

## Erratum to: Sexual dimorphism of the tibia in contemporary Greeks, Italians, and Spanish: forensic implications

Elena F. Kranioti<sup>1,2</sup> · Mario A. Apostol<sup>3</sup>

Published online: 3 November 2016  
© Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2016

**Erratum to: Int J Legal Med (2015) 129:357–363**  
**DOI 10.1007/s00414-014-1045-6**

The manuscript Int J Legal Med 129:357–363 contains a numerical error in Table 4. More specifically in the coefficient for UB (upper epiphyseal breadth) which in the equation IF4 for the Italians is 0.1739 instead of 0.1379 as appears in the original publication. The corrected version of Table 4 of the original publication can be seen in Table 4 (corrected).

Consequently, the formula for sex estimation in Italians using two variables (UB = upper epiphyseal breadth and LB = lower epiphyseal breadth) is the following:

$$IF4 = 0.1739 * UB + 0.1460 * LB - 19.1636 \quad (1)$$

An example of the application of the formula is given below:

---

The online version of the original article can be found at <http://dx.doi:10.1007/s00414-014-1045-6>.

---

✉ Elena F. Kranioti  
elena.kranioti@ed.ac.uk

<sup>1</sup> Edinburgh Unit for Forensic Anthropology, School of History, Classics and Archaeology, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH8 9AG, Scotland, UK

<sup>2</sup> Department of Forensic Sciences, University of Crete Medical School, 71110 Heraklion, Crete, Greece

<sup>3</sup> SC Medicina Legale—ASL TO4, Ivrea, TO, Italy

**Table 4** All subset discriminant functions and classification accuracies for the three populations and the pooled sample

		Coefficients			Constant	Male		Female		Total %	Male		Female		Total %
		TL	UB	LB		N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%	
Greek sample	GF1	0.0244	0.1116	0.1204	-21.6294	75/85	88.2	59/71	83.1	85.9	75/85	88.2	59/71	83.1	85.9
	GF2	0.0297	0.1576		-21.6321	76/85	89.4	60/72	83.3	86.6	75/85	88.2	59/72	83.1	85.4
	GF3	0.0344		0.1993	-20.4757	76/85	89.4	62/71	87.3	88.5	75/85	88.2	62/71	87.3	87.8
	GF4		0.1724	0.1527	-18.9237	76/85	89.4	61/71	85.9	87.8	76/85	89.4	61/71	85.9	87.8
Spanish sample	SF1	0.0096	0.2669	0.0002	-22.5316	40/42	95.2	46/50	92.0	93.5	40/42	95.2	46/50	92.0	93.5
	SF2	0.0072	0.2793		-22.6016	41/43	95.3	49/53	92.5	93.8	41/43	95.3	49/53	92.5	93.8
	SF3	0.034		0.1595	-19.6229	39/46	84.8	47/54	87.0	86.0	38/46	82.6	47/54	87.0	85.0
	SF4		0.2980	0.0066	-21.8219	40/42	95.2	46/50	92.0	93.5	40/42	95.2	45/50	90.0	92.4
Italian sample	IF1	0.0132	0.1478	0.1204	-20.7166	68/81	84.0	96/105	91.4	88.2	67/81	82.7	96/105	91.4	87.6
	IF2	0.018	0.1854		-19.8181	69/81	85.2	95/106	89.6	87.7	69/81	85.2	94/106	88.7	87.2
	IF3	0.0225		0.2290	-18.0086	67/81	82.7	93/107	86.9	85.1	67/81	82.7	93/107	86.9	85.1
	IF4		0.1739	0.1460	-19.1636	68/81	84.0	96/105	91.4	88.2	68/81	84.0	96/105	91.4	88.2
Pooled sample	F1	0.0183	0.1690	0.0505	-20.8371	181/208	87.0	200/226	88.5	87.8	180/208	86.5	200/226	88.5	87.6
	F2	0.0196	0.1890		-20.458	183/209	87.6	198/231	85.7	86.6	183/209	87.6	198/231	85.7	86.6
	F3	0.0372		0.1213	-18.3472	167/212	78.8	201/232	86.6	82.8	167/212	78.8	200/232	86.2	82.7
	F4		0.2255	0.0543	-18.7601	175/208	84.1	198/226	87.6	85.9	175/208	84.1	198/226	87.6	85.9

For a tibia, deriving from an individual of Italian origin, if LB = 39 mm and UB = 65 mm by replacing the unknown in (1) we get:

$$IF4 = 0.1739 * 65 + 0.1460 * 39 - 19.1636 = -2.167$$

Thus,  $IF4 < 0$  means that the unknown tibia belongs to a female individual. This value is smaller than  $-1.18$  which according to Table 5 of the original publication (Int J Legal Med 129 (2015):357–363) means that the posterior probability of correct classification of this individual is  $>95\%$ .

**Acknowledgments** We would like to acknowledge the discovery of this numerical error by an anonymous reviewer of Kotěrová et al. IJLM 2016 (in press). As seen above, the numerical error is due to reverse order of two digits which unfortunately resulted in erroneous results in the aforementioned validation study. We would like to suggest that researchers should get in touch with the authors of the original publications and request access to the original data in such cases as we feel that the exclusion of IF4 from this important validation study could have been omitted. Nevertheless, we are grateful to have the opportunity to provide a correction for our formula.