

Consistency of Familial DNA Search Results in Southeast Asian Populations

Monchai Kooakachai^{1,*}, Tiwakorn Chapalee¹, Chairat Thitiyan¹, Patsaya Jumnongwut¹

¹Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Faculty of Science, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, 10330 Thailand

ARTICLE HISTORY

Compiled December 8, 2025

ABSTRACT

DNA databases are widely used in forensic science to identify unknown offenders. When no exact match is found, familial DNA searches can help by identifying first-degree relatives using likelihood ratios. If multiple subpopulations are relevant, likelihood ratios can be computed separately based on allele frequency estimates. Various strategies exist to combine these ratios, such as averaging allele frequencies or taking the average, maximum, or minimum likelihood ratio. While some comparisons have been made in populations like those in the U.S., their effectiveness in other regions remains unclear. This study evaluates likelihood ratio-based strategies in Southeast Asian populations, specifically Thailand, Malaysia, and Singapore. Our findings align with previous research, showing that statistical power varies across strategies. Among Thai subpopulations, the minimum likelihood ratio strategy is preferred, as it maintains high power while minimizing differences between subpopulations.

KEYWORDS

likelihood ratio; power comparison; familial DNA search.

1. Introduction

In forensic investigation, it is very common to inquire whether a DNA sample from a crime scene matches any person in the forensic database. The problem is straightforward when an exact match is found. However, if the sample from the crime scene does not perfectly match any individual in the database but reveals some similarities, it could indicate that they are generated from two persons who are genetically related. This scenario leads to a familial DNA search, which is an approach that uses statistical tools to infer a familial relationship when a pair of DNA samples is provided. There were several attempts in developing searching strategies in many literatures, ranging from basics such as utilizing the number of alleles shared to advanced tools such as probabilistic strategies [1–5]. Familial DNA searches have gained popularity, as reported in [6], which noted that by 2014, at least 40 laboratories in the United States had used this technique to support their investigations, with approximately 75% of laboratories not yet using it considering future implementation.

In this context, we focus on formulating a hypothesis test to assess the relationship between two individuals or DNA profiles using a purely frequentist approach. A DNA

profile consists of an individual’s genotype across a specified set of loci. Each person’s genotype is represented as a set of short tandem repeats (STRs), with the number of loci varying depending on the region where the analysis is conducted. Notably, the probability of two unrelated individuals having identical DNA profiles is extremely low. For instance, in a randomly mating population, the likelihood of two unrelated Caucasian Americans sharing the same 13-loci DNA profile is approximately 1 in 575 trillion [7].

In the analysis of familial DNA searches, the common approach, known as the likelihood ratio statistic, evaluates the ratio of the probability of encountering a pair of DNA profiles under two different relationship scenarios. One scenario represents an unrelated relationship between two persons, while another accounts for the relatedness of interest, such as a parent-child relationship. Mathematically, the likelihood ratio can be written as:

$$\frac{P(\text{seeing two given DNA profiles} \mid \text{they are parent-child})}{P(\text{seeing two given DNA profiles} \mid \text{they are unrelated})}$$

A higher probability provides stronger evidence that the two DNA profiles are likely to belong to a parent and child. The use of the likelihood ratio statistic in kinship testing has grown steadily over the years. For example, a study on the New Zealand database [8] revealed that the likelihood ratio approach for parent-child and full-sibling tests outperformed the traditional counting of matching alleles approach. Although the likelihood ratio statistic is simple and easy to interpret, it also has some limitations. One major drawback is the assumption that every individual in the population shares the same genetic background, meaning their genetic information is drawn from a single set of allele frequency distributions. However, this assumption is often inaccurate in forensic applications, where it is more realistic to account for genetic substructures within populations. Population substructure, such as racial groups or ancestry contributions, should not be ignored when calculating the likelihood ratio, as Tian et al. [9] noted that incorporating allele frequency differences between ethnic groups can lead to distinct results in genetic studies.

One approach to incorporating population substructure, developed by the Denver Crime Lab in 2008 and inspired by [10], involves repeatedly computing likelihood ratios using allele frequency distributions from relevant local populations. The final test statistic is determined by selecting the maximum of these computed likelihood ratios. In contrast, an alternative method suggests using the minimum likelihood ratio instead. Ge and Budowle [11] demonstrated that the minimum likelihood ratio strategy is preferable to the maximum likelihood ratio strategy, as it tends to be closer to the true likelihood ratio. However, no evidence has yet confirmed its superiority in terms of statistical power for hypothesis testing. A 2019 study [12] examined likelihood ratio-based statistics for parent-child and full-sibling tests within the Colorado prison population, exploring various ways to combine likelihood ratios while accounting for population substructure. Their findings indicated that averaging local allele frequencies resulted in the highest statistical power while maintaining an acceptable false positive rate. Nevertheless, the consistency of these methods remains uncertain, as prior research has primarily focused on American populations and did not compare them with the minimum likelihood ratio approach. Investigating whether these findings hold true for Asian populations is essential, given the significant genetic differences between Asian and North American or Hispanic populations.

In this study, we evaluate the effectiveness of existing test statistics for hypothesis

testing in parent-child and full-sibling cases, along with a newly proposed statistic, in terms of Type I error and power. The article is structured as follows: Section 2 provides a detailed explanation of the problem, describes the algorithm used for the simulation study, and outlines the case study. Section 3 presents the findings from the numerical analysis, emphasizing power comparisons and biases related to subpopulations. Finally, Section 4 concludes with a discussion of the implications of our findings.

