

Gender Effect on Post-Operative Pain after Different Instrumentation Techniques

Baidaa M. Zeidan¹, Abeer A. Abass², Nada A. Mehdi¹

¹Lecturer, ²Assistant Lecturer College of Dentistry, Conservative Department, Mustansiriyah University, Baghdad, Iraq

Abstract

This study was conducted to assess gender effect on post-operative pain after different instrumentation techniques. One hundred and twenty patients (60 female, 60 male) were incorporated into this investigation, those patients requiring endodontic treatment on their permanent molar teeth with asymptomatic irreversible pulpitis preoperatively to do access opening and instrumentation at a similar visit. Patients ranged in age from 19 to 50 years of age, and all were healthy, as decided from a composed medical history and oral interview. The patients were relegated into two gatherings: first gathering (30 female and 30 male): Teeth were instrumented utilizing ProtaperNext System (Full Rotary method), second gathering (30 female, 30 male): Teeth were instrumented utilizing Wave One System (Reciprocating method). (Pain evaluation completed at day 1, 3 and 7 utilizing Verbal Rating Scale (4 -Point Scale). Patients recorded the occurrence and seriousness of pain experienced. Patients were called at 24, and 72 hours to acquire their reports for the initial three days. Seven days after treatment their records were inspected and percussion test performed. The information acquired were examined factually utilizing Chi-Square test. Result demonstrated that all gatherings incited Post-operative Pain both sexual orientation. The outcome appeared there were significant differences between sexual orientation from the outset and third day, while there were non-significant contrasts between sexes at 7day.

Key word: Wave one, Protaper Next, Verbal rating Scale

Introductio

Postoperative agony in endodontic techniques is unwanted for both patient and dentist. After the chemical and mechanical preparation of the root canal, the bothering of the periapical tissues results in irritation, discharging gathering of synthetic substances that start inflammation reactions. Arrival of these substances can either straightforwardly bring down the pain threshold sensory nerve or cause pain by implication by expanding the vascular porousness and creating edema and swelling. In spite of the fact that the purposes behind these intensifications are not clear, a number of theories, for example, physiologic changes chemical, physical

or immunological and microbiological factors, are offered⁽¹⁻²⁾.

Expulsion of contaminated debris to the per radicular tissues during chemo mechanical preparation is one of the chief reasons for postoperative pain. All preparation procedures and instruments are related with expulsion of debris, , even when the preparation is maintained short of the apical end and manual instrumentation appears to create more prominent expulsion contrasted and motor driven turning preparation⁽³⁻⁶⁾.

During root canal instrumentation procedure, dentin chips, pulp tissue, microorganisms, as well as irrigants might be expelled into the per radicular tissues. A careful control of the working length may diminish this hazard, yet in any case any expulsion of debris may possibly cause postoperative complications, for example, flare-ups. Flare-up is portrayed as the

Corresponding author:
Baidaa M. Zeidan
baidaa_mz@yahoo.com

event of pain, swelling, or the blend of both during root canal system treatment causing unscheduled visits of the patients. This phenomenon is also called inter appointment emergency. Irritants left inside the root canal system, iatrogenic elements, and (local) have host are identified with postoperative pain. (3) Counteractive action and the executives of post endodontic pain (PEP) is a vital piece of endodontic treatment. Educating patients about expected post endodontic t pain (PEP) and recommending medication to oversee it can expand patient trust in their dental specialists, increase patients' threshold, and improve their disposition toward future dental treatment(7).

Method and Materials

120 patients were chosen and incorporated into this investigation, those patients requiring endodontic treatment on permanent I molar teeth with asymptomatic irreversible pulpitis preoperatively. These patients went in age from 19 to 50 years of age, and all were healthy, as decided from a composed health history and oral interview. Age, sex, tooth area, pulp imperativeness and radio graphical assessment were recorded. A solitary clinician assessed all patients, utilizing radiographic and clinical discoveries, and a similar clinician was appointed for treatment everything being equal (8). The patients were allocated into two gatherings (each gathering 30 female, and 30 male) relies upon file system utilized in root canal treatment, the gatherings were close comparable worried in curvature of the roots and the quantity of root canal.

