

New Technologies to Improve Root Canal Disinfection

Gianluca Plotino¹, Teresa Cortese¹, Nicola M. Grande², Denise P. Leonardi³, Gianni Di Giorgio¹, Luca Testarelli¹, Gianluca Gambarini¹

¹Department of Endodontics, Sapienza University of Rome, Rome, Italy

²Catholic University of Sacred Heart, Rome, Italy

³Department of Dentistry, Universidade Positivo, Curitiba, PR, Brazil

Correspondence: Dr Gianluca Plotino, Via Tommaso Salvini, 57, 00197 Roma, Italia. Tel: +39-064202-0595. e-mail: endo@gianlucaplotino.com

Effective irrigant delivery and agitation are prerequisites to promote root canal disinfection and debris removal and improve successful endodontic treatment. This paper presents an overview of the currently available technologies to improve the cleaning of the endodontic space and their debridement efficacy. A PubMed electronic search was conducted with appropriate key words to identify the relevant literature on this topic. After retrieving the full-text articles, all the articles were reviewed and the most appropriate were included in this review. Several different systems of mechanical activation of irrigants to improve endodontic disinfection were analysed: manual agitation with gutta-percha cones, endodontic instruments or special brushes, vibrating systems activated by low-speed hand-pieces or by sonic or subsonic energy, use of ultrasonic or laser energy to mechanically activate the irrigants and apical negative pressure irrigation systems. Furthermore, this review aims to describe systems designed to improve the intracanal bacterial decontamination by a specific chemical action, such as ozone, direct laser action or light-activated disinfection. The ultrasonic activation of root canal irrigants and of sodium hypochlorite in particular still remains the gold standard to which all other systems of mechanical agitation analyzed in this article were compared. From this overview, it is evident that the use of different irrigation systems can provide several advantages in the clinical endodontic outcome and that integration of new technologies, coupled with enhanced techniques and materials, may help everyday clinical practice.

Key Words: root canal preparation, endodontic disinfection, biomechanical disinfection, root canal irrigants, activation systems.

Introduction

The major causative role of microorganisms in the pathogenesis of pulp and periapical diseases has clearly been demonstrated (1). The main aim of the endodontic therapy is to disinfect the entire root canal system, which requires elimination of microorganisms and microbial components and prevention of its re-infection during and after treatment. This goal is pursued by chemo-mechanical debridement, where the mechanical systems are associated with the irrigating solutions.

1. Standard Endodontic Irrigation Protocols

1.1 Sodium Hypochlorite (NaOCl)

Sodium hypochlorite (NaOCl) is the main endodontic irrigant used, due to its antibacterial properties and its ability to dissolve organic tissues (2). NaOCl is used during the instrumentation phase to increase as much as possible its time of action within the canal without being chemically altered by the presence of other substances (3). Its effectiveness has been shown to depend on its concentration, temperature, pH solution and storage conditions (3). Heated solutions (45-60 °C) and higher concentrations (5-6%) have greater tissue-dissolving properties (2). However, the greater the concentration the more severe is the potential reaction that may happen

if some of the irrigant is inadvertently forced into the periapical tissues (4). To reduce this risk, use of specially designed endodontic needles and a technique of injection without pressure are recommended (5).

1.2 Ethylene-diamine-tetra-acetic Acid (EDTA)

The main disadvantage of NaOCl is its inability to remove the inorganic portion of smear layer. For this reason, it is advised the combination of NaOCl with EDTA (2). EDTA has the ability to decompose the inorganic component of intracanal debris and is generally used at 17% concentration. EDTA seems to reduce the antibacterial and solvent activity of hypochlorite and so these two liquids should not be in the canal at same time (6). For this reason, during mechanical preparation abundant and frequent washing with sodium hypochlorite is used, while EDTA is used at the end of the preparation phase to completely remove the inorganic debris and smear layer from the canal walls.

