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 – 9, Issue – 2, April – 2026, Page No. : 101 – 112

Gutta-Percha in Endodontics: Composition, Properties, Clinical Applications, and Future Perspectives – A Comprehensive Review

[1]Dr Saurabh Ramesh, Postgraduate Student, Department of Conservative Dentistry and Endodontics, DAPMRV Dental College, Bengaluru, India.

[2]Dr H Murali, Professor, Department of Conservative Dentistry and Endodontics, DAPMRV, Dental College, Bengaluru, India.

[3]Dr Keshava Prasad B S, Professor and Head, Department of Conservative Dentistry and Endodontics, DAPMRV, Dental College, Bengaluru, India.

Corresponding Author: Dr Saurabh Ramesh, Postgraduate Student, Department of Conservative Dentistry and Endodontics, DAPMRV Dental College, Bengaluru, India.

Citation of this Article: Dr Saurabh Ramesh, Dr H Murali, Dr Keshava Prasad B S, "Gutta-Percha in Endodontics: Composition, Properties, Clinical Applications, and Future Perspectives – A Comprehensive Review", IJDSIR- April – 2026, Volume – 9, Issue – 2, P. No. 101 – 112.

Type of Publication: Review Article

Conflicts of Interest: Nil

Abstract

Gutta-percha has remained the gold standard obturation material in endodontics for over a century due to its favorable physical, biological, and clinical properties. This review comprehensively explores its composition, thermomechanical behavior, clinical applications, and recent advancements. Chemically composed of trans-polyisoprene with inorganic fillers such as zinc oxide and radiopacifiers, gutta-percha exhibits thermoplasticity, allowing effective adaptation to complex root canal anatomies. It demonstrates good biocompatibility and radiopacity, with minimal tissue irritation when confined within the canal. Various obturation techniques—including lateral compaction, warm vertical compaction, thermoplasticized injectable systems, and carrier-based methods—have been developed to enhance sealing ability and reduce microleakage. However, gutta-percha lacks adhesion to dentin, making the role of sealers critical for achieving an effective seal. Despite improvements in obturation techniques and the introduction of bioceramic sealers and modified gutta-percha systems, no alternative material has demonstrated consistent superiority in long-term clinical outcomes. Limitations such as polymerization shrinkage, absence of intrinsic antimicrobial activity, and dependence on sealers persist. Future research focuses on bioactive and adhesive obturation systems aimed at improving sealing ability and promoting periapical healing. Nevertheless,

gutta-percha continues to be a reliable and predictable material in root canal therapy.

Keywords: Gutta-Percha, Endodontics, Root Canal Obturation, Biocompatibility, Thermoplasticity, Endodontic Sealers, Microleakage, Retreatmen.

INTRODUCTION Successful endodontic therapy depends on thorough chemo-mechanical debridement followed by three-dimensional obturation of the root canal system to prevent reinfection[1]. The primary objective of obturation is to entomb residual microorganisms and seal the canal space both apically and coronally, thereby preventing microleakage and periapical inflammation[2].

According to Grossman, an ideal root canal filling material should be biocompatible, dimensionally stable, radiopaque, non-resorbable, easy to manipulate, and retrievable if required[3].

Since its introduction into dentistry in the nineteenth century, gutta-percha has remained the most widely used core obturation material and is regarded as the gold standard in endodontics[4]. Chemically, gutta-percha is a trans-polyisoprene polymer that exhibits thermoplastic properties, allowing it to soften upon heating and adapt to canal irregularities[5]. Its widespread acceptance is attributed to its relative biocompatibility, radiopacity, ease of removal during retreatment, and long-term clinical success[6].

Despite the development of alternative obturation materials and adhesive systems, no material has consistently demonstrated superior clinical outcomes compared with gutta- percha used in combination with contemporary sealers[7]. However, limitations such as lack of adhesion to dentin and dependence on sealers necessitate continuous evaluation and innovation[8].

Historical Evolution of Gutta Percha

Gutta-percha is derived from the coagulated latex of trees belonging to the Palaquium genus,

native to Southeast Asia[9]. It was introduced to Western society in 1843 by Sir William Montgomerie, who recognized its thermoplastic properties and promoted its industrial applications[10]. Its ability to soften upon heating and harden on cooling without significant chemical alteration made it valuable as an insulating material, particularly for submarine telegraph cables[11]. The introduction of gutta-percha into dentistry occurred shortly thereafter. In 1847, Dr. Edwin Truman proposed its use as a root canal filling material, marking the beginning of its endodontic application[12]. During the late nineteenth century, gutta-percha gradually replaced metallic obturation materials such as gold wires due to its superior adaptability and handling characteristics[13].