2. Methods

Suppose a population is made up of K subpopulations, each corresponding to a subgroup with a unique ethnic background, causing variations in allele frequency distributions. We denote the allele frequency distribution in subpopulation k by f_k where $k = 1, \dots, K$. Also, let p_1, \dots, p_K be the proportions of individuals in each subpopulation, such that the sum of these proportions must equal to one.

Let X_1 be a DNA profile from an unknown individual observed on m loci and f_{X_1} be the allele frequency distribution corresponding to the subpopulation such an individual belongs to. Note that the parameter f_{X_1} is generally unknown because it represents subpopulation information of the obtained forensic sample – we never know who left the sample in crime scene. Additionally, we define X_2 and f_{X_2} for the second unknown individual in the same fashion. Table 1 shows an example of two DNA profiles X_1 and X_2 , across five independent loci: D3S1358, D7S820, D8S1179, D13S317, and D22S1045. It can be observed that X_1 and X_2 share at least one allele (identical by state) at each locus considered. This raises the question of performing a statistical hypothesis test to determine whether X_1 and X_2 have a parent-child relationship, as a father and son always share one identical by descent allele at each locus.

Table 1. Example DNA profiles of two individuals, X_1 and X_2

	Locus				
	D3S1358	D7S820	D8S1179	D13S317	D22S1045
X_1	(13,14)	(11,12)	(17,18)	(13,13)	(9,10)
X_2	(13,14)	(12,14)	(18,18)	(12,13)	(9,11)

The primary goal is to develop and compare various test statistics for evaluating the following hypotheses: H_0 , where X_1 and X_2 are unrelated individuals, versus H_1 , where X_1 and X_2 share a specific genetic relationship.

In the alternative hypothesis, it is necessary to clarify the genetic relationship between two individuals, making it a case of simple versus simple hypotheses. The parameter here is the genealogical relatedness between two individuals, θ which can be measured by using the concept of identical by descent (IBD) alleles. In other words, any genetic relatedness between two persons can be derived as $\theta = (z_0, z_1, z_2)$ where z_0 is the probability that none of the four alleles from two individuals are IBD, z_1 is the probability that exactly one of the alleles of the first individual is IBD to one of the alleles of the second individual, and z_2 be the probability that both alleles of the first individual are IBD to those of the second person. For example, for a parent-child test, the hypothesis testing is $H_0 : \theta = (1, 0, 0)$ versus $H_1 : \theta = (0, 1, 0)$.

Given two DNA profiles X_1, X_2 and corresponding allele frequency distributions f_{X_1}, f_{X_2} the likelihood ratio test statistic for testing $H_0 : \theta = \theta_0$ versus $H_1 : \theta = \theta_1$ is

defined by

$$\Lambda = \frac{L(\theta_1 | X_1, X_2, f_{X_1}, f_{X_2})}{L(\theta_0 | X_1, X_2, f_{X_1}, f_{X_2})} \quad (1)$$

where L represents the likelihood function for a relationship. When a population is homogeneous, the likelihood function L is easily calculated because parameters f_{X_1} and f_{X_2} can be determined without any uncertainty.

Table 2 displays seven possible genotype combinations for two individuals, along with their corresponding probabilities and allele-sharing patterns for unrelated individuals, parent-child pairs, and full siblings. The formulas in each column of Table 2 differ based on the value of θ . This table is essential for computing the numerator and denominator in equation (1). For instance, if the allele frequencies for alleles 13 and 14 at the D3S1358 locus are 0.15 and 0.20, respectively, the probability of observing the genotypes (13,14) and (13,14) under the parent-child relationship would be $(0.15)(0.20)(0.15 + 0.20) = 0.0105$. In contrast, assuming unrelated individuals, the probability of observing the same genotypes would be $4(0.15)^2(0.20)^2 = 0.0036$. This results in a likelihood ratio at the D3S1358 locus of $0.0105/0.0036 \approx 2.9167$. Such probabilities can be calculated separately for each locus and then combined by multiplication, assuming the loci are independent.

Table 2. Probabilities of the 7 possible combinations of genotypes for multi-allelic loci in pairs of individuals, conditional on their relationship, as functions of allele frequencies. p_i represents the allele frequency of allele i .

Genotype	Unrelated $\theta = (1, 0, 0)$	Parent-Child $\theta = (0, 1, 0)$	Full Siblings $\theta = (1/4, 1/2, 1/4)$
AA,AA	p_A^4	p_A^3	$p_A^2(1 + p_A)^2/4$
AA,AB	$4p_A^3p_B$	$2p_A^2p_B$	$p_A^2p_B(1 + p_A)$
AA,BB	$2p_A^2p_B^2$	0	$p_A^2p_B^2/2$
AB,AB	$4p_A^2p_B^2$	$p_{APB}(p_A + p_B)$	$p_{APB}(2p_{APB} + p_A + p_B + 1)/2$
AA,BC	$4p_A^2p_Bp_C$	0	$p_A^2p_Bp_C$
AB,AC	$8p_A^2p_Bp_C$	$2p_{APB}p_C$	$p_{APB}p_C(2p_A + 1)$
AB,CD	$8p_{APB}p_Cp_D$	0	$2p_{APB}p_Cp_D$

In the presence of population substructure, where multiple subpopulations exist, it is essential to determine the allele frequency distributions, denoted as f_{X_1} and f_{X_2} . For instance, the probability of observing allele 13 at the D3S1358 locus may differ between populations—it could be 0.15 in one subpopulation and 0.18 in another. This variation creates ambiguity in selecting the appropriate value for calculations. The parameters f_{X_1} and f_{X_2} are called nuisance parameters as they are parameters that are not of direct interest but need to be accounted for in the analysis to avoid bias or errors in the estimation of the parameters of primary interest.

