Semblance analysis to assess GPR data from a five-year forensic study of simulated clandestine graves
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Abstract

Ground penetrating radar (GPR) surveys have proven useful for locating clandestine graves in a number of forensic searches. There has been extensive research into the geophysical monitoring of simulated clandestine graves in different burial scenarios and ground conditions. Whilst these studies have been used to suggest optimum dominant radar frequencies, the data themselves have not been quantitatively analysed to-date. This study uses a common-offset configuration of semblance analysis, both to characterise velocity trends from GPR diffraction hyperbolae and, since the magnitude of a semblance response is proportional to signal-to-noise ratio, to quantify the strength of a forensic GPR response. 2D GPR profiles were acquired over a simulated clandestine burial, with a wrapped-pig cadaver monitored at three-month intervals between 2008-2013 with GPR antennas
of three different centre-frequencies (110, 225 and 450 MHz). The GPR response to the cadaver was a strong diffraction hyperbola. Results show, in contrast to resistivity surveys, that semblance analysis show little sensitivity to changes attributable to decomposition, and only a subtle influence of seasonality: velocity increases (0.01-0.02 m/ns) were observed in summer, associated with a decrease (5-10%) in peak semblance magnitude, $S_M$, and potentially in the reflectivity of the grave. The lowest-frequency antennas consistently gave the highest signal-to-noise ratio although the grave was nonetheless detectable by all frequencies trialled. This therefore suggests forensic radar surveys should be undertaken without regard to seasonality. Whilst GPR analysis cannot currently provide a quantitative diagnostic proxy for time-since-burial, the consistency of responses suggests that graves will remain detectable beyond the five years shown here.
Graphical Abstract
Highlights (max. 85 characters)

- Analysis of 2D GPR profiles acquired over simulated clandestine graves, with antenna frequencies of 110-900 MHz.
- **Quantitative** semblance analysis undertaken for diffraction hyperbolae in common offset data.
- Grave with wrapped-pig cadaver produces consistent diffraction hyperbola, strongest in 110 MHz record.
- Wrapped burials should remain visible on radar profiles for longer than 5 years after burial.
- Forensic radar surveys can be undertaken without regard to seasonality.
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There are numerous and varied methods employed by forensic search teams to detect the clandestine burial of murder victims (Pringle et al., 2012a; Parker et al., 2010). Current best practice suggests a phased approach, which moves from large-scale remote sensing methods (Kalacska et al., 2009) through to initial ground reconnaissance (Ruffell and McKinley, 2014) and control studies before full searches are initiated (Harrison and Donnelly, 2009; Larsen et al., 2011). These full searches have themselves involved a variety of methods including, for example, forensic geomorphology (Ruffell and McKinley, 2014), forensic botany (Aquila et al., 2014) and entomology (Amendt et al., 2007), scent-trained search dogs (Lasseter et al., 2003), physical probing (Ruffell, 2005a), thanatochemistry (Vass, 2012) and near-surface geophysics (see e.g. France et al., 1992; Powell, 2004; Nobes, 2000; Cheetham, 2005; Pringle and Jervis, 2009).

Near-surface geophysics appeals in forensic searches principally because of survey efficiency and non-invasiveness. Ground penetrating radar is arguably the most commonly used near-surface geophysical technique for clandestine grave detection (see e.g. Mellet, 1992; Calkin et al., 1995; Davenport, 2001; Ruffell, 2005b; Schultz, 2007; Billinger, 2009; Novo et al., 2011; Ruffell et al., 2014), and Nobes (2000) deploys the technique alongside electromagnetic prospection methods. Forensic burials differ strongly from historical and/or archaeological graves (e.g. Fiedler et al., 2009; Hansen et al., 2014). Archaeological examples can be difficult, though not impossible, to detect due to limited skeletal remains and processes of soil
compaction (Vaughan, 1986); however, archaeological graves can be associated with monumental and/or ceremonial features, which are more readily detected. While the clandestine burial lacks any monumental features, organic remains are often present and the burial is typically shallow. As such, while archaeological survey methodologies may be replicated in forensic searches, the style and composition of the grave and its contents vary between the two settings.