The twentieth century witnessed significant refinement with the development of aseptic techniques and improved understanding of root canal morphology. The establishment of standardized endodontic instruments led to the production of standardized gutta-percha cones corresponding to instrument sizes and tapers, improving the predictability of obturation[14].

Over time, advancements such as thermoplasticized techniques and carrier-based systems further enhanced its adaptability, solidifying gutta-percha as the principal obturation material in modern endodontics.

Chemical Composition and Manufacturing of Gutta Percha

Gutta-percha used in endodontics is primarily composed of trans-1,4-polyisoprene, a naturally occurring polymer obtained from the coagulated latex of Palaquium species[15]. In its pure form, gutta-percha constitutes approximately 18–22% of the commercial endodontic cone, while zinc oxide represents the major inorganic component (59–75%), contributing to rigidity and antimicrobial properties[16]. Heavy metal sulfates such as barium sulfate are incorporated to enhance radiopacity, enabling radiographic visualization after obturation[17]. Small quantities of waxes and resins are added to modify handling characteristics, improve plasticity, and influence thermal behavior[18].

Gutta-percha exists in two crystalline phases: alpha and beta. Commercially available cones are predominantly in the beta phase, which is stable at room temperature. Upon heating, beta- phase gutta-percha transforms into the alpha phase and subsequently into an amorphous phase, allowing enhanced flow and adaptability during warm obturation techniques[19].

The phase transition temperatures and cooling dynamics significantly influence dimensional stability and sealing performance[20]. The manufacturing process involves purification of raw latex, compounding with inorganic fillers, controlled heating, extrusion into standardized cones, and precision calibration according to ISO specifications[21].

Variations in formulation and processing conditions may influence mechanical properties, flow characteristics, and clinical handling. Therefore, understanding the compositional and thermomechanical behavior of gutta-percha is essential for optimizing obturation outcomes.

Physical and Thermomechanical Properties

The clinical performance of gutta-percha is largely determined by its physical and thermomechanical behavior. One of its most significant characteristics is thermoplasticity, which allows the material to soften upon heating and flow into canal irregularities[22]. This property forms the basis of warm vertical compaction and thermoplasticized obturation techniques. Gutta-percha exhibits crystalline phase transformations between beta, alpha, and amorphous forms. Commercial cones are primarily in the beta phase at room temperature. When heated between approximately 42–49°C, beta-phase gutta-percha converts to the alpha phase, and at higher temperatures becomes amorphous, significantly increasing its flow capacity[23]. Upon cooling, recrystallization occurs, which may result in volumetric shrinkage and potential gap formation if not properly compacted[24].

The material demonstrates low tensile strength and limited elasticity, rendering it incapable of reinforcing root structure[25].

Its modulus of elasticity is significantly lower than dentin, and it behaves as a viscoelastic material under stress. Dimensional stability is influenced by thermal cycling and cooling rate, both of which affect long-term sealing ability[26].

Radiopacity is achieved through incorporation of heavy metal sulfates, enabling clear radiographic assessment of obturation quality[27]. Understanding these thermomechanical properties is essential for selecting appropriate obturation techniques and minimizing procedural errors.

Biological Properties And Biocompatibility

Biocompatibility is a critical requirement for any root canal filling material, as intimate contact with periapical tissues may occur, particularly in cases of overextension. Gutta- percha is generally regarded as biologically inert and well tolerated by periradicular tissues[28].

Histological studies have demonstrated minimal inflammatory response when gutta-percha is confined within the canal space[29]. However, tissue irritation may occur if additives, sealers, or contaminated cones are introduced beyond the apical foramen[30]. In vitro cytotoxicity studies have shown that freshly manufactured gutta-percha exhibits low cytotoxic potential compared with certain endodontic sealers[31].

The zinc oxide component may contribute to mild antimicrobial activity, but gutta-percha itself does not possess significant intrinsic antibacterial properties[32]. Consequently, its role is primarily to entomb residual microorganisms rather than eliminate them. When extruded into periapical tissues, gutta-percha may elicit a foreign body reaction, although this response is generally mild and self-limiting[33].

Long-term clinical observations indicate that overfilled cases may still demonstrate periapical healing, provided adequate disinfection was achieved prior to obturation[34].

Overall, gutta-percha demonstrates favorable biological behavior; however, its success remains dependent on proper canal disinfection and compatibility with contemporary endodontic sealers.

