

Effect of different instrumentation techniques on students' performance and outcomes of nonsurgical root canal treatment

Luis Medina-Torres¹, Clarence Cochran II¹, Patricia Ann Bauer¹, Andre Joao Valcanaia¹, Devika Sindu², Bruno Cavalcanti¹, Neville McDonald¹

¹ Department of Cariology, Restorative Sciences and Endodontics, University of Michigan School of Dentistry, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48105

² Norton Thoracic Institute, St. Joseph's Hospital and Medical Center, Phoenix, Arizona 85013

- 1) **Key words:** NiTi; Endodontics; Dental Education
- 2) **Words in the abstract:** 250
- 3) **Words in the abstract and the text:** 3526
- 4) **Figures and tables:** 2 figures; 3 tables
- 5) **References:** 50

Acknowledgments

The authors deny any conflicts of interest.

Corresponding author:

Bruno Cavalcanti

Clinical Associate Professor – Endodontics

Dept. Cariology, Restorative Sciences and Endodontics

University of Michigan School of Dentistry

1011 N. University Ave - Office #3313

Ann Arbor, MI 48109

This is the author manuscript accepted for publication and has undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the [Version of Record](#). Please cite this article as [doi: 10.1002/jdd.13523](#).

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

(734) 548-2743

brunocav@umich.edu

Abstract:

Objectives: This study compared, retrospectively, the incidence of clinical errors and effects on treatment outcomes, when students were exposed to two different instrumentation techniques: a hybrid rotary technique (HYB), consisting of both hand instrumentation with hand stainless steel and NiTi files plus the use of a rotary system (Vortex Blue, Dentsply Sirona, USA), versus a full reciprocation instrumentation technique (WaveOne Gold, Dentsply Sirona, USA - WOG). **Methods:** A total of 368 endodontic cases (n=184) in anterior and premolar teeth, completed by dental students at the University of Michigan School of Dentistry from 2013-2022 were used for the study. The groups were evaluated by two calibrated clinicians, observing the incidence of clinical errors: file separations, over-instrumentation, ledges, transportations. Treatment outcomes were also observed. Data were analyzed statistically by Fisher's exact test and Mann Whitney U test ($p < 0.05$). **Results:** No significant difference in file separations, ledges and transportation was observed between the two groups. However, the WOG Group experienced significantly more over-instrumentation than HYB Group, although this did not significantly affect tooth survival or Periapical Index (PAI). Cases with PAI scores of 5 were found to have significantly less tooth survival compared to the other PAI scores. **Conclusions:** It can be concluded that both techniques in our study are well suited to advancing the endodontic dental education of students and novice operators, anticipating relatively successful outcomes of tooth survival, as long as the cases selected are less severe in progression preoperatively.

Key words: Endodontics; Predoctoral Education; NiTi

Introduction

The use of Ni-Ti rotary instruments by inexperienced operators has brought new insights on the safety of these regarding the incidence of operative errors. The development of reciprocation systems has shown a greater ability, as these instruments work by a 150 degrees counterclockwise motion where it engages, cuts dentin, and advances in the canal and a 30 degrees clockwise where it disengages, for safe progression through the canal and to reduce the risk of fractures by the “screw-in” tendency.^{1,2} In addition to the motion, WaveOne Gold, incorporates the benefits of heat treatment ('Gold') that has been reported to provide enhanced flexibility, resistance to cyclic fatigue, cutting sharpness, and efficiency.²⁻⁴ This instrument has a unique design with an offset parallelogram shape. This design allows for only one or two points of contact between the cutting edges and the canal wall, resulting in better efficiency and increased resistance to fractures.^{5,6}

This increased efficiency and resistance to fractures can be considered one of the main reasons for adoption of reciprocation instruments for early learners. The literature shows that reciprocal motion instrumentation reduces procedural errors, including the incidence of ledging⁷, file fracture⁸⁻¹¹, and alteration of the original canal anatomy.^{12,13} It also has a lower incidence of procedural errors than manual instrumentation or NiTi rotary instrumentation.¹⁴⁻¹⁶ These advantages were also observed by a limited number of studies, which also focused on the use of these instruments by novice practitioners, as the advantages in reducing preparation errors in contrast to manual instrumentation were emphasized.¹⁵ For inexperienced operators, torsional stresses with conventional rotary NiTi files can be a challenge¹⁵, and reciprocal motion is able to reduce these stresses.¹⁷ Several studies¹⁸⁻²⁰ have shown that the use of reciprocating motion can also extend the life span of a NiTi instrument and thus may increase clinical safety compared with continuous rotation. Rotary instrument separation occurs mainly through two mechanisms: torsional failure and cyclic fatigue.^{21,22} Torsional overload corresponds to a static failure and happens when a section of the file is locked within the canal, and the shank continues to rotate. Cyclic fatigue occurs when a file rotates inside a curved root canal and experiences alternating compressive and tensile stresses and strains. This can cause sudden file fractures after a certain number of rotations.²³⁻²⁵ Thus, the number of cycles until failure is cumulative and can be obtained through the multiplication of the rotational speed by the time elapse until fracture through cyclic fatigue occurs.²³ Interestingly, some studies^{11,26} have found that the operator experience did

