

# Effect of Chlorhexidine on Microleakage of Composite Restorations

F. Darabi<sup>1</sup>✉, M. Eftekhari<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of Operative Dentistry, School of Dentistry, Guilan University of Medical Sciences, Guilan, Iran

<sup>2</sup>Dentist, Private Practice

## Abstract:

**Objective:** The aim of this study was to evaluate the effect of concepsis (a chlorhexidine gluconate based cavity disinfectant) application on composite restorations micro leakage, using two adhesive systems: Excite and Adhese.

**Materials and Methods:** In this interventional experimental study, class V cavities were prepared on buccal surfaces of seventy-two extracted bovine incisors. The specimens were randomly divided into 6 groups (n=12): A1: Acid Eching (AE), Excite; A2: AE, Concepsis, blot drying, Excite; A3: AE, Concepsis, water rinsing, Excite; B1: AE (only enamel margin), Adhese; B2: AE (only enamel margin), Concepsis, blot drying, Adhese; B3: AE (only enamel margin), Concepsis, water ringsing, Adhese. Afterwards, the cavities were restored with tetric Ceram composite, thermo-cycled (5 to 50°C, dwell time: 30s, 1000 cycles,), immersed in 0.5% methylen blue for 24 hours and the dye penetration was evaluated and scored on a scale on 0 to 4 under stereomicroscope (×30). The data were analyzed using Kruskal-Wallis and Multiple Comparison tests.

**Results:** The only statistically significant difference was found between groups B1 and B2 at both occlusal and gingival margins. (P<0.05)

**Conclusion:** Rinsing off the cavity disinfectant (Concepsis) before the bonding procedure does not affect the seal at the resin-tooth interface when using either of the adhesive systems; however, the sealing ability of Adhese seems to be inhibited by the remnants of the disinfecting agent.

**Key Words:** Composite Resins; Dentin-Bonding Agents; Dental Leakage; Chlorhexidine

*Journal of Dentistry, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran (2009; Vol. 6, No.1)*

✉ Corresponding author:  
F. Darabi, Operative Dentistry,  
School of Dentistry, Guilan  
University of Medical Sciences,  
Guilan, Iran.  
f\_darabi2002@yahoo.com

Received: 25 January 2008  
Accepted: 18 June 2008

## INTRODUCTION

Success in operative dentistry depends on total removal of the infected structure and achievement of a good seal [1]; however, the applied procedures for treating caries do not always eliminate all cariogenic microorganisms in residual tissues [2-4].

Although some authors believe that the number and pathogenicity of bacteria would be decreased once they are separated from the oral environment, the importance of the remaining bacteria in caries progression or pulpal in-

volvement is emphasized by others [5-7].

Residual bacteria have been shown to proliferate from the smear layer even in the presence of a good seal from the oral cavity [8]. Other studies have shown that bacteria left in the prepared cavity could survive for a long time and this problem may be magnified by microleakage of composite resin at margins not ending on enamel [9-11]. To solve this problem, the use of a disinfectant solution has been suggested [4,12-15]. Previous studies have depicted that a number of antibacterial solutions,

such as chlorhexidine, sodium hypochlorite, fluoride based solutions and benzalkonium chloride, can be used as cavity disinfectants to eliminate residual bacteria from prepared cavities [2,16]. Some of the mentioned disinfectant solutions were found not to affect either the bond strength or the sealing ability of dentin bonding agents [17-22]. However, depending on the brand of materials and application methods, some of the solutions have shown an adverse effect on the issues mentioned [14,15,23].

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the effect of Concepsis (2% chlorhexidine digluconate) on sealing abilities of two dentin-bonding systems: Excite and Adhese.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

Seventy-two freshly extracted bovine incisor teeth, stored in normal saline, were scraped of any residual tissue tags and cleaned with pumice. Standardized class V cavities (2 mm wide, 1.5 mm deep, and 4 mm long) were prepared on the buccal surfaces of the teeth with the incisal margins being at the enamel and the gingival margins being in the cementum/dentin. Using a random number table, the teeth were randomly divided into six groups of twelve (Table 1).

Group A1 (control group): The cavity disinfectant was not used and cavity surfaces were treated with 35% phosphoric acid, washed and blot dried. Then, the dentin bonding agent (Excite, Vivadent Co., Schaan, Liechtenstein) was rubbed on the surface for 10 seconds and light cured using an Optilux 500 curing unit (Demeton-Kerr, Orange, CA, USA) at 500

mW/cm<sup>2</sup> for 20 seconds.

