

The validity and reliability of an automated method of scoring dental arch relationships in unilateral cleft lip and palate using the modified Huddart-Bodenham scoring system

Catherine Martin*, Xinhui Ma**, Grant McIntyre*, Ping Lin***, Weijie Wang****, Peter Mossey*

* Orthodontic Department, University of Dundee Dental Hospital and School, Dundee, UK

** Department of Computer Science, University of Hull, Hull, UK

*** Division of Mathematics, University of Dundee, Dundee, UK

**** Ninewells Hospital and Medical School, University of Dundee, UK

Abstract

Objective: To evaluate an automated software tool for the assessment of dental arch relationships using the modified Huddart and Bodenham index.

Design: Cohort of 43 models of subjects aged 9-21 with UCLP and the ten GOSLON reference models sets.

Method: The 53 sets of plaster models were scored using the MHB index and scanned (R700, 3Shape, Copenhagen, Denmark). The digital models were MHB scored visually (Orthoanalyzer, 3Shape, Copenhagen, Denmark) and landmarked for automatic scoring using a Rhino software plug-in (Rhinoceros, version 5, www.rhino3d.co.uk). Scoring/landmarking was undertaken by three observers and repeated after one month. Intra- and inter-observer reproducibility were tested using Cronbach's Alpha and intraclass correlation coefficients (ICC) (threshold > 0.9). Bland-Altman plots demonstrated inter-observer agreement for each model format. Random and systematic error with digital landmark identification error were determined using the x, y and z coordinates for 28 models digitized twice one month apart using Cronbach's alpha and a t-test, respectively.

Results: Intra-operator landmark identification was excellent (Cronbach's alpha = 0.933) with no differences between sessions ($P > 0.05$). Intra-observer reproducibility was excellent for all examiners (Cronbach's alpha and ICC 0.986-0.988). Inter-observer reproducibility was highest for the software plug-in (0.991), followed by plaster (0.989) and Orthoanalyzer (0.979) and Bland-Altman plots confirmed no systematic bias and greater consistency of scores with the automated software.

Conclusion: The automated MHB software tool is valid, reproducible and the most objective method of assessing maxillary arch constriction for patients with UCLP.

Introduction

There are various methods for assessing surgical outcomes in cleft lip and palate from dental models. These include the GOSLON yardstick, 5 Year Old, Eurocran, BCLP Yardstick, and modified Huddart/Bodenham indices (1, 2). The GOSLON Yardstick was introduced for the assessment of dental arch relationships for subjects with UCLP in the late mixed or early permanent dentition (3) to provide an indication of treatment complexity and expected outcome. The 5 Year Old Index was later developed to determine earlier surgical outcomes (4). Both have been widely used in multicentre outcome comparisons and have good intra- and inter-observer reproducibility. However, they are only suitable for UCLP and require calibration and a set of reference models (5). Moreover, their five category nature lacks sensitivity as borderline cases are scored using subjective professional judgment (6), resulting in the potential for significant error (7). The Eurocran Yardstick modified from the GOSLON Yardstick and 5 year indices (8) but is not user friendly (9) whilst the reliability of scoring palatal morphology is only moderate (10).

The Huddart/Bodenham index was developed as an ordinal scoring system for the assessment of archform in the deciduous dentition stage in cases with UCLP (11). This was modified for use with any cleft sub-phenotype at any age and stage of dental development (6,7,12,13). The relationship of each maxillary tooth with the corresponding tooth in the mandibular arch is scored (excluding the frequently absent lateral incisors). Summation of scores from the 10 pairs of teeth (two incisors, canines, premolars, two molars), provides an overall score between -30 and +10. As the first permanent molars are not scored for patients younger than 6 years, scores can range between -24 to +8. Unlike the GOSLON and 5 Year Old indices, multicentre research comparisons are simplified due to the systematic method of scoring and as calibration is not required, both clinicians and non-clinicians can undertake scoring (12). The continuous scale is also more sensitive than the GOSLON and 5 Year Old indices (6) and a recent systematic review using WHO criteria for an ideal index recommended the MHB system as the index of choice in cleft outcome measurement (2).