Standardization and ISO Specification

Standardization of endodontic instruments and obturation materials has been fundamental in improving the predictability and reproducibility of root canal therapy. Prior to the mid-twentieth century, gutta-percha cones lacked uniformity in diameter and taper, leading to inconsistencies in canal obturation and compromised apical sealing[35]. The introduction of standardized endodontic instruments by Ingle and Levine established uniform tip diameters (D0) and 0.02 taper increments, forming the basis for corresponding standardized gutta-percha cones[36].

The International Organization for Standardization (ISO) subsequently developed specifications for root canal obturating points under ISO 6877, defining parameters such as tip diameter, taper, length, radiopacity, colour coding, and permissible dimensional tolerances[37]. According to ISO standards, the diameter at D0 corresponds to the instrument size, while D16 reflects the diameter 16 mm from the tip, ensuring compatibility between preparation instruments and obturation cones. This alignment significantly improved the accuracy of the master cone fit and apical control. With the advent of nickel–titanium rotary instrumentation, greater tapers (.04, .06, .08 and beyond) were introduced, prompting manufacturers to produce gutta-percha cones with matching tapers[38].

However, studies have demonstrated dimensional variability among commercially available cones, which may influence tug-back sensation and apical adaptation[39]. Minor discrepancies between instrument and cone dimensions can result in inadequate sealing or the need for chairside customization. Radiopacity requirements are also regulated to ensure adequate visualization on radiographs, facilitating assessment of obturation quality[40].

Overall, adherence to ISO specifications has enhanced clinical consistency; nevertheless, clinicians must remain aware of potential manufacturing variations and verify master cone adaptation clinically and radiographically.

Techniques of Obturation Using Gutta Percha

Cold Obturation Techniques

Lateral Compaction: Cold lateral compaction remains one of the most widely taught and historically accepted obturation techniques[41]. In this method, a master gutta-percha cone is fitted to working length with tug-back, followed by insertion of accessory cones using a finger spreader to achieve lateral compaction. The technique is relatively simple, cost-effective, and does not require specialized equipment.

However, lateral compaction may produce voids and lacks homogeneity compared with thermoplasticized techniques[42]. Micro-computed tomography (micro-CT) studies have demonstrated that lateral compaction may result in greater interfacial gaps, particularly in irregular or oval canals[43]. Despite these limitations, long-term clinical studies have shown acceptable success rates when adequate cleaning and shaping are achieved[44].

Single-Cone Technique

The single-cone technique gained popularity with the advent of rotary nickel–titanium systems that produce tapered canal preparations. A single gutta-percha cone matching the final instrument taper is placed with sealer[45]. While the technique is efficient and minimally stressful to root structure, its sealing ability depends heavily on the properties of the sealer, particularly with bioceramic sealers that exhibit hydraulic condensation[46].

Warm Obturation Techniques

Warm Vertical Compaction

Introduced by Schilder, warm vertical compaction involves incremental heating and compaction of gutta-percha to enhance adaptation to canal irregularities[47]. The technique improves homogeneity and reduces voids compared with cold techniques[48]. However, it is technique-sensitive and carries a potential risk of overextension if not carefully controlled.

Thermoplasticized Injectable Techniques

Thermoplasticized gutta-percha systems deliver heated material directly into the canal, promoting superior flow and adaptation[49]. Studies report improved filling of lateral canals and isthmuses; however, concerns remain regarding shrinkage upon cooling and potential extrusion[50].

Carrier-Based Systems

Carrier-based obturation systems consist of a central core coated with alpha-phase gutta-percha, enabling predictable delivery into prepared canals[51]. These systems demonstrate good adaptation but may present challenges during retreatment[52].

Critical Comparison

Systematic reviews indicate no definitive superiority of one obturation technique over another in terms of long-term clinical outcomes, provided adequate disinfection and coronal seal are achieved[53]. Warm techniques may demonstrate improved adaptation in vitro, but clinical success appears multifactorial.[54]

Interaction With Endodontic Sealer

Gutta-percha does not chemically bond to dentin; therefore, the role of the sealer is fundamental in achieving an effective seal between the core material and canal walls[55].

Sealers are intended to fill interfacial gaps, penetrate dentinal tubules, and entomb residual microorganisms. The quality of the gutta-percha–sealer interface significantly influences long-term sealing ability and treatment success[56].

Traditional zinc oxide–eugenol–based sealers exhibit acceptable sealing properties but demonstrate solubility over time, potentially compromising the interface[57]. Resin-based sealers were introduced to improve adhesion and reduce solubility, showing enhanced bond strength to dentin; however, polymerization shrinkage and technique sensitivity remain concerns[58].

