

National Board of Examination - Journal of Medical Sciences Volume 2, Issue 4, Pages 335–349, April 2024 DOI 10.61770/NBEJMS.2024.v02.i04.006

#### **ORIGINAL ARTICLE**

#### Estimation of Stature From Foot Length: An Anthropometric Study

S.M. Krishna Sagar<sup>1</sup>, Boddepalli Devaraj,<sup>2,\*</sup> Md.Shanawaz,<sup>4</sup> Mohit Kumar Moses T<sup>1</sup>, Amrutha Rauthu,<sup>3</sup> Anamika Singh,<sup>3</sup> Ganesh Yalla,<sup>3</sup> Roshini Konatham<sup>3</sup> and Kattamreddy Ananth Rupesh<sup>1</sup>

 <sup>1</sup>Assistant Professor of Forensic Medicine and Toxicology, Andhra Medical College, Visakhapatnam
<sup>2</sup>Junior Resident, Department of Forensic Medicine and Toxicology, Andhra Medical College, Visakhapatnam
<sup>3</sup>Department of Forensic Medicine and Toxicology, Andhra Medical College, Visakhapatnam
<sup>4</sup>Associate Professor of Forensic Medicine and Toxicology, KIMS & RF, Amalapuram

Accepted: 26-February-2024 / Published Online 31-March-2024

#### Abstract

**Background:** Identification is a crucial objective in autopsies, particularly when dealing with unknown, decomposed, or mutilated bodies. Various parameters are employed to establish the identity of a human being, and among them, stature holds significant importance in forensic casework. Stature estimation is pivotal in determining identity, especially when confronted with skeletal remains, fragmented bodies resulting from mass disasters, or mutilated corpses. **Objectives:** The main objective of the present study was to determine the relation between foot length and the stature of individual by using correlation coefficient in both sexes. To provide a linear regression model for estimation of stature from foot length in both males and females. Methodology: This cross-sectional study was conducted on 400 medical students aged between 20-25 years, studying at Andhra Medical College, Visakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh, India. The length of both right and left foot from the posterior most part of the heel to the longest toe is taken using measuring tool and height of the individual is measured using standard scale and both are compared. Using all the data the study aims to establish a linear regression model for estimation of stature from foot length in both male and female. Conclusion: In all the groups, a significant and positive correlation between stature and foot length was established, and regression equations were derived for both the feet. An attempt was made to study the correlation between stature and foot length separately in both the sexes. However, owing to no significant difference in the results obtained, entire study sample was taken as a single unit for deriving the regression equation. In conclusion, the individual foot length proves to be useful for stature estimation, offering crucial support for forensic experts and anthropologists.

Keywords: Identification, Stature, Foot length, Correlation coefficient, Linear Regression Equation.

\*Corresponding author: Boddepalli Devaraj Email: devarajboddepalli@gmail.com

#### **Graphical Abstract**



#### Introduction

Identification involves determining an individual's identity based on specific physical characteristics such as age, sex, stature. Positive and and negative identification are crucial aspects of forensic medicine, playing pivotal roles in investigations. Opinions formed through identification can serve as valuable investigative leads, and well-evaluated opinions can contribute to solving cases. In the investigation of the assassination of former Prime Minister of India, Rajiv Gandhi, foot length and footwear became critical pieces of evidence, aiding in collecting adjoining mortal remains and guiding the investigation.

Estimating stature is a vital factor in forensic investigation, particularly in forensic anthropology. The association between stature and the length of various body parts, such as long bones, trunk, and extremities, has been well-researched by the scientific community. Traditionally, stature has been estimated using long bones like the tibia, ulna, and humerus. Foot

length has also been employed for the same purpose by several researchers. The field of foot studies in forensic contexts is continually expanding, with a notable example being Forensic podiatry—a specialized branch that utilizes podiatric expertise to investigate and establish connections between individuals and crime scenes, addressing legal inquiries related to feet, footwear, and foot function. Forensic identification from the foot and its parts remains relevant even in the DNA era, especially in mass disasters like explosions, bomb blasts, and transportation accidents. The recovery of feet, often enclosed in shoes, is common and helpful. Moreover, choosing foot length for stature estimation can yield more precise results compared to long bones, given that the foot reaches its maximum length earlier, typically during adolescence. Variations in stature estimation from limb measurements are observed among individuals from different population groups and have been documented in published literature. To understand the relationship between stature

and foot length further, a cross-sectional study was conducted to explore the connection among our study participants.

### **Materials and Methods**

#### Study Design

This cross-sectional study was conducted over a period of three-months from June to August 2023 among 400 healthy subjects, medical students at Andhra Medical College, Visakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh who belong to south India.

## Inclusion Criteria

M.B.B.S. students of Andhra Medical College who belong to south India, aged 20-25 years, without skeletal deformities, who had not undergone any surgical procedures on their limbs or foot skeleton, were included in the study.

## Exclusion Criteria

Age below 20 and above 25, subjects diagnosed with lower limb and foot deformities and those who had sustained recent injuries, Obese individuals and Other than south Indians were excluded from the study.

## Materials & Methodology

An anthropometer, a stadiometer, a foot measuring tool which can measure in

millimetres, a computer with SPSS software. After taking informed written consent, stature of all subjects was measured using stadiometer in upright position with bare foot while standing on flat surface, heels, middle of the shoulders, buttocks and back of head touching stadiometer, with chin parallel to ground. The dimensions of both the left and right feet of each individual were measured and recorded on a data collection form separately. The maximum foot length was measured in sitting position to avoid error due to weight bearing, from the acropodion (tip of the hallux or second toe when the latter is longer than the hallux) to the pterion (most prominent point on the back of the heel), nails crossing the nailbeds were removed and measured. For the purpose of this study, the stature was defined as the vertical distance between the vertex and the floor when the head was held in the Frankfurt Horizontal (F.H) plane. The measurements are taken in the forenoon to avoid diurnal variations. The measurements are not rounded off. All findings were recorded in a proforma. The data analysis was carried out using Statistical Packages for Social Sciences, SPSS 26 (Figures 1 to 3).



