

***Evaluation of the Smear Layer Removal and the
Antibacterial Effect Using Chamomile Extract
as a Root Canal Irrigant***

Thesis

***Submitted to the Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine, Cairo
University in partial fulfillment of requirements of the Master Degree
in Endodontics***

By

Rasha Sameh Mahfouz

B.D.S (2004) Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine

6th October University

Cairo University

2010

Supervisors

Dr. Medhat Abd El Rahman Kataia

**Professor of Endodontics
Head of the Endodontic Department
Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine
Cairo University**

Dr. Yehia Mahmoud El Baghdady

**Professor of Endodontics
Head of the Endodontic Department
&Dean of the Faculty of Dentistry
October 6 University**

Dr. Suzan Abdul Wanees Amin

**Lecturer of Endodontics
Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine
Cairo University**



Acknowledgments

Frist of all I thank Allah, who helped me and gave me patience to complete this work.

I would like to express my sincere, unlimited appreciation & gratitude to Dr. Medhat Abd El Rahman Kataia, Professor of Endodontics and Chairman of the Endodontic Department, Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine, Cairo University, For his guidance, valuable advice, support, endless help and supervision during the entire course of this study and also for his father dealing sympathy .

I would like also to express my deepest appreciation and thanks to Dr. Yehia Mahmoud El Baghdady, Professor of Endodontics, Chairman of the Endodontic Department & Dean of Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine October 6 University, for his concern, understanding and his continuous and generous help during my study at colleague, and his continues support .

Great thanks and gratitude are extended to Dr. Suzan Abdul Wanees Amin, Lecturer of Endodontics, Endodontic Department, Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine, Cairo University, for her concern, assistance and keen supervision throughout the research.

Very deep thanks and gratitude are due to Dr Somaia Abd El Latif Eissa, Professor of Microbiology and Immunology, Chairman of Microbiology and Immunology Department, Faculty of Medicine, Cairo University. Thanks extend to Dr. Yasmine Samy Elkholy, Assistant Lecturer of Microbiology and Immunology, Microbiology and Immunology Department, Faculty of Medicine, Cairo University for her guidance, assistance and comprehensive facilities she afforded me in undertaking the microbiological investigation in this research.

Last but not least, I would like to express my great thanks and appreciation for Dr. Tamer Mahmoud Abd El Wahab, Assistant Lecturer of Prosthodontics, Faculty of Oral and Dental Modern Science and Art University, for his friendly and spiritual help and concern.

Dedication

***To my precious family especially my
Father, Mother, Brother for their sacrifices
throughout life, endless love and
continuous support and guidance in every
step in my life.***

List of Contents

	<i>Page</i>
<i>INTRODUCTION</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>REVIEW OF LITERATURE</i>	<i>4</i>
• History of irrigants	4
• Medicinal plants used as root canal irrigants	5
• Chamomile (Matricaria recutita) extract.....	6
• Morinda Citrifolia Juice (MCJ).....	7
• Salvadora Persica (Siwak).....	8
• Tea tree oil (Melaleuca alternifolia).....	9
• Other natural extracts as endodontic irrigants.....	10
• Rational for removing the smear layer	11
• Debris and smear layer removal by different irrigants	14
• Antibacterial effect of different root canal irrigants	28
<i>AIM OF THE STUDY</i>	<i>39</i>
<i>MATERIALS AND METHODS</i>	<i>40</i>
• Sample selection	42
• Sample preparation	42
• Preparation of the irrigating solutions.....	43
• Sample Classification.....	44
• Cleaning and shaping of the root canal system.....	46
• Evaluation of debris and smear layer removal.....	48
• Stereomicroscopic evaluation.....	48
• Environmental scanning electron microscopic (ESEM) evaluation.....	51
• Antibacterial activity evaluation.....	55
• Test microorganisms and growth conditions.....	55

• Kirby-Bauer diffusion (agar disc diffusion) method.....	56
• Evaluation of the antibacterial substantivity of irrigant solutions.....	58
• Statistical Analysis.....	60
RESULTS	61
• Microscopic evaluation	61
• Stereomicroscopic evaluation for debris removal.....	61
• Debris removal evaluation in each group.....	61
• Comparison for Debris removal among different groups.....	72
• Effect of canal level on Debris removal.....	74
• ESEM evaluation for Smear layer removal.....	76
• Smear layer removal evaluation in each group.....	76
• Comparison for smear layer removal among different groups.....	93
• Effect of canal level on smear layer removal.....	95
• Antibacterial effect.....	99
• Kirby-Bauer diffusion(agar disc diffusion) method.....	99
• Antibacterial effect of different irrigants on Enterococcus Faecalis.....	99
• Antibacterial effect of different irrigants on Staphylococcus aureus.	102
• Comparison between antibacterial effect against Enterococcus Faecalis and Staphylococcus aureus.....	105
• Evaluation of the antibacterial substantivity of irrigant solutions.....	106
DISCUSSION	111
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	119
RECOMMENDATIONS.....	121
REFERENCES	122
ARABIC SUMMARY	--

