BEYOND THE PATTERN: A FORENSIC FRAMEWORK FOR SERIAL-OFFENDER INVESTIGATIONS

Granville Salvadore, BBA. LLB. (Hons.), MIT-WPU School of Law
Research Intern, Centre for Crime Sciences and Forensic Intelligence

ABSTRACT

Serial-offender investigations frequently rely on behavioural similarity across offences, yet similarity alone cannot establish common authorship, identify a suspect, or support legal liability. This article develops a forensic decision-making framework for moving from behavioural linkage to investigative hypothesis, suspect relevance, and legally defensible evidentiary assessment. Drawing on crime-linkage research, forensic reliability principles, and a parallel reading of Indian and United States evidentiary law, it distinguishes modus operandi, signature behaviour, victimology, physical evidence, digital evidence, witness evidence, confession, and intelligence leads according to their investigative function, limitations, and corroborative requirements. The article also identifies diagnostic, predictive, and profiling overreach as distinct analytical failures. Its central argument is that linkage should organise inquiry rather than predetermine guilt: behavioural similarity may justify further investigation, but liability requires independently authenticated, methodologically reliable, and legally admissible evidence.

Keywords: serial-offender analysis, case linkage, forensic decision-making, evidentiary overreach, suspect relevance, liability.

Introduction: Why Pattern is not Proof?

The investigative landscape for serial offences exists at a critical intersection of behavioural science, criminal intelligence, and stringent legal standards. Historically, behavioural profiling has been misunderstood as an impressionistic methodology premised on direct psychological inference from crime-scene evidence. However, operational realities demand a shift away from personality-based prediction toward structured forensic decision-making. This section establishes the context of case linkage within modern law enforcement and outlines the rationale for maintaining strict boundaries between investigative intelligence and legal liability.

In complex investigations, analytical methodologies underscore the utility of comparing specific case features. Linkage analysis operates by evaluating behavioural consistency and distinctiveness across independently reported offences. Investigators systematically assess modus operandi, signature behaviors, and victimology to identify patterns. When applied correctly, identifying these indicators allows analysts to generate structured hypotheses and connect offences that may initially appear unrelated.

The fundamental risk in serial-offender analysis is the problematic conflation of investigative utility with evidentiary admissibility. Treating case linkage as a proxy for legal guilt constitutes an investigative failure. Behavioural similarities can easily arise from copycat offending, environmental constraints, local victim availability, media contamination, or investigative error.

Without a rigorous framework, investigations become vulnerable to confirmation bias, diagnostic overreach, and predictive overreach. Indeed, law enforcement agencies have themselves moved away from rigid offender typologies in recent practice (Morton et al., 2015). Courts globally demand that expert testimony satisfies reliability and admissibility requirements (Federal Rules of Evidence, 1975/2023, Rule 702; Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023, § 39), and any expert inference must be anchored in verifiable data rather than speculative typologies.

Consequently, there is an urgent need to formalise the transition from intelligence to evidence. Linkage analysis must remain restricted to generating hypotheses and establishing suspect relevance. These hypotheses must be systematically corroborated by independent physical evidence before any attribution of legal liability can be made.

Research Question and Aim

The core research question guiding this article asks how investigators can use linkage analysis in serial-offender cases to support legally responsible decisions about suspect relevance and liability without falling into diagnostic, predictive, or profiling overreach. The primary aim is to establish a forensic decision-making framework that transitions behavioural linkage indicators from investigative intelligence into structured hypotheses, and ultimately toward a legally defensible assessment of suspect relevance. To achieve this aim, the article addresses three subsidiary questions:

1. How can modus operandi, signature behaviors, and victimology be evaluated as linkage indicators without relying on empirically unsubstantiated inference?

2. What evidentiary hierarchy is required to corroborate behavioural linkage before it can support an assessment of suspect relevance?

3. How can confirmation bias, tunnel vision, and media contamination be prevented as an investigation moves from case linkage toward suspect relevance?

Taken together, these questions structure the article's progression from linkage to liability, ensuring that each analytical step is grounded in evidentiary discipline rather than behavioural assumption.

Contribution

The article’s contribution lies in separating four decisions that are often collapsed in practice: whether offences may be linked, whether a linkage hypothesis is sufficiently supported to guide investigation, whether a specific suspect is relevant to the linked series, and whether the evidence supports legal liability. It operationalises these distinctions through a staged decision-making framework and a context-sensitive evidence matrix.

Scope

Although serial murder literature provides several illustrations, the framework is intended for repeated-offence investigations in which cross-case behavioural, forensic, spatial, temporal, or victimological comparison is used to assess possible common authorship. Its application should

be adapted to the offence type and available empirical base.

Methodological Note

This article is a conceptual, doctrinal, and literature-based analysis. It does not present original case data, linkage testing, or empirical validation of the proposed framework. Instead, it synthesises selected research on behavioural case linkage, forensic reliability, intelligence analysis, and evidentiary law to construct a structured decision-making model. The framework is intended as an analytical aid rather than a validated predictive instrument, and its stages require empirical testing before operational adoption.