Figure 1. Foot Measuring Tool



Figure 2. Measuring foot length



Figure 3. Measuring the height

#### Results

A total of 400 subjects (200 boys and 200 girls) participated in this study, their minimum and maximum heights, mean height, range, standard deviation and standard error are summarised in Table 1. Gender wise distribution of the stature is tabulated under Table 2. Distribution of foot lengths in males and females is tabulated under Tables 3,4 respectively. An attempt was made to study the correlation between stature and foot length separately in both the sexes. However, owing to no significant difference in the results obtained, entire

study sample was taken as a single unit for deriving the regression equation. Similarly, the preliminary statistics calculated showed a promising difference between left and right foot. Hence, separate regression were derived. equations Pearson's correlation (r) between the stature and foot lengths is tabulated under Table 5. Right and left foot length measurement in both males and females combined together is tabulated under Table 6. Regression equations for stature from foot length is tabulated under Table 7.

| Total Number(n)         | 400    |
|-------------------------|--------|
| Minimum Height (cm)     | 143    |
| Maximum Height(cm)      | 188    |
| Mean Height(cm)         | 166    |
| Range(cm)               | 45     |
| Standard Deviation (SD) | 9.27   |
| Standard Error (SE)     | 0.4634 |

Table 1. Height in All the Subjects

### National Board of Examination - Journal of Medical Sciences, Volume 2, Issue 4

| Stature in cm | Male(n=200) | Percentage % | Female(n=200) | Percentage % |
|---------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| 143-150       | 0           | 0%           | 11            | 5.5%         |
| 151-160       | 03          | 1.5%         | 110           | 55.0%        |
| 161-170       | 69          | 34.5%        | 71            | 35.5%        |
| 171-180       | 107         | 53.5%        | 08            | 4.0%         |
| 181-188       | 21          | 10.5%        | 0             | 0%           |

Table 2. Gender Wise Distribution of the Stature

## Table 3. Distribution of Foot Lengths in Males

| Fast Langth (am) | Male(n=200) |            |  |
|------------------|-------------|------------|--|
| Foot Length (cm) | Left foot   | Right foot |  |
| 23-26            | 76          | 79         |  |
| 26.1-27.5        | 86          | 87         |  |
| 27.6-30          | 38          | 34         |  |

Table 4. Distribution of Foot Lengths in Females

| Foot Longth (am) | Female(n=200) |            |  |
|------------------|---------------|------------|--|
|                  | Left foot     | Right foot |  |
| 20-23            | 40            | 38         |  |
| 23.1-25          | 127           | 124        |  |
| 25.1-28          | 33            | 38         |  |

Table 5. Right and Left Foot Length Measurement in Both Males and Females Combined Together

|                          | Left Foot | Right Foot |
|--------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Minimum Foot length(cm)  | 20.1      | 20.3       |
| Maximum foot length(cm)  | 29.8      | 30         |
| Mean foot Length(cm)     | 25.2206   | 25.2715    |
| Range of foot Length(cm) | 9.7       | 9.7        |
| Standard Deviation       | 1.694756  | 1.678177   |
| Standard Error           | 0.0847378 | 0.08390885 |

|            | r     | $r^2$ | P value |
|------------|-------|-------|---------|
| Left foot  | 0.869 | 0.755 | < 0.001 |
| Right foot | 0.865 | 0.749 | <0.001  |

Table 6. Pearson's Correlation (R) Between the Stature and Foot Lengths

Table 7. Regression Equations for Stature from Foot Length

|            | Value of Regression |                 | Error | Regression Equation                 |
|------------|---------------------|-----------------|-------|-------------------------------------|
|            | Constant (A)        | coefficient (B) |       |                                     |
| Left foot  | 46.418              | 4.752           | 3.430 | 46.418 + 4.752 x LFL <u>+</u> 3.430 |
|            |                     |                 |       |                                     |
| Right foot | 45.498              | 4.779           | 3.514 | 45.498 + 4.779 x RFL <u>+</u> 3.514 |
|            |                     |                 |       |                                     |

Figures 4 and 5 shows the scatter plot of relation between the height and foot length of left and right foot respectively. X- axis - Foot measurements & Y-axis - Height of the individual.



Figure 4. Scatter Plot – Relation between the height and left foot length.



Figure 5. Scatter Plot – Relation between the height and right foot length.

The correlation coefficients between the parameters height and foot lengths are positive. "The low standard errors of estimates (SEE) for both left (4.5932) and right (4.6514) foot lengths, along with highly significant one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results (F=1226.587, P<0.001 for left foot; F=1186.247, P<0.001 for right foot), suggest that foot length is a significant and reliable predictor in estimating stature. This significance implies that the foot length provides highest reliability and accuracy in estimating stature of an unknown individual.

Based on this study, Regression equation is established for both left and right foot.

| STAURE         | (S)    | =      | VALUE    | OF   |
|----------------|--------|--------|----------|------|
| CONSTAN        | Г (А)  | +      | REGRESS  | SION |
| COEFFECI       | ENT (B | 3) x 1 | FOOT LEN | GTH  |
| <u>+</u> ERROR |        | ·      |          |      |

S (LEFT FOOT) = 46.418 + 4.752 x LF length <u>+</u> 3.430

#### S (RIGHT FOOT) = 45.498 + 4.779 x RF length <u>+</u> 3.514

#### Discussion

Several studies were carried out for estimation of human stature so far and researchers employed a multitude of methods. However, regression equation was used as a statistical tool by most of them. The chronological order of a few studies is summarized in the Table 8 below.