Dental arch relationships can be scored directly from the patient (13), or indirectly using photographs (14), plaster study models (15), digital models produced by scanning plaster models (15), and direct intra-oral scans (16). Digital study models have been shown to be reliable for the GOSLON Yardstick (15), MHB index (17), 5 Year Old Index (18) EUROCRAN index (19) and BCLP yardstick (20). To date all methods have involved manual methods of assessment.

There are numerous descriptions of geometric, algebraic, mathematical and statistical solutions for the assessment of dental archform in patients without clefts. These include the Bonwill and Hawley equilateral triangles, catenary curves, ellipses and parabolas trifocal ellipse, polynomial equations from the 2nd to 6th order, and conic sections (21, 22). These methods all have limitations for the assessment of asymmetric dental arches, which are frequently found in patients with orofacial clefts. Geometric morphometric techniques including Euclidean Distance Matrix analysis (23) and cubic splines (24-26) are more useful for asymmetric dental arches. A cubic spline is the connection of a series of 'knots' or points into a smooth curve irrespective of arch size

and symmetry. Previous work has used cubic splines with digitized x and y co-ordinates (25) and this has been further developed into a 2D planar computerized program for dental archform analysis (24). With the advent of digital models and digital landmarking, geometric shapes such as the fourth degree polynomial curve and the β function (26), and statistical models derived from Generalised Partial Procrustes Analysis (27) are now available. Several digital software systems produce 2D archforms using splines and incorporate the facility to undertake symmetric archform analysis using customized user prompts.

No study has investigated a software tool to automate scoring of cleft lip and/ or palate surgical outcomes. The objective of this study was to evaluate a plug-in developed in Rhino (www.rhino3d.co.uk), a commercial research and development software platform for use with high quality 3D images, for the assessment of dental arch relationships in cleft lip and palate using the modified Huddart and Bodenham index.

Null Hypothesis

MHB scores determined using the automatic software plug-in are no different to those determined using conventional visual methods with digital and plaster models of patients with UCLP.

Materials and methods

A consecutive sample of 43 UCLP subjects aged 9-21 with plaster models were identified from a concurrent study (16). In this study, 60 subjects were identified from the Cleft Care Scotland database in the Greater Glasgow and Clyde NHS Board area during 2013-2014. Of these subjects, 3 declined to participate and 14 failed their appointments. Forty-three subjects underwent alginate impressions for the construction of plaster models. A further 10 plaster models were added to the sample by anonymizing the GOSLON reference models. The 53 model sets were scanned using an R700 benchtop scanner (3Shape®, Copenhagen, Denmark) and exported as STL files (Figure 1).

Caldicott Guardian approval was obtained from the West of Scotland Ethics Service and Tayside Medical Science Centre for use of these models in the current project. A post-hoc sample size calculation using a clinically relevant difference of four MHB points at a power of 80% and $p=0.05$ found a sample size of 40 would be required. The range of possible scores in the MHB scoring system ranges from -30 to +10 (a 40 point scale) and the GOSLON yardstick comprises five categories, so one GOSLON category equates to 8 MHB points. It was felt reasonable to assume that clinically it would be desirable to detect half a GOSLON category, therefore a difference of 4 points was agreed by the investigators. As this study had 53 subjects, it was adequately powered to avoid a false positive result.




Figure 1: Recruitment for the study population

The plaster models were MHB scored manually, and the digital models were scored visually on-screen using OrthoAnalyzer viewing software (3Shape®, Copenhagen, Denmark) and automatically using a plug-in written for Rhinoceros, version 5 (Rhino)(www.rhino3d.co.uk)(Robert and McNeel Associates, 2014) under similar conditions on two occasions by three observers (two faculty and one resident in orthodontics), one month apart. The Rhino platform was chosen for the development of the automatic scoring plug-in as it is a commercial research and development software platform, designed for use with high quality 3D images. Written instructions were provided in order to standardize the scoring process.

