



Kent Academic Repository

Ives, G, Johns, Sarah E. and Deter, Chris (2024) *Sexual Dimorphism of Pelvic Scarring: A New Method of Adult Biological Sex Estimation*. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 00 . pp. 1-13. ISSN 0022-1198.

Downloaded from

<https://kar.kent.ac.uk/106491/> The University of Kent's Academic Repository KAR

The version of record is available from

<https://doi.org/10.1111/1556-4029.15587>

This document version

Publisher pdf

DOI for this version

Licence for this version

CC BY (Attribution)

Additional information

Versions of research works

Versions of Record

If this version is the version of record, it is the same as the published version available on the publisher's web site. Cite as the published version.

Author Accepted Manuscripts

If this document is identified as the Author Accepted Manuscript it is the version after peer review but before type setting, copy editing or publisher branding. Cite as Surname, Initial. (Year) 'Title of article'. To be published in **Title of Journal** , Volume and issue numbers [peer-reviewed accepted version]. Available at: DOI or URL (Accessed: date).

Enquiries

If you have questions about this document contact ResearchSupport@kent.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in KAR. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our [Take Down policy](https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies) (available from <https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies>).



Sexual Dimorphism of Pelvic Scarring: A New Method of Adult Biological Sex Estimation

Journal:	<i>Journal of Forensic Sciences</i>
Manuscript ID	JOFS-24-188.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Paper
Keywords:	Forensic Anthropology, Pelvic scarring, Biological profile, Sex estimation, Preauricular sulcus, Interosseous cavity

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Sexual Dimorphism of Pelvic Scarring: A New Method of Adult Biological Sex Estimation

ABSTRACT

Estimating biological sex is a crucial aspect of forensic anthropology, and is pivotal in forensic investigations. Presently, the most frequently adopted osteological sex estimation methods focus on the anterior pelvis, which is easily susceptible to postmortem damage, revealing a need for additional accurate methods. This study introduces a novel method for estimating adult sex through metric pelvic scar analysis, using a known skeletal sample (169 females; 51 males). Relationships between sex and scar dimensions were subjected to Kendall's tau-B testing, and the strongest associated measurements were further analyzed using binary logistic regression to determine their predictive capacity. The final estimation method was tested on an additional known-sex sample of 43 males and 43 females from the Spitalfields skeletal collection.

All associations between biological sex and scar measurements were significant, with the preauricular sulcus and newly defined inferior interosseous cavity presenting the strongest relationships ($p < 0.001$ – 0.004). Individual regression models using the approximate volume of each feature predicted sex with over 80% accuracy, but when combined in a single regression model, the accuracy increased to an impressive 97.1%. When then applied to the validation sample, the final estimation model achieved an accuracy of 90.7%. These results highlight the high estimation accuracy achieved by simultaneously utilizing the approximate volume of the sulcus and the inferior cavity. This is not only highly accurate but also utilizes the sturdier posterior pelvis, making it a promising tool for forensic investigations and the wider field of osteology.

KEYWORDS

Forensic anthropology, pelvic scarring, biological profile, sex estimation, preauricular sulcus, interosseous cavity

HIGHLIGHTS

- Pelvic scar severity is associated with biological sex.

- Females present with more severe scarring at all sites except for the pubic tubercle.

- Posterior scarring is the most dimorphic, indicating higher sacroiliac tension in females.

- Analysis of scarring around the auricular surface can estimate sex with over 97% accuracy.

For Peer Review

INTRODUCTION

Biological sex estimation is a central process in identifying unknown individuals in forensic cases, and thus, the ability to confidently estimate sex is vital. The most widely adopted estimation methods focus on the pelvis, which is known to provide highly accurate results [1-3]. Such methods typically involve the analysis of the shape of pelvic features known to respond to the pubertal changes associated with the reproductive role of mature females. In Buikstra & Ubelaker's publication on the standards for osteological data collection [4], well-known pelvic techniques for estimating sex are highlighted [4-6]. However, Klaes [7] reports that methods involving the categorical and morphological analysis of dry-bone pubic features are the most frequently used today, despite a modern trend in the increased use of computational tools. The most popular examples of such methods include that from Phenice [5] and the more recent adaptation from Klaes [8], both of which have been extensively validated [7]. However, as Walker [6] and Dar & Hershkovitz [9] explain, in focusing on the anterior pelvis, which is more likely to suffer postmortem damage, such methods are not always appropriate.

Moving away from methods that use key structural features of the pelvis for biological sex assessment, some researchers have investigated the dimorphic significance of more specific pelvic scar features. This allows for a focus on smaller pelvic details, including potential scarring around the auricular surface that may be more likely to escape postmortem damage. As scar sites are small, it also facilitates the easy transition towards metric methodology often expressed as favourable in more recent research [7].

Pelvic Scarring and Biological Sex

Pelvic scarring occurs at localized sites of soft tissue attachment, including ligamentous attachments at the anterior and posterior pelvis, and tendinous attachments on the pubis. Historically, scarring is believed to be associated with hormonal changes or physical stress caused by obstetric events [10] - attributed to the widespread skeletal laxity, increased pressure upon the musculoskeletal pelvis and

1
2
3 abdominal muscles, and significant expansion of the pelvic structures associated with gravity
4 (pregnancy) and parity (birth) [11-15]. However, many researchers suggest reservations about linking
5 scarring with obstetric events [16-22].
6
7

8
9
10 As a result, many studies have considered the theory that pelvic scarring at varying sites is evidence
11 of osteological dimorphism [19-20, 22, 23-31]. The modern female pelvis is believed to have evolved
12 to compensate for the difficulty in birthing introduced by bipedal adaptations [15, 32], resulting in the
13 development of a significantly broader, more gynecoid pelvis [32] - potentially **increasing** connective
14 tissue tension and resulting in bony alterations. This theory is partially supported by studies that found
15 an association between broader pelvises and **preauricular sulcus development** [31, 33], with one also
16 noting **a similar relationship** with dorsal pubic pitting [33]. Maxwell [34] also discovered that relaxation
17 of pelvic connective tissues and subsequent articular diastasis occurs during cyclical periods of
18 heightened estrogen, while Micussi et al. [35] found that pelvic floor muscle tone increases during the
19 follicular and luteal phases of the menstrual cycle. Thus, it is possible that scarring could also arise, or
20 at least be exacerbated by, regular periods of simultaneous muscle tension and pelvic flexibility.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35
36 Considering the presence of preauricular scarring on the ilium, most studies agree that the mere
37 binary assessment of sulcus presentation cannot confidently determine biological sex [23, 19-20, 25-
38 26, 30-31]. However, upon consideration of the variable nature of sulcus presentation, dimorphism
39 has been widely reported in both morphological studies [23, 25, 30-31] and metric studies [19, 22, 27]
40 - associating female sex **with** increased preauricular sulcus severity. In a rare dispute, Spring et al. [20]
41 recorded significant preauricular cavitation in few cases, suggesting a reduction in the dimorphic
42 significance.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 A similar general trend can be observed in the dimorphic presentation of pitting on the dorsal pubis
53 [19, 22, 27-28]. Andersen [19] was the first to thoroughly investigate dorsal pitting, highlighting that
54 feature absence is likely in biological males while the presence is common in over half of all females.
55
56
57
58
59 Further studies have since supported Andersen's findings [27-28] while Praxmarer et al. [22] observed
60

