World Journal of Advanced Engineering Technology and Sciences

eISSN: 2582-8266

Cross Ref DOI: 10.30574/wjaets

Journal homepage: https://wjaets.com/

(Research Article)

Facial Frontiers in the Era of AI and Biometry: Bridging anthropometric data with modern applications

Shifan Khanday *, Sarah Masood, Manal Saleem, Maryam Mohammed, Rahmatullah, Ifrah Ayesha Imdad, Asma Mohammed Aslam Sange, Shameema Alam and Faazila Naaz Mashooq

Department of Biomedical Sciences, Dubai Medical College for Girls, Dubai Medical University, Dubai, UAE.

World Journal of Advanced Engineering Technology and Sciences, 2025, 14(03), 248-253

Publication history: Received on 30 January 2025; revised on 07 March 2025; accepted on 10 March 2025

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.30574/wjaets.2025.14.3.0127

Abstract

Facial anthropometry—the systematic measurement of human facial features—has long provided critical insights for forensic investigations, reconstructive surgery, orthodontics, and anthropological research. In the contemporary era of artificial intelligence (AI) and advanced biometric systems, the importance of reliable, culturally diverse facial data has grown exponentially. This paper revisits a retrospective analysis of facial metrics spanning seven major ethnic groups (Caucasian, African, East Asian, South Asian, Middle Eastern, Indigenous American, and Hispanic/Latino) and explores the implications of observed variations for forensic science, plastic surgery, anthropological inquiry, and AI-driven biometric applications. Our results reveal statistically significant differences in key facial dimensions—including facial height, bizygomatic width, nasal width, intercanthal distance, and lower face height—that underscore the need for integrating ethnically representative datasets in both clinical and technological contexts. By providing a bridge between historical anthropometric research and modern technological applications, this study highlights avenues for future research and underscores ethical considerations in data utilization.

Keywords: Facial Anthropometry; Ethnic Variability; Forensic Science; Plastic Surgery; Anthropological Research; Artificial Intelligence; Biometric Applications

1. Introduction

The human face is a complex mosaic of genetic, environmental, and cultural influences that shape its structure and appearance. For centuries, researchers have employed facial anthropometry—the precise measurement of facial dimensions—to enhance our understanding of human diversity. Traditionally, these measurements have played a pivotal role in forensic science, where facial reconstruction assists in identifying unknown individuals, and in plastic surgery, where they guide aesthetic and reconstructive procedures. In the field of anthropology, such data help trace human evolution, migration, and adaptation to varying environments.

With the rapid advent of artificial intelligence (AI) and biometric technologies, facial anthropometry has emerged as a cornerstone for developing robust facial recognition systems. These systems depend on large-scale, diverse datasets that capture subtle inter-ethnic differences in facial structure. Despite technological advancements, challenges remain in ensuring that AI algorithms perform equitably across different ethnic groups. Algorithms trained on skewed or homogenous data risk perpetuating bias, thereby compromising identification accuracy and fairness in applications ranging from security to personalized healthcare.

This paper revisits retrospective facial anthropometric data to highlight ethnic variations in facial structure and discusses the multifaceted implications for forensic science, reconstructive surgery, anthropological studies, and AI-

* Corresponding author: Shifan Khanday

driven biometrics. The integration of historical datasets with modern analytical techniques represents a critical step toward reducing bias and enhancing the reliability of biometric systems in today's interconnected world.

2. Methodology

2.1. Study Design and Data Sources

A retrospective, cross-sectional study was designed to compile and reanalyze facial measurements gathered from diverse sources. Data were obtained from hospital records, digital imaging archives, and prior anthropometric studies conducted over the past decade. The study focused on a cohort of 1,000 adults aged 18 to 50 years, ensuring balanced representation across gender and ethnicity. The seven ethnic groups represented in this study include:

- Caucasian
- African
- East Asian
- South Asian
- Middle Eastern
- Indigenous American
- Hispanic/Latino

Each participant's inclusion was contingent upon documented ethnicity, the absence of craniofacial surgery or trauma, and no congenital facial anomalies, ensuring that the dataset reflected natural facial morphology.

2.2. Measurement Protocols

The core facial measurements evaluated in this study were as follows:

- **Facial Height (FH):** Measured as the vertical distance from the chin to the highest point of the forehead.
- **Bizygomatic Width (BW):** The horizontal distance between the most lateral points of the zygomatic arches.
- **Nasal Width (NW):** The width of the nose measured at its broadest point.
- **Intercanthal Distance (ID):** The distance between the medial canthi (inner corners) of the eyes.
- **Lower Face Height (LFH):** The distance from the base of the nose to the chin.

