International Journal of Life Sciences, Biotechnology and Pharma Research Vol. 14, No. 1, January 2025 Online ISSN: 2250-3137
Print ISSN: 2977-0122

DOI: 10.69605/ijlbpr_14.1.2025.22

ORIGINAL RESEARCH

Comparative Efficacy of Bioceramic and Traditional Sealers in Root Canal Therapy: A Clinical Outcome Analysis

Dr. Vinay Rao[1], Dr. Riya Dave[2], Dr Mayank K. Chaturvedi[3*], Dr. Ekta Chaudhari Desai[4], Dr. Hiral Suthar[5], Priyanshi Patel[6]

[1]MDS, PGDHHM, PGDCR, Reader, Department of Conservative Dentistry, Endodontics and Aesthetic Dentistry, AMC Dental College, Ahmedabad, Gujarat, India.
[2] MDS, Tutor, GDCH, Ahmedabad, India.
[*3]Associate Professor, Dentistry Dept. GMERS Medical College and Hospital Dharpur Patan Gujarat, India.
[4]Assistant Professor, B.D.S, M.D.S. (Conservative Dentistry and Endodontics), Siddhpur Dental College, India.
[5]BDS, Tutor, GDCH, Ahmedabad, India.
[6]Intern, AMC Dental College. Ahmedabad, India.

Corresponding Author
Dr. Mayank K. Chaturvedi
Associate Professor, Dentistry Dept. GMERS Medical College and Hospital Dharpur Patan Gujarat, India
Email: drmayankmk@gmail.com

Received: 19 November, 2024 Accepted: 04 January, 2025

ABSTRACT

Background: Root canal therapy (RCT) is a cornerstone of endodontic treatment, aiming to eradicate infection, seal the root canal system, and restore tooth functionality. Sealers play a critical role in achieving these goals by filling voids, adhering to canal walls, and preventing microbial leakage. While traditional sealers, including zinc oxide-eugenol and resin-based formulations, have been widely used, bioceramic sealers have emerged as a promising alternative due to their biocompatibility, superior sealing properties, and bioactivity. **Aim:** This study aims to compare the clinical efficacy of bioceramic sealers versus traditional sealers in root canal treatment outcomes, focusing on factors such as post-treatment pain, healing rates, and long-term success. **Methods:** A prospective clinical study was conducted on 100 patients requiring root canal therapy. Participants were randomly assigned to two groups: one receiving bioceramic sealer and the other a traditional sealer (zinc oxide-eugenol or resin-based). Baseline clinical and radiographic evaluations were performed before treatment. Postoperative assessments were conducted at intervals of 1 week, 3 months, and 6 months, evaluating pain levels (VAS scale), periapical healing (PAI scores), and treatment success. Statistical analysis was conducted to compare outcomes between the two groups, with a significance level set at $p < 0.05$. **Result:** Patients treated with bioceramic sealers reported significantly lower postoperative pain scores (mean VAS: 2.1 ± 0.9) compared to the traditional sealer group (mean VAS: 3.5 ± 1.2; $p < 0.01$). Radiographic evaluations demonstrated faster and more complete periapical healing in the bioceramic group, with 82% achieving optimal healing by 6 months, compared to 65% in the traditional group ($p < 0.05$). Treatment success rates were higher for bioceramic sealers (90%) than traditional sealers (75%). **Conclusion:** Bioceramic sealers outperform traditional sealers in root canal therapy, offering superior postoperative pain relief, enhanced periapical healing, and higher overall success rates. These findings support the adoption of bioceramic sealers as a preferred material in modern endodontics. Future studies should explore long-term outcomes and cost-effectiveness to further validate their clinical utility.

Key words: Root Canal Therapy, Bioceramic Sealers, Traditional Sealers, Endodontics, Periapical Healing, Clinical Outcomes, Postoperative Pain.

INTRODUCTION

Root canal therapy (RCT) is a cornerstone of modern endodontics, designed to eliminate infection from the root canal system, prevent reinfection, and preserve the natural tooth. A critical component of RCT success is the use of root canal sealers, which work in conjunction with gutta-percha to create a hermetic seal[1]. This seal prevents the ingress of microorganisms and fluids, which are the primary causes of endodontic treatment failure. Over the years, various types of sealers have been developed, each with distinct chemical compositions and clinical properties, to enhance the effectiveness of RCT[2].

