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Abstract

Introduction: Endodontic repair materials such as mineral trioxide aggregate (MTA) are used for various endodontic procedures. An alternative material to MTA with purportedly improved handling properties is EndoSequence Root Repair Material, which is available as premixed putty (ESP) or syringeable paste (ESS) and is described as possessing antibacterial activity during its setting reaction due to its highly alkaline pH. The aim of this in vitro study was to determine whether ESP and ESS possess antibacterial properties against a collection of Enterococcus faecalis strains recovered from root canal infections. The hypotheses tested were that (1) ESP and ESS possess antibacterial activity during their setting reaction, (2) there is no difference between ESP, ESS, and MTA in antibacterial activity, and (3) E. faecalis strains isolated from root canals differ in susceptibility to the materials. Methods: The direct contact test was used. ESP, ESS, and white MTA were preincubated at 37°C in >95% humidity for 30 minutes and 24 hours before 1-hour direct contact exposure to E. faecalis strains (n = 10). Absence of antibacterial carryover effect from the materials to the bacterial cultures was confirmed. Log_{10} viable counts were compared by using analysis of variance with significance level at P ≤ .05. Results: Combining data for all strains, the mean (± standard deviation) log_{10} viable counts for ESP (4.55 ± 0.85), ESS (4.5 ± 0.95), and MTA (4.12 ± 1.26) were significantly lower than for untreated controls (7.40 ± 0.85), ESS (4.5 ± 0.42), with no statistically significant differences between the materials or preincubation periods. One strain was significantly more susceptible than 4 other strains. Conclusions: ESP, ESS, and MTA had similar antibacterial efficacy against clinical strains of E. faecalis. Clinical strains varied in their susceptibility to the root repair materials. (J Endod 2011; volume: 1–5)
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Endodontic repair materials are used for various procedures that include pulp capping, apexification, root-end fillings, and perforation repairs. Successful placement of the materials is facilitated by optimal access to the repair site and trouble-free handling properties. For example, inadequately repaired perforations can lead to microbial leakage into the root canal and subsequent failure of the endodontic treatment (1, 2). Of the repair materials available, mineral trioxide aggregate (MTA) (Dentsply, Tulsa Dental Specialties, Tulsa, OK) possesses several advantageous properties that include good sealing capability, biocompatibility, and antibacterial activity (3, 4). A potential disadvantage, however, is that the setting time for white ProRoot MTA is reported to be 40 ± 2.9 minutes for initial set and 140 ± 2.6 minutes for final set (5), whereas the setting time for gray MTA averages 165 ± 5 minutes (6). Bioceramic materials with a shorter setting time and uniform consistency during placement might provide a useful alternative to MTA with improved handling characteristics.

EndoSequence Root Repair Material (ERRM) (Brasseler USA, Savannah, GA) is a bioceramic material delivered as premixed moldable putty (ESP) or as preloaded syringeable paste (ESS) with delivery tips for intracanal delivery of the material. There are few data available on the material. In one study, cell cytotoxicity tests (methyl-thiazol-diphenyltetrazolium assays) with L929 cells showed no difference between either set or freshly mixed states of white MTA, gray MTA, and ERRM (7). According to the manufacturer, ERRM has a working time of 30+ minutes and possesses antibacterial properties during its setting reaction because of its highly alkaline pH. The cytotoxicity of the materials was found to be similar to that of ProRoot MTA and MTA-Angeus (8). A similar material manufactured as a sealer under the name iRootSP in Canada (Innovative BioCeramix Inc, Vancouver, Canada) has been shown to possess adequate apical sealing ability (9), mild cytotoxicity (10), and antibacterial activity for up to 7 days after placement (11). However, at this time, there appears to be no independent information on the antibacterial properties of the moldable putty product or comparisons between the putty and syringeable material.

Enterococci are gram-positive microorganisms that are part of the normal flora in the gastrointestinal tract of humans (12). Enterococcus faecalis can be recovered from the root canals of teeth with primary and secondary root canal infections (13, 14). Clinical strains demonstrate various virulence characteristics (15, 16), for example, gelatinase activity that might contribute to long-term survival of E. faecalis in obturated root canals. (17)
root canals (17). The species is commonly used to evaluate the antimicrobial efficacy of materials used in endodontic treatment, but frequently by using only a single strain from a nonendodontic source as opposed to multiple strains isolated from infected root canals. On the basis of the existence of variable characteristics of clinical strains of *E. faecalis* recovered from infected root canals (15, 16), it is feasible that strains differ in their susceptibility to the antimicrobial activity of root repair material.

