

Symmetry and Harmony: The Concept of "Perfection" in Modern Plastic Surgery

J. Morao ^{1*}, Y. Lamon ²

¹Resident, Department of Plastic, Reconstructive, Aesthetic, and Maxillofacial Surgery, Hospital Carlos J. Bello, Venezuelan Red Cross / Universidad Central de Venezuela, Caracas, Venezuela.

²Resident, Department of Plastic, Reconstructive, Aesthetic, and Maxillofacial Surgery, Hospital Jesús Yarena de Lídice / Universidad Central de Venezuela, Caracas, Venezuela.

***Corresponding Author:** J. Morao MD, Resident, Department of Plastic, Reconstructive, Aesthetic, and Maxillofacial Surgery, Hospital Carlos J. Bello, Venezuelan Red Cross / Universidad Central de Venezuela, Caracas, Venezuela.

Received date: July 16, 2026; **Accepted date:** July 23, 2026; **Published date:** July 30, 2026

Citation: J. Morao, MD, Y. Lamon, (2026), Symmetry and Harmony: The Concept of "Perfection" in Modern Plastic Surgery, *J. General Medicine and Clinical Practice*, 9(8); DOI:10.31579/2639-4162/368

Copyright: © 2026, J. Morao. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Abstract

Background: Plastic, aesthetic, and reconstructive surgery functions within a constant dichotomy between objective anatomical perfection evaluated by the surgeon and subjective satisfaction experienced by the patient. This study analyzes the evolution of aesthetic standards and the clinical necessity of integrating patient self-perception into the definition of surgical success.

Methods: A retrospective analysis of clinical cases was performed, complemented by a critical narrative review of contemporary literature across indexed databases (PubMed, Google Scholar, SciELO). Direct clinical experience was integrated to evaluate the existing gaps between objective anatomical metrics and patient-reported outcomes.

Discussion: Historically, beauty metrics have relied on rigid, universal canons with an inherent Eurocentric bias, which prove insufficient in modern multicultural practice. Although high-resolution three-dimensional imaging and peer-review grading systems (such as the Aesthetic Items Scale, AIS) optimize operative planning, they fail to predict long-term patient satisfaction. The consolidation of Patient-Reported Outcome Measures (PROMs), such as BREAST-Q, FACE-Q, and BODY-Q, demonstrates that biopsychosocial factors, preoperative expectation management, and transparent clinical communication far outweigh absolute tissue precision.

Conclusion: Building surgical perfection requires abandoning purely mathematical-anatomical reductionism. Contemporary therapeutic success relies on a holistic approach that synergizes objective technical assessments (AIS) with subjective tools centered on the individual's quality of life (PROMs), while preserving ethnic and anthropological congruence.

Key Words: plastic surgery; aesthetics; patient satisfaction; patient-reported outcome measures; canons of beauty

Introduction

Plastic, reconstructive, and aesthetic surgery constitutes one of the most intricate surgical disciplines; unlike other medical-surgical specialties where success is defined by strict objective parameters, the subjective factor is a primary determinant in aesthetic interventions. (1,2) The pursuit of "perfection" is the overarching catalyst that has driven modern surgical approaches and fueled the development of advanced techniques and technologies designed to yield optimal outcomes for both the surgeon and the patient. (1,2) Nonetheless, the parameters of perfection diverge drastically depending on the observer. From the surgeon's perspective, success focuses on precise anatomical proportions, idealized anthropometric angles, and the flawless execution of specialized surgical techniques; paradoxically, this technical precision does not guarantee excellence from

the patient's viewpoint, where post-operative quality of life and self-image are paramount. (1,3,4,5)

This dichotomy highlights a clear disconnection between the objective, quantifiable parameters measured by the surgeon in the operating theater and the subjective outcomes the patient desires to see in the mirror. (6) Historically, clinical endpoints depended almost exclusively on the surgeon's judgment, where a paternalistic "professional" stance dictated therapeutic success. However, the field has evolved toward patient-centered medicine. The emergence of Patient-Reported Outcome Measures (PROMs) has demonstrated that motivations for undergoing surgery and aesthetic expectations vary widely among individual patients; consequently, they cannot be measured solely by evaluating the plastic surgeon's technical prowess or absolute tissue perfection. (7,8)

