

## OVERVIEW

# The relevance of gunshot residues in forensic science

Virginie Redouté Minzière<sup>1</sup>  | Anne-Laure Gassner<sup>2</sup>  | Matteo Gallidabino<sup>3</sup>  |  
Claude Roux<sup>4</sup>  | Céline Weyermann<sup>1</sup> 

<sup>1</sup>Ecole des Sciences Criminelles,  
Université de Lausanne, Vaud,  
Switzerland

<sup>2</sup>Federal Department of Defence, Civil  
Protection and Sport, Federal Office for  
Defence Procurement, Thun, Switzerland

<sup>3</sup>Centre for Forensic Science,  
Northumbria University, Newcastle, Upon  
Tyne, UK

<sup>4</sup>Centre for Forensic Science, University of  
Technology Sydney, Sydney, Australia

### Correspondence

Céline Weyermann, Ecole des Sciences  
Criminelles, Université de Lausanne,  
Vaud, Switzerland.  
Email: [celine.weyermann@unil.ch](mailto:celine.weyermann@unil.ch)

### Funding information

Swiss National Science Foundation,  
Grant/Award Numbers: 105211\_188898,  
10521A\_165608

**Edited by:** Sara Belkin, Executive Editor

### Abstract

Gunshot residues (GSR) are routinely exploited by forensic scientists in the investigation of firearm-related events. While many new techniques are daily reported in the literature for the analysis of GSR, there is still a significant lack of data on the transfer, persistence, and prevalence of GSR. Such fundamental knowledge is essential to fully exploit the information potential of GSR for investigation or in Court. This article provides an overview of the relevant questions related to GSR, more particularly to infer about the trace's origin (i.e., is it from a firearm discharge?) and the activity that caused transfer (e.g., primary, secondary, or subsequent transfer). GSR production and composition will be briefly described, considering both inorganic and organic components. Then, the available knowledge about the primary transfer, the secondary transfer, and the persistence of GSR will be outlined, as well as the prevalence (background level) of the targeted elements and/or compounds in the environment, more particularly on the hands of people unrelated to firearm incidents. Finally, the methods developed for the collection, analysis, and interpretation of GSR will be discussed. A holistic approach combining fundamental forensic science knowledge about GSR transfer, persistence, and prevalence together with other available information is discussed as a path forward to increase the relevance and value of the GSR trace in practice.

This article is categorized under:

Crime Scene Investigation > From Traces to Intelligence and Evidence  
Forensic Chemistry and Trace Evidence > Trace Evidence  
Forensic Chemistry and Trace Evidence > Explosive Analysis

### KEYWORDS

analysis, background level, detection, firearm discharge residue, forensic science, GSR, interpretation, persistence, prevalence, trace, transfer

## 1 | INTRODUCTION

Firearm related incidents can lead to the transfer of many traces, related or not to the discharge of the firearm(s). While DNA, fingerprints, or fibers can be transferred and detected on firearms and related materials (e.g., bullets, cartridge

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) License, which permits use and distribution in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, the use is non-commercial and no modifications or adaptations are made.

© 2022 The Authors. WIREs Forensic Science published by Wiley Periodicals LLC.

cases), specific traces are typically encountered during the investigation of such events such as striae and deformation of bullets, impact holes, spent cartridge cases, and gunshot residues (Charles et al., 2010, 2020; Maitre et al., 2017; Mattijssen et al., 2016). These traces contribute to the inference of bullet trajectories, number, distance, and time of the shooting, as well as material characterization (e.g., gunshot residue) and association (e.g., between bullet, cartridge case, and firearm; between the individuals involved and the firearm or the shooting event; Brozek-Mucha, 2017; Mattijssen et al., 2016; Meng & Caddy, 1997; Nichols, 2018; Niewoehner et al., 2005; Romolo & Margot, 2001). This overview focuses more particularly on the relevance of gunshot residues (GSR)<sup>1</sup> also referred to as firearm discharge residue (FDR) or cartridge discharge residue (CDR), in the forensic investigation of firearm related incidents.

GSR are produced during the discharge of a firearm and transferred on surrounding people and surfaces. The results of their qualitative and quantitative analysis have the potential to help answer different types of questions such as (Pitts & Lewis, 2019; Wallace, 2008; Wolten et al., 1977): Who handled or discharged a firearm? Who was present when a firearm was discharged? What firearm and ammunition were discharged? Where or when was a firearm discharged?

One of the main purposes of GSR detection and analysis is to evaluate if the trace's origin is a firearm discharge (source level) and what type of activity caused the transfer (activity level). It is important to differentiate these questions as GSR can be transferred directly due to a firearm discharge (primary transfer) or indirectly through secondary or a higher level transfer (Charles & Geusens, 2012; Ditrich, 2012; French et al., 2014; French & Morgan, 2015; Gassner et al., 2019; Gassner & Weyermann, 2020; Hofstetter et al., 2017; Krishnan, 1977; Maitre et al., 2019; Manganelli et al., 2019).

Thus, in practice, the following questions are generally more particularly addressed:

- Are GSR target components detected (e.g., specific inorganic elements or organic compounds)?
- How many different target components are detected?
- Where and when are they detected?
- In what quantity are they detected?

To answer these questions, forensic scientists need to acquire fundamental knowledge on the GSR trace (i.e., transfer, persistence, prevalence) and develop methodologies to detect, collect, analyze, and interpret the trace in a forensic casework context. This article aims at outlining available knowledge on the GSR trace, focusing more particularly on the residue transferred on shooter versus nonshooters (rather than on targets or surrounding objects). GSR detection and analysis are also described, and the possibilities and limitations of current approaches will be discussed, suggesting a path forward for the development of forensic GSR research.


## 2 | GSR PRODUCTION AND COMPOSITION

GSR refers to all material (e.g., particles, elements, and compounds) generated and transferred during or immediately after the discharge of a firearm. When the trigger is pulled, the firing pin strikes the primer of the cartridge, producing a burst of flame that ignites the smokeless powder. During the combustion of the powder, a large quantity of gas is produced and contributes to the rapid increase of temperature and pressure (Tenney, 1953; Thornton, 1994; Zeichner, 2009). Under these extreme conditions, the bullet is pushed out of the muzzle, and vapors (also called “plume”) composed of gas as well as burnt and unburnt particles are released through all available openings of the firearm (Schwoeble & Exline, 2000). These gas and particles known as GSR are transferred on nearby surfaces including the firearm, the hands, clothes, face, and hair of the shooter and bystanders. They can also be found on the target and surrounding surfaces (Blakey et al., 2018). The residues originate from the primer, the cartridge case, the projectile (i.e., the bullet), the propulsive charge (also called smokeless powder), and the weapon including lubricants and cleaning products (Figure 1).

Two main types of GSR are usually differentiated for methodological purposes as different methods are generally used to detect and/or analyze them: inorganic and organic GSR (Blakey et al., 2018; Dalby et al., 2010; Feeney et al., 2020; Romolo & Margot, 2001; Wallace, 2008; Wolten et al., 1977).

### 2.1 | Inorganic GSR

IGSR originates mainly from the primer mixture (Table 1). They are formed after the vaporization and condensation of heavy metals elements contained in the primer mixture (e.g., lead, antimony, tin, copper, and barium; Schwoeble &



**FIGURE 1** Different parts of ammunition contributing to the GSR trace

**TABLE 1** Example of primer mixture compositions

Primer mixture		
Ammunition type	Sinoxid-type	Heavy metal-free
Role	Compounds	
Initiator	Lead styphnate	Diazole (2-diazo-4,6-dinitrophenol)
Sensitizer	Tetrazene	Tetrazene
Oxidizer	Barium nitrate Lead peroxide Lead dioxide	Zinc peroxide
Fuel	Antimony sulfide Calcium silicate Metal powder (Magnesium, Titanium, Zirconium, or Aluminum)	Titanium chloride
Friction agent	Glass powder	Glass powder
Tagging elements	–	Gadolinium (III) oxide Gallium-copper-tin Samarium oxide Titanium oxide

*Note:* The main target components of current methods are PbBaSb, TiZnGd, GaCuSn particles as they are considered characteristic of IGSR. Other particles (such as PbBa, PbSb, PbBaCaSi, BaCaSi, BaAl, BaSb, Pb, Ba, and Sb) are also targeted by the analysis but are considered to be less specific (ASTM International, 2020). TiZn and Sr, were suggested as consistent with heavy-metal free ammunitions.

Exline, 2000). The weapon and the cartridge case also produce IGSR through surface wrenching but generally in smaller proportions (Gallidabino & Weyermann, 2020; Wolten et al., 1979). The primer is a mixture of components having different roles such as the primary explosives, the sensitizers, or the pyrotechnic system. These components are generally rich in heavy metals elements. The composition of the primer has changed over time. Mercury fulminate was initially used as the primary explosive together with potassium chlorate (oxidant), antimony trisulfide (flash development), and glass powder (friction agent). These primers were replaced by the Sinoxid<sup>®</sup>-type primer (in the early 1950s for the US military), a mixture of lead styphnate (primary explosive), barium nitrate, and antimony sulfide (pyrotechnic system), to avoid corrosion of the firearms (Brede et al., 1996; Wallace, 2008). Sinoxid<sup>®</sup> type primers have the advantages of high resistance to corrosion and good chemical stability. They produce heavy-metal particles, and some of them have an elemental combination that is considered characteristic of GSR (e.g., PbBaSb; Hagel & Redecker, 1986; ASTM International, 2020; Niewoehner et al., 2003; SWGGSR, 2011). While these primers are still predominantly used nowadays, toxic elements (lead, barium, and antimony) are released into the environment during the discharge (Brede

et al., 1996). Such toxicity is particularly an issue for indoor shooting activities and other similar situations. As a result, “heavy metal-free” primer or ammunition (e.g., Sintox<sup>®</sup>, Action 4, PEP II) were developed using less toxic elements such as diazole (primary explosive), zinc peroxides, and titanium chlorides (pyrotechnic system) instead of lead, barium, and antimony, leading to the production of different consistent particles such as TiZn and Sr (Charpentier & Desrochers, 2000; Gunaratnam & Himberg, 1994; Oommen & Pierce, 2006). Some police services also use modified heavy-metal free ammunition containing tagging elements<sup>2</sup> such as gadolinium, gallium, and samarium (Donghi et al., 2019; Niewoehner et al., 2006). Glass powder is also added to the primer mixture as a fractionator. Thus, glass particles can be encrusted in the IGSR particles (Seyfang, Lucas, Popelka-Filcoff, et al., 2019; Seyfang, Lucas, Redman, et al., 2019).

## 2.2 | Organic GSR

OGSR are mainly from the smokeless powder (Table 2) that is composed of primary explosives, stabilizers, plasticizers, gelatinizers, sensitizers, and flash inhibitors (Chang et al., 2013; Feeney et al., 2020; Goudsmits et al., 2015). During ammunition storage, reactions with stabilizers and sensitizers may occur (Dong et al., 2020; Laza et al., 2007). For example, the stabilizer diphenylamine (DPA) is known to capture the NO<sub>x</sub> produced by the degradation of NC and NG through the chemical reaction of N-nitrosation, C-nitration, and N-denitrosation, causing the production of compounds such as *N*-Nitrosodiphenylamine (*N*-nDPA), 2-nitrodiphenylamine (2-nDPA), 4-nitrodiphenylamine (4-nDPA), 2,4-dinitrodiphenylamine (2,4-DNDPA), and 4-nitrosodiphenylamine (4-NODPA; Espinoza & Thornton, 1994; Folly & Mäder, 2004; Laza et al., 2007; Tenney, 1953). Although 2-nDPA and 4-nDPA are depletion products, they are also reported in the literature as stabilizers added to the powder (Goudsmits et al., 2016; Joshi et al., 2011).

After the discharge of a firearm, unburnt components of the smokeless powder including degradation products can be found in GSR due to incomplete ignition, vaporization, and condensation of the smokeless powder. Combustion products are also produced during the discharge through pyrolysis, pyrosynthesis processes, and/or stoichiometric combustion reaction. For instance, benzonitrile and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) are reported in the literature

**TABLE 2** Example of the smokeless powder composition

Smokeless powder	
Role	Compounds
Energy carriers	Nitrocellulose (NC) Nitroglycerin (NG) Nitroguanidine (NQ)
Stabilizers	Diphenylamine (DPA) 2-nitrodiphenylamine (2-nDPA) 4-nitrodiphenylamine (4-nDPA) <i>N</i> -Nitrosodiphenylamine( <i>N</i> -nDPA) * 4-nitrosodiphenylamine (4-NODPA) * 2,4-dinitrodiphenylamine (2,4-DNDPA) * Ethylcentralite (EC) Methylcentralite (MC) Akardite I to III (AK-I to AK-III)
Sensitizers	2,4,6-trinitrotoluene (TNT) Pentaerythritol tetranitrate (PETN)
Flash inhibitor	Dinitrotoluene (2,3-, 2,4-, 2,6-, 3,4-DNT) 2 to 4-nitrotoluene (2 to 4-NT)
Plasticizers/gelatinizers	Dibutylphthalate (DBP) Dimethylphthalate (DMP) Diethylphthalate (DEP) Triacetin

*Note:* The target components of analytical methods are mainly the unburnt stabilizers. The primary explosives and flash inhibitors are less often targeted by the analysis. Compounds marked by an asterisk (\*) are degradation products of DPA and TNT, respectively.

as combustion products frequently detected in the spent cartridge and firearm muzzle (Ase et al., 1985; Crokek et al., 2001; Gallidabino et al., 2015; Gallidabino & Weyermann, 2020). Several authors also reported the development of luminescent markers that could be added to the ammunition to facilitate GSR detection (Destefani et al., 2014; Lucena et al., 2013; Weber et al., 2014). While this type of ammunition is not available on the market yet, OGSR are known to produce luminescence that can easily be visualized using optical methods (Hofer et al., 2017; Hofer & Wyss, 2017). Some researchers are also aiming at replacing current stabilizers (e.g., diphenylamine, akardite-II) with environment-friendlier molecules such as curcumin, 2,3,5-trimethylphenol, alpha-ionone, and alpha-tocopherol (Dejeaifve et al., 2018, 2020).

