

Antibacterial Effect, Physical Properties and Interfacial Adaptability of New MTA-Based Sealer

Thesis

Submitted to Endodontic Department
Faculty of Dentistry Ain Shams University

For

Partial Fulfillment of Requirements of Philosophy Degree
in Endodontics

By

Tarek Medhat Ahmed Elsewify

(M.Sc 2011, B.D.S. 2006)

Ain Shams University

(2015)

Supervisors

Prof. Dr. Salma Hassan El Ashry

Professor of Endodontics

Faculty of Dentistry - Ain Shams University

***Dr. Abeer A. Elhakim Mahmoud
Mohamed***

Associate Professor of Endodontics

Faculty of Dentistry - Ain Shams University

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

قَالُوا سُبْحَانَكَ لَا عِلْمَ لَنَا إِلَّا مَا عَلَّمْتَنَا إِنَّكَ أَنْتَ
الْعَلِيمُ الْحَكِيمُ

صدق الله العظيم

آية (32) من سورة البقرة

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my deep gratitude to *Professor Doctor Salma El Ashry*, Professor of Endodontics, Faculty of Dentistry, Ain Shams University for her valuable guidance and effort throughout my academic and clinical work.

My sincere gratitude to *Dr. Abeer A. Elhakim*, Associate Professor of Endodontics, Faculty of Dentistry, Ain Shams University for her sincere help and cooperation during this study.

My deep appreciation to *Professor Doctor Ehab Hassanein*, Chairman of Endodontic Department, and *all the Staff Members of the Endodontic Department*, Faculty of Dentistry, Ainshams University for their valuable help and cooperation.

Dedication

*To my beloved family for their
understanding & support throughout my
studies*

List of Contents:

	<i>Page</i>
Introduction	1
Review of Literature.....	3
○ Physical Properties.....	3
○ Interfacial Adaptability.....	12
○ Antibacterial Effect.....	33
Aim of the Study.....	42
Materials and Methods.....	43
Results.....	74
○ Physical Properties.....	74
○ Interfacial Adaptability.....	83
○ Antibacterial Effect.....	97
Discussion.....	103
Summary and Conclusion	123
References.....	126
Arabic Summary	143

List of Figures:

	<i>Page</i>
Figure 1: Self mixing tip used for mixing of MTA-Fillapex	45
Figure 2: Disc sample classification for part 1	46
Figure 3: pH meter used	47
Figure 4: Aluminum step-wedge used	48
Figure 5: Disc radiographed with the step-wedge.....	48
Figure 6: Disc sample weighted on the scale	52
Figure 7: Teeth sample classification for part 2.....	55
Figure 8: Custom made double diamond disc with 2 mm inter-discal distance.....	57
Figure 9: The cutting sequence followed to obtain the slices.	57
Figure 10: Colored Photograph of a middle root section.	58
Figure 11: Loading fixture containing sample secured with composite resin.	60
Figure 12: Plungers of different diameters that were used to dislodge the filling materials (from left to right 0.9, 0.7 and 0.5 mm in diameter).....	60
Figure 13: Diagram for the push-out bond strength test.	61
Figure 14: Push-out Strength Test: The specimen mounted on Lloyd testing machine and the plunger tip contacting the filling material to push it in an apico-coronal direction.....	62
Figure 15: Diagrammatic representation showing the components of the fluid filtration device.	65
Figure 16: Pressure gauge used to adjust the pressure of nitrogen gas.	65
Figure 17: T-junction connecting microtubing to micropipette.	66
Figure 18: T-junction connected to micro-syringe, micropipette, polyethylene tube.	66
Figure 19: Root segment cemented to the polyethylene tube filled with distilled water.	66
Figure 20: Snap shot of ImageJ software used to calculate percentage of surface area of gaps.	69
Figure 21: SEM Model Quanta 250 FEG.....	70
Figure 22: Plate containing BHI and 2 disc samples of the tested sealers	71
Figure 23: BHI agar plate after 10-fold serial dilution.....	73
Figure 24: Mean pH values of MTA-Fillapex and AH Plus at all observation periods	76
Figure 25: Change in mean pH reading of both sealers with time	77
Figure 26: Mean radio-opacity measurement (mm Al) of both sealers	78
Figure 27: Mean initial and final setting time of both sealers in hours.....	81
Figure 28: Mean solubility of both sealers as percentage weight loss	82

