## SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

A machine learning framework for automated diagnosis and computer-assisted planning in plastic and reconstructive surgery

Paul G.M. Knoops<sup>1,2,†</sup>, Athanasios Papaioannou<sup>1,3,†</sup>, Alessandro Borghi<sup>1</sup>, Richard. W.F.
Breakey<sup>1</sup>, Alexander T. Wilson<sup>4</sup>, Owase Jeelani<sup>1</sup>, Stefanos Zafeiriou<sup>3</sup>, Derek Steinbacher<sup>4</sup>,
Bonnie L. Padwa<sup>2</sup>, David J. Dunaway<sup>1</sup>, Silvia Schievano<sup>1,\*</sup>

- UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, London, UK & Craniofacial Unit, Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children, London, UK
- Department of Plastic and Oral Surgery, Boston Children's Hospital & Harvard School of Dental Medicine, Boston, MA, USA
- 3. Department of Computing, Imperial College London, London, UK
- Department of Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, Yale University School of Medicine, New Haven, CT, USA
- <sup>†</sup> These authors contributed equally to this work.
- \* Email: <u>s.schievano@ucl.ac.uk</u>



## **Supplementary figures**

**Supplementary Fig. 1 Patient characteristics. a**, Number of patients per surgical procedures, LF1: Le Fort 1 osteotomy, BSSO: bilateral split osteotomy, GP: genioplasty. **b**, Number of patients with syndromic diagnosis, HFM: hemifacial microsomia. **c**, Number of patients according to the main indication for surgery: history or no history cleft lip and/or palate (CLP). For those without a history of CLP, often multiple indications are present. **d**, Timing of preoperative and postoperative scans: average preoperative scan was  $73 \pm 86$  days before surgery (red, dotted line) and the average postoperative scan  $326 \pm 123$  days (green, dotted line) after surgery.



Supplementary Fig. 2 Hyper-parameters settings for t-SNE embedding. Different

visualisations for the manifold including non-patient (blue, n=500), preoperative patient (red, n=140) and postoperative patient (green, n=133) faces for perplexity = 2, 5, 10, 30, 50 and iterations = 1,000, 5,000.



**Supplementary Fig. 3 Error evaluation. a**, Colourmaps illustrate that the patient-specific simulations are better than predicting a face closer to the mean volunteer or the mean postoperative face; a comparison of error between the postoperative 3D scan (n=127) and patient-specific ridge regression simulations ( $1.1 \pm 0.3$  mm), the average postoperative face ( $1.6 \pm 0.5$  mm), and the average non-patient face ( $1.8 \pm 0.5$  mm). **b**, Colourmaps elucidate how the best patient-specific simulation compares to the ground-truth postoperative face, the mean postoperative face, and the mean volunteer face.