- First gathering (30 female and 30 male): Teeth were instrumented utilizing Protaper Next System (Full Rotary method).
- Second gathering (30 female, 30 male): Teeth were instrumented utilizing Wave One System (Reciprocating method)

The burs and all instruments were disposed of following every patient to dispense with any contamination. In the wake of managing a nearby anesthesia utilizing 2% lidocaine 1:100,000 epinephrine and applying rubberdam, end of all carious tissue to counteract presenting of microbes and their items from carious injury to root canal system, at that point access was made. Working length was resolved with the Root

ZX Apex locator and computerized radiograph with X-Pod My ray remote advanced System. Working length was viewed as at apical narrowing. During instrumentation, the root canal were flushed with typical saline (8,9,10)

Protaper next gathering:

Root canal was set up with ProTaper Next file as indicated by the maker guidance utilizing (X Smart Plus). The X Smart in addition to had pre-programmed setting to (300Rpm and 2.0 Ncm) the instrumentation was finished in crown down way utilizing delicate in and out movement. The instrumentation grouping was begun as following X1 was utilized in at least one goes, until working length is come to, X2 was utilized to full working length as MAF(11,12)

Wave one gathering:

The root canal were set up with a reciprocation Wave one Primary (25/0.07) file with responding The structure was made with in-and-out pecking movement until going to the WL. All root canal were instrumented on the buccolingual extensions with brushing movement, with 350 rpm and 5Ncm of torque).13,14)

In two the instrumentation procedure. All root canal were instrumented, cleaned in single visit. Utilizing typical saline as irrigants and 17% EDTA as a Glide all through the method, root was performed utilizing plastic syringe and irrigant needle measure 27mm' side vented, that addition into the root canal, apportioning of an irrigants into a root canal through needle with little checks, inactively and with disturbance by moving the needle up and dawn the canal space without restricting it on the canal wall. The irrigants stored while keeping the hand on movement to avert lock up the cannula. (15). All teeth were in this way dried with disinfected paper cones. Endoseptone was utilized as intracanal medicament for all cases (carefully adhered to maker's directions). At that point situation of cotton pellet, at that point the access opening were fixed by Riva self-fix, tar fortified glass ionomer to dispense with any probability of microleakage between the appointments.

Assessment of Post-Endodontic Pain:

After treatment, the treating dental specialist educated the patients that Post endodontic pain may

Table (3) Descriptive of group's female by times

	At first day				At third day				At 7 day			
	Protaper next	%	Wave one	%	Protaper next	%	Wave one	%	Protaper next	%	Wave one	%
No pain	21	70	12	40	29	96.7	25	83.3	30	100	29	96.7
Mild pain	9	30	6	20	1	3.33	2	6.67	0	0	1	3.33
Moderate pain	0	0	9	30	0	0	2	6.67	0	0	0	0
Sever pain	0	0	3	10	0	0	1	3.33	0	0	0	0
Total	30	100	30	100	30	100	30	100	30	100	30	100

Discussion

Root canal instrumentation systems are difficult to perform, because of anatomical complexities and impediments of the endodontic instruments, which regularly bring about a high danger of intracanal disappointment and other iatrogenic mistake. Much of the time dentine chips, pulp tissue fragment, necrotic tissue, microorganisms and intracanalirrigants might be expelled from the apical foramen during the root canal instrumentation. This is of worry since material expelled from the apical foramen might be identified with irritation of periapical tissue, postoperative pain and additionally flare up (8).

An acute inflammation reaction creates in the periradicular tissue because of extra affronts from the root canal system, which can be of mechanical, chemical, or microbial origin. Microbial damage to the periradicular tissues is most likely the commonest reason for flare-ups. Although microbial affront can be combined with iatrogenic components, it can some of the time happen notwithstanding when the root canal techniques have been sensible and cautious. Apical extrusion of debris to the periradicular tissues is one of the chief reasons for postoperative pain(20). A careful control of the working length may diminish this hazard, however by and by any extrusion of debris may possibly cause postoperative difficulties, for example, flare-ups in light of the fact

that when debris is pushed out of apical foramina, it will bring about an Ag-Ab response. This response will produce an acute inflammation in the periapical tissues, and cause harm to the cell layer bringing about prostaglandins discharge, bone resorption, amplification of the kinin system and eventually pain for patient (21). Most instrumentation procedures advocate early coronal flaring. Instrumentation methods that prepare canal in a cervical to apical direction are prescribed to limit the rate of apical extrusion(22). The fundamental target of this examination is to indicate sexual orientation impact on the accident and the severity of post-operative pain following root canal instrumentation utilizing two different techniques.