| S. | Authors   | Sample size   | Regression Equation  | Correlation   |
|----|---|---|--|---|
| No | (Year of study)   | (Male+Female)   |  | Coefficient   |
|    | (Place of study)  | (Age)   |  | (r)   |
| 1. | Krogman Pg.no.  | 3000  | Height =166.45716+4.0301 x Foot  | N.A   |
|    | <u>175,177</u>  | (>21yrs)  | Length - 25.68770 + 2.94453  |   |
|    | Macdonnel (2001)  |   |  |   |
| 2. | Hilmi Ozden et al.  | 569   | <b><u>Right foot</u></b> : stature = $47.93 + 1.083$   | RF:   |
|    | [1] (2004)  | (294+275)   | (maximum foot length) $+ 0.788$ (shoe  | 0.579   |
|    |   | (>19yrs)  | length) x 1.813 (shoe number).   | 0.500   |
|    |   |   | <b><u>Left foot</u></b> : stature = $47.33 + 1.139$  | LF:   |
|    |   |   | (maximum foot length) $+ 0.593$ (shoe  | 0.614   |
|    |   |   | length) x 1.924 (shoe number)  | 0.490   |
| 3. | Bhavna et al.   | N.A   | $\underline{\text{Height}} = 119.74 + 1.92 \text{ x Foot length}$  | N.A   |
|    | (2005)  |   | ± 4.77   |   |
|    | Delhi   |   | Multiplication factor to calculate   |   |
|    |   |   | stature from foot length to be 6.76  |   |
| 4. | Arun Kumar  | 250   | Stature = 67:568 + 3:862 RFL + 3:393   |   |
|    | Agnihotri MD et   | (125+125)   | Sex + 0:437 Age (Sex: M =1, F =0)  | Mean: 0.877   |
|    | <b>al.</b> (2006)   | (18-30yrs)  | Male Stature= 68:586 + 4:036 RFL   | Male:0.720  |
|    | Mauritius [2]   |   | Female Stature=77:059 + 3:536 RFL  | Female:0.608  |
| 5. | Tanuj Kanchan et  | 200   | Males:   | 0.759   |
| -  | J   |   |  |   |
|    | <b>al.</b> (2007)   | (100+100)   | RFL 93.269 + 2.819(RFL) + 3.878  | 0.764   |
|    | <b>al.</b> (2007)<br>Punjab [3]                                   | (100+100)<br>(18-80yrs males  | RFL 93.269 + 2.819(RFL) <u>+</u> 3.878<br>LFL 90.275 + 2.930(LFL) <u>+</u> 3.842   | 0.764   |
|    | <b>al.</b> (2007)<br>Punjab [3]                                   | (100+100)<br>(18-80yrs males<br>18-65yrs  | RFL 93.269 + 2.819(RFL) ± 3.878     LFL 90.275 + 2.930(LFL) ± 3.842     Females:   | 0.764   |
|    | <b>al.</b> (2007)<br>Punjab [3]                                   | (100+100)<br>(18-80yrs males<br>18-65yrs<br>females)                            | RFL 93.269 + 2.819(RFL) ± 3.878     LFL 90.275 + 2.930(LFL) ± 3.842     Females:     RFL 103.270 + 2.365(RFL) ± 4.398  | 0.764<br>0.512<br>0.502   |
|    | <b>al.</b> (2007)<br>Punjab [3]                                   | (100+100)<br>(18-80yrs males<br>18-65yrs<br>females)                            | RFL 93.269 + 2.819(RFL) $\pm$ 3.878     LFL 90.275 + 2.930(LFL) $\pm$ 3.842     Females:     RFL 103.270 + 2.365(RFL) $\pm$ 4.398     LFL 105.200 + 2.287(LFL) $\pm$ 4.427   | 0.764<br>0.512<br>0.502   |
| 6. | al. (2007)<br>Punjab [3]<br>Theodoros Grivas                      | (100+100)<br>(18-80yrs males<br>18-65yrs<br>females)<br>5093 school             | RFL 93.269 + 2.819(RFL) $\pm$ 3.878     LFL 90.275 + 2.930(LFL) $\pm$ 3.842     Females:     RFL 103.270 + 2.365(RFL) $\pm$ 4.398     LFL 105.200 + 2.287(LFL) $\pm$ 4.427     Mean Height=  | 0.764<br>0.512<br>0.502   |
| 6. | al. (2007)<br>Punjab [3]<br>Theodoros Grivas<br>et al. (2007) [4] | (100+100)<br>(18-80yrs males<br>18-65yrs<br>females)<br>5093 school<br>children | RFL 93.269 + 2.819(RFL) $\pm$ 3.878     LFL 90.275 + 2.930(LFL) $\pm$ 3.842     Females:     RFL 103.270 + 2.365(RFL) $\pm$ 4.398     LFL 105.200 + 2.287(LFL) $\pm$ 4.427     Mean Height=     17:369 + 5:879 x (right foot length)   | 0.764<br>0.512<br>0.502   |
| 6. | al. (2007)<br>Punjab [3]<br>Theodoros Grivas<br>et al. (2007) [4] | (100+100)<br>(18-80yrs males<br>18-65yrs<br>females)<br>5093 school<br>children | RFL 93.269 + 2.819(RFL) $\pm$ 3.878     LFL 90.275 + 2.930(LFL) $\pm$ 3.842     Females:     RFL 103.270 + 2.365(RFL) $\pm$ 4.398     LFL 105.200 + 2.287(LFL) $\pm$ 4.427     Mean Height=     17:369 + 5:879 x (right foot length)     cm  | 0.764<br>0.512<br>0.502   |
| 6. | al. (2007)<br>Punjab [3]<br>Theodoros Grivas<br>et al. (2007) [4] | (100+100)<br>(18-80yrs males<br>18-65yrs<br>females)<br>5093 school<br>children | RFL 93.269 + 2.819(RFL) $\pm$ 3.878     LFL 90.275 + 2.930(LFL) $\pm$ 3.842     Females:     RFL 103.270 + 2.365(RFL) $\pm$ 4.398     LFL 105.200 + 2.287(LFL) $\pm$ 4.427     Mean Height=     17:369 + 5:879 x (right foot length)     cm     17:592 + 5:861 x (left foot length) cm   | 0.764<br>0.512<br>0.502   |
| 6. | al. (2007)<br>Punjab [3]<br>Theodoros Grivas<br>et al. (2007) [4] | (100+100)<br>(18-80yrs males<br>18-65yrs<br>females)<br>5093 school<br>children | RFL 93.269 + 2.819(RFL) $\pm$ 3.878     LFL 90.275 + 2.930(LFL) $\pm$ 3.842     Females:     RFL 103.270 + 2.365(RFL) $\pm$ 4.398     LFL 105.200 + 2.287(LFL) $\pm$ 4.427     Mean Height=     17:369 + 5:879 x (right foot length)     cm     17:592 + 5:861 x (left foot length) cm     Boys: Height =  | 0.764<br>0.512<br>0.502<br>Boys:  |
| 6. | al. (2007)<br>Punjab [3]<br>Theodoros Grivas<br>et al. (2007) [4] | (100+100)<br>(18-80yrs males<br>18-65yrs<br>females)<br>5093 school<br>children | RFL 93.269 + 2.819(RFL) $\pm$ 3.878     LFL 90.275 + 2.930(LFL) $\pm$ 3.842 <b>Females:</b> RFL 103.270 + 2.365(RFL) $\pm$ 4.398     LFL 105.200 + 2.287(LFL) $\pm$ 4.427 <b>Mean Height=</b> 17:369 + 5:879 x (right foot length)     cm     17:592 + 5:861 x (left foot length) cm <b>Boys:</b> Height =     34:113 + 3:716 (right foot length) cm   | 0.764<br>0.512<br>0.502<br>Boys:<br>RF = 0.903  |
| 6. | al. (2007)<br>Punjab [3]<br>Theodoros Grivas<br>et al. (2007) [4] | (100+100)<br>(18-80yrs males<br>18-65yrs<br>females)<br>5093 school<br>children | RFL 93.269 + 2.819(RFL) $\pm$ 3.878     LFL 90.275 + 2.930(LFL) $\pm$ 3.842 <b>Females:</b> RFL 103.270 + 2.365(RFL) $\pm$ 4.398     LFL 105.200 + 2.287(LFL) $\pm$ 4.427 <b>Mean Height=</b> 17:369 + 5:879 x (right foot length)     cm     17:592 + 5:861 x (left foot length) cm     Boys: Height =     34:113 + 3:716 (right foot length) cm     + 2:499 (age) years  | 0.764<br>0.512<br>0.502<br>Boys:<br>RF = 0.903<br>LF =0.898                                     |
