(International Print/Online Journal)

SJIF IMPACT FACTOR: 6.829
PUBMED-National Library of Medicine ID-101739732

ISSN (Print): 2209-2870
ISSN (Online): 2209-2862

IJMSCR

International Journal of Medical Science and Current Research (IJMSCR)
Available online at: www.ijmscr.com
Volume 8, Issue 5 , Page No: 398-403
September-October 2025

Dynamics of Endodontic Irrigation

[1]Dr. Pradnya Bansode, [2]Dr. Seema Pathak, [3]Dr. Madhuri Ambhure, [4]Dr. Manav Modi
[1]Professor & Head,[2,3]Associate Professor,[4]Post Graduate Student,
Dept. Of Conservative Dentistry And Endodontics,
Government College And Hospital, Chhatrapati Sambhajinagar

***Corresponding Author:**
Dr. Manav Modi
Post Graduate Student, Dept. Of Conservative Dentistry And Endodontics, Government College And Hospital, Chhatrapati Sambhajinagar

Type of Publication: Original Research Paper
Conflicts of Interest: Nil

Abstract

Root canal infections are highly complex, often polymicrobial in nature, and involve intricate bacterial interactions that hinder effective treatment. The primary objective of endodontic therapy is to eliminate the infected content within the root canal system, thereby facilitating periapical tissue healing. Traditionally, syringe and needle irrigation combined with chemical agents has been the most common approach to canal disinfection. However, this method alone frequently fails to achieve thorough debridement and disinfection. Consequently, both novel irrigating solutions and innovative irrigation activation systems have been developed to improve the chemical and physical efficacy of endodontic irrigation. This review provides a detailed overview of classical and contemporary irrigants, along with recent advances in activation technologies, aiming to highlight their clinical relevance, advantages, limitations, and future perspectives.

Keywords: Sodium hypochlorite, Ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid, Chlorhexidine, Irrigation Activation

Introduction

The goal of chemomechanical preparation in endodontics extends beyond shaping the root canal; it involves the complete elimination of infected or necrotic pulp tissue and associated microorganisms. A properly prepared canal space provides an avenue for antimicrobial solutions to reach critical areas, disrupt bacterial biofilms, dissolve tissue remnants, and create conditions that support the placement of root filling materials. Biofilms, formed by dense microbial communities attached to dentinal walls, represent the most persistent source of intracanal infection. During instrumentation, a smear layer is formed, consisting of organic and inorganic debris compacted against the dentin surface. This smear layer may harbor bacteria and protect deeper biofilm colonies while simultaneously obstructing the intimate adaptation of root filling materials. Thus, the ultimate objective of endodontic procedures is not merely mechanical enlargement but the comprehensive disinfection of the root canal system, thereby preventing reinfection.

To achieve this goal, chemical irrigants are indispensable adjuncts to instrumentation. Despite decades of research, no single irrigant possesses all the ideal characteristics. Moreover, syringe irrigation alone has significant limitations in reaching complex anatomical regions, especially in the apical third and lateral canals. These challenges have driven the development of advanced irrigants and activation systems designed to enhance the efficacy of chemical solutions.

Irrigants

1. Ideal Properties of Root Canal Irrigants

An ideal irrigant should embody a unique combination of physicochemical and biological characteristics. It should possess low surface tension to enable penetration into the dentinal tubules and accessory canals, and low viscosity to ensure adequate flow through narrow spaces. Its antimicrobial spectrum should cover both aerobic and anaerobic bacteria, fungi, and possibly even viruses. Tissue dissolution capacity is essential to remove necrotic and vital pulp remnants, while chelating ability facilitates smear layer removal. Additional desirable properties include biocompatibility with periapical tissues, lack of staining or discoloration, chemical stability, and long-term substantivity to provide sustained antimicrobial action. No currently available irrigant fulfills all these requirements, which explains the ongoing research into both synthetic and natural alternatives.