1.3 Ultrasonic Activation of Sodium Hypochlorite

The use of ultrasound during and at the end the root canal preparation phase is a necessary step to improve endodontic disinfection. The range of frequencies used in the ultrasonic unit is between 25 and 40 kHz (7). The effectiveness of ultrasound in the irrigation is determined

by its ability to produce "cavitation" and "acoustic streaming". The cavitation is minimized and limited to the tip of the used instrument, while the effect of the acoustic streaming is more significant (7). Ultrasound creates bubbles of positive and negative pressure in the molecules of the liquid with which they come into contact. They become unstable and then they collapse and cause an implosion similar to a vacuum decompression. Exploding and imploding they release impact energy responsible for its detergent effect. It has been demonstrated that ultrasonic activation of sodium hypochlorite dramatically enhances the effectiveness of cleaning the root canal space. Besides, it greatly increases the flow of liquid and improves both the solvent and antibacterial capacities and the removal effect of organic and inorganic debris from the root canal walls (7).

Ultrasonic activation of NaOCl from 30 s to 1 min for each canal with 3 cycles of 10–20 s (with constant irrigant renewal) seems to be a sufficient time to obtain cleaned canals at the end of the preparation (7). Ultrasound appears to be less effective to enhance the activity of EDTA, although it may contribute to a better removal of the smear layer (7,8). Accumulation of debris produced by mechanical instrumentation in the inaccessible areas is preventable by ultrasonic activation of NaOCl even during the preparation phase (9). Therefore, use of ultrasonic continuous irrigation system might be advantageous. It involves the use of a needle activated by ultrasound. In this way, the irrigant is released into the canal and it is also activated by the action of ultrasonic needle at the same time (10).

1.4 Chlorhexidine (CHX)

A final flush with 2% CHX after NaOCl and EDTA has been proposed to ensure good results in cases of persistent infection, due to its broad spectrum of action and its property of substantivity (5,11). However, CHX is hindered by its interaction with NaOCl, which tends to create products that may discolor the tooth and precipitates that may be potentially mutagenic (12). For this reason, CHX should not be used together with or immediately after sodium hypochlorite (13). This interaction has been prevented or minimized by an intermediate wash with absolute alcohol, saline or distilled water (14).

2. Activation Systems

Mechanical instrumentation by itself could reduce microorganisms from root canal system even without using irrigants and intracanal dressings (15), but it is not able to assure an effective and complete cleaning (16). Irrigating solutions by themselves without a mechanical preparation, are not able to significantly reduce the intracanal bacterial infection (17). For these reasons, the systems that can

improve root canal disinfection through mechanical activation of endodontic irrigants as sodium hypochlorite have been currently researched. Multiple techniques and agitation systems of irrigants have been used over time (18) demonstrating more or less positive results (19).

2.1 Manual Agitation Techniques

The simplest of all mechanical activation techniques is the manual irrigant agitation, which can be performed with different systems. The easiest way to achieve this effect is moving vertically and passively the endodontic file within the root canal. The file promotes the irrigant penetration (20) and reduces the presence of air bubbles in the canal space (21), but does not improve the final cleaning (19). Another similar technique advises to move vertically a gutta-percha cone until reaching the working length while the canal is fill with irrigant. Even this method, however, does not improve the intracanal cleaning (19,22). Endodontic brushes and specific needles for endodontic irrigation with bristles on their surface is another technique suggested in order to move the irrigant more effectively within the canals. These systems have shown to be valid in the removal of smear layer from root canal walls (23,24), thus they can be indicated during irrigation with EDTA to improve their efficacy at the end of the preparation.

2.2 Machine-Assisted Agitation Systems

The evolution of the manual systems led to the introduction of instruments that may be rotated by hand-pieces at low speed inside the canal fill with irrigant. Instruments such as plastic files can show a smooth surface and increased taper (25–27), or even a surface with lateral plastic extensions (28–30). Studies on these systems have shown conflicting results. There are better results for the machine-assisted agitation systems than for the conventional irrigation technique with syringe, but worse than other more effective systems (18).

2.3 Continuous Irrigation during Instrumentation

Recently a new system for root canal preparation was introduced on the market. This system uses a particular instrument with abrasive surface that enlarges the canal by friction and in a vibrating motion allows the irrigant to flow through the file itself. This system has shown excellent results in terms of anatomy preservation and cleaning ability. It can reach anatomical areas of difficult access as isthmuses, oval canals or C-shaped canals (31). The low cutting efficiency of this system in some cases may limit its use in the root canal preparation. On the other hand, its characteristics make it an excellent additional technique to enhance the cleaning and disinfecting of the root canal system at the end of the preparation (32). The

concept of continuous irrigation was already developed in the past with mechanical instruments for sonic and ultrasonic preparation (33,34) that could contextually clean by continuous release of irrigant.

