



Ain Shams University  
Faculty of Dentistry  
Department of Endodontics

**Effect of Surfactant Addition to Three Irrigating Solutions on  
Canal Cleanliness and Resin Sealer Adaptation**

Thesis submitted to the Endodontic Department,  
Faculty of Dentistry, Ain Shams University

For

Partial fulfillment of the requirements of the master degree  
in Endodontics.

**By**

**Sarah Hossam Mahmoud Fahmy**

B.D.S. Ain Shams University, 2008

**Supervisors**

**Prof. Salma Hassan El Ashry**

Professor of Endodontics -Faculty of Dentistry

Ain Shams University

**Assoc. prof. Abeer Abdel Hakim EL Gendy**

Associate professor of Endodontics-Faculty of Dentistry

Ain Shams University

**2013**



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I am thanking *Allah* Almighty for accomplishing this modest work.

It is with immense gratitude that I acknowledge the support and help of my honorable Professor ***Dr. Salma Hassan El Ashry*** for her valuable instructions and for being my ideal ethically and scientifically.

I owe sincere and earnest thankfulness to Associate Professor ***Dr.Abeer Abdel Hakim El Gendy*** for her patience and useful guidance.

Words cannot convey my gratitude to Associate Professor ***Dr.Shehab El Din Saber, Dr. Mohamed Mokhtar Nagy*** and ***Dr.Hebatullah Adel Saleh*** for all their undeniable help in the technical phase of this study.

My heartfelt thanks to my parents who are credited with what I am until now and forever. With patience and wisdom, they were my greatest support all my lifetime.

Last but not least, I would like to convey my thanks to all my colleagues at the Department of Endodontics, Faculty of Dentistry, Ain Shams University who have been a constant support to me throughout the way.





## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS .....</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>List of Figures.....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>List of Tables .....</b>	<b>viii</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>LITERATURE REVIEW .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>SURFACTANTS INFLUENCE ON IRRIGANTS     PROPERTIES.....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>EFFECT OF ROOT CANAL IRRIGANTS ON ADAPTATION     OF OBTURATION MATERIALS.....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>AIM OF THE STUDY .....</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>MATERIALS AND METHODS .....</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>RESULTS .....</b>	<b>79</b>
<b>PILOT STUDY RESULTS FOR TWEEN 80     CONCENTRATIONS.....</b>	<b>79</b>
<b>ROOT CANAL CLEANLINESS.....</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>PUSH OUT BOND STRENGTH RESULTS.....</b>	<b>104</b>
<b>MODE OF FAILURE.....</b>	<b>117</b>
<b>DISCUSSION.....</b>	<b>120</b>
<b>SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS .....</b>	<b>112</b>
<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>127</b>
<b>ARABIC SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>126</b>



## List of Figures

<b>Figure 1.</b> Du Nuoy ring tensiometer for interfacial surface tension measurement.....	<b>56</b>
<b>Figure 2</b> Gradual insertion and withdrawal of the platinum ring till detachment of the fluid lamella.....	<b>56</b>
<b>Figure 3.</b> Surface tension values vs. logarithms of Tween 80 concentrations. The arrow points to the CMC value.....	<b>57</b>
<b>Figure 4.</b> Experimental design scheme highlighting the grouping of samples as a function of the irrigation protocols.....	<b>60</b>
<b>Figure 5.</b> Diagramatic explantation of the basic steps in image J software analysis.....	<b>63</b>
<b>Figure 6.</b> Scale set up.....	<b>64</b>
<b>Figure 7.</b> Canal outline demarcation (first step).....	<b>64</b>
<b>Figure 8.</b> Canal outline demarcation (second step).....	<b>65</b>
<b>Figure 9.</b> Active image conversion into 8 bit greyscale.....	<b>65</b>
<b>Figure 10.</b> Greyscale image thresholding into pixels of interest and background. The highlighted areas in red are the debris aggregates that are to be measured. The arrow points to the range of the highlighted .....	<b>66</b>
<b>Figure 11.</b> Scale set up prior to diameter measurement. Measurement selection (Feret diameter).....	<b>70</b>
<b>Figure 12.</b> A representative sample showing a canal cross-section with diameter and radius measurements.....	<b>71</b>
<b>Figure 13.</b> Schematic presentation of the loading fixture for push out bond strength measurement.....	<b>72</b>
<b>Figure 14.</b> Lower part of the loading fixture for bond strength measurement.....	<b>73</b>
<b>Figure 15.</b> Upper and lower compartments of the loading fixture for push out bond strength assessment.....	<b>73</b>
<b>Figure 16.</b> Sample under loading for push out bond strength measurement.....	<b>74</b>
<b>Figure 17.</b> Lloyd instrument for push out bond strength testing.....	<b>74</b>