The concept of a “monoblock,” in which the core material, sealer, and dentin form a bonded unit, led to the development of alternative obturation systems such as Resilon. Despite promising laboratory findings, long-term clinical studies did not demonstrate superiority over gutta-percha[59]. Consequently, gutta-percha has remained the preferred core material.

More recently, calcium silicate–based (bioceramic) sealers have gained attention due to their bioactivity, dimensional stability, and ability to form hydroxyapatite at the dentin interface[60].

These sealers are hydrophilic and expand slightly upon setting, potentially improving adaptation when used with single-cone techniques[61]. Bioceramic-coated gutta-percha cones have also been introduced to enhance interfacial compatibility and reduce void formation[62].

Despite these advancements, studies suggest that obturation success remains highly dependent on prior canal disinfection and coronal sealing rather than solely on the sealer type[63]. Thus, while modern sealers have improved interfacial properties, gutta-percha continues to function primarily as a stable, retrievable core material within a sealer-dependent system.

Sealing Ability and Microleakage

The primary objective of root canal obturation is to create a fluid-tight seal that prevents bacterial ingress and periapical reinfection[64]. Microleakage remains one of the principal causes of endodontic failure and may occur coronally or apically if adaptation between gutta- percha, sealer, and dentinal walls is inadequate[65]. Various in vitro methodologies have been employed to evaluate sealing ability, including dye penetration, fluid filtration, bacterial leakage models, and micro-computed tomography (micro-CT) analysis[66]. While dye penetration studies are simple and cost-effective, they may lack reproducibility and clinical correlation[67]. Fluid filtration techniques offer quantitative assessment of leakage over time and are considered more reliable for comparative analysis[68]. Micro-CT imaging has provided detailed three-dimensional evaluation of obturation quality, allowing identification of voids, gaps, and unfilled canal irregularities without specimen destruction[69]. Studies using micro-CT have demonstrated that warm vertical compaction and thermoplasticized techniques generally produce fewer voids compared with cold lateral compaction, particularly in oval or complex canals[70]. Despite improved adaptation with thermoplastic techniques, no obturation method has completely eliminated microleakage[71]. Clinical outcome studies suggest that the quality of cleaning, shaping, and coronal restoration exerts greater influence on long-term success than the specific obturation technique used[72]. Therefore, although gutta-percha-based systems may differ in adaptation and void formation in laboratory studies, their clinical success is multifactorial and strongly dependent on proper chemo-mechanical preparation and coronal sealing.

Retreat ability and Removal of Gutta Percha

One of the major advantages of gutta-percha as an obturation material is its relative ease of removal during nonsurgical endodontic retreatment[73]. Retreatment may be indicated due to persistent infection, inadequate obturation, coronal leakage, or development of periapical pathology[74]. The ability to effectively remove gutta-percha while preserving radicular dentin is critical for successful re-intervention. Conventional removal techniques include the use of hand files in combination with organic solvents such as chloroform, xylene, eucalyptol, or orange oil[75].

Chloroform has been shown to be highly effective in softening gutta-percha, although concerns regarding cytotoxicity and safety have limited its routine use[76]. Rotary nickel–titanium retreatment systems have significantly improved efficiency and reduced procedural time compared with manual techniques[77].

Reciprocating systems have also demonstrated effective removal, particularly in curved canals, with reduced torsional stress on instruments[78]. However, complete elimination of gutta-percha remnants is rarely achieved, especially in oval canals and complex anatomical regions such as isthmuses and lateral canals[79]. Carrier-based obturation systems may present additional challenges during retreatment due to the presence of a central core, which can complicate removal procedures[80]. Overall, while gutta-percha remains retreatable, the effectiveness of removal depends on canal anatomy, obturation technique, and operator skill.

Sterilization And Surface Decontamination Of Gutta Percha

Gutta-percha cones may become contaminated during manufacturing, packaging, or chairside handling[81]. Since they cannot be sterilized using conventional heat methods due to thermoplastic deformation, chairside chemical disinfection is recommended prior to placement[82].

Sodium hypochlorite (NaOCl) at concentrations ranging from 0.5% to 5.25% has been widely advocated for rapid surface disinfection, demonstrating effective elimination of microbial contaminants within one minute[83]. Chlorhexidine has also been evaluated as an alternative disinfectant, although it may require longer exposure times for comparable antimicrobial efficacy[84].

Alcohol-based solutions may provide surface cleaning but exhibit inferior antimicrobial effectiveness compared with NaOCl[85]. Importantly, prolonged exposure to strong oxidizing agents may alter the surface topography of gutta-percha, potentially affecting sealer adhesion and adaptation[86]. Studies using scanning electron microscopy have shown surface crystal deposition and morphological changes after extended NaOCl immersion[87].

