

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

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

صدق الله العظيم

البقرة (آية ٣٢)

Assessment of newly introduced fiber-reinforced posts on fracture resistance of endodontically compromised teeth

Thesis submitted to

Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine, Cairo University

In partial fulfillment of the requirements of

Master Degree in Fixed Prosthodontics

Presented by

Mohammed Taisser Hussein Sowwan

B.D.S

6th of October University

2004

Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine

Cairo University

2010

Supervisors

Dr. Ihab Elsayed Mosleh

Professor of Fixed Prosthodontics
Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine
Cairo University

Dr. Shereen Adel Amin

Assistant Professor of Fixed Prosthodontics
Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine
Cairo University

Dr. Ahmad Fouad Elragi

Lecturer of Civil Engineering
Faculty of Engineering
Fayoum University

Acknowledgment

*First and foremost, I fell indebted to **Allah**, the most kind and merciful who allowed me to accomplish this work.*

*This thesis grew out of a series of dialogues with my supervisor **Dr. Ihab Elsayed Mosleh** professor of Fixed Prosthodontics, Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine, Cairo University. Through his Socratic questioning, he brought me closer to the reality I had initially perceived, eventually enabling me to grasp its rich complexity. I would like to express my profound gratitude to him for giving me the honor of working under his supervision. His moral support and continuous guidance enabled me to complete my work successfully.*

*I am heartily thankful to **Dr. Shereen Adel Amin**, Assistant professor of Fixed Prosthodontics Department, Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine, Cairo University for her great help, support, supervision and suggestions. Her intellectual and constructive opinions were essential to dress this work in its final form.*

*My greatest sincere gratitude and deep appreciation to **Dr. Ahmad Fouad Elragi**, Lecturer of Civil Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Fayoum University for his great help, valuable advices and kind encouragement during this study.*

*I cannot find sufficient words to express my gratitude to **Dr. Barry Musikant** and **Dr. Brian Rasimick**, from essential dental systems for their valuable, faithful guidance, encouragement and for their kind help and useful remarks.*

Last but not least, I would like to thank the head of Fixed Prosthodontics Department, Faculty of Oral and Dental Medicine, Cairo University and all the staff members of the department for their support throughout the stages of my master degree.

Dedication

*To my great **Father** and **Mother**, who were the reason for where I am today and without their support, enthusiasm and encouragement, this work would have not been possible.*

*To my lovely brother **Hussein**, who was always supporting me.*

*To my best friend **Dr. Shaden Issa Sager** and all my friends for their love and support.*

LIST OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	I
List of Figures.....	II
Introduction	1
Review of Literature	3
Aim of the study	25
Materials and Methods	26
Results	71
Discussion	89
Summary and Conclusions	104
References	107
Appendices.....	122
Arabic Summary	

LIST OF TABLES

Table No.	Title	Page No.
Table 1	Materials used in the present study	26
Table 2	Elastic properties of the materials used in this study	66
Table 3	Mean, SD values and results of ANOVA test for comparison between fracture resistance (N) of tested post groups	72
Table 4	Mean, SD values, results of ANOVA and Kruskal-Wallis tests for comparison between number of cycles in tested post groups	74
Table 5	Mean, SD values and results of paired t-test for comparison between changes in number of cycles in tested post groups	76
Table 6	Frequencies, percentages and results of chi-square test for comparison between fracture patterns of the three post groups	79

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure No.	Title	Page No.
Figure 1	Glassix Post	28
Figure 2	Flexi-Post Fiber	28
Figure 3	everStick Post	29
Figure 4	Breeze Cement	29
Figure 5	Fiber-reinforced composite core	29
Figure 6	Multilink Resin Cement	30
Figure 7	Selection of teeth using a digital caliper and magnifying lens	31
Figure 8	Centralizing device parts	33
Figure 9	Centralizing Hole(Arrow)	34
Figure 10	Inserted file into the root canal of the tooth	34
Figure 11	Press drill device	38
Figure 12	Post space preparation	38
Figure 13	Split Flexi-Fiber Tap (A,B) and tap insertion (C)	39
Figure 14	Parts of loading device	40
Figure 15	External wrench fitting over Flexi-fiber post	41
Figure 16	everStick post cementation procedures	43
Figure 17	Parts of the Teflon mold core former	45
Figure 18	Assembled split Teflon mold core former	45
Figure 19	Build up fiber-reinforced composite core	46
Figure 20	Copper ring fitted over finish line	47
Figure 21	Preparation of the bevel-shaped cut	47
Figure 22	A standardized bevel of the core (Side view)	47
Figure 23	Schematic diagram of beveled core	47

