Made available through Montana State University's ScholarWorks

Audio forensic interpretation of the Trump rally assassination attempt (13 July 2024)

ROBERT C. MAHER

Accessibility Disclaimer:

For a more accessible version of this document, please submit an accessibility request form through the Montana State University Library website.

Audio forensic interpretation of the Trump rally assassination attempt (13 July 2024)*

ROBERT C. MAHER, *AES Fellow*
(rmaher@montana.edu)

Electrical & Computer Engineering, Montana State University, Bozeman, Montana, USA

This is a case study describing the rapid audio forensic assessment of recordings from the assassination attempt against presidential candidate Donald Trump in Butler, PA, on Saturday July 13, 2024. Audio from the podium microphones revealed gunshot sound sequences of ballistic shock waves and muzzle blast sounds consistent with rifle bullets traveling at supersonic speed. Additional independent audio evidence was captured by cell phone videos recorded by individuals in the crowd at the time of the shooting. The acoustical consistency between the podium microphone signal and the audio from the numerous user-generated cell phone videos, provided strong confidence of authenticity. Within a few hours of the incident, audio forensic analysis identified ten audible gunshots, with the first eight coming from a single position consistent with the subsequent identification of the would-be assassin's body, and two other shots attributable to law enforcement officers.

0 INTRODUCTION

On Saturday, July 13, 2024, a shooting incident took place at an outdoor rally held by presidential candidate Donald J. Trump at the Butler Farm Show grounds in Butler, Pennsylvania. Gunshot sounds were detected in audio from the venue's podium microphones, as well as from cell phone video recordings made by amateur bystanders who happened to be recording during the shooting incident. From the various audio recordings, gunshot sounds continued for approximately 16 seconds.

This paper describes audio forensic methods and analytical techniques used in the initial hours and days after the incident to answer scientific questions posed by news organizations reporting on the shooting. Unlike the relatively slow and methodical work typically done in acoustical research, this case study demonstrates the contemporary expectations of journalists and the public to receive authoritative information in the age of social media speculation with virtually instant promulgation.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. First, a brief summary is provided of the manner in which a forensic audio examiner works with a client to maintain scientific objectivity.

Next, the characteristics and initial findings from the lectern microphone are summarized. Finally, the very unusual situation of having multiple user-generated recordings of the shooting sequence is considered, followed by a concluding summary.

1 STARTING AN AUDIO FORENSIC EXAMINATION

Audio forensics is among the forensic sciences used to evaluate evidence that may ultimately be used in a court of law or as part of a formal scientific inquiry [1]. Among the challenges of forensic examination is avoiding bias in the investigation. Whether the examination request comes from a prosecutor, defense attorney, potential litigant, or a journalist, the audio forensic examiner is ethically bound to use only the audio evidence presented, not extraneous non-audio information nor potentially prejudicial statements about the desired results of the investigation. In the adversarial legal process or in the story construction of a journalist, the audio forensic examiner is not an advocate for a particular conclusion, nor for a particular side in a dispute. The examiner must therefore keep the investigators and advocates at arm's length to avoid either conscious or unconscious influence upon the scientific examination.

*To whom correspondence should be addressed, e-mail: rmaher@montana.edu

DRAFT

In this case, for example, the request for forensic examination came from a series of professional journalists beginning just 35 minutes after the shooting incident took place in Butler, PA. Authorities at the scene were not releasing information, so the reporters asked whether recordings of gunshot sounds they had obtained from the scene could help understand the circumstances of the shooting incident. The reporters initially stated that witnesses had heard "small-arms fire" and that there was evidence of injuries at the venue. They made available to me various audio recordings obtained confidentially through their regular reporting process, then requested my audio forensic interpretation without further influence.

2 GUNSHOT ACOUSTICS SUMMARY

A conventional firearm uses a confined combustion of gunpowder to propel the bullet out of the gun barrel. The sound energy emanating from the barrel is referred to as the *muzzle blast*, which typically lasts for less than 3 milliseconds. The sound of the rapid combustion is emitted from the gun in all directions, but most of the acoustic energy is expelled *in the direction the gun barrel is pointing*. Thus, the recorded sound will depend upon the orientation of the firearm with respect to the microphone [2,3,4].