### 3 | THE GSR TRACE

The description above focused on GSR from a material and composition viewpoint. This section will expand the discussion on GSR as a forensic trace. A forensic trace can be defined as *the vestige or mark of a presence, an existence, or an action of someone or something in a location or space that did not belong to that space initially* (Margot, 2017). The GSR trace is the vestige of an action (i.e., the firearm discharge) that was transferred to one or several individuals (i.e., shooter, bystander, victim), and surrounding surfaces (i.e., crime scene). However, the targeted GSR component can also be transferred through other actions. Thus, the relevance of a GSR trace in a forensic science context is directly linked to the following criteria:

- The trace must be transferred in sufficient quantity (transfer  $t = 0$ )
- The trace must be persistent (persistence  $t > 0$ )
- The trace must be specific (low prevalence in the environment)
- The trace must be easily and reliably detectable and quantifiable (see Section 4 below)


If these criteria are at least partially fulfilled, inferences about the source of the trace and the activity that has led to the transfer can be made through a hypothetico-deductive process. This process may be more or less mathematically formalized depending on the purpose and jurisdiction (ANZPAA-NFIS, 2017; ENFSI, 2010; Ribaux & Caneppele, 2017; Roux et al., 2012).

#### 3.1 | Transfer

##### 3.1.1 | Primary transfer

Primary transfer occurs during or immediately after a firearm discharge. GSR is generally transferred on the hands of the shooter, mainly on the upper parts of the thumb and index (Figure 2; Brozek-Mucha, 2011; Chohra et al., 2019; Hofstetter et al., 2017; Wolten et al., 1977). Residues can also be transferred to other body parts and clothes: on the forearms, arms, chest, trousers, pockets, face, or hairs of a shooter and by-standers (Andrasko & Pettersson, 1991; Hofstetter et al., 2017; Krishnan, 1977; Merli et al., 2016; Zeichner & Levin, 1995). Some surfaces, such as the inside of the ears or the nostrils were also reported as good receivers (Chavez Reyes et al., 2018; Dobarceanu, 2020a, 2020b).

Only a few studies, using a variety of different analytical methods, reported the relative quantities of I- and OGSR transferred just after the discharge. GSR transfer is influenced by several factors such as donor (firearm/ammunition)–receptor (receiving surface) affinity and the environment (indoor/outdoor) (Chohra et al., 2019; Ditrach, 2012; Moran & Bell, 2013, 2014). The type of firearm has a significant influence on the plume formation and the distribution of the GSR produced (Schwoeble & Exline, 2000). Studies have reported a higher concentration of GSR on the side corresponding to the ejection port of the firearm (Blakey et al., 2018; Fojtášek et al., 2003; Gerard et al., 2011; Hofstetter et al., 2017). For example, the position of the ejection port of a semi-automatic/automatic pistol, the different openings of the cylinder of revolvers, and the barrel length influence the direction and distribution of the transfer GSR (Ditrach, 2012). The type of ammunition used also influences the quantity, composition, and particle size of the produced GSR (Campbell, 2018; Chohra et al., 2019; Gallidabino et al., 2015; Gassner et al., 2016; Rijnders et al., 2010; Zeichner et al., 1991). Schwoeble and Exline (2000) noted that smaller particles are generated with revolvers than with semi-automatic/automatic pistols. Furthermore, the transfer is also known to vary significantly between shots of the



**FIGURE 2** GSR is generally transferred in the V-shaped part of the hand between the thumb and the index finger (Meng & Caddy, 1997). GSR are mostly transferred on the upper part of the hand(s) holding the firearm but can also be transferred on the palm(s) as GSR are also present on the firearms.

### BOX 1 The potential of GSR to infer about activities

GSR localization and quantification can be useful in the investigation of suspicious deaths (Figure 3). In a case known to the authors, IGSR was found in high amounts on the right hands of two dead people. The lifeless bodies were found lying together on the ground. The first person was holding the firearm with his right hand (very high quantities of IGSR were detected). The second person was holding the right forearm of the first person with her right hand (lower, but still relatively high quantity of IGSR was detected). This second person was placed partially under the first person. The lifeless body of a third person was also found close to the others (no GSR detected on the hands). The investigation and detected traces allowed to formulate the proposition that the first person was the shooter. Bullet holes and projectiles were used to reconstruct trajectories, sequence, and the number of discharges. It was inferred that the first person shot several times before the second person reached him and grabbed his right arm. The collected information (including IGSR) enabled to formulate the proposition that the person holding the firearm shot the other two persons in the head (first the third person at close range and then the second person point-blank in the head), before shooting himself also in the head.

same firearm and ammunition (Hofstetter et al., 2017; Lopez-Lopez et al., 2013). External environmental factors, such as airflow (e.g., wind), humidity, rain, and distance (of bystanders, target, and surrounding surfaces) to the firearms also play a role in GSR primary transfer. In general, the closer a receiving surface is to the plume, the higher is the GSR transfer. In fact, OGSR were observed to transfer in higher average quantities on the hands, gloves, and forearms close to the discharge than on the upper clothes of shooters (Hofstetter et al., 2017). Gerard et al. (2011) observed larger quantities of IGSR near the projectile path and on the right side (side of the ejection port) of the bullet path. This indicates that a person near the projectile or bullet path may be exposed to GSR. The GSR distribution and quantity on the target(s) is also influenced by the distance between the firearm and the impacted surface and can thus be used to estimate the shooting distance (Bartsch et al., 1996; Marty et al., 2002; Zeichner & Glattstein, 2002). Some GSR are additionally carried out with the bullet and can be found at entrance (and sometimes also at exit) holes (Brown et al., 1999; Merli et al., 2019; Box 1).

### 3.1.2 | Secondary (and subsequent) transfer

Following the primary transfer, GSR may be transferred to another surface (receptor) through a secondary transfer. In this case, there is no direct contact between the original donor (firearm/ammunition) and the receiving surface. Subsequent transfer (tertiary, quaternary, ...) can further occur, even if they may be difficult to trace back to the original GSR source (see also prevalence section).





**FIGURE 3** Case example 1: Schematic representation of the three lifeless bodies as found during the crime scene investigation (left) and the first person holding the firearm with his right hand (right)

The word contamination is often used to describe the consequence of the secondary (or subsequent) transfer. It is important to differentiate the contaminations that are due to careless or poor practice and should be avoided (e.g., caused by an investigator or a respondent at the scene) and those that are part of the scene background and cannot be avoided because they occurred before the scene was secured (e.g., contamination caused by environmental conditions, scavengers or simply the context). Contaminations that are avoidable and caused by poor practice can be referred to as “pollution” (Margot, 2017; Schwendener et al., 2016).

Unavoidable contaminations can occur through different processes linked to primary and subsequent transfers of GSR or GSR alike traces. Primary or secondary transfer of GSR can be due to legitimate activities such as sport shooting, hunting, or firearms manufacturing facilities (Gerard et al., 2013; Lucas, Brown, et al., 2016). However, a person of interest (POI) may also come into contact with GSR before the investigation at the crime scene when discovering an incident (e.g., touching a victim to check for vital signs, displacing a firearm, or passing through the GSR cloud a few minutes after the shot; Fojtášek et al., 2003; Luten et al., 2018). Finally, a person may also come into contact with GSR alike traces from other sources and activities unrelated to firearms (see prevalence section below for more details).

Secondary transfer of IGSR was reported from a shooter to a POI after a handshake or the handling of a firearm recently discharged (Brozek-Mucha, 2014; French et al., 2014). French et al. (2014) observed that, in general, a higher number of particles were transferred after a handshake (i.e., just after the discharge occurred) than after the handling of a firearm. A tertiary transfer was also observed in a study by French and Morgan (2015) after a series of handshaking. Secondary transfer of IGSR was reported from police officers to a POI during arrest (Lucas et al., 2019). The scenario involved physical contact for 5 min. In most experiments, characteristic particles were transferred to the hands of the POI (average value of four characteristic particles). Charles and Geusens (2012) studied the transfer of GSR from police officers and duty firearms to a POI. The scenarios did not involve shooting, but manipulation and loading of the service weapon. While the transfer of GSR did not occur every time, it occurred frequently when the police officer proceeding to the arrest was highly contaminated with GSR. In fact, up to 13 characteristic particles were found on the hands of the arrested person under the high pollution scenario (i.e., police officers were allowed to have their equipment; bulletproof vest, technical vest, and gloves). The gloves were identified as the main source of GSR transfer (average value of 66 characteristic particles on the gloves after the discharge). Moreover, on average, slightly more particles were found on the clothes (vest) in comparison to the hands of the POI.

Preliminary studies of secondary transfer using ion mobility spectrometry (IMS), detected no OGSR after handshaking (Arndt et al., 2012). Ali et al. (2016) also investigated the transfer of OGSR in a police vehicle using liquid chromatography coupled to tandem mass spectrometry (LC-MS/MS). The POI was handcuffed and placed 10 min inside the vehicle. Two specimens (of 32) were positive for ethylcentralite (EC). Secondary transfer of OGSR was also reported in two other studies that used LC-MS/MS (Gassner et al., 2019; Maitre et al., 2019). Three scenarios were tested, transfer from the shooter to a POI after a handshake or an arrest as well as transfer during the handling of a firearm recently discharged. While the results obtained in both studies differed in the percentage of positive specimens (i.e., number of polluted POI and relative quantities), both warned about the (sometimes relatively high) risk of pollution for the investigated scenarios. In some instances, more OGSR were found on the non-shooter than on the shooter after contact. The intensity and duration of the contact had an influence on the GSR transfer. However, all scenarios

**BOX 2 The risk of GSR contamination**

The Bloody Sunday inquiry<sup>3</sup> highlighted that the source of the recovered lead particles on the clothes and hands of the deceased remained undetermined and may have been contaminations rather than indications that they fired or manipulated guns. The following statement by Dr Martin, the forensic scientist in charge of the gunshot residue examination, highlighted the need for background samples to evaluate the risks of contamination of forensic specimens: *I think that contamination is the major issue. When I did the tests and prepared my report for Widgery I was under the impression that 20 to 30 shots had been fired and that the bodies had been transferred in clean conditions to the mortuary. It was only at my cross-examination that I became aware that over 100 shots had been fired, greatly increasing both the overall levels of gunshot residues in the immediate environment and the possibility of fragmentation. In addition, at least some of the bodies had been handled and transported in a way that could have resulted in contamination by gunshot residues.* The concurrent propositions (i.e., discharge of a firearm, ambient contamination due to the number of shootings in the area, secondary transfer due to the handling and transport of the victims) cannot be adequately evaluated without background control samples.

occurred directly after discharge (high-risk scenarios) and secondary transfer may significantly decrease sometime after the discharge (see also persistence section below).

While pollution occurring during a police intervention can to some extent be controlled and minimized by different measures (e.g., protecting a person's hands before sampling, single-use equipment during the sampling), all contaminations cannot be avoided and must be taken into account in practice. Indeed, police officers proceeding to a complicated arrest may be contaminated for example through shooting training sessions or regular contact with contaminated surfaces (e.g., police vehicles, special unit equipment, and firearms; Berk et al., 2007; Cook, 2016; Gassner & Weyermann, 2020; Gerard et al., 2013; Gialamas et al., 1995). Background samples taken at the scene and from similar materials to those under investigation are, therefore, very important to account for the risk of secondary transfer in the investigation of firearm incidents (Feeney et al., 2021; Lucas et al., 2019; Manganelli et al., 2019; Stamouli et al., 2021). For example, in Box 2, it would have been important to collect background samples from the scene of the shooting (e.g., very close to the bodies, and also further away to evaluate the “overall levels of gunshot residues in the immediate environment” as well as on the people having handled the bodies and in the vehicles used to transport them).


### 3.2 | Persistence ( $t > 0$ )

After transfer, GSR may be lost due to activity (e.g., walking, running, typing, or handwashing) and environmental conditions (e.g., wind, rain; Figure 4). Only a few persistence studies have been carried out as they are relatively complicated to design. They all showed the need to sample the area of interest (e.g., the hands, face, or forearms of the POI) as quickly as possible given the rapid loss of GSR in the first hours after the transfer (Brozek-Mucha, 2011; Jalanti et al., 1999; Maitre et al., 2018).

The persistence is also affected by the chemical properties of the GSR. IGSR and OGSR are two classes of residues coming from different parts of the ammunition (i.e., primer and smokeless powder). IGSR are very stable metallic particles, that are removed mainly by physical phenomena (i.e., movement and friction). OGSR are organic compounds, that can volatilize or be absorbed on the skin (lipophilic properties; Moran & Bell, 2013). Moran and Bell (2014) have identified EC, 2-nDPA, and 4-nDPA as more persistent compounds considering their low volatilization rate and their slow skin permeation.

In suicide cases, higher amounts of GSR are expected to persist on the hands considering the absence of activity of the shooter. However, studies on the subject reported the detection of very few or no characteristic particles on some of the samples taken (Lucas, Cook, et al., 2016). While the persistence can be affected by post-mortem changes, as well as outdoor conditions, studies on the persistence of GSR on decomposing porcine tissue found that GSR are still detected on tissue and skeletonized samples several weeks after a shot (Gibelli et al., 2010; Lagoo et al., 2010). The high variability of the transfer and persistence phenomenon illustrates the difficulty in distinguishing a self-inflicted from a non-self-inflicted wound based on GSR found on the hands of a dead person (Lucas, Cook, et al., 2016; Molina, Castorena, & DiMaio, 2007; Molina, Martinez, et al., 2007).





