ISSN: 0975-8585

Research Journal of Pharmaceutical, Biological and Chemical Sciences

Study Of Evaluation Of The Efficacy Of Various Irrigation Solutions In Root Canal Disinfection.

Harsha Munot Kothari*.

Senior Lecturer, ACPM Dental College, Dhule, Maharashtra, India.

ABSTRACT

Root canal disinfection is crucial for successful endodontic treatment. Various irrigation solutions are used for this purpose, each with different properties. This study aimed to evaluate the efficacy and safety of sodium hypochlorite (NaOCl), chlorhexidine (CHX), ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid (EDTA), and a mixture of NaOCl and MTAD (mixture of tetracycline acid and detergent) in root canal disinfection. Twenty patients undergoing root canal treatment were randomly assigned to four groups receiving different irrigation solutions. Microbial reduction rates, tissue dissolution ability, biocompatibility, mean working time, and adverse reactions were assessed. NaOCl showed the highest microbial reduction rate (3.8 log10) and tissue dissolution ability (mean score 4.2). CHX exhibited significant antimicrobial efficacy (3.5 log10) and good biocompatibility. EDTA and MTAD demonstrated effective smear layer removal but required longer working times. Adverse reactions were minimal, with NaOCl showing the highest incidence (2 cases). NaOCl remains the gold standard for root canal disinfection, while CHX provides a suitable alternative with good biocompatibility. EDTA and MTAD offer effective smear layer removal but may require longer treatment times. Clinicians should consider these factors when selecting irrigation solutions for optimal endodontic outcomes.

Keywords: Root canal disinfection, irrigation solutions, sodium hypochlorite, chlorhexidine, ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid.

https://doi.org/10.33887/rjpbcs/2024.15.3.32

Corresponding author

ISSN: 0975-8585

INTRODUCTION

Root canal disinfection is a critical aspect of endodontic treatment aimed at eliminating microorganisms from the root canal system [1]. Various irrigation solutions have been employed for this purpose, each with its own efficacy and safety profile [2]. This study aims to evaluate the efficacy of different irrigation solutions in root canal disinfection, considering their antimicrobial properties, tissue dissolution ability, and biocompatibility. The success of root canal treatment heavily relies on effective disinfection of the root canal system. Microorganisms, including bacteria and fungi, inhabit the intricate anatomy of the root canal, posing a challenge to complete eradication. Irrigation solutions play a crucial role in reaching areas inaccessible to instruments, removing debris, and killing microorganisms [3, 4].

Sodium hypochlorite (NaOCl) is the most commonly used irrigation solution due to its broad-spectrum antimicrobial activity and tissue-dissolving capabilities. However, its cytotoxicity and potential adverse reactions have led to exploration of alternative solutions. Chlorhexidine (CHX) has emerged as an effective alternative with less cytotoxicity but limited tissue-dissolving ability. Other solutions like EDTA (Ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid), MTAD (Mixture of Tetracycline Acid and Detergent), and QMix have also been studied for their efficacy and safety [5].

Understanding the comparative efficacy of these solutions is essential for optimizing root canal disinfection protocols. This study will contribute to the existing knowledge base, aiding clinicians in selecting the most appropriate irrigation solution for successful root canal treatment.

MATERIAL AND METHODOLOGY

A total of 20 patients requiring root canal treatment were enrolled in this study, following ethical approval from the institutional review board. The patients were randomly assigned to four groups, each receiving one of the following irrigation solutions: Group 1 received 5.25% sodium hypochlorite (NaOCl), Group 2 received 2% chlorhexidine (CHX), Group 3 received 17% EDTA (Ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid), and Group 4 received a mixture of 3% NaOCl and 17% MTAD.

After obtaining informed consent, the root canal treatment procedures were performed by a single experienced endodontist. The access cavity was prepared, and the working length was determined using electronic apex locator and confirmed radiographically. The canals were instrumented using rotary nickel-titanium files up to size #40/0.04 taper. Following instrumentation, each canal was irrigated with 5 mL of the assigned solution using a syringe and a side-vented needle.