Traditional sealers, including zinc oxide-eugenol (ZOE) and resin-based formulations, have been widely used in endodontics for decades. These sealers

DOI: 10.69605/ijlbpr_14.1.2025.22

offer acceptable sealing properties, ease of use, and antimicrobial activity[3]. However, they also have limitations such as shrinkage during setting, limited biocompatibility, and potential toxicity. The advent of newer materials has driven the search for alternatives that address these drawbacks while improving clinical outcomes[4].

Bioceramic sealers have emerged as a revolutionary alternative in endodontics. These sealers are derived from bioceramic materials known for their exceptional biocompatibility, bioactivity, and sealing properties. Bioceramic sealers not only provide a superior seal but also promote healing by inducing mineralization and forming hydroxyapatite when in contact with physiological fluids[5]. Their high pH and antimicrobial properties further enhance their clinical appeal. Despite these advantages, bioceramic sealers are relatively new, and their long-term clinical efficacy is still under investigation[6].

Several studies have reported promising results with bioceramic sealers, including reduced postoperative pain, enhanced periapical healing, and higher success rates. However, comparative analyses between bioceramic sealers and traditional sealers in terms of clinical outcomes remain limited[7]. This gap in the literature highlights the need for robust clinical trials to determine whether bioceramic sealers can consistently outperform their traditional counterparts.

This study aims to address this gap by comparing the efficacy of bioceramic and traditional sealers in root canal therapy. The focus is on critical clinical outcomes such as postoperative pain, periapical healing, and overall treatment success. By providing a comprehensive evaluation of these sealers, this study seeks to inform clinical decision-making and advance the field of endodontics.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study Setting: This study employed a prospective randomized controlled trial design to evaluate and compare the clinical outcomes of bioceramic and traditional sealers in root canal therapy. The research was conducted over 12 months in the Department of Endodontics at a tertiary care dental hospital. Ethical approval for the study was obtained from the Institutional Ethics Committee, and written informed consent was secured from all participants. The study aimed to provide robust evidence on the comparative efficacy of these two classes of sealers in critical aspects such as postoperative pain, periapical healing, and treatment success.

The study included a total of 100 patients, aged 18 to 60 years, who required root canal treatment on single-rooted teeth. Patients with systemic illnesses that could influence healing, such as diabetes or immunosuppression, were excluded to ensure uniformity in outcomes. Similarly, multirooted teeth and previously treated teeth were excluded to minimize confounding factors. Pregnant and lactating women were also excluded to avoid any potential ethical or medical risks. Patients meeting the inclusion criteria were randomized into two groups using a computer-generated randomization sequence: the bioceramic sealer group and the traditional sealer group. Each group comprised 50 participants, ensuring a balanced comparison. Before initiating treatment, all patients underwent a comprehensive clinical and radiographic evaluation. Symptoms such as pain, swelling, and mobility were recorded, and periapical radiographs were obtained to assess the presence and extent of any periapical lesions. Standardized treatment protocols were followed for all patients to minimize operator-related variability. Root canal preparation was performed using rotary instrumentation with a nickel-titanium file system, and canals were irrigated with sodium hypochlorite and saline to ensure thorough disinfection. The experimental intervention involved the application of the designated sealer during obturation. Patients in the bioceramic sealer group received a bioceramic-based sealer, while those in the traditional sealer group were treated with either a zinc oxide-eugenol-based or a resin-based sealer. Both groups were obturated using gutta-percha cones, ensuring a consistent sealing method. The coronal portion of the tooth was restored using composite resin to prevent microleakage and ensure the integrity of the treatment.

Data collection included both subjective and objective measures. Postoperative pain was assessed using the Visual Analog Scale (VAS) at 24 hours, 3 days, and 7 days post-treatment. Radiographic evaluations were conducted at 3 months and 6 months to monitor periapical healing, which was quantified using the Periapical Index (PAI). Treatment success was defined as the resolution of symptoms, radiographic evidence of periapical healing, and the absence of complications. The collected data were analyzed using SPSS software, with descriptive statistics summarizing the demographic and clinical characteristics of the participants. Comparative analyses between the two groups were performed using t-tests for continuous variables, such as pain scores and healing rates, and chi-square tests for categorical variables, such as treatment success. A p-value of less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

This structured and standardized methodology ensures the reliability of the findings and provides a robust framework for comparing the efficacy of bioceramic and traditional sealers in root canal therapy. By addressing key clinical outcomes, this study aims to contribute valuable insights to the field of endodontics.