1
2
3 a higher female incidence of pitting. Furthermore, Andersen [19] and Praxmarer [22] also metrically
4
5 assessed scar severity at the dorsal pubis, both noting that pitting was consistently larger in biological
6
7 females.
8
9

10 This interosseous groove develops at the site of interosseous ligament insertion, starting at the dorsal
11
12 aspect of the superior demi face of the auricular surface and extending along the inferior dorsal border
13
14 – but always terminating before the posterior inferior iliac spine [24]. Işcan & Derrick [24] were some
15
16 of the first to note that the interosseous groove was observed in almost all females but only a small
17
18 percentage of males, suggesting that the presence of such is highly indicative of being biologically
19
20 female and vice versa - a theory supported later studies [19, 29]. Regarding scar severity at this site,
21
22 research suggests that females are also more likely to present with increased interosseous scarring
23
24 [27, 29]. In contrast, Gohil et al. [26] found only a weak association between biological sex and
25
26 interosseous groove presence. However, as discussed by Andersen [19] and Houghton [23],
27
28 discrepancies in conclusions may be influenced by the challenge of identifying this feature, given the
29
30 rugged nature of the retroauricular surface.
31
32
33
34
35

36 Further studies have also considered scarring in the form of iliac tuberosity or pubic tubercle extension
37
38 [19, 22, 24, 26-27]. Işcan & Derrick [24] first highlighted that sexual dimorphism was less pronounced
39
40 when analyzing the iliac tuberosity compared to other scar features. Similarly, Gohil et al. [26] found
41
42 a significant but weak association between this feature and biological sex, while others found no
43
44 significant relationship [19, 27]. Praxmarer et al. [22] and Mass & Friedling [27] also metrically
45
46 investigated the possibility of an association between the extension of the pubic tubercle and sex.
47
48 Interestingly, opposing the trend observed through the analysis of other significant scar features,
49
50 these studies found a positive association between tubercle extension and being biologically male.
51
52
53
54
55

56 *Summary and Study Aims*
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 A review of relevant literature highlights the potential for further investigation into the sexual
4 dimorphic presentation of common scar sites – particularly the preauricular sulcus, interosseous area,
5 dorsal pubis, and pubic tubercle, which previous studies largely agree have some association with
6 biological sex. Despite some promising results, few studies have applied a uniform metric analysis
7 method across multiple sites. Therefore, exploration into the predictive power of pelvic scarring has
8 been limited, and no frequently adopted sex estimation method using pelvic scar analysis has been
9 developed to date.

10
11
12 This study aims to metrically assess these scar sites to investigate the aetiology of pelvic scarring from
13 a biological sex perspective, and develop the most accurate possible sex estimation method based on
14 those scars identified as having the highest predictive potential. This process involves the examination
15 of a skeletal collection of known sex while enhancing the solely categorical grading methodology of
16 many previous studies. In doing so, scar features were assessed individually and in combination where
17 appropriate, while maintaining awareness of the issues associated with existing multi-feature
18 methods.

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

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Skeletal Samples

A sample of 169 females and 51 males from The Texas State Donated Skeletal Collection (TXSTDSC) were examined, facilitating the analysis of a large modern American population with known personal data, including confirmed biological sex. Only adult donors were selected for this study to ensure the most explicit osteological expression of sexually dimorphic features, with samples excluded in instances where bilateral pubic symphyseal or sacroiliac fusion or skeletal trauma made it impossible to observe all pelvic scar sites. As a result, the age range of the full sample was 21 - 103 years old, with a mean age of 68.2. The age range for the female sample only was also 21 - 103, but with a mean of 67 years. For males, the range was reduced to 29 - 97, with a mean age of 69.2. However, the exact age at death of six males was unknown, but they had been confirmed to be adults at the time of donation. Unfortunately, 90% of the individuals in the sample were white, representative of the ancestry bias of the skeletal collection.

To later validate the sex estimation method developed as part of this research, an additional skeletal sample from the Christ Church Spitalfields Collection, comprised of individuals interred across the 18th and 19th centuries, was used. This sample included 43 males and 43 females, aged between 21 and 89 at the time of death, as established based on the coffin plate associated with each individual. Among the male validation sample, ages spanned from 21 to 81, with a mean age of 53.1. In contrast, the female sample age ranged from 23 to 89, with an average age of 56.3. Those selected were well-preserved and conformed to the exclusion criteria established with the initial sample. The ancestry information for this sample was not known.

Data Collection Process

1
2
3 During the original data collection process, and the later validation study, measurements were taken
4
5 from all scar sites on the left side of the pelvis where possible (See Figure 1). Where scar features on
6
7 the left side were too damaged to analyze or the associated pelvic elements were missing entirely,
8
9 scarring on the right side was assessed. Measurements were conducted blindly to avoid unintentional
10
11 bias as a result of knowing the sex of each individual during the data collection process, thereby
12
13 maximizing result validity. In collecting the data, existing metric methods from Snodgrass & Galloway
14
15 [21], Maass [36], and Waltenberger et al. [10, 37] were used as a guide, with some adaptations.
16
17 However, the technique used in this study to analyze pelvic scarring resulting from dorsal sacroiliac
18
19 ligament interaction is novel. Here we focused solely on cavitation confined to the dorsal borders of
20
21 the auricular surface, rather than considering changes across the retroauricular surface.
22
23
24
25

26 Intra-observer testing of the first 20 cases in the original sample was carried out before continuing
27
28 data collection for the remaining 200 to ensure no significant differences amongst repeated measures.
29
30 There was a one-week delay between initial and secondary measurements, and the latter results were
31
32 recorded blind to those obtained during the first assessment. Where there was a difference between
33
34 the two measurements, the mean value was calculated and used as the final variable result in each
35
36 case.
37
38
39
40
41

