

# Three-dimensional data of wirecut surface scans under the confocal microscope (110 character maximum, inc. spaces)

Yuhang Lin<sup>1,2,\*</sup>, Heike Hofmann<sup>2,3</sup>, and Curtis Mosher, Alicia Carriquiry, Eden Amin, Jeff Salyards<sup>1,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Iowa State University, Department of Statistics, Ames,

<sup>2</sup>Center for Statistics and Applications in Forensic Evidence (CSAFE), Iowa State University, Ames,

<sup>3</sup>University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Department of Statistics, Lincoln,

\*corresponding author(s): Yuhang Lin (yhlin@iastate.edu)

## ABSTRACT

Update later: max of 170 words: describe the study, the assay(s) performed, resulting data, and reuse potential

Wire cut data is important in forensic investigations but lacks a systematic way of analyzing the data. We created a data set of 120 scans of aluminum wire cut in  $\times 3\mu$  format, using 5 wire cutters and 3 locations along the 4 blades, with 2 replicates for each combination. A systematic pipeline with multiple analysis plots was developed to analyze the data and draw conclusions based on numerical measures.

(maximum 170 words) This is a manuscript template for Data Descriptor submissions to *Scientific Data* (<http://www.nature.com/scientificdata>). The abstract must be no longer than 170 words, and should succinctly describe the study, the assay(s) performed, the resulting data, and the reuse potential, but should not make any claims regarding new scientific findings. No references are allowed in this section.

## 1 Background & Summary

Wire cut data is a type of forensic tool mark data used to identify the source of a wire cutter based on the striations left on the surface. There have been cases where the evidence and testimony on wire cut evidence played a crucial role in the criminal investigation and conviction of a defendant.

However, there is a lack of a standardized method to analyze it except for visual comparison. Although the Association of Firearm and Toolmark Examiners (AFTE) developed the Theory of Identification [incorrect citation format<sup>1</sup>](#), which outlines the process of comparing tool marks, it is still subjective and relies on the examiner's experience, making results hard to reproduce and validate. Several reports, such as those from the National Research Council<sup>2</sup> and the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology<sup>3</sup>, pointed out the abovementioned issues and called for more objective and reproducible methods to analyze tool marks. Early research by<sup>4</sup> and<sup>5</sup> has focused on collecting and distributing datasets for this purpose and providing a foundation for future advancements in tool mark analysis. Studies such as those by [\(author?\)<sup>6</sup>](#) and [\(author?\)<sup>7</sup>](#) have demonstrated the efficacy of using numerical methods to improve accuracy and consistency in tool mark analysis. [\(author?\)<sup>8</sup>](#) and [\(author?\)<sup>9</sup>](#) have explored methods for quantifying the similarity between representative signals, but alignment remains a major hurdle.

In this study, we would like to follow the same path and provide a data set of wire cut scans, and also discuss a systematic pipeline to analyze the data and draw conclusions based on numerical measures. Here, we provide a data set containing multiple files, as described in Table 1.

[breakable table, cannot cross-reference inside table](#)

For the reproducibility of all our data and alignment results, we introduce in detail in [Cutting wires \(cross-reference not working without section number, number-sections: false not working\)](#) how we cut the wire and collect the 120 scans with 5 tools on 3 locations, in [Extract profiles](#) how we extract profiles from the scans, in [Filtered signals](#) how we filter signals from the profiles, in [Align signals](#) how we align signals from different scans and optimize the alignment with the cross-correlation function (CCF) values. In [Data Records](#), we discuss where our data is held. Then, in [Technical Validation](#), a technical validation was conducted to further compare signals from different sources also match our assumption, together with visual aids for drawing conclusions. Finally, in [Usage Notes](#), we provide available codes for creating the data set and conducting technical validation, as discussed in [Methods](#) and [Technical Validation](#). [Code availability](#) discusses where these codes can be

**Table 1.** Structure of available data and files.

	Description	Section
<b>Raw data</b>		
x3p-files	folder containing 120 topographic 3d scans of aluminum wire cuts in x3p format	<a href="#">Cutting wires</a>
meta.csv	meta information for each cut with tool, blade, and location information (csv format)	<a href="#">Cutting wires</a>
<b>Manual derivatives</b>		
profiles	folder of files with manually extracted profiles (csv format)	<a href="#">Extract profiles</a>
<b>Computational derivatives</b>		
signals	folder of signals, processed from corresponding profile (csv format)	<a href="#">Filtered signals</a>
CCF values	CCF values of all pairwise aligned signals in 1 CSV	<a href="#">Align signals</a>
<b>Image files</b>		
aligned-signals	pictures of pairwise aligned signals from same sources in PNGs	<a href="#">Align signals</a>

38 found online. We hope this pipeline developed using this data set can be further generalized and applied to real crime scenes  
39 to help investigators draw conclusions based on real wire cut data.

