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• Two main approaches
  – Comparison question method
  – Guilty knowledge method

• Did you kill a man in Reno?
  – If subject lies, expect greater physio response to this question than to other emotional questions (eg, Have you ever stolen?)

• Did the knife have a wooden handle?
  – If the subject knows about the murder weapon, the correct description will “ring a bell”/”click” and this will be reflected in physiology
Lie detection 101, continued

- How to measure the physiological impact of giving a deceitful answer or recognizing features of the crime?
- Deception increases autonomic nervous system arousal
  - Sympathetic division activates during arousal, emotion
Measuring sympathetic nervous system activity for lie detection

- Ancient China:
  - Interrogate with dry rice in mouth
- 20th Century, US and elsewhere, “polygraph”
  - Blood pressure
  - Respiration
  - Heart rate
  - Sweat
History of the polygraph

• William Moulton Marston’s undergraduate research project at Harvard
  – Blood pressure goes up when lying (Comparison Question) or hearing relevant crime facts (Guilty Knowledge)

• Later workers added respiration, HR and GSR
Polygraph

Note aura of science ( = objectivity, certainty, authority)
Does it work?

- Yes and no (mainly no).
  - Accuracy depends on who’s measuring
  - Hard to measure accuracy in real world situations
  - Does “work” mean better than guessing? 75%? 99%?
  - Especially bad for screening (low base rate)

- Despite this…
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Use in criminal investigation

Police Polygraph

Frequently Asked Questions about Polygraphs

Q. When are Polygraphs used?

A: The Santa Barbara Police Department conducts pre-employment polygraph examinations for most positions at the police department. They are conducted to verify information, qualifications, past criminal or drug history, if any.

The Santa Barbara Police Department also conducts criminal polygraphs on suspects or persons to find out if they committed a particular crime or to exonerate them from suspicion of criminal activity.
Polygraph and the law

• Employee Polygraph Protection Act of 1988
• Criteria for admissibility of scientific evidence
  – Frye (1923 – actually concerned polygraph)
    • Has the new method “gained general acceptance in the particular field in which it belongs”
    • More flexibility
What’s past is prologue

ERP and fMRI rain-based lie detection:
Even more scientific impressiveness
Even less empirical validation
ERP markers of guilty knowledge

• “Brain Finger-Printing”

• Admitted for reversal of Terry Harrington’s murder conviction
ERP markers of guilty knowledge

• Brain Electrical Oscillations Signature (BEOS)

• Used to convict Aditi Sharma of murder

• As of 2009 over 300 suspects or witnesses have taken the BEOS test
fMRI lie detection

• Starting in 2002, studies of the neural bases of deception
  – Basic research with simple tasks, eg Langleben’s playing card task: subject gets a card, must conceal its identity while being shown many cards and asked, for each one, “is this your card?”
  – How does this differ from real world deception?
Activation associated with deception

• Is there a “brain signature” of deception?

I.e. could lying be like face perception?

Is there a “Prefrontal Prevarication (lying) Area,” analogous to the Fusiform Face Area?
A constellation of areas typically, but not invariably, activated

- Across studies, dorsolateral PFC, ventrolateral PFC, posterior parietal, anterior insula, anterior cingulate
- Locations of lie-truth difference vary
- Regions associated with effort and cognitive control
- Lying not specific to lying
Multivariate techniques

- How well can we discriminate lies from truth using all the (inconsistent and nonspecific) information?
Major outstanding problems

- In the lab, confounds: deception trials also more familiar, different response demands
- Outside the lab, no relevant evidence
No Lie MRI, Inc. provides unbiased methods for the detection of deception and other information stored in the brain.

The technology used by No Lie MRI represents the first and only direct measure of truth verification and lie detection in human history!

No Lie MRI uses techniques that:
- Bypass conscious cognitive processing
- Measure the activity of the central nervous system (brain and spinal cord) rather than the peripheral nervous system (as polygraph testing does).
CEPHOS CORPORATION uses the latest advances in medical imaging to peer inside the inner workings of the brain during deception. Our goal is to develop accurate tools to detect lying.

Lying is shown to activate specific, discrete parts of the brain. We can use these regions to determine if a person is lying with a high degree of accuracy. No activation is seen when telling the truth.

Standard magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) technology is used to detect brain activations. This technique is referred to as functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI).

Over the last six years, this technology has been used in a series of studies to detect the neuronal basis of deception. fMRI has numerous advantages over standard "lie detectors" including:

- Accurate - currently 90% accuracy in clinical testing.
- Machine-based - all analysis performed using automated computer analysis.
- Non-subjective - humans do not ask the questions or examine the scans.
- Validated algorithms - uses algorithms used and developed in thousands of clinical studies.

CEPHOS continues to test and validate the technology with the goal of achieving 95% accuracy. Based on valid clinical results in 2006, the company intends to offer this service in the first half of this year.
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Daubert hearing 2010

Daubert hearing on fMRI lie detection in Memphis Federal Court, 2010
Evidence in science and law

• Truth.

• Truth, as best we can determine it, for practical purposes
  – The jury, not a lie detector, decides what is true… Lie detector evidence may help the jury decide
Not admitted, but…

• Judge Tu Pham:
  “in the future, should fMRI-based lie detection undergo further testing, development and peer review, improve upon standards controlling the technique’s operation, and gain acceptance by the scientific community for use in the real world, this methodology may be found to be admissible even if the error rate is not found to be quantified in a real world setting.”
Roles of neuroscience in law

1. Ammunition for attack on very idea of legal or moral responsibility and implications for punishment

2. Handmaiden to psychology
   - NGRI
   - Adolescent culpability
   - Mitigation at sentencing

3. Other
   - Detection of deception
   - Also: Screening and prediction, Therapeutic sentencing, Memory dampening, Pain detection...
Thank you!
How can we determine real-world validity?

• Peter Imrey (2010): a “clinical trial”
  – Cases selected prior to review of evidence
  – Scan defendants
  – Later, examine cases in which indisputable evidence came to light

• Cost estimated in the range of $10^8