



## The Cephalometric Norms of Various Ethnicities and their Significance

Eyas Abuhijleh<sup>1\*</sup>, Amjad Al Taki<sup>2</sup> and Ahmad Rahhal<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Assistant Professor, Orthodontic Department, University of Science and Technology of Fujairah, United Arab Emirates

<sup>2</sup>Associate Professor, Private orthodontic Practice, United Arab Emirates

<sup>3</sup>Associate Professor, Department of orthodontics, Arab American University, Jenin.

**\*Corresponding Author:** Eyas Abuhijleh, Assistant Professor, Orthodontic Department, University of Science and Technology of Fujairah, United Arab Emirates.

**Received:** June 24, 2019; **Published:** July 08, 2019

Evaluating the Cephalometric characteristics of the craniofacial structure is very useful in planning orthodontic treatment, which becomes even better by taking into consideration the facial and cephalometric morphology of the patient's ethnic group. For over 50 years, cephalometric norms have been included within orthodontics. A number of scientists have conducted cephalometric analyses and suggested norms accordingly such as Steiner [1], Jarabak [2], Downs [3], Ricketts [4], Sassouni [5]. However, most of the Cephalometric norms available concern Caucasians, while other ethnic groups are often ignored.

Significantly, some variances between different ethnic groups' dentofacial relationships have been detected, which encouraged researchers to develop standards for different races and ethnicities. So far, the cephalometric norms of Arab people have been the concern of very few researchers. For example, Bishara, *et al* [6]. developed cephalometric norms concerning male and female teenagers from Egypt and drew a comparison between and a matched Iowa teenager sample. A strong similarity between the two samples was found regarding the whole facial morphology. Similarly, Hamdan and Rock [7] studied cephalometric standards of Jordanians. They made a comparison between the cephalometric norms they developed for the Jordanian population studied and the Eastman standards and concluded that the Jordanian sample has a shorter lower face and proclined upper and lower incisors compared to the British sample.

Although facial skeleton and its soft tissues drape are effective factors in the overall facial balance, the majority of the available studies focus on determining the teeth position based on the

skeletal structure. Nonetheless, scarce research considered the soft tissue as an element in the profile assessment including Ricketts esthetic plane [4], Holdaway analysis [8] and Burstone's soft tissue analysis [9].

Moreover, the last ten years witnessed an increase in the importance of facial and dental esthetics. In fact, a paradigm shift has taken place in the field of orthodontics where esthetics became central, particularly regarding the soft tissues surrounding the mouth. However, facial esthetics is a subjective issue because harmonized and balanced facial components are not always attractive. Holdaway [10] stated that patients should be given the optimum balance and harmony of the facial components because it is crucial to the psychological and social development and self-image of young people.

The facial variances among different ethnic groups such as Caucasian [11], Mexican American [12], Chinese [13-15], Japanese [16-20], Korean [21,22], and Turkish [23] have been the subject of some studies. However, there is a paucity of studies attempted to develop soft tissue cephalometric norms for some ethnic groups in the Middle East, although facial esthetics is as important to these groups as to western ethnicities. In fact, history is abundant with beauty recipes and human being related to all cultures have made many attempts to be more beautiful and attractive [24]. Currently, many young people around the globe undergo orthodontic treatment and orthognathic surgeries to become more beautiful and attractive. Therefore, developing hard and soft tissue cephalometric norms for all ethnic groups is a necessity at present as treatment plans are arranged according to these norms [25].

## Bibliography

1. Steiner CC. "Cephalometrics for you and me". *American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics* 39 (1953): 729-755.
2. Jarabak JR and Fizzel JA. "Technique and treatment with light wire edgewise appliances". 2nd. ed. St. Louis: Mosby, (1972).
3. Downs WB. "Variation in facial relationships: their significance in the treatment and prognosis". *American Journal of Orthodontics* 34 (1948): 812-840.
4. Ricketts RM. "Planning treatment on the basis of the facial pattern and an estimate of its growth". *The Angle Orthodontist* 27 (1957): 14-37.
5. Sassouni V. "A Roentgenographic cephalometric analysis of cephalofacial-dental relationships". *American Journal of Orthodontics* 41.10 (1955): 735-764.
6. Bishara S., et al. "Cephalometric comparison of dentofacial parameters between Egyptians and North American adolescents". *American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics* 97 (1990): 413-421.
7. Hamdan AM and Rock WP. "Cephalometric norms in an Arabic population". *Journal of Orthodontics* 28 (2001): 297-300.
8. Holdaway RA. "Changes in relationship of points A and B during orthodontic treatment". *American Journal of Orthodontics* 42 (1956): 176-193.
9. Burstone CJ. "Integumental contour and extension patterns". *The Angle Orthodontist* 23 (1959): 146-157.
10. Holdaway RA. "Soft-tissue cephalometric analysis and its use in orthodontic treatment planning. Part I". *American Journal of Orthodontics* 84 (1983): 1-28.
11. Zylinski CG., et al. "Analysis of soft tissue facial profile in white males". *American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics* 101 (1992): 514-518.
12. Swlerenga D., et al. "Cephalometric values for adult Mexican-Americans". *American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics* 106 (1994): 146-155.
13. Cooke MS., et al. "Cephalometric "standards" for the southern Chinese". *European Journal of Orthodontics* 10 (1988): 264-272.
14. Wu J., et al. "Chinese norms of McNamara's cephalometric analysis". *The Angle Orthodontist* 77 (2007): 12-20.
15. Lew KK., et al. "Soft-tissue cephalometric norms in Chinese adults with esthetic facial profiles". *Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery* (1992): 1184-1189.
16. Ioi H., et al. "Comparison of cephalometric norms between Japanese and Caucasian adults in antero-posterior and vertical dimension". *European Journal of Orthodontics* 29 (2007): 493-499.
17. Alcalde RE., et al. "Soft tissue cephalometric norms in Japanese adults". *American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics* 118 (2000): 84-89.
18. Miyajima K., et al. "Craniofacial structure of Japanese and European-American adults with normal occlusions and well-balanced faces". *American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics* (1996).
19. Uesato G., et al. "Steiner cephalometric norms for Japanese and Japanese Americans". *American Journal of Orthodontics* 73 (1978): 321-327.
20. Hwang HS., et al. "Ethnic differences in the soft tissue profile of Korean and European-American adults with normal occlusion and well-balanced faces". *The Angle Orthodontist* 72 (2002): 72-80.
21. Park IC., et al. "A cephalometric study of Korean adults". *American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics* 96 (1989): 54-59.
22. Evanko AM., et al. "Mesh diagram analysis: developing a norm for Puerto Rican Americans". *The Angle Orthodontist* 67 (1997): 381-388.
23. Basciftci FA., et al. "Determination of Hold away soft tissue norms in Anatolian Turkish adults". *American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics* 123 (2003): 395-400.
24. A Al Taki., et al. "Dentofacial Cephalometric Values for Emirati Adults with Normal Occlusion and Well-Balanced Faces". *Smile Dental Journal* 5.4 (2011): 6-10.
25. Amjad Al Taki., et al. "Facial Soft Tissue Values in Persian Adults with Normal Occlusion and Well-Balanced Faces". *The Angle Orthodontist* 79.3 (2009): 491-494.

**Volume 3 Issue 8 August 2019**

© All rights are reserved by Eyas Abuhijleh., et al.