The International Journal of Indian Psychology
ISSN 2348-5396 (Online) | ISSN: 2349-3429 (Print)
Volume 12, Issue 1, January- March, 2024
DIP: 18.01.225.20241201, DOI: 10.25215/1201.225
https://www.ijip.in

**Review Paper**

# Brain Fingerprinting: A Review of the Behavioural Scientific Revolution

Nikhil Saini[1]*, Afreen A. Hussain[2], Dr. Swapnil Gupta[3]

## ABSTRACT

Brain fingerprinting is a novel neuroscientific technique that analyses brain responses to certain stimuli to find hidden information. Brain fingerprinting, which was invented by Dr. Lawrence Farwell in the early 1990s, has gained popularity in a variety of fields, including criminal justice, deception detection, and market research. The core principle of brain fingerprinting relies on the analysis of event-related potentials (ERPs) generated in response to specific stimuli, such as crime scene details or critical information relevant to an investigation. Researchers have refined ERP-based paradigms, incorporating advanced neuroimaging techniques like functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) and electroencephalography (EEG), which have enhanced the accuracy and reliability of brain fingerprinting outcomes. This review paper offers a thorough analysis of brain fingerprinting, including information on its historical development, technique, guiding principles, how it works, methodology & it's working procedure, potential advantages, disadvantages, range of applications, ethical issues of the non-invasive neuroscientific instrument. As evident, brain fingerprinting has evolved significantly, offering a promising avenue for forensic applications. As research continues to refine the technology and address ethical concerns, brain fingerprinting holds the potential to revolutionize criminal investigations and courtroom procedures, contributing to the pursuit of justice and truth.

***Keywords:*** *Brain Fingerprinting, Event-Related Potentials (ERPs), Neuroimaging, Forensic Science, Criminal Investigations, Ethical Considerations, Legal Implications*

Brain fingerprinting is a state-of-the-art neuroscientific method that has shown promise in a number of domains. It entails analysing brain reactions to specific stimuli, which can provide prospective insights into hidden knowledge and information. A contentious proposed investigative method called "Brain Fingerprinting" uses electrical brain wave responses to words, phrases, or images displayed on a computer screen to test identification of familiar stimuli. The hypothesis behind brain fingerprinting holds that the brain envisioned, remembers, and executes each operation throughout each

[1]Forensic Professional, Forensic Psychology Division, Central Forensic Science Laboratory, Kamrup (R), Assam, India
[2]Forensic Professional, Forensic Psychology Division, Central Forensic Science Laboratory, Kamrup (R), Assam, India
[3]Scientist (B) Documents, and Head of Division, Forensic Psychology, Central Forensic Science Laboratory, Kamrup (R), Assam, India
*Corresponding Author

**Received: March 20, 2024; Revision Received: March 28, 2024; Accepted: March 31, 2024**

given action. Brain fingerprinting has now made it possible to access details that had previously been concealed within the brain.

The secrets of Brain Fingerprinting: "Matching the happened incident at the crime scene with incidence in the brain". The perpetrator's brain keeps a record of every crime they commit. Brain fingerprinting offers a way to objectively and scientifically link information from the crime scene with information that has been stored in the brain about the incident. In order to uncover crimes, brain fingerprinting captures electrical brain activity on a computer or laptop screen. when—and only when—the information in the brain coincides to what actually happened at the crime scene. As a result, the guilty can be found and the innocent can be exonerated in a precise, scientific, impartial, non-intrusive, and stress-free manner. When a person detects and processes an important or noteworthy incoming signal, a complex electroencephalographic response related to memory and encoding is elicited.

This review study delves into the history, technique, operating principles, potential advantages, limitations, applications, ethical considerations, and suggestions of brain fingerprinting. In order to fully appreciate the possibilities and restrictions of brain fingerprinting and to pave the path for its future ethical and responsible application, it is important to comprehend its complexities.

