This is the pre-publication text version for
Kolose, S., T. Stewart, P. A. Hume and G. Tomkinson (2021). "Cluster size prediction for military clothing using 3D body scan data." Applied Ergonomics **96**: 103487.

Applied Ergonomics 96 (2021) 103487

# Cluster size prediction for military clothing using 3D body scan data

Stephven Kolose [a,*], Tom Stewart [a,b], Patria Hume [a], Grant R. Tomkinson [c,d]

[a] Sport Performance Research Institute New Zealand, Auckland University of Technology, Auckland, New Zealand
[b] Human Potential Centre, School of Sport and Recreation, Auckland University of Technology, Auckland, New Zealand
[c] Department of Education, Health and Behavior Studies, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, ND, USA
[d] Alliance for Research in Exercise, Nutrition and Activity (ARENA), School of Health Sciences, University of South Australia, Adelaide, SA, Australia

**ABSTRACT**

**Aim**: To determine how anthropometric characteristics cluster in the New Zealand Defence Force, and to describe the characteristics of each cluster. This information can inform the development of new uniform sizing systems for the New Zealand Defence Force.

**Methods**: Anthropometric data (n=84 variables) from 1,003 participants in New Zealand Defence Force Anthropometry Survey (NZDFAS) were used. The dataset was stratified by gender and variables isolated based on their relevance to shirt and trouser sizing. Principal Component Analysis was used to identify the most important variables for clustering. A combination of two-step and k-means clustering was used to derive cluster characteristics.

**Results**: The PCA identified optimal clothing (shirt = body height and waist girth; and trouser = inseam length and hip girth for females; inseam length and waist girth for males) variables. Two-step and k-means clustering identified optimal cluster numbers of 6 and 10 for female and male clothing, respectively. The female clothing clusters were more variable (intra-cluster) and further apart (inter-cluster) compared to males.

**Conclusions**: Anthropometric measurements in combination with clustering techniques show promise for partitioning individuals into distinct groups. The anthropometry dimensions associated with each cluster can be used by the garment industry to develop specific sizing systems for the New Zealand Defence Force population.

**KEY WORDS**

Anthropometry, PCA, Cluster analysis, Clothing size, New Zealand Defence Force

**INTRODUCTION**

A correctly sized uniform is extremely important for military personnel worldwide. Correct fitting clothing is important for performing various occupational and operational tasks (e.g. pack march, piloting an aircraft), for safety (e.g. body armour protects important organs, chemical suits must fit properly to seal against dangerous liquids or gases) (Keefe et al., 2015) and the ability to provide sufficient mobility and adopting various postures (e.g. using a weapon in prone position). Accurate fitting garments depends on a robust sizing system, the availability of an accurate set of body measurements, and an understanding of anthropometry (Varte et al., 2020; Vuruskan et al., 2011). A clothing sizing system consists of the number of sizes, intervals between sizes, and a size labelling system. It should ensure that the range of sizes fit as much as 95% of the target population (Carr et al., 2012; Keefe et al., 2017a; McCulloch et al., 1998; Zakaria and Ruznan, 2020).

Unfortunately, obtaining the correct fit is challenging due to the vast differences in body types and the variation in body types within a given size interval (Loker et al., 2005). Furthermore, the size intervals may not correspond with real size/shape combinations found in the population. Secular trends show that populations are growing taller (approximately 1 cm each decade) and becoming heavier for the general population (Marfell-Jones and Olds, 2007). These changes in body size and shape also vary by ethnicity, age, and gender (Apeagyei, 2010; Kroemer et al., 1997) and may not necessarily be reflected in current garment sizing systems. Recent increases in the body size of military personnel (e.g. in Australia, Canada and the U.S.) appear to have coincided with changes in body proportions which collectively create additional challenges for maintaining a current and effective uniform sizing scheme (Keefe et al., 2015; Keefe et al., 2017b; Knapik et al., 2018; Tomkinson et al., 2009; Tomkinson et al., 2017). In addition to human growth, there has been an increase in the number of females in the military worldwide. Women are increasingly being integrated into military 'front line' combat roles in addition to being in long standing roles such as air force pilots, search and rescue technicians, and clearance divers. For example, the number of enlisted women in the US military increased by 17% (between 2000 and 2019) to 220,000 (Eagan, 2019). In the New Zealand Defence Force (NZDF), individual service gender targets were set to increase female participation in the Air Force and Navy to 25% and 30%, respectively, by 2025. While the NZ Army is targeting a 25% and 35% increase in females in combat support and combat service support respectively, by 2025 (New Zealand Defence Force, 2019). As a result of the increase in women participation, the female body shape must be considered for clothing and equipment that was originally designed for use by male personnel (Keefe et al., 2017b). The implications of the changes in human growth and demographics in the military will influence clothing design, sizing, and fit.

In military apparel, key measurements or sizing systems are identified from the analysis of anthropometric data of military populations (Carr et al., 2012). The use of 3D body scanners in military surveys have gained in popularity over the last 20 years. Military anthropometry surveys have a long history in the United States, United Kingdom, Australia, and Canada (Kolose et al., 2020) and a growing presence in countries such as Brazil, Indonesia, India, and Iran (Da Silva et al., 2017; Pourtaghi et al., 2014; Purnomo and Kurnia, 2020; Varte et al., 2020). The introduction of 3D body scanners has improved the measurement process immensely. They enable the capture of surface anthropometric data in a time-efficient and non-invasive manner; a larger number of measurements can be taken at once while providing a digital record of the participant (Varte et al., 2020). Numerous studies have investigated the reliability and/or validity of scan-derived measurements compared to more traditional (e.g., ISAK) systems. Body scanners have been shown to measure body volumes, circumferences, and lengths more rapidly and accurately than traditional techniques (Wang et al., 2006). Jaeschke et al. (2015) discovered strong correlations between automatic and traditional measurements for body height; however, the automatic measurements generally 'overestimated' most other measurements. Glock et al. (2017) found that body height, waist, upper arm, calf, and hip circumference showed high validity for both traditional and body scanner methods. Choi and Ashdown (2011) found that automatic measurements provided significantly larger values for waist circumference compared to traditional measurements. Alternatively, Wells et al. (2007) found that traditional measurements were more accurate at predicting buttock girth and hip girth.