Conceptual Lens

This article approaches serial-offender investigation through three interlocking lenses: linkage analysis, forensic decision-making, and anti-overreach safeguards. Together they frame how investigators move from raw case data toward defensible conclusions, without collapsing the distance between behavioural similarity and proof of guilt.

Linkage analysis is the structured comparison of two or more offences to determine whether they share a common offender, method, or context. It rests on techniques such as link analysis, event charting, and spatial-temporal mapping, which organise raw information so an analyst can identify relationships rather than merely list facts. These techniques are tools used in deriving meaning from information, with the first analytical product being an inference drawn from the data rather than imposed on it (Atkin, 2011). In the crime-linkage literature, this rests on two theoretical pillars: behavioural consistency, similar offender actions across offences, and behavioural distinctiveness, unique patterns differentiating one offender from another (Burrell et al., 2024). Methods used to test this range from expert judgement and logistic regression to multidimensional scaling and Bayesian approaches, with accuracy assessed through hit rates and ROC analysis (Burrell et al., 2024), showing linkage to be probabilistic, with measurable error, not an exact science.

Forensic decision-making is the discipline of grading conclusions according to evidence strength rather than asserting them outright. This lens borrows from forensic science standards bodies, which exist because conclusions vary in reliability depending on method. Standards such as NIST's Organisation of Scientific Area Committees define minimum requirements and

protocols intended to ensure forensic results are reliable and reproducible (National Institute of Standards and Technology, n.d.). Applied here, every investigative conclusion should carry an explicit account of its uncertainty, alternative explanations, and available corroboration, rather than being presented as settled fact.

Anti-overreach safeguards against three recurring failure modes: diagnosing personality or pathology from behaviour, predicting future conduct without evidentiary basis, and narrowing an investigation prematurely around a single hypothesis. This lens does not reject behavioural inference; it constrains it. The UNODC manual's distinction is instructive here: intelligence is an instrumental step toward evidence gathering, not evidence itself, and analytical inference is not automatically usable in court (Atkin, 2011).

Together, these lenses produce one operating principle: linkage organises facts, forensic decision-making grades the strength those facts support, and anti-overreach prevents that strength from being mistaken for proof. A pattern is an investigative lead, not a diagnosis; a probability is not a prediction; a linked series is not a guilt of an accused person. This framework underlies the article's later movement from linkage through investigative hypothesis and suspect relevance, to the question of liability.

Case Linkage, Profiling, Suspect Relevance, and Liability: Distinct Questions

Behavioural linkage, offender profiling, suspect relevance, and legal liability are often treated as a single continuous judgement. They are four distinct questions, each with its own evidentiary basis and its own limits, and collapsing them is among the most common sources of overreach in serial-offender analysis.

Table 1.

(Four Distinct Questions in Serial-Offender Analysis)

Question	What It Asks	What It Does Not Establish
Case linkage	Are these offences likely connected to a common offender or source?	The identity of that offender
Profiling	What characteristics might the	A verified identity, a diagnosis, or a

Question	What It Asks	What It Does Not Establish
	unknown offender possess?	named suspect
Suspect relevance	What independent evidence connects this particular person to the offences?	Guilt; only that the person warrants evidentiary scrutiny
Legal liability	Does the admissible evidence prove the legally required elements to the applicable standard?	This determination is reserved to the court; a favourable finding at any earlier stage does not substitute for it

Each question corresponds to a later stage of the framework in ***Table 5***: case linkage to stages 1 through 6, suspect relevance to stage 7, and legal liability to stages 8 through 12. Profiling is not a formal stage of the framework; it appears here because it is the question most often mistaken for one of the other three, and the source of much of the overreach this article addresses.

Behavioural Consistency and Distinctiveness

Serial-offender analysis must be separated from popular profiling mythology, since the two rest on different evidentiary standards. Media-driven profiling promises direct personality insight from crime-scene behaviour, offering a quick psychological answer to a difficult case. Investigative analysis instead treats behaviour as one data point among many, always subject to corroboration rather than treated as a window into an offender's mind.

Serial murder is a low-frequency crime that most investigators encounter rarely over a career (Morton et al., 2015). Cases can span months or years, cross jurisdictions, and involve victims with no identifiable link to the offender, resisting the standard investigative approach of tracing known relationships between victim and offender. This cross-jurisdictional spread can also mean agencies do not realise they are investigating the same offender. This is part of why serial-offender cases feature prominently in wider justice-system discussions of cold-case investigation, since cases that go unsolved for years often resurface only through renewed cross-agency cooperation or advances in forensic technology (National Institute of Justice, n.d.-c). In the absence of a relational lead, offender selection pattern, including lifestyle, occupation, routine, and vulnerability, become a primary analytic tool for inferring why a particular victim was selected over another (Morton et al., 2015).

