Significant influence of scaler tip design on root substance loss resulting from ultrasonic scaling: a laserprofilometric in vitro study


Abstract

Objectives: Ultrasonic scalers have become increasingly popular for subgingival debridement. The aim of the present study was to investigate the influence of different working tip designs (narrow versus wide) on root substance loss caused by either magnetostrictive or piezoelectric ultrasonic devices.

Methods: In this in vitro study, a magnetostrictive ultrasonic system with either Slimline or TFI-10 inserts and a piezoelectric ultrasonic system with either Perioprobe or Type-A inserts were compared at different application forces. Loss of root dentin was determined by defect width, depth and defect volume resulting from standardized instrumentation using laser profilometry.

Results: There were consistent and statistically significant differences between all groups. The mean observed dentin alterations for the magnetostrictive ultrasonic device operating a Slimline insert at a lateral force of 0.3 N were 254.4 μm, 6.3 μm and 22.5 μm³ and for the TFI-10 tip 759.0 μm, 23.5 μm and 160.2 μm³ for the parameters defect width, depth and volume, respectively. For the piezoelectric ultrasonic system operating a Perioprobe insert, the corresponding mean values were 352.0 μm/12.1 μm/56.4 μm³ and for the universal Type-A insert they were 402.4 μm/14.0 μm/133.4 μm³. With application forces of 0.7 N, root substance removal increased up to twofold.

Conclusion: The present investigation could demonstrate that the aggressiveness of magnetostrictive and piezoelectric ultrasonic devices to root substance was significantly influenced by the scaler tip designs, increasing for wider scaler tips as compared with narrow, probe-shaped inserts.
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tive unit was more aggressive than a piezoelectric device regarding root substance removal (Flemming et al. 1998a, b). On the other hand, Busslinger et al. (2001) reported that a piezoelectric device left a rougher surface after instrumentation than a magnetostrictive device.

To our knowledge, a comparison of root substance loss between different scaler tips attached to either piezoelectric or magnetostrictive ultrasonic devices has not been reported. However, different surface alterations could be expected from different working tip designs since the tip geometry may significantly influence the displacement amplitude (Gankerseer & Walmsley 1987).

The following in vitro study was stimulated by the introduction of several new narrow probe-shaped scaler tip designs and the insufficient information regarding the influence of different working tips on root substance loss caused by either magnetostrictive or piezoelectric ultrasonic instrumentation.

Material and Methods

Processing of teeth

A total of 20 teeth that had been extracted for orthodontic reasons were prepared as follows: the roots were separated from the crown and embedded in resin (Stycast 1266, Grace, Westerlo, Belgium). The root surfaces were ground (Grinding device type GT 250, Jean Wirtz, Düsseldorf, Germany) until plane dentin surfaces of about 1 cm² were exposed. These surfaces were subsequently polished (extrafine sandpaper, Jean Wirtz) and the specimens were stored in sodium-chloride solution until further instrumentation and analysis.

Experimental root instrumentation

A magnetostrictive ultrasonic scaling device (Cavi-Med 200, Dentsply, York, USA) with either regular (30K TFI-10) or narrow probe-shaped (Slimline 30K FSI/SLI-10S Straight) inserts, and a piezoelectric ultrasonic scaling device (Piezon Master 400, EMS, Nyon, Switzerland) with either universal (Type-A) or narrow probe-shaped (Perioprobe) inserts were used for experimental root instrumentation (Table 1, Fig. 1). All oscillating instruments were operated at medium power setting.

The 20 root specimens were divided into these four treatment groups. On each specimen, there were two test areas (3 × 5 mm) available for the experimental instrumentation, one for a lateral force of 0.3 N and the other one for a lateral force of 0.7 N. Thus, a total of five test areas were instrumented by a given combination of scaler tip and force.