The muzzle blast acoustic wave propagates through the air at the speed of sound (e.g., c = 343 m/s at 20°C), and is partially reflected, absorbed, and diffracted by surrounding surfaces and obstacles. This inevitable mixture of sound due to the direct sound of the firearm and the overlapping acoustic reflections and reverberation creates a complicated pattern that depends upon the firearm type, orientation, acoustical surroundings, and relative location of the microphone.

In addition to the sound of the muzzle blast, a bullet traveling at supersonic speed V, where $V > c$, creates another source of sound. The projectile's supersonic travel through the air causes a cone-shaped shock wave (miniature sonic boom) that propagates outward along the bullet's path. The sound of the ballistic shock wave can be detected down range along the bullet's path. The shock wave cone expands outward with its wavefront moving at the speed of sound, and inner cone angle θ_M depending upon the *Mach Number*, $M = V/c$, as given in Equation 1 [3].

$$\theta_M = arcsin\left(\frac{1}{M}\right) \qquad (1)$$

A projectile traveling at a speed much greater than the speed of sound will create a narrow shock wave cone, while a projectile traveling at a speed just barely above the speed of sound will have a broad shock wave cone, as shown in Figure 1 [1].

The supersonic projectile carries the ballistic shock wave down range faster than the propagation of the muzzle blast sound. Therefore, a microphone located down range from the firearm will receive the bullet's shock wave "crack" sound prior to the arrival of the muzzle blast's "pop" sound, as depicted in Figure 2 [6].



Figure 1: Shock wave cone geometry for a supersonic projectile.



Figure 2: A supersonic bullet traveling toward the microphone: the bullet's shock wave reaches the microphone before the sound of the muzzle blast.

As the supersonic bullet travels down range, its supersonic speed V outpaces the sound of the muzzle blast which is propagating at speed c, and therefore the time gap between the arrival of the shock wave and the arrival of the muzzle blast increases down range, The result is a distinctive "crack-pop" sequence comprising two successive impulsive sounds, one due to the shock wave and one due to the muzzle blast [5].

The time lag (t_{diff}) between the ballistic shock wave arrival and the muzzle blast arrival depends upon the speed of sound (c), the average speed of the bullet (V), and the distance between the firearm and the microphone. Thus, given estimates of these parameters, the predicted distance between the firearm and microphone can be estimated from the measured time lag, as shown in Equation 2 [6].

$$distance = \frac{t_{diff}}{\left(\frac{1}{c} - \frac{1}{V}\right)} \qquad (2)$$

A bullet decelerates as it travels through the air due to frictional losses. The deceleration depends upon aerodynamic details of the bullet and other physical factors. It is typical to use experimental methods to characterize the muzzle velocity and deceleration characteristics of different types of ammunition.

An important detail is that the ballistic shock wave of a supersonic bullet propagates outward and *forward* along the bullet's trajectory. Therefore, an observer to the side of or behind the gun barrel will not receive the ballistic shock wave, while recordings from a position down range from the rifle will show evidence of the shock wave arrival (see Figure 3).



Figure 3: The ballistic shock wave from a supersonic bullet propagates as an expanding cone trailing the bullet. Observers to the front of the gun barrel and down range along the bullet's path will detect the shock wave, while observers to the side and the gun will not be in the shock wave's path. Once launched, the shock wave propagates at the local speed of sound.

An additional factor for interpreting gunshot sounds is the effect of the recording system and signal encoding format. The position and quality of the microphones built into consumer recording devices is often unknown, users may inadvertently cover the device's microphones with their fingers, and the perceptual audio coding used to process the audio may not be able to preserve precise timing and amplitude details with impulsive sounds such as gunshots.

3 THE FIRST OBSERVATIONS: LECTERN MICROPHONE

About 35 minutes after the shooting incident on July 13, 2024, journalists made available footage from news cameras that had been covering the rally in a routine manner. The news video showed what had happened on the podium, and the soundtrack captured the sounds recorded by lectern microphones. The reporters shared witness remarks from the scene that "small arms fire" had been heard, but no details were shared about the physical orientation of the rally venue, stage, bleachers, and audience configuration.

The lectern left and right channel audio and the corresponding spectrograms at the time of the first audible gunshots are shown in Figure 4. The first step of formal audio forensic analysis, *critical listening*, identified that most of the gunshot sounds consisted of "crack-pop" sequences, indicating supersonic bullets on a trajectory generally toward the lectern microphones [7].