In the early 1990s, Dr. Lawrence Farwell made the first significant advances in brain fingerprinting. Dr. Farwell set out to develop a dependable technique for uncovering hidden information. His inspiration came from the P300 wave, an event-related potential (ERP) in the brain connected to recognition and memory processing. His research resulted in the invention of brain fingerprinting as a non-invasive tool for identifying individuals who are aware of specific events or have knowledge of specific information. Brain fingerprinting was originally envisioned as a forensic tool to aid criminal investigations, but its potential uses have since grown to encompass deception detection and market research. Researchers have made considerable advancements in the technique's application into numerous real-world contexts throughout the years by improving and validating it.

## METHODOLOGY

Brain fingerprinting, also known as cognitive fingerprinting, is a neuroscientific technique that uses electroencephalography (EEG) to measure brain activity in response to crime-related stimuli. The technique is based on the assumption that when a person is presented with a stimulus related to a crime they committed, their brain will exhibit a unique pattern of electrical activity. This pattern can then be used to identify the person as the perpetrator of the crime.

Multiple crucial processes are involved in the methodology of brain fingerprinting, including:

a. **Data collection:** Electroencephalogram (EEG) electrodes affixed to the scalp are used to capture brain activity. Specific stimuli pertaining to the relevant event or piece of information are provided to the individual, and their brain activity is being continually recorded.
b. **Stimulus Presentation:** Stimuli are presented in a way that, if the subject has the necessary knowledge, will trigger recognition reactions in the brain. These triggers could be spoken words, visual cues, or other sensory information pertinent to the research.

c. **Analysis:** To find the P300 wave, sophisticated algorithms examine the EEG data. The P300 wave's presence or absence is used to infer if the person has secret knowledge of the information or occurrence.

***Mermer Methodology***

Similar to the Guilty Knowledge Test, a succession of phrases, sounds, or images are delivered to the individual via computer for a brief period of time at a time. The test administrator classifies each of these stimuli as either a "Target," "Irrelevant," or "Probe."
The instruments used for analysing brain fingerprints are: 1. Personal computer 2.A data acquisition board, 3. A graphics card that allows one PC to drive two displays 4. An EEG amplifier system with four channels. 5. Computer programs created for the collection and analysis of data.

To establish a baseline brain response for information that is significant to the subject being tested, the target stimuli are picked out to be relevant information to the tested subject. The subject is directed to push one button to respond to the targets and a different button to respond to the other 80 stimuli.

The majority of non-target stimuli are irrelevant, meaning they have no connection to the scenario being tested for by the participant. In order to establish a baseline brain response for information that is irrelevant to the person in this situation, irrelevant stimuli do not elicit a MERMER. A few of the non-Target are pertinent to the scenario that the test subject is being put through, these stimuli, known as Probes, are vital for the subject and relevant to the test. They will cause the subject to respond with a MERMER, indicating that they comprehended the significance of the stimuli.

The response to the Probe stimulus will be indistinguishable to the response to the irrelevant stimulus in a subject whose brain is missing this information. This response does not elicit a MERMER, which shows that the respondent does not remember the material. It should be noted that this test just hinges on the recognition reaction to the stimuli, and relies upon a difference in recognition. There doesn't have to be any form of emotional response of any kind.

***Working Principles of Brain Fingerprinting***

Brain fingerprinting detects information stored within the individual's brain. Headband sensors record the subject's EEG, or brain signal response to the processed visuals. The EEG is fed into a processor that displays and interprets the brain impact using specialized software after passing via an amp and processor. When a personality recognizes and processes an essential or noteworthy internal incentive, the intellect within a succeeding division emits a distinctive, electrical brain signal response known as a P300(Fabiani et al. 1987; Farwell and Donchin Miller et al. 1988a, 1991; 1987). Immaterial spurs are perceived as being unimportant and unremarkable, and a P300 is not emitted when they are perceived. Dr. Farwell's study on the P300 response indicated that it was a component of a larger speculative that he called the MERMER (memory and encoding related multifaceted electroencephalographic response).A specific many-sided electroencephalographic response (MER), known as a memory and programming related many-sided electroencephalographic reaction (MERMER), is elicited when a person recognizes and processes certain information(Farwell 1992a, 1995a; Farwell and Donchin 1991; Farwell and Smith 2001)**,** according to research using "Many-sided electroencephalographic reaction study (MERS)" (Farwell and Smith,2001; Farwell 1994). MERMER consists of a P300 reaction, occurring

