Fracture resistance of root-filled teeth after cavity preparation with conventional burs, Er:YAG and Er,Cr:YSGG lasers

Purpose
The aim of the present study is to compare the fracture resistance of teeth after access cavity preparation with conventional rotary burs, Erbium-doped yttrium aluminum garnet laser (Er:YAG) and Erbium, chromium: yttrium scandium gallium garnet laser (Er,Cr:YSGG) lasers.

Materials and methods
Fifty five intact mandibular molars were divided into 3 negative groups (groups 1, 2, 3; n=5 for each), 3 study groups (groups 4, 5, 6; n=10 for each) and 1 positive control group (intact teeth; n=10). Access cavities of groups 1, 2 and 3 were prepared with conventional burs, Er:YAG laser and Er,Cr:YSGG laser respectively. After root canal obturation, their coronal portions were left non-restored. Access cavities of groups 4, 5 and 6 were prepared by using the same equipment but their coronal portions were restored with composite resin after root canal obturation. Following thermocycling, fracture strength was evaluated with a Universal Testing Machine. Mean force at which each sample is fractured was recorded in Newton unit and statistically analyzed.

Results
Fracture resistance of group 7 (intact teeth) was significantly higher than all other groups (p<0.001). Differences among the fracture resistance values of groups 4, 5 and 6 were not significantly different but they were significantly higher than those of groups 1, 2 and 3 (p<0.001). No significant difference was found between Groups 1, 2 and 3.

Conclusion
Preparing access cavities with either laser or bur has no effect on the fracture resistance of teeth with root canal treatment.
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Introduction
Fracture is an important risk for endodontically treated teeth (ETT) (1). These teeth are more prone to fractures compared with those free of any endodontic application (2). Although the fractures of ETT have been traditionally associated with loss of elasticity and moisture (3), the main reason is the reduction of dental hard tissue bulk as a result of cavity preparation which is routinely done by using rotary burs (4). Furthermore, microcrack formation occurring during cavity preparation and/or root canal instrumentation renders teeth more susceptible to fractures (5).

Currently, laser technology is being used for many dental procedures including cavity preparation. The absence of vibration, noise and no or minimal need for local anesthesia have been emphasized as the advantages of laser over conventional rotary instruments in the cavity preparation (6, 7). Furthermore, lasers have been reported to allow minimal invasive approach (8). Particularly, erbium lasers including Er:YAG (AT Fidelis, Fotona, Ljubljana, Slovenia) and Er,Cr:YSGG (WaterLase® i Plus, Biolase, Irvine, CA, USA) lasers are contemporary systems used in order to excavate dental...
hard tissues (7-9). Following absorption of laser light, dental hard tissues heat above melting point and explode by releasing their mineral content (10).

Microleakage of restorations after cavity preparation with lasers (7-9) and their effectiveness during cavity preparation (10-12) have been previously investigated. However, to the best of our knowledge, fracture strengths of cavities prepared with laser devices and conventional burs have not been compared before. The aim of the present study is therefore to examine the coronal fracture resistance of root-filled teeth after access cavity preparation either with Er:Cr:YSGG, Er:YAG lasers or conventional rotary burs. The null hypothesis of this study is that there is no significant difference between Er, Cr:YSGG, Er:YAG lasers and bur groups in terms of fracture resistance.

Materials and methods

Sample preparation

The present study was approved by the ethical committee of Gaziantep University (Project number: 2015/125) and verbal consent was obtained from patients in order to use their extracted teeth for the present study. This experiment included 55 intact (N=55), human mandibular molars of nearly similar dimensions (15±1 mm mesiodistally; 8±1 mm buccolingually), extracted due to periodontal reasons having no decay, filling, or other hard tissue loss. Any remnants over the surface were removed with scalers. Specimens were kept in 0.1 M thymol solution for disinfection at room temperature until the experiment. The samples were randomly distributed into 7 groups including 3 study and 4 control groups by using an on-line randomizing software service. Negative control groups (group 1, 2 and 3) included 5 teeth per each group (n=5), while study groups (groups 4, 5 and 6) and positive control group (group 7) included 10 teeth per group (n=10). An easy inlet to the root canals is provided in all cavities. A size 15K-file (Sybron Endo, Scafati, Italy) was advanced throughout the canal until its tip was visible at the apical foramen. Working length was calculated as 0.5-1 mm shorter of this point. Following each instrument, the canals were rinsed with 2 mL of NaOCl solution. Root canals were prepared up to an apical diameter of 1 mm after each file until size 80 file. Coronal one-third was enlarged by using size 2-4 Gates-Glidden burs (Thomas, Bourges, France). Excess irrigants were dried with paper points (Dentalplus, Choonchong, Korea). Root canal filling was achieved with lateral condensation technique by using gutta-percha (Dentalplus, Choonchong, Korea) and sealer (AD seal, Meta-Biomed, Cheongwon, Korea). Excess gutta-percha was cut with a heating tool from canal tips (Gutta Cut, VDW, Munich, Germany). All cavities were modified to MOD configuration with cylindrical burs to reach a thickness of 2.5 mm at the buccal occlusal wall, 3.5 mm at the buccal cemento-enamel junction, 1.5 mm at the lingual occlusal surface and 2.5 mm at the lingual cemento-enamel junction by using caliper. Pulp chambers were filled with resin-modified glass-ionomer cement (GC Corporation, Tokyo, Japan) (Figure 1).