The audibly identified gunshot sounds were confirmed in the lectern audio using the standard audio forensic techniques of *waveform analysis* and *spectral analysis* [7]. The audio forensic interpretation was that the recording contained three audible gunshots (A, B, C) in quick succession, then a barrage of five shots (D, E, F, G, H), then two more shots (I, J): a total of ten audible gunshots.



Figure 4: Waveforms and spectrograms of lectern microphone audio, with manual indication of gunshot sounds (A-J).



Figure 5: Waveform and spectrogram of the first three audible shots (A, B, C), from the lectern microphone.

The first three shots from the lectern microphone recordings are depicted in Figure 5. The time interval shown is 4.5 seconds, beginning with Mr. Trump uttering the words "Take a look at what happened," then the sequence of three shots (labeled A, B, and C), and shouts from the Secret Service officers and crowd noise.

In the lectern recording, the time gap between shock wave and muzzle blast is approximately $t_{diff} = 217$ milliseconds. The type of rifle and ammunition used was not known immediately after the incident, so as is customary in audio forensic analysis, a typical speed for a rifle bullet is assumed for initial calculations, subject to refinement later in the investigation. A typical assumption is $V = 800$ meters per second.

The ambient air temperature at the time of the rally was above 30 Celsius, giving the speed of sound estimate $c = 350$ m/s. Using the assumed average bullet speed, air temperature, and $t_{diff} = 217$ ms, Eqn. 2 gives the estimate that the firearm causing shots A, B, and C was 135 meters from the podium. Note that if the actual average supersonic bullet speed over the path from the firearm to the microphone was as slow as 600 m/s or as fast as 900 m/s (Mach 1.7 to 2.6), the distance estimate would be between 182 and 124 meters, indicating the importance of verifying the likely average bullet speed over the trajectory.

3.1 The next five gunshots

After the sequence of three shots A, B, and C, there was a gap of about two seconds in the audio from the podium video, then a sequence of five shots in quick succession, labeled D-H in Figure 6. The shock wave and muzzle blast crack-pop sequences for shots D-H were of similar amplitude and time lags to shots A-C, although the cadence of shots D-H was sufficiently rapid that the shock wave arrival of subsequent shots overlapped the muzzle blast arrival of prior shots. Audio forensic analysis of the signals from the lectern microphone indicated that the sounds of the first eight shots were indistinguishable acoustically and therefore likely to be from the same firearm and location, but a scientifically-supported conclusion could not be justified from a single recording.

3.2 The final two gunshots

Critical listening, waveform analysis, and spectral analysis identified two more gunshot sounds, designated I and J, in the podium recording (see Figure 4). The character of these impulsive sounds differed from the eight shots A-H because no clear crack-pop sequence was observed for either I or J, and those two shots also differed from each other. The absence of the crack-pop sequence *could* indicate that the shots came from a firearm with ammunition that was not supersonic (e.g., a typical handgun), *or* that the orientation of the firearm(s) making those shots and the geometry of the venue was such that the shock wave and muzzle blast did not both impinge on the microphone (refer to Figure 3).

At this point, just a few hours after the incident on July 13, 2024, my audio forensic investigation determined that eight very similar crack-pop sequences took place in the span of about six seconds, and that the timing of those sequences indicated that the shots likely came from a single firearm (rifle with supersonic ammunition) at an estimated distance of approximately 135 meters from the podium, with distance uncertainty due to the unknown characteristics of the ammunition used. The other two audible shots (I and J) could not be fully understood from only the lectern recordings.

DRAFT



Figure 6: Waveform and spectrogram of the first three audible shots (A, B, C), followed by the next five audible shots (D-H), from the lectern microphone.

4 ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS: THE AMATEUR BYSTANDER VIDEOS

Within a few hours of the incident, the professional journalists began to receive videos sent to them or posted online by attendees at the rally who happened to have been recording with their handheld smartphones during all or some portion of the shooting incident. These *user-generated recordings* (UGRs) were from locations all over the rally venue. Some of the recordings were from many minutes before the first audible shot, while others included the sound of the gunshots from the users' camera locations.

The reporters were manually able to "geolocate" many of the camera positions in the UGRs by recognizing reference points from the rally scene in still frames from the video. Each UGR was assigned an arbitrary identification number and then made available to me for analysis. To maintain objectivity, the UGRs were handled as evidence, with no additional commentary from the reporters.