Methods

This study was methodologically designed as a retrospective clinical case analysis complemented by a critical narrative review of contemporary literature. For the theoretical framework, a systematic approach was employed for the search, selection, and synthesis of evidence using indexed databases (PubMed, Google Scholar, SciELO). Given the diagnostic and structural complexity addressed in this research, integrating direct clinical experience with a critical narrative review allows the consolidation of current gaps within neurovascular and anatomical algorithms—an analysis that would not be feasible under purely quantitative or restrictive methodological designs.

Discussion

The Historical Quest to Quantify Beauty

To comprehend the clinical obsession with quantifying attractiveness, one must examine its historical foundations. Since the Renaissance, the concept of beauty has been heavily influenced by classical artists and anatomists, such as Leonardo da Vinci and Albrecht Dürer, who defined aesthetic canons based on strict facial symmetries. These proportions established the aesthetic dogma used in subsequent centuries. (9,10,11) It was not until the second half of the 20th century that Dr. Leslie Farkas revolutionized the understanding of human morphology. By statistically challenging these Renaissance standards, Farkas demonstrated that only a minute fraction of the population actually exhibited these idealized proportions. Instead, Farkas established realistic anthropometric norms for facial proportions, proposing that mild asymmetry is an inherent, non-pathological characteristic of human facial biology. (12,13)

Subsequently, Dr. Stephen Marquardt introduced his "beauty mask" model (the Phi Mask), which purported to represent a universal geometric aesthetic ideal. Marquardt claimed its golden ratio dimensions defined human facial beauty throughout history. While its influence was widespread, the construction of this mask relied primarily on a highly restricted cohort of North-Western European Caucasian actresses and models. Consequently, populations of Asian, African, and Latin American descent were intrinsically disadvantaged by this model. (14,15)

Objective Assessment Metrics and Their Correlation with Patient Satisfaction

In an effort to standardize surgical practice, researchers have continuously attempted to develop objective aesthetic measurement scales. Advanced tools, such as high-resolution three-dimensional imaging, are now routinely implemented to reconstruct hyper-precise digital anatomical models. (2,16,17) Nevertheless, despite the volumetric accuracy offered by 3D modeling, basing the concept of surgical perfection solely on anatomical variables represents a critical clinical oversight. In specialties like oncological surgery, achieving negative tissue resection margins provides an absolute metric of success; in contrast, the definition of success in plastic surgery is inherently bound to emotional factors and the individual perception of each patient. (6,18)

This clinical disconnect was validated in a study comparing pre-operative and 6-month post-operative photogrammetric facial proportions in a cohort of patients using the Rhinoplasty Outcome Evaluation (ROE) questionnaire. The results revealed an absolute lack of correlation between how closely the surgical outcome approached idealized mathematical proportions and actual patient satisfaction. Conversely, data showed that the primary driver of satisfaction was the quality of pre-operative information delivered during the informed consent process and the effective mitigation of unrealistic expectations. (2,19) This, in conjunction with other clinical trials comparing technical perfection against patient-reported satisfaction, confirms that

purely objective tools fail to capture the nuanced human factor of the individual patient. (2,20,21)

The Revolution of Patient-Reported Outcome Measures (PROMs)

The inherent limitations of purely anatomical evaluation methods have been largely overcome through the clinical validation and standardization of Patient-Reported Outcome Measures (PROMs). These instruments utilize validated psychometric models to quantify the functional, aesthetic, and psychosocial impact of surgery based entirely on the patient's perception, thereby eliminating observer bias from the medical team. In contemporary plastic surgery, three primary PROMs are utilized: BREAST-Q, FACE-Q, and BODY-Q. (6,23,24,25)

The BREAST-Q instrument has evolved to encompass various surgical tracks, including oncological reconstruction, augmentation, reduction, and breast-conserving therapy. It places specific emphasis on the patient's lived experience, measuring satisfaction with breast appearance, the surgical outcome of the nipple-areola complex, and psychosocial and sexual well-being. (6,24,25) Similarly, the FACE-Q allows for specialized modular evaluation of patients undergoing interventions on the skin, lips, glabella, and periorbital regions. Furthermore, the BODY-Q incorporates scales covering personal appearance, health-related quality of life, eating behaviors, and physical symptoms associated with obesity or post-bariatric contouring (such as redundant skin). (6,24,25)

