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Summary

Objective: To evaluate the validity and reliability of three-dimensional (3D) landmark-based palatal superimposition of digital dental models using Ortho Mechanics Sequential Analyzer (OMSA).

Methods: The sample consisted of pre- and post-treatment digital maxillary dental models of 20 orthodontic cases. For each case, the pre- and post-treatment digital models were superimposed using surface-based methods utilizing 3dMD Vultus and Invivo 5 software as well as a landmark-based method utilizing OMSA. The same set of parameters were measured on the superimposed 3D data by the three softwares for comparison. Agreement in the superimposition outcomes among the three superimposition methods was evaluated with intraclass correlation coefficients (ICCs), Bland-Altman plots, and repeated measures ANOVA. A P value of ≤ 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Results: Repeatability was acceptable for all methods based on the ICCs. Agreement as measured by the ICCs and repeated measures ANOVA was high among the three methods.

Conclusion: The results indicate that OMSA offers a valid and reliable tool for 3D landmark-based digital dental models superimposition using 3 points marked along the midpalatal raphe as reference.

Introduction

Orthodontic treatment aims at correction of facial proportions and oral functions. Diagnostic imaging of the face and dental occlusion is necessary in order to assess growth and development, diagnose malocclusion, plan the treatment and evaluate the treatment outcomes (1–6). Radiographic assessment became more accurate by the use of multiplanar images including cone beam computed tomography (CBCT) scans. The introduction of the new generations of CBCT machines allowed significant reduction of radiation exposure and provided multiplanar imaging with high resolutions (7). Along with the multiplanar reformatting (MPR), CBCT also allows creating three-dimensional (3D) volume rendering which enables detailed 3D evaluation (7).

To evaluate the dentition and fabricate orthodontic appliances, impressions and plaster models are traditionally used. Plaster models require physical storage space, are difficult to retrieve during treatment or share for consultation, and cannot be digitally measured or superimposed (8). Nowadays, digital dental models can overcome some of the drawbacks associated with using plaster models and are considered to be of adequate accuracy for direct printing of removable orthodontic appliances (9).

Superimposition of a patient’s 2D cephalograms is traditionally indicated whenever evaluation of orthodontic treatment and/or growth is needed. More recently, superimposing the 3D digital models or CBCT images makes it possible to assess these changes in a 3D
manner (10). Superimposition techniques of 3D scan data are based on either of the following methods: voxel-based (registration algorithm based on maximizing mutual information with an iterative translation and rotation of the Digital Imaging and Communications in Medicine (DICOM) image volume to find the best fit of the grey scale intensity between the two overlapping DICOM images voxel by voxel); surface-based (registration based on surface area to bring the two preoperative and postoperative models to fit to each other); landmark-based (software-assisted best-fit registration of arbitrary selected anatomical points); or information theory and mathematical algorithm technique-based (software-assisted superimposition of the registered structures) (11–13). The accuracy of the voxel-based superimposition is evaluated by measuring the mean value of the absolute distance between the two 3D image surfaces (13).

A recently developed software program, the Ortho Mechanics Sequential Analyzer™ (OMSA, US patent 61/771,328), was introduced to enable visualization and superimposition of digital dental models. The input for this program are the STL files derived from either scanned plaster models or dental impressions. This software application is based on an algorithm that reduces the amount of work needed to superimpose the 3D scanned dental models to a minimum. The aim of the current study was to assess the validity and reliability of 3D landmark-based superimposition of digital dental models using OMSA as compared to surface-based superimposition utilizing two commonly used softwares.

**Materials and Methods**

The sample for this retrospective study included the pre- and post-treatment 3D images and digital maxillary dental models of 20 orthodontic patients treated with maxillary expansion using Hyrax palatal expanders as part of their comprehensive orthodontic treatment. The study was approved by the Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis Institutional Review Board Committee. The same sample has been used previously to confirm the reliability of linear and angular dental measurements with the OMSA software (14). Patients’ age ranged from 8 to 13 years (12.3 ± 1.9 years). Cases were treated by the palatal expanders over a period of 3 months. Models with any dental abnormalities or obvious distortions were excluded. Because the distal end of the incisive papilla and midpalatal raphe were used as reference landmarks for superimposing the laser-scanned pre- and post-treatment models, models of surgically assisted palatal expansion patients were also excluded.