List of Tables

Table (1): Different irrigating regimes used in the study.....	46
Table (2): Tukey Test multiple comparison procedure between coronal, middle and apical thirds of Group (II)	65
Table (3): Tukey Test multiple comparison procedure between coronal, middle and apical thirds of Group (III)	68
Table (4): Tukey Test multiple comparison procedure between Debris scores along the whole length of the canal for the four groups	74
Table (5): The presence of smear layer on the surface of root canals in the different groups	76
Table (6): Holm-Sidak multiple comparison procedure between smear layers scores coronal, middle and apical thirds of Group (I)	78
Table (7): Holm-Sidak multiple comparison procedure between smear layers scores coronal, middle and apical thirds of Group (II)	81
Table (8): Tukey multiple comparison procedure between smear layers scores coronal, middle and apical thirds of Group (III)	87
Table (9): Holm-Sidak multiple comparison procedure between smear layers scores coronal, middle and apical thirds of Group (IV)	90
Table (10): Tukey multiple comparison procedure between smear layers scores along the whole length of the canal for the four groups	95
Table (11): Tukey multiple comparison procedure between smear layers scores at the coronal, middle and apical thirds in the four groups	98
Table (12): The mean values of inhibition zones of <i>Enterococcus Faecalis</i> by the agar diffusion test	99
Table (13): One way analysis of variance (ANOVA) for the difference between the mean values of the inhibition zones of the different irrigants	101

Table (14): The mean values of inhibition zones of *Staphylococcus aureus* by the agar diffusion test.....102

Table (15): One way analysis of variance (ANOVA) for the difference between the mean values of the inhibition zones of the different irrigants..... 104

Table (16): Comparison between different irrigants antibacterial effect against *Enterococcus Faecalis* and *Staphylococcus aureus*..... 105

Table (17): The residual antibacterial effect of different irrigants tracked for 168 hours.....106

Table (18): One way analysis of variance (ANOVA) for the difference between the mean values of the antibacterial substantivity of irrigant solutions for *Staphylococcus aureus*.....108

List of Figures

Fig. (1): Preparation of the chamomile extract.....	44
Fig. (2): Samples' grouping	45
Fig.(3): Hybrid technique for cleaning and shaping of the root canal system	47
Fig.(4): Tooth longitudinally-split using chisel and mallet into halves.....	48
Fig. (5): Olympus SZ-PT stereomicroscope.....	50
Fig. (6): Stereomicroscopic photograph of the canal traced using image analysis software.....	50
Fig. (7): The Quanta 200 ESEM	52
Fig.(8): Samples mounted on a metallic disc before ESEM examination.....	52
Fig. (9): Scanning electron micrographs of the root canal wall showing scores 0-4	53
Fig. (10): Image analysis and scoring of ESEM photomicrographs for smear layer evaluation.....	54
Fig .(11): Enterococcus faecalis and Staphylococcus aureus on Mueller-Hinton agar plates.....	57
Fig. (12): Petri plates with nutrient agar and discs of irrigant solutions.....	57
Fig. (13): Zones of inhibition of microbial growth around the disc containing the tested substances.....	58
Fig. (14): Agar plates prepared for the evaluation of the antibacterial substantivity of irrigant solutions.....	59

