

1 **Is the human face a biomarker of health? – a scoping review**

2

3 **Weronika M. Obrochta<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Paula Bartecka<sup>1,2</sup>, Katarzyna Klas<sup>2,3</sup>, Magdalena Klimek<sup>1</sup>, Urszula M.**

4 **Marcinkowska<sup>1</sup>**

5

6 <sup>1</sup>Department of Environmental Health, Faculty of Health Sciences, Jagiellonian University Medical

7 College, Cracow, Poland

8 <sup>2</sup>Jagiellonian University Medical College, Doctoral School of Medical and Health Sciences, Cracow,

9 Poland

10 <sup>3</sup>Research Ethics in Medicine Study Group (REMEDY), Jagiellonian University Medical College,

11 Cracow, Poland

12

13 \*weronika.obrochta@doctoral.uj.edu.pl

14

## 15 **Abstract**

16 There is a widespread opinion that facial features could provide an important cue to individual's health  
17 and are a biomarker of a human developmental stability. Taking evolutionary lens, they are interpreted to  
18 be a signal physical and cognitive health. However, research to date does not clearly support this  
19 assumption. This is the first review that explores the association between various aspects of health and  
20 facial features, namely symmetry, averageness or sexual dimorphism in adults. We searched electronic  
21 databases including Web of Science, MEDLINE PubMed, Scopus and Embase. We followed the  
22 Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews  
23 (PRISMA-ScR) guidelines for reporting of our results. Of the 702 screened articles, 17 were eligible for  
24 inclusion. Studies presented a varied outcomes between facial features and cardiovascular health;  
25 immunocompetence; oxidative stress level; cortisol level; reproductive health, cognitive health and  
26 general physical health. This review presents mixed and inconclusive answer for the question whether  
27 facial features can serve as indicators of health. The results deepen our knowledge of the relationship  
28 between facial features and health outcomes and warrant caution when interpreting face as a biomarker  
29 of health. Protocol: Open Science Framework, <https://osf.io/dv9pu/>.

30

## 31 **Keywords**

32 facial asymmetry, facial averageness, facial sexual dimorphism, reproductive health, developmental  
33 stability, general health

34

## 35 **Introduction**

### 36 **Facial features in relation to health status**

37 Facial appearance plays a crucial role in social interactions [1]. In line with theories of sexual selection,  
38 facial features can presumably act as indicators of an individual's age, mating success, sexual behaviour and  
39 health [2]. Previous research has identified several facial features that may serve as indicators of health.  
40 These traits include e.g. symmetry, averageness, sexual dimorphism (masculinity and femininity), adiposity  
41 and skin colour. Among these, sexual dimorphism, averageness and symmetry have received extensive  
42 research attention [2]. Facial fluctuating asymmetry and averageness were suggested as morphological cues  
43 reflecting developmental stability and consequently being a proxy for individual's biological condition [3].  
44 Developmental stability is defined as the capability of an organism to sustain a consistent phenotype, despite  
45 potentially disruptive genetic and environmental factors encountered during prenatal and postnatal life. It is  
46 regarded as a vital component related to an individual's survival and reproductive success [4]. Beneficial  
47 early-life environment is considered to be related with higher bilateral symmetry of facial traits, whereas  
48 pronounced asymmetries might indicate a disruption of developmental stability [5]. Sexually dimorphic  
49 features differ between an average, typical female and male phenotype of a given species. These secondary  
50 sexual traits are being shaped under the influence of sex-typical hormones, androgens and estrogens, and  
51 were suggested to be related to one's health and reproductive potential [6-9].

52

### 53 **Facial fluctuating asymmetry**

54 Fluctuating asymmetry (FA) refers to random, small deviations from perfect bilateral symmetry, typically  
55 calculated across multiple traits. It is also regarded as an indicator of an organism's capacity to withstand or  
56 mitigate environmental disturbances during the prenatal development [10, 11]. For individuals manifesting  
57 minimal deviations from ideal symmetry, low FA indicates potential developmental stability and high

58 biological quality [12]. However, in the up-to-date studies results for FA as a marker of health are mixed  
59 and inconclusive [13, 14].

60

## 61 **Facial averageness**

62 Facial averageness, next to symmetry, is thought to reflect an individual's ability to withstand the negative  
63 impacts of genetic and environmental stressors during development [2, 15, 16]. Facial averageness is also  
64 often associated with attractiveness [17-19]. What is more, it was found that individuals with average traits  
65 have higher fitness (i.e. higher number of offspring). Therefore, facial averageness could also signal  
66 reproductive health [20]. On the other hand, facial distinctiveness can be considered as the opposite of  
67 averageness, and its relationship with actual health has also been examined. A negative correlation was  
68 observed between facial averageness and semen quality; however, no association was found between  
69 averageness and immune function [2]. An inverse relationship between distinctiveness and other aspects of  
70 measured health were also observed [13]. Nevertheless, similarly to asymmetry, results of the published  
71 studies are incongruent [9, 21, 22].

72

## 73 **Facial sexually dimorphism**

74 More masculine or more feminine facial features were previously suggested as indicators of sex hormone  
75 exposure during development [23]. More masculine facial features are manifested in strong jaw, brow ridge  
76 and higher facial weight-to-height ratio [24]. Facial masculinity may convey information about health  
77 through its association with testosterone [25]. Testosterone, while enhancing overall masculinity or muscle  
78 mass, can also compromise health by suppressing immune functions [21] and elevating oxidative stress  
79 levels [26]. Testosterone also plays a vital role in spermatogenesis [27], suggesting that masculinity may  
80 also be related with semen quality [2]. More feminine facial features are defined as fuller lips, bigger and  
81 rounder eyes, and narrow chin. Facial femininity has been suggested to be linked with estrogens [28], that

82 also play a role in enhancing immune function [29] and reproductive health, given that higher levels of  
83 estradiol are needed for a successful ovulation [30, 31]. Nevertheless, the impact of sex hormones on  
84 women's health remains a topic of debate and is possibly not as strong as in men [21].

85

## 86 **Cognitive and computational approaches to facial features**

87 Studies included in the current review were designed employing either cognitive or computational approach.  
88 The cognitive approach to assessments of facial features involves participants evaluating facial appearance  
89 of presented facial stimuli [32]. Evaluators are randomly assigned to grade facial photographs on one of the  
90 chosen traits e.g. perceived health or attractiveness, via Alternative Forced Choice or on a Likert Scale. For  
91 each trait, the average score for designated face is calculated by averaging all evaluators' ratings[2],  
92 sometimes accounting for the within and between rater agreements [33, 34].

93 The computational approach is based on measuring facial features from photographs. This method involves  
94 applying landmarks to the facial photographs and establishing their coordinates on a 2- or 3-dimensional  
95 grid. It is worth mentioning the importance of standardisation of photographs, i.e. employing Frankfurt  
96 horizontal plane (participant's head position, with the camera set at his or her eye level) [35], constant  
97 lightening and distance between camera and participants. To standardize the location, orientation and scale  
98 of landmarks and semi-landmarks configurations are employed, i.e. via superimposed generalised  
99 Procrustes analysis. The digitizing process is frequently carried out in the program tpsDig2 or Geomorph  
100 package [22, 35], but previously also other methods were employed [36]. The landmarking can be done  
101 manually or automatically (with slight differences between two techniques) [37].