Several recent GPR control studies use animal remains as a proxy for human remains in constructed graves, which are then repeatedly surveyed over extensive time periods (see e.g. France et al., 1992; Buck, 2003; Schultz et al., 2006; Schultz, 2007; Pringle et al., 2008; Schultz, 2008; Schultz and Martin, 2011; Pringle et al., 2012b; Schultz and Martin, 2012). These studies aim to determine optimal antenna centre-frequencies for numerous variables, including different time periods post-burial, varied burial styles, different soil types and local depositional environments. However, the assessment of GPR results has largely been visual, qualitative and/or subjective (Pringle et al., 2012b). This contrasts with a recent example of resistivity analysis, in which an objective and quantitative approach to characterising electrical responses was developed (Jervis and Pringle, 2014).

In this study, we develop a semblance-based method to quantify the assessment of a time-lapse archive of GPR observations from a simulated clandestine burial site. Semblance analysis, familiar for applications to data in the common midpoint (CMP) domain, is novelty adapted to 2D profiles of common offset GPR data. We demonstrate that the peak magnitude of semblance response can be used as an
indicator of signal-to-noise ratio, which in turn describes the underlying target reflectivity. We then consider the implications of semblance responses for the interpretation of real data.

2. Methods

Here, we describe the existing archive of pre-recorded GPR data, and describe the use of semblance analysis as a quantitative assessment tool.

2.1. Study background

This study focuses on the GPR archive of time-lapse geophysical observations acquired at a test site, where buried pig cadavers were used as a proxy for clandestine graves (Pringle et al. 2012b). The site is former garden land in the campus of Keele University (Staffordshire, UK) and is deemed typical of a semi-rural environment in the UK. The site vegetation is grassy with small deciduous trees on three sides. The soil at the site is predominantly sandy loam, above the local water table with $\sim0.31$ average fractional soil moisture content recorded over the first two years of monitoring (Jervis et al. 2009), with fragments of shallow sandstone bedrock present at depths below ground level (bgl) exceeding 0.5 m and bedrock itself at $\sim2.5$ m bgl. Three graves were dug at an interval of approximately 4 m, to a depth of 0.5 m bgl (representing a clandestine grave construction halted when encountering hard rock fragments). Pig cadavers weighing approximately 80 kg were placed in two graves before backfilling; the third grave was left empty and backfilled as a control. One pig cadaver was left naked (termed the ‘naked-pig grave’) and the second was wrapped in a porous tarpaulin (termed the ‘wrapped-pig grave’) (see
Jervis et al., 2009), to simulate the two commonest scenarios of murder victims (see Hunter & Cox, 2005). The study site remained dedicated as such throughout the study period and was subject to no change for its duration excepting natural processes. Extended discussion of the construction of the test site, and of the full suite of geophysical archives, is given in Jervis et al. (2009), Pringle et al. (2012b) and Jervis and Pringle (2014). In this analysis, we consider only the GPR profiles acquired over the wrapped-pig grave.

2.3 GPR survey data collection and basic processing

GPR profile positions were permanently marked in the field by non-conductive plastic pegs at the respective start/end positions and survey tapes allowed the accurate collection of quarterly repeat surveys, using the respective centre frequency sample spacings listed in Table 1, over the five year monitoring period. Sensors&Software PulseEKKO1000™ equipment was used to collect 2D common offset (CO) profiles, using antenna sets of 110 MHz, 225 MHz, and 450 MHz centre-frequency (acquisition parameters listed in Table 1). Throughout the monitoring period, vertical sample stacking (repeats) was set to 32 for consistency. Data were processed in Sandmeier ReflexW© version2 software, using sequential ‘dewow’ and Ormsby bandpass filters, static corrections to align time-zero within each trace, and a gain function based on the energy decay curve within each trace (Table 2). No form of migration is applied since this would collapse the diffraction hyperbolae which are the key focus of our analysis. Additionally, there is no topographic variation across the site hence static corrections are constant for each profile.
Representative time-lapse profiles acquired over the wrapped-pig grave are shown in Figure 1, the full suite of which is later supplied to semblance analysis for additional characterisation. The response to the wrapped-pig burial was a diffraction hyperbola, typically prominent throughout the survey period for all antenna frequencies acquired.

