Apical Patency: A Potentiate influencing the accuracy of EALs

Mukta Bansal[1], Asheesh Sawhny[2] , Pankaj Priyadarshi[3], Saurav Paul[4], Abhishek Shankar[5],Neha Singh[6]

[1]Senior Lecturer, Department of Conservative Dentistry and Endodontics, Rama Dental College, Hospital & Research Centre Kanpur (U.P.) [muktasaggi@gmail.com]

[2]Professor, Department of Conservative Dentistry and Endodontics, Rama Dental College, Hospital & Research Centre Kanpur (U.P.) [drasheeshmydentist@gmail.com]

[3]Senior Lecturer, Department of Conservative Dentistry and Endodontics, Rama Dental College Hospital & Research Centre Kanpur (U.P.) [pankaj.priyadarshi24@gmail.com]

[4]Senior Lecturer, Department of Conservative Dentistry & Endodontics, Rama Dental College, Hospital & Research Centre Kanpur (U.P.) [sauravpaul819@gmail.com]

[5]Senior Lecturer, Department of Orthodontics, Rama Dental College, Hospital & Research Centre Kanpur (U.P.) [drabhishekshankar@gmail.com]

[6]Post Graduate, Department of Conservative Dentistry and Endodontics, Rama Dental College, Hospital & Research Centre Kanpur (U.P.) [neha94kiddo@gmail.com]

ABSTRACT

INTRODUCTION: A study was conducted to look for the significance of apical patency and its role in the accuracy of 2 apex locators viz. Root-ZXMini [J Morita, Tokyo, Japan] and Proper Pixi Mini [Dentsply Maillefer, Ballaigues, Switzerland].

METHODS: We evaluated the actual working length in 80 extracted human mandibular molars with properly developed root apices and their respective patent apical foramen using a dental operating microscope at magnification of X20. Following that, those intact roots' apical foramen were blocked apically, and reamers were introduced to the same previous length established by given apex locator prior to blocked apices. Standard deviation was determined by comparing the variation in apex locator readings after blockage to the original readings before blockage.

RESULTS: Prior to blockage, Friedman's test none statistically significant difference between the two apex locators (P. .05; effect size 5 0.013) was revealed. Both Root ZX Mini and Proper Pixi Mini showed the alike , 96.7 percent accuracy rate, within the limit of error 61. Statistical significant difference of two apex locators was visible in measurement inaccuracy on the median after blockage comparison was done to measurements taken prior to blockage (P, .05; effect size 5 0.305). Root ZX Mini had a greater median measurement error than Proper Pixi Mini (–1 mm and 0.01–0.5 mm, respectively).

INFERENCE: Blockage of the apical foramen impacts negatively on apex locator's precision, which was seen more marked in Root ZX Mini and lesser in Proper Pixi Mini.

KEYWORDS: Apex locator's precision; blocks at apical foramen; apical patency; Root-ZX Mini, Proper Pixi Mini

Number: 10.14704/nq.2022.20.7.NQ33170 **Neuro Quantology 2022; 20(7):1388-1394**

INTRODUCTION

Root canal treatment is successful only when the entire root canal is shaped meticulously along with cleaning and disinfection, followed by 3-D obturation. This needs necessitation of precise measurement of narrowing of the apex. The minor apical diameter, also identified as apical constriction, is the end beyond which periodontal tissues starts1. This is the reasoning for limitation of all instruments, cleaning agents,

and filling materials into the apical portion of the root canal system is practiced and thence, secret to enhance the results of root canal treatment[2].

As it negates the limitations of the Sensitive periapical radiography using the 2-D approach[3], the Electronic Apex Locator (EAL) has become a paramount device to determine working length.

Since when the first apex locator was introduced, which used to rely on direct electrical current and resistance, there have been several generations. All recent generations rely on multi-frequency alternating current and impedance instead of resistance[4].