Crime-scene behaviour functions as a data source rather than a diagnostic lens. Behaviour Sequence Analysis conducted on a database of 233 male serial killers, tracing behavioural events from childhood experiences through to methods of murder, found identifiable sequences linking behaviour across offenders' lifetimes (Marono et al., 2020). This supports the view that crime-scene behaviours follow recognisable patterns shaped by an offender's history, rather than expressing a fixed personality type read directly off a single scene. Offender behaviour is not always consistent from case to case, which discourages confident single-behaviour linkage and should prompt caution wherever an apparent connection rests on one striking similarity alone (Morton et al., 2015).

Formal linkage therefore relies on convergence across several indicators rather than any single feature. Systems such as ViCAP operationalise this nationally, cross-referencing modus operandi, victimology, and forensic results across jurisdictions to surface connections individual departments might otherwise miss (Federal Bureau of Investigation, n.d.-b). Database matches strengthen an investigative picture and can direct resources efficiently, but they do not substitute for corroborating physical evidence.

MO, Signature-Like Behaviour, Victimology, and Spatial-Temporal Indicators

Modus operandi is the practical method an offender uses to approach, control, and complete an offence. It is functional rather than expressive, and because it serves a practical purpose it is also adaptable. Offenders refine method with experience, respond to what worked before, or adjust to unfamiliar circumstances, so consistency in modus operandi across cases is useful but never conclusive of common authorship on its own (Morton et al., 2015).

“Signature” is an interpretive label applied to behaviour thought to exceed immediate instrumental requirements. Whether a behaviour is genuinely non-functional, psychologically expressive, stable, or distinctive must itself be demonstrated rather than assumed. Popular accounts assume signatures remain fixed across a series, but even highly distinctive behaviours have been documented to shift as circumstances change (Morton & Hilts, 2008). Treating a signature as a stable personality marker rather than a case-specific observation open to revision is a common form of overreach in popular accounts of profiling.

Victimology examines why a particular victim was selected over others who were available, weighing lifestyle, routine, occupation, and accessibility. Where offender and victim share no

prior relationship, as is often the case in serial offending, victimology becomes one of the few productive analytic entry points available, since it can reveal patterns in opportunity even where no personal connection exists (Morton et al., 2015). Victimology should explain offender access and selection, not relocate responsibility from offender to victim.

Underlying all three concepts are two pillars from the crime-linkage literature: behavioural consistency, meaning similar offender actions recur across offences, and behavioural distinctiveness, meaning those actions are rare enough within the broader offender population to differentiate one offender from another (Burrell et al., 2024). An indicator that is consistent but common carries little linkage value, and one that is rare but observed only once is not yet a pattern; both properties are required together before an indicator meaningfully supports linkage.

From Similarity to Linkage Hypothesis

A set of converging indicators does not become fact simply because it is internally consistent with itself. At most, it becomes a hypothesis: a tentative explanation that requires further information before it can be accepted or rejected. This is distinct from a conclusion, which is an explanation already well supported by evidence that has been independently tested (Atkin, 2011). All inferences require testing before being treated as fact.

This distinction guards against a documented analytical error: forming an inference intuitively and then searching selectively for premises that support that inference, rather than building the inference upward from the premises themselves (Atkin, 2011). This is confirmation bias in practice, and it is easy to fall into because the resulting narrative can feel coherent even when it rests on a single misleading similarity. Because methods used to test crime linkage, including expert judgement, logistic regression, and Bayesian approaches, all carry measurable error rates rather than certainty (Burrell et al., 2024), a linkage hypothesis should be held provisionally, kept open to revision, and treated as a direction for further inquiry rather than an early verdict on any individual case or suspect.

Note On Use of Bayesian Terminology

This article uses “Bayesian approaches” in a precise sense. Prior odds mean how likely a hypothesis seems before new evidence. A likelihood ratio compares the evidence's probability

under two competing hypotheses. Posterior odds are the updated probability after that comparison.

Two mistakes follow from misusing this. The prosecutor's fallacy treats the chance of the evidence given innocence as if it were the chance of innocence given the evidence. The defence attorney's fallacy does the opposite, treating a low match probability as if it cancels out the evidence altogether.

A related distinction, already used in ***Table 2***, separates a source proposition, whose material this is, from an activity proposition, how it got there. Confirming the source does not confirm the activity, or that the person committed the offence.

Used loosely, the term is decorative. Used properly, it means reporting odds or likelihood ratios tied to a specific question, not a flat probability of guilt.

From Hypothesis to Suspect Relevance

A linked series does not by itself identify an offender. Suspect relevance requires evidence connecting a specific individual to the offences through independent points of contact, rather than through behavioural resemblance alone. Recognised bases include biological, friction-ridge, pattern, and trace evidence, digital and documentary records, possession of victim property, matching opportunity windows, and confession or admission, among others (Morton et al., 2015). None of these categories carries the same evidentiary weight, and none is self-sufficient.