Figure 29: Mean push-out bond strength (MPa) of both sealers at different levels.....	85
Figure 30: Mean leakage value ($\mu\text{L}/\text{min}$) of both sealers at all observation periods	87
Figure 31: Change in mean leakage value ($\mu\text{L}/\text{min}$) of both sealers with time.....	88
Figure 32: Mean percentage of gaps surface area of both sealers at all root levels.....	90
Figure 33: Number of samples that showed adaptability score of 2	92
Figure 34: Number of samples that showed adaptability score of 1	93
Figure 35: Mean adaptability score of both sealers at all root levels	93
Figure 36: Photomicrograph of the AH Plus dentin interface at the middle third showing uniform interfacial layer with resin tag formations and a few gaps (score 2). Arrow <i>indicates</i> gap. D, dentin	94
Figure 37: Photomicrograph of MTA-Fillapex dentin interface at the coronal third showing gaps at the interface (score 1). Arrow <i>indicates</i> gap. D, dentin.....	94
Figure 38: Photomicrograph of MTA-Fillapex dentin interface at the apical third (score 2). Arrow <i>indicates</i> intratubular sealer penetration. D, dentin	95
Figure 39: Photomicrograph of MTA-Fillapex dentin interface at the middle third showing uniform interfacial layer (score 1). Arrow <i>indicates</i> sealer. D, dentin.....	95
Figure 40: Photomicrograph of the AH Plus dentin interface at the coronal third (score 2). Arrows <i>indicate</i> uniform interfacial layer with resin tag formations. D, dentin	96
Figure 41: Photomicrograph of MTA-Fillapex dentin interface at the coronal third (score 1). Arrows <i>indicate</i> needle-shaped crystals. D, dentin	96
Figure 42: Photomicrograph of the AH Plus dentin interface at the apical third (score 2). Arrow <i>indicates</i> resin-dentin interdiffusion zone. D, dentin	97
Figure 43: Mean inhibition zone around each sealer in mm	99
Figure 44: Inhibition zone around MTA-Fillapex disc sample.....	99
Figure 45: Mean viable (\log_{10} CFU/ml) of both sealers at different observation periods	101
Figure 46: Change in mean viable (\log_{10} CFU/ml) of both sealers with time.....	102

List of Tables:

	<i>Page</i>
Table 1: Sealers tested and their composition	43
Table 2: Mean and standard deviation of pH values for both sealers at all observation periods	76
Table 3: Mean and standard deviation, maximum and minimum radio- opacity values of both sealers in mm Al	78
Table 4: Mean and standard deviation, maximum and minimum setting times of both sealers in hours	80
Table 5: Mean and standard deviation, maximum and minimum percentage weight loss (solubility) of both sealers	82
Table 6: Mean and standard deviation of push-out bond strength (MPa) of both sealers at different levels.....	85
Table 7: Mean and standard deviation of leakage value ($\mu\text{L}/\text{min}$) of both sealers at all observation periods.....	87
Table 8: Mean percentage surface area of gaps of both sealers at all root levels.....	89
Table 9: Mean and median of adaptability scores recorded at different root thirds for both sealers.....	92
Table 10: Mean and standard deviation, maximum and minimum diameter of inhibition zone around each sealer in mm	98
Table 11: Mean and standard deviation of viable (\log_{10} CFU/ml) for both sealers at different observation periods	101

To complement proper cleaning and shaping of the root canal system, three-dimensional filling with a biologically inert and dimensionally stable material is a major objective of root canal treatment. To serve this aim, gutta-percha has been used in combination with various endodontic sealers to fill any voids and gaps between the core root filling material and dentin. An ideal root canal sealer should also adhere to both dentin and the core filling material. The relatively recent introduction of methacrylate-based resin endodontic sealers has been a major step towards achieving this goal.

Epoxy resin-based sealers were introduced in endodontics and current modifications of the original formula are widely used for root canal filling procedures. One of these sealers is AH Plus, which has been extensively evaluated for its physical and mechanical properties.

Calcium silicate cements, well known as MTA, are novel self-setting biomaterials for oral and endodontic surgery. The setting reaction of calcium silicate cements requires water, so that they are able to set in a wet environment through the formation of a nanoporous calcium silicate hydrate gel. Because calcium silicate cements set in the presence of moisture such as blood and

other fluids, with a great clinical advantage, it appeared interesting to develop endodontic sealers based on calcium silicate hydraulic cements.

