

Tutorial on logistic-regression calibration and fusion:co ratio

Australian Journal of Forensic Sciences

45, 173-197

DOI: 10.1080/00450618.2012.733025

Citation Report

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
1	Testing the validity and reliability of forensic voice comparison based on reassigned time-frequency representations of Chinese /iau/. , 2013, , .		0
2	Experiments on using vocal tract estimates of nasal stops for speaker verification. , 2013, , .		0
3	A comparison of single-stage and two-stage modelling approaches for automatic forensic speaker recognition. , 2013, , .		2
4	Effects of telephone transmission on the performance of formant-trajectory-based forensic voice comparison – Female voices. Speech Communication, 2013, 55, 796-813.	1.6	19
5	Reliability of human-supervised formant-trajectory measurement for forensic voice comparison. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 2013, 133, EL54-EL60.	0.5	16
6	Forensic Speech Science. , 0, , .		3
7	A Comparative Study of Likelihood Ratio Based Forensic Text Comparison Procedures: Multivariate Kernel Density with Lexical Features vs. Word N-grams vs. Character N-grams. , 2014, , .		2
8	A fused forensic text comparison system using lexical features, word and character N-grams. , 2014, , .		0
9	Forensic strength of evidence statements should preferably be likelihood ratios calculated using relevant data, quantitative measurements, and statistical models – a response to Lennard (2013) Fingerprint identification: how far have we come?. Australian Journal of Forensic Sciences, 2014, 46, 282-292.	0.7	15
10	Application of automatic speaker verification techniques for forensic evidence evaluation. , 2014, , .		2
11	Biometric evidence evaluation: an empirical assessment of the effect of different training data. IET Biometrics, 2014, 3, 335-346.	1.6	7
12	Distinguishing between forensic science and forensic pseudoscience: Testing of validity and reliability, and approaches to forensic voice comparison. Science and Justice - Journal of the Forensic Science Society, 2014, 54, 245-256.	1.3	30
13	Issues and opportunities: The application of the numerical likelihood ratio framework to forensic speaker comparison. Science and Justice - Journal of the Forensic Science Society, 2014, 54, 292-299.	1.3	8
14	An investigation of supervector regression for forensic voice comparison on small data. Eurasip Journal on Audio, Speech, and Music Processing, 2015, 2015, .	1.3	0
15	The relevant population in forensic voice comparison: Effects of varying delimitations of social class and age. Speech Communication, 2015, 66, 218-230.	1.6	17
16	Sampling variability in forensic likelihood-ratio computation: A simulation study. Science and Justice - Journal of the Forensic Science Society, 2015, 55, 499-508.	1.3	13
17	Mismatched distances from speakers to telephone in a forensic-voice-comparison case. Speech Communication, 2015, 70, 28-41.	1.6	8
18	Speaker Recognition by Machines and Humans: A tutorial review. IEEE Signal Processing Magazine, 2015, 32, 74-99.	4.6	420

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
19	Fixed FAR correction factor of score level fusion. , 2016, , .		2
20	On the reproducibility and repeatability of likelihood ratio in forensics: A case study using face biometrics. , 2016, , .		2
21	Use of relevant data, quantitative measurements, and statistical models to calculate a likelihood ratio for a Chinese forensic voice comparison case involving two sisters. Forensic Science International, 2016, 267, 115-124.	1.3	4
22	Refining the relevant population in forensic voice comparison " A response to Hicks et alii (2015) The importance of distinguishing information from evidence/observations when formulating propositions. Science and Justice - Journal of the Forensic Science Society, 2016, 56, 492-497.	1.3	10
23	Two-step calibration method for multi-algorithm score-based face recognition systems by minimizing discrimination loss. , 2016, , .		2
24	A demonstration of the application of the new paradigm for the evaluation of forensic evidence under conditions reflecting those of a real forensic-voice-comparison case. Science and Justice - Journal of the Forensic Science Society, 2016, 56, 42-57.	1.3	24
25	Performance Study of a Score-based Likelihood Ratio System for Forensic Fingermark Comparison. Journal of Forensic Sciences, 2017, 62, 626-640.	0.9	34
26	Empirical test of the performance of an acoustic-phonetic approach to forensic voice comparison under conditions similar to those of a real case. Forensic Science International, 2017, 277, 30-40.	1.3	13
27	Evaluation of MSR Identity Toolbox under conditions reflecting those of a real forensic case () Tj ETQq0 0 0 rgBT /Oyerlock 10 Tf 50 422	1.6	8
28	Strength of linguistic text evidence: A fused forensic text comparison system. Forensic Science International, 2017, 278, 184-197.	1.3	13
29	Sample size and the multivariate kernel density likelihood ratio: How many speakers are enough?. Speech Communication, 2017, 94, 15-29.	1.6	6
30	Repeatability and reproducibility of forensic likelihood ratio methods when sample size ratio varies. , 2017, , .		3
31	Machine Learning Based Fitness Tracker Platform Using MEMS Accelerometer. , 2017, , .		7
32	Model-effects on likelihood ratios for fire debris analysis. Forensic Chemistry, 2018, 7, 38-46.	1.7	14
33	Avoiding overstating the strength of forensic evidence: Shrunk likelihood ratios/Bayes factors. Science and Justice - Journal of the Forensic Science Society, 2018, 58, 200-218.	1.3	25
34	The impact in forensic voice comparison of lack of calibration and of mismatched conditions between the known-speaker recording and the relevant-population sample recordings. Forensic Science International, 2018, 283, e1-e7.	1.3	15
35	A response to Marquis et al. (2017) What is the error margin of your signature analysis?. Forensic Science International, 2018, 287, e11-e12.	1.3	6
36	Sensitivity of likelihood-ratio based forensic voice comparison under mismatched conditions of within-speaker sample sizes across databases. Australian Journal of Forensic Sciences, 2018, 50, 307-322.	0.7	0