Cavity preparation

The teeth were grouped as follows: Group 1 and Group 4: Access cavities were prepared with diamond round burs (Medin, Nove Mestona Morave, Czech Republic) attached to a high-speed hand piece under water cooling. Group 2 and Group 5: Access cavities were prepared by using a non-contact tip (RO2 Handpiece) attached to Er:YAG laser at a wavelength of 2940 nm (AT Fidelis, Fotona, Ljubljana, Slovenia). The energy settings were: 300 mJ 30 Hz (9 W) 6 water (65%) and 4 air (45%) in Medium Short Pulse (MSP=100 microseconds) mode for enamel, 225 mJ 15 Hz (3.35 W) 5 water (55%) and 3 air (35%) in MSP mode for dentin. Average energy used for each sample was approximately 2700 joule for enamel and 3000 joule for dentin. Group 3 and Group 6: Access cavities were prepared with a non-contact tip Turbo handpiece (MX7 tip) attached to Er:Cr:YSGG laser at a wavelength of 2780 nm (WatLase iPlus, Biolase, Irvine, CA, USA). The energy settings were: 8 W 20 Hz 70% Air and 80% water in H mode for enamel, 6W 15 Hz 50% Air and 70% Water in Hard Mode (H mode=60 microseconds) for dentin. Average energy used for each sample was approximately 2800 joule for enamel and 3200 joule for dentin. Group 7: No treatment was applied (intact teeth).

Coronal restoration

Coronal restorations of groups 4, 5 and 6 were done as follows: After applying self-etching bonding agent (Single Bond Universal Adhesive, 3M ESPE, St. Paul, MN, ABD) for 20 seconds, it was gently dried and light-cured for 10 seconds with light-emitting diode device (Valo Cordless, Ultradent Products Inc., South Jordan, UT, USA) at 1000 mW/cm² intensity. Cavities were restored with composite resin (Filtek Z550, 3M ESPE, St. Paul, MN, USA) by using incremental technique. Two mm resin was placed in each layer (Figure 2). To provide standardization, the light source was applied by positioning it just over the cusp tips. Following each 10 samples, the density of the light was checked with a dental radiometer (Demetron, Kerr, Orange, CA, USA) because the intensity of light source should not decline under 1000 mW/cm². Coronal segments of the samples in groups 1, 2 and 3 (negative control) were left unfilled. Roots of all samples were embedded in cylindrical molds filled with self-curing polymethylmethacrylate (Imicryl, Istanbul, Turkey) up to cemento-enamel junction.

Figure 1. Schematic representation of cavities without coronal restoration.
B: Buccal, L: Lingual, RMGIC: Resin Modified Glass Ionomer Cement, GP: Gutta Percha
Fracture Test

All specimens were thermocycled for 5000 cycles between 5 and 55 °C, using a dwell time of 30 seconds in each bath. Following thermocycling process, the samples were placed in a Universal Testing Machine (AGS-X, Shimadzu, Kyoto, Japan). A round-shaped steel tip in 5 mm diameter was connected to the testing machine in contact with restoration surface, buccal and lingual walls of the teeth (Figure 3). Fracture resistance of each group was measured by applying force parallel to the long axis of each tooth at a crosshead speed of 1 mm/min (Figure 4). Force necessary to fracture each tooth was recorded in Newton. Fracture test was applied by another blinded researcher. Fracture modes were classified according to the study of Taha et al. (1); Type 1: Horizontal cuspal fracture above cemento-enamel junction (CEJ) (Restorable). Type 2: Vertical fracture of either lingual or buccal wall above CEJ (Restorable). Type 3: Vertical fracture of either lingual or buccal wall below CEJ (Non-restorable).

