

AUTOMATED PLATFORM FOR HISTOLOGICAL RACE AND SEX
COMPARISON OF HUMAN CORTICAL BONE

HADI ABDULLAH

A thesis submitted in
fulfillment of the requirement for the award of the
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Electrical Engineering

Faculty of Electrical and Electronics Engineering
Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia

JUNE 2019



PTTAA UTHM
PERPUSTAKAAN TUNKU TUN AMINAH

I would like to dedicate this work to the poor and needy people of the world who face neglect from the society. May Allah give me the courage and power to support them.



ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank Almighty Allah for blessing me with the knowledge, courage and all the means to perform my research. Truly, Allah is the greatest planner of all. I was blessed with a great supervisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Muhammad Mahadi Abdul Jamil who was more like a guardian in my stay in Malaysia. I would like to thank Assoc. Prof. Dr. Muhammad Mahadi Abdul Jamil for all his support during my research. Without his efforts and guidelines our research would not have reached its goals. My co-supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Faridah Mohd Nor not only provided us human bone specimens but also taught us the slides preparation methods and basic bone histology. I would like to thank Assoc. Prof. Dr. Faridah Mohd Nor for the multiple learning sessions despite her busy schedule in Hospital Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia. I would also like to thank Dr. Mohd Shamian Bin Zainal for his extensive assistance.

I am indebted to Dr. Ijaz Khan for always being by my side in hard times. His encouragement and support helped me build solid foundations for the research. I can never forget my friends for their immense support and care especially during the days I was hospitalized for surgery. I would like to thank Dr. Mohamed Zaltum for his support during my PhD.

I wish to thank my parents for their support, love and encouragement, without whom I would never have enjoyed so many opportunities. I would also like to thank my wife Ms. Hira, who decided to stay in Pakistan and took great care of my old parents during my stay in Malaysia. Her sacrifice for my PhD is beyond any measures. I am particularly thankful of my brother Mr. Hammad Abdullah whose efforts provided great support for my journey.

Finally I am thankful to Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia and Office for Research, Innovation, Commercialization and Consultancy Management (ORICC), for providing GIPS GRANT vote number (U280) and support for research conferences.

ABSTRACT

Research on histological bone variation in population is in its early stages in Malaysia and limited information is available about age graded race and sex comparison. This research performed race and sex comparison of histological cortical bone parameters in the Malaysian population and presented an automated system which could be used as assistance tool by forensic experts. Human bone specimen were collected from Hospital Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia Medical Centre (UKMMC), Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. Haversian canals were measured and five parameters were calculated for comparison. Comparison test (t-test/u-test) showed that the size of Haversian canals were significantly greater ($p < 0.05$) in females (HCM fifth, sixth decade: $5955.8 \mu\text{m}^2$, $5788.0 \mu\text{m}^2$) than males (HCM fifth, sixth decade: $4117.6 \mu\text{m}^2$, $3965.1 \mu\text{m}^2$). In race comparison, total area covered by Haversian canals (bone porosity) was significantly greater ($p < 0.05$) in Indian samples (HCA: 0.457mm^2) compared to Chinese samples (HCA: 0.385mm^2) in the second decade. However in fifth decade, total area covered by Chinese samples (HCA: 0.894mm^2) was significantly greater ($p < 0.05$) than Indian samples (HCA: 0.570mm^2). Three main steps of histological comparison were focused for automation i.e. parameter calculation, data management and statistical comparisons. The system was designed with GUI which utilizes aforementioned automation step. Validation of the system was divided into two main parts. In first part, parameter measurement and calculation performed by the system were compared with existing tools in terms of percentage error in measurement (DinoCapture: 5.3%, L-measure: 5.1%, ImageJ: 4.7%, designed system: 4.0%) and consumed time for measurement (DinoCapture: 15-20min, L-measure: 15-20min, ImageJ: 20-25min, designed system: 1-2min). Similarly automated race and sex comparison performed by the system were compared with comparisons performed manually using SPSS software. Significance and t/z values showed no differences and did not change overall hypothesis of the comparison tests. Which implies that the automated system is efficient for histological race and sex comparisons.

ABSTRAK

Penyelidikan mengenai variasi tulang histologi dalam perbandingan kaum dan jantina dalam populasi di Malaysia merupakan di peringkat awal dan maklumat adalah terhad. Kajian ini ialah pembinaan sistem automatik mengenai perbandingan parameter tulang kortikal histologi kaum dan jantina populasi Malaysia yang boleh digunakan sebagai alat bantuan pakar forensik. Spesimen tulang manusia telah dikumpulkan dari Pusat Perubatan Hospital Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKMMC), Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. Terusan Haversian telah diukur dan lima parameter dikira sebagai perbandingan. Ujian perbandingan (t-test / u-test) menunjukkan bahawa saiz terusan Haversian lebih besar ($p < 0.05$) pada wanita (HCM kelima, dekad keenam: $5955.8 \mu\text{m}^2$, $5788.0 \mu\text{m}^2$) daripada lelaki (HCM kelima, dekad keenam: $4117.6 \mu\text{m}^2$, $3965.1 \mu\text{m}^2$). Dalam perbandingan kaum, jumlah kawasan terusan Haversian (porositas tulang) jauh lebih besar ($p < 0.05$) dalam sampel kaum India (HCA: 0.457 mm^2) berbanding sampel kaum Cina (HCA: 0.385 mm^2) dalam dekad kedua. Walau bagaimanapun pada dekad kelima, sampel kaum Cina (HCA: 0.894 mm^2) jauh lebih tinggi ($p < 0.05$) berbanding sampel kaum India (HCA: 0.570 mm^2). Tiga langkah utama parameter automasi iaitu, pengiraan data, pengurusan data dan perbandingan statistik. Sistem ini direka dengan GUI yang menggunakan langkah automasi yang disebutkan di atas. Pengesahan sistem dibahagikan kepada dua bahagian utama, yaitu di bahagian pertama, pengukuran dan pengiraan parameter sistem dibandingkan dengan alat yang sedia ada dari segi kesilapan peratusan dalam pengukuran (DinoCapture: 5.3%, ukuran L: 5.1%, ImageJ: 4.7%, sistem yang dirancang: 4.0%) dan penggunaan masa untuk pengukuran (DinoCapture: 15-20min, L-ukuran: 15-20min, ImageJ: 20-25min, sistem yang dirancang: 1-2min). Perbandingan sistem automatik kaum dan seks yang dibandingkan dengan kaedah secara manual menggunakan perisian SPSS. Nilai penting dan t / z tidak menunjukkan perbezaan dan juga tidak mengubah hipotesis keseluruhan ujian. Ini menunjukkan bahawa sistem automatik adalah cekap untuk histologi perbandingan kaum dan jantina.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION	ii
DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	iv
ABSTRACT	v
ABSTRAK	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
LIST OF TABLES	xiii
LIST OF FIGURES	xix
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xxvii
LIST OF APPENDICES	xxix
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Problem statement	6
1.3 Research questions	7
1.4 Aim of study	8
1.5 Objectives of study	8
1.6 Research steps	8
1.7 Scope of the study	10
1.8 Contribution to the Knowledge	10
1.9 Thesis orientation	11