To enhance data integrity, all measurements were recalibrated according to established anthropometric protocols. Both two-dimensional (2D) photographs and three-dimensional (3D) imaging techniques were employed, and any discrepancies between the methods were minimized by applying consistent calibration techniques across datasets.

2.3. Data Analysis Procedures

The study adopted both descriptive and inferential statistical methods:

- **Descriptive Statistics:** Mean values and standard deviations for each facial parameter were calculated for every ethnic group.
- **Comparative Analysis:** Variance analysis (ANOVA) was applied to normally distributed data, whereas non-parametric tests (e.g., Kruskal-Wallis) were used for datasets that did not meet normality assumptions.
- **Post-hoc Testing:** In cases of significant differences, post-hoc analyses were conducted to identify specific intergroup disparities.
- **Adjustments:** Age and gender were controlled as covariates to mitigate potential confounding effects.

Statistical significance was established at a p-value of less than 0.05, ensuring that reported differences were robust and not attributable to chance.

3. Results

3.1. Summary of Measurements

Table 1 below summarizes the primary facial measurements recorded across the seven ethnic groups:

Table 1 Mean facial measurements and standard deviations across ethnic groups

Ethnic Group	Facial Height (mm)	Bizygomatic Width (mm)	Nasal Width (mm)	Intercanthal Distance (mm)	Lower Face Height (mm)
Caucasian	120.0 ± 5.5	135.0 ± 4.8	34.0 ± 2.3	33.0 ± 2.1	65.0 ± 3.2
African	115.0 ± 5.2	145.0 ± 5.0	40.0 ± 2.8	35.0 ± 2.4	60.0 ± 3.1
East Asian	110.0 ± 5.3	138.0 ± 4.6	32.0 ± 2.1	37.0 ± 2.5	62.0 ± 3.4
South Asian	112.0 ± 5.1	140.0 ± 4.9	36.0 ± 2.5	34.0 ± 2.3	63.0 ± 3.3
Middle Eastern	118.0 ± 5.4	137.0 ± 4.7	38.0 ± 2.6	34.0 ± 2.2	64.0 ± 3.4
Indigenous American	113.0 ± 5.3	139.0 ± 4.9	35.0 ± 2.4	33.5 ± 2.3	61.0 ± 3.2
Hispanic/Latino	114.0 ± 5.2	140.0 ± 4.8	36.0 ± 2.4	34.0 ± 2.2	63.0 ± 3.3

3.2. Detailed Findings

3.2.1. Facial Height (FH)

The Caucasian group exhibited the highest average facial height at 120 mm, while the East Asian cohort presented the shortest at 110 mm. These findings were statistically significant ($p < 0.05$), suggesting that overall vertical facial dimensions vary with ethnicity.

3.2.2. Bizygomatic Width (BW)

The African participants demonstrated the broadest facial structure, with a mean bizygomatic width of 145 mm, contrasting sharply with the Caucasian group's mean of 135 mm. The broad difference ($p < 0.01$) highlights the need for tailored biometric parameters in populations with broader facial structures.

3.2.3. Nasal Width (NW)

Similarly, nasal width showed significant intergroup variability ($p < 0.05$). African subjects again registered the highest nasal width at 40 mm, while East Asians had the narrowest measurements at 32 mm, reflecting adaptive morphological features that may be influenced by climatic factors.

3.2.4. Intercanthal Distance (ID)

The study identified the largest intercanthal distance in East Asian individuals (37 mm), followed by African subjects (35 mm). These differences are of particular interest in biometric applications where the distance between the eyes plays a critical role in facial recognition algorithms.

3.2.5. Lower Face Height (LFH)

Caucasians also exhibited the highest lower face height (65 mm), whereas Africans recorded a significantly shorter lower face height (60 mm). Such distinctions could have implications for reconstructive surgery, where precise proportionality is critical for achieving natural results.