| 6. | al. (2007)<br>Punjab [3]<br>Theodoros Grivas<br>et al. (2007) [4] | (100+100)<br>(18-80yrs males<br>18-65yrs<br>females)<br>5093 school<br>children | RFL 93.269 + 2.819(RFL) $\pm$ 3.878     LFL 90.275 + 2.930(LFL) $\pm$ 3.842     Females:     RFL 103.270 + 2.365(RFL) $\pm$ 4.398     LFL 105.200 + 2.287(LFL) $\pm$ 4.427     Mean Height=     17:369 + 5:879 x (right foot length)     cm     17:592 + 5:861 x (left foot length) cm     Boys: Height =     34:113 + 3:716 (right foot length) cm     + 2:499 (age) years     33:869 + 3:689 (left foot length) cm +   | 0.764<br>0.512<br>0.502<br>Boys:<br>RF = 0.903<br>LF =0.898                                     |
| 6. | al. (2007)<br>Punjab [3]<br>Theodoros Grivas<br>et al. (2007) [4] | (100+100)<br>(18-80yrs males<br>18-65yrs<br>females)<br>5093 school<br>children | RFL 93.269 + 2.819(RFL) $\pm$ 3.878     LFL 90.275 + 2.930(LFL) $\pm$ 3.842 <b>Females:</b> RFL 103.270 + 2.365(RFL) $\pm$ 4.398     LFL 105.200 + 2.287(LFL) $\pm$ 4.427 <b>Mean Height=</b> 17:369 + 5:879 x (right foot length)     cm     17:592 + 5:861 x (left foot length) cm <b>Boys:</b> Height =     34:113 + 3:716 (right foot length) cm     + 2:499 (age) years     33:869 + 3:689 (left foot length) cm +     2:533 (age)years   | 0.764<br>0.512<br>0.502<br>Boys:<br>RF = 0.903<br>LF =0.898                                     |
| 6. | al. (2007)<br>Punjab [3]<br>Theodoros Grivas<br>et al. (2007) [4] | (100+100)<br>(18-80yrs males<br>18-65yrs<br>females)<br>5093 school<br>children | RFL 93.269 + 2.819(RFL) $\pm$ 3.878     LFL 90.275 + 2.930(LFL) $\pm$ 3.842     Females:     RFL 103.270 + 2.365(RFL) $\pm$ 4.398     LFL 105.200 + 2.287(LFL) $\pm$ 4.427     Mean Height=     17:369 + 5:879 x (right foot length)     cm     17:592 + 5:861 x (left foot length) cm     Boys: Height =     34:113 + 3:716 (right foot length) cm     + 2:499 (age) years     33:869 + 3:689 (left foot length) cm +     2:533 (age)years     Girls: Height =  | 0.764<br>0.512<br>0.502<br>Boys:<br>RF = 0.903<br>LF =0.898<br>Girls:                           |
| 6. | al. (2007)<br>Punjab [3]<br>Theodoros Grivas<br>et al. (2007) [4] | (100+100)<br>(18-80yrs males<br>18-65yrs<br>females)<br>5093 school<br>children | RFL 93.269 + 2.819(RFL) $\pm$ 3.878     LFL 90.275 + 2.930(LFL) $\pm$ 3.842     Females:     RFL 103.270 + 2.365(RFL) $\pm$ 4.398     LFL 105.200 + 2.287(LFL) $\pm$ 4.427     Mean Height=     17:369 + 5:879 x (right foot length)     cm     17:592 + 5:861 x (left foot length) cm     Total foot length) cm     17:592 + 5:861 x (left foot length) cm     Total foot length) cm     2:592 + 5:861 x (left foot length) cm     Total foot length) cm     2:499 (age) years     33:869 + 3:689 (left foot length) cm +     2:533 (age)years     Girls: Height =     34:113 + 3:716 (right foot length) cm  | 0.764<br>0.512<br>0.502<br>Boys:<br>RF = 0.903<br>LF =0.898<br>Girls:<br>RF =0.855              |
| 6. | al. (2007)<br>Punjab [3]<br>Theodoros Grivas<br>et al. (2007) [4] | (100+100)<br>(18-80yrs males<br>18-65yrs<br>females)<br>5093 school<br>children | RFL 93.269 + 2.819(RFL) $\pm$ 3.878     LFL 90.275 + 2.930(LFL) $\pm$ 3.842     Females:     RFL 103.270 + 2.365(RFL) $\pm$ 4.398     LFL 105.200 + 2.287(LFL) $\pm$ 4.427     Mean Height=     17:369 + 5:879 x (right foot length)     cm     17:592 + 5:861 x (left foot length) cm     Boys: Height =     34:113 + 3:716 (right foot length) cm     + 2:499 (age) years     33:869 + 3:689 (left foot length) cm +     2:533 (age)years     Girls: Height =     34:113 + 3:716 (right foot length) cm +     2:533 (age)years     Girls: Height =     34:113 + 3:716 (right foot length) cm +     1:558 + 2:499 (age)years  | 0.764<br>0.512<br>0.502<br>Boys:<br>RF = 0.903<br>LF =0.898<br>Girls:<br>RF =0.855<br>LF =0.841 |
| 6. | al. (2007)<br>Punjab [3]<br>Theodoros Grivas<br>et al. (2007) [4] | (100+100)<br>(18-80yrs males<br>18-65yrs<br>females)<br>5093 school<br>children | RFL 93.269 + 2.819(RFL) $\pm$ 3.878     LFL 90.275 + 2.930(LFL) $\pm$ 3.842     Females:     RFL 103.270 + 2.365(RFL) $\pm$ 4.398     LFL 105.200 + 2.287(LFL) $\pm$ 4.427     Mean Height=     17:369 + 5:879 x (right foot length)     cm     17:592 + 5:861 x (left foot length) cm     Poys: Height =     34:113 + 3:716 (right foot length) cm     + 2:499 (age) years     33:869 + 3:689 (left foot length) cm +     2:533 (age)years     Girls: Height =     34:113 + 3:716 (right foot length) cm +     2:533 (age)years     33:869 + 3:689 (left foot length) cm +     1:558 + 2:499 (age)years     33:869 + 3:689 (left foot length) cm  | 0.764<br>0.512<br>0.502<br>Boys:<br>RF = 0.903<br>LF =0.898<br>Girls:<br>RF =0.855<br>LF =0.841 |
| 6. | al. (2007)<br>Punjab [3]<br>Theodoros Grivas<br>et al. (2007) [4] | (100+100)<br>(18-80yrs males<br>18-65yrs<br>females)<br>5093 school<br>children | RFL 93.269 + 2.819(RFL) $\pm$ 3.878     LFL 90.275 + 2.930(LFL) $\pm$ 3.842 <b>Females:</b> RFL 103.270 + 2.365(RFL) $\pm$ 4.398     LFL 105.200 + 2.287(LFL) $\pm$ 4.427 <b>Mean Height=</b> 17:369 + 5:879 x (right foot length)     cm     17:592 + 5:861 x (left foot length) cm <b>Boys:</b> Height =     34:113 + 3:716 (right foot length) cm     + 2:499 (age) years     33:869 + 3:689 (left foot length) cm +     2:533 (age)years <b>Girls:</b> Height =     34:113 + 3:716 (right foot length) cm +     1:558 + 2:499 (age) years     33:869 + 3:689 (left foot length) cm +     1:558 + 2:499 (age) years     33:869 + 3:689 (left foot length) cm +     1:558 + 2:499 (age) years     33:869 + 3:689 (left foot length) cm + | 0.764<br>0.512<br>0.502<br>Boys:<br>RF = 0.903<br>LF =0.898<br>Girls:<br>RF =0.855<br>LF =0.841 |

