

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article:

Effect of Different Irrigation Systems on Sealer Penetration into Dentinal Tubules / Generali, Luigi; Cavani, Francesco; Serena, Valentina; Pettenati, Corinne; Righi, Elena; Bertoldi, Carlo. - In: JOURNAL OF ENDODONTICS. - ISSN 0099-2399. - 43:4(2017), pp. 652-656. [10.1016/j.joen.2016.12.004]

Terms of use:

The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

25/04/2026 11:21

(Article begins on next page)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

EFFECT OF DIFFERENT IRRIGATION SYSTEMS ON SEALER PENETRATION INTO DENTINAL TUBULES

Luigi Generali, *DDS*¹, Francesco Cavani, *MSc*², Valentina Serena, *DDS*¹,
Corinne Pettenati, *DDS*¹, Elena Righi, *PhD*², Carlo Bertoldi, *MD, DDS*¹

¹ Department of Surgery, Medicine, Dentistry and Morphological Sciences with
Transplant Surgery, Oncology and Regenerative Medicine Relevance (CHIMOMO),
University of Modena and Reggio Emilia, Modena, Italy.

² Department of Biomedical, Metabolic and Neural Sciences, University of Modena
and Reggio Emilia, Modena, Italy.

Acknowledgments

The authors deny any conflicts of interest related to this study.

Running title: sealer penetration inside tubules

Keywords

Confocal laser scanning microscopy; dentinal tubules; irrigation; sealer penetration;
Thermafil Obturator

Correspondence: Luigi Generali, Department of Surgery, Medicine, Dentistry and
Morphological Sciences with Transplant Surgery, Oncology and Regenerative
Medicine Relevance (CHIMOMO), University of Modena and Reggio Emilia,
Modena, Italy. (Tel.: +39 059 4224324; e-mail: luigi.general@unimore.it)

Abstract

Introduction: Different irrigation systems have been developed to improve the efficacy and distribution of the irrigants. The aim of this study was to compare the effect of conventional endodontic needle irrigation, with other irrigant delivery and/or agitation systems on sealer penetration into dentinal tubules.

Methods: Fifty single-rooted teeth with round-shaped root canals were distributed in 5 homogeneous groups characterized by the different cleansing system used: conventional endodontic needle irrigation, EndoActivator, Irrisafe, Self-Adjusting File and EndoVac. After instrumentation, all teeth were filled by Thermafil Obturators and Rhodamin B dye labelled TopSeal sealer. Teeth were transversally sectioned at 2-, 5-, and 7-mm levels from the apex and observed under confocal laser scanning microscope. Maximum, mean and percentage of sealer penetration inside tubules around the root canal were measured. Moreover, the integrity of the sealer layer perimeter was evaluated.

Results: No significant differences both in mean ($P > 0.05$) and in maximum penetration depth ($P > 0.05$) were observed among groups, while both parameters showed an increased trend within each group from the 2- to the 7-mm level from apex. Similarly, the percentage of penetration around the root canal wall did not differ among groups ($P > 0.05$) and showed an increasing trend within each group from the apical to the coronal portion of the canal.

Conclusions: Sealer penetration into dentinal tubules is not affected by the irrigant delivery and/or agitation systems studied. Thermafil with TopSeal technique achieves the complete sealer perimeter integrity in all groups.