Clothing measurements extracted from 3D body scans (e.g. sleeve in-seam and waist girth) can be used to develop sizing systems. Shape categorisation may use statistical techniques such as principal component analysis (PCA) or cluster analysis (CA) to identify "clusters" of body shapes, develop new size templates, and thus increase the likelihood of a good fit and adequate coverage of the target population (Kaufmann, 1997;

Olds and Honey, 2006). Previous research has utilised various types of cluster analysis (e.g. k-means, hierarchical, two-step) to establish sizing charts for the civilian sector such as the New Zealand fire service (Laing et al., 1999) and UK offshore workers (Stewart et al., 2017). These methods have also been used to size uniforms for the Sudanese and Indian militaries (Elfaki and Ali, 2016; Varte et al., 2020), as well as ballistic protection for the Taiwanese and Indonesian militaries (Purnomo and Kurnia, 2020; Wen and Shih, 2020).

Until recently, 3D body scanning technology had never been used to assist garment sizing and selection in the New Zealand Defence Force. In 2019, the New Zealand Army expressed interest in how this technology could optimise their recruit combat uniform sizing process (Kolose et al., 2019). Using the 2016–18 New Zealand Defence Force Anthropometric Survey (NZDFAS) dataset, a previous study was conducted using decision tree models to predict clothing size, using the tailor-assigned clothing size as the gold standard. The study also captured subjective ratings of perceived clothing fit. Findings showed a modest level of size classification accuracy (up to 62%) and a high proportion of perceived poor fitting garments, particularly for females (Kolose et al., 2019). This may suggest inconsistencies between body anthropometry, sex-specific differences in body shape and fit, and the sizing system of the uniform at the time. Now that current 3D anthropometric data (NZDFAS) exists for this population, it may be possible to develop a more adequate sizing system. Therefore, the aims of this study were: (1) to determine how anthropometric characteristics cluster in the NZDFAS data, and (2) describe the characteristics of each cluster. This information may inform the development of a new sizing system for the NZDF.

**METHOD**

Anthropometric data from the 2016–18 NZDFAS was used in this study (Kolose et al., 2020). The study had ethical approval from the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee (AUTEC #14/126 NZDF anthropometry Survey: Variations in kinanthropometry and implications for the New Zealand Defence Force).

Participants

The NZDFAS dataset was collected between February 2016 and June 2018 and consisted of 1,003 uniformed participants from the Royal New Zealand Navy (n= 131), Royal New Zealand Air Force (n=289) and the New Zealand Army (n=583). The participants were recruited from nine NZDF centres across New Zealand using a mixture of stratified (e.g., based on selected demographics such as gender, service, trade, and ethnicity) and purposive (e.g., where a point of contact at each site helped identify participants based on their availability and suitability for the study) sampling.

Procedures

The data collection consisted of four stages run by a minimum of six staff (receptionist, four trained anthropometrists and a dedicated body scan technician).

(i) Brief, where participants had the study aims explained to them and they completed written informed consent and an electronic demographic questionnaire. This questionnaire captured information such as their service type, years of service, sex, ethnicity, trade, and questions on how they rated the fit of their current uniforms and other military equipment.

(ii) Physical landmarking, where participants had 20 landmarks physically palpated and marked by anthropometrists trained at Levels 1 and 2 by the International Society for the Advancement of Kinanthropometry (ISAK). The landmarks were used to help identify and extract physical and post-processed measurements according to a measurement schedule (Kolose et al., 2020).

(iii) Physical measurements, where participants had 25 measurements (Kolose et al., 2020) taken twice by the anthropometrist using equipment recommended by ISAK (e.g., anthropometer, large sliding calliper, small bone calliper, tape). If the first and second measurements were outside specified limits (i.e., 1% for breadths, length, and girths, 5% for reach measurements) then a third measurement was taken.

(iv) Body scan, where participants were scanned inside the *Vitus Smart XXL*® body scanner (Human Solutions, Kaiserlauten, Germany) wearing tight-fitting underwear (e.g., briefs for males, and sports bra and underwear for females) and a swim cap (to standardise head-related measures such as standing height). Participants were scanned in three different postures (two standing and one sitting posture) whilst wearing stickered landmarks required for post-processed measurements.

The 84 measurements were derived using three measurement methods (automatic, physical, and post-processed) to optimize participant throughput while limiting individual processing times at each data collection activity (Kolose et al., 2020). The measurements were derived from a combination of various international standards: ISO 7250, ANSUR II, ISAK, NHANES and survey protocols from Australia, UK, Canada and New Zealand (Centers for Disease Control Prevention, 2007; Gordon et al., 2014; International Organization for Standardization, 2008; Keefe et al., 2015; Kolose et al., 2020; Pringle et al., 2011; Tomkinson et al., 2012). The three methods are summarised in Table 1**.**

**Table 1**. NZDFAS measurement methods description.

| **Method (n)** | **Description** | **Hardware** | **Software** | **Processing time per individual (min)** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Automatic (17) | Measurements are captured using an automatic landmark algorithm. Requires minimum operator effort except for final checking of measurement placement. The software extracts the measurements. | Vitus XXL 3-D body scanner. Human Solutions Ltd. | Anthroscan© software. Human Solutions Ltd. | <1 |
| Physical (25) | Traditional anthropometric measurements conducted by accredited anthropometrists. High operator input (e.g. physical palpation of skin surface) is required. High accuracy dependant on the skill of the anthropometrist. | Traditional anthropometry equipment (callipers, scales, stadiometer). | Excel spreadsheet | 30–50 |
| Post-processed (42) | Raw body scans are analysed using a separate software called CySlice. The operator extracts the measurements from each body scan using a suite of digital tools (e.g. tapes, rulers). Requires high operator input with specialist skills in 3D anthropometric and digital manipulation. | Vitus XXL 3-D body scanner. Human Solutions Ltd. | CySlice™ Headus Ltd | 20–30 |

The number in parentheses in Column 1 refers to the number of measurements in each method. Processing time refers to approximate duration of the activity per participant.

Analysis

The analysis was stratified by clothing type (i.e. shirt and trouser) and sex (male and female). Two subsets of data were created by identifying measurements that were related to shirt (i.e. upper body and traditional shirt sizing dimensions) and trouser measurements (i.e. lower body and traditional trouser sizing dimensions). Variables common to both shirt and trouser sizing (i.e. body height and weight) were added to each dataset. Inseam length (calculated as crotch height – 50.8 mm) is regularly used in conjunction with waist girth for sizing military clothing (Brantley, 2020; Dāboliņa et al., 2017; Traumann et al., 2019; Zakaria and Ruznan, 2020) and was thus added to the trouser dataset. See Supplementary file 1 for a full list of variables in these two datasets.