Group A2: Concepsis, (Ultradent Co., South Jordan, UT, USA) was applied after acid etching with a mini brush tip, left in contact for 20s and blot dried. Bonding procedures were performed as previously described (as in group A1).

Group A3: Concepsis was applied as in group A2 except that it was rinsed off for 15 s, air dried and then bonding procedures were performed as previously described.

Group B, (control group): The cavity disinfectant was not used. First, the enamel margins were treated with 35% phosphoric acid, washed, and blot dried. Then, a self-etch 2-step dentin-bonding agent (Adhese, Vivadent Co., Schaan, Liechtenstein) was applied in the cavities according to the manufacturer's instructions and light cured for 20s.

Group B2: Enamel margins were treated with 35% Phosphoric Acid, washed, and blot dried. Concepsis was applied as in group A2 (without being rinsed) and bonding procedures were performed as in group B1.

Group B3: Concepsis was applied as in group B2 except that it was rinsed off for 15s, air dried and then bonding procedures were performed as previously described.

All the cavities were filled with two increments of composite restorative material (Tetric Ceram, Vivadent Co., Schaan, Liechtenstein) each cured for 40s. After 24 hours, the restorations were finished to the cavosurface margins using a 12 fluted carbide-finishing bur (SS White burs Inc., Lakewood, NJ 08701) and soft-lex disks (3 M Dental Products, St Paul, S0144) before being thermo-cycled (5 to 55°C,

**Table 1.** Treatment Groups.

Group	Acid Etching	Disinfectant	Dentin bonding agent
A <sub>1</sub>	Total-etch	No	Excite
A <sub>2</sub>	Total-etch	Concepsis 60s +blot drying	Excite
A <sub>3</sub>	Total-etch	Concepsis 60s +water rinsing	Excite
B <sub>1</sub>	only enamel margin	No	Adhese
B <sub>2</sub>	only enamel margin	Concepsis 60s +blot drying	Adhese
B <sub>3</sub>	only enamel margin	Concepsis 60s +water rinsing	Adhese

dwel time: 30s, 1000 cycles). After thermo-cycling, the apices of the specimens were sealed with paraffin and all tooth surfaces were covered with two coats of nail varnish to approximately 1.0 mm from the restoration margin. The specimens were then immersed in 0.5% methylen blue dye at 37°C for 24 hours, rinsed cleaned from the nail varnish, embedded in epoxide resin and sectioned buccolingually at the center of the restorations with a diamond disc and low speed handpiece.

The amounts of microleakage were assessed for both of enamel and dentin margins by two calibrated examiners blinded to the test groups using a stereomicroscope ( $\times 30$ ) and scored on a scale of 0 to 4 as follows:

0=No leakage

1=penetration less than or the length of occlusal/gingival wall

2=penetration grater than the length of occlusal/gingival wall

3=penetration up to axial wall

4=penetration along the axial wall

The data were analyzed using Kruskal-Wallis one-way ANOVA and multiple comparison (Dunn) tests.

## RESULTS

Kruskal-Wallis was carried out to compare the microleakage mean ranks in A and B groups separately (Table 2, 3). There was no significant difference between mean ranks of the groups treated with Excite (A1, A2 and A3) at both occlusal and gingival margins ( $P > 0.05$ ).

However, there were such differences between the groups treated with Adhese (B1, B2 and B3) at the occlusal margin ( $P = 0.026$ ) and also a slightly significant difference between those at the gingival margin ( $P = 0.057$ ).

Dunn test revealed no significant difference between the specimens in groups B1 & B3, or B2 & B3 at either occlusal or gingival margins. However, a significant difference was found between the groups B1 and B2 at occlusal and gingival margins ( $P = 0.008$  and  $P = 0.017$  respectively).

## DISCUSSION

According to the result of this study, using chlorhexidine with or without further rinsing prior to bonding did not adversely affect the sealing property of Excite; however, doing so without rinsing prior to the application of Adhese significantly increased microleakage scores. This may be indicative that there may have been some negative interactions between the remnants of the disinfectant and Adhese. It has also been stated that the use of a cavity disinfectant with composite resin appears to be material-specific regarding interactions with various dentin bonding systems [14,17-19,23]. Only a few studies have revealed an increased amount of microleakage when not rinsing chlorhexidine prior to dentin bonding agent application [23,24]. Tulunoglu et al [23] evaluated the effect of two disinfectants, one chlorhexidine based, and one alcohol based, as cavity washes prior to the application of two

