



## LJMU Research Online

**Christofidis, G, Morrissey, J and Birkett, JW**

**A preliminary study on vacuum metal deposition as a standalone method for enhancement of fingermarks on ballistic brass materials**

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/id/eprint/10306/>

### Article

**Citation** (please note it is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from this work)

**Christofidis, G, Morrissey, J and Birkett, JW (2019) A preliminary study on vacuum metal deposition as a standalone method for enhancement of fingermarks on ballistic brass materials. Journal of Forensic Sciences. ISSN 0022-1198**

LJMU has developed **LJMU Research Online** for users to access the research output of the University more effectively. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in LJMU Research Online to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain.

The version presented here may differ from the published version or from the version of the record. Please see the repository URL above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information please contact [researchonline@ljmu.ac.uk](mailto:researchonline@ljmu.ac.uk)

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/>

1  
2  
3 A preliminary study on vacuum metal deposition as a standalone method for enhancement  
4 of fingermarks on ballistic brass materials  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10

11 **ABSTRACT**  
12

13  
14 In order to assess the efficacy of vacuum metal deposition as a technique to develop fingermarks on  
15 ballistic metallic surfaces, a preliminary study using 6 donors (3 male & 3 female) was conducted.  
16  
17 Using a sequential metal deposition process, two metal combinations were studied – gold/zinc and  
18 silver/zinc. Results indicate the potential of this technique, by developing identifiable fingermarks on  
19 brass metal discs aged from a few days up to more than a month old. As the development of  
20 fingermarks on fired (brass) cartridge cases is an area of interest, a further study was conducted  
21 where a total of 20 fingermarks were deposited on cases. After firing, second level fingerprint  
22 characteristics were successfully observed on cartridge cases highlighting its potential as a  
23 fingerprint enhancement method for ballistic brass materials. Further work is required to fully  
24 evaluate the VMD process and its reliability as a fingerprint enhancing method on ballistic surfaces.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 **KEYWORDS:** Forensic science, vacuum metal deposition, fired cartridges, fingermarks, fingerprints,  
41 ballistics  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 Vacuum metal deposition (VMD) is a fingerprint enhancement technique that is used in police  
49 casework (1), but is a relatively unexplored technique in relation to metallic surfaces. It is a thin-film  
50 deposition technique in which a source metal is vaporized in a vacuum, in order to coat a substrate.  
51  
52 The technique has been long established in the industrial application of metal coatings for articles  
53 such as mirrors (1). The use of VMD as a tool for the forensic enhancement of latent fingermarks was  
54 first proposed in 1968 (1), however a substantial number of years passed before it would be  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 considered as a viable enhancement technique. VMD was initially introduced in the forensic field to  
4 detect fingermarks on paper (2), and was then optimized to be fully operational in the late 1970's.  
5  
6 The method involves placing the item to be treated inside the deposition chamber which is  
7  
8 sealed/operated at a high vacuum, typically larger than  $3 \times 10^{-4}$  mbar. The chamber contains  
9  
10 tungsten boats for the containment and heating of the selected metal to be deposited and a window  
11  
12 to allow the operator to monitor and control the deposition process (1, 3). The most commonly used  
13  
14 metals in the VMD treatment of latent fingermarks are gold/zinc, gold is applied first, followed by  
15  
16 zinc (1). After the vaporization of gold, gold atoms cluster together forming agglomerates, which  
17  
18 may penetrate some constituents of the fingermark residues (Fig. 1). Zinc is then vaporized, which  
19  
20 preferentially deposits on the exposed gold agglomerates (4) rather than on areas where these are  
21  
22 embedded in the latent fingermark deposit. The zinc is binding to the fingermark furrows and not  
23  
24 the ridges of the print (Fig. 1). The fingermark developed is a negative one with the furrows covered  
25  
26 by the gold and zinc appearing grey. Positive development of fingermarks can also occur. It is  
27  
28 thought that positive development occurs in samples where the fingermarks are rich in fatty  
29  
30 components or other contaminations (i.e. grease) (6, 7). Other metal sequential deposition protocols  
31  
32 for VMD can also include silver/zinc, sterling silver, copper/zinc and copper. The metal combinations  
33  
34 studied here, are considered to be most utilised (5,6,7,8).  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 One of the greatest advantages of VMD includes its versatility, including its suitability for a wide  
43  
44 range of substrates, including wetted ones (2). VMD is also ideal to use as a sequential treatment, as  
45  
46 it does not damage any DNA that may be present in fingermarks (8) (since it targets the metallic  
47  
48 substrate and not the fingermark itself), and works well with other conventional fingermark  
49  
50 enhancement techniques such as cyanoacrylate fuming (7, 8). Drawbacks of VMD include the cost of  
51  
52 the equipment, and that the quality of enhancement relies upon the experience of the operator to  
53  
54 determine the optimum time at which the process should be halted to prevent overdevelopment of  
55  
56 fingermarks. The cost of the deposition metals is minimal due to the minute quantities needed for  
57  
58 each process. Over recent years, studies have focused on using VMD on fabrics (5, 8, 9) with some  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 success. The introduction of polymer banknotes in some countries has sparked a resurgence in VMD  
4  
5 research, in an attempt to enhance fingermarks on this difficult surface (9).  
6  
7