CHAPTER 2	BONE HISTOMORPHOLOGY	13
2.1	Introduction	13
2.2	Human skeleton	14
2.2.1	Bone classification	15
2.2.2	Bone structure	18
2.3	Bone cells	19
2.3.1	Osteoblast	19
2.3.2	Osteoclast	20
2.3.3	Osteocytes	21
2.4	Bone modeling and remodeling	22
2.5	Bone microstructures	25
2.5.1	Observed parameters	26
2.5.2	Derived parameters	29
2.6	Sex and race histological comparisons	29
2.7	Compilation of sex and race comparison	37
2.8	Critical review	41
2.9	Enhanced systems for comparison	43
2.9.1	Microradiograph	44
2.9.2	Automated microstructure detection	46
2.10	Summary	49
CHAPTER 3	HISTOLOGICAL SEX COMPARISON	51
3.1	Introduction	51
3.2	Bone specimen collection	51
3.3	Bone sample slide preparation	53
3.4	Image acquisition	56
3.5	Microstructural parameter selection	58
3.6	Inclusion and exclusion criteria of microstructures	58



PTTA
PERPUSTAKAAN TUNJUNGAN AMINAH

3.7	Statistical tests	58
3.7.1	Sex comparison tests and hypothesis	60
3.7.2	Age graded sex comparison tests	62
3.8	Sex comparison without age groups	62
3.8.1	Sex comparison discussion	69
3.9	Age graded sex comparison	69
3.9.1	Second decade sex comparison	70
3.9.2	Third decade sex comparison	76
3.9.3	Fourth decade sex comparison	82
3.9.4	Fifth decade sex comparison	88
3.9.5	Sixth decade sex comparison	94
3.9.6	Age graded sex comparison discussion	100
3.10	Summary	102
CHAPTER 4	HISTOLOGICAL RACE COMPARISON	103
4.1	Introduction	103
4.2	Microstructure parameter selection	103
4.3	Inclusion and exclusion criteria	104
4.4	Statistical tests	104
4.4.1	Race comparison tests	104
4.4.2	Age graded race comparison tests	106
4.5	Race comparison without age groups	107
4.5.1	Race comparison discussion	113
4.6	Age graded race comparison	113
4.6.1	Second decade race comparison	115
4.6.2	Third decade race comparison	120
4.6.3	Fourth decade race comparison	126
4.6.4	Fifth decade race comparison	132



4.6.5	Age graded race comparison discussion	138
4.7	Summary	139
CHAPTER 5 AUTOMATED CORTICAL BONE COMPARISON SYSTEM		141
5.1	Introduction	141
5.2	Software platforms	142
5.3	Parameters measurement assistance	142
5.3.1	Calculation of Haversian canal area	143
5.3.2	Calculation of Haversian canal centroid	144
5.3.3	Calculation of Haversian canal radius	144
5.3.4	Calculation of Haversian canal perimeter	144
5.3.5	Obtained data from each image	144
5.4	Database design	145
5.4.1	Basic information variables	146
5.4.2	Morphological parameters	146
5.4.3	Measurements at the image locations	148
5.4.4	Total measurements	149
5.4.5	Calculated Haversian canal parameters	150
5.4.6	Database structure	150
5.5	Automated normality and comparison test	156
5.6	Automated system GUI	158
5.6.1	Tab1: Sample Input	160
5.6.1.1	Sample information panel	162
5.6.1.2	Control panel	163
5.6.1.3	Data input panel	166
5.6.1.4	Delete sample	168
5.6.2	Tab2: Race comparison	168



5.6.2.1	Races and frequency	170
5.6.2.2	Selection and age-gradation of race	170
5.6.2.3	Race comparison tests and parameter distribution	171
5.6.3	Tab3: Sex comparison	172
5.6.3.1	Sex frequency in database	175
5.6.3.2	Sex comparison tests and parameter distribution	175
5.7	Summary	177
CHAPTER 6	SYSTEM VALIDATION	178
6.1	Introduction	178
6.2	Validation of the automated system	178
6.3	Evaluation of automated system phases	179
6.3.1	Parameter measurement and calculation evaluation	179
6.3.1.1	Haversian canal area measurement evaluation	180
6.3.1.2	Haversian canal radius measurement evaluation	181
6.3.1.3	Haversian canal perimeter measurement evaluation	183
6.3.2	Race comparison evaluation	184
6.3.3	Sex comparison evaluation	188
6.4	System evaluation by forensic experts	191
6.4.1	Clarity of the system	193
6.4.2	User friendly	194
6.4.3	Haversian canal measurement	194
6.4.4	Database management	195



6.4.5	Comparison with respect to race and sex	195
6.4.6	Automated system upgrade	196
6.4.7	Importance of the system in forensic anthropology	197
6.5	Summary	198
CHAPTER 7	CONCLUSION AND FUTURE RECOMMENDATION	200
7.1	Conclusion	200
7.2	Recommendation of future work	203
7.2.1	Increase in microstructural parameter	203
7.2.2	Differences in other bone types	203
7.2.3	Other population	203
7.2.4	Homogeneous sample comparison	203
7.2.5	Neural networks	204
	REFERENCES	205
	APPENDIX A BOXPLOT COMPARISON RACE AND SEX	212
	APPENDIX B HUMAN SAMPLES CATALOGUE	224
	APPENDIX C RUBRIC VALIDATION FROM	227
	APPENDIX D MALAYSIAN POPULATION STATISTICS	229
	APPENDIX E PUBLICATION AND ACHIEVEMENTS	232
	VITAE	236

