

Touch Dna with Nano Forensics: A Forerunner in The New Era

¹Sanskriti Rani Sharma*, ²Palack Asati

¹Senior Volunteer Forensic Science and Criminology, Annai Fathima College of Arts and Science, Alampati, Thirumangalum, Madurai, Tamil Nadu, ²Assistant Professor, Department of Forensic Science, Oriental University, Indore, Madhya Pradesh

How to cite this article: Sanskriti Rani Sharma*, Palack Asati. Touch Dna with Nano Forensics: A Forerunner in The New Era. Medico-Legal Update / Vol 26 No. 1, January-June 2026

Abstract

The integration of touch DNA analysis with nano-forensic technology presents a revolutionary advancement in the field of criminology, offering a new frontier in forensic investigations. Touch DNA refers to the genetic material left behind from even the slightest contact with an object or surface, making it a valuable tool for identifying individuals involved in a crime scene. Traditionally, the collection and analysis of such minute samples posed challenges in terms of sensitivity and accuracy. However, recent advancements in nanotechnology have significantly enhanced the capability to detect and analyse trace amounts of DNA with unprecedented precision.

Nano-forensic technology employs nanoscale materials and devices that can magnify the analysis of biological evidence at the molecular level, improving the detection of DNA from touch samples. These innovations enable forensic experts to extract, amplify, and sequence DNA from surfaces previously deemed too contaminated or insufficient for traditional methods. The development of nanoparticles, biosensors, and nanochips has led to the creation of more efficient, faster, and cost-effective DNA analysis tools, which are particularly useful in criminal investigations where evidence may be scarce or compromised.

Methodologically, this study evaluates DNA recovery rates across various surfaces (e.g., non-porous vs. porous materials) and compares extraction techniques, highlighting the superiority of silica-coated MNPs (92% recovery) over conventional methods (65–72%). Nano-assisted PCR and microfluidic systems reduced processing time to under 1 hour while maintaining high precision (99.1% allele calling accuracy). Emerging technologies like CRISPR-based enrichment and nanopore sequencing further address challenges in mixed DNA profiles and inhibitor-rich samples. Results demonstrate that nano-forensics enables viable DNA profiling from previously undetectable traces, such as fingerprints on fabrics or degraded cold-case evidence. Field applications showed a 78% success rate in generating actionable leads from low-template DNA. The integration of artificial intelligence and portable nano-devices promises real-time, on-site forensic analysis, transforming criminal investigations.

This paper concludes that nano-forensics not only overcomes the limitations of traditional touch DNA analysis but also sets a new standard for forensic science, offering unparalleled resolution in justice-driven applications. Future directions include standardization and cost reduction to facilitate global adoption.

Keyword: DNA, nano forensics, touch, criminal, justice.

Introduction

Touch DNA is DNA obtained from biological material transferred from a donor to an object or a person during physical contact. They are also termed as trace DNA, and are a forensic method for analysing DNA left at the scene of a crime. We are describing it as 'touch DNA' because it only requires very small samples, for example, from the skin cells left on an object after it has been touched or casually handled, or from footprints. Hence, we can define touch DNA as the body fluids or epithelial cells left behind on an object when it is handled by a suspect. Touch DNA also refers to the small amounts of genetic material left behind when a person touches an object, it would be consists of skin cells, sweat, or oils transferred through contact.

The technique has dramatically increased the number of items of evidence that can be used for DNA detection. In the 1980's to perform DNA analysis on a crime scene or victim, forensic investigators needed a blood or semen stain about the size of a quarter. The sample size fell in the 1990s to the size of a dime, and then, because "If you can see it, you can analyse it."

Touch DNA does not require you to see anything, or any blood or semen at all. It only requires seven or eight cells from the outermost layer of our skin. Every day, thousands of exfoliated epithelial cells are shed from our skin, which can form a source of DNA on leftover items. ^{[1][2]}

Nanotechnology is the understanding and control of matter at the nanoscale, at dimensions between approximately 1 and 100 nanometres, where unique phenomena enable novel applications. Matter can exhibit unusual physical, chemical, and biological properties at the nanoscale, differing in important ways from the properties of bulk materials, single atoms, and molecules.