120 patients (60 female and 60 male) were haphazardly allotted into two gatherings agreeing instrumentation procedure , each gathering patients (30 male and 30 female), required endodontic treatment on their permanent molar teeth with asymptomatic irreversible pulpitis preoperatively, to access opening and instrumentation preformed at a similar visit. Asymptomatic irreversible pulpitis with no periapical changes cases were chosen for this examination because of the way that reviews have demonstrated the nearness of preoperative pain altogether builds the likelihood of postoperative pain. (23), this discovering associates with different examinations (24). Additionally Higher

rate of postoperative pain in teeth without periradicular inflammation may be ascribed to an absence of room for weight discharge when periradicular bone resorption is missing ⁽²⁵⁾. Likewise roots curvature of teeth incorporated into this investigation extended from slight to moderate that sever curve canal extrude more debris, while studies demonstrated no significant difference between slight to moderate curve canal ⁽²⁶⁾

A single clinician assessed all patients; a similar clinician (the specialist) was relegated for treatment everything being equal. This technique was performed to wipe out interpersonal variability in the treatment between clinicians ⁽⁸⁾. In the wake of securing direct access to the channel hole, the working length was built up. The working length for root canal was viewed as at the apical construction, the assurance of an exact working length is one of the most basic strides of endodontic treatment. The perfect working length was resolved utilizing an electronic apex locator and periapical radiographs ⁽²⁷⁾ Subsequent to utilizing Apex locator; cases into which the file situated at 0.5 to 1mm from radiographic summit were incorporated into this investigation. File to the foramen brought about more debris contrasted with 1 mm shorter than the foramen this is in concurrence with ^(32,33,34) The Irrigation needle utilized was side vented type since standard needle or top vented needle extrude greater amount of irrigants and side-vented irrigation system needles appeared to lowering affect irrigants expulsion, this result concurrence with ⁽²⁸⁾

Ethical Clearance: The Research Ethical Committee at scientific research by ethical approval of both environmental and health and higher education and scientific research ministries in Iraq

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Funding: Self-funding

References

1. Seltzer S. Pain in endodontics. *J Endod* 2000; 30: 501-3.
2. Seltzer S. *Endodontology*, 2nd edition; Lea &Febiger, Philadelphia, USA: 1988
3. Sebastian B, €urklein, med dent, and Edgar S. Apically Extruded Debris with Reciprocating Single-File and Full-sequence Rotary Instrumentation Systems, (*J Endod* 2012;38:850–852.
4. Parashos P. and Messer HH. The diffusion of innovation in dentistry: a review using rotary nickel-titanium technology as an example. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod* 2006;10:395-401.
5. Zarna S, and Kunjal M. Design Feature Of Rotary Instruments in Endodontics, *The Journal of Ahmedabad Dental College*, 2(1), March 2011 - August 2011
6. Ken Koch and Dennis B. Design Features of Rotary Files and How They Affect Clinical Performance, *RWE-ENDO*, 2002; 1-866
7. Gotler M., Bar-Gil B. and Ashkenazi M. Postoperative Pain after Root Canal Treatment A Prospective Cohort Study, *International Journal of Dentistry* Volume 2012; Article ID 310467, 5 pages
8. Gianluca G., Luca T., Massimo De., Valerio M., Gianluca P., Nicola M., Alessio Giansiracusa , Dina Al Sudani, Gianpaolo S. The influence of three different instrumentation techniques on the incidence of postoperative pain after endodontic treatment, *Annali di Stomatologia*. 2013; IV (1): 152-155
9. Jenifer M., Marta E., Benito S., Maria-L. , Lizett C., Francisco-Javier L. and Juan-Jose S. Influence of root canal instrumentation and obturation techniques on intra-operative pain during endodontic therapy *Med Oral Patol Oral Cir Bucal*. 2012; Sep 1;17 (5):e912-8.
10. Mehdi JA, Al-Zaka IM, Al-Obiedy A. Evaluation of apically extruded debris by using hand and rotary Nickel-Titanium instruments. *MDJ* 2009; 6(4):292-298
11. Jindal R, Singh S and Gupta S, Jindal P. Comparative evaluation of apical extrusion of debris and irrigant with three rotary instruments using crown down technique - An in vitro study. *Journal of Oral Biology and Craniofacial Research*. 2012; 2(2):105-109.
12. Ruddle CJ. The shaping movement 5TH generation technology, *Dentistry today* April 2013.
13. Julian Webber, Pierre Machtou Wilhelm Pertot, Sergio Kuttler, Clifford Ruddle & John West. The WaveOne single-file reciprocating system, 2011.
14. Mangalam S, Rao CVN, Lakshminarayanan