2.4 Sonic Activation

Sonic activation has shown to be an effective method to disinfect the root canals (35). Most actual systems have smooth plastic tips of different sizes activated at sonic frequency by a hand piece (36). This system seems to be able to effectively clean the main canal, to remove the smear layer and to promote the filling of a greater number of lateral canals (19,37). Another recently introduced technique uses a syringe with sonic vibration that allows the delivery and activation of the irrigant in the root canal at the same time. Sonic activation differs from the ultrasonic because it operates at a lower frequency (1-6 kHz) (38), and for this reason it is generally found to be less effective in removing debris than the ultrasonic systems (19,39-41).

2.5 Apical Negative-Pressure Irrigation

In order to deliver the irrigant into the root canal for the entire length and to obtain a good flow of fluid, apical negative-pressure systems have been introduced to simultaneously release and remove the irrigant. These systems comprise a macrocannula for the coronal and middle portions and a microcannula for the apical portion, which are connected to a syringe for irrigation and the aspiration system integrated with the dental unit (42). During irrigation, a tip connected to a syringe delivers the irrigant in the pulp chamber, while the cannula placed in the canal pulls irrigant into the canal, through the aspiration system to which it is connected, and evacuates it through the suction holes. This system has the purpose to ensure a constant and continuous flow of new irrigant in the apical third, with safety and a lower risk of extrusion (43). Most of the studies on this technique have shown that it is very effective to ensure a greater volume of irrigant in the apical third (44) and excellent removal of debris in this area (45) and in inaccessible areas (46), with results in most cases similar to those of the ultrasonic activation techniques (47-49).

2.6 Laser Activation

The interaction between laser and the irrigant in the root canal outlines a new area of interest in the field of endodontic disinfection. This concept is the base of the Laser Activated Irrigation (LAI) and the so-called PIPS technology (Photon-Initiated Photoacoustic Streaming) (50). The mechanism of this interaction has been attributed to the effective absorption of laser light by sodium hypochlorite. This leads to the vaporization of the irrigant and to

formation of vapor bubbles, which expand and implode with secondary cavitation effects. The PIPS technique is based on the power of Erbium:YAG laser to create photoacoustic shock waves within the irrigant introduced in the canal. When activated in a limited volume of liquid, the high absorption of the laser in hypochlorite combined with the high peak power derived from the short pulse duration (50 μ s) determines a photomechanical phenomenon (50). A study showed that there was no difference in bacterial reduction achieved by hypochlorite sodium activated by laser compared to sodium hypochlorite only (51). Another study found that it did not completely remove the biofilm from the apical third of the root canal and infected dentinal tubules (52). However, the finding that laser activation generated a higher number of samples with negative bacterial cultures and a lower number of bacteria in the apical third was a promising result on the effectiveness of the technique, also confirmed by more recent studies (53).

3. Additional Disinfection Systems

In addition to the above-mentioned systems, endodontic research is also oriented towards the identification of alternative solutions that could further refine the disinfection and assist the destruction of biofilms and elimination of microorganisms.

3.1 Photo-Activated Disinfection (PAD)

A new method recently introduced in endodontics is the Photo-Activated Disinfection (PAD). This technique is based on the principle that the photosensitizing molecules (photosensitizer - PS) are able to bind to the membrane of the bacteria. PS is activated at specific wavelength and produces free oxygen, which causes the rupture of the bacterial cell wall on which the PS is associated with, determining a bactericidal action (54). An endodontic system called Light-Activated Disinfection (LAD) was developed. It is based on a combination of a PS and a special light source. The PS attacks the membranes of microorganisms and binds to their surface, absorbs energy from light and then releases this energy in the form of oxygen (O_2), which is transformed into highly reactive forms that effectively destroy microorganisms. The LAD is not only effective against bacteria, but also against other microorganisms including viruses, fungi and protozoa (55). The PSs have far less affinity for the cells of the body; therefore toxicity tests carried out did not report adverse effects of this treatment (56).