Table 8. Data from a few previous studies on estimating stature from foot length in a chronological order.

| 7.  | Gulsah Zevbek et   | 249            |  | RF:        |
|-----|--------------------|----------------|--|------------|
|     | <b>al.</b> (2008)  | (136 + 113)    | • Stature = $545.070 + 3.707 \text{ x}$          | M:0.741    |
|     | Turkey [5]         | 18-44vrs       | $RFL = 0.308 \times RFW + 1.583 \times 10^{-10}$ | F:0.678    |
|     |                    |                | $RFMH + 2.058 \times RFNH +$                     | LF:        |
|     |                    |                | 38.69.   | M: 0.711   |
|     |                    |                |  | F:0.667    |
|     |                    |                |  |            |
| 8.  | Derya Atamturk     | 516            | • S = 5.295 x FL + 38.903 +                      | Height and |
|     | et al. (2008)      | (253+263)      | 5.142  | FL: 0.737  |
|     | Ankara, Turkey [6] | (17.6-82.9yrs) | • $S = (4.211 \text{ x FL}) + (4.981 \cdot$      | Height, FL |
|     |                    |                | Sex) + $62.208 \pm 4.835$                        | and Sex:   |
|     |                    |                | (sex; female = 0 and male = 1)                   | 0.768      |
| 9.  | Jaydip Sen and     | 350            | Male: S= 83.518 + 3.282(FL)                      | 0.626      |
|     | Shila Ghosh        | (175+175)      | RFL 84.041 + 3.264(RFL)                          | 0.624      |
|     | (2008)             |                | LFL 84.076 + 3.255(LFL)                          | 0.623      |
|     | Darjeeling, West   |                | <b><u>Females</u></b> : S= 67.009 + 3.707(FL)    | 0.692      |
|     | Bengal [7]         |                | RFL 68.642 + 3.638(RFL) 0.682                    | 0.682      |
|     |                    |                | LFL 68.663 + 3.632(LFL) 0.682                    | 0.682      |
|     |                    |                |  |            |
| 10. | Tanuj Kanchan et   | 100            | <u>RFL</u> :                                     |            |
|     | <b>al.</b> (2009)  | (50+50)        | Males:   |            |
|     | Punjab [8]         | (18-32yrs)     | H= 88.116 + 3.007 (RFL) <u>+</u> 3.746           | 0.750      |
|     |                    |                | Female:  |            |
|     |                    |                | H= 106.709 + 2.219 (RFL) <u>+</u> 4.313          | 0.558      |
|     |                    |                | LFL:   |            |
|     |                    |                | Males:   |            |
|     |                    |                | H=95.202 + 2.737 (LFL) <u>+</u> 4.024            | 0.704      |
|     |                    |                | Female:  |            |
|     |                    |                | H=104.302 + 2.324 (LFL) <u>+</u> 4.387           | 0.536      |
| 11. | Nivedita Pandey    | 200            | Males:   | Males:     |
|     | et al.             | (100+100)      | $S = 128.951 + 1.695(RFL) \pm 0.339$             | 0.451      |
|     | (2011)             | (18-23 years)  | $S = 106.265 + 2.236 (LFL) \pm 0.385$            | 0.452      |
|     | Mumbai [9]         |                | Females:   | Females:   |
|     |                    |                | $S = 118.533 + 1.692 (RFL) \pm 0.368$            | 0.421      |
|     |                    |                | $S = 128.233 + 1.726 (LFL) \pm 0.344$            | 0.506      |
|     |                    |                | Mean:  |            |
|     |                    |                | Males:   |            |
|     |                    |                | S = 128.039+0.761 (RFL)+0.971                    |            |
|     |                    |                | (LFL) <u>+</u> 3.176                             |            |
|     |                    |                | Females:   |            |
|     |                    |                | S = 106.623+0.297(RFL)+2.520                     |            |
|     |                    |                | (LFL) <u>+</u> 1.492                             |            |
|     |                    |                |  |            |