- L. Evaluation of apically extruded debris and irrigant using three instrumentation techniques. *Endodontology*. 2002; 14:19-23.
15. Gary G. Safety and Efficacy Considerations in Endodontic Irrigation, PennWell, 2011.
 16. Gotler M., Bar-Gil B. and Ashkenazi M. Postoperative Pain after Root Canal Treatment A Prospective Cohort Study, *International Journal of Dentistry* Volume 2012; Article ID 310467, 5 pages
 17. Jorge P. V and Julieta A.G, Incidence and severity of post-operative pain following root canal treatment of teeth with non-vital pulps using hand and rotary instrumentation techniques. *Endodontic Practice* August, 2009.
 18. Ruddle CJ. Cleaning and shaping the root canal system. Cohen S, Burns RC. *Pathways of the pulp*. 2002 8th edition. St.Louis: CV Mosby Company. 2002; 231-273.
 19. Gustavo Almeida, Eduardo M, Alexandre S, Carlos Eduardo da S, Anthony N, Rodrigo S. Influence of Irrigating Solution on Postoperative Pain Following Single-Visit Endodontic Treatment: Randomized Clinical Trial. *J Can Den Asso*2012;78;c84.
 20. Siqueira JF, Rocas IN, Favieri A, Machado AG, Gahyva SM, Oliveira JCM. Incidence of postoperative pain after intracanal procedures based on an antimicrobial strategy. *J Endod* 2002;28:457–60.
 21. Ruiz-HubardEE.,Gutmann JL. And Wagner MJ. A quantitative assessment of canal debris forced periapically during root canal instrumentation using two different techniques. *J Endod*. 1987; 13(12):554-558.
 22. Marianne J. Fayers P. Haugen DF. Caraceni A. HanksG. JH Loge, Fainsinger R. Aass N. and KaasaS. Studies comparing Numerical Rating Scales, Verbal RatingScales and Visual Analogue Scales for assessment of pain intensity, *EAPC Glasgow*2010.
 23. Imura N, Zuolo ML. Factors associated with endodontic flare-ups: a prospective study. *IntEndod J* 1995;28:261–5.
 24. Abdel Hameed H. ElMubarak, Neamat H. Abubakr, and Yahia E. Ibrahim, Postoperative Pain in Multiple-visit and Single-visit Root Canal Treatment, (*J Endod* 2010;36:36–39)
 25. Siqueira JF, Rocas IN, Favieri A, Machado AG, Gahyva SM, Oliveira JCM. Incidence of postoperative pain after intracanal procedures based on an antimicrobial strategy. *J Endod* 2002;28:457–60.
 26. Leonardi LE, Atlas DM, Raiden G. Apical extrusion of debris by manual and mechanical instrumentation. *Brazilian Dental Journal*(2007) 18, 16-9.
 27. Luis-O. Alonso-E., Carmen G-G., Lizett C-C., Jenifer M-G., Francsico-J. L-F., Juan-J. and Segura-E. Postoperative pain after one-visit root-canal treatment onteeth with vital pulps: Comparison of three different obturation techniques, *Med OralPatol Oral Cir Bucal*. 2012 Jul 1;17 (4):e721-7.
 28. Martin H. and Cunningham WT. The effect of endosonic and hand manipulation on the amount of root canal material extruded. *Oral Surgery Oral Medicine Oral Pathology* 1982; 53, 611-3.