**Table 2.** Score frequency and mean rank for microleakage in group A at occlusal and gingival margins.

Margin	Group	Score Frequency					Mean Rank	P-value
		†0	1	2	3	4		
Occlusal	A1	*10	1	1	0	0	17.21	0.797
	A2	8	3	1	0	0	20.04	
	A3	10	2	0	0	0	18.25	
Gingival	A1	6	2	3	1	0	16.38	0.349
	A2	2	5	3	2	0	21.92	
	A3	3	7	2	0	0	17.21	

\* sample number

† Dye penetration scoring system; 0 = No microleakage, 1=penetration less than or length of occlusal/gingival wall, 2=penetration greater than length of occlusal/gingival wall, 3=penetration up to axial wall, 4=penetration along the axial wall

dentin bonding agents (Prime&Bond and Syntac). They found a remarkable increase in microleakage in deciduous teeth when the cavities were previously treated with a chlorhexidine based solution [23]. However, it is hard to compare their study with others due to some structural differences between primary teeth dentin and that in permanent teeth [24]. Concepsis Scrub (with no further rinsing) was evaluated as a cavity disinfectant prior to PQ1 and shown to cause a significant increase in microleakage [25].

According to the findings of Meiers and Kresin by scanning electron microscope (SEM), chlorhexidine-treated smear layers (without being rinsed off before bonding) were less affected by a self-etching primer and Tenure conditioner, indicating them to be more resistant to acidic materials. Nevertheless, the results of their study indicated that a 2% chlorhexidine cavity cleaner can be used as a cavity wash prior to the use of Syntac and Tenure without affecting their ability to prevent microleakage. However, their findings cannot explain the greater amounts of microleakage in group B2 of our study at the occlusal/enamel margin because of using phosphoric prior to the application of chlorhexidine. Still, a surprising result from that study was the relative effectiveness of chlorhexidine (without using dentin-bonding agent) in reducing the amount of microleakage. They explained this finding by a possible stabilizing effect exerted on the smear layer, turning it from a semi permeable,

loosely bonded layer to a more impermeable, firmly bonded one [14]. In our study, Concepsis was used as a cavity disinfectant because in other studies chlorhexidine-based cavity disinfectant solutions displayed the most effective and the longest antibacterial activity, which will contribute to elimination of residual bacteria. Therefore, it is better not to rinse off the disinfectant if they would not have an adverse effect on the bonding process. Some clinicians prefer to apply the disinfectant before acid etching, but we think that the application sequence of the disinfectant depends on the generation of the bonding system. Total-etch adhesive systems operate by removing the smear layer and the subjacent dentin, so, it is more reasonable to disinfect the dentin after etching. Although, self-etch dentin bonding systems affect the smear layer using a milder acidic monomeric primer with no rinse step necessitating the smear layer to be disinfected before using the acidic primer [2].

The two dentin-bonding systems used in this study were Excite, a total-etch adhesive system, and Adhese, a two-step self-etching adhesive, with nearly the same formulation. They were chosen to examine how chlorhexidine would affect two different smear layer management techniques in different sequences of bonding according to their clinical use.

Theoretically, chlorhexidine could improve the sealing ability of the adhesives. Chlorhexidine has a strong positive ionic charge making capable of easily binding to phosphate groups

**Table 3.** Score frequency and mean rank for microleakage in group B at occlusal and gingival margins.

Margin	Group	Score Frequency					Mean Rank	P-value
		†0	1	2	3	4		
Occlusal	B1	*12	0	0	0	0	15	0.026
	B2	7	3	2	0	0	22.67	
	B3	10	2	0	0	0	17.83	
Gingival	B1	8	3	1	0	0	14.29	0.057
	B2	2	7	2	1	0	23.63	
	B3	6	4	2	0	0	17.58	

\* sample number

† Dye penetration scoring system; 0 = No microleakage, 1=penetration less than or length of occlusal/gingival wall, 2=penetration greater than length of occlusal/gingival wall, 3=penetration up to axial wall, 4=penetration along the axial wall

[26]. It has a strong affinity for tooth surfaces and this affinity is increased by acid-etching. Chlorhexidine also increases the surface free energy of enamel and can as well have a similar effect on dentin [27].