There are several existing methods for handling multiple sets of available allele frequencies. First, we can average all allele frequencies before incorporating them into the likelihood function calculation. Specifically, we define

$$f_{local} = p_1f_1 + p_2f_2 + \cdots + p_Kf_K$$

and use f_{local} within the likelihood ratio framework. Mathematically, this can be ex-

pressed as follows:

$$\Lambda_{LAF} = \frac{L(\theta_1 | X_1, X_2, f_{local})}{L(\theta_0 | X_1, X_2, f_{local})}.$$

In this approach, both f_{X_1} and f_{X_2} are set equal to the local allele frequency f_{local} . This method, introduced in [12], is referred to as LRLAF. Beyond averaging allele frequencies, alternative algebraic methods can be applied at the likelihood ratio level. Instead of averaging allele frequencies first, we can compute the likelihood ratio separately for each subpopulation and then explore different ways of combining them. One such approach involves using the population proportions as weights for each likelihood ratio, leading to the following statistic:

$$\Lambda_{AVG} = p_1 \frac{L(\theta_1 | X_1, X_2, f_1)}{L(\theta_0 | X_1, X_2, f_1)} + p_2 \frac{L(\theta_1 | X_1, X_2, f_2)}{L(\theta_0 | X_1, X_2, f_2)} + \dots + p_K \frac{L(\theta_1 | X_1, X_2, f_K)}{L(\theta_0 | X_1, X_2, f_K)}$$

We denote this statistic Λ_{AVG} as LRAVG. Additionally, instead of averaging, we can take either the maximum or minimum likelihood ratio across all available subpopulations, resulting in the following statistics (referred as LRMAX and LRMIN, respectively):

$$\Lambda_{MAX} = \max \left\{ \frac{L(\theta_1 | X_1, X_2, f_1)}{L(\theta_0 | X_1, X_2, f_1)}, \frac{L(\theta_1 | X_1, X_2, f_2)}{L(\theta_0 | X_1, X_2, f_2)}, \dots, \frac{L(\theta_1 | X_1, X_2, f_K)}{L(\theta_0 | X_1, X_2, f_K)} \right\}$$

$$\Lambda_{MIN} = \min \left\{ \frac{L(\theta_1 | X_1, X_2, f_1)}{L(\theta_0 | X_1, X_2, f_1)}, \frac{L(\theta_1 | X_1, X_2, f_2)}{L(\theta_0 | X_1, X_2, f_2)}, \dots, \frac{L(\theta_1 | X_1, X_2, f_K)}{L(\theta_0 | X_1, X_2, f_K)} \right\}$$

In [11], the authors demonstrated that taking the minimum likelihood ratio is a preferable approach to the maximum, as simulations indicated that it provides a logarithm of the likelihood distribution closest to the true values. Our goal is to validate this finding in terms of statistical power. Additionally, we introduce a new alternative approach for comparison. Instead of computing the maximum or minimum likelihood ratio directly, we can calculate the maximum or minimum likelihood functions separately under the null and alternative hypotheses and then combining them as a ratio later. These methods are defined as follows:

$$\Lambda_{RMAX} = \frac{\max \{L(\theta_1 | X_1, X_2, f_1), L(\theta_1 | X_1, X_2, f_2), \dots, L(\theta_1 | X_1, X_2, f_K)\}}{\max \{L(\theta_0 | X_1, X_2, f_1), L(\theta_0 | X_1, X_2, f_2), \dots, L(\theta_0 | X_1, X_2, f_K)\}}$$

$$\Lambda_{RMIN} = \frac{\min \{L(\theta_1 | X_1, X_2, f_1), L(\theta_1 | X_1, X_2, f_2), \dots, L(\theta_1 | X_1, X_2, f_K)\}}{\min \{L(\theta_0 | X_1, X_2, f_1), L(\theta_0 | X_1, X_2, f_2), \dots, L(\theta_0 | X_1, X_2, f_K)\}}$$

We refer to these two approaches as LRRMAX and LRRMIN, respectively. While LRRMAX was previously introduced in [12], it has not been applied to any populations beyond the Colorado prison population. In contrast, LRRMIN is a completely new approach.

2.1. Algorithm for Power Comparison

To evaluate the performance of each statistic, we need to compare their power while maintaining the same false positive rate (FPR). Since there is no direct algebraic method for this comparison, we will assess power through simulation. The numerical study requires allele frequency distributions for each subpopulation (f_1, f_2, \dots, f_k) , along with estimates of the proportion p_i of each subpopulation. For each hypothesis test concerning the relationship of interest (parent child or full sibs), we follow the algorithm outlined below.