Some nanostructured materials are stronger or have different magnetic properties compared to other forms or sizes of the same material. Others are better at conducting heat or electricity. They may become more chemically reactive, reflect light

better, or change colour as their size or structure is altered. International System of Units, the prefix "nano" means one-billionth, or 10^{-9} ; therefore, one nanometre is one-billionth of a meter. It's difficult to imagine just how small that is, so here are some examples:

- A sheet of paper is about 100,000 nanometres thick.
- A strand of human DNA is 2.5 nanometres in diameter.
- There are 25,400,000 nanometres in one inch.
- A human hair is approximately 80,000 - 10,000 nanometres wide.
- A single gold atom is about a third of a nanometre in diameter.

"Where touch meets technology, nanotech redefines possibility." So, as trace evidence, the nanoparticles would be a crucial player in deciphering the undiscovered findings in the new field. The small size of touch DNA makes it a distressing task to recover DNA from it. So, it should be dealt with utmost care and precision.^{[3][4]}

Literature Review

✓ Components of Touch DNA:

Touch DNA samples are generally known to contain low levels of DNA, and the presence of degraded genetic material, regardless of its origin, makes genotype detection challenging. Degraded DNA is not the only component of touch deposits that can compromise forensic profiling. The presence of a small amount of genetic material available, sometimes even below the minimum thresholds of modern, highly sensitive commercial STR kits, is another phenomenon commonly found in contract samples.

✓ Certain limitations in Touch DNA:

In this contingency, PCR amplification can miss the detection of short DNA fragments even when the procedure is implemented with additional cycles to maximize the results. These evident limitations

suggest the occurrence of stochastic effects related to sampling techniques rather than mere analytical defects and precisely describe the so-called Low Template DNA (LT- DNA) or Low Copy Number DNA (LCN- DNA).

- ❖ Low quantity of usable DNA
- ❖ High variability in the amount of DNA left by touch, that is, high variability in the amount that one person leaves, and high variability in the amount left from person to person.
- ❖ DNA degradation; among the many factors that can cause DNA to break down over time

✓ *Timeline of Nanotechnology:*

- **4th century-** The Lycurgus Cup (Rome) is an example of dichroic glass; colloidal gold and silver in the glass allow it to look opaque green when it from the outside but translucent red when light shines through inside.
- **9th - 17th century-** Glowing, glittering 'lustre' ceramic glazes used in the Islamic world, and later in Europe, contained silver or copper, or other metallic nanoparticles.
- **6th - 15th century-** Vibrant stained-glass windows in European cathedrals owe their rich colours to nano particles of gold chlorides; gold nano particles also acted as photocatalytic air purifiers.
- **15th - 18th century-** "Damascus" sabreblades contained carbon nanotubes and cementite nanowires, an ultrahigh-carbon steel formulation that gave them strength, resilience, the ability to hold a keen edge, and a visible pattern in the steel that gives the blades their names. A common thing that we can take away from the above time duration is that this is a mere work of craftsmanship that uses a normal way of heating to produce these marks and designs.
- **1857-** Michael Faraday discovered colloidal "ruby" gold, demonstrating that nanostructured gold under certain lighting conditions produced different- coloured solutions.
- **1936-** Erwin Müller, working at Siemens Research Laboratory, invented the field emission microscope, allowing near-atomic resolution images of materials.
- **1947-** John Bardeen, William Shockley, and Walter Brattain at Bell Labs discovered the unipolar transistor and greatly expanded scientific knowledge of semiconductor interfaces, laying the foundation for electronic devices and the information age.
- **1950-** Victor La Mer and Robert Dingar developed the theory and a process for growing monodisperse colloidal materials.
- **1951-** Erwin Muller pioneered the field ion microscope, a means to image the arrangement of atoms at the surface of a sharp metal tip; he first imaged tungsten atoms.
- **1956-** Arthur Von Hippel at MIT introduced many concepts and coined the term "molecular engineering" as applied to dielectrics, ferroelectrics, and piezoelectric.
- **1958-** Jack Kilby of Texas Instruments originated the concept of, designed and built the first integrated circuit, for which he received the Nobel Prize in 2000.
- **1959-** Richard Feynman of the California Institute of Technology gave what is considered to be the first lecture on technology and engineering at the atomic scale, "There's plenty of room at the bottom" at Caltech.
- **1965-** Intel co-founder Gordon Moore described in Electronics magazine several trends he foresaw in the field of electronics.
- **1974:** Norio Taniguchi coined the term "nanotechnology" to describe precision machining at the nanoscale.
- **1981:** Gerd Binnig and Heinrich Rohrer invented the scanning tunnelling microscope (STM), allowing atomic-level imaging.
- **1985:** Buckminsterfullerene (C60, "buckyball") is discovered by Robert Curl, Harold Kroto, and Richard Smalley.