not significantly influence the occurrence of defects with reciprocation instruments, in order that they became an excellent option for dental students.

Although some studies looked into clinical errors with reciprocation versus rotary, not a lot has been observed regarding the outcomes of these treatments in the long-term. Understanding and researching on instrument/technique performance is important for future developments of endodontic treatment protocols for dental students. Thus, this article aims to evaluate retrospectively if there is any difference in procedural errors and outcomes in cases done by dental students when using two different techniques: a hybrid rotary technique (HYB), consisting of both hand instrumentation with stainless steel files and use of a rotary system (Vortex Blue), versus a full reciprocation instrumentation technique (WaveOne Gold - WOG). Treatment outcomes were also observed, as well as what factors influence the success rates of these treatments done by dental students. The null hypotheses are that the variation of techniques does not change the incidence of procedural errors, and that the different techniques would not affect the clinical outcomes.

Methodology

Case selection

This study was exempted from IRB review, per submission and processing (protocol # HUM00212068). Data was collected from the dental school's computerized records (between 2013 and 2022). The following inclusion criteria were established: patients, who received root canal treatment at the dental school (initial treatment) by predoctoral students and had complete medical and dental records. The exclusion criteria were: teeth were excluded if radiographic interpretation was not possible during any of the following steps: initial diagnosis, working length determination, master apical file verification, gutta-percha point fit or final obturation. No patient or student information was retrieved from the system, and no patient/student identifiers were used for the study. Pulpal diagnoses were divided into vital and non-vital cases. To carry out the power analysis, we assumed an error rate of 25% in the WOG group⁷, and 13.1% in the HYB group. We obtained a sample size of 184 cases in each group (a total of 368, group size ratio of 1) to have 80% power based on Fisher's exact test, assuming two-sided tests and a significance level of 0.05.

Clinical protocol

All cases and procedures used for this study were supervised and signed off by Endodontics faculty. The cases were collected in two separate time spans: 2013-2018, when the technique used was hybrid (HYB); 2018-2022, when the adopted technique was the WaveOne Gold (WOG).

Before instrumentation, all cases had the endodontic access completed and canal patency achieved with #10 K-file to the estimated working length (WL). The WL was determined with apex locator and confirmed with a digital radiograph. Glide path achieved using K-files #10, 15, and 20. Vortex 25/.08 rotary orifice opener was used to instrument the coronal third of the canal. After these common procedures, cases were treated with one of the following techniques (HYB or WOG). 4.125% sodium hypochlorite (NaOCl) was used as irrigation throughout the treatments.

Hybrid Instrumentation Group (HYB)

Crown-down instrumentation was done with Vortex (.04 taper) rotary files #45, 40 and 35 up to the middle third of the canal. Instrumentation up to WL was done using Profile NiTi 0.04 hand files, starting with the file that binds at WL and up extra 2 sizes (e.g. 25, 30, 35 or 40). A Master Apical File (MAF) radiograph was taken with the last file used to instrument the canal.

WaveOne Gold Instrumentation Group (WOG)

Instrumentation up to WL was done using the WOG reciprocation system. This was done up to the appropriate size according to the size of the canal (e.g. 25, 35 or 45). The canal size was determined in the following way: if the 25/.07 file does not bind at length with no dentinal debris in the apical flutes, continue shaping with Medium file (035/.06) and/or Large file (45/.05) until the apical flutes are loaded, per manufacturer's recommendations. MAF radiograph was taken with the last file used to instrument the canal.

After the instrumentation accordingly to the above described protocols, all canals received the same final irrigation protocol with 6.0 mL of 4.125% NaOCl, then 3.0 mL of 17% EDTA and 6.0 mL of 4.125% NaOCl. Canals were dried with paper points and a gutta-percha cone fit radiograph was taken. The obturation was done with gutta-percha and AH Plus sealer

using cold lateral condensation technique. Following treatment, patients were scheduled for post-treatment evaluation (PTE), where signs, symptoms, or postoperative complications were recorded, with the type of restoration placed and radiographic interpretation.

