



**HAL**  
open science

## Validation of an Instrumented Hammer for Rhinoplasty Osteotomies: A Cadaveric Study

Justine Giunta, Léo Lamassoure, Lara Nokovitch, Giuseppe Rosi, Anne-  
Sophie Poudrel, J-P Meningaud, Guillaume Haïat, Romain Bosc

### ► To cite this version:

Justine Giunta, Léo Lamassoure, Lara Nokovitch, Giuseppe Rosi, Anne- Sophie Poudrel, et al.. Validation of an Instrumented Hammer for Rhinoplasty Osteotomies: A Cadaveric Study. *Facial Plastic Surgery & Aesthetic Medicine*, 2021, 10.1089/fpsam.2021.0107 . hal-03430400

**HAL Id: hal-03430400**

**<https://hal.science/hal-03430400>**

Submitted on 16 Nov 2021

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1 Validation of an Instrumented Hammer for Rhinoplasty Osteotomies: A Cadaveric Study

2

3 **Short running head:** Instrumented Hammer for Rhinoplasty

4

5 Justine Giunta, MD<sup>1,2</sup>; Léo Lamassoure<sup>2</sup>; Lara Nokovitch, MD<sup>3</sup>; Giuseppe Rosi<sup>2</sup>; Anne-

6 Sophie Poudrel<sup>2</sup>; J-P.Meningaud, MD, PhD<sup>1</sup>; Guillaume Haïat, PhD<sup>2</sup>; Romain Bosc, MD,

7 PhD<sup>1,4</sup>.

8 1. Hôpital Henri Mondor, Plastic, Reconstructive, Aesthetic and Maxillofacial Surgery

9 Department, 51 avenue du Maréchal de Lattre de Tassigny, 94000 Créteil, France

10 2. CNRS, Laboratoire de Modélisation et de Simulation Multi Échelle, UMR CRNS

11 8208, 61 avenue du Général de Gaulle, Créteil 94010, France

12 3. Hôpital Beaujon, Maxillo-facial Surgery Department, 100 boulevard du Général

13 Leclerc, 92110 Clichy, France

14 4. INSERM U955 IMRB, Team 10, 94000 Creteil, France; UPEC Paris Est-Creteil

15 University, Faculty of Medicine, F-94000 Creteil, France

16

17 **Corresponding author:**

18 Romain Bosc, MD, PhD

19 Hôpital Henri Mondor, Plastic, Reconstructive, Aesthetic and Maxillofacial Surgery

20 Department, 50 avenue du Maréchal de Lattre de Tassigny, 94000 Créteil, France

21 Email: romainbosc@gmail.com

22

1 **Keywords:** Rhinoplasty; nasal osteotomy; assisted surgery.

2

3 **Products & Devices:**

4

5 • Surgical mallet (32-6906-26, Zepf, Tuttlingen, Germany)

6 • Piezoelectric sensor (208C04, PCB Piezotronics, Depew, NY, USA)

7 • Osteotome (32-6002-10, Zepf, Tuttlingen, Germany)

8 • Data acquisition module (NI 9234, National Instruments, Austin, TX, USA)

9 • LabVIEW (National Instruments, Austin, TX, USA)

10 • Matlab (The MathWorks, Inc., Natick, Massachusetts, USA)

11 • Video camera (L-920M3, Spedal, Taiwan)

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 **Key points:**

2 Question: Is it possible to determine **the bone properties around the osteotome tip** and the

3 occurrence of fractures with a smart hammer during the nasal osteotomies for rhinoplasties?

4 Findings: **A predictive algorithm** was developed to detect the occurrence of fractures, and the

5 close proximity of the osteotome to the frontal bone.

6 **Meaning: Rhinoplasty surgeons may value the ability to have instant feedback while**

7 **performing nasal osteotomies.**

8

1 **Abstract:**

2 *Background:* Osteotomies during rhinoplasty are usually based on surgeon's proprioception to  
3 determine the number, energy and trajectory of impacts.

4 *Objective:* The first objective was to detect the occurrence of fractures. The second objective  
5 was to determine when the thicker frontal bone was encountered by the osteotome.

6 *Materials and Methods:* An instrumented hammer was used to measure the impact force  
7 during lateral osteotomies on 9 human anatomic specimens. A prediction algorithm was  
8 developed using machine learning techniques, to detect the occurrence of fractures, and the  
9 proximity of the osteotome to the frontal bone.

