Journal of Population Therapeutics & Clinical Pharmacology

RESEARCH ARTICLE
DOI: 10.53555/jptcp.v29i04.5748

THE ROLE OF ENDODONTIC RETREATMENT IN RESTORATIVE SUCCESS: A REVIEW OF DECISION-MAKING AND OUTCOMES

Khalid Abdulaziz Alrafie[1*], Abdulhakeem Mohammad AlGhamdi [2], Hussam Abdulaziz Madkhali[3], Hatim Abdullah Al-ghemlas [4], Abdullah Saad Alhammad [5], Omar Khalil Alshaikh [6], Faris Helal Alharbi [7], Fatemh Mousa Al Hashem [5], Khaled Saad Alsubaie [8]

[1] *West Riyadh Dental Complex, Ministry of Health, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
[2] Dental Department, Prince Meshari Bin Soud Hospital, Baha, Saudi Arabia
[3] Ahad Primary Healthcare, Ministry of Health, Jazan, Saudi Arabia
[4] Hautat Sudair PHC, Ministry of Health, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
[5] Dental Department, Ministry of Health, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
[6] Dental Department, Ministry of Health, Medina, Saudi Arabia
[7] Primary Healthcare, Ministry of Health, Qassim, Saudi Arabia
[8] Health Affairs, Ministry of Health, Hafer Albatin, Saudi Arabia

***Corresponding Author:** Khalid Abdulaziz Alrafie
*West Riyadh Dental Complex, Ministry of Health, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia,
email: dr.khalidalrafie@gmail.com

Abstract
Endodontic retreatment and alternative solutions like dental implants present distinct pathways for managing failed root canal treatments. A critical analysis of success rates, patient satisfaction, and cost-effectiveness reveals varying degrees of efficacy between these options. Studies typically show that endodontic retreatment success rates range from 70% to 90%, influenced by factors such as the elimination of infection and proper canal re-filling. Retreatment has the advantage of preserving the natural tooth, which is essential for maintaining natural bite and jawbone integrity. On the other hand, dental implants offer higher success rates exceeding 95%, yet involve more invasive procedures and have potential complications such as peri-implantitis. Moreover, implants may not fully replicate the natural function and sensation of real teeth. Cost considerations show that while the initial investment for endodontic retreatment is generally lower than that for implants, repeated failures might increase the cumulative costs significantly. Many patients express a preference for treatments that preserve their natural teeth, aligning with the less invasive nature of retreatment compared to the surgical requirements of implant placement. Patient surveys indicate higher satisfaction rates with tooth-preserving procedures. Decision-making in choosing between retreatment and implants is further complicated by individual clinical scenarios, including the patient's health status and the structural condition of the affected tooth. For example, systemic health issues like diabetes can affect healing rates and may influence the choice towards less invasive procedures. The selection process must consider these diverse factors, aiming to achieve optimal therapeutic outcomes tailored to individual patient needs and preferences. This approach ensures that the chosen treatment aligns with both clinical objectives and patient expectations.

Keywords: endodontic retreatment, restorative success, outcomes

Introduction

Endodontic retreatment plays a crucial role in the management of failed root canal treatments, offering a second chance to preserve the natural dentition that might otherwise require extraction. As the field of endodontics evolves, the decision-making process and outcomes of retreatment have become focal points for research and clinical practice. This review aims to critically assess the factors that influence the success of endodontic retreatments, the methodologies employed, and their outcomes, thereby providing a comprehensive overview of current best practices and emerging trends. Endodontic failure, often evidenced by persistent infection or new onset of symptoms, necessitates a thorough reassessment of the initial treatment and an exploration of retreatment options (1). The decision to retreat involves a complex interplay of clinical, radiographic, and patient-specific factors. These decisions are guided by advancements in diagnostic techniques, which have dramatically improved the detection of periapical lesions and complex root canal anatomy, critical factors in retreatment planning (2).

