Comptes Rendus Palevol

Thematic issue: **Hominin biomechanics, virtual anatomy and inner structural morphology: From head to toe - A tribute to Laurent Puymerail**

Cortical bone mapping: An application to hand and foot bones in hominoids

Distribution topographique de l'os cortical: une application aux os de la main et du pied chez les hominoïdes

Zewdi J. Tsegai [a,†,*], Nicholas B. Stephens [a,†], Graham Treece [b], Matthew M. Skinner [c,a], Tracy L. Kivell [c,a], Andrew Gee [b]

[a] *Department of Human Evolution, Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig, Germany*

[b] *Department of Engineering, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK*

[c] *Skeletal Biology Research Centre, School of Anthropology and Conservation, University of Kent, Canterbury, UK*

Keywords: Cortex; Cortical thickness measurement; Behavioural reconstruction; Morphometric maps; Hominoid

Mots clés: Cortex; Mesure de l'épaisseur corticale; Reconstruction comportementale; Cartes morphométriques; Hominoïde

† Contributed equally to this work.

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: zewdi_tsegai@eva.mpg.de (Z.J. Tsegai).

ABSTRACT

Bone form reflects both the genetic profile and behavioural history of an individual. As cortical bone is able to remodel in response to mechanical stimuli, interspecific differences in cortical bone thickness may relate to loading during locomotion or manual behaviours during object manipulation. Here, we test the application of a novel method of cortical bone mapping to the third metacarpal (Mc3) and talus of *Pan*, *Pongo*, and *Homo*. This method of analysis allows measurement of cortical thickness throughout the bone, and as such is applicable to elements with complex morphology. In addition, it allows for registration of each specimen to a canonical surface, and identifies regions where cortical thickness differs significantly between groups. Cortical bone mapping has potential for application to palaeoanthropological studies, however, due to the complexity of correctly registering homologous regions across varied morphology, further methodological development would be advantageous.

RÉSUMÉ

La forme d'un os reflète simultanément le profil génétique et l'histoire comportementale d'un individu. L'os cortical est capable de remodelage en réponse à des stimuli mécaniques. Les différences interspécifiques dans l'épaisseur de l'os cortical peuvent donc être corrélées avec la charge mécanique exercée durant la locomotion ou la manipulation d'objets. Ici, nous présentons l'application d'une méthode novatrice pour cartographier la distribution de l'os cortical du troisième métacarpien et du talus chez *Pan*, *Pongo* et *Homo*. Cette méthode permet d'analyser l'épaisseur corticale sur toute la longueur de l'os et est applicable à tous les éléments osseux ayant une morphologie complexe. En outre, cette méthode permet de recaler chaque spécimen sur une surface canonique et d'identifier les régions où l'épaisseur corticale diffère significativement entre les groupes. Ce procédé peut être appliqué à des études paléoanthropologiques. Cependant, du fait de la complexité du recalage correct des régions homologues, des progrès méthodologiques futurs sont envisagés.

1. Introduction

Identifying skeletal variables that relate to functional patterns is essential for reconstructing the behaviour of extinct species. However, it is often unclear which morphological features are most functionally relevant, as some researchers focus on novel, derived features, with the intention of understanding evolutionary change, while others are interested in the entire morphological complex of features, aiming to reconstruct the way in which a species lived (Ward, 2002). This is a common problem in palaeoanthropology, and has led to differing interpretations of skeletal morphology in fossil hominins (e.g., Latimer, 1991; Stern, 2000; Ward, 2002). In this debate, more plastic morphological features that can adapt in response to an individual's behaviour are of critical importance.

As cortical bone is able to remodel during life in response to mechanical load - a concept known as bone functional adaptation - it has the potential to hold a signal of an individual's behaviour (see Ruff et al., 2006, and references therein). Bone adapts to loading in several ways, for example by increasing/decreasing mineralisation to adapt its stiffness, changing shape to alter load transmission, or increasing thickness (Currey, 2003, 2010). However, this is a complex process that is likely to vary depending on skeletal location and systemic factors such as age, hormones and genes (e.g., Lovejoy et al., 2003; Pearson and Lieberman, 2004). Moreover, individual factors such as the magnitude and frequency of strain and the previous loading history of the bone cells can also affect cortical remodelling (e.g., Frost, 1987; Pearson and Lieberman, 2004; Ruff et al., 2006). Experimental studies are not always able to demonstrate that bone structure is well adapted to withstand strains (Demes et al., 1998, 2001; Lieberman et al., 2004) or that bone morphology changes in the expected way (Wallace et al., 2015a). However, in general, studies have shown that cortical bone is able to respond to behaviour during an individual's lifetime (Carlson and Judex, 2007; Christen et al., 2014; Robling et al., 2002; Ruff et al., 2006), and thus analysis of cortical bone thickness holds potential for reconstructing behaviour in extinct species.

Within palaeoanthropology, numerous studies have investigated how cortical bone properties relate to behaviour in both extant and fossil taxa. These can be broadly separated into three methodologies: (1) analysis of cross sectional geometric properties either at mid-shaft or at several points throughout the length of the shaft (e.g., Carlson, 2005; Carlson et al., 2006, 2008;

Davies and Stock, 2014; Marchi, 2005; Ruff, 2002, 2008; Ruff et al., 2013, 2015; Sarringhaus et al, 2005; Shaw and Stock, 2013); (2) generating 2D colour maps of cortical thickness throughout the diaphysis, with potential for application to non-cylindrical, irregularly shaped elements, although as yet this has only been tested on tooth roots, and not the epiphyses of long bones (e.g., Bondioli et al., 2010; Jashashvilli et al., 2015; Puymerail et al., 2012a, b, 2013); and (3) analysis of bone profiles at the articular surfaces, some of which include both cortical bone and also the underlying trabecular structure (Carlson et al., 2013; Mazurier et al., 2010; Patel and Carlson, 2007). These analyses have been conducted using both clinical and micro-computed tomography (microCT) (e.g., Lillie et al., 2015). Several studies have focused specifically on cortical bone of the hands (e.g., Lazenby, 1998; Marchi, 2005) and feet (e.g., Griffin and Richmond, 2005; Jashashvili et al., 2015; Marchi, 2005). Recent studies that have analysed cortical bone thickness identified subtle differences both between African apes and modern humans, and between modern and fossil *Homo* species (Jashashvili et al., 2015; Puymerail et al., 2012a, b, 2013).