Introduction

1
2
3
4 Needle irrigation is the conventional method to deliver irrigants inside the root canal
5 system (RCS), but to reach the full length of the root canal, the needle tip has to be
6 inserted within 1-mm of working length (1) increasing the risk of irrigants extrusion
7 from apical foramen. Nonetheless, the vapor lock phenomenon might prevent the
8 direct contact of the irrigant with the root canal wall, especially in its most apical
9 portion, thus making the irrigant action ineffective (2). Therefore, to improve the
10 efficacy and distribution of the irrigants different irrigation techniques and devices
11 have been developed, such as EndoActivator, Irrisafe, Self-Adjusting File and
12 Endovac. EndoActivator (Dentsply, Tulsa Dental Specialities, Tulsa, OK) is a sonic
13 device that employs frequencies in the ranges of 2-3 kHz to activate irrigant
14 solutions. It has been reported that this device produces a hydrodynamic activation of
15 the irrigants that is able to safely clean the RCS and morphological irregularities as
16 lateral canals and apical deltas (3). Irrisafe (Satelec Acteon Group, Merignac, France)
17 is an ultrasonic device operating in the range of 25-30 kHz that activates the irrigant
18 solution by acoustic streaming and micro-cavitation; this technique is referred as
19 passive ultrasonic irrigation (PUI) and it allows the delivery of irrigants up to the
20 working length of the root canal unlike conventional endodontic needle (4). The Self-
21 Adjusting File (ReDent Nova, Ra'anana, Israel) is a hollow and flexible file that
22 adapts itself three-dimensionally to the root canal. During the instrumentation
23 technique, this file allows for the continuous irrigation that, in combination with the
24 vibrating motion, influences cleaning ability in the root canal, particularly in the
25 apical third (5). The EndoVac (KerrEndo, Orange County, CA) is an apical negative
26 pressure irrigation system that sucks the irrigant solution by means of a microcannula
27 positioned at the working length. Thus, the vapor lock effect and the risk of NaOCl
28 extrusion beyond the apical foramen are prevented. Moreover, the EndoVac has been
29 shown to improve the cleaning of the apical third with respect to conventional needle
30 irrigation (6).
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 The aim of the present study was to compare the effect of conventional endodontic
2 needle irrigation and four different irrigation systems on sealer penetration into
3 dentinal tubules of extracted teeth with round root canal using confocal laser
4 scanning microscopy (CLSM). The null hypothesis tested was that there is no
5 difference in the depth and percentage of sealer penetration between the conventional
6 endodontic needle irrigation, and four different method of root canal cleaning.
7 Moreover, the integrity of the sealer layer perimeter was evaluated.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 **Materials and Methods**

20
21
22
23 Fifty human teeth with single round-shaped root canals and straight mature roots
24 were selected from a pool of extracted teeth.
25

26
27 After access cavity preparation, the working length (WL) was established by
28 subtracting 1 mm from the total root length. The apex was covered with
29 cyanoacrylate to simulate in vivo conditions. Samples were distributed into 5
30 experimental groups of 10 teeth each and characterized by the different systems used:
31 conventional endodontic needle irrigation group (CENI); EndoActivator group (EA);
32 Irrisafe group (IS); Self-adjusting File group (SAF) and EndoVac group (EV). Canal
33 width, measured on radiographs at 5 mm from the apex, and WL were not different
34 among groups (Kruskal-Wallis test, $P > 0.05$). Each canal was instrumented in a
35 crown-down manner using the ProTaper Universal rotary system (Dentsply Maillefer,
36 Ballaigues, Switzerland) to size 40 at the WL.
37

38
39 In the CENI group, after the use of each instruments, the root canals were irrigated
40 with 1 mL 5.25% NaOCl (Nicolor, Oagna, Muggiò, Italy) using a syringe with a 30-G
41 side-vented needle (Max-i-Probe, Dentsply Rinn, Elgin, IL) placed before the binding
42 point but not closer than 2 mm from the WL. After instrumentation, the canals were
43 finally rinsed with 1 mL 5.25% NaOCl left in place for 30 seconds followed by 1 mL
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 17% EDTA (Ogna, Muggiò, Italy), left in place for 30 seconds and with 1 mL 5.25%
2 NaOCl left in place for another 30 seconds. The needle was placed 2 mm from WL.
3

4 In the EA group, the irrigation protocol was the same as the CENI group but the final
5 irrigation was performed using the 25 .04 non cutting polymer tip of the
6 EndoActivator, placed 2 mm from the WL for 30 seconds for each irrigant solution.
7
8
9

10 In the IS group, the irrigation protocol was the same as the CENI group but the final
11 irrigation was performed using a stainless steel non cutting 25 tip (Irrisafe, Satelec,
12 Acteongroup, Merignac, France) mounted on an ultrasonic device (P5 Newtron,
13 Satelec), placed 2 mm from the WL for 30 seconds for each irrigant solution.
14
15
16
17
18