The concept behind these generations is electrical conductivity between the associated file clip and the lip clip, with the root canal dentin functioning as an non conductor whereas periodontal ligaments standing as a conductor. When current is passed through the periodontal ligament into the tunica mucosa oris and running down to the lip clip[5], required electrical circuit is complete.

If irrigation and recapitulation aren't being used during cleaning and shaping, the apical foramen can become blocked. A blockage could be detected by a tactile sensation in a reamer that stops short of correct working length[6], or maybe it could go unnoticed if obligated to the apical foramen by denial of a patency file[7]. Apical patency is a technique that involves recapitulation with a small reamer through the apical foramen[8] to keep the apical region of the canal free of dentinal debris. Because the apical plug is contaminated by microorganisms of the infected root canal, their apical blockage could be a major contributing cause to unsuccessful root canal treatment.

METHODS

Selection and Preparation of Teeth :

The study included 80 extracted human mandibular molars having fully established roots, two distinct mesial canals and distinct foramina (Vertucci type IV), and a single distal canal. Teeth were collected and decontaminated with 5.2% sodium hypochlorite , and is there after kept in distilled water until they were required.

To observe possible fractures and ascertain apex maturity, a dental operating microscope (ZEISS OPMI pico, CARL ZEISS, Germany) was put in use at X20 magnification to examine root surfaces and apical regions. The study excluded tooth that had open apices, were fractured, or were resorbed.

Determination of Real Working Length (Microscopic Working Length Measure) :

Collected specimens (50 experimental ; 30 negative control) were initially decoronated with wheel diamond discs at the cementoenamel junction (Kerr Dental, Orange, CA). The canals were thoroughly irrigated using 5mL of 2.5 percent NaOCl after the apical patency was confirmed using the #15 K-reamer (Dentsply Maillefer, Ballaigues, Switzerland). Fifty experimental samples were numbered one through fifty, with the remaining 30 samples serving as negative controls. Under a dental operating microscope set at magnification of X20, K-reamer #15 was put deep inside the root canal until it became apparent at the apical foramen. The file was removed, and the canal length was measured with a triangular architectural scale ruler (Esquisse, RVRA), with the readings noted to the nearest 0.02 mm. Each measurement was taken thrice, with mean of results serving as the sample's representative measurement. We did take this measurement and subtracted 0.5 mm to get the Actual Working Length (AWL).

Determination of Electronic Working Length:

The mold made of plastic with dimensions : 20 X 15 X 10 mm, and then filled it with enough alginate (Septodont Plastalgin Alginate) to conceal the roots, leaving closely 5mm of the molar root surfaces exposed[9].

Before taking measurements, caliberation of two apex locators was done to ensure correct procedure. The lip clip was pressed into the alginate while its setting during electronic measurement. Each and every electronic measurements were taken within a span of 1hour.The manufacturers' recommendations were followed when using Root-ZX Mini (J Morita, Tokyo, Japan) and Proper Pixi Mini (Dentsply Maillefer, Ballaigues, Switzerland). We inserted a #15 K-reamer with a silicone stopper as guide inside the canal for Root ZX Mini up till the root apex was obtained. Then the file was relegated to the display's green flash bar (0.5). The file was put into the root canal for Proper

Pixi Mini until the second orange bar appeared on the display, and then it was removed until all blue flash bars were attained. Each EAL was used to assess the depth of penetration inside the root canal of each specimen, which was then compared to AWL.

Measures of Working Length after Canal Blockage:

Cervical dentin was filled using Hedstrom files (MicroMega) creating dentinal mud was used for intentionally inducing canal blockage in the experimental samples (n 5 50). The created dentinal plug was then inserted into the root canal's apical foramen as long as there wasn't any loss of canal patency confirmed[10], where the #15-K reamer could reach but not exceed the priorly noted lengths. The #15 K-reamer was put in to the same priorly noted lengths for the two apex locators during electronic measurement, and then renewed readings were taken. If the reading value was maintained stable for at least 5 seconds, the reading was accepted to be creditable.