The classifications below are illustrative rather than absolute. Evidentiary significance depends on the quality, context, specificity, provenance, authentication, transfer mechanism, and alternative explanations present in the particular case, and no category is inherently probative of liability in isolation.

Table 2. (Illustrative Evidence-Weight Matrix for Suspect-Relevance Assessment)

Evidence Category	**Investigative Value**	**Evidentiary Significance (Context-Dependent)**	**Reliability Threats and Risks**	**Corroboration / Authentication Requirement**
Biological evidence (DNA, body fluids)	High	Establishes source-level presence of biological material only; does not by itself establish timing, activity, or presence at the offence	Secondary transfer; mixed or low-template profiles; contamination; database or familial-search match confusion; source-level/activity-level conflation	Validated methodology with documented error rates; activity-level proposition tested against alternative explanations; documented chain of custody (Fed. R. Evid. 702, 2023; Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023, § 39)
Friction-ridge evidence (fingerprints)	High	Source-level identification only; presence does not establish timing or participation	Partial or degraded prints; examiner subjectivity; contextual bias; database search effects	Independent verification; documented comparison methodology; blind or blinded verification where feasible (National Institute of Standards and Technology, n.d.)
Pattern/impression evidence (tool marks, footwear, tyre impressions)	Moderate to High	Class characteristics only in most cases; individualisation claims require caution	Subjective comparison; limited validated error-rate data; substrate and surface variability	Documented comparison protocol; independent corroboration before treating as individualising (National Institute of Standards and Technology, n.d.)
Trace/material evidence (fibres, glass, soil, hair, paint, gunshot residue)	Moderate	Associative only; indicates possible contact, not	Innocent or coincidental transfer; environmental prevalence;	Comparison against a documented source population; corroboration by an independent

Evidence Category	**Investigative Value**	**Evidentiary Significance (Context-Dependent)**	**Reliability Threats and Risks**	**Corroboration / Authentication Requirement**
		conduct	contamination	evidence category
Digital evidence (device, communications, and geolocation data)	High	Establishes device or account activity, not necessarily the identity of the person operating it at the relevant time	Spoofing; shared device or account use; extraction and chain-of-integrity failure	Technical authentication of origin and integrity; expert opinion where contested (Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023, § 39)
Documentary/communication evidence	Moderate	Content may be probative, but authorship and context require independent confirmation	Impersonation; third-party access; decontextualised interpretation	Authentication of origin and custody; expert linguistic or technical opinion where meaning is contested (Fed. R. Evid. 702, 2023)
Possession of victim property	High	May indicate contact with the victim or scene; numerous innocent explanations remain possible	Innocent acquisition; planting; coincidence	Independent account of acquisition required before treating possession as probative
Opportunity and timeline	Moderate	Narrows the suspect pool; does not establish participation	Overlapping opportunity among many individuals; incomplete records	Cross-referenced against independent records such as employment or travel data
Witness evidence	Moderate	Can be highly probative or unreliable depending on conditions of observation	Memory distortion; suggestion; media contamination	Structured, non-suggestive interview protocols; independent corroboration before reliance

Evidence Category	**Investigative Value**	**Evidentiary Significance (Context-Dependent)**	**Reliability Threats and Risks**	**Corroboration / Authentication Requirement**
		and interview		
Behavioural similarity	Moderate	Supports an investigative hypothesis only; does not identify a specific offender	Confirmation bias; coincidental similarity; tunnel vision	Generates investigative direction only; does not substitute for independently authenticated evidence (Morton et al., 2015)
Intelligence leads	Moderate	A prelude to evidence gathering, not evidence itself	Treating unverified leads as established fact	Requires independent verification before any evidentiary reliance (Atkin, 2011)
Offender statements (non-confessional)	Moderate	Probative value depends heavily on context; may be self-serving	Self-serving content; unreliable without independent context	Independent corroboration required before any evidentiary reliance
Confession or admission	High, where voluntary and detailed	Ranges from highly probative (voluntary, independently corroborated, containing non-public details) to unreliable (retracted, contaminated, or induced through coercive or suggestive interviewing); admissibility and weight	False confession; contamination through investigator-supplied detail; coercive or suggestive interviewing; retraction	Independent corroboration required; reliability subject to expert review where contested; distinct voluntariness and admissibility rules apply to police, custodial, and magistrate-recorded statements under Indian law (Fed. R. Evid. 702, 2023; Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023, §§ 23, 39)

Evidence Category	Investigative Value	Evidentiary Significance (Context-Dependent)	Reliability Threats and Risks	Corroboration / Authentication Requirement
		are governed separately		

(Note. Categories, ratings, and safeguards are illustrative. Ratings reflect typical investigative utility, not a fixed determination of legal weight in any given case.)