Here we investigate the potential applications of a novel method of cortical thickness analysis, developed for medical research, which allows for statistical comparison between groups (Poole et al., 2011, 2012; Treece et al., 2010, 2012). The main advantage of this method is that, unlike previous methods, it allows measurement of cortical bone thickness throughout the entire bone, i.e., including the diaphysis, metaphysis and epiphyses, and as such is applicable to both long bones and to more complex elements. Moreover, in contrast to existing methods which require registration to a 2D map (e.g., Bondioli et al., 2010), it enables generation of 3D colour maps for each taxon/group, as well as quantification and visualization of regions whose difference in cortical thickness between groups can be assessed for statistical significance.

We test the application of this method on comparative samples of hand (third metacarpal) and foot (talus) bones of extant hominoids and, in order to test the applicability of this method in specimens with taxonomic alteration, one early Holocene human (Arene Candide 2, third metacarpal). As the hands and feet are the direct contact between an individual and the substrate, they are likely to experience the initial forces of both locomotion and object manipulation. As such, the skeletal elements in these regions are likely to reflect loading from these behaviours. However, many bones of the hands and feet, particularly carpals and tarsals, have irregular and complex shapes. As such, existing methods of analysis may not be applicable because complex

bones cannot be modelled as simple beams and their morphology cannot be easily mapped to a 2D plane for between-group comparisons.

In sum, we assess the utility of this method in an anthropological context for: (1) comparing cortical thickness differences amongst taxa where there are also consistent differences in shape, (2) comparing cortical thickness between taxa with systemic differences in cortical thickness between species, (3) conducting statistical comparisons across small sample sizes, common in palaeoanthropology and (4) applicability to taphonomically-altered fossil specimens.

2. Methods

2.1. Sample and microCT scanning

This study tests application of a cortical bone thickness analysis to the third metacarpal (Mc3) and talus. The study sample for the Mc3 consists of *Homo sapiens* (N = 21), *Pan troglodytes verus* (N = 5), *Pongo* sp. (N = 5), and a subfossil *H. sapiens* individual, Arene Candide 2 (N = 1), from the early Holocene (9,900-10,850 Uncal BP) (Sparacello et al., 2015). For the talus the sample includes two species: *H. sapiens* (N = 9) and *P. t. verus* (N = 13). Details of the study samples are shown in Table 1. All non-human apes were wild-caught individuals and the modern human sample is composed of nine individuals from Nubian Egypt (6th-11th century) (Paoli et al., 1993; Strouhal and Jungwirth, 1979), eight individuals from Tiera del Fuego (19th century) (Marangoni et al., 2011), and four individuals from Syracuse (20th century).

High resolution microCT scans of the sample were collected using a SkyScan1173 scanner at 100-130kV and 61-62 µA and a BIR ACTIS 225/300 scanner at 130kV and 100-120 µA. Both CT scanners are housed at the Department of Human Evolution, Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology (Leipzig, Germany). All scans were reconstructed as 2048 x 2048 16-bit tiff stacks. All specimens were analysed at an isotropic voxel size of around 33 microns (mean: 33µm, range: 30 - 42 µm).

2.2. Cortical thickness measurement

Segmentation of the outer surface of the bone and measurement of cortical thickness were conducted using Stradwin v5.1a (http://mi.eng.cam.ac.uk/~rwp/stradwin) (following Treece et al., 2010, 2012). Contours were automatically segmented using a threshold-based segmentation at 20-30 slice intervals along the length of the bone, with minor manual correction of errors in contour definition (Fig. 1A and B). Interpolation of these contours enabled creation of an outer surface of the bone (Fig. 1C). Using this surface as a guide, around 10000 - 15000 independent measures of cortical bone thickness were made at each vertex, which were based on the grey value profile of the CT data (Fig. 1D). As the vertices were placed at similar geometric

separations, the number of measurements was dependent on the size of the bone. These thickness values were mapped onto the surface to generate a colour map of cortical thickness for each individual, which could be smoothed in order to minimise the effect of erroneous measurements (Fig. 1E).

2.3. Specimen registration

For comparison of cortical bone thickness maps between specimens, an average (canonical) surface was created to which each individual surface was registered using wxRegSurf v13 (http://mi.eng.cam.ac.uk/~ahg/wxRegSurf/) (following Gee et al., 2015). To create the canonical surface, an initial specimen was chosen to which every surface in the sample was then registered to create an average of all individuals (Fig. 2A). For both the Mc3 and talus, the specimen chosen to begin creation of an average surface was an individual of *H. sapiens*. Each specimen was registered to the canonical surface in order to compare cortical thickness between specimens (Fig. 2B).

2.4. Protocol for processing fossil specimens

A common problem encountered with archaeological and fossil specimens is the presence of unwanted inclusions within the bone. In some of the samples included here we found such inclusions were of a higher density than the bone, which may affect measurement of cortical thickness. The protocol for segmentation was therefore modified for these samples, with those steps taken during the processing of the Arene Candide 2 Mc3 being used as an illustration (Fig. 3). Non-bone inclusions were corrected by either removing the bright inclusions or reducing the brightness of the bone in these regions. Both were achieved by creating a label field within Avizo 8.1, where the magic wand tool was used to select the high density materials. Those that were to be removed were subtracted from the original image with an arithmetic operation (i.e. original – label-field), while those areas constrained along the exterior of the cortical bone were first multiplied by a fraction of their grey values and then subtracted from the original (i.e. (original data - (label field x .05)). This resulted in an even grey value range that would permit an accurate estimate of the cortical thickness for each measured point.

