ISSN: 2581-5989
PubMed - National Library of Medicine - ID: 101738774

International Journal of Dental Science and Innovative Research (IJDSIR)

IJDSIR : Dental Publication Service

Available Online at:www.ijdsir.com

Volume – 7, Issue – 5, September – 2024, Page No. : 250 - 253

Rotary vs. Manual Endodontic Files in Root Canal Therapy: Efficiency, Precision, and Outcomes

[1]Dr. Sandip Dnyaneshwar Patil, MDS, Department of Conservative Dentistry and Endodontics, Jalgaon.

[2]Dr. Siddharth Cahudhari, MDS, Department of Oral Medicine, Diagnosis and Radiology, Jalgaon

Corresponding Author: Dr. Sandip Dnyaneshwar Patil, MDS Department of Conservative Dentistry and Endodontics, Jalgaon.

Citation of this Article: Dr. Sandip Dnyaneshwar Patil, Dr. Siddharth Cahudhari, "Rotary vs. Manual Endodontic Files in Root Canal Therapy: Efficiency, Precision, and Outcomes", IJDSIR- September – 2024, Volume –7, Issue - 5, P. No. 250 – 253.

Type of Publication: Original Research Article

Conflicts of Interest: Nil

Abstract

Endodontic therapy, commonly known as root canal treatment, is a crucial dental procedure that aims to remove infected tissue and prevent tooth loss. Central to this treatment are endodontic files, which can be categorized as either rotary or manual instruments. Rotary files are motor-driven and generally made of nickel-titanium (NiTi), while manual files are handheld, traditionally made of stainless steel or NiTi. This review compares rotary and manual files in terms of efficiency, precision, and patient outcomes. Rotary files are associated with faster procedures, smoother canal shaping, and lower post-operative pain. Manual files, while more time-consuming, provide enhanced tactile control and are particularly useful in complex canal systems. The discussion evaluates the advantages and limitations of each system, highlighting the importance of selecting the appropriate technique based on clinical circumstances. A hybrid approach that combines both techniques is often recommended for optimal results.

Keywords: Rotary endodontic files, Manual endodontic files, Root canal therapy, Canal shaping, Endodontic efficiency, Nickel-titanium files, Instrumentation, Procedural outcomes, Endodontic precision, Post-operative pain.

Introduction

Root canal therapy is a standard procedure aimed at treating infected or necrotic dental pulp. A crucial aspect of the procedure involves the cleaning and shaping of the root canal system, which is achieved using specialized endodontic files. These files can be divided into two broad categories: rotary files and manual files. (1,2)

Rotary files, typically made of nickel-titanium (NiTi), are driven by a motorized handpiece, allowing them to rotate within the canal. They are known for their flexibility, ability to maintain canal curvature, and

efficiency in shaping. Manual files, in contrast, are handheld tools, traditionally made from stainless steel or NiTi, requiring the clinician to manually shape the canal.(3-5)

In recent years, the debate over which system—rotary or manual—yields superior outcomes has intensified. Clinicians must consider various factors such as treatment efficiency, the precision of canal shaping, patient comfort, and the risk of procedural errors. This article aims to review the literature comparing the two instrumentation techniques, focusing on key aspects such as efficiency, precision, clinical outcomes, and patient comfort.

Discussion

1. Efficiency

Rotary Files: Rotary instrumentation is generally faster than manual techniques due to its mechanized operation. The ability to remove debris and shape the canal with a continuous, automated motion significantly reduces chair time. Studies have shown that rotary systems can shorten the treatment time by 25% to 40% compared to manual instrumentation. This is particularly beneficial for multi-canal teeth, where time efficiency is essential. (6,7)

Manual Files: In contrast, manual files require more time and effort from the clinician. The process of shaping the canal is slower, as each file must be operated manually with a push-pull or watch-winding motion. While manual instrumentation provides more tactile feedback, the increased time and labor can be a drawback, especially for less experienced practitioners or when dealing with multiple canals in a single tooth. (8,9)