| 12. | Petra Uhrova et            | 71            | <b><u>Right foot:</u></b> 54.354 + 4.715 RFL <u>+</u>                  | Females:                    |
|-----|----------------------------|---------------|--|-----------------------------|
|     | al.                        | (18-27yrs)    | 4.652  | RFL:0.722,                  |
|     | (2012)                     |               |  | LFL:0.704                   |
|     | Slovakia [10]              |               | <b>Left foot:</b> 52.999 + 4.755 LFL <u>+</u> 4.765                    | <u>Males:</u><br>RFL:0.759, |
|     |                            |               | Multiple regression:   | LFL:0.755                   |
|     |                            |               | 53.125 + 3.455 RFL + 1.304 LFL +                                       |                             |
|     |                            |               | 4.668  |                             |
| 13. | Sonali                     | 1000          | 'Height = $55.5+4.5$ x Foot length'.                                   | Females and                 |
|     | khanapurkar et             | (536+464)     | The correlation coefficient for foot                                   | males were                  |
|     | <b>al.</b> (2012)          | (19-22 yrs)   | length in females and males was 0.702                                  | 0.702 and                   |
|     | Maharashtra [11]           |               | and 0.645 respectively.  | 0.645                       |
|     |                            |               |  | respectively.               |
| 14. | Mansur et al.              | 440           | Mean:  | <u>Mean</u> :               |
|     | (2012)                     | (258+182)     | Height = $3.179 \text{ x}$ foot length + $87.65$ '.                    | 0.703                       |
|     | Nepal [12]                 | (17-25yrs)    | Males:   | Male:                       |
|     |                            |               | Height = $2.738$ x left foot length +                                  | 0.689                       |
|     |                            |               | 100.2  | 0.688                       |
|     |                            |               | Height = $2.74 \text{ x right foot length } +$                         |                             |
|     |                            |               | 100.1  |                             |
|     |                            |               | Females:   | Female:                     |
|     |                            |               | Height = $2.66 \text{ x}$ left foot length +                           | 0.589                       |
|     |                            |               | 96.40  | 0.587                       |
|     |                            |               | Height = 2.66 x right foot length +                                    |                             |
|     |                            |               | 96.31  |                             |
| 15. | Kewal Krishan et           | 246           | Males: 69.544 + 3.995 (FL)   | N.A                         |
|     | <b>al.</b> (2012)          | (123 +123)    | <u>Females</u> :74.820 þ 3.579 (FL)                                    |                             |
|     | Himachal Pradesh           | (17-20 years) |  |                             |
|     | [13]                       |               |  |                             |
| 16. | Mohanty et al.             | 300           | <u>Males:</u> H = -27.77 + 7.695x FL                                   | N.A                         |
|     | (2012)                     | (206+94)      | <b><u>Females:</u></b> H = 77.85 + 3.58 x FL                           |                             |
|     | Odisha [14]                | (18-25yrs)    |  |                             |
| 17. | Saranabasavappa            | 100 Males     | <b><u>Right foot:</u></b> $H = 86.9 + 3.40(RFL)$                       | 0.82                        |
|     | Karaddi                    | (18-23yrs)    | Left foot: H =112 + 2.41(LFL)  | 0.80                        |
|     | et al. (2013)              |               |  |                             |
|     | Gulbarg [15]               |               |  |                             |
| 18. | <b>Patel et al.</b> (2014) | 150           | $\underline{Males} = 75.45 + 3.64 \text{ x Foot length}$               | 0.65                        |
|     | Gujrat                     | (72+78)       | <b><u>Females</u></b> = $75.41 + 3.43$ x Foot length                   | 0.80                        |
|     |                            | (18-22yrs)    |  |                             |
| 19. | Sunita Arvind              | 200           | $\underline{Stature} = 81.\overline{978 + .294} \text{ x foot length}$ | 0.554                       |
|     | Athavale et al.            | (100+100)     | $\pm 6.91$   | 0.550                       |
|     | (2015) [16]                | (20-30yrs)    |  |                             |