Castro reported that a 2% chlorhexidine solution applied either before or after acid etching of the dentin does not interfere with the microtensile bond strength of the composite resin to the dentin treated with either Prime&Bond NT, Single Bond, or Clearfil SE Bond bonding systems [28]. In addition, in the study of Soares et al [20], the use of chlorhexidine at concentrations of 0.12% and 2%, before, after or associated with acid etching did not significantly affect the microtensile bond strength of Adper Single Bond 2 to dentin. There have also been studies advocating application of chlorhexidine on dentin after phosphoric acid-etching has no adverse effect on bond strength of Single bond and even showing that after six months, the bond strength remains stable in chlorhexidine treated specimens while decreasing significantly in the control group. SEM examination revealed that chlorhexidine solution deposits debris on the surface and within the tubules of the etched dentin while having no significant adverse effect on the shear bond strength of the composite to dentin using All-Bond2 adhesive system. It has also been depicted in the same study that dentin-resin interfaces in these specimens were essentially the same as those in not treated with chlorhexidine [29]. According to the results of our study, these deposits apparently interfered with the sealing ability of Adhese.

Cao et al [30] believed that disinfectants decrease shear bond strength to dentin. However, the degree of the decrease is related to the brands of the adhesive and the disinfectant. Concepsis was the only disinfectant that was not significantly different from the control in their study [30]. Nevertheless, Gürgen et al [31] applied Concepsis before and after acid etching resulting in significantly reduced shear

bond strength while rinsing off the cavity disinfectant before the bonding procedure did not affect the bond strength. Meiers & Shook have also reported a remarkable decrease in the shear bond strength of a self-etching dentin bonding agent when the cavity was previously treated with chlorhexidine without being rinsed off [15].

Adhese is a two component self-etch adhesive supplied in two bottles. Both the etchant and the primer are there in one bottle with the resin adhesive in the other one. The first bottle (primer) contains phosphonic acid acrylate, bis-acrylamide, water, initiators, and stabilizers and the second bottle (bonding agent) contains dimethacrylates, hydroxyethyl methacrylate, highly dispersed silicon dioxide, initiators, and stabilizers.

All these chemical compositions are employed in Excite as well except for bis-acrylamide and the solvent, which is ethanol. However, it seems that chemical residues left from chlorhexidine may contribute to a decrease in wettability of Adhese and a resultant decrease in its ability to impregnate the tooth surface. SEM examinations appear to be needed to clarify this hypothesis. Although in most cases the use of chlorhexidine has not exhibited an adverse effect on the sealing ability of dentin bonding agents, further investigations can be beneficial

## CONCLUSION

Concepsis can be used as a cavity disinfectant with no further rinsing prior to the application of Excite but it must be rinsing off before Adhese is applied in the cavity.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Authors would like to thank Dr. Kazemnejad for his assistance in this study.

## REFERENCES

1-Bocangel JS, Kraull A, Vargas AG. Influence of disinfectant solution on the tensile bond strength of

