2-3: Supplementary scoring system for zero values	39
Table 2-4: Results from pseudo-operational study	65
Table 3-1: Surfactants used in this study.....	75
Table 3-2: Bandey scale used for comparison [116].....	76
Table 3-3: STaR 11 SPR-SDS concentration experiment.	79
Table 3-4: STaR 11 SPR- STaR 11 concentration experiments.	79
Table 3-5: STaR 11 SPR multivariate experiment parameters.....	80
Table 3-6: Al ₂ O ₃ and STaR 11 optimisation experiments.....	87
Table 3-7: Surfactant concentration experiment.	104
Table 3-8: STaR 11 SPR- STaR 11 concentrations.....	105
Table 3-9: STaR 11 multivariate experiment.	107
Table 3-10: Further STaR 11 SPR Al ₂ O ₃ mass optimisation.....	112
Table 4-1: Amino acids used for this study [12, 146].....	136
Table 4-2: Solvents used and concentrations of fingerprint reagents.	137
Table 4-3: Solubility of styrylisatin (soluble = all styrylisatin was dissolved, sparingly soluble = styrylisatin not completely dissolved, insoluble = styrylisatin remains undissolved).	139

Table 4-4: Colour changes and luminescence emission limits of detection for styrylisatin in DMSO reacted with the amino acids selected.....	143
Table 4-5: Concentrations of styrylisatin in DMSO that were tested in this study (*concentration is similar to that of indanedione and DFO working solutions, †concentration is similar to that of ninhydrin working solution).....	144
Table 4-6: Styrylisatin dilution study solutions.....	146
Table 4-7: Styrylisatin concentrations in methanolic solutions.....	149
Table 4-8: Styrylisatin development temperature experimental conditions.....	151
Table 5-1: Parameters Recommended by Foster + Freeman for PolyCyano UV.....	169
Table 5-2: Parameters used for optimisation.....	169
Table 5-3: Preparation of 200 mL solutions for cyanoacrylate stains used in this study.....	171
Table 5-4: Comparison scoring system.....	172
Table 5-5: Supplementary scoring system.....	172
Table 5-6: Optimised Parameter for PolyCyano UV.....	175
Table 6-1: Surfaces used in the imaging system comparison study.....	199
Table 6-2: Imaging conditions for each surface and imaging system.....	201
Table 6-3: Adapted Bandey scale used in the comparison study.....	202
Table 6-4: Average of exposure times for the different imaging systems.....	209

Abbreviations

^{13}C NMR	Carbon 13 spectroscopy
^1H NMR	Hydrogen-1 (proton) nuclear magnetic resonance spectroscopy
AA	Acetic acid
Ala	Alanine
ATR-FTIR	Attenuated Total Reflectance Fourier Transform Infrared
CB	Cyanobloom
CCD	Charged-coupled device
CdCl_3	Deuterated chloroform
CdS	Cadmium sulfide
CdTe	Cadmium telluride
CdTe-MMT	Cadmium telluride montmorillonite
CTAB	Cetyl trimethylammonium bromide
Δ^9 -THC	Δ^9 -Tetrahydrocannabinol
DESI-MS	Desorption electrospray ionisation-mass spectrometry
DEUS	Digital enclosed ultra-violet imaging system
DFO	1,8-Diazafluoren-9-one
DMAB	p-Dimethylaminodbenzaldehyde
DMF	Dimethyl formamide
DMSO	Dimethyl sulfoxide
DMSO-d_6	Deuterated dimethylsulfoxide
DNA	Deoxyribonucleic acid
Em	Emission
ESA	Europium-doped strontium aluminate
Ex	Excitation
FRET	Forster resonance energy transfer
FTIR	Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy

GD	Good development
Gly	Glycine
His	Histidine
IND	1,2-Indanedione
IND-Zn	1,2-Indanedione zinc
Leu	Leucine
LED	Light emitting diode
λ_{\max}	Wavelength of maximum absorbance or luminescence
LOD	Limit of detection
Lys	Lysine
MALDI-MSI	Matrix-assisted laser desorption ionization mass spectroscopy imaging
MeOH	Methanol
MAO	Monoamine oxidase
MHz	Megahertz
MMD	Multi metal deposition
mp	Melting point
ND	No development
NIN	Ninhydrin
NIR	Near-infrared
NMR	Nuclear magnetic resonance spectroscopy
OPSC	Optically pumped semi-conductor
Orn	Ornithine
PC UV	PolyCyano UV
PD	Physical developer
PD	Poor development
Phe	Phenylalanine
QD	Quantum dots
R6G	Rhodamine 6G