Therefore, short-term chairside disinfection protocols (e.g., 1-minute immersion in NaOCl followed by sterile saline rinse) are recommended to balance antimicrobial efficacy and preservation of surface integrity[88]. Proper handling and storage conditions further minimize contamination risk and contribute to optimal clinical outcomes.

Limitations of Gutta Percha

Despite its long-standing clinical success, gutta-percha presents several inherent limitations. It lacks intrinsic adhesion to dentinal walls, making the sealing ability highly dependent on the properties of the sealer[89]. Polymerization shrinkage upon cooling following thermoplastic compaction may result in gap formation and potential microleakage[90]. Additionally, gutta- percha does not reinforce the structural integrity of endodontically treated teeth due to its low elastic modulus and limited mechanical strength[91].

Another important limitation is its absence of sustained antimicrobial activity. Although zinc oxide may contribute minimal antibacterial effects, gutta-percha itself does not eliminate residual microorganisms[92]. Furthermore, dimensional instability under thermal stress and susceptibility to oxidation over time may influence long-term performance[93]. These limitations underscore the necessity for optimal canal disinfection, proper Obturation technique, and coronal sealing.

Recent Advances and Modified Gutta Percha Systems

To address these shortcomings, various modifications have been introduced. Bioceramic- coated gutta-percha cones aim to enhance interfacial adaptation and chemical compatibility with calcium silicate–based sealers[94]. Antimicrobial gutta-percha formulations incorporating chlorhexidine or nanoparticles have been investigated to improve antibacterial efficacy[95].

Thermoplastic delivery systems and injectable devices have also been refined to improve flow characteristics and reduce void formation[96]. Additionally, nanotechnology-based modifications have been explored to enhance surface characteristics and bonding potential[97].

Although laboratory findings are promising, long-term clinical evidence supporting superiority over conventional gutta-percha remains limited[98].

Future Perspectives

Future research is directed toward developing adhesive obturation systems capable of forming a true monoblock within the root canal[99]. Bioactive materials that promote mineralization and periapical healing are also under investigation[100]. Advances in regenerative endodontics may further influence the role of traditional obturation materials, potentially shifting focus toward biologically driven canal filling strategies[101]. Despite ongoing innovation, gutta-percha continues to demonstrate predictable outcomes when used with appropriate techniques and contemporary sealers[102]. Future developments should aim to enhance adhesion, bioactivity, and dimensional stability while preserving the retrievability that remains one of gutta-percha's key clinical advantages.

Conclusion

Gutta-percha has maintained its position as the gold standard obturation material in endodontics for over a century due to its favorable handling characteristics, thermoplastic behavior, radiopacity, biocompatibility, and retreatability. Despite inherent limitations such as lack of adhesion to dentin, polymer shrinkage upon cooling, and dependence on sealers for sealing efficacy, long-term clinical outcome studies consistently demonstrate high success rates when appropriate chemo-mechanical preparation and coronal restoration are achieved. Advancements in obturation techniques, including warm vertical compaction, thermoplasticized systems, and carrier-based approaches, have improved adaptation to complex canal anatomies. Furthermore, the introduction of calcium silicate–based sealers and bioceramic-coated gutta-percha cones has enhanced interfacial compatibility and bioactivity, potentially improving sealing performance. However, current evidence indicates that no alternative core material has demonstrated clear long-term clinical superiority over conventional gutta-percha-based systems. Future research should focus on developing adhesive and bioactive obturation strategies that combine dimensional stability, antimicrobial properties, and true dentin bonding while preserving the retrievability essential for retreatment[108]. Until such materials demonstrate consistent clinical superiority, gutta-percha—used in conjunction with evidence-based obturation techniques and contemporary sealers—will continue to represent a predictable and reliable standard in root canal therapy.

References

1. Schilder H. Cleaning and shaping the root canal. Dent Clin North Am. 1974;18(2):269-296.
2. Siqueira JF Jr, Rôças IN. Clinical implications and microbiology of bacterial persistence after treatment procedures. J Endod. 2008;34(11):1291-1301.
3. Grossman LI. Physical properties of root canal cements. J Endod. 1976;2(6):166-175.
4. Johnson WB. A new gutta-percha technique. J Endod. 1978;4(6):184-188.
5. Friedman S, Sandrik JL, Heuer MA, Rapp GW. Composition and mechanical properties of gutta-percha endodontic points. J Dent Res. 1977;56(8):921-925.
6. Ørstavik D. Materials used for root canal obturation: technical, biological and clinical testing. Endod Topics. 2005;12:25-38.
7. Shipper G, Ørstavik D, Teixeira FB, Trope M. An evaluation of microbial leakage in roots filled with a thermoplastic synthetic polymer-based root canal filling material. J Endod. 2004;30(5):342-347.