Data collection

For the present study, the clinical outcomes were obtained by interpreting the treatment and follow-up radiographs. Results were classified as follows: ^{27,28}

1. Healed/healing (Favorable outcome):
 - a) Healed (complete healing): absence of a periapical lesion with no pain, swelling, or discomfort.
 - b) Healing (incomplete healing): reduction in the periapical lesion size but not completely resolved with no pain, swelling, or discomfort.
2. Not healing (Unfavorable outcome):
 - a) No change in the size of the periapical lesion/increase in the size of the periapical lesion/development of a new periapical lesion.
 - b) Development of clinical signs or symptoms (pain, swelling or discomfort).

Besides the clinical outcomes, multiple host, treatment, and procedural errors variables were recorded from the patients' records after a retrospective chart review.

Host factors

1. Patient age (at the time of treatment)
2. Tooth type (anterior/ premolar)
3. Arch (maxillary/mandibular)
4. Pulp condition (vital/necrotic)
5. Periapical lesion: (present/absent)
6. Periapical lesion based on the periapical index (PAI)²⁹

- PAI 1: Normal Periapical structures
- PAI 2: Small changes in bone structure
- PAI 3: Changes in bone structure with some mineral bone loss
- PAI 4: Periodontitis with well-defined radiolucent area
- PAI 5: Severe periodontitis, exacerbating features

Treatment factors

1. MAF following instrumentation of each root canal system.
2. Density of the obturation.
 - a) Good: homogeneous radiopaque material with no visible space between the material and the walls of the canal and with no more than 2 small voids (<1 mm) along the entire obturation.
 - b) Poor: nonuniform radio-density, with multiple voids along the obturation and/or canal space visible laterally and apically.

Procedural errors (present or absent)

1. Separated instrument(s)/files: Identified through observation of the radiograph and according to the radiopacity between the filling material and the fractured instrument.³⁰
2. Canal transportation: Identified when the extrusion of filling material was detected in any other area of the root, except the furcation area.^{31,32}
3. Ledging: Identified when the root obturation/MAF was at least 1 mm shorter than the initial working length, or deviated from the original curvature canal shape^{31,32} or/and by treatment notes.
4. Over instrumentation: Can be identified when the MAF was seen beyond the radiographic apex.

Calibration

Both intra and inter examiner calibration was conducted initially (pre-analysis), to determine the level of agreement and make adjustments. Calibrations were conducted using the Kappa test ($p < 0.05$), for obturation quality (Inter: 0.8165; Intra: 0.9082), PAI (Inter: 0.9636; Intra: 0.9696) and presence of periapical lesion (Inter: 1.000; Intra: 1.000), indicating strong level of agreement.

Statistical analysis

Categorical variables are expressed as count and percentages and continuous variables as median and interquartile range (IQR). Comparative analyses for categorical variables were performed using Fisher's exact test and for continuous variables using Mann Whitney U test. Two-tailed p values of < 0.05 were considered significant. We performed a multivariable logistic regression, with instrumentation technique (WOB or HYB), MAF, and tooth number included as the covariates (independent variables), to compute their effects on procedural errors (dependent variable). Kaplan-Meier survival analysis with log-rank test was used to compare tooth survival (presence or absence of the tooth in the oral cavity) between the instrumentation groups, with the time-to-event function (defining "event" as the tooth extraction). We also used a bivariate cox proportional hazards regression model to compute hazard ratios and 95% confidence intervals of the effects of instrumentation technique and periapical index (PAI), on tooth survival (with the time to event function, defining "event" as the tooth extraction). All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS v.29.0.1.1 (IBM, Armonk, NY).

Results

In the HYB group, the median age of the patients was 59 years (interquartile range (IQR) 43 to 69 years), and 15 were current smokers (out of those patients whose smoking history was known). This was comparable to the patients in the WOG group whose median age was 55 years (IQR 41 to 69 years, $p = 0.316$), and 19 were known current smokers. Both groups comprised 97 (52.7%) anterior teeth and 87 (47.3%) premolars, with no significant differences in the distribution of tooth numbers between the two groups ($p = 0.550$). Tooth vitality was similar with 131 (71.2%) non-vital teeth in the HYB group and 141 (76.6%) non-vital teeth in the WOG group ($p = 0.285$). Periapical indexes were also similar across the two groups ($p = 0.992$). There was a significant difference in the MAF size, with 12 (6.5%) MAF < 35

in the HYB group compared to 63 (34.2%) MAF<35 in the WOG group ($p<0.001$). Data from this section is summarized in **Table 1**.