Figure 7: Example geolocation information for several of the user-generated recordings (i.e., arbitrary identification 005, 023, 028, etc.).

The location of several of the UGRs that contained sounds relevant to the audio forensic investigation are shown in Figure 7, superimposed on a Google Earth image of the rally location.

4.1 Initial review of several user-generated recordings

As the user-generated recordings were received over the next 48 hours, the audio forensic analysis process proceeded by performing critical listening, waveform analysis, and spectral analysis of each available recording.

One of the first recordings received, ID "076," was recorded from a location near a chain link fence north of the podium. The video showed law enforcement officers looking toward the roof of a tan metal-sided building, and several audible utterances of individuals shouting, "*he has a gun!*" in the moments before the gunshots are audible. The waveform and spectrogram of UGR 076 are shown in Figure 8.

Another UGR, this one with ID "006," was recorded from an entirely different location southeast of the podium area. The waveform and spectrogram of UGR 006 are shown in Figure 9.

Audio forensic observations from UGR 076 (north location) and UGR 006 (southeast location) gave the timing comparison shown in Table 1, each referenced to the time of shot A. Even though the two recording locations were separated by approximately 150 meters, the timing comparison of each of the first eight shots (A-H) relative to shot A is within 20 milliseconds.



Figure 8: Waveform and spectrogram from user-generated recording 076.

TABLE 1: Timing comparison in seconds for audible shots in recording 076 and 006.

Shot ID	Recording 076	Recording 006	Difference
A	0.000	0.000	0.000
B	0.859	0.858	0.001
C	1.538	1.535	0.003
D	4.329	4.317	0.012
E	4.584	4.573	0.011
F	4.768	4.787	-0.019
G	4.945	4.938	0.007
H	5.104	5.085	0.019
I	5.869	5.801	0.068
J	15.927	15.794	0.133



Figure 9: Waveform and spectrogram for user generated recording 006.

Considering the facts that the recordings contain noise and shouting, the audio was processed with a perceptual audio coder (MP4), and the mobile phones were moving somewhat during the recording interval as the individuals making the recordings turned and took a few steps, the audio forensic interpretation of the relatively small timing discrepancies in this comparison indicated that the first eight shots were indeed likely from the same shooting location.

4.2 Reviewing more of the user-generated recordings

As additional UGRs became available, it was possible to determine the relative onset timing of the audible gunshots compared to the first muzzle blast sound in each recording. For example, a visual comparison of five UGRs is shown in Figure 10, with the alignment based upon the first muzzle blast sound in each recording (shot A).

As was noted in the initial comparison of recordings 076 and 006, the relative timing of shots A-H is found to be consistent among the UGRs.

The audio forensic conclusion from these observations was that shots A-H each came from the same location, so that the relative time-of-arrival of the sound at each microphone was the same. The observation that shots I and J exhibit different time lags in different recordings indicates that those two shots were not from the same location as shots A-H, and furthermore, were not from the same location as each other.



Figure 10: Five example concurrent user-generated recordings of the gunshot sequence. The eight identified gunshot sounds A-H show onset synchrony, while shots I and J are asynchronous. The conclusion is that shots A-H came from a single location, while shots I and J were from two other (and different) locations.

Within a few days, more UGRs became known, and ultimately thirteen of the user-generated recordings captured all ten audible shots. A graphical depiction of the relative time-of-arrival of each shot is shown in Figure 11. The small timing difference (within 20 ms) for shots A-H among the thirteen UGRs provided additional support for the audio forensic conclusion that the first eight audible shots came from a single location.

The relative timing of shots I and J showed a greater difference among the thirteen UGRs, with a discrepancy among the UGRs of more than 200 ms for shot I and more than 400 ms for shot J. The audio forensic conclusion is that shots I and J came from different locations than shots A-H.

4.3 Interpretation of shots I and J

At this point in the investigation, the professional reporters sought an explanation for audible shots I and J. It became known from witnesses and official reports that a Secret Service counter-sniper had shot the assassination suspect, so there was an assumption that one of those two audible shots was from a Secret Service rifle.

