

**CORONAL MICROLEAKAGE OF DIFFERENT POST SYSTEMS
USED
IN ENDODONTICALLY TREATED TEETH**

Dr. FATMA K. OMAR SOLTAN

**A THESIS SUBMITTED IN FULFILMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF DENTAL
SCIENCE IN CONSERVATIVE DENTISTRY**

**DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATIVE DENTISTRY
FACULTY OF DENTISTRY
UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA
KUALA LUMPUR
MALAYSIA
2011**

ABSTRACT

Objective: The purpose of this study was to investigate the effectiveness of two different traditional luting cements and one adhesive system on the microleakage in endodontically treated teeth restored with different post systems.

Methods: A total of seventy single- rooted mandibular premolar teeth were selected and endodontically treated with standard root length of 14 mm. The teeth were then randomly divided into three groups, two of them consist of 30 teeth and were restored with two different post systems; Fiber Lux ParaPost (F), and ParaPost XH (P). Then each group was subdivided into 3 subgroups of 10 teeth, each one cemented with different luting agents; RelyX™ U100 Self-Adhesive Universal Resin Cement (R), Elite Zinc Phosphate Cement (ZP), and Fuji I- Glass Ionomer Luting Cement (GI). For the third main group which consisted of 10 teeth, only endodontic treatment was done to it and was made as the control group (RCT).

All the samples were then restored with a composite core (Synergy D6 universal composite, Coltene/Whaledent, USA) and then thermocycled. All the specimens were coated with a double layer of nail varnish to cover the entire root surface except for 2mm around the coronal orifice, covered with a tin foil and the apical foramen was sealed with sticky wax. The specimens were immersed in 2% solution of methylene blue dye for 24 hours. The specimens were then cross sectioned perpendicular to the long axis of the root into discs 1mm thick starting from the coronal part and descending corono-apically up to a total of 6 mm. The microleakage was evaluated by investigating the coronal surface of each section under a stereomicroscope (Olympus, Japan) and the data were analyzed with Kruskal–Wallis test and Mann-Whitney U test.

Results: For different types of cements, there was significant differences in microleakage between them and RCT group ($p=0.018$). Pairwise comparison showed that significant difference in microleakage was only found between glass ionomer cement groups and root canal treatment group (control group) $p=0.03$ but no significant difference between the other pairs. For post systems, there is a significant difference in microleakage between Fiber Lux ParaPost and ParaPost XH and RCT group ($p=0.005$).

Conclusions: There was statistically significant difference in coronal microleakage between different types of post systems. However, there was no statistically significant difference in coronal microleakage between the different types of cements.

DECLARATION

I certify that this research is based on my own independent work, except where acknowledged in the text or by reference. No part of this work has been submitted for any degree or diploma to this or any other university.

Dr. Fatma K. Omar Soltan

Date:

Supervisor: Prof Dato' Dr. Abdul Aziz Abdul Razak

Department of Conservative Dentistry
Faculty of Dentistry
University of Malaya
Kuala Lumpur
Malaysia

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

All praise and thanks to ALLAH for inspiring me with the strength and willingness to perform this work.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor Professor Dato' Dr. Abdul Aziz Razak, for being the best mentor and for his encouragement and guidance throughout the preparation of this study. I personally felt that without time and knowledge that he had given me, it would have been difficult to complete this study.

I am grateful to Dr. Mariam Abdullah, Head of the Department of Conservative Dentistry for her support.

I would like to thank Professor Dr. Rosnah Mohd Zain, Dean of the Faculty of Dentistry, University of Malaya for her continuous support for the postgraduate students.

I wish to convey my most sincere appreciation to all members of staff of the Department of Conservative Dentistry for their support.

Finally, I cannot imagine going through this study without my lovely husband Ehab and my sweet daughter, Noor Asmaa. They provided me with support and patience.

Content

Title Page	i
Abstract	ii
Declaration	iv
Acknowledgment	v
Table of content	vi
List of figures	xii
List of tables	xiii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION, AIM AND OBJECTIVE	1
1.1 Introduction	2
1.2 Aim	4
1.3 Objectives	5
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	6
2.1 Restoration of endodontically treated teeth	7
2.1.1 Restorative factors affecting the prognosis of endodontic treatment	7
2.2 Dentine in bonding	8
2.2.1 Dentine permeability and dentine adhesion	10
2.2.3 Types of dentine permeability	10
2.2.4 Theoretical model of dentine bonding	11
2.2.5 Dentine permeability and microleakage	12
2.3 Dentine bonding agent	13
2.3.1 Classification of dentine bonding agent	13
2.4 Microleakage	18

2.4.1	Causes of microleakage	18
2.4.2	Consequence of microleakage	18
2.4.3	Significance of microleakage	19
2.4.4	Coronal microleakage	19
2.4.5	Microleakage tests	20
2.4.5.1	Direct observation	20
2.4.5.2	Organic dyes	20
2.4.5.3	Fluorescent dyes	21
2.4.5.4	Radioisotopes	21
2.4.5.5	Bacterial penetration	22
2.4.5.6	Fluid filtration or transportation	22
2.4.5.7	Dye extraction method	22
2.5	Luting cements	23
2.5.1	Resin luting cement	23
2.5.1.1	Structure	24
2.5.1.2	Classification	24
2.5.1.2.1	Self/Auto-cured resin cement	25
2.5.1.2.2	Light-cured resin cement	25
2.5.1.2.3	Dual-cured resin cement	26
2.5.1.3	Properties of resin luting cement	26
2.5.1.3.1	Adhesion	26
2.5.1.3.2	Polymerization shrinkage	27
2.5.1.3.3	Film thickness	27
2.5.1.3.4	Radiopacity	28
2.5.1.3.5	Biocompatibility	28