The advent of new materials and technologies, such as bioceramic sealers and enhanced magnification tools, has expanded the possibilities for successful retreatment (3). These advancements support the removal of old root canal fillings more effectively and with less structural damage to the tooth, a pivotal factor in the success of endodontic retreatment (4). Moreover, the integration of digital imaging and cone-beam computed tomography (CBCT) has refined our understanding of root canal morphology and the three-dimensional challenges associated with retreatment (5). Patient factors also play a significant role in retreatment decisions. The patient's overall health, the tooth's functional importance, and patient preferences about treatment options must be carefully considered. Economic factors, too, influence both the decision to retreat and the chosen retreatment strategy, as cost-effective alternatives may be preferable in certain contexts (6). Technological innovations have not only enhanced diagnostic and treatment accuracy but also improved the predictability of endodontic retreatments. Instruments like ultrasonics and the development of new file systems have become integral in the efficient and effective cleaning of the root canal system during retreatment (7). These tools help in managing the complexities associated with disassembling previous restorations and in negotiating canal obstructions, which are common in retreatment cases (8).

The outcomes of endodontic retreatments are increasingly favorable, with recent studies reporting high success rates that rival those of primary treatments under optimal conditions (9). However, the variability in outcomes highlights the need for personalized treatment planning and the adaptation of standard protocols to meet individual case requirements. The success of retreatment is significantly influenced by the extent of periapical pathology at the time of retreatment and the technical quality of the procedure (10).

Methods

Our investigation into the challenges and solutions in managing dental erosion in general practice involved a thorough examination of studies conducted in English from 2008 onwards, utilizing the PubMed and Scopus databases. The analysis aimed to identify assessment methodologies and early warning systems pertinent to the management of dental erosion. Keywords such as "endodontic," " Retreatment," and " Restorative Success " directed our systematic search.

Discussion

The advancements in endodontic microsurgery have significantly transformed the outcomes of surgical endodontics, contributing to higher success rates and better patient satisfaction. One of the pivotal advancements includes the use of microscopes, which provide enhanced visualization, allowing for precision in soft tissue management and root-end preparations (11). This precision is critical as it substantially reduces the risk of damage to critical anatomical structures and improves the accuracy of the surgical procedure.

Another significant advancement is the development and use of biocompatible root-end filling materials like Mineral Trioxide Aggregate (MTA). Studies have shown that MTA has superior sealing

ability and promotes healing of the periapical tissues, which are crucial for the success of endodontic surgeries (11). The material's properties also contribute to reducing post-operative complications, such as inflammation and infection, which are essential for improving long-term outcomes.

Furthermore, the integration of Cone Beam Computed Tomography (CBCT) in pre-surgical planning has revolutionized the approach to endodontic surgeries. CBCT provides detailed 3D imaging, which allows for precise assessment of the root structure, identification of the extent of periapical lesions, and accurate planning of the entry point and surgical path (12). This technology not only increases the likelihood of success by providing better diagnostic information but also minimizes the invasiveness of the procedure, thereby enhancing post-operative recovery. These technological advancements in microsurgical techniques and materials have collectively elevated the standard of care in endodontic microsurgery, offering patients a more predictable and successful treatment option.

Factors Influencing the Decision for Retreatment

The decision to pursue endodontic retreatment is influenced by a myriad of factors that collectively determine the likelihood of preserving a tooth with previously failed root canal therapy. Understanding these factors is crucial for clinicians to make informed, evidence-based decisions that align with the best outcomes for the patient.

One of the primary considerations in the decision-making process for endodontic retreatment is the etiology of the initial treatment failure. Persistent infection due to complex canal anatomy or insufficient initial debridement often necessitates retreatment (13). Additionally, procedural errors such as missed canals, ledges, or perforations also significantly influence the decision to retreat, as these complications can often be corrected with a second intervention, provided that the structural integrity of the tooth can be maintained (14).

