

## Highlights of 2024–2025

The *Litigator's Handbook of Forensic Medicine, Psychiatry, and Psychology* was written for expert litigators and litigators' experts. Editor-in-chief Dr. Demosthenes Lorandos has brought together a world-class team of more than 40 experts and litigators to help judges, lawyers, and experts deal with expert evidence in forensic medicine, psychiatry, and psychology. The handbook provides attorneys and experts with the tools necessary to handle scientific evidence in the courts, with step-by-step guidance on how to use and challenge experts and ensure favorable rulings under Daubert, Kumho Tire, Frye, and other legal standards on expert testimony.

### Topics covered include:

- The admissibility of expert evidence
- Direct and cross-examination of experts
- Forensic medicine, psychiatry, and psychology
- Statistics for lawyers
- Independent medical examinations
- Forensic autopsies
- Sexual abuse examinations
- False memories
- Interrogative suggestibility
- Capacity to waive Miranda warnings
- Assessment of competence and criminal responsibility
- Malingering
- Involuntary commitment
- Neuropsychological and neurobehavioral evidence in tort cases
- Child custody and child protection issues
- Child sexual abuse interviews
- Professional standards for clinical psychiatry and psychology
- Child sexual abuse accommodation syndrome and rape trauma syndrome
- Munchausen by Proxy
- Violence risk assessment and evaluation
- Forensic neuropsychological and neurological evaluation of violence

- Sex offender evaluation and risk assessment [new]

The handbook is built to meet the needs of attorneys who deal with forensic science issues—from criminal defense attorneys, prosecutors, judges, death penalty specialists, personal injury attorneys, insurance defense attorneys, family law practitioners, and civil rights specialists.

Wherever practicable, each of these chapters follows an introductory section with an explication of what the relevant subject matter looks like when the expert's work is done well (the good), descriptions and case law examples illustrating how to keep less-than-adequate or unreliable expert testimony out (the bad), and examples that could be used in argumentation about the consequences of getting it wrong (the ugly).