

**“Comparative Study of Three Different Types of Root
Canal Sealers”**

InVitro Study

Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty of Dentistry,

Ain Shams University

For

Partial Fulfillment of Requirements of the Doctorate

degree in

Endodontics

By

Dr. Mennattullah Mohsen Hafez Mohamed

Thabet

B.D.S. Misr International University (2008)

M.D.S. AinShams University (2015)

2018

Supervisors

Prof. Dr. Ihab El-Sayed Hassanein

Head of Endodontic department,
Faculty of Dentistry, Ain Shams University

Dr. Mohamed Mokhtar Nagy

Associate professor of Endodontics,
Endodontic department,
Faculty of dentistry, AinShams University

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

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

صدق الله العظيم

ايه 32 سورة البقره

Acknowledgment

*My Deepest thanks and appreciation to Professor Doctor **Ihab El-Sayed Hassanein** Professor of Endodontics, Head of Endodontic Department, Ain Shams University, for all his help, collaborations, useful critiques, and guidance along the way till this thesis got completed.*

*I would like to thank Doctor **Mohamed Mokhtar Nagy** Associate Professor of Endodontics, Endodontic Department, Ain Shams University for offering me time, support and enthusiastic encouragement throughout the whole work.*

*I extend my thanks to professor Doctor **Salma El Ashry** head of Endodontic department Misr International University and all my colleagues and staff members at the **Endodontic Department** either at **MU** or **ASU**.*

Dedication

To my family, for their endless support, and love.

To my one and only brother, for his continuous guidance.

To my Lovely dear Friends for their encouragement

*Special dedication to @Mr Mostafa & Khaled Elgamaz
my dearest friends for their unconditional love, support, and
continuous motivation, thanks for helping me bringing this
work out to light,*

List of Contents

List of Tables	II
List of Figures.....	III
Introduction	1-2
Review of Literature	3-48
Aim of the study	49
Materials and Methods	50-73
Results	74-100
Discussion	101-118
Summary	119-122
Conclusions	123
Recommendations	124
References	125-142
Arabic Summary	143-144

List of Tables

<i>Table #</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Page #</i>
Table (1)	List of Materials	50
Table (2)	List of Instruments and Devices	50
Table (3)	Inclusion/Exclusion criteria	51
Table (4)	Sample Grouping	54
Table (5)	Criteria for dye penetration scoring	60
Table (6)	Sample Grouping for cytotoxicity testing	67
Table (7)	comparison between adaptability scores in the three groups	74
Table (8)	comparison between push-out bond strength in the three groups	77
Table (9)	comparison between push-out bond strength at different root levels within each group	79
Table (10)	interaction of grouping and segment variables regarding bond strength	80
Table (11)	Mode of failure in different groups	80
Table (12)	comparison between sealer penetration % in the three groups	84
Table (13)	sealer penetration (%) and comparison of different depths within the same group	85
Table (14)	interaction of grouping and depth variables regarding sealer penetration (%)	86
Table (15)	comparison between sealer penetration depth (µm) in the three groups	87
Table (16)	sealer depth (µm) and comparison of different depths within the same group	88

Table (17)	interaction of grouping and depth variables regarding sealer depth (μm)	89
Table (18)	comparison between retreatment times in the three groups	90
Table (19)	Patency in different groups	91
Table (20)	comparison between debris % in the three groups	92
Table (21)	amount of debris (%) and comparison of different depths within the same group	93
Table(22)	interaction of grouping and depth variables regarding amount of debris (%)	94
Table (23)	comparison between sealer penetration depth (μm) after retreatment in the three groups	95
Table (24)	penetration depth (μm) after re-treatment and comparison of different depths within the same group	96
Table (25)	interaction of grouping and depth variables regarding penetration depth (μm) after re-treatment	97
Table (26)	Comparison of penetration depth (μm) before and after retreatment	98
Table (27)	comparison between viability % in the three groups	99
Table (28)	comparison between viability % at different time periods within each group	100
Table (29)	summary of outcomes	120

List of Figure

Figure #	Title	Page #
Figure (1)	decoronated roots at 14mm	52
Figure (2)	AH Plus Sealer	52
Figure (3)	Total Fill BC Sealer	53
Figure (4)	Flow Chart of Groups and Test Groups	55
Figure (5)	Digital Balance	58
Figure (6)	Homogenizer	58
Figure (7)	Sample root levels demarcation	58
Figure (8)	Nail varnish applied on root except apical 2mm	59
Figure (9)	Roots embedded in acrylic resin blocks	60
Figure (10)	A: Isomet Saw machine B: roots during sectioning C: Root segments (coronal,Middle, Apical)	61
Figure (11)	Digital Caliber	61
Figure (12)	Sample under loading fixture	62
Figure (13)	A: sample Examination under CLSM B: Confocal image of root section C: Image of sealer penetration depth in dentinal tubule D: Image Showing Penetration Percent	64
Figure (14)	A: Image Under CLSM, B: Remaining Debris in Canal, C: Longest Penetration Depth of Residual Sealer D: Stereomicroscopic image for root canal after retreatment	66
Figure (15)	96 wellplate	68
Figure (16)	Culture media inspected under inverted microscope	69
Figure (17)	Spectrophotometer	70
Figure (18)	Microscopic images for viable cells	71
Figure (19)	Box plot representing median and range values for adaptability scores in the three groups	74
Figure (20)	streomicroscopic images of scoring for adaptability using methylene blue dye penetration	75

Figure (21)	Column chart illustrating mean bond strength in different groups in each segment	78
Figure (22)	Bar chart illustrating mean bond strength in different segments within the same group	79
Figure (23)	Bar chart showing distribution of mode of failure in different group	81
Figure (24)	stereomicroscopic image of Cohesive Failure	81
Figure (25)	stereomicroscopic image of Adhesive Failure	82
Figure (26)	stereomicroscopic image of Mixed Failure	82
Figure (27)	Bar chart showing sealer penetration (%) at 2 and 4mm depth in different groups	84
Figure (28)	Bar chart representing mean and standard deviation values for sealer penetration % at different root levels	85
Figure (29)	Bar chart representing mean and standard deviation values for sealer penetration depth in the three groups	87
Figure (30)	Bar chart representing mean and standard deviation values for sealer penetration depth at different root levels	88
Figure (31)	Bar chart representing mean and standard deviation values for retreatment time in the three groups	90
Figure (32)	Bar chart showing patency in different groups	91
Figure (33)	Bar chart representing mean and standard deviation values for debris % in the three groups	92
Figure (34)	Bar chart representing mean and standard deviation values for debris % at different root levels	93
Figure (35)	Bar chart representing mean and standard deviation values for sealer penetration depth after retreatment in the three groups	95
Figure (36)	Bar chart representing mean and standard deviation values for sealer penetration depth after retreatment at different root levels	96
Figure (37)	Bar chart showing mean penetration depth (μm) before and after retreatment	98
Figure (38)	Box plot representing median and range values for viability % in the three groups	100