These MTA-based root canal sealers produce calcium hydroxide, which is released in solution and induces formation of hydroxyapatite structures in simulated body fluid. MTA-based endodontic sealers may also offer adhesive properties comparable to those of resin-based ones.

MTA-Fillapex is a recently introduced MTA-based sealer composed of resins (salicylate, diluting, natural), radiopaque bismuth, nano-particulated silica, MTA, and pigments. To date, only scant knowledge is available with regard to its adhesive properties.

Although the physical properties, sealing ability and biocompatibility of MTA are well documented, there have been fewer studies ^(1,2,3) conducted using MTA-based sealers. It is worth to study the physical properties, interfacial adaptability, and antibacterial effect of MTA-Fillapex as a root canal sealer.

1. Physical Properties:

A number of tests have been developed to assess the physical and technological properties of endodontic filling materials, such tests serve a number of purposes. They ensure that the materials are presented in a consistency and workability so that they are practical to use in a clinical situation, they provide a physical characterization of the material when mixed and set, and they may in some instances be helpful in anticipating how the material will perform clinically⁽⁴⁾.

McMichen et al ⁽⁵⁾ compared the solubility, film thickness, flow, working and setting times of five root canal sealer; Roth 801, Tubliseal, AH Plus, Apexit and Endion. Ten samples of each of the five sealers were mixed according to the manufacturer's instructions and packed into copper matrices. The materials were then stored for 48 hours at 37 °C and 100% relative humidity. Solubility was measured by weight changes of standard over a three-month period; the specimens were desiccated and weighted at week intervals. Storage solutions were evaporated and the remaining residue was weighed. Results of their study showed that AH Plus was the least soluble sealer, while Apexit was the most unstable in water.

Versiani et al ⁽⁶⁾ evaluated setting time, solubility and disintegration, flow, film thickness and dimensional change following setting of Epiphany root canal sealer and compared it with AH Plus. Experiments were performed according to ANSI/ADA specification no. 57. Five samples of each material were tested for each of the properties. The solubility (AH Plus: 0.21%; Epiphany: 3.41%) and dimensional alterations following setting (AH Plus: expansion of 1.3%; Epiphany: expansion of 8.1%) were statistically different. Dimensional alteration test for both cements were greater than values considered acceptable by ANSI/ADA. Epiphany values regarding solubility were also greater than values considered acceptable by ANSI/ADA.

Islam et al ⁽⁷⁾ evaluated and compared the pH, radiopacity, setting time, solubility, dimensional change, and compressive strength of ProRoot MTA (PMTA), ProRoot MTA (tooth colored formula), white Portland cement, and ordinary Portland cement. Results showed that PMTA and Portland cement have very similar physical properties. However, the radiopacity of Portland cement is much lower than that of PMTA. Compressive strength of PMTA was greater than that of Portland cement.

Carvalho-Junior et al ⁽⁸⁾ proposed smaller dimensions for samples used in solubility and dimensional change tests of root filling materials on the basis of ANSI/ADA specification no. 57. Volume, mass, and density of the test samples were determined, and 6 different samples of smaller dimensions were proposed for each test. Endofill and AH Plus were used. For the solubility test, 2 samples were weighted, stored in distilled and deionized water for 24 hours, dried, and weighed again. Solubility was determined as percentage weight loss. For dimensional change, samples' heights were measured before and after immersion in deionized water for 30 days. Endofill presented higher solubility values than AH Plus. Endofill presented 0.56% of shrinkage and AH Plus 0.62% expansion. They concluded that smaller dimensions for test samples used in solubility and dimensional change tests are a viable alternative, decreasing the amount of filling material necessary for executing these tests.

Camilleri ⁽⁹⁾ evaluated properties of MTA as a sealer. MTA was mixed with water at powder/liquid ratios of 4 and 3.33 and an addition of 2 mL to 20 mL of water-soluble polymer. Materials were tested for flow and film thickness, and the optimal quantity of polymer required to conform to ISO 6876 Section 4.3.1, 4.3.4 (2002) was determined. The resultant MTA sealer was tested for radiopacity using methods suggested by ISO 6876 (2002) using