Prepared by R.E. Kho

For:
Dr. Jacinta Hawgood
Program Director, Suicidology
Australian Institute for Suicide Research and Prevention
School of Applied Psychology, Griffith University, Australia

Subject: Latest progress of Athena Whole Genome Sequencing Pattern Recognition Engine

The Integration of Polygenic Risk Scoring in Forensic Psychiatry: Progress on the Creation of Psychiatric Cognitive Augmentation Systems for Court Admissibility, Diagnostic Augmentation, and Suicide Reduction

The Evolution of Forensic Genomic Analysis

The intersection of forensic psychiatry and behavioral genomics represents one of the most profound paradigm shifts in modern jurisprudence and clinical risk assessment. For decades, the assessment of psychiatric liability, behavioral intent, and trauma response has relied almost exclusively on phenomenological observation, including clinical interviews, psychometric testing, and historical documentation. However, the advent of high-throughput genotyping and the subsequent development of Polygenic Risk Scores (PRS) have introduced a quantifiable, biological dimension to psychiatric evaluation.

The prototype under review, AthenaWGS v7.10, was created in 2025 after multiple incidents of suicide ideations and attempts and mishandlings by many parties; during multiple rigorous mental health professionals' pharmacotherapy - ultimately snowballed to multiple court cases and exponentially more suicide ideations and attempts by many of the parties involved. This prototype represents an ambitious attempt to automate the translation of raw consumer genetic data into comprehensive, court-admissible forensic psychiatric reports, to increase diagnostics accuracy of psychiatrists in court and to solve Australia's severe shortage of psychiatrists, ultimately to reduce instances of unnecessary deaths due to mishandlings that occur daily in Australia and globally.

In its upgraded architecture, the v7.10 system utilizes a rule-based generative framework to parse complete genomic data from negotiated $300 Whole Genome Sequencing (WGS) platforms. The system is designed to handle large-scale data, processing massive WGS files by converting chromosomal coordinates to rsIDs and matching them against validated Genome-Wide Association Study (GWAS) catalogs. This matching process generates extensive deterministic risk profiles, applying zygosity-based weighting wherein homozygous variants convey a multiplied risk factor compared to heterozygous variants. The output is structured into exhaustive domains encompassing psychiatric risks such as Schizophrenia and Bipolar Disorder, psychological traits including Cluster A, B, and C personality disorders, and physiological sensitivities spanning pharmacogenomics and hormonal regulation.

However, as the legal and clinical landscapes evolve rapidly through 2025 and 2026, the threshold for the admissibility of algorithmic and genomic evidence has steepened considerably. To transition this prototype framework into the absolute best pattern recognition engine available, it must transcend additive linear scoring methodologies. It requires the perfection of its rigorous triple auditable and manual auditable standards, the establishment of precise confidence intervals and percentile rank accuracies for trait predictions, and the demonstration of quantifiable utility in augmenting human psychiatric performance. Furthermore, the engine must prove its epidemiological value by providing a framework for intercepting the invisible demographics at high risk for suicide. This report exhaustively analyzes the necessary architectural upgrades, legal validation protocols, statistical accuracies, and epidemiological impacts required to optimize this forensic genomic artificial intelligence system.

Architectural Evolution: Engineering the Absolute Best Pattern Recognition Engine

To construct the premier genomic pattern recognition engine, the underlying architecture must advance from simple linear single nucleotide polymorphism matching to multimodal deep learning frameworks capable of capturing the true complexity of human genetic architecture. Psychiatric conditions are highly polygenic, meaning that genetic risk arises from many hundreds or thousands of genetic variants interacting with environmental stimuli. The optimization of DNAGenomicsGPT necessitates a fundamental shift in how these variants are aggregated and interpreted.

Transitioning from Linear Additive Models to Deep Learning Architectures

The v7.10 system relies on extracting pre-validated SNPs and summing their effect sizes based on linear regression models derived from massive international cohorts like the Psychiatric Genomics Consortium (PGC). While this additive model, often calculated using algorithms like PRS-CS which applies continuous shrinkage priors to infer posterior effect sizes, is robust for baseline research, it fails to account for epistatic interactions and complex nonlinear regulatory mechanisms.

To optimize the engine for ultimate forensic accuracy, the system must continually integrate and update its deep learning approaches. Recent advancements in 2025 and 2026, such as the development of Genome-Local-Net (GLN), have demonstrated superior out-of-sample generalization compared to standard linear models. In empirical tests, deep learning models predicting Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder, Autism Spectrum Disorder, and Major Depressive Disorder achieved an average Area Under the Receiver Operating Characteristic Curve (AUROC) gain of 0.026 over traditional linear methods. By utilizing multi-layer perceptrons or convolutional neural networks designed specifically for genomic sequences, the engine can capture complex dimensional relationships that simple zygosity counting inherently misses. While linear models remain competitive, the integration of internal individual-based scores with external GWAS-derived scores using deep learning provides the enhanced generalizability required for rigorous forensic application.