2. Classification of Irrigants

Root canal irrigants serve both physical and chemical purposes. Physically, they flush debris, provide lubrication, and carry microorganisms out of the canal system. Chemically, they inactivate endotoxins, eradicate bacterial biofilms, and dissolve organic and inorganic matter. Based on activity, irrigants may be classified into **inert irrigants**, which exert only mechanical flushing effects, and **active irrigants**, which include chemical and natural agents with antimicrobial or chelating properties.

2.1 Inert Irrigants

Inert irrigants primarily serve as flushing agents without intrinsic antibacterial or tissue-dissolving properties. Examples include distilled water and saline. Their importance lies in their ability to physically dislodge debris and dilute bacterial load through flow and backflow dynamics. While saline is highly biocompatible, it lacks antimicrobial activity and tissue dissolution. Interestingly, clinical trials using saline as a control have demonstrated significant bacterial reductions, underscoring the role of mechanical action and instrumentation in microbial elimination. However, saline interacts unfavorably with chlorhexidine (CHX), producing precipitates that complicate its clinical use. Hence, inert irrigants are rarely used as primary solutions but may serve supportive roles in irrigation protocols.

2.2 Active Irrigants

Active irrigants can be broadly grouped into chemical agents (e.g., sodium hypochlorite, chlorhexidine, EDTA) and natural alternatives (e.g., herbal extracts). Each has distinct antimicrobial, chelating, or tissue-dissolving properties.

2.2.1 Sodium Hypochlorite (NaOCl)

Sodium hypochlorite remains the cornerstone of endodontic irrigation due to its unparalleled tissue-dissolving ability and potent antimicrobial action. Its efficacy is influenced by concentration, volume, temperature, and frequency of replenishment. The active chlorine in NaOCl disrupts microbial cell membranes and denatures proteins, while oxygen release is particularly effective against anaerobic species. Despite these advantages, NaOCl is associated with drawbacks, including cytotoxicity when extruded beyond the apex, unpleasant taste and odor, and instability upon exposure to light, heat, or metallic surfaces. Optimal concentration remains debated, with recommendations ranging between 0.5% and 6%.

2.2.2 Chlorhexidine (CHX)

Chlorhexidine digluconate is widely regarded as a gold-standard antiseptic in dentistry. In endodontics, it is commonly employed at a 2% concentration, offering broad-spectrum antibacterial activity and substantivity that provides prolonged antimicrobial effects even after removal. Unlike NaOCl, CHX does not dissolve organic tissues, limiting its use as a sole irrigant. It is frequently used in conjunction with other solutions, particularly in retreatment cases or as a final rinse. However, clinicians must avoid mixing CHX with NaOCl, as this interaction produces a toxic and potentially staining precipitate (parachloroaniline). Careful irrigation protocols involving intermediate rinsing with distilled water are therefore mandatory.

2.2.3 Ethylenediaminetetraacetic Acid (EDTA)

EDTA is primarily used as a chelating agent to remove the smear layer and inorganic debris from root canal walls. By demineralizing dentin, EDTA enhances the penetration of disinfectants and medicaments into dentinal tubules. Typically employed at a concentration of 17%, it is often used as a final rinse following NaOCl irrigation. Prolonged exposure, however, can result in dentin erosion, necessitating cautious application. A combined irrigation sequence of NaOCl followed by EDTA is considered the gold standard for optimal cleaning and disinfection.

PROPERTIES OF IRRIGANTS	SODIUM HYPOCHLORITE	CHLORHEXIDINE	EDTA
Antimicrobial action	Yes	yes	no
Effect on biofilm	Yes(most)	yes	yes
Tissue solvent	yes	no	no
Inactivate endotoxin	yes	no	No
Substantivity	no	yes	no
Lubricant	yes	yes	no
Colorless		yes	
Don’t stain tooth(bleaching action)	yes	no	No
Stability	no	yes	no
Suspension of debris	no	yes	no
Chelation	no	no	yes
Be active in presence of blood, serum	no	yes	no
Biocompatible with periapical tissues	no	yes	no
Potential to cause anaphylaxis	no	yes	no
Don’t interfere with dentin physical property	no	yes	no
Don’t interfere with dentin restoration adhesion	no	yes	yes
Don’t interfere with stem cell viability	no	no	yes
Gutta percha disinfection	yes	yes	no
Smear layer remove	no	yes	yes