Clinically, after the root canal preparation, PS is introduced into the canal until working length with an endodontic needle and is left *in situ* for 60 s. The specific endodontic tip is then inserted into the root canal up to the depth that can be reached and the light irradiation

is performed for 30 s in each canal. This technique was proven effective in laboratory studies to eliminate high concentrations of bacteria present in artificially infected root canals (57). Care should be taken to ensure maximum penetration of the PS, since it is important that it comes in direct contact with the bacteria, otherwise the process of photosensitivity does not occur (58). In addition, LAD seems to be effective not only against the bacteria in suspension, but also against biofilm (5,59). Currently LAD is not considered as an alternative, but rather as a possible supplement to standard protocols of root canal disinfection already in use (5).

3.2 Laser

In the Endodontics area several types of laser have been used to improve root canal disinfection: diode laser, gas laser (CO₂), erbium: YAG laser, neodymium: YAG laser. Bactericidal action of the laser depends on the wavelength and energy, and in many cases it is due to thermal effects that produce alteration of the cell wall of the bacteria, leading to changes in osmotic gradients up to cell death. Some studies have concluded that the laser irradiation is not an alternative, but rather a possible integration to existing protocols to disinfect root canal (60). The laser energy emitted from the tip of the optical fiber is directed along the canal and not necessarily lateral to the walls. To overcome this limitation, a delivery system that allows lateral emission of the radiation aimed to improve the antimicrobial effect (61), but a complete elimination of the biofilm and bacteria was not yet possible (62). In conclusion, there is still no strong evidence to support the application of high-power lasers for direct disinfection of root canals (63).

3.3 Ozone

Ozone (O₃) rapidly dissociates in water and releases a reactive form of oxygen that may oxidize cells, thus having antimicrobial efficacy without inducing drug resistance (64). The results of the available studies on its effectiveness against endodontic pathogens are inconsistent, especially against biofilms (65).

4. Alternative Antibacterial Systems

4.1 Nanoparticles

Nanoparticles of magnesium oxide, calcium oxide or zinc oxide are microscopic particles that have antibacterial properties (66). Nanoparticles synthesized from powders of silver, copper oxide and zinc oxide are currently used and may generate active oxygen species. They are responsible for the anti-bacterial effect by the electrostatic interaction between positively charged nanoparticles and negatively charged bacterial cells (67). In addition, nanoparticles may change the chemical and physical properties of dentin and

reduce the bacterial strength of adhesion to the dentin itself (68).

4.2 Bioactive Glass

Recently, the bioactive glass or bioactive glass-ceramics have been the object of considerable interest for endodontic disinfection due to their antibacterial properties, but with conflicting results (69).

4.3 Natural Plant Extracts

A current trend directed to the use of natural plant extracts takes advantage of the antibacterial activity of polyphenolic molecules generally used for storing food (70) These compounds have a poor antibacterial efficacy, but a little significant ability to reduce the formation of biofilms, although the mechanism by which this occurs is not clear. (5,71).

4.4 Non-Instrumentation Techniques

The first trial of a method of cleaning without canal preparation was the Non-Instrumentation Technique (NIT) conceived by Lussi et al. (72). This technique did not provide for the enlargement of the root canals because there was no mechanical instrumentation of root canal walls. In fact, root canal cleaning was obtained exclusively with hypochlorite at low concentration, introduced and removed from the canal by a vacuum pump and an electric piston that created fields of alternating pressure inside the canal. This caused the implosion of the produced bubbles and hydrodynamic turbulence that facilitated the penetration of hypochlorite into the root canal ramifications.

A method for cleaning the entire root canal system has recently been developed using a broad spectrum of sound waves transmitted within an irrigating solution to quickly remove pulp tissue, debris and microorganisms (73). One study showed that this technique is able to dissolve the tested tissues at a significantly higher rate compared to conventional irrigation (4).

