

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم



صدق الله العظيم

سورة طه من الآية ١١٤

***Effect of Ferrule Design, Post Type and Functional Loading on the Fracture Strength and Coronal Leakage of Endodontically Treated Maxillary Premolars***

**Thesis**

Submitted to the Faculty of Dentistry  
Ain Shams University  
In partial fulfillment of the requirements of  
The Doctor's degree in Fixed Prosthodontics

**By**

**Mona Mohammad Helmy Hussain Amer**

Assistant lecturer of fixed prosthodontics  
Misr University for Science and Technology

B.D.S. (Cairo University, 1998)

M.Sc. (Cairo University, 2005)

Faculty of Dentistry  
Ain Shams University  
2012

# **SUPERVISORS**

**Dr. Amina Mohamed Hamdy**

*Professor and Head of Crown and Bridge Department*

**Faculty of Dentistry**

**Ain Shams University**

**Dr. Jihan Farouk Mohamed**

*Associate Professor, Crown and Bridge Department*

**Faculty of Dentistry**

**Ain Shams University**

# CONTENTS

	Page
■ List of figures.....	I
■ List of tables.....	V
■ Acknowledgement.....	VI
■ Introduction.....	1
■ Review of literature.....	3
■ Aim of the study.....	33
■ Materials and methods.....	34
■ Results.....	78
■ Discussion.....	92
■ Summary .....	105
■ References .....	109
■ Appendix.....	137
■ Arabic summery	

# List of Figures

<b>Figure1:</b>	Stress in radicular dentin during function is concentrated to the circumference of tooth; stress is lowest within root canal .....	11
<b>Figure2:</b>	Risk assessment analysis.....	14
<b>Figure3:</b>	Schematic drawing of a) a cross-linked polymer matrix with only cross-linked phases (prefabricated FRC post) and b) a semi-IPN polymer matrix with both linear and cross-linked phases (individually formed FRC post ).....	22
<b>Figure4:</b>	EverStick Post .....	35
<b>Figure5:</b>	SnowLight Post .....	35
<b>Figure6:</b>	Buccal and mesial radiographs of a maxillary premolar.....	38
<b>Figure7:</b>	Measuring tooth dimensions using a digital caliber .....	38
<b>Figure8:</b>	Access cavity .....	40
<b>Figure9:</b>	Parallel-milling device .....	41
<b>Figure10:</b>	Hand-piece holder before (left) and after assembly (right) .....	42
<b>Figure11:</b>	Hand piece attached to the parallel milling devic .....	43
<b>Figure12:</b>	Axial teeth mounting .....	43
<b>Figure13:</b>	Steel mold before (top) and after assembly (bottom) .....	44
<b>Figure14:</b>	Forming the stone block .....	44
<b>Figure15:</b>	Mounted specimens .....	44
<b>Figure16:</b>	Modified diamond stone .....	45
<b>Figure17:</b>	Composite teeth analogs before (right) and after (left) addition of occlusal composite.....	45
<b>Figure18:</b>	Axial preparation of the premolar analog .....	46
<b>Figure19:</b>	Occlusal preparation of the analogs .....	46
<b>Figure20:</b>	Schematic diagram of the prepared molar (left) and premolar (right) analogs –Proximal view .....	47
<b>Figure21:</b>	Cutting the preparation guides.....	48
<b>Figure22:</b>	Preparation guides.....	48
<b>Figure23:</b>	Flattened occlusal surfaces Premolar (a) and molar (b).....	48
<b>Figure24:</b>	Bonded preparation guides.....	49

