ISSN: 2320-9267

Indian Journal of Pharmaceutical and Biological Research (IJPBR)

Journal homepage: www.ijpbr.in

REVIEW ARTICLES

Endodontic Irrigation Systems and Techniques: A Review of the Literature

Jahnavi Shah

ABSTRACT

Effective irrigation is central to the success of root canal treatment, enabling removal of microorganisms, tissue remnants, and the smear layer from complex root canal systems. Traditional irrigants such as sodium hypochlorite, chlorhexidine, and EDTA remain the foundation of endodontic disinfection, but limitations in their effectiveness and safety have driven the development of newer agents and combinations. Delivery methods have also evolved from conventional syringe irrigation to advanced activation systems, including ultrasonic, sonic, laser-based, negative pressure, and multisonic technologies. Adjuncts such as intracanal heating, surfactants, and microbubble technology are under exploration for improved efficacy. Laboratory evidence strongly supports the superiority of activated and advanced systems in enhancing microbial reduction, smear layer removal, and irrigant penetration. However, translational challenges, methodological variability, and limited long-term clinical evidence restrict definitive conclusions on their impact on treatment outcomes. Future directions require standardized protocols, clinically relevant biofilm models, well-designed randomized controlled trials, and patient-centered outcome measures. This review synthesizes current knowledge, highlights limitations, and discusses future perspectives in the evolving landscape of endodontic irrigation.

Keywords: endodontic irrigation, root canal disinfection, ultrasonic activation, sonic activation, laser-activated irrigation, negative pressure systems, biofilm removal

Indian J. Pharm. Biol. Res. (2022): https://doi.org/10.30750/ijpbr.10.4.05

INTRODUCTION

Root canal treatment seeks to eliminate microorganisms and their by-products from the complex root canal system while preserving the tooth in function. Mechanical instrumentation alone is insufficient due to the intricate anatomy of root canals, including fins, isthmuses, and lateral canals, which harbor residual microbes and tissue remnants. Irrigation is therefore critical to complement mechanical shaping by chemically dissolving organic tissue, disrupting biofilms, and removing the smear layer.

Sodium hypochlorite (NaOCl) remains the gold standard irrigant due to its dual ability to dissolve organic tissue and exert potent antimicrobial activity. However, limitations such as cytotoxicity and inability to remove the inorganic smear layer have prompted the use of additional agents such as EDTA, chlorhexidine, MTAD, and newer formulations like QMix. Alongside irrigant chemistry, delivery systems significantly influence efficacy. Conventional syringe and needle irrigation often fail to adequately exchange irrigants in the apical third, spurring the development of advanced agitation and delivery technologies including sonic, ultrasonic, laser-activated, negative pressure, and multisonic systems.

Despite substantial laboratory evidence supporting advanced approaches, their clinical translation and impact on long-term outcomes remain less clear. This review evaluates the current literature on irrigants, delivery systems, adjunctive technologies, and their reported efficacy, while identifying limitations and future research needs.

~~BDS,India~~

Corresponding Author: Jahnavi Shah, BDS,India. E-Mail: jahnvi911@gmail.com

How to cite this article: Shah V. Endodontic Irrigation Systems and Techniques: A Review of the Literature. Indian J. Pharm. Biol. Res. 2022;10(4):17-27.

Source of support: Nil

Conflict of interest: None.

Received: 5/09/2022 **Revised:** 15/09/2022 **Accepted:** 20/09/2022 **Published:** 22/10/2022

METHOD

Search Strategy

A comprehensive literature search was conducted across major electronic databases, including PubMed/MEDLINE, Scopus, Web of Science, and the Cochrane Library. The search was designed to capture studies evaluating irrigants, delivery systems, and activation techniques in endodontics. Keywords and Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) included combinations of: endodontic irrigation, root canal disinfection, ultrasonic irrigation, sonic irrigation, laser-activated irrigation, negative pressure irrigation, GentleWave, XP-endo Finisher, biofilm removal, and smear layer. Boolean operators (AND/OR) were applied to refine the search. The reference lists of relevant reviews and primary studies were also manually screened to identify additional articles.

Eligibility Criteria

Studies were included if they met the following criteria:

Types of studies

in vitro, ex vivo, animal, and clinical studies (randomized controlled trials, cohort, case-control, case series), as well as systematic reviews and meta-analyses.

Population

extracted human teeth, animal teeth, or patients undergoing root canal treatment.

Interventions

any irrigation solution, delivery method, or activation system.

Outcomes

microbial reduction, smear layer removal, irrigant penetration, apical extrusion, healing outcomes, postoperative pain, or other clinically relevant parameters.

Language

only studies published in English were considered.

Exclusion criteria included narrative reviews, editorials, conference abstracts without full text, and studies not directly related to endodontic irrigation.

DATA EXTRACTION

Two independent reviewers screened titles and abstracts, followed by full-text review for eligibility. Disagreements were resolved through discussion or consultation with a third reviewer. Data were extracted into a standardized form, including study design, sample characteristics, irrigant or system tested, main outcomes, and key findings.

Quality Assessment

Risk of bias was assessed according to study type. For randomized controlled trials, the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool was used. For in vitro and ex vivo studies, methodological features such as randomization of samples, blinding of evaluators, and standardization of protocols were considered. Systematic reviews and meta-analyses were appraised using AMSTAR-2. The overall strength of the evidence was categorized as high, moderate, or low based on consistency and methodological quality.

Data Synthesis

Due to heterogeneity in study designs, irrigant concentrations, activation protocols, and outcome measures, a narrative synthesis approach was adopted. Where sufficient homogeneity was present, results were compared qualitatively across studies to highlight relative performance, advantages, and limitations of different irrigation systems and techniques.