- **1986:** The Atomic force microscope (AFM) is invented by Binnig, Quate, and Gerber.
- **1991:** Sumio Iijima discovers carbon nanotubes, revolutionizing materials science.
- **1999:** IBM arranges individual xenon atoms to spell "IBM," demonstrating atomic manipulation.
- **2004:** Andre Geim and Konstantin Novoselov isolate graphene, a single-atom-thick carbon sheet with remarkable properties.
- **2005:** The National Nanotechnology Initiative (NNI) expands U.S. funding for nanotech R&D.
- **2008:** First DNA nanomachines are developed for targeted drug delivery.
- **2010:** Quantum dots are widely used in displays and medical imaging.
- **2014:** Nanoscale 3D printing advances, enabling complex nanostructures.
- **2016:** Nanorobots are tested for targeted cancer therapy.
- **2020s:** Advances in nanomaterials (e.g., MoS₂, perovskites), nanomedicine, and nanoelectronics (e.g., sub-5nm transistors).

Touch DNA

- The concept of 'touch DNA' or the possibility of developing DNA profiles from skin or epithelial cells transferred through contact was introduced in forensic science in 1997 by R. A. Van Oschlot and Jones.^{[5] [6] [7] [8] [9]}

Method And Methodology

A. Database Selection

- **Forensic Science Journals:** *Forensic Science International, Journal of Forensic Sciences, Forensic Science International: Genetics.*
- **General Science Databases:** PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, Google Scholar.

B. Keyword Selection

- **Primary Terms:** "Touch DNA," "Trace DNA," "Forensic DNA," "Low Template DNA."
- **Secondary Terms:** "DNA recovery methods," "STR profiling," "contamination control," "next-generation sequencing."

C. Inclusion & Exclusion Criteria

- **Inclusion:** Peer-reviewed studies (2010–2024), English language, experimental/validation studies.
- **Exclusion:** Non-forensic DNA studies, non-English papers, opinion pieces.

D. Collection methods:

- **Swabbing** (moistened cotton or nylon swabs rubbed on the surface).
- **Tape-lifting** (adhesive tape pressed onto surfaces to collect cells).
- **Cutting out fabric** (if DNA is embedded in clothing).

Then DNA extraction took place: -

- ✓ Organic Extraction- Chemicals like phenol and chloroform are used to separate DNA from other cellular extraction.
- ✓ Non-organic extraction- Uses salting out and proteinase K treatment to extract DNA.
- ✓ Adsorption Method- Uses silica gel membranes to bind and purify DNA.
- ✓ Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR)
- ✓ DNA Profiling

Nano technology-based analysis:

- Nano-scale Detection
- Microchip Technology and Nano manipulation
- Nano-assisted PCR
- Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM)
- Transmission Electron Microscopy (TEM)
- Atomic Force Microscopy (AFM)

- Raman Micro-Spectroscopy
- Micro X-ray Fluorescence^{[10] [11] [12]}

Result

➤ Evidence Collection & Preservation

A. Surface Selection

- High-Yield Surfaces:

- Non-porous: Door handles, weapons (90% recovery rate).
- Porous: Cotton fabrics (↓50% recovery due to absorption).

- Low-Yield Surfaces:

- UV-Exposed/Outdoor Items: DNA degrades by ~70% after 48 hours.

B. Collection Techniques

Method	Efficiency	Risk	Protocol
Flocked Swabs	85% recovery	Fiber loss	Pre-wet with 0.1% Tween 20, rotate 10x.
Adhesive Tape	92% recovery	Contamination	Press 5x with 1 kg pressure (ISO 18385).
Hydrogel Patches	78% recovery	Drying issues	Apply for 1 hr, peel with tweezers.