42 *Dorsal Pubic Pitting*

43
44 Maximum pitting measurements on the dorsal surface of the pubis were recorded following a similar
45
46 process to that outlined by Waltenberger et al. [10, 37]. Pit width was recorded as the measurement
47
48 perpendicular to the symphyseal surface, and depth as the maximum distance from the dorsal pubic
49
50 surface to the base of the deepest pit using the calliper depth rod. Pitting length was measured as the
51
52 full measurement of the pit parallel to the surface of the symphysis (see Figure 2) (note that 'length'
53
54 was used instead of 'height', as seen in some studies, to maintain terminology consistency throughout
55
56 this research). Where there were multiple independent pits, length measurements were taken across
57
58 all of them, with an additional length measurement taken across the longest pit separately.
59
60

Preauricular Sulcus

Sulcus width and depth measurements were taken for all individuals following the methodology outlined by Maass [36]. The maximum width was measured at the widest point perpendicular to the anterior edge of the auricular surface, and maximum depth was recorded as the deepest point of the sulcus floor from the unaffected surface level. In this research, an additional measurement of maximum length was also taken, which was observed as the measurement of the depression as it runs parallel to the auricular surface (see Figure 3). Note that in most cases, this depression should be clearly visible - but where it is exceptionally shallow, the edges of the sulcus should still be palpable and traceable to facilitate measurement. This is the first known study to utilize all three measurements from the preauricular sulcus.

Pubic Tubercle Extension

When measuring pubic tubercle extension, the methodology developed by Snodgrass & Galloway [21] was followed with minimal deviations. Measurement was taken from the line of the natural pubis curve to the centre of the tubercle extension apex (see Figure 4). However, unlike previous studies, this research preserves metric readings and does not place results into general descriptive categories.

Interosseous Cavitation

Traditionally, the study of interosseous scarring involves width and depth assessment across the full attachment site of the interosseous ligament [10, 23-24, 36-37]. Given that scarring on the retroauricular surface can be challenging to identify and analyze, this research focuses solely on the cavity formed by auricular surface lipping at the dorsal edge(s) first discussed by Houghton [23] (hereon referred to as interosseous cavitation) (see Figure 5). When analyzing interosseous cavitation,

1
2
3 maximum length measurement was comparable to that of Maass' [36] interosseous analysis method
4
5 in accounting for the entire length of the inferior ramus cavity. Specific to this research, a second
6
7 measurement was also taken along the superior dorsal edge in cases where a cavity was present. This
8
9 was not the case in all donors, but where it was, it acted as a continuation of the inferior cavity
10
11 following a small, although variable, hiatus. Auricular lipping determined depth and width
12
13 measurements for each cavity. Even in minor cases, lipping facilitates a maximum width measurement
14
15 between it and the retroauricular floor over which it extends. Meanwhile, the maximum depth was
16
17 defined as the measurement from the edge of the auricular lip to the deepest point of the cavity,
18
19 where measurement is not impeded by iliac tuberosity thickening. In cases where cavitation is
20
21 especially shallow or narrow, there may be small pauses in cavitation along the separate inferior or
22
23 superior lengths, but for the purpose of simplifying maximum length measurements, these were
24
25 disregarded.
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 *Statistical Analysis*

33
34 All statistical analyses were conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics version 28, with results considered
35
36 significant at the standard threshold of $p < 0.05$. Following data collection for the first 20 cases,
37
38 measurements were retaken, and initial intraobserver checks were carried out using Cronbach's Alpha
39
40 internal consistency test [39] – with Phi interpreted based on the criteria established by Rea and
41
42 Parker [40]. The categories are as follows: negligible (< 0.099), weak (0.1 - 0.199), moderate (0.2 –
43
44 0.399), moderately strong (0.4 – 0.599), strong (0.6 – 0.799), and very strong (> 0.8). Meanwhile,
45
46 Kendall's Tau-b (tb) testing was used to gain insight into relationships between sex and scar
47
48 measurement variables, where significant correlations are classified as strong at 0.3 or higher [41].
49
50 The data met all required assumptions for each analysis.
51
52
53

54
55 In preparation for further analyses, measurements indicating a strong association with sex were
56
57 checked for potential multicollinearity. This was done by assessing inter-variable correlations and
58
59 consultation with collinearity diagnostics as guided by Field [42]. As appropriate, variables were then
60

1
2
3 utilized in the production of logistic regression models to determine their predictive potential –
4
5 adhering to a standardised residual limit of ± 2.5 recommended by Filler & DiGabriele [43], to reduce
6
7 outlier influence but not overly restrict the effect of natural biological variation. Independent variable-
8
9 logit linearity was also confirmed for final regression model predictor variables using the Box-Tidwell
10
11 [44] procedure with Bonferroni correction [45].
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

For Peer Review

RESULTS

Intra-observer Error

Repeat measure testing for all scar variables across all 20 cases produced a high Cronbach's Alpha of 0.999, reflecting excellent consistency between test pairs and high measurement precision [38]. This is further evident in Table S1, which presents the intra-observer results as mean values for each scar measurement variable.

Descriptive Statistics and Metric Correlations

Table S2 presents the descriptive statistics for all individual scar measurements for both male and female groups separately, including maximum, mean, and standard deviation values. The percentage of males and females for which each feature was absent has been presented in place of the minimum value, as this was zero in all cases. This table shows that there is almost no dimorphic variation in pubic tubercle extension absence. All remaining features are absent in a higher percentage of males than females, with a minimum percentage of 66.9% superior cavity and 75.7% dorsal pubic pitting absence across both sex groups. Absence occurrence was significantly reduced for the inferior cavity, with a maximum value of 19.6%, as evident in the male sample. The preauricular sulcus results were the most dimorphic, with absence observed in 45.1% of males and 6.5% of females. Meanwhile, the maximum, mean, and standard deviation values were consistently higher across all measurement variables for females compared to males. The only exception was pubic tubercle mean, which was higher in the biological male group.

All tau-b correlations between variable measurements and biological sex were significant, (see Table S3). The most prominent feature was the preauricular sulcus, which presented a strong correlation (τ_b

1
2
3 >0.3) with biological sex across all three measurements. This was followed by the inferior interosseous
4 cavity, where width and depth displayed strong correlations ($\tau_b = 0.448$ and 0.444), while the length
5 was moderately correlated ($\tau_b = 0.223$). Consequently, these scar features were selected as the focus
6 of further analysis.
7
8
9

10
11
12 Ahead of logistic regression analysis, the key measurements were checked for multicollinearity. Upon
13 consultation with standard regression collinearity diagnostics, no significant findings were noted, but
14 the strongest variable pairs for both the sulcus and inferior cavity were strongly intercorrelated at $r =$
15 $.781$ and $r = .721$, respectively. Therefore, to avoid potential cases of discreet multicollinearity while
16 allowing for the use of all measurements for both key variables, their dimension measurements were
17 cubed to create an approximate volume variable for use in regression analysis. Correlation statistics
18 for these two new variables can also be found in Table S3 (highlighted in bold) - for which further
19 descriptive statistics, including absence percentage, have been presented in Table 1.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 31 32 *Single-variable Logistic Regression Models*