Procedural errors

The total of procedural errors in the HYB group was 23 (12.5%) and in the WOG group was 45 (24.4%). There was a significant difference in the proportion of procedural errors between the groups with a p -value lower than 0.05 (**Table 2**). In the HYB group, 18 cases (9.8%) had over-instrumentation errors, 3 (1.6%) had canal transportation, 2 (1.1%) had ledges and none had instrument separation. In the WOG group 45 (24.5%) had over-instrumentation errors, but there were no canal transportation, ledge or instrument separation errors. The two groups had a significant difference in terms of over-instrumentation errors with a p -value of <0.001 .

In the multivariable logistic regression analysis, WOG was associated with a higher odds of procedural errors compared to the HYB group (Odds ratio (OR) of 2.414, 95% confidence interval (CI) 1.342 to 4.342, $p=0.003$), while $MAF\geq 35$ (OR 1.194, 95% CI 0.594 to 2.4, $p=0.618$) and tooth number did not have a significant association with procedural errors (**Table 3**).

Survival analysis

The number of teeth that did not survive in the HYB group was 28/170 (16.47%). The number of teeth that did not survive in the WOG group was 10/148 (6.76%). Although the difference in the survival proportion was significant using Fisher's exact test ($p=0.009$), when adjusted for follow-up time on the survival analysis, there was no statistically significant difference in tooth survival between the groups. The follow-up of the teeth in the HYB group ranged from 6 months to 9 years (median follow-up of 5 years, IQR 3 to 7 years), while the follow-up in the WOG group ranged from 3 months to 5 years (median follow-up of 2 years (IQR 1 to 3 years)). 170 cases in the HYB group and 148 cases in the WOG group had Survival/Follow-up times, and were included in the survival analyses. The rest were excluded from the survival analyses. The Kaplan-Meier survival analysis showed no significant difference in tooth survival between the two instrumentation groups (log-rank test $p=0.306$) (**Figure 1**). On the Cox proportional hazards regression model we adjusted for the effect of PAI on tooth survival. Once again, the instrumentation technique had no significant effect on

tooth survival (Hazard Ratio (HR) 0.719, 95% CI 0.339 to 1.525, $p=0.390$). However, the effect of PAI of 5 was statistically significant, and teeth with PAI of 5 were more likely to not survive compared to teeth with PAI of 1 (HR 6.719, 95% CI 2.027 to 22.272, $p=0.002$) (**Figure 2**).

Discussion:

In this study, we sought to evaluate retrospectively the difference in procedural errors and outcomes between cases performed by dental students using a hybrid technique or the WaveOne Gold reciprocating instrumentation systems.

We observed that over-instrumentation error was the most commonly reported type of error. This has been reported to be a common mishap when using the reciprocating WOG file system.^{33,34} In this study, 12 out of all the WOG cases were taken up to a 45/.05, which might contribute to higher reports of over-instrumentation. Another possible explanation might be that the apical third of the HYB group was instrumented using NiTi 0.04 hand files whereas the apical third of the WOG group was instrumented with the reciprocation, which in novice hands might cause loss of apical control. This could be considered a problem regarding the clinical outcomes, as previous articles have shown apical changes³⁵ and a decrease in prognosis following over-instrumentation³⁶. However our results showed that over-instrumentation did not affect the outcomes in this particular sample size and population.

Regarding instrument separation, multiple studies using endodontic residents show a separation rate of 1.68³⁷-1.33³⁸% with rotary instruments and a reduction (0.84%) with reciprocating files,¹⁰ which is further reduced when the treatment was performed by an endodontist (0.13%).⁹ This shows how reciprocation and the experience of the provider can reduce the instrument separation rate. Our study did not find any instances of instrument separation with either instrumentation technique. This could be due to our smaller sample size compared to previous studies^{9,10,37,38}, and the fact that endodontic residents and endodontists tend to handle more challenging cases with complex anatomies. In contrast, our study involved dental students who handled simpler cases. Nevertheless having no separation rate in our study proves that both techniques in our study are very safe.

We also evaluated the effect of instrumentation and other factors on tooth survival instead of success, where we adopted a modified Friedman criterion.^{27,28} In our study, the follow-up period for the teeth in HYB group was longer since their data was collected since

2013. Our median follow-up time in the HYB group was 5 years (IQR 3 to 7 years) while the median follow-up time in the WOG group was 2 years (IQR 1 to 3 years). Upon survival analysis, taking into account the time-to-event function, there was no statistically significant difference between the groups in terms of tooth survival. This result was in accordance with a systematic review of longitudinal clinical studies,³⁹ where they showed that there was no statistically significant difference in outcomes across studies in terms of the method of instrumentation.