These datasets were analysed using principal component analysis and cluster (two-step and k-means) analysis using a similar process to previous work (Bagherzadeh et al., 2010; Tiwari and Anand, 2020). All analyses were performed using IBM SPSS Statistics v24.0.

*PCA*

The filtered measurements were analysed using PCA to reduce the dimensionality of the dataset and to determine the variables best suited for the cluster analysis. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy, Bartlett's test of sphericity, and the assessment of the anti-image correlation and communalities matrices were administered to ensure the data were suitable for PCA. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin scores were all greater than 0.6, and the Bartlett's test of sphericity were all significant (i.e. female shirt [$\chi^2$ (20672.5) = 2415, $p < .01$], female trouser [$\chi^2$ (9521.4) = 666, $p < .01$], male shirt [$\chi^2$ (82815) = 2415, $p < .01$], male trouser [$\chi^2$ (41136.4) = 666, $p < .01$]).

*Cluster analyses*

Two-Step Cluster

The variables in the PCA step with the highest loadings that were also deemed practical measurements for clothing sizing were then utilised in the two-step cluster analysis (TSC). Two variables were used for each cluster based on previous cluster studies (Bagherzadeh et al., 2010; Kausher and Srivastava, 2019). TSC was selected because it allows the detection of natural groups within a dataset (in the form of clusters) based on different body types (Majumder and Sharma, 2015), and is frequently used to help simplify high dimensional anthropometric data for the purpose of determining garment size (Bari et al., 2017; Hu et al., 2019; Stewart et al., 2017). The TSC was used to identify the optimal number of clusters for female-shirt, female-trouser, male-shirt and male-trouser datasets by minimising the Akaike Information Criterion (*AIC)* score.

K-means

Next, a k-means analysis was performed using the optimal cluster number and the two main measurement variables used in the TSC. K-means was used to determine cluster membership for each participant in the sample along with the cluster centroids. The body scan image of the individuals with the smallest distance to each cluster centroid were identified as a visual representative of each cluster. Finally, descriptive statistics including the Coefficient of Variation (CV%) percentage (calculated as (stdev/mean)*100) were calculated for the variables used in the analysis, for each cluster. An overview of the analysis process is presented in Figure 1.




**Figure 1**. NZDFAS cluster analysis process for female-shirt, female-trouser, male-shirt and male-trouser datasets.

**RESULTS**

Descriptive statistics

Over half of the participants (58%) were from the Army, and most participants had less than five years of full-time service. European and Other (mainly consisting of those who identify themselves as 'New Zealanders') were the most prominent ethnicities. One quarter of the sample comprised participants from the Engineering and Technical trades. Significant differences between males and females were observed for the proportion of personnel in each of the three services, as well as each trade (Table 2).

**Table 2.** Descriptive characteristics of the NZDFAS sample.

| Variable | Level | Male (n = 791) | Female (n = 212) | Total (n= 1003) | P-value[a] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Age** | | 31.6±10.7 | 30.5± 0.4 | 31.3±10.4 | (0.17) |
| **Ethnicity** | Asian | 22 (2.8) | 1 (0.5) | 23 (2.3) | (0.14) |
| | European | 327 (41.3) | 81 (38.2) | 408 (40.7) | |
| | Maori/Pacific | 152 (19.2) | 48 (22.6) | 200 (19.9) | |
| | Other | 290 (36.7) | 82 (38.7) | 372 (37.1) | |
| **Service** | Army | 486 (61.4) | 97 (45.8) | 583 (58.1) | (<0.001) |
| | Air Force | 217 (27.4) | 72 (34.0) | 289 (28.8) | |
| | Navy | 88 (11.1) | 43 (20.3) | 131 (13.1) | |
| **Years of service** | <5 | 331 (46.9) | 90 (47.6) | 421 (47.0) | (0.67) |
| | 6–10 | 152 (21.5) | 41 (21.7) | 193 (21.6) | |
| | 11–15 | 61 (8.6) | 22 (11.6) | 83 (9.3) | |
| | 16–20 | 49 (6.9) | 12 (6.3) | 61 (6.8) | |
| | 21–25 | 36 (5.1) | 10 (5.3) | 46 (5.1) | |
| | 26–30 | 39 (5.5) | 10 (5.3) | 49 (5.5) | |
| | 30+ | 38 (5.4) | 4 (2.1) | 42 (4.7) | |
| **Trade** | Apprenticeship | 45 (5.7) | 2 (0.9) | 47 (4.7) | (<0.001) |
| | Aviation | 32 (4.0) | 14 (6.6) | 46 (4.6) | |
| | Combat | 170 (21.5) | 21 (9.9) | 191 (19.0) | |
| | Engineering/Technical | 225 (28.4) | 25 (11.8) | 250 (24.9) | |
| | Hospitality | 20 (2.5) | 14 (6.6) | 34 (3.4) | |
| | Intelligence IT/COMS | 69 (8.7) | 25 (11.8) | 94 (9.4) | |
| | Logistics/Administration | 56 (7.1) | 56 (26.4) | 112 (11.2) | |
| | Medical/Health | 31 (3.9) | 29 (13.7) | 60 (6.0) | |
| | Other | 54 (6.8) | 19 (9.0) | 73 (7.3) | |
| | Specialist | 89 (11.3) | 7 (3.3) | 96 (9.6) | |

Data are presented as mean±SD or n (%) where appropriate; [a]P-value of difference between males and females (Fisher's exact test or Mann-Whitney U test where appropriate).

PCA

The first two principal components and their associated factor loadings are presented in Table 3. For female shirt, a height (e.g. eye height, acromiale height, body height) and mixed-dimension component (e.g. waist girth, ab-extension depth sitting, waist breadth), were identified. For female trouser, components related to girth (e.g. buttock girth, waist breadth, waist girth, buttock depth and hip girth) and height (e.g. inseam, knee height, buttock height) were identified. Male shirt consisted of a height (acromiale height, body height, eye height) and a mixed-variable (e.g. waist circumference preferred, waist girth, waist breadth, ab-extension depth sitting) component. For male trousers, a girth (e.g. waist circumference preferred, hip girth maximum) and height (e.g. inseam, knee height and buttock height) component were identified.