The aim of this *in vitro* study was to determine whether the putty and syringeable forms of ERRM possess antibacterial properties comparable to MTA during their setting reaction against a collection of *E. faecalis* strains isolated from infected root canals. The hypotheses tested were that (1) ESP and ESS possess antibacterial activity during the setting reaction, (2) there is no difference between ESP, ESS, and MTA in antibacterial activity, and (3) *E. faecalis* strains isolated from root canals differ in susceptibility to the materials.

### Materials and Methods

#### Bacterial Strains and Media

*E. faecalis* strains (n = 10) previously isolated from infected root canals were selected for antibacterial assays on the basis of diversity of phenotypic, genotypic, and biofilm formation characteristics (15, 17, 18) (Table 1). Strains were taken from –80°C stocks and plated onto Todd Hewitt Broth (Becton, Dickinson and Co, Sparks, MD) supplemented with 1.5% agar and incubated aerobically for 24 hours at 37°C. Expected colony and cell morphology and gram stain reaction were verified for each strain. For experiments, an isolated colony-forming unit (CFU) of each strain was suspended in 5 mL brain heart infusion (BHI) (Becton, Dickinson and Co) broth overnight. Then 0.5 mL of the suspension was added to 4.5 mL BHI broth and grown to an optical density of OD$_{650}$ of 0.36, which was shown in pilot studies to correspond to approximately 3 $\times$ 10$^7$ CFU/mL.

#### Preparation of Materials for Antimicrobial Assays

EndoSequence Root Repair Material Putty (ESP), EndoSequence Root Repair Material Syringeable (ESS), and white ProRoot MTA (Dentsply, Tulsa Dental Specialties) were compared for antibacterial efficacy by using the direct contact test based on previous studies (19, 20), including controls for carryover effect (11).

A section of fixed area (3-mm diameter) and thickness (1 mm) on the side of a well in a vertically positioned 96-well microtiter plate was coated with an equal amount of material by using the tip of a mixing spatula. MTA was mixed and handled according to the manufacturer’s directions. ESP and ESS are provided premixed and, according to the manufacturer, require the presence of moisture to initiate the setting reaction. Initial observations were made that ESP and ESS in wells did not set during a 5-day period when stored aerobically at 37°C in >95% humidity. Subsequent pilot studies showed that when ESP and ESS in wells were covered with sterile distilled water (SDW) (100 µL per well), initiation of the setting process occurred. After 30 minutes, ESP and ESS remained soft and penetrable by an endodontic explorer; by 24 hours, ESP and ESS had attained a hardened state impenetrable by an endodontic explorer instrument up to 50 g of pressure, after which the material crumbled. MTA (which was not covered with SDW) also remained unset at 30 minutes; at 24 hours, MTA was impenetrable to an explorer tip up to 25 g of pressure, after which the material crumbled. Therefore, to evaluate whether different stages of the setting reaction were associated with variations in antimicrobial activity, materials were preincubated for both 30 minutes and 24 hours aerobically at 37°C in >95% humidity before exposure to bacteria. During the preincubation period ESP and ESS were covered with 100 µL SDW, which was removed by sterile pipette at the end of the period.

#### Antimicrobial Assays with the Direct Contact Test

A 10-µL bacterial suspension was placed onto the surface of the ESP, ESS, and MTA. Strain suspensions (10-µL) placed in uncoated wells served as nonexposed (positive) controls. Materials incubated without bacteria served as negative controls. All samples were incubated aerobically for 1 hour at 37°C in >95% humidity; then 240 µL of BHI broth was added to each of the wells and gently mixed with a pipette for 1 minute. Serial dilutions were prepared in BHI broth and plated onto BHI agar. After aerobic incubation for 24–48 hours at 37°C, CFUs were enumerated, and CFU/mL was calculated. Experiments were performed in duplicate.

#### Controls for Carryover Effect

To investigate the potential for antimicrobial carryover effect of the materials, procedures were performed on the basis of Zhang et al (11). ESP, ESS, and MTA were preincubated for 30 minutes and 24 hours as described above, including coverage of ESP and ESS with SDW, which was aspirated after the incubation period. Fresh SDW (10 µL) was placed in direct contact with the materials. After incubation for 1 hour at 37°C, 240 µL of BHI broth was added to the wells and mixed gently with a pipette for 1 minute. After mixing, 10 µL of broth was transferred to 970 µL of BHI broth to which a 20-µL suspension of bacteria was added. As controls, the same amount of SDW was placed on the wall.