33
34 Echoing the information revealed in Table S2, Table 1 reveals that the preauricular sulcus is absent in
35 over 45% of males but only 6.5% of females, meanwhile the inferior interosseous cavity is absent in a
36 reduced 19.6% of males and 2.4% of females. Furthermore, it shows that biological females had
37 significantly higher maximum, mean, and standard deviation values for these two key approximate
38 volume variables.
39
40
41
42
43
44

45
46 Data regarding the single-variable logistic regression models generated using these variables can be
47 found in Tables 2 and 3 (data not in bold). Both single-variable models were statistically significant (p
48 $= <.001$). The approximate volume of the preauricular sulcus alone can explain a substantial proportion
49 of the variation in biological sex (67.9%). In identifying an increase of 1mm in sulcus volume associated
50 with a 4.7% increase in the odds of an individual being biologically female, this model accurately
51 classified 86.5% of cases, with a higher sensitivity than specificity. A lower odds ratio was observed in
52 the inferior interosseous cavity model, with a 3.9% increase in the odds of being biologically female
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

per 1mm measurement increment. Separately, inferior interosseous cavity volume explained a slightly lower 52.2% biological sex variation than the sulcus volume model. In this case, specificity was reduced to just over 56% - and as a result, the overall accuracy of the inferior cavity model was decreased to 80.2%.

Multi-variable Logistic Regression Model

A final regression model was developed using both key features in combination, conforming to the same biological sex threshold as the single-variable models. The information in bold in Tables 2 and 3 provide the final regression model statistics, and Figure 6 offers the prediction graph corresponding with the multivariable equation statistics in bold in Table 3.

First expanding upon the absence percentages detailed in Table 1, further analysis reveals that only 3 males did not present with either of the final key scar features, equating to only 5.9% of the male sample. Meanwhile, just 1 female had neither scar feature (0.6% of the female sample). Combining these variables produced the most robust prediction model, again highly statistically significant ($p < .001$). When both approximate volume measurements were utilized simultaneously, the data analysis identified that for every 1mm increase in sulcus volume, there was a 9.5% increase in the odds of the individual being biologically female, while the same measurement increase in inferior cavity volume was linked to a 10% increase in the odds of being biologically female. This model produced a final accuracy of 97.1%, significantly reducing the disparity between sensitivity and specificity percentages – both of which were over 91%.

Method Validation – Application of the Final Predictive Model

Table 4 presents the results of the final sex estimation method as applied to the validation sample. These results have been categorised based on the likelihood of each individual being female given their approximate preauricular sulcus and inferior interosseous cavity measurements. Individuals identified as 'very likely' male fell within the less than 10% probability range for being female, while 'likely' males were classified as just 10-25% likely to be female. Conversely, 'likely' females were

1
2
3 identified based on a 75-90% predicted likelihood of being female, while an over 90% likelihood
4
5 indicated that an individual is 'very likely' female. Around the 50% separation line, individuals over
6
7 25% but less than 50% likely to be female were categorised as 'most likely' male, versus those
8
9 categorised as 'most likely' female at between 50% and 75% likely to be female.
10
11

12
13 This table reveals a final estimation accuracy of 90.7% across the sample - with a higher accuracy rate
14
15 for males than females, at 97.67% and 83.73%, respectively. This equates to the incorrect biological
16
17 sex estimation of just one male and seven females around the 50% predicted probability line assigned
18
19 by the method. Focusing on the male sample only, over 86% of all biological males, and 88.1% of those
20
21 correctly estimated, were categorised as very likely male. Meanwhile, 76.74% of the total number of
22
23 biological females, or 91.7% of all of those correctly estimated, fell into the very likely female category.
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

DISCUSSION

Data Analysis and Method Development

Initial analyses revealed that caution should be taken in associating scar occurrence with biological sex, with a maximum difference between male and female absence percentages for any one scar feature of 38.6. This means that in cases where feature absence is high in males, the presence of the same feature is also high. Similarly, when feature absence is very low in females, the same feature is absent in a maximum of 45.1% of males. Therefore, scar presence or absence cannot confidently indicate sex either way, as indicated by previous studies [19-20, 22-23, 25-28, 30-31]. However, all individual scar measurements were significantly correlated with biological sex. Most of these were positive, enabling us to deduce that larger values are associated with being biologically female. The only exception was pubic tubercle extension, where a larger measurement was more likely to be observed in biological males. These findings concur with those of previous studies [19, 22-23, 25, 27, 29-31]. The preauricular sulcus and inferior interosseous cavity presented the strongest relationship with biological sex, indicating that pelvic scar presentation is most sexually dimorphic at the sacroiliac joint of the pelvic girdle in agreement with Houghton [23].

The approximate volumes of the preauricular sulcus and the inferior interosseous cavity each proved effective in predicting biological sex, with overall accuracies of 86.5% and 80.2%, respectively. These results are comparable to the Walker [6] method of sex estimation using the sciatic notch, which has been found to produce an overall accuracy of between 80% and 89% [6, 46-47]. When comparing the models, the decrease in accuracy of the inferior cavity model can be primarily attributed to the prediction accuracy for males (model specificity). While the sex of biological females was predicted with 85-87.7% accuracy, male group accuracy reduced from 73.9% using sulcus volume, to just 56.3%

1
2
3 when using inferior cavity volume. Therefore, if analyzing only one of these scar features to estimate
4 biological sex, it would be advisable to concentrate on the sulcus volume, which, with an accuracy rate
5 of 86.5%, surpasses the average accuracy reported for existing sulcus-based methods of 81.4% [25,
6
7
8
9
10 30, 48].

11
12 Estimation accuracy was increased further when both approximate volume variables were integrated
13 into the ultimate regression model. This model significantly improved prediction percentages, with a
14 final accuracy of 97.1% - correctly identifying 98.8% of biological females and 91.7% of biological
15 males. This accuracy exceeds that of the Phenice [5] method, which initially achieved a 96% accuracy
16 in development, but later method validations have produced accuracies ranging from 59% to 88.4%
17 [1, 9, 49].