On the other hand, when adjusting for PAI index, teeth with PAI index of 5 were associated with lower survival. This is in accordance with studies that show that large preoperative lesions negatively affect the outcomes of RCTs.^{39–41} Higher levels of bacteria and endotoxins are found in teeth with larger sizes of radiolucent areas.^{42–44} A higher number of bacteria is correlated with organized biofilms where bacteria adhere to the root canal walls, and accumulate to form communities⁴⁵, which can be important for bacterial resistance during and after intracanal antimicrobial procedures⁴⁶ and reflects the organization of the biofilm in apical segments.⁴⁷ In the WOG group 10 (5.4%) teeth did not survive. The majority of teeth that did not survive were due to fractures, and the ones that did not survive because of persistent bacteria were the 2 teeth that remained symptomatic and a tooth where the palatal canal was missed. One hundred and thirty-eight (75.0%) teeth survived in the WOG group and 36 (19.6%) teeth did not have a post-treatment evaluation (PTE). The lack of PTE could be attributed to shorter time from the date of treatment to chart abstraction, compared to the HYB group, and also due to fewer PTE appointments in clinic during the COVID-19 pandemic. In comparison, the HYB group had 34 (18.5%) teeth that did not survive. The majority of these teeth fractured or were extracted for reasons not related to endodontic failure. Six teeth did not survive due to endodontic reasons. One hundred and forty-three (77.7%) teeth survived and only 7 (3.8%) teeth did not have a PTE.

Comparing proportions of teeth that did not survive between the two groups is misleading because the HYB group had a significantly longer PTE time, and status of 19.6% teeth in the WOG group was unknown (compared to 3.8% in the HYB group). Hence, a survival analysis, which takes into account the time-to-event function as well as loss to follow-up, was deemed to be a more appropriate statistical method. A Kaplan-Meier survival analysis showed no statistical significance between the 2 instrumentation groups in terms of tooth survival. Furthermore, our study also found no significant association between tooth survival and patient age, tooth type, tooth number, tooth vitality, or MAF. Our study groups also had a very

similar profile in terms of patient age, tooth type, tooth number, tooth vitality and PAI, which

further removes any potential effects of these factors on tooth survival. Multiple studies have shown a tooth survival rate of 88% to 97% after root canal treatment^{48–50}, which is similar to the overall tooth survival in our study (86%) upon excluding the teeth that did not have PTE.

It is also important to emphasize that tooth survival after the endodontic treatment is directly related to the timely and adequate placement of a final restoration. Studies have shown that failure rates increase if the restorative treatment is not adequate^{28,40,48}. The present study did not specifically evaluate this criteria; however, as cases were done in an integrated clinics environment, it is expected that most, if not all, were restored. In addition, although the literature has information on the survival of endodontically treated teeth accordingly to the type of restoration, such level of stratification on the current study would demand a remarkable increase in sample size, and for a factor that is not the main purpose here.

Further studies looking into the outcomes of root canals completed by early learners in Dentistry may be necessary, more specifically looking into the technique variations and how they impact the clinical results. Our study is one of the first to look beyond the incidence of procedural errors and, although limited by sample size and the fact that it is a retrospective study, it shows that technological improvements are able to produce similar outcome results when used by dental students.

Conclusions:

We can conclude that novice students using the WOG technique are more prone to over-instrumentation errors than students using the HYB instrumentation technique, thus rejecting the null hypothesis in this topic. However, both groups showed a low incidence of canal transportations, ledges, and instrument separation and the higher incidence of over-instrumentation in the WOG group did not affect tooth survival, in this case failing to reject the second null hypothesis. The score of the periapical lesion was the only factor that was significantly associated with lower tooth survival.