### Table 1. *E. faecalis* Strains Used in the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strain and treatment</th>
<th>Phenotype</th>
<th>Biofilm scores*</th>
<th>Genotype</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GS1</td>
<td>Gel', Tc'</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>Plasmid', gelE, asa, ace, efaA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS2</td>
<td>Gel', PR'</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>Plasmid', gelE, ef184/fsr, asa, ace, efaA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS4</td>
<td>Gel', PR'</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>Plasmid', gelE, ef184/fsr, asa, ace, efaA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS6</td>
<td>Gel', PR'</td>
<td>1.162</td>
<td>Plasmid', gelE, asa, ace, efaA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS7</td>
<td>Gel'</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>Plasmid', gelE, asa, ace, efaA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS9</td>
<td>Gel', Bac'</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>gelE, esp, asa, ace, efaA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS10</td>
<td>Bac'</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>Plasmid', gelE, ef184/fsr, esp, asa, ace, efaA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS18</td>
<td>PR'</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>Plasmid', gelE, ef184/fsr, esp, asa, ace, efaA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS25</td>
<td>PR'</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>Plasmid', gelE, ef184/fsr, asa, ace, cylA, efaA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS33</td>
<td>Bac', PR'</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td>Plasmid', gelE, ef184/fsr, asa, ace, cylA, efaA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Referred to optical density readings at 570 nm in microtiter plate assays.

*ace, collagen binding antigen; asa, aggregation substance; Bac', bacteriocin activity; cyl, cytolysin activator; ef184, endocarditis antigen; esp, enterococcal surface adhesin; Gel', gelatinase activity; gelE, gelatinase; ef184/fsr, gelatinase-negative phenotype determinant; N/A, endodontic treatment details not available; Plasmid', plasmid(s) present; PR', clumping response to pheromone; Tc', tetracycline resistance.
of the uncoated wells and processed as outlined above. Serial dilutions of test and control suspensions were processed for determination of CFU/mL as described above. The carryover tests were performed in triplicate. Viable counts of bacteria in controls were compared with those exposed to the material for each preincubation period; no difference in viable counts indicated the absence of a carryover effect.

**Statistical Analysis**

Viable counts were transformed to their log10 values. Data were confirmed to be normally distributed by using Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality tests. Analysis of variance and Tukey multiple comparisons were used to evaluate (1) whether ESP, ESS, and MTA had antibacterial properties by comparing viable counts of exposed and nonexposed bacteria; (2) the antibacterial activity of ESP, ESS, and MTA during their setting period by comparing the reduction of viable counts of bacteria exposed to materials preincubated for 30 minutes or 24 hours before exposure to bacteria; and (3) variations in the susceptibility of different E. faecalis strains by comparing the reduction in viable counts after exposure to ESP, ESS, and MTA.

Prism 4.0a for Macintosh software (GraphPad Software Inc, La Jolla, CA) was used for statistical analyses. Significance was set at $P < .05$.

**Results**

**Controls**

E. faecalis was not recovered from any of the negative controls in direct contact tests. There was no evidence of carryover of the antibacterial effect from the materials to the bacterial cultures.

**Antibacterial Activity of ESP, ESS, and MTA**

Combining data for all strains, the mean ($\pm$ standard deviation) log10 viable counts for ESP ($4.55 \pm 0.85$), ESS ($4.5 \pm 0.95$), and MTA ($4.12 \pm 1.26$) were significantly lower than for nonexposed controls ($7.40 \pm 0.33$) ($P < .0001$). Differences between materials were not significant.

**Antibacterial Activity during the Setting Reaction**

The reduction of viable counts after preincubation for 30 minutes ($2.90 \pm 0.55$, ESP; $2.97 \pm 0.73$, ESS; $3.44 \pm 0.77$, MTA) and 24 hours ($2.81 \pm 0.47$, ESP; $2.93 \pm 0.81$, ESS; $3.13 \pm 0.94$, MTA) were not significantly different ($P > .05$) (Fig. 1).

