Clinical and Radiographical Evaluation of a Resin-based Root Canal Sealer: A 5-Year Follow-up

Osvaldo Zmener, DDS, Dr Odont,* and Cornelis H. Pameijer, DMD, DSc, PhD[†]

Abstract

A retrospective clinical and radiographical analysis of 5-year postendodontic treatment with a resin-based sealer (EndoRez; Ultradent Products Inc, South Jordan, UT) and gutta-percha was conducted. The results after 14 to 24 months were reported previously. Of 180 patients, 120 responded to the 5-year recall. Success of root canal treatments was based on absence of clinical symptoms, a normal or slightly widened periodontal ligament, and absence or reduction of periapical radiolucencies in patients who had preexisting lesions. Root canals had been adequately filled to the working length in 92 teeth (76.66%) and short in 13 (10.83%). Fifteen cases (12.50%), filled flush at the initiation of the experiment, showed slight resorption of the filling material at the apex within the lumen of the root canal. Of the 10 roots with extrusion, none had radiographic evidence of sealer in the periradicular tissues after 5 years. All patients were free of clinical symptoms. Four cases (3.3%) showed partial healing, whereas 8 cases (6.66%) were judged failures. A life table analysis revealed a cumulative probability of success of 86.3% at the 5-year recall with a 95% confidence interval of 79.7 to 91.0. The clinical and radiographical data suggest that the tested resin-based sealer used in conjunction with gutta-percha performed very well as a root canal sealer over a period of up to 5 years. (J Endod 2007; 33:676–679)

Key Words

Endodontic therapy, EndoRez, resin-based sealer, root canal filling

*Head Professor from the Postgraduate Program for Specialists in Endodontics, Faculty of Medicine, School of Dentistry, University of El Salvador/AOA, Buenos Aires, Argentina; and [†]Professor Emeritus, University of Connecticut School of Dental Medicine, Farmington, Connecticut.

Address requests for reprints to Dr. Cornelis H. Pameijer, 10 Highwood, Simsbury, CT 06070. E-mail address: cornelis@pameijer.com.

Numerous studies have been published evaluating endodontic success and failure using a clinical and radiographical examination (1–5). Predefined criteria offer a reliable method to evaluate the long-term results of endodontic therapy (4).

It is generally accepted that after complete debridement and disinfection, total obliteration of the root canal system with biocompatible materials constitutes one of the principal prerequisites for successful endodontic therapy (6). In this respect, the choice of a sealer will influence the outcome of endodontic therapy (7). In a preliminary short-term retrospective study on 180 patients (8), the results of endodontic treatment of root canals filled with laterally condensed gutta-percha cones in conjunction with EndoRez (ER; Ultradent Products Inc, South Jordan, UT) were evaluated. ER is a hydrophilic, 2-component dimethacrylate- based material that meets the essential requirements of an endodontic sealer (9). When retreatment is indicated, it can easily be removed by mechanical instrumentation (9). After 14 to 24 months, 145 patients were available for a follow-up examination. The results showed an overall success rate of 91% and indicated that the use of ER as a sealer constituted a potential promising alternative to conventional sealers. Because the favorable outcome of the preliminary evaluation (8) was not considered a long-term success, the present retrospective study was undertaken to obtain 5-year posttreatment data on the same patient pool that was previously evaluated.

Materials and Methods

Patients responding to a 5-year follow-up examination were clinically and radiographically evaluated for the outcome of endodontic treatment. In the original 180 patients (age range 12–75 years, 41.67% male and 58.33% female), 295 root canals were filled with gutta percha and ER. At the time of initial endodontic therapy, an informed consent was obtained, preoperative radiographs were made, and the condition of the pulp and a periradicular tissue diagnosis was recorded. All root canal treatment procedures were completed in one visit by one operator in a private practice limited to endodontics. After administration of local anesthesia, a rubber dam was placed and the pulp chamber accessed. In all cases, canals were prepared and filled according to a standardized procedure. Canals were hand instrumented by using a crown-down technique for radicular access combined with a step-back technique for apical preparation. After the coronal two thirds of the canals were flared with #1 to 3 Gates Glidden burs (Dentsply/Maillefer, Ballaigues, Switzerland), the working length was established with a #15 file, approximately 1-mm short of the radiographic apex. Finally, the canals were prepared with K-type and Hedström files (Dentsply/Maillefer) at the apical third to a master apical # 30 to 40 file and coronally to a #60 file, each size 1-mm short of the preceding instrument. On occasion, the instrumentation sequence had to be modified because of difficulty in negotiating root canals with complex anatomy. The patency of the apical foramen was confirmed with a #10 K-file. During instrumentation, the canals were irrigated with 2.0 mL of 2.5% NaOCl followed by rinsing with 2.0 mL of sterile saline after every instrument change. The irrigants were delivered from plastic syringes and through 30-G endodontic irrigation needles. Excess irrigation solution was removed with sterile paper points. For obturation, a master cone fitted with tug-back at the working length was selected. ER was obtained directly from the TwoSpense2 mixing and delivery syringe (Ultradent Products Inc), and the moist canal walls were coated with the sealer by using a size 20 K-file. The master cone was coated with the sealer and placed to length followed by lateral condensation by using fine-fine or fine-medium accessory cones dipped in sealer. The access cavities were temporarily