**Table 1.** Acquisition and relevant parameters for GPR antennae used in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre-frequency (MHz)</th>
<th>Spatial sampling interval (m)</th>
<th>Temporal sampling interval (ns)</th>
<th>Antenna separation (m)</th>
<th>Approx. 1st Fresnel zone footprint diameter (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 1. Representative GPR 2D profiles, from 110, 225 and 450 MHz records over the wrapped-pig grave, acquired 12, 24, 36, 48 and 60 months after the creation of the graves. All profiles were 5 m wide. After Pringle et al. (2012b).
2.4 Semblance as a measure of data quality

Semblance is commonly applied in seismic and GPR velocity analysis routines (see, e.g., Yilmaz, 2001; Porsani et al., 2006; Fomel and Landa, 2014), which seek to derive a subsurface velocity distribution from travel-time relationships in a dataset. Typically, semblance analysis is applied to reflection hyperbola in the common midpoint (CMP) domain, where the travel-time, \( t(x) \), of energy reflected from the horizontal base of homogeneous, isotropic, overburden is approximated by the ‘normal moveout’ (NMO) equation:

\[
t(x)^2 = t_0^2 + \left( \frac{x^2}{V_{ST}^2} \right), \tag{Eq. 1}
\]

where \( x \) is the source-receiver offset, \( t_0 \) is the travel-time to that base at \( x = 0 \), and \( V_{ST} \) is termed ‘stacking velocity’, a near-offset approximation to root-mean-square velocity \( V_{RMS} \). For the case of a single overburden layer, \( V_{RMS} \) is equivalent to interval velocity, \( V_{INT} \), the propagation velocity within any one interval of the subsurface. The semblance statistic then provides a measure of the coherency of energy along trial trajectories defined by the substitution of trial pairs of \( V_{ST} \) and \( t_0 \) into Equation (1).

However, the data considered in this study were profiles of common offset (CO) data and the responses to be analysed in semblance analysis were diffraction, rather than reflection, hyperbolae. As such, the NMO equation was reconfigured for diffraction trajectories in the CO profile, such that travel-time, \( t(x) \), was approximated as:

\[
t(x)^2 = t(x_0)^2 + \left( \frac{4(x-x_0)^2}{V_{ST}^2} \right), \tag{Eq. 2}
\]
with $x$ redefined as the position along a profile, $x_0$ as the surface position vertically above the diffracting target and $t(x_0)$ as the travel-time to the target when antennas are positioned at $x_0$ (see Ristic et al., 2009). By substituting trial $x_0$, $t(x_0)$ and $V_{ST}$ values into Equation (2), semblance is therefore measured along trajectories corresponding to diffraction hyperbolae in the GPR profile.

In addition to the objective definition of a subsurface velocity distribution from diffraction hyperbolae (as opposed to subjective curve-fitting), the semblance statistic could also provide an objective measure of data quality in terms of velocity resolution and signal-to-noise ratio (SNR). Assuming that the only changes within a time-lapse dataset are related to subsurface processes, and not environmental ones (e.g., ambient noise level), the changing semblance response could provide a proxy for the evolving reflectivity of the target and/or its detectability against background noise levels.

The relationship between signal-to-noise ratio and semblance-derived parameters was explored for synthetic GPR data (Fig. 2a), simulated using GprMax (see Giannopoulos, 2005). Specifically, synthetic data were used to investigate how variations in SNR are manifested in the peak magnitude and the velocity resolution expressed by a semblance response. The simulation represented the GPR response over a point diffractor, located at a depth of 0.7 m within a homogeneous layer of constant interval velocity of 0.12 m/ns; the GPR pulse was approximated by a 500 MHz Ricker wavelet, transmitted from a monostatic antenna with a spatial sampling interval of 0.01 m. Normally-distributed random noise amplitudes were
scaled and added to the synthetic data, to give SNR of +10 dB. The semblance response (Fig. 2b), computed in Mathworks Matlab® for ranges of $V_{ST}$ and $t(x_0)$ substituted into Equation (2), showed a characteristic arrangement of peaks which correspond to the slower stacking velocities expressed by successive wavelet half-cycles, given their increasing delay from first-break (see Booth et al., 2010a for background). Semblance trajectories were defined for an aperture of 240 traces, i.e., for $x = 1.2$ m either side of the target diffraction (blue box in Fig. 2c), located vertically beneath $x_0 = 2.5$ m. The source pulse is dominated by the second wavelet half-cycle (Fig. 2c), hence the peak semblance magnitude, $S_M$ (a dimensionless quantity), was measured for the second semblance peak; here, $S_M = 0.703$. The half-width of the same semblance peak spanned a range of stacking velocities from $\sim 0.117$ m/ns to $0.127$ m/ns, hence $v_{ST}$ resolution is the velocity enclosed by this range, $\approx 0.01$ m/ns.