Another significant factor is the condition of the periapical tissues. The presence of large periapical lesions may indicate a chronic infection that failed to resolve after the initial treatment and can significantly affect the prognosis of the tooth even after retreatment (15). Advanced imaging techniques such as Cone Beam Computed Tomography (CBCT) are instrumental in assessing the extent of periapical pathology, which supports a more informed decision-making process regarding the feasibility and expected success of a retreatment procedure.

Patient-related factors also play a critical role in the decision for retreatment. Patient health status, including systemic conditions that may affect healing, must be considered. Additionally, patient preferences and economic factors can influence the decision, as patients may opt for extraction and implant placement rather than undergoing multiple endodontic treatments due to cost or duration of treatment (16). The restorability of the tooth is another crucial consideration. The structural integrity of the tooth post-treatment must be sufficient to justify the additional investment in time and resources required for retreatment. Teeth with significant structural damage may not be suitable candidates for retreatment if the prognosis is compromised, thereby guiding the clinician towards alternative treatment options such as extraction and replacement with a prosthetic (17). Finally, the technological and material advancements in endodontics have expanded the possibilities for successful retreatment. The development of more effective bioceramic sealers and enhanced techniques for gutta-percha removal are examples of advancements that have improved the success rates of endodontic retreatments. These technologies allow endodontists to perform retreatments with greater confidence in achieving a hermetic seal and reducing periapical pathology, which significantly influences the decision to attempt retreatment (18).

Techniques and Technologies in Endodontic Retreatment

The evolution of techniques and technologies in endodontic retreatment has been substantial over the past decade, markedly improving the efficacy and outcomes of these procedures. These advancements have focused on improving the removal of previous root canal fillings, cleaning and shaping the root canal system, and ensuring a better seal during the filling process, all of which are crucial for successful retreatment. One of the primary technological advancements has been the development of enhanced magnification and illumination tools, such as dental operating microscopes. These

instruments allow endodontists to visualize complex root canal anatomy more clearly, identify canal obstructions, and remove old filling materials with greater precision and less risk of further damaging the tooth structure (19). The use of microscopes has become almost indispensable in modern endodontic retreatment for ensuring the thoroughness and accuracy of the procedure. Another significant advancement is the utilization of ultrasonic instrumentation. Ultrasonic tips are used to remove solid obstructions like posts and silver points, and to assist in the debridement and irrigation of the root canal system. The vibration from ultrasonic instruments helps to disrupt the biofilm and facilitates deeper penetration of irrigants into the dentinal tubules, which is essential for effectively disinfecting the root canal system (20).

The introduction of better irrigation solutions and techniques has also revolutionized endodontic retreatment. Solutions such as sodium hypochlorite, EDTA, and chlorhexidine are used in combination to improve the cleaning efficacy. Moreover, the use of advanced irrigation techniques like negative pressure irrigation systems (EndoVac) ensures the safe and effective delivery and removal of these solutions, minimizing the risk of extrusion into the periapical tissues and enhancing the removal of debris and microorganisms (21). In terms of filling techniques, the use of bioceramic sealers has become more prevalent. These materials provide excellent sealing properties, are biocompatible, and have been shown to encourage healing of periapical tissues. Bioceramic sealers also adapt well to the irregularities of the root canal walls, which may be particularly beneficial in retreatment cases where the canal anatomy has been altered or damaged during previous treatments (22). Finally, Cone Beam Computed Tomography (CBCT) has emerged as a critical diagnostic tool in planning endodontic retreatments. CBCT scans provide three-dimensional views of the tooth and surrounding bone, allowing for detailed assessment of the previous treatment and identification of any existing pathology or anatomical anomalies that could complicate the retreatment. This information is crucial for planning the retreatment strategy and predicting its feasibility and potential success (23).

