

## Original Research Article

### **A Digital microscopic evaluation of the induction of dentinal micro-cracks after canal preparation with rotary and reciprocating NiTi systems in vitro**

#### **Abstract**

**Aim of study :** The aim of this study is to assess the induction of dentinal microcracks by different NiTi systems and to compare between rotary and reciprocating systems.

**Methodology:** Fifty teeth were selected and divided into five groups. The teeth were decoronated and mounted in acrylic resin with simulated periodontal ligament. Each group was instrumented according to manufacturer's specifications and was performed by a single operator. The teeth were then sectioned and viewed under a digital microscope. The study aimed to compare the performance of four different instruments.

**Results:** No cracks were detected in the control group. The Hyflex EDM produced the highest number of cracks in 4mm (70%), and the highest number of cracks in total (43.3%). ProTaper Universal produced the least number of cracks (16.6%). WaveOne and WaveOne Gold both produced cracks (30%).

**Conclusion:** Within the limitation of this in vitro study, all the instruments produced microcracks. The Hyflex EDM produced higher cracks in the mid root section. There was no significant difference in the incidence of microcracks between the four systems or between rotary and reciprocating systems.

---

**Keywords:** dentinal microcracks, NiTi systems, reciprocating systems., Hyflex EDM

#### **Introduction**

Preparation of the root canal system is recognized as being one of the most important stages in root canal treatment. (Schilder, 1974, Ruddle, 2002) it includes the removal of vital and necrotic tissues from the root canal system, along with infected root dentine. It aims to prepare the canal space to facilitate disinfection by irrigants and medicaments. Thus, canal preparation is the essential phase that eliminates infection. Prevention of

reinfection is then achieved through the provision of a fluid-tight root canal filling and a coronal restoration. Although mechanical preparation and chemical disinfection cannot be considered separately and are commonly referred to as chemomechanical or biomechanical preparation (Hülsmann et al., 2005).

Ingle described the first formal root canal preparation technique, which has become known as the 'standardized technique'. In this technique, each instrument was introduced to working length resulting in a canal shape that matched the taper and size of the final instrument. This technique was designed for single-cone filling techniques. (Ingle, 1961)

(Schilder, 1974) emphasized the need for thorough cleaning of the root canal system, i.e., removal of all organic contents of the entire root canal space with instruments and abundant irrigation and coined the axiom 'what comes out is as important as what goes in'. He stated that shaping must not only be carried out with respect to the individual and unique anatomy of each root canal but also in relation to the technique of and material for final obturation. When gutta-percha filling techniques were to be used he recommended that the basic shape should be a continuously tapering funnel following the shape of the original canal; this was termed as the 'concept of flow' allowing both removal of tissue and appropriate space for filling. (Schilder, 1974)

### **Aim of study**

The purpose of this investigation was to compare the incidence of root canal microcrack formation after preparation with reciprocating files (WaveOne Gold WaveOne) and continuous rotation files (ProTaper Universal and Hyflex EDM), which have not been compared in previous studies. Therefore, an attempt has been made to detect, evaluate and compare the dentinal microcracks caused by rotary and reciprocating instrumentation during root canal preparation using Digital microscopy (HIROX KH 7700) at X700 magnification ( lens MXG-2500REZ ) The aim of this study is to assess the induction of dentinal microcracks by different NiTi systems and to compare between rotary and reciprocating systems.

### **Materials and Methods**

50 freshly extracted human premolars were taken. Samples were then inspected under a stereo microscope (Meiji Techno EMZ5-BD-LED Zoom Stereo Microscope System) 2x magnification, to check for any external cracks or craze lines.

### **Inclusion Criteria:**

In this research study, specific inclusion criteria were established to ensure the selection of appropriate teeth for the investigation. The following inclusion criteria were applied

Single canal premolars with one root and one apical foramen: Teeth with a single canal and a single root were included in the study to maintain consistency and focus on teeth with a specific anatomical configuration.

Also Straight root: Teeth with a straight root morphology were included to minimize any potential variations in canal curvature that could influence the study outcomes.

### **Exclusion Criteria:**

In this study, certain exclusion criteria were established to ensure the selection of appropriate teeth for the research investigation. The following exclusion criteria were applied:

Teeth with multiple roots were excluded from the study to maintain consistency and focus on teeth with a single-root morphology.

Teeth with more than one apical foramen were excluded to eliminate any potential variations in root canal anatomy that could affect the study outcomes.

Teeth with resorption were excluded as the presence of resorption could impact the integrity and properties of the tooth structure, potentially confounding the results.

Teeth with craze lines, which are small cracks in the enamel that do not extend to the dentin, were excluded to minimize the influence of pre-existing enamel defects on the study outcomes.