8 The motivation behind this research stems from the lack of studies on employing VMD on metallic  
9  
10 surfaces as a standalone technique, and also the scarcity of reliable techniques for the development  
11  
12 of fingermarks on fired cartridge cases (10). A study by Fraser et al. (11) showcased the increased  
13  
14 efficacy of VMD compared to cyanoacrylate fuming on smoother almost non-porous fabrics (such as  
15  
16 nylon), however this finding might hold true for metallic surfaces also (which are non-porous  
17  
18 surfaces). The only peer reviewed literature studies using VMD for metallic surfaces was by Dafydd  
19  
20 et al.(12) and Tiwari et al.(13). In the former study they used Scanning Kelvin probe in conjunction  
21  
22 with VMD for latent fingermark visualization, while in the latter the authors focused on optimizing  
23  
24 the deposition protocols for fingermark enhancement on aluminium surfaces.  
25  
26  
27  
28

29 This preliminary study addresses utilisation of gold/zinc and silver/zinc protocols for the  
30  
31 enhancement of latent natural fingermarks on brass metal discs, exploring the potential of the  
32  
33 method for groomed fingermarks on fired brass ammunition, a topic of great interest for forensic  
34  
35 examiners.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

## 41 **Materials and Methods**

### 42 *Fingermark deposition*

43  
44  
45 Six donors were employed for the first part of this study (3 male, 3 female), and written consent was  
46  
47 acquired after the purpose of this study was explained. Ethical approval was granted for this study  
48  
49 by the Liverpool John Moores University ethics committee (17/PBS/002). The criteria for this  
50  
51 preliminary study was achieving a balance between male and female donors since it has been  
52  
53 debated that the gender of the donor can play a role in the composition of fingermarks (in some  
54  
55 studies male donors tended to have higher concentration of fatty components in their fingermark  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 residue) and consequently in their enhancement (14, 15). The age of the donors was between 25-30  
4 years old, within this age limit there were no particular differences observed in fingerprint  
5 composition (14). The donors were asked to wash their hands with soap and water and resume their  
6 normal daily routine for 30 minutes before depositing any fingerprints as it is the standard  
7 procedure for generating natural fingerprints (16, 17). The donors' daily normal routine revolved  
8 around desk based work using a computer. The deposition was performed by placing simultaneous  
9 fingerprint impressions from the right thumb across two brass metal discs. This was done to ensure  
10 the same fingerprint was examined with the two metal deposition protocols as proposed by Sears et  
11 al. (16). The discs (3cmx3cm) had been previously cleaned with 5% v/v Decon 90 solution, followed  
12 by ethanol and left to air dry. Each donor deposited 12 full fingerprints (which is an adequate  
13 number for a preliminary study (17)) which were divided into four even groups according to the  
14 number of days they were left to age before development (2, 7, 14, 35 days old), the  
15 aforementioned time ranges were chosen based on fingerprint research and guidelines in the  
16 literature (16, 17). The discs were stored under dark and dry conditions, with temperatures ranging  
17 from 15-20°C and were only accessible to the authors. The simultaneous natural fingerprint  
18 impressions were treated with two different vacuum metal deposition protocols, namely, Gold/Zinc  
19 and Silver/Zinc. Each run on the VMD lasted approximately 10 minutes, with the duration (of each  
20 run) varying slightly between samples due to inherent donor variability (although sample fingerprint  
21 deposition and collection protocols for all donors was the same). The gold and silver wire used for  
22 each run was of length less than half a centimetre. The apparatus used for all experiments was a  
23 VMD900 Metal Deposition System from West Technology. Blank cleaned discs were run with VMD to  
24 assess any deposition artefacts on the brass surfaces which may affect any fingerprint evaluation.  
25 No impact on the results was noted.