102

## 103 **The aim of the scoping review**

104 So far, no review has been conducted that would comprehensively describe the up-to-date literature on the  
105 association between the facial features and health status. Our review fills this gap. It is of great importance,

106 as frequently the connection between facial features and underlining “biological quality” is assumed and  
107 treated as a given. This stand is reinforced by the evolutionary rationale for bases of what humans find  
108 attractive (and why attractiveness to e.g. symmetry or sexual dimorphism would be adaptive) [38]. This  
109 scoping review offers a summary of findings on the relationship between health and facial features  
110 (symmetry, averageness and sexual dimorphism), while simultaneously stratifying the results by types of  
111 health measurements, and accounting for the employed approach in facial features evaluation (cognitive or  
112 computational).

113

## 114 **Materials and methods**

### 115 **Protocol, Registration, and Reporting Methods**

116 We conducted this scoping review according to JBI (formerly Joanna Briggs Institute) methodology for  
117 scoping reviews [39] guided by a protocol registered in Open Science Framework (<https://osf.io/dv9pu/>).  
118 We reported this review in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and  
119 Meta-Analyses extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-ScR, see S1 Table) [40].

120

### 121 **Search strategy**

122 We implemented the three-step search strategy endorsed by JBI for conducting scoping reviews [39]. To  
123 build our search strategy, we conducted a series of pilot searches of the relevant databases to identify articles  
124 focused on the topic and appropriate keywords. An initial pilot search of Web of Science, MEDLINE  
125 PubMed, Cochrane Database and Embase was developed by the first author (WO). The analysis of  
126 terminology within the articles allowed to develop a full search strategy. Records obtained from the pilot  
127 search were reviewed to confirm the appropriateness of the used keywords to identify articles related to the  
128 scoping review’s research questions. Based on that we developed the following search strategy: “*health*”

129 *AND (facial AND ((symmetry OR averageness OR dimorphism) NOT (attractiveness OR palsy))) NOT*  
130 *children.*

131 The databases searched for the final analysis were MEDLINE PubMed, Web of Science, Scopus and  
132 Embase. The final search was conducted on March 1, 2024. Two independent judges (WO and PB) screened  
133 the reference lists of all included articles for further studies.

134

## 135 **Eligibility criteria**

136 **Concept and Context.** The concept of interest focused on studies evaluating the association between health  
137 status and chosen facial features. We included studies if 1) they examined facial symmetry, averageness or  
138 sexual dimorphism in relation to health, 2) they assessed health through analysis of biological material (i.e.  
139 blood samples, saliva samples), medical records or questionnaires (self-report, ratings). We included studies  
140 with computational and cognitive approaches to assessing facial features. We excluded articles reporting on  
141 participants' health measured retrospectively e.g. a survey about health state in childhood. **Participants.** We  
142 included studies involving individuals over 18 years old. We excluded studies that report results of  
143 individuals with a history of craniofacial surgeries, Bell's palsy, lip cleft, or current or past extensive  
144 orthodontic treatment. **Types of Sources.** The scoping review considered observational and quantitative  
145 studies that describe relation between facial features and health. Qualitative studies, case reports, books,  
146 letters and correspondence were excluded. **Publication date.** There were no restrictions on the publication  
147 dates of articles other than the search timing. **Language.** Only studies published in English were included  
148 in the review.

149

## 150 **Study Selection**

151 Following the search, all identified papers were collected and uploaded into EndNote 21.2.0.17387 (2023).  
152 Duplicates were removed. Titles and abstracts were screened by two independent reviewers (WO and PB)

153 for assessment against the eligibility criteria. The full texts of selected articles were assessed in detail against  
154 the eligibility criteria by two independent reviewers (WO and PB), see Fig 1 for more details. Data was  
155 screening by two independent reviewers (WO and PB) using a data screening tool – Rayyan [41]. The  
156 reviewers resolved any disagreements that arose between through discussion or with additional  
157 participation. of experienced reviewers (UMM and MK).

158

159 **Fig 1.** PRISMA 2020 flow diagram

160

## 161 **Data Extraction**

162 We extracted details about the participants, concept, context, study methods and key findings relevant to the  
163 review questions. Two reviewers (WO and PB) independently gathered the data from each study and  
164 extracted information on relation between facial features and health status and employed methodology.

165

## 166 **Quality assessment**

167 Quality assessment was not conducted, as per the JBI guidance on scoping reviews [39].

168

## 169 **Data synthesis and analysis**

170 Public health studies are often complex as measuring human health holistically is virtually impossible. They  
171 investigate diverse populations and are characterised by heterogeneous endpoints or varied methodological  
172 approaches. As a result of the complexity, significant heterogeneity in analysed research was expected.

173 We used tables for synthesis, and descriptive summaries were utilised for reporting on the article  
174 characteristics. Two reviewers (WO and PB) independently and then collaboratively (with UMM and MK)



175 summarised the results' tables. We compared similarities based on the facial features studied and types of  
176 health measurements. Due to the multiple approaches to health measurements, for the sake of scientific  
177 clarity we developed categorisation guide to segregate results as follows: 1) cardiovascular health; 2)  
178 immunocompetence; 3) oxidative stress level; 4) cortisol level; 5) reproductive health 6) cognitive health;  
179 7) general physical health.

180

## 181 **Results**

### 182 **Literature search**

183 A total of 702 titles and abstracts were reviewed, and 43 articles were identified for a full-text review.  
184 There were 35 qualitative studies that were excluded (see Fig 1 for exact reasons for exclusion). We  
185 additionally included 9 records identified manually from references lists search, resulting in 17 articles  
186 included in the final analysis (Fig 1, Table 1). The 17 articles considered the results of 24 analyses.

187

### 188 **Articles characteristic**

189 The earliest publication identified was published in 2000 by *Tomkinson et al.* [5] The latest publications  
190 included in this review was *Borráz-León et al.* [42] and *Marcinkowska et al.* [43] both published in 2021.  
191 Around half of the studies (9/17; 53%) were published since 2015, with vast majority published since 2010  
192 (15/17; 88%, Table 1). Most of the included articles evaluate facial fluctuating asymmetry or symmetry  
193 (11/17; 65%), and facial femininity or masculinity (11/17; 65%), and only few evaluated facial averageness  
194 (3/17; 18%).

