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Root Surface Roughness After Scaling and Root Planing with Er:YAG Laser Compared to Hand and Ultrasonic Instruments by Profilometry
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Abstract

Objectives: Scaling and root planing (SRP) is one of the most commonly used procedures during periodontal treatment. The aim of this study was to evaluate the root surface roughness after SRP with erbium: yttrium aluminum garnet (Er:YAG) laser compared to ultrasonic and hand instruments.

Materials and Methods: In this experimental study, 56 extracted sound single-rooted teeth with moderate level of calculus were selected and randomly divided into four groups: SRP was performed with Er:YAG laser (100 mJ pulse, 1W, 10Hz, VSP and contact mode, with 50% water and air) in group one, hand instrument in group two and ultrasonic tool in group three. Group four was considered as the control group. After SRP, all samples were cut by Servocut cutting machine into pieces with 3×3×2 mm dimensions. The samples were mounted in acrylic resin. The surface roughness of the samples was evaluated with profilometry, and the data were analyzed using one-way ANOVA and Tukey’s test in SPSS software.

Results: Surface roughness was higher in laser and lower in ultrasonic group compared to other groups. There was a significant difference in surface roughness between laser and ultrasonic groups (P=0.043), but there was no significant difference in surface roughness among other groups (P>0.05).

Conclusion: The results of this study showed that surface roughness after SRP with Er:YAG laser was not higher than that after manual SRP, but the former value was higher than that after SRP with ultrasonic instrument.
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INTRODUCTION

Bacterial plaque is the primary etiology of gingivitis and periodontitis. Bacterial plaque is converted to calculus after mineralization and can be formed on natural teeth or dental prostheses. Calculus plays a major role in development and progression of periodontal disease due to its contact with periodontal tissues. Therefore, removing the calculus and the collected bacterial plaque from the tooth surface is among the most important interventions for treatment of periodontal...
disease. Scaling and root planing is performed to remove calculus and plaque [1]. The goal of SRP is to smooth the root surface [2]. Various methods such as hand instruments, ultrasonic scalers, and recently erbium family of lasers have been used for SRP [3-5]. Hand instruments have some advantages such as better control over the instrument, sense of touch to recognize the roughness of the surface, and obtaining a smooth surface. There are also some disadvantages such as being time consuming, the need for high level of physical force to remove calculus, bleeding, which limits vision and access, pain, lack of access to distant areas such as furcations and fissures and the resultant roughness of root surface. In addition, the efficacy of treatment with hand instruments depends on the operator’s skills [6,7].

In comparison with hand instruments, ultrasonic tools leave more contaminated cementum on the surface of the teeth after treatment, and are valuable adjuncts to hand instruments for tooth surface debridement [8,9]. When ultrasonic tools are appropriately used, the discomfort after the operation decreases; thus, they are suitable for primary debridement of root surfaces in patients with acute necrotizing ulcerative gingivitis [10]. There are also disadvantages like production and release of contaminating aerosols, potential injury to tooth structure, formation of micro-cracks in dental enamel and porcelain crown surfaces, roughening the surface, risk of interference in patients with cardiac pacemakers and leaving a smear layer [11,12].

With regard to the aforementioned disadvantages for hand instruments and ultrasonic tools, replacing them with more appropriate and efficient methods has always been considered and therefore, various researchers recommend the application of Er:YAG laser with different wavelengths to remove deposits on root surfaces [13]. Various types of lasers such as carbon dioxide (CO₂), neodymium yttrium aluminum garnet (Nd:YAG), Er:YAG and erbium chromium: yttrium scandium gallium garnet (Er,Cr:YSGG) have been used for SRP, but Er:YAG is more appropriate due to its absorption by H₂O and hydroxyapatite, which is the highest in comparison with other wavelengths [14]. Evidence shows that laser yields clinical and microbiological results comparable to those of hand instruments and sonic and ultrasonic tools [15,16]. Therefore, the question is whether the application of laser for SRP would result in a smoother surface compared to other methods. The goal of this study was to assess the surface roughness following SRP with Er:YAG laser compared to ultrasonic and hand instruments using profilometry.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

In this experimental study, 42 extracted sound single rooted teeth covered with calculus and 14 sound teeth with no calculus were collected and immersed in sodium azide solution (pH=7.05, 0.2%). Mesial and distal surfaces of the teeth below cementoenamel junction (CEJ) with calculus were considered as areas for SRP. In case of any decay, breakage, congenital anomaly or concavity in these areas, the tooth was excluded and replaced with another tooth. The samples were randomly divided into four equal groups.