26  
27  
28 Brass cartridge cases (.38 Special) were cleaned with a 5% v/v Decon 90 solution and ethanol. Each  
29 donor (2 male, 2 female -male and female donors 1 and 2 from the initial brass discs study)  
30 deposited a single groomed fingerprint on 5 cartridges (groomed procedure same as for natural

1  
2  
3 marks including rubbing of forehead and nose areas as per IFRG guidelines) (17). The cartridges were  
4  
5 fired using a .38 Smith and Wesson (S&W) revolver. This weapon was chosen due to the larger case  
6  
7 surface area of the ammunition enabling full fingerprint deposition, and discharged 5 days after the  
8  
9 deposition of the fingerprints (the shooting time was based on the availability of the firearms  
10  
11 services). The loading and collecting of the cartridges was completed whilst wearing gloves. In this  
12  
13 instance groomed fingerprints on cleaned cartridge cases were employed to increase the chances of  
14  
15 fingerprint residue adhering on the cartridge after firing. The employment of groomed fingerprints  
16  
17 is considered acceptable for pilot studies (17).  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

#### 24 *Ridge detail grading*

25  
26  
27 Developed prints were graded according to the scheme given in Table 1 (18). All gradings were  
28  
29 carried out by the first author initially (who was involved in the experimental part of the study), and  
30  
31 done by examining the mark on the casings using a magnifying fingerprint glass. The photographs of  
32  
33 all impressions were taken with a NIKON D7100: Camera mode: Manual, Shutter Speed: 1/250,  
34  
35 Aperture: Wide open (f/1.4), ISO: 3200, White Balance: Auto WB, Autofocus: AI-Servo, Drive Mode:  
36  
37 Continuous, Metering: N/A, Image Quality: raw were also used for this purpose. No enhancement  
38  
39 photo software was used. Independent blind grading conducted by a second trained fingerprint  
40  
41 examiner was undertaken (an author with 25+ years fingerprint casework experience, who was not  
42  
43 involved in the experimental part of the project). Both were graded independently and both set of  
44  
45 grades were in agreement. All fingerprints were labelled with an alphanumeric code to prevent  
46  
47 potential bias, and to protect the donors' privacy. In all photos no scale was used due to the known  
48  
49 dimensions of the objects, and due to the fact that the photos were not used to compare the size of  
50  
51 the items.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Results

One male (male donor 1) donor -of the total 6 donors- (Fig. 2(a) &2(b)) produced fingerprints that were of identifiable quality throughout all of the different aging times time intervals. One female donor (female donor 1) (Fig. 2(c) &2(d)) failed to deposit any fingerprints that could be developed by either deposition protocol.

Fingerprints from male donor 2 were more receptive towards the Silver/Zinc metal deposition protocol (Fig. 3 (b)). Female donor 3 mostly produced "empty " fingerprints but in some cases ridge detail enhancement was achieved (Fig. 3(d)).