Dental models were scanned using Ortho Insight 3D laser scanner (version 5.1, Motionview, Hixson, TN) with scanning resolution set at 20 μm. The scan data was then exported from the laser scanner in STL format file extension and the files were imported into the OMSA. Pre- and post-treatment digital models were superimposed with the OMSA software using the landmark-based method. The medial rugae area was considered a stable reference area to superimpose maxillary models for longitudinal cast analysis. In order to perform the landmark-based superimposition using OMSA, three points were registered on the digital maxillary model: the first point was located at the distal end of the incisive papilla, the other two points were located arbitrary distal to the first point along the midpalatal raphe (Figure 1). The 3 points on each model form a mathematical 3D reference plane. The pre- and post-treatment reference planes were used to calculate the required transformations to overlay both models on the top of each other using the distal end of the incisive papillae as a guide reference point.

A reference frame that is required to register the models for proper superimposition was established by creating a plane passing through the three selected points. For each model, the three selected points form a triangle where, X-Y plane originates at the first point (the distal end of the incisive papilla) (Figure 2). The digital models were then oriented to coincide the first point with the axes origin (0, 0, 0) and with the X-Y plane. Registration was automatically performed by moving and orienting all models with the same frame of reference. The software then rotated the two triangles around their X-Y planes (Figure 3) and around Z-axis (Figure 4) until the best fit is obtained. Since two of the landmarks were located arbitrary distal to the first point along the midpalatal raphe and thus may not exactly coincide between the pre- and post-treatment models, the algorithm was programmed to relocate these points on the post-treatment model to match their locations on the pre-treatment model by matching the distances between the first point and the other 2 points (Figure 5). Performing these orientations of the 3D models resulted in a complete registration of the.
pre- and post-treatment models (Figure 6). The digital models were also superimposed using 3dMD Vultus software (3dMD, Atlanta, GA) using the best fit surface-based method (Figure 7).

The 3D images were obtained using a spiral low dose scanning machine (model X, vision; GE Medical Systems, Milwaukee, WI) before and immediately after the expansion appliance was removed for all subjects. The scans were taken at 120 kV and 20 mA, with a scanning time of 2 seconds per section. Scan parameters included an A2-90 scanning filter, a 25-cm field of view, and a 0.4-mm voxel size. The DICOM files were imported into the Invivo Dental 3D software (version 5.1, Anatomage, San Jose, CA) and the pre- and post-treatment scans of each subject were superimposed on the cranial bases using the best fit surface-based method (Figure 8). The cranial base superimposition was achieved by qualitative visualization of the semi-transparent axial, sagittal, and coronal cross-sectional slices of all corresponding anatomical structures. The selected parameters (Table 1 and Figure 9) were measured on the superimposed 3D data by the three software for comparison. Additionally, intercanine and intermolar widths were measured on the pre- and post-treatment digital models and compared statistically so as to ensure the reliability of the scan data when viewed by all three software.

Measurements on the digital models and the 3D images were repeated once under the same conditions with a time interval of one week to assess intrarater reliability. All measurements were made by the same examiner (S.T.). Reliability was determined as the extent to which the measurements on the digital models and the 3D images were repeatable under the same conditions. Validity was considered as the extent to which the measurements on the digital models and the 3D images yielded equal results. Intraclass correlation coefficients (ICCs) and Bland-Altman plots were used to evaluate the repeatability of the measurements for each method. Comparisons between the methods were made using repeated measures ANOVA. ICCs were also calculated to measure the agreement between the methods. A P value of ≤0.05 was considered statistically significant.
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Table 1. Parameters measured on the superimposed pre- and post-treatment models using the three software (OMSA, 3dMD, Anatomage Invivo 5). R = right; L = left; MB = mesiobuccal; DB: distobuccal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R6 MB</td>
<td>Distance between the maxillary right first molar mesiobuccal cusp tips of the superimposed pre- and post-treatment digital models. Same parameter was measure on the left side (L6 MB).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6 DB</td>
<td>Distance between the maxillary right first molar distobuccal cusp tips of the superimposed pre- and post-treatment digital models. Same parameter was measured on the left side (L6 DB).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Distance between the maxillary right canine cusp tips of the superimposed pre- and post-treatment digital models. Same parameter was measured on the left side (L3).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Distance between the midpoint of the incisal edges of the maxillary right central incisors of the superimposed pre- and post-treatment digital models. Same parameter was measured on the left side (L1).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9. A superimposed image showing the distance between the maxillary right first molar MB cusp tips of the superimposed pre- and post-treatment digital models using OMSA software.