4. Discussion

4.1. Forensic Science Implications

Forensic reconstruction often depends on accurately reassembling a person's facial features from skeletal remains. Ethnic differences in facial anthropometry, as demonstrated in this study, provide forensic experts with valuable benchmarks for reconstructing faces with greater precision. For example, the broader nasal and bizygomatic dimensions observed in African subjects suggest that incorporating ethnic-specific data into reconstruction models can improve identification outcomes. Similarly, the relatively shorter facial height in East Asian populations provides forensic practitioners with additional context for reconstructing facial profiles from limited or fragmentary remains. These nuanced differences can help avoid misidentification and enhance the overall accuracy of forensic analyses.

4.2. Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery

In the realm of plastic surgery, the demand for procedures that respect and enhance natural ethnic features has grown significantly. Surgeons rely on anthropometric data to customize procedures such as rhinoplasty, facelifts, and jaw reconstructions. By understanding ethnic-specific norms—such as the broader nasal widths seen in African and Middle Eastern groups or the distinct intercanthal distances common among East Asians—surgeons can design interventions that not only achieve aesthetic harmony but also maintain cultural congruence. For instance, reconstructive efforts in patients from the African demographic might incorporate strategies to preserve or subtly enhance broader nasal and facial structures, ensuring the postoperative outcome appears both natural and respectful of ethnic identity.

4.3. Anthropological and Evolutionary Perspectives

Facial anthropometry has long served as a window into the evolutionary history of human populations. Variations in facial dimensions can be linked to adaptations to different environmental pressures. The broader nasal widths found in African populations may be an evolutionary response to hotter climates, potentially aiding in thermoregulation and the humidification of air. Conversely, narrower nasal structures in East Asians could represent adaptations to colder environments, where minimizing heat loss is advantageous. Moreover, the differences in facial height and proportions can provide insights into migration patterns and the intermingling of various genetic lineages. Longitudinal anthropometric studies, such as the one presented here, help trace shifts in facial morphology over time, reflecting both genetic drift and cultural evolution.

4.4. AI and Biometric Applications

The integration of AI into biometric systems has revolutionized personal identification and security protocols. However, the success of these systems is critically dependent on the diversity of the datasets used for training. An underrepresentation of certain ethnic groups in facial datasets can lead to higher error rates and bias in facial recognition systems. This study’s findings underscore the importance of including ethnically diverse, high-quality anthropometric data in AI algorithms. By recalibrating facial measurements across multiple ethnicities, developers can refine the accuracy of recognition software, reducing instances of false positives and negatives. In high-security environments such as airports, banking, and law enforcement, even small improvements in algorithmic accuracy can have significant real-world implications. Furthermore, as biometric systems evolve to incorporate dynamic features—such as facial expressions and micro-movements—baseline anthropometric data remain essential for calibrating these advanced models.

4.5. Ethical Considerations and Data Privacy

The increasing reliance on biometric data for security and identification purposes raises important ethical and privacy concerns. While comprehensive facial anthropometric datasets offer clear benefits for forensic, clinical, and technological applications, they also pose risks related to data misuse, surveillance, and personal privacy. It is imperative that the integration of AI in biometric applications is accompanied by robust ethical guidelines and data protection protocols. Future research must prioritize informed consent, anonymization, and secure data storage, ensuring that the benefits of AI-driven technologies do not come at the cost of individual privacy. As biometric data become increasingly integrated into everyday technology, establishing global standards for ethical use and data security will be crucial.

4.6. Limitations of the Study

Despite its contributions, this study is not without limitations. The retrospective design inherently introduces the possibility of selection bias, and the reliance on historical data may have led to inconsistencies in measurement techniques. Furthermore, the categorization of ethnicity based on self-reported data does not always capture the full genetic complexity of mixed heritage individuals. Future studies should aim to collect prospective data using standardized, high-resolution imaging techniques, and consider genetic markers to more accurately represent the diverse makeup of modern populations.

4.7. Future Research Directions

Building on the findings of this study, several avenues for future research emerge:

- **Prospective Longitudinal Studies:** Tracking facial measurements over time will help elucidate the effects of aging, environmental influences, and socio-cultural shifts on facial morphology.
- **Integration of 3D Imaging and AI:** Advanced imaging technologies, combined with machine learning, can uncover subtle morphological variations that traditional 2D measurements may overlook.

