Predictors of Root Canal Treatment Outcomes in Patients with Apical Periodontitis

Ashwag Siddik Noor Saeed[1], Muntadar Abdulhadi Alhaidar[2], AlMutasimBilla Ahmed Khawjah[3], Murooj Ahmed Mudeer[4], Abdullah sitr eid Aljuaid[5], Abdullah Rasheed Alanazi[6], Waleed Ghazi Al-Sh Arari[7], Jehan abdulwahab zakzouk[8], Ola Ali Alghorayed[9], Jawharah Jamil Alghmdi[10], Bader Ashaq Alotaibi[11]

[1]Consultant Restorative Dentist, King Abdulaziz Medical City, King Khalid Hospital, National Guard, Saudi Arabia, Email: ashsns@hotmail.com
[2]General dentist, Qatif Central Hospital, Eastern Province, Qatif, Saudi Arabia, Email: muntadar1982@gmail.com
[3]General Dentist, Primary Healthcare, Madinah, Saudi Arabia, Email: Dr.makhoja@gmail.com
[4]General dentist, King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia, Email: M-mudeer@hotmail.com
[5]Dentist, Alhindawiya PHC-Makkah, Saudi Arabia, Email: abdallahs.j5555@gmail.com
[6]Intern, Jouf University, Sakaka, Saudi Arabia, Email: Abo0ody-2011@windowslive.com
[7]Dentist Student, Al-Jouf University, Sakaka, Saudi Arabia, Email: drwaleedalsharari@gmail.com
[8]General dentist, Andalusia Dental Center, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia, Email: jehanzagzoug@gmail.com
[9]Clinical attachment in Endodontics, Specialized Dental Center in Tabuk, Saudi Arabia, Email: Ola1996ali@hotmail.com
[10]General dentist, Umm Alqura University, Makkah, Saudi Arabia, Email: joojeejamil@gmail.com
[11]Dentist, Prince Sultan Military Hospital, Taif, Saudi Arabia, Email: alotebibader@gmail.com

Corresponding author: Dr Ashwag Siddik Noor saeed, **Email:** ashsns@hotmail.com

ABSTRACT
The outcome of root canal treatment (RCT) in teeth with apical periodontitis (AP) is multifactorial. This review article aims to synthesize the current evidence on the key predictors of RCT outcomes in teeth diagnosed with AP. It provides a comprehensive analysis of the factors influencing healing and long-term tooth survival, spanning biological mechanisms, clinical considerations, and technical procedures. A narrative review of the scientific literature was conducted, examining studies on the pathophysiology of AP, patient-related factors, radiographic parameters, endodontic techniques, and post-treatment management. The focus was on identifying evidence-based predictors that correlate with successful and unsuccessful outcomes. The outcome of RCT in teeth with AP is multifactorial. The elimination of the intraradicular biofilm is the primary determinant of success, heavily influenced by the technical quality of the chemomechanical preparation and obturation. Pre-operatively, large radiolucent lesions (>5mm), certain systemic conditions (e.g., diabetes, smoking), and complex tooth anatomy reduce prognosis. Intra-operatively, the use of contemporary technologies—such as nickel-titanium instrumentation, activated irrigation protocols, and the dental operating microscope—significantly enhances disinfection efficacy. Post-operatively, the quality of the coronal seal and final restoration is critical for preventing reinfection, and structured recall protocols are essential for monitoring healing. Predicting RCT success requires a holistic integration of pre-, intra-, and post-operative factors. A thorough understanding of the disease pathophysiology, coupled with meticulous attention to technical detail and restorative principles, allows clinicians to optimize treatment strategies, improve prognostic accuracy, and ultimately enhance the long-term retention of endodontically treated teeth.
Keywords: apical periodontitis, root canal treatment, treatment outcome, prognostic factors, periapical index, coronal leakage.

INTRODUCTION

Apical periodontitis (AP) is a prevalent inflammatory and destructive disease of the periradicular tissues, representing a host response to microbial infection within the root canal system of a tooth [1]. It is a significant global oral health concern, with a reported prevalence in adult populations ranging from 27% to 70% across various geographical regions, often increasing with age [2]. The primary etiological agent of this disease is the polymicrobial consortium residing in the necrotic pulp space, with bacteria being the dominant microorganisms, although fungi and archaea may also play a contributory role in persistent cases [3]. The ultimate goal of root canal treatment (RCT) in teeth diagnosed with AP is to eliminate this intraradicular infection and prevent reinfection by establishing a hermetic seal of the root canal system, thereby creating a biological environment conducive to the healing of the periradicular tissues and the functional retention of the tooth [4].

The success of RCT is not a foregone conclusion, and outcomes can vary significantly. Historically, the definition of "success" has evolved from a mere absence of symptoms to a more comprehensive assessment incorporating both clinical and radiographic parameters. A tooth is typically considered successfully treated when it is free of clinical signs and symptoms such as pain, swelling, or sinus tracts, and when radiographic

evaluation demonstrates the complete healing of a previous radiolucent area or the maintenance of normal periradicular architecture over time [5]. Reported success rates for RCT in teeth with AP are generally high but demonstrate considerable heterogeneity. Large-scale longitudinal studies and systematic reviews have reported success rates ranging from 74% to 86% [6],[7]. For instance, a meta-analysis by Ng et al. found an overall pooled success rate of approximately 77% for teeth with pre-operative apical periodontitis after a minimum follow-up period of two years [8]. This variability underscores the fact that treatment outcome is not random but is influenced by a complex interplay of numerous pre-operative, intra-operative, and post-operative factors.

Pre-operative factors set the baseline prognostic landscape for the treatment. The status of the periradicular tissues at the time of treatment initiation is one of the most critical determinants. Teeth with a pre-existing periapical lesion, particularly those larger than 5 mm in diameter, have been consistently shown to have a lower probability of complete healing compared to teeth with a normal periapical index or a vital pulp [9]. The microbial load and complexity of the intraradicular biofilm also play a pivotal role. Primary infections are often more amenable to disinfection than secondary or persistent infections, where selected, more resistant microbial species like *Enterococcus faecalis* may inhabit the complexities of the root canal system [10]. Furthermore, the specific tooth involved influences the prognosis. Molars, with their complex canal anatomy including isthmuses, lateral canals, and C-shaped configurations, present a greater challenge for complete cleaning and shaping, leading to lower reported success rates—often in the range of 70-75%—compared to single-rooted teeth, which can exhibit success rates exceeding 90% [11],[12].