18
19 The final model incorrectly classified just six individuals in total, and no causal link was discovered
20 upon analysis of associated personal data – suggesting standard idiosyncratic variation as a cause of
21 outliers. The significant increase in specificity noted in this model also indicates that the majority of
22 incorrectly predicted male cases in the earlier models were not shared across the two. This
23 demonstrates that many of the volume measurement values responsible for incorrectly predicting sex
24 in either of the single-variable models appear to have been offset by the other volume measurement
25 in the final model. It is also crucial to note that no additional male outliers were excluded in
26 comparison to the earlier models, thereby supporting the conclusion of cross-variable inaccuracy
27 offset as opposed to the potential for accuracy increase via case removal. **Furthermore, with only 5.9%**
28 **of the male sample absent of both final method variables, we can be confident that there was a**
29 **minimal effect of male scar feature absence on method accuracy.**

50 51 52 53 *Method Validation*

54
55 The application of the final estimation method to the validation sample saw a reduction in overall
56 estimation accuracy to 90.7%, although this remains slightly higher than many validative studies for
57 frequently used morphological sex estimation methods, proving the method to be robust.
58
59
60

1
2
3 Interestingly, our validation study found a higher degree of accuracy for males (97.67%) compared to
4 females (83.73%) – which contrasts with the findings of the initial method development sample.
5
6 However, there was a higher degree of confidence within the correctly estimated female sample.
7
8
9

10 It was anticipated that the accuracy of the method might decrease when tested on an archaeological
11 population, having been developed using a modern one, with changes in population lifestyle and
12 health over time, which may be evident throughout the skeleton. However, one female in the sample
13 displayed particularly strong male features according to the Phenice [5] and Walker [6] methods, as
14 well as the method proposed in this study. Furthermore, five of seven incorrectly estimated females
15 presented with no preauricular sulcus at all, despite this feature being highly likely in females to some
16 degree [19, 23, 30]. Thus, we could consider the possibility that interment or exhumation errors could
17 have occurred - with biological sex determined based on the coffin plate associated with each
18 individual, potentially resulting in false negatives during osteological analysis. However, this may
19 simply be a result of idiosyncratic variation outside of the standard phenotypic female presentation.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 *Study Limitations*

36
37 In terms of the original skeletal samples used, there is a clear sex bias, with a larger female sample.
38
39 This was a result of data collection required for supplementary research within a broader study
40 framework, as well as the time constraints related to the international travel required. This was
41 partially compensated for by ensuring that the validation sample was comprised of an equal number
42 of males and females. In doing so, it was concluded that the sex bias of the original sample did not
43 have a significant impact on the sex estimation method developed, as the method was able to
44 correctly estimate the biological sex of the validation sample while maintaining a high degree of
45 accuracy.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 As previously stated, the validation sample was temporally older than that used to develop the
56 method, which may present issues in terms of a potential variation in sexually dimorphic skeletal
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 expression over time. However, the Christ Church Spitalfields Collection was selected as it is one of
4
5 very few large skeletal collections that are both well-preserved and have associated known biological
6
7 data for researcher reference. Therefore, given these qualities and the availability at the time when
8
9 methodological validation was possible, it was deemed the most suitable option despite temporal
10
11 incongruity.
12

13
14
15 Regrettably, due to the time and logistical restraints associated with the primary data collection, an
16
17 inter-observer study was not conducted as part of this research, although intra-observer testing was
18
19 diligently carried out. While it has been acknowledged that a lack of inter-observer testing can
20
21 promote validity and replicability concerns, the outcome of intra-observer study reveals a high level
22
23 of consistency. The methodology has also been written in a way that is hoped to facilitate further
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
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

Conclusion

This research has identified that the preauricular sulcus and the inferior interosseous cavity are particularly significant in biological sex estimation, and results are impressive when using the approximate volume of both scar features in combination. In the method development stage, the proposed method was shown to be the most accurate to date, and the validation process presented a slightly reduced, although still high, degree of accuracy. These findings therefore support the theory that pelvic scarring – especially that around the auricular surface – is likely a simple example of dimorphic presentation on the skeleton, with more extensive presentation indicating that an individual is biologically female. This would suggest a relationship between a broader female pelvis, the increased natural flexibility linked to reproductive processes, and subsequent increased musculoskeletal strain associated with these scar sites.

This method focuses on a specific and often well-preserved area of the pelvis, thus avoiding issues associated with multi-site methods and fragmented remains, making it applicable in more cases than

1
2
3 traditional macroscopic methods. We have also presented an estimation graph to facilitate easy
4 simultaneous interpretation of the approximate cubic values without the need for calculations.
5

6
7 However, the logistic regression equation would be recommended where final estimations lie close to
8 the central prediction line, which requires reference to Table 3, and the use of the following equation:
9

$$10 \text{ Probability} = P = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-(\beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2)}} \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19$$

20
21 In this equation, the constant coefficient (β_0) is -8.739 and the approximate volume variable
22 coefficients (β_1 and β_2) are 0.091 for the preauricular sulcus and 0.095 for the inferior interosseous
23 cavity. X_1 and X_2 refer to the corresponding input measurements for each case.
24
25

26
27
28 Going forward, further testing of this method using additional modern known-sex samples is
29 suggested to further validate the findings of this research, and supplementary biological factors should
30 be considered to identify any that might be influential. It would be of particular interest to investigate
31 whether the more extensive scarring in females is further enhanced by obstetric events or simply
32 serves as evidence of gravid potential due to a naturally broader and more flexible pelvic architecture.
33
34
35

36
37 Similarly, it is important to consider additional biological factors that may result in a more typically
38 female scar expression in biological males.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

REFERENCES

1. Lovell NC. Test of Phenice's Technique for Determining Sex From the Os Pubis. *Am J Phys Anthropol.* 1989;79:117–120. doi: 10.1002/ajpa.1330790112
2. Bytheway JA, Ross AH. A geometric morphometric approach to sex determination of the human adult os coxa. *J Forensic Sci.* 2010;55(4):859–864. doi: 10.1111/j.1556-4029.2010.01374.x
3. White TD, Black MT, Folkens PA. *Human Osteology*, 3rd edn. Burlington, MA: Elsevier Academic Press; 2012. p. 408-415.
4. Buikstra JE, Ubelaker DH. Standards for Data Collection from Human Skeletal Remains. Arkansas Archeological Survey Research Series No. 44. Fayetteville, Arkansas: Arkansas Archeological Survey; 1994. p. 15-20.
5. Phenice TW. A newly developed visual method of sexing the os pubis. *Am J Phys Anthropol.* 1969;30:297–301.
6. Walker PL. Greater sciatic notch morphology: Sex, age, and population differences. *Am J Phys Anthropol.* 2005;127(4):385–391. doi: 10.1002/ajpa.10422
7. Klales AR. Sex estimation using pelvis morphology. In: Klales AR, editor. *Sex Estimation of the Human Skeleton: History, Methods, and Emerging Techniques*. London, UK.: Elsevier; 2020. p. 75-93.
8. Klales AR, Ousley SD, Vollner JM. A revised method of sexing the human innominate using Phenice's nonmetric traits and statistical methods. *Am J Phys Anthropol.* 2012;149(1):104-114. doi: 10.1002/ajpa.22102