The differences in readings before and after each EAL's blockage were computed. Positive differences indicated that lengths measured after a blockage were longer in comparison to that prior to blockage, while negative measured values indicated shorter length, and 0.0 indicated that the assesment were coincident.

In negative control specimens (n 5 30), small size of Filtek Z350 XT (3M ESPE) was forced upto the apical 2mm of the molar root canals with a small hand plugger and then cured for 60 seconds. To inspect display of two apex locators, #15 K-reamer was put into the level of the apical blockage.

When numerical data were checked for normality using the distributed data along with the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, they were found to be nonparametric. To compare the two apex locators, the Wilcoxon signed-rank test was put in use.

Frequencies along with percentages were used to give qualitative data. To compare the two apex locators, Friedman's test was used.

RESULT:

Measurement Error of mentioned two Apex Locators: Statistical analysis revealed that Root ZX Mini was blocked either before or after the blockage (P-value‹.05).A median error that was higher than (P value‹.001). In terms of the influence of blockage within each given group, Root-ZX Mini (P value‹.05; effect size 5 0.612) and Proper Pixi Mini (P value‹.05; effect size 5 0.382) both presented a notable statistical increase in median measurement error after apical blockage.

Control Group

With both apex locators, negative control specimens couldn't produce readings. As a result, these samples were left out of the statistical study.

Disposition of Working Lengths before or after apical Blockage

Group in Charge Friedman's test revealed none noteworthy statistical difference between two mentioned apex locators prior to blockage (P value.05; effect size 5 0.013) (Table 1). Both Root ZX Mini and Proper Pixi Mini had the unchanging of précised accuracy, 96.7 percent when using the measure of precision 61; however, when using the perimeter of accuracy of 60.5, Root-ZX Mini had 60% and Proper Pixi Mini had 53.3 percent. There wasn't any noteworthy statistical dissimilarity between the two drawn groups.

Before and after the apical blockage, there happened to be a statistically worthy variance seen in median error values determined by two apex locators (P value, .05; effect size 50.305). Root-ZX Mini had a higher measurements error median.

However, Proper Pixi Mini presented greater median measurement error in the range of –1 to –0.51 mm and –0.5 to –0.01 mm than Root ZX Mini. None statistically worthy variance was gauged between the two working lengths of before and after apical blockage by the two given apex locators at distances of 0 and 0.5 to 1 mm, recording the unchanged percentage of error (6.7%).

DISCUSSION

Because a intraoral periapical radiograph alone is lesser precise tool for measuring the working length, specifically if the apical foramen exits laterally[11], the exact length was made out with the dental operating microscope (x20) in this study.

Alginate is regarded as one of the ideal materials for use in in vitro dental research. Molars were placed in it, and it served as a conductor for an electric circuit between a file clip inserted into the molar root canals and a lip clip attached to the alginate.

Before the blockage, both the Root ZX Mini and the Proper Pixi Mini had an precision value of 96.7 percent, keeping in view the deviation of 61 from the actual canal length (minor apical diameter) to be acceptable. However, when using a deviation of 60.5 from the actual canal length as the suitable range of error, the precision dropped significantly, with Root-ZX Mini and Proper Pixi Mini recording 60% and 53.3 percent, respectively.

Within a range of 60, the percentage of accuracy. Though results of thus study were inconsistent with those of Guise et al19's report that Root-ZX Mini's accuracy was 97.5 percent within 60.5 mm; disparities may be seen because of unlike methodology used because the apical foramen (apex) was measured instead of apical constriction (0.5).

Apical canal blockage occurs when dentin chips are packed into the apical area of the root canal during biomechanical preparation, in combination with insufficient irrigation and improperly established apical patency. Residual or secondary infection following initial root canal procedure causes persistent apical periodontitis. The microorganisms that cause this infection live in the apical third of the root canal, where they have unrestricted access to the periapical tissue[20].