**FIGURE 4** The GSR trace detected during the investigation of a firearm discharge is dependent: (1) on the state and composition of the initial materials used (e.g., firearm, ammunition) and on the age of the smokeless powder (e.g., depletion of the stabilizers/sensitizers), (2) on the transfer conditions (e.g., wind, distance to surrounding surfaces, receptor affinities), and (3) on the time, environment and activities between transfer and collection (e.g., rain or handwashing will strongly limit the persistence of GSR on the exposed surfaces)

Studies on the persistence of IGSR in the hands of a shooter indicated that most target elements (e.g., Pb, Ba, Sb) were lost during the first hours after a discharge (following an exponential decrease; Andrasko & Maehly, 1977; Brozek-Mucha, 2011; Jalanti et al., 1999; Kilty, 1975; Nesbitt et al., 1976; Nesbitt et al., 1977; Wolten et al., 1977). Despite the rapid loss, Andrasko and Maehly (1977), Jalanti et al. (1999), and Brozek-Mucha (2011) still reported the detection of a few characteristic particles (PbBaSb) up to 4 h after the discharge using the Scanning Electron Microscopy coupled to Energy Dispersive x-Ray Spectrometry (SEM/EDS). Rosenberg and Dockery (2008) were also able to detect Ba up to 5.27 days after six consecutive shots using laser-induced breakdown spectroscopy (LIBS). All research had in common a large variation in particle counts between replicates. Schütz et al. (2001) additionally, observed that the type of ammunition and firearm influenced the amount of IGSR generated. While IGSR persistence on hands is limited due to handwashing or hand sanitizer application (Feeney et al., 2021; Kilty, 1975; Nesbitt et al., 1977), particles could be detected up to 23 h on the hair and face as well as in the nose and ears of the shooter (Chavez Reyes et al., 2018; Dobarceraanu, 2020a, 2020b; Zeichner & Levin, 1993). In the case of collection on clothes, the recovery of IGSR is influenced by the type of surface (e.g., cotton, leather, wool; see the section on collection device below; Charles et al., 2013) and it is important to mention, that brushing and washing can result in a significant loss (Vinokurov et al., 2001).

As for the IGSR, studies showed that OGSR concentrations decrease rapidly in the first hours following the transfer (Northrop, 2001b), but that target compounds can still be detected after 4 h (Arndt et al., 2012; Gassner et al., 2016; Gassner & Weyermann, 2016; Maitre et al., 2018). After half an hour, Maitre et al. (2018) detected up to 50% of the initial concentration on the hands of a shooter. However, the detected amount decreased to 8%–37% after 4 h depending on the targeted compound and firearm used. In the study of Gassner et al. (2016) less than 1% and 5% of the initial concentrations of ethylcentralite and 2-nitrodiphenylamine respectively were found on the hands of a shooter after 2 h.

### 3.3 | Prevalence

The prevalence of a trace can be defined by its background distribution in a given population (e.g., on the hands of people unrelated to firearm incidents) or in the environment (e.g., on scenes before the occurrence of a crime; Berk, 2009a, 2009b; Drzyzga, 2003; Llyod, 1987; Torre et al., 2001). While secondary GSR transfer can explain some background contaminations, other activities also promote the transfer of particles or compounds undifferentiable from I- or OGSR (e.g., welding or fireworks; Brozek-Mucha, 2015; Mosher et al., 1998). Knowledge of the prevalence of target components in given contexts is essential for correct evaluation of the signification of their presence in case situations. Thus, prevalence studies are necessary knowledge to take into account the risk of legitimate occurrence of targeted components on POI.

The prevalence of IGSR in the civilian population has been studied in various countries and results indicate that a low number of characteristic particles were generally detected. Three characteristic particles (PbBaSb) were found in the hands of one person out of 289 in Australia (Lucas, Brown, et al., 2016). In a Polish study, only one characteristic particle was found on the hands of one person out of 100 persons declaring no contact with firearms (Brozek-Mucha, 2014). A recent international study investigated the prevalence on the hands of more than 1300 persons and found that the mean probability of finding at least one PbBaSb particle for a low-risk population (i.e., general population and car mechanics,  $n = 752$  persons) was 1.7% (Stamouli et al., 2021). More than 10 PbBaSb particles were detected only on the hand of one person in the general population. In all these studies, car mechanics were not found to be more at risk than the general population, while police officers and people owning firearms presented a much higher IGSR prevalence (see also the section about the secondary transfer above).

For OGSR, a study in the US used micellar electrokinetic capillary electrophoresis (MECE) to analyze samples collected from the hands of 100 volunteers, and no positive results were obtained (Northrop, 2001a). Another study conducted in the US on the hands of 73 persons from the general population using IMS yielded less than 5% positive results (Bell & Seitzinger, 2016). Two studies in Switzerland investigated the prevalence of OGSR in the civilian population using LC-MS/MS. This instrument is particularly interesting considering the lower limits of detection. In the first study, no OGSR target compounds were found in the hand of 27 people (Hofstetter et al., 2017). In the second study, samples from the hands, forearms, and sleeves of 122 persons were analyzed (Manganelli et al., 2019). While one or more OGSR compounds were detected in 18% of the population, only two persons had more than four compounds. One person with six OGSR compounds on his hands indicated having discharged a firearm less than 10 min before the sampling occurred. However, the other person could not explain the presence of four OGSR compounds on his sleeves. In this prevalence study, 4-nDPA and AK II were the most frequently detected compounds.

One recent study investigated the prevalence of both I- and OGSR on a low-risk (i.e., general population having no contact with firearms) and a high-risk (i.e., police officers, mechanics, agricultural workers, ballistics research personnel) population (Feeney et al., 2021). Low concentrations or concentrations below the detection limits were obtained for IGSR and OGSR in the low-risk population. EC was detected in 42% of these samples. For the high-risk population, higher concentrations were obtained for the EC, Ba, and Pb. These components were detected in approximately 40%, 90%, and 34% of these samples, respectively. Interestingly, the combination of EC, Ba, and Pb was observed in 9% of these samples.

## 4 | GSR COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

The first methodological step starts during the crime (scene) investigation. At this stage, the aim is to find relevant traces of the scene and people of interest following an hypothetico-deductive cycle (see graphical abstract) to reconstruct what happened (Baechler et al., 2020; Ribaux & Caneppele, 2017; Roux et al., 2012).


The following aspects need to be considered to extract relevant information from the GSR trace:

- The *forensic aspects*: knowledge about the trace, including specific case information for example about the competing hypotheses (e.g., suicide vs. homicide vs. accident) as well as knowledge about the trace transfer, persistence, and prevalence are essential to determine where specimen (and background samples) should be collected.
- The *technical aspects*: knowledge about the efficiency of a collection device on encountered surfaces (e.g., skin, hair, fabrics) as well as selection criteria for analytical and data treatment methods (e.g., invasiveness, specificity, reliability, and limits of detection) are needed to determine how specimen (and control samples) should be collected and analyzed.

While both are important, the forensic aspects (Section 3) form the basis upon which the technical aspects (Section 4) can be developed (Roux et al., 2021). As a reminder, GSR detection and analysis is considered here mainly to evaluate if the trace's origin is a firearm discharge (source level) and what type of activity provoked the transfer (activity level). Thus, the methodological details will focus on GSR on a person of interest rather than on surrounding surfaces.

### 4.1 | Collection

While OGSR particles can be visible to the naked eye (see black spots around the bullet hole in Figure 5), many are latent and need to be collected and analyzed in more detail.



**FIGURE 5** Visible GSR particles around a bullet hole on a white cotton tissue. The bullet was shot at 30 cm using a SigSauer P220 pistol (Thun® 9 mm Parabellum). This picture was provided by our colleague Julia Fischer

The collection stage needs to be compatible with the subsequent analysis method. It also requires knowledge about the transfer, persistence, and prevalence of GSR to target relevant areas on a person of interest (Section 3). For example, hands are generally targeted shortly after the discharge as high quantities are generally transferred on the hand(s) holding the firearm (Chohra et al., 2019; Hofstetter et al., 2017). During a discharge, GSR will be transferred both on the palms and back of the hands. If a person has only manipulated a firearm without discharging it, GSR are expected mainly on the palms. However, in practice, the sampling is often performed on the entirety of each hand (back and palm) to ensure sufficient quantities and decrease analysis costs. Moreover, if some time has passed between the investigated discharge event and the trace collection, persistence might be lower on the hands (e.g., if a person of interest has washed his hands in the interval) (Feeney et al., 2021; Kilty, 1975). Thus, other surfaces might also be targeted for collection such as hair, clothes, face, or nostrils (Brozek-Mucha, 2011; Hofstetter et al., 2017). While knowledge about the persistence and prevalence of GSR in those areas is limited (complicating the subsequent interpretation in a forensic context), other issues must also be taken into account as collection efficiency differs on different surfaces such as skin, fabrics, or hair.

The efficiency of collection devices was tested on different areas of interest for IGSR and/or OGSR. The main collection device, routinely used by police services and forensic laboratories, is an aluminum stub mounted with a double-sided carbon adhesive (Figure 6). This device was reported as the most efficient tested device for the collection of IGSR and OGSR on the skin (DeGaetano et al., 1992; Gassner et al., 2016; Reid et al., 2010; Taudte et al., 2016). A modified stub was also recently proposed to access the nostrils (Chavez Reyes et al., 2018). Stubs can also be used to collect GSR on hair and fabrics, but the saturation of the carbon adhesive may occur for example on wool or cotton fabrics, thus, limiting the collection efficiency (Charles et al., 2013; Zeichner & Levin, 1993). Moreover, the presence of a large number of fibers and skin debris on the stub may complicate the detection of GSR particles with the SEM/EDS (Romolo & Margot, 2001).

Other collection devices were reported in the literature. For example, swabbing was proposed to collect OGSR as the targeted molecules dissolve easily in solvents. However, two studies indicated that swabs were less effective than stubs for the collection of OGSR on the hands (Gassner et al., 2016; Taudte et al., 2016). Swabs were reported to have the same efficiency as stubs to collect IGSR from the hair (Zeichner & Levin, 1993). Swabs were also found suitable for collection in the nasal mucus with the risk of causing nasal bleeding (Aliste & Chavez, 2016; Schwartz & Zona, 1995). An alternative was proposed by blowing noses on handkerchiefs, fabrics, or polymer film (Merli et al., 2016; Schwartz & Zona, 1995). Other devices were also tested to collect GSR such as a fine-toothed comb to collect GSR from the hair (MacCrehan et al., 2003) or vacuuming through a filtration system for collection from clothes including pockets (Andrasko & Pettersson, 1991). GSR particles may also be transferred onto materials such as filter papers, adhesive foils, or photo papers (ENFSI, 2015; Werner et al., 2020).




FIGURE 6 Collection of GSR using an aluminum stub mounted with a carbon adhesive

It is important to have general knowledge about the collection efficiency (i.e., the recovered quantities) to infer about the transferred quantities. However, a firearm discharge is a highly variable event, and it is difficult to reproduce GSR-like particles in controlled conditions. A successive sampling of the same target surface was studied and showed that some GSR were still present after a first sampling (Zeichner & Levin, 1993). Thus, it may be interesting to study and compare recovery rates between devices, but also to evaluate how many iterations are necessary until GSR components cannot be detected anymore.

## 4.2 | Analysis

The analysis of GSR aims to detect, qualify, or quantify targets components (e.g., particles, elements, molecules). Each type of analysis has advantages and disadvantages that will be briefly discussed considering important criteria such as destructivity (i.e., the trace can be reanalyzed using the same or a different technique), specificity (i.e., capacity to identify compounds or chemical elements), reliability (i.e., precision and accuracy), and limits of detection (LODs). Other criteria such as availability in forensic laboratories, cost, time, level of complexity (i.e., needed skills), hazards, and possible application on the crime scene (e.g., portability) should also be considered when selecting a suitable method in a given forensic context.

- *Optical methods* have been found useful to deliver spatial information for the estimation of the shooting distance. In fact, luminescent GSR particles may be visualized in the near-infrared wavelength. Certain organic compounds (e.g., diethyl phthalate and dibutyl phthalate) have been identified as having a strong IR-luminescent (Hofer et al., 2017; Hofer & Wyss, 2017). Moreover, the visualization of GSR particles on dark or multi-colored fabrics may be enhanced using digital infrared photography (Bailey, 2007). These optical methods are thus, nondestructive and relatively rapid but, they have limited specificity and relatively high LODs. They can to some extent be carried out directly on the scene.
- *Chemographic methods* can be performed on the crime scene, deliver spatial and timely information about the trace (Geusens et al., 2019; Marty et al., 2002). Although they are invasive, some of them can also be carried out in sequence with other methods presenting higher selectivity (Werner et al., 2020). However, chemographic tests are only indicative and have thus, a high risk of false positive (Schwoeble & Exline, 2000). In practice, they are usually implemented to estimate the distance of shooting rather than to detect GSR on the hands of a person of interest. The Sodium Rhodizonate test targeting several inorganic elements (i.e., Pb, Ba, Sr, Cd, Sn, Ag, Hg, Ti, Cu, and Zn), and the Rubeanic acid test (or the Dithiooxamide test) targeting copper and nickel, and the Modified Griess test targeting free nitrites, are usually used in practice for GSR analysis (Andreola et al., 2011; Bartsch et al., 1996; Berger et al., 2019; ENFSI, 2015; Lekstrom & Koons, 1986).
- *Spectrometric instruments* are the most common techniques for the analysis of IGSR. To date, the method of choice for the detection of IGSR in most forensic laboratories is Scanning Electron Microscopy coupled with Energy Dispersive X-Ray Spectrometry (SEM/EDS; ASTM International, 2020; White & Owens, 1987; Wolten et al., 1977). It has the advantage over other methods of allowing a quantitative analysis as well as giving detailed information about the composition and morphology of the detected particles. However, SEM/EDS requires a high level of skill, is costly,



and requires long analysis times. Neutron Activation Analysis (NAA) and Atomic Absorption Spectrometry (AAS; Kanstrup et al., 2016; Krishnan, 1974; McFarland & McLain, 1973; Rudzitis et al., 1973) were the first methods proposed for the detection of inorganic elements and are complementary since NAA has a low LOD for barium, antimony, and iron while AAS has a low LOD for lead. However, these two techniques are less specific and therefore, rarely found in forensic laboratories. NAA is also a complex technique that requires specific knowledge (Chohra et al., 2019; Stone & Petty, 1974). More recently, Graphite Furnace AAS (GFAAS) has been proposed as a more sensitive and specific alternative to AAS, but this method is also rarely available in forensic laboratories (Aliste & Chavez, 2016; Yuksel et al., 2016). X-ray fluorescence (XRF) and laser-induced breakdown spectroscopy (LIBS) have also been proposed for the elemental mapping of inorganic particles on specimens (e.g., clothes, stubs; Berendes et al., 2006; Dockery & Goode, 2003; Gong et al., 2022; Latzel et al., 2012; Lopez-Lopez et al., 2017). They can be (trans)portable for direct analysis on the crime scene. However, they do not deliver information on morphology and particle counts. Inductively Coupled Plasma (ICP) coupled with Optical Emission Spectrometry (OES), Atomic Emission Spectrometry (AES) or mass spectrometry (MS), and Time-of-Flight Secondary Ion Mass Spectrometry (ToF-SIMS) are instruments with adequate LODs and specificity for heavy metals elements (e.g., Pb, Sb, Ba, Co, Ni, Zn). ToF-SIMS can additionally detect some organic compounds such as EC, NC, and NG (Coumbaros et al., 2001; Mahoney et al., 2006). However, these techniques are also less available in forensic laboratories (Brunjes et al., 2022; Coumbaros et al., 2001; Diaz et al., 2012; Koons, 1998; Szykowska et al., 2012). Fourier transform infrared (FTIR) and Raman spectroscopy were proposed for the analysis of OGSR (i.e., stabilizers and primary explosives; Lopez-Lopez, Delgado, & Garcia-Ruiz, 2012; Lopez-Lopez, Ferrando, & Garcia-Ruiz, 2012). These instruments are not commonly used in practice but could be integrated as screening techniques considering their rapidity and potential portability. However, they have relatively high detection limits and may still require destructive sample preparation (to concentrate the samples). Desorption Electrospray Ionization-Mass spectrometry (DESI-MS) was proposed for OGSR analysis as it required minimal specimen preparation and allowed a rapid analysis (Morelato et al., 2012; Zhao et al., 2008). The limit of detection was however deemed too high to be useful in forensic practice.