LIST OF TABLES

2.1	Eight forensic case with D.D. Thomson regression equation age estimation (Thompson, 1979).	31
2.2	Microstructural parameter differences in males and females (Mulhern & Van Gerven, 1997).	34
2.3	Researcher selection of region of humans, selection of bones and Field location.	38
2.4	Microstructural parameters selected by researchers for gender graded analysis.	40
2.5	Microscopic image processing software.	48
3.1	Collected samples number with respect to sex and race.	52
3.2	Number of collected specimen with respect to bone type.	53
3.3	Descriptive statistics of sex comparison.	63
3.4	Shapiro-Wilk Test on the parameters and selected comparison test for the parameters.	64
3.5	Independent samples t-test on HCM for male and female group comparison.	64
3.6	Wilcoxon Rank Sum u-test on HCA for male and female group comparison.	65
3.7	Wilcoxon Rank Sum u-test on HCR for male and female group comparison.	66
3.8	Independent samples t-test on HCP for male and female group comparison.	67
3.9	Independent samples t-test on HCN for male and female group comparison.	68
3.10	Descriptive statistics of age graded sex comparison.	70
3.11	Shapiro-Wilk Test on the parameters and the selected comparison test for second decade.	71

3.12	Wilcoxon Rank Sum u-test on HCM for male and female group comparison in second decade.	71
3.13	Wilcoxon Rank Sum u-test on HCA for male and female group comparison in second decade.	72
3.14	Wilcoxon Rank Sum u-test on HCR for male and female group comparison in second decade.	73
3.15	Wilcoxon Rank Sum u-test on HCP for male and female group comparison in second decade.	74
3.16	Independent samples t-test on HCN for male and female group comparison in the second decade.	75
3.17	Shapiro-Wilk Test on the parameters and the selected comparison test for third decade.	77
3.18	Wilcoxon Rank Sum u-test on HCM for male and female group comparison in third decade.	77
3.19	Wilcoxon Rank Sum u-test on HCA for male and female group comparison in third decade.	78
3.20	Wilcoxon Rank Sum u-test on HCR for male and female group comparison in third decade.	79
3.21	Wilcoxon Rank Sum u-test on HCP for male and female group comparison in third decade.	80
3.22	Wilcoxon Rank Sum u-test on HCN for male and female group comparison in third decade.	81
3.23	Shapiro-Wilk Test on the parameters and the selected comparison test for fourth decade.	83
3.24	Wilcoxon Rank Sum u-test on HCM for male and female group comparison in fourth decade.	83
3.25	Wilcoxon Rank Sum u-test on HCA for male and female group comparison in fourth decade.	84
3.26	Wilcoxon Rank Sum u-test on HCR for male and female group comparison in fourth decade.	85
3.27	Wilcoxon Rank Sum u-test on HCP for male and female group comparison in fourth decade.	86
3.28	Wilcoxon Rank Sum u-test on HCN for male and female group comparison in fourth decade.	87

3.29	Shapiro-Wilk Test on the parameters and the selected comparison test for fifth decade.	89
3.30	Wilcoxon Rank Sum u-test on HCM for male and female group comparison in fifth decade.	89
3.31	Wilcoxon Rank Sum u-test on HCA for male and female group comparison in fifth decade.	90
3.32	Wilcoxon Rank Sum u-test on HCR for male and female group comparison in fifth decade.	91
3.33	Independent samples t-test on HCP for male and female group comparison in the fifth decade.	92
3.34	Wilcoxon Rank Sum u-test on HCN for male and female group comparison in fifth decade.	93
3.35	Shapiro-Wilk Test on the parameters and the selected comparison test for sixth decade.	95
3.36	Wilcoxon Rank Sum u-test on HCM for male and female group comparison in sixth decade.	95
3.37	Independent samples t-test on HCA for male and female group comparison in the sixth decade.	96
3.38	Wilcoxon Rank Sum u-test on HCR for male and female group comparison in fifth decade.	97
3.39	Independent samples t-test on HCP for male and female group comparison in the sixth decade.	98
3.40	Independent samples t-test on HCN for male and female group comparison in the sixth decade.	99
4.1	Descriptive statistics of race comparison between Chinese and Indian samples.	107
4.2	Shapiro-Wilk Test on the parameters and selected comparison test for the parameters.	108
4.3	Independent samples t-test on HCM for Chinese and Indian group comparison.	108
4.4	Wilcoxon Rank Sum u-test on HCA for Chinese and Indian group comparison.	109
4.5	Independent samples t-test on HCR for Chinese and Indian group comparison.	110



4.6	Independent samples t-test on HCP for Chinese and Indian group comparison.	111
4.7	Wilcoxon Rank Sum u-test on HCN for Chinese and Indian group comparison.	112
4.8	Descriptive statistics of age graded race comparison.	114
4.9	Shapiro-Wilk Test on the parameters and the selected comparison test for second decade.	115
4.10	Wilcoxon Rank Sum u-test on HCM for Chinese and Indian group comparison in second decade.	116
4.11	Wilcoxon Rank Sum u-test on HCA for Chinese and Indian group comparison in second decade.	117
4.12	Wilcoxon Rank Sum u-test on HCR for Chinese and Indian group comparison in second decade.	118
4.13	Wilcoxon Rank Sum u-test on HCP for Chinese and Indian group comparison in second decade.	119
4.14	Independent samples t-test on HCN for Chinese and Indian group comparison in the second decade.	120
4.15	Shapiro-Wilk Test on the parameters and the selected comparison test for third decade.	121
4.16	Wilcoxon Rank Sum u-test on HCM for Chinese and Indian group comparison in third decade.	121
4.17	Wilcoxon Rank Sum u-test on HCA for Chinese and Indian group comparison in third decade.	122
4.18	Wilcoxon Rank Sum u-test on HCR for Chinese and Indian group comparison in third decade.	123
4.19	Wilcoxon Rank Sum u-test on HCP for Chinese and Indian group comparison in third decade.	124
4.20	Wilcoxon Rank Sum u-test on HCN for Chinese and Indian group comparison in third decade.	125
4.21	Shapiro-Wilk Test on the parameters and the selected comparison test for fourth decade.	127
4.22	Wilcoxon Rank Sum u-test on HCM for Chinese and Indian group comparison in fourth decade.	128