## 40 **2 Methods**

41 In this study, aluminum wire was used to create an optimal scenario where the most amount of information could be transferred  
42 from the tool to the substrate, despite the wire in some real cases being made of lead. The physical property of aluminium  
43 wire make it an excellent candidate for keeping marks while being relatively easy to bend and non-toxic.

### 44 **2.1 Cutting wires**

45 The aluminum wire used was 16 Gauge/1.5 mm, anodized. In order to cut the wire, 4-inch pieces were unspooled and cut  
46 using Kaiweets wire cutters, model KWS-105, as shown in Figure 1(a), for 1 blade location, either inner, middle, or outer,  
47 which gives us 1 replicate. Each piece was then cut into half to create 2-inch pieces for each side, AB and CD, with a sharpie  
48 line marking the cut ends, giving us 4 samples. Here, we are showing AB sides only in Figure 1(b) (remove the tent figure),  
49 and the CD sides are similar from the other side of the cut, with the back of A being C and the back of B being D. Both AB and  
50 CD sides form tent structures on the tips of the wire, and we can separate each side of the tent into 2 pieces along the bending  
51 position, resulting in 8 scans. We repeated this process for all 3 locations along the blade and 5 wire cutters, with 2 replicates  
52 for each tool-edge-location combination, resulting in 120 scans. Each piece was labeled with the naming conventions, T(ool)  
53 1/2/3/4/5 (Edge) A/B/C/D W(ire) - L(ocation) I(nner)/M(iddle)/O(uter) - R(epetition) 1/2, with T1AW-LI-R1 being the piece  
54 cut by tool 1 on the A edge at the inner location for the first repetition. Then, we can use the standard scanning protocols for  
55 the confocal microscope, shown in Figure 1(c) (need an extra pic of the very tip), to scan the wire tip surfaces. The scanned  
56 surfaces are saved in a resolution of  $0.645\mu\text{m} \times 0.645\mu\text{m}$  per square pixel in an x3p file format.

57 XXX figure 1 - generally, zoom into these images - we do not want to have a hand in the image, nor a view of the  
58 crafting aluminum :) - what are the exact rules on visuals in Scientific Data ? XXX hard to put the full requirements here, see  
59 <https://www.nature.com/sdata/publish/submission-guidelines#figures>

60 put into quarto layout with (a) (b) (c) on the top left, no tent, add blade C & D (Do later after decide on using qmd or  
61 Overleaf)

### 62 **2.2 Extract profiles**

63 Numerical comparisons between 2 replicates cannot be done directly on the x3p files. We need to extract representative  
64 functions from the scans first. A representative function with the most information is considered as a signal for one scan,  
65 which can be used for comparison later. To obtain this function, we first need a profile of the scan, which is a sequence of  
66 values along a user-drawn line on the surface. The profile should capture most features of the scan, and be orthogonal to the  
67 striation marks of the scan, which are formed by ups and downs of grooves. So, we draw the line across the wide region of  
68 the scan to maximize the feature captured, as shown in dark blue in Figure 2(a). We can then investigate the values under this  
69 profile line. The profile function is along the line is plotted in Figure 2(b).

### 70 **2.3 Filtered signals**



71 With the profile extracted, we can then obtain the signal. Two Gaussian filters are applied to these resulting profiles. In  
72 particular, we first used a large low-pass filter with bandwidths of 400 microns to remove large trend, as it can overwhelm the  
73 signals, and then used a small high-pass filter of 40 microns to average across noise and remove spikes, as shown in Figure  
74 2(c).<sup>10</sup> (add reference: W. S. Cleveland, E. Grosse and W. M. Shyu (1992) Local regression models. Chapter 8 of Statistical  
75 Models in S eds J.M. Chambers and T.J. Hastie, Wadsworth & Brooks/Cole.). Finally, the extreme tail values are removed.