Comparison of shot sounds I and J in the thirteen UGRs showed significant differences in signal amplitude and apparent presence or absence of a crack-pop sequence. As noted in Figure 3, the presence of a ballistic shock wave depends upon the trajectory of the bullet with respect to the microphone. The UGRs from the area west of the podium, such as 006 and 023, did not show a discernable and consistent crack-pop sequence for shots I and J, while recordings such as UGR 076 from north of the podium showed some evidence of a shock wave and muzzle blast combination. However, the interpretation was not as clear and consistent as had been observed for the initial shots A, B, and C from the lectern microphone recording.

Another issue when the bullet trajectory is not directly toward the microphone is depicted in Figure 12. This has been studied in prior investigations (e.g., see reference 6, section 6, for a discussion of the bullet trajectory geometry and timing considerations).



Figure 11: Relative timing comparison for sequence of ten shots A-J observed at 13 locations. The first eight shots (A H) have consistent relative timing. Shots I and J have notably different relative timing among the recordings.



Figure 12: Shock wave geometry for bullet trajectory a distance "d" from the microphone.

Ultimately, the audio forensic conclusion was that because shots I and J were not fired directly toward any of the recording devices, the crack-pop observation and timing (Equation 2) based upon the geometry of Figure 2, which is based upon the assumption that the bullet trajectory is very close to the microphone, was simply not valid for shots I and J.

5 CONCLUDING REMARKS

This case study described how audio forensic analysis was applied immediately after the Trump assassination attempt in Butler, Pennsylvania, on Saturday, July 13, 2024. From the audio forensic standpoint, the case included an unprecedented number of concurrent user-generated recordings of gunshots from the scene of a tragic criminal shooting incident. These user-generated recordings provided essential corroborative information that lessened the likelihood of manipulated audio surfacing on social media sites, or unfounded claims gaining traction on the internet. Had anyone come forward with a recording that purported to have a different sequence of gunshot sounds, it would be hard to explain in light of the numerous—and consistent—UGRs available in this case. While the multiple audio recordings available from this incident largely prevented hoaxes from confusing the situation, the potential for forged material remains a challenge for future sensational incidents with fewer concurring recordings.

In the weeks and months since the incident, physical evidence and witness reports from the scene have confirmed that a single shooter with an AR-15 style rifle fired eight shots from the roof of a building approximately 130 meters north of the podium. A law enforcement officer standing on the ground northeast of the podium fired one rifle shot toward the perpetrator on the roof (shot I), and then a Secret Service counter-sniper officer on the roof of a structure southeast of the podium fired one rifle shot (shot J) that killed the suspect [8].

The FBI described the perpetrator's firearm as a DPMS Panther Arms-produced AR-15–style rifle with a 16-inch (41 cm) barrel, chambered in 5.56×45mm NATO. Although the exact ammunition type and bullet weight has not been disclosed, the description is .223 Remington caliber cartridges with a Hornady ammunition headstamp [9]. Published velocity information for an example 223 Hornady BTHP Match 75 grain bullet indicates a muzzle speed of 841 m/s, slowing uniformly to 749.5 m/s at a distance of 135 meters [10]. The average example bullet speed is therefore 795 m/s, which agrees remarkably well with the original audio forensic assumption of 800 m/s. Should additional information become available regarding the exact nature of the perpetrator's ammunition, this calculation can be revisited.

These updated findings are consistent with the initial audio forensic observations of shots A-H being from one location approximately 135 meters from the podium, and two additional shots (I and J) coming from two other locations.

6 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This paper was enabled using information provided by many professional journalists, including the reporters and contributors who produced the following articles.

- CNN, "Forensic analysis suggests at least 2 weapons were fired at Trump rally" (2024 July 26), https://www.cnn.com/politics/live-news/trump-rally-shooting-07-14-24#h_e3b77ce122987eb5d2059a2dff21a270 (accessed April 28, 2025)
- New York Times, "Speculation swirls about what hit Trump. An analysis suggests it was a bullet" (2024 July 26), https://www.nytimes.com/2024/07/26/us/politics/trump-shooter-bullet-trajectory-ear.html?unlocked_article_code=1._U0.xNxX.CWDTVlrG2bXu&smid=url-share (accessed April 28, 2025)
- CBS News, "Trump rally gunman fired 8 shots in under 6 seconds before he was killed, analysis shows" (2024 July 25), https://www.cbsnews.com/news/trump-rally-gunman-fired-eight-shots-under-six-seconds-before-being-killed-by-secret-service-analysis-shows/ (accessed April 28, 2025)
- Washington Post, "Obstructed view may have delayed sniper response at Trump rally" (2024 July 16), https://wapo.st/4dgWL0M (accessed April 28, 2025)
- New York Times, "Videos show suspect lying motionless on nearby rooftop after shooting" (2024 July 13), https://www.nytimes.com/2024/07/13/us/politics/trump-rally-shooting-suspect-video.html?unlocked_article_code=1.7E0.nKME.53cFMyEafhM-&smid=url-share (accessed April 28, 2025)
- Audio file source: CSPAN, "Gunshots at Former President Trump's Rally," July 13, 2024, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qLybWj-ojck (accessed April 28, 2025)
- Audio file source: TMZ, "Trump rally gunman seen opening fire & getting killed seconds later in new video," July 13, 2024, https://www.tmz.com/watch/2024-07-14-071324-