Intra-operative factors are directly under the clinician's control and are therefore of paramount importance in determining the final treatment outcome. The technical quality of the root canal procedure, encompassing cleaning, shaping, and obturation, is a cornerstone of success. The principle of "what is removed" is as crucial as "what is placed." Inadequate debridement, failure to negotiate the full working length, or missing a canal leaves behind a niche for microbial persistence. Consequently, the quality of the coronal restoration and the root canal filling are intimately linked. A well-obturated root canal system, defined as a filling that is homogenous and terminates within 0-2 mm of the radiographic apex, is associated with significantly higher success rates. Studies have demonstrated that teeth with technically adequate root fillings and satisfactory coronal restorations have success rates as high as 91-94% [13]. In contrast, the presence of a poor root filling, especially when combined with an inadequate coronal seal, drastically reduces the prognosis, with success rates plummeting to as low as 30-40% [14],[15]. This highlights the critical importance of a three-dimensional seal to prevent coronal leakage of saliva and bacteria, which is a major cause of post-treatment disease.

The use of contemporary technological adjuncts has also been identified as a significant predictor. The incorporation of an operating microscope, with its superior illumination and magnification, enhances the clinician's ability to locate additional canals, better negotiate calcified or curved canals, and improve the detection of fractures or procedural errors. Similarly, electronic apex locators provide more accurate working length determination compared to traditional radiographic methods alone. The adoption of nickel-titanium rotary instrumentation systems has improved the consistency and quality of canal shaping, reducing the risk of transportation and ledge formation. While direct causality is complex to establish, studies suggest that treatments performed with these advanced technologies can improve outcomes by 5-10% compared to conventional techniques, primarily by enhancing the efficacy of debridement and the precision of the procedure [16].

Post-operative factors, though sometimes overlooked, complete the prognostic picture. The quality and timing of the final coronal restoration are inextricably linked to the long-term success of RCT. A delayed or defective coronal restoration can compromise the entire treatment by allowing microbial recontamination of the root canal system. Research indicates that the long-term survival of a root-filled tooth is more significantly influenced by the quality of the coronal coverage than by the quality of the root filling itself [17]. Furthermore, systemic health conditions of the patient can modulate the healing response. Conditions such as uncontrolled diabetes mellitus, immunosuppression, and heavy smoking have been associated with impaired wound healing and a higher prevalence of persistent apical periodontitis. For example, some studies report that smokers may have a 10-20% higher risk of RCT failure compared to non-smokers, likely due to the detrimental effects of nicotine on the microvasculature and immune cell function [18].

METHODS

This study is a narrative review of the scientific literature concerning predictors of root canal treatment outcomes in teeth with apical periodontitis. The aim was to synthesize current evidence from key studies and reviews to provide a comprehensive overview of factors influencing healing and long-term success.

A systematic search was performed across several electronic databases, including PubMed/MEDLINE, Scopus, and Web of Science, for articles published from January 2000 to December 2023. The search strategy utilized a combination of Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) terms and free-text keywords, such as "apical periodontitis," "root canal treatment," "treatment

outcome," "prognostic factors," "periapical healing," "endodontic success," and "coronal leakage."

Inclusion criteria encompassed clinical studies, retrospective and prospective cohort studies, randomized controlled trials, systematic reviews, and meta-analyses published in English that examined predictors of outcomes following non-surgical root canal treatment in permanent teeth with pre-existing apical periodontitis. Exclusion criteria included case reports, studies on primary teeth, surgical endodontic outcomes only, and articles not directly related to prognostic factors.

The selection process involved initial screening of titles and abstracts, followed by full-text review of relevant articles. Data from selected studies were extracted thematically, focusing on pre-operative, intra-operative, and post-operative factors. Given the narrative design of this review, no formal quality assessment or meta-analytic pooling was conducted. Instead, studies were selected to ensure a representative and comprehensive synthesis of current knowledge, with emphasis on higher levels of evidence when available (e.g., systematic reviews and large longitudinal studies). This approach allows for a broad discussion of clinical and biological predictors while acknowledging the heterogeneity inherent in endodontic outcome research.

Pathophysiology of Apical Periodontitis:

The journey to AP almost invariably begins with the compromise of the pulp chamber's integrity, typically through caries, trauma, or fractures. This breach allows oral microorganisms, primarily bacteria, to gain access to the sterile, enclosed environment of the root canal system [11]. The initial host response is pulpitis, an attempt to wall off the infection. However, when the blood supply is severely damaged or the microbial insult overwhelms the defensive capacity, pulp necrosis occurs. The necrotic pulp tissue then serves as an ideal nutrient-rich medium for microbial proliferation. The root canal system, with its complexities such as isthmuses, lateral canals, and dentinal tubules, provides a protected ecological niche for these microorganisms to organize into structured, polymicrobial biofilms [12]. These biofilms are ecologically dynamic, with synergistic and antagonistic interactions between species, and are characterized by a matrix of extracellular polymeric substances that confer significant resistance to host defenses and antimicrobial agents. The primary goal of endodontic treatment is the eradication of this biofilm.

As bacteria and their byproducts (e.g., lipopolysaccharides from Gram-negative bacteria,

lipoteichoic acid from Gram-positive bacteria) egress from the root canal system via apical and lateral foramina, they encounter the periradicular tissues, triggering a robust host response. The initial response is mediated by the innate immune system. Resident macrophages and mast cells are activated, releasing pro-inflammatory cytokines such as Tumor Necrosis Factor-alpha (TNF-α), Interleukin-1 (IL-1), and Interleukin-6 (IL-6) [13]. This cytokine storm leads to increased vascular permeability, influx of plasma proteins, and recruitment of neutrophils from the circulation. Neutrophils are the first line of cellular defense, attempting to phagocytose and destroy the invading microbes via oxidative and non-oxidative mechanisms.

If the microbial challenge persists, the adaptive immune system is engaged. Antigen-presenting cells migrate to local lymph nodes and present bacterial antigens to T and B lymphocytes. This leads to a clonal expansion of antigen-specific cells that infiltrate the periradicular lesion. Histologically, established AP lesions are characterized by a mixed inflammatory infiltrate dominated by lymphocytes, plasma cells, and macrophages [14]. The specific profile of T-helper cells (Th1, Th2, Th17, T-reg) within the lesion dictates the nature and intensity of the inflammatory response and the balance between tissue destruction and attempted repair. The activation of these immune cells, particularly osteoclasts, is the direct cause of the bone resorption visible radiographically.

