Finding discriminating factors between Male and Female

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Ratio | P value | | | Cutoff Age\*? | R -Square |
|  | Gender | Age | Gender\*Age |  |  |
| Ratio of Femur Physis to Epiphysis | <0.0001 | <0.0001 | 0.0070 | >15? | 0.7188 |
| Ratio of Femur M:L Epiphysis | 0.3817 | 0.0321 | 0.9139 | -- | 0.0327 |
| Ratio of Tibial Physis to Epiphysis | 0.0327 | <0.0001 | <0.0001 | 6 | 0.5596 |
| Ratio of Tibial M:L Epiphysis | 0.0131 | <0.0001 | 0.1377 | -- | 0.1544 |
| Ratio of CartilageCap to Epiphysis | <0.0001 | <0.0001 | <0.0001 | >15? | 0.6498 |
| Ratio of Tibial Cartilage width to Epiphyseal width | <0.0001 | <0.0001 | 0.1896 |  | 0.6713 |
| Ratio of Femur Cartilage volume to Tibial Cartilage Cap | 0.4261 | <0.0001 | 0.2062 | -- | 0.0694 |
| Ratio of Femur Cartilage volume to Femur volume epiphysis | <0.0001 | <0.0001 | <0.0001 |  | 0.7275 |
| Ratio of Tibial Cartilage Cap to Tibial Epiphysis Volume | <0.0001 | <0.0001 | <0.0001 |  | 0.7282 |

1. The highlight rows in yellow color show there are significant difference between male and female. The results are from ANOVA analysis, see graphs in file of “(see the file of “ratio by age.pdf”)
2. The highlight rows in green color show the trend from the fitting with quadratic term are acceptable, and the cut-off ages were estimated roughly from the graphs (see the file of “ratio by age trend.pdf”)