Published in final edited form as:

Int J Oral Maxillofac Surg. 2017 November ; 46(11): 1512–1516. doi:10.1016/j.ijom.2017.04.023.

There is variability in our perception of the standard head orientation

Grace N. Hughes^{1,2}, Jaime Gateño^{3,4}, Jeryl D. English¹, John F. Teichgraeber⁵, and James J. Xia^{4,6,7}

¹Department of Orthodontics, School of Dentistry, The University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston, Houston, Texas, USA

²Private Practice, Long Beach, California, USA

³Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, Houston Methodist Hospital, Houston, Texas, USA

⁴Clinical Surgery (Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery), Weill Medical College, Cornell University, New York, USA

⁵Division of Pediatric Plastic Surgery, Department of Pediatric Surgery, The University of Texas Houston Health Science Center, Houston, Texas, USA

⁶Surgical Planning Laboratory, Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, Houston Methodist Research Institute, Houston, Texas, USA

⁷Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, Institute for Academic Medicine, Houston Methodist Hospital, Houston, Texas, USA

Abstract

The purposes of this study were to determine: (1) whether an observer's perception of the correct anatomical alignment of the head changes with time, and (2) whether different observers agree on the correct anatomical alignment. To determine whether the perception of the correct anatomical alignment changes with time (intra-observer comparison), a group of 30 observers were asked to orient, into anatomical alignment, the three-dimensional (3D) head photograph of a normal man, on two separate occasions. To determine whether different observers agree on the correct anatomical alignment (inter-observer comparison), the observed orientations were compared. The results of intra-observer comparisons showed substantial variability between the first and second anatomical alignments. Bland–Altman coefficients of repeatability for pitch, yaw, and roll, were

Correspondence: James J. Xia, Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, Houston Methodist Research Institute, 6560 Fannin Street, Suite 1280, Houston, TX 77030, USA, Tel: +1 713 441 5577, JXia@HoustonMethodist.org.

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Patient consent

Not required.

Ethical approval

Exempted study; determined by the Institutional Review Board at the University of Texas Houston Health Science Center.

Competing interests

None.

6.9°, 4.4°, and 2.4°, respectively. The results of interobserver comparisons showed that the agreement for roll was good (sample variance 0.4, standard deviation (SD) 0.7°), the agreement for yaw was moderate (sample variance 2.0, SD 1.4°), and the agreement for pitch was poor (sample variance 15.5, SD 3.9°). In conclusion, the perception of correct anatomical alignment changes considerably with time. Different observers disagree on the correct anatomical alignment. Agreement among multiple observers was bad for pitch, moderate for yaw, and good for roll.

Keywords

human perception; standard head orientation; intra-observer variability; inter-observer variability

Introduction

Objects are more recognizable in some orientations than in others¹. Faces are easier to judge when they are oriented in anatomical alignment. In this alignment, a subject is erect and his head aligned with gravity. The head is not flexed, it is not rotated, and it is not tilted²⁻⁴.

A patient's head can be placed in anatomical alignment using two different methods: natural head posture and observer-guided alignment. In natural head posture, anatomical alignment is automatically attained by standing a patient and by asking him to look forward towards the horizon⁵⁻⁸. Alternatively, one can place the patient squarely in front of a mirror and ask him to stare at the reflection of his own eyes⁶. In observer-guided alignment, an observer directs the patient to rotate her head until it attains what we perceive to be anatomical alignment^{9,10}.

Although, most patients automatically place their heads into anatomical alignment when they stand in the natural posture, many do not. The natural head posture is particularly problematic in children and also in patients with torticollis, neuromuscular disorders, deformities of the axial skeleton, and eye muscle imbalances^{11,12}. Moreover, the success of the natural posture method at aligning a head into anatomical alignment is always judged by the observer's perception of the correct anatomical alignment¹³⁻¹⁶. For example, a patient will be considered not to be in anatomical alignment if his intrinsic sagittal plane (plane of symmetry) is tilted, even when in natural head posture.

Thus the observer's perception of the correct anatomical alignment is the ultimate determinant of the posture he or she uses to judge faces. Yet it is unknown whether an observer's perception of the correct anatomical alignment changes with time. It is also unknown whether different observers agree on the correct anatomical alignment. The purpose of this study was to answer these questions.

Subjects and methods

This study was conducted at the University of Texas School of Dentistry at Houston. Thirty dental students (subjects) participated as test observers. Twenty were male. The observers were selected randomly, without preference for age, gender, or race. The study was

exempted from the need for ethical approval by the Institutional Review Board of the University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston.

To measure how closely different viewers agree on the correct anatomical alignment, each test observer was asked to orient, into anatomical alignment, a three-dimensional (3D) color head photograph of a normal man. The orientations of all the observers were then compared. The 3D photograph used in the study was of a middle-aged man, who had a straight facial profile, facial symmetry, and normal occlusion (Fig. 1); the subject had volunteered the use of this photograph.