19 In the SAF group, the irrigation protocol was the same as the CENI group but the
20 final irrigation was performed using the 1.5-mm SAF file (ReDent-Nova, Ra'anana,
21 Israel). The SAF file was operated by using an in-and-out manual motion for 30
22 seconds (0.4-mm amplitude and 5000 vibrations per minute) with continuous
23 irrigation by using 5.25% NaOCl provided by a VATEA peristaltic pump (ReDent-
24 Nova) at a rate of 2 mL/min. A second cycle was performed as just described but
25 employing 17% EDTA, and the third and last cycle with 5.25% NaOCl.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 In the EV group, after each instrument change, 1 mL of NaOCl was delivered to fill
35 the access cavity. At the end of instrumentation, NaOCl 5.25% was delivered with
36 the macrocannula for 30 seconds with an up and down movement from a point where
37 it started to bind to a point just below the canal orifice. NaOCl was left in place for
38 60 s then 3 cycles of microirrigation were performed inserting the microcannula at
39 WL for 6 s, then at 2 mm from WL for 6 s, and eventually at WL for another 6 s. This
40 was done until a total of 30 s was reached, for each cycle. At the end of cycles, the
41 microcannula completely aspirated the irrigant from within the canal. The first and
42 third cycles were performed using NaOCl 5.25% while the second cycle employed
43 17% EDTA. In all groups the same amounts of irrigants were employed.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 All canals were dried with paper points and filled by Thermafil Obturators 40
56 (Dentsply, Tulsa Dental Specialities, Johnson City, TN, USA) with TopSeal sealers
57 (Dentsply De Trey, Konstanz, Germany) labeled with 0.1% wt Rhodamin B dye
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 (Carlo Erba Reagenti, Arese, Italy). The sealer was introduced into the canal by
2 means of a paper point 40 to 1 mm short of the WL in a pumping motion for 5 s. A
3 coronal filling was performed with a temporary material (Cavit, 3M ESPE, Seefeld,
4 Germany) and then teeth were stored in an incubator at 37°C and 100% humidity for
5
6 7 days to allow the sealer to set.
8
9

10 The teeth were embedded in methacrylate resin (Technovit 3040, Heraeus Kulzer,
11 Wehrheim, Germany) and transversally sectioned at 2-, 5- and 7-mm from the apex
12 with a saw microtome (Leica SP 1600, Nussloch, Germany) to obtain 200- μ m-thick
13 sections. These were examined under CLSM (Leica TCS SP2 AOBS, Mannheim,
14 Germany) at 5 X and 10 X magnification. The depth of sealer penetration into
15 dentinal tubules was calculated as the average penetration measured, using the
16 straight-line tool of ImageJ software (National Institutes of Health, USA), at 8
17 standardized points starting from the inner side of canal wall at 2-, 5- and 7-mm from
18 the apex (7). Moreover, the point of deepest penetration was measured from the canal
19 wall to the point of maximum depth of sealer penetration. The percentage of sealer
20 penetration was calculated by measuring the Rhodamine B stained surfaces of the
21 canal wall where sealer penetrated inside dentinal tubules (sealer tags) and dividing
22 these values by the circumference of the root canal itself and multiplying the result by
23 100. Moreover, the integrity of the sealer layer perimeter was evaluated on each
24 image acquired measuring the Rhodamine stained perimeter of the canal wall and
25 dividing this value for the root canal circumference and expressed as percentage.
26
27

28 Comparisons among groups in sealer penetration (expressed as mean, maximum and
29 percentage penetration) were performed using the nonparametric Kruskal-Wallis test,
30 allowing post hoc pairwise multiple comparisons when appropriate. Differences
31 within each group in sealer penetration at 2-, 5- and 7-mm levels were analyzed by
32 using the Wilcoxon signed rank sum test. Statistical analyses were performed using
33 IBM SPSS Statistics package ver. 21 and a *P* values < 0.05 was considered
34 significant.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Results

Figure 1 shows an overview of representative CLSM images from each experimental groups at 2-, 5- and 7-mm levels.

Sealer penetration (Figure 2) was not different among groups (Kruskal-Wallis test, $P > 0.05$), while, within each group, mean depth of sealer penetration showed an increasing trend from the apical toward the coronal third. More specifically, within each experimental group, at the 2-mm level the results were significantly lower compared to those measured at 5- and 7-mm level (Wilcoxon signed rank sum tests, $P < 0.05$). Further, in the SAF group, the mean depth measured at 5-mm level appeared significantly lower than that measured at 7-mm level (Wilcoxon signed rank sum test, $P < 0.05$).