Some of the high loading variables identified in the PCA were not suitable to represent their respective component from a logical and practical clothing perspective. For female shirt sizing, eye height and acromial height obtained higher loadings than body height (Table 3). However, both variables would be difficult to measure digitally (acromial height requires physical skin surface palpation, a high degree of skill, and is time consuming) compared to body height (a validated and automatic measurement). We chose waist girth to represent the mixed-variable component for male and female shirt, as it was clearly the highest loading variable except for waist circumference preferred (male). Waist circumference preferred requires user input (e.g. where they would normally wear their belt) and thus deemed too subjective for a reliable clothing measure.

For female trousers, despite obtaining the 5$^{th}$ highest loading within PC1, we chose hip girth to represent the female girth component as it is commonly used in female garment manufacturing and previous cluster sizing research (Hsu and Wang, 2007). Buttock girth and waist breadth were the highest loading variables followed by buttock depth in PC1 (Table 3). However, they are not traditional trouser sizing variables as identified in the literature. Waist girth is the only other alternative that is well documented in the clothing literature (Brantley, 2020; Dāboliņa et al., 2017; Zakaria and Ruznan, 2020). For male trousers, waist girth was chosen to represent the girth component (PC1) based on the shortcomings of other high loading variables such as waist circumference preferred (subjective), waist breadth (non-traditional sizing variable), hip girth maximum (more popular for female as opposed to male trouser sizing), and weight (non-traditional clothing sizing dimension; increases in weight do not necessarily amount to increases size). For both female and male trousers, inseam length (calculated as crotch height – 50.8 mm) was chosen to represent the length or height component. It was the highest loading variable for female trouser PC2 and ranked second for male PC2. Buttock height had a higher loading score for male but buttock height is also subjective (derived based on the height of the most posterior protruding point of the buttock). Finally, inseam length is regularly used in conjunction with waist girth for sizing clothing and military garments (Brantley, 2020; Dāboliņa et al., 2017; International Standards Organisation, 1977; Traumann et al., 2019; Zakaria and Ruznan, 2020).

As such, body height and waist girth were selected to represent shirt in the cluster analysis for both male and female. For female trouser, hip girth and inseam length were selected for use in the cluster analysis. Waist girth and inseam length were selected to represent male trousers in the cluster analysis.

**Table 3.** PCA results by gender and clothing type. An asterisk "*" depicts the greatest loading factor within the associated component. Square boxes depict variables selected for clustering.

| | Female | | | | Male | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Shirt | | Trouser | | Shirt | | Trouser | |
| | PC1 | PC2 | PC1 | PC2 | PC1 | PC2 | PC1 | PC2 |
| Eye height | 0.92* | | | | | | | |
| Acromiale height | 0.92 | | | | 0.93* | | | |
| Body height | 0.91 | | | 0.89 | 0.93 | | | 0.91 |
| Neck height front | 0.91 | | | | 0.92 | | | |
| T2 height | 0.90 | | | | | | | |
| Waist girth | | 0.94* | 0.91 | | | 0.93 | 0.91 | |
| Ab extension depth sitting | | 0.91 | | | | 0.91 | | |
| Waist breadth | | 0.91 | 0.92 | | | 0.92 | 0.93 | |
| Waist depth standing | | 0.89 | | | | | | |
| Weight | | 0.88 | | | | 0.90 | 0.92 | |
| Eye height | | | | | 0.93 | | | |
| Axilla height | | | | | 0.92 | | | |
| Waist circumference preferred | | | | | | 0.94* | 0.94* | |
| Hip girth maximum | | | 0.89 | | | | 0.93 | |
| Buttock height | | | | 0.90 | | | | 0.93* |
| Inseam | | | | 0.92* | | | | 0.93 |
| Knee height | | | | 0.90 | | | | 0.93 |
| Iliocristale height | | | | 0.89 | | | | 0.91 |
| Buttock girth | | | 0.92* | | | | | |
| Buttock depth | | | 0.91 | | | | | |
| Chest girth | | 0.88 | | | | 0.88 | | |
| Variance explained (%) | 38.8 | 17.9 | 42.5 | 21.1 | 42.5 | 21.1 | 45.3 | 22.7 |
| Total proportion (%) | 38.8 | 56.7 | 42.5 | 63.7 | 41.2 | 60.0 | 45.3 | 68.1 |

Cluster analysis

A TSC analysis was performed using the variables identified from the PCA. Based on the TSC results, the optimal number of clusters for female clothing (shirt and trouser) was 6 (*AIC* scores of 141.2 and 140.1, respectively) and the optimal number of clusters for male clothing (shirt and trouser) was 10 (*AIC* scores of 324.3 and 317.8, respectively). The clusters and representative body shapes (based on cluster centroid) for each sex and clothing type are presented in Figures 2 and 3. The anthropometric variables from each cluster are summarised in Table 4 and 5.




**Figure 2.** [Top] Scatter plot showing the different clusters for females shirt (body height vs waist girth) and body shape images representative of each cluster centroid.[Bottom] Scatter plot showing the different clusters for female trousers (Inseam length vs hip girth) and body shape images representative of each cluster centroid.