195

### 196 **Facial features and various aspects of health**

## 197 **1. Cardiovascular health**

198 *Stephen et al.* [17] measured facial shape variation (expressed as a combination of facial symmetry,  
199 averageness and sexual dimorphism) and its' relation to cardiometabolic health with both computational  
200 and cognitive approaches. They employed geometric morphometric method [44] of facial landmark data to  
201 forecast the presence of risk factors for cardiovascular disease – Body Mass Index (BMI, 32% of variance  
202 explained by facial shape), percentage of body fat (21% explained), and blood pressure (21% explained).  
203 Furthermore, the BMI and blood pressure values, although not a percentage of body fat exhibited a  
204 significant correlation with health judged by random judges (rated facial health). In a study by *Han et al.*  
205 [45], BMI was found to be negatively related to facial femininity ( $r=-0.32$ ,  $p=0.002$ ). *Nunes et al.* [46] used  
206 geometric morphometrics approach to identify facial shape traits associated with the presence of diabetes,  
207 hypertension or both conditions (D2 Mahalanobis distances ranged between 1.78-6.10; all p-values  $<0.02$ ).  
208 The largest facial morphological disparity was observed between individuals without these conditions and  
209 those with diabetes. Additionally, individuals with hypertension tended to exhibit higher levels of facial  
210 asymmetry ( $p>0.05$ , effect sizes not provided). Incongruently, *Tomkinson et al.* [5] reported no significant  
211 relationship between health-related physiological parameters (resting blood pressure, lung function, vertical  
212 jump, grip strength, sit and reach, blood lipid cholesterol and maximal oxygen uptake using cycle ergometry,  
213 correlation coefficients between -0.41 and 0.32,  $ps>0.05$ ) and facial asymmetry. Similarly, *Penke et al.* [47]  
214 did not report significant relationships between horizontal fluctuating asymmetry (HFA) and comprehensive  
215 fluctuating asymmetry (CFA) indices and the physical fitness factors for either gender i.e. blood pressure,  
216 history of diabetes, cardiovascular or vascular diseases ( $rs<|0.11|$ ,  $ps>0.30$ ).

## 217 **2. Immunocompetence**

218 Cognitive approach results in *Foo et al.* [2] indicated weak associations between facial features and various  
219 aspects of immune function. Multiple regression models showed that bacterial immunity was not related to  
220 facial appearance predictors (p-values ranged between 0.20–0.66) in either men or women. Going further,

221 *Rantala et al.* [48] reported an association between hepatitis B antibody response and facial features. They  
222 found that following a hepatitis B vaccination protocol, there was a positive association between men's  
223 immune reaction and facial masculinity ( $r=0.47$ ,  $p<0.001$ ) rated by female participants. On the other hand,  
224 *Lie et al.* [34] did not find a significant relationship between facial symmetry or masculinity judged by  
225 opposite-sex raters and an indirect measure of innate immunity (diversity at the major histocompatibility  
226 complex, MHC) in men. However, the study revealed that facial averageness was associated positively with  
227 overall MHC heterozygosity in men ( $R^2=0.177$ ;  $p<0.001$ ).

### 228 **3. Oxidative stress level**

229 Oxidative stress (OS), among other factors, contributes to the development of diabetes, obesity, and  
230 diabetes-related microvascular diseases, atherosclerosis, and cardiovascular diseases [49, 50] and is  
231 frequently used as a biomarker of the condition of an organism, its health and pace of ageing. *Marcinkowska*  
232 *et al.* [22] showed mixed results, including positive, negative and null relationship between OS and facial  
233 features in a sample of postmenopausal women. In this study a multivariate regression analysis was used to  
234 investigate the relationship between OS levels (measured by DNA damage and 3 levels of biomarkers,  
235 namely 8-hydroxy-20-deoxyguanosine (8-OHdG), copper/zinc superoxide dismutase (Cu-Zn SOD),  
236 thiobarbituric acid reactive substances (TBARS) levels) and facial morphology features calculated using  
237 PsychoMorph Program [51]. Analyses were based on computational and cognitive approaches.  
238 Interestingly, the first analysis with a cognitive approach showed that faces of women with high OS were  
239 chosen as less symmetrical ( $F=-4.370$ ,  $p=0.037$ ), but healthier ( $F=84.39$ ,  $p<0.001$ ), than faces of women  
240 with low OS. The second analysis, where the Geometric Morphometric Modelling was used to calculate the  
241 facial features, did not confirm any statistically significant relationship between OS biomarkers and facial  
242 morphology (all  $p$ -values  $>0.449$ ). In the third study, based on a computational approach, negative  
243 correlations between both facial symmetry ( $b=-0.096$ , 95% CI [-0.18, -0.01],  $R^2=0.042$ ,  $p=0.025$ ) and  
244 averageness ( $b=-0.140$ , 95% CI [-0.25, -0.03],  $R^2=0.050$ ,  $p=0.016$ ) and 8-OHdG were observed. Moreover,  
245 Cu-Zn SOD, was negatively correlated with averageness ( $b=-0.054$ , 95% CI [-0.10, -0.01],  $R^2=0.038$ ,

246  $p=0.032$ ) but not symmetry. No statistically significant associations with either averageness or symmetry  
247 and TBARS were detected [22].

248 *Gangestad et al.* [52] also explored 8-OHdG as a marker of OS levels and additionally malondialdehyde  
249 (MDA), which is a marker of lipid oxidative damage. In their computational approach, FA significantly and  
250 positively predicted levels of urinary OS biomarkers ( $r=0.26$ ,  $p=0.021$  for aggregated OS biomarkers,  
251  $r=0.24$ ,  $p<0.05$  for 8-OHdG, and  $r=0.16$ , no  $p$  value reported for MDA). Moreover, the study found no  
252 evidence that either cortisol or testosterone mediate association between FA and OS levels. On the contrary,  
253 *Foo et al.* [2], showed no significant relationship between facial features and OS measures (urinary 8-OHdG  
254 and isoprostanes) in women and men ( $0.16 < p < 0.91$ ).

#### 255 **4. Cortisol level**

256 Cortisol is a steroid hormone that performs various roles in the human body, including managing the stress  
257 response, regulating metabolism, the immune function and inflammatory response [53, 54], and is  
258 frequently used as a biomarker of chronic stress exposure and health deterioration resulting from it. Analyses  
259 based on facial measurements in *Borráz-León et al.* [55] showed no significant associations between facial  
260 FA and morning salivary cortisol levels ( $p>0.05$ ). However, after a stress test, symmetrical men (with lower  
261 FA) showed an increase in cortisol levels, whereas asymmetrical men (with higher FA) exhibited a decrease  
262 in cortisol levels ( $b=0.788$ ,  $p<0.001$ ). Additionally, *Gangestad et al.* [52] showed that there was no  
263 relationship between cortisol level and FA ( $p>0.05$ ). Likewise, *Han et al.* 2016 [45] did not observe  
264 significant correlations between cortisol levels (averaged over 5 test sessions) and ratings of facial  
265 femininity in women ( $r=-0.08$ ,  $p=0.43$ ).

#### 266 **5. Reproductive health**

267 *Foo et al.* [2] measured relation between facial features and semen quality in men. They indicated that the  
268 linearity of sperm movement was positively predicted by facial masculinity ( $r=0.29$ ,  $p=0.01$ ). Furthermore,

269 sperm concentration and percentage of motile sperm was negatively predicted by facial averageness ( $r=-$   
270  $0.21$ ,  $p=0.04$ ) and positively by facial masculinity rated by opposite-sex judges ( $r=0.23$ ,  $p=0.03$ ). *Rantala*  
271 *et al.* [48] showed that facial masculinity was significantly correlated with testosterone levels ( $r= 0.38$ ,  
272  $p=0.001$ ) in men. On the other hand, a study of *Marcinkowska et al.* [56] found no evidence for a change in  
273 facial asymmetry, averageness or sexual dimorphism between three different points in the menstrual cycle  
274 that vary in conception probability and levels of female typical sex hormones, namely estradiol and  
275 progesterone ( $F_s \leq 0.78$ , partial  $\eta^2_s \leq 0.01$ ,  $p_s \geq 0.542$ ). In another study, *Marcinkowska et al.* [43] using  
276 complex methodological cognitive approach (comparison of results from 3-Alternative Forced Choice and  
277 Likert Scale judgements, inclusion of varying visual stimuli and based on a cross-cultural sample of raters),  
278 found limited evidence for the relation between femininity, and conception probability and sex hormones.  
279 Even more importantly, the few statistically significant effects differed depending on the methods employed  
280 - forced choice vs. Likert Scale. Strikingly, associations between two methodological approaches were  
281 statistically significant ( $p=0.046$ ) in 1 out of 5 analyses. This result provides methodological evidence for  
282 complexity of the relationship between facial judgement and facial features.