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
37	Score based procedures for the calculation of forensic likelihood ratios “ Scores should take account of both similarity and typicality. Science and Justice - Journal of the Forensic Science Society, 2018, 58, 47-58.	1.3	36
38	9. Forensic voice comparison. , 2018, , 219-255.		2
39	Re-ranking spoken term detection with acoustic exemplars of keywords. Speech Communication, 2018, 104, 12-23.	1.6	5
40	Deconstructing Cross-Entropy for Probabilistic Binary Classifiers. Entropy, 2018, 20, 208.	1.1	60
41	A statistical procedure to adjust for time-interval mismatch in forensic voice comparison. Speech Communication, 2019, 112, 15-21.	1.6	3
42	Toward Robust Audio Spoofing Detection: A Detailed Comparison of Traditional and Learned Features. IEEE Access, 2019, 7, 84229-84241.	2.6	42
43	Evaluation of Phonexia automatic speaker recognition software under conditions reflecting those of a real forensic voice comparison case (forensic_eval_01). Speech Communication, 2019, 111, 22-28.	1.6	10
44	Formant dynamics of Spanish vocalic sequences in related speakers: A forensic-voice-comparison investigation. Journal of Phonetics, 2019, 75, 1-26.	0.6	7
45	Semiparametric likelihood ratio-based biometric score-level fusion via parametric copula. IET Biometrics, 2019, 8, 277-283.	1.6	2
46	Automated face recognition in forensic science: Review and perspectives. Forensic Science International, 2020, 307, 110124.	1.3	36
47	Evaluation of Forensic Data Using Logistic Regression-Based Classification Methods and an R Shiny Implementation. Frontiers in Chemistry, 2020, 8, 738.	1.8	4
48	Spatial-Temporal Omni-Scale Feature Learning for Person Re-Identification. , 2020, , .		3
49	Consensus on validation of forensic voice comparison. Science and Justice - Journal of the Forensic Science Society, 2021, 61, 299-309.	1.3	37
50	Calculating LR for presence of body fluids from mRNA assay data in mixtures. Forensic Science International: Genetics, 2021, 52, 102455.	1.6	11
51	Evaluation of distance-based approaches for forensic comparison: Application to hand odor evidence. Journal of Forensic Sciences, 2021, 66, 2208-2217.	0.9	1
52	Testing for Calibration Discrepancy of Reported Likelihood Ratios in Forensic Science. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society, 2022, 185, 267-301.	0.6	3
53	Calculation of likelihood ratios for inference of biological sex from human skeletal remains. Forensic Science International (Online), 2021, 3, 100202.	0.6	2
54	Score-based likelihood ratios for linguistic text evidence with a bag-of-words model. Forensic Science International, 2021, 327, 110980.	1.3	8