3. Emerging Irrigant Alternatives

3.1 Nanoparticles

Nanoparticles (NPs) have gained significant interest in endodontics due to their unique physicochemical properties, including ultra-small size, high surface-area-to-volume ratio, and enhanced reactivity. Silver nanoparticles (AgNPs) demonstrate strong antibacterial effects, disrupting biofilm structure and causing microbial lysis. Incorporation of AgNPs into gutta-percha and mineral trioxide aggregate has been explored to provide sustained antimicrobial activity in obturation materials. Similarly, chitosan and zinc oxide nanoparticles exhibit antimicrobial effects against planktonic and biofilm-associated bacteria, although higher concentrations and longer exposure are necessary for biofilm eradication. Nanometric bioactive glass, composed of silica, calcium oxide, sodium oxide, and phosphorus pentoxide, raises pH and exerts antibacterial properties. Despite their promise, nanoparticle toxicity and systemic accumulation raise biocompatibility concerns, necessitating further safety evaluations.

3.2 Ozonated Water

Ozone, available in gaseous or aqueous form, has been studied as an adjunctive endodontic irrigant. Its strong oxidizing potential makes it highly effective against bacteria, fungi, viruses, and even antibiotic-resistant strains. Ozone disrupts microbial cell membranes and oxidizes intracellular components, with Gram-positive bacteria generally more susceptible than Gramnegative species. It is biocompatible and well tolerated by oral tissues. However, despite promising results, evidence regarding its superiority to conventional irrigants remains inconsistent, with some studies supporting its adjunctive use while others demonstrate limited benefits.

Irrigation Activation Systems

The efficacy of irrigants is strongly influenced by their delivery and activation methods. While conventional syringe and needle irrigation is simple and cost-effective, it is limited by poor irrigant penetration, especially in the apical third, lateral canals, and isthmuses. Moreover, the vapor lock phenomenon—an entrapment of air preventing irrigant flow—further reduces efficacy. To overcome these challenges, numerous activation systems have been developed, employing mechanical agitation, sonic or ultrasonic energy, light-based activation, and pressure differentials.

4. Conventional Needle Irrigation

Syringe-based irrigation remains widely practiced. Needles of various gauges can be used passively or with agitation, and flow is controlled by operator pressure. However, irrigant penetration is typically limited to 1–1.5 mm beyond the needle tip, restricting effective cleaning in complex canal anatomies. Side-vented needles reduce the risk of apical extrusion, but limitations in irrigant replacement and the persistence of vapor lock diminish the technique's overall efficacy.

5. Manual Dynamic Activation (MDA)

MDA involves repeatedly inserting a well-fitted gutta-percha cone or file into the prepared canal with short push–pull strokes. This simple, low-cost method enhances irrigant exchange, disrupts vapor lock, and improves contact between irrigant and dentinal walls. Though less effective than advanced ultrasonic or sonic systems, MDA provides a practical enhancement of conventional irrigation without specialized equipment.

6. Passive Ultrasonic Irrigation (PUI)

PUI is one of the most researched activation methods. A small-diameter ultrasonic tip oscillates at 25–40 kHz, generating acoustic streaming and cavitation that promote powerful fluid dynamics within the canal. The tip, positioned just short of the working length, must vibrate freely within an enlarged preparation to maximize energy transfer. Both continuous and intermittent flushing techniques can be used. PUI has been shown to significantly improve smear layer removal, debris elimination, and antimicrobial efficacy compared to syringe irrigation alone.

7. Continuous Ultrasonic Irrigation (CUI) and Intermittent Ultrasonic Irrigation (IUI)

CUI provides a continuous supply of fresh irrigant during ultrasonic activation, enhancing chemical replenishment and reducing procedural time. In contrast, IUI involves alternating syringe delivery with ultrasonic activation cycles. Both methods significantly enhance canal debridement, with CUI offering superior efficiency.