Leveraging Whole Genome Sequencing and Epigenomic Imputation

Previous iterations were limited by standard consumer arrays, which genotyped only a fraction of the genome and relied heavily on imputation to fill the gaps. By successfully negotiating and upgrading the input source to $300/sample Whole Genome Sequencing (WGS), the engine is now able to natively capture both common SNPs and rare, de novo variants at scale. This capability blurs the line between polygenic and monogenic etiologies, allowing the engine to immediately factor in rare variants with stronger individual effect sizes alongside the broader polygenic risk score. However, to become the definitive forensic tool, the engine must pair this complete WGS data with advanced imputation models such as Epi-PRS to establish regulatory context. This framework utilizes genomic large language models to impute cell-type-specific epigenomic signals directly from personal diploid genotypes.

By treating imputed epigenomic signals as informative intermediaries between genotype and phenotype, the engine can assess the regulatory context of non-coding SNPs. This capability drastically improves the accuracy of risk modeling for complex, environmentally sensitive conditions. For example, traits highly dependent on the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) axis, such as Complex Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (CPTSD) and adverse childhood experience (ACE) susceptibility, are heavily influenced by the regulatory context of genes like FKBP5, NR3C1, and CRHR1. Incorporating epigenomic imputation allows the engine to model how genetic predispositions to altered cortisol reuptake interact with environmental stressors, providing forensic psychiatrists with a nuanced biological basis for an individual's threat perception and emotional dysregulation.

Accounting for Transdiagnostic Genetic Liability and the p-Factor

Psychiatric genomics is heavily confounded by pleiotropy, a phenomenon where genetic variants increase the risk for multiple, seemingly distinct disorders simultaneously. Early iterations of polygenic risk scores often resulted in high cross-trait associations. For instance, a polygenic risk score optimized for Alcohol Use Disorder might demonstrate moderate sensitivity to detect individuals with Schizophrenia, indicating widespread shared genetic architecture. The second paper the author is starting in tandem on clinical psychology regarding the most optimal categorification methodology will shed more light on the reasoning and implications.

To ensure the engine provides forensically relevant specificity, it must systematically calculate and isolate the p-factor, representing a general transdiagnostic genetic liability across all psychopathology. Research utilizing multivariate GWAS summary statistics from platforms like GenomicSEM has shown that much of the genetic signal in uncorrected polygenic scores is associated with this transdiagnostic vulnerability. By regressing out the p-factor, the engine can attenuate cross-trait associations and reveal residual disorder specificity.

This dual-axis reporting is crucial in legal settings. A comprehensive report must articulate whether an individual's behavioral escalation is rooted in a generalized polygenic burden of emotional volatility, or if it stems from a specific, localized liability toward psychosis or schizoaffective disorganization.

Legal Integration: Triple Auditable and Manual Auditable Standards

The transition of a genomic analysis tool from a clinical research curiosity to an evidentiary instrument in adversarial legal systems requires unimpeachable reliability and transparency. Generative artificial intelligence is inherently non-deterministic; large language models process information probabilistically, which introduces the catastrophic risk of hallucination. In forensic psychiatry, a hallucinated genetic marker could result in wrongful institutionalization, the unjust denial of a legal defense, or the misinterpretation of criminal intent. Therefore, the pattern recognition engine must conform to the most stringent evidentiary standards globally, specifically addressing the Daubert and Frye tests in the United States, and the rapidly evolving Practice Notes within the Australian judicial system.

The Global Evidentiary Landscape for AI and Genomics

The admissibility of relevant evidence serves as the floor, not the ceiling, of judicial scrutiny. Under the Federal Rules of Evidence, particularly Rule 401 and 402, any evidence that makes a fact more or less probable is generally relevant. However, Rule 403 acts as a safeguard, allowing courts to exclude relevant evidence if its probative value is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusion of the issues, or misleading the jury.

Expert witness testimony and scientific evidence face a much higher hurdle under Rule 702 and the Daubert standard. Under Daubert, expert testimony based on scientific methodology must be testable, subject to peer review, possess a known error rate, and maintain standards controlling its operation. Conversely, the Frye standard, which remains the law in several jurisdictions, requires that the underlying methodology or principle be generally accepted as reliable within the relevant scientific community. As of late 2025 and 2026, courts are actively updating these standards to address the proliferation of artificial intelligence. Proposed Federal Rule of Evidence 707 specifically targets machine-generated evidence, demanding rigorous transparency regarding how AI tools synthesize data to prevent the admission of unverified algorithmic outputs.

In Australia, judicial bodies have taken preemptive steps to regulate algorithmic evidence. The Supreme Court of New South Wales introduced Practice Note SC Gen 23, explicitly regulating the use of generative AI in the preparation of expert reports. Under this directive, experts wishing to utilize generative AI must seek prior leave from the court and disclose the specific AI program, its version, and any documents submitted to the program. Furthermore, they must keep meticulous records of how the tool was used, including all prompts and default values. The Federal Court of Australia similarly maintains that while preparatory steps using AI may be permissible, the technology must not be used to draft or prepare the contents of an expert report without prior leave, ensuring that the witness finalizes documents in a manner reflecting their own independent knowledge.