## 283 **6. Cognitive health**

284 *Borráz-León et al.* [42] showed no correlations (in a mixed group of both men and women) between facial  
285 symmetry and minor mental ailments i.e. Somatization, Obsessive–Compulsive, Interpersonal Sensitivity,  
286 Depression, Anxiety, Hostility, Phobic Anxiety, Paranoid Ideation, Psychoticism, and the General  
287 Psychopathology Index measured via Symptom Checklist-90-Revised (SCL-90-R),  $r_s < 0.10$ ,  $p_s > 0.05$ ).  
288 *Penke et al.* [47] showed that facial asymmetry indices (namely horizontal fluctuating asymmetry, HFA;  
289 and comprehensive fluctuating asymmetry index, CFA) at age 83 were unrelated to measured intelligence  
290 assessed at age 11, 79 or 83 (all  $p$ -values  $> 0.05$ ). Facial asymmetry at age 83 was also not related to change  
291 in cognitive abilities from age 11 to age 79 years ( $p > 0.05$ ). However, cognitive decline between age 79 and  
292 83 in men was significantly, negatively related to all symmetry indices ( $r_s = -0.24$  to  $-0.35$ ,  $0.001 < p_s < 0.05$ );  
293 men with lower FA at age 83 had experienced less cognitive decline in the preceding 4 years, and showed

294 lower reaction times ( $r_s=.05-.30$ ) This effect was not replicated in women. *Gilani et al.* [57] showed that  
295 men and women with high levels of autistic-like traits present less prominent facial sexual dimorphism than  
296 individuals with low levels of autistic-like traits (for 4 out of 6 facial measurements depending on the sex,  
297 for men  $<0.001 < p_s < 0.05$ ; for women  $<0.001 < p_s < 0.003$ ). One of the measurements (nasal bridge length)  
298 showed an opposite pattern in women – shorter average nasal bridge length (more feminine) was observed  
299 in a group of higher autism scores.

## 300 **7. General health**

301 *Dykiert et al.* [58] indicated that rated facial symmetry was not associated with the risk of mortality in a  
302 group of participants with an average age of 83 years, who were monitored over a period of 7 years ( $p=0.55$   
303 for the whole sample;  $p=0.32$  for men;  $p=0.58$  for women). Also, *Penke et al.* [47] did not report significant  
304 relationships between any of the two measured symmetry indices (HFA, CFA) and the physical fitness  
305 factors for either sex ( $r_s < |0.11|$ ,  $p_s > 0.30$ ). *Thornhill & Gangestad* [59] demonstrated that facial masculinity  
306 interacted with sex and predicted the number of reported occurrences of antibiotic use (measure of effective  
307 immunocompetence) and respiratory infections (for number of infections  $\beta=-0.19$ ,  $p=0.001$ , for days of  
308 infection  $\beta=-0.17$ ,  $p=0.002$ , effect stronger for males than for females). No such association was observed  
309 for stomach/intestinal infections ( $\beta=0.04$ ,  $p>0.05$ ). Moreover, FA was not related to the total number of  
310 infections ( $p=0.139$ ), and only marginally predicted the total days infected ( $p=0.07$ ). On the other hand, FA  
311 was positively associated with days ( $\beta=0.14$ ,  $p=0.011$ ) and number ( $\beta=0.11$ ,  $p=0.03$ ) of respiratory  
312 infections. It is worth mentioning that the association between FA and number of respiratory infections was  
313 only marginally significant when controlled for potential confounders. No effect was observed when FA  
314 and intestinal ailments were analysed ( $p>0.05$ ). Facial symmetry was marginally related to the number of  
315 times that antibiotics were used ( $p=0.057$ ) for both sexes combined.

316

## 317 **Discussion**

318 This scoping review provides a comprehensive evaluation of literature focused on the relationship between  
319 most frequently analysed facial features (asymmetry, averageness and sexual dimorphism) and various  
320 measures of health, including cardiovascular, reproductive and overall health, oxidative stress level and  
321 immune function. Across 17 articles included in the review, 24 analyses on facial features and health were  
322 conducted (frequently one article reported results on multiple aspects of health). Of the five studies including  
323 the cardiovascular health, only one showed a positive relationship with facial features. Positive correlation  
324 with immunocompetence was also depicted in one study out of three and partially in a second one. When it  
325 comes to oxidative stress and reproductive health and facial features the analyses present all possible results  
326 (positive, negative and null). None of the studies found a relationship between FA, femininity and salivary  
327 cortisol level, aside from one study showing a relationship between C reaction to stress and FA. Of the three  
328 studies, two showed negative relationship with cognitive health (Table 1). Three studies tested relation  
329 between general health measures and facial features, and all reported null results (either entirely, or partly).  
330 Although there seems to be an assumption that facial features are a signal of healthiness, and face as such  
331 seemed to be interpreted as a biomarker of health and biological quality, the current body of evidence does  
332 not provide a strong support for this claim.

333 Other than the actual lack of relation between facial features and health in some studies, there can be multiple  
334 reasons for discrepancy in the results. The articles included in the review included adult populations from  
335 Europe, Asia, Africa and the Middle East. Participants in the study ranged in age from 18 to 83. Fourteen  
336 studies involved male as well as female participants, 6 focused only on male participants and 5 only on  
337 females. The pronounced variation on the sampling level could have led to varying results and effect sizes  
338 of the reported significant effects. Additionally, the differences between publications could stem from  
339 different methods of measuring facial features and also due to a great array of employed measures of health.  
340 Computational approaches (measuring the facial features) differed in protocols and number of landmarks.  
341 The cognitive approach (judgements of the facial features) in most, but not all publications relied on opposite  
342 sex raters. Also, most studies did not report between and within rater-agreements.

343

## 344 **The significance of attractiveness and facial adiposity**

345 When considering face as a biomarker of health, two more aspects seem to be closely related, facial  
346 attractiveness and adiposity. As facial attractiveness refers to other people's perception, it can only be  
347 assessed by cognitive approach. If face was a biomarker of health, then facial appearance could serve as an  
348 honest signal manifesting mate quality to potential mates. Taking the evolutionary lens, individuals who  
349 would find “healthy faces” attractive would then be able to obtain better genes or/and improved fitness for  
350 their children. Published studies present mixed results for the relationship between the three facial  
351 characteristics of interest (sexual dimorphism, averageness, and symmetry) and attractiveness. Although  
352 theories of sexual signaling predict that attractive appearance would be positively related to actual health  
353 [2, 60, 61], not all studies found such connection.