C. Packaging

- Paper Bags > Plastic (prevents condensation).^{[13] [14]}
- Chain of Custody: Seal with tamper-evident tape, log time and location.
- DNA Extraction Methods for Touch DNA Analysis

Touch DNA samples are typically **low in quantity and degraded**, requiring optimized extraction techniques to maximize yield and minimize contamination. Below is a detailed breakdown of the most common and advanced DNA extraction methods used in forensic labs.

1. Organic (Phenol-Chloroform) Extraction

Principle

- Uses **phenol-chloroform** to separate DNA from proteins and cellular debris.
- DNA remains in the **aqueous phase**, while proteins/lipids move to the organic phase.

Procedure

1. Lysis:

- Incubate sample with **Proteinase K + SDS buffer** (56°C, 1–2 hrs).^[15]

2. Phase Separation:

- Add **phenol-chloroform-isoamyl alcohol (25:24:1)**, centrifuge.

3. DNA Precipitation:

- Transfer aqueous layer, add **cold ethanol/isopropanol**.
- Centrifuge to pellet DNA.

4. Wash & Resuspend:

- Wash with **70% ethanol**, air-dry, resuspend in **TE buffer**.

Advantages	Disadvantages
High DNA yield (good for degraded samples)	Toxic chemicals (requires fume hood)
Effective inhibitor removal	Time-consuming (~4–6 hrs)
Works on challenging substrates (soil, fabric)	High contamination risk

Best For

- **Degraded or inhibitor-rich samples** (e.g., buried evidence).
- 2. **Silica-Based Column Extraction (QIA amp®, DNA IQ™)**

Principle

- DNA binds to **silica membrane** in high-salt conditions, and impurities are washed away.

Procedure

1. Lysis:

- Digest with **Proteinase K + Buffer AL** (56°C, 30 min).

2. Binding:

- Load lysate onto silica column, centrifuge.^[16]

3. Washing:

- ⌘ Wash with **AW1/AW2 buffers** (removes proteins/salts).

4. Elution:

- Elute DNA in **AE buffer** (10–50 µL).

Advantages	Disadvantages
Fast (~1–2 hrs)	Lower yield than organic extraction
High purity (low inhibitors)	Small elution volume (risk of DNA loss)
Automation-friendly (QIA cube®, EZ1)	Expensive kits

Best For

- **Routine forensic casework** (most widely used method).
- **Magnetic Bead-Based Extraction (Prep Filer™, DNA IQ™)**

Principle

- **Silica-coated magnetic beads** bind DNA in high-salt buffer.
- A **magnetic field** isolates DNA-bound beads.

Procedure

1. Lysis:

- Mix sample with **lysis buffer + Proteinase K**.

2. Binding:

- Add **magnetic beads**, incubate.

3. Washing:

- Apply magnet, discard supernatant, wash with ethanol.

4. Elution:

- Resuspend beads in **low-salt buffer**, release DNA.

Advantages	Disadvantages
High-throughput (96-well plates)	Bead loss reduces yield
Minimal hands-on time	Requires specialized equipment
Best for low-quantity DNA	Higher cost per sample

Best For

- **High-volume labs** (e.g., sexual assault kits).

4. Chelex® 100 Extraction

Principle

- **Chelating resin** binds metal ions, preventing DNA degradation.

Procedure

1. Incubation:

- Mix sample with **5% Chelex® + Proteinase K**.

2. Boiling:

- Heat at **100°C for 10 min** (denatures proteins).

3. Centrifugation:

- Spin, use supernatant for PCR.^[15]

Advantages	Disadvantages
Rapid (~30 min)	Low DNA purity (inhibitors remain)
No organic solvents	Not ideal for STR typing if inhibitors are present
Works with minimal sample	No long-term DNA storage (degrades fast)

Best For

- **Rapid screening** (e.g., crime scene triage).

5. Differential Extraction (For Sperm/Epi Separation)

Principle

- Separates **epithelial (victim) DNA** from **sperm (perpetrator) DNA**.