Table 2. presents an illustrative evidence-weight matrix summarising thirteen recognised categories of evidence relevant to suspect relevance, together with their typical investigative value, the reliability threats particular to each category, and the corroboration or authentication ordinarily required before an item can be relied upon. No category carries a fixed liability value: evidentiary significance depends on the quality, context, specificity, provenance, authentication, transfer mechanism, and alternative explanations present in the particular case. Biological evidence, authenticated digital evidence, and independently corroborated confession tend to carry the greatest investigative and corroborative value, but even these categories require an accompanying activity-level or contextual account before they can support a finding relevant to liability. Behavioural similarity and unverified intelligence leads remain useful for investigative direction but cannot, on their own, establish that a specific individual committed a specific offence. Even the highest-value categories carry procedural safeguards for exactly this reason: confessions made to a police officer are inadmissible outright under Indian law, and confessions made in police custody require the immediate presence of a magistrate before they can be relied upon at all, reflecting the same concern that motivates corroboration requirements more broadly (Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023, § 23).

Competing Hypothesis and Linkage Error

Guarding against confirmation bias requires more than awareness of the risk. Following the Analysis of Competing Hypotheses method (Heuer, 1999), a linkage claim should be tested against a fixed set of alternative explanations before it is accepted, rather than assessed only against the shared-offender hypothesis that first suggested itself. ***Table 3*** sets out eight such alternatives, together with the kind of evidence that would support or undermine each. This list corresponds to the competing-hypothesis log required at the alternative-explanation testing

stage of the framework in ***Table 5***.

Table 3.

(Analysis of Competing Hypotheses for Case-Linkage Claims)

Competing Hypothesis	**What It Proposes**	**Evidence Consistent With It**	**Evidence Inconsistent With It**
1. Shared-offender hypothesis	A single offender committed all offences in the series	Convergent MO, signature, victimology, and spatial-temporal features with no equally plausible alternative source	Similarities attributable to chance, common practice, or environment
2. Independent offenders, common methods	Different offenders each used a similar method without contact or coordination	The shared method is common, low-skill, or widely known	Features too idiosyncratic or rare to arise independently
3. Copycat offending	A later offender deliberately imitated a specific known offence	Imitated features match details that were already public; clear sequence from disclosure to the later offence	Similarity includes non-public details unknown to a potential copycat
4. Media-influenced imitation	General exposure to crime media shaped offending behaviour, without replication of one specific case	Behaviour reflects widely circulated crime tropes rather than one identifiable source offence	Similarity is specific enough to trace to a single, identifiable incident
5. Environmental constraint	Similarities reflect a shared physical or situational environment rather than a shared offender	Similar features are explainable by shared location, access, or opportunity structure	Similarities extend to behaviours with no environmental explanation
6. Repeated victim availability	Different offenders independently targeted the same type of available victim	Victim similarities reflect a shared local victim pool or common vulnerability, not distinctive selection	Selection reflects distinctive criteria unlikely to be independently replicated
7. Recording	Apparent similarity or	Divergence or	The pattern persists after

Competing Hypothesis	What It Proposes	Evidence Consistent With It	Evidence Inconsistent With It
inconsistency	difference is an artefact of how the offences were documented, not genuine offender behaviour	convergence disappears once documentation differences are normalised	accounting for documentation and reporting differences
8. Contamination or investigative leakage	Similarity was created by information passing between cases, rather than reflecting real offender behaviour	Chronology shows information transfer between case files, media, or witnesses before the similarity was recorded	The similarity predates any possible information transfer, or the detail was never disclosed

Note. Adapted for case-linkage analysis from the Analysis of Competing Hypotheses method (Heuer, 1999). Hypothesis 1 is the shared-offender hypothesis that a linkage claim proposes; hypotheses 2 through 8 are the alternative explanations against which it must be tested.

Evidence is discriminating when it is consistent with one hypothesis but inconsistent with another, since only that evidence helps an analyst choose between them. Evidence that is equally consistent with several hypotheses is neutral: it may still be true, but it does not by itself favour any explanation and should not be treated as though it does. A linkage claim that survives this test, meaning that the evidence discriminates against the seven alternative explanations rather than merely being consistent with the shared-offender hypothesis, stands on stronger footing than one assessed against that hypothesis alone.

A linkage analysis can also fail in ways that are not captured by testing a single case against competing hypotheses, since some errors arise from how a series is investigated and recorded over time rather than from any one item of evidence. Table 4 sets out five such errors.

Table 4 *Linkage Error Taxonomy for Serial-Offender Analysis*

Linkage Error	Definition	Safeguard Within the Framework
False-positive linkage	Unrelated offences are wrongly treated as belonging to one series.	Requires convergence across multiple indicators (Table 3) rather than reliance on a single striking

Linkage Error	Definition	Safeguard Within the Framework
		similarity.
False-negative linkage	Related offences are treated as separate and the series goes unrecognised.	Cross-jurisdictional data sharing and periodic re-review of unlinked cases sharing partial features.
Suspect substitution	A suspect who fits the behavioural pattern diverts attention from stronger, independent evidence against another individual.	Suspect relevance (stage 7) requires independent corroboration, not behavioural fit alone.
Series contamination	Public disclosure or investigative practice alters how later offences are committed or recorded.	Track the disclosure timeline; treat features that emerged only after publicity with added caution.
Classification drift	Analysts redefine or reinterpret features over time to preserve a preferred series theory.	Fix feature definitions before comparison (stage 4); document any later revision and its rationale.