- *Separation methods*, particularly when coupled to mass spectrometry (MS), are specific, reliable, and have low LODs. While sample preparation is required and invasive, the extracts can generally be stored in a freezer and re-analyzed. Gas Chromatography (GC) and Liquid Chromatography (LC) coupled with MS or MS/MS have been proposed for the analysis of OGSR (Laza et al., 2007; Tarifa & Almirall, 2015). Ultra High Performance (UHP)LC-MS presents nowadays the best LODs (sub-nanogram range; Gassner & Weyermann, 2016; Taudte et al., 2015). GC-MS generally has higher LODs and some thermolabile compounds can be degraded during injection (e.g., NG, N-nDPA; Muller et al., 2007; Zeichner & Eldar, 2004). Capillary electrophoresis is another separation technique that allows the simultaneous analysis of both I and OGSR but has relatively high LODs (Morales & Vazquez, 2004; Northrop, 2001a, 2001b). Such instrumental techniques are generally relatively costly and cannot be easily carried out on the scene. Ion mobility spectrometry is the only portable and quick separation method but is, unfortunately, less specific and reliable than the previous techniques (Arndt et al., 2012; Moran & Bell, 2013). OGSR can be collected on stubs without disturbing the distribution of IGSR allowing lower invasiveness and the possibility of sequential analysis of both types of residues (Bonnar et al., 2020).

Nowadays, the analysis of IGSR using SEM/EDS is the one commonly applied in forensic laboratories. OGSR analysis is still rarely implemented in practice although a combined analysis of both types of GSR would provide additional information. Several studies have been carried out to develop and evaluate different approaches for the combined detection and/or analysis of I- and OGSR (Bell & Feeney, 2019; Benito et al., 2015; Bonnar et al., 2020; Redoute Minziere et al., 2020; Taudte et al., 2016). In total, three different approaches have been suggested using a combination of different collection and analysis techniques:

- One specimen is collected and divided into half for parallel analysis of I- and OGSR using different techniques (Abrego et al., 2014; Benito et al., 2015; Redoute Minziere et al., 2020). The disadvantage of this approach is that the recovered quantities are approximately divided by half for each type of GSR, with the risk of falling below the limit of detection of the instrument used for the analysis. Instead of dividing one specimen, collection of several specimens in sequence (ENFSI, 2017) or on different areas of interest has also been suggested as an alternative and may present potential if I- and OGSR transfer and persistence mechanisms were sufficiently different. However, current knowledge on the transfer and persistence of GSR does not support this hypothesis (Sections 3.1 and 3.2).



- One specimen is collected and analyzed in sequence (Gandy et al., 2018; Goudsmits et al., 2019; Morelato et al., 2012; Tarifa & Almirall, 2015; Zeichner & Eldar, 2004). In this approach, a good recovery was generally observed for the type of GSR analyzed first, while a loss was observed for the type of GSR analyzed subsequently (Bonnar et al., 2020; Redoute Minziere et al., 2020; Taudte et al., 2016). If a priority is given to one type of GSR or if the loss can be minimized, this represents an interesting approach.
- One specimen is collected and analyzed simultaneously using a single technique for both types of GSR (Bell & Feeney, 2019; Feeney et al., 2021; Morales & Vazquez, 2004; Ott et al., 2020). While this is theoretically the best approach (at least in terms of efficiency), none of the analytical techniques tested has adequate LODs for both types of GSR yet.

The selected combined analysis approach should maximize the recovery of both IGSR and OGSR and allow reanalysis of the specimen. According to available data, the sequential analysis of one specimen for both types of residues is the most adequate approach for maximum recovery of GSR. It is even possible to recover OGSR from a stub while preserving the quantity and distribution of the IGSR particles on the stub for subsequent analysis and storage (Bonnar et al., 2020; Redouté Minzière & Weyermann, 2021).

## 5 | INTERPRETATION

The GSR trace can contribute to the reconstruction of events (Baechler et al., 2020; Kind, 1994) or it can be used as evidence in a trial (ANZPAA-NFIS, 2017; ENFSI, 2010). While some methods can be directly applied on site (Section 4.2), this remains relatively rare in practice. GSR specimens are often collected by forensic technicians or police investigators and sent to the laboratory for analysis (mainly using SEM-EDX as indicated in Section 4.2). Several weeks can occur between the collection and the analysis of the GSR specimens, thus only visible (or easily enhanced) traces can generally be used in the early crime scene investigation. The next sections will describe how GSR can contribute as a clue in the investigation and as a proof in Court.

### 5.1 | Investigation (the problem to find)

During the investigation of a firearm-related event, the forensic scientists search for relevant traces and contribute to the formulation of hypotheses about the activities and involved persons with the other investigators (Baechler et al., 2020; Kind, 1994). It was proposed to follow an hypothetico-deductive reasoning cycle to find relevant traces (deductive inferences) and formulate hypotheses/propositions<sup>4</sup> about the event (abductive inferences; Crispino, 2008; Ribaux & Caneppele, 2017; Ribaux & Talbot Wright, 2014; Roux et al., 2012). At this stage, all possible propositions should be considered and tested according to the available knowledge (e.g., case information as well as trace fundamentals from Section 3), and when necessary, through case-specific experimentation.

As mentioned, knowledge about the transfer, persistence, and prevalence of GSR is very important at this stage, but generally lacking in availability and representativity (Cadola et al., 2021). Indeed, as reported in Section 3, it is not possible to collect comprehensive data for all singular cases (Crispino et al., 2021). Many factors will influence the amount of transferred GSR and their subsequent persistence (see Figure 3), such as the type of firearm, the ammunition, the discharge conditions (e.g., number of shots, environmental and weather conditions, ...), the targeted zones for collections (e.g., location relative to the firearm, type of surface, orientation of the surface, ...), or the activities after the discharge (e.g., handwashing, typing, running, ...).

When investigating a suspicious death, four main propositions can be considered: suicide, accident, homicide, or natural death. If we consider only suicide and homicide, clues about the intervention of a third party can be useful to differentiate these alternatives. In this case, GSR is believed to help, as more GSR are expected on the hand(s) of a shooter than on the hand(s) of a nonshooter. Thus, a high amount of GSR on the dominant hand of the deceased together with a nearby firearm generally supports the hypothesis of suicide rather than a homicide. Estimating the shooting distance is also useful in such cases. However, one has to remain careful, as relatives often discover and touch the deceased before calling the police (i.e., risk of secondary transfer and GSR displacement<sup>5</sup>). Moreover, firearm position and GSR amount can significantly vary even in undisturbed suicide cases (Lucas, Cook, et al., 2016; Molina, Castorena, & DiMaio, 2007; Molina, Martinez, et al., 2007; Vachon & Martinez, 2019). Increasing the knowledge on

transfer, persistence, and prevalence of GSR, considering also unusual cases, is particularly useful to support the investigation. Such knowledge can then also feed the evaluation of the GSR trace for subsequent stages (e.g., trial).

Once the hypothetico-deductive reasoning cycle has allowed refuting some propositions and ideally strengthen the confidence in one set of mutually exclusive propositions (e.g., homicide vs. suicide), the investigation moves to the next stage (Baechler et al., 2020; Kind, 1994). In general, if no clue about the intervention of a third party was gathered (i.e., the suicide proposition is supported rather than the alternative), then the investigation stops at the reconstruction of the event. On the other hand, if the proposition about the intervention of a third party is retained and a person of interest has been identified, the investigation moves to the evaluation stage (Kind, 1994).

## 5.2 | Evaluation (the problem to prove)

Following analysis, the forensic laboratories generally submit their report following standardized protocols (e.g., ASTM, ENFSI, NIST, OSAC; ASTM International, 2020; Niewoehner et al., 2003; OSAC, 2020; SWGGSR, 2011). Three classes of inorganic particles have been defined by the ASTM:

- Characteristic particles (composition: PbBaSb, TiZnGd, or GaCuSn)
- Consistent particles (composition: PbBa, PbSb, PbBaCaSi, BaCaSi, BaAl, BaSb, TiZn, or Sr)
- Commonly associated with GSR particles (composition: Pb, Ba, or Sb)

Characteristic particles are the most specific to IGSR as they are rarely encountered in the environment and are thus, strongly associated with the discharge of a firearm (Seyfang, Lucas, Redman, et al., 2019; Wolten et al., 1977). On the other hand, commonly associated with GSR particles have many alternative sources in the environment and are, therefore less specific. Based on the number of each particle detected on the stub (and their morphology), the results can be interpreted from a case-specific forensic perspective.

Depending on the composition of the ammunition (Section 2), other specific particles were suggested in the literature. For example, Bender et al. (2021) proposed a new classification to distinguish TiZn particles generated by lead-free ammunition from alternative sources of TiZn in the environment. Moreover, particles of glass elements (e.g., Al, O, Si, Na) combined with heavy metal elements (e.g., Pb, Ba, Sb) were also reported as rarely found in the environment (Seyfang, Lucas, Popelka-Filcoff, et al., 2019; Seyfang, Lucas, Redman, et al., 2019).

Guidelines have been proposed to adequately address this evaluative stage (ANZPAA-NFIS, 2017; ENFSI, 2010). The GSR trace (e.g., *number and type of detected IGSR particles on the hands*) needs to be evaluated under two mutually exclusive propositions (Benzaquen et al., 2020; Biedermann et al., 2009, 2011; Cardinetti et al., 2006; Kaplan Damary et al., 2016; Maitre et al., 2017, 2022; Romolo & Margot, 2001). For example, propositions can be formulated at the *source* level:


- *Proposition*: The trace is a GSR (i.e., it originates from a firearm discharge)
- *Alternative*: The trace is not a GSR (i.e., it originates from another source)

Addressing the source level requires data about the composition of GSR (as proposed in the classification discussed above) as well as knowledge about alternative sources of GSR-like components (e.g., welding, fireworks, motor oil, and airbags). Some studies address a more specific source level with the aim to associate a GSR composition to a specific ammunition (Brozek-Mucha & Jankowicz, 2001; Gallidabino et al., 2019; Rijnders et al., 2010).

As the presence of GSR on a person of interest may be explained by legitimate activities or non-firearm sources, it is advised to address the activity level rather than the source level when considering “trace evidence<sup>6</sup>” (Buzzini et al., 2019; ENFSI, 2010; Margot, 2017; Roux et al., 2015). Thus, propositions can also be formulated at the *activity* level:

- *Proposition*: The person of interest has discharged a firearm.
- *Alternative*: The person of interest has not discharged a firearm, the GSR comes from another activity.

Addressing the activity level requires information on the time since the discharge and all factors influencing the transfer and persistence of GSR. Knowledge about the prevalence (background level) of the GSR trace also needs to be



**FIGURE 7** Simulated data for the transfer ( $t = 0$  h), the persistence ( $t = 1$  and  $4$  h), and prevalence of the stabilizer, the ethylcentralite (EC), on the hands of shooters and non-shooters based on available literature on the subject (Gassner et al., 2016; Hofstetter et al., 2017; Maitre et al., 2018; Manganelli et al., 2019)

considered, as well as the recent activities and professional occupation of the person (to account for the potential risk of contamination). In addition, alternative activities can explain the presence of GSR and may need to be considered in the evaluation (depending on the context of the case) such as:

- Manipulation of the firearm by the POI (e.g., when discovering the scene),
- POI close to the discharge (but not having touched the firearm itself),
- POI arrested by a contaminated police officer.

Ideally, data corresponding to the specific conditions of the case (firearm, ammunition, ...) should be used to evaluate the probability of finding the observed GSR (E) under both propositions. This allows the estimation of a likelihood ratio (Benzaquen et al., 2020; Biedermann et al., 2009, 2011; Cardinetti et al., 2006; Kaplan Damary et al., 2016; Maitre et al., 2017, 2022). An example of required (raw) data is presented in Figure 7 for an OGSR molecule based on available literature (Gassner et al., 2016; Hofstetter et al., 2017; Maitre et al., 2018; Manganelli et al., 2019).

A first perusal of the simulated data indicates that there are:

1. some overlap between the distributions of the data (i.e., the initial transfer of GSR can be low in some instances, while prevalence can occasionally be relatively high without explanations);
2. more overlap between the distributions when longer times occur between the discharge and the collected specimen can be expected.

In practice, the probative value will increase if the information from several target components is combined (i.e., multivariate approaches). However, multivariate statistical models also increase in complexity, thus holistic approaches combining data from different traces (e.g., DNA, shoemarks, reconstructed trajectories of bullets, GSR) may be efficient alternatives (Crispino et al., 2021; Roux et al., 2015; Weyermann & Roux, 2021). Regarding the GSR trace, qualitative, and quantitative distribution of inorganic particles and organic compounds found on different surfaces (e.g., hands, hair, clothes) and times after the discharge present important information to infer alternative hypotheses (ANZPAA-NFIS, 2017; ENFSI, 2010)

## 6 | CONCLUSION

While GSR continuously attracted interest and research over the years (Blakey et al., 2018; Charles et al., 2020; Feeney et al., 2020; Maitre et al., 2017), it mainly focused on the technical aspects rather than the trace itself (Cadola

et al., 2021; Roux et al., 2021; Séguin et al., 2021; Sobreira et al., 2020; Vachon & Martinez, 2019). This may be due to several reasons, among them the fact that GSR research requires regulated material and infrastructure not easily available in all laboratories (e.g., firearms, ammunitions, and shooting range). Moreover, as for many types of traces, GSR transfer, and persistence studies are much more complex and time consuming than the testing of new technological approaches on reference substances and materials. This should not divert forensic scientists from the purposes, and the need to increase forensic basic knowledge before addressing technical and organizational challenges (Roux et al., 2022).

