



Surgical Removal of Fractured Endodontic Instrument in the Periapex via open approach-A Clinical Case Report

¹Dr. Rakesh Damarapu, ²Dr. Minhaj A, ³Dr. P.Shamini, ⁴Dr. K.Chandana vani
⁵Dr. Sanjana Samala, ⁶Dr. Vishnu Priya Cherukuri, ⁷Dr. Nissi Evelyn R, ⁸Dr .Shravan Teja

^{1,3,6}Assistant Professor, ^{2,7}Surgeon, ^{4,8}Senior Resident, ⁵BDS,

^{1,2,4,7,8}Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery,

²Meghna institute of Dental Sciences, Nizamabad

¹Care Dental College And Hospital, Potturu

^{4,7,8}Government Dental College and Hospital, Hyderabad,Telangana

³Department of Pedodontics and Preventive Dentistry, Thirumala Institute Of Dental Sciences And Research Center, Nizamabad.

⁶Department of Orthodontics And Dentofacial Orthopaedics, MNR Dental College And Hospital

***Corresponding Author:**

Dr. Shravan Teja

Senior Resident, Department Of Oral And Maxillofacial Surgery, Government Dental College And Hospital, Hyderabad

Type of Publication: Case Report

Conflicts of Interest: Nil

Abstract

The purpose of this article is to present the surgical removal of a broken endodontic file from the periapical region of the lower premolar. The methods of diagnosis and measurement of the distance of the instrument to the adjacent vital structures in the periapical region was done with simple means and in an economical manner.

Keywords: Fractured endodontic instrument, periapical surgery, open approach

Introduction

Fracture of root canal instruments is one of the most troublesome incidents in endodontic therapy. Several studies focused on factors influencing defects of endodontic instruments after clinical use, and some recommendations were given to minimize the risk of instrument breakage.¹⁻³ It is reported that the prevalence of broken instruments ranges from 0.5% to 5%.⁴⁻⁷ If the broken file impedes adequate cleaning of the canal beyond the obstruction, prognosis might be adversely affected.⁸ Many a times, this lead to failure of root canal therapy and burdened the patients with anxiety.^{9,10} Strindberg found a statistically significant 19% higher failure frequency for cases in which there was instrument breakage compared with cases without breakage.¹¹ Therefore, the best option in the management of root canal instrument fracture is removal. Several

techniques and devices have been used for the removal of broken instrument. Difficult cases are occasionally encountered in which the separated file cannot be retrieved from the canal. Intentionally leaving a fragment in the root canal might be considered when non-surgical removal has been attempted without success. In addition, vigorous reduction of the dentinal walls of the root canal space might cause perforation of the canal wall. This can adversely affect the prognosis of teeth. Endodontic instruments rarely separate beyond the apical foramen. The fractured segment, always accompanied with bacteria and dentine debris, is a foreign object and might cause inflammation. Moreover, patients often regard the fractured segment as “a broken needle” and suffer psychologically. Therefore, an attempt to remove the segment from such cases with a surgical approach is often

necessary. Before surgery, the precise position and size of the fractured instrument should be understood as well as its relation to the root apex and surrounding anatomic structures. The aim of the article is to present a case that used RVG to locate and successfully remove a fractured endodontic instrument partially beyond the apical foramen using a surgical approach.

Case Report:

A 42-year-old Indian male patient came to our institute with a complaint of pain in the lower right posterior region. On clinical and radio graphical examination, it was diagnosed as a case of irreversible pulpitis due to a deep carious lesion

involving the pulp and it was indicated for root canal treatment. Medical history was unremarkable. After access opening, cleaning and shaping was initiated. Rotary protapers (Dentsply Maillefer, Ballaigues, Switzerland) were used with a 64:1 reduction gear Rotary endodontic hand piece (NSK, Nakanishi, Japan). In the process of cleaning and shaping, a 5 mm segment of F2 rotary protaper got fractured in the apical canal . A decision to remove the instrument nonsurgically was undertaken with the consent of the patient. In an attempt to remove the file , the file got accidentally pushed into the canal such that 2/3rd of the file was beyond the periapex and 1/3rd inside the canal (Figure 2).

Fig 1: Surgical exposure of peri apex area



Fig 2: Broken file in peri apex identified in RVG



Fig 3: Assessment of position of file in RVG



Fig 5: Surgical wound closure



Fig 4: Retrieval of the broken file



The tooth was temporized and the patient was informed regarding the mishap and kept under observation for a week. During the recall, the patient gave a positive history for pain on mastication and a decision was made to surgically remove the fragment

Pre Operative Assessment:

A 19 gauge wire of a known length (10 mm) was used as a radiographic marker and was taped to the sensor, while taking the RVG. The radiographic marker was then measured on the RVG to calculate any elongation or shortening of the image (Figure 3). The RVG was taken to measure: (1) The exact size of the fractured instrument, (2) the distance from the reference point (cusp) to the apex of the tooth, and (3) the distance from the reference point to the upper border inferior alveolar canal. The actual size of the marker was compared with the size of the marker on the RVG and the above mentioned measurements were made. In our case, the pre-determined length of the radiographic marker coincided with its length on the RVG. Therefore all measurements were directly carried out using the RVG software