<b>Figure 18.</b> Scanning Electron Microscope for qualitative mode of failure evaluation.....	77
<b>Figure 19.</b> Sputter coating procedure of samples prior to SEM examination.....	78
<b>Figure 20.</b> Line graph showing 2.5 %NaOCl contact angle values vs. Tween 80 logarithmic concentrations.....	82
<b>Figure 21.</b> Line graph showing 2.5% NaOCl surface tension values vs Tween 80 logarithmic concentrations.....	82
<b>Figure 22.</b> Line graph showing EDTA contact angle values vs. Tween .80 logarithmic concentrations.....	83
<b>Figure 23.</b> Line graph showing EDTA contact angle values vs. Tween 80 logarithmic concentrations.....	83
<b>Figure 24.</b> Line graph showing maleic acid contact angle values vs Tween 80 logarithmic concentrations.....	84
<b>Figure 25.</b> Line graph showing 7 % maleic acid surface tension values vs Tween 80 logarithmic concentrations.....	84
<b>Figure 26.</b> Column chart representing the mean percentage of debris at the same root canal third among the EDTA irrigation protocols and the control group.....	88
<b>Figure 27.</b> Column chart representing the overall mean percentage of debris among the EDTA irrigation protocols and the control group.....	88
<b>Figure 28.</b> Column chart representing the mean percentage of debris at the root canal thirds among the EDTA irrigation protocols.....	90
<b>Figure 29.</b> Column chart showing the mean percentage of debris at the same root canal segment among the Maleic acid irrigation protocols and the control group.....	93
<b>Figure 30.</b> Column chart showing the overall mean percentage of debris values among the Maleic acid irrigation protocols and the control group.....	93
<b>Figure 31.</b> Column chart showing the mean percentage of debris at the different root canal segments among Maleic acid irrigation protocols.....	95

- Figure 32.** Column chart showing the overall debris percentages among EDTA and Maleic acid irrigation protocols.....**97**
- Figure 33.** Stereophotomicrographs (magnification 40 X) of root canal walls irrigated with distilled water at the coronal (A), middle (B) and apical (C) thirds highlighting the debris fraction (red) before and after submission to image J analysis. Second column shows results of manual thresholding, third column shows results of automatic thresholding (Binary process).....**98**
- Figure 34.** Stereophotomicrographs (magnification 40 X) of root canal walls irrigated with plain 17% EDTA followed by plain 2.5% NaOCl at the coronal (A), middle (B) and apical (C) thirds highlighting the debris fraction before and after submission to image J analysis. Second column shows results of manual thresholding, third column shows results of automatic thresholding (Binary process).....**99**
- Figure 35.** Stereophotomicrographs (magnification 40 X) of root canal walls irrigated with 17% EDTA with 1% Tween 80 followed by 2.5% NaOCl at the coronal (A), middle (B) and apical (C) thirds highlighting the debris fraction before and after submission to image J analysis. Second column shows results of manual thresholding, third column shows results of automatic thresholding (Binary process).....**100**
- Figure 36.** Stereophotomicrographs (magnification 40 X) of root canal walls irrigated with 7% plain 7% Maleic acid followed by 2.5% NaOCl and 0.6 % Tween 80 (A), middle (B) and apical (C) thirds highlighting the debris fraction before and after submission to image J analysis. Second column shows results of manual thresholding, third column shows results of automatic thresholding (Binary process).....**101**
- Figure 37.** Stereophotomicrographs (magnification 40 X) of root canal walls irrigated with 7% Maleic acid and 1% Tween 80 followed by plain 2.5% NaOCl at the coronal (A), middle (B) and apical (C) thirds highlighting the debris fraction before and after submission to image J analysis. Second column shows results of manual thresholding, third column shows