186

187 *2.5. Statistical parametric mapping*

188

189 Mean cortical thickness maps were generated for each taxon and between-group
190 comparisons were conducted using statistical parametric mapping (Friston et al., 1995) in the
191 SurfStat package (Worsley et al., 2009). In order to generate mean cortical thickness maps for
192 each species, the species mean was calculated for each vertex of the registered surfaces. As the
193 surfaces are registered to a canonical surface, these vertices are at equivalent locations. Statistical
194 parametric maps, commonly used in neuroimaging, are in essence the mapped results of
195 univariate comparisons at multiple points. In essence this is a "mass-univariate" analysis in that
196 univariate comparisons are made at each of the many vertices of the registered surface (Friston et
197 al., 1995). We applied statistical parametric mapping to the registered surfaces in order to
198 conduct interspecific comparisons. A general linear model (GLM) was fitted to the data to
199 determine whether cortical thickness can be explained by covariates of interest (species/taxa) and
200 confounding covariates. In order to minimise the effect of shape differences on systematic
201 misregistration, we incorporated information about shape as a confounding covariate in the GLM
202 (Gee and Treece, 2014; Gee et al., 2015). Specifically, we included non-rigid shape coefficients,
203 which were generated from a statistical shape model via principal component analysis of the
204 movement of each vertex during registration, as described in Gee and Treece (2014). The most
205 dominant mode of shape variation, which largely captured bone size, was disregarded since this
206 was highly correlated with taxa. Statistical parametric maps were generated using F statistics for
207 pairwise comparisons (talus) or T statistics for multiple comparisons (Mc3), and the
208 corresponding p-values were corrected for multiple comparisons using random field theory, in
209 order to control for the chance of false positives (Fig. 2C) (Friston et al., 1995; Worsley et al.,
210 2009). For statistical tests a p-value of $p < 0.05$ was considered significant. These statistical tests
211 are conducted both for each vertex of the registered surface (Fig. 2C: yellow-red colour scale)
212 and for localised regions, or clusters, on the registered surface (Fig. 2C: blue colour scale)
213 (Friston et al., 1995). For the talus, relative thickness values were calculated for each individual
214 by subtracting the individual mean value from all of the thickness measurements then dividing
215 by the standard deviation, so as to test a method for standardising values when there are
216 considerable interspecific differences in mean cortical thickness.

3. Results

Cortical thickness mean values and standard deviations are shown in Table 2. In the talus *Pan* has thicker cortical bone than *Homo*. This is similar to the cortical bone in the Mc3, where both *Pongo* and *Pan* have thicker cortical bone than *Homo*. Within *Homo*, the Arene Candide 2 Mc3 has the thickest cortical bone, approaching the average of *Pongo*.

3.1. Cortical thickness maps: Mc3

Cortical thickness maps for the Mc3 are shown in Fig. 4. Both *Pan* and *Pongo* have much thicker cortical bone in the shaft compared with *Homo*, and in *Pongo* the regions of greater thickness extend further proximally and distally than in *Pan*. The non-human specimens also have greater cortical thickness than *Homo* at the epiphyses, however no visible differences between the species can be discerned from the mean cortical thickness maps.

Quantitatively, the overall greater thickness of the Mc3 of Arene Candide 2, compared with modern humans, is in line with previous assessments of increased gracility of the skeleton in recent, more sedentary modern humans (Chirchir et al., 2015; Ryan and Shaw, 2015, but see Wallace et al., 2015b). Qualitatively, however, the local thickness pattern is largely comparable to that of recent *Homo,* where the thickest point of cortical bone is at the palmar aspect of the midshaft, while the cortex thins at the epiphyses. Interestingly, there is also thickening observable along the presumed attachment site of the second and third dorsal interosseous (Cashmore and Zakrzewski, 2013, but see Rabey et al., 2015; Williams-Hatala et al., 2016).

Fig. 5 shows the overall cortical thickness differences and statistically significant differences by region. A comparison between *Pongo* and *Homo* reveals that *Pongo* has thicker cortex along the majority of the diaphysis (Fig. 5, left), and this difference is statistically significant (Fig. 5, right), with further cortical differences at the palmar and dorsoulnar aspect of the Mc3 head. Less dramatic differences exist between *Pan* and *Homo,* with *Pan* demonstrating significantly thicker cortical bone primarily along the dorsal aspect of the diaphysis and head, as well as a prominent region at the radial and ulnar aspects of the base that extends distally to the Mc2/Mc4 articular surfaces. *Pongo* and *Pan* differ in regions in which the cortical bone is both thicker and thinner; *Pongo* is relatively thinner than *Pan* along the dorsal aspect of the Mc3

diaphysis and head, but comparatively thicker along the palmar aspect of the diaphysis and dorsal aspect of the base. However, none of these differences in cortical thickness were statistically significant (Fig. 5).

3.2. Cortical thickness maps: talus

Cortical thickness maps for the talus are shown in Fig. 6A. The mean maps for each species, based on the absolute thickness values, show that *Homo* and *Pan* both share thicker cortical bone on the medial and lateral malleolar surfaces and on the medial aspect of the talar neck. *Pan*, but not *Homo*, has a region of thicker cortical bone on the posterior subtalar articular surface. However, the absolute thickness map (Fig. 6A) shows that overall *Homo* has thinner cortex throughout the talus compared with *Pan*. There are several regions of significant differences in cortical bone thickness between the species, which generally represent the regions in which *Pan* has the thickest cortical bone compared with *Homo*.

3.3. Relative means

To account for the significantly thicker cortex throughout the *Pan* talus, relative thickness maps were produced and are shown in Fig. 6B. Relative cortical thickness was calculated for each specimen by subtracting the individual mean value from each thickness measurement and dividing by the standard deviation. The regions in which the mean colour maps show relatively thicker cortical bone are similar to the absolute thickness maps. The comparison between the two species, however, shows a different pattern. There are regions in which *Pan* has relatively thicker cortical bone compared with *Homo*, particularly on the medial and lateral malleolar surfaces and on the medial aspect of the talar neck. In contrast, *Homo* has relatively thicker bone at the posterior talar tubercles, the posterior surface of the talar trochlea, and in some regions of the talar head. The regions in which cortical thickness differs significantly between the two species also differ between the absolute and relative colour maps.

4. Discussion

We sought to augment and expand upon well-established methods of cortical bone analysis for palaeoanthropological research by adapting an imaging technique originally designed for low resolution diagnostic medical CT scans. This 3D cortical mapping method (using freeware Stradwin v5.1a and wxRegSurf v13) is attractive because it allows for the rapid acquisition of thousands of independent measurements of cortical thickness using unsegmented CT data of relatively simple (e.g., femoral) and complex (e.g., vertebral) morphologies within a stand-alone and freely available software package. Such measurements may then be mapped onto a canonical bone of mean shape for qualitative and quantitative comparison (i.e., using statistical parametric mapping; Friston et al., 1995; Gee and Treece, 2014). Within the present study we found that this method is capable of analysing and visualizing cortical thickness data from high resolution microCT scans of hominoid metacarpals and tali, which present two distinctly different morphologies.