From a biological point of view, endodontic therapy must be directed to the elimination of microorganisms and prevention of a possible reinfection. Unfortunately, the root canal system with its anatomical complexity is a challenging environment for the effective removal of bacteria and biofilm adhered to the canal walls. The chemo-mechanical preparation involves mechanical instrumentation and antibacterial irrigation and it is the most important phase for disinfection of the endodontic space. The technological advances of instruments brought significant improvements in the ability to shape the root canals, with less procedural complications. Various antimicrobial agents have been employed in the management of infected root canal systems. Furthermore, some clinical

technical procedures - such as the increase in apical preparation and a more effective system of irrigation delivery and activation of irrigant - can promote and make more predictable the reduction of intracanal bacteria, especially in complex anatomical and not instrumented areas of the root canal system.

Resumo

A irrigação do canal radicular é coadjuvante na desinfecção e remoção de debris, contribuindo para o sucesso do tratamento endodôntico. Este artigo apresenta uma visão geral das tecnologias atuais indicadas para melhorar a limpeza e desbridamento do canal radicular.

Foi realizado um levantamento bibliográfico eletrônico no site Pubmed utilizando palavras-chave específicas ao tema a fim de abordar literatura relevante. Após busca eletrônica, artigos completos foram revisados e os mais apropriados ao tema foram incluídos nesta revisão. Diferentes sistemas de ativação mecânica foram considerados: agitação manual com cone de guta-percha, instrumentos e escovas endodônticas, sistemas de vibração ativados por peças manuais em baixa rotação ou por energia sônica e subsônica, ultrassom, laser, assim como sistemas de irrigação que utilizam pressão apical negativa. Além disso, esta revisão descreve outros meios indicados para ampliar a descontaminação endodôntica por meio de agentes químicos como ozônio e desinfecção por meio de luz. A ativação ultrassônica do hipoclorito de sódio ainda permanece o padrão ouro e nos estudos é usada como controle na comparação aos demais sistemas que empregam agitação mecânica. A presente revisão mostra vantagens de diversos sistema de irrigação e associações entre eles, podendo aumentar a efetividade da irrigação endodôntica.