Statistical analysis

Prior to statistical analysis, the normality of the data was analyzed with Shaphiro-Wilk test. Due to normal distribution of the data, statistical analysis was performed with one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and post-hoc Tukey’s Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) tests by using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) (IBM Corp.; Released 2010. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 19.0. Armonk, NY, USA) software. Confidence level was set to 95% and p values less than 0.05 were considered as statistically significant.

Results

The mean force required for the fracture to occur in each group in Newton (N) and their standard deviations are presented in Table 1. Fracture resistance of group 7 (intact teeth) was significantly higher than all other groups (p<0.001). Differences between the fracture resistance values of groups 4, 5 and 6 were not significantly different, while they were significantly higher those of the groups 1, 2 and 3 (p<0.001). There were no statistically significant differences between the mean fracture resistances of Group 1, 2 and 3. Fracture modes of the groups are presented in Table 2. The percentage of non-restorable fractures were; 80% in group 1, 100% in group 2, 80% in group 3, 50% in group 4, 50% in group 5, and 60% in group 6. All fracture occurred in dental hard tissues while coronal restorations were observed to be intact.

Discussion

Erbium lasers work by ablating water either present within the structure of dental hard tissues or supplied as a spray by laser devices. Ablation causes microstructural changes that include flaking, charring, microcrack and pore formation in dental hard tissues which may lead to fractures. The studies of Meister et al. (13) and Ekwarapoj et al. (14) pointed out that Er:YAG laser ablates endogenous water found in collagen of intertubular den-
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Thus, less hard tissue removal leads to increased resistance. This can be minimized and more conservative cavities can be prepared. By using correct water settings for lasers, both microstructural damages can be minimized and the amount of ablated tissue (14, 16). During clinical practice, lower water settings in order to provide standardization. Previous studies indicated a positive correlation of power settings with the fracture strength values. Furthermore, results of the present study related to providing sufficient amount of water in the present groups are non-restorable, while this percentage is 90-100% in non-restored groups. This may be due to the irrelevancy of cavity preparation techniques with the reinforcing capacity of coronal restoration. Better strengthening of coronal restoration results in more restorable fracture modes (20).

Re-restorability of root-filled teeth following fracture is another issue of concern. If fracture occurs in non-restorable form, extraction may be required. However, according to our results, 50-60% of the fracture modes in coronally restored groups are non-restorable, while this percentage is 90-100% in non-restored groups. This may be due to the irrelevancy of cavity preparation techniques with the reinforcing capacity of coronal restoration. Better strengthening of coronal restoration results in more restorable fracture modes (20).

Thermocycling was performed in the present study to simulate aging effects of intra-oral conditions. Eakle (21) stated that the thermocycling process reduces the strengthening capacity of resin restorations, therefore, long-term use of the root-filled and restored teeth can be simulated. The study of Kruzic et al. (22) reported that micro cracks leading to fractures occur as a result of fatigue cycling rather than the force load itself. For these reasons, samples of present study were subjected to thermocycling before the fracture strength tests.

Table 1. Mean fracture resistances and standard deviations of 7 experimental groups. Same superscript symbols indicate no significant difference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Bur cavity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>375.56 †</td>
<td>72.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Er:YAG cavity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>469.58 †</td>
<td>129.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Er:Cr:YSGG cavity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>208.69 †</td>
<td>74.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Bur+composite</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2249.99 ‡</td>
<td>402.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Er:YAG+composite</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1767.18 †</td>
<td>384.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Er:Cr:YSGG+composite</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1930.50 †</td>
<td>442.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Intact</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2745.83 †</td>
<td>628.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1676.44</td>
<td>964.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Er:YAG: erbium-doped yttrium aluminum garnet laser; Er:Cr:YSGG: erbium, chromium: yttrium scandium gallium garnet laser; SD: standard deviation

