

Houston poster presentation EOS Krakow 2025

Shape variability and sexual dimorphism of the chin: a 3D geometric morphometric analysis

Isidora Christopoulou, Georgios Kanavakis, Demetrios Halazonetis

References

1. Robinson L. The story of the chin. Annual Report of the Smithsonian Reports 1914, 599e609.
2. Waterman TT. Evolution of the chin. Am. Nat.1916;50 (592), 237e242.
3. Weidenreich F. The Mandibles of Sinanthropus pekinensis: A Comparative Study. A M S Press, Peiping, 1936.
4. Du Brul EL, Sicher H. The Adaptive Chin. Charles C. Thomas,1954, Springfield.
5. Gould SJ. The exaptive excellence of spandrels as a term and prototype. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 1997;94, 10750e10755.
6. Gould SJ, Lewontin C. The spandrels of San Marco and the panglossian paradigm: a critique of the adaptationist programme. Proc. R. Soc. B. Biol. Sci. 1979;205, 581e598.
7. Wolff JEA. A theoretical approach to solve the chin problem. In: Chivers, D.J., Wood, B.A., Bilsborough, A. (Eds.), Food Acquisition and Processing in Primates. Plenum, New York, pp. 1984;391e405.
8. Daegling DJ. Functional morphology of the human chin. Evol. Anthropol. 1993;1, 170e177.
9. Ichim I., Kieser J., Swain M. Tongue contractions during speech may have led to the development of the bony geometry of the chin following the evolution of human language: a mechanobiological hypothesis for the development of the human chin. Med. Hypotheses 2007;69, 20e24.
10. Hershkovitz P. The decorative chin. Bull. Field Mus. Nat. Hist.1970;41, 6e10.
11. Thayer ZM, Dobson SD. Sexual dimorphism in chin shape: implications for adaptive hypotheses. Am. J. Phys. Anthropol. 2010;143, 417e425.
12. Franklin D, Oxnard CE, O'Higgins P, Dadour I. Sexual dimorphism in the subadult mandible: Quantification using geometric morphometrics. J. Forensic Sci. 2007;52:6–10.
13. Bosman AM, Moisik SR, Dediu D, Waters-Rist A. Talking heads: Morphological variation in the human mandible over the last 500 years in the Netherlands. Homo. 2017;68:329–342.

14. Nicholson E, Harvati K. Quantitative analysis of human mandibular shape using three-dimensional geometric morphometrics. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 2006;131:368–383.
15. Franklin D, O'Higgins P, Oxnard CE, Dadour I. Sexual dimorphism and population variation in the adult mandible: Forensic applications of geometric morphometrics. *Forensic Sci. Med. Pathol.* 2007;3:15–22.
16. Costa Mendes L, Delrieu J, Gillet C, Telmon N, Maret D, Savall F. Sexual dimorphism of the mandibular conformational changes in aging human adults: A multislice computed tomographic study by geometric morphometrics. *PLoS One.* 2021;22;16(6):e0253564.
17. Gunz P, Mitteroecker P. Semilandmarks: A method for quantifying curves and surfaces. *Hystrix It. J. Mamm.* 2013;24:103–109.
18. Gunz P, Mitteroecker P and Bookstein FL. Semilandmarks in three dimensions. In *Modern Morphometrics in Physical Anthropology* (ed. Slice, D. E.) 73–98 (Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, 2005).
19. Rohlf FJ, Slice D. Extensions of the Procrustes method for the optimal superimposition of landmarks. *Syst. Zool.* 1990;39:40–59.
20. Bookstein FL. Landmark methods for forms without landmarks: Morphometrics of group differences in outline shape. *Med. Image Anal.* 1997;1:225–243.
21. Gower JC. Generalized Procrustes analysis. *Psychometrika.* 1975;40:33–51.
22. Mitchell DR, Kirchhoff CA, Cooke SB, Terhune CE. Bolstering geometric morphometrics sample sizes with damaged and pathologic specimens: Is near enough good enough? *J. Anat.* 2021;238:1444–1455.
23. Cardini A, Elton S. Sample size and sampling error in geometric morphometric studies of size and shape. *Zoomorphology.* 2007;126:121–134.
24. Cardini A, Seetah K, Barker G. How many specimens do I need? Sampling error in geometric morphometrics: Testing the sensitivity of means and variances in simple randomized selection experiments. *Zoomorphology.* 2015;134:149–163.
25. Khramtsova EA, Davis LK, Stranger BE. The role of sex in the genomics of human complex traits. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* 2019;20:173–190.