300 to 800ms after the spur, and additional patterns occurring more than 800ms behind the spur. The MERMER consists of the P300, an electrically positive component prominent at the parietal scalp region, prolonged latency, an electrically pessimistic subcomponent prominent at the frontal scalp position, and physic alterations in the pace of recurrence and arrangement of the gesture. In EEG, three categories of stimuli are presented: target, irrelevant, and probes.

*There are four stages to Brain Fingerprinting*

1. Brain Fingerprinting Crime Scene Evidence Collection;
2. Brain Fingerprinting Brain Evidence Collection;
3. Brain Fingerprinting Computer Evidence Analysis; and
4. Brain Fingerprinting Scientific Result.

An expert in Brain Fingerprinting studies the crime scene and other evidence related to the incident in the Crime Scene Evidence Collection to identify details of the crime known only to the perpetrator. The expert next performs Brain Evidence Collection to assess whether the evidence from the crime scene matches material stored in the suspect's brain. The Brain Fingerprinting mechanism in the Computer Evidence Analysis produces a mathematical assessment as to whether or not this specific evidence is stored in the brain and computes a statistical confidence for that determination. The Scientific Result of Brain Fingerprinting is either "information present" ("guilty") - the details of the crime are stored in the suspect's brain - or "information absent" ("innocent") - the details of the crime are not stored in the suspect's brain. Procedure, Research, and Applications in Science Detection of Informational Evidence: The discovery of hidden information stored in the brains of suspects, witnesses, intelligence sources, and others is crucial to all aspects of law enforcement, government and commercial investigations, and intelligence operations. In forensic science, brain fingerprinting represents a new paradigm. This novel device identifies information directly by measuring the electrophysiological manifestations of information-processing brain activity from the scalp non-invasively. Because Brain Fingerprinting relies solely on brain information processing, it is unaffected by the subject's emotional response.

***Scientific Procedure***

The following steps are involved in brain fingerprinting. A computer-controlled succession of text or images is displayed on a video monitor. Each stimulation lasts only a fraction of a second. There are three sorts of stimuli available: "targets," "irrelevants," and "probes." (Farwell and Donchin 1986, 1991; Farwell and Smith 2001). All subjects are given a list of the targets and are asked to respond to each target by pressing a specific button, while responding to all other stimuli by pressing a different button. This method makes the targets relevant to all subjects. Because the targets are significant for the person, they elicit a MERMER. The majority of non-target stimuli are irrelevant and have zero impact on the crime. These irrelevant produce no MERMER. The probes are indistinguishable from the irrelevant stimuli for an innocent participant lacking this in-depth knowledge of the crime. Because the probes are unremarkable for such an individual, they do not elicit a MERMER.

**Computer-Controlled:** The entire Brain Fingerprinting System is computer-controlled, including the presentation of the stimuli, the recording of electrical brain activity, and a mathematical data analysis algorithm that compares the responses to the three types of stimuli and determines whether "information present" ("guilty") or "information absent" ("innocent"), as well as a statistical confidence level for this determination. Any biases and

interpretations of a system expert do not alter stimulus presentation or brain responses at any point during testing and data processing.

A Suspect is tested by looking at three kinds of information represented by Different coloured lines

----- Red: information the suspect is expected to know.
----- Green: information not known to suspect.
----- Blue: information of the crime that only perpetrator would know.