Results

Reliability of each method and agreement among the three methods as measured by the ICCs was high. ICC ≥0.90 was reported for all measurements except for R6 MB cusp tip with ICC of 0.88 using 3dMD. Statistically significant differences were detected among the
methods for R6 MB cusp tip, R6 DB cusp tip, L6 MB cusp tip, R1,
and L1 (Table 2). OMSA measured significantly lower R6 MB cusp
tip values than 3dMD (P = 0.0399) and Anatomage (P = 0.0272).
OMSA yielded significantly lower R6 DB cusp tip values than 3dMD
(P = 0.0128) and Anatomage (P < 0.0001) and 3dMD produced
significantly lower R6 DB cusp tip measurements than Anatomage
(P = 0.0003). Anatomage produced significantly higher L6 MB
cusp tip values than 3dMD (P = 0.0489) and OMSA (P = 0.0117).
Anatomage gave significantly higher R1 measurements than 3dMD
(P = 0.0054) and OMSA (P = 0.0001). Anatomage gave significantly
higher L1 measurements than 3dMD (P = 0.0082) and OMSA
(P = 0.0003) (Table 3).

Discussion

One of the main limitations in 3D superimposition is that it is very
time consuming and computing intensive, yet, it is strongly needed
because it offers a practical way for comprehensive visual and
quantitative 3D analysis of changes that accompany orthodontic
treatment and/or growth (11). The main advantages of superimpos-
ing digital dental models over CBCTs is being less time consum-
ing and reducing patients’ exposure to unnecessary radiation doses
whenever sequential assessment of the orthodontic treatment is
needed. In the literature, several methods for digital dental models
superimposition have been reported (15–17). Thiruvenkatachari
et al. (15) superimposed digital dental models by selecting 12 regis-
tration points and drawing a mushroom shaped area on the palate.
Choi et al. (16) superimposed digital dental models using a point
and a surface area that were marked on the palate. Cho et al. (17)
superimposed pre- and post-treatment 3D virtual models using the
best-fit method.

Baumrind et al. (18) quantified the differences in the perceived
displacement of the same landmarks in the same sample when a
standard ‘anatomical best fit’ rule was used as opposed to super-
imposition on maxillary implants. They found that the anatomical
best fit superimposition misses the remodelling that happens in the
anatomy that was observed when the implant superimposition was
used. They, however, indicated that in situations in which there are
no implants, clinicians and researchers may continue to use anato-
merically based superimpositions and that some systemic errors
will be incurred. In the current study an algorithm that depends on
marking anatomic landmarks was used rather than best fit super-
imposition. The aim was to assess the validity and reliability of
landmark-based superimposition of digital dental models using
OMSA algorithm as compared to surface-based superimposition
using two commonly used software. The results indicated strong
agreement between the OMSA, the 3dMD, and Invivo 5 software
for superimposing 3D scan data. The statistically significant dif-
ferences between some of the measured parameters among the
three superimposition methods were clinically acceptable from the
orthodontic point of view.