| 20. | Arif Rasheed               | 291           | Left foot length:                                 |        |
|-----|----------------------------|---------------|---|--------|
|     | <b>Malik et al.</b> (2015) | (>20yrs)      | <u>Mean:</u> S = 58 .101+ 4.261(LFL)              | 0.807  |
|     | Lahore, Pakistan           |               | <u>Males:</u> S=104.455 + 2.591(LFL)              | 0.590  |
|     | [17]                       |               | <b><u>Females:</u></b> S= 8 8.210 + 2.9 3(LFL)    | 0.630  |
| 21. | <b>Phang et al.</b> (2016) | 150           | <b><u>Mean:</u></b> H= 56.6471 + (4.408 x FL) ±   | 0.815  |
|     | Malaysia [18]              | (75 +75)      | 6.2571  |        |
|     |                            | (20-30 years) | Male: H= 98.8059 + (2.792 x FL) ±                 | 0.594  |
|     |                            |               | 11.2328   |        |
|     |                            |               | <b><u>Female</u></b> : H = 60.9966 + (4.167 x FL) | 0.697  |
|     |                            |               | $\pm 11.6854$                                     |        |
| 22. | Chauhan Viral et           | 208           | <u>Stature</u> = 55.427 + 4.633 x Foot            | 0.806  |
|     | <b>al.</b> (2017) Gujarat  | (105+103)     | length <u>+</u> 5.126                             |        |
|     | [19]                       | (10-60yrs)    |   |        |
| 23. | Arun S.                    | 1000          | <u>Stature</u> =                                  | 0.670  |
|     | Karmalkar (2021)           | (18–50 years) | 63.1858×intercept+1.7392×right foot               |        |
|     | Kolhapur [20]              |               | length -0.2278× left foot length -                |        |
|     |                            |               | 2.801×right foot breadth +2.7907×left             |        |
|     |                            |               | foot breadth +0.4377×right hand                   |        |
|     |                            |               | length +2.7687×left hand length –                 |        |
|     |                            |               | 4.7225×right hand breadth                         |        |
|     |                            |               | +5.5211×left hand breadth $\pm$ 4.689             |        |
| 24. | Trishna Priya              | 200 males     | <u><b>Height</b></u> = 4.56414(RFL) + 58.58265    | 0.9720 |
|     | Devi et al.                | (18-65yrs)    |   |        |
|     | (2021)                     |               | Height = 4.71546(LFL) + 55.78708                  | 0.9749 |
|     | Assam [21]                 |               |   |        |
| 25. | Kumar et al.               | 200           | Mean:   | Mean:  |
|     | (2023)                     | (100+100)     | Stature=53.591+4.489×RFL                          | 0.811  |
|     | South India [22]           | (21-40 y      | Stature=55.195+4.469×LFL                          | 0.823  |
|     |                            |               | Males:  |        |
|     |                            |               | Stature=89.297+3.158×RFL                          | 0.677  |
|     |                            |               | Stature=89.163+3.189×LFL                          | 0.707  |
|     |                            |               | Females:  |        |
|     |                            |               | Stature=84.203+3.087×RFL                          | 0.592  |
|     |                            |               | Stature=82.477+3.203×LFL                          | 0.582  |

Our study established a positive correlation between stature and foot length, aligning with findings in several other studies as detailed in Table 8 and we used a linear regression method for deriving the regression formula. However, our results indicated no significant differences in estimating stature from foot length, irrespective of left or right side and gender. This observation is consistent with the findings of Hilmi Ozden et al. (2005).[2] Nonetheless, some other studies have suggested that the standard error of estimate is lower when a multiple regression equation is utilized for stature estimation, as opposed to linear regression. Additionally, among females, the standard error of estimate is lower compared to males. This implies that the accuracy of stature estimation is higher in females, as highlighted by Tanuj Kanchan (2007) [5]

Future studies on estimating stature from foot length in India need to consider a multitude of neglected aspects within this subject. Firstly, existing research predominantly focuses on intact foot and more research is needed on relationship between skeletal foot length and stature. The roots of this research lie in dry bones, and delving further into that can help standardise this method further. Secondly, while some studies touch upon parameters like the breadth of the foot and the height of the malleolar bone, there remains a need for more extensive investigations utilizing these metrics in stature estimation. Thirdly, the majority of studies conducted thus far have centred around the living, potentially overlooking the impact of postmortem changes on measurements. Future research should emphasize studies on the deceased, recognizing the potential errors that may arise due to postmortem alterations and ensuring the applicability of findings in forensic contexts. By the same taken, considering the diverse regional demographics in India, it is imperative to conduct age-wise distributions based on previous studies. This approach will not only enhance the specificity of stature estimation methods but also provide valuable data for different age groups, contributing to а more nuanced understanding of the population.

Furthermore, as research on stature estimation in India has yielded varied regression formulas from different states, there is a pressing need for a multicentric project involving several medical colleges in different states. Such an initiative would consolidate findings from across the country, facilitating a standardized approach to stature estimation with an acceptable margin of error.

In advancing future studies on stature estimation from foot length in India, a crucial avenue to explore involves incorporating radiology data. Utilizing large datasets from clinical cases where foot X-rays are routinely taken can significantly enhance the precision of regression formulas. By obtaining consent and recording the height of individuals undergoing foot X-rays for clinical purposes, researchers can establish comprehensive databases.

Estimating stature from foot length has become a popular medical school project for many individuals, and existing literature in this context is abundant. However, the need to delve deeper into standardizing these methods is evident, as the established relationship between stature and foot length may vary across populations. It is crucial to recognize that data generated in one population cannot be universally applied to another. Therefore, the next phase of research requires the compilation of comprehensive datasets to further refine and standardize these techniques. This is especially pertinent for practical applications in forensic anthropology settings, where accurate and population-specific stature estimations are essential.

# Conclusion

The current study successfully establishes a clear correlation between stature and foot length, providing a basis for the development of regression equations within the studied sample. Notably, during the calculation of the regression equation, a consistent linear relationship between stature and foot length is observed, aligning with findings from previous studies. The established regression equations offer a valuable tool for forensic practitioners in scenarios such as mass disasters, cases involving dismembered bodies posthomicide, bomb explosions, accidents, and other situations where only partial remains are recovered.