References

1. Kakehashy S, Stanley HR, Fitzgerald RJ. The effect of surgical exposures of dental pulps in germ-free and conventional laboratory rats. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol* 1965;20:340-349.
2. Zehnder M. Root canal irrigants. *J Endod* 2006;32:389-398.
3. Beus C, Safavi K, Stratton J, Kaufman B. Comparison of the effect of two endodontic irrigation protocols on the elimination of bacteria from root canal system: a prospective, randomized clinical trial. *J Endod* 2012;38:1479-1483.
4. Mehdipour O, Kleier DJ, Averbach RE. Anatomy of sodium hypochlorite accidents. *Compend Contin Educ Dent* 2007;28:544-550.
5. Kishen A. Advanced therapeutic options for endodontic biofilms. *Endod Topics* 2010;22:99-123.
6. Clarkson RM, Podlich HM, Moule AJ. Influence of ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid on the active chlorine content of sodium hypochlorite solutions when mixed in various proportions. *J Endod* 2011;37:538-543.
7. Plotino G, Grande NM, Pameijer CH, Somma F. Ultrasonics in endodontics: a review of the literature. *J End* 2007;33:81-95.
8. Cameron JA. The choice of irrigant during hand instrumentation and ultrasonic irrigation of the root canal: a scanning electron microscope study. *Aust Dent J* 1995;40:85-90.
9. Paqué F, Boessler C, Zehnder M. Accumulated hard tissue debris levels in mesial roots of mandibular molars after sequential irrigation steps. *Int Endod J* 2011;44:148-153.
10. Jiang LM, Lak B, Eijsvogels LM, Wesselink P, van der Sluis LW. Comparison of the cleaning efficacy of different final irrigation techniques. *J Endod* 2012;38:838-841.
11. Mohammadi Z, Abbot PV. The properties and applications of chlorhexidine in endodontics. *Int Endod J* 2009;42:288-302.
12. Basrani BR, Manek S, Sodhi RN, Fillery E, Manzur A. Interaction between sodium hypochlorite and chlorhexidine gluconate. *J Endod* 2007;33:966-999.
13. Zehnder M, Paqué F. Disinfection of the root canal system during root canal re-treatment. *Endod Topics* 2011;19:58-73.
14. Krishnamurthy S, Sudhakaran S. Evaluation and prevention of the precipitate formed on interaction between sodium hypochlorite and chlorhexidine. *J Endod* 2010;36:1154-1157.
15. Matos Neto M, Santos SS, Leão MV, Habitante SM, Rodrigues JR, Jorge AO. Effectiveness of three instrumentation systems to remove *Enterococcus faecalis* from root canals. *Int Endod J* 2012;45:435-438.
16. Soares JA, Roque de Carvalho MA, Cunha Santos SM, Mendonça RM, Ribeiro-Sobrinho AP, Brito-Júnior M, et al.. Effectiveness of chemomechanical preparation with alternating use of sodium hypochlorite and EDTA in eliminating intracanal *Enterococcus faecalis* biofilm. *J Endod* 2010;36:894-898.
17. Garcez AS, Nunez SC, Lage-Marques JL, Hamblin MR, Ribeiro MS. Photonic real-time monitoring of bacterial reduction in root canals by genetically engineered bacteria after chemomechanical endodontic therapy. *Braz Dent J* 2007;18:202-207.
18. Gu LS, Kim JR, Ling J, Choi KK, Pashley DH, Tay FR. Review of contemporary irrigant agitation techniques and devices. *J Endod* 2009;35:791-804.
19. Paragliola R, Franco V, Fabiani C, Mazzoni A, Nato F, Tay FR, et al.. Final rinse optimization: influence of different agitation protocols. *J Endod* 2010;36:282-285.
20. Bronnec F, Bouillaquet S, Machtou P. *Ex vivo* assessment of irrigant penetration and renewal during the final irrigation regimen. *Int Endod J*. 2010;43:663-672.
21. Vera J, Arias A, Romero M. Dynamic movement of intracanal gas bubbles during cleaning and shaping procedures: the effect of maintaining apical patency on their presence in the middle and cervical thirds of human root canals - an *in vivo* study. *J Endod* 2012;38:200-203.
22. Caron G, Nham K, Bronnec F, Machtou P. Effectiveness of different final irrigant activation protocols on smear layer removal in curved canals. *J Endod* 2010;36:1361-1366.
23. Zmener O, Pameijer CH, Serrano SA, Palo RM, Iglesias EF. Efficacy of the NaviTip FX irrigation needle in removing post instrumentation canal smear layer and debris in curved root canals. *J Endod* 2009;35:1270-1273.
24. Goel S, Tewari S. Smear layer removal with passive ultrasonic irrigation and the NaviTip FX: a scanning electron microscopic study. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod* 2009;108:465-470.
25. Townsend C, Maki J. An *in vitro* comparison of new irrigation and agitation techniques to ultrasonic agitation in removing bacteria from a simulated root canal. *J Endod* 2009;35:1040-1043.
26. Tunga U, Parlak E, Bodrumlu E, Aydemir H, Yesilsoy C. Effect of F-File on removal of the smear layer: a scanning electron microscope study. *Aust Endod J* 2011;37:65-69.
27. Klyn SL, Kirkpatrick TC, Rutledge RE. *In vitro* comparisons of debris removal of the EndoActivator system, the F file, ultrasonic irrigation, and NaOCl irrigation alone after hand-rotary instrumentation in human mandibular molars. *J Endod* 2010;36:1367-1371.
28. Al-Ali M, Sathorn C, Parashos P. Root canal debridement efficacy of different final irrigation protocols. *Int Endod J* 2012;45:898-906.
29. Garip Y, Sazak H, Gunday M, Hatipoglu S. Evaluation of smear layer removal after use of a canal brush: an SEM study. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod* 2010;110:e62-e66.
30. Rödiger T, Bozkurt M, Konietzschke F, Hülsmann M. Comparison of the Vibringe system with syringe and passive ultrasonic irrigation in removing debris from simulated root canal irregularities. *J Endod* 2010;36:1410-1413.
31. Paqué F, Al-Jadaa A, Kfir A. Hard-tissue debris accumulation created by conventional rotary versus self-adjusting file instrumentation in mesial root canal systems of mandibular molars. *Int Endod J* 2012;45:413-418.
32. Dietrich MA, Kirkpatrick TC, Yaccino JM. *In vitro* canal and isthmus debris removal of the self-adjusting file, K3, and WaveOne files in the mesial root of human mandibular molars. *J Endod* 2012;38:1140-1144.
33. Dummer PM, Alodeh MH, Doller R. Shaping of simulated root canals in resin blocks using files activated by a sonic hand piece. *Int Endod J* 1989;22:211-215.
34. Martin H, Cunningham W. Endosonic endodontics: the ultrasonic synergistic system. *Int Dent J* 1984;34:198-203.