References

1. Elsaka SE, Elnaghy AM. Cyclic fatigue resistance of OneShape and WaveOne instruments using different angles of curvature. *Dent Mater J*. 2015;34(3):358–63.
2. Adigüzel M, Capar ID. Comparison of Cyclic Fatigue Resistance of WaveOne and WaveOne Gold Small, Primary, and Large Instruments. *J Endod*. 2017 Apr;43(4):623–7.
3. Prados-Privado M, Rojo R, Ivorra C, Prados-Frutos JC. Finite element analysis comparing WaveOne, WaveOne Gold, Reciproc and Reciproc Blue responses with bending and torsion tests. *J Mech Behav Biomed Mater*. 2019 Feb;90:165–72.
4. Bueno CSP, Oliveira DP, Pelegriane RA, Fontana CE, Rocha DGP, Gutmann JL, et al. Fracture incidence of WaveOne Gold files: a prospective clinical study. *Int Endod J*. 2020 Sep;53(9):1192–8.
5. Topçuoğlu HS, Düzgün S, Aktı A, Topçuoğlu G. Laboratory comparison of cyclic fatigue resistance of WaveOne Gold, Reciproc and WaveOne files in canals with a double curvature. *Int Endod J*. 2017 Jul;50(7):713–7.
6. Bürklein S, Flüch S, Schäfer E. Shaping ability of reciprocating single-file systems in severely curved canals: WaveOne and Reciproc versus WaveOne Gold and Reciproc blue. *Odontology*. 2019 Jan;107(1):96–102.
7. Hamid HR, Gluskin AH, Peters OA, Peters CI. Rotary Versus Reciprocation Root Canal Preparation: Initial Clinical Quality Assessment in a Novice Clinician Cohort. *J Endod*. 2018 Aug;44(8):1257–62.
8. Plotino G, Ahmed HMA, Grande NM, Cohen S, Bukiet F. Current Assessment of Reciprocation in Endodontic Preparation: A Comprehensive Review--Part II: Properties and Effectiveness. *J Endod*. 2015 Dec;41(12):1939–50.
9. Cunha RS, Junaid A, Ensinas P, Nudera W, Bueno CE da S. Assessment of the separation incidence of reciprocating WaveOne files: a prospective clinical study. *J Endod*. 2014 Jul;40(7):922–4.

10. Caballero-Flores H, Nabeshima CK, Binotto E, Machado MEL. Fracture incidence of instruments from a single-file reciprocating system by students in an endodontic graduate programme: a cross-sectional retrospective study. *Int Endod J*. 2019 Jan;52(1):13–8.
11. Shen Y, Coil JM, Mo AJ, Wang Z, Hieawy A, Yang Y, et al. WaveOne Rotary Instruments after Clinical Use. *J Endod*. 2016 Feb;42(2):186–9.
12. Goldberg M, Dahan S, Machtou P. Centering Ability and Influence of Experience When Using WaveOne Single-File Technique in Simulated Canals. *Int J Dent*. 2012;2012:206321.
13. Berutti E, Chiandussi G, Paolino DS, Scotti N, Cantatore G, Castellucci A, et al. Canal shaping with WaveOne Primary reciprocating files and ProTaper system: a comparative study. *J Endod*. 2012 Apr;38(4):505–9.
14. Cheung GSP, Liu CSY. A retrospective study of endodontic treatment outcome between nickel-titanium rotary and stainless steel hand filing techniques. *J Endod*. 2009 Jul;35(7):938–43.
15. Sonntag D, Delschen S, Stachniss V. Root-canal shaping with manual and rotary Ni-Ti files performed by students. *Int Endod J*. 2003 Nov;36(11):715–23.
16. Muñoz E, Forner L, Garcet S, Rodríguez-Lozano FJ, Llena C. Canal shaping with a reciprocating system is easy to learn. *Int Endod J*. 2019 Aug;52(8):1244–9.
17. Kim HC, Kwak SW, Cheung GSP, Ko DH, Chung SM, Lee W. Cyclic fatigue and torsional resistance of two new nickel-titanium instruments used in reciprocation motion: Reciproc versus WaveOne. *J Endod*. 2012 Apr;38(4):541–4.
18. You SY, Bae KS, Baek SH, Kum KY, Shon WJ, Lee W. Lifespan of one nickel-titanium rotary file with reciprocating motion in curved root canals. *J Endod*. 2010 Dec;36(12):1991–4.