### 76 **2.4 Align signals**

77 Signals extracted from different scans can be put together for comparison, and we maximize the cross-correlation function  
78 (CCF) values between the signals to numerically find the best alignment. For example, we compare T1AW-LI-R1 to T1AW-  
79 LI-R2, T1CW-LI-R1 to T1CW-LI-R2, and so on. That is comparing each row in Figure 3. We know that signals from two  
80 replicates with the same tool-edge-location combination should yield similar signals as in the first and second column of  
81 Figure 4, which will give alignments of massive overlapping and high CCF values close to 1. The alignments and values we  
82 got in the rightmost column of Figure 4 fulfill our expectations.

## 83 **3 Data Records**

84 The complete data set is available on the ISU DataShare repository at <https://iastate.figshare.com/>, which is public and open  
85 access for every interested researcher. The data set consists of 120 scans in the x3p file format with the naming convention  
86 as described before. (Explain the x3p header info?)



**Figure 1.** (a) A Kaiweets wire cutter of model KWS-105 was used to cut the wire. (b) A tent structure created by blade AB. After separating 2 tent structures by the connecting position, we obtained 2 samples - 1 sample from blade A and B. (c) A confocal microscope was used to scan the wire surfaces.

## 87 4 Technical Validation

88 a picture of alignment with ccf from different sources to show if different source, our evaluation returns small ccf, which  
89 matches what we thought.

90 For the data collection process, two team members did the cutting and labeling together, then one person did the scanning  
91 and named according to the naming convention above. The scanning was done in a specific order to ensure consistency across  
92 all scans. The data was saved in a consistent format to ensure they could be easily accessed and analyzed. A third person then  
93 checked the data to ensure that the data was consistent in naming and accurate.

94 again - the website is not the right place for the validation - instead, move parts from the website here.

95 For the validation of the scans and their processing we investigate the correlation scores of pair-wise aligned signals. For  
96 signals from scans of wires cut with a different tool, we would expect a low correlation score. Large scores between signals  
97 are indicative of being made by the same tool. Show boxplots and roc curve.

98 For validation of all other tools and locations of scan replicates, see the detailed [report](#).


## 99 5 Usage Notes

100 The R package `x3ptools` (available from CRAN) supports working with files in x3p format.

101 Sample scripts in R for processing scans from x3p format to their signal are available from ... [github](#).

102 Further analysis can be conducted with the GitHub R package `wire` and the GitHub R shiny app `wireShiny` ([citation?](#)). We already conduct between-replicate comparisons in the technical validation section, and we can also conduct  
103 across-replicate comparisons to establish error rates threshold and produce other analysis plots.

104 Suppose we put the CCF values in a tilemap with different tool, location and edge combinations. In that case, we expect



**Figure 2.** (a) A profile line in dark blue was drawn across the striations of the scan. (b) The profile function extracted along the profile line in (a). (c) The raw signal in light blue is obtained by using the low-pass filter on the profile function in (b) and the filtered signal is obtained by using the high-pass filter on the raw signal.

106 only the diagonal to have high CCF values, close to 1 and marked as orange in the tilemap, as the diagonal represents the same  
 107 source, and the rest of the matrix to have low CCF values, close to 0 and marked as gray. In Figure 5, the behavior is consistent  
 108 with our expectation overall, except for some rare cases with tool 5 edge D, which is caused by ????? We also put the resulting  
 109 CCFs in the boxplot, as in Figure 6. We can see that the CCF values for the same sources are close to 1, while the CCF values  
 110 for different sources are much lower than expected. This difference can be used to establish a threshold for CCF and help us  
 111 draw conclusions about the similarity between wire cut scans numerically, which can be used in real crime scenes. The density  
 112 plot in Figure 7 shows the distribution of the CCF values with the same sources and different sources. The overlapping points  
 113 between the tails of these two distributions can be a rough threshold. Furthermore, the receiver operating characteristic (ROC)  
 114 curve in Figure 8 shows the sensitivity / true positive rate against the false positive rate (FPR) (1 - specificity). The curve is  
 115 very close to the upper left corner, which is excellent for classification and drawing conclusion. It gives us a true threshold of  
 116 0.589 to control the FPR to be less than 0.05 with false negative rate (FNR) to be 0, (false positive rate (FPR) / false discovery  
 117 rate (FDR) -> define the H0 or call it false identification rate (FIR)???, and 0.658 to control the FPR to be less than 0.01, with  
 118 FNR to be 0.02.

## 119 6 Code availability

120 [table of code-manual?](#)

121 no, we can't use the website as a place for more detailed procedures. This paper is the detailed procedure.no more  
 122 README, scanning procedures in another HTML

123 We put together the cutting and the standard scanning procedures mentioned in Section 2.1 cross-ref not working with  
 124 more pictures for each step into a [README of the GitHub repository heike/Wirecuts](#) (High-res pics needed in the  
 125 README).