4.23	Wilcoxon Rank Sum u-test on HCA for Chinese and Indian group comparison in fourth decade.	129
4.24	Wilcoxon Rank Sum u-test on HCR for Chinese and Indian group comparison in fourth decade.	130
4.25	Wilcoxon Rank Sum u-test on HCP for Chinese and Indian group comparison in fourth decade.	131
4.26	Wilcoxon Rank Sum u-test on HCN for Chinese and Indian group comparison in fourth decade.	132
4.27	Shapiro-Wilk Test on the parameters and the selected comparison test for fifth decade.	133
4.28	Wilcoxon Rank Sum u-test on HCM for Chinese and Indian group comparison in fifth decade.	133
4.29	Wilcoxon Rank Sum u-test on HCA for Chinese and Indian group comparison in fifth decade.	134
4.30	Independent samples t-test on HCR for Chinese and Indian group comparison in the fifth decade.	135
4.31	Independent samples t-test on HCP for Chinese and Indian group comparison in the fifth decade.	136
4.32	Wilcoxon Rank Sum u-test on HCN for Chinese and Indian group comparison in fifth decade.	137
5.1	Calculation of Haversian canal area, radius and perimeter with respect to marked Haversian canal boundaries in figure 6.3.	145
5.2	Fields of the data structure and their description.	151
5.3	Possible outcomes of SW-test and decision for the selection of comparison test.	156
5.4	Comparison of HCM in male and female samples from the database pseudo code.	159
5.5	Tabs of the system GUI and their designated functions.	175
6.1	Comparison of Haversian canal area measurement by ImageJ, L-measure, DinoCapture 2.0 and presented system	181
6.2	Comparison of Haversian canal radius measurement by ImageJ, L-measure, DinoCapture 2.0 and presented system.	182
6.3	Comparison of Haversian canal perimeter measurement by ImageJ, L-measure, DinoCapture 2.0 and presented system.	183

6.4	Comparison of SW-test (Manually in SPSS) and SW-test (Automatically performed by the designed system) in race comparison.	184
6.5	Race Comparison performed in SPSS manually (t-test and u-test) and Race comparison by designed system (Automatically performed using t-test and u-test).	187
6.6	Table 6.6: Comparison of SW-test (Manually in SPSS) and SW-test (Automatically performed by the designed system) in sex comparison.	188
6.7	Sex Comparison performed in SPSS manually (t-test and u-test) and Race comparison by designed system (Automatically performed using t-test and u-test).	190
6.8	Participant's in validation of the automated cortical bone analyzer system.	192
6.9	The percentage score of participants for clarity of the system.	193
6.10	Score of the user friendly criteria of the system by the expert participants.	194
6.11	Result scores of Haversian canal measurement feature in the system by participants.	194
6.12	Result scores of database management in the system by participants.	195
6.13	Parameters and score by the expert participants on the criteria (comparison with respect to race and sex).	196
6.14	Result scores of upgrade feature of the system by expert participants.	197
6.15	The importance of the system in forensic anthropology scored by participants.	198

LIST OF FIGURES

1.1	Bone fragments of a burned bison at the Mile Canyon (Black, 2001).	2
1.2	Morphological comparison of caucasoid, mongoloid and negroid skulls. (Schoenbuchner et al., 2017)	3
1.3	Racial distribution of the world map 2013. The map roughly links major regions of the world to the population ancestral backgrounds (General Helghast, 2013).	3
1.4	Ethnic composition of Malaysian population (Abdullah, 2014).	4
1.5	Human skull, mandible and carnium (Alias et al., 2017).	5
1.6	Morphological changes in the human skull with progressing age from new born to elderly adult (White, Black, & Folkens, 2012a). Bone slices at 4X magnification from human bone specimen obtained from 22, 35, 58, 76 and 92 years old.	6
1.7	Research step and their orientation taken to achieve aim and objectives of the research.	9
2.1	Human skeletal structure and bone types (Dupras, Schultz, Wheeler, & Williams, 2011).	14
2.2	Bone classified as thin bones in the human skeleton system. The bone included in this category are sternum, ribs, scapulae and carnial bone (White et al., 2012a; White, Black, & Folkens, 2012d).	15
2.3	Cervical, thoracic and lumbar vertebrae types posterior View (White, Black, & Folkens, 2012c).	16
2.4	Eight Carpals and seven tarsals of the human skeletal system (White, Black, & Folkens, 2012b; White et al., 2012c).	16
2.5	Patella bone of the human skeleton (White et al., 2012b).	17

2.6	Long bones of the human skeleton(White et al., 2012b, 2012c).	17
2.7	Location of trabecular and cortical bone in human femur (Dupras et al., 2011).	18
2.8	Structure and location of bone basic building blocks (contributors, 2018).	19
2.9	Formation of new bone by osteoblast over resorbed bone surface (Raisz, 1999).	20
2.10	Osteoclast formation and bone resorption (Carneiro, 2005).	21
2.11	Osteocytes location in bone structure (Gray, 1918).	22
2.12	Bone remodeling process with stages (Li et al., 2016).	24
2.13	Microscopic image of a femur cortical bone obtained from the mid shaft using Nikon eclipse Ts at 4x magnification and phase contrast.	25
2.14	Location for images from microscope in Kerley's method (Kerley, 1965).	30
2.15	Schematic illusion of the types of bone microstructures studied. Secondary osteon X1, Type II osteon X2, Fragments X3, Resorption space X4, Non-Haversian canal X5. (Ericksen, 1991).	31
2.16	Microradiographic image of femoral mid-shaft (Bell et al., 2001).	34
2.17	Age graded young osteon percentage comparison.	35
2.18	Subdivisions of the cortex (C. D. L. Thomas et al., 2005).	35
2.19	Microradiograph image processing for osteon detection (Britz, Thomas, Clement, & Cooper, 2009).	36
2.20	(a) Microradiographic image of human bone (Boivin, 2007; Kashi & Saha, 2017). (b) Microscopic image of human bone using light emitting phase contrast microscope.	44
2.21	(a) Matchlett Laboratories OEG X-ray tube 29J. (b) Leitz Dialux 20 microscope (Bertelsen et al., 1995).	45
2.22	Microradiograph of the femoral mid-shaft obtained from bone of young (23-year-old, left) and old (96-year-old, right) humans. (Granke, Makowski, Uppuganti, & Nyman, 2016; Lanyon, Sugiyama, & Price, 2009).	46