The radiographic radiolucency that defines AP is a testament to active osteoclast-mediated bone resorption. This process is meticulously regulated by a complex signaling system. The key mediator is the RANK/RANKL/OPG pathway. Receptor Activator of Nuclear Factor Kappa-B Ligand (RANKL), expressed by osteoblasts and activated T-lymphocytes, binds to its receptor RANK on osteoclast precursors, promoting their differentiation and activation [15]. In healthy tissues, this is counterbalanced by Osteoprotegerin (OPG), a decoy receptor that binds to RANKL and inhibits osteoclastogenesis. In AP, the pro-inflammatory cytokine milieu (e.g., IL-1, TNF-α, PGE_2) profoundly upregulates RANKL expression and suppresses OPG production, tipping the balance decisively in favor of bone resorption [16]. Consequently, the periradicular bone is destroyed in an attempt to create an "immune wall" that prevents the systemic spread of infection. While this is a protective host mechanism, it results in the local pathology that necessitates treatment. Table (1) illustrates key mediators in the pathophysiology of apical periodontitis:

Table 1: Key Mediators in the Pathophysiology of Apical Periodontitis [11-16]

Mediator/Cell Type	Primary Source	Primary Role in Apical Periodontitis
Lipopolysaccharide (LPS)	Gram-negative bacterial cell walls	Potent immunogen; triggers cytokine release (TNF-α, IL-1) from host cells.
TNF-α & IL-1	Macrophages, Neutrophils	Master pro-inflammatory cytokines; induce bone resorption by stimulating RANKL expression.
RANKL	Osteoblasts, T-lymphocytes	Binds to RANK on osteoclasts, driving their formation, activation, and survival.
Osteoprotegerin (OPG)	Osteoblasts, Gingival Fibroblasts	Decoy receptor for RANKL; inhibits osteoclastogenesis and bone resorption.
Matrix Metalloproteinases (MMPs)	Neutrophils, Macrophages, Fibroblasts	Degrade extracellular matrix components (e.g., collagen) in bone and connective tissue.
Neutrophils	Circulating blood	First responders; attempt phagocytosis of bacteria; release lytic enzymes and ROS, causing collateral tissue damage.

Over time, an acute inflammatory response may evolve into a chronic, established lesion. Chronic lesions are histologically classified as granulomas, cysts, or scar tissue. Periapical granulomas, which constitute the majority (approximately 50-87%) of chronic AP lesions, are not simply "pus-filled sacs" but are complex, vascularized masses of inflamed granulation tissue walling off the root apex [17]. A subset of these lesions may undergo epithelial proliferation, derived from the epithelial cell rests of Malassez, leading to the formation of periapical cysts (true cysts with a completely enclosed lumen or bay cysts that remain open to the root canal) [18]. The traditional view that cysts are less likely to heal after conventional RCT due to their self-sustaining nature is debated, but it is accepted that the presence of a large, well-defined radiolucency (>5mm) often indicates a more complex biological environment that may be less amenable to resolution.

The pathophysiology of AP directly informs the principles of endodontic treatment and its predictable outcomes. The primary obstacle to healing is the persistent intraradicular biofilm. The host's immune system, while effective at containing the infection within the bone, is incapable of eliminating microorganisms located within the necrotic and inaccessible recesses of the root canal system. Therefore, the objective of RCT is to iatrogenically disrupt and remove this biofilm through chemomechanical preparation.

The presence of a pre-existing AP lesion signifies an active, dynamic host-microbe interaction. The size and nature of the lesion can influence healing capacity. Larger lesions may have a more compromised blood supply, potentially slowing the reparative process after treatment. Furthermore, the microbial ecology within the root canal shifts in persistent or secondary infections. The environment becomes more selective for species that can survive in nutrient-scarce conditions and resist host defenses, such as *Enterococcus faecalis* and *Candida albicans* [12]. These organisms are often more challenging to eradicate with standard irrigants and medicaments.

Clinical Factors Influencing Treatment Success:

The impact of age on the outcome of RCT is a subject of ongoing investigation, with studies presenting conflicting results. From a biological perspective, advanced age is associated with reduced tissue perfusion, diminished stem cell activity, and a generally attenuated immune response, a phenomenon known as immunosenescence [19]. This could theoretically impair the body's ability to resolve inflammation and regenerate periapical tissues following endodontic therapy. Some large-scale retrospective studies have reported slightly lower success rates in older patient cohorts. However, many other well-controlled studies have found no significant correlation between age and treatment outcome when the quality of the root canal procedure is accounted for [20]. It is plausible that the increased technical challenges often encountered in older patients—such as pulp canal calcification, complex anatomy, and the presence of full-coverage restorations—may confound this relationship. Therefore, while biological age may modestly influence healing capacity, it is likely that the technical feasibility of achieving a well-obturated and well-restored tooth is a more powerful predictor of success than chronological age alone.

Similarly, the influence of gender on RCT prognosis is generally considered to be minimal or non-significant. Most large-scale epidemiological studies and meta-analyses have failed to identify gender as an independent predictor of treatment outcome [21]. Any observed differences in prevalence or outcome are more likely attributable to behavioral factors, such as gender-specific tendencies in healthcare-seeking behavior or the timing of treatment, rather than a fundamental biological difference in healing potential between males and females. Consequently, clinical decision-making is not typically altered based on a patient's gender [21].

In contrast to age and gender, a patient's systemic health status exerts a profound and well-documented influence on the pathogenesis of AP and the healing trajectory after RCT. Systemic conditions can disrupt the

delicate balance between microbial aggression and host defense, tipping the scales toward treatment failure [4].

Diabetes Mellitus, particularly when poorly controlled, is one of the most significant systemic risk factors for impaired endodontic outcomes. Chronic hyperglycemia leads to the formation of advanced glycation end-products (AGEs) that promote a persistent pro-inflammatory state, compromise neutrophil and macrophage function, and impair collagen synthesis and angiogenesis [22]. These pathophysiological disturbances manifest clinically as a higher prevalence of large periapical radiolucencies, a greater risk of asymptomatic exacerbations (flare-ups), and delayed or compromised healing post-treatment. Studies have shown that diabetic patients, especially those with elevated HbA1c levels, can have success rates 10-20% lower than those in non-diabetic individuals [23]. For these patients, close collaboration with the patient's physician to improve glycemic control is a crucial component of pre-operative management.

Osteoporosis and other metabolic bone diseases directly affect the bony compartment involved in AP. The systemic upregulation of bone resorption, driven by an imbalance in the RANKL/OPG axis, can exacerbate the local bone destruction caused by the periapical inflammatory process. Furthermore, medications used to manage osteoporosis, particularly antiresorptive agents like bisphosphonates and denosumab (a RANKL inhibitor), pose a significant risk [24]. While these drugs can suppress the osteoclastic activity responsible for the periapical lesion, they can also severely impair the bony remodeling and repair necessary for healing after RCT. More critically, they are associated with the risk of medication-related osteonecrosis of the jaw (MRONJ), making any surgical endodontic procedure a high-risk undertaking. A thorough medical history is essential to identify these patients and manage them appropriately.