- a fourth generation dentin bonding agent. *Pesq Odon Bras* 2000 Apr-June; 14(2):107-11.
- 2-Turkun M, Ozata F, Uzer E, Ates M. Antimicrobial substantivity of cavity disinfectants. *Gen Dent* 2005 May-Jun;53(3):182-6.
- 3-Kidd EA, Joyston-Bechal S, Beighton D. Microbiological validation of assessments of caries activity during cavity preparation. *Caries Res* 1993; 27(5):402-8
- 4-Yazici AR, Atilla P, Ozgünlaltay G, Müftüoğlu S. In vitro comparison of the efficacy of Carisolv and conventional rotary instrument in caries removal. *J Oral Rehabil* 2003 Dec;30(12):1177-82.
- 5-Crone FL. Deep dentinal caries from a microbiological point of view. *Int Dent J* 1968 Sep;18(3): 481-8.
- 6-Mertz-Fairhurst EJ, Schuster GS, Williams JE, Fairhurst CW. Clinical progress of sealed and unsealed caries. Part I: Depth changes and bacterial counts. *J Prosthet Dent* 1979 Nov;42(5):521-6.
- 7-Paterson RC. Management of the deep cavity. *Br Dent J* 1974 Sep 17;137(6):150-2.
- 8-Brännström M. The cause of postrestorative sensitivity and its prevention. *J Endod* 1986 Oct; 12(10):475-81.
- 9-Boston DW, Graver HT. Histological study of an acid red caries-disclosing dye. *Oper Dent* 1989 Autumn;14(4):186-92.
- 10-Schouboe T, Macdonald JB. Prolonged viability of organisms sealed in dentinal caries. *Arch Oral Biol* 1962 Jul-Aug;7:525-6.
- 11-Leung RL, Loesche WJ, Charbeneau GT. Effect of Dycal on bacteria in deep carious lesions. *J Am Dent Assoc* 1980 Feb;100(2):193-7.
- 12-Azrak B, Callaway A, Grundheber A, Stender E, Willershausen B. Comparison of the efficacy of chemomechanical caries removal (Carisolv) with that of conventional excavation in reducing the cariogenic flora. *Int J Paediatr Dent* 2004 May; 14(3):182-91.
- 13-Brännström M, Nyborg H. Cavity treatment with a microbicidal fluoride solution: growth of bacteria and effect on the pulp. *J Prosthet Dent* 1973 Sep;30(3):303-10.
- 14-Meiers JC, Kresin JC. Cavity disinfectants and dentin bonding. *Oper Dent* 1996 Jul-Aug;21(4): 153-9.
- 15-Meiers JC, Shook LW. Effect of disinfectants on the bond strength of composite to dentin. *Am J Dent* 1996 Feb;9(1):11-4.
- 16-Ersin NK, Uzel A, Aykut A, Candan U, Eronat C. Inhibition of cultivable bacteria by chlorhexidine treatment of dentin lesions treated with the ART technique. *Caries Res* 2006;40(2):172-7.
- 17-Sung EC, Chan SM, Tai ET, Caputo AA. Effects of various irrigation solutions on microleakage of Class V composite restorations. *J Prosthet Dent* 2004 Mar;91(3):265-7.
- 18-Geraldo-Martins VR, Robles FR, Matos AB. Chlorhexidine's effect on sealing ability of composite restorations following Er:YAG laser cavity preparation. *J Contemp Dent Pract* 2007 Jul 1;8(5): 26-33.
- 19-Türkün M, Türkün LS, Kalender A. Effect of cavity disinfectants on the sealing ability of non-rinsing dentin-bonding resins. *Quintessence Int* 2004 Jun;35(6):469-76.
- 20-Soares CJ, Pereira CA, Pereira JC, Santana FR, do Prado CJ. Effect of chlorhexidine application on microtensile bond strength to dentin. *Oper Dent* 2008 Mar-Apr;33(2):183-8.
- 21-Carrilho MR, Geraldini S, Tay F, de Goes MF, Carvalho RM, Tjäderhane L, et al. In vivo preservation of the hybrid layer by chlorhexidine. *J Dent Res* 2007 Jun;86(6):529-33.
- 22-Carrilho MR, Carvalho RM, de Goes MF, di Hipólito V, Geraldini S, Tay FR, et al. Chlorhexidine preserves dentin bond in vitro. *J Dent Res* 2007 Jan;86(1):90-4.
- 23-Tulunoglu O, Ayhan H, Olmez A, Bodur H. The effect of cavity disinfectants on microleakage in dentin bonding systems. *J Clin Pediatr Dent* 1998 Summer;22(4):299-305.
- 24-Filler SJ, Lazarchik DA, Givan DA, Retief DH, Heaven TJ. Shear bond strengths of composite to chlorhexidine-treated enamel. *Am J Dent* 1994 Apr;7(2):85-8.
- 25-Owens BM, Lim DY, Arheart KL. The effect of antimicrobial pre-treatments on the performance of resin composite restorations. *Oper Dent* 2003 Nov-

Dec;28(6):716-22.

26-Gjerme P. Chlorhexidine and related compounds. *J Dent Res* 1989 Dec; 68(11):1602-8.

27-Perdok JF, van der Mei HC, Genet MJ, Rouxhet PG, Busscher HJ. Elemental surface concentration ratios and surface free energies of human enamel after application of chlorhexidine and adsorption of salivary constituents. *Caries Res* 1989;23(5):297-302.

28-de Castro FL, de Andrade MF, Duarte Júnior SL, Vaz LG, Ahid FJ. Effect of 2% chlorhexidine on microtensile bond strength of composite to den-

tin. *J Adhes Dent* 2003 Summer;5(2):129-38.

29-Perdigao J, Denehy GE, Swift EJ Jr. Effects of chlorhexidine on dentin surfaces and shear bond strengths. *Am J Dent* 1994 Apr;7(2):81-4.

30-Cao DS, Hollis RA, Christensen RP, Christensen GJ. Effect of tooth disinfecting procedures on dentin shear bond strength. *J Dent Res* 1995 Jan; 74(1):81-4.

31-Gürkan S, Bolay S, Kiremitçi A. Effect of disinfectant application methods on the bond strength of composite to dentin. *J Oral Rehabil* 1999 Oct; 26(10):836-40.