2. Precision and Canal Shaping

Rotary Files: Rotary files, particularly those made of NiTi, offer superior flexibility, allowing them to adapt to the natural curvature of the canal. This reduces the risk of ledge formation, canal transportation, and zipping, ensuring more predictable canal shaping. Additionally, rotary systems tend to maintain the original anatomy of the canal, which is crucial for long-term success. However, over-preparation and apical enlargement are potential concerns, particularly in less experienced hands, which could weaken the tooth structure. (10,11)

Manual Files: Manual files, while less flexible, provide greater tactile control. This control allows the clinician to feel subtle anatomical nuances within the canal, such as calcifications or curvatures, and adjust the instrumentation accordingly. Manual files, particularly stainless steel ones, have a higher risk of creating procedural errors like ledging and canal transportation, especially in severely curved canals. However, in complex cases or when delicate control is needed, manual instrumentation can offer superior precision. (12,13)

3. Clinical Outcomes

Rotary Files: Numerous studies have shown that rotary files achieve excellent clinical outcomes, particularly in terms of reducing post-operative pain and complications. Their ability to efficiently clean and shape the canal leads to fewer procedural errors like debris blockage or over-instrumentation. Rotary systems also reduce apical debris extrusion, a key factor in post-treatment discomfort. However, the risk of instrument separation, though minimized with modern designs, remains a concern and can compromise clinical outcomes if not addressed promptly. (14,15)

Manual Files: Manual instrumentation is associated with fewer instances of instrument breakage, although it is more prone to procedural errors like ledge formation and apical blockages. In experienced hands, manual files can yield excellent clinical outcomes, particularly in uncomplicated root canals. However, the higher

incidence of ledging or transportation in curved canals can lead to incomplete cleaning, increasing the risk of long-term treatment failure. (16,17)

4. Patient Comfort and Post-Operative Pain

Rotary Files: Patients treated with rotary files often report less post-operative discomfort compared to manual files. This is primarily due to the reduced chair time and the smoother operation of rotary instruments, which minimizes apical debris extrusion—a known cause of post-operative pain. Additionally, the uniformity of the canal preparation tends to lead to fewer flare-ups and better healing.

Manual Files: Manual instrumentation, due to its slower and more repetitive nature, can sometimes result in greater post-operative discomfort. The likelihood of apical debris extrusion is higher, leading to increased inflammation and pain after the procedure. However, with careful technique and proper irrigation, post-operative discomfort can be minimized. (18-20)

Conclusion

In conclusion, both rotary and manual endodontic files have their advantages and limitations in root canal therapy. Rotary files excel in terms of efficiency and precision, making them ideal for routine cases where speed and canal conformity are critical. Their ability to reduce procedural errors and post-operative pain has made them a popular choice among modern clinicians.

Manual files, on the other hand, offer enhanced tactile control, which is valuable in complex canal systems and cases that require delicate handling. While more time-consuming, manual files allow for greater clinician feedback and are less prone to breakage than rotary systems.

Ultimately, the choice between rotary and manual instrumentation should be based on clinical judgment, the complexity of the canal system, and the experience of the practitioner. In many cases, a hybrid approach, utilizing both manual and rotary files, may provide the best outcomes by leveraging the strengths of both systems. Future advances in file design and materials may further enhance the capabilities of both manual and rotary instrumentation techniques.