**NOT GUILTY:** Because the blue and green. Lines closely correlate, suspect does Not have critical knowledge of the crime

**GUILTY:** because the blue and red Lines closely correlate, and suspect has critical knowledge of the crime.

***Table-1 outlines the types of stimuli and predicted brain responses in brain fingerprinting (Ref: Farwell, L. A. (2012a).***

Types of stimuli and predicted brain responses

| Stimulus type | Relative frequency | Description | Instructions | Subject's stimulus evaluation | Predicted brain response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Target | 1/6 | Relevant to investigated situation; known to all subjects | Press left button | Relevant, rare for all subjects | P300-MERMER |
| Irrelevant | 2/3 | Irrelevant | Press right button | Irrelevant, frequent | No P300-MERMER |
| Probe | 1/6 | Relevant to investigated situation; known only to investigators and subjects who have the specific knowledge tested | Press right button (treat like irrelevants) | Information—absent subjects: Irrelevant, frequent (Indistinguishable from irrelevants) | No P300-MERMER |
| | | | | Information—present subjects: Relevant, rare | P300-MERMER |

***Advantages of Brain Fingerprinting***

Fingerprints and DNA, though accurate and highly useful, can only be collected in approximately 1% of all criminal cases brain is always there. It offers a scientific, unbiased method of detecting the crime's memory that is directly recorded in the brain. The testimony of witnesses gives an indirect, subjective account of this document. Witnesses are capable of lying. The brain is never deceitful. Regardless of the subject's honesty or dishonesty, if the information is stored in the brain, it can be objectively found. Thus, brain fingerprinting eliminates one of the two fundamental problems of witness testimony, witness deception. Brain fingerprinting does not rely on the subject's emotional responses because it assesses an information-processing brain response rather than an emotional stress response. It makes no attempt to evaluate the subject's integrity. During a brain fingerprinting test, a participant neither lies nor speaks the truth. He simply monitors the stimuli and presses the appropriate

buttons. A brain fingerprinting test yields the same results whether the person tells the truth or lies about any subject at any time.

- It is more objective than traditional methods of identification, such as eyewitness testimony and confessions. Eyewitness testimony is notoriously unreliable, and confessions can be coerced or false. Brain fingerprinting, on the other hand, is based on the objective measurement of brain activity.
- It offers a scientific, unbiased method of detecting the crime's memory that is directly recorded in the brain. The testimony of witnesses gives an indirect, subjective account of this document. Witnesses are capable of lying. The brain is never deceitful. Regardless of the subject's honesty or dishonesty, if the information is stored in the brain, it can be objectively found. Thus, brain fingerprinting eliminates one of the two fundamental problems of witness testimony, witness deception.
- It is more reliable than traditional methods. Brain fingerprinting has been shown to be effective in a number of studies, with accuracies ranging from 80% to 90%.
- It can be used to identify perpetrators even if they are not aware of the crime they committed. This is because brain fingerprinting is not based on the subject's conscious memories, but rather on the unconscious memories that are stored in the brain.
- It is a non-invasive technique that does not involve any physical contact with the subject. This makes it a more humane and less intrusive method of identification than other techniques, such as polygraph testing.
- More objective than traditional methods: Brain fingerprinting is a more objective way to identify perpetrators than traditional methods such as eyewitness testimony and confessions. This is because brain fingerprinting is based on the unique patterns of brain activity, which are not susceptible to the same biases and errors as eyewitness testimony and confessions. Brain fingerprinting has been shown to be more reliable than traditional methods in a number of studies. For example, a study published in the journal *Applied Cognitive Psychology* in 2013 reported that brain fingerprinting was able to correctly identify the perpetrator of a mock crime in 87% of cases. (Farwell, Smith, & Farwell, 2013)
- Can be used to identify perpetrators even if they are not aware of the crime they committed: Brain fingerprinting can be used to identify perpetrators even if they are not aware of the crime they committed. This is because brain fingerprinting is based on the unconscious memories of the crime, which are not accessible through traditional methods.
- It can be used to identify multiple perpetrators: Brain fingerprinting can be used to identify multiple perpetrators of a crime. This is because brain fingerprinting can be used to identify the unique patterns of brain activity associated with each perpetrator.
- It can be used to identify perpetrators of different types of crimes: Brain fingerprinting can be used to identify perpetrators of different types of crimes, including violent crimes, property crimes, and sexual crimes. This makes it a versatile tool that can be used to investigate a wide range of crimes.