In group one, the samples were subjected to SRP with Er:YAG laser at a wavelength of 2940 nm (Fotona, Fidelisplus, Ljubljana, Slovenia), energy of 100 mJ pulse, 1W, frequency of 10Hz, VSP mode, power density of 15.38 W/cm², water/ air of 50% and hand piece of R 14 with a chisel tip until a smooth surface was achieved [17-20] (Fig. 1). The contact angle of the device tip relative to the tooth surface was fixed as 20-30° visually, and laser was used with a strong scrubbing motion from the apex towards the CEJ in all groups. Then, root planing movements were performed more smoothly with a higher range and lower side force.
Scaling and root planing was continued until calculus was completely removed based on the clinician’s judgment leaving a smooth and flat surface. Finally, explorers No. 17 and 23 were used for further examination of the surface roughness and to confirm its smoothness. The samples in group two were scaled by a hand instrument. Scaling was conducted by Gracey curette No. 3–4 (Medesy SRL, Maniago, Italy) with its heavy shank grasped in hand in modified pen grasp position with short and strong movements from apex toward the CEJ. Root planing was performed after scaling. In group three, scaling was conducted by an ultrasonic device (Micropiezo S, Mectron, Carasco, Italy) with a universal tip. In a previous study done by Casarin et al., [21] it was demonstrated that the power setting of the ultrasonic scaler did not influence the defect depth on root surface; therefore we used the ultrasonic device in moderate power under high water irrigation. The contact angle between the tip of the device and the tooth was fixed a little less than 90° during the process and the process was continued until a smooth surface was achieved. Group four was the control group with no calculus. No intervention on the mesial or distal surfaces of the teeth was performed. After finishing SRP, the samples were cut by Servocut M300P (Metkon instrument LTD, Bursa, Turkey) into pieces measuring 2x3x3mm in such a way that the scaled surfaces remained intact.

The cut samples were mounted in glass blocks containing acrylic resin within holes made inside the acrylic with a diameter of 25mm and depth of 6mm so that the scaled surfaces were at the level of the cold cure acrylic resin surface (Acropars, Marlic Medical Co., Karaj, Iran). Then, two pairs of parallel lines distanced 1mm from each other were perpendicularly drawn on the blocks obtained from mounting to guide the direction of profilometer movement. Next, the mounted samples were analyzed by a profilometer (Marsurf PS1, Mahr Co., Gottingen, Germany) to determine the level of surface roughness. Finally, the obtained results were analyzed by one-way ANOVA and Tukey’s tests using SPSS version 16 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA).

RESULTS
The P-value of Levene’s test for homogeneity of variances was 0.179 indicating existence of homogeneity among the groups. The mean surface roughness scores were compared by one-way ANOVA and it was revealed that the lowest mean score of surface roughness was noted in the group treated with ultrasonic method (1.08 µm). The scores were 1.1 µm in the control, 1.21 µm in the hand instrument and 1.2 in the laser group, respectively (P=0.03) (Table 1). One-way ANOVA was followed by Tukey’s test for pairwise comparison of the groups. The results showed a significant difference between the two groups of laser and ultrasonic tool (P=0.043). Meanwhile, the results showed no significant difference among other groups including the control group and ultrasonic tool group (P>0.05, Table 2).