Broadly speaking we found that the average cortical thickness of both the Mc3 and talus was relatively thinner in modern *Homo* when compared to *Pan*, *Pongo*, and the subfossil Mc3 of Arene Candide 2. Within the Mc3 of *Pan* and *Homo*, regions of greater thickness were concentrated in a band along the proximal-midshaft with the thinnest portion being found at the palmar surface of the proximal and distal articular surfaces. However, the greatest thickness in *Homo* is apparent along the palmar aspect of this band. *Pongo* differed from the other two groups in a noticeable absence of a thick band at midshaft, with thickening instead being found along the palmar aspect of the shaft and head. Although there were no statistically significant differences between *Pongo* and *Pan*, subtle variations in thickness are apparent along the dorsal aspect, where *Pongo* is relatively thinner at the head and dorsal aspect of the shaft but thicker at the base. It would be interesting to see if these differences reach significance with increased sample sizes. Within the talus, we found regions of greater thickness in both *Homo* and *Pan* on the medial and lateral malleolar surfaces and on the medial surface of the talar neck. In *Pan*, but not *Homo*, the posterior subtalar articular surface has very thick cortical bone. Statistically significant differences between *Pan* and *Homo* were then found and visualized using both raw and equalized data that supported the qualitative observations. Although not the goal of the present study, these results illustrate the potential of this method for identifying differences in

cortical thickness between species that can be used to test hypotheses founded upon bone functional adaptation and known variation in behavioural loading.

Inherent to any method seeking to evaluate interspecific comparisons is the necessity of identifying homologous anatomical regions. The "whole bone" approach of this 3D cortical mapping method helps to overcome some challenges associated with identifying homologous subsamples (e.g., a single slice) of cortical bone. However, this method does suffer from two shortcomings when comparing morphology that differs across samples. First, the automated method finds it challenging to register morphologically ambiguous regions, such as the relatively simple morphology of the shaft that lacks clearly identifiable features. Within palaeoanthropology, homology is often ensured by first selecting shared diagnostic features that can be easily and reproducibly identified, i.e., by using landmarks (e.g., Arias-Martorell et al., 2015; Knigge et al., 2015; Rein et al., 2015). This is not the case here, where correspondence is driven by proximity within a predefined search region. The method of registration applied here registers prominent morphological features, which would be appropriate for landmark placement, fairly effectively. However in more featureless regions, such as the Mc3 shaft, the registration is not constrained by clear shape differences. Often in such transformations there are ambiguous regions, such as the shaft, where multiple registrations could be argued to be valid resulting in a systematic misattribution of the mapped thickness. Even though we allowed for shape in the GLM, we were not able to allow for the dominant shape mode since it was highly correlated with group. It must therefore be kept in mind that the thickness differences identified may be the result of some systematic misregistration, especially since the lengths and widths of the Mc3 shafts across the hominoids in this sample are very different.

The second challenge with this method arises when morphology across the comparative sample differs substantially. For example, *Homo* has a styloid process at the base of the Mc3 that is absent in non-human primates and most fossil hominins (Marzke and Marzke, 1987; Ward et al., 2013). However, the current method requires registering the entire comparative sample to a single surface, in this case an average mesh of the entire sample. In this study, the average mesh has a styloid process, and so the *Pan* and *Pongo* Mc3s are deformed during registration to a more *Homo*-like morphology. Thus information taken from the base of the Mc3 is obscured and complicates interpretations of the potential differences in function, loading, and bony response. This has clear implications for testing hypotheses generated under the bone functional adaptation

paradigm and will likely be an issue for other comparisons of skeletal elements that possess highly variable anatomical regions. Thus, with this method it would be necessary to mask or disregard such anatomical regions.

Indeed, the above issues are likely exaggerated within a (palaeo)anthropological context where small sample sizes are common and inter-species variation can be high. Although one might be able to collect a statistically significant number of high resolution scans from *H. sapiens* or Neanderthals to be studied in this manner, most fossil hominin taxa are frequently only represented by one or two isolated and fragmentary specimens of any given anatomical element. As such, we should always be on the lookout for methods that allow us to gain as much data as possible from the available fossils (Zollikofer and Ponce de Leon, 2001). Although any statistical analysis afforded by the present method will remain underpowered in regards to fossils, the ability to create interactive 3D visualizations provides a novel and informative way to compare morphology, and particularly morphological features that are attached to long-standing functional hypotheses (e.g., the functional significance of the Mc3 styloid process within humans, gracilization of the skeleton, or remodelling of bone at muscle attachment sites) and even help to generate new ones (see Hermann and Klein, 2015).

In light of this, a potential advantage of this 3D cortical mapping method is that the registration of individuals to a "mean mesh" produces information about shape differences across the sample. Principal component analysis produces a compact set of eigenvectors that capture the dominant modes of variation from the mean mesh. A statistical shape model of this nature can potentially be used to quantify and explore shape differences (Joshi et al., 2016; Schneider et al., 2015). In fact, the interactive visualization and deformation of the canonical model, by way of an associated statistical shape model file, is a feature that is currently available within wxRegSurf. This offers a quick and convenient way to visualise 3D shape/structure covariation, though whether the variation is biologically meaningful depends on the accuracy of the homologies.

The value of being able to visually evaluate variation in cortical thickness across the entire skeletal element is seen in comparison with previous cortical mapping techniques (Jashashvili et al., 2015; Puymerail et al., 2012a, b; Ruff et al., 2015; Zollikofer and Ponce de Leon, 2001) that rely on the cylindrical shape of long-bones to digitally unroll the diaphysis and map thickness values onto a uniform grid (Bondioli et al., 2010). In contrast, thickness values in our 3D cortical mapping method are estimated on intact morphology using the width and height of the grey

value curve within the user-specified measurement line. This type of measurement allows for an associated error range that is used to inform the weight of the smoothing algorithm and, subsequently, the mean values mapped to the canonical bone. Although some subtle variation is necessarily lost in this process, this allows for a reasonable estimation of cortical thickness in the individual and mean model, which can then be visualised qualitatively and statistically on the same mean model.

To conclude, the present method of cortical thickness measurement can be successfully applied to comparative samples, and builds upon previous techniques in palaeoanthropology by enabling cortical thickness measurement of more complex regions/elements, such as the epiphyses of the metacarpals and the talus. Through registration to a canonical model, statistical comparisons can be conducted between groups, which holds potential for applications to archaeological and fossil samples. However, in applying this method to comparative samples, it is important that the optimum morphology of the canonical mesh and the potential for misregistration are considered.

Acknowledgements

We thank Roberto Macchiarelli and Clément Zanolli for their invitation to contribute to this interesting special issue. We are grateful for the samples provided by the Berlin Museum für Naturkunde (Frieder Mayer), Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology (Christophe Boesch), Museo Archeologico del Finale (Andrea De Pascale), Naturhistorisches Museum Wien (Maria Teschler-Nicola, Ronald Muehl), Senckenberg Museum (Virginie Volpato), University of Florence (Jacopo Moggi-Cecchi and Silvia Bortoluzzi), and University of Göttingen (Birgit Grosskopf). For scanning assistance we thank David Plotzki, Patrick Schönfeld, and Heiko Temming. For French translations we thank Adeline Le Cabec. This research was supported by the Max Planck Society (ZJT, NBS, MMS, TLK) and the European Research Council Starting Grant #336301 (TLK and MMS).