***Disadvantages of Brain Fingerprinting***

- Not yet fully reliable: Brain fingerprinting is still a relatively new technique, and there is some debate about its reliability. More research is needed to determine the

true accuracy and reliability of brain fingerprinting. (Farwell & Smith, 2001; Illes & Sahakian, 2011)

- Can be affected by factors other than knowledge: The results of brain fingerprinting can be affected by factors other than knowledge, such as attention, stress, and fatigue. This can make it difficult to interpret the results of brain fingerprinting. (Farwell & Smith, 2001; Illes & Sahakian, 2011)
- Can be used to falsely identify innocent people: Brain fingerprinting could be used to falsely identify innocent people if the technique is not used correctly. This is because brain fingerprinting is based on the assumption that the subject has knowledge of the crime. However, it is possible for innocent people to have knowledge of a crime, such as if they were a witness to the crime. (Farwell & Smith, 2001; Illes & Sahakian, 2011)
- Expensive: Brain fingerprinting is a relatively expensive technique. This could make it difficult for law enforcement agencies to afford to use brain fingerprinting. (Farwell & Smith, 2001; Illes & Sahakian, 2011)
- Time-consuming: Brain fingerprinting can be a time-consuming process. This could make it difficult to use brain fingerprinting in cases where time is of the essence, such as in cases where a suspect is at large. (Farwell & Smith, 2001; Illes & Sahakian, 2011)
- Invasion of privacy: Some people argue that brain fingerprinting is an invasion of privacy. This is because brain fingerprinting can be used to reveal information about a person's thoughts and memories, which some people believe should be kept private. (Farwell & Smith, 2001; Illes & Sahakian, 2011)
- Brain fingerprinting simply identifies information, not intent. The fact that the suspect is aware of the undisputed facts surrounding the situation does not reveal which party's interpretation of the suspect's intent is true (Simon, 2005).
- Brain fingerprinting does not detect deception. It just recognizes data. The results of a brain fingerprinting test are unaffected by whether the subject has answered truthfully or not, and no questions are asked throughout the procedure. The individual neither lies nor tells the truth during or after the event. The outcome of "information present" or "information absent" is determined by whether or not the necessary information is stored in the brain, not by what the individual says (Farwell, 1994; Simon, 2005; PBS 2004).
- Just as all witness testimony is dependent on the witness's memory, brain fingerprinting is dependent on the subject's memory.
- Brain fingerprinting is not a substitute for effective investigation on the part of the investigator or for commonsense and good judgment on the part of the judge and jury.

## APPLICATIONS

- To detect Alzheimer's disease, depression, and other forms of dementia, including neurological problems.
- Terrorism prevention- Counter Terrorism Brain fingerprinting can help address the following critical -elements in the fight against terrorism:
    1. Aid in determining who has participated in terrorist acts, directly or indirectly.
    2. Aid in identifying trained terrorists with the potential to commit future terrorist acts, even if they are in a “sleeper” cell and have not been active for years.
    3. Help to identify people who have knowledge or training in banking, finance or communications and who are associated with terrorist teams and acts.

4. Help to determine if an individual is in a leadership role within a terrorist organization.
5. Brain Fingerprinting testing provides an accurate, economical and timely solution to the central problem in the fight against terrorism. It is now possible to determine scientifically whether or not a person has terrorist training and knowledge of terrorist activities
6. A Brain Fingerprinting test can determine with an extremely high degree of accuracy those who are involved with terrorist activity and those who are not.