The fit of the cranial base superimposition using Anatomage
Invivo 5 was verified by qualitative visualization of the semi-trans-
parent axial, sagittal, and coronal cross-sectional slices of all corre-
sponding anatomical structures, and this was considered as the gold
standard for the various superimposition comparisons carried out
in this study. Superimposition of the 3D models using the 3dMD
depends on best fitting of the meshes of the pre- and post-treatment
3D maxillary models showing the palate together with the teeth and
their dental/kevelar processes. The OMSA is based on an algorithm
that reduces the amount of the preparation work needed to superim-
pose the 3D scanned dental models to a minimum. The medial rugae
area was considered a stable reference area to superimpose maxillary
models for longitudinal cast analysis (16, 19–20).

To test the reliability and validity of the superimposition
achieved by this algorithm, it was compared to the best fit super-
imposition achieved by the 3dMD and Invivo 5 on digital models
and DICOM files, respectively. Results showed a strong agree-
mence between the OMSA, the 3dMD, and Invivo 5 software for
superimposing 3D scan data. This indicated that the new software
used to superimpose fused images from scanned plaster models
provides reliable information when compared with the best fit
methods.
Table 2. Mean (SE) for each measurement (in mm) by method. *P* value represents an overall test for any differences among the 3 methods. ICCs were calculated to evaluate the agreement among all 3 methods as well as each pair of methods. R = right; L = left; MB = mesiobuccal; DB = distobuccal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>3dMD</th>
<th>Anatomage</th>
<th>OMSA</th>
<th><em>P</em> value</th>
<th>3dMD versus Anatomage</th>
<th>3dMD versus OMSA</th>
<th>Anatomage versus OMSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R6 MB cusp tip</td>
<td>4.39 (0.30)</td>
<td>4.41 (0.28)</td>
<td>4.14 (0.30)</td>
<td>0.0486*</td>
<td>0.91 0.91</td>
<td>0.94 0.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6 DB cusp tip</td>
<td>4.23 (0.32)</td>
<td>4.56 (0.29)</td>
<td>4.02 (0.31)</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001*</td>
<td>0.93 0.94</td>
<td>0.95 0.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6 MB cusp tip</td>
<td>4.26 (0.38)</td>
<td>4.48 (0.38)</td>
<td>4.20 (0.37)</td>
<td>0.0301*</td>
<td>0.96 0.96</td>
<td>0.96 0.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6 DB cusp tip</td>
<td>4.19 (0.33)</td>
<td>4.33 (0.31)</td>
<td>4.12 (0.34)</td>
<td>0.1510</td>
<td>0.95 0.95</td>
<td>0.95 0.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3 cusp tip</td>
<td>2.57 (0.54)</td>
<td>2.91 (0.53)</td>
<td>2.63 (0.50)</td>
<td>0.0722</td>
<td>0.95 0.98</td>
<td>0.95 0.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3 cusp tip</td>
<td>2.37 (0.39)</td>
<td>2.51 (0.39)</td>
<td>2.49 (0.40)</td>
<td>0.4547</td>
<td>0.95 0.96</td>
<td>0.97 0.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>1.47 (0.24)</td>
<td>1.77 (0.26)</td>
<td>1.33 (0.26)</td>
<td>0.0004*</td>
<td>0.89 0.95</td>
<td>0.90 0.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>1.60 (0.28)</td>
<td>1.86 (0.31)</td>
<td>1.49 (0.30)</td>
<td>0.0009*</td>
<td>0.93 0.94</td>
<td>0.95 0.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter 3-3 pre ttt</td>
<td>31.29 (0.87)</td>
<td>31.32 (0.86)</td>
<td>31.33 (0.90)</td>
<td>0.9489</td>
<td>0.99 1.00</td>
<td>1.00 0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter 3-3 post ttt</td>
<td>33.75 (0.82)</td>
<td>33.72 (0.81)</td>
<td>33.82 (0.83)</td>
<td>0.3850</td>
<td>0.99 0.99</td>
<td>0.99 0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter 6-6 pre ttt</td>
<td>45.65 (0.80)</td>
<td>45.68 (0.79)</td>
<td>45.61 (0.80)</td>
<td>0.7855</td>
<td>0.99 1.00</td>
<td>0.99 0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter 6-6 post ttt</td>
<td>52.04 (0.95)</td>
<td>52.07 (0.99)</td>
<td>52.28 (0.92)</td>
<td>0.0654</td>
<td>0.99 1.00</td>
<td>0.99 0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistically significant at *P* ≤ 0.05.