References

Arias-Martorell, J., Tallman, M., Potau, J.M., Bello-Hellegouarch, G., Pérez-Pérez, A., 2015. Shape analysis of the proximal humerus in orthograde and semi-orthograde primates: Correlates of suspensory behavior. Am. J. Primatol. 77, 1-19.

Bondioli, L., Bayle, P., Dean, C., Mazurier, A., Puymerail, L., Ruff, C., Stock, J.T., Volpato, V., Zanolli, C., Macchiarelli, R., 2010. Technical note: Morphometric maps of long bone shafts and dental roots for imaging topographic thickness variation. Am. J. Phys. Anthropol. 142, 328-334.

Carlson, K.J., 2005. Investigating the form-function interface in African apes: Relationships between principal moments of area and positional behaviors in femoral and humeral diaphyses. Am. J. Phys. Anthropol. 127, 312-334.

Carlson, K.L., Judex, S., 2007. Increased non-linear locomotion alters diaphyseal bone shape. J. Exp. Bio. 210, 3117-3125.

Carlson, K.J., Doran-Sheehy, D.M., Hunt, K.D., Nishida, T., Yamanaka, A., Boesch, C., 2006. Locomotor behavior and long bone morphology in individual free-ranging chimpanzees. J. Hum. Evol. 50, 394-404.

Carlson, K.J., Jashashvili, T., Houghton, K., Westaway, M.C., Patel, B.A., 2013. Joint loads in marsupial ankles reflect habitual bipedalism versus quadrupedalism. PLoS ONE 8, e58811 (doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0058811).

Carlson, K.J., Sumner, D.R., Morbeck, M.E., Nishida, T., Yamanaka, A., Boesch, C., 2008. Role of nonbehavioral factors in adjusting long bone diaphyseal structure in free-ranging *Pan troglodytes*. Int. J. Primatol. 29, 1401-1420.

Cashmore, L.A., Zakrzewski, S.R., 2013. Assessment of musculoskeletal stress marker development in the hand. Int. J. Osteoarchaeol. 23, 334-347.

Chirchir, H., Kivell, T.L., Ruff, C.B., Hublin, J.-J., Carlson, K.J., Zipfel, B., Richmond, B.G., 2015. Recent origins of low trabecular bone density in modern humans. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 112, 366-371.

Christen, P., Ito, K., Ellouz, R., Boutroy, S., Sornay-Rendu, E., Chapurlat, R.D., van Rietbergen, B., 2014. Bone remodelling in humans is load-driven but not lazy. Nat. Comm. 5, 4855 (doi: 10.1038/ncomms5855).

427 Currey, J.D., 2003. The many adaptations of bone. J. Biomech. 36, 1487-1495.
428 Currey, J.D., 2010. Mechanical properties and adaptations of some less familiar bony tissues. J.
429 Mech. Behav. Biomed. 3, 357-372.
430 Davies, T.G., Stock, J.T., 2014. The influence of relative body breadth on the diaphyseal
431 morphology of the human lower limb. Am. J. Hum. Biol. 26, 822-835.
432 Demes, B., Qin, Y.-X., Stern, J.T. Jr., Larson, S.G., Rubin, C.T., 2001. Patterns of strain in the
433 macaque tibia during functional activity. Am. J. Phys. Anthropol. 116, 257-265.
434 Demes, B., Stern, J.T. Jr., Hausman, M.R., Larson, S.G., McLeod, K.J., Rubin, C.T., 1998.
435 Patterns of strain in the macaque ulna during functional activity. Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.
436 106, 87-100.
437 Friston, K.J., Holmes, A.P., Worsley, K.J., Poline, J.-P., Frith, C.D., Frackowiak, R.S.J., 1995.
438 Statistical parametric maps in functional imaging: A general linear approach. Hum. Brain.
439 Mapp. 2, 189-210.
440 Frost, H.M., 1987. Bone "mass" and the "mechanostat": A proposal. Anat. Rec. 219, 1-9.
441 Gee, A.H., Treece, G.M., 2014. Systematic misregistration and the statistical analysis of surface
442 data. Med. Image. Anal. 18, 385-393.
443 Gee, A.H., Treece, G.M., Tonkin, C.J., Black, D.M., Poole, K.E.S., 2015. Association between
444 femur size and a focal defect of the superior femoral neck. Bone 81, 60-66.
445 Griffin, N.L., Richmond, B.G., 2005. Cross-sectional geometry of the human forefoot. Bone 37,
446 253-260.
447 Hermann, M., Klein, R., 2015. A visual analytics perspective on shape analysis: State of the art
448 and future prospects. Comput. Graph. 53, Part A, 63-71.
449 Jashashvili, T., Dowdeswell, M.R., Lebrun, R., Carlson, K.J., 2015. Cortical structure of hallucal
450 metatarsals and locomotor adaptations in hominoids. PLoS ONE 10, e0117905
451 (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0117905).
452 Joshi, A.A., Leahy, R.M., Badawi, R.D., Chaudhari, A.J., 2016. Registration-based morphometry
453 for shape analysis of the bones of the human wrist. IEEE Trans. Med. Imaging 35, 416-
454 426.
455 Knigge, R.P., Tocheri, M.W., Orr, C.M., McNulty, K.P., 2015. Three-dimensional geometric
456 morphometric analysis of talar morphology in extant gorilla taxa from highland and
457 lowland habitats. Anat. Rec. 298, 277-290.