TABLE 1. Tooth Number and Location in the Maxillary or Mandibular Arch Evaluated 4.5 to 5 Years Postoperatively

	Maxillary	Mandibular	Total
Central incisor	20	2	22
Lateral incisor	10	1	11
Canine	12	5	17
First premolar	5	10	15
Second premolar	9	10	19
First molar	8	11	19
Second molar	4	8	12
Third molar	1	4	5
Total	69	51	120

TABLE 3. Relation of Preoperative Factors to Treatment Results in Root Canals Filled with Gutta-Percha and ER

Factor	# of teeth %	Success %	Failure %
Pulp diagnosis			
Vital	51 (42.50)	48 (94.11)	3 (5.88)
Non vital	69 (57.50)	64 (92.75)	5 (7.24)
Periapical radiolucency			
Present	48 (40.00)	44 (91.66)	4 (8.33)
Absent	72 (60.00)	68 (94.44)	4 (5.55)
Lesion size			
<2 mm	37 (77.08)	33 (89.18)	4 (10.81)
>2 mm	11 (22.91)	7 (63.63)	4 (36.36)

sealed with IRM (Dentsply/LD Caulk Division, Milford, DE), and the patients were instructed to see their referring dentists for definitive restorative care.

Postoperative and recall radiographs were made immediately and 5 years after endodontic treatment by using the same X-ray unit with a film holder attached to a beam-guiding XCP instrument (Rinn Corp, Elgin, IL) and Kodak 32×43 mm ultraspeed films (Eastman Kodak Company, Rochester, NY). When needed, additional radiographs were made at different horizontal angles to enhance visualization and evaluation. To minimize subjectivity during evaluation, the following precautions were taken. Postoperative radiographs were compared with the 5-year recall radiograph by using a viewer with a magnifying glass. All radiographs were analyzed by two independent endodontists with more than 25 years of clinical experience. Before evaluating the radiographs, both endodontists were calibrated by having them analyze twice a standard set of 100 individual pairs of postoperative and recall radiographs of endodontic treatments that were selected at random from the files of two private endodontic services. The radiographs were of high quality and exhibited findings such as normal periapical tissues, widened or thickened periodontal ligament space, loss of cortical bone, changes in trabecular patterns, and radiographically discernible periapical radiolucencies. If there was a disagreement between the evaluators; the X-rays were reassessed jointly until a consensus was reached. The level of the root fillings in relation to the working length was recorded, and the quality of the fillings were judged to be adequate when they were placed to the full working length and no voids or empty spaces were observed, especially in the apical third. Canals that did not meet these conditions were categorized as short fill or inadequate obturation. In multirooted teeth, one or more canals showing similar conditions resulted in a designation of inadequate obturation for the entire tooth. In cases with apical radiolucencies, the size of each lesion was estimated on the radiograph as being <2 mm or >2 mm. The success and failure of the endodontic therapy was determined on the basis of radiographic findings and clinical signs and symptoms. The following criteria were used. Treatment was considered successful when at recall the contours and width of the periodontal space were normal or slightly widened around an overfill and the patient was free of symptoms. Slight tenderness to percussion for a brief postoperative period was acceptable. The treat-

ment was considered a failure when periapical radiolucencies were observed in the preoperative radiograph and remained unchanged or increased over time. If the radiolucency decreased in size by at least 50% and the patient was comfortable and the contours and width of the periodontal space had returned to normal, the treatment was considered successful. The treatment was also considered successful in the absence of periapical radiolucency in the preoperative radiographs and with an appearance that remained unchanged. Vice versa, a root that developed a radiolucency was considered a failure. Failure of one canal in multirooted teeth was considered a complete failure; thus, multirooted teeth were evaluated as single-rooted ones, regardless of the number of canals. The relation of the treatment outcome with respect to age, sex, and specific preoperative and postoperative data were analyzed by using the Fisher exact test with a significance factor of $p < 0.05$. Taking into consideration the number of patients who did not respond to the 14- to 24-month recall (35 patients, censored data), a life table survival analysis was used to determine the cumulative probability of success at the 5-year recall. A corresponding 95% confidence interval was determined.