Immunosuppression, whether from disease (e.g., HIV/AIDS, leukemia) or pharmacologic therapy (e.g., corticosteroids, chemotherapeutic agents, post-transplantation drugs), directly compromises the cellular and humoral immune responses required to combat intraradicular and periradicular infection.[25] Immunosuppressed patients may present with more aggressive or widespread infections and may demonstrate a muted clinical response, making diagnosis and assessment of healing more challenging. Their reduced ability to mount an effective inflammatory response can lead to persistent infection and a higher likelihood of post-treatment disease [25].

Tobacco Smoking is a major modifiable risk factor that negatively impacts endodontic outcomes. The numerous toxic compounds in tobacco smoke, notably nicotine and carbon monoxide, induce tissue hypoxia through vasoconstriction, impair neutrophil chemotaxis and phagocytosis, and disrupt fibroblast function and collagen production [26]. Multiple studies have consistently demonstrated that smokers have a higher prevalence of AP in root-filled teeth and a lower success rate following both primary and secondary endodontic treatment, with some analyses suggesting a risk of failure increased by 50-100% compared to non-smokers [27]. Cessation counseling should be an integral part of the management plan for patients who use tobacco.

Table 2: Impact of Selected Systemic Conditions on Root Canal Treatment Outcomes [19-27]

Systemic Factor	Proposed Pathophysiological Mechanism	Impact on RCT Outcome	Clinical Recommendations
Diabetes Mellitus	Immunosuppression, impaired neutrophil function, microangiopathy, chronic inflammation.	Lower success rates; delayed healing; higher risk of flare-ups.	Coordinate with physician for glycemic control (HbA1c <7-8%); consider culture-based disinfection.
Osteoporosis	Systemic imbalance in bone remodeling favoring resorption.	Potentially impaired osseous healing.	Standard non-surgical RCT is first-line; be cautious with surgical endodontics.
Bisphosphonate Use	Profound suppression of osteoclast activity, impaired bone remodeling.	High risk of impaired healing and MRONJ after surgery.	Avoid surgical endodontics; emphasize non-surgical retreatment. Medical consultation is mandatory.
Immunosuppression	Compromised cellular and humoral immune response to infection.	Higher risk of persistent infection; muted clinical signs.	Aggressive disinfection protocols; use of intracanal medicaments; close recall monitoring.
Tobacco Smoking	Tissue hypoxia, impaired neutrophil function, disrupted fibroblast activity.	Significantly lower success rates; higher prevalence of post-treatment disease.	Strongly encourage smoking cessation; longer recall intervals to monitor for failure.

The success of root canal treatment is not solely dependent on the clinician's skill but is also a reflection of the patient's host response. Factors such as age and gender play a relatively minor role, whereas systemic health conditions like diabetes, osteoporosis, immunosuppression, and tobacco use are potent modifiers of the healing environment.

Radiographic Predictors of Treatment Efficacy:

The subjective interpretation of periapical radiographs has historically been a source of significant variability in outcome studies. To address this, standardized scoring systems have been developed, with the Periapical Index (PAI) being the most widely adopted [26]. The PAI provides a categorical scale from 1 to 5, where 1 represents normal periapical structures, 2 represents minor changes in bone pattern, 3 represents bone mineral loss with changes to the cortical bone, 4 represents a well-defined radiolucent area (lesion with distinct border), and 5 represents a radiolucent area with features of exacerbation (e.g., sinus tract). The use of PAI ensures a more reproducible and comparable assessment of disease presence and healing progression. A successful outcome is typically defined as a shift from a PAI score of 3, 4, or 5 pre-operatively to a score of 1 or 2 at recall, indicating the resolution of inflammation and regeneration of the periradicular structures [27]. The size of a periapical radiolucency, as a reflection of the extent of bone destruction, is one of the most powerful radiographic predictors of treatment outcome. A robust body of evidence indicates an inverse relationship between the initial lesion size and the probability of complete healing following non-surgical RCT [28]. Small lesions (typically <5 mm in diameter) are associated with high success rates, often exceeding 90%. These lesions generally represent a contained inflammatory process that the host immune system can efficiently resolve once the intraradicular infection is eliminated. In contrast, large lesions (>5 mm, and particularly those >10 mm) are consistently linked to reduced success rates, which can drop to 50-70% in some studies [29]. Several biological factors underpin this correlation. First, a large radiolucency often indicates a long-standing infection with a more established and complex intraradicular biofilm that may be more challenging to eradicate completely. Second, large lesions may have undergone cyst formation. While the debate on the self-sustaining nature of true radicular cysts continues, their enclosed structure can sometimes present a physical barrier to the ingrowth of granulation tissue necessary for healing, even after successful root canal disinfection [30]. Third, extensive bone destruction can compromise the local blood supply, potentially slowing the reparative response and bone regeneration. Therefore, the presence of a large radiolucency should alert the clinician to a case of higher complexity, potentially warranting more aggressive disinfection protocols, the use of intracanal medicaments

like calcium hydroxide, and a longer observation period before declaring success. The anatomical location of the periapical lesion can also influence the healing potential, albeit to a lesser extent than size. Lesions associated with maxillary posterior teeth, particularly those approximating the maxillary sinus, may present a diagnostic and prognostic challenge. The close relationship between the root apices and the sinus floor can lead to a phenomenon where the lesion, upon healing, is replaced not by trabecular bone but by fibrous scar tissue [31]. This "scar healing" appears radiographically as a persistent, well-defined radiolucency that can be mistaken for a failure. However, clinically, the tooth is asymptomatic and functional. Distinguishing between a scar and persistent disease is crucial and may require advanced imaging.

Furthermore, the integrity of the cortical bone plates is a significant factor. Lesions confined within the cancellous bone, with an intact buccal and lingual cortical plate, often heal predictably with bone fill from the periphery. However, lesions that have perforated the cortical plate, particularly the buccal plate, may heal with a bony defect or require a much longer time for complete osseous regeneration. In such cases, the radiographic appearance at recall may show a reduction in the size of the radiolucency and increased bone density, but a complete return to a normal PAI score of 1 may not occur, even in a clinically successful case. The limitations of 2D radiography have been partially overcome by the advent of cone-beam computed tomography (CBCT). CBCT provides a three-dimensional, undistorted view of the periapical tissues, allowing for a far more accurate assessment of lesion size, location, and its relationship to anatomical structures [32]. CBCT offers superior diagnostic sensitivity compared to periapical radiography by revealing bone defects in the bucco-lingual dimension and within cancellous bone, which are often hidden in 2D images. However, this increased sensitivity comes with trade-offs: a significantly higher radiation dose and the potential for lower specificity, as CBCT may detect incidental findings not related to active disease [30]. Therefore, its use follows the ALARA principle and is not recommended for routine periapical diagnosis. Guidelines reserve CBCT for complex cases where 2D imaging is inconclusive, such as for non-surgical retreatment planning, suspected vertical fractures, trauma, resorption, and pre-surgical assessment [33]. This enhanced visualization has direct prognostic and therapeutic implications. A lesion that appears small on a 2D radiograph may be shown by CBCT to be extensive, potentially changing the prognosis and shifting the treatment approach from non-surgical to surgical intervention [34]. Furthermore, for follow-up, especially in complex cases, CBCT provides a definitive, three-dimensional baseline to assess healing more accurately than inconclusive 2D images, allowing for more confident evaluation of treatment outcomes [31].