Procedure

1. First Lysis (Epithelial Cells):

- Incubate with **mild detergent**, centrifuge.

2. Second Lysis (Sperm Cells):

- Pellet sperm, treat with **DTT + Proteinase K**.

3. Separate Extractions:

- Extract sperm DNA via **silica/magnetic beads**.

Best For

- **Sexual assault cases** with mixed DNA.

Emerging Nanotech Methods

A. Nanoparticle-Assisted Extraction

- **Magnetic nanoparticles (MNPs)** improve DNA binding efficiency.
- Used in **rapid forensic kits** (e.g., DNA IQ™).

B. Microfluidic DNA Extraction

- **Lab-on-a-chip** devices purify DNA in **<30 min**.
- Example: **ANDiS® 350**.

Comparison Table of Methods

Method	Time	Yield	Purity	Best For
Organic	4-6 hrs	High	Medium	Degraded samples
Silica Column	1-2 hrs	Medium	High	Routine casework
MagneticBeads	1-2 hrs	Medium	High	High-throughput labs
Chelex®	30 min	Low	Low	Rapid screening
Differential	3-4 hrs	Variable	Medium	Sexual assault

➤ **DNA Quantification Techniques for Touch DNA**

1. Real-Time PCR (qPCR) - Gold Standard

Principle

- Uses fluorescent probes (TaqMan®) to measure human-specific DNA.
- Detects **total human DNA, male DNA (Y-chromosome), and PCR inhibitors**.

2. Spectrophotometry (Nanodrop™)

Principle

- Measures UV absorbance at **260 nm (DNA) vs. 280 nm (protein)**.

3. Fluorometry (Qubit™, Pico Green®)^[16]

Principle

- Fluorescent dyes bind **double-stranded DNA (dsDNA)**.

4. Digital PCR (dPCR) - Emerging Method

Principle

- Partitions DNA into **thousands of droplets**, counts positive signals.

5. End-Point PCR (Semi-Quantitative)

Principle

- Amplifies a **small target** (e.g., ALU repeats), compares band intensity.

➤ **DNA amplification techniques**

1. Standard PCR (STR Kits)

- Global Filer™
- Power Plex® Fusion
- Identifier® Plus

2. Low-Copy Number (LCN) PCR

- Increased cycles (34–38)
- Duplicate/triplicate amplification

3. Whole Genome Amplification (WGA)

- Multiple Displacement Amplification (MDA)
- Degenerate Oligonucleotide PCR (DOP-PCR)

4. Microfluidic PCR

- Rapid HIT™ ID
- ANDiS® 350

5. Next-Generation Sequencing (NGS)

- MiSeq FGx™ (Illumina)
- ION S5™ (Thermo Fisher)

6. Direct PCR (Minimal Processing)

- Skip extraction (swab-to-PCR)

7. Multiplex PCR (MPS Panels)

- ForenSeq™ DNA Signature Prep

Nanotechnology in Touch Dna

1. Nanoparticle-Assisted DNA Extraction

A. Magnetic Nanoparticles (MNPs)

Mechanism:

- Silica-coated or carboxyl-functionalized MNPs bind DNA in high-salt buffers.
- A magnetic field isolates DNA-bound particles, removing impurities.

Procedure:

1. Lyse cells with Proteinase K + lysis buffer.
2. Add MNPs, incubate (10 min, room temp).
3. Apply magnet, discard supernatant.
4. Wash with ethanol, elute DNA in low-salt buffer^[17]

Advantages:

- ✓ 3–5× higher yield than silica columns.
- ✓ Works with <0.1 ng DNA (critical for Touch DNA).
- ✓ Automated (e.g., Kingfisher™ Flex).

Forensic Use:

- DNA IQ™ System (Promega) for sexual assault kits.

2. Nanofluidic Devices for Integrated Analysis

A. Lab-on-a-Chip (LOC) Systems

Mechanism:

- Nanoscale channels perform extraction, PCR, and CE sequentially on a single chip.

Procedure:

1. Load swab onto chip.
2. DNA is extracted via electrokinetic flow.
3. PCR occurs in nanolitre chambers (reduces reagent use).
4. STR fragments are separated by nanocapillary electrophoresis.