**Table 4.** Female shirt cluster number, measurement variable (mm) and descriptives by clothing type.

| Clothing/cluster | Variable | N | Mean | S. D | Range | Min | Max | CV% |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Shirt Cluster 1 | Body height | 50 | 1660 | 30.1 | 119 | 1587 | 1706 | 1.81 |
| | Waist girth | 50 | 806 | 22.8 | 81 | 764 | 845 | 2.83 |
| Shirt Cluster 2 | Body height | 49 | 1704 | 31.5 | 126 | 1659 | 1785 | 1.85 |
| | Waist girth | 49 | 722 | 32.4 | 141 | 636 | 777 | 4.49 |
| Shirt Cluster 3 | Body height | 14 | 1675 | 45.6 | 136 | 1627 | 1763 | 2.72 |
| | Waist girth | 14 | 1036 | 35.6 | 115 | 981 | 1096 | 3.44 |
| Shirt Cluster 4 | Body height | 21 | 1765 | 30.8 | 118 | 1714 | 1832 | 1.75 |
| | Waist girth | 21 | 838 | 43.1 | 161 | 783 | 944 | 5.14 |
| Shirt Cluster 5 | Body height | 42 | 1608 | 32.8 | 137 | 1515 | 1652 | 2.04 |
| | Waist girth | 42 | 727 | 33.9 | 125 | 661 | 786 | 4.66 |
| Shirt Cluster 6 | Body height | 36 | 1658 | 37.1 | 150 | 1580 | 1730 | 2.24 |
| | Waist girth | 36 | 901 | 27.0 | 109 | 856 | 965 | 3.00 |
| Trouser cluster 1 | Hip girth | 28 | 1110 | 22.9 | 92 | 1078 | 1171 | 2.06 |
| | Inseam length | 28 | 747 | 25.1 | 86 | 715 | 801 | 3.36 |
| Trouser cluster 2 | Hip girth | 31 | 1095 | 23.7 | 75 | 1061 | 1135 | 2.16 |
| | Inseam length | 31 | 691 | 20.9 | 93 | 630 | 722 | 3.02 |
| Trouser cluster 3 | Hip girth | 48 | 1020 | 16.3 | 65 | 986 | 1051 | 1.60 |
| | Inseam length | 48 | 691 | 17.7 | 72 | 647 | 719 | 2.56 |
| Trouser cluster 4 | Hip girth | 30 | 965 | 25.2 | 95 | 903 | 998 | 2.61 |
| | Inseam length | 30 | 712 | 36.1 | 149 | 623 | 771 | 5.07 |
| Trouser cluster 5 | Hip girth | 16 | 1188 | 34.1 | 115 | 1152 | 1267 | 2.87 |
| | Inseam length | 16 | 704 | 18.9 | 60 | 676 | 736 | 2.68 |
| Trouser cluster 6 | Hip girth | 59 | 1040 | 20.8 | 72 | 1002 | 1073 | 2.00 |
| | Inseam length | 59 | 740 | 20.3 | 87 | 711 | 797 | 2.74 |




**Figure 3.** [Top] Scatter plot showing the different clusters for male shirt (body height vs waist girth) and body shape images representative of each cluster centroid. [Bottom] Scatter plot showing the different clusters for male trousers (Inseam length vs waist girth) and body shape images representative of each cluster centroid.

**Table 5.** Male cluster number, measurement variable (mm) and descriptives by clothing type.

| Clothing/cluster | Variable | N | Mean | S. D | Range | Min | Max | CV% |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Shirt Cluster 1 | Body height | 66 | 1870 | 40.9 | 193 | 1816 | 2009 | 2.19 |
| | Waist girth | 66 | 947 | 32.0 | 135 | 896 | 1031 | 3.38 |
| Shirt Cluster 2 | Body height | 64 | 1834 | 34.4 | 169 | 1778 | 1947 | 1.88 |
| | Waist girth | 64 | 1063 | 36.4 | 131 | 1006 | 1137 | 3.42 |
| Shirt Cluster 3 | Body height | 107 | 1761 | 33.1 | 152 | 1666 | 1818 | 1.88 |
| | Waist girth | 107 | 979 | 30.4 | 116 | 926 | 1042 | 3.11 |
| Shirt Cluster 4 | Body height | 91 | 1830 | 31.5 | 162 | 1785 | 1947 | 1.72 |
| | Waist girth | 91 | 785 | 29.8 | 134 | 701 | 835 | 3.80 |
| Shirt Cluster 5 | Body height | 94 | 1704 | 33.0 | 167 | 1579 | 1746 | 1.94 |
| | Waist girth | 94 | 879 | 33.1 | 140 | 805 | 945 | 3.77 |
| Shirt Cluster 6 | Body height | 51 | 1890 | 39.6 | 193 | 1842 | 2035 | 2.10 |
| | Waist girth | 51 | 854 | 28.8 | 104 | 803 | 907 | 3.37 |
| Shirt Cluster 7 | Body height | 118 | 1729 | 38.2 | 169 | 1609 | 1778 | 2.21 |
| | Waist girth | 118 | 779 | 33.1 | 141 | 689 | 830 | 4.25 |
| Shirt Cluster 8 | Body height | 31 | 1738 | 31.1 | 101 | 1692 | 1793 | 1.79 |
| | Waist girth | 31 | 1105 | 36.1 | 122 | 1044 | 1166 | 3.27 |
| Shirt Cluster 9 | Body height | 161 | 1792 | 24.7 | 94 | 1748 | 1842 | 1.38 |
| | Waist girth | 161 | 876 | 26.8 | 109 | 821 | 930 | 3.06 |
| Shirt Cluster 10 | Body height | 8 | 1800 | 26.5 | 87 | 1764 | 1851 | 1.47 |
| | Waist girth | 8 | 1244 | 50.0 | 165 | 1186 | 1351 | 4.02 |
| Trouser Cluster 1 | Waist girth | 100 | 911 | 24.9 | 109 | 853 | 962 | 2.73 |
| | Inseam length | 100 | 782 | 25.8 | 108 | 745 | 853 | 3.30 |
| Trouser Cluster 2 | Waist girth | 7 | 1252 | 47.8 | 141 | 1210 | 1351 | 3.82 |
| | Inseam length | 7 | 733 | 28.1 | 85 | 710 | 795 | 3.83 |
| Trouser Cluster 3 | Waist girth | 143 | 851 | 20.8 | 88 | 806 | 894 | 2.44 |
| | Inseam length | 143 | 745 | 17.5 | 76 | 714 | 790 | 2.35 |
| Trouser Cluster 4 | Waist girth | 32 | 1117 | 31.0 | 129 | 1057 | 1186 | 2.78 |
| | Inseam length | 32 | 703 | 25.1 | 110 | 638 | 748 | 3.57 |
| Trouser Cluster 5 | Waist girth | 110 | 922 | 24.7 | 92 | 885 | 977 | 2.68 |
| | Inseam length | 110 | 706 | 24.3 | 128 | 618 | 746 | 3.44 |
| Trouser Cluster 6 | Waist girth | 104 | 998 | 24.9 | 100 | 953 | 1053 | 2.49 |
| | Inseam length | 104 | 737 | 28.2 | 131 | 663 | 794 | 3.83 |
| Trouser Cluster 7 | Waist girth | 60 | 841 | 24.7 | 88 | 794 | 882 | 2.94 |
| | Inseam length | 60 | 684 | 21.4 | 79 | 633 | 713 | 3.13 |
| Trouser Cluster 8 | Waist girth | 101 | 767 | 28.7 | 119 | 689 | 808 | 3.74 |
| | Inseam length | 101 | 714 | 23.3 | 138 | 621 | 758 | 3.26 |
| Trouser Cluster 9 | Waist girth | 84 | 792 | 30.2 | 147 | 701 | 848 | 3.81 |
| | Inseam length | 84 | 790 | 31.6 | 159 | 752 | 911 | 4.00 |
| Trouser Cluster 10 | Waist girth | 50 | 1067 | 30.9 | 139 | 998 | 1137 | 2.90 |
| | Inseam length | 50 | 772 | 35.1 | 153 | 729 | 882 | 4.55 |