2.5.1.4	Advantages of resin luting cement	29
2.5.1.5	Disadvantages of resin luting cement	29
2.5.2	Glass ionomer cement	29
2.5.3	Zinc phosphate cement	31
2.6	Post systems	32
2.6.1	Function of posts	32
2.6.2	Indication of posts	32
2.6.3	Classification of posts	33
2.6.4	Metal posts versus non-metal posts	34
2.6.5	Post space preparation	35
2.6.5.1	Post length	35
2.6.5.2	Post diameter	35
2.6.5.3	Post cementation	36
2.6.6	Post aesthetics	36
2.6.7	Retrievability	37
CHAPTER THREE: MATERIALS AND METHODS		38
3.1	Materials	39
3.2	Methods	43
3.2.1	Tooth collection	43
3.2.2	Tooth selection	43
3.2.3	Decoronation of teeth	44
3.2.4	Root canal preparation and obturation	45
3.2.5	Groups	47
3.2.6	Removing gutta-percha and post space preparation	48

3.2.7 Post cementation	50
3.2.8 Core build up	50
3.2.9 Thermocycling procedure	51
3.2.10 Evaluation of microleakage	51
3.2.10.1 Preparation prior to immersion in dye solution	51
3.2.10.2 Microleakage test	53
3.2.10.3 Sectioning of specimens	53
3.2.10.4 Microleakage evaluation procedure	54
3.2.11 Reliability test	54
3.2.12 Data analysis	54
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS	59
4.1 Evaluation of coronal microleakage among different types of cements	60
4.1.1 Descriptive statistic	60
4.1.2 Statistic analysis	64
4.2 Evaluation of coronal microleakage among different types of post	67
4.2.1 Descriptive statistic	67
4.2.2 Statistic analysis	67
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION	70
5.1 Methodology	71
5.1.1 Tooth collection	71
5.1.2 Tooth selection	71
5.1.3 Root canal preparation	72
5.1.4 Post space preparation	74

5.1.5 Post cementation	75
5.1.6 Post systems	76
5.1.7 Thermocycling	77
5.1.8 Evaluation of microleakage	78
5.1.8.1 Preparation prior to immersion in dye solution	78
5.1.8.2 Microleakage test	79
5.1.8.3 Sectioning of specimens	79
5.1.8.4 Assessment of microleakage	80
5.2 Results	81
5.3 Limitations of the study	85
CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDIES	86
6.1 Conclusions	87
6.2 clinical recommendations	88
6.3 Recommendations for further studies	89
References	90
Appendices	103
Appendix I	104
Appendix II	105
Appendix III	106
Appendix IV	107

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Description	Page
3.1	Post systems used in this study	39
3.2	RelyX™ U100 Self-Adhesive Universal Resin Cement	40
3.3	Fuji I –Glass Ionomer Luting Cement	41
3.4	Elite Zinc Phosphate Cement	41
3.5	Synergy D6 universal composite	42
3.6	Mesiodistal and buccolingual radiographs	44
3.7	Decoronation of teeth	44
3.8	Chemomechanical preparation of the teeth	46
3.9	Gutta-percha cones	46
3.10	Pulpdent Root Canal Sealer	47
3.11	Groups of the study	48
3.12	Parapost XH with matching drill	49
3.13	Fiber Lux ParaPost with matching drill	49
3.14	Tooth with its composite core	51
3.15	Thermocycling machine	52
3.16	Tooth covered with a tin foil	52
3.17	The samples immersed in dye solution	55
3.18	Low speed cutting machine	55
3.19	Six equal transversal sections	56
3.20	Stereomicroscope	56
3.21	Microscopic observations of the dye penetration	57
3.22	Microscopic observations of the dye penetration	58
4.1	Comparison of coronal microleakage (%) between 3 different cements and RCT group	65

4.2 Comparison of coronal microleakage (%) between 2 different post and
RCT

68

LIST OF TABLES

Tables	Description	Page
3.1	Components of post systems used in this study	40
3.2	The components of three different cements used in the study	42
3.3	The components of the composite core build up material	43
4.1	The mean percentages value of the dye infiltration for the resin cement groups for both fibre and metal posts	61
4.2	The mean percentages value of the dye infiltration for the zinc phosphate cement groups for both fibre and metal posts	62
4.3	The mean percentages value of the dye infiltration for the glass ionomer cement groups for both fibre and metal posts	63
4.4	The mean percentages value of the dye infiltration for the root canal treatment groups (control group)	64
4.5	Comparison of coronal microleakage between 3 different cements and RCT	65
4.6	Pairwise comparison of microleakage between different types of cement and RCT	66
4.7	Comparison of coronal microleakage between 2 different posts and RCT	68
4.8	Pairwise comparison of microleakage between different types of post and RCT	69
I.1	List of materials used in this study	104
II.1	List of equipments used in this study	105
III.1	Reliability test	106
IV.1	Intra-class Correlation Coefficient	107