- (1) Simulate a pair of unrelated DNA profiles (using m loci). The subpopulation information of individuals is pulled at random from a multinomial distribution. Probabilities in multinomial distribution are estimates of proportions.
- (2) Calculate the likelihood ratio (LR)-based statistics for a pair drawn in step 1. Then save the value. Note that the LR-based statistics considered here include LRLAF, LRAVG, LRMAX, LRMIN, LRRMAX, and LRRMIN.
- (3) Repeat steps 1 and 2 so many times, say $B = 1,000,000$ times. Here, we obtain the null distribution of likelihood ratios based on those B values.
- (4) Estimate a threshold c from the null distribution in step 3. That is, find c such that $\mathbb{P}(LR > c) = \alpha$ where α is a given false positive rate. Note that the threshold varies for each statistic.
- (5) Generate a pair of DNA profiles based on the relationship in the alternative hypothesis (using m loci). For each pair, the subpopulation information of the first individual is selected randomly from a multinomial distribution as introduced in step 1 and the subpopulation information of the second individual is forced to be the same as the first person because they are genealogical related.
- (6) Calculate the likelihood ratio (LR)-based statistic for a pair drawn in step 5. Then save the value.
- (7) Repeat steps 5 and 6 so many times, say $B = 1,000,000$ times. Therefore, we obtain the alternative distribution of likelihood ratios based on those samples.
- (8) Estimate power of each statistic by calculating the ratio of the number of pairs such that LR is greater than the threshold c and the total number of simulated pairs in step 7.

In this study, three specific tests are focused. The first one is $H_0 : \theta = (1, 0, 0)$ versus $H_1 : \theta = (0, 1, 0)$, which tests unrelated pairs against parent-child relationships. The second relationship tests unrelated individuals versus full siblings and can be expressed as $H_0 : \theta = (1, 0, 0)$ versus $H_1 : \theta = (1/4, 1/2, 1/4)$. Lastly, the half-sibling test can be formulated as $H_0 : \theta = (1, 0, 0)$ versus $H_1 : \theta = (0, 1/2, 1/2)$. It is also important to note that we assume independence between loci, which allows us to multiply the probabilities computed for each locus when performing calculations on these m loci.

2.2. Case Study Description

Three Southeast Asian populations—Thailand, Singapore, and Malaysia—were selected as a case study. Previous studies, both archaeological and linguistic, have supported the notion that Thailand has a complex genetic structure. The genetic differences among subgroups in Thailand were confirmed by Kutanan et al. (2014) [13], who revealed distinctions in genetic structure between Thai-Malay Muslims, primarily residing in the southern part of Thailand, and Thai Buddhists, who predominantly live in other regions of the country. In the same year, genetic relationships between

northeastern Thai people and other subpopulations were investigated based on mitochondrial DNA-HVR1 variation, suggesting a genetic distinction between northern and northeastern Thai subgroups [14]. Furthermore, a genome-wide study involving 32 subpopulations in Thailand [15] indicates the need for reconstructing the human genetic history of mainland Southeast Asia. The authors highlighted the need for careful selection of Thai populations in ongoing biomedical or clinical studies due to the significant genetic differences among various subpopulations. Considering these literature reviews, it is highly likely that Thailand exhibits population substructure. For simplicity, we assume four subpopulations in Thailand based on the main regions where Thai people reside: North, Northeastern, Central, and South. The allele frequency distributions for each subpopulation are derived from Shotivaranon et al. [16], in which DNA was extracted from 929 unrelated Thai individuals at $m = 15$ loci, including FGA, TH01, TPOX, CSF1PO, vWA, D2S1338, D3S1358, D5S818, D7S820, D8S1179, D13S317, D16S539, D18S51, D19S433, and D21S11. The sample sizes for the North, Northeastern, Central, and South subgroups are 202, 304, 212, and 211, respectively. For shorthand notation, we denote the allele frequency distributions for North, Northeastern, Central, and South subgroups by f_N, f_{NE}, f_{CT} and f_S , respectively. The corresponding f_{local} in this case is $p_N f_N + p_{NE} f_{NE} + p_{CT} f_{CT} + p_S f_S$ where the prior probabilities $(p_N, p_{NE}, p_{CT}, p_S) = (0.1108, 0.3695, 0.3538, 0.1659)$ estimated from Thai population census.

The Singaporean database utilizes 15 loci spread across 23 chromosomes. Some of these loci overlap with those in the Thai database, but not all of them. In particular, the core loci include FGA, TH01, TPOX, CSF1PO, vWA, D3S1358, D5S818, D7S820, D8S1179, D13S317, D16S539, D18S51, D21S11, Penta D, and Penta E. According to a previous study [17], the population of Singapore comprises three primary ethnic groups: Chinese (C), Malays (M), and Indians (I). The estimated proportions of these subpopulations are 77.13% Chinese, 15.24% Malays, and 7.63% Indians. Lastly, the Malaysian DNA database relies on 9 loci distributed across 23 chromosomes. The key loci in this database are FGA, TH01, TPOX, CSF1PO, vWA, D3S1358, D5S818, D7S820, and D13S317. Previous research [18] identifies three main ethnic groups in Malaysia: Chinese (C), Malays (M), and Indians (I), with approximate population proportions of 23.43% Chinese, 69.49% Malays, and 7.08% Indians.

3. Results

This section presents the simulation results, organized into two key subsections: one comparing power and the other examining bias across subpopulations.

3.1. Power Comparison

Table 3 presents a power comparison for the full-sibling test at an FPR of 0.0002 across three subpopulations. This FPR was selected for two main reasons. First, since power increases and eventually approaches 1 as the FPR rises, choosing an appropriate FPR allows for meaningful power differences to be observed; otherwise, all statistics would yield power values close to 1. Conversely, if the FPR is too low, the resulting power would also be low. Second, this FPR was chosen to align closely with values used in previous studies. In [12], the authors identified 0.000012 as a reasonable FPR for the full-sibling test in the Colorado prison population, making 0.0002 a suitable compromise between maintaining comparability and ensuring detectable differences in

power.

Table 3. Power comparison for the full-sibling test at $\alpha = 0.0002$.