Cluster descriptives

1

*Female clothing*

For female shirt, cluster 5 represents small individuals based on medium-short stature (<1652 mm) and low waist girth (<786 mm) (Table 4 and Figure 2) based on visual fit. Clusters 1 and 6 represent medium-size individuals consisting of medium-tall body height (1587 mm to 1730 mm) and waist girth (1002 mm to 965 mm). Clusters 3 and 4 represent large individuals based on high waist girth (>984 mm) and tall body height (>1714 mm), respectively. For female trousers, cluster 4 covers the widest inseam length range (15 cm) with a low (<1000 mm) hip girth. Clusters 6 and 1 represent medium-large to large individuals based on their high inseam lengths (>711 mm) and medium hip girth values (>1002 mm). Cluster 5 represents large individuals with medium inseam lengths (676 mm to 736 mm) and high hip girth values (>1152 mm) (Table 4 and Figure 2). For shirt, the average CV% for body height and waist girth were 3.93 and 2.07, respectively. For trouser, the average CV% for hip girth and inseam length was 2.22 and 3.24, respectively.

*Male clothing*

For male shirt, cluster 7 represents small individuals with low waist girth (<830 mm) and the lowest stature range (1609 mm to 1778 mm) (Table 5 and Figure 3). Cluster 10 represent large individuals based on high waist girth values (>1186 mm) with medium stature (compared to other clusters). Clusters 3 and 9 appear to be at the centre and thus represent medium size individuals with respect to both body height and waist girth. For male trousers, cluster 8 represents small individuals based on a combination of low inseam length (<758 mm) and waist girth (<808 mm). Cluster 2 represent larger individuals based on high waist girth (>1210 mm) however they have medium to low inseam length (between 710 mm and 795 mm). Clusters 5 and 9 represent medium size individuals based on a combination of both inseam length and waist girth values relative to other clusters (Table 4). For shirt, the average CV% for body height and waist girth were 3.54 and 1.85, respectively. For trouser, the average CV% for waist girth and inseam length was 3.03 and 3.53, respectively.

2

**Discussion**

The aim of this study was to determine how anthropometric characteristics cluster in the NZDFAS dataset and to describe the characteristics of each cluster. PCA was used to determine key body dimensions for shirt (waist girth and body height) and trouser (waist girth, hip girth and inseam length) clustering. Two-step and k-means cluster analyses were performed on these variables, resulting in 6 and 10 clusters for female and males, respectively.

*PCA findings*

In contrast to previous studies (Bagherzadeh et al., 2010; Hsu et al., 2007; Hsu and Wang, 2005) the highest loading variables for the second principal component for shirt (female and male) were not dominated by any one dimension (e.g. it was neither all girth nor all length variables). Hence, PC2 for shirt was named a 'mixed-dimension'. However, the high loading variables for PC2 (waist girth, abdominal extension depth sitting, waist breadth and waist depth) were all related to the lower torso or waist region. This suggests that these variables could be important for garment sizing. The use of waist girth and inseam length for trouser sizing has worked successfully in the past (Elfaki and Ali, 2016; Traumann et al., 2019). A surprising finding is that chest girth, a traditional shirt sizing variable, was ranked 6$^{th}$ in the PC2 (female and male) variable loadings. Therefore, waist girth (highest loading variable traditionally used for clothing sizing) was used in the shirt cluster analysis.

*Cluster findings*

There were more male shirt and trouser clusters (10) than female (6). When considering gender differences in within-cluster variability for shirt, the male clusters were less variable for waist girth (CV = 3.54 vs. 3.91%) and height (1.85 vs. 2.07%) compared to females. For trousers, males had a higher within-cluster variation for waist girth (3.03% vs. female hip girth of 2.22%) and inseam length (3.53 vs. 3.24%) compared to females. Based on this evidence, the potential female shirt sizing system could have a smaller size range, but greater within-size intervals than males. A potential male shirt and trouser sizing system will have more

sizes but with greater and more defined size intervals than female. The higher number of clusters for males compared to females may reflect their respective cohort size (791 male verses 212 females). However, the proportion of females in our sample is an overrepresentation of the number of females in the NZDF population (approximately 17%) (New Zealand Defence Force, 2019), which provides some reassurance that variation in anthropometry in our female sample is representative of females in the NZDF.
The findings suggest that our cluster data could be used to develop gender-specific sizing systems (as opposed to unisex). The trouser variables (e.g. waist girth for male and hip girth for female) also support this separation. However, according to Table 5, some individuals (particularly male) may sit at the border of two or more clusters. For example, a male (1810 mm stature and 980 mm waist girth) may be placed within the common border of three shirt clusters (1, 3 and 9). Varying the cluster input parameters (e.g. using different fixed cluster numbers between 10 and 15) provided no meaningful separation of these clusters. Garment dimensions that are based on the observed clusters could pose problems for these individuals, as they could fall into the upper or lower extremes of a given size category.
Our results are comparable to previous work. Other studies using cluster analysis on anthropometric data for garment sizing have identified a minimum of 3 clusters for female lower body garment sizing (Moon and Nam, 2003) and used chest and waist girth variables to identify 8 clusters for the Sudanese military uniforms (Elnour et al., 2015). In terms of the optimal number of clusters for males, this study had fewer clusters than Purnomo and Kurnia (2020) who identified 19 clusters. These comparisons demonstrate that cluster analysis is a popular method; however, comparisons are difficult to make due to the differences in population-specific anthropometry (e.g. NZ vs Sudanese body size).

