

## **Acknowledgements**

During my time at Middle Tennessee State University, I have received a great deal of support and encouragement from friends, family, and MTSU staff. First, I would like to thank the staff at the Honors College, Ms. Susan Lyons, Ms. Judy Albakry, Ms. Karen Demonbruem, Ms. Kathy Davis, and Dean John Vile for all they have done to guide me through the Honors College. I would also like to thank some of my professors, Dr. Dunlap, Dr. Farone, Dr. McClelland, Dr. Phelps, Dr. Bailey, and Dr. Wright for being such encouraging teachers, providing the scaffolding with which I will continue to grow and pursue my career. I especially want to thank Dr. Seipelt-Thiemann for going above and beyond as a research mentor, from troubleshooting to revising, I am so thankful she was willing to attempt this outside the box forensics research project with me.

Outside the classrooms, I have received unending encouragement as well. I would like to thank my wonderful boyfriend, Alex, who has supported me from beginning to end on every endeavor I set out to achieve. I also want to thank my amazing family for all the support and kind words that helped me get through the long nights, weeks, and months of studies.

Without all of these people, I would not be where I am today. My gratitude is immeasurable for all of these amazing people I have been blessed with in my life.

## **Abstract**

Violent crimes are largely prevalent in cities across the United States. In current popular television shows, display characters involved with violent crimes and disposing of victims' bodies using harsh chemicals, including drain cleaners. Without an intact body at a crime scene, how does a criminalistics team process decomposed evidence? This study used pig rib as a surrogate for human flesh to analyze the effects of drain cleaner on the process of forensically analyzing DNA. The rib tips were exposed to acid, base, and enzymatic based drain cleaners for two weeks, with DNA samples extracted and isolated daily. Nanodrop was used to analyze the concentration of DNA for each sample. Samples were analyzed using PCR and gel electrophoresis. The results displayed inconsistent DNA degradation across all treatment replicates. Base and enzymatic drain cleaner appeared to be less effective than the acid or water at degrading the DNA.

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	i
Abstract .....	ii
List of Tables .....	iv
List of Figures.....	v
Introduction.....	1
Materials and Methods.....	5
Treatment of Pork Ribs and Isolation of DNA.....	5
Quantitation and PCR.....	5
Results.....	8
Discussion.....	21
References.....	22

## List of Tables

Table 1. pH Measurements for Treatment Solutions.....	5
Table 2. Sequence Names and Primer Sequences for the Primers Used for the <i>Sus</i> <i>scrofa</i> .....	6
Table 3. Average Nanodrop Concentrations.....	11

## **List of Figures**

Figure 1. PCR Analysis of Untreated Pork DNA .....	7
Figure 2. Visual Appearance of Treated Ribs from Day Zero to Day Fourteen.....	9
Figure 3. Forensic DNA Analysis of Acid Drain Cleaner Treated Samples.....	14
Figure 4. Forensic DNA Analysis of Base Drain Cleaner Treated Samples .....	16
Figure 5. Forensic DNA Analysis of Enzymatic Drain Cleaner Treated Samples .....	18
Figure 6. Forensic DNA Analysis of Water Treated Samples .....	20