Table 3. Differences between methods. R = right; L = left; MB = mesiobuccal; DB = distobuccal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Difference in mm</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>95% CI for Difference</th>
<th><em>P</em> value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R6 MB cusp tip</td>
<td>3dMD &amp; Anatomage n.s.</td>
<td>−0.02</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>−0.26</td>
<td>0.22 0.8658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3dMD &gt; OMSA</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.49 0.0399*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anatomage &gt; OMSA</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.51 0.0272*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6 DB cusp tip</td>
<td>3dMD &lt; Anatomage</td>
<td>−0.33</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>−0.50</td>
<td>−0.16 0.0003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3dMD &gt; OMSA</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.38 0.0128*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anatomage &gt; OMSA</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.71 0.0000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6 MB cusp tip</td>
<td>3dMD &lt; Anatomage</td>
<td>−0.22</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>−0.43</td>
<td>0.00 0.0489*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3dMD &amp; OMSA n.s.</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>−0.15</td>
<td>0.28 0.5420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anatomage &gt; OMSA</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.49 0.0117*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6 DB cusp tip</td>
<td>3dMD &amp; Anatomage n.s.</td>
<td>−0.14</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>−0.35</td>
<td>0.08 0.0568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3dMD &amp; OMSA n.s.</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>−0.14</td>
<td>0.28 0.0272*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anatomage &amp; OMSA n.s.</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>−0.01</td>
<td>0.42 0.0568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3 cusp tip</td>
<td>3dMD &lt; Anatomage</td>
<td>−0.34</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>−0.64</td>
<td>−0.03 0.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3dMD &amp; OMSA n.s.</td>
<td>−0.06</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>−0.37</td>
<td>0.24 0.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anatomage &amp; OMSA n.s.</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>−0.03</td>
<td>0.58 0.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3 cusp tip</td>
<td>3dMD &amp; Anatomage n.s.</td>
<td>−0.14</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>−0.39</td>
<td>0.10 0.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3dMD &amp; OMSA n.s.</td>
<td>−0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>−0.37</td>
<td>0.13 0.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anatomage &amp; OMSA n.s.</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>−0.23</td>
<td>0.27 0.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>3dMD &lt; Anatomage</td>
<td>−0.30</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>−0.50</td>
<td>−0.09 0.0054*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3dMD &amp; OMSA n.s.</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>−0.06</td>
<td>0.34 0.1697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anatomage &gt; OMSA</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.64 0.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>3dMD &lt; Anatomage</td>
<td>−0.26</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>−0.45</td>
<td>−0.07 0.0082*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3dMD &amp; OMSA n.s.</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>−0.07</td>
<td>0.30 0.2250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anatomage &gt; OMSA</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.56 0.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter 3-3 pre ttt</td>
<td>3dMD &amp; Anatomage n.s.</td>
<td>−0.03</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>−0.23</td>
<td>0.18 0.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter 3-3 post ttt</td>
<td>3dMD &amp; OMSA n.s.</td>
<td>−0.03</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>−0.24</td>
<td>0.18 0.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter 6-6 pre ttt</td>
<td>3dMD &amp; OMSA n.s.</td>
<td>−0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>−0.30</td>
<td>0.10 0.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter 6-6 post ttt</td>
<td>3dMD &amp; Anatomage n.s.</td>
<td>−0.03</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>−0.23</td>
<td>0.17 0.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3dMD &lt; OMSA</td>
<td>−0.25</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>−0.47</td>
<td>−0.02 0.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anatomage &amp; OMSA n.s.</td>
<td>−0.21</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>−0.43</td>
<td>0.01 0.0001*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistically significant at *P* ≤ 0.05.
Conclusion
The results reported from the sample tested in this study indicate that 3D landmark-based superimposition of digital dental models using OMSA software was found to be a valid and reliable tool. Future research will be needed to evaluate the superimposition outcomes with different orthodontic treatment strategies using different mechanics.
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