354 *Foo et al.* [2] found that neither symmetry nor averageness significantly predicted perceived attractiveness  
355 in females. On the other hand, *Rantala et al.* [48] showed that antibody response was significantly correlated  
356 with facial attractiveness ( $r=0.43$ ,  $p<0.001$ ). Similarly, *Lie et al.* [34] showed that MHC heterozygosity  
357 positively predicted male attractiveness [34]. *Gangestad et al.* [52] found a modest negative correlation  
358 between male physical attractiveness and OS biomarkers levels, but *Foo et al.* failed to find such relationship  
359 [2]. Interestingly, *Marcinkowska et al.* reported that faces of women with high OS were perceived as more  
360 attractive [22]. There are also mixed results on the relationship between attractiveness and plasma cortisol  
361 level [54, 62]. In the overall health domain, *Thornhill & Gangestad* presented no associations between facial  
362 attractiveness and total infections and antibiotic use [59]. No correlations were found between minor  
363 ailments in mental health outcomes and other-perceived attractiveness, however, self-perceived  
364 attractiveness was a significant predictor of health among both men and women[42]. Attractiveness also did  
365 not significantly predict mortality [58]. These strongly mixed findings suggest that even if facial symmetry  
366 and averageness would indicate health, the perception of attractiveness based on these cues may not be as  
367 universally consistent as previously expected [2, 56]. Importantly, if the components of attractiveness were



368 symmetry, averageness and sexual dimorphism, then evidence for the interpretation of attractiveness as an  
369 adaptive signal of health is not as strong as assumed.

370 Another theoretical concept that is closely related to facial appearance and health is adiposity. *Foo et al.*  
371 showed that male perceived health was negatively predicted by adiposity [2]. A study by *Coetzee et al.*  
372 indicated that facial adiposity can act as a cue to health in young adult participants [63]. Research showed  
373 also a negative correlation between adiposity and immune response in men [48]. Interestingly, women's  
374 adiposity did not correlate with immune responsiveness [62]. The review of *de Jager et al.* 2018 presented  
375 3 studies which investigated the relationship between facial adiposity and mental health. Only one of these  
376 three articles found that rated facial adiposity was negatively correlated with a psychological condition  
377 factor in women [64, 65]. Due to the possible relationship between adiposity and health, and adiposity and  
378 facial appearance, future studies should include a measurement of it as a confounding factor.

379

## 380 **Strengths and limitations**

381 This scoping review can serve as a valuable resource that charts the existing evidence for linkage between  
382 health and facial shape, offering the characteristics of the included studies, highlighting gaps and areas  
383 requiring further research. The strength of this scoping review is the standardized literature screening  
384 process and the evaluation of the extracted data by the second and third reviewers, which increases the  
385 credibility and validity of the review. The scientific transparency and open science approach  
386 (<https://osf.io/dv9pu/>) provides a foundation for subsequent systematic reviews or primary research to  
387 investigate the evidence on the relationship between health and facial features, employing various  
388 measurement approaches across different populations and settings.

389 Nevertheless, there are several limitations to our scoping review that should be noted. Firstly, the search  
390 strategy's scope, either involving restrictive inclusion/exclusion criteria and the selected databases may not  
391 encompass all relevant literature on the research topic, objectives, and questions. Secondly, language

392 restrictions by focusing solely on articles published in English could omit evidence published in other  
393 languages. There is a risk that relevant articles in other languages were excluded. In addition, we have not  
394 included “grey literature” i.e. evidence published in forms other than scientific articles. Finally, due to the  
395 high heterogeneity of the studies, it is currently not possible to carry out a meta-analysis that could provide  
396 a numeric answer to the validity of face as biomarker approach. Possibly, with accumulation of new  
397 published studies in future a meta-analytic approach will be possible.

398

## 399 **Conclusion**

400 This review verifies a common assumption that the face is a biomarker of health [1]. However, most of the  
401 studies to date on this topic have not confirmed this assumption. Out of 24 analyses that were retrieved from  
402 the existing 17 articles, as many as 17 showed null results, either entirely or partly. Some of the studies also  
403 found results opposite than expected (worse health was related to better facial judgements or measurements,  
404 i.e. higher OS was related to greater perceived facial health [56]. Other than methodological and sampling  
405 differences that could have led to the pronounced results’ incongruency, it is also plausible that the  
406 previously widely assumed interpretation of face as a biomarker of good health and beneficial  
407 developmental conditions actually lacks a scientific, evidence-based grounding.

408 More studies are needed that comprehensively test the relationship between facial features and physical and  
409 cognitive health, especially in the areas were results are most incongruent, i.e. immune health, oxidative  
410 stress and reproductive health.

411 Additionally, with more studies employing standardised approaches based on publicly available protocols,  
412 it might be possible to either rule out previous hypotheses or to add more knowledge to support its scientific  
413 grounding, and as an outcome understand the complexity that led to the current lack of agreement on  
414 whether facial features can serve as a biomarker of health. Currently, we cannot conclude that there is  
415 sufficient support for the hypothesis that the human face contains valid cues to health, and that facial

416 appearance therefore provides a reliable cue for identifying healthy and unhealthy individuals.

417

## 418 **Declarations**

## 419 **Acknowledgments**

420 Not applicable.

421

## 422 **Author contributions:**

423 Conceptualization: WO, UMM, MK

424 Methodology: WO, KK

425 Investigation: WO, PB, UMM

426 Visualization: WO, KK, MK

427 Supervision: KK, MK

428 Writing—original draft: WO, PB, UMM

429 Writing—review & editing: WO, KK, MK, PB, UMM

430

## 431 **Funding**

432 This work was supported by Research Support Module Program ID UJ grant number

433 U1C/W43/NO/28.08.

434

## 435 **Competing interests**

436 The authors declare no competing interests.

437

## 438 **Data availability**

439 Data and material are available from the authors upon request to the corresponding author.

440

## 441 **Patient and public involvement**

442 Patients and/or the public were not involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans  
443 of this research.

444

## 445 **Patient consent for publication**

446 Not applicable.

447

## 448 **Supporting information**

449 S1 Table. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping  
450 Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) Checklist