Table 1 reports the average values of maximum depth of sealer penetration (μm) recorded at each level for each group. No statistically significant differences were observed among groups (Kruskal-Wallis test, $P > 0.05$), while values measured at 2-mm levels were always smaller compared to those observed at 5- and 7-mm levels (Wilcoxon signed rank sum tests, $P < 0.05$), within each group, except for EA group. In this group values at 2-mm were not significantly lower than those measured at 5-mm level (Wilcoxon signed rank sum tests, $P > 0.05$), while values observed at 5-mm were significantly lower than those measured at 7-mm level (Wilcoxon signed rank sum test, $P < 0.05$).

In SAF group, on the contrary; differences in maximum depth observed among levels were always statistically significant (Wilcoxon signed rank sum tests, $P < 0.05$).

The percentage of sealer penetration into dentinal tubules (Fig. 3) was not significantly different (Kruskal-Wallis test, $P > 0.05$) among groups when the overall distribution of values was compared. Within each group, an increase in the percentage of sealer penetration was observed from the apex toward the coronal third. Percentages of penetration measured at 2-mm level appeared always significantly lower than those recorded at 5- and 7-mm levels (Wilcoxon signed rank sum tests, P

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

< 0.05), and, both in EndoVac and in SAF group, percentages observed at 5-mm level resulted significantly lower than those measured at 7-mm level (Wilcoxon signed rank sum tests, $P < 0.05$), while in remaining groups no significantly differences could be measured between 5- and 7-mm levels (Wilcoxon signed rank sum tests, $P > 0.05$).

The integrity of the sealer layer perimeter was 100% in all groups and in all levels examined.

Discussion

Sealer penetration into dentinal tubules is considered a positive outcome in order to: prevent bacterial repopulation or bacterial inactivation inside the tubules as a blocking agent (8), improve filling material retention within the root canal thanks to mechanical interlocking between sealer and root dentin (9), entomb remaining bacteria within dentinal tubules (10). Therefore, sealer penetration into dentinal tubules is considered clinically relevant (11).

No studies have been performed so far about sealer penetration into dentinal tubules comparing, at the same time, different activation/delivery irrigation systems in association with a sealer and a core-carried based technique (Thermafil) by using CLSM analysis. Few studies (7,12,13), based on CLSM analysis, evaluated sealer penetration into dentinal tubules using the Thermafil technique. Only two studies using Thermafil (12,13) employed an activation of the irrigants by means of passive ultrasonic irrigation.

In this study no significant differences were found in all investigated parameters related to sealer penetration in association with the different systems evaluated. These results are similar to those reported by Bolles (14), who showed that sonic activation of irrigants by means of EndoActivator and Vibringe did not significantly improve sealer penetration with respect to conventional irrigation. The EndoActivator system does not increase smear layer removal compared to conventional irrigation (15).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Contrary to our results, Kara Tuncer & Unal (16) show that the EndoVac irrigation system improves sealer penetration with respect to conventional irrigation at 1- and 3-mm levels from the apex. Sealer penetration cannot be reputed an absolute index of smear layer removal, because the presence of smear layer limits, but do not completely prevents sealer penetration into tubules (11). Therefore, sealer penetration into dentinal tubules might more likely depend on its physico-chemical properties (17) and on the filling technique employed rather than on the activation of irrigants. In this study, TopSeal, an epoxy resin-based sealer, has been employed with a core-carried filling technique. AH Plus (TopSeal) sealer has a pseudoplastic behavior characterized by a reduction of viscosity and an increase in flow when shear rate increases during the filling procedure (18). This physical property allows the sealer to adhere to the root canal wall, to fill uninstrumented accessory root-canals and to penetrate dentinal tubules. In case of retreatment, an epoxy resin based sealer is impossible to remove completely from dentinal tubules, because it deeply penetrates into dentinal tubules and its removal would imply a removal up to 60 % of additional root dentin. Nonetheless, the complete removal of the sealer from dentinal tubules does not mean a retreatment failure (19).

In all our sections examined, the integrity of the sealer layer perimeter was 100%, thus indicating an optimal adaptation of the sealer to the canal wall. This is probably due, not only to the physico-chemical characteristics of the sealer, but also to the core-carried filling technique employed. Also Kok (12) found that the integrity of the sealer layer was 100% when AH Plus sealer was associated with the Thermafil technique, while it was 98.43% with the cold lateral compaction technique and 99.54% with the single master cone one. Core-carried techniques, in fact, allow a homogeneous root filling where the sealer layer is thin and well adapted to the canal wall (20).