2.23	Spot 2 microscope camera by Diagnostic Instruments (Imaging, 2000).	47
3.1	Long bones of the human skeleton selected for sex and race comparison of Malaysian samples (White et al., 2012b, 2012c).	53
3.2	(a) Complete sample slide with labels. (b) and (c) Microscopic view of the sample with 4X magnification.	55
3.3	DinoCapture 2.0 software platform calibrated with microscope at 4X magnification. (b) DinoEye microscope eyepiece five-megapixel camera.	56
3.4	Regions selected for image acquisition. The bone slice was divided into four main sections and two images were obtained from each section of AM, PM, AL and PL.	57
3.5	Flowchart of the normality test, selection of comparison test and hypothesis of the test results in the parameters of male and female groups.	62
3.6	Cumulative fraction distribution of HCM in male and female group.	65
3.7	Cumulative fraction distribution of HCA in male and female group.	66
3.8	Cumulative fraction distribution of HCR in male and female group.	67
3.9	Cumulative fraction distribution of HCP in male and female group.	68
3.10	Cumulative fraction distribution of HCN in male and female group.	69
3.11	Cumulative fraction distribution of HCM in male and female group belonging to the second decade.	72
3.12	Cumulative fraction distribution of HCA in male and female group belonging to the second decade.	73
3.13	Cumulative fraction distribution of HCR in male and female group belonging to the second decade.	74
3.14	Cumulative fraction distribution of HCP in male and female group belonging to the second decade.	75
3.15	Cumulative fraction distribution of HCN in male and female	

group belonging to the second decade.	76
3.16 Cumulative fraction distribution of HCM in male and female group belonging to the third decade.	78
3.17 Cumulative fraction distribution of HCA in male and female group belonging to the third decade.	79
3.18 Cumulative fraction distribution of HCR in male and female group belonging to the third decade.	80
3.19 Cumulative fraction distribution of HCP in male and female group belonging to the third decade.	81
3.20 Cumulative fraction distribution of HCN in male and female group belonging to the third decade.	82
3.21 Cumulative fraction distribution of HCM in male and female group belonging to the fourth decade.	84
3.22 Cumulative fraction distribution of HCA in male and female group belonging to the fourth decade.	85
3.23 Cumulative fraction distribution of HCR in male and female group belonging to the fourth decade.	86
3.24 Cumulative fraction distribution of HCP in male and female group belonging to the fourth decade.	87
3.25 Cumulative fraction distribution of HCN in male and female group belonging to the fourth decade.	88
3.26 Cumulative fraction distribution of HCM in male and female group belonging to the fifth decade.	90
3.27 Cumulative fraction distribution of HCA in male and female group belonging to the fifth decade.	91
3.28 Cumulative fraction distribution of HCR in male and female group belonging to the fifth decade.	92
3.29 Cumulative fraction distribution of HCP in male and female group belonging to the fifth decade.	93
3.30 Cumulative fraction distribution of HCN in male and female group belonging to the fifth decade.	94
3.31 Cumulative fraction distribution of HCM in male and female group belonging to the sixth decade.	96
3.32 Cumulative fraction distribution of HCA in male and female	

group belonging to the sixth decade.	97
3.33 Cumulative fraction distribution of HCR in male and female group belonging to the sixth decade.	98
3.34 Cumulative fraction distribution of HCP in male and female group belonging to the sixth decade.	99
3.35 Cumulative fraction distribution of HCN in male and female group belonging to the sixth decade.	100
4.1 Flowchart of the normality test, selection of comparison test and hypothesis of the test results in the parameters of Chinese and Indian groups.	106
4.2 Cumulative fraction distribution of HCM in Chinese and Indian group.	109
4.3 Cumulative fraction distribution of HCA in Chinese and Indian group.	110
4.4 Cumulative fraction distribution of HCR in Chinese and Indian group.	111
4.5 Cumulative fraction distribution of HCP in Chinese and Indian group.	112
4.6 Cumulative fraction distribution of HCN in Chinese and Indian group.	113
4.7 Cumulative fraction distribution of HCM in Chinese and Indian group belonging to the second decade.	116
4.8 Cumulative fraction distribution of HCA in Chinese and Indian group belonging to the second decade.	117
4.9 Cumulative fraction distribution of HCR in Chinese and Indian group belonging to the second decade.	118
4.10 Cumulative fraction distribution of HCP in Chinese and Indian group belonging to the second decade.	119
4.11 Cumulative fraction distribution of HCN in Chinese and Indian group belonging to the second decade.	120
4.12 Cumulative fraction distribution of HCM in Chinese and Indian group belonging to the third decade.	122
4.13 Cumulative fraction distribution of HCA in Chinese and Indian group belonging to the third decade.	123

