

Supplementary Material

Aleksandar Milojevic¹, Daniel Peter², Niko B. Huber², Luis Azevedo³, Andrei Latyshev³, Irena Sailer³, Markus Gross¹, Bernhard Thomaszewski^{1,2}, Barbara Solenthaler¹, and Baran Gözcü¹

¹ Department of Computer Science, ETH Zurich, Switzerland

² Align Technology

³ Faculty of Medicine, University of Geneva, Switzerland

Table 1. Ablation of activations on the CBCT test set (B) with AutoSkull+. As the purpose of our work is to serve an orthodontics simulation pipeline, we decided for a configuration that benefits the mouth area the most.

Activation	Mean Error:Face Area	Mean Error:Mouth Area
gelu	1.54mm \pm 0.29	1.38mm \pm 0.21
relu	1.56mm \pm 0.18	1.36mm \pm 0.18
elu	1.56mm \pm 0.23	1.43mm \pm 0.24

Table 2. Ablation of the size of hidden layers on the CBCT test set (B) with AutoSkull+.

Size of Hidden Layers	Mean Error:Face Area	Mean Error:Mouth Area
210	1.58mm \pm 0.17	1.43mm \pm 0.28
410	1.56mm \pm 0.18	1.36mm \pm 0.18
610	1.54mm \pm 0.22	1.40mm \pm 0.29




Fig. 1. Since the top and back of head was not available in CBCT scan training data, we evaluate the accuracy of the skull estimation in the area *face*. To evaluate the improvement due to *AutoSkull+*, we also use the evaluation area *mouth*.



Fig. 2. A sample of the CBCT test set predictions with ground truth skull in blue and our prediction overlaid in white. We present a comparison of skull shape predictions utilizing OSSO, Sculptor, PPCA, AutoSkull (ours), and AutoSkull+ (ours with teeth prior).