Procedure:

The procedure was performed under local anesthesia 2% lignocaine with 1:80,000 adrenaline. A crevicular incision was given from the mesial aspect of the mandibular left first pre-molar till the distal aspect of the mandibular left second molar and a mesial releasing incision extending into the vestibule was taken to raise a triangular flap. Subperiosteal reflection was done. A 5 mm bony window was prepared through the buccal cortex corresponding to the root apex of the premolar at the previously calculated length (Figure 1). The instrument was carefully visualized and then removed with a mosquito forceps (Figure 4). A post-operative radiograph was taken to confirm complete removal of the fractured segment. Next, the canal was obturated using 6% gutta-percha and 4% accessory cones and AH plus Sealer (Dentsply, Maillefer). The gutta-percha was burnished at the apical end of the distal canal with a hot burnisher. The wound was then curetted, and irrigation was done with normal saline. Demineralised freeze dried bone allograft was used to graft the surgical site and closure was done with 3-0 silk (Figure 5). Patient was prescribed amoxicillin 500 mg/8 h for 7 days, ibuprofen 600 mg/8 h for 3 days, and 0.12% chlorhexidine gluconate mouthwash

thrice a day for 7 days. After 7 days, the patient was recalled for suture removal. A post-endodontic restoration was done. At the 6 month recall examination, the mandibular premolar was asymptomatic with progressive regeneration of the periapical bone.

Discussion:

Endodontic procedural errors, such as under-filling, overfilling, fractured instruments, and root perforations and ledges, increase the risk of post-treatment disease largely as a result of the inability to eliminate intra-radicular microorganisms from the infected root canal. When an instrument fractures during root canal preparation, there are three basic approaches to deal with the problem: (i) Remove it; (ii) bypass and seal it within the root canal; or (iii) block the root canal with it. A thorough history, clinical examination, and good quality periapical radiographs are essential for pre-operative diagnosis of teeth scheduled to undergo apical surgery.

Periapical surgery in mandibular premolars presents certain technical difficulties such as the close proximity of the apices to the mandibular canal, difficult access to the roots due to their posterior location and their lingual inclination and type and thickness of the buccal plate. The close proximity of the pathologic process to the mandibular canal can be a difficult surgical problem in terms of protecting this vital structure from damage. Wesson and Gale found a sensory disturbance of variable duration in the lower lip after 20%-21% of mandibular premolar procedures. Periapical radiography is limited by the fact that information is rendered in only two dimensions. Interpretation is more difficult when the background pattern is complex. The use of computed tomography (CT) scans has enabled evaluation of the true extent of periapical lesions and their spatial relationship to important anatomical landmarks.

The introduction of cone-beam CT represented an important new development in dentomaxillofacial radiology and precipitated a shift from 2 to 3 dimensional data acquisition, image reconstruction, and visualization.

Conclusion:

Precise location of the fractured segment was predicted and removed with the aid of modern

gadgets and tooth was successfully treated without any complications.

References:

1. Shen Y, Haapasalo M, Cheung GS, Peng B. Defects in nickel-titanium instruments after clinical use. Part 1: Relationship between observed imperfections and factors leading to such defects in a cohort study. *J Endod* 2009;35(1):129-32.
2. Shen Y, Coil JM, McLean AG, Hemerling DL, Haapasalo M. Defects in nickel-titanium instruments after clinical use. Part 5: Single use from endodontic specialty practices. *J Endod* 2009;35(10):1363-7.
2. Shen Y, Coil JM, Haapasalo M. Defects in nickeltitanium instruments after clinical use. Part 3: A 4-year retrospective study from an undergraduate clinic. *J Endod* 2009;35(2):193-6.
3. Spili P, Parashos P, Messer HH. The impact of instrument fracture on outcome of endodontic treatment. *J Endod* 2005;31(12):845-50.
4. Knowles KI, Hammond NB, Biggs SG, Ibarrola JL. Incidence of instrument separation using LightSpeed rotary instruments. *J Endod* 2006;32(1):14-6.
5. Wolcott S, Wolcott J, Ishley D, Kennedy W, Johnson S, Minnich S, *et al*. Separation incidence of protaper rotary instruments: A large cohort clinical evaluation. *J Endod* 2006;32(12):1139-41.
6. 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;32(11):1048-52.
7. Fors UG, Berg JO. A method for the removal of broken endodontic instruments from root canals. *J Endod* 1983;9(4):156-9.
8. Sjogren U, Hagglund B, Sundqvist G, Wing K. Factors affecting the long-term results of endodontic treatment. *J Endod* 1990;16(10):498-504.
9. Siqueira JF Jr. Aetiology of root canal treatment failure: Why well-treated teeth can fail. *Int Endod J* 2001;34(1):1-10.
10. Strindberg LZ. The dependence of the results of pulp therapy on certain factors. *Acta Odontol Scand* 1956;14(Suppl 21):1-156