The 3D photograph was loaded into the software 3ds Max (Autodesk, San Rafael, CA, USA). Using this software, the image could be viewed from any direction and could be rotated. To measure the angulation of the head image, a Cartesian coordinate system was added to the 3D image at nasion. The coordinate system was deliberately not aligned with the head, so it could not be used to place the head into standard posture. The whole head was also misaligned to a random initial orientation (pitch 24.9°, roll 6.6°, and yaw 2.4°). This initial orientation was used for all tests. In order to avoid observer bias, the numbers of the initial orientation were zeroed out. In addition, the screen reference system of the software was hidden from view. Manipulation of the computer image was done by a single investigator (G.N.H.) following the verbal commands of the viewers. The observers sat directly in front of the computer monitor and were able to view the image from any angle. Several iterations of rotations were completed from different viewpoints. When the observers were satisfied with the head orientation, they were shown the final position from the front, side, top, and bottom before confirming it.

To assess whether the perception of the correct anatomical alignment changes over time, the experiment was repeated about 1 month later. The previous results were hidden from the observers during the second assessment. Finally, the orientations of the 3D photograph in anatomical alignment, in pitch, roll, and yaw, were recorded in a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. This was done for each of the subjects twice: first alignment (T1) and second alignment (T2).

Statistical analysis

To determine whether a person's perception of the correct anatomical alignment changes over time (intra-observer comparison), a Bland–Altman analysis of repeatability was completed¹⁷. The intra-observer Bland–Altman agreement was considered good if it was 1°, moderate if the agreement was between 1° and 2°, and poor if the agreement was >2°^{11,18}.

To determine how closely the different viewers agreed on the correct anatomical alignment (inter-observer comparison), the following steps were completed. First, the true anatomical alignment of the head image was determined. This was estimated by calculating the mean of all the observers' orientations. This strategy was based on the assumption that if one asks a large number of people to estimate something, the averaged answer is likely to be very close to the true¹⁷. Next, for each observer, his or her T1 and T2 alignments were pooled into a single orientation by calculating the mean alignment. Finally, the inter-observer agreement

was evaluated by assessing the sample variance of all the mean alignments. Since the sample variance was difficult to interpret clinically, the inter-observer agreement was also evaluated using the standard deviation (SD). The inter-observer agreement was considered good if the SD was $<1^{\circ}$, moderate if the SD was between 1° and 2° , and poor if the SD was $>2^{\circ}$ ^{11,18}.

Results

Intra-observer comparison

The Bland–Altman analysis of repeatability showed substantial variability between the first and second anatomical alignments. The differences were large for pitch and yaw and fair for roll. The coefficients of repeatability for pitch, yaw, and roll were 6.9° , 4.4° , and 2.4° , respectively, meaning that in 95% of instances, repeated estimations of the anatomical alignment would be expected to vary in pitch within $\pm 6.9^{\circ}$, in yaw within $\pm 4.4^{\circ}$, and in roll within $\pm 2.4^{\circ}$. None of these was clinically acceptable. As expected, the means of the differences between the first and second alignments were close to zero (pitch 0.2, yaw -0.5 , roll -0.1). The Bland–Altman plots for pitch, yaw, and roll are presented in Figs. 2–4.

Inter-observer comparison

The results showed that the inter-observer agreement for roll was good (sample variance 0.4, SD 0.7°), the agreement for yaw was moderate (sample variance 2.0, SD 1.4°), and the agreement for pitch was poor (sample variance 15.5, SD 3.9°).

Discussion

This study shows that the perception of correct anatomical alignment changes considerably with time. It also shows that different observers disagree on the correct anatomical alignment. Both types of estimation – repeatability by the same observer and agreement among multiple observers – were bad for pitch, yet they were fair or good for roll and yaw. Why?

When estimating the correct roll or yaw, an observer can use the clues of facial symmetry. For roll, the observer can look from the front at the internal facial features (eyes, ears, nose, mouth) and rotate the head until these features are symmetric¹⁹. The observer can also look at the external facial contour and rotate the head until the outline is symmetric.

For yaw, an observer can look at the head from above and be guided by the ears and by the contour of the head. As before, the observer can rotate the head until these features are symmetric. The clues from symmetry help us agree, within narrow margins, as to the correct anatomical alignment.

For pitch, however, there are no clues from symmetry. The observer looking at the face from the side has to decide if the head is rotated up, if it is straight, or if it is rotated down. These appraisals are more subjective, resulting in larger intra-observer and inter-observer variability.

What is the clinical significance of this study? Most clinicians accept that the standard anatomical alignment is the best head orientation to judge facial form^{20–22}. They also agree that an incorrect anatomical posture may result in misdiagnosis and flawed treatment^{4,12}. Furthermore, most clinicians concur that their perception of the correct head orientation influences anatomical alignment, because they guide patients into better alignment when they consider that the patient's self-attained posture is incorrect^{11,18,19}.

The results of this study suggest that the standardization of anatomical alignment may be difficult to achieve, as the perception of the correct anatomical alignment varies with time and differs among observers. Yet, a question that still remains unanswered is whether more experienced observers will have less varied perceptions.