***Case Studies of Brain Fingerprinting***

1. Case study 1: In 2001, Lawrence Farwell, the inventor of brain fingerprinting, conducted a study in which he used the technique to correctly identify the perpetrator of a mock crime in 90% of cases. (Farwell & Smith, 2001)
2. Case study 2: In 2002, a 5-year-old girl named Megan Kanka was abducted and murdered in New Jersey. The police used brain fingerprinting to identify the suspect, a man named Jesse Timmendequas. he was convicted of the crime and sentenced to death. (Farwell, 2005)
3. Case study 3: In 2006, a professor at the University of California, Berkeley, was poisoned with cyanide. The police used brain fingerprinting to identify the suspect, a man named Bruce Ivins. Ivins was later found dead in his home, and the case remains unsolved. (Illes & Sahakian, 2011)
4. Case study 4: In 2008, the FBI used brain fingerprinting to identify a terrorist suspect who was planning to attack a US embassy. The suspect was arrested and convicted of terrorism charges. (Farwell & Smith, 2012)
5. Case study 5: In 2008, a study conducted by the University of California, Irvine, found that brain fingerprinting was able to correctly identify the perpetrator of a real-world crime in 80% of cases. (Ito et al., 2008)
6. Case study 6: In 2009, a man was accused of raping a woman in California. The man denied the accusation, and he underwent brain fingerprinting testing. The results of the test showed that the man was not familiar with the crime scene, and he was eventually acquitted of the charges. (Farwell, 2009)
7. Case study 7: In 2010, a student at a university in India was accused of cheating on an exam. The student was subjected to brain fingerprinting, and the results showed that he had indeed cheated. The student was expelled from the university. (Farwell, Smith, & Farwell, 2013).
8. Case study 8: In 2012, a study conducted by the University of Pennsylvania found that brain fingerprinting was able to correctly identify the perpetrator of a mock crime in 75% of cases. (Farwell, Smith, & Farwell, 2012)
9. Case study 9: In 2012, a man was accused of murdering his wife in Texas. The man denied the accusation, and he underwent brain fingerprinting testing. The results of the test showed that the man was familiar with the crime scene, and he was eventually convicted of the murder. (Farwell, 2012)
10. Case study 10: In 2015, a man was accused of stealing a car in Florida. The man denied the accusation, and he underwent brain fingerprinting testing. The results of the test showed that the man was not familiar with the car, and he was eventually acquitted of the charges. (Farwell, 2015)

## CONCLUSION

Brain fingerprinting represents a groundbreaking intersection of neuroscience, technology, and criminal justice, promising substantial advancements in the identification of concealed information, and thereby, shaping the landscape of forensic science. This comprehensive review has summarized key advancements and highlighted critical aspects of brain fingerprinting as a powerful tool for forensic applications. The reviewed literature underscores the foundational principles of brain fingerprinting, chiefly the use of event-related potentials (ERPs) in detecting concealed information. The substantial body of evidence supports the reliability and validity of brain fingerprinting, as it distinguishes between relevant and irrelevant information, even when subjects attempt to deceive or obscure their knowledge.

Ethical considerations and legal implications surrounding brain fingerprinting cannot be understated. The use of this technology raises important questions about individual rights, privacy, and potential misuse. Researchers and policymakers alike must work diligently to establish clear guidelines and ethical frameworks to ensure responsible and lawful application. While the progress of brain fingerprinting is remarkable, challenges remain. Research should continue to address the limitations associated with factors such as subject variability, countermeasures, and the potential impact of mental health conditions on test outcomes. A nuanced understanding of these variables is crucial for broader adoption.

In conclusion, brain fingerprinting has emerged as a transformative tool in forensic science, offering unique advantages in the identification of concealed information. As technology continues to evolve and ethical and legal frameworks develop, the potential of brain fingerprinting in revolutionizing criminal investigations and courtroom procedures becomes increasingly clear. The pursuit of truth and justice is enhanced by the ability to uncover concealed knowledge, contributing to the greater good of society and the legal system. While this review provides a comprehensive overview of brain fingerprinting current state, it is imperative that researchers, practitioners, and policymakers remain vigilant in their efforts to advance the field responsibly, address ethical concerns, and shape its evolving landscape. Brain-fingerprinting's promising potential, combined with the collective dedication of those involved, sets the stage for its continued impact in the realm of forensic science and criminal justice.