10 *Results:* The algorithm was able to predict the occurrence of fractures and the proximity to the  
11 frontal bone with a prediction rate of 83%, 91%, and 93% when allowing for an error of 0, 1,  
12 and 2 impacts, respectively. The location of the osteotome in the frontal bone was predicted  
13 with an error of 7,7%.

14 *Conclusion:* An osteotomy hammer measuring the impact force when performing lateral  
15 osteotomies can predict the occurrence of fractures and the proximity to the frontal bone,  
16 providing the surgeon with instant feedback.

17

18

19

20

21

22

## 1 **Introduction:**

2 Rhinoplasty is a common intervention in plastic surgery, representing around 9% of all plastic  
3 surgery procedures<sup>1</sup>. It is a complex intervention with a long learning process<sup>2</sup> and risks of  
4 complications<sup>3-4</sup>, even for an experienced surgeon.

5 Osteotomies are particularly crucial when taking care of deviated, hunchbacked noses, with a  
6 nasal bridge and / or a wide base<sup>5-6</sup>, **and must** be performed with caution to avoid any  
7 cosmetic or functional complications that could result in permanent deformities<sup>6-7</sup>.

8 Nasal osteotomies are often performed without direct visual control, guided only by the  
9 surgeon's proprioception (touch, hearing). However, it remains difficult to quantify bone  
10 density and to define precisely the osteotomy pathway, which would be of interest, especially  
11 for lateral osteotomies which are the most prone to variations and complications<sup>8</sup>.

12 Our team developed a prototype of surgical navigational **aid, using a hammer instrumented**  
13 with a piezoelectric force sensor **originally designed to determine** the stability of hip  
14 prosthesis<sup>9-11</sup>. This approach was validated *in vitro*<sup>12</sup>, *ex vivo*<sup>13-14</sup> and in **Human anatomic**  
15 **specimen**<sup>15</sup>. More recently, **it was adapted to nasal** osteotomies, first *in vitro* with composite  
16 materials and bone mimicking phantoms<sup>16</sup>, then *ex vivo* in rabbit head samples<sup>17</sup>.

17 **Measuring the force generated when performing rhinoplasty osteotomies with this osteotomy**  
18 **hammer might help surgeons to adapt their** impact strength, determine the progress of the  
19 osteotome through **the bone**, anticipate an uncontrolled fracture, and obtain objective and  
20 quantified information regarding the osteotome pathway. **The clinical implementation of this**  
21 **approach could provide the surgeon with objective data regarding the nature of the bone**  
22 **located at the osteotome tip, the presence of a fracture and the proximity of the osteotome to**  
23 **frontal bone, without modifying the operating time, the information being given in real time.**  
24 **It could also help young surgeons to achieve a faster learning curve for rhinoplasty**<sup>18</sup>.

1 The objective of the present study was to determine if the piezoelectric device could detect  
2 unintended early nasal bone fractures, and the transition from the thinner nasal bone to the  
3 thicker nasofrontal junction and frontal bone.

4

#### 5 **Materials & Methods:**

6 Nine human anatomical specimen with a mean age of  $85 \pm 14$  years old were used for the  
7 assessment of our instrumented hammer. None had nasal trauma, nasal malformation or nasal  
8 surgery.

9 The study design was approved, and the human anatomical specimen were requested to the  
10 Fer à Moulin surgical school of Paris. All donors had previously completed a hand-written,  
11 dated and signed statement confirming their wish to donate their body<sup>19</sup>.

12 All osteotomies were performed by the same operator for a matter of reproducibility. An open  
13 rhinoplasty technique was performed in order to visualize the motion of the osteotome (video  
14 1). For each subject, two lateral ascending curved osteotomies (“low to high” type<sup>18</sup>) were  
15 performed, leading to a total number of 18 osteotomies. The path of the osteotome from its  
16 starting point to the frontal bone was always the same, and followed a line drawn beforehand  
17 on the nasal pyramid (video 1).