Thai population			
Statistic	Threshold	Power	95% CI
Λ_{LAF}	411.7	0.781	(0.7805, 0.7821)
Λ_{AVG}	995.1	0.757	(0.7561, 0.7578)
Λ_{MAX}	2489.7	0.741	(0.7401, 0.7419)
Λ_{MIN}	253.8	0.775	(0.7741, 0.7757)
Λ_{RMAX}	705.2	0.662	(0.6606, 0.6625)
Λ_{RMIN}	89875.2	0.607	(0.6060, 0.6079)
Singaporean population			
Statistic	Threshold	Power	95% CI
Λ_{LAF}	310.5	0.804	(0.8029, 0.8044)
Λ_{AVG}	560.1	0.803	(0.8026, 0.8042)
Λ_{MAX}	2592.1	0.776	(0.7757, 0.7773)
Λ_{MIN}	214.3	0.810	(0.8087, 0.8103)
Λ_{RMAX}	648.2	0.656	(0.6546, 0.6565)
Λ_{RMIN}	264220.7	0.640	(0.6388, 0.6407)
Malaysian population			
Statistic	Threshold	Power	95% CI
Λ_{LAF}	489.7	0.369	(0.3681, 0.3697)
Λ_{AVG}	593.6	0.361	(0.3605, 0.3621)
Λ_{MAX}	1973.4	0.328	(0.3268, 0.3283)
Λ_{MIN}	331.1	0.357	(0.3559, 0.3575)
Λ_{RMAX}	399.6	0.272	(0.2713, 0.2731)
Λ_{RMIN}	13487.0	0.262	(0.2612, 0.2629)

All thresholds shown in Table 3 are referred to as null thresholds and are used for power calculations. While these values may not be particularly informative for comparing different statistics, they hold practical significance in real-world applications. For example, when using Λ_{LAF} as the test statistic for a full-sibling test, the rejection region would be set at approximately 411.7 or higher for the Thai population and approximately 310.5 or higher for the Singaporean population. If the calculated likelihood ratio falls within this region, we would conclude that there is sufficient evidence to determine that the two individuals are full siblings.

As described in the algorithm, the power of each statistic is estimated based on the proportion of simulated pairs under the alternative hypothesis (where the relationship is assumed) whose statistic is greater than or equal to the null threshold. Additionally, the 95% confidence interval for power is provided, calculated using the exact binomial test.

For the Thai population, Λ_{LAF} exhibits the highest performance, with a power of approximately 78%, followed by Λ_{MIN} , Λ_{AVG} , Λ_{MAX} , Λ_{RMAX} and finally Λ_{RMIN} . The differences are significant, as the 95% confidence intervals do not overlap. For the Singaporean population, Λ_{MIN} performs the best, with a power of around 81%, but there is no clear distinction between Λ_{LAF} and Λ_{AVG} . In fact, the power estimates for the top three statistics in this population are quite similar, making it difficult to draw definitive conclusions. As in the Thai population, Λ_{MAX} , Λ_{RMAX} and Λ_{RMIN} perform the worst. In the Malaysian population, Λ_{LAF} again leads, followed by Λ_{AVG} , Λ_{MIN} , Λ_{MAX} , Λ_{RMAX} and Λ_{RMIN} . Notably, Λ_{MAX} , Λ_{RMAX} and Λ_{RMIN} consistently

underperform compared to Λ_{LAF} , Λ_{AVG} , and Λ_{MIN} across all three subpopulations.

These findings are consistent with those reported in the Colorado prison population study [12], where Λ_{LAF} showed the highest statistical power, followed by Λ_{AVG} , while Λ_{MAX} ranked the lowest. However, it is somewhat unexpected that Λ_{RMAX} and Λ_{RMIN} performed poorly in Southeast Asian populations, given that in the Colorado study, Λ_{RMAX} exhibited significant power comparable to Λ_{LAF} . Further elaboration on these outcomes will be provided in the upcoming section.

Next, we take a different approach to power comparison by examining it across various relationship types. We analyze 3 relationships: parent-child, full-sibling, and half-sibling, using FPRs of 0.00002, 0.0002, and 0.002, respectively. The partial results of these comparisons are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4. Power comparison across different genetic relationships.

Parent-child at $\alpha = 0.00002$			
Statistic	Thai	Singaporean	Malaysian
Λ_{LAF}	0.835	0.791	0.167
Λ_{AVG}	0.816	0.802	0.153
Λ_{MAX}	0.800	0.729	0.116
Λ_{MIN}	0.823	0.786	0.148
Λ_{RMAX}	0.545	0.490	0.019
Λ_{RMIN}	0.513	0.423	0.021
Full-sibling at $\alpha = 0.0002$			
Statistic	Thai	Singaporean	Malaysian
Λ_{LAF}	0.781	0.804	0.369
Λ_{AVG}	0.757	0.803	0.361
Λ_{MAX}	0.741	0.776	0.328
Λ_{MIN}	0.775	0.810	0.357
Λ_{RMAX}	0.662	0.656	0.272
Λ_{RMIN}	0.607	0.640	0.262
Half-sibling at $\alpha = 0.002$			
Statistic	Thai	Singaporean	Malaysian
Λ_{LAF}	0.984	0.934	0.607
Λ_{AVG}	0.973	0.989	0.632
Λ_{MAX}	0.948	0.968	0.548
Λ_{MIN}	0.986	0.993	0.636
Λ_{RMAX}	0.582	0.556	0.175
Λ_{RMIN}	0.522	0.554	0.188

A clear pattern that emerges is that the performance of each statistic can be grouped into three main categories. The first group includes Λ_{LAF} , Λ_{AVG} , and Λ_{MIN} , which all exhibit similar performance levels. The second group consists of Λ_{MAX} , while the third group, containing Λ_{RMAX} and Λ_{RMIN} , consistently demonstrates low power across the three relationships considered. Moving forward, the analysis will exclude Λ_{RMAX} and Λ_{RMIN} due to their consistently low power. Possible reasons for their poor performance will be explored in the next section.