Results

The calibration exercise established that the interexaminer agreement ratio was 93%. Because this constituted a strong interobserver agreement, the radiographic interpretation was considered reliable. The posttreatment time ranged from 4.5 to 5 years. The recall rate after 5 years was 66.66%. A total of 120 patients with 218 treated root canals presented for follow-up evaluation. All data that were collected from the 120 patients who presented at the 5-year recall were entered in a computer program. Table 1 presents the number and location of teeth that were evaluated. Distribution of patients by age and sex is presented in Table 2. Distribution by significant preoperative factors and postoperative factors related to treatment results are presented in Tables 3 and 4, respectively.

Ninety-two teeth (76.66%) were rated to be adequately filled to the working length. Thirteen cases (10.83%) were obturated short; 15 (12.50%), although filled flush at the initiation of the evaluation, showed a slight resorption of the filling material (probably sealer) within the lumen of the root canal. In these cases, the end of the root fill

TABLE 2. Analysis of Success and Failure by Sex and Age in Root Canals Filled with Gutta-Percha and ER

Factor	# of cases %	Success %	Failure %
Sex			
Male	52 (43.33)	49 (94.23)	3 (5.76)
Female	68 (56.66)	63 (92.64)	5 (7.35)
Age			
12–30	21 (17.5)	19 (90.47)	2 (9.52)
31–55	62 (51.66)	59 (95.16)	3 (4.83)
56–75	37 (30.83)	34 (91.89)	3 (8.10)

TABLE 4. Relation of Final Restoration to Treatment Results in Root Canals Filled with Gutta-Percha and ER

Restoration	# of teeth %	Success %	Failure %
None	4 (3.3)		4 (100.0)
Post (with or without crown)	50 (41.66)	48 (96.00)	2 (4.00)
Coronal filling (amalgam, composite glass ionomer, etc)	66 (55.00)	64 (96.96)	2 (3.03)

Figure 1. Radiographs of a mandibular left first molar. A: Immediate postoperative view of obturation with lateral condensation of gutta-percha cones and EndoRez. Note extrusion of the sealer into periapical tissues. B: Postoperative radiograph after 5 years showing no radiographic evidence of the extruded sealer and a stable periapical condition.

was located approximately 2 mm from the radiographic apex. Of the original 10 cases in which extrusion of sealer was radiographically established immediately postoperatively, none revealed radiographic evidence of the sealer in the periradicular tissues (Figs. 1 and 2). Fifty-one teeth (42.5%) with preoperative vital pulps were successful in 48 instances, whereas 69 with nonvital pulps (57.5%) were successful in 64 cases. Forty-eight teeth (40.0%) with preoperative apical radiolucent areas revealed partial or total healing in 44 instances, whereas 4 of them were considered clinically and radiographically a failure. Sixty-eight of 72 teeth (60.0%) without preoperative lesions showed no radiographic changes. In 9 of these, the periodontal ligament showed a slight widening at the apical area, but the teeth were asymptomatic. The remaining 4 cases were judged failures. After 5 years, all patients were free of clinical symptoms and were comfortable. The differences in treatment results related to age, sex, vital and nonvital teeth, presence or absence of periapical lesions, the size of the periapical lesions, and the type of permanent restorations were not statistically significant (p > 0.05). The life table analysis showed a cumulative probability of success of 86.3% at the 5-year recall with a 95% confidence interval of 79.7 to 91.0.

Discussion

In this retrospective 5-year follow-up study, the clinical and radiographical data of a methacrylate-based endodontic sealer ER, used in conjunction with laterally condensed gutta-percha cones, was evaluated. In common with clinical trials of similar nature, this study was designed to show the potential of the sealer for routine use in conjunction with gutta-percha when obturating root canals. The 14- to 24-month findings of this study have previously been reported (8). The low recall rate (66.66%) after 5 years was considered acceptable for a longitudinal clinical trial. This recall rate met the American Dental Association requirements for subject size in clinical trials as reported by Franco et al. (10) and compared well with those of previous studies (2–5). The patients who were not evaluated could either not be located or did not respond. It is possible that these patients had no discomfort; they were relocated or returned to the referring dentist when problems occurred. The nonresponders were repeatedly contacted by telephone up to four times. In addition, letters were mailed and e-mails sent.

