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In the draft of "Specifications for Fast Tenprint Capture Devices", Version 1.0, it states that the evaluation of FTC devices is threefold: the absolute measurement stipulating the specifications and designing targets to implement specifications, the relative measurement for interoperability matching 2-d rolled-equivalent fingerprint images produced using FTC devices against those collected from certified live scanners, and the real-time speed of completing one transaction carried out by an FTC device. Further, the absolute measurement requires the evaluation regarding the geometric accuracy. Thus, a target that can simulate the human fingers needs to be designed. Now the question is what sizes these simulated fingers should be.

In order to obtain the finger sizes, one way is to collect samples. For instance, the human finger sizes can be collected in any public areas. Then, an inferential statistical analysis follows.

The alternative is to analyze the segmentation data. However, it must be noticed that 1 ) the sizes of two thumbs cannot be obtained, 2) only the widths and heights but not the thicknesses of the fingers can be estimated, 3) the widths and heights shown in the segmentation data are the widths and heights of images, respectively, that are smaller than the widths and heights of real fingers, which is because only the front part of a finger touches the platen of a live scanner to form a flat image during a capture process. This third point is the most important issue. Nonetheless, the analysis of the segmentation data can provide some information, for example, the proportion between two finger sizes, etc., for designing the simulated fingers to be the targets in the absolute measurement.

The segmentation data provided by Craig Watson's subgroup included data from dos3s and lacnty (LA County). Some data contained the age information, but some data didn't. In addition, some data were corrupted, in which the sizes of width and/or height were inappropriately recorded, or the birth date and the capture date did not match properly, or the age of the subject was less than 10 . The corrupted data were deleted.

As a matter of fact, the set of the segmentation data is the direct product of the set of gender (male and female), the set of eight fingers (R2, R3, R4, R5, L7, L8, L9, and L10), and the set of the dimension (width and height). They can be mathematically expressed as,
$\{$ segmentation data $\}=\{$ male, female $\} \otimes\{R 2, R 3, R 4, R 5, L 7, L 8, L 9, L 10\} \otimes$ \{width, height $\}$
As a result, the segmentation data can be subdivided into 32 subsets in terms of gender, finger, and the dimension, such as M_R2_w, M_R2_h, etc. In each subset of the 32 subsets, the statistical analysis was carried out. And the results, such as the number of data (i.e., the sample size), the median, the mean, the standard error (SE) of the sample mean, and the $95 \%$ confidence interval (CI) of the sample mean, are provided. The unit of the sizes in the segmentation data was in pixel, as requested, which is more accurate than other units. However, the results in terms of
the unit millimeter, which were converted from the results using the unit of pixel, are also provided. The statistical analysis regarding the age divisions is not included this time.

The results of the statistical analysis are listed from Table 1 to Table 4. It is shown in these four tables that the median and the mean are quite close in each subset. This indicates that the distribution in each subset is quite symmetric. Therefore, the standard errors and the $95 \%$ confidence intervals of the sample mean instead of median were computed. The standard error for female is generally greater than the one for male. This is because the sample size for female is smaller than the sample size for male in the segmentation data. In addition, the size of the middle finger should be larger than the sizes of the index finger, the ring finger, and the little finger, respectively. However, this does not hold good for the subsets of male and heights (See Table 2 and Table 4). This is probably due to the segmentation issue. Nonetheless, while designing a simulated finger to be a target, the information for the widths is more important than the information for the heights.