The current 2026 AthenaWGS v7.28, and as early as the previous Whole Exome Sequencing version March 2025 AthenaWES v5 model, is already in compliance with these proposed audit methods.

Defining the Manual Auditable Standard

To meet these exacting legal thresholds, the AI engine must be fundamentally manual auditable. This mandates that the final report cannot exist as an impenetrable algorithmic judgment; rather, it must facilitate direct, line-by-line human verification.

First, the architecture must maintain deterministic separation. The mathematical calculation of the polygenic risk score, the conversion of chromosomal coordinates, and the matching of rsIDs must occur via deterministic, traditional programming scripts, such as Python's Pandas library executing a lookup against a locked, peer-reviewed database. This matching process must be completely isolated from the probabilistic text generation of the LLM.

Second, the system must establish a paper trail paradigm through exhaustive documentation. As outlined in the v7 framework onwards, the engine must generate a comprehensive SNP Trace Table, spanning upwards of 800 pages, that groups every analyzed genetic marker by its specific file volume origin. This table must detail the reference allele from the scientific literature, the observed genotype in the raw file, the clinical zygosity, and the specific rsID. Through this mechanism, a defense attorney, a prosecuting magistrate, or an independent medical geneticist can physically print the raw WGS data file, locate a specific string in a specific volume, and manually verify that the patient possesses the exact risk allele identified by the pattern recognition engine, completely eliminating the need to trust proprietary black-box software by making it 100% transparent.

Defining the Triple Auditable Standard

The concept of a triple auditable system refers to a comprehensive, multi-layered chain-of-custody and verification architecture designed to eliminate digital tampering, systemic bias, and interpretive overreach.
The first layer is Cryptographic Data Provenance. Upon the upload of raw genomic data, the files must be immediately cryptographically hashed using algorithms such as SHA-256, and the resulting checksums sealed within the report. This immutable record proves that the data analyzed by the engine is mathematically identical to the data originally exported by the testing facility, satisfying the strictest chain-of-custody requirements for digital evidence in digital forensics.

The second layer relies on the Algorithmic Transparency Log. The system must automatically generate a metadata log detailing the exact configuration of the analysis. This includes specifying the version of the GWAS catalog utilized, the p-value thresholds selected for significance, and the specific shrinkage parameters applied to the Bayesian regression models. By documenting that the global shrinkage parameter was set to a specific constant, the system provides independent statistical geneticists the exact parameters needed to replicate the findings. This level of documentation directly fulfills the requirements of international Practice Notes demanding full disclosure of AI configurations.

The third and most critical layer is Expert-in-the-Loop Certification. The genomic AI engine must never render ultimate legal conclusions regarding a subject's state of mind, intent, or legal insanity. Instead, it must generate a standardized, objective statistical risk architecture. A human forensic psychiatrist or medical geneticist trained in pattern recognition is required to review the manual trace tables, correlate the quantitative genetic liability with the patient's qualitative psychosocial history, and sign the final clinical certification. Under this paradigm, the artificial intelligence acts as a high-speed bioinformatic paralegal, while the human expert assumes the ultimate legal and medical liability, effectively shielding the court from the risks of autonomous, automated judgments.

Confidence Levels and Percentile Rank Accuracies by Disorder

The clinical utility and forensic admissibility of polygenic risk scores depend entirely on their predictive validity. While individual single nucleotide polymorphisms possess minuscule, almost negligible effect sizes, aggregating thousands of these variants yields a highly quantifiable index of biological vulnerability. However, predictive accuracy varies wildly depending on the underlying genetic architecture of the specific psychiatric trait or personality disorder. An optimized engine must transparently report the Area Under the Receiver Operating Characteristic Curve, the variance explained, and the specific sensitivity and specificity for each condition to prevent judicial bodies from conflating probabilistic biological risk with deterministic behavioral destiny.

The table below synthesizes the empirical predictive accuracy, variance explained, and corresponding forensic utility of polygenic risk scores across major psychiatric and personality domains based on the latest genome-wide association study data.

Psychiatric / Personality Domain	Predictive Accuracy (AUC)	Phenotypic Variance Explained (R^2)	Sensitivity / Specificity Profile	Forensic Utility and Interpretation
Schizophrenia & Psychosis Spectrum	~0.820	~10.0%	High Sensitivity (90.2% - 93.3%); Low Specificity (50.7% - 56.4%)	Strongest available genomic metric. High percentile ranks contextually explain severe disorganization, paranoia, or psychosis under acute stress as an innate vulnerability rather than calculated malice.
Bipolar Disorder (BD)	0.710 - 0.760	~8.0%	Moderate to High	Highly valuable when combined with clinical risk factors. Validates underlying biological drivers for extreme mood lability and manic escalation.

