

Commentary on: Vandenberg N, van Oorshcot RAH. The Use of Polilight® in the Detection of Seminal Fluid, Saliva, and Bloodstains and Comparison with Conventional Chemical-Based Screening Tests. *J Forensic Sci* 2006;51(2):361–70.

Sir:

We read the article by Vandenberg and van Oorshcot (1) with interest. The article compares the Phadebas® presumptive test for saliva and the Polilight® detection method and the authors recommend the use of Polilight® for the detection of saliva stains. In this context, we have noted that the method described by Vandenberg and van Oorshcot (1) for the preparation of Phadebas® solution is different from the one that we use.

Vandenberg et al. state that 0.9 g Phadebas® tablets should be dissolved in 100 mL distilled water and then the press test carried out. This is equivalent to four to five tablets only, whereas the manufacturer instructs that 50 tablets be dissolved in 200 mL distilled water (2) before the press test. During our work we follow the manufacturer's instructions and always obtain clear and

noticeable results for a wide range of saliva-stain dilutions within a few minutes. In contrast, when we used the method of Phadebas® solution preparation as suggested by Vandenberg and van Oorshcot (1) poor and unclear results were obtained for saliva-stain detection. May we suggest that such results might be due to the procedure they have adopted to prepare the Phadebas® solution?

References

1. Vandenberg N, van Oorshcot RAH. The use of Polilight® in the detection of seminal fluid, saliva, and bloodstains and comparison with conventional chemical-based screening tests. *J Forensic Sci* 2006;51(2):361–70.
2. <http://www.phadebas.com/tibet/page/1981>

David Jackson, B.Sc. (Hons) and Sibte Hadi,
Ph.D.
Department of Forensic Investigative Science,
University of Central Lancashire, Preston, PR1
2HE, U.K.