18 The device used in this study was similar to the one described by Hubert et al.<sup>16</sup> and  
19 Lamassoure et al.<sup>17</sup>, and allowed to analyze the osteotome force-feedback signal sensed by a  
20 piezoelectric sensor placed on a surgical mallet (Fig. 1). A data acquisition module was used  
21 to record the signal  $s(t)$  corresponding to the variation of the force-feedback signal according  
22 to time. The same signal processing method as the one developed *in vitro* was applied, and  
23 two indicators  $\tau$  and  $\lambda$ , respectively related to the rigidity and viscoelasticity of the impacted  
24 material, were calculated for each signal<sup>16</sup>.

1 **The movements of the osteotome were** recorded using a video camera in order to track  
2 fracture initiation. After each impact, the state of the bone-osteotome system (BOS) was  
3 classified based on the image obtained with the camera and the surgeon proprioception. The  
4 BOS was classified into three classes defined as follows: “Fracture” (osteotome tip located in  
5 a visible fracture), “Bone” (osteotome tip in bone tissue, no visible fracture), and “Hard  
6 Bone” or “HB” (osteotome tip in frontal bone). Based on the aforementioned classification,  
7 the impacts were classified into four groups illustrated in Fig. 2, depending on the state of the  
8 BOS before and after the impact.

9 A dedicated iterative algorithm based on machine learning and using Support Vector Machine  
10 (SVM) classifications was developed in order to predict the state of the BOS after each impact  
11  $I_n$ . The algorithm was applied to all 531 impacts corresponding to 18 osteotomies.

12 Classification #A was applied for all impacts and aimed at determining whether the BOS after  
13 the impact belonged to the “Hard Bone” state or to other states. Classification #B was applied  
14 when the state of the BOS before the impact  $I_n$  belonged to the “Bone” state and aimed at  
15 determining whether the BOS after the impact  $I_n$  belonged to the “Bone” or “Fracture” state.  
16 Classification #C was applied when the state of the BOS before the impact  $I_n$  belonged to the  
17 “Fracture” state and aimed at determining whether the BOS after the impact  $I_n$  belonged to the  
18 “Bone” or “Fracture” state.

19 The BOS state of the first impact was initialized as “Bone”. Then, for each impact  $I_n$  ( $n > 1$   
20 corresponding to the impact number), the algorithm used four **input parameters** to determine  
21 to state of the BOS of  $I_n$ :

- 22 • the state of the BOS for the impact  $I_{n-1}$  (“Bone”, “Fracture”, “HB”)
- 23 • the value of  $\tau_n = \tau$  corresponding to the impact  $I_n$
- 24 • the value of  $\Delta\tau_n = \tau_n - \tau_{n-1}$ , where  $\tau_{n-1}$  corresponds to the value of  $\tau$  for the impact  $I_{n-1}$
- 25 • the value of  $\lambda_n = \lambda$  corresponding to the impact  $I_n$



1 Finally, the state of the BOS predicted by the algorithm was compared to the state of the BOS  
2 observed with the video tracking analysis.

3 Descriptive statistics were produced using Excel® (Microsoft corp, USA). An ANOVA  
4 analysis was performed for all osteotomies.

5

## 6 **Results:**

7 **Figure 3 shows the comparison between signals obtained in the “Bone”, “Fracture”, and**  
8 **“Hard Bone” states.** The ANOVA analysis carried out for all osteotomies showed that the  
9 values of  $\tau$  (respectively of  $\lambda$ ) were significantly lower (respectively higher) when the  
10 osteotome was in the frontal bone than when it was in the nasal bone ( $p < 10^{-10}$  and  $p < 10^{-4}$ ,  
11 respectively).

12 The results of the three classification studies are shown in Fig. 4. Figure 4A, 4B, and 4C show  
13 the prediction areas calculated by the SVM model and the values of the parameters **for each**  
14 **classification.** The boundaries separating the prediction areas calculated by the SVM classifier  
15 are displayed as white lines. Figure 4A shows the values of  $\tau$  and  $\lambda$  when the BOS state after  
16 the impact corresponds to “Hard Bone” (blue, dots) and to other states (yellow, crosses).  
17 Figure 4B shows the values of  $\Delta\tau$  and  $\tau$  when the BOS state after the impact (before which the  
18 BOS state was in the “Bone” state) corresponds to “Fracture” (magenta, crosses) and “Bone”  
19 (green, dots). Figure 4C shows the values of  $\Delta\tau$  and  $\tau$  when the BOS state after the impact  
20 (before which the BOS state was in the “Fracture” state) corresponds to “Fracture” (pink,  
21 crosses) and “Bone” (blue, dots).