Taking this into account, this overview identified the following main research challenges in order to improve the GSR investigative and evidential value:

- *Trace transfer*: In order to evaluate how GSR transfer (what, where, and how much), it is important to ensure that recovery approaches are reproducible and allow the collection of a maximum of GSR particles. Some researchers have suggested that reproducing GSR-like material (proxy) would greatly help the field (Menking-Hoggatt et al., 2021; Sobreira et al., 2020). For example, several studies have proposed to produce tailor-made microparticles or to create synthetic GSR particles for proficiency tests and research experiments (ENFSI, 2017; Menking-Hoggatt et al., 2021; Niewoehner et al., 2003, 2005). The second challenge is the infinite number of parameters that need to be tested to study the transfer of GSR, such as used material (e.g., firearm and ammunition), transfer conditions (e.g., airflow, humidity, distance to the firearm openings), and the surfaces targeted for collection (e.g., hands, face, hair, nostrils, clothes, surrounding objects). All these parameters must also be tested for subsequent transfer studies (secondary, tertiary). Thus, a more case-specific approach may be more efficient to collect (and increase) data for specific cases and conditions (Benzaquen et al., 2020). It is also important to consider the risk of pollution from the police intervention and investigation.
- *Trace persistence*: Persistence studies present the same challenges as transfer studies with the additional “time” variable. This explains why few research investigated persistence over 4 h. The multitude of activities and contacts occurring between the discharge event and GSR collection increases the complexity of the experimental design. However, these are essential to correctly evaluate the meaning of GSR in a practical case. Research indicates that in most situations, the loss is rapid at the hands of a shooter (a few hours), but more research would be useful to orient how long after the event and where samples should be collected.
- *Trace prevalence*: Without background studies, the GSR trace cannot be correctly evaluated either. While prevalence studies are easier to carry out as no firearm, ammunition, or shooting range are required, it is important to use the same collection and analysis protocols as transfer and persistence studies. For example, the results obtained for GSR collected on the hands using a stub cannot be compared with those obtained with a swab on the hair. While large studies were carried out for IGSR, more data is needed on OGSR and combined GSR prevalence.
- *Trace evaluation*: with a few exceptions, GSR interpretation still mainly focused on the type of detected particles and their specificity (ASTM International, 2020). Such guidelines are useful but remain very technical without consideration of quantities, localization, and context-specific information (Romolo & Margot, 2001). While multivariate statistical approaches may contribute to the interpretation of the GSR trace, holistic interpretation approaches should also be considered for a better integration of the GSR trace with other available clues and information in caseworks (Roux et al., 2015, 2022; Weyermann & Roux, 2021).
- *Technical considerations*: Finally, on the more technical aspects, while SEM–EDX has been the method of choice for IGSR analysis, it does not mean that less costly methods such as LIBS or XRF, may not be an interesting alternative in practice (Almog, 2006; Berendes et al., 2006; Lopez-Lopez et al., 2017; Schumacher et al., 2010). Organizational habits should not hamper forensic development. The same observation can be made about the forensic potential of OGSR, as a complementary or alternative source of information to IGSR in practice (Roux et al., 2021). Similarly, increasingly complex statistical modeling (including AI approaches) will not entirely solve the root forensic issues (i.e., the case-specific nature of the trace; Roux et al., 2022). Simplified and holistic models should also be considered to promote a better understanding of the trace by the different stakeholders of the justice system.

## AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

**Virginie Redouté Minzière**: Conceptualization (equal); writing – original draft (equal). **Anne-Laure Gassner**: Conceptualization (equal); writing – review and editing (equal). **Matteo Gallidabino**: Conceptualization (equal); writing – review and editing (equal). **Claude Roux**: Conceptualization (equal); writing – review and editing (equal). **Céline Weyermann**: Conceptualization (equal); writing – original draft (equal).

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors wish to thank Dr Jean-Luc Gremaud (former head of the judicial police of Lausanne city in Switzerland), Sébastien Charles (GSR forensic expert at the National Institute for Criminalistics and Criminology in Belgium), Olivier Robyr (Technical director and analyst engineer at Microscan Service SA) and Prof. Paul K. Kirkbride (Flinders University, Australia) for very interesting discussions about firearm-related casework and research. They also want to thank Julia Fischer (forensic scientist at the regional police of Basel-Landschaft in Switzerland) for providing a photograph of the distribution of GSR on a targeted cotton fabric. Virginie Redouté Minzière, Anne-Laure Gassner, and Céline Weyermann also wish to thank the Swiss National Science Foundation for its support (Grants 10521A\_165608 and 105211\_188898). Open access funding provided by Université de Lausanne.

## CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors have declared no conflicts of interest for this article.

## DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

No data is linked to this paper as it is an overview. All data is cited and available through the references.

## ORCID

Virginie Redouté Minzière  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5278-8421>

Anne-Laure Gassner  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6845-6069>

Matteo Gallidabino  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7871-9793>

Claude Roux  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3610-420X>

Céline Weyermann  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3533-3919>

## RELATED WIREs ARTICLES

[Trace evidence? The term trace from adjective to noun  
Towards another paradigm for forensic science?](#)

## ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup> The acronym GSR will be used in this article.

<sup>2</sup> Tagging elements are added for better traceability of GSR (more particularly for GSR produced by police ammunitions).

<sup>3</sup> See more particularly the volume VI of the report of the Bloody Sunday Inquiry and main hearing on Day 226: <https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20101017060829/http://report.bloody-sunday-inquiry.org/transcripts-index/> (last access: June 2020).

<sup>4</sup> More information about the use of the term «hypotheses» and «proposition» in forensic science is given in the Sydney Declaration (Roux et al., 2022).

<sup>5</sup> In a case known to the authors, a close friend held the deceased when she discovered the lifeless body (before the police arrived on the scene), thus displacing the firearm and contaminating herself with traces (i.e., blood, GSR).

<sup>6</sup> The term «trace» is often used in English to refer to the «small size of materials» (see Buzzini et al., 2019). Thus, «trace evidence» is used to refer to the GSR trace. In this article, we generally use another meaning of the word «trace» (see Margot, 2017).

## REFERENCES

- Abrego, Z., Grijalba, N., Unceta, N., Maguregui, M., Sanchez, A., Fernández-Isla, A., Goicolea, M. A., & Barrio, R. J. (2014). A novel method for the identification of inorganic and organic gunshot residue particles of lead-free ammunitions from the hands of shooters using scanning laser ablation-ICPMS and Raman micro-spectroscopy. *Analyst*, 139(23), 6232–6241. <https://doi.org/10.1039/c4an01051e>
- Ali, L., Brown, K., Castellano, H., & Wetzel, S. J. (2016). A study of the presence of gunshot residue in Pittsburgh police stations using SEM/-EDS and LC-MS/MS. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 61(4), 928–938. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1556-4029.13077>
- Aliste, M., & Chavez, L. G. (2016). Analysis of gunshot residues as trace in nasal mucus by GFAAS. *Forensic Science International*, 261, 14–18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2016.01.034>
- Almog, J. (2006). Forensic science does not start in the lab: The concept of diagnostic field tests. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 51(6), 1228–1234. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1556-4029.2006.00256.x>



- Andrasko, J., & Maehly, A. (1977). Detection of GSR on hands by scanning electron microscopy. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 22(2), 279–287. <https://doi.org/10.1520/JFS10589J>
- Andrasko, J., & Pettersson, S. (1991). A simple method for collection of gunshot residues from clothing. *Journal of the Forensic Science Society*, 31(3), 321–330. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0015-7368\(91\)73164-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0015-7368(91)73164-2)
- Andreola, S., Gentile, G., Battistini, A., Cattaneo, C., & Zoja, R. (2011). Forensic applications of sodium rhodizonate and hydrochloric acid: A new histological technique for detection of gunshot residues. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 56(3), 771–774. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1556-4029.2010.01689.x>
- ANZPAA-NFIS. (2017). National Institute of Forensic Science Australia New Zealand—An introductory guide to Evaluative Reporting. Retrieved from <https://www.anzpaa.org.au/forensic-science/our-work/projects/evaluative-reporting>.
- Arndt, J., Bell, S., Crookshanks, L., Lovejoy, M., Oleska, C., Tulley, T., & Wolfe, D. (2012). Preliminary evaluation of the persistence of organic gunshot residue. *Forensic Science International*, 222(1–3), 137–145. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2012.05.011>
- Ase, P., Eisenberg, W., Gordon, S., Taylor, K., & Snelson, A. (1985). Propellant combustion product analyses on an M16 rifle and a 105 mm caliber gun. *Journal of Environmental Science and Health. Part A: Environmental Science and Engineering*, 20(3), 337–368. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10934528509375229>
- ASTM International. (2020). ASTM E1588-20. Standard practice for gunshot residue analysis by scanning electron microscopy/energy dispersive X-ray spectrometry. <https://doi.org/10.1520/E1588-20>
- Baechler, S., Morelato, M., Gittelsohn, S., Walsh, S., Margot, P., Roux, C., & Ribaux, O. (2020). Breaking the barriers between intelligence, investigation and evaluation: A continuous approach to define the contribution and scope of forensic science. *Forensic Science International*, 309, 110213. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2020.110213>
- Bailey, J. A. (2007). Digital infrared photography to develop GSR patterns. *Australian Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 39(1), 33–40. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00450610701324932>
- Bartsch, M. R., Kobus, H. J., & Wainwright, K. P. (1996). An update on the use of the sodium rhodizonate test for the detection of lead originating from firearm discharges. *Journal of Forensic Science*, 41, 1046–1051. <https://doi.org/10.1520/JFS14047J>
- Bell, S., & Feeney, W. (2019). Single shot, single sample, single instrument detection of IGSR and OGSR using LC/MS/MS. *Forensic Science International*, 299, 215–222. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2019.04.002>
- Bell, S., & Seitzinger, L. (2016). From binary presumptive assays to probabilistic assessments: Differentiation of shooters from non-shooters using IMS, OGSR, neural networks, and likelihood ratios. *Forensic Science International*, 263, 176–185. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2016.04.020>
- Bender, R., Neimke, D., Niewöhner, L., Barth, M., & Ebert, M. (2021). Discrimination of SINTOX® GSR against environmental particles and its automated investigation by SEM/EDS. *Forensic Chemistry*, 24, 100338. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forc.2021.100338>
- Benito, S., Abrego, Z., Sánchez, A., Unceta, N., Goicolea, M. A., & Barrio, R. J. (2015). Characterization of organic gunshot residues in lead-free ammunition using a new sample collection device for liquid chromatography-quadrupole time-of-flight mass spectrometry. *Forensic Science International*, 246, 79–85. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2014.11.002>
- Benzaquen, D., Mandel, M., Israelsohn Azulay, O., Zidon, Y., & Cohen, Y. (2020). A mixture model for the number of gunshot residues found on suspects' hands. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 65(4), 1114–1119. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1556-4029.14310>
- Berendes, A., Neimke, D., Schumacher, R., & Barth, M. (2006). A versatile technique for the investigation of gunshot residue patterns on fabrics and other surfaces: M-XRF. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 51(5), 1085–1090. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1556-4029.2006.00225.x>
- Berger, J., Upton, C., & Springer, E. (2019). Evaluation of Total nitrite pattern visualization as an improved method for gunshot residue detection and its application to casework samples. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 64(1), 218–222. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1556-4029.13802>
- Berk, R. E. (2009a). Automated SEM/EDS analysis of airbag residue. I: Particle identification. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 54(1), 60–68. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1556-4029.2008.00918.x>
- Berk, R. E. (2009b). Automated SEM/EDS analysis of airbag residue. II: Airbag residue as a source of percussion primer residue particles. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 54(1), 69–76. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1556-4029.2008.00919.x>
- Berk, R. E., Rochowicz, S. A., Wong, M., & Kopina, M. A. (2007). Gunshot residue in Chicago police vehicles and facilities: An empirical study. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 52(4), 838–841. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1556-4029.2007.00457.x>
- Biedermann, A., Bozza, S., & Taroni, F. (2009). Probabilistic evidential assessment of gunshot residue particle evidence (part I): Likelihood ratio calculation and case pre-assessment using Bayesian networks. *Forensic Science International*, 191(1–3), 24–35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2009.06.004>
- Biedermann, A., Bozza, S., & Taroni, F. (2011). Probabilistic evidential assessment of gunshot residue particle evidence (part II): Bayesian parameter estimation for experimental count data. *Forensic Science International*, 206(1–3), 103–110. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2010.07.009>
- Blakey, L. S., Sharples, G. P., Chana, K., & Birkett, J. W. (2018). Fate and behavior of gunshot residue—A review. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 63(1), 9–19. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1556-4029.13555>
- Bonnar, C., Moule, E. C., Lucas, N., Seyfang, K. E., Dunsmore, R. P., Popelka-Filcoff, R. S., Redman, K., & Paul Kirkbride, K. (2020). Tandem detection of organic and inorganic gunshot residues using LC-MS and SEM-EDS. *Forensic Science International*, 314, 110389. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2020.110389>
- Brede, U., Hagel, R., Redecker, K. H., & Weuter, W. (1996). Primer compositions in the course of time: From black powder and SINOXID to SINTOX compositions and SINCO booster. *Propellants, Explosives, Pyrotechnics*, 21(3), 113–117. <https://doi.org/10.1002/prop.19960210302>