**Fig. 2.** Synthetic 500 MHz GPR diffraction hyperbola (a), showing the response to a point diffractor. The semblance response (b) is calculated within a 2.4 m-wide aperture. The second semblance peak is picked, since this corresponds to the largest-magnitude of the four wavelet half-cycles labelled in (c).
Since semblance is a measure of wavelet coherency, an increase in the underlying noise level (i.e., a reduction in SNR) should reduce $S_M$. In Figure 3a, $S_M$ is measured for the synthetic data as SNR is increased from -10 dB to +20 dB, and reduces sharply for SNR < +2.5 dB. For the time-lapse applications of this study, assuming that noise is stationary, $S_M$ would be expected to vary as (e.g.) the reflectivity of the target changes, or with changes to the attenuation characteristics (typically associated with changing water saturation) of the overburden. Given the link to water saturation, the latter process may also be associated with a reduction in $v_{ST}$.

The resolution of stacking velocity $v_{ST}$ in a semblance panel is a function of the travel-time moveout (the difference between $t(x)$ and $t(x_0)$) displayed by a diffraction hyperbola; the greater the moveout that is expressed, the better the resolution of $v_{ST}$ will be (Booth et al., 2011). If a wavelet undergoes greater attenuation, it follows that it will be visible in an increasingly narrow aperture around the diffraction hyperbola, and therefore display less travel-time moveout. We simulated this effect in Figure 3b by reducing the semblance aperture across which the synthetic data were analysed, from 2.4 to 0.4 m (corresponding to travel-time moveout reducing to 0.5 ns). The curves in this plot span the half-width of the resulting semblance peaks (as shown in Fig. 2b), therefore a narrower span implies superior resolution. Note that this ‘funnel-shaped’ plot was observed by Booth et al. (2011) for semblance analysis of CMP gathers, suggesting that the behaviour of the semblance statistic is independent of the domain in which it is applied. For a fixed analysis aperture, the
resolution of velocity can also be used as a proxy SNR, since a higher-amplitude wavelet will be perceptible across a longer moveout range.

Fig. 3. Characteristics of semblance responses for modified synthetic data. a) Peak semblance magnitude, $S_M$, is increased for higher SNR within the synthetic data. b) The half-width of semblance peaks spans a narrower range of stacking velocity (i.e., improved resolution) for hyperbolae perceived across a wider aperture, corresponding to a longer travel-time moveout.

3. Data Analysis

Characteristics of the semblance response were used to quantify the assessment of GPR data quality. For all data analysed, we recorded:

1) the peak magnitude of the semblance response, $S_M$, to the diffraction hyperbola within each input profile;

2) the stacking velocity ($v_{ST}$) at which $S_M$ is expressed;

3) the half-width of the peak semblance response, to quantify the resolution of $v_{ST}$, and;

4) the travel-time, $t(x_0)$, at which $S_M$ is expressed.
While quantifying the assessment of GPR data quality, any systematic variation in these quantities could also be diagnostic of some decompositional process acting on the burials, or a change in the local overburden.

All GPR profiles were exported from ReflexW© processing software into Mathworks Matlab® for semblance analysis, and continuous time series of semblance characteristics could be derived for the five-year study period. All semblance analyses considered a range of trial stacking velocities from 0.05-0.12 m/ns, in increments of 0.0001 m/ns. The reference position, $x_0$, was taken in all cases to be 2.4 m (the position of the trace in which the apex of the diffraction hyperbola was perceived), and $t(x_0)$ spanned a range from 0-30 ns in increments equal to the temporal sampling interval of the input data (see Table 1). The semblance analysis window also spanned an interval equivalent to one temporal sample, to give the highest-resolution semblance response (see Booth et al., 2011 for background). The analysis aperture was fixed at 4 m in all cases, consistent with the widest range of traces over which the diffraction hyperbola could be perceived.
4. Results

Figure 4 shows diffraction hyperbolae in GPR 2D profiles, and their corresponding semblance responses. This illustrative example, shown here for profiles acquired over the graves one year after their creation (the ‘12 MTH’ set of profiles in Fig. 1), was repeated for all profiles in the study. The hyperbolic curves which overlie the profiles were defined by substituting the \( V_{ST} \) and \( t(x_0) \) pair expressed at the peak semblance response (as annotated in Fig. 4) into Equation (2). The 110 MHz response showed the highest peak semblance (> double that of the other diffractions) but, consistent with its lower frequency (Booth et al., 2011), the poorest velocity resolution.