For the software plug-in, a series of landmarks were identified (Figure 2) using the x, y and z co-ordinates:

- Most buccal point on the groove between the mesial and mid buccal cusps of the upper and lower first and second molar, or any deciduous molar.
- Buccal cusp tips of the first and second premolars, where erupted.
- Cusp tip of the canines.
- Mid-point of the incisal edges for all incisors.




Figure 2: Landmark identification. Note: Landmarks have been enlarged for the purposes of illustration

The molar groove was used to accommodate for any rotational discrepancies. A total of 14 landmarks were identified for the lower arch, and 10 for the upper arch (as lateral incisors are commonly missing and second molars are not scored using MHB index). Where any teeth were absent in the mandibular arch, the adjacent erupted tooth was landmarked twice to maintain continuity of the cubic spline. If a tooth was absent in the maxillary arch, the mid alveolar ridge point was landmarked. The deciduous teeth were scored in exactly the same way as the permanent dentition, using the landmarks identified above. The process was consistent with Mossey et al (2003).

For the software plug-in, in order to compare the relative archforms of the maxillary and mandibular arches, the 3 dimensional mandibular archform was used as a reference, created with a cubic spline (Figure 3). A reference plane was also constructed from the mandibular landmarks using the least square fitting technique. Two of the authors of this study had expertise in computer science and mathematics for construction of these algorithms. Details of the algorithm can be found in Ma et al. (2016) (28). The software generated the nearest distance of the maxillary landmark to the cubic spline. Projection of the horizontal vector of this distance, to the reference plane, generated distances between the maxillary landmarks and the mandibular archform.

The MHB scores were recorded in a spreadsheet (Excel, Microsoft, Redmond, California). The data were examined for probability distribution using Skewness coefficients prior to statistical analysis. Intra- and inter-observer reproducibility were

tested using Cronbach's Alpha (29) and Intraclass Correlation coefficients (ICC) with the threshold set at 0.9 (30). Bland-Altman plots (31) were used for visual interpretation of inter-observer agreement for each model medium using 95% confidence intervals (the mean difference of the two readings plus or minus 1.96 times the standard deviation of the differences).

Random and systematic error with digital landmark identification for the Rhino models were determined using the x, y and z co-ordinates for 28 models digitized on two occasions one month apart (32) using Cronbach's alpha and a t-test, respectively. Statistical analysis was carried out using SPSS version 21 (IBM Corporation, New York).




Figure 3: Distance calculation using cubic spline interpolation

Results

Intra-operator landmark identification was excellent (Cronbach's alpha value of 0.933) with no statistically significant difference between the sessions using a paired t-test ($P > 0.05$).

The data were found to follow a normal distribution. Intra-observer reproducibility was excellent for all observers (Cronbach's alpha and ICC 0.986-0.988) (Table 1) demonstrating that each examiner was consistent with repeated scoring. Inter-observer reproducibility (Table 2) was highest for the software plug-in (0.991), followed by plaster (0.989) and Orthoanalyzer™ (0.979) and Bland-Altman plots confirmed no systemic bias and greater consistency of scores with the automated software. All were in the excellent category.

Examiner	Intraclass Correlation	95% Confidence Interval	
		Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Single Measures 1	0.975	0.971	0.979
Average Measures 1	0.988	0.985	0.989
Single Measures 2	0.974	0.970	0.978
Average Measures 2	0.987	0.985	0.989
Single Measures 3	0.972	0.967	0.976
Average Measures 3	0.986	0.983	0.988

Table 1: Intraclass correlation coefficients and confidence intervals for each examiner for all variables and methods of scoring combined.