Table 3: Radiographic Predictors of Root Canal Treatment Outcome [26-30]

Radiographic Parameter	Favorable Prognostic Indicator	Unfavorable Prognostic Indicator	Rationale & Clinical Implications
Pre-op Lesion Size	Small or no radiolucency (<5mm).	Large radiolucency (>5mm, especially >10mm).	Larger lesions suggest established biofilm, possible cyst, compromised blood supply; lower success rates.
Pre-op PAI Score	PAI 1, 2, or 3.	PAI 4 or 5.	Higher PAI scores indicate more severe disease and bone destruction.
Lesion Location	Confined to cancellous bone.	Involvement/perforation of cortical plate; proximity to maxillary sinus.	Cortical perforation may lead to scar healing; sinus proximity complicates diagnosis of true healing.
Post-op Healing Pattern	Progressive reduction in size and increased radiodensity over 1-4 years.	Static or enlarging radiolucency after 1 year.	Lack of progressive healing suggests persistent infection or non-odontogenic pathology.
Root Fracture	Absent.	Present (vertical root fracture).	Vertical root fractures have a hopeless prognosis, necessitating extraction.
Root Resorption	Minimal or absent.	Extensive apical or lateral root resorption.	Extensive resorption compromises the seal and structural integrity of the root.

Beyond the radiolucency itself, other radiographic findings carry significant prognostic weight. The presence of a vertical root fracture (VRF) is a hallmark of a hopeless prognosis, almost universally leading to treatment failure and necessitating extraction. Radiographic signs of VRF include a characteristic "J-shaped" radiolucency or a halo-like bone loss extending along the root surface [33]. Similarly, extensive root resorption, either internal or external, can compromise the structural integrity of the root and the ability to achieve a hermetic seal, thereby reducing the long-term prognosis. Finally, the quality of the post-operative root filling itself, as judged radiographically, is a critical predictor [34]. Root fillings that are homogenous and terminate within 0-2 mm of the radiographic apex are consistently associated with higher success rates than those that are short, overextended, or contain voids [13].

Endodontic Procedures and Techniques:

The long-term success of root canal treatment (RCT) in teeth with apical periodontitis is fundamentally predicated on the elimination of intraradicular infection and the prevention of microbial recontamination [33]. This goal is pursued through a sequence of meticulously executed clinical procedures collectively known as chemomechanical preparation. The choice of specific techniques and technologies for each step—from access cavity design to the final obturation—profoundly

influences the efficacy of biofilm disruption and, consequently, the treatment outcome [34].

The initiation of RCT begins with the access cavity, a step whose importance cannot be overstated. The primary objectives are to achieve straight-line access to the canal orifices and to locate all canals, while preserving sound tooth structure. Historically, access cavities were often overly extensive. The modern paradigm has shifted towards minimally invasive endodontics, which aims to conserve pericervical dentin—the dentin located 4 mm coronal and apical to the alveolar bone crest [35]. This dentin is critical for the long-term fracture resistance of the tooth. While overly conservative access may compromise visibility and instrumentation, evidence suggests that conserving structural integrity through designed minimal access cavities does not negatively impact cleaning and shaping efficacy and may enhance the tooth's survival by reducing the risk of vertical root fracture [36]. Therefore, the access design must strike a delicate balance between maximal exposure for disinfection and maximal conservation for strength.

The core of mechanical preparation is the shaping of the root canal system to facilitate irrigation and obturation. The advent of nickel-titanium (NiTi) alloy revolutionized this process. Compared to traditional stainless steel files, NiTi instruments possess superior superelasticity and shape memory, allowing them to prepare curved canals with significantly less transportation, ledge formation, and other iatrogenic

errors.[37] The introduction of rotary and reciprocating NiTi systems has improved the consistency, speed, and quality of canal shaping. Studies have demonstrated that the use of engine-driven NiTi systems results in better-centered preparations and a lower incidence of procedural complications compared to manual instrumentation with stainless steel files [38].

Further advancements continue to refine this field. Heat-treated NiTi alloys (e.g., M-Wire, Controlled Memory wire) offer enhanced fatigue resistance and flexibility. Single-file systems, used in a reciprocating motion, aim to simplify the instrumentation process and reduce instrument inventory. More recently, the development of minimally invasive shaping concepts, which seek to preserve more root dentin particularly in the coronal and middle thirds, is gaining traction. While the direct impact of each specific file system on long-term success rates is difficult to isolate, the collective evidence strongly indicates that the use of modern NiTi instrumentation leads to a higher probability of achieving a well-shaped, cleanable canal, which is a prerequisite for success [39].

Mechanical instrumentation alone is insufficient for biofilm removal, as it contacts less than 50% of the main canal wall surface area [40]. Irrigation is therefore the indispensable chemical component of disinfection. Sodium hypochlorite (NaOCl) remains the gold standard irrigant due to its unique ability to dissolve organic pulp tissue and its broad-spectrum antimicrobial activity. The efficacy of NaOCl is concentration- and volume-dependent, with higher concentrations (e.g., 5.25%) offering superior tissue-dissolving capability, though with increased cytotoxicity. The final rinse with a chelating agent, such as EDTA or citric acid, is essential to remove the smear layer—an amorphous layer of debris created during instrumentation that can harbor bacteria and impede sealer penetration [41].

Perhaps the most significant advancement in chemical disinfection is the development of irrigation activation techniques. Traditional passive irrigation with a syringe and needle is limited by vapor lock and ineffective fluid exchange in complex anatomies like isthmuses, lateral canals, and dentinal tubules [41]. To overcome this, various activation methods have been introduced:

- **Manual Agitation:** Simple movement of a small file in the canal.
- **Sonic and Ultrasonic Activation:** Uses energy waves to create acoustic streaming and cavitation, enhancing irrigant penetration and biofilm disruption [41].
- **Laser-Activated Irrigation (e.g., PIPS):** Uses laser pulses to create powerful shockwaves in the irrigant.
- **Negative Pressure Irrigation Systems (e.g., EndoVac):** Apically delivers irrigant and safely aspirates it, minimizing the risk of extrusion.