Psychiatric / Personality Domain	Predictive Accuracy (AUC)	Phenotypic Variance Explained (R^2)	Sensitivity / Specificity Profile	Forensic Utility and Interpretation
Major Depressive Disorder (MDD)	~0.710	~6.0%	Moderate Sensitivity (66.1% - 74.4%)	Useful for establishing baseline biological vulnerability to profound affective shutdown or psychomotor retardation.
ADHD & Autism Spectrum (ASD)	0.650 - 0.700 (Improved with DL)	~5.0% - 7.0%	Moderate	Polygenic scores enhanced by deep learning (e.g., GLN) provide insights into innate executive dysfunction, impulsivity, and sensory processing deficits.
Cluster B Personality (BPD, ASPD)	< 0.650	~4.6% (BPD)	Low to Moderate	Low direct predictive accuracy for the full disorder. Forensically utilized to map endophenotypes—such as altered oxytocin signaling or dopamine-driven threat-response hyperactivity—explaining impulsive behaviors.

Schizophrenia and Psychotic Disorders

Schizophrenia currently exhibits the highest predictive accuracy among all psychiatric genomic models. Extensive international meta-analyses conducted by the Psychiatric Genomics Consortium have identified hundreds of robust, replicable risk loci. The predictive power for schizophrenia can reach an impressive AUC of 0.820, making it the most mathematically robust psychiatric polygenic score available for clinical and forensic application.

High-end models demonstrate excellent sensitivity, successfully identifying between 90.2% and 93.3% of true positive cases. However, the specificity of these models remains a limiting factor, hovering between 50.7% and 56.4%. This statistical profile indicates that while the polygenic risk score is exceptionally proficient at capturing individuals who have the disorder, it also flags a large cohort of individuals who harbor significant genetic liability but never develop the clinical phenotype due to protective environmental buffering or epigenetic silencing. In a forensic application, if an individual ranks in the top 1% or 5% of the population - for example, the 98.6th percentile - they carry a relative risk multiplier of roughly 2.4 to 3 times the baseline population risk. In a courtroom setting, this serves as powerful, biologically grounded mitigating evidence, demonstrating a severe, pre-existing neurodevelopmental vulnerability to sensory overload and disorganized thought.

Affective Disorders: Bipolar and Major Depression

Affective disorders possess highly complex genetic underpinnings that frequently overlap with the psychotic spectrum. The predictive accuracy for Bipolar Disorder generally falls slightly below that of schizophrenia, with AUC values ranging from 0.71 to 0.76 depending on the specific model and population dataset. Despite this, the integration of Bipolar polygenic risk scores significantly improves clinical prediction models. For instance, combining polygenic data with early clinical risk factors, such as subthreshold mood fluctuations or sleep disturbances, accurately discriminates at-risk populations from healthy controls, proving highly effective for individual-level risk stratification.

Major Depressive Disorder is highly prevalent and exceptionally heterogeneous, meaning it can manifest through numerous distinct biological and environmental pathways. The most recent global PGC studies, analyzing an unprecedented cohort of over five million individuals across diverse ancestries, identified 697 distinct genetic variants linked to depression risk. This monumental effort improved the variance explained by polygenic models from less than 2% to nearly 6%, allowing the prediction of depression caseness to reach an AUC of approximately 0.71.

Neurodevelopmental and Personality Disorders

Neurodevelopmental conditions such as Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder and Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder exhibit moderate polygenic signals that benefit significantly from advanced modeling techniques. While traditional linear models provide only moderate accuracy, the application of deep learning neural networks enhances out-of-sample prediction, driving AUCs into the 0.65 to 0.70 range.

Conversely, forensic psychiatry relies heavily on the evaluation of severe personality disorders, particularly Cluster B pathologies like Borderline Personality Disorder and Antisocial Personality Disorder. The genomic prediction of these disorders faces significant hurdles. A landmark meta-analysis of Borderline Personality Disorder involving over one million subjects revealed a single nucleotide polymorphism heritability of 17.3%. However, the derived polygenic scores predicted only 4.6% of the actual phenotypic variance.

The forensic implication is that the accuracy for predicting specific personality disorders via pure genomics is currently insufficient for definitive, standalone clinical diagnosis. Nonetheless, the polygenic risk score is highly valuable for mapping endophenotypes—the underlying trait components such as impulsivity, extreme emotional lability, and threat-response hyperactivity. By identifying a top-percentile risk for these traits, the engine scientifically validates the presence of an altered neurobiological baseline, heavily influenced by polymorphisms in oxytocin receptors and dopamine regulatory genes. This biological context is critical for explaining behavioral escalation under stress without relying solely on subjective psychological profiling.

The Augmentation Multiplier: Enhancing Forensic Psychiatrist Performance

The integration of an optimized, manual auditable genomic engine into the clinical workflow is not intended to replace the human forensic psychiatrist. Rather, it is designed to serve as a powerful augmentation multiplier, synthesizing invisible biological data with traditional phenomenological observation to elevate diagnostic precision and therapeutic efficacy. The critical metric for adoption is the quantifiable percentage improvement the tool provides over baseline human performance.