| Fingers | Number | Median | Mean | SE | 95\% CI |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| M_R2_w | 25913 | 296 | 294.82 | 0.18 | $(294.47,295.16)$ |
| M_R3_w | 25913 | 304 | 303.32 | 0.18 | $(302.96,303.68)$ |
| M_R4_w | 25913 | 296 | 294.24 | 0.17 | $(293.90,294.57)$ |
| M_R5_w | 25913 | 272 | 271.30 | 0.19 | $(270.93,271.68)$ |
| M_L7_w | 24809 | 288 | 290.50 | 0.18 | $(290.15,290.85)$ |
| M_L8_w | 24809 | 304 | 300.23 | 0.18 | $(299.87,300.59)$ |
| M_L9_w | 24809 | 288 | 288.14 | 0.18 | $(287.80,288.49)$ |
| M_L10_w | 24809 | 268 | 266.52 | 0.19 | $(266.14,266.90)$ |
| F_R2_w | 13341 | 272 | 270.24 | 0.24 | $(269.77,270.71)$ |
| F_R3_w | 13341 | 274 | 275.08 | 0.25 | $(274.59,275.58)$ |
| F_R4_w | 13341 | 270 | 268.39 | 0.23 | $(267.94,268.84)$ |
| F_R5_w | 13341 | 240 | 242.38 | 0.25 | $(241.89,242.88)$ |
| F_L7_w | 13434 | 262 | 263.31 | 0.23 | $(262.85,263.76)$ |
| F_L8_w | 13434 | 270 | 267.91 | 0.25 | $(267.43,268.39)$ |
| F_L9_w | 13434 | 257 | 258.73 | 0.23 | $(258.27,259.18)$ |
| F_L10_w | 13434 | 232 | 232.32 | 0.25 | $(231.83,232.81)$ |

Table 1 The statistical results for the widths in pixel of the $2^{\text {nd }}, 3^{\text {rd }}, 4^{\text {th }}$, and $5^{\text {th }}$ finger of the right hand and the $7^{\text {th }}, 8^{\text {th }}, 9^{\text {th }}$, and $10^{\text {th }}$ finger of the left hand for both male and female, where the number stands for the sample size.

| Fingers | Number | Median | Mean | SE | 95\% CI |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| M_R2_h | 25913 | 472 | 470.29 | 0.27 | $(469.76,470.82)$ |
| M_R3_h | 25913 | 480 | 478.22 | 0.32 | $(477.59,478.85)$ |
| M_R4_h | 25913 | 486 | 484.37 | 0.31 | $(483.78,484.97)$ |
| M_R5_h | 25913 | 424 | 420.05 | 0.30 | $(419.46,420.63)$ |
| M_L7_h | 24809 | 464 | 467.15 | 0.27 | $(466.63,467.68)$ |
| M_L8_h | 24809 | 480 | 476.07 | 0.34 | $(475.40,476.74)$ |
| M_L9_h | 24809 | 488 | 487.26 | 0.30 | $(486.67,487.85)$ |
| M_L10_h | 24809 | 416 | 413.33 | 0.33 | $(412.69,413.97)$ |
| F_R2_h | 13341 | 432 | 428.76 | 0.37 | $(428.03,429.49)$ |
| F_R3_h | 13341 | 440 | 440.30 | 0.42 | $(439.47,441.12)$ |
| F_R4_h | 13341 | 434 | 435.88 | 0.42 | $(435.06,436.69)$ |
| F_R5_h | 13341 | 376 | 375.41 | 0.39 | $(374.65,376.18)$ |
| F_L7_h | 13434 | 426 | 424.58 | 0.36 | $(423.87,425.29)$ |
| F_L8_h | 13434 | 438 | 438.44 | 0.41 | $(437.64,439.25)$ |
| F_L9_h | 13434 | 432 | 434.20 | 0.39 | $(433.42,434.97)$ |
| F_L10_h | 13434 | 374 | 372.65 | 0.40 | $(371.87,373.43)$ |

Table 2 The statistical results for the heights in pixel of the $2^{\text {nd }}, 3^{\text {rd }}, 4^{\text {th }}$, and $5^{\text {th }}$ finger of the right hand and the $7^{\text {th }}, 8^{\text {th }}, 9^{\text {th }}$, and $10^{\text {th }}$ finger of the left hand for both male and female, where the number stands for the sample size.