In this study all investigated parameters related to sealer penetration show an increasing trend from the apical to the coronal level. Our results are in line with those reported by recent investigations (7, 21-23). The minor penetration here observed at

1 the apical level might be ascribed to the reduction of tubular diameter and number
2 towards the apex, and to dentinal sclerosis (24).
3
4
5

6 **Conclusion**

7
8 The use of either EndoActivator or Irrisafe or Self-Adjusting file or Endovac systems
9 in round-shaped straight root canals does not improve sealer penetration into dentinal
10 tubules with respect to conventional endodontic needle irrigation when TopSeal
11 sealer is associated with the Thermafil Obturator technique.
12
13

14
15 This filling method ensured an integrity of the sealer layer perimeter of 100%
16 independently of the device employed.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 **References**

- 26
27 1. Boutsoukis C, Lambrianidis T, Verhaagen B et al. The effect of needle-insertion
28 depth on the irrigant flow in the root canal: evaluation using an unsteady
29 computational fluid dynamics model. J Endod 2010;36:1664-8
30
31
32
33
34
35
- 36 2. Tay FR, Gu LS, Schoeffel GJ et al. Effect of vapor lock on root canal debridement
37 by using a side-vented needle for positive-pressure irrigant delivery. J Endod
38 2010;36:745-50
39
40
41
42
43
- 44 3. Ruddle CJ. Hydrodynamic disinfection: tsunami endodontics. Dent Today
45 2007;26:4-7
46
47
48
49
50
- 51 4. Munoz HR, Camacho-Cuadra K. In vivo efficacy of three different endodontic
52 irrigation systems for irrigant delivery to working length of mesial canals of
53 mandibular molars. J Endod 2012;38:445-8
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
5. Metzger Z, Teperovich E, Zary R, Cohen R, Hof R. The self-adjusting file (SAF). Part 1: respecting the root canal anatomy-a new concept of endodontic files and its implementation. *J Endod* 2010;36:679-90
 6. Siu C, Baumgartner JC. Comparison of the debridement efficacy of the EndoVac irrigation system and conventional needle root canal irrigation in vivo. *J Endod* 2010;36:1782-5
 7. Generali L, Prati C, Pirani C, Cavani F, Gatto MR, Gandolfi MG. Double dye technique and fluid filtration test to evaluate early sealing ability of an endodontic sealer. *Clin Oral Investig* 2016;doi: 10.1007/s00784-016-1878-0 [epub ahead of print]
 8. Kokkas AB, Boutsoukias ACh, Vassiliadis LP, Stavrianos CK. The influence of the smear layer on dentinal tubule penetration depth by three different root canal sealers: an in vitro study. *J Endod* 2004;30:100–2
 9. Akçay M, Arslan H, Durmus N, Mese M, Capar ID. Dentinal tubule penetration of AH Plus, iRoot SP, MTA Fillapex, and GuttaFlow Bioseal root canal sealers after different final irrigation procedures: a confocal microscopic study. *Lasers Surg Med* 2016;48:70-76
 10. Shokouhinejad N, Sabeti M, Gorjestani H, Saghiri MA, Lotfi M, Hoseini A. Penetration of Epiphany, Epiphany self-etch, and AH Plus into dentinal tubules: a scanning electron microscopy study. *J Endod* 2011;37:1316-19
 11. Kara Tuncer A, Tuncer S. Effect of different final irrigation solutions on dentinal tubule penetration depth and percentage of root canal sealer. *J Endod* 2012;38:860–863