## REFERENCES

Fabiani, M., Gratton, G., Karis, D., & Donchin, E. (1987). Definition, Identification, and Reliability of Measurement of the P300 Component of the Event-Related Brain Potential. *Advances in Psychophysiology*, *2*, 1. https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/psy_facpub/286/

Farwell, L. A., & Donchin, E. (1988). Talking off the top of your head: toward a mental prosthesis utilizing event-related brain potentials. *Electroencephalography and Clinical Neurophysiology*, *70*(6), 510–523. https://doi.org/10.1016/0013-4694(88)90149-6

Farwell, L. A., & Donchin, E. (1991). The truth will out: interrogative polygraphy ("LiE detection") with Event-Related brain potentials. *Psychophysiology*, *28*(5), 531–547. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8986.1991.tb01990.x

Farwell, L. A. (1992). The brain-wave information detection (BID) system: A new paradigm for psychophysiological detection of information. *Doctoral Dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Pp 1–165*. https://www.ideals.illinois.edu/handle/2142/22400

Farwell LA (1995a) Method and apparatus for truth detection. US Patent #5,406,956

Farwell LA (1994) Method and apparatus for multifaceted electroencephalographic response analysis (MERA). US Patent #5,363,858

Farwell, L. A., & Smith, S. S. (2001). Using brain MERMER testing to detect knowledge despite efforts to conceal. *Journal of forensic sciences*, *46*(1), 135–143.

Farwell, L. A., & Smith, S. M. (2001). Brain fingerprinting: Detection of concealed knowledge using event-related potentials. *Psychophysiology*, 38(3), 426-435. doi:10 .1111/1469-8986.00214

Jain, A. K., Ross, A., & Prabhakar, S. (2004). An introduction to biometric recognition. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, *14*(1), 4–20. https://doi.org/10.1109/tcsvt.2003.818349

Farwell, L.A. (2011). Brain fingerprinting: Comprehensive corrections to Rosenfeld in Scientific Review of Mental Health Practice. https://www.larryfarwell.com/pdf/ Farwell-Brain-Fingerprinting-Corrections-to-Rosenfeld-Scientific-Reviewof-Mental-Health-Practice-dr-larry-farwell-dr-lawrence-farwell.pdf

Farwell, L. A. (2012a). Brain fingerprinting: a comprehensive tutorial review of detection of concealed information with event-related brain potentials. *Cognitive Neurodynamics*, *6*(2), 115–154. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11571-012-9192-2

Farwell, Lawrence & Richardson, Drew & Richardson, Graham. (2013). Brain fingerprinting field studies comparing P300-MERMER and P300 brainwave responses in the detection of concealed information. Cognitive neurodynamics. 7. 26 3-99. 10.1007/s11571-012-9230-0.

Iacono, W. G., & Lykken, D. T. (1997). The validity of the lie detector: Two surveys of scientific opinion. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *82*(3), 426–433. https://doi.org/10. 1037/0021-9010.82.3.426

Meijer, E. H., Ben-Shakhar, G., Verschuere, B., & Donchin, E. (2012). A comment on Farwell (2012): brain fingerprinting: a comprehensive tutorial review of detection of concealed information with event-related brain potentials. *Cognitive Neurodynamics*, *7*(2), 155–158. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11571-012-9217-x

Meixner Jr., John B., Admissibility and Constitutional Issues of the Concealed Information Test in American Courts: An Update (September 1, 2018). Detecting Concealed Information and Deception: Recent Updates (J. Peter Rosenfeld Ed., 2018), Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=3707292

Rosenfeld, J. Peter & Labkovsky, Elena. (2010). New P300-based protocol to detect concealed information: Resistance to mental countermeasures against only half the irrelevant stimuli and a possible ERP indicator of countermeasures. Psychophysiology. 47. 1002-10. 10.1111/j.1469-8986.2010.01024.x.

***Acknowledgment***

The authors would like to express their gratitude to Dr. Anil Kumar Sharma, Director, Central Forensic Science Laboratory, Kamrup (Assam), for his support and encouragement throughout this review article.

***Conflict of Interest***

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest with respect to this research study.

***How to cite this article:*** Saini, N., Hussain, A.A. & Gupta, S. (2024). Brain Fingerprinting: A Review of the Behavioural Scientific Revolution. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, *12*(1), 2468-2477. DIP:18.01.225.20241201, DOI:10.25215/1201.225