These validated metrics clearly demonstrate that patients do not seek "anatomical perfection" in isolation. Elements such as the surgeon's interpersonal behavior during consultations, the patient's perception of the physician's clinical skill, meticulous post-operative follow-up, and robust patient education are the strongest predictors of long-term satisfaction—frequently overriding the presence of minor, objective anatomical asymmetries. (18,24)

Peer-Review and Objective Aesthetic Grading Systems

While PROMs position the patient's perspective as the central axis of outcome analysis, academic validation within the medical community, comparative surgical trials, and peer-reviewed journals require stringent scrutiny of the surgeon's technical execution. (18,26) To fulfill this need for standardized peer evaluation, the medical community developed the Aesthetic Items Scale (AIS) to formalize visual outcomes. This tool utilizes an independent panel of blinded experts who evaluate standardized post-operative photographs, scoring surgical outcomes across a 5-point scale encompassing five key domains: volume, shape, symmetry, scarring, and the alignment of the nipple-areola complex. (27)

Despite the clinical utility of the AIS—which offers a high-level technical evaluation and allows the surgeon to objectively audit morphological outcomes—it cannot be used in isolation. It must be paired with subjective PROMs that capture the patient's psychological reality. (26,28) Ultimately, it is the deliberate combination of both evaluation strategies—the objective technical parameters of the AIS and the subjective quality-of-life metrics of PROMs—that allows the modern surgeon to comprehensively appraise the true success of an intervention and move closer to true "perfection." (26)

Dismantling the 21st-Century Myth of a Universal Aesthetic Standard

One of the primary limitations of historical standardized aesthetic scales is that notions of physical beauty are deeply intertwined with local culture, ethnicity, and geography. Clinical observations confirm that preferences for specific anatomical and morphological variants are by no means universally constant. Historically, the unyielding application of Northern Caucasian anthropometric norms has introduced a systemic bias into aesthetic software and evaluation tools. For instance, contemporary 3D post-operative simulation software frequently bases its algorithmic projections on a

Eurocentric phenotype. For patients of Middle Eastern, Asian, or Latin American descent, this imposes unrealistic aesthetic standards and implicitly characterizes their native ethnic traits as structurally anomalous. (13,30) Anatomically adjusted surgical approaches, such as ethnic rhinoplasty, have been developed to prioritize harmony and racial congruence, exalting intrinsic features rather than erasing them. (13,30)

Simultaneously, extensive efforts are underway to cross-culturally adapt and validate PROMs for populations with diverse geographical backgrounds. For example, psychometric instruments such as the Acceptance of Cosmetic Surgery Scale—which evaluates body weight discrepancies, psychopathological history, self-esteem, and sociocultural motivations for seeking surgery—exhibit significant variance when applied outside the United States. Therefore, these tools must be empirically adjusted and validated depending on the target country to ensure optimal clinical utility. (2,13,26,30,31)

Conclusion

The classical reductionist premise that perfection is an absolute, immutable, and invariable state—quantifiable solely through mathematical angles, cephalometric ratios, and rigid projections—is increasingly obsolete in modern clinical practice. (6,9) In the 21st century, plastic surgeons possess an array of micro-surgical techniques and technologies that allow for millimetric anatomical adjustments. However, this technical dexterity must be integrated with the patient's broader biopsychosocial framework to guarantee genuine therapeutic success. (18,19)

Currently, the field of plastic surgery faces significant modern challenges, including the widespread prevalence of Body Dysmorphic Disorder (BDD) and the compounding influence of social media in generating unfeasible, filtered expectations. (8) Attempting to satisfy a patient's idealized construct solely through technical virtuosity is clinically futile. The plastic surgeon must approach the patient holistically, rather than treating the anatomical site as an isolated morphological entity. (2,20,24) Achieving perfection extends far beyond the boundaries of the operating theater; empathetic pre-operative communication, active management of expectations, and structured post-operative follow-up remain the true determinants of patient satisfaction. (20,24,27) By synthesized utilization of subjective PROMs alongside objective peer-reviewed systems like the AIS, the modern plastic surgeon can achieve true excellence—both from a rigorous technical standpoint and, most importantly, within the patient's own self-perception.