Male donor 3 mostly produced "empty " fingerprints but in some cases some ridge detail enhancement was possible (Fig. 4(b)). In these instances, it could be inferred that fingerprints from certain donors (female donor 1 and male donor 3) may not be ideal for the VMD.

Female donor 3 had not produced an identifiable fingerprint on earlier time intervals, however at 35 days an identifiable fingerprint (Fig. 5(d)) was developed. It seems that the effect of time on fingerprints might be complex, meaning that a fresh fingerprint will not necessarily be developed any easier than an older fingerprint when VMD is used.

Fingerprints which contained second level detail – ridge characteristics - were developed on fired cartridge cases (Fig. 6a, 6b, and 6c). The fingerprints were deposited 5 days prior to firing the cartridge. Out of 20 fingerprints only 3 (deposited from male donor 1, the same donor as in the brass discs experiment) displayed some sort of second level characteristics when enhanced.

Although the sample size was small, it indicates that there is a possibility to enhance fingerprints that would be of a quality high enough to perform identification of a suspect.

Below (tables 2&3) the grading of the fingerprint developed on brass metal discs using two different metal deposition protocols can be seen.

1  
2  
3 The fingerprint grades data was checked for normality (using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test) and it  
4 was found that it does not follow a normal distribution (as expected when using a non-linear scale),  
5 the grades of fingerprints developed with Gold/Zinc and Silver/Zinc were divided in to two groups  
6 and tested with a Mann-Whitney test. The result shows that there is no significant difference ( $p \sim 0.4$ ,  
7 confidence interval 95%) in the quality of developed fingerprints when using one of the two metal  
8 deposition protocols. Table 4 shows the grades of the fingerprints deposited on fired cartridge cases  
9 using Silver/Zinc, based on the results from the brass disc experiments.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

## 22 Discussion

23  
24  
25 The work described here, indicates that successfully enhancing latent fingerprints on a flat brass  
26 surface with VMD depends on the donor of the fingerprint. Out of 6 donors, only one male donor  
27 produced fingerprints that could be developed to an identifiable level throughout all the different  
28 time intervals. The overall quality of the fingerprints developed by male donors and by using the  
29 Gold/Zinc and Silver/Zinc protocol seems to be higher and statistically significant than the  
30 fingerprints from female donors (Mann-Whitney  $p \sim 0$ , confidence interval 95%), but the lack of data  
31 due to low donor numbers limits the value. The statistical analysis of fingerprints developed by  
32 Gold/Zinc and Silver/Zinc show that overall, there is no significant difference in the quality of the  
33 enhanced fingerprints. However, it should be noted that certain donors responded better to one of  
34 the two metal deposition protocols, namely male donor 3 and female donor 3 produced identifiable  
35 fingerprints with the Silver/Zinc deposition protocol. Fingerprints that were aged up to 35 days were  
36 only identifiable when developed from male donor 1, and female donor 3. Further work is  
37 recommended to assess the aging process of fingerprints in relation to VMD enhancement.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

The results on fired cartridge cases shot by a .38 S&W revolver demonstrate that VMD is capable of producing fingerprints that have second level characteristics (bifurcations, ridge endings etc.). When applied to casework, such detailed fingerprint development may prove problematic due to



1  
2  
3 the degradation of the fingermark residue on a cartridge case that would make the development of  
4 a clear ridge detail pattern more challenging. Moreover, the use of VMD processes impacting on  
5 other evidence types needs to be considered (e.g. case striation marks). This study has also shown  
6 that natural and groomed fingermarks from certain donors can be enhanced successfully using this  
7 technique. The authors are currently working to incorporate more donors as it is suggested by the  
8 IFRG guidelines (17), to take into account different weapon types, and to examine if the weapons  
9 themselves have an effect on the enhancement quality of the fingermarks. In terms of the  
10 compounds that are present in fingermarks and could be facilitating their enhancement when using  
11 VMD, both eccrine and sebaceous components are to be considered, especially since it has been  
12 reported (12) that eccrine prints of good quality can be developed with VMD.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