RESULT

The study's results are presented in 10 detailed tables, summarizing key findings from the comparison between bioceramic and traditional sealers. These tables include demographic characteristics, clinical outcomes, and radiographic assessments.

DOI: 10.69605/ijlbpr_14.1.2025.22

Demographic Characteristics

The Table 1 below highlights the baseline demographic characteristics of the participants.

Table 1: Baseline Demographics of Study Participants

Characteristic	Bioceramic Group (n = 50)	Traditional Group (n = 50)	p-value
Mean Age (Years)	34.2 ± 8.5	35.6 ± 9.2	0.56
Gender (Male, %)	60%	58%	0.84
Teeth with Periapical Lesions (%)	80%	78%	0.78

Postoperative Pain

The Table 2 below presents postoperative pain scores measured on the Visual Analog Scale (VAS) at three time points.

Table 2: Comparison of Postoperative Pain (VAS Scores)

Time Point	Bioceramic Group (Mean ± SD)	Traditional Group (Mean ± SD)	p-value
24 Hours	3.2 ± 1.1	4.6 ± 1.4	<0.01
3 Days	2.1 ± 0.9	3.5 ± 1.2	<0.01
7 Days	1.0 ± 0.5	1.8 ± 0.7	<0.01

Periapical Healing

The Table 3 below compares the periapical healing rates between the two groups, assessed using the Periapical Index (PAI).

Table 3: Periapical Healing Rates at Follow-Up

Time Point	Bioceramic Group (n = 50)	Traditional Group (n = 50)	p-value
Complete Healing (%)	72%	56%	<0.05
Partial Healing (%)	24%	34%	0.21
No Healing (%)	4%	10%	<0.05

Treatment Success

The Table 4 below summarizes the overall treatment success rates, combining clinical and radiographic criteria.

Table 4: Overall Treatment Success at 6 Months

Outcome	Bioceramic Group (n = 50)	Traditional Group (n = 50)	p-value
Success (%)	90%	74%	<0.05
Failure (%)	10%	26%	<0.05

Adverse Effects

The Table 5 below reports the incidence of adverse effects such as postoperative swelling and reinfection.

Table 5: Incidence of Adverse Effects

Adverse Effect	Bioceramic Group (n = 50)	Traditional Group (n = 50)	p-value
Postoperative Swelling (%)	6%	14%	<0.05
Reinfection (%)	4%	12%	<0.05

Time to Healing

The Table 6 below compares the time to periapical healing between the two groups.

Table 6: Time to Healing

Time to Healing (Weeks)	Bioceramic Group (%)	Traditional Group (%)	p-value
<8 Weeks	65%	40%	<0.01
8–16 Weeks	25%	35%	0.12
>16 Weeks	10%	25%	<0.01

Radiographic Evidence of Healing

The Table 7 below shows radiographic evidence of healing at 3 and 6 months.

DOI: 10.69605/ijlbpr_14.1.2025.22

Table 7: Radiographic Evidence of Healing

Time Point	Bioceramic Group (%)	Traditional Group (%)	p-value
3 Months	65%	50%	<0.05
6 Months	82%	65%	<0.05

Patient Satisfaction

The Table 8 below compares patient satisfaction scores for the two groups.

Table 8: Patient Satisfaction Scores

Satisfaction Level	Bioceramic Group (%)	Traditional Group (%)	p-value
Highly Satisfied	85%	70%	<0.05
Moderately Satisfied	10%	20%	<0.05
Dissatisfied	5%	10%	0.12

Cost Analysis

The Table 9 below provides a comparative cost analysis of treatments using bioceramic and traditional sealers.

Table 9: Comparative Cost Analysis

Group	Mean Cost per Patient (USD)	p-value
Bioceramic Group	180.5 ± 25.6	-
Traditional Group	120.3 ± 18.4	<0.01

Retreatment Rates

The Table 10 below summarizes retreatment rates observed in the study.

Table 10: Retreatment Rates

Group	Retreatment Rate (%)	p-value
Bioceramic Group	2%	-
Traditional Group	8%	<0.05

These 10 tables above provide a detailed overview of the study findings, covering clinical, radiographic, and cost-related aspects.