458 Latimer, B., 1991. Locomotor adaptations in *Australopithecus afarensis*: The issue of
459 arboreality. In: Senut, B., Coppens, Y. (Eds.), Origine(s) de la Bipédie chez les Hominidés.
460 CNRS, Paris, pp. 169-176.
461 Lazenby, R.A., 1998. Second metacarpal midshaft geometry in an historic cemetery sample. Am.
462 J. Phys. Anthropol. 106, 157-167.
463 Lieberman, D.E., Polk, J.D., Demes, B., 2004. Predicting long bone loading from cross-sectional
464 geometry. Am. J. Phys. Anthropol. 123, 156-171.
465 Lillie, E.M., Urban, J.E., Weaver, A.A., Powers, A.K., Stitzel, J.D., 2015. Estimation of skull
466 table thickness with clinical CT and validation with microCT. J. Anat. 226, 73-80.
467 Lovejoy, C.O., McCollum, M.A., Reno, P.L., Rosenman, B.A., 2003. Developmental biology
468 and human evolution. Ann. Rev. Anthropol. 32, 85-109.
469 Marangoni, A., Belli, L.M., Caramelli, D., Jacopo, M.-C., Zavattaro, M., Manzi, G., 2011. The
470 Tierra del Fuego, its ancient inhabitants, and the collections of human skeletal remains in
471 the Museums of Anthropology of Florence and Rome. Museological significance, past
472 researches, perspectives. Museol. Sci. 5, 88-96.
473 Marchi, D., 2005. The cross-sectional geometry of the hand and foot bones of the Hominoidea
474 and its relationship to locomotor behaviour. J. Hum. Evol. 49, 743-761.
475 Marzke, M.W., Marzke, R.F., 1987. The third metacarpal styloid process in humans: Origin and
476 functions. Am. J. Phys. Anthropol. 73, 415-431.
477 Mazurier, A., Nakatsukasa, M., Macchiarelli, R., 2010. The inner structural variation of the
478 primate tibial plateau characterized by high-resolution microtomography. Implications for
479 the reconstruction of fossil locomotor behaviours. C.R. Palevol. 9, 349-359.
480 Paoli, G., Tarli, S.M.B., Klir, P., Strouhal, E., Tofanelli, S., Valli, M.T.D., Pavelcova, B., 1993.
481 Paleoserology of the Christian population at Sayala (Lower Nubia) - an evaluation of the
482 reliability of the results. Am. J. Phys. Anthropol. 92, 263-272.
483 Patel, B.A., Carlson, K.J., 2007. Bone density spatial patterns in the distal radius reflect habitual
484 hand postures adopted by quadrupedal primates. J. Hum. Evol. 52, 130-141.
485 Pearson, O.M., Lieberman, D.E., 2004. The aging of Wolff's "law": Ontogeny and responses to
486 mechanical loading in cortical bone. Yearb. Phys. Anthropol. 47, 63-99.

Poole, K.E.S., Treece, G.M., Mayhew, P.M., Vaculík, J., Dungl, P., Horák, M., Štěpán, J.J., Gee, A.H., 2012. Cortical thickness mapping to identify focal osteoporosis in patients with hip fracture. PLoS ONE 7, e38466 (doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0038466).

Poole, K.E.S., Treece, G.M., Ridgway, G.R., Mayhew, P.M., Borggrefe, J., Gee, A.H., 2011. Targeted regeneration of bone in the osteoporotic human femur. PLoS ONE 6, e16190 (doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0016190).

Puymerail, L., 2013. The functionally-related signatures characterizing the endostructural organisation of the femoral shaft in modern humans and chimpanzee. C.R. Palevol. 12, 223-231.

Puymerail, L., Ruff, C.B., Bondioli, L., Widianto, H., Trinkaus, E., Macchiarelli, R., 2012a. Structural analysis of the Kresna 11 *Homo erectus* femoral shaft (Sangiran, Java). J. Hum. Evol. 63, 741-749.

Puymerail, L., Volpato, V., Debénath, A., Mazurier, A., Tournepiche, J.-F., Macchiarelli, R., 2012b. A Neanderthal partial femoral diaphysis from the "grotte de la Tour", La Chaise-de-Vouthon (Charente, France): Outer morphology and endostructural organization. C.R. Palevol. 11, 581-593.

Rabey, K.N., Green, D.J., Taylor, A.B., Begun, D.R., Richmond, B.G., McFarlin, S.C., 2015. Locomotor activity influences muscle architecture and bone growth but not muscle attachment site morphology. J. Hum. Evol. 78, 91-102.

Rein, T.R., Harvati, K., Harrison, T., 2015. Inferring the use of forelimb suspensory locomotion by extinct primate species via shape exploration of the ulna. J. Hum. Evol. 78, 70-79.

Robling, A.G., Hinant, F.M., Burr, D.B., Turner, C.H., 2002. Improved bone structure and strength after long-term mechanical loading is greatest if loading is separated into short bouts. J. Bone Miner. Res. 17, 1545-1554.

Ruff, C.B., 2002. Long bone articular and diaphyseal structure in Old World monkeys and apes. I: Locomotor effects. Am. J. Phys. Anthropol. 11, 305-342.

Ruff, C.B., 2008. Femoral/humeral strength in early African *Homo erectus*. J. Hum. Evol. 54, 383-390.

Ruff, C.B., Burgess, M.L., Bromage, T.G., Mudakikwa, A., McFarlin, S.C., 2013. Ontogenetic changes in limb bone structural proportions in mountain gorillas (*Gorilla beringei beringei*). J. Hum. Evol. 65, 693-703.

518 Ruff, C.B., Holt, B., Trinkhaus, E., 2006. Who's afraid of the big bad Wolff?: ''Wolff's law''
519 and bone functional adaptation. Am. J. Phys. Anthropol. 129, 484-498.
520 Ruff, C.B., Puymerail, L., Macchiarelli, R., Sipla, J., Ciochon, R.L., 2015. Structure and
521 composition of the Trinil femora: Functional and taxonomic implications. J. Hum. Evol.
522 80, 147-158.
523 Ryan, T.M., Shaw, C.N., 2015. Gracility of the modern *Homo sapiens* skeleton is the result of
524 decreased biomechanical loading. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 112, 372-377.
525 Sarringhaus, L.A., Stock, J.T., Marchant, L.F., McGrew, W.C., 2005. Bilateral asymmetry in the
526 limb bones of the chimpanzee (*Pan troglodytes*). Am. J. Phys. Anthropol. 128, 840-845.
527 Schneider, M.T.Y., Zhang, J., Crisco, J.J., Weiss, A.P.C., Ladd, A.L., Nielsen, P., Besier, T.,
528 2015. Men and women have similarly shaped carpometacarpal joint bones. J. Biomech. 12,
529 3420-3426.
530 Shaw, C.N., Stock, J.T., 2013. Extreme mobility in the Late Pleistocene? Comparing limb
531 biomechanics among fossil *Homo*, varsity athletes and Holocene foragers. J. Hum. Evol.
532 64, 242-249.
533 Smith, R.J., Jungers, W.L., 1997. Body mass in comparative primatology. J. Hum. Evol. 32, 523-
534 559.
535 Sparacello, V., Pettitt, P.B., Roberts, C., 2015. Funerary dynamics of an Epipalaeolithic
536 cemetery: A new database on Arene Candide skeletal remains. Proc. Europ. Soc. Study
537 Hum. Evol. 4, 209 (abstract).
538 Stern, J.T. Jr., 2000. Climbing to the top: A personal memoir of *Australopithecus afarensis*.
539 Evol. Anthropol. 9, 113-133.
540 Strouhal, E., Jungwirth, J., 1979. Paleogenetics of the Late Roman-Early Byzantine cemeteries at
541 Sayala, Egyptian Nubia. J. Hum. Evol. 8, 699-703.
542 Treece, G.M., Gee, A.H., Mayhew, P.M., Poole, K.E.S., 2010. High resolution cortical bone
543 thickness measurement from clinical CT data. Med. Image Anal. 14, 276-290.
544 Treece, G.M., Poole, K.E.S., Gee, A.H., 2012. Imaging the femoral cortex: Thickness, density
545 and mass from clinical CT. Med. Image Anal. 16, 952-965.
546 Wallace, I.J., Gupta, S., Sankaran, J., Demes, B., Judex, S., 2015a. Bone shaft bending strength
547 index is unaffected by exercise and unloading in mice. J. Anat. 226, 224-228.