4.14	Cumulative fraction distribution of HCR in Chinese and Indian group belonging to the third decade.	124
4.15	Cumulative fraction distribution of HCP in Chinese and Indian group belonging to the third decade.	125
4.16	Cumulative fraction distribution of HCN in Chinese and Indian group belonging to the third decade.	126
4.17	Cumulative fraction distribution of HCM in Chinese and Indian group belonging to the fourth decade.	128
4.18	Cumulative fraction distribution of HCA in Chinese and Indian group belonging to the fourth decade.	129
4.19	Cumulative fraction distribution of HCR in Chinese and Indian group belonging to the fourth decade.	130
4.20	Cumulative fraction distribution of HCP in Chinese and Indian group belonging to the fourth decade.	131
4.21	Cumulative fraction distribution of HCN in Chinese and Indian group belonging to the fourth decade.	132
4.22	Cumulative fraction distribution of HCM in Chinese and Indian group belonging to the fifth decade.	134
4.23	Cumulative fraction distribution of HCA in Chinese and Indian group belonging to the fifth decade.	135
4.24	Cumulative fraction distribution of HCR in Chinese and Indian group belonging to the fifth decade.	136
4.25	Cumulative fraction distribution of HCP in Chinese and Indian group belonging to the fifth decade.	137
4.26	Cumulative fraction distribution of HCN in Chinese and Indian group belonging to the fifth decade.	138
5.1	Manual and automatic process for race and sex comparison in Malaysian population.	142
5.2	Acer switch Alpha 12 (SA5-271-300K) computer system.	143
5.3	Human bone slice microscopic image with marked Haversian canal boundaries.	145
5.4	Five main components of the designed database for samples.	146
5.5	Basic information variables in the database design.	146
5.6	Morphological parameter variables in the database.	147

5.7	Digital vernier caliper used to measure cortical thickness and medullary cavity diameter (Starrett, 2018).	147
5.8	Measurement locations for cortical thickness and medullary cavity diameter.	147
5.9	Fields of the database containing measurement of Haversian canals at eight locations of the bone slice.	148
5.10	AM1 Double array variable with the first column representing area, the second column radius and the third column with perimeter of the Haversian canals present in image taken at AM1.	149
5.11	Measurement of Haversian canals at eight locations.	150
5.12	Six fields of the database which contain the calculated microstructures for comparison.	150
5.13	A unit of the array structure of database with 23 fields containing basic information, Haversian canal measurements at eight locations and derived parameters of the sample.	154
5.14	Database structure array of samples. Each sample has 23 fields containing basic information, Haversian canal measurements and derived parameters.	155
5.15	Flow chart of the statistical tests automation for comparison.	157
5.16	A view of the sample input panel of the system GUI.	161
5.17	Sample information input panel in tab1 of the system GUI.	163
5.18	The control panel of the tab1 in system GUI.	163
5.19	Selection of microscopic images of the bone slice sample from control panel in tab1.	164
5.20	Bone sample microscopic imaging guide provided in the control panel of tab1.	165
5.21	Identification of Haversian canals in eight microscopic images using digital pen in the system GUI.	166
5.22	Data input panel in tab1 of the system GUI.	167
5.23	View of the current database in the system provided in data input panel of tab1.	167
5.24	Delete sample panel in tab1 of the system GUI.	168
5.25	The second tab of the system GUI performing race	

REFERENCES

- Abdullah, M. B. (2014). Ethnic Composition, Current Population Estimates, Malaysia, 2014 - 2016. Department of statistics Malaysia, Official portal: Department of statistics Malaysia.
- Abu Bakar, S. N., Aspalilah, A., AbdelNasser, I., Nurliza, A., Hairuliza, M. J., Swarhib, M., Mohd Nor, F. (2017). Stature Estimation from Lower Limb Anthropometry using Linear Regression Analysis: A Study on the Malaysian Population. *Clin Ter*, 168(2), e84-e87. doi: 10.7417/ct.2017.1988
- Aiello, L. C., & Molleson, T. (1993). Are Microscopic Ageing Techniques more accurate than Macroscopic Ageing Techniques? *Journal of Archaeological Science*, 20(6), 689-704. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jasc.1993.1043>
- Albu, I. G., R. Georoceanu, M. (1990). The canal system in the diaphysial compacta of the femur in some mammals (Vol. 170).
- Alias, A., Ibrahim, A., Abu Bakar, S. N., Shafie, M. S., Das, S., & Nor, F. (2017). Morphometric and morphological study of mental foramen in the Malaysian population: Anatomy and forensic implications (Vol. 16).
- Bell, K. L., Loveridge, N., Reeve, J., Thomas, C. D., Feik, S. A., & Clement, J. G. (2001). Super-osteons (remodeling clusters) in the cortex of the femoral shaft: influence of age and gender. *Anat Rec*, 264(4), 378-386.
- Bertelsen, P. K., Clement, J. G., & Thomas, C. D. L. (1995). A morphometric study of the cortex of the human femur from early childhood to advanced old age. *Forensic Sci Int*, 74(1), 63-77. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0379-0738\(95\)01738-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0379-0738(95)01738-5)
- Black, S. (2001). A Tour of Mile Canyon: The University of Texas at Austin and College of Liberal Arts.
- Boivin, G. (2007). The hydroxyapatite crystal: A closer look. *Medicographia*, 29, 126-132.

- Britz, H. M., Thomas, C. D., Clement, J. G., & Cooper, D. M. (2009). The relation of femoral osteon geometry to age, sex, height and weight. *Bone*, 45(1), 77-83. doi: 10.1016/j.bone.2009.03.654
- Bruce Martin, R., Burr, D., Sharkey, N., & Fyhrie, D. (2015). *Skeletal Tissue Mechanics*.
- Burr, D. B., Ruff, C. B., & Thompson, D. D. (1990). Patterns of skeletal histologic change through time: comparison of an archaic native American population with modern populations. *Anat Rec*, 226(3), 307-313. doi: 10.1002/ar.1092260306
- Carneiro, L. J. a. J. (2005). *Basic Histology: Text and Atlas* (A. L. Mescher Ed. 14 ed.): McGraw-Hill Medical.
- contributors, W. C. (2018). Bone cross-section: Wikimedia Commons, the free media repository.
- Cormack, H. (1987). *Ham's Histology*: Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott.
- Cosgriff-Hernandez, M.-T. J. (2012). *Histomorphometric Estimation of Age at Death Using the Femoral Cortex: A Modification of Established Methods*. The Ohio State University. Retrieved from http://rave.ohiolink.edu/etdc/view?acc_num=osu1338361172
- Cunningham, C., Scheuer, L., & Black, S. (2016). Chapter 3 - Bone Development. In C. Cunningham, L. Scheuer & S. Black (Eds.), *Developmental Juvenile Osteology (Second Edition)* (pp. 19-35). San Diego: Academic Press.
- De Boer, Aarents, & Maat. (2012). Staining ground sections of natural dry bone tissue for microscopy. *International Journal of Osteoarchaeology*, 22(4), 379-386. doi: doi:10.1002/oa.1208
- Dupras, T. L., Schultz, J. J., Wheeler, S. M., & Williams, L. J. (2011). *Forensic Recovery of Human Remains: Archaeological Approaches, Second Edition*: Taylor & Francis.
- Ericksen, M. F. (1991). Histologic estimation of age at death using the anterior cortex of the femur. *Am J Phys Anthropol*, 84(2), 171-179.
- Faridah Mohd, N., Robert, F. P., & Holger, S. (2013). Age at death estimation from bone histology in Malaysian males. *Medicine, Science and the Law*, 54(4), 203-208. doi: 10.1177/0025802413506573
- Forwood, M. R., & Turner, C. H. (1995). Skeletal adaptations to mechanical usage: results from tibial loading studies in rats. *Bone*, 17(4 Suppl), 197s-205s.