Although the 2D profiles were acquired over the same target, each hyperbola expressed a different stacking velocity and travel-time. This effect was partly attributable to effects of target geometry (i.e., the size of the target scattered different components of each frequency-limited wavelet), but also to the incorrect assumption in Equation (2) that there is zero offset between antennas (i.e., a monostatic GPR system). No correction was made for this since it would require a priori knowledge of the RMS velocity, but the necessary travel-time corrections could be included into the semblance analysis if required. Nevertheless, the semblance parameters we obtained should not be interpreted in terms of absolute subsurface properties (e.g., dielectric permittivity, or target radius; see Shihab and Al-Nuaimy, 2005; Ristic et al., 2009 for background); instead, they were simply the quantities that the hyperbolae express. However, since the geometry of the acquisition surveys never changed throughout the survey period due to the permanent marked lines, relative differences
between successive semblance responses could be related to a change either in subsurface properties or ambient conditions. Note that both cadaver decomposition (specifically the chest cavity collapse) and soil compaction would lead to a gradual deepening of the target top as burial time increases (see Pringle et al. 2012b), but this was not deemed to significantly affect the data shown here.

![GPR 2D profiles](image)

**Fig. 4.** Representative GPR 2D profiles acquired 12 months after burial, with corresponding calculated semblance analyses for (a) 110 MHz, (b) 225 MHz and (c) 450 MHz data. Arrows and corresponding annotations in semblance panels (right) indicate the respective peak semblance response.
The time series for $v_{ST}$, $v_{ST}$ resolution and $t(x_0)$ are shown in Figure 5. Resolution was represented by the vertical $v_{ST}$ error bar, and the colour of the symbol corresponds to $t(x_0)$. The time series of semblance magnitude is shown in Figure 6. Abbreviations W, SP, SU and A correspond respectively to seasons of the year (defined here as the complete months of January-March for winter, April-June for spring, July-September for summer, and November-December for autumn).

No long-term trend was perceived throughout the observations for the wrapped-pig grave, for any semblance parameter or indeed antenna frequency; however, there was limited seasonality indicated within the $V_{ST}$ and $S_M$ series. Stacking velocities tended to increase during the spring and summer months (an increase of $\sim$0.01-0.02 m/ns compared to winter and autumn). This observation was consistent with soil moisture budget calculations of Jervis and Pringle (2014), who showed that the site was significantly drier during summer. These trends were supported by crossplots in which $V_{ST}$ data are separated according to the season acquired (Fig. 7).

In contrast to $V_{ST}$, semblance magnitudes exhibited reductions ($\sim$5-10%) in spring and summer compared to their values in autumn and winter, potentially suggesting that the reflectivity of the wrapped-pig burial is weakest when the soil was driest (i.e., a stronger dielectric contrast exists between the grave and a moist soil). This effect was most apparent in the 450 MHz record; in the crossplot in Figure 7c, $V_{ST}$ and $S_M$ are anti-correlated, but the equivalent relationship is weaker for the 110 and (especially) 225 MHz records.
Fig. 5. Time series of stacking velocity (symbols) with velocity resolution (error bars) and travel-time (symbol colour), calculated by semblance analysis of 110 MHz, 225 MHz and 450 MHz diffraction hyperbolae data.
Fig. 6. Time series of semblance magnitude, $S_M$, expressed by semblance analysis of 110 MHz, 225 MHz and 450 MHz diffraction hyperbolae.