RAY	Rhodamine 6G, Ardrox™ and basic yellow 40 dye mixture
RH	Relative humidity
RP	Ruhemann's purple
RUVIS	Reflected ultra-violet imaging system
SDS	Sodium dodecyl sulfate
Ser	Serine
SMD	Single metal deposition
SPR	Small particle reagent
SPR UV	Small particle reagent ultra-violet
SSP	Sticky side powder
STaR 11	Styryl 11 and rhodamine 6G mixture
SWGFAST	Scientific working group on friction ridge analysis, study and technology
SWGIT	Scientific working group on imaging technology
TEC	Thenoyl europium chelate
TECTOPO	Thenoyl europium trioctylphosphine oxide
Thr	Threonine
THF	Tetrahydrofuran
TIFF	Tagged image file format
Tyr	Tyrosine
UTS	University of Technology Sydney
UV	Ultra violet
Val	Valine
VMD	Vacuum metal deposition
VSC	Video spectral comparator
Zn-RP	Zinc Ruhemann's purple complex

Abstract

The near infrared region (700 nm – 2000 nm) of the electromagnetic spectrum provides significant potential for fingerprint detection. Many ubiquitous commercial surfaces give luminescent interferences that can present a challenge for latent fingerprint enhancement. Background interference from these types of surfaces can be reduced when viewed in the near infrared region. The development of near infrared luminescent techniques for latent fingerprints would improve the possibility of imaging an exploitable fingerprint. This research aimed to develop methods for near infrared detection of latent fingerprints across a number of different surface types and assess the effectiveness of the developed techniques by comparing them to conventional detection methods.

A mixture of two dyes, styryl 11 and rhodamine 6G (STaR 11), was coated onto a range of metal oxide powders to produce a luminescent fingerprint powder. This was applied as a dry powder for fingerprints on non-porous surfaces as well as a suspension for developing fingerprints on adhesive and wetted surfaces. The dry powder was successful in developing fingerprints and gave comparable results to a commercially available luminescent fingerprint powder. The suspension for adhesive surfaces was able to develop fingerprints however when compared to the commercial method, the developed fingerprints were of significantly poor quality. The suspension for wetted surfaces, when used in conjunction with the EcoSpray® device (a pressurised sprayer which delivers the suspension in a fine mist to prevent fingerprint damage), had shown significant promise when compared to conventional luminescent SPR. Ultimately, however, the suspension was unable to develop natural fingerprints, which affected its potential for routine use.

Styrylisatin was trialled as a potential near infrared luminescent amino acid sensitive reagent for the detection of latent fingerprints on porous surfaces. Styrylisatin was successfully synthesised, however there were several issues that made it unsuitable for use as a fingerprint detection technique. Despite attempts to optimise the formulation, the sensitivity of styrylisatin to amino acids was not improved, thus it was not pursued any further.

The use of one-step luminescent cyanoacrylate (PolyCyano UV®) was also explored in this research and compared to conventional cyanoacrylate development subsequently stained with rhodamine 6G and STaR 11. PolyCyano UV® developed fingerprints were assessed for

development and visualisation under UV illumination as well as how they performed in a sequence. PolyCyano UV[®] developed fingermarks were applied successfully in sequence with rhodamine 6G and STaR 11. Sequencing allowed the developed marks to be visualised in the luminescence mode for two different visible wavelength regions as well as in the near infrared region, which was found to improve the possibility of imaging an exploitable fingermark.

A range of imaging systems are available to forensic laboratories, however, the suitability of these systems for near infrared imaging has not been explored in any published study. Four imaging systems (Condor, Fuji IS Pro, Poliview IV and VSC 6000) were compared based on their ability to image fingermarks developed with STaR 11 magnetic powder and cyanoacrylate developed fingermarks stained with STaR 11. Overall, the Poliview IV and VSC 6000 were found to give the best imaging capabilities of all the systems tested. Generally the VSC 6000 was better suited for well-developed fingermarks; however the Poliview IV produced better quality images for poorly developed fingermarks. The Fuji IS Pro was suitable as a lab based near infrared camera; however when used for field purposes it displayed a significant decrease in effectiveness.

The research has successfully developed a range of fingermark detection techniques that are luminescent in the near infrared region. These techniques can be used in conjunction with conventional techniques to improve and possibly increase the number of exploitable fingermarks.