The ranking pattern for each population can be described as follows.

- For the Thai population, Λ_{LAF} exhibits the highest power in both the parent-child test (83.5%) and the full-sibling test (78.1%), followed by Λ_{MIN} , Λ_{AVG} , and then Λ_{MAX} . This result aligns with findings from the Colorado popula-

tion study in the literature. Notably, Λ_{MIN} , which was previously suggested to outperform Λ_{MAX} at the likelihood ratio distribution level, also demonstrates superior statistical power.

- In the Singaporean population, the top-performing statistics for the parent-child and full-sibling tests are closely matched, as Λ_{LAF} , Λ_{AVG} , and Λ_{MIN} produce nearly identical results. Λ_{MAX} shows lower power, approximately 6–8% less than the leading group in the parent-child test at $FPR = 0.00002$, and about 3% lower in the full-sibling test at $FPR = 0.0002$.
- For the Malaysian subpopulation, we primarily focus on the half-sibling test, as the parent-child and full-sibling tests exhibit relatively low power at the specified FPRs. In this case, Λ_{MIN} and Λ_{AVG} perform best, with no clear leader for the half-sibling test at $\alpha = 0.002$, followed by Λ_{LAF} and Λ_{MAX} .

To facilitate a meaningful comparison, we expanded our analysis by introducing an additional statistic that disregards subpopulation structure. Specifically, we assumed a homogeneous population and designated this statistic as Λ_{CB} or LRCB, where "CB" stands for "combine," reflecting the merging of all subpopulations into a single homogeneous group. In other words, Λ_{CB} serves as a benchmark for evaluating the performance of statistics both with and without accounting for population substructure.

To evaluate the relative performance ranking of the five statistics— Λ_{LAF} , Λ_{AVG} , Λ_{MAX} , Λ_{MIN} , and Λ_{CB} —across a reasonable range of false positive rates (FPRs), power was estimated for significance levels (α) ranging from approximately 10^{-6} to 4×10^{-5} . Figure 1 (left) shows the power versus false positive rate for these five statistics in parent-child relationship tests. The dashed vertical line represents the estimated false positive rate of 0.000017, as reported in a previous study [12]. Similarly, Figure 1 (right) illustrates the power versus false positive rate for the five statistics in full-sibling relationship tests, with the dashed vertical line indicating an estimated false positive rate of 0.000012, also derived from the same study.




Figure 1. Plot of power versus FPR for five different statistics. The plot on the left represents parent-child testing, while the one on the right represents full-sibling testing.

As a result from Figure 1, in the full-sibling test, the ranking pattern of the statistics remains consistent across the considered range of false positive rates, except for Λ_{LAF} and Λ_{MIN} . For false positive rates exceeding 2×10^{-5} , no clear distinction can be made between Λ_{LAF} and Λ_{MIN} in terms of performance. A close pattern is observed in the parent-child case, where Λ_{LAF} , Λ_{AVG} , and Λ_{MIN} perform well with no clear distinction beyond 2×10^{-5} . Overall, it is clearly evident that the four test statistics incorporating population substructure consistently achieve higher power than Λ_{CB} .

3.2. Bias towards Subpopulations

In this subsection, we examined the power for each Thai subpopulation using the eight-step algorithm outlined in Section 2.1. The distinction here is that, when calculating power, we limit the sample to include only pairs from the specific subpopulation under consideration, rather than using the full set of pairs from the alternative distribution. For example, to calculate the parent-child power for the Northeastern subpopulation at an FPR of 0.000017 using the Λ_{MIN} statistic, we only select the parent-child pairs from the alternative hypothesis distribution that were generated under the assumption of Northeastern descent. The power is then computed as the proportion of those Northeastern pairs whose Λ_{MIN} value exceeds the null threshold corresponding to the FPR of 0.000017. It is important to note that the denominator includes the total number of simulated pairs from the Northeastern subpopulation. This process is repeated for each statistic and each subpopulation.

We created plots showing power versus FPR for each subpopulation. Figure 2 presents the plot of full-sibling power versus FPR for the Λ_{CB} statistic, broken down by subpopulation. The vertical line indicates the estimated false positive rate of 0.000012. The plot reveals considerable differences in full-sibling power across subpopulations, with the South subpopulation exhibiting the lowest power and the Central subpopulation showing the highest. This suggests that the Λ_{CB} statistic, which does not account for subpopulation structure, may not be the best choice, as it leads to biased power variations between subpopulations. To achieve more consistent results in relatedness testing, it is crucial to use a statistic that provides uniform power across all subpopulations.




Figure 2. Plot of full-sibling power versus FPR for the LRCB statistic, categorized by subpopulation.