results of automatic thresholding (Binary process).....	102
<b>Figure 38.</b> Stereophotomicrographs (magnification 40 X) of root canal walls irrigated with 7% Maleic acid and 1% Tween 80 followed by 2.5% NaOCl and 0.6% Tween 80 at the coronal (A), middle (B) and apical (C) thirds highlighting the debris fraction before and after submission to image J analysis. Second column shows results of manual thresholding, third column shows results of automatic thresholding (Binary process).....	103
<b>Figure 39.</b> Column chart showing the mean push out bond strength values of gutta percha/AH Plus among the EDTA irrigation protocols at the same root canal level.....	107
<b>Figure 40.</b> Column chart showing the mean overall push out bond strength values of gutta percha/ AH plus resin sealer among the different EDTA irrigation protocols.....	107
<b>Figure 41.</b> Column chart showing the mean push out bond strength values of gutta percha/AH plus resin sealer to dentin among the EDTA irrigation protocols and the control group at the different root canal levels.....	109
<b>Figure 42.</b> Column chart highlighting the mean push out bond strength values of gutta percha/AH Plus among the maleic acid irrigation protocols and the control group at the same root canal level.....	112
<b>Figure 43.</b> Column chart highlighting the overall mean push out bond strength values of gutta percha/AH Plus to root canal dentin among the Maleic acid irrigation protocols and the control group.....	112
<b>Figure 44.</b> Column chart highlighting the push out bond strength values of gutta percha/AH Plus to root canal dentin among the Maleic acid irrigation protocols and the control group at the different root canal levels.....	114
<b>Figure 45.</b> Column chart showing the overall push out bond strength values among the EDTA and Maleic acid irrigation protocols.....	116

- Figure 46.** Stereomicrographs showing the different mode of bond failure at 40 X magnification. (A) Adhesive failure at sealer/sealer interface. (B) Cohesive failure within gutta percha. (C) Mixed failure; cohesive and mixed at sealer/ dentin interface, note sealer and gutta percha remnants on canal walls.....**118**
- Figure 47.** Scanning electron photomicrographs showing the different modes of failure: (A) Cohesive failure. (B) Mixed failure. (C) and (D) Higher magnifications for (B) showing one side of root canal lumen with adhesive mode of failure at the sealer/ dentin interface and mixed failure ; adhesive at sealer/gutta percha interface and cohesive within gutta percha respectively.....**119**

## List of Tables

<b>Table 1.</b> Contact angle values vs. logarithmic concentrations of Tween 80.....	<b>80</b>
<b>Table 2.</b> Surface tension values vs. Tween 80 logarithmic concentrations.....	<b>81</b>
<b>Table 3.</b> Mean percentage of debris at the same root canal third among the EDTA irrigation protocols.....	<b>87</b>
<b>Table 4.</b> Mean percentage of debris at the different root canal segments among the EDTA irrigation protocols and the control group.....	<b>89</b>
<b>Table 5.</b> Mean percentage of debris at the same root canal level among Maleic acid irrigation protocols.....	<b>92</b>
<b>Table 6.</b> Mean percentage of debris at the different root canal levels among the Maleic acid irrigation protocols and the control group.....	<b>94</b>
<b>Table 7.</b> Overall mean percentages of debris of the two main groups.....	<b>96</b>
<b>Table 8.</b> Mean push out bond strength values of gutta percha/AH Plus to root canal dentin among the EDTA irrigation protocols and the control group at the same root canal level.....	<b>106</b>
<b>Table 9.</b> Mean push out bond strength values of gutta percha/AH Plus to root canal dentin among the EDTA irrigation protocols and the control group at the different root canal levels.....	<b>108</b>
<b>Table 10.</b> Mean push out bond strength values of gutta percha/AH Plus to root canal dentin at the same root canal level among the Maleic acid irrigation protocols and the control group.....	<b>111</b>
<b>Table 11.</b> Mean push out bond strength values of gutta percha/AH Plus among the Maleic acid irrigation protocols and the control group at the different root canal segments.....	<b>113</b>
<b>Table 12.</b> Overall mean push out bond strength values of the two main groups.....	<b>115</b>
<b>Table 13.</b> Different modes of failure among the different irrigation protocols.....	<b>117</b>

# INTRODUCTION