- Brown, H., Cauchi, D. M., Holden, J. L., Wrobel, H., & Cordner, S. (1999). Image analysis of gunshot residue on entry wounds I – The technique and preliminary study. *Forensic Science International*, 100, 163–177. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0379-0738\(98\)00210-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0379-0738(98)00210-2)
- Brozek-Mucha, Z. (2011). Chemical and morphological study of gunshot residue persisting on the shooter by means of scanning electron microscopy and energy dispersive X-ray spectrometry. *Microscopy and Microanalysis*, 17(6), 972–982. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1431927611012141>
- Brozek-Mucha, Z. (2014). On the prevalence of gunshot residue in selected populations—An empirical study performed with SEM-EDX analysis. *Forensic Science International*, 237, 46–52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2014.01.020>
- Brozek-Mucha, Z. (2015). Chemical and physical characterisation of welding fume particles for distinguishing from gunshot residue. *Forensic Science International*, 254, 51–58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2015.06.033>
- Brozek-Mucha, Z. (2017). Trends in analysis of gunshot residue for forensic purposes. *Analytical and Bioanalytical Chemistry*, 409(25), 5803–5811. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00216-017-0460-1>
- Brozek-Mucha, Z., & Jankowicz, A. (2001). Evaluation of the possibility of differentiation between various types of ammunition by means of GSR examination with SEM–EDX method. *Forensic Science International*, 123, 39–47. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0379-0738\(01\)00518-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0379-0738(01)00518-7)
- Brunjes, R., Schuurman, J., Kammer, F. V., & Hofmann, T. (2022). Rapid analysis of gunshot residues with single-particle inductively coupled plasma time-of-flight mass spectrometry. *Forensic Science International*, 332, 111202. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2022.111202>
- Buzzini, P., Kammrath, B. W., & De Forest, P. (2019). Trace evidence? The term trace from adjective to noun. *WIREs Forensic Science*, 1(5), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wfs2.1342>
- Cadola, L., Charest, M., Lavallée, C., & Crispino, F. (2021). The occurrence and genesis of transfer traces in forensic science: A structured knowledge database. *Canadian Society of Forensic Science Journal*, 54(2), 86–100. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00085030.2021.1890941>
- Campbell, J. A. (2018). Analysis of metallic components of GSR from various types of ammunition and firearms utilizing an SEM-EDX. Retrieved from <https://dsc.duq.edu/gsr/2018/proceedings/3>.
- Cardinetti, B., Ciampini, C., Abate, S., Marchetti, C., Ferrari, F., di Tullio, D., D'Onofrio, C., Orlando, G., Gravina, L., Torresi, L., & Saporita, G. (2006). A proposal for statistical evaluation of the detection of gunshot residues on a suspect. *The Journal of Scanning Microscopies*, 28(3), 142–147. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sca.4950280302>
- Chang, K., Jayaprakash, P., Yew, C. H., & Abdullah, A. (2013). Gunshot residue analysis and its evidential values: A review. *Australian Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 45(1), 3–23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00450618.2012.691546>
- Charles, S., De Ceuster, J., De Smet, P., & Nys, B. (2010). Examination of firearms—Review: 2007 to 2010. In *Proceedings of the 16th Interpol Forensic Science Symposium*, Lyon.
- Charles, S., & Geusens, N. (2012). A study of the potential risk of gunshot residue transfer from special units of the police to arrested suspects. *Forensic Science International*, 216(1–3), 78–81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2011.08.022>
- Charles, S., Geusens, N., Vergalito, E., & Nys, B. (2020). Interpol review of gunshot residue 2016–2019. *Forensic Science International: Synergy*, 2, 416–428. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fsisyn.2020.01.011>
- Charles, S., Lannoy, M., & Geusens, N. (2013). Influence of the type of fabric on the collection efficiency of gunshot residues. *Forensic Science International*, 228(1–3), 42–46. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2013.02.022>
- Charpentier, B., & Desrochers, C. (2000). Analysis of primer residue from Lead free ammunition by X-ray microfluorescence. *Journal of Forensic Science*, 45, 14705J. <https://doi.org/10.1520/JFS14705J>
- Chavez Reyes, L., Elgueta Lopez, C., Briceno Barrios, A., Garrido Soto, C., Ibanez, C., & Jamett Diaz, F. (2018). Development and application of a new nose hairs sample collection device for GSR particles by scanning electron microscopy with energy dispersive X-ray spectroscopy (SEM-EDS). *Forensic Science International*, 290, 42–48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2018.06.029>
- Chohra, M., Beladel, B., Baba Ahmed, L., Mouzai, M., Akretche, D., Zeghdaoui, A., Mansouri, A., & Benamar, M. E. A. (2019). Study of gunshot residue by NAA and ESEM/EDX using several kinds of weapon and ammunition. *Journal of Radiation Research and Applied Science*, 8(3), 404–410. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrras.2015.02.012>
- Cook, M. (2016). Gunshot residue contamination of the hands of police officers following start-of-shift handling of their firearm. *Forensic Science International*, 269, 56–62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2016.11.002>
- Coumbaros, J., Kirkbride, K. P., Klass, G., & Skinner, W. (2001). Characterisation of 0.22 caliber rimfire gunshot residues by time-of-flight secondary ion mass spectrometry (TOF-SIMS): A preliminary study. *Forensic Science International*, 119(1), 72–81. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0379-0738\(00\)00421-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0379-0738(00)00421-7)
- Crispino, F. (2008). Nature and place of crime scene management within forensic sciences. *Science and Justice*, 48, 24–28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scijus.2007.09.009>
- Crispino, F., Weyermann, C., Delémont, O., Roux, C., & Ribaux, O. (2021). Towards another paradigm for forensic science? *WIREs Forensic Science*, 4, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wfs2.1441>
- Cropek, D. M., Kemme, P. A., & Day, J. M. (2001). *Pyrolytic decomposition studies of AA2, a double-base propellant*. US Army Corps of Engineers.
- Dalby, O., Butler, D., & Birkett, J. (2010). Analysis of gunshot residue and associated materials—A review. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 55(4), 924–943. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1556-4029.2010.01370.x>
- DeGaetano, D., Siegel, J. A., & Klomparens, K. L. (1992). A comparison of three techniques developed for sampling and analysis of gunshot residues by scanning electron microscopy/energy dispersive X-ray analysis (SEM-EDX). *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 37(1), 281–300. <https://doi.org/10.1520/JFS13234J>

- Dejeaifve, A., Fantin, A., Monseur, L., & Dobson, R. (2018). Making progress towards «green» propellants. *Propellants, Explosives, Pyrotechnics*, 43(8), 831–837. <https://doi.org/10.1002/prep.201800026>
- Dejeaifve, A., Sarbach, A., Roduit, B., Folly, P., & Dobson, R. (2020). Making progress towards «green» propellants—Part II. *Propellants, Explosives, Pyrotechnics*, 45(8), 1185–1193. <https://doi.org/10.1002/prep.202000059>
- Destefani, C. A., Motta, L. C., Vanini, G., Souza, L. M., Filho, J. F. A., Macrino, C. J., Silva, E. M., Greco, S. J., Endringer, D. C., & Romão, W. (2014). Europium–organic complex as luminescent marker for the visual identification of gunshot residue and characterization by electrospray ionization FT-ICR mass spectrometry. *Microchemical Journal*, 116, 216–224. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.microc.2014.05.009>
- Diaz, E., Sarkis, J. E., Viebig, S., & Saldiva, P. (2012). Measurement of airborne gunshot particles in a ballistics laboratory by sector field inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry. *Forensic Science International*, 214(1–3), 44–47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2011.07.016>
- Ditrich, H. (2012). Distribution of gunshot residues—The influence of weapon type. *Forensic Science International*, 220(1–3), 85–90. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2012.01.034>
- Dobarceranu, V. (2020a). Persistency of Gunshot Residue in the Head Area Practical Approach—Part I. In *Proceedings of the RAIS Conference*.
- Dobarceranu, V. (2020b). Persistency of Gunshot Residue in the Head Area Practical Approach—Part II. In *Proceedings of the RAIS Conference*.
- Dockery, C. R., & Goode, S. R. (2003). Laser-induced breakdown spectroscopy for the detection of gunshot residues on the hands of a shooter. *Applied Optics*, 42, 6153–6158. <https://doi.org/10.1364/AO.42.006153>
- Dong, X., Chang, Y., Niu, B., & Jia, M. (2020). Development of a practical reaction model of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon (PAH) formation and oxidation for diesel surrogate fuel. *Fuel*, 267, 117159. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuel.2020.117159>
- Donghi, M., Orsenigo, S., Niewoehner, L., Barth, M., Fiocchi, C., & Pomi, A. (2019). A new ammunition for forensic needs: FIOCCHI-RIS. *Forensic Chemistry*, 13, 100159. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forc.2019.100159>
- Drzyzga, O. (2003). Diphenylamine and derivatives in the environment: A review. *Chemosphere*, 53(8), 809–818. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0045-6535\(03\)00613-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0045-6535(03)00613-1)
- ENFSI. (2010). European Network of Forensic Science Institutes guideline for evaluative reporting in forensic science—Strengthening the Evaluation of Forensic Results across Europe (STEOFRAE). European project HOME/2010/ISEC/MO/4000001759.
- ENFSI. (2015). European Network of Forensic Science Institutes, Best Practice Manual for Chemographic Methods in Gunshot Residue Analysis, ENFSI-BPM-FGR-01.
- ENFSI. (2017). Federal Criminal Police Office of Germany (BKA). Development of analytical methods for sensitive detection and identification of organic gunshot residues (OGSR) based on liquid chromatography-mass spectrometry (LC-MS) for routine casework. *Project Number: HOME/2011/ISEC/AG/2504*.
- Espinoza, E., & Thornton, J. (1994). Characterization of smokeless gunpowder by means of diphenylamine stabilizer and its nitrated derivatives. *Analytica Chimica Acta*, 288(1–2), 57–69. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-2670\(94\)85116-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-2670(94)85116-6)
- Feeney, W., Menking-Hoggatt, K., Arroyo, L., Curran, J., Bell, S., & Trejos, T. (2021). Evaluation of organic and inorganic gunshot residues in various populations using LC-MS/MS. *Forensic Chemistry*, 27, 100389. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forc.2021.100389>
- Feeney, W., Vander Pyl, C., Bell, S., & Trejos, T. (2020). Trends in composition, collection, persistence, and analysis of IGSR and OGSR: A review. *Forensic Chemistry*, 19, 100250. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forc.2020.100250>
- Fojtášek, L., Vácinová, J., Kolář, P., & Kotrlý, M. (2003). Distribution of GSR particles in the surroundings of shooting pistol. *Forensic Science International*, 132(2), 99–105. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0379-0738\(03\)00018-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0379-0738(03)00018-5)
- Folly, P., & Mäder, P. (2004). Propellant chemistry. *Chimia*, 58, 374–382. <https://doi.org/10.2533/00094290477677713>
- French, J., & Morgan, R. (2015). An experimental investigation of the indirect transfer and deposition of gunshot residue: Further studies carried out with SEM-EDX analysis. *Forensic Science International*, 247, 14–17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2014.10.023>
- French, J., Morgan, R., & Davy, J. (2014). The secondary transfer of gunshot residue: An experimental investigation carried out with SEM-EDX analysis. *X-Ray Spectrometry*, 43(1), 56–61. <https://doi.org/10.1002/xrs.2498>
- Gallidabino, M., Romolo, F. S., & Weyermann, C. (2015). Characterization of volatile organic gunshot residues in fired handgun cartridges by headspace sorptive extraction. *Analytical and Bioanalytical Chemistry*, 407(23), 7123–7134. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00216-015-8874-0>
- Gallidabino, M. D., Barron, L. P., Weyermann, C., & Romolo, F. S. (2019). Quantitative profile profile relationship (QPPR) modelling: A novel machine learning approach to predict and associate chemical characteristics of unspent ammunition from gunshot residue (GSR). *Analyst*, 144(4), 1128–1139. <https://doi.org/10.1039/c8an01841c>
- Gallidabino, M. D., & Weyermann, C. (2020). Time since last discharge of firearms and spent ammunition elements: State of the art and perspectives. *Forensic Science International*, 311, 110290. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2020.110290>
- Gandy, L., Najjar, K., Terry, M., & Bridge, C. (2018). A novel protocol for the combined detection of organic, inorganic gunshot residue. *Forensic Chemistry*, 8, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forc.2017.12.009>
- Gassner, A. L., Manganelli, M., Werner, D., Rhumorbarbe, D., Maitre, M., Beavis, A., Roux, C. P., & Weyermann, C. (2019). Secondary transfer of organic gunshot residues: Empirical data to assist the evaluation of three scenarios. *Science and Justice*, 59(1), 58–66.
- Gassner, A. L., Ribeiro, C., Kobylinska, J., Zeichner, A., & Weyermann, C. (2016). Organic gunshot residues: Observations about sampling and transfer mechanisms. *Forensic Science International*, 266, 369–378. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2016.06.029>
- Gassner, A. L., & Weyermann, C. (2016). LC-MS method development and comparison of sampling materials for the analysis of organic gunshot residues. *Forensic Science International*, 264, 47–55. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2016.03.022>