*Practical significance*
In practical terms, if our six female and 10 male shirt and trouser clusters represented real-world clothing sizes for the NZDF, then it would provide fewer sizes for each sex compared to the NZDF unisex combat uniforms (currently consisting of up to 12 shirt sizes and 12 trouser sizes for Air force, Navy and Army). A reduction in sizes can be beneficial, as more sizes leads to increased costs (e.g. production) and complexity involved in both the manufacturing and the distribution process (Viktor et al., 2006). Clothing manufacturers could design a male and a female variant of the MCU, with the clothing dimensions for each size based on the cluster descriptives presented here. However, given the creation of separate uniforms for males and females, these decisions are dependent on several external factors, particularly resources (e.g. cost, time, and expertise).

*Strengths and limitations*
Consistent with previous work (Brantley, 2020; Varte et al., 2020), this study examined both upper and lower body measurements separately, with others examining either the whole body (Elfaki and Ali, 2016) or either the upper or lower body (Wen and Shih, 2020). Studying the upper and lower body separately may reduce complexity when interpreting factor loadings during PCA. For example, head circumference may provide a high loading variable for the lower body, despite having no logical relationship with trouser size. The cluster interpretations or labels (e.g. referring to clusters representing small, medium, or large individuals) were subjective. These labels were used in absence of any applied sizing system classification which was beyond the scope of this study.

*Future Implications*
Future improvements to this study include stratifying the analysis by service (Army, Navy or Air Force), as particular body types may be associated with each service. Given an adequate sample size, the study could focus on specific trades within the defence force (e.g. pilots, navy divers, special forces, or drivers) as these roles may be body-shape specific and require specialised sizing systems. Finally, future work could focus on more specific items of clothing such as body armour. The NZDF and associated industry partners (military garment manufacturers and suppliers) could utilise these results as a foundation for developing a sizing system specific to the New Zealand Defence Force population.

**Conclusions**

Anthropometric measurements in combination with dimensionality reduction and clustering techniques show promise for partitioning individuals into distinct groups; information that is useful for developing sizing systems for military uniform garments. The results suggested that participants could be organised into 6 and 10 clusters for females and males, respectively. The anthropometric dimensions associated with each cluster can be used by the garment industry to develop specific sizing system for the New Zealand Defence Force population.

**Authors' contributions**

SK was responsible for study design and recruitment, and managed data collection with assistance from AUT and NZDF personnel. SK and PH were responsible for the ethics approval for the NZDF anthropometry survey. Data cleaning and processing were performed by SK and TS. SK performed the analysis with assistance from TS and drafted the manuscript. All authors contributed to the interpretation of results, editing and critical reviewing of the final manuscript, approved the final manuscript as submitted, and agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work. The results of this study are presented clearly, honestly, and without fabrication, falsification, or inappropriate data manipulation.

**Acknowledgements**

The authors would like to thank all participants for their involvement in this study, members of the NZDF, The Workwear Group and the AUT kinanthropometry team for their assistance during data collection. Data collection for this study was funded by the NZDF. Participants were recruited as part of a Defence Technology Agency, Anthropometry project endorsed by the New Zealand Vice Chief of Defence and individual service chiefs.

**Competing interests**

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

**References**

Apeagyei, P., 2010. Application of 3D Body Scanning Technology to Human Measurement for Clothing Fit. International Journal of Digital Content Technology. 4, 58-68.

Bagherzadeh, R., Latifi, M., Faramarzi, A., 2010. Employing a Three-Stage Data Mining Procedure to Develop Sizing System. *World Applied Sciences Journal.* 8, 923-929.

Bari, S.B., Salleh, N.M., Osman, S., 2017. Development of Female Adolescents Clothing Sizing Based on Cluster Analysis Classification, Proceeding: International Business Management Conference (IBMC 2017), Adya Hotel Langkawi, Kedah, Malaysia.

Brantley, D., 2020. New Standard Army Anthropometric Sizing System for Clothing and Equipment, in: Command, U.S.A.C.C.D. (Ed.). Department of the Army, U.S. Department of Defence, Natick, Massachusetts, U.S.

Carr, D.J., Wilson, C.A., Laing, R.M., 2012. 3 - Anthropometric Methods for the Successful Design of Military Clothing and Equipment, in: Sparks, E. (Ed.), Advances in Military Textiles and Personal Equipment. Woodhead Publishing, pp. 49-63.

Da Silva, G.V., Halpern, M., Gordon, C.C., 2017. Anthropometry of Brazilian Air Force pilots. Ergonomics. 60, 1445-1457.

Dāboliņa, I., Viļumsone, A., Lapkovska, E., 2017. Anthropometric Parametrization of Uniforms for Armed Forces, Proceedings of the 11th International Scientific and Practical Conference. Volume III, p. 46.

Eagan, S.M., 2019. Menstrual Suppression For Military Women: Barriers to Care in the United States. Obstetrics & Gynecology. 134, 72-76.

Elfaki, E., Ali, A., 2016. A Comparison Between the New Established Sizing Systems Sud and Sur Military Clothing Factory Sizing Chart for Poshirt (U4)-Part 1. International Journal of Advanced Research in Engineering and Applied Sciences. 5, 32-41.

Elnour, E.F.E., Ali, A.H.M., Elhafiz, M., Latif Mohammed, S.A., 2015. International Journal of Engineering Sciences & Research-Technology Application of Data Mining Methods In Establishing Sizing System for Clothing Industry.

Hsu, C.H., Lin, H.F., Wang, M.J.J., 2007. Developing Female Size Charts for Facilitating Garment Production by Using Data Mining. Journal of the Chinese Institute of Industrial Engineers. 24, 245-251.

Hsu, C.H., Wang, M.J.J., 2005. Using Decision Tree-Based Data Mining to Establish A Sizing System for the Manufacture of Garments. The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology 26, 669-674.

Hu, T.C., Chen, J.C.H., Yang, G.K., Chen, C.M., 2019. Development of a Military Uniform Size System Using Hybrid Support Vector Clustering With a Genetic Algorithm. Symmetry 11, 1-19.

International Standards Organisation, 1977. Size Designation of Clothes — Men's and Boys' Outerwear Garments. International Organization for Standardization, Geneva, Switzerland.

Kaufmann, K., 1997. Invasion of the Body Scanners. IEEE Circuits and Devices Magazine 13, 12-17.

Kausher, H., Srivastava, S., 2019. Developing Structured Sizing Systems for Manufacturing Ready-Made Garments of Indian Females Using Decision Tree-Based Data Mining. International Journal of Materials and Textile Engineering. 13, 517-575.