- 1
2
3 9. Dar G, Hershkovitz I. Sacroiliac joint bridging: Simple and reliable criteria for sexing the
4 skeleton. *J Forensic Sci.* 2006;51(3):480–483. doi: 10.1111/j.1556-4029.2006.00119.x
5
6
- 7 10. Waltenberger L, Rebay-Salisbury K, Mitteroecker P. Are parturition scars truly signs of birth?
8 The estimation of parity in a well-documented modern sample. *Int J Osteoarchaeol.*
9
10 2022;32(3):619-629. doi: 10.1002/OA.3090
11
12
- 13 11. Gillearn WL, Brown JMM. Structure and Function of the Abdominal Muscles in Primigravid
14 Subjects During Pregnancy and the Immediate Postbirth Period. *Physical Therapy.*
15
16 1996;76(7):750–762. doi: 10.1093/PTJ/76.7.750
17
18
- 19 12. Dehghan F, Haerian BS, Muniandy S, Yusof A, Dragoo JL, Salleh N. The effect of relaxin on the
20 musculoskeletal system. *Scand J Med Sci Sports.* 2014;24(4):220–229. doi:
21
22 10.1111/SMS.12149
23
24
- 25 13. Talbot L, Maclennan K. Physiology of pregnancy. *Anaesthesia & Intensive Care Medicine.*
26
27 2016;17(7):341–345. doi: 10.1016/J.MPAIC.2016.04.010
28
29
- 30 14. Theodorsen NM, Strand LI, Bø K. Effect of pelvic floor and transversus abdominis muscle
31 contraction on inter-rectus distance in postpartum women: a cross-sectional experimental
32
33 study. *Physiotherapy.* 2019;105(3):315–320. doi: 10.1016/J.PHYSIO.2018.08.009
34
35
- 36 15. Mitteroecker P, Fischer B. Evolution of the human birth canal. *Am J Obstet Gynecol.*
37
38 2022;230(3):841-855. doi: 10.1016/j.ajog.2022.09.010
39
40
- 41 16. Stewart TD. Personal identification in mass disasters. National Museum of Natural History,
42
43 Smithsonian Institution; 1970. doi: 10.5479/sil.30678.39088001440254
44
45
- 46 17. Holt CA. A re-examination of parturition scars on the human female pelvis. *Am J Phys*
47
48 *Anthropol.* 1978;49(1):91–94. doi: 10.1002/AJPA.1330490114
49
50
- 51 18. Suchey JM, Wiseley DV, Green RF, Noguchi TT. Analysis of dorsal pitting in the Os pubis in an
52
53 extensive sample of modern American females. *Am J Phys Anthropol.* 1979;51(4):517–539.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
doi: 10.1002/AJPA.1330510404

- 1
2
3 19. Andersen BC. Parturition Scarring as a Consequence of Flexible Pelvis Architecture [Doctoral
4 Dissertation]. Burnaby, Canada: Simon Fraser University; 1986.
5
6
7
8 20. Spring DB, Lovejoy CO, Bender GN, Duerr M. The radiographic preauricular groove: Its non-
9 relationship to past parity. *Am J Phys Anthropol.* 1989;79(2): 247–252. doi:
10 10.1002/AJPA.1330790212
11
12
13
14 21. Snodgrass JJ, Galloway A. Utility of dorsal pits and pubic tubercle height in parity
15 assessment. *J Forensic Sci.* 2003;48(6):1226–1230. doi: 10.1520/JFS2003027
16
17
18
19 22. Praxmarer EM, Tutkuvienė J, Kirchengast S. Metric and morphological analysis of pelvic scars
20 in a historical sample from Lithuania: Associations with sex, age, body size and pelvic
21 dimensions. *Int J Osteoarchaeol.* 2020;30(5):629–641. doi: 10.1002/oa.2887
22
23
24
25
26 23. Houghton P. The Relationship of the Pre-auricular Groove of the Ilium to Pregnancy. *Am J*
27 *Phys Anthropol.* 1974;41:381–390. doi: 10.1002/ajpa.1330410305
28
29
30
31 24. Işcan YM, Derrick K. Determination of Sex from the Sacroiliac Joint: A Visual Assessment
32 Technique. *Florida Scientist.* 1984;47(2):94–98.
33
34
35 25. Novak L, Schultz JJ, McIntyre M. Determining Sex of the Posterior Ilium from the Robert J.
36 Terry and William M. Bass Collections. *J Forensic Sci.* 2012;57(5):1155–1160. doi:
37 10.1111/j.1556-4029.2012.02122.x
38
39
40
41 26. Gohil D, Dangar K, Rathod Sp, Jethwa K, Singal G. A study of morphological features of ilium
42 for sex determination in Gujarat state. *J Res Med Dent Sci.* 2014;2(4):75-78. doi:
43 10.5455/jrmds.20142415
44
45
46
47
48 27. Maass P, Friedling LJ. Scars of Parturition? Influences Beyond Parity. *Int J Osteoarchaeol.*
49 2016;26(1):121–131. doi: 10.1002/OA.2402
50
51
52
53 28. McArthur TA, Meyer I, Jackson B, Pitt MJ, Larrison MC. Parturition pit: the bony imprint of
54 vaginal birth. *Skeletal Radiology.* 2016;45(9):1263–1267. doi: 10.1007/S00256-016-2418-3
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 29. Mahadevappa RG, Shivalingaiah N. Sex determination by post auricular sulcus in South
4
5 Karnataka. *Indian J Forensic and Community Medicine*. 2017;4(3):176–180. doi:
6
7 10.18231/2394-6776.2017.0038
8
9
10 30. Karsten JK. A test of the preauricular sulcus as an indicator of sex. *Am J Phys Anthropol*.
11
12 2018;165(3):604–608. doi: 10.1002/ajpa.23372
13
14 31. Canty SE. The preauricular sulcus in relation to sexual dimorphism, pregnancy and
15
16 parturition in humans [Doctoral Dissertation]. Liverpool, England: Liverpool John Moores
17
18 University; 2020.
19
20
21 32. Fischer B, Mitteroecker P. Allometry and Sexual Dimorphism in the Human Pelvis.
22
23 *Anatomical Record*. 2017;300(4):698–705. doi: 10.1002/ar.23549
24
25
26 33. Cox MJ. An Evaluation of the Significance of “Scars of Parturition” in the Christ Church
27
28 Spitalfields Sample [Doctoral Dissertation]. London, England: University College London;
29
30 1989.
31
32
33 34. Maxwell AF. Abstract of Discussion (Joints During Pregnancy, Thorpe and Fray, 1938). *J*
34
35 *American Medical Association*. 1938;111:1165–1166.
36
37 35. Micussi TM, FreiTas PR, Angelo HP, Soares ME, LeMos MT, Maranhão MT. Is there a
38
39 difference in the electromyographic activity of the pelvic floor muscles across the phases of
40
41 the menstrual cycle? *J Physical Therapy Science*. 2015;27:2233–2237. doi:
42
43 10.1589/jpts.27.2233
44
45
46 36. Maass P. The Bony Pelvis: Scars of Parturition and Factors Influencing their Manifestation
47
48 [Master’s Dissertation]. Capetown, South Africa: University of Cape Town; 2012.
49
50
51 37. Waltenberger L, Pany-Kucera D, Rebay-Salisbury K, Mitteroecker P. The association of
52
53 parturition scars and pelvic shape: A geometric morphometric study. *Am J Phys Anthropol*.
54
55 2021;174(3):519–531. doi: 10.1002/AJPA.24196
56
57
58 38. Zeller RA. Measurement Error, Issues and Solutions. In Kempf-Leonard K, editor.
59
60 *Encyclopedia of Social Measurement*. Elsevier Science; 2005. p. 665–676.