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
55	Improving calibration of forensic glass comparisons by considering uncertainty in feature-based elemental data. <i>Chemometrics and Intelligent Laboratory Systems</i> , 2021, 217, 104399.	1.8	11
56	In the context of forensic casework, are there meaningful metrics of the degree of calibration?. <i>Forensic Science International (Online)</i> , 2021, 3, 100157.	0.6	3
57	Vowel Inherent Spectral Change in Forensic Voice Comparison. , 2013, , 263-282.		6
58	A likelihood ratio-based evaluation of strength of authorship attribution evidence in SMS messages using N-grams. <i>International Journal of Speech, Language and the Law</i> , 2014, 21, 23-50.	0.2	13
59	Strength of forensic voice comparison evidence from the acoustics of filled pauses. <i>International Journal of Speech, Language and the Law</i> , 2016, 23, 99-132.	0.2	17
60	A Likelihood Ratio-Based Forensic Text Comparison in SMS Messages. <i>Advances in Information Security, Privacy, and Ethics Book Series</i> , 2014, , 208-224.	0.4	0
61	Proposta de Construção de um Banco de Dados de Amostras de Fala para Uso Forense em um Arcabouço Bayesiano. <i>Revista Brasileira De Criminalística</i> , 2016, 5, 35-45.	0.1	1
62	Friction Ridge Identification Process. <i>International Forensic Science and Investigation Series</i> , 2016, , 33-126.	0.0	0
63	Likelihood Ratio Calculation in Acoustic-Phonetic Forensic Voice Comparison: Comparison of Three Statistical Modelling Approaches. , 0, , .		0
64	Null-Hypothesis LLR: A Proposal for Forensic Automatic Speaker Recognition. , 0, , .		1
65	The effect of sampling variability on systems and individual speakers in likelihood ratio-based forensic voice comparison. <i>Speech Communication</i> , 2022, 138, 38-49.	1.6	5
66	From facial images of different quality to score based LR. <i>Forensic Science International</i> , 2022, 332, 111201.	1.3	5
67	Likelihood ratio estimation for authorship text evidence: An empirical comparison of score- and feature-based methods. <i>Forensic Science International</i> , 2022, 334, 111268.	1.3	6
68	Forensic comparison of fired cartridge cases: Feature-extraction methods for feature-based calculation of likelihood ratios. <i>Forensic Science International (Online)</i> , 2022, 5, 100272.	0.6	4
70	A segmentally informed solution to automatic accent classification and its advantages to forensic applications. <i>International Journal of Speech, Language and the Law</i> , 2022, 28, .	0.2	0
71	Sub-band cepstral distance as an alternative to formants: Quantitative evidence from a forensic comparison experiment. <i>Journal of Phonetics</i> , 2022, 94, 101177.	0.6	0
72	Forensic Voice Comparison: Human-Supervised-Automatic Approach. , 2023, , 720-736.		1
73	Forensic Voice Comparison: Overview. , 2023, , 737-750.		1

#	ARTICLE	IF	CITATIONS
74	The effect of sampling variability on overall performance and individual speakers'™ behaviour in likelihood ratio-based forensic voice comparison. <i>International Journal of Speech, Language and the Law</i> , 0, , .	0.2	1
75	A response to Busey & Klutzke (2022): Regarding subjective assignment of likelihood ratios. <i>Science and Justice - Journal of the Forensic Science Society</i> , 2023, 63, 61-62.	1.3	0
76	Likelihood ratios for categorical count data with applications in digital forensics. <i>Law, Probability and Risk</i> , 2023, 21, 91-122.	1.2	0
77	Assessing significant factors that can influence physical fit examinations – Part I. Physical fits of torn and cut duct tapes. <i>Forensic Science International</i> , 2023, 343, 111567.	1.3	3
78	Weight of authorship evidence with multiple categories of stylometric features: A multinomial-based discrete model. <i>Science and Justice - Journal of the Forensic Science Society</i> , 2023, 63, 181-199.	1.3	1
79	Speaker-specificity in speech production: The contribution of source and filter. <i>Journal of Phonetics</i> , 2023, 97, 101224.	0.6	0
80	Promoting transparency in forensic science by integrating categorical and evaluative reporting through decision theory. <i>Frontiers in Analytical Science</i> , 0, 3, .	1.1	0
81	Ink source prediction and assessment based on direct analysis in real-time mass spectrometry via the likelihood ratio. <i>Journal of Chemometrics</i> , 2023, 37, .	0.7	1
88	A Model-Agnostic Feature Selection Technique to Improve the Performance of One-Class Classifiers. , 2023, , .		1