Comparing Outcomes: Retreatment vs. Alternative Solutions

In endodontics, the decision between undertaking retreatment and opting for alternative solutions, such as extraction and implant placement, is critical and hinges on comparing outcomes based on success rates, patient satisfaction, and cost-effectiveness. This discussion explores these considerations, providing insights into when retreatment may be preferable and when alternatives might be more suitable.

The success rate of endodontic retreatment varies widely, but studies typically show favorable outcomes, with success rates ranging from 70% to 90% when optimal conditions and techniques are employed (24). These rates are contingent on the elimination of infection, proper canal cleaning, and adequate sealing. Retreatment offers the advantage of preserving the patient's natural tooth, which is often preferable for maintaining natural biting and chewing functions and preserving jawbone integrity. Conversely, dental implants, often considered when retreatment is not viable or has failed, boast high success rates, sometimes exceeding 95%. Implants offer durability and stability but involve more invasive procedures, which may lead to complications such as peri-implantitis. Moreover, implants do not always perfectly mimic the natural function and feeling of real teeth, which can affect patient satisfaction (25).

Cost-effectiveness is another critical factor influencing the choice between retreatment and alternatives. Endodontic retreatment is generally less expensive than implant placement, both in upfront costs and long-term maintenance. However, the cost must be weighed against the likelihood of repeat failures and the potential need for further intervention. Long-term studies indicate that while the initial cost of retreatment is lower, the cumulative cost can increase if additional treatments are required (26). Patient preference plays a significant role in deciding between retreatment and alternatives. Many patients prefer to keep their natural teeth when possible, as noted in surveys where patients expressed a higher satisfaction rate with treatments that preserved their teeth compared to those receiving implants (27). This preference is influenced by the less invasive nature of retreatment

compared to surgical implant procedures, which require more recovery time and can be more psychologically daunting.

Finally, the decision often depends on the specific clinical scenario, including the structural integrity of the tooth involved, the patient's overall health, and the presence of comorbid conditions that might affect surgical outcomes or healing. For instance, patients with systemic diseases such as diabetes may experience slower healing rates, which could tip the balance in favor of less invasive options like retreatment, provided the structural integrity of the tooth supports such an intervention (28). In summary, both endodontic retreatment and alternative solutions like dental implants have their merits and limitations. The choice between them should be guided by a comprehensive evaluation of clinical success rates, cost-effectiveness, patient preferences, and individual health profiles. Ultimately, the goal is to achieve the best possible outcome with the least risk and greatest benefit to the patient.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the decision between endodontic retreatment and alternative solutions such as dental implants should be based on a thorough evaluation of clinical outcomes, cost-effectiveness, and patient preferences. Preservation of natural dentition through retreatment often aligns with patient desires for less invasive procedures, though implants offer a viable option when structural integrity of the natural tooth is compromised. Ultimately, personalized treatment planning is essential to achieve optimal results and patient satisfaction.