Administrative Disclosures

- **Conflict of Interest Statement:** The authors declare that they have no competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have influenced the work reported in this paper.
- **Use of Artificial Intelligence:** No artificial intelligence or automated drafting technologies were utilized in the design, execution, or preparation of this manuscript.
- **Funding Sources:** This research received no specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors. It was entirely self-funded by the authors.
- **Author Contributions:** All authors contributed equally to the study concept, design, data acquisition, analysis, and formal interpretation of the literature.

References

1. Alosfoor M, Alkhalifah AA, Algadiem EA, Alarfaj AA, Alsalman A. (2023). Comparison Between Patient and Plastic Surgeon Aesthetic Analysis in Rhinoplasty Consultation. *Plast Reconstr Surg Glob Open*. 11(4): e4948.
2. Sharma K, Steele K, Birks M, Jones G, Miller G. (2019). Patient-Reported Outcome Measures in Plastic Surgery: An Introduction and Review of Clinical Applications. *Ann Plast Surg*. 83(3):247-252.
3. Chang IA, Wells MW, Chang IA, Arquette CP, Tang CJ, (2022). Gatherwright JR, et al. The Positive Patient Experience: A Comprehensive Analysis of Plastic Surgery Online Reviews. *Aesthet Surg J*. 42(9):1083-1093.
4. Lowery JC, Wilkins EG, Kuzon WM, Davis JA. (1996). Evaluations of aesthetic results in breast reconstruction: an analysis of reliability. *Ann Plast Surg*. 36(6):601-6.
5. Nelson JA, Chu JJ, McCarthy CM, Stern CS, Shamsunder MG, et al. (2022). BREAST-Q REACT: Clinical Reference Values for the BREAST-Q in Post-mastectomy Breast Reconstruction Patients. *Ann Surg Oncol*. 29(8):5280-5293.
6. Pusic AL, Klassen AF, Scott AM, Klok JA, Cordeiro PG, et al. (2009). Development of a new patient-reported outcome measure for breast surgery: the BREAST-Q. *Plast Reconstr Surg*. 124(2):345-353.
7. Björserud C, Elander A, Fagevik Olsén M. SESQ, (2023). a patient-reported outcome instrument addressing excess skin; report on the updated version and the validation process. *J Plast Surg Hand Surg*. 7(1-6):360-364.
8. Mancin P, Gaudenzi V, Telesca R, Centofanti D, Bartoletti E, et al. (2026). Exploring Snapchat Dysmorphia, Body Dysmorphic Disorder Symptoms, and Body Trust in Patients Seeking Aesthetic Medicine Procedures. *Aesthet Surg J*. 46(2):213-221.
9. Al-Sebaei MO. (2015). The validity of three neo-classical facial canons in young adults originating from the Arabian Peninsula. *Head Face Med*. 11:4.
10. Hwang K, Park CY. (2021). The Divine Proportion: Origins and Usage in Plastic Surgery. *Plast Reconstr Surg Glob Open*. 9(2): e3419.
11. Thomas JR, Dixon TK. (2016). A Global Perspective of Beauty in a Multicultural World. *JAMA Facial Plast Surg*. 18(1):7-8.
12. Gibelli D, Cappella A, Bertozzi F, Sala D, Sitta S, et al. (2022). Three-Dimensional Facial Anthropometric Analysis with and Without Landmark Labelling: Is There a Real Difference? *J Craniofac Surg*. 33(2):665-668.
13. Deutsch C, Shell A, Francis R, Bird B. (2012). The Farkas System of Craniofacial Anthropometry: Methodology and Normative Databases.
14. YS. (2022). The Golden Ratio Test for Beauty is a Myth. *Trends Appl Sci Res*. 17(1):18-19.
15. Holland E. (2008). Marquardt's Phi Mask: Pitfalls of Relying on Fashion Models and the Golden Ratio to Describe a Beautiful Face. *Aesthetic Plast Surg*. 32:200-208.
16. Farkas L, Deutsch C. (1996). Anthropometric determination of craniofacial morphology. *Am J Med Genet*. 65:1-4.
17. Lopez X, Panton J, Nagarkar P, Preston S, Abramowitz J, Amirlak B. (2023). Initial Assessment of VECTRA Three-Dimensional Imaging to Accurately Simulate Breast Volume Changes in Transfeminine Patients: A Mannequin Study. *Aesthet Surg J Open Forum*. 5: ojad015.
18. Alosfoor M, Alkhalifah AA, Algadiem EA, Alarfaj AA, Alsalman A. (2023). Comparison Between Patient and Plastic