Keefe, A., Angel, H., Mangan, B., 2015. 2012 Canadian Forces Anthropometric Survey (CFAS) - Final Report. Defense Research and Development Canada.

Keefe, A., Kuang, J., Daanen, H., 2017a. 3D Scanning for Clothing Fit and Logistics., in: Daanen, H. (Ed.), Proceedings of 3DBODY.TECH 2017. 8th International Conference and Exhibition on 3D Body Scanning and Processing Technologies, Montreal, Canada,.

Keefe, A., Kuang, J., Daanen, H., 2017b. NATO Research Task Group: 3D Scanning for Clothing Fit and Logistics. *Proceedings of 3DBODY.TECH 2017. 8th International Conference and Exhibition on 3D Body Scanning and Processing Technologies.*, Montreal, Canada,, pp. 201-209.

Knapik, J.J., Redmond, J.E., Grier, T.L., Sharp, M.A., 2018. Secular Trends in the Physical Fitness of United States Army Infantry Units and Infantry Soldiers, 1976–2015. Military Medicine 183, e414-e426.

Kolose, S., Hume, P.A., Stewart, T., Tomkinson, G.R., Stewart, A.D., Legg, S.J., 2020. Three-Dimensional Physique Assessment in the Military: New Zealand Defence Force Anthropometry Survey Protocols and Summary Statistics. SPRINZ, Auckland University of Technology, Auckland, New Zealand.

Kolose, S., Stewart, T., Hume, P.A., 2019. NZDF Uniform Size Prediction Model and Application Development: Technical Report to NZDF. Auckland University of Technology., Auckland, New Zealand.
Kroemer, K.H.E., Kroemer, H.J., Kroemer-Elbert, K.E., 1997. Engineering Physiology: Bases of Human Factors/Ergonomics. John Wiley & Sons.
Laing, R.M., Holland, E.J., Wilson, C.A., Niven, B.E., 1999. Development of Sizing Systems for Protective Clothing for the Adult Male. Ergonomics 42, 1249-1257.
Loker, S., Ashdown, S.P., Schoenfelder, K., 2005. Size-Specific Analysis of Body Scan Data to Improve Apparel Fit. Journal of Textile and Apparel, Technology and Management. 4, 1-15.
Majumder, J., Sharma, L.K., 2015. Identifying Body Size Group Clusters from Anthropometric Body Composition Indicators. Journal of Ecophysiology and Occupational Health 15, 81.
Marfell-Jones, M., Olds, T., 2007. Kinanthropometry X: Proceedings of The 10th International Society for the Advancement of Kinanthropometry Conference, Held in Conjunction with the 13th Commonwealth International Sport Conference. Routledge.
McCulloch, C.E., Paal, B., Ashdown, S.P., 1998. An Optimisation Approach to Apparel Sizing. Journal of the Operational Research Society. 49, 492-499.
Moon, J.Y., Nam, Y.J., 2003. A Study the Elderly Women's Lower Figure Type Classification and Lower Garment Sizing Systems, Proceedings of International Ergonomics Association Conference, Seoul, Korea.
New Zealand Defence Force, 2019. Women in the NZDF, in: Inclusion, D.D. (Ed.). New Zealand Defence Force, Wellington, New Zealand.
Olds, T., Honey, F., 2006. The Use of 3D Whole-Body Scanners in Anthropometry., in: Olds, T. (Ed.), Proceedings of the 9th International Conference of the International Society for the Advancement of Kinanthropometry. Taylor & Francis, pp. 1-12.
Pourtaghi, G., Valipour, F., Sadeghialavi, H., Lahmi, M.A., 2014. Anthropometric Characteristics of Iranian Military Personnel and their Changes over Recent Years. International Journal of Occupational Environmental Medicine. 5, 115 - 124.
Purnomo, H., Kurnia, F., 2020. An Analysis of Body Armor Sizing and the Development of an Existing Sizing System for the Indonesian National Army. Engineering Letters 28, 1-7.
Stewart, A., Ledingham, R.L., Williams, H., 2017. Variability in Body Size and Shape Of UK Offshore Workers: A Cluster Analysis Approach. Applied Ergonomics 58, 265-272.
Tiwari, M., Anand, N., 2020. An Anthropometric Study of Young Indian Men for Bottom Wear Sizing. International Journal of Forensic Engineering and Management 1, 24-41.
Tomkinson, G., Clark, A., Blanchonette, P., 2009. Body Size Changes of Royal Australian Air Force Aircrew: 1971 - 2005., in: Division., D.S.a.T.O.A.O. (Ed.), Melbourne, Australia, p. 28.
Tomkinson, G.R., Daniell, N., Fulton, A., Furnell, A., 2017. Time Changes in the Body Dimensions of Male Australian Army Personnel Between 1977 and 2012. Applied Ergonomics 58, 18-24.
Traumann, A., Peets, T., Dabolina, I., Lapkovska, E., 2019. Analysis of 3-D Body Measurements to Determine Trousers Sizes of Military Combat Clothing. *Textile Leather Review* 2, 6-14.
Varte, L.R., Rawat, S., Singh, I., Choudhary, S., Singh, S., Kakkar, D., Chaudhary, Y., Kapoor, N., Kumar, B., 2020. Personal Protective Ensemble Reference Size Development for Indian Male Defence Personnel Based on 3D Whole Body Anthropometric Scan. The Journal of the Textile Institute, 1-8.
Viktor, H.L., Paquet, E., Guo, H., 2006. Measuring to Fit: Virtual Tailoring Through Cluster Analysis and Classification., European Conference on Principles of Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery. Springer, pp. 395-406.
Vuruskan, A., Seider, B., Detering-Koll, U., 2011. Data Compatibility Analysis of 3D Body Scanning., 2nd International Conference on 3D Body Scanning Technologies, pp. 338-348.
Wen, C.H., Shih, Y.C., 2020. Designing New Sizing Bulletproof Vests for Taiwanese Soldiers. International Journal of Clothing Science and Technology.
Zakaria, N., Ruznan, W., 2020. 4 - Developing apparel sizing system using anthropometric data: Body size and shape analysis, key dimensions, and data segmentation, in: Zakaria, N., Gupta, D. (Eds.), Anthropometry, Apparel Sizing and Design (Second Edition). Woodhead Publishing, pp. 91-121.