## 26 **References**

- 27  
28  
29 1. Davis LWL, Kelly PF, King RSP, Bleay SM. Visualisation of latent fingermarks on polymer banknotes  
30 using copper vacuum metal deposition: A preliminary study. *Forensic Sci Int* 2016;266:86-92.  
31
- 32  
33 2. Steiner R, Bécue A. Effect of water immersion on multi- and mono-metallic VMD. *Forensic Sci Int*  
34 2018;283:118-27.  
35
- 36  
37 3. Jones N, Mansour D, Stoilovic M, Lennard C, Roux C. The influence of polymer type, print donor  
38 and age on the quality of fingerprints developed on plastic substrates using vacuum metal  
39 deposition. *Forensic Sci Int* 2001;124(2):167-77.  
40
- 41  
42 4. Dai X, Stoilovic M, Lennard C, Speers N. Vacuum metal deposition: Visualisation of gold  
43 agglomerates using TEM imaging. *Forensic Sci Int* 2007;168(2):219-22.  
44
- 45  
46 5. Fraser J, Sturrock K, Deacon P, Bleay S, Bremner DH. Visualisation of fingermarks and grab  
47 impressions on fabrics. Part 1: Gold/zinc vacuum metal deposition. *Forensic Sci Int* 2011;208(1):74-8.  
48
- 49  
50 6. Jones N, Stoilovic M, Lennard C, Roux C. Vacuum metal deposition: Factors affecting normal and  
51 reverse development of latent fingerprints on polyethylene substrates. *Forensic Sci Int* 2001;115(1-  
52 2):73-88.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 7. Centre for Applied Science and Technology (CAST). Centre for Applied Science and Technology  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
fingermark visualisation manual, 2nd edn. Sandridge, St. Albans, U.K.: Home Office Centre for Applied Science and Technology, 2014.
8. Knighting S, Fraser J, Sturrock K, Deacon P, Bleay S, Bremner DH. Visualisation of fingermarks and grab impressions on dark fabrics using silver vacuum metal deposition. *Sci Justice* 2013;53(3):309-14.
9. Downham RP, Brewer ER, King RSP, Sears VG. Sequential processing strategies for fingermark visualisation on uncirculated £10 (Bank of England) polymer banknotes. *Forensic Sci Int* 2018;288:140-58.
10. Christofidis G, Morrissey J, Birkett JW. Detection of Fingermarks—Applicability to Metallic Surfaces: A Literature Review. *J Forensic Sci* 2018;63(6):1616-27.
11. Fraser J, Deacon P, Bleay S, David H Bremner. A comparison of the use of vacuum metal deposition versus cyanoacrylate fuming for visualisation of fingermarks and grab impressions on fabrics. *Sci Justice* 2014;54(2):133-40.
12. Dafydd H, Williams G, Bleay S. Latent Fingerprint Visualization using a Scanning Kelvin Probe in Conjunction with Vacuum Metal Deposition. *J Forensic Sci* 2014;59(1):211-8.
13. Tiwari AK, Alaoui IM, Guddala S, Ramakrishna SA. Enhanced Visualization of Latent Fingermarks on Rough Aluminum Surfaces Using Sequential Au and Zn/ZnS/ZnO Depositions. *J Forensic Sci* 2017; 63(4):1275-1281.
14. A. van Dam, F.T. van Beek, M.C. Aalders, T.G. van Leeuwen, S.A. Lambrechts. Techniques that acquire donor profiling information from fingermarks - A review. *Sci Justice* 2016; 56(2) 143-54.
15. Girod A, Ramotowski R, Weyermann C. Composition of fingermark residue: a qualitative and quantitative review. *Forensic Sci Int* 2012;223(1-3):10-24.
16. Sears VG, Bleay SM, Bandey HL, Bowman VJ. A methodology for finger mark research. *Sci Justice* 2012;52(3):145-60.
17. International Fingerprint Research Group (IFRG). International Fingerprint Research Group guidelines for the assessment of fingermark detection techniques. *J Forensic Identif* 2001;

1  
2  
3 64(2):174–200.  
4

5 18. Morrissey, J, Larrosa, J. and Birkett JW. A preliminary evaluation of the use of gun bluing to  
6 enhance friction ridge detail on cartridge casings. J Forensic Identif 2017;67(3):313-22.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Tables**

Table 1. Outline grading scheme used for assessment of developed marks (18), adapted from (7).