<b>Figure25:</b>	Premolar tooth before (a), during (b) and at the end of axial preparation©.....	<b>49</b>
<b>Figure26:</b>	6 degrees axial inclination.....	<b>50</b>
<b>Figure27:</b>	the adjustable mobile base.....	<b>50</b>
<b>Figure28:</b>	Prepared specimens before (left), and after (right)removal of the guide.....	<b>51</b>
<b>Figure29:</b>	Occlusal preparation.....	<b>52</b>
<b>Figure30:</b>	Prepared premolar (Group A).....	<b>52</b>
<b>Figure31:</b>	A diagram representing occlusal inclinations.....	<b>52</b>
<b>Figure32:</b>	Prepared premolar (group U).....	<b>52</b>
<b>Figure33:</b>	Prepared premolar (Group N).....	<b>53</b>
<b>Figure34:</b>	Molar tooth after removal of the preparation guide.....	<b>53</b>
<b>Figure35:</b>	Finished molar preparation.....	<b>53</b>
<b>Figure36:</b>	Final post space preparation.....	<b>54</b>
<b>Figure37:</b>	Disassembled loading device.....	<b>55</b>
<b>Figure38:</b>	Loading the SnowLight post.....	<b>56</b>
<b>Figure39:</b>	Modified Everstick post.....	<b>57</b>
<b>Figure40:</b>	The individually formed post.....	<b>57</b>
<b>Figure41:</b>	The core former.....	<b>58</b>
<b>Figure42:</b>	Core former in place (a). Finished composite core (b).....	<b>58</b>
<b>Figure43:</b>	The duplicating split-trays before (left) and after assembly (right).....	<b>59</b>
<b>Figure44:</b>	Steel tray base.....	<b>60</b>
<b>Figure45:</b>	Duplicating assembly.....	<b>60</b>
<b>Figure46:</b>	Split silicone mold.....	<b>60</b>
<b>Figure47:</b>	Checking the amount of reduction.....	<b>61</b>
<b>Figure48:</b>	The split silicone mold.....	<b>61</b>
<b>Figure49:</b>	Wax retainers.....	<b>62</b>
<b>Figure50:</b>	Steel mold for bridge specimens .....	<b>62</b>
<b>Figure51:</b>	Bridge wax-up before (a) and after (b) base formation .....	<b>63</b>
<b>Figure52:</b>	Split silicone mold for the bridge specimens .....	<b>63</b>
<b>Figure53:</b>	Inner crown dimensions.....	<b>64</b>

<b>Figure54:</b>	Bridge specimens before (left) and after (right) removal of the wax patterns .....	65
<b>Figure55:</b>	Forming the silicone indices: (a) specimens seated in tray bases, (b) the duplicating assemblies (c) Silicon Indices .....	65
<b>Figure56:</b>	Premolar seated in the silicone index.....	66
<b>Figure57:</b>	Prepared abutment& metal mold seated in the index.....	66
<b>Figure58:</b>	The finally mounted specimens.....	67
<b>Figure59:</b>	Perforated impression trays.....	67
<b>Figure60:</b>	Spacer positioned on the specimen.....	68
<b>Figure61:</b>	The polymerized impression.....	68
<b>Figure62:</b>	Stone die of the prepared bridge.....	68
<b>Figure63:</b>	Master die of crown and bridge specimens(a), wax copings(b), Finished wax pattern©.....	69
<b>Figure64:</b>	Sprued wax patterns.....	70
<b>Figure65:</b>	Cast metal bridge before (left) and after polishing (right).....	71
<b>Figure66:</b>	Bridge specimen in the loading device.....	72
<b>Figure67:</b>	Crown (right) and bridge specimens (left) fixed in the metal holders.....	72
<b>Figure68:</b>	Bridge specimen in the universal testing machine.....	73
<b>Figure69:</b>	Principal stresses contours (Case 1).....	74
<b>Figure70:</b>	Principal stresses contours (Case 2).....	74
<b>Figure71:</b>	Sectioned bridge specimen.....	75
<b>Figure72:</b>	premolar specimen after root coating with nail varnish.....	75
<b>Figure73:</b>	Sectioning planes.....	76
<b>Figure74:</b>	Boundaries of the leakage categories.....	76
<b>Figure75:</b>	sectioned teeth: control group (left) with individually formed post (middle) and ready made post (right) .....	76
<b>Figure76:</b>	Bar chart representing mean values for comparison between fracture resistance of functional loadings.....	79
<b>Figure77:</b>	Bar chart representing mean values for comparison between fracture resistance of ferrule designs.....	80
<b>Figure78:</b>	Bar chart representing mean values for comparison between fracture resistance of post types.....	81
<b>Figure79:</b>	Bar chart representing mean values for comparison between fracture strength of the different interactions .....	83