451

## 452 **References**

- 453 1. Little AC, Jones BC, DeBruine LM. Facial attractiveness: Evolutionary based research. *Philos Trans*  
454 *R Soc Lond B Biol Sci.* 2011;366(1571):1638-59. doi: 10.1098/rstb.2010.0404.
- 455 2. Foo YZ, Simmons LW, Rhodes G. Predictors of facial attractiveness and health in humans. *Sci Rep.*  
456 2017;7. doi: 10.1038/srep39731.
- 457 3. Van Dongen S, Gangestad SW. Human fluctuating asymmetry in relation to health and quality: a  
458 meta-analysis. *Evol Hum Behav.* 2011;32(6):380-98. doi: 10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2011.03.002. PubMed  
459 PMID: WOS:000295955500002.
- 460 4. Klimek M, Marcinkowska UM, Galbarczyk A, Nenko I, Jasienska G. The age at first reproduction  
461 as a potential mediator between facial fluctuating asymmetry and reproductive success in women. *Am J*  
462 *Biol Anthropol.* 2023;181(2):166-72. Epub 20230408. doi: 10.1002/ajpa.24746. PubMed PMID: 37029695.
- 463 5. Tomkinson GR, Olds TS. Physiological correlates of bilateral symmetry in humans. *Int J Sports*  
464 *Med.* 2000;21(8):545-50. doi: 10.1055/s-2000-8479.
- 465 6. Boothroyd LG, Scott I, Gray AW, Coombes CI, Pound N. Male facial masculinity as a cue to health  
466 outcomes. *Evol Psychol.* 2013;11(5):1044-58. Epub 20131120. doi: 10.1177/147470491301100508.  
467 PubMed PMID: 24252513; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC10434411.
- 468 7. Pflüger LS, Oberzaucher E, Katina S, Holzleitner IJ, Grammer K. Cues to fertility: perceived  
469 attractiveness and facial shape predict reproductive success. *Evol Hum Behav.* 2012;33(6):708-14. doi:  
470 10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2012.05.005.
- 471 8. Rhodes G, Chan J, Zebrowitz LA, Simmons LW. Does sexual dimorphism in human faces signal  
472 health? *Proc Biol Sci.* 2003;270 Suppl 1(Suppl 1):S93-5. doi: 10.1098/rsbl.2003.0023. PubMed PMID:  
473 12952647; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC1698019.
- 474 9. Cai Z, Hahn AC, Zhang W, Holzleitner IJ, Lee AJ, DeBruine LM, et al. No evidence that facial  
475 attractiveness, femininity, averageness, or coloration are cues to susceptibility to infectious illnesses in a  
476 university sample of young adult women. *Evol Hum Behav.* 2019;40(2):156-9. doi:  
477 10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2018.10.002.
- 478 10. Palmer AR, Strobeck C. Fluctuating asymmetry as a measure of developmental stability:  
479 implications of non-normal distributions and power of statistical tests. *Acta Zool Fennica.* 1992;191:57-72.
- 480 11. Vanvalen L. Study of fluctuating asymmetry. *Evolution.* 1962;16(2):125-+. PubMed PMID:  
481 WOS:A1962D767600008.
- 482 12. Grammer K, Thornhill R. Human (*Homo sapiens*) facial attractiveness and sexual selection: the role  
483 of symmetry and averageness. *J Comp Psychol.* 1994;108(3):233-42. doi: 10.1037/0735-7036.108.3.233.  
484 PubMed PMID: 7924253.
- 485 13. Rhodes G, Zebrowitz LA, Clark A, Kalick SM, Hightower A, McKay R. Do facial averageness and  
486 symmetry signal health? *Evol Hum Behav.* 2001;22(1):31-46. doi: 10.1016/s1090-5138(00)00060-x.  
487 PubMed PMID: WOS:000167134900003.
- 488 14. Pound N, Lawson DW, Toma AM, Richmond S, Zhurov AI, Penton-Voak IS. Facial fluctuating  
489 asymmetry is not associated with childhood ill-health in a large British cohort study. *Proc Biol Sci.*  
490 2014;281(1792). doi: 10.1098/rspb.2014.1639. PubMed PMID: 25122232; PubMed Central PMCID:  
491 PMCPMC4150332.
- 492 15. Polak M. *Developmental instability: causes and consequences*: Oxford University Press, USA;  
493 2003.
- 494 16. Lee AJ, Mitchem DG, Wright MJ, Martin NG, Keller MC, Zietsch BP. Facial averageness and  
495 genetic quality: Testing heritability, genetic correlation with attractiveness, and the paternal age effect. *Evol*  
496 *Hum Behav.* 2016;37(1):61-6. Epub 20150828. doi: 10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2015.08.003. PubMed PMID:  
497 26858521; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4743547.
- 498 17. Stephen ID, Hiew V, Coetsee V, Tiddeman BP, Perrett DI. Facial shape analysis identifies valid  
499 cues to aspects of physiological health in Caucasian, Asian, and African populations. *Front Psychol.*  
500 2017;8(OCT). doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01883.

- 501 18. Rhodes G, Yoshikawa S, Clark A, Lee K, McKay R, Akamatsu S. Attractiveness of facial  
502 averageness and symmetry in non-western cultures: in search of biologically based standards of beauty.  
503 Perception. 2001;30(5):611-25. doi: 10.1068/p3123. PubMed PMID: 11430245.
- 504 19. Thornhill R, Gangestad SW. Facial attractiveness. Trends Cogn Sci. 1999;3(12):452-60. doi:  
505 10.1016/s1364-6613(99)01403-5. PubMed PMID: 10562724.
- 506 20. Koeslag JH. Koinophilia groups sexual creatures into species, promotes stasis, and stabilizes social  
507 behaviour. J Theor Biol. 1990;144(1):15-35. doi: 10.1016/s0022-5193(05)80297-8. PubMed PMID:  
508 2200930.
- 509 21. Foo YZ, Nakagawa S, Rhodes G, Simmons LW. The effects of sex hormones on immune function:  
510 a meta-analysis. Biol Rev Camb Philos Soc. 2017;92(1):551-71. Epub 20160122. doi: 10.1111/brv.12243.  
511 PubMed PMID: 26800512.
- 512 22. Marcinkowska UM, Ziomkiewicz A, Kleisner K, Galbarczyk A, Klimek M, Sancilio A, et al.  
513 Oxidative stress as a hidden cost of attractiveness in postmenopausal women. Sci Rep. 2020;10(1). doi:  
514 10.1038/s41598-020-76627-9. PubMed PMID: WOS:000601309100027.
- 515 23. Fink B, Grammer K, Mitteroecker P, Gunz P, Schaefer K, Bookstein FL, et al. Second to fourth  
516 digit ratio and face shape. Proc Biol Sci. 2005;272(1576):1995-2001. doi: 10.1098/rspb.2005.3179. PubMed  
517 PMID: 16191608; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC1559906.
- 518 24. Hodges-Simeon CR, Albert G, Richardson GB, McHale TS, Weinberg SM, Gurven M, et al. Was  
519 facial width-to-height ratio subject to sexual selection pressures? A life course approach. PLoS One.  
520 2021;16(3):29. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0240284. PubMed PMID: WOS:000629591800018.
- 521 25. Folstad I, Karter AJ. Parasites, bright males, and the immunocompetence handicap. Am Nat.  
522 1992;139(3):603-22. doi: 10.1086/285346. PubMed PMID: WOS:A1992HL87300009.
- 523 26. Alonso-Alvarez C, Bertrand S, Faivre B, Chastel O, Sorci G. Testosterone and oxidative stress: the  
524 oxidation handicap hypothesis. Proc Biol Sci. 2007;274(1611):819-25. doi: 10.1098/rspb.2006.3764.  
525 PubMed PMID: 17251089; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC2093982.
- 526 27. Zirkin BR. Spermatogenesis: its regulation by testosterone and FSH. Semin Cell Dev Biol.  
527 1998;9(4):417-21. doi: 10.1006/scdb.1998.0253. PubMed PMID: 9813188.
- 528 28. Smith MJ, Perrett DI, Jones BC, Cornwell RE, Moore FR, Feinberg DR, et al. Facial appearance is  
529 a cue to oestrogen levels in women. Proc Biol Sci. 2006;273(1583):135-40. doi: 10.1098/rspb.2005.3296.  
530 PubMed PMID: 16555779; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC1560017.
- 531 29. Gray AW, Boothroyd LG. Female facial appearance and health. Evol Psychol. 2012;10(1):66-77.  
532 Epub 20120201. doi: 10.1177/147470491201000108. PubMed PMID: 22833849; PubMed Central PMCID:  
533 PMCPMC10426873.
- 534 30. Huang J, Lu Y, He Y, Wang Y, Zhu Q, Qi J, et al. The effect of peak serum estradiol level during  
535 ovarian stimulation on cumulative live birth and obstetric outcomes in freeze-all cycles. Front Endocrinol  
536 (Lausanne). 2023;14:1130211. Epub 20230717. doi: 10.3389/fendo.2023.1130211. PubMed PMID:  
537 37529616; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC10390295.
- 538 31. Patil M. In: Allahbadia GN, Morimoto Y, editors. Ovarian Stimulation Protocols. New Delhi:  
539 Springer India; 2016. p. 17-55.
- 540 32. O'Toole AJ. In: Calder AJ, Rhodes G, Johnson MH, Haxby JV, editors. Oxford Handbook of Face  
541 Perception: Oxford University Press; 2011.
- 542 33. Zebrowitz LA, Montepare JM. Social Psychological Face Perception: Why Appearance Matters.  
543 Soc Personal Psychol Compass. 2008;2(3):1497. doi: 10.1111/j.1751-9004.2008.00109.x. PubMed PMID:  
544 20107613; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC2811283.
- 545 34. Lie HC, Rhodes G, Simmons LW. Genetic diversity revealed in human faces. Evolution.  
546 2008;62(10):2473-86. doi: 10.1111/j.1558-5646.2008.00478.x. PubMed PMID: WOS:000259900800003.
- 547 35. Windhager S, Schaefer K, Fink B. Geometric morphometrics of male facial shape in relation to  
548 physical strength and perceived attractiveness, dominance, and masculinity. Am J Hum Biol.  
549 2011;23(6):805-14. Epub 20110928. doi: 10.1002/ajhb.21219. PubMed PMID: 21957062.