These errors are not mutually exclusive, and a series can be affected by more than one simultaneously. Recognising them as distinct categories, rather than treating any divergence from the working theory as noise, is what allows an analyst to revisit stage 5 or stage 6 of the framework rather than defend the original hypothesis by default.

Forensic Decision-Making Framework

Behavioural linkage, suspect relevance, and legal liability are frequently treated as a single continuous judgement. They are not. Each represents a distinct analytical decision with its own evidentiary requirements, and collapsing them risks converting an investigative hypothesis into a legal conclusion before it has earned that status. The twelve-stage framework set out in ***Table 5*** makes each of these decisions explicit, assigns it a defined output, and attaches a safeguard intended to prevent the most common analytical failure at that stage.

The framework is sequential but not strictly linear: findings at a later stage, particularly alternative-explanation testing and the overreach checkpoint, may require an analyst to revisit an earlier stage before proceeding. It is intended as an analytical aid rather than a validated predictive instrument, and its stages require empirical testing, including inter-rater reliability

assessment, before operational adoption.

Table 5. *Twelve-Stage Forensic Decision-Making Framework for Serial-Offender Analysis*

Stage	Core Task	Decision Question	Required Output	Safeguard
1. Case intake	Standardise information	Are records sufficiently complete for comparison?	Structured case file	Do not compare incomplete or differently recorded cases
2. Victimology	Analyse victim selection and opportunity	Are similarities meaningful or environmentally common?	Victimology profile	Avoid blaming victims or treating vulnerability as causation
3. Scene and temporal analysis	Map place, time, sequence, access	Do spatial-temporal patterns support linkage?	Event and location map	Test local opportunity explanations
4. Feature extraction	Identify MO, signature, forensic, digital, and contextual features	Which features are reliable enough to compare?	Feature list with confidence rating	Separate observation from interpretation
5. Linkage matrix	Compare consistency and distinctiveness	Do multiple features converge?	Linkage score or graded hypothesis	Avoid single-feature linkage
6. Alternative-explanation testing	Generate competing hypotheses	Could similarity arise from coincidence, copying, environment, or contamination?	Competing-hypothesis log	Document disconfirming evidence
7. Suspect-relevance assessment	Connect a person to the series	What independent evidence links the suspect?	Relevance assessment	Behaviour alone cannot identify the suspect
8. Evidence-weight review	Evaluate each evidence stream	What is the quality, provenance, and limitation of each item?	Contextual evidence matrix	Avoid universal ranking
9. Corroboratio	Identify missing	What independent	Investigation	Do not treat repeated weak

Stage	Core Task	Decision Question	Required Output	Safeguard
n plan	evidence	evidence is required?	plan	evidence as strong evidence
10. Overreach checkpoint	Screen diagnostic, predictive, and profiling claims	Is any inference answering a question beyond its competence?	Revised bounded inference	Remove unsupported personality or dangerousness claims
11. Legal threshold review	Examine relevance, admissibility, reliability, and sufficiency	What can lawfully be said and used?	Legal-review memorandum	Separate expert scope from judicial conclusion
12. Decision output	Grade the conclusion	What level of support is justified?	Lead / hypothesis / supported link / evidentiary link / liability support	Preserve uncertainty and reviewability

(Note. Stages 1 through 5 concern case linkage; stage 7 concerns suspect relevance; stages 8 through 11 concern evidentiary and legal sufficiency; stage 12 records the graded conclusion. The stages do not by themselves establish liability, and a case may legitimately stop at any stage where the required output cannot be produced.)

The final decision output is graded rather than binary. A lead is a preliminary indicator warranting further inquiry. A linkage hypothesis is a reasoned but unconfirmed proposition that cases may share an offender, source, or context. A supported linkage is a hypothesis supported by multiple consistent and distinctive indicators after alternative-explanation testing. An evidentiary linkage is a cross-case connection supported by authenticated, independent evidence suitable for legal consideration. Liability support refers to evidence relevant to whether a specific accused committed the offence, without implying that guilt has been judicially established. None of these outputs substitutes for the court's own determination of guilt.

Diagnostic, Predictive, and Profiling Overreach

Three distinct failure modes threaten serial-offender analysis, each easy to mistake for ordinary analytical reasoning rather than a departure from it. Diagnostic overreach occurs when clinical

claims are drawn from crime-scene behaviour without a proper clinical assessment ever having taken place. Predictive overreach occurs when a person is claimed likely to reoffend, or is identified as the offender, on the basis of pattern or type alone, without evidence connecting that specific person to that specific act. Profiling overreach occurs when a behavioural inference, useful as a lead, is converted into a personality label or an outright conclusion of guilt. All three substitute inference for evidence, and general forensic-science standards exist precisely to guard the reliability of evidence relied on within the justice system (National Institute of Justice, n.d.-a).