Medium	Intraclass Correlation	95% Confidence Interval	
		Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Single Measures Plaster	0.967	0.954	0.976
Average Measures Plaster	0.989	0.984	0.992
Single Measures OrthoAnalyzer™	0.938	0.916	0.956
Average Measures OrthoAnalyzer™	0.979	0.970	0.985
Single Measures software plug-in	0.974	0.965	0.982
Average Measures software plug-in	0.991	0.988	0.994

Table 2: Intraclass correlation coefficients and confidence intervals for each medium using combined repeat scores, for all examiners for all variables.

The Bland-Altman plots (Figure 4) show that the majority of the data for the three examiners for the three mediums lie between the upper and lower confidence intervals with a good scatter of points around the mean difference of the two readings. The confidence intervals for the software plug-in were smaller, with a greater concentration around the mean (Figure 4) indicating that the software plug-in was more consistent than the other two mediums. There were a lower number of outliers with the plaster and automatic scoring methods than with manual scoring of the digital models.




Figure 4: Bland-Altman plots for Total MHB scores for all examiners with different mediums. (a: plaster, b: Orthoanalyzer, c: Software plug-in).

Discussion

This study is the first to present an automated method of scoring dental arch relationships in cleft lip and palate. Excellent agreement was found between all examiners for MHB scores for all three mediums with excellent intra and inter examiner reproducibility for landmarking the digital models. It has been suggested that a reproducibility coefficient greater than 0.9 should be regarded as a suitable threshold for clinical applications (31), which was exceeded by all three mediums. Furthermore, there was excellent agreement between the examiners for each scoring medium. The highest level of inter-observer agreement was found for the software plug-in followed closely by plaster models. The software plug-in also had the narrowest confidence intervals for all three methods indicating that the automated system was more accurate than conventional methods of MHB scoring. The null hypothesis was therefore accepted.

The results of this study demonstrate that the inherently objective software plug-in is a more reliable system than visual scoring of plaster and digital models. This is most likely due to the elimination of human error associated with the visual estimation of dental anatomical landmarks. Although landmark identification was still required in conjunction with the measurement algorithm, random and systematic error resulting from visual judgment of the relationship of each pair of teeth and errors resulting during data transcription are eliminated. Furthermore, when working with digital models the occlusal relationship is fixed at the time of scanning. This is particularly advantageous for cases with an anterior open bite or class III relationship where the true occlusal relationship on plaster models is more difficult to estimate in vertical and horizontal dimensions with the potential for measurement error.

The GOSLON reference models were added to the existing 43 UCLP models to ensure a full range of malocclusions were included to test reliability of the software. We chose similar dental anatomical landmarks for the software plug-in to those used in other studies. Adaškevičius and Vasiliauskas (2009) used the x and y co-ordinates of 12 landmarks on digital models to generate polynomial curves for the prediction of customised archforms for a selection of pre-treated malocclusions (26). Landmarks using occlusal cusps have also been used in a recent study for comparing maxillary and mandibular archforms using Generalised Procrustes Analysis (33). Intra-observer reliability for landmark identification was excellent. This is in keeping with Brief et al. 2006, who found the intra-observer error of landmark placement for four observers to range from 0.61mm to 1.99mm when assessing a sample of 40 digital models from 20 patients with UCLP aged between 3 and 8 months (34). Interestingly they found that landmark identification error varied between the x, y and z axis for different landmarks.

Other recent studies comparing maxillary and mandibular archforms have used the Generalised Procrustes Analysis (GPA) superimposition methods which involve rotation, translation and scaling of the dental arches (34,35) to achieve a best-fit relationship prior to calculating differences between the maxillary and mandibular archforms. Whilst this is a useful technique, the cubic spline was more appropriate for this project as the archform it was only needed in the mandibular arch, to which the linear distance from the maxillary landmarks could be calculated. In addition, as a

complete maxillary arch was not always present due to the inherent nature of the cleft and the range of ages examined where teeth were either yet to erupt or had been extracted. This would have made superimposition of the dental arches difficult using the GPA method.