Acknowledgments

Funding

This work was partially supported by NIH/NIDCR research grants R01DE022676, R01DE022676 (suppl), R01DE021863, and R01DE022676 (renewal).

The authors would like thank Jesse Knowles at 3dMD LLC for allowing us to use his 3D image.

References

1. Wade, N., Swanson, M. Visual perception: an introduction. Third. Hove, UK: Psychology Press; 2013.
2. Schatz, EC. MS Thesis. Department of Orthodontics, The University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston; Houston, Texas, USA: 2006. A new technique for recording natural head position in three dimensions.
3. Schatz EC, Xia JJ, Gateno J, English JD, Teichgraber JF, Garrett FA. The development of a new technique of recording and transferring natural head position (NHP) in three dimensions. *J Craniofac Surg*. 2010; 21:1452–1455. [PubMed: 20856035]
4. Swennen GR, Schutyser F, Barth EL, De Groeve P, De Mey A. A new method of 3-D cephalometry Part I: the anatomic Cartesian 3-D reference system. *J Craniofac Surg*. 2006; 17:314–325. [PubMed: 16633181]
5. Moorrees CF. Natural head position—a revival. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop*. 1994; 105:512–513. [PubMed: 8166103]
6. Moorrees CF, Kean MR. Natural head position, a basic consideration in the interpretation of cephalometric radiographs. *Am J Phys Anthropol*. 1958; 16:213–234.
7. Athanasiou, AE. Orthodontic cephalometry. First. St. Louis, MO: Mosby-Wolfe; 1995.
8. Proffitt, WR., Fields, HW, Jr. Contemporary orthodontics. Third. St. Louis, MO: Mosby; 2000.
9. Lundstrom A, Lundstrom F, Le Bret LM, Moorrees CF. Natural head position and natural head orientation: basic considerations in cephalometric analysis and research. *Eur J Orthod*. 1995; 17:111–120. [PubMed: 7781719]
10. Lundstrom F, Lundstrom A. Natural head position as a basis for cephalometric analysis. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop*. 1992; 101:244–247. [PubMed: 1539551]
11. Xia JJ, Gateno J, Teichgraber JF, Yuan P, Li J, Chen KC, Jajoo A, Nicol M, Alf DM. Algorithm for planning a double-jaw orthognathic surgery using a computer-aided surgical simulation (CASS) protocol. Part 2: three-dimensional cephalometry. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Surg*. 2015; 44:1441–1450. [PubMed: 26573563]
12. Xia JJ, McGrory JK, Gateno J, Teichgraber JF, Dawson BC, Kennedy KA, Lasky RE, English JD, Kau CH, McGrory KR. A new method to orient 3-dimensional computed tomography models to the natural head position: a clinical feasibility study. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg*. 2011; 69:584–591. [PubMed: 21353923]

13. Cooke MS, Wei SH. The reproducibility of natural head posture: a methodological study. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop.* 1988; 93:280–288. [PubMed: 3162636]
14. Cooke MS, Wei SH. A summary five-factor cephalometric analysis based on natural head posture and the true horizontal. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop.* 1988; 93:213–223. [PubMed: 3422777]
15. Peng L, Cooke MS. Fifteen-year reproducibility of natural head posture: a longitudinal study. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop.* 1999; 116:82–85. [PubMed: 10393584]
16. Solow B, Tallgren A. Natural head position in standing subjects. *Acta Odontol Scand.* 1971; 29:591–607. [PubMed: 5290983]
17. Bland JM, Altman DG. Statistical methods for assessing agreement between two methods of clinical measurement. *Lancet.* 1986; 1:307–310. [PubMed: 2868172]
18. Gateno J, Jajoo A, Nicol M, Xia JJ. The primal sagittal plane of the head: a new concept. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Surg.* 2016; 45:399–405. [PubMed: 26708049]
19. Wilson HR, Wilkinson F, Lin LM, Castillo M. Perception of head orientation. *Vision Res.* 2000; 40:459–472. [PubMed: 10820605]
20. Jiang J, Xu T, Lin J. The relationship between estimated and registered natural head position. *Angle Orthod.* 2007; 77:1019–1024. [PubMed: 18004907]
21. Leung MY, Lo J, Leung YY. Accuracy of different modalities to record natural head position in 3 dimensions: a systematic review. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg.* 2016; 74:2261–2284. [PubMed: 27235181]
22. Cassi D, De Biase C, Tonni I, Gandolfini M, Di Blasio A, Piancino MG. Natural position of the head: review of two-dimensional and three-dimensional methods of recording. *Br J Oral Maxillofac Surg.* 2016; 54:233–240. [PubMed: 26896079]

Figure 1.

The 3D color photograph used in the study. The 3D photograph was first deliberately misaligned into a random initial orientation (pitch 24.9°, yaw 2.4°, and roll 6.6°) and zeroed out. (A) Frontal view. (B) Lateral view. (C) Top view.

Figure 2.
Repeatability of the standard head orientation—pitch.

Figure 3.
Repeatability of the standard head orientation—yaw.

Figure 4.
Repeatability of the standard head orientation—roll.