- 550 36. Gangestad SW, Thornhill R. The analysis of fluctuating asymmetry redux: the robustness of  
551 parametric statistics. *Anim Behav.* 1998;55(2):497-501. doi: 10.1006/anbe.1997.0610. PubMed PMID:  
552 9480715.
- 553 37. Jones AL, Schild C, Jones BC. Facial metrics generated from manually and automatically placed  
554 image landmarks are highly correlated. *Evol Hum Behav.* 2021;42(3):186-93. doi:  
555 10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2020.09.002.
- 556 38. Little AC. In: Zeigler-Hill V, Welling LLM, Shackelford TK, editors. *Evolutionary Perspectives on*  
557 *Social Psychology.* Cham: Springer International Publishing; 2015. p. 319-32.
- 558 39. Peters MDJ, Marnie C, Tricco AC, Pollock D, Munn Z, Alexander L, et al. Updated methodological  
559 guidance for the conduct of scoping reviews. *JBI Evid Synth.* 2020;18(10):2119-26. doi: 10.11124/jbies-  
560 20-00167. PubMed PMID: 33038124.
- 561 40. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA Extension for  
562 Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Ann Intern Med.* 2018;169(7):467-73. Epub  
563 20180904. doi: 10.7326/m18-0850. PubMed PMID: 30178033.
- 564 41. Johnson N, Phillips M. Rayyan for systematic reviews. *J Electron Resour Librariansh.*  
565 2018;30(1):46-8. doi: 10.1080/1941126X.2018.1444339.
- 566 42. Borraz-Leon JI, Rantala MJ, Luoto S, Krams IA, Contreras-Garduño J, Krama T, et al. Self-  
567 Perceived Facial Attractiveness, Fluctuating Asymmetry, and Minor Ailments Predict Mental Health  
568 Outcomes. *Adapt Human Behav Physiol.* 2021;7(4):363-81. doi: 10.1007/s40750-021-00172-6. PubMed  
569 PMID: WOS:000691176500001.
- 570 43. Marcinkowska UM, Ziolkiewicz-Wichary A, Nowak-Szczepanska N, Kornafel D, Koziel S, Danel  
571 DP. Changes in facial shape throughout pregnancy—a computational exploratory approach. *Symmetry.*  
572 2021;13(10). doi: 10.3390/sym13101944.
- 573 44. O'Higgins P, Jones N. Facial growth in *Cercocebus torquatus*: an application of three-dimensional  
574 geometric morphometric techniques to the study of morphological variation. *J Anat.* 1998;193 ( Pt 2)(Pt  
575 2):251-72. doi: 10.1046/j.1469-7580.1998.19320251.x. PubMed PMID: 9827641.
- 576 45. Han C, Hahn AC, Fisher CI, Debruine LM, Jones BC. Women's facial attractiveness is related to  
577 their body mass index but not their salivary cortisol. *Am J Hum Biol.* 2016;28(3):352-5. Epub 20150926.  
578 doi: 10.1002/ajhb.22792. PubMed PMID: 26407832.
- 579 46. Nunes LA, de Jesus AS, Casotti CA, de Araujo ED. Geometric morphometrics and face shape  
580 characteristics associated with chronic disease in the elderly. *Biosci J.* 2018;34(2):1035-46. PubMed PMID:  
581 WOS:000428420300018.
- 582 47. Penke L, Bates TC, Gow AJ, Pattie A, Starr JM, Jones BC, et al. Symmetric faces are a sign of  
583 successful cognitive aging. *Evol Hum Behav.* 2009;30(6):429-37. doi:  
584 10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2009.06.001. PubMed PMID: WOS:000271225600006.
- 585 48. Rantala MJ, Coetzee V, Moore FR, Skrinda I, Kecko S, Krama T, et al. Adiposity, compared with  
586 masculinity, serves as a more valid cue to immunocompetence in human mate choice. *Proc Biol Sci.*  
587 2013;280(1751). doi: 10.1098/rspb.2012.2495. PubMed PMID: WOS:000311994600014.
- 588 49. Furukawa S, Fujita T, Shimabukuro M, Iwaki M, Yamada Y, Nakajima Y, et al. Increased oxidative  
589 stress in obesity and its impact on metabolic syndrome. *J Clin Invest.* 2004;114(12):1752-61. doi:  
590 10.1172/jci21625. PubMed PMID: 15599400; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC535065.
- 591 50. Reddy VP. Oxidative Stress in Health and Disease. *Biomedicines.* 2023;11(11). Epub 20231029.  
592 doi: 10.3390/biomedicines11112925. PubMed PMID: 38001926; PubMed Central PMCID:  
593 PMC535065.
- 594 51. Tiddeman B, Burt D, Perrett D. Prototyping and Transforming Facial Textures for Perception  
595 Research. *IEEE Comput Graph Appl.* 2001;21:42-50. doi: 10.1109/38.946630.
- 596 52. Gangestad SW, Merriman LA, Thompson ME. Men's oxidative stress, fluctuating asymmetry and  
597 physical attractiveness. *Anim Behav.* 2010;80(6):1005-13. doi: 10.1016/j.anbehav.2010.09.003. PubMed  
598 PMID: WOS:000284398600009.