To identify the best statistic from all available options, the ideal choice would be the one that demonstrates high power while minimizing subpopulation bias. Based on the results from the previous subsection, Λ_{LAF} and Λ_{MIN} emerge as the top candidates in terms of power, so we will keep them for the next phase of analysis. To make a final decision between Λ_{LAF} and Λ_{MIN} , we will calculate confidence intervals for the difference in power using normal quantiles. Let $\hat{\beta}_1$ and $\hat{\beta}_2$ represent the estimated power for the first and second subpopulations, respectively. Then, a $(1 - \alpha)100\%$ confidence interval for the difference in power is given by:

$$(\hat{\beta}_1 - \hat{\beta}_2) \pm z_{\alpha/2} \sqrt{\frac{\hat{\beta}_1(1 - \hat{\beta}_1)}{N_1} + \frac{\hat{\beta}_2(1 - \hat{\beta}_2)}{N_2}}$$

where $z_{\alpha/2}$ denotes the standard normal quantiles at the significance level α , and N_k represents the size of subpopulation k . It is important to note that this formula is derived from the normal confidence interval, which is valid given the large sample size.

Figures 3 and 4 illustrate the 95% confidence intervals for the parent-child and full-sibling tests using Λ_{MIN} and Λ_{LAF} , respectively. The x -axis represents the difference in power, while the y -axis shows the ordering of pairs of two selected Thai subpopulations out of four. The ideal statistic is one that includes zero within its interval. When the confidence interval encompasses zero, it indicates that zero is a plausible value for the difference in power, suggesting insufficient evidence to claim that the power of the first subpopulation differs from that of the second at the 0.05 significance level. In our study, we prefer the confidence interval to include zero, as this promotes fairness in hypothesis testing for each subpopulation. In both the parent-child and full-sibling tests, we found that Λ_{MIN} outperforms the well-established Λ_{LAF} , as the confidence intervals are closer to zero.




Figure 3. Plot of 95% confidence intervals for the difference in power, broken down by two statistics and two relationships.

4. Discussion and Conclusions

In this study, we introduce several test statistics for hypothesis testing to assess the relationship between two individuals. The available options include Λ_{LAF} , Λ_{AVG} , Λ_{MAX} , Λ_{MIN} , Λ_{RMAX} , and Λ_{RMIN} . Our primary findings clearly indicate that the statistic Λ_{MIN} performs exceptionally well in both parent-child and full-sibling tests, achiev-




Figure 4. Plot of 95% confidence intervals for the difference in power, broken down by two statistics and two relationships.

ing power levels comparable to the well-established Λ_{LAF} . We strongly recommend the practical use of Λ_{MIN} , especially for Thai subpopulations, for two main reasons. First, Λ_{MIN} minimizes bias toward subpopulations, as shown in Figure 3, helping to promote fairness in DNA testing across all subpopulations. Second, it is easier to access relevant datasets, as many standard racial group allele frequencies are readily available in the literature. This allows Λ_{MIN} to take advantage of these pre-existing datasets, making it a convenient and practical option. While Λ_{LAF} is also a strong choice in terms of power, it requires the use of a local average allele frequency distribution, and in practice, this may necessitate estimating a local average allele frequency from an existing database.

The performance of Λ_{AVG} is also comparable to the top two statistics, Λ_{LAF} and Λ_{MIN} , under certain parameter settings, although further investigation is required. As for Λ_{MAX} , its power is lower than that of the first three statistics, particularly when compared to Λ_{MIN} . These findings are consistent with the previous study by Ge and Budowle (2012) [11], which examined results at the likelihood ratio level. We have confirmed this outcome through our analysis of statistical power.

The statistic Λ_{RMAX} performed similarly to Λ_{LAF} in the Colorado population, but surprisingly, it showed poorer performance in Southeast Asian populations. This highlights the importance of being cautious when conducting studies in this field, as statistical power is highly sensitive to the population under study. As shown here, changing the population can lead to different results for the same test statistic, such as Λ_{RMAX} . Another notable finding is that Λ_{RMIN} performed poorly. This statistic

was initially motivated by the strong performance of Λ_{MIN} , but our results suggest that separately calculating likelihood functions for the null and alternative hypotheses worsens the situation, at least in the three Southeast Asian populations. This is evident from the extremely high null thresholds obtained, as shown in Table 3, which likely makes it much harder to reject the null hypothesis, ultimately leading to low power.

Furthermore, the results in Figure 1 emphasize the critical role of accounting for subpopulation structure in genetic analyses, as they reveal a notable decrease in the power of Λ_{CB} when substructure is not considered. Additionally, the bias towards subpopulations becomes more apparent when subpopulation structure is not incorporated, as shown in Figure 2. However, the observed bias could be attributed to other factors, such as differences in allelic diversity between subpopulations. For instance, it is well-known that African populations have greater genetic diversity, making them more suitable for familial identification compared to Native American populations. Therefore, it is not surprising that some differences persist.

In comparing power across populations, we find a strong consistency among Southeast Asian populations, with Λ_{LAF} , Λ_{MIN} , and Λ_{AVG} emerging as the top performers. In contrast, Λ_{MAX} , Λ_{RMAX} , and Λ_{RMIN} consistently exhibit lower power compared to this leading group. The lower power observed for Λ_{MAX} aligns with similar findings in studies of North American populations. Additionally, the Malaysian population, which only used 9 loci in this study, showed lower power compared to the Thai and Singaporean populations, which used 15 loci. This result is expected, as a higher number of loci typically leads to greater power due to increased variation available for detection. To boost the power of the Malaysian population to match that of the Thai or Singaporean populations, increasing the number of loci would be a recommended approach.