8. Sonic Irrigation (SI)

Sonic systems operate at lower frequencies (1–10 kHz) but generate larger amplitude oscillations compared to ultrasonic devices. Although fluid velocities and shear stresses are lower, sonic devices such as the EndoActivator produce substantial hydrodynamic agitation. Disposable flexible polymer tips oscillate safely within canals, creating vigorous irrigant movement that enhances penetration into inaccessible areas. Sonic systems are particularly advantageous due to their ease of use and safety.

9. Specialized Endodontic Files

Devices such as the Self-Adjusting File (SAF) and XP-Endo Finisher were designed to enhance irrigant distribution during instrumentation. The SAF permits continuous irrigant delivery through its hollow lattice structure, ensuring constant replenishment and agitation. The XP-Endo Finisher, made of thermomechanically treated nickel-titanium, changes shape at body temperature, expanding to contact canal walls and dislodge debris in complex anatomies.

10. Polymer Devices: EasyClean

The EasyClean system consists of a flexible polymer instrument designed to agitate irrigants mechanically through reciprocating or rotary motion. Its small caliber allows insertion to working length, optimizing irrigant activation in uninstrumented regions. Studies demonstrate improved debris and smear layer removal with EasyClean compared to syringe irrigation.

11. Light-Based Adjuncts

Laser-activated irrigation (LAI) employs high-energy light to agitate irrigants. Techniques such as photon-induced photoacoustic streaming (PIPS) and shock wave enhanced emission photoacoustic streaming (SWEEPS) use erbium lasers to generate photoacoustic shock waves within irrigants, improving penetration and cleaning efficacy. Additionally, antimicrobial photodynamic therapy (aPDT) utilizes photosensitizers activated by light to produce reactive oxygen species lethal to bacteria. These modalities hold promise but require specialized equipment and training.

12. Apical Negative Pressure Irrigation

Systems such as EndoVac deliver irrigants coronally while suctioning apically through fine cannulas, eliminating vapor lock and minimizing apical extrusion risks. Continuous apical negative-pressure ultrasonic irrigation (CANUI) and devices like iVac combine negative pressure with ultrasonic activation, providing both safety and improved irrigant dynamics, even in curved canals.

13. Multisonic and Hydrodynamic Systems

The GentleWave system represents a novel approach using multisonic energy and optimized irrigant delivery to clean minimally instrumented canals. This technology enables deep irrigant penetration into complex anatomies while preserving dentin structure. Similarly, hydrodynamic devices such as RinsEndo apply simultaneous irrigation and aspiration under pressure to enhance irrigant exchange.

Conclusion

Both in vitro and in vivo studies have shown that current endodontic therapy cannot fully eliminate microorganisms from the root canal system. This limitation arises not only from the complex anatomy of the pulp space, which prevents complete removal of microbes, but also because residual nutrients allow remaining microorganisms to survive and proliferate. Mechanical preparation techniques are particularly ineffective in cleaning oval-shaped canals, often leaving untouched recesses or fins in buccal and lingual extensions. These uninstrumented areas can harbor persistent bacterial biofilms, contributing to ongoing infection and compromised treatment outcomes.

As a result, irrigation and intracanal medicaments play a crucial role in compensating for the limitations of mechanical debridement. To address these challenges, novel approaches collectively termed **adjunct therapies** have been introduced. These additional treatment steps follow conventional cleaning and shaping, with the goal of enhancing canal disinfection and improving clinical outcomes.