According to Friedman et al. (5), when a patient does not respond to a recall, there should always be concern that we are dealing with a root canal treatment that was a failure. Consequently, the teeth that were evaluated may not be totally representative of the follow-up evaluation (5). However, it is generally accepted that endodontic treatment from patients who cannot be recalled (censored data) are not considered representative of a particular treatment result category (5). Of the 120 patients who presented for the 5-year evaluation, 23 belonged to the group of 35 patients who did not respond to the 14- to 24-month recall (8). Taking into consideration the censored data, a life table analysis was used to analyze the cumulative probability of success considering the root canal treatments that could not be evaluated at the 14- to 24-month recall.

In the current study, factors such as age and sex did not skew the findings and therefore are in agreement with previous reports (5, 11–14). All data with respect to type and location of teeth were pooled because it has been shown that these factors do not influence the outcome of endodontic treatment (3–5, 14). The success rate of teeth with vital and nonvital pulps confirms reports by Barbakow et al. (3) and Sjögren et al. (14). The success rate of teeth that had preoperative periapical radiolucent areas is consistent with our previous results (8) but differs from other authors (1, 5, 15, 16) who showed significantly lower success rates in teeth with infected root canals and preexisting periapical radiolucent areas. The data reported in this study corroborate the findings of Sjögren et al. (14) who reported that the prognosis for nonvital teeth with periapical lesions was as good as that for vital teeth, providing the instrumentation and obturation of the canals are performed at an optimum level. Perhaps the instrumentation technique, in which early coronal flaring followed by incremental removal of the bulk of the infected canal, thus allowing for a deeper penetration of irrigants, may have contributed to the high rate of success. Furthermore, it has been reported that the adaptation of ER to the dentin walls provides a better seal than conventional materials (9). These factors may have contributed to a more favorable condition for healing and long-term success.

Another important factor to be addressed is the extrusion of sealer through the apical foramen. Some authors (16–18) have stated that this may interfere with the repair process. On completion of treatment,

Figure 2. Radiographs demonstrating complete healing following endodontic therapy of maxillary left central incisor. A: Preoperative radiograph showing a large periapical lesion. B: Immediate postoperative radiograph showing accidental extrusion of sealer. C: 5-year follow-up radiograph showing apical resolution. The root canal was used for the placement of a cast post and core.

extrusion of sealer occurred in 10 cases. The short-term clinical and radiographical follow-up (8) revealed that only three of these cases were interpreted as endodontic failures. The remaining 7 cases did not show postoperative complications, and no radiographic evidence of sealer was observed in the periapical tissues resulting in a return to a normal radiographic appearance. After 5 years, these 7 cases appeared radiographically normal, indicating that the sealer was well tolerated by the periapical tissues. The few cases that showed a slight resorption of filling material within the lumen of the root canal had a root fill that was located approximately 2 mm from the radiographic apex. It was therefore believed that the sealer had disappeared, not the fill.

In this study, all root canal treatments were performed in a single visit. The reported findings tend to support previous evidence that the single-visit endodontic treatment is a reasonable treatment procedure (19, 20), even in cases with infected root canals.

Consistent with previous reports (5, 14), the results showed that the type of coronal restoration and the presence or absence of a post within the canal did not significantly affect the outcome. In the 14- to 24-month evaluation, the majority of the cases presented with amalgam, resin-based, or glass ionomer coronal fillings (data not shown). In this 5-year recall, 41.66% of the cases were restored with posts and 55.0% with coronal fillings. Four of the 8 cases classified as endodontic failure had no coronal restoration. Based on feedback from the patients, they were without a filling for about 4 to 12 months, thus exposing the tooth to saliva for prolonged periods of time. These findings suggest that despite good adaptation of ER to the canal walls (21–23), the sealer does not totally prevent endodontic failure if the access of the pulp chamber and canals are not coronally sealed.

Admittedly, subtle differences in the results may have been observed if histological observations could have been conducted. Nevertheless, we consider evaluating consenting patients according to a predetermined clinical and radiographic protocol a reliable procedure to evaluate the outcome of endodontic therapy (2–4), especially because endodontists use the same criteria in clinical practice.

Notwithstanding the limitations of the present study, the results tend to support the clinical use of ER in conjunction with gutta-percha as an acceptable treatment modality. Extensive toxicological studies as well as endodontic studies in subhuman primates (24), in addition to subcutaneous and bone implantation experiments in rats (25, 26), have shown safety and efficacy of the sealer. In conclusion, after 5 years, the ER sealer seems to be well tolerated by periapical tissues, whereas the patients reported being comfortable. The success rate was comparable to what has been reported in previous studies using other sealers (4, 5, 7, 27, 28).