Diagnostic overreach is easiest to see where clinical terms are used loosely. Psychopathy, psychosis, personality disorder, and mental illness are not interchangeable. Psychopathy is a largely personality-based construct that bears a negligible or negative association with psychosis, which involves a loss of contact with reality such as hallucinations or delusions (Berg et al., 2013). Psychopathy also overlaps with, but is not identical to, antisocial personality disorder, since the former centres on interpersonal and affective traits while the latter is defined largely by behaviour (Berg et al., 2013). Mental illness is a broader clinical and legal category still, encompassing many conditions unrelated to either construct, and collapsing these categories into one label is itself a form of overreach.

This caution extends well beyond psychopathy and psychosis. A crime-scene or behavioural analyst is not in a position to diagnose psychopathy, psychosis, personality disorder, paraphilic disorder, neurodevelopmental disorder, sadism, an “evil” personality, or dangerousness, and crime-scene behaviour should never be treated as sufficient grounds for any of these labels. A forensic psychiatric diagnosis instead requires a direct assessment of the individual, a documented history, collateral information gathered from sources independent of the offence itself, recognised diagnostic tools such as the DSM, a differential diagnosis that rules out competing explanations, and the professional competence and licensure to carry out all of the above (Glancy et al., 2015). None of this is available to an analyst working from a case file. A behavioural analyst who nonetheless offers a clinical label is not extending behavioural analysis; they are performing a diagnosis without a clinician, an assessment, or a patient.

Even where a clinical construct is genuinely present, it does not explain or excuse offending. Not all violent offenders are psychopaths, and not all psychopaths are violent offenders; psychopathy alone does not explain a serial offender’s motivations (Morton & Hilts, 2008). A

trait consistent with a crime-scene is not a verified diagnosis, and a verified diagnosis does not itself establish why a specific offence occurred.

Clinical diagnosis and legal responsibility operate on separate axes. A diagnosis classifies a pattern of traits or symptoms. Legal responsibility asks whether, at the time of the act, a person met a specific statutory threshold, such as incapacity to understand the nature of the act or that it was wrong, the standard for unsoundness of mind under the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, section 22. A diagnosis such as psychopathy is not, on its own, an adequate basis for such a defence (Berg et al., 2013), which is why the two questions are kept separate rather than treated as one determination. Legitimate behavioural analysis exists to support investigation, not to render either finding (Federal Bureau of Investigation, n.d.-a).

Predictive overreach carries a parallel risk. Because offender behaviour is not always consistent from case to case (Morton et al., 2015), claims that a person will reoffend, or that a given individual is the offender, cannot rest on pattern or type alone. Even where structured, empirically validated risk assessment tools are used for this purpose in appropriate clinical contexts, a recent meta-analysis found only moderate predictive accuracy for future violence, with the best-performing instruments still leaving considerable uncertainty in any individual case (Ogonah et al., 2023). If purpose-built, validated instruments carry this much uncertainty, an informal claim of dangerousness drawn from crime-scene pattern alone carries far more. The framework's overreach checkpoint and legal threshold review exist to intercept exactly these claims before they progress toward suspect relevance or liability.

Implementation Limits, Data Quality, and Inter-Rater Reliability

Serial cases frequently cross jurisdictions, and case records compiled by different agencies rarely share a common format. Reporting conventions and terminology vary between departments, forensic practices differ, scene data goes unrecorded or is recorded inconsistently, negative findings are often omitted rather than logged, and information can leak between agencies through media coverage or informal contact. Stage 1 of the framework in Table 5 begins with standardised intake for exactly this reason, but standardisation cannot repair a record that was never complete. The validity of linkage is constrained by the completeness and comparability of case records. Standardisation cannot retrospectively recover unrecorded scene detail, and apparent inconsistency may reflect documentation differences rather than offender variation.

Where behavioural features are extracted and coded by an analyst, as in stage 4 of the framework, a second analyst may reasonably code the same case differently. This is a methodological limitation of the framework as presented, not an incidental detail, and should be addressed directly rather than assumed away. Before the framework is used operationally, an implementing team should be able to answer each of the following:

- Are feature definitions standardised in advance, rather than developed case by case?
- Do coders receive comparable training?
- Is inter-rater reliability actually measured, rather than assumed?
- Are scene descriptions complete enough to support coding?
- Are behavioural categories coded before suspect information becomes available, to limit the influence of a preferred suspect on how features are described?
- Are analysts blinded to case outcome where feasible?

Where these questions cannot yet be answered, the framework's outputs should be treated as provisional rather than validated.