**Comparison of Susceptibility of Different Strains**

Log10 reductions in viable counts for strains exposed to ESP, ESS, and MTA are shown in Table 2. The mean ($\pm$ standard deviation) reduction in log10 viable counts ranged from $2.17 \pm 0.62$ for E. faecalis GS33 to $3.36 \pm 0.47$ for E. faecalis GS2 when exposed to ESP, from $1.94 \pm 0.44$ for E. faecalis GS25 to $4.21 \pm 1.42$ for E. faecalis GS9 when exposed to ESS, and from $1.86 \pm 0.24$ for E. faecalis GS4 to $4.78 \pm 0.42$ for E. faecalis GS9 when exposed to MTA. The greatest reduction in viable counts occurred with GS9; this strain was significantly more susceptible than GS7, GS25, and GS33 ($P < .05$) and GS4 ($P < .01$) (Fig. 2). There were no differences between other strains.

**Discussion**

The results of this in vitro investigation showed that EndoSequence Root Repair premixed putty and syringeable paste, as well as white Pro-Root MTA, possess antibacterial properties against clinical strains of E. faecalis during their setting period. There was no difference between the materials in their antibacterial efficacy. Clinical strains varied in the susceptibility to the materials tested. All hypotheses tested were accepted.

The rationale for selection of a 30-minute preincubation period during the setting process was based on the manufacturer’s information that the material has a 30+-minute working time. Pilot studies showed that the materials were still undergoing setting at 24 hours; thus, this was included as an interim setting period for the material. For both time periods, the materials possessed similar antibacterial effects against the E. faecalis strains.

ERRM is a bioceramic material composed of calcium silicates, zirconium oxide, tantalum oxide, calcium phosphate monobasic, thickening agents, and proprietary fillers. EndoSequence has been manufactured to overcome some of the difficult handling characteristics of MTA. The materials have very different working properties; MTA has to be mixed with a sterile liquid to a desired consistency, and the EndoSequence materials are ready-to-use as packaged. Depending on the consistency desired, ERRM is manufactured in a syringeable form, which is flowable, and a putty form, which is firm and moldable. A difficulty encountered during the research was attaining a complete set of the EndoSequence materials. The manufacturer states that the moisture present in the dentinal tubules is adequate to allow the material to set. In pilot studies it was observed that the materials started to set only when completely covered by water. Interestingly, another study reported an inability of both putty and syringeable materials incubated at 37°C in >95% humidity for 30 minutes and 24 hours before 1-hour exposure to E. faecalis strains. There were no statistically significant differences between materials or preincubation periods ($P > .05$). Bars represent mean ± standard deviation log10 viable counts of combined data for 10 E. faecalis strains.
However, a limitation of the method is that it does not allow evaluation of microorganisms under biofilm conditions. In the present study, harvesting of microorganisms was standardized to mid-exponential growth phase. Future studies could use models that include microorganisms in different phases of growth, since it has been shown that *E. faecalis* strains are more susceptible to endodontic medicaments during exponential growth phase compared with stationary and starved phases (22).

MTA is the current material of choice for root perforations, retrograde filling materials, and pulp capping (3, 4, 23). Previous studies have shown conflicting results regarding the antibacterial activity of MTA. For example, the antimicrobial activity of MTA has been limited in some studies (24–26), whereas it was effective against microorganisms including *E. faecalis* in other studies (27–30). In addition, antibacterial efficacy of MTA is dependent on concentrations and the type of preparation (31). The authors are not aware of any previous information regarding the antibacterial activity of both EPS and ESS. However, a sealer composed of similar materials but with a different amount of filler material for increased flow consistency demonstrated an antibacterial effect against an *E. faecalis* strain for up to 7 days in direct contact tests (11). This was attributed to the sealer’s high pH, hydrophilicity, and active calcium hydroxide diffusion. In a recent study, intracanal placement of ESS and white MTA resulted in diffusion of hydroxyl ions across dentin (32). Although pH of materials was not measured in this study, it is feasible that the pH of the material during its setting reaction contributed to the antibacterial activity seen in the present study.

In conclusion, within the limitations of the present study, ERRM, both putty and syringeable forms, and white ProRoot MTA demonstrated similar antimicrobial properties during their setting reactions against 10 clinical strains of *E. faecalis*. Not all of the bacterial strains were equally susceptible to the materials, suggesting that the use of more than 1 strain in antimicrobial assays is advisable.
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