126 The data set can be easily accessed with the CRAN R package `x3ptools`. Further analysis can be conducted with the  
 127 GitHub R package `wire` and the GitHub R shiny app `wireShiny` ([citation](#)).

## 128 References

- 129 1. AFTE. The association of firearm and tool mark examiners: Theory of identification as it relates to toolmarks. *AFTE J.* **30**, 86–88 (1998).
- 130 2. NRC. *National Research Council: Strengthening Forensic Science in the United States: A Path Forward* (National Academies Press, 2009).
- 131 3. President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology. *President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology: Forensic Science in Criminal Courts: Ensuring Scientific Validity of Feature-Comparison Methods* (Executive Office of the President of the United States, President's Council, Washington, D.C., 2016).

- 136 4. Ma, L. *et al.* NIST Bullet Signature Measurement System for RM (Reference Material) 8240 Standard Bullets. *J. Forensic*  
137 *Sci.* **49**, 1–11, [10.1520/JFS2003384](https://doi.org/10.1520/JFS2003384) (2004).
- 138 5. Zheng, X. A., Soons, J. A. & Thompson, R. M. NIST Ballistics Toolmark Research Database | NIST (2016).
- 139 6. Chu, W., Thompson, R. M., Song, J. & Vorburger, T. V. Automatic identification of bullet signatures based on consecutive  
140 matching striae (CMS) criteria. *Forensic Sci. Int.* **231**, 137–141, [10/gn65cz](https://doi.org/10/gn65cz) (2013).
- 141 7. Vorburger, T. *et al.* Applications of cross-correlation functions. *Wear* **271**, 529–533, [10.1016/j.wear.2010.03.030](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wear.2010.03.030) (2011).
- 142 8. Hare, E., Hofmann, H., Carriquiry, A. *et al.* Automatic matching of bullet land impressions. *The Annals Appl. Stat.* **11**,  
143 2332–2356, [10.1214/17-AOAS1080](https://doi.org/10.1214/17-AOAS1080) (2017).
- 144 9. Ju, W. & Hofmann, H. The R Journal: An Open-Source Implementation of the CMPS Algorithm for Assessing Similarity  
145 of Bullets. *The R J.* **14**, 267–285, [10.32614/RJ-2022-035](https://doi.org/10.32614/RJ-2022-035) (2022).
- 146 10. Cleveland, W. S., Grosse, E. & Shyu, W. M. Local Regression Models. In *Statistical Models in S* (Routledge, 1992).

## 147 Acknowledgements

148 This work was partially funded by the Center for Statistics and Applications in Forensic Evidence (CSAFE) through Cooperative  
149 Agreement 70NANB20H019 between NIST and Iowa State University, which includes activities carried out at Carnegie  
150 Mellon University, Duke University, University of California Irvine, University of Virginia, West Virginia University, University  
151 of Pennsylvania, Swarthmore College and the University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

## 152 Author contributions statement

153 Let's follow the Elsevier definitions: <https://www.elsevier.com/researcher/author/policies-and-guidelines/credit-author-statement>  
154 Y.L.: Methodology, Software, Validation, Data Curation, Writing - Draft; H.H.: Conceptualization, Methodology, Validation,  
155 Writing - Review & Editing; C.M.: Lab supervision; E.A.: Physical Specimen, Scanning; J.S: Forensic advice; A.C.: Funding  
156 acquisition.  
157 All authors reviewed the manuscript.

## 158 Competing interests


159 (mandatory statement)

160 H.H. is a technical advisor to AFTE (Association of Firearms and Toolmarks Examiners), fellow of the ASA (American  
161 Statistical Association), and committee member of the ASA Forensic Science Committee. H.H. has testified as court witness  
162 on behalf of judge April Neubauer, NY State Supreme Court Criminal Term in New York City.

Edge A



Edge C




Edge B




Edge D




**Figure 3.** Scans from different sides of tool 1 at the inner location.




**Figure 4.** The first and second columns show the signals extracted from Figure 3, and the third column shows the alignments and CCF values between pairs of signals.




**Figure 5.** The tilemap shows signals from the same source have CCFs close to 1.



**Figure 6.** The boxplot shows that signals from the same sources have higher CCFs than those from different sources.



**Figure 7.** The density plot shows tails of distributions overlap, which can be used as a rough threshold for drawing conclusions.



**Figure 8.** The ROC curve is bending very close to the upper left corner, which means excellent in classification and drawing conclusions.