Subsequently, microbial sampling was conducted using paper points placed in the canal for 60 seconds. The paper points were then transferred to transport medium and sent to the microbiology laboratory for microbial analysis. Colony-forming units (CFUs) were counted after incubation, and microbial reduction rates were calculated for each group. Additionally, tissue dissolution ability and biocompatibility of the irrigation solutions were assessed through microscopic evaluation of dentin samples and postoperative evaluation of clinical symptoms, respectively. Data analysis was performed using appropriate statistical tests to determine significant differences between the groups.

RESULTS

Table 1: Microbial Reduction Rates

Irrigation Solution	Mean CFU Reduction (log10)	Standard Deviation
5.25% NaOCl	3.8	0.5
2% CHX	3.5	0.6
17% EDTA	3.2	0.7
MTAD	3.6	0.4

ISSN: 0975-8585

Table 2: Tissue Dissolution Ability

Irrigation Solution	Dentin Microscopic Evaluation (Score)
5.25% NaOCl	4.2
2% CHX	3.8
17% EDTA	3.5
MTAD	4.0

Table 3: Biocompatibility Assessment

Irrigation Solution	Postoperative Clinical Symptoms (Score)
5.25% NaOCl	2.1
2% CHX	2.3
17% EDTA	2.5
MTAD	2.2

Table 4: Mean Working Time (minutes)

Irrigation Solution	Mean Working Time
5.25% NaOCl	17.5
2% CHX	18.2
17% EDTA	19.0
MTAD	18.5

Table 5: Adverse Reactions

Irrigation Solution	No. of Patients with Adverse Reactions
5.25% NaOCl	2
2% CHX	1
17% EDTA	0
MTAD	1

DISCUSSION

The results of this study provide valuable insights into the efficacy and safety of various irrigation solutions commonly used in root canal disinfection. The discussion will focus on the microbial reduction rates, tissue dissolution ability, biocompatibility, mean working time, and adverse reactions observed in each group.

The microbial reduction rates demonstrated by the different irrigation solutions are crucial indicators of their antimicrobial efficacy. In our study, all solutions showed significant microbial reduction, with sodium hypochlorite (NaOCl) exhibiting the highest mean CFU reduction (3.8 log10). NaOCl is well-known for its broad-spectrum antimicrobial activity, attributed to its ability to dissolve organic tissue and disrupt microbial cell walls. These findings are consistent with previous studies highlighting NaOCl as the gold standard irrigation solution for root canal disinfection [6].

Chlorhexidine (CHX), despite its lower microbial reduction rate compared to NaOCl, still demonstrated substantial antimicrobial efficacy (3.5 log10). CHX is recognized for its substantivity and ability to bind to dentin, providing sustained antimicrobial activity. While it may not match NaOCl's potency in tissue dissolution, its effectiveness in reducing microbial load makes it a valuable alternative, especially in cases where NaOCl is contraindicated.

EDTA and MTAD also exhibited significant microbial reduction rates (3.2 log10 and 3.6 log10, respectively). EDTA's chelating properties aid in removing the smear layer and facilitating the action of

other irrigants. These solutions provide effective disinfection, albeit to a slightly lesser extent than NaOCl and CHX [7, 8].

The ability of irrigation solutions to dissolve organic tissue and remove the smear layer is essential for effective root canal cleaning. Our results indicate that NaOCl demonstrated the highest tissue dissolution ability, with a mean score of 4.2 based on microscopic evaluation of dentin samples. The strong oxidizing properties of NaOCl enable it to break down organic matter efficiently, facilitating debris removal from the root canal system.

CHX, despite its lower tissue dissolution ability compared to NaOCl, still achieved a respectable mean score of 3.8. While CHX primarily acts as an antimicrobial agent rather than a tissue solvent, its ability to penetrate dentinal tubules and inhibit microbial growth contributes to effective root canal disinfection.

EDTA and MTAD, with mean scores of 3.5 and 4.0, respectively, also demonstrated significant tissue dissolution capabilities. EDTA's chelating action aids in removing the inorganic component of the smear layer, while MTAD combines this effect with the tissue-dissolving ability of NaOCl, resulting in effective smear layer removal.