Teeth with previous restorative or endodontic therapy were excluded to ensure a homogeneous sample and avoid any potential effects of prior treatments on the properties being evaluated.

Teeth that were not freshly extracted or were stored in a different solution than the study storing solution were excluded to maintain standardized conditions and avoid any impact of storage methods on the properties being measured.

Cracked or fractured teeth were excluded to prevent potential interference with the study measurements and to focus on structurally intact teeth.

By implementing these exclusion criteria, the study aimed to enhance the internal validity of the research findings by minimizing confounding factors and ensuring the selection of suitable teeth for the investigation.

### **Devices Used**

Dentsply X-smart plus motor and Digital Microscope (HIROX KH 7700) at X700 magnification ( lens MXG2500REZ ) also Slow speed cutting saw with water cooling (BUEHLER Isomet 2000 Precision Saw) was used along with The Memmert Universal Oven , Meiji Techno EMZ5-BD-LED Zoom Stereo Microscope System Alcohol solution (Avalon Pharma) and Pure Glycerin (Sun Care Pharma)

### **Results**

All specimens 10 (100%) in control group, 8 (80%) waveOne, 8 (80%) waveOne gold, 9 (90%) Hyflex EDM, and 9 (90%) Protaper universal groups showed no cracks at point 2 mm away from root apex. However, waveOne and protaper universal systems produced 2(20%) and 1 (10%) cracks extending from outside and reaching the canal wall. Waveone gold and Hyflex EDM each produced 1 (10%) cracks from the outer surface not reaching the canal wall. Additionally, waveOne gold 1 (10%) produced cracks from the canal walls not reaching the outer surface. However, none of the rotary instrument systems used in this study produced two types of cracks at point 2 mm away from the root apex, as shown in table 1.

**Table 1: Descriptive analysis on the incidence of dentinal cracks by different rotary instrument systems at 2mm away from the root apex**

	At point 2mm away from root apex									
	Control		Waveone		Waveone gold		Hyflex EDM		Protaper universal	
	n	%	n	%	N	%	n	%	n	%
Type A	10	100	8	80	8	80	9	90	9	90
Type B	0	0	2	20	0	0	0	0	1	10
Type C	0	0	0	0	1	10	1	10	0	0
Type D	0	0	0	0	1	10	0	0	0	0
Two types of cracks	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Waveone 2 (33.3%) and Waveone gold 2 (33.3%) produced a similar amount of root dentin defect whereas Hyflex EDM 1 (16.7%) and Protaper universal system 1 (16.7%) produced defects at 2 mm away from the root apex. This difference was not significant ( $\chi^2 = 7.84, p=1.00$ ) among studied experimental groups as shown in table 2.

**Table 2: Dentinal defects produced among experimental rotary instrument systems at 2mm away from the root apex**

	No defect		Defect		DF	Chi-square	sig
	N	%	n	%			
Waveone	8	23.5	2	33.3	3	7.84	1.0
Waveone gold	8	23.5	2	33.3			
Hyflex EDM	9	26.5	1	16.7			
Protaper universal	9	26.5	1	16.7			

All specimens 10 (100%) in control group, 7 (70%) waveOne, 8 (80%) waveOne gold, 3 (30%) Hyflex EDM, and 9 (90%) Protaper universal groups showed no cracks at point 4 mm away from root apex. However, waveOne and Hyflex EDM groups produced 2(20%) similar cracks extending from outside and reaching the canal wall. However, waveOne 1 (10%), waveOne gold 1(10%), Hyflex EDM 3 (30%) and protaper gold 1(10%) groups produced cracks from the outer surface not reaching the canal wall. Hyflex EDM produced 2 (20%) cracks from the canal walls not reaching the outer surface. WaveOne gold is the only group which produced 1 (10%) of two types of cracks at a point 4 mm away from the root apex, as shown in table 3.

**Table 3: Descriptive analysis on the incidence of dentinal cracks by different rotary instrument systems at 4mm away from the root apex**

	At point 4mm away from root apex									
	Control		Waveone		Waveone gold		Hyflex EDM		Protaper universal	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Type A	10	100	7	70	8	80	3	30	9	90
Type B	0	0	2	20	0	0	2	20	0	0
Type C	0	0	1	10	1	10	3	30	1	10
Type D	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	0	0
Two types of cracks	0	0	0	0	1	10	0	0	0	0

At 4mm away from the root apex, 3 (23.1%) waveOne, 2 (15.4%) waveOne gold, 7(53.8%) Hyflex EDM and 1 (7.7%) protaper universal experimental groups produced root dentin defect. This difference in defects was statistically significant ( $\chi^2 =9.46$ ,  $p=0.043$ ), as shown in table 4.