TABLE 1 - Descriptive Statistics and Results of Friedman's Test for the Comparison between Distributions of Distances from Real Working Length

Blockage	Distance (mm)	Root-ZX Mini (*N= 50*) *n* (%)	Proper PixiMini (*N= 50*) *n* (%)	*P*-value	Effect size (w)
Before blockage	–1	3(3.3)	5 (3.3)	.532	.013
	–1 to –0.51	14 (30)	18 (33.3)		
	–0.5 to –0.01	16 (26.7)	10 (30)		
	0.00	11 (23.3)	0 (0)		
	0.01–0.5	4 (10)	10 (23.3)		
	0.51–1	2 (6.7)	7 (10)		
After blockage	–1	26 (66.7)	0 (0)	.002*	.305
	–1 to –0.51	5 (3.3)	22 (53.3)		
	–0.5 to –0.01	8 (10)	14 (30)		
	0.00	8 (10)	9 (10)		
	0.01–0.5	4 (3.3)	0 (0)		
	0.51–1	3 (6.7)	5 (6.7)		

*Significant at *P‹0*.05

As a result, failed cases are always managed with the objective of eliminating these bacteria from the infection's frontline[21]; this can be accomplished by creating apical patency, due to which output is improved beside the success rate of root canal treatment too[22]. Apical patency's

importance is better understood in symptomatic apical periodontitis, where maintaining apical patency permits inflammatory exudates to escape from canal's periapex, relieving pain caused by apical pressure and allowing the host defense mechanism to start healing the confined periapical area[23]. It is similar to periapical drainage in an acute periapical abscess, except the apical foramen of root is fractionally enlarged to allow pus to drain via root canal[24]. From a biological standpoint, apical patency appears to be unimportant when there is tooth with vital pulp; however, from a practical standpoint, keeping apical patency is critical to prevent the repurcussions of loosing working length and doing apical transportation in curved canals[25], which can negatively impact RCT's outcomes.

Although the declaration of apical patency results in debris extrusion into the periapical tissue, with the ensuing flare-up or infection in cases of necrotic pulp with contaminated dentinal debris, if a large patency file closely fitting the apical size was introduced into the canal[26,27], may be considered. Whereas small patency file #15, on the other hand, doesn't push out the dentinal debris but instead pierces through it to loosen it and enable removal via different irriganting solutions[28].

Moreover, apical patency stops making of vapor lock and increases the penetration of irrigantng solution into the apical 2 mm of the root canal[29].

Irritation or inflammation to the normal periapical tissue expressed by postoperative pain shouldn't be expected as the diameter of patency file #15's tip is 100mm lesser to that of the acupuncture needles (300–400 mm). Confirmation for this is presented in many previous studies demonstrating that root's apical patency either decreases the chances of postoperative pain[30,31] or has zero effect on it[32–34].

In this experiment, the blockage apically was made intentionally by filing and reaming the middle and coronal thirds of root, followed by apically pushing and packing the shaved debris there to mimic the clinical condition of roots' blocked apices.

Another study[10] evaluated by comparing the precision of Root-ZX II against Apex ID and Propex II in the presence of foraminal obstruction and found that the precision of Root-ZX II was noticebly reduced, with the greatest chances of diverging from the actual canal length of –1 mm (59.6%) in comparison to Apex ID and Propex II, which weren't much affected by foraminal obstruction. Further, El Ayouti et al[35] investigated the impact of various clinical factors on the solidity of Root-ZX Mini and Proper Pixi Mini, that included tooth vitality, obliterated canals, and metallic restoration. Presence of obliteration in the root canal was the main factor that affected their consistency; all obliterated root canals, without exception, contributed to the inaccurate function of both apex locators.Other study found that the ideal procedure for obtaining the most precise EALs reading was when the reamer was either pushed to the apical foramen or beyond it and then pulled back to the apical foramen[36], they necessitate apical foraminal patency.