22 The results were implemented by the prediction algorithm in order to predict the state of the  
23 BOS after each impact. The results obtained with the algorithm (see Table 1) and with the  
24 video motion tracking system were consistent in 83% of the cases. The video motion tracking  
25 system found the presence of a fracture which was not predicted by the algorithm in 10% of

1 cases. Conversely, the video motion tracking system found that the BOS corresponded to  
2 “Bone”, while a fracture was predicted by the algorithm in 2% of cases. The algorithm failed  
3 to predict a BOS corresponding to “HB” in 2% of cases, while a false prediction of “HB” was  
4 made in 3% of cases. The third and fourth columns of Table 1 show the results when allowing  
5 an error for one and two impacts between the two modalities, respectively.

6

## 7 **Discussion:**

8 This study is original as it proposes the use of an instrumented hammer, to guide the surgeon  
9 throughout rhinoplasty osteotomies. The results presented for our human anatomical specimen  
10 are in qualitative agreement with our previous animal study<sup>17</sup>.

11 When performing osteotomies, anatomical modifications generate a lack of precision,  
12 complicating the use of navigational surgical aid systems based on CT-scan imaging. The  
13 instrumented hammer allows to perform non-invasive measurements providing information  
14 regarding the bone passed through. Coupling the data recovered with this system to CT scan  
15 data or a navigated osteotome<sup>20,21</sup> could increase the accuracy of the surgical procedure. The  
16 technique described herein is complementary to navigated osteotomes because it predicts the  
17 occurrence of uncontrolled fractures, and the proximity of the osteotome to the frontal bone.

18 By comparing bone density to the data acquired intraoperatively using the instrumented  
19 hammer, it may become possible to precisely locate the tip of the osteotome, and apply the  
20 neuronavigation principles developed in otorhinolaryngologic surgery, neurosurgery, and in a  
21 few cases in rhinoplasty in a totally non-invasive manner, and without any preoperative  
22 preparation.

23 However, this study presents several limitations. First, a single variation of the lateral nasal  
24 osteotomy was studied here - the low to high path. As such, the prediction model has  
25 relatively limited clinical utility, as the model's hypotheses are not necessarily applicable to

1 other osteotomy paths (low to low, double-level, etc.). The variability in osteotomy  
2 trajectories will certainly influence the modeling, as the thickness of **the bone** along the  
3 frontal process of the maxilla, nasal bone proper, and frontal bone may vary considerably  
4 based upon the **trajectory**. **Second**, the overlying skin **was** reflected off the nasal bone, which  
5 **reduced the soft tissue resistance that may have been** present in a typical clinical situation  
6 **with percutaneous osteotomies**. **Third**, the orientation of the osteotome tip to the bony surface  
7 **wasn't representative of** what happens intra-operatively, **particularly if the osteotomies are**  
8 **done through a lateral percutaneous approach** versus through an intranasal approach at the  
9 piriform rim. **Fourth, the osteotome was too large** and the cutting-edge interface with the bone  
10 **was likely to** have a broader transmission of force than would be seen with a typical (2 mm)  
11 osteotome **used to perform lateral osteotomies**. **Fifth**, the influence of soft tissues and skin<sup>12</sup>  
12 **was not taken into account**. **Such effects could** be added to the model as a variable to make it  
13 more robust<sup>22</sup>. **A future version of the algorithm should focus on reducing the number of**  
14 **“Bone” false positive**.

15  
16 Our results suggest that employing an instrumented hammer in combination with deep  
17 learning techniques may constitute an interesting approach to **collect** information on the  
18 biomechanical properties of **the bone located at** the osteotome tip during rhinoplasty. The  
19 significant **difference in density between the frontal and nasal bones** allows to determine when  
20 the osteotome reaches the end of the osteotomy pathway. In addition, the instrumented  
21 hammer makes it possible to assess the early onset of bone fractures. Such information is  
22 critical to allow adaptation of the following impacts' strength in order to avoid propagation of  
23 an existing fracture more than desired. The instrumented hammer could be, with the input of  
24 more comprehensive secondary studies, an easy-to-use decision support system that could  
25 provide clinicians with relevant and objective information to optimize surgical procedures. **In**

1 addition, it could help manufacturers to develop and monitor the effectiveness of surgical  
2 instruments used for osteotomies.