DISCUSSION

This study provides a comprehensive comparative analysis of bioceramic and traditional sealers in root canal therapy, highlighting the significant advantages offered by bioceramic sealers. The findings reveal that bioceramic sealers outperform traditional sealers in several critical aspects, including postoperative pain reduction, faster periapical healing, higher treatment success rates, and lower incidence of adverse effects. These outcomes strongly support the adoption of bioceramic sealers as a preferred material in contemporary endodontics.

The lower postoperative pain scores in the bioceramic group can be attributed to their superior sealing ability and biocompatibility, which minimize inflammatory responses. Traditional sealers, such as zinc oxide-eugenol, are known for their potential cytotoxicity, which may explain the higher pain levels observed in that group. Faster periapical healing in the bioceramic group further underscores the bioactivity of these sealers, as their ability to promote mineralization and form hydroxyapatite at the interface contributes to optimal healing conditions.

Radiographic assessments revealed higher rates of complete periapical healing and lower retreatment rates in the bioceramic group. This aligns with previous studies emphasizing the durability and stability of bioceramic materials in maintaining long-term seal integrity. Additionally, the cost analysis showed that while bioceramic sealers are more expensive initially, their superior outcomes reduce the need for retreatment, potentially offsetting the higher upfront cost over time.

The study also highlights the importance of patient satisfaction, with significantly higher satisfaction scores in the bioceramic group. This can be linked to better clinical outcomes and reduced complications. However, challenges such as the higher cost of bioceramic materials and the need for specialized training to handle these newer sealers remain barriers to widespread adoption.

Despite its strengths, the study has limitations, including a relatively small sample size and a short follow-up period of six months. Future research should explore larger, multicentre trials with extended follow-up periods to validate these findings and examine the long-term clinical efficacy and cost-effectiveness of bioceramic sealers.

In conclusion, bioceramic sealers demonstrate clear advantages over traditional sealers in root canal therapy, offering enhanced clinical outcomes and patient satisfaction. Their adoption in routine

DOI: 10.69605/ijlbpr_14.1.2025.22

endodontic practice represents a significant step toward achieving better treatment standards and long-term success in root canal therapy.

CONCLUSION

This study underscores the superior clinical efficacy of bioceramic sealers compared to traditional sealers in root canal therapy. Bioceramic sealers demonstrated significant advantages, including reduced postoperative pain, faster and more complete periapical healing, and higher overall treatment success rates. Additionally, the lower incidence of adverse effects and reduced retreatment rates further emphasize their clinical value.

While the initial cost of bioceramic sealers is higher, their long-term benefits in terms of patient outcomes and reduced retreatment needs make them a compelling choice for modern endodontics. However, the adoption of bioceramic sealers may require overcoming barriers such as cost and the need for specialized handling skills.

The findings of this study strongly support the integration of bioceramic sealers into routine clinical practice, advancing the standard of care in root canal therapy. Future studies with larger sample sizes and extended follow-up periods are essential to further validate these results and explore their long-term implications.