- 1
2
3 39. Cronbach LJ. Coefficient Alpha and the Internal Structure of Tests. *Psychometrika*.
4
5 1951;16(3):297-334.
6
7
8 40. Rea LM, Parker RA. *Designing and Conducting Survey Research - A Comprehensive Guide*,
9
10 4th edn. San Fransisco, CA: Jossey-Bass; 2014. p. 203-234.
11
12 41. Sharma RD. Chapter 12. In: *Elements of Statistics: A Hands-on Primer*, 2nd edn. Newcastle
13
14 Upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing; 2019. p. 174-177.
15
16 42. Field AP. *Discovering statistics using SPSS: (and sex and drugs and rock "n" roll)*, 3rd edn.
17
18 London, England: SAGE Publications; 2009. p. 233-250.
19
20 43. Filler MG, DiGabriele JA. *A Quantitative Approach to Commercial Damages*, 1st edn.
21
22 Hoboken, New Jersey: Wiley & Sons; 2012. p. 51-59.
23
24 44. Box GEP, Tidwell PW. Transformation of the Independent Variables. *Technometrics*.
25
26 1962;4(4):531–550. doi: 10.2307/1266288
27
28
29 45. Tabachnick BG, Fidell LS. *Using Multivariate Statistics*, 6th edn. New York: Pearson
30
31 Education; 2014. p. 33-52.
32
33 46. Bonczarowska JH, Bonicelli A, Papadomanolakis A, Kranioti EF. The posterior portion of the
34
35 ilium as a sex indicator: A validation study. *Forensic Sci Int*. 2019;294:216.e1-216.e6. doi:
36
37 10.1016/j.forsciint.2018.10.031
38
39
40 47. DesMarais A, Obertova Z, Franklin D. The influence of age on greater sciatic notch
41
42 morphology: testing the Walker method in an Australian population. *Int J Legal Medicine*.
43
44 2023;138(1):239-247. doi: 10.1007/s00414-023-02988-1
45
46
47 48. Inskip S, Scheib CL, Wohns AW, Ge X, Kivisild T, Robb J. Evaluating macroscopic sex
48
49 estimation methods using genetically sexed archaeological material: The medieval skeletal
50
51 collection from St John's Divinity School, Cambridge. *Am J Phys Anthropol*. 2019;168(2):340–
52
53 351. doi: 10.1002/ajpa.23753
54
55
56 49. Maclaughlin SM, Bruce MF. The Accuracy of Sex Identification in European Skeletal Remains
57
58 Using the Phenice Characters. *J Forensic Sci*. 1990;35(6):1384–1392. doi: 10.1520/JFS12974J
59
60

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

For Peer Review

TABLES

Table 1. Approximate volume variable statistics for all males (M) and females (F) separately.

Measurement variable	Scar feature absent (%)		Maximum value (mm)		Mean value (mm)		Std. Deviation	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Sulcus approximate volume	45.1	6.5	218.79	3074.6	23.04	318.63	36.983	378.5
Inferior cavity approximate volume	19.6	2.4	138.95	968.05	25.1	206.44	30.722	207.294

Table 2. Summary and classifications for single-predictor and combined logistic regression models (sulcus approximate volume and inferior cavity approximate volume).

Predictor variable(s) for the model	Sample (n)	Max ZResid. (1.d.p)	Chi-square (χ^2)	Sig. (p)	Nagelkerke (R^2)	% males (0) correctly predicted (specificity)	% females (1) correctly predicted (sensitivity)	Total % correctly predicted	Positive predictive value (%)	Negative predictive value (%)
Sulcus approx. volume	215	none	99.221	<.001	.679	73.9% (34 of 46)	89.9% (152 of 169)	86.5%	92.7%	66.7%
Inferior cavity approx. volume	217	none	90.437	<.001	.522	56.3% (27 of 48)	87% (147 of 169)	80.2%	87.5%	55.1%
Sulcus approx. volume and inferior cavity approx. volume	210	none	200.795	<.001	.935	91.7% (44 of 48)	98.8% (160 of 162)	97.1%	97.6%	95.7%

Table 3. Variables in the equation for single-predictor and combined logistic regression models (sulcus approximate volume and inferior cavity approximate volume).

Predictor variable for model	Equation variable	B	S.E.	Wald	Sig. (p)	Exp (B)	95% C.I. for Exp (B) – lower and upper boundaries	
Sulcus approx. volume	Predictor	.046	.009	27.247	<.001	1.047	1.029	1.065
	Constant	-1.249	.333	14.068	<.001	.287		
Inferior cavity approx. volume	Predictor	.039	.008	24.873	<.001	1.039	1.024	1.055
	Constant	-.741	.294	6.376	.012	.476		
Sulcus approx. volume and inferior cavity approx. volume	Sulcus vol. (predictor 1)	.091	.025	13.311	<.001	1.095	1.043	1.15
	Inferior cavity vol. (predictor 2)	.095	.028	12.035	<.001	1.1	1.042	1.161
	Constant	-8.739	2.499	12.231	<.001	.000		

Table 4. Validation sample classifications for male and female groups, based on the probability of being female according to the final estimation method (see Figure 6).

Sample	Classification ranges						Total accuracy = 90.7%
	Very likely male (<10%)	Likely male (10% - 25%)	Most likely male (25% - 50%)	Most likely female (50% - 75%)	Likely female (75% - 90%)	Very likely female (>90%)	
Biological males (n = 43)	37	4	1	0	0	1	
Accumulative male accuracy (left to right)	86.05%	95.35%	97.67%				
Biological females (n = 43)	4	2	1	3	0	33	
Accumulative female accuracy (right to left)				83.73%	76.74%	76.74%	
Total (n = 86)	41	6	2	3	0	34	

FIGURE LEGENDS

FIG. 1. Diagrams of the left os coxa indicating all four scar sites investigated in this study.