- **Expanding Ethnic Databases:** Increasing the sample size and including more detailed sub-ethnic classifications will enhance the robustness of anthropometric databases.
- **Ethical Framework Development:** As biometric systems become ubiquitous, research into ethical frameworks and privacy-preserving technologies will be essential to safeguard personal data.
- **Multidisciplinary Collaboration:** Combining expertise from anthropology, forensic science, plastic surgery, and computer science will foster a more holistic approach to understanding and applying facial anthropometric data

5. Conclusion

This comprehensive retrospective analysis reinforces the critical role of facial anthropometry in a broad spectrum of fields, from forensic science and plastic surgery to anthropological research and AI-driven biometric applications. The study's findings—highlighting significant ethnic variations in facial dimensions—demonstrate the importance of integrating culturally diverse datasets to improve both scientific understanding and practical applications. By bridging historical anthropometric data with modern technological advancements, this research contributes to the ongoing efforts to refine biometric systems, reduce bias, and promote equitable outcomes across different populations. As the fields of AI and biometrics continue to evolve, future research must maintain a commitment to ethical practices, inclusivity, and the pursuit of knowledge that respects the rich tapestry of human diversity

Compliance with ethical standards

Disclosure of conflict of interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest regarding this study. All data utilized in this analysis were anonymized and handled in accordance with ethical standards, ensuring the integrity and privacy of all participants.

References

[1] Farkas, L. G., & Kolar, J. C. (1987). Anthropometrics and art in the aesthetics of women's faces. Clinical Plastic Surgery, 14(4), 599-616.

[2] Enlow, D. H., & Hans, M. G. (1996). Essentials of Facial Growth. W.B. Saunders.

[3] Hall, R. L. (2005). Geographic variation of native people along the Pacific Coast. American Journal of Physical Anthropology, 127(1), 34-45.

[4] Ngeow, W. C., & Aljunid, S. T. (2009). Craniofacial anthropometric norms of Malays. Singapore Medical Journal, 50(5), 525-528.

[5] Porter, J. P., & Olson, K. L. (2001). Analysis of the African American female nose. Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, 107(6), 1401-1411.

[6] Ferrario, V. F., Sforza, C., Poggio, C. E., & Schmitz, J. H. (1998). Soft tissue facial morphometry in a three-dimensional coordinate system. Journal of Craniofacial Surgery, 9(1), 11-18.

[7] Franciscus, R. G. (1999). Neandertal nasal structures and upper respiratory tract "specialization". Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 96(4), 1805-1809

[8] Bulygina, E., Mitteroecker, P., & Aiello, L. C. (2006). The role of modularity in craniofacial development. Evolution & Development, 8(1), 46-60. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1525-142X.2006.05076.x

[9] Burton, A. M., Jenkins, R., Hancock, P. J. B., & White, D. (2005). Robust representations for face recognition: The power of averages. Cognitive Psychology, 51(3), 256-284. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogpsych.2005.06.003

[10] Danel, D. P., Fedurek, P., Coetzee, V., Stephen, I. D., Nowak, J., & Stirrat, M. (2020). A cross-cultural study of sex differences in facial width-to-height ratio. Scientific Reports, 10, 17515. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-74620-w

[11] Fagertun, J., Harder, S., de Bruijne, M., & Larsen, R. (2014). 3D facial landmarking under expression variation. Pattern Recognition Letters, 43, 57-63. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patrec.2013.11.007

[12] Hennessy, R. J., Baldwin, P. A., Browne, D. J., & Kinsella, A. (2010). Three-dimensional laser surface imaging and geometric morphometrics resolve frontonasal dysmorphology in schizophrenia. Biological Psychiatry, 67(5), 467-473. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2009.08.027

[13] Klingenberg, C. P. (2013). Cranial integration and modularity: Insights into evolution and development from morphometric data. Hystrix, 24(1), 43-58. https://doi.org/10.4404/hystrix-24.1-6367

[14] Mehta, U., & Sinha, P. (2019). The role of demographic diversity in improving facial recognition algorithms. Journal of AI Research, 65, 589-602. https://doi.org/10.1613/jair.1.11630

[15] Mitteroecker, P., & Gunz, P. (2009). Advances in geometric morphometrics. Evolutionary Biology, 36(2), 235-247. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11692-009-9055-x

[16] Tajima, K., Masuda, M., & Shibata, K. (2021). Influence of ethnicity on facial soft-tissue depths: Implications for forensic reconstruction. Forensic Science International, 321, 110735. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2021.110735

[17] Zhao, W., Chellappa, R., Phillips, P. J., & Rosenfeld, A. (2003). Face recognition: A literature survey. ACM Computing Surveys, 35(4), 399-458. https://doi.org/10.1145/954339.954342