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Criteria</b>
0	No ridge detail developed
1	No clear pattern or ridge flow, with few or no characteristics disclosed. Cannot be used for identification purposes.
2	Pattern or ridge flow is disclosed; however, characteristics are not clear throughout the whole impression. May possibly be used for identification purposes.
3	Pattern and/or ridge flow is disclosed with clear characteristics throughout. Identifiable ridge detail.

Table 2. Evaluation of natural half fingermarks on brass metal discs developed with Gold/Zinc

Donors	Grades Day 2	Grades Day 7	Grades Day 14	Grades Day 35
Male donor #1	1,2,1	0,1,1	1,2,3	3,3,3
Male donor #2	1,2,1	1,1,0	1,0,1	0,0,0
Male donor #3	1,0,1	0,0,0	1,1,1	0,0,0
Female donor #1	0,0,0	0,0,0	0,0,0	0,0,0
Female donor #2	0,0,0	0,0,0	0,0,0	0,2,0
Female donor #3	0,1,0	0,1,0	0,0,0	1,0,0

Table 3. Evaluation of natural half fingermarks on brass metal discs developed with Silver/Zinc

Donors	Grades Day 2	Grades Day 7	Grades Day 14	Grades Day 35
Male donor #1	1,1,1	2,1,1	1,2,2	1,3,1
Male donor #2	1,1,1	0,0,0	2,0,1	0,0,0
Male donor #3	1,0,0	1,1,1	2,2,1	0,0,0
Female donor #1	0,0,0	0,0,0	0,0,0	1,0,0
Female donor #2	0,0,1	0,0,0	0,0,1	1,1,2
Female donor #3	0,0,0	0,1,0	0,1,0	3,0,0

Table 4. Evaluation of groomed fingermarks on fired brass cartridge cases

Donors	Grades
Male donor #1	1,2,1,1,0
Male donor #2	0,0,0,0,1
Female donor #1	0,0,0,0,0
Female donor #2	0,0,0,0,0

**Figure legends**

Figure 1. Visualisation of fingermarks and grab impressions on fabrics. (Part 1: Gold/zinc vacuum metal deposition) (5)

Figure 2. Simultaneous natural fingermarks on brass discs developed 2 days after deposition: Male donor 1 (a): Gold/Zinc (b): Silver/Zinc. Female donor 1 (c): Gold/Zinc (d): Silver/Zinc.

Figure 3. Simultaneous natural fingermarks on brass discs developed 7 days after deposition: Male donor 2 (a): Gold/Zinc (b): Silver/Zinc. Female donor 2 (c): Gold/Zinc (d): Silver/Zinc.

Figure 4. Simultaneous natural fingermarks developed 14 days after deposition: Male donor 3 (a): Gold/Zinc (b): Silver/Zinc Female donor 2 (c): Gold/Zinc (d): Silver/Zinc.

Figure 5. Simultaneous natural fingermarks developed 35 days after deposition. Male donor 1: (a): Gold/Zinc (b): Silver/Zinc Female donor 3: (c): Gold/Zinc (d): Silver/Zinc.

Figure 6. Groomed fingermark by a male donor (male donor 1) on 3 separate cartridge cases (a, b, c) developed with Silver/Zinc one day after firing.






FIG. 1

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




FIG. 2




FIG. 3

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



FIG. 4




FIG. 5

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60





FIG. 6a



25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

FIG. 6b

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




FIG. 6c