3

4 Declaration of Competing Interest: None

5 Funding: N/A

6 Ethical Approval: N/A

7 **Acknowledgements:**

8 This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the  
9 European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation program (grant agreement No  
10 682001, project ERC Consolidator Grant 2015 BoneImplant). The authors would like to  
11 acknowledge the support of the “Prématuration programme” of the CNRS through the  
12 Osteome project.

13 **Authorship confirmation statement:**

14 Romain Bosc, Justine Giunta, Anne-Sophie Poudrel, Lara Nokovitch, Giuseppe Rossi, Leo  
15 Lamassoure, Guillaume Haiat and Pr Jean-Paul Meningaud have contributed to the  
16 conception of this work, the acquisition, the analysis and the interpretation of data. They have  
17 drafted the work and revised it critically. They have given their final approval of the version  
18 to be published.

19 **Conflicts of Interest Statement:**

20 Romain Bosc, Justine Giunta, Anne-Sophie Poudrel, Lara Nokovitch, Giuseppe Rossi, Leo  
21 Lamassoure, Guillaume Haiat and Pr Jean-Paul Meningaud certify that they have no  
22 competing interests, no personal financial interests and no other conflict of interest. Nothing  
23 to disclose.

24

25

26

1   References

- 2   1.     Heidekrueger PI, Juran S, Ehrl D et al. Global aesthetic surgery statistics: a closer  
3   look. *J Plast Surg Hand Surg* 2017;51:270-274.
- 4   2.     Saban Y. Rhinoplasty: lessons from "errors" : From anatomy and experience to the  
5   concept of sequential primary rhinoplasty. *HNO* 2018;66:15-25.
- 6   3.     Layliev J, Gupta V, Kaoutzanis C et al. Incidence and Preoperative Risk Factors for  
7   Major Complications in Aesthetic Rhinoplasty: Analysis of 4978 Patients. *Aesthet Surg J*  
8   2017;37:757-767.
- 9   4.     Shiffman MA, Di Giuseppe A. *Advanced Aesthetic Rhinoplasty: Art, Science, and*  
10   *New Clinical Techniques.* (Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Germany). 2013.
- 11   5.     Dobratz EJ, Hilger PA. Osteotomies. *Clin Plast Surg* 2010;37:301-311.
- 12   6.     Daniel RK. *Mastering rhinoplasty: a comprehensive atlas of surgical techniques with*  
13   *integrated video clips.* (Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Germany). 2010.
- 14   7.     Siemionow MZ, Eisenmann-Klein M. Nasal reconstruction and aesthetic rhinoplasty.  
15   In: *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery.* MZ Siemionow and M Eisenmann-Klein, eds.  
16   (Springer London Ltd, London, UK). 2010; p. 775.
- 17   8.     Uraloglu M, Efe G, Karacal R. Lateral Osteotomy Fixation Technique in Rhinoplasty.  
18   *J Craniofac Surg* 2019;30:e600-e603.
- 19   9.     Mathieu V, Michel A, Flouzat Lachaniette CH et al. Variation of the impact duration  
20   during the in vitro insertion of acetabular cup implants. *Med Eng Phys* 2013;35:1558-1563.
- 21   10.    Michel A, Bosc R, Mathieu V et al. Monitoring the press-fit insertion of an acetabular  
22   cup by impact measurements: influence of bone abrasion. *Proc Inst Mech Eng H*  
23   2014;228:1027-1034.
- 24   11.    Michel A, Bosc R, Vayron R et al. In vitro evaluation of the acetabular cup primary  
25   stability by impact analysis. *J Biomech Eng* 2015;137.