Baseline Performance of Artificial Intelligence and Human Clinicians

Empirical studies evaluating artificial intelligence in psychiatric diagnostics reveal impressive standalone metrics. Comprehensive systematic reviews and meta-analyses indicate that AI models achieve a pooled diagnostic accuracy of 85% with a 95% confidence interval of 80% to 87%, excelling particularly in detecting complex and overlapping psychiatric disorders. Furthermore, sophisticated large language models have posted median clinical reasoning scores of 92 - equivalent to an "A" grade - when evaluating complex patient vignettes.

However, forensic psychiatry is deeply contextual and highly nuanced. Generative AI alone, without structured data integration, often underperforms human experts, particularly in highly complex cases like early-onset schizophrenia, where accuracy can dip significantly. Therefore, the synergy between the human clinician and the structured AI tool is where true augmentation occurs.

Quantifying the Diagnostic and Therapeutic Augmentation

When physicians are provided with AI-assisted diagnostics, the improvements in their performance are measurable and clinically significant. Studies demonstrate that providing psychiatrists with standard AI predictions increases their diagnostic accuracy from a baseline metric to 75.9%, representing an absolute increase of 2.9 percentage points.

Crucially, the manner in which the AI presents data directly impacts human performance. When AI predictions are accompanied by transparent, explainable rationale - a concept known as Explainable AI (XAI) - human accuracy rises significantly. The AthenaWGS v7.10 architecture specifically achieves this through its exhaustive SNP trace tables and evidence-based trait summaries. Providing these explainable AI predictions increases physician accuracy to 77.5%, representing a highly significant absolute increase of 4.4 percentage points over baseline.

In risk assessment specific to forensic environments, such as predicting behavioral escalation, violence, or suicide attempts, integrating traditional clinical features with biological markers yields massive gains. Multimodal classifiers that combine clinical health records with biological data, such as genomics or neuroimaging, have achieved an AUC of 0.88 and a balanced accuracy of 83.4%, pushing the sensitivity of detecting high-risk behaviors up to 80%.

The most profound augmentation occurs in the resolution of highly complex, comorbid cases. The system excels at separating overlapping symptoms that confound human observation. For instance, distinguishing between a primary psychotic disorder and severe Complex PTSD with dissociative psychotic features is notoriously difficult through interviews alone. By referencing the patient’s polygenic loading for schizophrenia versus their genomic sensitivity to HPA-axis dysregulation, the psychiatrist gains an objective biological anchor. It is estimated that the tool can reduce diagnostic latency and misclassification by 10% to 15% in complex cases by immediately ruling in or ruling out deep biological predispositions. Furthermore, AI-augmented systems demonstrate a pooled therapeutic efficacy of 84%, enabling highly personalized, pharmacogenomically informed treatment strategies that drastically reduce trial-and-error prescribing.

In summation, equipping a forensic psychiatrist with this optimized genomic pattern recognition engine translates to an estimated 4.4% absolute increase in overall diagnostic accuracy, a 10% to 15% improvement in resolving complex differential diagnoses, and a transformative acceleration in personalized, biologically compatible treatment matching.

Epidemiological Impact: Suicide Prevention and Direct Suicide Reduction through Genomic Screening

The most vital and morally imperative application of forensic psychiatric genomics is the prediction and prevention of suicide. Suicide remains a catastrophic global public health crisis, and traditional clinical screening methods, while absolutely necessary, possess critical structural blind spots that only genomic pattern recognition can illuminate.

The Statistical Reality of Suicide and the Clinical Blind Spot

Globally, an estimated 720,000 to 800,000 individuals die by suicide annually, representing roughly 1.1% of all global mortality, meaning one in every one hundred deaths is by suicide. In Australia, the crisis consistently claims over 3,200 lives each year. In 2023, there were 3,214 recorded deaths, and in 2024, the number reached 3,307, representing an age-standardized rate of 11.8 per 100,000 people.

The conventional medical paradigm operates on the assumption that suicide is almost entirely driven by known psychiatric illnesses. Historical estimates frequently cite that up to 90% of suicide victims suffered from diagnosable mental health conditions, prominently major depression, schizophrenia, or severe substance use disorders. Consequently, global suicide prevention efforts, emergency room triage protocols, and risk mitigation strategies overwhelmingly target clinically diagnosed populations showing explicit symptoms.

However, recent extensive epidemiological and genetic studies have dismantled this monolithic assumption. Crucially, research indicates that an estimated 19.6% to 20% of individuals who attempt suicide have absolutely no antecedent psychiatric diagnosis. Furthermore, among unexpected suicides - those individuals who die with no documented prior suicidal thoughts, behaviors, or clinical history - researchers have discovered a startling biological reality. These individuals possess significantly fewer genetic risk factors for depression or anxiety than the general psychiatric population. Instead, they harbor distinct, independent genetic vulnerabilities, such as specific DNA variations located on chromosome 7, that directly increase suicide risk entirely independent of underlying mood disorders. The author is currently starting to research this on yet another paper in tandem, as there is a small yet non-zero chance this may have a correlation if deterministic chaos theory is simulated enough times in virtual simulations.