## Acknowledgements

We extend our sincere appreciation to Dr. Jyothsna Kiran Burila, Senior Resident, and Dr. M. Sudeep Chandra, Junior Resident in the Department of Community Medicine at Andhra Medical College, for their invaluable statistical support in this study. Our gratitude also goes to Professor & Head of the Department of Forensic Medicine & Toxicology, Dr. K. Mamatha, along with other faculty members and postgraduates for their unwavering assistance and support. We also thank the M.B.B.S students from the 2020 and 2021 batches for participating in the study.

## Ethics committee approval

The present study was approved by the Ethics Committee of Andhra Medical College, Visakhapatnam vide reference (Serial no. 243/IEC AMC/OCT 2023).

# **Conflict of Interest**

The authors declares that they do not have conflict of interest.

# Funding

Not Applicable

# List of abbreviations used in the table or in the study as a whole

LF= Left foot, RF: Right foot, LFL: Left foot length, RFL: Right foot length, H= Height, S= Stature, FL= Foot Length, RFW= Right Foot Width, RFMH= Right foot Malleolar height, RFNH= Right foot Navicular height, M=Male, F=Female, r = Correlation coefficient, N.A: Not Available.

# References

- Hilmi Ozdena Y, Balcib C, Demirustu A, Turgutd M. Stature and sex estimate using foot and shoe dimensions. Forensic Science International 2004;147:181–4.
- Kumar Agnihotri A, Purwar B, Googoolye K, Agnihotri S. Nilima Jeebun. Estimation of stature by foot length. Journal of Forensic and Legal Medicine 2007;14:279–83.
- Kanchan T, Menezes RG, Moudgil R, Kaur R, Kotian MS, Garg RK. Stature estimation from foot dimensions. Forensic Sci Int 2008;179:241.e1-241.e5. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.20

08.04.029.

- Grivas TB, Mihas C, Arapaki A, Vasiliadis E. Correlation of foot length with height and weight in school age children. J Forensic Leg Med 2008;15:89–95. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jflm.2007.0</u> <u>5.007</u>.
- Zeybek G, Ergur I, Demiroglu Z. Stature and gender estimation using foot measurements Forensic Science International 181. Forensic Science International 2008;181.
- 6. Atamturk D, Duyar I. Age-related factors in the relationship between foot measurements and living stature and body weight. J Forensic Sci 2008;53:1296–300.

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1556-4029.2008.00856.x.

- Sen J, Ghosh S. Estimation of stature from foot length and foot breadth among the Rajbanshi: An indigenous population of North Bengal. Forensic Sci Int 2008;181:55.e1-55.e6. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.20</u> 08.08.009.
- Kanchan T, Menezes RG, Moudgil R, Kaur R, Kotian MS, Garg RK. Stature estimation from foot length using universal regression formula in a north Indian population. J Forensic Sci 2010;55:163–6. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1556-</u> 4029.2009.01243.x.
- Pandey N, Roshan S, Kharate R, Sonawane M, Bhivate V, Ujwal NS. Prediction of stature based on foot length. Journal of Nobel Medical College. 2011.3(1 Issue 5).
- Uhrová P, Beňuš R, Masnicová S. Stature estimation from various foot dimensions among Slovak population. J Forensic Sci 2013;58:448–51. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/1556-</u> 4029.12059.
- Khanapurkar S, Radke D. Estimation of stature from the measurement of foot length, hand length and head length in Maharashtra region. . IJBAMR 2012 Mar;1:77–85.
- Mansur DI, Haque MK, Sharma K, Karki RK, Khanal K, Karna R. Estimation of stature from foot length in adult Nepalese population and its clinical relevance. Kathmandu Univ Med J (KUMJ) 2012;10:11–5. <u>https://doi.org/10.3126/kumj.v10i1.6</u> <u>907</u>.
- Krishan K, Kanchan T, Sharma A. Multiplication factor versus regression analysis in stature estimation from hand and foot

dimensions. J Forensic Leg Med 2012;19:211–4. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jflm.2011.1</u> 2.024.

- Mohanty BB, Agrawal D, Mishra K, Samant singhar P, Chinara PK. Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India; Estimation of height of an individual from foot length: A study on the population of Odisha International Journal of Review in Life Sciences 2012;2(2):69-74
- Karaddi DS, Suntnoore DD, Garampalli DS, Hiremath DR, Mugadlimath DA. Estimation of stature by foot length in males. Int J Biomed Adv Res 2013;4:443. <u>https://doi.org/10.7439/ijbar.v4i7.40</u> <u>0</u>.
- Geetha GN. Estimation of stature from hand and foot measurements in a rare tribe of Kerala state in India. J Clin Diagn Res 2015. <u>https://doi.org/10.7860/jcdr/2015/13</u> <u>777.6582</u>.
- Malik AR, Akhter N, Ali R, Farrukh R, Aziz K. A study on estimation of stature from foot length: A study on estimation of stature from foot length. Prof Med J 2015;22:632–9. https://doi.org/10.29309/tpmj/2015.2 2.05.1304.
- SF Phang, AI Normaizatul, PS Lai. Stature and sex estimation using foot measurements. J Forensic Sci criminal. 2017;5(1). Available from: <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.15744/2348-9804.5.105</u>
- 19. Viral N.C, Sunil M.D, Mangal H.M, Viral J.A, Prince J.M, Raghurajsinh D.V. Estimation of stature from foot length in population of Rajkot region, Gujarat. Indian Journal of Forensic Medicine and Pathology

2017;10(1):37–41. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.21088/ijfmp.097 4.3383.10117.7

- Karmalkar AS, Nikam VR. Prediction of stature from long bones versus hand and foot measurements: A comparative study of the Kolhapur population. Natl Med J India. 2021;34(3):154–7. Available from: <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.25259/NMJI 79</u> <u>20</u>
- 21. Devi TP, Kumar P, Pratim KP, Chandravanshi LP, Chauhan M. Estimation of Stature from foot length in male indigenous population of Assam Region. Foot (Edinb). 2021;49(101840):101840. Available from:

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foot.2021. 101840 22. Kumar SV, Shruthi K, Anand PB, Tejas J. A cross sectional descriptive study for estimation of stature from foot length in south Indian population. Jiafm. 2023;45(2):146–8. Available from: <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.48165/jiafm.202</u> <u>3.45.2.12</u>