Operating principle of apex locators could be to blame for the erroneous values of blocked apices in this research. The two apex locators quantify the electrical impedance in the circuit, demonstrating the distinction that Root ZX Mini measures the electrical impedance at two different frequencies (0.5 and 4 kHz) whereas Proper Pixi Mini measures the impedance at multiple frequencies. As electric current flows via file attached to the file-clip, then to the root canal's dentin, and out of the root's constricted apex to the periodontium, finally running through the mucosa into the lip-clip on the patient's lip[3], EAL's electrical circuit is completed.

Current flow through the insulated file within the encased dentin and cementum inside the root canal would be hindered if the apical foramen is blocked with shaved dentinal chips. Experiment's control group, was seem to be failed in recording any reading values with the two apex locators, all due to completely blocked apical 2mm of the foramen with composite resin, has backed up this hypothesis.

It is important to note that keeping the apical foramen patent doesn't actually entail over instrumentation or overfilling as biomechanical preparation and obturation should be finite upto the apical constriction, although the apex locators in already patent foramen can accurately determine present apical constriction, as revealed during this investigation.

INFERENCE

As per the results of the done research, we concluded that root canal's apical blockage do have a negative impact on the précised accuracy of both the apex locators. Though it was more marked in Root-ZX Mini and lesser in Proper Pixi Mini. Apical foraminal patency may be counted to be a precondition for a definitive working length calculation using apex locators.

REFERENCES

1. Ricucci D. Apical limit of root canal instrumentation and obturation: part 1—literature review. IntEndod J 1998;31:384–93.
2. Estrela C, Holland R, Rodrigues C, et al. Characterization of successful root canal treatment. BrazDent J 2014;25:3–11.
3. Ali R, Okechukwu NC, Brunton P, Nattress B. An overview of electronic apex locators: part 1.Braz Dent J 2013;214:155–8.
4. Ali R, Okechukwu NC, Brunton P, Nattress B. An overview of electronic apex locators: part 2.Braz Dent J 2013;214:227–31.
5. Khadse A, Shenoi P, Kokane V, et al. Electronic apex locators: an overview. Indian J ConservEndod2017;2:35–40.
6. Lambrianidis T. Ledging and blockage of root canals during canal preparation: causes,recognition, prevention, management, and outcomes. Endod Topics 2009;15:56–74.
7. Hargreaves KM, Cohen S, Berman LH. Cohen's Pathways of the Pulp. 10th ed. St Louis, MO:Mosby Elsevier; 2011.
8. American Association of Endodontists. Glossary of Endodontic Terms. 9th ed. chicago:American Association of Endodontists; 2019.
9. Baruah Q, Sinha N, Singh B, et al. Comparative evaluation of the accuracy of two electronic apexlocators in the presence of contemporary irrigants: an *in vitro* study. J Int Soc Prevent CommunitDent 2018;8:349–53.
10. Vasconcelos BCD, Verissimo Chaves RD, Vivacqua-Gomes N, et al. *Ex vivo* evaluation of theaccuracy of electronic foramen locators in root canals with an obstructed apical foramen. J Endod2015;41:1551–4.
11. Alothmani OS, Friedlander LT, Chandler NP. Radiographic assessment of endodontic workinglength. Saudi Endod J 2013;3:57–64.
12. Lipski M, Trabska-Swistelnicka M, Wozniak K, et al. Evaluation of alginate as a substitute for root-surrounding tissues in electronic root canal measurements. Aust Endod J 2013;39:155–8.
13. Baldi JV, Victorino FR, Bernardes RA, et al. Influence of embedding media on the assessment ofelectronic apex locators. J Endod2007;33:476–9.
14. StoberEK,deRibotJ,Mercad´eM,etal.Evaluation oftheRaypex andtheMiniapexlocator:an *in vivo* study. J Endod2011;37:1349–52.
15. Aguiar A, Reinaldo R, Luciana M, et al. Root ZX electronic foramen locator: an *ex vivo* study of itsthree models—precision and reproducibility. Int J Dent 2017;2017:5893790.
16. Tselnik M, Baumgartner JC, Marshall JG. An evaluation of Root ZX and elements diagnostic apexlocators. J Endod2005;31:507–9.
17. da Silva Thais M, Alves Flavio RF. *Ex vivo* accuracy of Root ZX II, Root ZX Mini and RomiApex A-15apex locators in extracted vital pulp teeth. J Contemp Dent Pract2014;15:312–4.
18. Gurel MA, HelvaciogluKivanc B, Ekici A. A comparative assessment of the accuracies of Raypex5, Raypex 6, iPex, and iPex II electronic apex locators: an *in vitro* study. J Istanb Univ Fac Dent2017;51:28–33.
19. Guise G, Goodell G, Imamura G. *In vitro* comparison of three electronic apex locators. J Endod2010;36:279–81.
20. Siqueira JF Jr, Roças IN. Clinical implications and microbiology of bacterial persistence aftertreatment procedures. J Endod2008;34:1291–301.
21. Siqueira JF Jr. Treatment of Endodontic Infections. 1st ed. London: Quintessence Int; 2011.
22. Ng Y, Mann V, Gulabivala K. A prospective study of the factors affecting outcomes of nonsurgicalroot canal treatment: part 1—periapical health. Int Endod J 2011;44:583–