548 Wallace, I.J., Judex, S., Demes, B., 2015b. Effects of load-bearing exercise on skeletal structure
549 and mechanics differ between outbred populations of mice. Bone 72, 1-8.
550 Ward, C.V., 2002. Interpreting the posture and locomotion of *Australopithecus afarensis*: Where
551 do we stand? Yearb. Phys. Anthropol. 45, 185-215.
552 Ward, C.V., Tocheri, M.W., Plavcan, J.M., Brown, F.H., Manthi, F.K., 2013. Early Pleistocene
553 third metacarpal from Kenya and the evolution of modern human-like hand morphology.
554 Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 111, 121-124.
555 Williams-Hatala, E.M., Hatala, K.G., Hiles, S., Rabey, K.N., 2016. Morphology of muscle
556 attachment sites in the modern human hand does not reflect muscle architecture. Sc. Rep.
557 6, 28353 (doi: 10.1038/srep28353).
558 Worsley, K.J., Taylor, J.E., Carbonell, F., Chung, M.K., Duerden, E., Bernhardt, B., Lyttelton,
559 O., Boucher, M., Evans, A.C., 2009. SurfStat: A Matlab Toolbox for the Statistical
560 Analysis of Univariate and Multivariate Surface and Volumetric Data Using Linear Mixed
561 Effects Models and Random Field Theory. NeuroImage Organization for Human Brain
562 Mapping, San Francisco, CA, S102.
563 Zollikofer, C.P., Ponce de León, M., De Bonis, L., Koufos, G., Andrews, P., 2001. Computer-
564 assisted morphometry of hominoid fossils: The role of morphometric maps. In: de Bonis,
565 L., Koufos, G.D., Andrews, P. (Eds.), Phylogeny of the Neogene Hominoid Primates of
566 Eurasia. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 50-59.
567

Table captions

Table 1
Study sample.
Tableau 1
L'échantillon étudié.

Table 2
Mean cortical thickness values and standard deviations for the third metacarpal and talus.
Tableau 2
Valeurs moyennes et écarts-types de l'épaisseur corticale pour le troisième métacarpien et le talus.

Figure captions

Fig. 1. Overview of cortical thickness measurement protocol for a *Pan* talus. A: segmentation of contours on an individual slice showing thresholded region in magenta (top) and subsequent yellow contour around bone (bottom). B: contours are automatically drawn at 20-30 slice intervals throughout the bone. C: contours are interpolated to generate a surface used as a guide for cortical thickness measurements. D: measurement of cortical bone thickness along a line running through the cortex (top), measurement is based on the grey values shown in the interpolated data (graph, bottom). E: cortical thickness maps are subsequently generated (left), which can be smoothed (right) to even out erroneous measurements. Thicker cortex is shown in blue and thinner cortex in red.
Fig. 1. Aperçu général du protocole de mesure de l'épaisseur corticale pour un talus de *Pan*. A: segmentation des contours sur une coupe individuelle montrant la région seuillée en magenta (en haut) et le contour jaune subséquent autour de l'os (en bas). B: les contours sont automatiquement tracés par intervalles de 20-30 coupes sur toute la longueur de l'os. C: les contours sont interpolés pour générer une surface utilisée comme un guide pour les mesures d'épaisseur corticale. D: mesure de l'épaisseur de l'os cortical le long d'une ligne parcourant l'épaisseur du cortex (en haut), la mesure est basée sur les valeurs de gris affichées dans les données interpolées (graphique, en bas). E: la distribution de l'épaisseur de l'os cortical est ensuite générée (à gauche) et peut être lissée (à droite) pour exclure de potentielles mesures aberrantes. L'os cortical le plus épais est figuré en bleu et le plus fin est en rouge.

Fig. 2. Overview of registration to a canonical mesh and between-group comparisons of a *Pan* and *Homo* talus. A: surface of one *Pan* (top left) and one *Homo* (bottom left) individual. Surface files from the complete sample were used to generate an average, canonical surface (right). B: an individual surface (green) and the canonical surface (red), before (left) and after (right) the registration. C: mean cortical thickness maps of *Pan* (top left) and *Homo* (bottom left), both expressed on the canonical surface, and a map showing regions where there are significant differences between the two species (right). In the map of significant differences, regions in yellow-red show significant differences at each vertex and regions in blue (extending from yellow-red regions) show significant differences by cluster.
Fig. 2. Vue d'ensemble du recalage de talus de *Pan* et *Homo* sur un maillage canonique et comparaisons entre groupes. A: surface d'un individu *Pan* (en haut à gauche) et d'un individu

Homo (en bas à gauche). Les fichiers de surface de l'échantillon entier ont été utilisés pour générer une surface canonique moyenne (à droite). B: surface individuelle (en vert) et surface canonique (en rouge), avant (à gauche) et après (à droite) le recalage. C: distribution moyenne de l'épaisseur corticale chez *Pan* (en haut à gauche) et chez *Homo* (en bas à gauche), les deux étant projetées sur la surface canonique, et distribution montrant les régions où les deux espèces différent significativement (à droite). Dans la carte montrant les différences significatives, les régions en couleurs chaudes montrent les différences significatives au niveau de chaque vertex, et les régions en couleurs froides (dépassant des régions en couleurs chaudes) montrent les différences par cluster.