We minimized error through the use of an identical scoring protocol for the three model types where the models were scored in the same order at each session. The GOSLON reference models were randomly interspersed with the models from the cohort of patients aged 9-21 years. Although it was not possible to blind the observers to model type due to the visual differences between them, they were scored under identical conditions at each scoring session. Mullen et al. (2007) found that magnification of digital models was linked with improvements in measurement accuracy therefore a large monitor screen was used for the Rhino software so each examiner could magnify the digital model for landmark identification (36).

A cubic spline involving third order polynomials was used to generate the mandibular archform (24,25) for several reasons. It facilitated mathematical flexibility and accuracy, whilst limiting the number of calculations required. An algebraic formula based on a cartesian co-ordinate system using the mandibular digital landmarks resulted in a mathematical expression for the cubic spline in order to generate the MHB values. Other archform methods such as the ellipse, catenary curve, parabola, hyperbola, conic sections, polynomial functions and beta functions (33) would either impose or require arch symmetry. Cubic splines do not have this limitation and are therefore suitable for use with severe malocclusions and patients with clefts where asymmetry is a common feature (37).

The software plug-in could be used to assess MHB scores in other cleft sub-phenotypes for longitudinal studies and comparisons, unlike other surgical outcome scoring indices which are limited to specific sub-phenotypes (38). More importantly, developments to include automatic landmark identification in a similar manner to facial recognition from both 3D static images and 3D videos (39,40) would eliminate the need for landmarking. Fully automated MHB scoring has the potential to be performed remotely using uploaded digital models or intraoral scans. This would contribute much needed data on surgical outcomes to global registries. As a universal scoring method for all cleft types at any age, that does not require sophisticated calibration courses and anchor study models, it has advantages over existing methods for such purposes. With further development it is anticipated that this index could be developed to include a vertical component, and an assessment of the skeletal bases. This would distinguish between minor and major maxillary retrusion, which is one drawback to this index over the GOSLON yardstick.

Adoption of a single yet reliable method of recording surgical outcomes by international collaborative centres will enhance comparative research studies and enable subtle differences in global techniques to be established. Numerical MHB data can easily be fed back into the WHO database for assimilation with the Global Burden of Disease (GBD) project. With more accurate, reliable and universal measurement the effects of different methods of surgical intervention can be compared, techniques and protocols refined and ultimately there is potential for optimizing care and for reduction of the burden of care for individuals born with cleft defects.

Conclusion

The automated MHB system was found to be a valid, reproducible and a more consistent method of assessing maxillary arch constriction for patients with unilateral cleft lip and palate, than conventional MHB scoring on digital or plaster models.

Conflict of interest statement

The authors declare no conflict of interest or financial relationship with any organization or software used within the study.