609.

23. Brankovi L, Ajanovic M, Smajkic N, et al. Endodontic treatment as a non-surgical alternative inmanaging multiple periapical lesions. J Health Sci Inst 2011;29:250–3.
24. Oei A, Hulsmann M. The acute apical abscess: etiology, microbiology, treatment, and prognosis.ENDO (LondEngl) 2018;12:75–85.
25. Buchanan LS. Management of the curved root canal. J Calif Dent Assoc 1989;17:18–27.
26. Ricucci D, Langeland K. Apical limit of root canal instrumentation and obturation, part 2: ahistological study. Int Endod J 1998;31:394–409.
27. Deonizio M, Sydney G, Batista A, et al. Influence of apical patency and cleaning of the apicalforamen on periapical extrusion in retreatment. Braz Dent J 2013;24:482–6.
28. Tay Franklin R, Gu L, Schoeffel GJ, et al. Effect of vapor lock on root canal debridement by using aside-vented needle for positive-pressure irrigant delivery. J Endod2010;36:745–50.
29. Vera J, Hern EM, Romero M, et al. Effect of maintaining apical patency on irrigant penetration intothe apical two millimeters of large root canals: an *in vivo* study. J Endod2012;38:19–22.
30. Arias A, Azabal M, Hidalgo J, et al. Relationship between post endodontic pain, tooth diagnosticfactors, and apical patency. J Endod2009;35:189–92.
31. Ahmed MR, Shahzad R, Sandhu IN. Effects of maintaining apical patency on postoperative painin molars with necrotic pulp and apical periodontitis. APMC 2018;12:59–61.
32. Yaylali IE, Demirci GK, Kurnaz S, et al. Does maintaining apical patency during instrumentationincrease postoperative pain or flare-up rate after nonsurgical root canal treatment? a systematicreview of randomized controlled trials. J Endod2018;44:1228–36.
33. Arora M, Sangwan P, Tewari S, et al. Effect of maintaining apical patency on endodontic pain inposterior teeth with pulp necrosis and apical periodontitis: a randomized controlled trial. IntEndod J 2016;49:317–24.
34. Garg N, Sharma S, Chhabra A, et al. Clinical evaluation of maintenance of apical patency inpost endodontic pain: an *in vivo* study. Endodontology 2017;29:115–9.
35. ElAyouti A, Dima E, Ohmer J, et al. Consistency of apex locator function: a clinical study. J Endod2009;35:179–81.
36. Oliveira TN, Vivacqua-Gomes N, Bernardes RA, et al. Determination of the accuracy of 5electronic apex locators in the function of different employment protocols. J Endod2017;43:1663–7.