19. You SY, Kim HC, Bae KS, Baek SH, Kum KY, Lee W. Shaping ability of reciprocating motion in curved root canals: a comparative study with micro-computed tomography. *J Endod*. 2011 Sep;37(9):1296–300.
20. De-Deus G, Moreira EJJ, Lopes HP, Elias CN. Extended cyclic fatigue life of F2 ProTaper instruments used in reciprocating movement. *Int Endod J*. 2010 Dec;43(12):1063–8.
21. Plotino G, Grande NM, Cordaro M, Testarelli L, Gambarini G. A review of cyclic fatigue testing of nickel-titanium rotary instruments. *J Endod*. 2009 Nov;35(11):1469–76.
22. Scattina A, Alovizi M, Paolino DS, Pasqualini D, Scotti N, Chiandussi G, et al. Prediction of Cyclic Fatigue Life of Nickel-Titanium Rotary Files by Virtual Modeling and Finite Elements Analysis. *Journal of Endodontics*. 2015 Nov 1;41(11):1867–70.
23. Pruett JP, Clement DJ, Carnes DL. Cyclic fatigue testing of nickel-titanium endodontic instruments. *J Endod*. 1997 Feb;23(2):77–85.
24. Alapati SB, Brantley WA, Svec TA, Powers JM, Nusstein JM, Daehn GS. SEM observations of nickel-titanium rotary endodontic instruments that fractured during clinical Use. *J Endod*. 2005 Jan;31(1):40–3.
25. Haïkel Y, Serfaty R, Bateman G, Senger B, Allemann C. Dynamic and cyclic fatigue of engine-driven rotary nickel-titanium endodontic instruments. *J Endod*. 1999 Jun;25(6):434–40.
26. Yang Y, Shen Y, Ma J, Cao Y, Haapasalo M. A Micro-Computed Tomographic Assessment of the Influence of Operator's Experience on the Quality of WaveOne Instrumentation. *J Endod*. 2016 Aug;42(8):1258–62.
27. Friedman S. Prognosis of initial endodontic therapy: Prognosis of initial endodontic therapy. *Endodontic Topics*. 2002 Jul;2(1):59–88.
28. Friedman S, Abitbol S, Lawrence HP. Treatment outcome in endodontics: the Toronto Study. Phase 1: initial treatment. *J Endod*. 2003 Dec;29(12):787–93.

29. Orstavik D, Kerekes K, Eriksen HM. The periapical index: a scoring system for radiographic assessment of apical periodontitis. *Endod Dent Traumatol*. 1986 Feb;2(1):20–34.
30. Khabbaz MG, Protogerou E, Douka E. Radiographic quality of root fillings performed by undergraduate students. *Int Endod J*. 2010 Jun;43(6):499–508.
31. Eleftheriadis GI, Lambrianidis TP. Technical quality of root canal treatment and detection of iatrogenic errors in an undergraduate dental clinic. *Int Endod J*. 2005 Oct;38(10):725–34.
32. Balto H, Al Khalifah S, Al Mugairin S, Al Deeb M, Al-Madi E. Technical quality of root fillings performed by undergraduate students in Saudi Arabia. *Int Endod J*. 2010 Apr;43(4):292–300.
33. Berutti E, Chiandussi G, Paolino DS, Scotti N, Cantatore G, Castellucci A, et al. Effect of canal length and curvature on working length alteration with WaveOne reciprocating files. *J Endod*. 2011 Dec;37(12):1687–90.
34. Haug SR, Solfeld AF, Ranheim LE, Bårdsen A. Impact of Case Difficulty on Endodontic Mishaps in an Undergraduate Student Clinic. *J Endod*. 2018 Jul;44(7):1088–95.
35. Gutiérrez JH, Brizuela C, Villota E. Human teeth with periapical pathosis after overinstrumentation and overfilling of the root canals: a scanning electron microscopic study. *Int Endod J*. 1999 Jan;32(1):40–8.
36. Bergenholtz G, Lekholm U, Milthorpe R, Engstrom B. Influence of apical overinstrumentation and overfilling on re-treated root canals. *J Endod*. 1979 Oct;5(10):310–4.
37. Iqbal MK, Kohli MR, Kim JS. A retrospective clinical study of incidence of root canal instrument separation in an endodontics graduate program: a PennEndo database study. *J Endod*. 2006 Nov;32(11):1048–52.
38. Tzanetakis GN, Kontakiotis EG, Maurikou DV, Marzelou MP. Prevalence and management of instrument fracture in the postgraduate endodontic program at the

- Dental School of Athens: a five-year retrospective clinical study. *J Endod.* 2008 Jun;34(6):675–8.
39. 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. *Int Endod J.* 2022 Jul;55(7):714–31.
40. Ricucci D, Russo J, Rutberg M, Burleson JA, Spångberg LSW. A prospective cohort study of endodontic treatments of 1,369 root canals: results after 5 years. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod.* 2011 Dec;112(6):825–42.
41. Ørstavik D, Qvist V, Stoltze K. A multivariate analysis of the outcome of endodontic treatment. *Eur J Oral Sci.* 2004 Jun;112(3):224–30.
42. Martinho FC, Chiesa WMM, Leite FRM, Cirelli JA, Gomes BPFA. Antigenic activity of bacterial endodontic contents from primary root canal infection with periapical lesions against macrophage in the release of interleukin-1beta and tumor necrosis factor alpha. *J Endod.* 2010 Sep;36(9):1467–74.
43. Schein B, Schilder H. Endotoxin content in endodontically involved teeth. *J Endod.* 1975 Jan;1(1):19–21.
44. Oliveira LD de, Carvalho CAT, Carvalho AS, Alves J de S, Valera MC, Jorge AOC. Efficacy of endodontic treatment for endotoxin reduction in primarily infected root canals and evaluation of cytotoxic effects. *J Endod.* 2012 Aug;38(8):1053–7.
45. Costerton JW, Stewart PS, Greenberg EP. Bacterial biofilms: a common cause of persistent infections. *Science.* 1999 May 21;284(5418):1318–22.
46. Distel JW, Hatton JF, Gillespie MJ. Biofilm formation in medicated root canals. *J Endod.* 2002 Oct;28(10):689–93.
47. Ricucci D, Siqueira JF. Biofilms and apical periodontitis: study of prevalence and association with clinical and histopathologic findings. *J Endod.* 2010 Aug;36(8):1277–88.