References

1. Jones, T., Al-Ghatam, R., Atack, N., Deacon, S., Power, R., Albery, L, Ireland, T., and Sandy, J. (2014) A review of outcome measures used in cleft care. *Journal of orthodontics*, 41, 128-140.
2. Altalibi, M., Saltaji, H., Edwards, R., Major, P.W., and Flores-Mir, C. (2013) Indices to assess malocclusions in patients with cleft lip and palate. *European Journal of Orthodontics*, 35(6), 772-82.
3. Mars, M., Plint, D.A., Houston, W., Bergland, O. and Semb, G. (1987) The Goslon Yardstick: a new system of assessing dental arch relationships in children with unilateral clefts of the lip and palate. *The Cleft Palate Journal*, 24, 314-322.
4. Atack, N.E., Hathorn, I.S., Semb, G.V., Dowell, T., and Sandy J.R.. (1979) A new index for assessing surgical outcome in unilateral cleft lip and palate subjects aged five: reproducibility and validity. *The Cleft Palate- Craniofacial Journal*, 34(3), 242-6.
5. Jones, T., Leary, S., Atack, N., Chawla, O., Ness, A., Ireland, T. and Sandy, J. (2015) Are photographs a suitable alternative to dental study casts when assessing primary surgical outcome in children born with unilateral cleft lip and palate? *The European Journal of Orthodontics*. In Press.
6. Mossey, P., Clark, J., and Gray, D. (2003) Preliminary investigation of a modified Huddart/Bodenham scoring system for assessment of maxillary arch constriction in unilateral cleft lip and palate subjects. *The European Journal of Orthodontics*, 25, 251-257.
7. Gray, D., and Mossey, P. (2005) Evaluation of a modified Huddart/Bodenham scoring system for assessment of maxillary arch constriction in unilateral cleft lip and palate subjects. *European Journal of Orthodontics*, 27, 507-511.
8. Oskouei. (2007) *Web-based Learning package on The EUROCRAN Yardstick for Rating Surgical Outcome in Unilateral cleft Lip & Palate Patients*. Master of Science, University of Manchester.
9. Patel, D. (2011) *Evaluation of the use of the modified Huddart Bodenham & EUROCRAN yardstick for the assessment of surgical outcome for unilateral cleft lip and palate*. Master of Dental Science, University of Dundee.
10. Fudalej, P., Katsaros, C., Bongaarts, C., Dudkiewicz, Z. and Kuijpers-jagtman, A.M. (2011) Dental arch relationship in children with complete unilateral cleft lip and palate following one-stage and three-stage surgical protocols. *Clinical Oral Investigations*, 15, 503-510.
11. Huddart, A., and Bodenham, R. (1972) The evaluation of arch form and occlusion in unilateral cleft palate subjects. *The Cleft Palate Journal*, 9, 194-209.
12. Tohill, C., and Mossey, P.A. (2007) Assessment of arch constriction in patients with bilateral cleft lip and palate and isolated cleft palate: a pilot study. *The European Journal of Orthodontics*, 29, 193-197.
13. Dobbyn, L., Weir, J., Macfarlane, T. and Mossey, P. (2012) Calibration of the modified Huddart and Bodenham scoring system against the GOSLON/5-year-olds' index for unilateral cleft lip and palate. *The European Journal of Orthodontics*, 34, 762-767.
14. Nollet, P.J., Katsaros, C., Van't Hof, M.A., Bongaarts, C.A., Semb, G., Shaw, W.C. and Kuijpers-Jagtman, A.M. (2004) Photographs of study casts: an alternative medium for rating dental arch relationships in unilateral cleft lip and palate. *The Cleft Palate-Craniofacial Journal*, 41, 646-650.