| Fingers | Number | Median | Mean | SE | 95\% CI |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| M_R2_w | 25913 | 15.04 | 14.98 | 0.0091 | $(14.96,14.99)$ |
| M_R3_w | 25913 | 15.44 | 15.41 | 0.0091 | $(15.39,15.43)$ |
| M_R4_w | 25913 | 15.04 | 14.95 | 0.0086 | $(14.93,14.96)$ |
| M_R5_w | 25913 | 13.82 | 13.78 | 0.0097 | $(13.76,13.80)$ |
| M_L7_w | 24809 | 14.63 | 14.76 | 0.0091 | $(14.74,14.78)$ |
| M_L8_w | 24809 | 15.44 | 15.25 | 0.0091 | $(15.23,15.27)$ |
| M_L9_w | 24809 | 14.63 | 14.64 | 0.0091 | $(14.62,14.66)$ |
| M_L10_w | 24809 | 13.61 | 13.54 | 0.0097 | $(13.52,13.56)$ |
| F_R2_w | 13341 | 13.82 | 13.73 | 0.0122 | $(13.70,13.75)$ |
| F_R3_w | 13341 | 13.92 | 13.97 | 0.0127 | $(13.95,14.00)$ |
| F_R4_w | 13341 | 13.72 | 13.63 | 0.0117 | $(13.61,13.66)$ |
| F_R5_w | 13341 | 12.19 | 12.31 | 0.0127 | $(12.29,12.34)$ |
| F_L7_w | 13434 | 13.31 | 13.38 | 0.0117 | $(13.35,13.40)$ |
| F_L8_w | 13434 | 13.72 | 13.61 | 0.0127 | $(13.59,13.63)$ |
| F_L9_w | 13434 | 13.06 | 13.14 | 0.0117 | $(13.12,13.17)$ |
| F_L10_w | 13434 | 11.79 | 11.80 | 0.0127 | $(11.78,11.83)$ |

Table 3 The statistical results for the widths in millimeter of the $2^{\text {nd }}, 3^{\text {rd }}, 4^{\text {th }}$, and $5^{\text {th }}$ finger of the right hand and the $7^{\text {th }}, 8^{\text {th }}, 9^{\text {th }}$, and $10^{\text {th }}$ finger of the left hand for both male and female, where the number stands for the sample size.

| Fingers | Number | Median | Mean | SE | 95\% CI |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| M_R2_h | 25913 | 23.98 | 23.89 | 0.0137 | $(23.86,23.92)$ |
| M_R3_h | 25913 | 24.38 | 24.29 | 0.0163 | $(24.26,24.33)$ |
| M_R4_h | 25913 | 24.69 | 24.61 | 0.0157 | $(24.58,24.64)$ |
| M_R5_h | 25913 | 21.54 | 21.34 | 0.0152 | $(21.31,21.37)$ |
| M_L7_h | 24809 | 23.57 | 23.73 | 0.0137 | $(23.70,23.76)$ |
| M_L8_h | 24809 | 24.38 | 24.18 | 0.0173 | $(24.15,24.22)$ |
| M_L9_h | 24809 | 24.79 | 24.75 | 0.0152 | $(24.72,24.78)$ |
| M_L10_h | 24809 | 21.13 | 21.00 | 0.0168 | $(20.96,21.03)$ |
| F_R2_h | 13341 | 21.95 | 21.78 | 0.0188 | $(21.74,21.82)$ |
| F_R3_h | 13341 | 22.35 | 22.37 | 0.0213 | $(22.33,22.41)$ |
| F_R4_h | 13341 | 22.05 | 22.14 | 0.0213 | $(22.10,22.18)$ |
| F_R5_h | 13341 | 19.10 | 19.07 | 0.0198 | $(19.03,19.11)$ |
| F_L7_h | 13434 | 21.64 | 21.57 | 0.0183 | $(21.53,21.60)$ |
| F_L8_h | 13434 | 22.25 | 22.27 | 0.0208 | $(22.23,22.31)$ |
| F_L9_h | 13434 | 21.95 | 22.06 | 0.0198 | $(22.02,22.10)$ |
| F_L10_h | 13434 | 19.00 | 18.93 | 0.0203 | $(18.89,18.97)$ |

Table 4 The statistical results for the heights in millimeter of the $2^{\text {nd }}, 3^{\text {rd }}, 4^{\text {th }}$, and $5^{\text {th }}$ finger of the right hand and the $7^{\text {th }}, 8^{\text {th }}, 9^{\text {th }}$, and $10^{\text {th }}$ finger of the left hand for both male and female, where the number stands for the sample size.