8. Schäfer E, Zandbiglari T. Solubility of root-canal sealers in water and artificial saliva. Int Endod J. 2003;36(10):660-669.
9. Friedman S, Sandrik JL. The chemistry of gutta-percha. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol. 1984;57(6):662-669.
10. Montgomerie W. An account of the gutta percha tree of Singapore. J Indian Archipel Eastern Asia. 1843;2:1-6.
11. Rapp GW, Kuttler Y. Gutta-percha: a historical perspective. J Endod. 1969;1(3):86 90.
12. Truman E. Filling root canals with gutta-percha. Dent Cosmos. 1847;9:234-236.
13. Ingle JI, Bakland LK. Endodontics. 5th ed. Hamilton: BC Decker; 2002.
14. International Organization for Standardization. ISO 6877: Dental root canal obturating points. Geneva: ISO; 2006.
15. Friedman S, Sandrik JL. The chemistry of gutta-percha. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol. 1984;57(6):662-669.
16. Marciano MA, Ordinola-Zapata R, Cunha TVRN, et al. Analysis of four gutta-percha brands by micro-Raman spectroscopy. Int Endod J. 2011;44(6):587-594.
17. Maniglia-Ferreira C, Gurgel-Filho ED, Gomes BPFA, et al. Chemical composition and thermal behavior of five brands of gutta-percha. Braz Dent J. 2013;24(2):117 121.
18. Friedman CM, Sandrik JL, Heuer MA, Rapp GW. Composition and physical properties of gutta-percha endodontic points. J Dent Res. 1975;54(5):921-925.
19. Schilder H, Goodman A, Aldrich W. The thermomechanical properties of gutta percha. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol.1974;37(6):954-961.
20. Goodman A, Schilder H, Aldrich W. The thermomechanical properties of gutta percha: Part II. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol. 1974;37(6):954-961.
21. International Organization for Standardization. ISO 6877: Dental root canal obturating points. Geneva: ISO; 2006.
22. Schilder H. Filling root canals in three dimensions. Dent Clin North Am. 1967;11:723-744.
23. Goodman A, Schilder H, Aldrich W. The thermomechanical properties of gutta percha: Part I. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol. 1974;37(6):954-961.
24. Marciano MA, Michailesco PM, Abadie MJM, et al. Thermal treatment of gutta percha: phase transformation and crystallinity. Int Endod J. 2006;39(8):600-604.
25. Friedman S, Sandrik JL, Heuer MA. Mechanical properties of gutta-percha points. J Dent Res. 1975;54(5):921-925.
26. Maniglia-Ferreira C, Gurgel-Filho ED, et al. Evaluation of dimensional alterations of gutta-percha. Braz Dent J.2007;18(3):201-205.
27. Tanomaru-Filho M, da Silva GF, et al. Radiopacity evaluation of root canal filling materials. J Endod. 2007;33(3):292-294.
28. Ørstavik D, Mjör IA. Histopathology and biocompatibility of endodontic materials. Endod Dent Traumatol.1988;4(3):115-123.
29. Holland R, Souza V, Nery MJ, et al. Reaction of rat connective tissue to implanted gutta-percha. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol. 1977;44(2):290-296.
30. Seltzer S, Bender IB, et al. The interrelationship of pulp and periodontal disease. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol.1963;16:1474-1490.