Standardized root instrumentation was performed by moving the mounted ultrasonic handpiece with a computer-operated stepper motor over the test specimens in a horizontal direction. The resin blocks with the exposed root surfaces were attached to a hinge connected to a spring balance that determined the lateral application force (0.3 or 0.7 N). The scaler tips were used at 0° angulation in relation to the dentin surfaces with water cooling according to the manufacturer’s instructions. The stepper motor moved the mounted handpiece at a constant speed (2.5 mm/s) in a reciprocal motion (three times forwards and backwards) over the test area.

Quantification of root substance removal

Following instrumentation, the root specimens were washed and dried. An impression was taken (President light body, Coltene, Altstätten, Switzerland) and replicas (Stycast 1266, Grace) of the surfaces were cast. Replicas were sputtered with a 200 Å thick gold layer, mounted on an SEM plate, which was connected to an x–y table and aligned horizontally to the laser profilometer. The measurements were performed with an optical, non-contact profilometer system (UB16, UBM, Ettlingen, Germany), which used a laser as an optical stylus. The light beam (780 nm, spot size 1 μm) was focused by a wide-aperture objective onto the surface. The light reflected from the surface was collected by a photodetector, which received the maximum signal when the surface was at the focal point. Every time the laser beam was out of focus, a vertical movement of the objective occurred until the focal point was settled again. The vertical movement of the objective was recorded. The vertical resolution was ± 0.01 μm.

The lateral resolution of the optical system was 1 μm and the lateral resolution of the table was 2 μm. The profilometric analysis was performed perpendicular to the traces of the instrumentation with 10 parallel measurements in a distance of 0.2 mm per test area.

Table 1. The ultrasonic scalers and scaler tip designs used in the present study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Brand</th>
<th>Frequency (kHz)</th>
<th>Mode of action</th>
<th>Tip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piezon Master 400</td>
<td>EMS</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>piezoelectric</td>
<td>Type-A Perioprobe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavi-Med 200</td>
<td>Dentsply</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>magnetostrictive</td>
<td>TFI-10 Slimline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1. Frontal and lateral aspects of the four different scaler tips evaluated in the present study. (a) Slimline, (b) TFI-10, (c) Perioprobe, (d) Type-A.

Statistical analysis

The determination of root substance loss was based on the “mean line” according to the British roughness standard 1134. Outcome variables computed by the laser profilometric software (UBSOFT Version 2.4, UBM) were defect width, defect depth and defect volume averaged over the entire scaled dentin...
The differences between the treatment modalities were analysed by the Games–Howell M-ANOVA test. The significance level was set at \( p < 0.05 \).

### Results

The mean values computed for defect width, defect depth and defect volume are presented in Tables 2–4.

The mean defect width resulting from ultrasonic scaling ranged from 254.4 \( \mu m \) for the Cavi-Med 200/Slimline to 759.0 \( \mu m \) for the Cavi-Med 200/TFI-10 combination at a lateral force of 0.3 N, and from 383.2 \( \mu m \) for the Cavi-Med 200/Slimline to 851.8 \( \mu m \) for the Cavi-Med 200/TFI-10 combination at a lateral force of 0.7 N. Only slight differences were seen between both scaler tips that were operated by the piezoelectric device (Table 2).

The mean defect depth ranged from 6.3 \( \mu m \) for Cavi-Med 200/Slimline to 7.4 \( \mu m \) for Cavi-Med 200/Slimline to 851.8 \( \mu m \) at 0.7 N. Intermediate results were observed following instrumentation with the piezoelectric device, with significantly higher values following the use of Type-A inserts (Table 3).

Overall, with increasing application forces from 0.3 to 0.7 N, the aggressiveness to the root dentin as assessed by defect depth, defect width and defect volume increased for all tested instruments by a factor of 1–2x.

### Discussion

Since ultrasonic scalers are often considered to be less strenuous for the operator and more comfortable for the patients than hand curettes, they have become increasingly popular for subgingival debridement. The difficulties of carrying out adequate root debridement, coupled with the need to prevent reinfection of a pocket by periodic professional cleaning, may cause a major loss of root substance over time.