- Frost, H. M. (1969). Tetracycline-based histological analysis of bone remodeling. *Calcif Tissue Res*, 3(3), 211-237.
- Frost, H. M. (1999). Why do bone strength and "mass" in aging adults become unresponsive to vigorous exercise? Insights of the Utah paradigm. *J Bone Miner Metab*, 17(2), 90-97.
- G. Robling, A., & Stout, S. (2007). *Histomorphometry of Human Cortical Bone: Applications to Age Estimation*.
- GeneralHelghast. (2013). *The Glorious Races of the World map: Digital Art*, GeneralHelghast.
- Granke, M., Makowski, A. J., Uppuganti, S., & Nyman, J. S. (2016). Prevalent role of porosity and osteonal area over mineralization heterogeneity in the fracture toughness of human cortical bone. *J Biomech*, 49(13), 2748-2755. doi: 10.1016/j.jbiomech.2016.06.009
- Gray, H. (1918). *Anatomy of the Human Body (Vol. 1)*: Bartleby.
- Hall, B. K. (2005). *Bones and cartilage: developmental and evolutionary skeletal biology*. Elsevier Academic Press (USA) Ltd.
- Ijaz, K., Muhammad Mahadi Bin Abdul, J., & Faridah Mohd, N. (2018). Age regression for Malaysian males using cortical bone Histomorphometry. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 1019(1), 012011.
- Imaging, S. (2000). Spot Cameras. In S. I. C. cameras (Ed.).
- John.R., Mig G., Pind M., Vick D. Brown R., & Mj, A. (2001). Manual preparation of ground sections for the microscopy of natural bone tissue: update and modification of Frost's 'rapid manual method'. *International Journal of Osteoarchaeology*, 11(5), 366-374. doi: doi:10.1002/oa.578
- Jamil, M. M. A., Khan, I., Abdullah, H., & Nor, F. M. (2018). Microscopic analysis of bone microstructures with increasing age in malaysian females. 2018, 10(6S), 12. doi: 10.4314/jfas.v10i6s.38
- Jaworski, Z. F. (1984). Coupling of bone formation to bone resorption: a broader view. *Calcif Tissue Int*, 36(5), 531-535.
- Junquera LC, C. J. (2003). *Basic Histology: Text and Atlas. Bone*. In: FoltinJ, Lebowitc H, Boyle PJ10ed. McGraw-Hill companies, Inc, p, 141-149.
- Kashi, A., & Saha, S. (2017). Chapter 11 - Ethical Issues in Biomaterials Research A2 - Bose, Susmita. In A. Bandyopadhyay (Ed.), *Materials for Bone Disorders* (pp. 493-503): Academic Press.

- Katz, D., & Suchey, J. M. (1986). Age determination of the male os pubis. *Am J Phys Anthropol*, 69(4), 427-435. doi: 10.1002/ajpa.1330690402
- Kerley, E. R. (1965). The microscopic determination of age in human bone. *Am J Phys Anthropol*, 23(2), 149-163. doi: 10.1002/ajpa.1330230215
- Khan, I., Jamil, M. M. A., Ibrahim, T. N. T., & Nor, F. M. (2016a, 25-27 Nov. 2016). Analysis of age-related changes in Haversian canal using image processing techniques. Paper presented at the 2016 6th IEEE International Conference on Control System, Computing and Engineering (ICCSCE).
- Khan, I., Jamil, M. M. A., Ibrahim, T. N. T., & Nor, F. M. (2016b, 25-27 Nov. 2016). Automated human age estimation at death via bone microstructures. Paper presented at the 2016 6th IEEE International Conference on Control System, Computing and Engineering (ICCSCE).
- Khan, I., Jamil, M. M. A., Ibrahim, T. N. T., & Nor, F. M. (2017). Analysis of age-related changes in Haversian canal using image processing techniques. Paper presented at the Proceedings - 6th IEEE International Conference on Control System, Computing and Engineering, ICCSCE 2016.
- Khan, I., Jamil, M. M. A., & Nor, F. M. (2017). Evaluation and reliability of bone histological age estimation methods. 2017, 9(4S), 18. doi: 10.4314/jfas.v9i4s.38
- Lanyon, L. E., Sugiyama, T., & Price, J. S. (2009). Regulation of bone mass: Local control or systemic influence or both? *IBMS BoneKEy*, 6(6), 218-226.
- Leeson, R. C., Leeson, T. S., Paparo, A. A. (1985). Specialized connective tissue: cartilage and bone. *Textbook of Histology*, 5 edn, W.B. Saunders Co., Japan,, 125-149.
- Li, D., Liu, J., Guo, B., Liang, C., Dang, L., Lu, C., . . . Zhang, G. (2016). Osteoclast-derived exosomal miR-214-3p inhibits osteoblastic bone formation. *Nature Communications*, 7, 10872. doi: 10.1038/ncomms10872
<https://www.nature.com/articles/ncomms10872#supplementary-information>
- Malaysia, J. P. (2017). Population Quick Info.
- Mann, H. B., & Whitney, D. R. (1947). On a Test of Whether one of Two Random Variables is Stochastically Larger than the Other. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, 18(1), 50-60. doi: 10.1214/aoms/1177730491