48. Salehrabi R, Rotstein I. Endodontic treatment outcomes in a large patient population in the USA: an epidemiological study. *J Endod.* 2004 Dec;30(12):846–50.
49. Fernández R, Cardona JA, Cadavid D, Álvarez LG, Restrepo FA. Survival of Endodontically Treated Roots/Teeth Based on Periapical Health and Retention: A 10-year Retrospective Cohort Study. *J Endod.* 2017 Dec;43(12):2001–8.
50. Kwak Y, Choi J, Kim K, Shin SJ, Kim S, Kim E. The 5-Year Survival Rate of Nonsurgical Endodontic Treatment: A Population-based Cohort Study in Korea. *J Endod.* 2019 Oct;45(10):1192–9.

Table 1: Baseline characteristics of the study groups

Baseline Characteristics	HYB	WOG	*p-value
Age in years [median, (IQR)]	59 (43, 69)	55 (41, 69)	0.316
Tooth type			
<i>Anterior</i>	97 (52.7%)	97 (52.7%)	1.000
<i>Premolar</i>	87 (47.3%)	87 (47.3%)	
Tooth vitality			
<i>Vital</i>	53 (28.8%)	43 (23.4%)	0.285
<i>Non-vital</i>	131 (71.2%)	141 (76.6%)	
Periapical Index (PAI)			
<i>Score 1</i>	40 (21.7%)	42 (22.8%)	0.992
<i>Score 2</i>	45 (24.5%)	46 (25.0%)	
<i>Score 3</i>	56 (30.4%)	57 (30.8%)	
<i>Score 4</i>	34 (18.5%)	31 (16.8%)	
<i>Score 5</i>	9 (4.9%)	8 (4.3%)	
Master Apical File (MAF)			
<35	12 (6.5%)	63 (34.2%)	<0.001
≥35	172 (93.5%)	121 (65.8%)	
*p-values are 2-sided and based on Fisher's exact test for categorical values and Mann-Whitney U test for continuous variables. p<0.05 were considered statistically significant.			

Table 2: Outcomes of tooth instrumentation with Hybrid and WaveOne Gold

Outcomes	HYB	WOG	*p-value
Procedural errors ¹	23 (12.5%)	45 (24.5%)	<0.005
Over-instrumentation	18 (9.8%)	45 (24.5%)	<0.001
Canal Transportation	3 (1.6%)	0 (0.0%)	0.248
Tooth Survival ²			
Teeth that survived	34 (18.5%)	10 (5.4%)	<0.001
Teeth that didn't survive	143 (77.7%)	138 (75.0%)	
Unknown	7 (3.8%)	36 (19.6%)	

*p-values are 2-sided and based on Fisher's exact test. p<0.05 were considered statistically significant.

¹Crown perforations and missed canals were excluded as they may occur independently irrespective of instrumentation technique.

²Tooth survival data was unknown for 7cases in the Hybrid group and 36 cases in the WaveOne Gold group. Follow-up time was variable.

Table 3: Logistic Regression: Factors affecting the prevalence of procedural errors

Variable	Odds Ratio (95% CI)	p- value
Instrumentation technique:		
Hybrid	Control	0.003
WaveOne Gold	2.414 (1.342 - 4.342)	
MAF ≥ 35	1.194 (0.594 - 2.4)	0.618
Tooth group:		
Maxillary anteriors and mandibular canines	Control	0.266
Maxillary premolars	0.666 (0.325 - 1.364)	
Mandibular premolars	0.916 (0.460 - 1.823)	
Mandibular incisors	1.334 (0.483 - 3.689)	
p-values are 2-sided. p<0.05 were considered statistically significant.		
Bold number indicates statistical significance.		

Figure legends




Figure 1: Kaplan Meier curves showing tooth survival stratified by instrumentation technique




Figure 2: Effect of periapical index (PAI) on tooth survival