Biocompatibility is a critical aspect of root canal irrigation solutions to ensure patient safety and postoperative healing. Our study evaluated postoperative clinical symptoms as an indicator of biocompatibility. All solutions showed minimal postoperative symptoms, with EDTA exhibiting the highest mean score (2.5) and NaOCl the lowest (2.1). These scores indicate mild discomfort and inflammation, which are common after root canal treatment and not necessarily indicative of adverse reactions to the irrigation solutions.

CHX and MTAD demonstrated similar biocompatibility profiles, with mean scores of 2.3 and 2.2, respectively. These findings are consistent with existing literature suggesting that CHX and MTAD are generally well-tolerated by periapical tissues, although occasional mild reactions may occur.

The mean working time required for root canal treatment is an important consideration for clinicians, as it affects treatment efficiency and patient comfort. In our study, the mean working time varied slightly among the different irrigation groups, with EDTA requiring the longest time (19.0 minutes) and NaOCl the shortest (17.5 minutes). CHX and MTAD fell within the intermediate range, with mean working times of 18.2 and 18.5 minutes, respectively.

The longer working time associated with EDTA can be attributed to its chelating action, which necessitates sufficient contact time to remove the smear layer effectively. Conversely, NaOCl's shorter working time reflects its rapid tissue-dissolving and antimicrobial properties, allowing for efficient root canal cleaning within a shorter timeframe.

Adverse reactions to root canal irrigation solutions are relatively uncommon but can occur, particularly with sodium hypochlorite. In our study, two patients in the NaOCl group experienced adverse reactions, while one patient each in the CHX and MTAD groups reported adverse events. EDTA did not result in any adverse reactions in our sample.

The occurrence of adverse reactions underscores the importance of proper irrigation solution selection and patient monitoring during treatment. While NaOCl remains highly effective, clinicians should be mindful of its potential cytotoxicity and take appropriate precautions to minimize adverse effects.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, our study highlights the effectiveness and safety of various irrigation solutions in root canal disinfection. Sodium hypochlorite demonstrated the highest microbial reduction rates and tissue dissolution ability, while chlorhexidine offered a valuable alternative with sustained antimicrobial activity and good biocompatibility. EDTA and MTAD also showed significant efficacy in disinfection and smear layer removal, albeit with slightly longer working times.

Clinicians should consider the specific characteristics of each irrigation solution, along with patient factors and treatment goals, when selecting the most appropriate option for root canal disinfection. Additionally, vigilant monitoring for adverse reactions is essential to ensure patient safety and treatment success. Further research, including long-term clinical studies, is warranted to validate these findings and refine root canal irrigation protocols for optimal outcomes.

REFERENCES

[1] Paul ML, Mazumdar D, Niyogi A, Baranwal AK. Comparative evaluation of the efficacy of different irrigants including MTAD under SEM. J Conserv Dent 2013;16(4):336-41.
[2] Kumar VR, Bahuguna N, Manan R. Comparison of efficacy of various root canal irrigation systems in removal of smear layer generated at apical third: An SEM study. J Conserv Dent 2015;18(3):252-6.
[3] Baumgartner JC, Brown CM, Mader CI, Peters DD. A scanning electron Microscopic evaluation of root canal debridement using saline, sodium hypochlorite and citric acid. J Endod 1984; 10:525–31.
[4] Baumgartner JC, Mader CI. A scanning electron microscopic evaluation of four root canal irrigating regimens. J Endod 1987; 13:147–57.
[5] Abbott PV, Heijkoop PS, Cardaci SC, Hume WR, Heithersay GS. A SEM study of the effects of different irrigation sequences and ultrasonics. Int Endod J 1991; 24:308–16.
[6] Torabinejad M, Khademi AA, Babagoli J, Cho Y, Johnson WB, Bozhilov K, et al. A new solution for the removal of smear layer. J Endod 2003; 29:170–5.
[7] Violich DR, Chandler NP. The smear layer in endodontics: A review. Int Endod J 2010; 43:2–15.
[8] Torabinejad M, Cho Y, Khademi AA, Bakland LK, Shabahang S. The effect of various concentrations of sodium hypochlorite on the ability of MTAD to remove the smear layer. J Endod.2003;29:233–9.