References

1. Preserved for endurance: minimal invasive endodontics. Chethan M, Revathi K, Natesan R, Rashmi M, Soubhagya M, Nair VS. IP Indian J Conserv Endod. 2021;6:88–91. [Google Scholar]
2. Minimally invasive endodontics: saving the precious dentin. Taneja S. J Dent Spec. 2021;9:44–45. [Google Scholar]
3. Minimally invasive endodontics: challenging prevailing paradigms. Gluskin AH, Peters CI, Peters OA. Br Dent J. 2014;216:347–353. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
4. Minimally invasive endodontics. Shibu TM, Julie SR. J Dent Oral Hyg. 2014;6:36–38. [Google Scholar]
5. Walia HM, Brantley WA, Gerstein H. An initial investigation of the bending and torsional properties of Nitinol root canal files. J Endod. 1988;14(7):346–
6. 51. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
7. Buehler WH, Gilfrich JV, et al. Effect of low temperature phase changes on the mechanical properties of alloys near composition TiNi. J Appl Phys. 1963;34(1):1475–1477. [Google Scholar]
8. Grossman L. Endodontics 1776–1976: A bicemental history against the background of general dentistry. J Am Dent Assoc. 1976;93:78–87. doi: 10.14219/jada.archive.1976.0606. DOI: [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
9. Crespo S, Cortes O, et al. Comparison between rotary and manual instrumentation in primary

teeth. Int J Clin Pediatr Dent. 2008;32(4):295–298. doi: 10.17796/jcpd.32.4.l57l36355u606576. DOI: [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]

10. Barr ES, Kleier DJ, et al. Use of nickel-titanium rotary files for root canal preparation in primary teeth. Pediatr Dent. 2000;22(1):77–78. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
11. Can ED, Gerek M, Kayahan MB, Mohseni K, Sunay H, Bayirli G. Comparision of two different preparation protocol of Ni-Ti Rotary PathFile-ProTaper instruments in simulated s-shaped canals. Acta Odontol Scand. 2014;72(1):76–80. doi: 10.3109/00016357.2013.805430. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
12. Sakkir N, Thaha KA, Nair MG, Joseph S, Christalin R. Management of dilacerated and S-shaped root canals-An endodontist's challenge. J Clin Diagn Res. 2014;8(6):ZD22. doi: 10.7860/JCDR/2014/9100.4520. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
13. Hiran-us S, Pimkhaokham S, Sawasdichai J, Ebihara A, Suda H. Shaping ability of ProTaper NEXT, ProTaper Universal and iRace files in simulated S-shaped canals. Aust Endod J. 2016;42(1):32–6. doi: 10.1111/aej.12117. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
14. Schäfer E, Diez C, Hoppe W, Tepel J. Roentgenographic investigation of frequency and degree of canal curvatures in human permanent teeth. J Endod. 2002;28 (3): 211–6. doi: 10.1097/00004770-200203000-00017. [PubMed] [Cross Ref] [Google Scholar]
15. Alves VO. Endodontic flare-ups: a prospective study. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod. 2010;110:e68–e72. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
16. Bürklein S, Mathey D, Schäfer E. Shaping ability of ProTaper NEXT and BT-RaCe nickel-titanium instruments in severely curved root canals. Int Endod J. 2015;48:774–781. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
17. Caviedes-Bucheli J, Castellanos F, Vasquez N, Ulate E, Munoz HR. The influence of two reciprocating single-file and two rotary-file systems on the apical extrusion of debris and its biological relationship with symptomatic apical periodontitis. A systematic review and meta-analysis. Int Endod J. 2016;49:255–270. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
18. Elnaghy AM. Cyclic fatigue resistance of ProTaper Next nickel-titanium rotary files. Int Endod J. 2014;47:1034–1039. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
19. Mickel AK, Wright AP, Chogle S, Jones JJ, Kantorovich I, Curd F. An analysis of current analgesic preferences for endodontic pain management. J Endod. 2006;32(12):1146–54. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
20. Moskow A, Morse DR, Krasner P, Furst ML. Intracanal use of a corticosteroid solution as an endodontic anodyne. Oral Sur, Oral Med, Oral Pathol. 1984;58(5):600–4. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
21. Menke ER, Jackson CR, Bagby MD, Tracy TS. The effectiveness of prophylactic etodolac on postendodontic pain. J Endod. 2000;26(12):712–5. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]