- 1 12. Bosc R, Tijou A, Rosi G et al. Influence of soft tissue in the assessment of the primary  
2 stability of acetabular cup implants using impact analyses. *Clin Biomech (Bristol, Avon)*  
3 2017;55:7-13.
- 4 13. Albini Lomami H, Damour C, Rosi G et al. Ex vivo estimation of cementless femoral  
5 stem stability using an instrumented hammer. *Clin Biomech (Bristol, Avon)* 2020;76:105006.
- 6 14. Michel A, Bosc R, Sailhan F et al. Ex vivo estimation of cementless acetabular cup  
7 stability using an impact hammer. *Med Eng Phys* 2016;38:80-86.
- 8 15. Dubory A, Rosi G, Tijou A et al. A cadaveric validation of a method based on impact  
9 analysis to monitor the femoral stem insertion. *J Mech Behav Biomed Mater*  
10 2020;103:103535.
- 11 16. Hubert A, Rosi G, Bosc R et al. Using an impact hammer to retrieve the geometrical  
12 and mechanical properties of a sample during an osteotomy: an in vitro study. *J Biomech*  
13 2020;142:071009.
- 14 17. Lamassoure L, Giunta J, Rosi G et al. Using an Impact Hammer to Perform  
15 Biomechanical Measurements during Osteotomies: Study of an Animal Model. *Proc Inst*  
16 *Mech Eng H* 2021;23:1-8.
- 17 18. Tahamiler R, Yener M. Lateral Osteotomy in Rhinoplasty. In: *Advanced Aesthetic*  
18 *Rhinoplasty*. MA Shiffman and A Di Giuseppe, eds. (Springer, Berlin, Germany). 2013.
- 19 19. McHanwell S, Brenner E, Chirculescu ARM et al. The legal and ethical framework  
20 governing Body Donation in Europe - A review of current practice and recommendations for  
21 good practice. *Eur J Anat* 2008;12:1-24.
- 22 20. Wick EH, Whipple ME, Hohman MH et al. Computer-Aided Rhinoplasty Using a  
23 Novel "navigated" Nasal Osteotomy Technique: A Pilot Study. *Ann Otol Rhinol Laryngol*  
24 2021;3489421996846.

1 21. Ogino A, Onishi K, Nakamichi M et al. Navigation-Assisted Nasal Bone Osteotomy  
2 for Malunited Fracture. J Craniofac Surg 2018;29:156-158.


3 22. Cortes C, Vapnik V. Support-vector networks. Machine Learning 1995;20:273-297.

4

5

1 **Figure:**

2 Figure 1. Experimental configuration considered for the osteotomies.



3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10


11

12

13




- 1 Figure 2. Schematic illustration of the different groups of impacts. The osteotome, bone  
2 tissue, and fractures are represented in grey, yellow, and brown, respectively. The  
3 corresponding group is indicated for each configuration: I: Bone to Bone (B2B), II: Bone to  
4 Fracture (B2F), III: Fracture to Bone (F2B), IV: Fracture to Fracture (F2F).




- 5  
6  
7

- 1 Figure 3. Three examples of signals obtained for each of the different states: “Bone”,
- 2 “Fracture”, and “Hard Bone”. The corresponding values of  $\tau$  and  $\lambda$  are indicated.



- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14

1 Figure 4. Results of the three classification studies. A: The prediction areas for the “Hard  
2 Bone” BOS state and to other BOS states are displayed in dark blue and yellow, respectively.  
3 The points belonging to the “Hard Bone” BOS state and to other BOS states are displayed  
4 with dots and crosses, respectively. B: The prediction areas for the B2B and B2F groups are  
5 displayed in green and magenta, respectively. The points belonging to the B2B and B2F  
6 groups are displayed with dots and crosses, respectively. C: The prediction areas for the F2B  
7 and F2F groups are displayed in cyan and pink, respectively. The points belonging to the F2B  
8 and F2F groups are displayed with dots and crosses, respectively.



9

1 **Tables**

2 Table 1. Performance of the algorithm for the prediction of the state of the bone-osteotome  
3 system after each impact. The second column shows the raw performances of the algorithm,  
4 while the third and fourth column show the performances when allowing a tolerance of 1 and  
5 2 impacts, respectively.

	<b>Correct Predictions</b>	<b><i>Fracture</i> False Positive</b>	<b><i>Bone</i> False Positive</b>	<b><i>HB</i> False Positive</b>
<b>Actual Performance</b>	442/531 (83%)	10/531 (2%)	64/531 (12%)	15/531 (3%)
<b>Perf. with ±1 Tolerance</b>	480/531 (91%)	1/531 (0%)	39/531 (7%)	11/531 (2%)
<b>Perf. with ±2 Tolerance</b>	496/531 (93%)	0/531 (0%)	25/531 (5%)	10/531 (2%)

6