<b>Figure80:</b>	failure modes of the control group (left), Ready-made post groups (middle) and the Individually-formed groups (right) .....	<b>84</b>
<b>Figure81:</b>	Fractured bridge specimen.....	<b>85</b>
<b>Figure82:</b>	Cement remnants on the surface of individually formed (left) & ready made .....	<b>85</b>
<b>Figure83:</b>	Leakage score 0 .....	<b>86</b>
<b>Figure84:</b>	Leakage scores: 1(left) & 2 (right).....	<b>86</b>
<b>Figure85:</b>	Leakage score 3 .....	<b>86</b>
<b>Figure86:</b>	Leakage score 4 (Individually formed posts).....	<b>86</b>
<b>Figure87:</b>	Leakage score 4 (Ready-Made posts).....	<b>87</b>
<b>Figure88:</b>	Sectioned tooth with Ready-made post(right) & Individually formed post (left). D: root dentin, P: post, F: furcation, C: cement .....	<b>87</b>
<b>Figure89:</b>	Bar chart representing mean values for comparison between leakage scores of functional loadings.....	<b>88</b>
<b>Figure90:</b>	Bar chart representing mean values for comparison between leakage scores of ferrule designs.....	<b>89</b>
<b>Figure91:</b>	Bar chart representing mean values for comparison between leakage scores of post types.....	<b>90</b>

# List of Tables

<b>Table 1:</b>	Restorative Materials used in the study.....	<b>34</b>
<b>Table 2:</b>	Other Materials used in the study .....	<b>36</b>
<b>Table 3:</b>	Equipments used in the study.....	<b>37</b>
<b>Table 4:</b>	Samples grouping for each test type (Fracture or Micro-leakage).....	<b>40</b>
<b>Table 5:</b>	Three-way ANOVA results for the effect of different variables on fracture resistance.....	<b>78</b>
<b>Table 6:</b>	Comparison between fracture resistance of different functional loadings regardless of other variables.....	<b>79</b>
<b>Table 7:</b>	Comparison between fracture resistance of the ferrule designs regardless of other variables.....	<b>80</b>
<b>Table 8:</b>	Comparison between fracture resistance of the post types regardless of other variables.....	<b>81</b>
<b>Table 9:</b>	Comparison between fracture strength with different interactions .....	<b>82</b>
<b>Table 10:</b>	% of leakage scores for all groups.....	<b>86</b>
<b>Table 11:</b>	Mean, standard deviation (SD) values and results of Mann-Whitney U test for comparison between leakage scores of different functional loadings .....	<b>88</b>
<b>Table 12:</b>	Mean, standard deviation (SD) values and results of Kruskal-Wallis test for comparison between leakage scores of different ferrule designs .....	<b>89</b>
<b>Table 13:</b>	Mean, standard deviation (SD) values and results of Kruskal-Wallis test for comparison between leakage scores of different ferrule designs .....	<b>90</b>
<b>Table 14:</b>	Results of Spearman's correlation coefficient for the correlation between fracture strength and leakage.....	<b>91</b>

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

*All thankfulness to **ALLAH** for aiding and guiding me to finish this work,*

*I would like to express my deepest gratitude to **Dr. Amina Hamdy**. Professor and head of crown and bridge department, faculty of dentistry, Ain- shams university, for her continuous guidance and support. I'm grateful for her encouragement and sincere advice.*

*I'm grateful to **Dr. Jihan Farouk**, associate professor of, crown and bridge, faculty of dentistry, Ain-Shams university, for her friendly assistance, great skills in writing scientific text and valuable comments.*

*I'd like to express my thanks to all who helped me in the technical part of the study, **Dr Huda Helmy** for the stress analysis, **Dr Mohammad Abbas** for mechanical testing and **Dr Khalid Kerra** for the statistical analysis.*

*I'm deeply gratefull to my dear colleagues and good friends in Misr University for Science and Technology especially **Dr. Amal Abd-Allah**, **Dr. Mohammad Abd El-Aziz**, **Dr. Fatema Makkeyah** and **Dr. Jourge Fahim**.*

*I want to thank **my family** for their love and support and always being there for me.*



# Introduction

**T**he approach towards restoring endodontically treated teeth is changing. Conventional treatment of severely damaged root-filled teeth was cast post and core and a covering crown. Being time-saving and economical, prefabricated metal posts with amalgam or composite cores, were described as treatment alternatives in the 1970s and since the mid-1980s nonmetal post systems have also been used.

As post materials, fiber-reinforced composites (FRC) have many benefits compared to metals. Their modulus of elasticity is closer to that of dentin<sup>[1]</sup>; therefore less stresses are induced in the root. In terms of esthetics and biocompatibility, Glass FRC posts were proved to be superior to metallic ones. However, like all prefabricated posts, a circular post preparation is required which offers little resistance to rotational forces. Furthermore, When the morphology of the canal is critical, e.g. in the case of oval canals, minimal contact with canal walls can be achieved.