DISCUSSION
The obtained results of the current study showed that among the three methods of SRP namely laser, ultrasonic and hand instruments, the smoothest surface was obtained by ultrasonic instrument while the roughest surface after SRP was obtained by laser.
These findings are consistent with the results of former studies reporting the smoothest surface after SRP with ultrasonic method [22-27]. However, Crespi et al. [3] and Schwarz et al. [28] showed that surface roughness after SRP with laser was lower than that in other methods. Their findings were not in line with those of the current study. De Mendonca et al. [25] and Folwaczny et al. [29] reported that the roughness following laser therapy was almost similar to that following SRP with hand or ultrasonic instruments. Ota-Tsuzuki et al. [24] compared three methods of hand instrument, ultrasonic instrument and Er:YAG laser and stated that the roughest surface was obtained by hand instrument, while the smoothest surface was obtained with ultrasonic method. The surface roughness following SRP with laser ranked between the two abovementioned methods. There was no significant difference between ultrasonic and control groups. Hakki et al. investigated the effect of hand instrumentation and Er,Cr:YSGG laser irradiation on the roughness of root surfaces. They observed greater roughness in laser group than in group treated with hand instruments and showed the ability of laser to do SRP in treatment of periodontitis [30]. In another study, Er:Cr:YSGG laser and hand instrumentation were compared in terms of their effect on attachment of periodontal ligament fibroblasts to periodontally diseased root surfaces and it was shown that short-pulse laser was more promising with regard to the attachment of periodontal ligament cells [31]. Marda et al. compared the roughness of root surfaces after root planing with Gracey curettes, ultrasonic instrument and rotary bur and concluded that ultrasonic instrument caused the lowest mean roughness, which was comparable to our results [32]. However, the findings of the current study showed that application of laser for SRP results in higher roughness compared to other methods. These results are more reliable due to the precise method of profilometry adopted in the current study compared to some other studies [22-27].

### Table 1. Comparison of the mean and standard deviation of surface roughness (µm) in the four groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laser</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand instrument</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultrasonic</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. P-values for the pairwise comparison of the groups with Tukey’s post hoc test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Laser</th>
<th>Hand instrument</th>
<th>Ultrasonic</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laser</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.268</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand Instrument</td>
<td>0.268</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.832</td>
<td>0.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultrasonic</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.832</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>0.893</td>
<td>0.893</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although the method of laser application and the selected parameters can affect the results, the difference in standards, surface roughness measurement methods, application of various tools with different sharpness and tip size, tip contact with the root surface, operator’s skills and force applied during SRP may be responsible for the controversial results in various studies [22,23]. Ota-Tsuzuki et al, [24] and Quirynen et al. [33,34] emphasized that increased root surface roughness can enhance bacterial accumulation and biofilm formation and lead to gingivitis. Schwarz et al. [35] compared two groups of laser and hand instrument and showed an increase in the bond of cocci and rods and a decrease in the bond of spirochetes to the treated surfaces in both groups. They reported no significant difference in clinical attachment level between the two groups. Etemadi et al, [36] in a recent study compared Er:YAG and Er,Cr:YSGG lasers for scaling of root surfaces and concluded that there were no significant differences in their efficacy for calculus removal. Although based on the results of the afore-mentioned studies, the effect of laser method with regard to causing surface roughness after SRP is controversial to some extent, there are studies emphasizing on optimal efficacy of laser for SRP. Laser can be applied as an adjunct to conventional methods of SRP due to an increase in adhesion of fibroblasts and periodontal ligament to tooth surface as the result of causing higher roughness in addition to its antimicrobial effects on the microorganisms responsible for periodontitis [37,38]. Considering all the above, it can be concluded that surface roughness may be somehow favorable in root dentin since it is adjacent to the periodontal ligament, but in coronal dentin exposed to oral environment, surface roughness must be minimized. Further studies in this field particularly controlled clinical trials are required. Also, use of more precise tools for measurement of surface roughness is suggested.

CONCLUSION
The results of the current study showed that application of Er:YAG laser for SRP was not different from the hand instrument in terms of surface roughness, but led to higher surface roughness compared to the ultrasonic method.
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