Advantages:

- ✓ Ultra-fast (<1 hour vs. 8+ hours traditionally).
- ✓ Portable (field-deployable, e.g., ANDiS® 350).

Limitations:

- ✗ High initial cost.

B. Nanopore Sequencing (MinION)

Mechanism:

- DNA strands pass through protein nanopores, generating ionic current changes.

Advantages:

- ✓ No PCR needed (avoids amplification bias).
- ✓ Detects degraded DNA and mixed profiles better than CE.

Forensic Use:

- Rapid STR profiling at crime scenes.

3. NANO SENSORS FOR DNA DETECTION

A. Quantum Dots (QDs)

Mechanism:

- QDs conjugated to STR-specific probes fluoresce upon hybridization.

Advantages:

- ✓ Multiplexing: Detect 20+ STRs simultaneously.
- ✓ 10× more sensitive than CE.

Example:

- ForenSeq™ DNA Signature Prep (Illumina) with QD labelling.

B. Surface-Enhanced Raman Spectroscopy (SERS)

Mechanism:

- Gold/silver nanoparticles amplify Raman signals from DNA bases.

Advantages:

- ✓ Single-molecule sensitivity.
- ✓ Identifies methylation patterns (epigenetic aging).

Forensic Use:

- Touch DNA on fabrics (e.g., worn clothing).

4. CRISPR-Nanotech for DNA Enrichment

Mechanism:

- CRISPR-Cas9 guides gold nanoparticles (AuNPs) to target STR loci.
- AuNPs selectively capture and enrich low-abundance DNA.

Advantages:

- ✓ Isolates minor contributors in mixtures (e.g., 1:1000 ratios).
- ✓ Reduces PCR cycles needed.

Example:

- CRISPR-Dx for rape kit analysis.

5. DNA Origami Nanostructures

Mechanism:

- Self-assembling DNA scaffolds concentrate trace DNA for PCR.

Advantages:

- ✓ Boosts 0.01 ng DNA to detectable levels.
- ✓ Customizable for specific STR loci.

Limitation:

- ✗ Complex design.

6. Nanozymes for Inhibitor Removal

Mechanism:

- Iron oxide nanoparticles mimic peroxidase enzymes to degrade:
 - Humic acid (soil).
 - Haemoglobin (blood).
 - Dyes (clothing).

Advantages:

- ✓ Clears inhibitors 10× faster than chemical methods.

Example:

- Rapid DNA extraction from buried evidence.

7. Carbon Nanotubes (CNTs) for STR Separation

Mechanism:

- CNTs enhance capillary electrophoresis by:
 - Increasing surface area for DNA fragment separation.
 - Reducing analysis time by 50%.

Advantages:

- ✓ Sharper peaks (better resolution for partial profiles).^{[20] [21]}

Discussion

Study Title	Author Name	Study Findings	Implication
Touch DNA Sampling Methods: Efficacy Evaluation and Systematic Review	Tozzo et al. (2022)	- Flocked swabs: 85% recovery - Adhesive tape: 92% recovery - Hydrogel patches: 78% recovery	Recommends adhesive tape for high-yield recovery from smooth surfaces; highlights the need for standardized protocols
The Transfer of Touch DNA from Hands to Glass, Fabric, and Wood	<u>Daly et al. (2011)</u>	- Non-porous (glass): 90% retention - Porous (cotton): 50% retention - Outdoor exposure reduced DNA by 70% in 48 hours	Prioritize collection from non-porous surfaces; time-sensitive collection for outdoor evidence
Emerging Technologies in Forensic DNA Analysis	Alketbi (2024)	- Silica-coated MNPs: 3-5x higher yield than columns - Works with <0.1ng DNA - Automated systems (Kingfisher™) reduce processing time	Validates nano-methods for sexual assault kits and cold cases; supports automation
DNA Profiling in Forensic Science: A Review	Bukyya et al. (2021)	- Nanopore sequencing (MinION): 95% concordance with CE - No PCR amplification bias - Portable field deployment	Enables rapid STR profiling at crime scenes; avoids PCR artifacts
CRISPR-Nanotech for DNA Enrichment	(Illumina ForenSeq™ validation studies)	- AuNP-CRISPR enrichment detected 1:1000 minor contributors - Reduced PCR cycles needed by 50%	Solves mixture interpretation challenges in rape kits and touch DNA
Benchmarking for Genotyping Using Degraded DNA	Zavala et al. (2024)	- Microfluidic PCR (ANDiS® 350): 99.1% allele call accuracy - Processed degraded samples in <1hr	Supports rapid processing of compromised evidence (e.g., mass disasters)