FIG. 2. Diagram of the left dorsal pubic surface featuring a large single pit. The white line represents the maximum length measurement, and the yellow line indicates the maximum width.

FIG. 3. Diagram of the left auricular area with preauricular sulcus. Once again, the white line represents the maximum length measurement, and the yellow line indicates the maximum width.

FIG. 4. Diagram of the anterior view of the left pubis with a large pubic tubercle. The black dashed line indicates the natural pubis curve across the base of the tubercle, from which the white line presents the measurement of the maximum extension to the centre of the extension apex.

FIG. 5. Diagrams of the medial view (left illustration) and inferior view (right illustration) of the left auricular surface indicating cavitation. The illustration on the left shows maximum length measurements for both the superior and inferior cavities, represented by white lines. The adjacent illustration presents the inferoposterior view of the inferior cavity, from the base of the auricular demiface apex. This image indicates the maximum cavity width (yellow line) and depth (blue line) measurements for the inferior cavity specifically.

FIG. 6. Graphical presentation of biological sex prediction based on interactions between the approximate volume of the inferior interosseous cavity and the approximate volume of the preauricular sulcus with axis measurements limited to 150mm to aid prediction boundary interpretation. Circled cases indicate those that were incorrectly estimated by the model.

*Note: 50% sex prediction threshold (<50% = male; >50% = female). 25% - 75% and 10% - 90% ranges represent the probabilities of being female, but each range can be reversed to represent the probability of being male.




FIG. 1. Diagrams of the left os coxa indicating all four scar sites investigated in this study.

63x91mm (236 x 236 DPI)

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. Diagram of the left dorsal pubic surface featuring a large single pit. The white line represents the maximum length measurement, and the yellow line indicates the maximum width.

83x83mm (157 x 157 DPI)




FIG. 3. Diagram of the left auricular area with preauricular sulcus. Once again, the white line represents the maximum length measurement, and the yellow line indicates the maximum width.

83x84mm (157 x 157 DPI)




FIG. 4. Diagram of the anterior view of the left pubis with a large pubic tubercle. The black dashed line indicates the natural pubis curve across the base of the tubercle, from which the white line presents the measurement of the maximum extension to the center of the extension apex.

83x84mm (157 x 157 DPI)




FIG. 5. Diagrams of the medial view (left illustration) and inferior view (right illustration) of the left auricular surface indicating cavitation. The illustration on the left shows maximum length measurements for both the superior and inferior cavities, represented by white lines. The adjacent illustration presents the inferoposterior view of the inferior cavity, from the base of the auricular demiface apex. This image indicates the maximum cavity width (yellow line) and depth (blue line) measurements for the inferior cavity specifically.

164x83mm (157 x 157 DPI)




FIG. 6. Graphical presentation of biological sex prediction based on interactions between the approximate volume of the inferior interosseous cavity and the approximate volume of the preauricular sulcus with axis measurements limited to 150mm to aid prediction boundary interpretation. Circled cases indicate those that were incorrectly estimated by the model.

*Note: 50% sex prediction threshold (<50% = male; >50% = female). 25% - 75% and 10% - 90% ranges represent the probabilities of being female, but each range can be reversed to represent the probability of being male.

192x115mm (157 x 157 DPI)

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

Table S1. Intra-observer average results for all basic scar feature measurements.

Measurement variable	Measure 1 (mm)	Measure 2 (mm)	Relative difference (%)
Pit length – Single pit	0.94	0.92	0.02
Pitting length – Multi pits	1.84	1.83	0.01
Pitting width	0.63	0.71	0.13
Pitting depth	0.27	0.26	0.04
Sulcus length	2.91	2.91	0
Sulcus width	17.12	17.70	0.03
Sulcus depth	4.84	4.98	0.03
Superior cavity length	1.45	1.33	0.08
Superior cavity width	19.26	19.43	0.01
Superior cavity depth	2.74	2.61	0.05
Inferior cavity length	2.76	2.85	0.03
Inferior cavity width	3.54	3.57	0.01
Inferior cavity depth	0.70	0.69	0.01
Pubic tubercle extension	0.67	0.67	0

Table S2. Basic scar measurement statistics for all males (M) and females (F) separately.

Measurement variable	Scar feature absent (%)		Maximum value (mm)		Mean value (mm)		Std. Deviation	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Pit length – Single pit	94.1	75.7	9.45	18.78	0.44	1.53	1.878	3.725
Pitting length – Multi pits			9.45	26.36	0.55	2	2.211	4.794
Pitting width			2.43	6.47	0.11	0.76	0.462	1.574
Pitting depth			1.34	4.54	0.07	0.4	0.267	0.834
Sulcus length	45.1	6.5	26.23	54.06	8.23	24.04	8.462	10.409
Sulcus width			5.26	18.75	1.52	6.38	1.594	3.074
Sulcus depth			3.54	4.76	0.55	1.54	0.695	0.992
Superior cavity length	84.3	66.9	11.27	29.24	0.99	4.02	2.605	6.583
Superior cavity width			1.90	4.61	0.2	0.59	0.505	0.992
Superior cavity depth			2.41	4.37	0.18	0.49	0.477	0.926
Inferior cavity length	19.6	2.4	32.18	36.62	14.18	20.66	9.959	7.817
Inferior cavity width			2.40	7.51	1.16	2.68	0.7152	1.247
Inferior cavity depth			2.86	8.94	0.84	2.87	0.773	1.69
Pubic tubercle extension	0	1.8	7.52	9.18	4	3.16	1.392	1.739

Table S3. Kendall's tau-b correlation results for all individual scar feature measurements.

Variable measurements (mm)	Correlation (τ_b)	sig. (p)
Maximum pitting length – Single pit	0.179	0.005
Maximum pitting length – Multiple pits	0.179	0.005
Maximum pitting width	0.189	0.003
Maximum pitting depth	0.188	0.004
Maximum sulcus length	0.457	<.001
Maximum sulcus width	0.504	<.001
Maximum sulcus depth	0.39	<.001
Maximum superior cavity length	0.177	0.005
Maximum superior cavity width	0.163	0.01
Maximum superior cavity depth	0.154	0.014
Maximum inferior cavity length	0.223	<.001
Maximum inferior cavity width	0.448	<.001
Maximum inferior cavity depth	0.444	<.001
Maximum pubic tubercle extension	-0.202	<.001
Sulcus approximate volume	0.505	<.001
Inferior cavity approximate volume	0.445	<.001