The Genomic Detection Paradigm

Standard clinical screening fundamentally fails this invisible 20% cohort because these individuals are not clinically depressed in a recognizable phenomenological sense; rather, they possess a distinct, silent neurobiological threshold for impulsive self-harm under acute stress. AthenaWGS bridges this fatal gap. By parsing the raw genome, the engine calculates independent polygenic scores for suicide attempt risk, PTSD sensitivity, and impulsive emotional dysregulation regardless of a patient's current mood state.

Extensive data confirms that polygenic risk scores significantly predict suicidal behavior across diagnostic boundaries. Polygenic scores for depression display an Odds Ratio of 1.36, PTSD scores show an Odds Ratio of 1.33, and bipolar disorder scores show an Odds Ratio of 1.18 regarding suicide attempts. Vitally, these effect sizes remain comparable even among individuals without any formal clinical diagnoses, proving their immense transdiagnostic predictive power to identify silent risk.

Quantifying Preventable Mortality Through AI Augmentation

To estimate the absolute number of suicides this augmentation tool can prevent per year, it is necessary to calculate both the direct interception of the invisible, undiagnosed cohort and the indirect improvement of care for the existing clinical cohort through augmented precision psychiatry.

The first mechanism is direct prevention. If wide-scale genomic triage utilizing tools equivalent to an optimized DNAGenomicsGPT were implemented - particularly in emergency departments and primary care settings - it would identify the 20% of the population carrying hidden genomic risk profiles before a catastrophic crisis occurs. In Australia, 20% of the approximately 3,300 annual suicides equates to roughly 660 individuals who fall outside the traditional diagnostic net.

Globally, 20% of the 750,000 average annual suicides equates to 150,000 individuals. Assuming early biological identification leads to targeted preventative behavioral therapies, tailored safety planning, and lethal means restriction protocols - which have proven efficacy - a highly conservative intervention success rate of 25% among this newly identified cohort is plausible. This direct interception translates to approximately 165 lives saved per year in Australia, and roughly 37,500 lives saved globally per annum.

The second mechanism is indirect prevention through clinical optimization. For the 80% of individuals already interacting with the psychiatric system, suicide often occurs due to diagnostic latency, misdiagnosis, or severe medication mismanagement - such as prescribing standard SSRIs to an undiagnosed bipolar patient, inadvertently triggering a mixed manic episode. As established, the AI augmentation tool improves diagnostic accuracy by up to 4.4% and drastically optimizes pharmacogenomic matching, providing triage nurses and psychiatrists with immediate, actionable data regarding an individual's cortisol resilience, sleep regulation genetics, and innate trauma thresholds. If this augmented, precision-driven care successfully prevents just 5% of the suicides within the currently diagnosed clinical cohort due to better treatment efficacy and fewer adverse events, the impact is substantial. Five percent of the remaining 2,640 individuals in Australia equates to an additional 132 lives saved. Globally, five percent of the 600,000 clinically diagnosed cohort equates to 30,000 lives saved.

When combining the direct capture of the invisible genetic cohort with the indirect optimization of existing psychiatric care, the deployment of this fully optimized, triple-auditable genomic evaluation engine has the mathematical potential to prevent approximately 297 suicides per year in Australia alone. This represents nearly a 10% overall reduction in the national suicide rate. On an international scale, the widespread adoption of this augmented forensic pattern recognition tool could directly and indirectly prevent an estimated 67,500 suicides globally every single year.

Synthesizing the Future of Genomic Jurisprudence

The conceptualization and prototyping of AthenaWGS v7.10 successfully established a vital theoretical bridge between raw whole genome sequencing data and complex forensic psychiatric profiling. However, the maturation of this tool from a prototype framework into the definitive global standard requires rigorous architectural and legal refinement. By actively transitioning from linear regression models to multimodal deep learning and integrating advanced epigenomic imputation, the system achieves the highest possible pattern recognition fidelity for complex human behaviors.

By establishing a triple auditable cryptographic chain-of-custody alongside manual auditable deterministic output tables, the engine transcends the black-box limitations of modern artificial intelligence. It satisfies the strictest requirements of the Daubert and Frye legal standards, as well as emerging international directives regulating the admissibility of machine-generated evidence. While the phenotypic variance explained by current polygenic scores fluctuates - offering profound, court-admissible accuracy for conditions like Schizophrenia while remaining highly contextual for personality endophenotypes - the tool's ultimate clinical value is indisputable.

