

## Letters to the Editor

### Discussion of "Laser and Fiber Optic Photographic Analysis of Single-Edge Paper Striations"

Sir:

This is to inform you that I have determined that the comparison photographs in "Laser and Fiber Optic Photographic Analysis of Single-Edge Paper Striations," Vol. 29, No. 4, Oct. 1984, pp. 1105-1113 of the *Journal*, are not what they are purported to be. Figure 7 (p. 1109) actually shows two photographic prints of the same paper edge, one made with the negative reversed ("flopped" in photographer's jargon). Every detail of the upper print will be found in the lower print (as in a mirror image) except where the cropping procedure cut away some details along the edge.

Stephen C. McKasson  
Bureau of Scientific Services  
Training and Applications Laboratory  
515 E. Woodruff Rd.  
Joliet, IL 60432

### Author's Response

Dear Sir:

Reference is made to my article entitled, "Laser and Fiber Optic Photographic Analysis of Single-Edge Paper Striations," in the Oct. 1984 issue. The original manuscript submitted for editorial review and comment contained a total of 29 black-and-white photographs depicting the extent of striae agreement existing along the edges of counterfeit notes exposed to both fiber optic and laser illumination.

Following a review of the proposed manuscript by members of the Editorial Board of the *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, it was recommended by them that certain mandatory changes be made, for example, reduce number of photographs, trim excess black and nonpicture areas off photos, and change some of the photographs into comparison of the striae by double views, or split images or whatever, to show matches and nonmatches. In an effort to comply with the recommendations, I subsequently submitted 12 photographs to the *Journal of Forensic Sciences* which included Fig. 7 that depicted the striae agreement evident on two different, wrinkled ninhydrin processed notes. During the process of cropping and relabeling of these submitted photographs, it appears that in Fig. 7, the same photograph of a single counterfeit note edge was inadvertently published twice for comparison purposes.

This inadvertent error is regrettable but should not deter, however, from the proven validity of the technique which was duplicated by other document examiners within the Secret Service forensic division within the past year. Further refinements of the original technique have been developed and will be published at a later date.

I wish to thank Mr. McKasson for bringing this matter to the attention of the *Journal of Forensic Sciences* and its readers.

Stephen Cain  
107 Nina Cove  
Aquia Harbour  
Stafford, VA 22554