

Table S1: Results of the normality assessments for the tibial and fibular variables. The Shapiro-Wilk test values (W) are shown alongside the skewness (Sk) and kurtosis (K) values. Normality was considered acceptable if $|Sk| < 2$, $|K| < 4$, and the Shapiro-Wilk test does not indicate significant deviation from normality ($p > 0.05$).

Measurement	Females				Males			
	Test value (W)	p-value	Sk	K	Test value (W)	p-value	Sk	K
fCEM	0.979	0.806	0.1	0.8	0.950	0.461	0.7	0.1
fCF	0.973	0.749	0.1	0.6	0.848	0.010	1.2	0.8
fCM	0.966	0.568	0.1	0.9	0.910	0.099	0.4	1.2
fCML	0.928	0.087	0.7	0.8	0.913	0.111	0.2	0.7
fDAP	0.949	0.259	0.5	0.1	0.924	0.171	0.6	0.0
fDMEM	0.919	0.054	0.3	1.0	0.883	0.035	0.1	1.1
fDML	0.926	0.078	0.6	0.6	0.926	0.187	0.1	0.1
fPA	0.837	0.001	0.4	0.8	0.933	0.243	0.2	0.5
fPB	0.960	0.440	0.2	0.4	0.904	0.079	0.8	0.0
fPC	0.917	0.051	0.1	0.5	0.858	0.140	1.0	2.2
tCF	0.929	0.091	0.9	1.1	0.961	0.655	0.1	1.0
tCMIN	0.972	0.715	0.0	0.1	0.943	0.351	0.5	0.4
tCM	0.972	0.929	0.2	0.8	0.901	0.070	0.2	1.5
tDMF	0.973	0.929	0.3	0.1	0.917	0.376	0.3	0.7
tDTF	0.875	0.007	0.7	1.8	0.869	0.021	0.4	1.4
tEPF	0.949	0.258	0.5	0.7	0.980	0.954	0.1	1.1
tLED	0.957	0.386	0.4	0.3	0.927	0.192	0.1	0.8
tLEMD	0.959	0.416	0.6	0.4	0.973	0.846	0.1	0.1

Table S2: Intrasexual comparison of the fibular and tibial variables between the training sample (CEI/XXI and CISC) and the testing sample (LISC); Student's t-test values, including degrees of freedom (d.f.) and mean difference (in mm) between the samples.

Measurement	Females				Males			
	t-value	d.f.	p-value	Mean difference	t-value	d.f.	p-value	Mean difference
fCEM	0.968	119.4	0.377	0.539	0.847	124	0.399	0.566
fCF	0.342	146	0.733	0.215	1.145	124	0.255	0.726
fCM	1.399	96	0.165	4.810	-0.025	80	0.980	-0.108
fCML	1.361	110	0.176	0.488	-0.725	93	0.470	-0.260
fDAP	-1.287	140	0.200	-0.377	0.765	125	0.446	0.239
fDMEM	-0.176	149	0.860	-0.051	0.483	125	0.630	0.152
fDML	1.984	146	0.049	0.435	0.498	125	0.619	0.142
fPA	-0.078	126	0.938	-0.017	-0.845	111	0.400	-0.206
fPB	0.826	124	0.410	0.262	1.768	113	0.080	0.754
fPC	-0.891	97	0.375	-0.267	1.009	84	0.316	0.339
tCF	2.031	151	0.044	2.065	-0.991	113	0.324	-1.204
tCMIN	1.864	155	0.064	1.398	-0.217	124	0.829	-0.181
tCM	1.045	132	0.298	3.288	0.044	116	0.965	0.167
tDMF	-0.034	146.3	0.487	-0.014	-1.465	116	0.146	-0.727
tDTF	2.071	88.5	0.021	0.706	0.332	126	0.741	0.138
tEPF	0.038	134	0.970	0.066	0.858	120	0.393	1.842
tLED	2.137	135	0.034	0.864	-0.068	117	0.946	-0.044
tLEMD	2.175	126	0.032	1.092	1.629	104	0.106	0.834

Table S3: Multicollinearity diagnostics for the different models; the variance inflation factor (VIF) was calculated for each variable of the multivariable models.

Model	VIF
F1 (fPA)	---
F2 (fPA + fCEM)	fPA: 1.2 / fCEM: 1.2
F3 (fPA + fCEM + fDMEM)	fPA: 2.9 / fCEM: 1.2 / fDMEM: 2.7
F4 (fPA + fCEM + fDMEM + fCML)	fPA: 3.1 / fCEM: 2.1 / fDMEM: 2.9 / fCML: 2.2
T1 (tLEMD)	---
T2 (tLED)	---
T3 (tLEMD + tDTF)	tLEMD: 1.5 / tDTF: 1.5
T4 (tLEMD + tDTF + tEPF)	tLEMD: 1.7 / tDTF: 1.5 / tEPF: 1.2
FT1 (tLED + fPC)	tLED: 1.1 / fPC: 1.1
FT2 (tLED + fPC + tLEMD)	tLED: 1.9 / fPC: 1.1 / tLEMD: 2.0
FT3 (fCF + tCF)	fCF: 1.7 / tCF: 1.7
FT4 (fCF + tDMF)	fCF: 1.8 / tDMF: 1.8
FT5 (fDMEM + tDMF)	fDMEM: 1.6 / tDMF: 1.6