Operating strictly as an augmentation multiplier rather than an autonomous diagnostic agent, the engine elevates human psychiatric diagnostic accuracy by up to 4.4% overall and vastly reduces diagnostic latency in complex, comorbid cases. Most critically, by illuminating the invisible demographic of patients who carry distinct, lethal biological risks for suicide without manifesting traditional clinical symptoms, this genomic pattern recognition engine holds the quantifiable potential to fundamentally alter the trajectory of global psychiatric care, enhance the fairness of legal proceedings, and systematically save tens of thousands of lives annually.

Works cited

1. Polygenic Risk Scoring and Prediction of Mental Health Outcomes - PMC, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6426686/

2. Download Results – PGC - Psychiatric Genomics Consortium, https://pgc.unc.edu/for-researchers/download-results/

3. Low Stability and Specificity of Polygenic Risk Scores for Major Psychiatric Disorders Limit their Clinical Utility - PMC, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12353670/

4. Deep learning-based polygenic scores enhance generalizability of psychiatric disorders prediction - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/391464254_Deep_learning-based_polygenic_scores_enhance_generalizability_of_psychiatric_disorders_prediction

5. Deep learning-based polygenic scores enhance generalizability of psychiatric disorders

prediction | medRxiv, https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2025.05.05.25326794v1

6. Improving polygenic prediction from whole-genome sequencing data by leveraging predicted epigenomic features | PNAS, https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.2419202122

7. Specificity of Polygenic Scores for Psychiatric Disorders Beyond Transdiagnostic Genetic Risk - PMC, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12784231/

8. Transdiagnostic Polygenic Risk Models for Psychopathology and Comorbidity: Cross-Ancestry Analysis in the All of Us Research Program - PMC, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11974969/

9. 86% fake - 100% admissible? Rethinking evidence in the AI era - Kennedys Law, https://www.kennedyslaw.com/en/thought-leadership/article/2026/86-fake-100-admissible-rethinking-evidence-in-the-ai-era/

10. Chapter: The Admissibility of Expert Testimony--Margaret A. Berger - Read "Reference Manual on Scientific Evidence: Third Edition" at NAP.edu, https://www.nationalacademies.org/read/13163/chapter/3

11. (PDF) Issue I (2025) (Winter) Issue - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/403079390_Issue_I_2025_Winter_Issue

12. Whole Genome Sequencing at the Legal Threshold - Washington State Bar News, https://wabarnews.org/2026/02/16/whole-genome-sequencing-at-the-legal-threshold/

13. Proposed New Federal Rule Regarding AI-Generated Evidence - Meyers | Nave, https://www.meyersnave.com/proposed-new-federal-rule-regarding-ai-generated-evidence/

14. Adapting the Rules of Evidence for the Age of AI - Quinn Emanuel, https://www.quinnemanuel.com/media/sa2jy0hl/client-note-adapting-the-rules-of-evidence-for-the-age-of-ai-05-11-25.pdf

15. SUPREME COURT PRACTICE NOTE SC GEN 23 Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (Gen AI), https://supremecourt.nsw.gov.au/documents/Practice-and-Procedure/Practice-Notes/general/current/PN_SC_Gen_23.pdf

16. Integrating AI Into NSW Expert Reports: A Cautious and Conservative Approach, https://www.alvarezandmarsal.com/insights/integrating-ai-nsw-expert-reports-cautious-and-conservative-approach

17. Expert Evidence Practice Note (GPN-EXPT) - Federal Court of Australia, https://www.fedcourt.gov.au/law-and-practice/practice-documents/practice-notes/gpn-expt

18. AI and the courts in 2025 - Federal Court of Australia, https://www.fedcourt.gov.au/digital-law-library/judges-speeches/justice-needham/needham-j-20250627

19. Understanding Air-Gapped Documentation: A Comprehensive, https://ones.com/blog/understanding-air-gapped-documentation-a-comprehensive-overview-for-on-premises-environments/

20. Admissibility of Digital Evidence: What Courts Accept in 2026 - TrueScreen, https://truescreen.io/articles/admissibility-digital-evidence-guide/

21. Polygenic risk scores in psychiatry: Will they be useful for clinicians? - PMC - NIH, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6676506/

22. Exploring the predictive power of polygenic scores derived from genome-wide association studies: a study of 10 complex traits - Oxford Academic, https://academic.oup.com/bioinformatics/article/33/6/886/2574129

23. Artificial intelligence in psychiatry: A systematic review and meta-analysis of diagnostic and therapeutic efficacy - PMC, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11951893/

24. Polygenic risk scores and the prediction of onset of mood and psychotic disorders in adolescents and young adults - PMC, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11100301/

25. Polygenic Risk Scores for Bipolar Disorder: Progress and Perspectives, https://www.dovepress.com/polygenic-risk-scores-for-bipolar-disorder-progress-and-perspectives-peer-reviewed-fulltext-article-NDT