- G. Plotino et al.
35. Pitt WG. Removal of oral biofilm by sonic phenomena. *Am J Dent* 2005;18:345-352.
 36. Ruddle CJ. Endodontic disinfection: tsunami irrigation. *Endod Practice* 2008;7-15.
 37. Kanter V, Weldon E, Nair U, Varella C, Kanter K, Anusavice K, et al.. A quantitative and qualitative analysis of ultrasonic versus sonic endodontic systems on canal cleanliness and obturation. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod* 2011;112:809-813.
 38. Ahmad M, Pitt Ford TR, Crum LA. Ultrasonic debridement of root canals: an insight into the mechanisms involved. *J Endod* 1987;13:93-101.
 39. Uroz-Torres D, González-Rodríguez MP, Ferrer-Luque CM. Effectiveness of the EndoActivator System in removing the smear layer after root canal instrumentation. *J Endod* 2010;36:308-311.
 40. Sabins RA, Johnson JD, Hellstein JW. A comparison of the cleaning efficacy of short-term sonic and ultrasonic passive irrigation after hand instrumentation in molar root canals. *J Endod* 2003;29:674-678.
 41. Johnson M, Sidow SJ, Looney SW, Lindsey K, Niu LN, Tay FR. Canal and isthmus debridement efficacy using a sonic irrigation technique in a closed-canal system. *J Endod* 2012;38:1265-1268.
 42. Schoeffel GJ. The EndoVac method of endodontic irrigation: safety first. *Dent Today* 2007;26:92-96.
 43. Desai P, Himel V. Comparative safety of various intracanal irrigation systems. *J Endod* 2009;35:545-549.
 44. de Gregorio C, Paranjpe A, Garcia A, Navarrete N, Estevez R, Esplugues EO, et al.. Efficacy of irrigation systems on penetration of sodium hypochlorite to working length and to simulated uninstrumented areas in oval shaped root canals. *Int Endod J* 2012;45:475-481.
 45. Nielsen BA, Baumgartner CJ. Comparison of the EndoVac system to needle irrigation of root canals. *J Endod* 2007;33:611-615.
 46. Susin L, Liu Y, Yoon JC, Parente JM, Loushine RJ, Ricucci D, et al.. Canal and isthmus debridement efficacies of two irrigant agitation techniques in a closed system. *Int Endod J* 2010;43:1077-1090.
 47. Saber S el-D, Hashem AA. Efficacy of different final irrigation activation techniques on smear layer removal. *J Endod* 2011;37:1272-1275.
 48. Townsend C, Maki J. An *in vitro* comparison of new irrigation and agitation techniques to ultrasonic agitation in removing bacteria from a simulated root canal. *J Endod* 2009;35:1040-1043.
 49. Goode N, Khan S, Eid AA, Niu LN, Gosier J, Susin LF, Pashley DH, et al.. Wall shear stress effects of different endodontic irrigation techniques and systems. *J Dent* 2013;41:636-641.
 50. De Moor RJ, Blanken J, Meire M, Verdaasdonk R. Laser induced explosive vapor and cavitation resulting in effective irrigation of the root canal. Part 2: evaluation of the efficacy. *Lasers Surg Med* 2009;41:520-523.
 51. Pedullà E, Genovese C, Campagna E, Tempera G, Rapisarda E. Decontamination efficacy of photon-initiated photoacoustic streaming (PIPS) of irrigants using low-energy laser settings: an *ex vivo* study. *Int Endod J* 2012;45:865-870.
 52. Peters OA, Bardsley S, Fong J, Pandher G, Divito E. Disinfection of root canals with photon-initiated photoacoustic streaming. *J Endod* 2011;37:1008-1012.
 53. Arslan H, Capar ID, Saygili G, Gok T, Akcay M. Effect of photon-initiated photoacoustic streaming on removal of apically placed dentinal debris. *Int Endod J* 2014;47:1072-1077.
 54. Burns T, Wilson M, Pearson G J: Sensitisation of cariogenic bacteria to killing by light from a helium neon laser. *J Med Microbiol* 1993;38:401-405.