In concluding this paper, we propose several avenues for future research. First, while our hypothesis tests primarily concentrated on parent-child, full-sibling, and half-sibling relationships, exploring more intricate familial relationships, such as first cousins, second cousins, and double first cousins, would be a valuable next step. Investigating how statistical power varies as the complexity of relationships increases could provide valuable insights into relatedness testing. However, care must be taken when selecting the false positive rates to appropriately differentiate between the performance of each test statistic. Second, while Λ_{LAF} and Λ_{MIN} have proven to be effective, there may be other statistics that outperform them in terms of power. Although both of these statistics are robust, it remains unclear whether they are the most powerful available. At present, there is no established theory that identifies the most universally powerful statistic in this context. One potential direction for future research could be to employ machine learning or classification methods to first identify the subpopulation to which a DNA profile belongs, followed by applying likelihood ratio specific to that subpopulation. This approach may lead to improved performance in relatedness testing, especially when subpopulation structure is considered more explicitly. Finally, our analysis was based on a Thai and Southeast Asian population with regional substructure. A valuable extension of this research would be to replicate these tests in different populations with their own unique substructure. By comparing results across a variety of populations, we could better understand the limitations of our findings, and explore how subpopulation structure influences relatedness testing in diverse genetic contexts.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to express their heartfelt gratitude to the editor, associate editor and referees for their insights and suggestions. This research project is supported by Ratchadapiseksompotch Fund Chulalongkorn University.

References

- [1] Bieber, F.R., Brenner, C.H. & Lazer, D., *Finding criminals through DNA of their relatives*, Science, **312**(5778), pp.1315-1316, 2006.
- [2] Ge, J., Chakraborty, R., Eisenberg, A. & Budowle, B., *Comparisons of familial DNA database searching strategies*, Journal of Forensic Sciences, **56**(6), pp.1448-1456, 2011.
- [3] Balding, D.J., Krawczak, M., Buckleton, J.S. & Curran, J.M., *Decision-making in familial database searching: KI alone or not alone?*, Forensic Science International: Genetics, **7**(1), pp.52-54, 2013.
- [4] Kruijver, M., Meester, R. & Slooten, K., *Optimal strategies for familial searching*, Forensic Science International: Genetics, **13**, pp.90-103, 2014.
- [5] Slooten, K. & Meester, R., *Probabilistic strategies for familial DNA searching*, Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series C: Applied Statistics, **63**(3), pp.361-384, 2014.
- [6] Debus-Sherrill, S. & Field, M.B., *Familial DNA searching-an emerging forensic investigative tool*, Science & Justice, **59**(1), pp.20-28, 2019.
- [7] Reilly, P., *Legal and public policy issues in DNA forensics*, Nature Reviews Genetics, **2**(4), pp.313-317, 2001.
- [8] Curran, J.M. & Buckleton, J.S., *Effectiveness of familial searches*, Science & Justice, **48**(4), pp.164-167, 2008.
- [9] Tian, C., Gregersen, P.K. & Seldin, M.F., *Accounting for ancestry: population substructure and genome-wide association studies*, Human Molecular Genetics, **17**(R2), pp.143-150, 2008.
- [10] Presciuttini, S., Toni, C., Tempestini, E., Verdiani, S., Casarino, L., Spinetti, I., Stefano, F.D., Domenici, R., & Bailey-Wilson, J.E., *Inferring relationships between pairs of individuals from locus heterozygosities*, BMC Genetics, **3**, pp.1-11, 2002.
- [11] Ge, J. & Budowle, B., *Kinship index variations among populations and thresholds for familial searching*, PLoS One, **7**(5), e37474, 2012.
- [12] Kooakachai, M., LaBerge, G. & Santorico, S.A., *A new framework to test parent-child and full sibling relationships with population substructure*, Forensic Science International, **305**, 110012, 2019.
- [13] Kutanan, W., Kitpipit, T., Phetpeng, S. & Thanakiatkrai, P., *Forensic STR loci reveal common genetic ancestry of the Thai-Malay Muslims and Thai Buddhists in the deep Southern region of Thailand*, Journal of Human Genetics, **59**(12), pp.675-681, 2014.
- [14] Kutanan, W., Srithawong, S., Kamlao, A. & Kampuansai, J., *Mitochondrial DNA-HVR1 variation reveals genetic heterogeneity in Thai-Isan peoples from the lower region of North-eastern Thailand*, Advances in Anthropology, **4**(1), pp.7-12, 2014.
- [15] Kutanan, W., Liu, D., Kampuansai, J., Srikummool, M., Srithawong, S., Shoocongdej, R., Sangkhano, S., Ruangchai, S., Pittayaporn, P., Arias, L. & Stoneking, M., *Reconstructing the human genetic history of mainland Southeast Asia: insights from genome-wide data from Thailand and Laos*, Molecular Biology and Evolution, **38**(8), pp.3459-3477, 2021.
- [16] Shotivaranon, J., Chirachariyavej, T., Leetrakool, N. & Rerkamnuaychoke, B., *DNA database of populations from different parts in the Kingdom of Thailand*, Forensic Science International: Genetics, **4**(1), pp.e37-38, 2009.
- [17] Yong, R.Y.Y, Aw, L.T. & Yap, E.P.H., *Allele frequencies of 15 STR loci of three main ethnic populations in Singapore using an in-house marker panel*, Forensic Science International, **141**(2-3), pp.175-183, 2004.

- [18] Lim, K.B., Jeevan, N.H., Jaya, P., Othman, M.I. & Lee, Y.H., *STR data for the AmpFlSTR Profiler loci from the three main ethnic population groups (Malay, Chinese and Indian) in Malaysia*, Forensic Science International, **119**(1), pp.109-112, 2001.