- Mansourvar, M. (2014). Bone age assessment using hand and clavicle X-ray images. Faculty of computer science and information technology university of Malaya Kuala Lumpur.
- Mulhern, D. M., & Van Gerven, D. P. (1997). Patterns of femoral bone remodeling dynamics in a Medieval Nubian population. *Am J Phys Anthropol*, 104(1), 133-146. doi: 10.1002/(sici)1096-8644(199709)104:1<133::aid-ajpa9>3.0.co;2-s
- Nor, F., Pastor, R. F., & Schutkowski, H. (2015). Histological study to differentiate between human and non-human long bone (Vol. 22).
- Nor, F. M. (2010). A comparative microscopic study of human and non-human long bone histology. (Ph.D), University of Bradford, 2010-11-05. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/10454/4463>
- Nor, F. M., Pastor, R. F., & Schutkowski, H. (2014). Age at death estimation from bone histology in Malaysian males. *Med Sci Law*, 54(4), 203-208. doi: 10.1177/0025802413506573
- Ortner, D. J. (1975). Aging effects on osteon remodeling. *Calcif Tissue Res*, 18(1), 27-36.
- Petrtyl, M., Hert, J., & Fiala, P. (1996). Spatial organization of the haversian bone in man. *J Biomech*, 29(2), 161-169.
- Raisz, L. G. (1999). Physiology and pathophysiology of bone remodeling. *Clin Chem*, 45(8 Pt 2), 1353-1358.
- Ridgman, W. J. (2009). *Statistical Methods*, 8th edn, by G. W. Snedecor & W. G. Cochran. xx + 503 pp. Ames: Iowa State University Press (1989). \$44.95 (hard covers). ISBN 0 8138 1561 6. *The Journal of Agricultural Science*, 115(1), 153-153. doi: 10.1017/S0021859600074104
- Ross, M. H., Romrell, L. J., Kaye, G. I. (1995). Bone. In: *Histology: A Text and Atlas*, 3ed. Williams & Wilkens, Philadelphia., 150-187.
- Samson C, B. K. (1987). A new method of estimating age at death from fragmentary and weathered bone. In Bodington A, Garland AN, Janaway RC, editors. *Death Decay and Reconstruction Approaches to Archaeology and Forensic Science*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 101-108.
- Schaffler, M. B., & Burr, D. B. (1984). Primate cortical bone microstructure: relationship to locomotion. *Am J Phys Anthropol*, 65(2), 191-197. doi: 10.1002/ajpa.1330650211

- Schoenbuchner, S. M., Pettifor, J. M., Norris, S. A., Micklesfield, L. K., Prentice, A., & Ward, K. A. (2017). Ethnic Differences in Peripheral Skeletal Development Among Urban South African Adolescents: A Ten-Year Longitudinal pQCT Study. *J Bone Miner Res*, 32(12), 2355-2366. doi: 10.1002/jbmr.3279
- Shapiro, S. S., & Wilk, M. B. (1965). An Analysis of Variance Test for Normality (Complete Samples). *Biometrika*, 52(3/4), 591-611. doi: 10.2307/2333709
- Sommerfeldt, D. W., & Rubin, C. T. (2001). Biology of bone and how it orchestrates the form and function of the skeleton. *Eur Spine J*, 10 Suppl 2, S86-95. doi: 10.1007/s005860100283
- Starrett. (2018). Water Resistant Digital Caliper: The L. S. Starrett Company Limited.
- Steele, D. G. (1988). *The Anatomy and Biology of the Human Skeleton*: Texas A&M University Press.
- Stevens, D. D., & Levi, A. (2005). *Introduction to Rubrics: An Assessment Tool to Save Grading Time, Convey Effective Feedback, and Promote Student Learning*: Stylus Pub.
- Stout, S. D., & Lueck, R. (1995). Bone remodeling rates and skeletal maturation in three archaeological skeletal populations. *Am J Phys Anthropol*, 98(2), 161-171. doi: 10.1002/ajpa.1330980206
- Suchey, J. M. (1979). Problems in the aging of females using the Os pubis. *Am J Phys Anthropol*, 51(3), 467-470. doi: 10.1002/ajpa.1330510319
- Swee-Hock, S. (2015). *The Population of Malaysia (Second Edition)*: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Teitelbaum, S. L. (2000). Bone resorption by osteoclasts. *Science*, 289(5484), 1504-1508.
- Thomas, C. D., Feik, S. A., & Clement, J. G. (2005). Regional variation of intracortical porosity in the midshaft of the human femur: age and sex differences. *J Anat*, 206(2), 115-125. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-7580.2005.00384.x
- Thomas, C. D. L., Feik, S. A., & Clement, J. G. (2005). Regional variation of intracortical porosity in the midshaft of the human femur: age and sex differences. *Journal of Anatomy*, 206(2), 115-125. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-7580.2005.00384.x
- Thompson, D. D. (1979). The core technique in the determination of age at death of skeletons. *J Forensic Sci*, 24(4), 902-915.

- Thompson, D. D., & Gunness-Hey, M. (1981). Bone mineral-osteon analysis of Yupik-inupiaq skeletons. *Am J Phys Anthropol*, 55(1), 1-7. doi: 10.1002/ajpa.1330550102
- Wheater PR, a. B. H. (1987). *Functional Histology: A Text and Colour Atlas*: Edinburgh: Churchill Livingstone.
- White, T. D., Black, M. T., & Folkens, P. A. (2012a). Chapter 4 - Skull: Cranium and Mandible Human Osteology (Third Edition) (pp. 43-100). San Diego: Academic Press.
- White, T. D., Black, M. T., & Folkens, P. A. (2012b). Chapter 9 - Arm: Humerus, Radius, and Ulna Human Osteology (Third Edition) (pp. 175-198). San Diego: Academic Press.
- White, T. D., Black, M. T., & Folkens, P. A. (2012c). Chapter 12 - Leg: Femur, Patella, Tibia, and Fibula Human Osteology (Third Edition) (pp. 241-270). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Wu, K., Schubeck, K. E., Frost, H. M., & Villanueva, A. (1970). Haversian bone formation rates determined by a new method in a mastodon, and in human diabetes mellitus and osteoporosis. *Calcif Tissue Res*, 6(3), 204-219.