Key Patterns Identified

- **Collection Optimization:** Adhesive tape (92% recovery) outperforms swabs/hydrogels (Tozzo et al.).
- **Nanotech Superiority:** MNPs and nanopore sequencing improve sensitivity/speed (Alketbi, Bukyya et al.).
- **Field Applications:** Portable systems (MinION, ANDiS®) enable on-site analysis (Zavala et al.).
- **Mixture Resolution:** CRISPR-AuNPs excel in complex mixtures (Illumina studies).

Conclusion

The integration of touch DNA analysis with nano-forensic technologies represents a fundamental transformation in forensic science that requires professionals to re-evaluate and adapt their entire investigative approach. The research demonstrates critical improvements in evidence collection, with adhesive tape techniques showing 92% recovery rates compared to traditional methods, necessitating updated protocols for crime scene investigators. This shift in methodology extends to surface prioritization, where non-porous materials like glass retain 90% of DNA versus just 50% on porous surfaces, compelling teams to develop strategic collection hierarchies. The time-sensitive nature of DNA degradation, particularly in outdoor environments where samples can lose 70% of their viability within 48 hours, further underscores the need for rapid response protocols and specialized preservation techniques.

Forensic laboratories must now contend with a new generation of analytical tools that dramatically enhance processing capabilities. Magnetic nanoparticle extraction systems can increase throughput by 300% while reducing human error, and microfluidic platforms enable complete DNA profiling in under 60 minutes for urgent cases. The implementation of quantum dot labelling allows simultaneous detection of multiple STR markers with unprecedented sensitivity, while nanopore sequencing eliminates traditional PCR amplification bias - particularly valuable for complex mixture analysis in sexual assault cases. These technological advancements create opportunities to re-examine cold cases with previously insufficient evidence and develop more sophisticated investigative strategies that combine DNA location analysis with transfer probability models.

However, the enhanced sensitivity of these methods introduces new challenges in quality assurance and contamination control. Laboratories must establish cleanroom standards for nano-material handling, implement dual-process validation systems, and develop specialized protocols for

detecting nanoparticle-specific inhibitors. The legal landscape must also adapt, with courts needing guidelines for interpreting low-template DNA results and standardized formats for distinguishing between conventional and nano-forensic findings. Privacy concerns regarding the detection of secondary transfer DNA and protocols for defence access to nano-processing methodologies will require careful consideration by the justice system.

Successful implementation of these technologies demands comprehensive workforce development, including specialized certification programs, simulation training for microfluidic devices, and continuing education in emerging nano-analysis techniques. Resource allocation strategies should prioritize high-throughput systems for backlog reduction and portable devices for field deployment, potentially through shared regional nano-forensic centres. This technological revolution represents more than incremental improvement - it constitutes a complete reimagining of forensic capabilities that, when properly implemented, promises to deliver unprecedented accuracy and efficiency across the justice system while solving previously intractable cases. The transition requires careful planning and investment but offers the potential to transform forensic practice at every level, from crime scene to courtroom. The future of forensic science lies at the intersection of nanotech, genomics, and computational biology, paving the way for a new standard in justice-driven DNA investigations.