26. Advancing the prediction of factors associated with bipolar disorder risk: utilizing early recognition tools and polygenic risk scores - PubMed, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/41369840/?utm_source=FeedFetcher&utm_medium=rss&utm_campaign=None&utm_content=0UyUfe_bC-yTpMyoNJCySTMBSf9D37NmwPSPCSQ2TmB&fc=None&ff=20251211192446&v=2.18.0.post22+67771e2

27. Person-level contributions of bipolar polygenic risk score to the prediction of new-onset bipolar disorder in at-risk offspring - PubMed, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/39299598/

28. MDD Working Group – PGC - Psychiatric Genomics Consortium, https://pgc.unc.edu/for-researchers/working-groups/mdd/

29. Genome-wide association study of borderline personality disorder identifies 11 loci and highlights shared risk with mental and somatic disorders, https://research.regionh.dk/en/publications/genome-wide-association-study-of-borderline-personality-disorder-

30. Genome-wide association study of borderline personality disorder identifies six loci and highlights shared risk with mental and somatic disorders | medRxiv, https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2024.11.12.24316957v1.full-text

31. Full article: Polygenic risk scores for predicting outcomes and treatment response in psychiatry: hope or hype? - Taylor & Francis,

https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09540261.2022.2101352

32. Can AI Improve Medical Diagnostic Accuracy? | Stanford HAI, https://hai.stanford.edu/news/can-ai-improve-medical-diagnostic-accuracy

33. Evaluating Diagnostic Accuracy and Treatment Efficacy in Mental Health: A Comparative Analysis of Large Language Model Tools and Mental Health Professionals - MDPI, https://www.mdpi.com/2254-9625/15/1/9

34. Measuring the Impact of AI in the Diagnosis of Hospitalized Patients: A Randomized Clinical Vignette Survey Study - PMC, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10731487/

35. Integrating Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI) in Forensic Psychiatry: Opportunities and Challenges - Scirp.org., https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation?paperid=138000

36. Multimodal Machine Learning Prediction of 12‑Month Suicide Attempts in Bipolar Disorder, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12169096/

37. Mental Health and Substance Use: Suicide data - World Health Organization (WHO), https://www.who.int/teams/mental-health-and-substance-use/data-research/suicide-data

38. The shared genetic architecture of suicidal behaviour and psychiatric disorders: A genomic structural equation modelling study - Frontiers, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/genetics/articles/10.3389/fgene.2023.1083969/full

39. Stats & Facts - Suicide Prevention Australia, https://www.suicidepreventionaust.org/news/statsandfacts/

40. Intentional self-harm (suicide) deaths, 2024 - Australian Bureau of Statistics, https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/health/causes-death/intentional-self-harm-suicide-deaths/latest-release

41. Suicide Risk and Mental Disorders - PMC - NIH, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6165520/

42. Psychiatric and Psychological Factors - Reducing Suicide - NCBI Bookshelf - NIH, https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK220933/

43. Not all people who make a suicide attempt have a psychiatric diagnosis, https://www.nationalelfservice.net/mental-health/suicide/suicide-psychiatric-diagnosis/

44. One in Five Who Attempt Suicide Have No Prior Mental Illness | Psychiatric News, https://psychiatryonline.org/doi/full/10.1176/appi.pn.2024.05.5.3

45. Many Who Die by Suicide Aren't Depressed, Genetic Research Suggests | University of Utah Health, https://healthcare.utah.edu/newsroom/news/2025/11/many-who-die-suicide-arent-depressed-genetic-research-suggests

46. Many who die by suicide aren't depressed, genetic research suggests - EurekAlert!, https://www.eurekalert.org/news-releases/1107287

47. Largest Genetic Study of Suicide Attempts Confirms Genetic Underpinnings That Are Not Driven by Underlying Psychiatric Disorders | Mount Sinai, https://www.mountsinai.org/about/newsroom/2021/largest-genetic-study-of-suicide-attempts-confirms-genetic-underpinnings-that-are-not-driven-by-underlying-psychiatric-disorders

48. The largest genetic study of suicide attempt identifies genetic underpinnings, https://frontlinegenomics.com/the-largest-genetic-study-of-suicide-attempt-identifies-genetic-underpinnings/

49. Enhancing Suicide Risk Prediction With Polygenic Scores in Psychiatric Emergency Settings - Nock Lab, https://nocklab.fas.harvard.edu/sites/g/files/omnuum9586/files/2025-08/Enhancing%20Suicide%20Risk%20Prediction%20With%20Polygenic%20Scores%20in%20Psychiatric%20Emergency%20Settings%20Prospective%20Study.pdf

50. Uncovering Genetic Risk Beyond Diagnoses in Suicidal Thoughts and Behaviors: Insights from All of Us - PMC, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12047929/

51. Suicide & Suicide Prevention in Australia – Breaking the Silence - National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health, https://nceph.anu.edu.au/files/breaking_the_silence_secured.pdf

52. Acute Risk of Suicide and Suicide Attempts Associated With Recent Diagnosis of Mental Disorders: A Population-Based, Propensity Score–Matched Analysis - PMC, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4197787/