- Surgeon Aesthetic Analysis in Rhinoplasty Consultation. *Plast Reconstr Surg Glob Open*. 11(4): e4948.
19. Goljanian Tabrizi A, Ghazizadeh M, Rootivand Z. (2024). Harmonizing Beauty and Function: A Comprehensive Exploration of Patient Satisfaction in Rhinoplasty. *World J Plast Surg*. 13(1):43-49.
 20. Nelson JA, Chu JJ, McCarthy CM, Stern CS, Shamsunder MG, et al. (2022). BREAST-Q REACT: Clinical Reference Values for the BREAST-Q in Post-mastectomy Breast Reconstruction Patients. *Ann Surg Oncol*. 29(8):5280-5293.
 21. Klassen AF, Cano SJ, Alderman A, Soldin M, Thoma A, et al. (2016). The BODY-Q: A Patient-Reported Outcome Instrument for Weight Loss and Body Contouring Treatments. *Plast Reconstr Surg Glob Open*. 4(4): e679.
 22. Nelson JA, Chu JJ, Dabic S, Kenworthy EO, Shamsunder MG, et al. (2023). Moving towards patient-reported outcomes in routine clinical practice: implementation lessons from the BREAST-Q. *Qual Life Res*. 32(1):115-125.
 23. Klassen AF, Cano SJ, Schwitzer JA, Scott AM, Pusic AL. FACE-Q scales for health-related quality of life, early life impact, satisfaction with outcomes, and decision to have treatment: development and validation. *Plast Reconstr Surg*. 2015;135(2):375-386.
 24. Dikmans REG, Nene LEH, Bouman MB, de Vet HCW, Mureau MAM, et al. (2017). The Aesthetic Items Scale: A Tool for the Evaluation of Aesthetic Outcome after Breast Reconstruction. *Plast Reconstr Surg Glob Open*. 5(3): e1254.
 25. Cuning J, Mookerjee V, Alper D, Rios-Diaz A, Bauder A, et al. (2023). How Does Reduction Mammoplasty Surgical Technique Impact Clinical, Aesthetic, and Patient-Reported Outcomes? A Comparison of the Superomedial and Inferior Pedicle Techniques. *Ann Plast Surg*. 91:28-35.
 26. Stern C, Kim LN, Plotsker E, Boyce L, Dayan J, et al. (2023). An updated systematic review of esthetic grading tools in postmastectomy breast reconstruction. *J Surg Oncol*. 127(5):782-790.
 27. Jagadish Chandra H, Ravi MS, Sharma SM, Rajendra Prasad B. (2012). Standards of facial esthetics: an anthropometric study. *J Maxillofac Oral Surg*. 11(4):384-9.
 28. Henderson-King D, Henderson-King E. (2005). Acceptance of cosmetic surgery: scale development and validation. *Body Image*. 2(2):137-49.



This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License

To Submit Your Article Click Here:

Submit Manuscript

DOI:10.31579/2639-4162/368

Ready to submit your research? Choose Auctores and benefit from:

- fast, convenient online submission
- rigorous peer review by experienced research in your field
- rapid publication on acceptance
- authors retain copyrights
- unique DOI for all articles
- immediate, unrestricted online access

At Auctores, research is always in progress.

Learn more <https://www.auctoresonline.org/journals/general-medicine-and-clinical-practice>