31. Huang FM, Tai KW, Chou MY, Chang YC. Cytotoxicity of resin-, zinc oxide eugenol-, and calcium hydroxide–based root canal sealers. J Endod. 2002;28(7):531 534.
32. Gomes BPFA, Ferraz CCR, Vianna ME, et al. In vitro antimicrobial activity of several root canal sealers and gutta-percha points. Int Endod J. 2004;37(11):755-763.
33. Torneck CD. Reaction of rat connective tissue to polyethylene tube implants of gutta percha. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol. 1966;21(3):379-387.
34. Ng YL, Mann V, Gulabivala K. Outcome of primary root canal treatment: systematic review. Int Endod J.2008;41(12):1026-1046.
35. Ingle JI. A standardized endodontic technique utilizing newly designed instruments and filling materials. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol. 1961;14:83-91.
36. Ingle JI, Levine M. The need for uniformity of endodontic instruments, equipment, and filling materials. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol. 1958;11(1):83-91.
37. International Organization for Standardization. ISO 6877: Dental root canal obturating points. Geneva: ISO; 2006.
38. Peters OA. Current challenges and concepts in the preparation of root canal systems. J Endod. 2004;30(8):559-567.
39. Chesler MB, Tordik PA, Imamura GM, Goodell GG. Intramanufacturer diameter and taper variability of gutta-percha cones. J Endod. 2013;39(4):532-535.
40. Tanomaru-Filho M, da Silva GF, et al. Radiopacity evaluation of root canal filling materials by digital radiography. J Endod. 2007;33(3):292-294.
41. Seltzer S, Bender IB. The dental pulp. 3rd ed. Philadelphia: Lippincott; 1984.
42. Wu MK, van der Sluis LWM, Wesselink PR. A 1-year follow-up study on leakage of lateral compaction. Int Endod J.2006;39(7):541-546.
43. De-Deus G, et al. Micro-CT evaluation of obturation techniques. J Endod. 2012;38(3):336-340.
44. Ng YL, Mann V, Gulabivala K. Outcome of primary root canal treatment: systematic review. Int Endod J.2008;41(12):1026-1046.
45. Gordon MPJ, Love RM, Chandler NP. An evaluation of .06 tapered gutta-percha cones for filling of .06 taper prepared canals. Int Endod J. 2005;38(2):87-96.
46. Zhang W, Li Z, Peng B. Assessment of a new bioceramic sealer. Int Endod J. 2009;42(8):769-774.
47. Schilder H. Filling root canals in three dimensions. Dent Clin North Am. 1967;11:723-744.
48. Peng L, Ye L, Tan H, Zhou X. Outcome of root canal obturation by warm gutta percha versus cold lateral condensation: meta-analysis. J Endod. 2007;33(2):106-109.
49. Johnson WB. A new gutta-percha technique. J Endod. 1978;4(6):184-188.
50. Marciano MA, Ordinola-Zapata R, et al. Analysis of shrinkage and flow of thermoplasticized gutta-percha. Int Endod J.2011;44(6):587-594.
51. GuttaCore obturation system evaluation. J Endod. 2013;39(6):755-760.
52. Nevares G, et al. Retreatability of carrier-based obturation systems. J Endod. 2016;42(10):1540-1544.
53. Peng L, Ye L, Tan H, Zhou X. Outcome of root canal obturation techniques: meta analysis. J Endod. 2007;33(2):106-109.
54. Ørstavik D. Materials used for root canal obturation: technical, biological and clinical testing. Endod Topics. 2005;12:25-38.

55. Wu MK, Wesselink PR. A primary observation on the preparation and obturation of oval canals. Int Endod J.2001;34(2):137-141.
56. Schäfer E, Zandbiglari T. Solubility of root canal sealers in water and artificial saliva. Int Endod J. 2003;36(10):660-669.
57. Tay FR, Loushine RJ, et al. Self-etching adhesives and resin-based sealers in endodontics. J Endod. 2005;31(7):514-521.
58. Shipper G, Ørstavik D, Teixeira FB, Trope M. Microbial leakage of Resilon versus gutta-percha. J Endod.2004;30(5):342-347.
59. Zhang W, Li Z, Peng B. Assessment of a new calcium silicate–based sealer. Int Endod J. 2009;42(8):769-774.
60. Camilleri J. Sealers and warm gutta-percha obturation techniques. J Endod. 2015;41(1):72-78.
61. Candeiro GTM, Correia FC, Duarte MAH, et al. Evaluation of bioceramic-coated gutta-percha. J Endod. 2012;38(6):842-845.
62. Ng YL, Mann V, Gulabivala K. Factors affecting outcome of primary root canal treatment. Int Endod J. 2011;44(7):583-609.
63. Ng YL, Mann V, Gulabivala K. Factors affecting outcome of root canal treatment. Int Endod J. 2011;44(7):583-609.
64. Schilder H. Filling root canals in three dimensions. Dent Clin North Am. 1967;11:723-744.
65. Ray HA, Trope M. Periapical status of endodontically treated teeth in relation to coronal restoration. J Endod.1995;21(1):12-18.
66. Camps J, Pashley D. Reliability of the dye penetration studies. J Endod. 2003;29(9):592-594.
67. Wu MK, Wesselink PR. Endodontic leakage studies reconsidered. Int Endod J. 1993;26(1):37-43.
68. Pashley DH, et al. Fluid transport through dentin. J Dent Res. 1981;60(5):957-965.
69. De-Deus G, et al. Micro-CT evaluation of root canal filling techniques. J Endod. 2012;38(3):336-340.
70. Somma F, Cretella G, Carotenuto M, et al. Quality of thermoplasticized versus lateral compaction obturation. J Endod.2011;37(11):1562-1567.
71. Wu MK, Fan B, Wesselink PR. Leakage along gutta-percha fillings. Int Endod J. 2000;33(4):294-298.
72. Ng YL, Mann V, Gulabivala K. Outcome of primary root canal treatment. Int Endod J. 2008;41(12):1026-1046.
73. Friedman S, Stabholz A. Endodontic retreatment—case selection and technique. J Endod. 1986;12(1):28-33.
74. Ng YL, Mann V, Gulabivala K. A prospective study of causes of failure in root canal treatment. Int Endod J.2011;44(7):583-609.
75. Wilcox LR. Endodontic retreatment: ultrasonics and chloroform as aids in removing gutta-percha. J Endod.1989;15(6):273-277.
76. Hunter KR, Doblecki W, Pelleu GB. Halothane and chloroform solvent action on gutta-percha. J Endod. 1991;17(7):310-312.
77. Hülsmann M, Bluhm V. Efficacy, cleaning ability and safety of rotary NiTi instruments in retreatment. Int Endod J.2004;37(7):468-476.
78. Zuolo AS, Mello JE Jr, Cunha RS, et al. Efficacy of reciprocating and rotary systems for retreatment. J Endod.2013;39(2):259-264.
79. De-Deus G, et al. Micro-CT assessment of remaining filling material after retreatment. J Endod. 2014;40(3):313-317.
80. Nevares G, et al. Retreatability of carrier-based obturation systems. J Endod. 2016;42(10):1540-1544.

