

**Scanning Electron Microscopic Evaluation of the
Efficacy of Two Chemo-Mechanical Caries Removal
Agents Versus Mechanical Caries Removal
(In Vitro Study)**

Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine,
Cairo University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For Master Degree in Pediatric Dentistry

By

Gehan Saad El-Din Habik

B.D.S. (2003)

Cairo University

Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine

Cairo University

2011

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

﴿اقْرَأْ بِاسْمِ رَبِّكَ
الَّذِي خَلَقَ﴾

صدق الله العظيم

سورة العلق، الآية رقم (1)

SUPERVISORS

Dr. Ali Ali Mortada

*Associate Professor of Pediatric Dentistry and
Dental Public Health
Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine
Cairo University*

Dr. Ola Mostafa Omar

*Associate Professor of Pediatric Dentistry and
Dental Public Health
Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine
Cairo University*

Acknowledgment

I am most grateful to **God** for being kind, giving me patience and helping me to accomplish this work.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to **Ass. Prof. Dr. Ali A. Mortada**, Associate Professor of Pediatric Dentistry and Dental Public Health, Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine, Cairo University, for his valuable advises and precious scientific guidance which were of great value to the accomplishment of this work . It was really a great honor for me to work under his supervision.

I would also like to express my deepest thanks and appreciation to **Ass. Prof. Dr. Ola M. Omar**, Associate Professor of Pediatric Dentistry and Dental Public Health, Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine, Cairo University. Really, I can't express how to thank her for her kind cooperation, close supervision, valuable guidance and her generosity with her time. Her support and patience will always be remembered.

At last, my deepest thanks and appreciation are extended to all my professors and staff members of **Pediatric Dentistry and Dental Public Health**, Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine, Cairo University and all those who helped me in accomplishing my work.

Dedication

To my parents

for their endless support and love.

To my husband

for always being there.

To my precious daughter

Contents

Introduction.....	1
Review of Literature.....	3
Aim of the Study.....	36
Materials and Methods	37
Results.....	53
Discussion	65
Summary.....	74
Conclusions.....	77
Recommendations	78
References.....	79

List of Figures

Figure	page
Figure (1): Primary molars having occlusal carious lesions	37
Figure (2): The Carisolv twin multimix system.	39
Figure (3): The different shapes of the Carisolv instrument tips.	41
Figure (4): The different tips of the instruments that have been designed to provide optimal access to different types of lesions.	41
Figure (5): The Papacarie gel syringe containing 3ml of solution.	42
Figure (6): The slow speed contra-angled handpiece with a round bur size 4.	43
Figure (7): A primary tooth before and after the removal of caries using a round bur on a slow speed contra-angled handpiece.	43
Figure (8): The transparent Carisolv gel being applied to the cavity by the Carisolv instrument 2.	45
Figure (9): After the application of the gel it became cloudy with debris.	45
Figure (10): When the gel became cloudy with debris, the softened dentin was gently scraped off with the suitable instrument.	46
Figure (11): The primary tooth after the removal of caries.	46
Figure (12): The carious cavity was filled with the Papacarie gel.	47
Figure (13): The gel turned turbid with debris soon after the application of the gel.	48
Figure (14): The primary tooth after the removal of caries.	48
Figure (15): The primary tooth after being restored with the Te-Econom Plus composite resin restoration.	49
Figure (16): The Scanning Electron Microscope.	50

Figure (17): Comparison of the mean values of time taken for caries removal by the three investigated methods.	54
Figure (18): Smooth dentinal surface covered with a smear layer and bur marks are clearly visible (a: $\times 500$, $50\mu\text{m}$ and b: $\times 1500$, $20\mu\text{m}$).	55
Figure (19): Smooth dentinal surface covered with a homogenous smear layer with more evident bur marks ($\times 500$, $50\mu\text{m}$).	55
Figure (20): Rough dentinal surface with patent dentinal tubules and clearly visible micro cracks (a: $\times 500$, $50\mu\text{m}$ and b: $\times 1500$, $20\mu\text{m}$).	56
Figure (21): Rough and irregular dentinal surface with no evidence of smear layer and patent dentinal tubule orifices (a: $\times 500$, $50\mu\text{m}$ and b: $\times 1500$, $20\mu\text{m}$).	57
Figure (22): Smooth dentinal surface with numerous patent dentinal tubule orifices and clearly visible micro cracks on the surface (a: $\times 500$, $50\mu\text{m}$ and b: $\times 1500$, $20\mu\text{m}$).	58
Figure (23): Irregular and rough dentinal surface covered with a smear layer with the appearance of micro cracks on the surface (a: $\times 500$, $50\mu\text{m}$ and b: $\times 1000$, $20\mu\text{m}$).	58
Figure (24): Rough dentinal surface covered with a smear layer, with occluded and patent dentinal tubules (a: $\times 500$, $50\mu\text{m}$ and b: $\times 1000$, $20\mu\text{m}$).	59
Figure (25): A continuous, clearly distinguishable hybrid layer (H) and numerous resin tags (black arrows) with deep resin infiltration, also micro tags (white arrows) are clearly seen (a: $\times 800$, $20\mu\text{m}$ and b: $\times 2000$, $10\mu\text{m}$).	60
Figure (26): A continuous, clearly distinguishable hybrid layer (H) and numerous resin tags (black arrows) with deep resin infiltration and clearly visible micro tags (white arrows) (a: $\times 1500$, $20\mu\text{m}$ and b: $\times 2000$, $10\mu\text{m}$).	61
Figure (27): Numerous resin tags (black arrows) with shallow resin infiltration and an undistinguishable hybrid layer (a: $\times 800$, $20\mu\text{m}$ and b: $\times 1500$, $20\mu\text{m}$).	62