Conclusion

This article has argued that behavioural linkage can assist serial-offender investigations only when its function is kept within strict analytical boundaries. Modus operandi, signature-like behaviour, victimology, and spatial-temporal patterns may support a common-source hypothesis, but they do not identify a particular suspect and cannot establish legal liability. The proposed framework therefore separates case comparison, hypothesis formation, suspect relevance, evidence evaluation, corroboration, and legal review. It also requires competing explanations and overreach claims to be tested before any conclusion is advanced. Its purpose is not to turn behavioural analysis into proof, but to prevent investigative utility from being mistaken for evidentiary sufficiency. The framework remains conceptual and requires empirical validation, including inter-rater testing and retrospective application to linked and unlinked case sets. A pattern may direct inquiry; only independently corroborated, authenticated, and legally tested evidence can support liability.

REFERENCES

Atkin, H. (2011). *Criminal intelligence: Manual for analysts* (10th ed.). United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. https://www.unodc.org/documents/organized-crime/Law-Enforcement/Criminal_Intelligence_for_Analysts.pdf

Berg, J. M., Smith, S. F., Watts, A. L., Ammirati, R., Green, S. E., & Lilienfeld, S. O. (2013). Misconceptions regarding psychopathic personality: Implications for clinical practice and research. *Neuropsychiatry, 3*(1), 63-74. https://doi.org/10.2217/npy.12.69

Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, § 22 (India). https://www.indiacode.nic.in/bitstream/123456789/20062/1/a202345.pdf

Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023, § 23 (India). https://www.indiacode.nic.in/bitstream/123456789/20063/1/aa202347.pdf

Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023, § 39 (India). https://www.indiacode.nic.in/bitstream/123456789/20063/1/aa202347.pdf

Burrell, A., Costello, B., & Woodhams, J. (2024). Methods used to link crimes using behaviour: A literature review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 79*, Article 102014. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2024.102014

Federal Bureau of Investigation. (n.d.-a). *Behavioral analysis*. U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved July 3, 2026, from https://www.fbi.gov/how-we-investigate/behavioral-analysis

Federal Bureau of Investigation. (n.d.-b). *Violent Criminal Apprehension Program (ViCAP)*. U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved July 3, 2026, from https://www.fbi.gov/how-we-can-help-you/more-fbi-services-and-information/vicap

Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 702, 1975/2023. Legal Information Institute, Cornell Law School. https://www.law.cornell.edu/rules/fre/rule_702

Glancy, G. D., Ash, P., Bath, E. P. J., Buchanan, A., Fedoroff, P., Frierson, R. L., Harris, V. L., Hatters Friedman, S. J., Hauser, M. J., Knoll, J., Norko, M., Pinals, D., Price, M., Recupero, P., Scott, C. L., & Zonana, H. V. (2015). AAPL practice guideline for the forensic assessment. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law, 43*(2 Supplement), S3-S53. https://jaapl.org/content/43/2_Supplement/S3

Heuer, R. J., Jr. (1999). *Psychology of intelligence analysis*. Center for the Study of Intelligence, Central Intelligence Agency. https://www.cia.gov/resources/csi/static/Pyschology-of-Intelligence-Analysis.pdf

Marono, A. J., Reid, S., Yaksic, E., & Keatley, D. A. (2020). A behaviour sequence analysis

of serial killers' lives: From childhood abuse to methods of murder. *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law, 27*(1), 126-137. https://doi.org/10.1080/13218719.2019.1695517

Morton, R. J., & Hilts, M. A. (Eds.). (2008). *Serial murder: Multi-disciplinary perspectives for investigators*. Federal Bureau of Investigation, National Center for the Analysis of Violent Crime. https://www.fbi.gov/file-repository/reports-and-publications/stats-services-publications-serial-murder-serial-murder-july-2008-pdf

Morton, R. J., Tillman, J. M., & Gaines, S. J. (2015). *Serial murder: Pathways for investigations*. Federal Bureau of Investigation, National Center for the Analysis of Violent Crime. https://www.fbi.gov/file-repository/reports-and-publications/serialmurder-pathwaysforinvestigations.pdf

National Institute of Justice. (n.d.-a). *Forensic and investigative sciences*. Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved July 3, 2026, from https://nij.ojp.gov/topics/forensics

National Institute of Justice. (n.d.-b). *Law 101: Legal guide for the forensic expert. Rules for experts (FREs): 701-706*. Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved July 3, 2026, from https://nij.ojp.gov/nij-hosted-online-training-courses/law-101-legal-guide-forensic-expert/importance-case-preparation/rules-experts/rules-experts-fres-701-706

National Institute of Justice. (n.d.-c). *Serial murders*. Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved July 3, 2026, from https://nij.ojp.gov/taxonomy/term/serial-murders

National Institute of Standards and Technology. (n.d.). *Organization of Scientific Area Committees for Forensic Science*. U.S. Department of Commerce. Retrieved July 3, 2026, from https://www.nist.gov/forensic-science

Ogonah, M. G. T., Seyedsalehi, A., Whiting, D., & Fazel, S. (2023). Violence risk assessment instruments in forensic psychiatric populations: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet Psychiatry, 10*(10), 780-789. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(23)00256-0