There appears to be general agreement in the literature that hand instrumentation may lead to more loss of root substance than ultrasonic instrumentation, irrespective of the study design (Ritz et al. 1991, Dragoo et al. 1992, Jacobson et al. 1994, Rees et al. 1999, Busslinger et al. 2001, Schmidlin et al. 2001). Standardization of experimental conditions with respect to treatment modalities and surface analysis is important in studies that evaluate the effects of instrumentation on root surfaces. Earlier in vitro studies demonstrated that working parameters such as power setting, lateral force and tip angulation determine the amount of root damage by ultrasonic instrumentation (Flemmig et al. 1998a, b). In the present study, the power of the ultrasonic devices was set at a medium level, which was recommended by Flemmig et al. (1998a, b) for clinical practice.
The lateral forces used in the present study of 0.3, 0.7 N were comparable with the application forces used by Ritz et al. (1991), 0.98 N, by Flemming et al. (1998a,b), 0.5–2 N and by Schmidlin et al. (2001), 0.4 N. Nevertheless, the analysis of the published reports indicated that there is still a need to establish standards for in vitro tests to measure tooth substance loss in the emerging field of power-driven root instrumentation. Because some studies determined the endpoint of instrumentation by time and others by the number of working strokes, the data reported in the literature were difficult to compare with the data of the present study.

Defect depth and defect volume on the instrumented dentin surface appear to be the most meaningful parameters for clinical implications regarding surface alterations. Interestingly, in the present study the lowest substance loss as well as the most severe damage to the root surfaces were both observed for the magnetostrictive device, the only difference being the tip used. This may indicate that the magnetostrictive ultrasonic unit was more sensible to changes of the scaler tip design than the piezoelectric unit with respect to root surface damage. The tip movement of a magnetostrictive unit ranges from nearly linear to elliptical or circular (Drisko et al. 2000). In contrast, the oscillation pattern of a piezoelectric ultrasonic unit produces a tip movement that is primarily linear in direction. One may speculate that the observed variation of root surface alterations were because of the more complex movement of the magnetostrictive unit as compared with the piezoelectric ultrasonic unit, although Lea et al. (2003) demonstrated that with medium power settings the displacement amplitude of the tips were generally higher for piezoelectric than for magnetostrictive devices. The clinician has to be aware that changing the scaler tip attached to a magnetostrictive or piezoelectric ultrasonic device may have a great impact on the aggressiveness of the root surface treatment provided. These findings are in agreement with Kocher et al. (2001), who reported variable substance loss produced by different working tips when examining sonic scalers.

The measurements of the defect width in the present study, which ranged for individual combinations of ultrasonic units and scaler tips between 200 and 800 μm, may give an indication for the clinical efficacy of root planing with different ultrasonic devices. The interpretation of the defect width as the area instrumented by a single movement from apical to coronal showed that the same root area covered by one movement of the Cavi-Med 200/TFI-10 combination would require four strokes of the Cavi-Med 200/Slimline combination. In other words, the time needed for a complete instrumentation of the root surface with ultrasonic devices is significantly influenced by the tip design used. Therefore, future studies will have to determine whether the less aggressive narrow probe-shaped scaler inserts can accomplish the same efficacy in calculus removal and lead to the same improvement in clinical conditions.

In conclusion, distinct and consistent differences, which were statistically significant, were observed for the four ultrasonic scaler tips under study. For all parameters examined under the selected experimental conditions, a significant increase in the aggressiveness to root dentin was seen for wide scaler tips as compared with narrow probe-shaped instruments. These differences were particularly apparent for the magnetostrictive ultrasonic system. The present investigation showed that in addition to established working parameters like power setting, lateral force and tip angulation, the aggressiveness of magnetostrictive or piezoelectric ultrasonic devices is significantly influenced by the scaler tip design.
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