 55. Konopka K, Goslinski T: Photodynamic therapy in dentistry. *J Dent Res* 2007;86:694-707.
 56. Kömerik N, Curnow A, MacRobert AJ, Hopper C, Speight PM, Wilson M. Fluorescence biodistribution and photosensitising activity of toluidine blue on rat buccal mucosa. *Lasers Med Sci* 2002;17:86-92.
 57. Williams JA, Pearson GJ, Wilson M, Colles MJ. Antibacterial action of photo-activated disinfection (PAD) used on endodontic bacteria in planktonic suspension and in artificial and human root canals. *J Dent* 2006;34:363-371.
 58. Bonsor SJ, Nichol R, Reid TMS, Pearson GJ. Microbiological evaluation of photo-activated disinfection in endodontics (An *in vivo* study). *Br Dent J* 2006;200:337-341.
 59. George S, Kishen A. Photophysical, photochemical and photobiological characterization of methylene blue formulations for light-activated root canal disinfection. *J Biomed Opt* 2007;12:29-34
 60. Bergmans L, Moisiadis P, Teughels W, Van Meerbeek B, Quirynen M, Lambrechts P. Bactericidal effect of Nd:YAG laser irradiation on some endodontic pathogens *ex vivo*. *Int Endod J* 2006;39:547-557.
 61. Stabholz A, Zeltser R, Sela M, Peretz B, Moshonov J, Ziskind D, et al.. The use of lasers in dentistry: principles of operation and clinical applications. *Compend Contin Educ Dent* 2003;24:935-948.
 62. Noiri Y, Katsumoto T, Azakami H, Ebisu S. Effects of Er:YAG laser irradiation on biofilm-forming bacteria associated with endodontic pathogens *in vitro*. *J Endod* 2008;34:826-829.
 63. Leonardo MR, Guillén-Carías MG, Pécora JD, Ito IY, Silva LA. Er:YAG laser: antimicrobial effects in the root canals of dogs' teeth with pulp necrosis and chronic periapical lesions. *Photomed Laser Surg* 2005;23:295-299.
 64. Restaino L, Frampton EW, Hemphill JB, Palnikar P. Efficacy of ozonated water against various food-related microorganisms. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 1995;61:3471-3475.
 65. Hems RS, Gulabivala K, Ng YL, Ready D, Spratt DA. An *in vitro* evaluation of the ability of ozone to kill a strain of *Enterococcus faecalis*. *Int Endod J* 2005;38:22-29.
 66. Sawai J. Quantitative evaluation of antibacterial activities of metallic oxide powders (ZnO, MgO and CaO) by conductimetric assay. *J Microbiol Methods* 2003;54:177-182.
 67. Kim JS, Kuk E, Yu KN, Kim JH, Park SJ, Lee HJ, et al.. Antimicrobial effects of silver nanoparticles. *Nanomedicine* 2007;3:95-101.
 68. Kishen A, Sum CP, Mathew S, Lim CT. Influence of irrigation regimens on the adherence of *Enterococcus faecalis* to root canal dentin. *J Endod* 2008;34:850-854.
 69. Gubler M, Brunner TJ, Zehnder M, Waltimo T, Sener B, Stark WJ. Do bioactive glasses convey a disinfecting mechanism beyond a mere increase in pH? *Int Endod J* 2008;41:670-678.
 70. Duthie G, Crozier A. Plant-derived phenolic antioxidants. *Curr Opin Clin Nutr Metab Care* 2000;3:447-451.
 71. Jagani S, Chelikani R, Kim DS. Effects of phenol and natural phenolic compounds on biofilm formation by *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. *Biofouling* 2009;25:321-324.
 72. Lussi A, Nussbacher U, Grosrey J. A novel noninstrumented technique for cleansing the root canal system. *J Endod* 1993;19:549-553.
 73. Haapasalo M, Wang Z, Shen Y, Curtis A, Patel P, Khakpour M. Tissue dissolution by a novel multisonic ultracleaning system and sodium hypochlorite. *J Endod* 2014;40:1178-1181.

Received December 22, 2015

Accepted February 22, 2016