- 1
2 12.Kok D, Húngaro Duarte MA, Abreu Da Rosa R, Wagner MH, Pereira JR, Só MV.
3
4 Evaluation of epoxy resin sealer after three root canal filling technique by
5
6 confocal laser scanning microscopy. *Microsc Res Technique* 2012;75:1277-80
7
8
9
10 13.Ordinola-Zapata R, Bramante CM, Bernardineli N et al. A preliminary study of
11
12 the percentage of sealer penetration in roots obturated with the Thermafil and
13
14 RealSeal-1 obturation techniques in mesial root canals of mandibular molars. *Oral*
15
16 *Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod* 2009;108:961-8
17
18
19
20
21 14.Bolles JA, He J, Svoboda KKH, Schneiderman E, Glickman GN. Comparison of
22
23 vibringe, endoactivator and needle irrigation on sealer penetration in extracted
24
25 human teeth. *J Endod* 2013;39:708-11
26
27
28
29
30 15.Uroz-Torres D, Gonzalez-Rodriguez MP, Ferrer-Luque CM. Effectiveness of the
31
32 EndoActivator System in removing the smear layer after root canal
33
34 instrumentation. *J Endod* 2010;36:308-11
35
36
37
38 16.Kara Tuncer A, Ünal S. Comparison of sealer penetration using the EndoVac
39
40 irrigation system and conventional needle root canal irrigation. *J Endod*
41
42 2014;40:613–17
43
44
45
46
47 17.Oksan T, Aktener BO, Şen BH, Tezel H. The penetration of root canal sealers
48
49 into dentinal tubules. A scanning electron microscopic study. *Int Endod J*
50
51 1993;26:301–305
52
53
54
55
56 18.Zhou HM, Shen Y, Zheng W, Li L, Zheng YF, Haapasalo M. Physical properties
57
58 of 5 root canal sealers. *J Endod* 2013;39:1281-6
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
19. Kim H, Kim E, Lee SJ, Shin SJ. Comparisons of the retreatment efficacy of calcium silicate and epoxy resin-based sealers and residual sealer in dentinal tubules. J Endod 2015;41:2025-30
 20. Gençoğlu N, Samani S, Günday M. Dentinal wall adaptation of thermoplasticized gutta-percha in the absence or presence of smear layer: a scanning electron microscopic study. J Endod 1993;19:558-62
 21. Chandra SS, Shankar P, Indira R. Depth of penetration of four resin sealers into radicular dentinal tubules: a confocal microscopic study. J Endod 2012;38:1412-6
 22. Şen BH, Pişkin B, Baran N. The effect of tubular penetration of root canal sealers on dye microleakage. Int Endod J 1996;29:23-8
 23. Akcay M, Arslan H, Durmus N, Mese M, Capar ID. Dentinal tubule penetration of AH Plus, iRoot SP, MTA Fillapex, and GuttaFlow Bioseal root canal sealers after different final irrigation procedures: a confocal microscopic study. Lasers Surg Med 2016;48:70-76
 24. Giardino L, Cavani F, Generali L. Sodium hypochlorite solution penetration into human dentine: a histochemical evaluation. Int Endod J 2016;doi: 10.1111/iej.12641. [Epub ahead of print]

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Figure legends

Figure 1 Representative CLSM images from each experimental groups at 2-, 5- and 7-mm levels.

Figure 2 Mean depth of sealer penetration (μm) measured at different levels within each experimental group. In each boxplot, the median value (the line inside the box), the interquartile range (IQR length of the box), the minimum and maximum values (extreme lines) are reported. Values more than 1.5 IQR's but < 3 IQR's are labeled as outliers (o); values ≥ 3 IQR's are labeled as extreme cases (*).

Figure 3 Percentage of sealer penetration measured at different levels within each experimental group. In each boxplot, the median value (the line inside the box), the interquartile range (IQR length of the box), the minimum and maximum values (extreme lines) are reported. Values more than 1.5 IQR's but < 3 IQR's are labeled as outliers (o); values ≥ 3 IQR's are labeled as extreme cases (*).

Figure 1
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49





Figure 2
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Table 1 Maximum depth of sealer penetration (mean \pm SD, μm) recorded at each level with each experimental group

group	level		
	2-mm	5-mm	7-mm
CENI	288 \pm 403 ^{a,b}	987 \pm 374 ^a	1012 \pm 269 ^b
EA	348 \pm 402 ^b	658 \pm 298 ^c	900 \pm 352 ^{b,c}
IS	401 \pm 205 ^{a,b}	756 \pm 420 ^a	844 \pm 228 ^b
SAF	215 \pm 230 ^{a,b}	570 \pm 469 ^{a,c}	858 \pm 498 ^{b,c}
EV	214 \pm 252 ^{a,b}	703 \pm 466 ^a	963 \pm 324 ^b

^a 2-mm vs 5-mm level: Wilcoxon test $P < 0.05$; ^b 2-mm vs 7-mm level: Wilcoxon test $P < 0.05$; ^c 5-mm vs 7-mm level: Wilcoxon test $P < 0.05$.

Figure 3
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49