- Gassner, A. L., & Weyermann, C. (2020). Prevalence of organic gunshot residues in police vehicles. *Science and Justice*, 60(2), 136–144. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scijus.2019.09.009>
- Gerard, R. V., Lindsay, E., McVicar, M. J., Randall, E. D., & Gapinska, A. (2013). Observations of gunshot residue associated with police officers, their equipment, and their vehicles. *Canadian Society of Forensic Science Journal*, 45(2), 57–63. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00085030.2012.10757183>
- Gerard, R. V., McVicar, M. J., Lindsay, E., Randall, E. D., & Harvey, E. (2011). The long range deposition of gunshot residue and the mechanism of its transportation. *Canadian Society of Forensic Science Journal*, 44(3), 97–104. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00085030.2011.10768145>
- Geusens, N., Nys, B., & Charles, S. (2019). Implementation and optimization of the sodium-rhodizonate method for chemographic shooting distance estimation. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 64(4), 1169–1172. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1556-4029.13984>
- Gialamas, D. M., Rhodes, E. F., & Sugarman, L. A. (1995). Officers, their weapons and their hands—An empirical study of GSR on the hands of non-shooting police officers. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 40(6), 1086–1089. <https://doi.org/10.1520/JFS13882J>
- Gibelli, D., Brandone, A., Andreola, S., Porta, D., Giudici, E., Grandi, M. A., & Cattaneo, C. (2010). Macroscopic, microscopic, and chemical assessment of gunshot lesions on decomposed pig skin. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 55(4), 1092–1097. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1556-4029.2010.01378.x>
- Gong, S. A., Homburger, N., & Huang, L. (2022). Elemental profiling of total gunshot residue using total reflection X-ray fluorescence spectrometry. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 67, 1198–1207. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1556-4029.14988>
- Goudsmits, E., Blakey, L. S., Chana, K., Sharples, G. P., & Birkett, J. W. (2019). The analysis of organic and inorganic gunshot residue from a single sample. *Forensic Science International*, 299, 168–173. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2019.03.049>
- Goudsmits, E., Sharples, G. P., & Birkett, J. W. (2015). Recent trends in organic gunshot residue analysis. *Trends in Analytical Chemistry*, 74, 46–57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trac.2015.05.010>
- Goudsmits, E., Sharples, G. P., & Birkett, J. W. (2016). Preliminary classification of characteristic organic gunshot residue compounds. *Science and Justice*, 56(6), 421–425. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scijus.2016.06.007>
- Gunaratnam, L., & Himberg, K. (1994). The identification of gunshot residue particles from Lead-free Sintox ammunition. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 39(2), 532–536. <https://doi.org/10.1520/JFS13626J>
- Hagel, R., & Redecker, K. (1986). Sintox-A new, non-toxic primer composition by Dynamit Nobel AG. *Propellants, Explosives, Pyrotechnics*, 11(6), 184–187. <https://doi.org/10.1002/prep.19860110606>
- Hofer, R., Graf, S., & Christen, S. (2017). The use of unburned propellant powder for shooting-distance determination. Part I: Infrared luminescence. *Forensic Science International*, 273, 10–19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2017.01.019>
- Hofer, R., & Wyss, P. (2017). The use of unburned propellant powder for shooting-distance determination. Part II: Diphenylamine reaction. *Forensic Science International*, 278, 24–31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2017.06.022>
- Hofstetter, C., Maitre, M., Beavis, A., Roux, C. P., Weyermann, C., & Gassner, A. L. (2017). A study of transfer and prevalence of organic gunshot residues. *Forensic Science International*, 277, 241–251. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2017.06.013>
- Jalanti, T., Henchoz, P., Gallusser, A., & Bonfanti, M. S. (1999). The persistence of gunshot residue on shooters' hands. *Science and Justice*, 39(1), 48–52. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1355-0306\(99\)72014-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1355-0306(99)72014-9)
- Joshi, M., Rigsby, K., & Almirall, J. R. (2011). Analysis of the headspace composition of smokeless powders using GC-MS, GC-mu ECD and ion mobility spectrometry. *Forensic Science International*, 208(1–3), 29–36. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2010.10.024>
- Kanstrup, N., Thomas, V. G., Krone, O., & Gremse, C. (2016). The transition to non-lead rifle ammunition in Denmark: National obligations and policy considerations. *Ambio*, 45(5), 621–628. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-016-0780-y>
- Kaplan Damary, N., Mandel, M., Levin, N., & Izraeli, E. (2016). Calculation of likelihood ratios for gunshot residue evidence—Statistical aspects. *Law, Probability and Risk*, 15, 107–125. <https://doi.org/10.1093/lpr/mgw001>
- Kilty, J. W. (1975). Activity after shooting and its effect on the retention of primer residue. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 20(2), 219–230.
- Kind, S. (1994). Crime investigation and the criminal trial: A three chapter paradigm of evidence. *Journal of the Forensic Science Society, Science & Justice*, 34(3), 155–164. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0015-7368\(94\)72908-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0015-7368(94)72908-X)
- Koons, R. D. (1998). Analysis of gunshot primer residue collection swabs by inductively coupled plasma-mass spectrometry. *Journal of Forensic Science*, 43, 748–754. <https://doi.org/10.1520/JFS14301J>
- Krishnan, S. (1974). Detection of GSR on the hands by neutron activation and atomic absorption analysis. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 19(4), 789–797. <https://doi.org/10.1520/JFS14301J>
- Krishnan, S. (1977). Detection of GSR on the hands by trace element analysis. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 22(2), 304–324. <https://doi.org/10.1520/JFS10591J>
- Lagoo, L., Schaeffer, L. S., Szymanski, D. W., & Smith, R. W. (2010). Detection of gunshot residue in blowfly larvae and decomposing porcine tissue using inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry (ICP-MS). *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 55(3), 624–632. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1556-4029.2010.01327.x>
- Latzel, S., Neimke, D., Schumacher, R., Barth, M., & Niewohner, L. (2012). Shooting distance determination by m-XRF--examples on spectra interpretation and range estimation. *Forensic Science International*, 223(1–3), 273–278. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2012.10.001>
- Laza, D., Nys, B., Kinder, J. D., Kirsch-De Mesmaeker, A., & Moucheron, C. (2007). Development of a quantitative LC-MS/MS method for the analysis of common propellant powder stabilizers in gunshot residue. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 52(4), 842–850. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1556-4029.2007.00490.x>
- Lekstrom, J. A., & Koons, R. D. (1986). Copper and nickel detection on gunshot targets by dithiooxamide test. *Journal of Forensic Science*, 31, 1283–1291. <https://doi.org/10.1520/JFS11907J>



- Llyod, B. (1987). Diphenylamine traces in hand swabs and clothing debris: Cleanup and liquid chromatography with sequential oxidative and reductive electrochemical detection. *Analytical Chemistry*, 59(10), 1401–1404. <https://doi.org/10.1021/ac00137a006>
- Lopez-Lopez, M., Alvarez-Llamas, C., Pisonero, J., Garcia-Ruiz, C., & Bordel, N. (2017). An exploratory study of the potential of LIBS for visualizing gunshot residue patterns. *Forensic Science International*, 273, 124–131. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2017.02.012>
- Lopez-Lopez, M., Delgado, J. J., & Garcia-Ruiz, C. (2012). Ammunition identification by means of the organic analysis of gunshot residues using Raman spectroscopy. *Analytical Chemistry*, 84(8), 3581–3585. <https://doi.org/10.1021/ac203237w>
- Lopez-Lopez, M., Delgado, J. J., & Garcia-Ruiz, C. (2013). Analysis of macroscopic gunshot residues by Raman spectroscopy to assess the weapon memory effect. *Forensic Science International*, 231(1–3), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2013.03.049>
- Lopez-Lopez, M., Ferrando, J. L., & Garcia-Ruiz, C. (2012). Comparative analysis of smokeless gunpowders by Fourier transform infrared and Raman spectroscopy. *Analytica Chimica Acta*, 717, 92–99. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aca.2011.12.022>
- Lucas, N., Brown, H., Cook, M., Redman, K., Condon, T., Wrobel, H., Kirkbride, K. P., & Kobus, H. (2016). A study into the distribution of gunshot residue particles in the random population. *Forensic Science International*, 262, 150–155. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2016.02.050>
- Lucas, N., Cook, M., Kirkbride, K. P., & Kobus, H. (2019). Gunshot residue background on police officers: Considerations for secondary transfer in GSR evidence evaluation. *Forensic Science International*, 297, 293–301. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2019.02.017>
- Lucas, N., Cook, M., Wallace, J., Kirkbride, K. P., & Kobus, H. (2016). Quantifying gunshot residues in cases of suicide: Implications for evaluation of suicides and criminal shootings. *Forensic Science International*, 266, 289–298. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2016.06.006>
- Lucena, M. A. M., de Sá, G. F., Rodrigues, M. O., Alves, S., Talhavini, M., & Weber, I. T. (2013). ZnAl<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub>-based luminescent marker for gunshot residue identification and ammunition traceability. *Analytical Methods*, 5(3), 705–709. <https://doi.org/10.1039/c2ay25535a>
- Luten, R., Neimke, D., Barth, M., & Niewoehner, L. (2018). Investigating airborne GSR particles by the application of impactor technology. *Forensic Chemistry*, 8, 72–81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forc.2018.02.005>
- MacCrehan, W., Layman, M., & Secl, J. (2003). Hair combing to collect organic gunshot residues (OGSR). *Forensic Science International*, 135, 167–173. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0379-0738\(03\)00207-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0379-0738(03)00207-X)
- Mahoney, C., Gillen, G., & Fahey, A. (2006). Characterization of gunpowder samples using time-of-flight secondary ion mass spectrometry (TOF-SIMS). *Forensic Science International*, 158, 36–51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2005.02.036>
- Maitre, M., Chadwick, S., Kirkbride, K. P., Gassner, A. L., Weyermann, C., Beavis, A., & Roux, C. (2019). An investigation on the secondary transfer of organic gunshot residues. *Science & Justice*, 59, 248–255. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scijus.2019.01.007>
- Maitre, M., Horder, M., Kirkbride, K. P., Gassner, A.-L., Weyermann, C., Gupta, A., Beavis, A., & Roux, C. (2022). An application example of the likelihood ratio approach to the evaluation of organic gunshot residues using a fictional scenario and recently published data. *Forensic Science International*, 335, 111267. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2022.111267>
- Maitre, M., Horder, M., Kirkbride, K. P., Gassner, A. L., Weyermann, C., Roux, C., & Beavis, A. (2018). A forensic investigation on the persistence of organic gunshot residues. *Forensic Science International*, 292, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2018.08.036>
- Maitre, M., Kirkbride, K. P., Horder, M., Roux, C., & Beavis, A. (2017). Current perspectives in the interpretation of gunshot residues in forensic science: A review. *Forensic Science International*, 270, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2016.09.003>
- Manganelli, M., Weyermann, C., & Gassner, A. L. (2019). Surveys of organic gunshot residue prevalence: Comparison between civilian and police populations. *Forensic Science International*, 298, 48–57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2019.02.050>
- Margot, P. (2017). Traceology, the bedrock of forensic science and its associated semantics. In *The Routledge international handbook of forensic intelligence and criminology* (pp. 30–39). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315541945-3>
- Marty, W., Sigrist, T., & Wyler, D. (2002). Determination of firing distance using the rhodizonate staining technique. *International Journal of Legal Medicine*, 116(1–4), 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s004140100220>
- Mattijssen, E. J., Kerkhoff, W., Berger, C. E., Dror, I. E., & Stoel, R. D. (2016). Implementing context information management in forensic casework: Minimizing contextual bias in firearms examination. *Science and Justice*, 56(2), 113–122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scijus.2015.11.004>
- McFarland, R. C., & McLain, M. E. (1973). Rapid neutron activation analysis for gunshot residue determination. *Journal of Forensic Science*, 18, 226–231. <https://doi.org/10.1520/JFS10446J>
- Meng, H., & Caddy, B. (1997). Gunshot residue analysis—A review. *Journal of Forensic Science*, 42(4), 553–570. <https://doi.org/10.1520/JFS14167J>
- Menking-Hoggatt, K., Martinez, C., Vander Pyl, C., Heller, E., Pollock, E. C., Arroyo, L., & Trejos, T. (2021). Development of tailor-made inorganic gunshot residue (IGSR) microparticle standards and characterization with a multi-technique approach. *Talanta*, 225, 121984. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.talanta.2020.121984>
- Merli, D., Amadasi, A., Mazzarelli, D., Cappella, A., Castoldi, E., Ripa, S., Cucca, L., Cattaneo, C., & Profumo, A. (2019). Comparison of different swabs for sampling inorganic gunshot residue from gunshot wounds: Applicability and reliability for the determination of firing distance. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 64(2), 558–564. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1556-4029.13870>
- Merli, D., Brandone, A., Amadasi, A., Cattaneo, C., & Profumo, A. (2016). The detection of gunshot residues in the nasal mucus of suspected shooters. *International Journal of Legal Medicine*, 130(4), 1045–1052. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00414-016-1375-7>
- Molina, D. K., Castorena, J. L., & DiMaio, V. J. (2007). Gunshot residue testing in suicides: Part II: Analysis by inductive coupled plasma-atomic emission spectrometry. *American Journal of Forensic Medicine and Pathology*, 28(3), 191–194. <https://doi.org/10.1097/PAF.0b013e31813e62cf>