15. Nicholls, W., Singer, S.L., Southall, P.J., and Winters, J.C. (2014) The Assessment of Digital Study Models Using the GOSLON Yardstick Index. *The Cleft Palate-Craniofacial Journal*, 51, 264-269.
16. Chalmers, E. (2015) Intra-oral three dimensional scanning for assessment of surgical outcome in patients with unilateral cleft lip and palate. *Clinical MDS by Research*, University of Dundee.
17. Asquith, J.A., and McIntyre, G.T. (2012) Dental arch relationships on three-dimensional digital study models and conventional plaster study models for patients with unilateral cleft lip and palate. *The Cleft Palate- Craniofacial Journal*, 49(5), 530-4.
18. Chawla, O., Attack, N., Deacon, S., Leary, S., Ireland, A. and Sandy, J. (2013) Three-dimensional digital models for rating dental arch relationships in unilateral cleft lip and palate. *The Cleft Palate-Craniofacial Journal*, 50, 182-186.
19. Sabelis, A.J., Kuijpers, M.A., Nada, R.M., Chiu, Y.T., Bronkhorst, E.M., Kuijpers-Jagtman, A.M., and Fudalej, P.S. (2015) Rating dental arch relationships and palatal morphology with the EUROCRAN index on three different formats of dental casts in children with unilateral cleft lip and palate. *Clinical oral investigations*, 13, 1-8.
20. Leenarts C.M., Bartzela, T.N., Bronkhorst, E.M., Semb, G., Shaw, W.C., Katsaros, C., and Kuijpers-Jagtman, A.M. (2012) Photographs of dental casts or digital models: rating dental arch relationships in bilateral cleft lip and palate. *International journal of oral and maxillofacial surgery*. 29,180-5.
21. Rudge, S. (1981) Dental arch analysis: arch form A review of the literature. *The European Journal of Orthodontics*, 3, 279-284.
22. Fleming, P., Dibiasse, A., and Lee, R. (2007) Arch form and dimensional changes in orthodontics. *Progress in orthodontics*, 9, 58-64.
23. Ferrario, V., Sforza, C., Miani, JR, A. and Serrao, G. (1993) Dental arch asymmetry in young healthy human subjects evaluated by Euclidean distance matrix analysis. *Archives of Oral Biology*, 38, 189-194.
24. Begole, E.A. (1979) A computer program for the analysis of dental arch form using the cubic spline function. *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine*. 10(2), 136-42.
25. Begole, E. A. (1980). Application of the cubic spline function in the description of dental arch form. *Journal of Dental Research*, 59, 1549-1556.
26. Adaškevičius, R., and Vasiliauskas, A. (2015) Evaluation of dental arch form using 3D dental cast scanning technology. *Elektronika ir Elektrotechnika*, 93(5), 99-102.
27. Nam, S.E., Kim, Y.H., Park, Y.S., Baek, S.H., Hayashi, K., Kim, K.N., and Lee, S.P. (2012) Three-dimensional dental model constructed from an average dental form. *American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics*, 141, 213-218.
28. Ma, X., Martin, C., McIntyre, G., Lin, P., Mossey, P. (2016) Digital three-dimensional automation of the modified Huddart and Bodenham scoring system for patients with cleft lip and palate. *The Cleft Palate-Craniofacial Journal*. In Press
29. Cronbach L.J. (1951) Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*; 16, 297-334.
30. Bland, J.M., and Altman, D.G., (1997) Statistics notes: Cronbach's alpha. *British Medical Journal*, 314, 572.
31. Bland, J.M., and Altman, D.G. (1986) Statistical methods for assessing agreement between two methods of clinical measurement. *The Lancet*, 327, 307-310.
32. Houston, W. (1983) The analysis of errors in orthodontic measurements. *American Journal of Orthodontics*, 83, 382-390.

33. Papagiannis, A., and Halazonetis, D.J. (2015) Shape variation and covariation of upper and lower dental arches of an orthodontic population. *The European Journal of Orthodontics*, 1, 10
34. Brief, J., Behle, J.H., Stellzig-eisenhauer, A., and Hassfeld, S. (2006) Precision of landmark positioning on digitized models from patients with cleft lip and palate. *The Cleft Palate- Craniofacial Journal*, 43, 168-173.
35. Nam, S.E., Kim, Y.H., Park, Y.S., Baek, S.H., Hayashi, K., Kim, K.N., and Lee, S.P. (2012) Three-dimensional dental model constructed from an average dental form. *American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics*, 141, 213-218.
36. Mullen, S. R., Martin, C. A., Ngan, P. & Gladwin, M. (2007) Accuracy of space analysis with emodels and plaster models. *American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics*, 132, 346-352.
37. Hechter, F. (1978) Symmetry and dental arch form of orthodontically treated patients. *Dental Journal*, 44, 173-184.
38. Mars, M., Batra, P., and Worrell, E. (2006) Complete unilateral cleft lip and palate: validity of the five-year index and the Goslon yardstick in predicting long-term dental arch relationships. *The Cleft Palate- Craniofacial Journal*, 43, 557-562.
39. Hayat, M., Bennamoun, M., and El-sallam, A.A. (2012) Fully automatic face recognition from 3D videos. *Pattern Recognition (ICPR)*, 21st International Conference on, IEEE, 1415-1418.
40. Best-Rowden, L., and Jain, A.K. (2015) A longitudinal study of automatic face recognition. *International Conference on Biometrics*.