Acknowledgment

References

1. Grossman LI, Shepard LI, Pearson LA. Roentgenologic and clinical evaluation of endodontically treated teeth. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol 1964;17:368–74.
2. Heling B, Tamshe A. Evaluation of the success of endodontically treated teeth. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol 1970;30:533–6.
3. Barbakow FH, Cleaton-Jones P, Friedman D. An evaluation of 566 cases of root canal therapy in general dental practice. 2. Postoperative observations. J Endod 1980;6:485–9.
4. Swartz DB, Skidmore AE, Griffin JA. Twenty years of endodontic success and failure. J Endod 1983;9:198–202.
5. Friedman S, Löst C, Zarrabian M, Trope M. Evaluation of success and failure after endodontic therapy using a glass ionomer cement sealer. J Endod 1995;21:384–90.
6. Nguyen TN. Obturation of the root canal system. In: Cohen S, Burns RC, eds. Pathways of the Pulp. 4th ed. St Louis: Mosby; 1987:183–94.
7. Ørstavik D, Kerekes K, Eriksen HM. Clinical performance of three endodontic sealers. Endod Dent Traumatol 1987;3:178–86.
8. Zmener O, Pameijer CH. Clinical and radiographic evaluation of a resin-based root canal sealer. Am J Dent 2004;17:19–22.
9. Pameijer CH, Zmener O. Current status of methacrylate-based sealers and obturation techniques. Pract Proced Aesthet Dent 2006;18:674–6.
10. Franco EB, Benetti AR, Ishikiriama SK, et al. 5-year clinical performance of resin composite versus resin modified glass ionomer restorative system in non-carious cervical lesions. Oper Dent 2006;31:403–8.
11. Strindberg LZ. The dependence of the results of pulp therapy on certain factors: an analytic study based on radiographic and clinical follow-up examinations. Acta Odontol Scand 1956;14(suppl 21):1–175.
12. Selden HS. Pulpoperiapical disease: diagnosis and healing. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol 1974;37:271–82.
13. Kerekes K, Tronstad L. Long term results of endodontic treatment performed with a standardized technique. J Endod 1979;5:83–90.
14. Sjögren U, Hagglund B, Sundqvist G, Wing K. Factors affecting the long-term results of endodontic treatment. J Endod 1990;16:498–504.
15. Seltzer S, Bender IB, Smith J, Freedman I, Nazimov H. Endodontic failures—An analysis based on clinical, roentgenographic, and histologic findings. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol 1967;23:517–30.
16. Seltzer S, Bender IB, Turkenkopf S. Factors affecting successful repair after root canal theraphy. J Am Dent Assoc 1963;67:651–62.
17. Storms JL. Factors that influence the success of endodontic treatment. J Can Dent Assoc 1969;35:83–97.
18. Seltzer S. Long term radiographic and histological observations of endodontically treated teeth. J Endod 1999;25:818–22.
19. Soltanoff W. A comparative study of the single-visit and the multiple-visit endodontic procedure. J Endod 1978;4:278–81.
20. Pekruhn RB. The incidence of failure following single-visit endodontic therapy. J Endod 1986;12:68–72.
21. Zmener O, Banegas G. Apical leakage of endodontic sealers. Endod Pract 2004;7:30–2.
22. Zmener O, Pameijer CH, Macri E. Evaluation of the apical seal in root canals prepared with a new rotary system and obturated with a methacrylate-based endodontic sealer: an in vitro study. J Endod 2005;31:392–5.
23. Gillespie WT, Loushine RJ, Weller RN, et al. Improving the performance of EndoRez root canal sealer with a dual-cured two-step self-etch adhesive. II. Apical and coronal seal. J Endod 2006;32:771–5.
24. Louw NP, Pameijer CH, Norval G. Histopathological evaluation of a root canal sealer in subhuman primates. J Dent Res 2001;79:654 (abstr).
25. Zmener O. Tissue response to a new methacrylate-based root canal sealer: preliminary observations in the subcutaneous connective tissue of rats. J Endod 2004;30:348–51.
26. Zmener O, Banegas G, Pameijer CH. Bone tissue response to a methacrylate-based endodontic sealer: a histological and histometric study. J Endod 2005;31:457–9.
27. Augsburger RA, Peters DD. Radiographic evaluation of extruded obturation materials. J Endod 1990;16:492–7.
28. Huumonen S, Lenander-Lumikari M, Sigurdsson A, Ørstavik D. Healing of apical periodontitis after endodontic treatment: a comparison between a silicone-based and zinc oxide-eugenol-based sealer. Int Endod J 2003;36:296–301.