Fig. (15): Agar plates placed in the incubator (upper shelf), irrigating solutions placed in tubes (lower shelf).....	59
Fig. (16): A stereomicroscopic picture for a canal of the 5.25% NaOCl and 17% EDTA group.	63
Fig. (17): A stereomicroscopic picture for a canal of the 5.25% NaOCl and 17% EDTA group showing mild debris at the middle third.....	64
Fig. (18): A stereomicroscopic picture for a canal of the Chamomile group showing debris at the middle and apical thirds.	66
Fig. (19): A stereomicroscopic picture for a canal of the Chamomile group showing debris at the apical third.	66
Fig. (20): A stereomicroscopic picture for a canal of the Chamomile group showing debris at the middle third.....	67
Fig. (21): A stereomicroscopic picture for a canal of the 5.25% NaOCl and Chamomile group showing debris at the apical third.	69
Fig. (22): A stereomicroscopic picture for a canal of the 5.25% NaOCl and Chamomile group showing debris at the middle third.....	69
Fig. (23): A stereomicroscopic picture for a canal of the Chamomile and 17 % EDTA group.....	71
Fig. (24): A stereomicroscopic picture for a canal of the Chamomile and 17 % EDTA apical third.....	71
Fig. (25): A stereomicroscopic picture for a canal of the Chamomile and 17 % EDTA middle third.....	72
Fig. (26): SEM photograph of the coronal third using 5.25% NaOCl and 17% EDTA showing open dentinal tubules.	78
Fig. (27): SEM photograph of the middle third using 5.25% NaOCl and 17% EDTA showing open dentinal tubules.	79
Fig. (28): SEM photograph of the apical third using 5.25% NaOCl and 17% EDTA showing. smear layer and partially open dentinal tubules.....	79

Fig. (29): SEM photograph of the coronal third using Chamomile and Chamomile as the final flush.....	81
Fig. (30): SEM photograph of the middle third using Chamomile and Chamomile as the final flush.....	82
Fig. (31): SEM photograph of the apical third using Chamomile and Chamomile as the final flush showing heavy smear layer.	82
Fig. (32): SEM photograph of the coronal third using Chamomile and Chamomile as the final flush.....	83
Fig. (33): SEM photograph of the middle third using Chamomile and Chamomile as the final flush.....	83
Fig. (34): SEM photograph of the apical third using Chamomile and Chamomile as the final flush showing heavy smear layer.....	84
Fig. (35): SEM photograph of the coronal third using 5.25% NaOCl and Chamomile as the final flush.....	85
Fig. (36): SEM photograph of the middle third using 5.25% NaOCl and Chamomile as the final flush.....	86
Fig. (37): SEM photograph of the apical third using 5.25% NaOCl and Chamomile as the final flush.....	86
Fig. (38): SEM photograph of the coronal third using 5.25% NaOCl and Chamomile as the final flush.....	87
Fig. (39): SEM photograph of the middle third using 5.25% NaOCl and Chamomile as the final flush.....	88
Fig. (40): SEM photograph of the apical third using 5.25% NaOCl and Chamomile as the final flush.....	88
Fig. (41): SEM photograph of the coronal third using Chamomile and 17 % EDTA as the final flush.....	90
Fig. (42): SEM photograph of the middle third using Chamomile and 17 % EDTA as the final flush.....	91

Fig. (43): SEM photograph of the apical third using Chamomile and 17 % EDTA as the final flush.....	91
Fig. (44): SEM photograph of the coronal third using Chamomile and 17 % EDTA as the final flush.....	92
Fig. (45): SEM photograph of the middle third using Chamomile and 17 % EDTA as the final flush.....	92
Fig. (46): SEM photograph of the apical third using Chamomile and 17 % EDTA as the final flush.....	93
Fig. (47): Inhibition zones of <i>Enterococcus Faecalis</i> by the agar diffusion test.....	100
Fig. (48): Inhibition zones of <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> by the agar diffusion test.....	103

List of Graphs

Graph (1): Bar chart showing Debris scores for the coronal, middle and apical thirds of Group(I).....	63
Graph (2): Bar chart showing Debris scores for the coronal, middle and apical thirds of Group (II).....	65
Graph (3): Bar chart showing Debris scores for the coronal, middle and apical thirds of Group (III).....	68
Graph (4): Bar chart showing Debris scores for the coronal, middle and apical thirds of Group (IV).....	70
Graph (5): Bar chart showing Debris scores along the whole length of the canal for the four groups.....	73
Graph (6): Mean debris score for the four groups at the middle third.....	75
Graph (7): Mean debris score for the four groups at the apical third.....	75
Graph (8): Bar chart showing smear layer scores for the coronal, middle and apical thirds of Group (I).....	77
Graph (9): Bar chart showing smear layer scores for the coronal, middle and apical thirds of Group (II).....	80
Graph (10): Bar chart showing smear layer scores for the coronal, middle and apical thirds of Group (III).....	85
Graph (11): Bar chart showing smear layer scores for the coronal, middle and apical thirds of Group (III).....	89
Graph (12): Bar chart showing smear layer scores along the whole length of the canal for the four groups.....	94