A substantial body of evidence confirms that activated irrigation protocols are significantly more effective than syringe irrigation alone in reducing bacterial loads and removing hard tissue debris from complexities [42]. The adoption of these techniques is a major factor in improving the prognosis of teeth with complex anatomies and established apical periodontitis.

The objective of obturation is to hermetically seal the disinfected root canal system to prevent reinfection. The quality of the root filling, as assessed radiographically by its homogeneity and apical extent, is a well-established predictor of outcome [43]. The "gold standard" for obturation has long been considered cold lateral compaction of gutta-percha with a sealer. However, warm vertical compaction techniques have gained widespread popularity. By softening the gutta-percha with heat, these methods allow for a more three-dimensional adaptation of the core material to the irregular canal walls, potentially leading to a superior seal, especially in oval canals and isthmuses [44].

Continuous wave obturation techniques, which combine elements of warm vertical compaction with efficiency, are commonly used. Furthermore, carrier-based techniques (e.g., Thermafil) offer a rapid method for filling canals, though concerns regarding the retrievability of the carrier during retreatment exist. The choice of sealer has also evolved, with bioactive endodontic cements, such as mineral trioxide aggregate (MTA)-based and other bioceramic sealers, becoming prominent. These materials are osteoconductive, form a chemical bond with dentin, and are highly biocompatible, which may be advantageous in cases with large periapical lesions or procedural errors like perforations [45]. While no obturation technique alone can compensate for inadequate cleaning, a well-condensed, three-dimensional fill that extends to the prepared working length is critical for long-term success.

Table 4: Comparison of Key Endodontic Techniques and Their Impact [34, 38, 41- 45]

Procedural Step	Traditional Technique	Advanced Technique	Impact on Efficacy and Outcomes
Instrumentation	Manual Stainless-Steel Files.	Engine-driven Nickel-Titanium (Rotary/Reciprocating).	**Markedly Improved.** Reduced transportation, fewer ledges, better-centered shape, more efficient debridement [38].
Irrigation	Syringe and Needle (Passive).	Activated Irrigation (Ultrasonic, Laser, Negative Pressure).	**Significantly Improved.** Superior biofilm disruption and debris removal from complexities (isthmuses, lateral canals) [42].
Obturation	Cold Lateral Compaction.	Warm Vertical Compaction / Continuous Wave.	**Moderately Improved.** Better 3D adaptation of gutta-percha, potentially superior seal in irregular canals [44].
Sealer	Zinc Oxide Eugenol, Epoxy Resin.	Bioceramic Sealers.	**Potentially Improved.** Enhanced biocompatibility, bioactivity, and potential for a stable chemical seal [45].
Magnification	Naked Eye / Surgical Loupes.	Dental Operating Microscope.	**Fundamentally Improved.** Dramatically improves ability to locate canals, remove obstructions, and perform precision dentistry [34].

While not a specific obturation or instrumentation technique, the adoption of the dental operating microscope (DOM) has arguably been the single most impactful technological advancement in modern endodontics. The DOM provides unparalleled illumination and magnification, transforming endodontics from a tactile procedure to a visual one. Its benefits permeate every stage of treatment: it enables the predictable location of calcified and additional canals (e.g., MB2 in maxillary molars), the identification of cracks and fractures, the improved removal of previous filling materials during retreatment, and the precise control of obturation techniques [34].

Post-treatment Factors Affecting Long-term Success:

The conclusion of root canal treatment (RCT) does not signify the end of the therapeutic journey; rather, it marks the beginning of the restorative and maintenance phases, which are equally critical for long-term tooth survival. A technically perfect root canal procedure can be entirely negated by failures occurring after the obturation is complete [40]. The most significant of these post-treatment threats are coronal microleakage, the quality and type of the final restoration, and the lack of appropriate follow-up care. These factors collectively determine the long-term prognosis of the endodontically treated tooth (ETT), influencing its ability to remain functional, asymptomatic, and free of recurrent apical periodontitis [39].

The quality of the coronal restoration is, therefore, inextricably linked to the outcome of RCT. A large body of evidence, including seminal studies by **Ray and Trope**, has established that the quality of the coronal restoration may have an even greater impact on periapical health than the quality of the root filling itself [13].

Their research and subsequent meta-analyses have shown that teeth with poor-quality root fillings but high-quality coronal restorations have a better prognosis than teeth with high-quality root fillings but poor-quality coronal restorations [34]. The restoration of an ETT presents unique challenges. The loss of tooth structure from caries, previous restorations, and the endodontic access cavity itself significantly compromises the tooth's structural integrity and resistance to fracture. Furthermore, the dehydration of dentin following pulp removal may reduce its elasticity, potentially increasing brittleness [43]. The primary objectives of the final restoration are to provide a coronal seal, protect the remaining tooth structure, and restore function.

The need for a post is often overemphasized. Posts do not strengthen teeth; their sole function is to retain a core foundation when there is insufficient coronal tooth structure to support it. Indiscriminate post placement requires additional dentin removal, which can weaken the root and increase the risk of fracture [44].

The most significant factor in preventing fracture is the preservation of sound dentin, particularly in the critical pericervical region. When a post is necessary, the choice of material and design is important. Passive, parallel-sided fiber posts are generally preferred over active, threaded posts, as they are less likely to generate stress concentrations within the root. Fiber posts also possess a modulus of elasticity similar to dentin, which helps distribute functional stresses more evenly and may reduce the risk of catastrophic root fracture [44]. The definitive coronal coverage for most posterior ETTs is a full-coverage crown. This is particularly true for molars and premolars with significant loss of marginal ridges. The cuspal coverage provided by a crown envelops and protects the remaining tooth structure, preventing fracture under occlusal load [45]. For anterior teeth, where esthetics are paramount and occlusal forces are primarily shear, a direct composite restoration or a partial coverage restoration may be sufficient if enough sound tooth structure remains. The timing of the final restoration is also crucial; it should be placed as soon as possible after the completion of RCT to establish a durable seal.

Table 5: Key Post-treatment Factors and Their Impact on Long-term Success [42-46]

Factor	Objective	Clinical Best Practices	Impact on Long-term Outcome
Coronal Seal	Prevent bacterial microleakage into the root canal system.	Place a definitive, well-sealed coronal restoration immediately after obturation. Use a double seal (e.g., GIC base) if final restoration is delayed.	**Critical.** A poor coronal seal is a leading cause of failure, negating a perfect RCT [42].
Post Placement	Retain core material only when necessary.	Avoid posts when possible. Use when >50% coronal structure is lost. Prefer passive, adhesive fiber posts over rigid metal posts.	**Significant.** Unnecessary posts weaken roots. Correct post choice minimizes fracture risk [44].
Cuspal Coverage	Protect remaining tooth structure from fracture.	Provide full cuspal coverage (crown) for posterior teeth with significant tissue loss.	**High.** Crowns significantly improve the long-term survival of molars and premolars [45].
Follow-up Care	Monitor healing and detect early failure.	Schedule recall visits at 6 months, 1 year, and then annually for at least 4 years. Use standardized radiographs (PAI) for comparison [46].	**Essential.** Allows for early intervention in cases of delayed healing or failure [46].