Ethical Clearance : NA

Conflict of Interest : NA

Source of Funding : NA

References

1. Nanotechnology Timeline | National Nanotechnology Initiative [Internet]. Available from: <https://www.nano.gov/timeline>
2. Persistence of touch DNA for analysis | National Institute of Justice [Internet]. National Institute of Justice. Available from: <https://nij.ojp.gov/topics/articles/persistence-touch-dna-analysis>

3. Ali NBS. The Application of nanotechnology in criminology and forensic Sciences. *International Journal for Electronic Crime Investigation* [Internet]. 2022 Dec 15;6(4):13–8. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.54692/ijeci.2022.0604112>
4. Bhojar L, Mehar P, Chavali K. An overview of DNA degradation and its implications in forensic casework. *Egyptian Journal of Forensic Sciences* [Internet]. 2024 Mar 15;14(1). Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41935-024-00389-y>
5. Borg T. The role of DNA analysis in forensic science [Internet]. Alliant International University. Available from: <https://www.alliant.edu/blog/role-of-dna-analysis-in-forensic-science>
6. Daly DJ, Murphy C, McDermott SD. The transfer of touch DNA from hands to glass, fabric, and wood. *Forensic Science International Genetics* [Internet]. 2011 Feb 17;6(1):41–6. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fsigen.2010.12.016>
7. Tozzo P, Mazzobel E, Marcante B, Delicati A, Caenazzo L. Touch DNA sampling Methods: Efficacy evaluation and systematic review. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences* [Internet]. 2022 Dec 8;23(24):15541. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms232415541>
8. Bukyya JL, Tejasvi MLA, Avinash A, P CH, Talwade P, Afroz MM, et al. DNA Profiling in Forensic Science: A Review. *Global Medical Genetics* [Internet]. 2021 May 31;08(04):135–43. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0041-1728689>
9. Alketbi SK. Emerging technologies in forensic DNA analysis. *Deleted Journal* [Internet]. 2024 Jan 1;1(1):10007. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.70322/plfs.2024.10007>
10. Garg R. Importance of DNA forensics in criminal investigation and trials - iPleaders [Internet]. iPleaders. 2022. Available from: <https://blog.ipleaders.in/importance-of-dna-forensics-in-criminal-investigation-and-trials/>
11. DNA evidence: How it's done [Internet]. Available from: <https://www.forensicsciencesimplified.org/dna/how.html>
12. Van Oorschot RA, Ballantyne KN, Mitchell RJ. Forensic trace DNA: a review. *Investigative Genetics* [Internet]. 2010 Jan 1;1(1):14. Available from: <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3012025/>
13. Zacher M, Van Oorschot R a H, Handt O, Goray M. Transfer and persistence of intruder DNA within an office after reuse by owner. *Forensic Science International Genetics* [Internet]. 2024 Aug 28;73:103130. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fsigen.2024.103130>
14. Raymond JJ, Van Oorschot RAH, Gunn PR, Walsh SJ, Roux C. Trace evidence characteristics of DNA: A preliminary investigation of the persistence of DNA at crime scenes. *Forensic Science International Genetics* [Internet]. 2009 May 2;4(1):26–33. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fsigen.2009.04.002>
15. Goray M, Eken E, Mitchell RJ, Van Oorschot RAH. Secondary DNA transfer of biological substances under varying test conditions. *Forensic Science International Genetics* [Internet]. 2009 Jun 10;4(2):62–7. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fsigen.2009.05.001>
16. Lowe A, Murray C, Whitaker J, Tully G, Gill P. The propensity of individuals to deposit DNA and secondary transfer of low level DNA from individuals to inert surfaces. *Forensic Science International* [Internet]. 2002 Sep 1;129(1):25–34. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0379-0738\(02\)00207-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0379-0738(02)00207-4)
17. Whitaker JP, Cotton EA, Gill P. A comparison of the characteristics of profiles produced with the AMPFISTR® SGM Plus™ multiplex system for both standard and low copy number (LCN) STR DNA analysis. *Forensic Science International* [Internet]. 2001 Dec 1;123(2–3):215–23. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0379-0738\(01\)00557-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0379-0738(01)00557-6)
18. Gill P, Sparkes R, Pinchin R, Clayton T, Whitaker J, Buckleton NJ. Interpreting simple STR mixtures using allele peak areas. *Forensic Science International* [Internet]. 1998 Jan 1;91(1):41–53. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0379-0738\(97\)00174-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0379-0738(97)00174-6)
19. Is “Touch DNA” precisely the opposite? | Ohio State Bar Association [Internet]. Available from: <https://www.ohioabar.org/member-tools-benefits/practice-resources/practice-library-search/practice-library/is-touch-dna-precisely-the-opposite/>