- Molina, D. K., Martinez, M., Garcia, J., & DiMaio, V. J. (2007). Gunshot residue testing in suicides: Part I: Analysis by scanning electron microscopy with energy-dispersive X-ray. *American Journal of Forensic Medicine and Pathology*, 28(3), 187–190. <https://doi.org/10.1097/PAF.0b013e31806195e1>
- Morales, E. B., & Vazquez, A. L. R. (2004). Simultaneous determination of inorganic and organic gunshot residues by capillary electrophoresis. *Journal of Chromatography A*, 1061(2), 225–233. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chroma.2004.10.083>
- Moran, J. W., & Bell, S. (2013). Analysis of organic gunshot residue permeation through a model skin membrane using ion mobility spectrometry. *International Journal for Ion Mobility Spectrometry*, 16, 247–258. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12127-013-0138-0>
- Moran, J. W., & Bell, S. (2014). Skin permeation of organic gunshot residue: Implications for sampling and analysis. *Analytical Chemistry*, 86(12), 6071–6079. <https://doi.org/10.1021/AC501227e>
- Morelato, M., Beavis, A., Ogle, A., Doble, P., Kirkbride, P., & Roux, C. (2012). Screening of gunshot residues using desorption electrospray ionisation-mass spectrometry (DESI-MS). *Forensic Science International*, 217(1–3), 101–106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2011.10.030>
- Mosher, P. V., McVicar, M. J., Randall, E. D., & Sild, E. H. (1998). Gunshot residue-similar particles produced by fireworks. *Canadian Society of Forensic Science Journal*, 31(3), 157–168. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00085030.1998.10757115>
- Muller, D., Levy, A., Vinokurov, A., Ravreby, M., Shelef, R., Wolf, E., Eldar, B., & Glattstein, B. (2007). A novel method for the analysis of discharged smokeless powder residues. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 52(1), 75–78. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1556-4029.2006.00309.x>
- Nesbitt, R., Wessel, J., & Jones, P. (1976). Detection of gunshot residue by use of the scanning electron microscope. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 21(3), 1053J. <https://doi.org/10.1520/JFS10532J>
- Nesbitt, R., Wessel, J., Wolten, G., & Jones, P. (1977). Evaluation of a photoluminescence technique for the detection of GSR. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 22(2), 288–303. <https://doi.org/10.1520/JFS10590J>
- Nichols, R. (2018). *Firearm and toolmark identification: The scientific reliability of the forensic science discipline*. Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/C2016-0-04649-1>
- Niewoehner, L., Andrasko, J., Biegstraaten, J., Gunaratnam, L., Steffen, S., & Uhlig, S. (2005). Maintenance of the ENFSI proficiency test program on identification of GSR by SEM/EDX (GSR2003). *Journal of Forensic Science*, 50(4), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1520/JFS2004454>
- Niewoehner, L., Eichner, S., Merkel, J., & Buchholz, N. (2006). New Ammunitions for the German Police Forces—Technical Guideline: cartridge 9 mm × 19, pollutant reduced. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.4074.7762>
- Niewoehner, L., Wenz, H. W., Andrasko, J., Beijer, R., & Gunaratnam, L. (2003). ENFSI proficiency test program on identification of GSR by SEM/EDX. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 48(4), 786–793. <https://doi.org/10.1520/JFS2002396>
- Northrop, D. M. (2001a). Gunshot residue analysis by micellar electrokinetic capillary electrophoresis: Assessment for application to case-work. Part I. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 46(3), 549–559. <https://doi.org/10.1520/JFS15003J>
- Northrop, D. M. (2001b). Gunshot residue analysis by micellar electrokinetic capillary electrophoresis: Assessment for application to case-work. Part II. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 46(3), 560–572. <https://doi.org/10.1520/JFS15003J>
- Oommen, Z., & Pierce, S. M. (2006). Lead-free primer residues: A qualitative characterization of Winchester WinClean, Remington/UMC LeadLess, federal BallistiClean, and Speer lawman CleanFire handgun ammunition. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 51(3), 509–519. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1556-4029.2006.00107.x>
- OSAC. (2020). Organization of Scientific Area Committees (OSAC) for Forensic Science, Proposed Standard: Standard Practice for Gunshot Residue Analysis by Scanning Electron Microscopy/Energy Dispersive X-Ray Spectrometry.
- Ott, C. E., Dalzell, K. A., Calderon-Arce, P. J., Alvarado-Gamez, A. L., Trejos, T., & Arroyo, L. E. (2020). Evaluation of the simultaneous analysis of organic and inorganic gunshot residues within a large population data set using electrochemical sensors. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 65(6), 1935–1944. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1556-4029.14548>
- Pitts, K. M., & Lewis, S. W. (2019). Forensic sciences | gunshot residues. In P. Worsfold, C. Poole, A. Townshend, & M. Miró (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of analytical science* (3rd ed., pp. 48–55). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-409547-2.14538-X>
- Redoute Minziere, V., Werner, D., Schneider, D., Manganelli, M., Jung, B., Weyermann, C., & Gassner, A. L. (2020). Combined collection and analysis of inorganic and organic gunshot residues. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 65(4), 1102–1113. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1556-4029.14314>
- Redouté Minzière, V., & Weyermann, C. (2021). How to perform a combined analysis of inorganic and organic GSR? In *Proceedings of the ENFSI 27th Annual Meeting for Firearms and GSR*, Paris.
- Reid, L., Chana, K., Bond, J. W., Almond, M. J., & Black, S. (2010). Stubs versus swabs? A comparison of gunshot residue collection techniques. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 55(3), 753–756. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1556-4029.2010.01332.x>
- Ribaux, O., & Caneppele, S. (2017). Forensic intelligence. In *The Routledge international handbook of forensic intelligence and criminology*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315541945-12>
- Ribaux, O., & Talbot Wright, B. (2014). Expanding forensic science through forensic intelligence. *Science and Justice*, 54(6), 494–501. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scijus.2014.05.001>
- Rijnders, M. R., Stamouli, A., & Bolck, A. (2010). Comparison of GSR composition occurring at different locations around the firing position. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 55(3), 616–623. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1556-4029.2009.01292.x>
- Romolo, F., & Margot, P. (2001). Identification of gunshot residue: A critical review. *Forensic Science International*, 119, 195–211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0379-0738\(00\)00428-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0379-0738(00)00428-X)
- Rosenberg, M. B., & Dockery, C. R. (2008). Determining the lifetime of detectable amounts of gunshot residue on the hands of a shooter using laser-induced breakdown spectroscopy. *Applied Spectroscopy*, 62(11), 1238–1241. <https://doi.org/10.1366/000370208786401473>

- Roux, C., Bucht, R., Crispino, F., de Forest, P., Lennard, C., Margot, P., Miranda, M. D., NicDaeid, N., Ribaux, O., Ross, A., & Willis, S. (2022). The Sydney declaration—Revisiting the essence of forensic science through its fundamental principles. *Forensic Science International*, 332, 111182. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2022.111182>
- Roux, C., Ribaux, O., & Crispino, F. (2012). From forensics to forensic science. *Current Issues in Criminal Justice*, 21(1), 7–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10345329.2012.12035941>
- Roux, C., Talbot-Wright, B., Robertson, J., Crispino, F., & Ribaux, O. (2015). The end of the (forensic science) world as we know it? The example of trace evidence. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, 370(1674), 20140260. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2014.0260>
- Roux, C., Willis, S., & Weyermann, C. (2021). Shifting forensic science focus from means to purpose: A path forward for the discipline? *Science and Justice*, 61(6), 678–686. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scijus.2021.08.005>
- Rudizitis, E., Kopina, M., & Wahlgren, M. (1973). Optimization of firearm residue detection by neutron activation analysis. *Journal of Forensic Science*, 18, 93–100. <https://doi.org/10.1520/JFS10016J>
- Schumacher, R., Barth, M., Neimke, D., & Niewöhner, L. (2010). Investigation of gunshot residue patterns using milli-XRF-techniques: First experiences in casework. *Scanning Microscopy*, 2010, 772917. <https://doi.org/10.1117/12.853852>
- Schütz, F., Bonfanti, M. S., & Desboeufs, S. (2001). Evaluation of parameters influencing GSR'S retention on shooter's hands. *Problems of Forensic Sciences*, 47, 380–386.
- Schwartz, R. H., & Zona, C. A. (1995). A recovery method for airborne gunshot residue retained in human nasal mucus. *Journal of Forensic Science*, 40(4), 659–661. <https://doi.org/10.1520/JFS13845J>
- Schwendener, G., Moret, S., Cavanagh-Steer, K., & Roux, C. (2016). Can “contamination” occur in body bags?—The example of background fibres in body bags used in Australia. *Forensic Science International*, 266, 517–526. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2016.07.012>
- Schwoeble, A. J., & Exline, D. L. (2000). *Current methods in forensic gunshot residue analysis*. CRC Press.
- Séguin, K., Falardeau, M., Mousseau, V., Ducharme, N., Cadola, L., & Crispino, F. (2021). First lessons regarding the data analysis of gunshot residue traces at activity level in TTADB. *Canadian Society of Forensic Science Journal*, 54(4), 196–209. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00085030.2021.2007666>
- Seyfang, K. E., Lucas, N., Popelka-Filcoff, R. S., Kobus, H. J., Redman, K. E., & Kirkbride, K. P. (2019). Methods for analysis of glass in glass-containing gunshot residue (GSR) particles. *Forensic Science International*, 298, 359–371. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2019.03.019>
- Seyfang, K. E., Lucas, N., Redman, K. E., Popelka-Filcoff, R. S., Kobus, H. J., & Kirkbride, K. P. (2019). Glass-containing gunshot residues and particles of industrial and occupational origins: Considerations for evaluating GSR traces. *Forensic Science International*, 298, 284–297. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2019.03.010>
- Sobreira, C., Klu, J. K., Cole, C., Nic Daéid, N., & Ménard, H. (2020). Reviewing research trends—A scientometric approach using gunshot residue (GSR) literature as an example. *Publication*, 8(1), 7. <https://doi.org/10.3390/publications8010007>
- Stamouli, A., Niewoehner, L., Larsson, M., Colson, B., Uhlig, S., Fojtasek, L., Machado, F., & Gunaratnam, L. (2021). Survey of gunshot residue prevalence on the hands of individuals from various population groups in and outside Europe. *Forensic Chemistry*, 23, 100308. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forc.2021.100308>
- Stone, I. C., & Petty, C. S. (1974). Examination of gunshot residues. *Journal of Forensic Science*, 19, 784–788. <https://doi.org/10.1520/JFS10468J>
- SWGSR. (2011). Scientific Working Group-Gunshot Residue (SWGSR). Guide for Primer Gunshot Residue Analysis by Scanning Electron Microscopy/Energy Dispersive X-Ray Spectrometry.
- Szynkowska, M. I., Parczewski, A., Szajdak, K., & Rogowski, J. (2012). Examination of gunshot residues transfer using ToF-SIMS. *Surface and Interface Analysis*, 45(1), 596–600. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sia.5142>
- Tarifa, A., & Almirall, J. R. (2015). Fast detection and characterization of organic and inorganic gunshot residues on the hands of suspects by CMV-GC-MS and LIBS. *Science and Justice*, 55(3), 168–175. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scijus.2015.02.003>
- Taudte, R. V., Roux, C., Bishop, D., Blanes, L., Doble, P., & Beavis, A. (2015). Development of a UHPLC method for the detection of organic gunshot residues using artificial neural networks. *Analytical Methods*, 7(18), 7447–7454. <https://doi.org/10.1039/C5AY00306G>
- Taudte, R. V., Roux, C., Blanes, L., Horder, M., Kirkbride, K. P., & Beavis, A. (2016). The development and comparison of collection techniques for inorganic and organic gunshot residues. *Analytical and Bioanalytical Chemistry*, 408(10), 2567–2576. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00216-016-9357-7>
- Tenney, L. D. (1953). *The chemistry of powder and explosives*. Wiley.
- Thornton, J. (1994). The chemistry of death by gunshot. *Analytica Chimica Acta*, 288(1–2), 71–81. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-2670\(94\)85117-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-2670(94)85117-4)
- Torre, C., Mattutino, G., Vasino, V., & Robino, C. (2001). Brake linings: A source of non-GSR particles containing lead, barium, and antimony. *Journal of Forensic Science*, 47, 494–504. <https://doi.org/10.1520/JFS2001093>
- Vachon, C. R., & Martinez, M. V. (2019). Understanding gunshot residue evidence and its role in forensic science. *American Journal of Forensic Medicine and Pathology*, 40(3), 210–219. <https://doi.org/10.1097/PAF.0000000000000483>
- Vinokurov, A., Zeichner, A., Glattstein, B., Koffman, A., Levin, N., & Rosengarten, A. (2001). Machine washing or brushing of clothing and its influence on shooting distance estimation. *Journal of Forensic Science*, 46, 928–933. <https://doi.org/10.1520/JFS15072J>
- Wallace, J. S. (2008). *Chemical analysis of firearms, ammunition, and gunshot residue*. CRC Press.

- Weber, I. T., Melo, A. J., Lucena, M. A., Consoli, E. F., Rodrigues, M. O., de Sá, G. F., Maldaner, A. O., Talhavini, M., & Alves, S., Jr. (2014). Use of luminescent gunshot residues markers in forensic context. *Forensic Science International*, 244, 276–284. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2014.09.001>
- Werner, D., Gassner, A. L., Marti, J., Christen, S., Wyss, P., & Weyermann, C. (2020). Comparison of three collection methods for the sodium rhodizonate detection of gunshot residues on hands. *Science and Justice*, 60(1), 63–71. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scijus.2019.09.004>
- Weyermann, C., & Roux, C. (2021). A different perspective on the forensic science crisis. *Forensic Science International*, 323, 110779. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2021.110779>
- White, R. S., & Owens, A. D. (1987). Automation of gunshot residue detection and analysis by scanning electron microscopy/energy dispersive X-ray analysis (SEM/EDX). *Journal of Forensic Science*, 32, 1595–1603. <https://doi.org/10.1520/JFS11219J>
- Wolten, G., Nesbitt, R., Calloway, A., Loper, G., & Jones, P. (1979). Particle analysis for the detection of GSR. I: Scanning electron microscopy I energy dispersive X-ray characterization of hand deposits from firing. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 24(2), 409–422. <https://doi.org/10.1520/JFS10848J>
- Wolten, G. M., Nesbitt, R. S., Calloway, A. R., Loper, G. L., & Jones, P. F. (1977). *Final report on particle analysis for gunshot residue detection*. Aerospace Corporation.
- Yuksel, B., Ozler-Yigiter, A., Bora, T., Sen, N., Kayaalti, Z., & Yuksel, B. (2016). GFAAS determination of antimony, barium, and lead levels in gunshot residue swabs: An application in forensic chemistry. *Atomic Spectroscopy*, 37, 164–169. <https://doi.org/10.46770/AS.2016.04.006>
- Zeichner, A. (2009). Firearm discharge residue: Analysis of. In A. Jamieson & A. A. Moenssens (Eds.), *Wiley encyclopedia of forensic science*. Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470061589.fsa342>
- Zeichner, A., & Eldar, B. (2004). A novel method for extraction and analysis of gunpowder residues on double-side adhesive coated stubs. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 49(6), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1520/JFS2004022>
- Zeichner, A., & Glatstein, B. (2002). Recent developments in the methods of estimating shooting distance. *ScientificWorldJournal*, 2, 573–585. <https://doi.org/10.1100/tsw.2002.140>
- Zeichner, A., & Levin, N. (1993). Collection efficiency of GSR (GSR) particles from hair and hands using double-side adhesive tape. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 38(3), 571–584. <https://doi.org/10.1520/JFS13441J>
- Zeichner, A., & Levin, N. (1995). Casework experience of GSR detection in Israel, on samples from hands, hair, and clothing using an autosearch SEM/EDX system. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 40, 13881J. <https://doi.org/10.1520/JFS13881J>
- Zeichner, A., Levin, N., & Springer, E. (1991). Gunshot residue particles formed by using different types of ammunition in the same firearm. *Journal of Forensic Science*, 36, 1020–1026. <https://doi.org/10.1520/JFS13117J>
- Zhao, M., Zhang, S., Yang, C., Xu, Y., Wen, Y., Sun, L., & Zhang, X. (2008). Desorption electrospray tandem MS (DESI-MSMS) analysis of methyl centralite and ethyl centralite as gunshot residues on skin and other surfaces. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 53(4), 807–811. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1556-4029.2008.00752.x>

**How to cite this article:** Minzière, V. R., Gassner, A.-L., Gallidabino, M., Roux, C., & Weyermann, C. (2022). The relevance of gunshot residues in forensic science. *WIREs Forensic Science*, e1472. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wfs2.1472>