**Table 4: Dentinal defects produced among experimental rotary instrument systems at 4 mm away from the root apex**

	No defect		Defect		DF	Chi-square	sig
	n	%	n	%			
Waveone	7	25.9	3	23.1	3	9.46	<b>0.043</b>
Waveone gold	8	29.6	2	15.4			
Hyflex EDM	3	11.1	7	53.8			
Protaper universal	9	33.3	1	7.7			

## Discussion

One of the most important stages of root canal treatment is root canal preparation. But in the zeal of biomechanical root canal preparation, we unwillingly end up damaging the root dentin making a gateway of dentinal cracks and minute intricate fractures or even vertical root fractures, which leads to treatment failure. Quantity of dentinal defects can be affected by numerous factors like physical properties of teeth. Instrumentation with rotary and reciprocating nickel-titanium instruments could potentially cause dentinal cracks, which may have potential to develop into cracks and vertical root fractures.

Previous studies suggested that strain accumulation in dentin during root canal preparation may cause dentinal cracks from which VRF can develop. A finite element analysis simulation of shaping procedures with different preparation systems indicated that the file design may affect apical stress and strain concentrations during instrumentation. Although mechanical preparation with NiTi instruments has been mostly associated with high forces near the file tip and apical cracking, the highest root stresses were actually located at the most curved mid-root canal wall area.

(Shemesh et al., 2009) and (Bier et al., 2009) hypothesized that the large amount of microcracks observed on root dentin after instrumentation with NiTi instruments could be attributed to their rotary kinematics. Additionally, a variance in

The extent of defects with different file designs was also observed. Root canal preparation is prone to induce dentinal defects such as fractures, craze lines, incomplete cracks, and dentinal detachment.

A lot of stress will be concentrated on test samples if they were mounted in acrylic resin only, but a periodontal simulation will aid in distributing the forces and help mimic a more realistic scenario (Soares et al., 2005) in this study periodontal simulation was achieved during the mounting stage.

Concerning the ProTaper Files, several studies compared it to different file systems. (Kim et al., 2010a) studied the effect of the file design on stress during dentin preparation, using a finite element analysis test. They found that ProTaper Universal induced the highest von Mises stress concentration in the root dentin and had the highest tensile and compressive principal strain components at the external root surface. The calculated stress values from ProTaper Universal, which had the biggest taper shaft, approached the strength properties of dentin. Light-Speed generated the lowest stresses. In the present study 111 protaper produced microcracks in 16.6% of the total sections (n=30). A study by (Adl et al., 2015) reported that protaper produced microcracks in only 8.75% of the samples. (Burklin et al., 2013, Ustun et al., 2015)

reported that there was no significant difference found between ProTaper files and other files tested in their studies, which comes in agreement with our study.

WaveOne has several studies evaluating its effect on the presence of dentinal microcracks especially because it's one of the main reciprocating files out in the market. In the present study WaveOne created microcracks in 30% of the specimen sections. (Burklin et al., 2013, Kansal et al., 2014, Arias et al., 2014, Aydin et al., 2015, Pedulla et al., 2017) have reported varying results concerning the incidence of microcracks related to WaveOne file, numbers as high as 91% was reported (Pedulla et al., 2017) , and as low as 15% which was reported by (Kansal et al., 2014) .

There are not a lot of studies on WaveOne Gold and Hyflex EDM. . In the present study Hyflex EDM system produced the highest number of cracks: 70% of the mid root section (4mm) and a total of 43.3% of all sections were cracked making it the highest file system to produce cracks in this study. The WaveOne Gold produced microcracks in 30% of the tested samples. The statistical analysis concluded that Hyflex EDM produced significantly more microcracks in the mid root section, but when comparing the sum of the sections with 112 the rest of the tested groups it was found that there were no significant differences among file systems. (Pedulla et al., 2017) did compare between the WaveOne Gold , Hyflex EDM and the WaveOne system and two single file systems. In his study Hyflex EDM

produced the lowest percentage of roots with microcracks 33.3%, the WaveOne Gold produced 58.3% and the WaveOne produced 91% microcracked roots.

The sectioning method used in this study is more commonly used because it does not require sophisticated sample preparation, and has low cost. not labor-intensive, not time consuming and dedicated software may not be required, but on the other hand this technique is criticized in that it is a destructive method, part of the sample is lost during the cutting procedure, which causes loss of information, allows the evaluation of only a few slices per root, the pre-operative condition of the dentin tissue is unknown, unable to assess cracks developing on the longitudinal axis of the root and , submits the specimens to an additional mechanical stress and inability to assess the severity of cracks, particularly subsurface dentinal cracks (A Versiani et al., 2015).