Figure 24	Individual impression in sectional tray	48
Figure 25	Master die	48
Figure 26	Crown resin pattern	49
Figure 27	Rubber base index	49
Figure 28	Spruing of the pattern for the pressable ceramic	49
Figure 29	The investment ring with Alox plunger	51
Figure 30	Investment ring at press furnace	51
Figure 31	Rough divesting (A), Fine divesting (B)	52
Figure 32	Stained and glazed crowns	52
Figure 33	Application of the load during crown cementation	54
Figure 34	Universal testing machine	55
Figure 35	Fatigue loading test	55
Figure 36	The obtained charts from the universal testing machine	56
Figure 37	Stereomicroscope	58
Figure 38	SOMATOM CT Machine	59
Figure 39	Visualization of the C.T. images of the assemblies by MIMICS	60
Figure 40	Thresholding and color coding	61
Figure 41	Refining and re-meshing of the tooth	63
Figure 42	Bone support construction	64
Figure 43	Gutta-perch, post, ferrule and core construction	64
Figure 44	Sagittal section of the finite element model for the assembly	65
Figure 45	Load application	67
Figure 46	The relation between forces, displacement, stress and strain	70
Figure 47	Mean fracture resistance values of tested post groups	73
Figure 48	Mean number of cycles in tested post groups	75
Figure 49	Changes in number of cycles in tested post groups	77
Figure 50	Representative sample of favorable fracture pattern (A) and unfavorable fracture pattern (B)	78
Figure 51	Percentage of favorable and unfavorable fracture patterns in tested post groups	79

Figure 52	Fracture pattern in Flexi-post fiber specimen	80
Figure 53	Fracture pattern in a repairable Glassix post specimen (Arrow)	81
Figure 54	Fracture line in ferrule in Flexi-post specimen (Arrow)	81
Figure 55	Fracture pattern of everStick post group	82
Figure 56	Semilunar Root fracture	83
Figure 57	Beveled root and post fracture in Glassix post specimen	83
Figure 58	Fracture line in Flexi-post	84
Figure 59	Debonding of everStick post	84
Figure 60	Stress values in epoxy resin of tested post groups	126
Figure 61	Stress values in root of tested post groups	131
Figure 62	Stress values in post of tested post groups	136
Figure 63	Stress values in Gutta-perch of tested post groups	141
Figure 64	Stress values in ferrule of tested post groups	146
Figure 65	Stress values in core of tested post groups	151
Figure 66	Stress values in crown of tested post groups	156

Introduction

With the advent of endodontic therapy, the challenges have been increased for restorative dentistry. The endodontic therapy has reduced the rate of tooth loss, however the prognosis of success is highly dependent on the proper restoration of these treated teeth ^(1, 2).

Root filled teeth have a higher risk of biomechanical failure than teeth with vital pulps ⁽³⁾. Post and core systems are commonly used for the restoration of endodontically treated teeth to retain coronal restorations when inadequate tooth structure remained. For decades, restorative modalities for root filled teeth have been the main concern of much research, with the aim of identifying the adequate methods that make the complex root, post and core unit more resistant to the stresses of masticatory loads⁽⁴⁾.

Loosening of the post and core or fracture of the remaining tooth structure is the most frequent problem observed. This failure is related to many factors such as, post length, diameter, material and post design which can influence the biomechanical behavior of endodontically treated teeth by modifying the pattern of stress distribution⁽⁴⁾.

With the increasing esthetic demands, tooth colored post and core restorations have become popular for restoring endodontically treated teeth especially in the anterior region. The combination of tooth colored posts with all ceramic restorations has overcome the disadvantages of metal posts with their inherent opacity that adversely affects the color of the final restoration ⁽⁵⁾.