Fig. 7. Crossplots of $V_{ST}$ versus $S_M$ for (a) 110 MHz, (b) 225 MHz and (c) 450 MHz profiles. Symbols are coloured according to season acquired (see legend).
Interestingly, even with the pig cadaver gradually decomposing and with some overlying soil compaction occurring over the five year study period, the combined $V_{ST}$ and $t(x_0)$ quantities consistently estimated the depth of the burial as 0.50 m ± 0.07 m, suggesting that geometric changes were not significant (see Shibab and Al-Nuaimy, 2005). The 1st Fresnel zone footprints (see Cassidy et al. 2011 for background) of the different radar centre frequency antennae (Table 1) were also not found to be problematic in detecting the target burial.
5. Discussion

In their study of simulated grave sites, Jervis and Pringle (2014) quantified the resistivity response of wrapped- and naked-pig burials over a five year monitoring period, and cautioned that seasonal variations may make grave-related anomaly(s) undetectable at certain times of the year, in particular the summer. Although limited primarily to the study of the wrapped-pig grave, the quantitative semblance analyses we have performed show, by contrast, no evidence of a systematic evolution of GPR properties over the course of the survey, and only a small seasonal control on the responses. GPR methods are therefore unlikely to be readily sensitive to changes in the condition of a burial, and are instead more directly influenced by the environmental state (e.g., water content) of the host soil material. This insensitivity likely impedes the forensic application of GPR semblance analysis to date a burial. However, by contrast with resistivity methods (Jervis and Pringle, 2014), there was also no time of the year which could be described as obstructive to GPR methods; hence a forensic search team could expect similar results from the GPR survey regardless of when the survey was conducted.

The highest semblance magnitudes were typically observed for the 110 MHz data (their mean $S_M$ was 13%, and 20%, higher than those of the 225 MHz and 450 MHz series, respectively), presumably because SNR in the low frequency dataset was higher given the reduced signal attenuation. While antenna frequencies should be chosen on a site and/or target-specific basis, we suggest that semblance analysis offers no practical limitation on the lowest recommendable frequency, an observation made by other researchers (e.g. Schultz and Martin, 2011; Pringle et al. 2012b).
Semblance analysis was a promising means of quantifying the assessment of GPR data profiles, but only where targets (such as wrapped-pig burials) were expressed as diffraction hyperbolae. The method would be unsuitable for assessing data in which targets do not present prominent diffractions, including the majority of the 2D profiles acquired over the naked pigs (Pringle et al. 2012b). However, in these cases, it may be possible to conduct equivalent semblance analyses but for data acquired as CMP gathers, although these are significantly more time-consuming to collect (see Booth et al. 2010b). A future development of the method would be to incorporate the finite offset of the GPR antennas into the semblance calculation or, alternatively, obtain the zero-offset response from the CO profile by the application of dip moveout (DMO) methods (e.g. see Jakubowicz, 1990). In this way, semblance-derived parameters would be more interpretable in terms of the underlying physical properties of the subsurface and, potentially, the geometry of the burial.
6. Conclusions

This study showed a quantitative method of assessing GPR diffraction hyperbolae from simulated graves, with semblance-derived quantities of stacking velocity, velocity resolution and semblance magnitude all useful to this end. Data from the wrapped-pig grave were consistently able to undergo semblance analysis, featuring strong diffraction hyperbolae. The lowest frequency (110 MHz) acquisition consistently featured the highest signal-to-noise ratio responses, albeit with the lowest resolution.

In contrast to the electrical resistivity surveys detailed in Jervis and Pringle (2014), there was no detectable long-term temporal trend observed with the GPR data over the survey period, although Pringle et al. (2012b) noted a qualitative tendency for hyperbolae to reduce in amplitude as burial time increased. This gives confidence that GPR could detect a wrapped burial much older than five years in a comparable study setting of a sandy loam, semi-rural, environment. Subtle seasonal variations were observed with increased velocities and lower reflectivity in summer months, but not to the extent that seasonality would preclude a forensic radar survey in summer.

We recommend further development of quantitative GPR analysis of forensic data, and suggest further research on control data, from a range of study settings, to validate the derivation of subsurface properties and determine the long-term sensitivity of semblance analysis to established decomposition trends.
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Appendix A. Supplementary data

Raw GPR profiles will be made downloadable as Sensors&Software formatted data files, in a WinZip archive. [NOTE TO EDITOR/REVIEWER: These will be uploaded at a later date, as I couldn’t upload them as a single Zip file through the journal website].
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