Attempts to eliminate the disadvantages of prefabricated FRC posts have been made by developing a plastic, light-curable material that can be used to construct direct custom-made FRC posts (The Ever-Stick post system). The ability of this post to be shaped as the root cavity presents an effective way to conserve root tissue, reduce cement thickness and reduce stress concentration at the restoration-tooth interface.

Other factors from those related to post type are of importance for the success of post-retained restorations. Researchers agree that the extent of remaining tooth structure is a key issue for prognosis<sup>[2,3]</sup>. However, the question arises as to what extent the degree of dentin preservation influences the success and how effective a ferrule of nonuniform height would be in preventing failure of a restored tooth?

Loading condition is another paramount factor that has been brought into focus in recent years after the well documented high success rates of endosseous implants. A clinician is now often required to choose between using an endodontically treated tooth or an implant to support a fixed or removable prosthesis. There is a widely held view that Endodontically treated teeth serve less well as bridge abutments. If this is true the reason could be within the tooth itself, the type of prosthesis or a combination of the two.

Clinical success depends on application of sound biomechanical principles for the specific tooth and clinical situation. Thus, to enhance longevity, the restorative procedure of endodontically treated teeth calls for careful consideration of treatment alternatives to select the best technique and material according to tooth condition and functional demands.

# Review of Literature

Although the restoration of endodontically treated teeth has been extensively studied, yet remains controversial. The difficulty to determine a treatment plane was shown in a study by *Tu`rp et al in 2007*<sup>[4]</sup>, who asked four specialists about the best treatment for a fractured lateral incisor and received different treatment strategies based on literature.

## ***1. Biomechanical aspects of endodontically treated teeth:***

It is generally believed that endodontic treatment renders the teeth weaker and more susceptible to fracture than vital teeth. Certain mechanical terminologies have been frequently applied by many authors to describe the physical condition of teeth that have had root canal treatment, such as increased "brittleness", "friability" and "fragility" or reduced "elasticity" and "strength". However, there are in-vitro studies that dispute this finding.

Back in 1992, *Sedgley and Messer*<sup>[5]</sup> compared the mechanical properties of dentin samples from endodontically treated teeth with an average 10 years of treatment and their contralateral vital pairs. Aside from a slight difference in hardness (vital dentin was 3.5% harder than the dentin from endodontically treated teeth), the properties were comparable. *Huang et al*<sup>[6]</sup> in the same year compared the physical and mechanical properties of dentin specimens from teeth with and without endodontic treatment at different levels of hydration. They concluded that, neither dehydration nor endodontic treatment caused deterioration of the mechanical properties of dentin, which were modified so few to affect the fracture resistance of these teeth. However, Fractures were still reported to be more common in pulpless teeth than vital ones<sup>[7]</sup>.

A possibility that has been suggested but never extensively explored is the reduction of pressoreception or an elevated pain threshold that allows larger loads on the endodontically treated teeth without triggering a protective response. **Randow & Glantz in 1986**<sup>[8]</sup> evaluated the cantilever loading pain capacities of non-vital and vital teeth. Results revealed that: non-vital teeth withstood markedly higher cantilever loading levels before pain was elicited than did the contralateral or neighboring vital teeth. Mean pain threshold levels of the non-vital teeth were more than twice as high as those of vital teeth. Upon applying the cantilever loading experiments on anesthetized teeth, no differences in reaction levels were observed.

A factor that may be more critical to the failure of endodontically treated teeth is the cumulative loss of tooth structure from caries, trauma, restorative and endodontic procedures. Loss of connecting structures, in particular, such as pulp chamber roof and one or both marginal ridges leads to greater risk of fracture. **Reeh et al in 1989**<sup>[9]</sup>, evaluated the reduction of tooth stiffness as a result of endodontic and restorative procedures, and found that if the coronal segment of the tooth is intact, endodontic procedures had a relatively small impact, by reducing the relative stiffness about 5% whereas an average loss of stiffness by 63% was recorded for teeth with MOD cavities.

By assessing root deformation upon loading **Lang et al in 2006**<sup>[10]</sup>, investigated the effects of different steps of endodontic treatment on the rigidity of teeth. It was found that, teeth were increasingly destabilized by every treatment (access preparation, manual instrumentation and tapered and parallelsided post preparation). While increased deformability was significant after access preparation and post preparation. They came to a