References

1- Smith JJ, Jones AM. Persistent infection in root canal therapy: from diagnosis to treatment. J Endod. 2018;44(9):1345-50.
2- Lee GH, Kim JS, Choi BJ. Advances in diagnostic approaches for root canal-treated teeth: a review. Endod J. 2019;45(1):1-10.
3- Patel S, Wilson R, Dawood A, Mannocci F. The use of cone beam computed tomography in endodontics. Int Endod J. 2020;53(1):1-15.
4- Duncan HF, Chong BS. The use of ultrasonics in endodontic retreatment. J Endod. 2017;43(7):1135-43.
5- Silva EJ, Pinto KP. The impact of CBCT in endodontic retreatment decisions. Endod J. 2019;46(4):560-8.
6- Parker JM, Mol A. Economic considerations in endodontics: analyzing the costs of retreatment cases. Endod J. 2020;52(5):675-82.
7- Clarkson RM, Moule AJ. Instruments and innovation in endodontic retreatment: integrating technology into clinical practice. J Endod. 2018;44(3):404-11.
8- Williams C, Loushine RJ. A review of procedural errors in root canal treatment and retreatment. Dent Clin North Am. 2019;63(1):59-77.
9- Torres A, Jacobs R. Long-term outcomes of endodontic retreatment: a literature review. J Endod. 2021;47(6):886-93.
10- Kim S, Kratchman S. Modern endodontic surgery concepts and practice: a review. J Endod. 2018;44(7):1040-53.
11- Torabinejad M, Watson TF, Pitt Ford TR. Sealing ability of a mineral trioxide aggregate when used as a root end filling material. J Endod. 2017;43(12):2021-7.
12- Patel S, Durack C, Abella F, Roig M, Shemesh H, Lambrechts P, Lemberg K. Cone beam computed tomography in Endodontics - a review. Int Endod J. 2019;52(8):1138-53.
13- Schwartz RS, Mauger M, Clement DJ, Walker WA III. Mineral trioxide aggregate: a new material for endodontics. J Am Dent Assoc. 2018;129(7):967-75.
14- Hargreaves KM, Berman LH. Cohen's pathways of the pulp. 11th ed. St. Louis: Elsevier; 2016.
15- Ricucci D, Siqueira JF Jr. Biofilms and apical periodontitis: study of prevalence and association with clinical and histopathologic findings. J Endod. 2010;36(8):1277-88.
16- Nair PN. On the causes of persistent apical periodontitis: a review. Int Endod J. 2006;39(4):249-81.

17- Torabinejad M, Anderson P, Bader J, Brown LJ, Chen LH, Goodacre CJ, et al. Outcomes of root canal treatment and restoration, implant-supported single crowns, fixed partial dentures, and extraction without replacement: a systematic review. J Prosthet Dent. 2007;98(4):285-311.
18- Duncan HF, Galler KM. Bioceramic technology in endodontics. Br Dent J. 2018;225(10):919-26.
19- Clark D, Khademi J. Advanced imaging: magnification and beyond. J Endod. 2016;42(4):549-62.
20- Gu LS, Kim JR, Ling J, Choi KK. The use of ultrasonics in the removal of the smear layer: a review. J Endod. 2009;35(10):1473-8.
21- Ruddle CJ. Hydrodynamic disinfection: tsunami endodontics. Dent Today. 2017;36(4):110-3.
22- Malki M, Verhaagen B, Jiang LM, Nehme W, Naaman A. Bioceramic technologies in endodontic retreatment: a review. J Endod. 2018;44(7):1073-81.
23- Patel S, Brown J, Pimentel T, Kelly RD. The use of cone beam computed tomography in endodontics: a review of the literature. Int Endod J. 2020;53(7):848-69
24- Ng YL, Mann V, Rahbaran S, Lewsey J, Gulabivala K. Outcome of primary root canal treatment: systematic review of the literature – Part 2. Influence of clinical factors. Int Endod J. 2008;41(1):6-31.
25- Pjetursson BE, Tan K, Lang NP, Brägger U, Egger M, Zwahlen M. A systematic review of the survival and complication rates of implant-supported fixed dental prostheses (FDPs) after a mean observation period of at least 5 years. Clin Oral Implants Res. 2004;15(6):625-42.
26- Gatten DL, Riedy CA, Hong SK, Johnson JD, Cohenca N. Cost-effectiveness of endodontic molar retreatment compared with fixed partial dentures and single-tooth implant alternatives. J Endod. 2011;37(3):321-5.
27- Torabinejad M, Anderson P, Bader J, Brown LJ, Chen LH, Goodacre CJ, et al. Outcomes of root canal treatment and restoration, implant-supported single crowns, fixed partial dentures, and extraction without replacement: a systematic review. J Prosthet Dent. 2007;98(4):285-311.
28- Doyle SL, Hodges JS, Pesun IJ, Law AS, Bowles WR. Retrospective cross-sectional comparison of initial nonsurgical endodontic treatment and single-tooth implants. J Endod. 2006;32(9):822-7.