## **Conclusion**

After comparing the results it was found that :

There is no significant difference between rotary and reciprocating systems.

Although when compared at individual sectioning levels, Hyflex EDM was found to produce the highest number of microcracks at the 4mm level .

There was no significant difference when comparing all systems together thus proving the null hypothesis.

## **Ethical Approval:**

This research study, titled "A Digital microscopic evaluation of the induction of dentinal micro-cracks after canal preparation with rotary and reciprocating NiTi systems in vitro," has obtained ethical approval from the relevant institutional review board or ethics committee. The study protocol and all associated procedures involving human teeth or specimens comply with the ethical principles outlined in the Declaration of Helsinki and other applicable guidelines.

The ethical approval process involved a comprehensive review of the research proposal, including the study objectives, methodology, potential risks, and benefits. The committee assessed the protection of human subjects, the informed consent process (if applicable), and the adherence to ethical standards for conducting research.

Informed consent was obtained for the use of human teeth or specimens, ensuring that the study participants were fully informed about the nature of the research, its purpose, potential risks, and any alternative options. Confidentiality and privacy of any identifiable information were strictly maintained throughout the study.

The ethical approval obtained for this research study demonstrates the commitment to conduct the research in an ethically responsible manner, safeguarding the rights, well-being, and confidentiality of all individuals involved.

## **References**

1. A Versiani, M., Souza, E. & De□Deus, G. 2015. Critical Appraisal Of Studies On Dentinal Radicular Microcracks In Endodontics: Methodological Issues,

Contemporary Concepts, And Future Perspectives. *Endodontic Topics*, 33, 87-156.

2. Adl, A., Sedigh-Shams, M. & Majd, M. 2015. The Effect Of Using Rc Prep During Root Canal Preparation On The Incidence Of Dentinal Defects. *Journal Of Endodontics*, 41, 376-379
3. Arias, A., Lee, Y. H., Peters, C. I., Gluskin, A. H. & Peters, O. A. 2014. Comparison Of 2 Canal Preparation Techniques In The Induction Of Microcracks: A Pilot Study With Cadaver Mandibles. *Journal Of Endodontics*, 40, 982-5.
4. Bier, C. A. S., Shemesh, H., Tanomaru-Filho, M., Wesselink, P. R. & Wu, M.-K. 2009. The Ability Of Different Nickel-Titanium Rotary Instruments To Induce Dentinal Damage During Canal Preparation. *Journal Of Endodontics*, 35, 236-238.
5. Burklein, S., Tsotsis, P. & Schäfer, E. 2013. Incidence Of Dentinal Defects After Root Canal Preparation: Reciprocating Versus Rotary Instrumentation. *Journal Of Endodontics*, 39, 501-504
6. Hulsmann, M. 2013. Effects Of Mechanical Instrumentation And Chemical Irrigation On The Root Canal Dentin And Surrounding Tissues. *Endodontic Topics*, 29, 55-86.
7. Hulsmann, M., Peters, O. A. & Dummer, P. M. 2005. Mechanical Preparation Of Root Canals: Shaping Goals, Techniques And Means. *Endodontic Topics*, 10, 30-76.
8. Ingle, J. I. 1961. A Standardized Endodontic Technique Utilizing Newly Designed Instruments And Filling Materials. *Oral Surgery, Oral Medicine, Oral Pathology*, 14, 83-91.
9. Kansal, R., Rajput, A., Talwar, S., Roongta, R. & Verma, M. 2014. Assessment Of Dentinal Damage During Canal Preparation Using Reciprocating And Rotary Files. *Journal Of Endodontics*, 40, 1443-1446.

10. Kim, H.-C., Lee, M.-H., Yum, J., Versluis, A., Lee, C.-J. & Kim, B.-M. 2010a. Potential Relationship Between Design Of Nickel-Titanium Rotary Instruments And Vertical Root Fracture. *Journal Of Endodontics*, 36, 1195-1199.
11. Pedulla, E., Genovesi, F., Rapisarda, S., La Rosa, G. R., Grande, N. M., Plotino, G. & Adorno, C. G. 2017. Effects Of 6 Single-File Systems On Dentinal Crack Formation. *Journal Of Endodontics*, 43, 456-461.
12. Soares, C. J., Pizi, E. C. G., Fonseca, R. B. & Martins, L. R. M. 2005. Influence Of Root Embedment Material And Periodontal Ligament Simulation On Fracture Resistance Tests. *Brazilian Oral Research*, 19, 11-16.

UNDER PEER REVIEW