Highlighting the effect of post design on the biomechanical performance of the restored teeth under different conditions might be of value to the clinician for proper post selection.

Review of Literature

The successful restoration of an endodontically treated tooth can pose a difficult challenge to the restorative dentist. A tooth which has lost significant coronal and radicular structure due to caries, endodontic procedures or trauma must be reestablished as a fully functioning member of the dental arch ^(6, 7).

Effect of root canal treatment on tooth structure

Root filled teeth are weaker than intact ones due to decreased dentin moisture, loss of dental structure and root canal preparation which will limit tooth deformation capacity under loading, thus increasing the potential for tooth fracture⁽⁸⁾.

It is generally believed that the dentin in endodontically treated teeth is substantially more brittle than dentin in teeth with vital pulps, probably because of water loss and loss of collagen cross-linking ⁽⁹⁾. Despite these findings, more recent studies were conducted in this aspect. A comparison of the physical and mechanical properties of dentin specimens from teeth with and without endodontic treatment at different levels of hydration was studied by **Huang et al** in (1991) ⁽¹⁰⁾. They concluded that neither dehydration nor endodontic treatment caused degradation of the physical or mechanical properties of dentin. On the other hand, **Gutman** in (1992) ⁽¹¹⁾ found that root canal treatment changed the actual composition of the remaining tooth structure.

Sedgley and Messer (1992) ⁽¹²⁾ tested the biomechanical properties of dentin from twenty three endodontically treated teeth with an average of ten years of post treatment. They compared them to their contralateral vital pairs. Aside from a slight difference in hardness, the properties were comparable. The study did not support the conclusion that endodontically treated teeth are more brittle. It was claimed that the loss of structural integrity associated with the access preparation rather than changes in the dentin that lead to a higher occurrence of fractures in endodontically treated teeth compared with vital teeth. Access preparations result in increased cuspal deflection during function and increase the possibility of cusp fracture and microleakage at the margins of restorations.

An earlier study by **Randow and Glantz** in **(1986)** ⁽¹³⁾ reported that teeth have a protective feedback mechanism that is lost when the pulp is removed, which also may contribute to tooth fracture.

The high success rate of modern-day endodontics has resulted in an increased demand for clinically convenient post core systems to help restore the lost tooth structure ⁽¹⁴⁾. There is a considerable controversy surrounding the need for using coronal-radicular restoration and the strengthening role of posts. There are three basic philosophies. The first group advocate posts in each tooth after root canal treatment because posts supposedly strengthen the tooth against occlusal forces. The second group discourages the use of posts claiming that the tooth preparation of the root canal and the insertion of the post results in substantial weakening of the tooth. A third group believes that there is no appreciable improvement in fracture resistance of the tooth to occlusal forces ⁽¹⁵⁾.

In (1994), Assif et al⁽¹⁵⁾ pointed out that posts should be used only for retention of a core within remaining tooth structure when there are no other alternatives. Appropriate retentive features can be selected to retain the core as restorations that use parapulpal retentive pins in dentin or an intra-radicular post requiring removal of a minimal amount of tooth structure. They further added that increasing the length and diameter of the metal post to improve its radicular retention compromises the prognosis of the restored tooth. Finally they concluded that the use of a post to strengthen pulpless tooth aiming to resist occlusal forces, is hardly justified and possibly detrimental.

Post Types and Designs

In general, the decision whether to use a post in any clinical situation must be made judiciously. The posts should be used only when there is insufficient tooth substance remaining to support the final restoration. In other words, the main function of a post is the retention of a core to support the coronal restoration^(16, 17).

Generally, posts and cores can be classified into two groups, custom-made and prefabricated. Custom-made post and core can be cast from a direct pattern fabricated in the patient's mouth, or an indirect pattern can be fabricated in the dental laboratory. A direct technique with autopolymerizing or light-polymerized resin is recommended for single canals with good clinical access, whereas an indirect procedure is more appropriate for multiple canals or when access is more problematic^(18, 19).