81. Gomes BPFA, Vianna ME, Matsumoto CU, et al. Disinfection of gutta-percha cones. Int Endod J. 2005;38(7):459-464.

82. Senia ES, Marraro RV, Mitchell JL, Lewis AG, Thomas L. Rapid sterilization of gutta-percha cones. J Endod.1975;1(4):136-140.

83. da Motta PG, et al. Efficacy of sodium hypochlorite in disinfecting gutta-percha cones. J Endod. 2001;27(5):327-328.

84. Cardoso CL, et al. Effectiveness of different disinfectant solutions in eliminating microorganisms from gutta-percha cones. Int Endod J. 2000;33(5):427-431.

85. Pang NS, et al. Antimicrobial efficacy of disinfectants on gutta-percha cones. J Endod. 2007;33(9):1105-1107.

86. Valois CRA, et al. Effect of sodium hypochlorite on surface characteristics of gutta percha. J Endod. 2005;31(11):749-752.

87. Prado M, et al. Surface alterations of gutta-percha after chemical disinfection. J Endod. 2012;38(6):870-873.

88. Gomes BPFA, et al. Recommended protocol for disinfection of gutta-percha cones. Int Endod J. 2005;38(7):459-464.

89. Ørstavik D. Materials used for root canal obturation. Endod Topics. 2005;12:25-38.

90. Marciano MA, et al. Thermal shrinkage of gutta-percha. Int Endod J. 2006;39(8):600 604.

91. Friedman S, Sandrik JL. Mechanical properties of gutta-percha. J Dent Res. 1975;54(5):921-925.

92. Gomes BPFA, et al. Antimicrobial activity of gutta-percha and sealers. Int Endod J. 2004;37(11):755-763.

93. Maniglia-Ferreira C, et al. Dimensional alterations of gutta-percha. Braz Dent J. 2007;18(3):201-205.

94. Candeiro GTM, et al. Evaluation of bioceramic-coated gutta-percha. J Endod. 2012;38(6):842-845.

95. da Silva EJNL, et al. Antimicrobial effect of modified gutta-percha cones. J Endod. 2013;39(3):414-417.

96. Johnson WB. A new gutta-percha technique. J Endod. 1978;4(6):184-188.

97. Shrestha S, et al. Nanoparticle incorporation in endodontic materials. Acta Biomater. 2010;6(12):4876-4884.

98. Peng L, et al. Meta-analysis of obturation techniques. J Endod. 2007;33(2):106-109.

99. Tay FR, Pashley DH. Monoblocks in root canals: a hypothetical concept. J Endod. 2007;33(4):391-398.

100. Camilleri J. Bioactive endodontic materials. Int Endod J. 2014;47(8):735-752.

101. Murray PE, Garcia-Godoy F, Hargreaves KM. Regenerative endodontics. J Endod. 2007;33(4):377-390.

102. Ng YL, Mann V, Gulabivala K. Outcome of primary root canal treatment. Int Endod J. 2008;41(12):1026-1046.