References

1. Zehnder M. Root canal irrigants. J Endod. 2006;32(5):389–398. doi: 10.1016/j.joen.2005.09.014. PMID: [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
2. Kandaswamy D, Venkateshbabu N. Root canal irrigants. J Conserv Dent. 2010;13(4):256–264. doi: 10.4103/0972-0707.73378. PMID: [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
3. Rath PP, Yiu CKY, Matinlinna JP, Kishen A, Neelakantan P. The effect of root canal irrigants on dentin: a focused review. Restor Dent Endod. 2020;45(3) doi: 10.5395/rde.2020.45.e39. e39. PMID: [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
4. Prado M, Santos HM, Júnior, Rezende CM, Pinto AC, Faria RB, Simão RA, et al. Interactions between irrigants commonly used in endodontic practice: a chemical analysis. J Endod. 2013;39(4):505–510. doi: 10.1016/j.joen.2012.11.050. Epub. PMID: [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
5. van der Sluis LW, Versluis M, Wu MK, Wesselink PR. Passive ultrasonic irrigation of the root canal: a review of the literature. Int Endod J. 2007;40(6):415–426. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2591.2007.01243.x. Epub. PMID: [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
6. Clarkson RM, Moule AJ, Podlich HM. The shelf-life of sodium hypochlorite irrigating solutions. Aust Dent J. 2001;46(4):269–276. doi: 10.1111/j.1834-7819.2001.tb00291.x. PMID: [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
7. Rahimi S, Janani M, Lotfi M, Shahi S, Aghbali A, Vahid Pakdel M, et al. A review of antibacterial agents in endodontic treatment. Iran Endod J. 2014;9(3):161–168. Epub. PMID: [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
8. Aveiro E, Chiarelli-Neto VM, de-Jesus-Soares A, Zaia AA, Ferraz CCR, Almeida JFA, et al.

Efficacy of reciprocating and ultrasonic activation of 6% sodium hypochlorite in the reduction of microbial content and virulence factors in teeth with primary endodontic infection. Int Endod J. 2020;53(5):604–618. doi: 10.1111/iej.13261. Epub. PMID: [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

9. Fouad AF. Microbial factors and antimicrobial strategies in dental pulp regeneration. J Endod. 2017;43(9S):S46–S50. doi: 10.1016/j.joen.2017.06.010. Epub. PMID: [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
10. Oliveira DP, Gomes BP, Zaia AA, Souza-Filho FJ, Ferraz CC. In vitro assessment of a gel base containing 2% chlorhexidine as a sodium perborate's vehicle for intracoronal bleaching of discolored teeth. J Endod. 2006;32(7):672–674. doi: 10.1016/j.joen.2006.01.004. Epub. PMID: [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
11. Herrera DR, Martinho FC, de-Jesus-Soares A, Zaia AA, Ferraz CCR, Almeida JFA, Gomes BPFA. Clinical efficacy of EDTA ultrasonic activation in the reduction of endotoxins and cultivable bacteria. Int Endod J. 2017;50(10):933–940. doi: 10.1111/iej.12713. Epub. PMID: [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
12. Wong J, Zou T, Lee AHC, Zhang C. The Potential Translational Applications of Nanoparticles in Endodontics. Int J Nanomedicine. 2021;9(16):2087–2106. doi: 10.2147/IJN.S29351. PMID: [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
13. Sinha N, Asthana G, Parmar G, Langaliya A, Shah J, Kumbhar A, et al. Evaluation of Ozone Therapy in Endodontic Treatment of Teeth with Necrotic Pulp and Apical Periodontitis: A Randomized Clinical Trial. J Endod. 2021;47(12) doi: 10.1016/j.joen.2021.09.006. 1820-1828. Epub. PMID: [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
14. Susila A, Minu J. Activated Irrigation vs. Conventional non-activated Irrigation in Endodontics - A Systematic Review. Eur Endod J. 2019;4(3):96–110.. doi: 10.14744/eej.2019.80774. PMID: [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
15. Boutsioukis C, Lambrianidis T, Kastrinakis E, Bekiaroglou P. Measurement of pressure and flow rates during irrigation of a root canal ex vivo with three endodontic needles. International Endodontic Journal. 2007;40:504–513. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2591.2007.01244.x. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
16. Haapasalo M, Shen Y, Wang Z, Park E, Curtis A, Patel P, Vandrangi P. Apical pressure created during irrigation with the GentleWave™ system compared to conventional syringe irrigation. Clin Oral Investig. 2016;20(7):1525–1534. doi: 10.1007/s00784-015-1632-z. Epub. PMID: [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
17. Layton G, Wu WI, Selvaganapathy PR, Friedman S, Kishen A. Fluid Dynamics and Biofilm Removal Generated by Syringe-delivered and 2 Ultrasonic-assisted Irrigation Methods: A Novel Experimental Approach. J Endod. 2015;41(6):884–889. doi: 10.1016/j.joen.2015.01.027. Epub. PMID: [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]