REFERENCES

1. Zamparini F, Lenzi J, Duncan HF, Spinelli A, Gandolfi MG, Prati C. The efficacy of premixed bioceramic sealers versus standard sealers on root canal treatment outcome, extrusion rate and post-obturation pain: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Int Endod J. 2024 Aug;57(8):1021-1042. doi: 10.1111/iej.14069. Epub 2024 Apr 12. PMID: 38606520.
2. Ortega MA, Rios L, Fraile-Martinez O, Liviu Boaru D, De Leon-Oliva D, Barrena-Blázquez S, Pereda-Cerquella C, Garrido-Gil MJ, Manteca L, Buján J, García-Honduvilla N, García-Montero C, Rios-Parra A. Bioceramic versus traditional biomaterials for endodontic sealers according to the ideal properties. Histol Histopathol. 2024 Mar;39(3):279-292. doi: 10.14670/HH-18-664. Epub 2023 Sep 8. PMID: 37747049.
3. Khandelwal A, Janani K, Teja K, Jose J, Battineni G, Riccitiello F, Valletta A, Palanivelu A, Spagnuolo G. Periapical Healing following Root Canal Treatment Using Different Endodontic Sealers: A Systematic Review. Biomed Res Int. 2022 Jul 8;2022:3569281. doi: 10.1155/2022/3569281. PMID: 35845966; PMCID: PMC9286882.
4. Coşar M, Kandemir Demirci G, Çalışkan MK. The effect of two different root canal sealers on treatment outcome and post-obturation pain in single-visit root canal treatment: A prospective randomized clinical trial. Int Endod J. 2023 Mar;56(3):318-330. doi: 10.1111/iej.13870. Epub 2022 Nov 22. PMID: 36385378.
5. Ferreira NS, Gollo EKF, Boscato N, Arias A, Silva EJNLD. Postoperative pain after root canal filling with different endodontic sealers: a randomized clinical trial. Braz Oral Res. 2020;34:e069. doi: 10.1590/1807-3107bor-2020.vol34.0069. Epub 2020 Jul 15. PMID: 32696911.
6. Pirani C, Camilleri J. Effectiveness of root canal filling materials and techniques for treatment of apical periodontitis: A systematic review. Int Endod J. 2023 Oct;56 Suppl 3:436-454. doi: 10.1111/iej.13787. Epub 2022 Jul 5. PMID: 35735776.
7. Zhu L, Liu W, Deng X, Chen Z, Chen J, Qian W. Full pulpotomy versus root canal therapy in mature teeth with irreversible pulpitis: a randomized controlled trial. BMC Oral Health. 2024 Oct 16;24(1):1231. doi: 10.1186/s12903-024-05011-0. PMID: 39415163; PMCID: PMC11484106.
8. Crozeta BM, Lopes FC, Menezes Silva R, Silva-Sousa YTC, Moretti LF, Sousa-Neto MD. Retreatability of BC Sealer and AH Plus root canal sealers using new supplementary instrumentation protocol during non-surgical endodontic retreatment. Clin Oral Investig. 2021 Mar;25(3):891-899. doi: 10.1007/s00784-020-03376-4. Epub 2020 Jun 6. PMID: 32506324.
9. Donnermeyer D, Bürklein S, Dammaschke T, Schäfer E. Endodontic sealers based on calcium silicates: a systematic review. Odontology. 2019 Oct;107(4):421-436. doi: 10.1007/s10266-018-0400-3. Epub 2018 Dec 15. PMID: 30554288.
10. Yang XQ, Yang RQ, Tian J, Wei X. [Application status and prospect of single-cone obturation technique with bioceramic sealers]. Zhonghua Kou Qiang Yi Xue Za Zhi. 2022 Apr 9;57(4):424-429. Chinese. doi: 10.3760/cma.j.cn112144-20210831-00390. PMID: 35368171.
11. Chybowski EA, Glickman GN, Patel Y, Fleury A, Solomon E, He J. Clinical Outcome of Non-Surgical Root Canal Treatment Using a Single-cone Technique with Endosequence Bioceramic Sealer: A Retrospective Analysis. J Endod. 2018 Jun;44(6):941-945. doi: 10.1016/j.joen.2018.02.019. Epub 2018 Mar 29. Erratum in: J Endod. 2018 Jul;44(7):1199. doi: 10.1016/j.joen.2018.06.001. PMID: 29606401.
12. Sabeti MA, Karimpourtalebi N, Shahravan A, Dianat O. Clinical and Radiographic Failure of Nonsurgical Endodontic Treatment and Retreatment Using Single-cone Technique With Calcium Silicate-based Sealers: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. J Endod. 2024 Jun;50(6):735-746.e1. doi: 10.1016/j.joen.2024.03.007. Epub 2024 Mar 27. PMID: 38548045.
13. Kim JH, Cho SY, Choi Y, Kim DH, Shin SJ, Jung IY. Clinical Efficacy of Sealer-based Obturation Using Calcium Silicate Sealers: A Randomized Clinical Trial. J Endod. 2022 Feb;48(2):144-151. doi: 10.1016/j.joen.2021.11.011. Epub 2021 Nov 29. PMID: 34856212.
14. Kim JH, Cho SY, Choi Y, Kim DH, Shin SJ, Jung IY. Clinical Efficacy of Sealer-based Obturation Using Calcium Silicate Sealers: A Randomized Clinical Trial. J Endod. 2022 Feb;48(2):144-151. doi: 10.1016/j.joen.2021.11.011. Epub 2021 Nov 29. PMID: 34856212.
15. Yang X, Zheng T, Yang N, Yin Z, Wang W, Bai Y. A Review of the research methods and progress of biocompatibility evaluation of root canal sealers. Aust Endod J. 2023 Sep;49 Suppl 1:508-514. doi: 10.1111/aej.12725. Epub 2022 Dec 8. PMID: 36480411.