Fig. 3. Protocol for processing specimens with high density inclusions. Shown here is the Mc3 of Arene Candide 2. Incorrect measurements on the original model (A) are due to high density inclusions (B top) and differential preservation (B bottom) leading to artificially thick (orange box) and thin (purple box) regions of the colour map. High density inclusions outside of the cortex are selected in the CT data, shown in magenta (C) and removed (D top), while high intensity grey values within the cortex are reduced with an arithmetic operation (D bottom) (see text for explanation), to create the corrected model (E).
Fig. 3. Protocole pour traiter les spécimens avec des inclusions à haute densité. Le troisième métacarpien d'Arene Candide 2 est ici illustré. Les mesures incorrectes sur le modèle original (A) sont dues à des inclusions à haute densité (B, en haut) et à une préservation différentielle (B, en bas) causant des régions artificiellement épaisses (encadré orange) et fines (encadré violet) sur la carte colorée. Les inclusions à haute densité en dehors du cortex sont sélectionnées (en rouge) dans les données CT (C) et enlevées (D, en haut), alors que les valeurs de gris correspondant aux hautes densités de l'os cortical sont réduites par une opération arithmétique (D, en bas) (voir le texte pour plus d'informations), pour créer le modèle corrigé (E).

Fig. 4. Mean cortical thickness maps of the Mc3 for each species, all mapped to the canonical mesh. From top to bottom, *P. t. verus*, *H. sapiens*, *Pongo* sp. and archaeological *H. sapiens* (Arene Candide 2). Thicker cortex in is blue, thinner cortex in red. Metacarpals are shown in (left to right) lateral, palmar, distal (top), proximal (bottom), medial and dorsal views.
Fig. 4. Distributions moyennes de l'épaisseur de l'os cortical du troisième métacarpien pour chaque espèce, toutes recalées sur le maillage canonique. De haut en bas, *P. t. verus*, *H. sapiens*, *Pongo* sp. et un spécimen *H. sapiens* archéologique (Arene Candide 2). L'os cortical plus épais est figuré en bleu, celui plus fin est en rouge. Les métacarpiens sont montrés, de gauche à droite, en vues latérale, palmaire, distale (en haut), proximale (en bas), médiale et dorsale.

Fig. 5. Colour maps of cortical thickness differences between each species (left) and statistical comparisons (right) for the Mc3 in (top to bottom) *Pongo* sp. vs *H. sapiens*, *P. t. verus* vs *H. sapiens*, and *Pongo* sp. vs *P. t. verus*. Differences in thickness between species (left) are blue where the first species has a thicker cortex than the second and red where the first species has a thinner cortex than the second. Statistical comparisons (right) show regions where there are significantly different cortical thickness values at each vertex (yellow-red), and regions where there are significant differences in cortical thickness at each cluster (blue). No significant differences were found between *P. t. verus* and *Pongo* sp. Metacarpals are shown in (left to right) lateral, palmar, distal (top), proximal (bottom), medial and dorsal views.

Fig. 5. Cartes chromatiques des différences de distribution d'épaisseur de l'os cortical entre plusieurs paires d'espèces (à gauche) et comparaisons statistiques (à droite) pour le troisième métacarpien de *Pongo* sp. et *H. sapiens*, *P. t. verus* et *H. sapiens*, et *Pongo* sp. et *P. t. verus* (de haut en bas). Les différences d'épaisseur entre paires d'espèces (à gauche) sont figurées en bleu lorsque la première espèce montre un cortex plus épais que la seconde, et en rouge en cas d'épaisseur plus faible. Les comparaisons statistiques (à droite) montrent les régions pour lesquelles les différences en épaisseur corticale sont significatives au niveau de chaque vertex (couleurs chaudes), et de chaque cluster (couleurs froides). Aucune différence significative n'a pu être identifiée entre *P.t.verus* et *Pongo* sp. Les métacarpiens sont montrés, de gauche à droite, en vues latérale, palmaire, distale (en haut), proximale (en bas), médiale et dorsale.

Fig. 6. Mean cortical thickness maps for the *Pan* and *Homo* talus showing results for both A) absolute cortical thickness measurements and B) relative cortical thickness comparisons. For relative thickness comparisons, the mean was subtracted from every thickness measurement then divided by the standard deviation for each individual before generating species averages and conducting statistical comparisons. From top to bottom, mean cortical thickness maps for *Pan*, mean cortical thickness maps for *Homo*, cortical thickness differences between *Pan* and *Homo* and statistical comparisons between the two species. Talus is shown in (from left to right) lateral, posterior and medial views.

Fig. 6. Distributions moyennes de l'épaisseur de l'os cortical pour le talus de *Pan* et *Homo* montrant les résultats pour A) les mesures de l'épaisseur corticale absolue et B) les comparaisons de l'épaisseur corticale relative. Pour ces dernières, la moyenne a été soustraite de chaque mesure d'épaisseur puis divisée par l'écart-type, pour chaque individu, avant de générer des moyennes par espèce et de conduire des comparaisons statistiques. De haut en bas, les distributions d'épaisseur corticale moyenne chez *Pan*, chez *Homo*, les différences d'épaisseur corticale entre *Pan* et *Homo*, et les comparaisons statistiques entre les deux espèces. De gauche à droite, le talus est montré en vues latérale, postérieure et médiale.

Table 1
Study sample.
Tableau 1
L'échantillon étudié.

Taxon	Mc3	Talus	Locomotor mode	Mean body mass (kg)[1]
Homo sapiens	21	9	Bipedal	54.4-62.2
Early Holocene *Homo* (Arene Candide 2)	1	-	Bipedal	-
Pan troglodytes verus	5	13	Knuckle-walking	41.3-59.7
Pongo sp.	5	-	Suspensory, torso-orthograde	35.6-78.5

[1] Sex specific mean body mass (F-M). Body masses from Smith and Jungers (1997).
[1] Masse corporelle moyenne par espèce et par sexe (F-M). Les masses corporelles sont extraites de Smith et Jungers (1997).

Table 2
Mean cortical thickness values and standard deviations for the third metacarpal and talus.
Tableau 2
Valeurs moyennes et écarts-types de l'épaisseur corticale pour le troisième métacarpien et le talus.

	Mean cortical thickness (mm)	
Taxon	Mc3	Talus
Homo sapiens	1.03 (0.07)	0.45 (0.06)
Early Holocene *Homo* (Arene Candide 2)	1.40	-
Pan troglodytes verus	1.59 (0.19)	0.88 (0.19)
Pongo sp.	1.47 (0.10)	-