alleged-shooter-on-roof-1863912-620/
(accessed April 28, 2025)

- Audio file source: Yeshiva World News, @YWNReporter, https://x.com/YWNReporter, July 13-22, 2024, https://x.com/search?q=from%3AYWNReporter%20until%3A2024-07-22
(accessed April 28, 2025)

7 REFERENCES

[1] R.C. Maher, *Principles of Forensic Audio Analysis* (Springer Nature Switzerland, 2018). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-99453-6

[2] B.E. Koenig, S.M. Hoffman, H. Nakasone, and S.D. Beck, "Signal Convolution of Recorded Freefield Gunshot Sounds," *J. Audio Eng. Soc.*, vol. 46, no. 7/8, pp. 634-653 (1998 July/August).

[3] R.C. Maher, "Acoustical Characterization of Gunshots," Proceedings IEEE SAFE 2007: Workshop on Signal Processing Applications for Public Security and Forensics, Washington, DC, pp. 109-113 (2007 April). https://doi.org/10.1109/IEEECONF12259.2007.4218954

[4] S.D. Beck, H. Nakasone, and K.W. Marr, "Variations in Recorded Acoustic Gunshot Waveforms Generated by Small Firearms," *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, vol. 129, no. 4, pp. 1748-1759 (2011 April). https://doi.org/10.1121/1.3557045

[5] R.C. Maher and S.R. Shaw, "Deciphering Gunshot Recordings," *Proceedings Audio Eng. Soc. 33rd Conference, Audio Forensics—Theory and Practice*, elib 14410, Denver, CO (2008 June).

[6] R.C. Maher, "Interpretation of Audio Forensic Information from the Shooting of Journalist Shireen Abu Akleh," *Proceedings of the 153rd Audio Engineering Society Convention*, Express Paper 22, New York, NY (2022 October).

[7] D.R. Begault, S.D. Beck, and R.C. Maher, "Overview of Forensic Gunshot Analysis Techniques," *Proceedings of the 2019 Audio Engineering Society International Conference on Audio Forensics*, elib 20475, Porto, Portugal (2019 June).

[8] United States Senate Committee On Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, "Examination of U.S. Secret Service Planning and Security Failures Related to the July 13, 2024, Assassination Attempt," Interim Joint Report, pp. 84-86 (2024 September).

[9] U.S. House Task Force on the Attempted Assassination of Donald J. Trump, "Final Report of Findings and Recommendations," p. 125 (2024 December).

[10] Sniper Country, ".308 Win vs. .223 Rem – Cartridge Comparison" (2020 Oct 3), https://www.snipercountry.com/308-vs-223/
(accessed July 8, 2025)

DRAFT

THE AUTHOR



Robert C. Maher

Dr. Robert C. (Rob) Maher is a Professor of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Montana State University in Bozeman, MT USA. He joined the faculty in August 2002, after prior work in both academia and industry. He holds a BS degree from Washington University in St. Louis, an MS degree from the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and a Ph.D. from the University of Illinois-Urbana, all in Electrical Engineering. His research and teaching interests are in digital signal processing, with particular emphasis upon audio forensic analysis.

Dr. Maher is a Fellow of the AES, and formerly served as Associate Technical Editor (2007-2024) and Deputy Editor-In-Chief of the AES Journal (2022-2024). He is a Senior Member of IEEE, a member of the Acoustical Society of America, and an Associate Member of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences. He is the author of the book "Principles of Forensic Audio Analysis" (Springer, 2018).

DRAFT