- 599 53. Oakley RH, Cidlowski JA. The biology of the glucocorticoid receptor: new signaling mechanisms  
600 in health and disease. *J Allergy Clin Immunol.* 2013;132(5):1033-44. Epub 20130929. doi:  
601 10.1016/j.jaci.2013.09.007. PubMed PMID: 24084075; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4084612.
- 602 54. Thau L, Gandhi J, Sharma S. *StatPearls.* Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing; 2024.
- 603 55. Borráz-León JI, Cerda-Molina AL, Mayagoitia-Novales L. Stress and cortisol responses in men:  
604 differences according to facial symmetry. *Stress.* 2017;20(6):573-9. Epub 20170919. doi:  
605 10.1080/10253890.2017.1378341. PubMed PMID: 28927320.
- 606 56. Marcinkowska UM, Holzleitner IJ. Stability of women's facial shape throughout the menstrual  
607 cycle. *Proc Biol Sci.* 2020;287(1924). doi: 10.1098/rspb.2019.2910.
- 608 57. Gilani SZ, Tan DW, Russell-Smith SN, Maybery MT, Mian A, Eastwood PR, et al. Sexually  
609 dimorphic facial features vary according to level of autistic-like traits in the general population. *J Neurodev*  
610 *Disord.* 2015;7(1):14. Epub 20150415. doi: 10.1186/s11689-015-9109-6. PubMed PMID: 25901187;  
611 PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4404287.
- 612 58. Dykiert D, Bates TC, Gow AJ, Penke L, Starr JM, Deary IJ. Predicting Mortality From Human  
613 Faces. *Psychosom Med.* 2012;74(6):560-6. doi: 10.1097/PSY.0b013e318259c33f. PubMed PMID:  
614 WOS:000306531700001.
- 615 59. Thornhill R, Gangestad SW. Facial sexual dimorphism, developmental stability, and susceptibility  
616 to disease in men and women. *Evol Hum Behav.* 2006;27(2):131-44. doi:  
617 10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2005.06.001. PubMed PMID: WOS:000236137900004.
- 618 60. Andersson M, Iwasa Y. Sexual selection. *Trends Ecol Evol.* 1996;11(2):53-8. doi: 10.1016/0169-  
619 5347(96)81042-1.
- 620 61. Shackelford TK, Larsen RJ. Facial attractiveness and physical health. *Evol Hum Behav.*  
621 1999;20(1):71-6. doi: 10.1016/s1090-5138(98)00036-1. PubMed PMID: WOS:000078483500005.
- 622 62. Rantala MJ, Coetsee V, Moore FR, Skrinda I, Kecko S, Krama T, et al. Facial attractiveness is  
623 related to women's cortisol and body fat, but not with immune responsiveness. *Biol Lett.* 2013;9(4). doi:  
624 10.1098/rsbl.2013.0255. PubMed PMID: WOS:000321563600024.
- 625 63. Coetsee V, Perrett DI, Stephen ID. Facial adiposity: A cue to health? *Perception.* 2009;38(11):1700-  
626 11. doi: 10.1068/p6423.
- 627 64. de Jager S, Coetsee N, Coetsee V. Facial Adiposity, Attractiveness, and Health: A Review. *Front*  
628 *Psychol.* 2018;9. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02562. PubMed PMID: WOS:000454112900001.
- 629 65. Tinlin RM, Watkins CD, Welling LLM, Debruine LM, Al-Dujaili EAS, Jones BC. Perceived facial  
630 adiposity conveys information about women's health. *Br J Psychol.* 2013;104(2):235-48. doi:  
631 10.1111/j.2044-8295.2012.02117.x.
- 632
- 633
- 634




**Table 1.** Studies reporting on cardiovascular health and facial features

Category health of predictors	Health measurements	Facial features	Approach to facial features	N	Relationship (+/-/null)	Study (first author, year)
Cardiovascular health	resting blood pressure, lung function, vertical jump, grip strength, sit and reach, blood lipid cholesterol and maximal oxygen uptake	FA	computational	21♂ 25♀	Null	Tomkinson, 2000
	percentage body fat, body mass index, blood pressure	shape variation	computational cognitive	135♂ 137♀	N/A	Stephen, 2017
	body mass index	sexual dimorphism	cognitive	96 ♀	-	Han, 2016
	diabetes hypertension	FA	computational	88♂ 121♀	+	Nunes, 2018
	physical fitness factors for either gender i.e., blood pressure, history of diabetes, cardiovascular or vascular diseases	FA	computational	95♂ 121♀	Null	Penke , 2009
Immunocompetence	overall bacterial immunity	FA averageness sexual dimorphism	cognitive	101♂ 80♀	Null	Foo, 2017
	antibodies rise after Hepatitis B vaccine	masculinity	cognitive	74 ♂	+	Rantala, 2013
	MHC Heterozygosity	FA averageness sexual dimorphism	cognitive	80♂ 80♀	Null, +	Lie, 2008
Oxidative stress	urinary 8-OHdG, Cu-Zn SOD, TBARS	FA averageness health	computational cognitive	97 ♀	Null, +, -	Marcinkowska, 2020
	urinary 8-OHdG, isoprostanes	FA averageness sexual dimorphism	cognitive	101♂ 80♀	Null	Foo, 2017
	urinary 8-OHdG and MDA	FA	computational	98 ♂	+	Gangestad, 2010
Cortisol level	morning salivary cortisol level stress-test cortisol	FA	computational	100 ♂	Null, +	Borráz-León, 2017
	morning salivary cortisol level	FA	computational	98♂	Null	Gangestad, 2010
	multiple measurements of salivary cortisol level	sexual dimorphism	cognitive	96 ♀	Null	Han, 2016
Reproductive health	semen quality	averageness sexual dimorphism FA	cognitive	86- 91♂	Null, +, -	Foo, 2017
	blood testosterone level	masculinity	cognitive	69 ♂	+	Rantala, 2013

	conception probability	averageness sexual dimorphism FA	computational	75♀	Null	Marcinkowska, 2020
	conception probability sex hormones levels	sexual dimorphism	cognitive	88 ♀	Null, +	Marcinkowska, 2021
Cognitive health	somatization, obsessive-compulsive, interpersonal sensitivity, depression, anxiety, hostility, phobic anxiety, paranoid ideation, psychoticism and the general psychopathology index	FA	computational	168♂ 190♀	Null	Borráz-León, 2021
	cognitive decline (standard cognitive tests and reaction time measures)	FA	computational	95♂ 121♀	Null, -, +	Penke, 2009
	Autism-spectrum Quotient (AQ)	sexual dimorphism	computational (3D)	107♂ 101♀	-	Gilani, 2015
General health	mortality risk	FA	cognitive	133♂ 159♀	Null	Dykiert, 2012
	physical fitness index	FA	computational	95♂ 121♀	Null	Penke, 2009
	antibiotics use, respiratory infections (duration, number of infections), stomach/intestinal infections (duration, number of infections)	FA sexual dimorphism	computational	203♂ 203♀	Null, +, -	Thornhill, 2006

FA – facial fluctuating asymmetry, Cu-Zn SOD – copper/zinc superoxide dismutase, MDA – malondialdehyde, MHC – major histocompatibility complex, TBARS – thiobarbituric acid reactive substances, 8-OHdG – 8-hydroxy-deoxyguanosine

PRISMA 2020 flow diagram for new systematic reviews which included searches of databases and registers only



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.01.14.25320526>; this version posted January 15, 2025. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

\*Consider, if feasible to do so, reporting the number of records identified from each database or register searched (rather than the total number across all databases/registers).

\*\*If automation tools were used, indicate how many records were excluded by a human and how many were excluded by automation tools.

From: Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ* 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71

For more information, visit: <http://www.prisma-statement.org/>