The biological process of periapical healing after RCT is not instantaneous; it can take months to several years for complete osseous regeneration, particularly for large initial lesions. Therefore, a definitive declaration of "success" cannot be made immediately after treatment. A structured recall system is an indispensable component of endodontic practice, allowing for the monitoring of healing progression and the early detection of potential failures [46].

The standard protocol involves clinical and radiographic examinations at 6 months, 1 year, and then annually for up to 4 years. At each recall, the tooth is assessed for clinical symptoms, and a periapical radiograph is taken. This new radiograph must be compared side-by-side with the baseline (immediate post-op) radiograph to assess any changes in the periapical bone architecture. Healing is typically evidenced by a gradual reduction in the size of the radiolucency and an increase in surrounding bone density. The use of a standardized scoring system like the Periapical Index (PAI) adds objectivity to this assessment [47].

LIMITATIONS

This review has several limitations inherent to its narrative design. As a narrative synthesis rather than a systematic review or meta-analysis, the selection of included literature may be subject to author bias, and the findings were not derived from quantitative pooling of data. The heterogeneity in outcome definitions across studies—such as variations in criteria for "success," follow-up durations, and radiographic assessment methods—limits direct comparability and generalizability of reported success rates. Additionally, while efforts were made to include recent and high-impact evidence, some relevant studies may have been omitted due to the non-systematic search approach. These limitations underscore the need for cautious interpretation of the conclusions and highlight the value of future systematic reviews with meta-analyses to quantitatively evaluate the strength of predictors.

CONCLUSION

The success of root canal treatment in teeth with apical periodontitis is not the result of a single intervention but the product of a carefully managed continuum of care. From diagnosis to long-term maintenance, outcome is governed by a hierarchy of factors. While the eradication of the intraradicular infection through advanced instrumentation and disinfection techniques forms the non-negotiable foundation, this effort must be safeguarded by a flawless coronal seal and a protective final restoration. Furthermore, the patient's systemic health and the lesion's inherent biology set a baseline healing potential that must be acknowledged. Ultimately, the predictable achievement of periapical health depends on the clinician's ability to synthesize biological understanding with technical excellence and a commitment to comprehensive, long-term patient management.

DECLARATIONS

Authors' Contributions

A.S.N. conceived the review topic, coordinated the project, and contributed to writing and critical revision of the manuscript. M.A.A., A.B.A., M.A.M., A.S.E., A.R.A., W.G.A., J.A.Z., O.A.A., J.J.A., and B.A.A. participated in the literature search, data extraction, and drafting of sections of the manuscript. All authors contributed to the critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content, and read and approved the final version for publication.

Acknowledgements

Not applicable.

REFERENCES

1. Ørstavik D. Apical periodontitis: microbial infection and host responses. Essential endodontology: prevention and treatment of apical periodontitis. 2019 Dec 9:1-0.
2. Jiménez-Pinzón A, Segura-Egea JJ, Poyato-Ferrera M, Velasco-Ortega E, Ríos-Santos JV. Prevalence of apical periodontitis and frequency of root-filled teeth in an adult Spanish population. International endodontic journal. 2004 Mar;37(3):167-73.
3. Siqueira Jr JF, Rôças IN. Diversity of endodontic microbiota revisited. Journal of dental research. 2009 Nov;88(11):969-81.
4. European Society of Endodontology. Quality guidelines for endodontic treatment: consensus report of the European Society of Endodontology. International endodontic journal. 2006 Dec;39(12):921-30.
5. Friedman S, Mor C. The success of endodontic therapy—healing and functionality. Journal of the California Dental Association. 2004 Jun 1;32(6):493-503.
6. de Chevigny C, Dao TT, Basrani BR, Marquis V, Farzaneh M, Abitbol S, Friedman S. Treatment outcome in endodontics: the Toronto study—phases 3 and 4: orthograde retreatment. Journal of Endodontics. 2008 Feb 1;34(2):131-7.
7. 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. International endodontic journal. 2008 Jan;41(1):6-31.
8. Ng YL, Mann V, Gulabivala K. Outcome of secondary root canal treatment: a systematic review of the literature. International endodontic journal. 2008 Dec;41(12):1026-46.
9. Laukkanen E, Vehkalahti MM, Kotiranta AK. Radiographic outcome of root canal treatment in general dental practice: tooth type and quality of root filling as prognostic factors. Acta Odontologica Scandinavica. 2021 Jan 2;79(1):37-42.
10. Ricucci D, Siqueira Jr JF. Biofilms and apical periodontitis: study of prevalence and association with clinical and histopathologic findings. Journal of endodontics. 2010 Aug 1;36(8):1277-88.
11. Lazarski MP, Walker III WA, Flores CM, Schindler WG, Hargreaves KM. Epidemiological evaluation of the outcomes of nonsurgical root canal treatment in a large cohort of insured dental patients. Journal of endodontics. 2001 Dec 1;27(12):791-6.
12. Salehrabi R, Rotstein I. Endodontic treatment outcomes in a large patient population in the USA: an epidemiological study. Journal of endodontics. 2004 Dec 1;30(12):846-50.
13. Ray HA, Trope M. Periapical status of endodontically treated teeth in relation to the technical quality of the root filling and the coronal restoration. International endodontic journal. 1995 Jan;28(1):12-8.
14. Tronstad L, Asbjørnsen K, Døving L, Pedersen I, Eriksen HM. Influence of coronal restorations on the periapical health of endodontically treated teeth. Dental Traumatology. 2000 Oct;16(5):218-21.
15. Gillen BM, Looney SW, Gu LS, Loushine BA, Weller RN, Loushine RJ, Pashley DH, Tay FR. Impact of the quality of coronal restoration versus the quality of root canal fillings on success of root canal treatment: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Journal of endodontics. 2011 Jul 1;37(7):895-902.
16. Setzer FC, Boyer KR, Jeppson JR, Karabucak B, Kim S. Long-term prognosis of endodontically treated teeth: a retrospective analysis of preoperative factors in molars. Journal of Endodontics. 2011 Jan 1;37(1):21-5.
17. Hansen EK, Asmussen E, Christiansen NC. In vivo fractures of endodontically treated posterior teeth restored with amalgam. Dental Traumatology. 1990 Apr;6(2):49-55.
18. Doyle SL, Hodges JS, Pesun IJ, Baisden MK, Bowles WR. Factors affecting outcomes for single-tooth implants and endodontic restorations. Journal of endodontics. 2007 Apr 1;33(4):399-402.
19. Niazi SA, Bakhsh A. Association between endodontic infection, its treatment and systemic health: a narrative review. Medicina. 2022 Jul 14;58(7):931.
20. Torabinejad M, Kutsenko D, Machnick TK, Ismail A, Newton CW. Levels of evidence for the outcome of nonsurgical endodontic treatment. Journal of endodontics. 2005 Sep 1;31(9):637-46.
21. Burns LE, Kim J, Wu Y, Alzwaideh R, McGowan R, Sigurdsson A. Outcomes of primary root canal therapy: An updated systematic review of longitudinal clinical studies published between 2003 and 2020. International Endodontic Journal. 2022 Jul;55(7):714-31.
22. Fouad AF. Diabetes mellitus as a modulating factor of endodontic infections. Journal of Dental Education. 2003 Apr;67(4):459-67.
23. Britto LR, Katz J, Guelmann M, Heft M. Periradicular radiographic assessment in diabetic and control individuals. Oral Surgery, Oral Medicine, Oral Pathology, Oral Radiology, and Endodontology. 2003 Oct 1;96(4):449-52.
24. Pickett FA. Bisphosphonate-associated osteonecrosis of the jaw: a literature review and clinical practice guidelines. American Dental Hygienists' Association. 2006 Jul 1;80(3):10-10.
25. Mattila KJ, Nieminen MS, Valtonen VV, Rasi VP, Kesäniemi YA, Syrjälä SL, Jungell PS, Isoluoma M, Hietaniemi K, Jokinen MJ. Association between dental