Table 2. Fracture modes observed in each group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Type 1</th>
<th>Type 2</th>
<th>Type 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Bur cavity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Er:YAG cavity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Er:Cr:YSGG cavity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Bur+composite</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Er:YAG+composite</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Er:Cr:YSGG+composite</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Intact</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Er:YAG: erbium-doped yttrium aluminum garnet laser; Er:Cr:YSGG: erbium, chromium: yttrium scandium gallium garnet laser

tine more than exogenous water, while Er:Cr:YSGG laser uses exogenous water more than endogenous water. Franzen et al. (15) found that similar microstructural changes occur if adequate water supply is provided for both type of lasers. We assume that the similarity in the fracture strength values of laser groups is related to providing sufficient amount of water in the present study. In other words, using correct water settings for lasers resulted in similar microstructural changes and thus, similar fracture strength values. Furthermore, results of the present study revealed no significant difference between laser and bur groups. Thus, the null hypothesis was accepted. The results of this study, when combined with those of the previous researches suggest that the fracture of root-filled teeth may be correlated with either the amount of dental hard tissue loss or the micro crack formation during cavity preparation. We also need to highlight that the samples of the present study were prepared from intact teeth and cavities were modified as MOD type by using high power settings in order to provide standardization. Previous studies indicated a positive correlation of power settings with the amount of ablated tissue (14, 16). During clinical practice, lower power settings, which are only sensitive to decayed tissue, can be used and, by doing this, both microstructural damages can be minimized and more conservative cavities can be prepared. Thus, less hard tissue removal leads to increased resistance. This was also confirmed by Corona et al. (17) and Fornaini et al. (18). Franzen et al. (15) reported that minimal invasive cavities can be prepared and patient comfort can be enhanced by using Erbium lasers during cavity preparation. Accordingly, despite the present study found that fracture resistance did not vary either with burs or with laser, other advantages of cavity preparation with laser mentioned above may also motivate the clinicians to use Erbium lasers for cavity preparation. Further in vivo and in vitro studies with lower power settings may be beneficial to explore such advantages of laser devices.

The results of the present study further indicated that the reinforcing properties of the coronal restoration is more important than the technique used for access cavity preparation because as seen in Table 1, all coronally restored groups (4, 5 and 6) have significantly higher fracture strengths compared to non-restored groups (1, 2 and 3). In the study of Sengun et al. (19), it was reported that restoring the coronal portion of the root-filled teeth with appropriate materials compensates the loss of hard tissue bulk and reinforces dental hard tissues. Thus, it can be stated that the quality of the coronal restorative material are more important than the technique used for cavity preparation in terms of fracture strength.

Re-restorability of root-filled teeth following fracture is another issue of concern. If fracture occurs in non-restorable form, extraction may be required. However, according to our results, 50-60% of the fracture modes in coronally restored groups are non-restorable, while this percentage is 90-100% in non-restored groups. This may be due to the irrelevancy of cavity preparation techniques with the reinforcing capacity of coronal restoration. Better strengthening of coronal restoration results in more restorable fracture modes (20).

Although different cavity preparation techniques have been used in the present study, all coronal restorations were performed with the same material in a similar manner.

Thermocycling was performed in the present study to simulate aging effects of intra-oral conditions. Eakle (21) stated that the thermocycling process reduces the strengthening capacity of resin restorations, therefore, long-term use of the root-filled and restored teeth can be simulated. The study of Kruzic et al. (22) reported that micro cracks leading to fractures occur as a result of fatigue cycling rather than the force load itself. For these reasons, samples of present study were subjected to thermocycling before the fracture strength tests.

Zadik et al. (23) stated that mandibular molars are the most likely to be extracted following endodontic treatment resulting from fractures compared to other teeth. For this reason, mandibular molars were included in the present study. Dental hard tissue bulk remained following caries removal and cavity preparation is another risk factor in terms of fracture occurrence. Tang et al. (24) found that MOD cavities carry more fracture risk compared to MO and OD cavities. In the present study, all cavities were modified to MOD configuration to increase fracture risk. Furthermore, all fractures have notably occurred between dental tissues and composite restoration (adhesive failure). This may be related to the low thickness of the cavity walls, particularly at the cavity base (3.5 mm for buccal, 2.5 mm for lingual) which may have led to fracture of these thin walls before composite restoration. Fracture resistance values were determined with a universal testing machine by applying force parallel to the long axis of teeth. However, magnitude and directions of physiological chewing forces may be different from those of simulators (25). Therefore, the results of in vivo studies must be confirmed by clinical trials.
Conclusions

Within the limitations of this in vitro study, it can be stated that preparing access cavities with either laser or bur does not have any deleterious effect on the fracture resistance of teeth with root canal treatment.
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