health and acute myocardial infarction. British medical journal. 1989 Mar 25;298(6676):779-81.

26. Krall EA, Garvey AJ, Garcia RI. Alveolar bone loss and tooth loss in male cigar and pipe smokers. The Journal of the American Dental Association. 1999 Jan 1;130(1):57-64.

27. Vahdati SA, Torabinejad M, Handysides R, Lozada J. A retrospective comparison of outcome in patients who received both nonsurgical root canal treatment and single-tooth implants. Journal of endodontics. 2019 Feb 1;45(2):99-103.

28. Sjögren UL, Hägglund B, Sundqvist G, Wing K. Factors affecting the long-term results of endodontic treatment. Journal of endodontics. 1990 Oct 1;16(10):498-504.

29. Wang CH, Chueh LH, Chen SC, Feng YC, Hsiao CK, Chiang CP. Impact of diabetes mellitus, hypertension, and coronary artery disease on tooth extraction after nonsurgical endodontic treatment. Journal of endodontics. 2011 Jan 1;37(1):1-5.

30. Nair PR, Sjögren U, Krey G, Kahnberg KE, Sundqvist G. Intraradicular bacteria and fungi in root-filled, asymptomatic human teeth with therapy-resistant periapical lesions: a long-term light and electron microscopic follow-up study. Journal of endodontics. 1990 Dec 1;16(12):580-8.

31. Molven O, Halse A, Grung B. Observer strategy and the radiographic classification of healing after endodontic surgery. International journal of oral and maxillofacial surgery. 1987 Aug 1;16(4):432-9.

32. Wu MK, Shemesh H, Wesselink PR. Limitations of previously published systematic reviews evaluating the outcome of endodontic treatment. International endodontic journal. 2009 Aug;42(8):656-66.

33. Tamse A, Kaffe I, Lustig J, Ganor Y, Fuss Z. Radiographic features of vertically fractured endodontically treated mesial roots of mandibular molars. Oral Surgery, Oral Medicine, Oral Pathology, Oral Radiology, and Endodontology. 2006 Jun 1;101(6):797-802.

34. Carr GB, Murgel CA. The use of the operating microscope in endodontics. Dental Clinics. 2010 Apr 1;54(2):191-214.

35. Clark D, Khademi J. Modern molar endodontic access and directed dentin conservation. Dental Clinics. 2010 Apr 1;54(2):249-73.

36. Krishan R, Paqué F, Ossareh A, Kishen A, Dao T, Friedman S. Impacts of conservative endodontic cavity on root canal instrumentation efficacy and resistance to fracture assessed in incisors, premolars, and molars. Journal of endodontics. 2014 Aug 1;40(8):1160-6.

37. Walia H, Brantley WA, Gerstein H. An initial investigation of the bending and torsional properties of Nitinol root canal files. Journal of endodontics. 1988 Jan 1;14(7):346-51.

38. Pettiette MT, Metzger Z, Phillips C, Trope M. Endodontic complications of root canal therapy performed by dental students with stainless-steel K-files and nickel-titanium hand files. Journal of endodontics. 1999 Apr 1;25(4):230-4.

39. Pasqualini D, Corbella S, Alovisi M, Taschieri S, Del Fabbro M, Migliaretti G, Carpegna GC, Scotti N, Berutti E. Postoperative quality of life following single-visit root canal treatment performed by rotary or reciprocating instrumentation: a randomized clinical trial. International endodontic journal. 2016 Nov;49(11):1030-9.

40. Peters OA, Schönenberger K, Laib A. Effects of four Ni–Ti preparation techniques on root canal geometry assessed by micro computed tomography. International endodontic journal. 2001 Apr;34(3):221-30.

41. Van der Sluis LW, Versluis M, Wu MK, Wesselink PR. Passive ultrasonic irrigation of the root canal: a review of the literature. International endodontic journal. 2007 Jun;40(6):415-26.

42. Urban K, Donnermeyer D, Schäfer E, Bürklein S. Canal cleanliness using different irrigation activation systems: a SEM evaluation. Clinical oral investigations. 2017 Dec;21(9):2681-7.

43. Ng YL, Mann V, Rahbaran S, Lewsey J, Gulabivala K. Outcome of primary root canal treatment: systematic review of the literature–part 1. Effects of study characteristics on probability of success. International endodontic journal. 2007 Dec;40(12):921-39.

44. Smith CS, Setchell DJ, Harty FJ. Factors influencing the success of conventional root canal therapy—a five-year retrospective study. International endodontic journal. 1993 Nov;26(6):321-33.

45. Zhou HM, Shen Y, Zheng W, Li LI, Zheng YF, Haapasalo M. Physical properties of 5 root canal sealers. Journal of endodontics. 2013 Oct 1;39(10):1281-6.

46. Friedman S. Expected outcomes in the prevention and treatment of apical periodontitis. Ørstavik D, Pitt Ford T, eds. Essential endodontology. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Munksgaard Ltd. 2008:408-69.

47. Ørstavik D. Time-course and risk analyses of the development and healing of chronic apical periodontitis in man. International endodontic journal. 1996 May;29(3):150-5.