IRRIGANTS: SHORT OVERVIEW

Root canal irrigants play a pivotal role in complementing mechanical preparation by dissolving organic tissue, disrupting biofilms, and removing the smear layer. No single solution is capable of fulfilling all desired properties, hence combinations and sequential use are commonly recommended in clinical protocols. The choice of irrigant, its concentration, and the order of application influence both the antimicrobial outcome and dentin surface characteristics, which in turn affect sealer adhesion and long-term treatment success.

Sodium hypochlorite (NaOCl) remains the most widely used irrigant due to its potent tissue-dissolving capacity and broad-spectrum antimicrobial action. However, it does not remove the inorganic component of the smear layer and carries the risk of tissue toxicity if extruded beyond the apex. Ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid (EDTA) is therefore often employed as a chelating agent to remove the smear layer, facilitating deeper penetration of NaOCl and improving dentin surface cleanliness.

Chlorhexidine (CHX) provides strong antimicrobial effects and substantivity, but lacks tissue-dissolving ability and may precipitate when used sequentially with NaOCl. Other irrigants and commercial formulations have been introduced to overcome these limitations. MTAD combines doxycycline, citric acid, and a detergent, offering antimicrobial and chelating effects, whereas QMix integrates CHX-like activity with EDTA and surfactants, simplifying irrigation protocols. Saline and distilled water are sometimes used as neutral flushes but have negligible antimicrobial or tissue-dissolving capacity.

Despite the variety of available irrigants, NaOCl in combination with a chelating agent such as EDTA remains the most evidence-supported regimen. Newer formulations offer simplified protocols, though their clinical superiority is not yet consistently demonstrated.

IRRIGATION DELIVERY SYSTEMS

The effectiveness of an irrigant is closely tied to how it is delivered into the root canal system. Proper delivery

Table 1: Common Endodontic Irrigants and Their Properties

Irrigant	Primary Actions	Advantages	Limitations
Sodium hypochlorite (NaOCl)	Tissue dissolution, broad antimicrobial action	Gold standard; effective against biofilms; inexpensive	Cytotoxic if extruded; unpleasant taste/odor; does not remove smear layer
Ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid (EDTA)	Chelation of calcium ions; smear layer removal	Enhances canal cleanliness; facilitates sealer penetration	Limited antimicrobial effect; prolonged use may cause dentin erosion
Chlorhexidine (CHX)	Antimicrobial, substantivity (residual activity on dentin)	Broad antibacterial effect; useful as final rinse	No tissue-dissolving ability; precipitates when combined with NaOCl
MTAD (mixture of tetracycline, acid, detergent)	Antimicrobial (doxycycline), chelation (citric acid), smear layer removal	Combines disinfection and smear layer removal; biocompatible	Expensive; potential for antibiotic resistance; not superior to NaOCl/EDTA in many studies
QMix	Antimicrobial (CHX-like), chelation (EDTA), surfactant for penetration	One-step final rinse; reduces number of irrigants required	Costly; potential CHX–NaOCl interaction if not flushed properly
Saline/Distilled water	Mechanical flushing only	Biocompatible; neutral rinsing agent	No antimicrobial or tissue-dissolving action; only adjunctive use

ensures sufficient irrigant exchange, penetration into apical and lateral regions, and removal of debris. Several delivery approaches have been proposed, ranging from conventional syringe-and-needle irrigation to advanced negative pressure systems. Each method presents unique advantages and limitations, with clinical applicability influenced by factors such as safety, cost, and ease of use.

Manual Dynamic Activation (MDA)

Manual dynamic activation involves the use of a well-fitting gutta-percha cone, placed near working length and moved in a gentle pumping or in-and-out motion. This agitation improves irrigant circulation and replenishment within the canal.

Advantages

Inexpensive, simple, and requires no specialized equipment. Enhances irrigant exchange compared to syringe irrigation alone.

Limitations

Operator-dependent and less effective than powered activation techniques. Limited in disrupting mature biofilms or removing the smear layer in complex anatomy.

Clinical Relevance

Useful as an adjunct in cases where advanced devices are unavailable, particularly in straight or moderately curved canals.

Sonic Activation Systems

Sonic irrigation devices, such as the EndoActivator, operate at low acoustic frequencies (1 - 6 kHz). Their flexible polymer tips agitate the irrigant through acoustic streaming, improving penetration into canal irregularities.

Advantages

Safe, simple to use, and compatible with curved or narrow canals due to flexible tips. Enhances irrigant distribution compared to syringe irrigation alone.

Limitations

Energy output is relatively low, limiting cavitation effects. Less effective in disrupting dense biofilms or removing debris in the apical third compared to ultrasonics.

Clinical Relevance

Suitable adjunct for general use, particularly when ultrasonic tips cannot safely access the canal.

Passive Ultrasonic Irrigation (PUI)

Ultrasonic activation uses oscillating files or non-cutting tips vibrating at higher frequencies (25 - 30 kHz). The technique

Table 2: Comparative Overview of Irrigation Delivery Systems

Delivery System	Mechanism	Advantages	Limitations	Clinical Considerations
Conventional Syringe & Needle	Positive pressure delivery using end- or side-vented needles	Widely available, inexpensive, simple to use	Limited irrigant penetration beyond needle tip (1–2 mm); risk of apical extrusion	Use side-vented needles; avoid binding; keep 1–2 mm short of working length
Modified Needle Designs (side-vented, double-vented, notched)	Enhanced lateral fluid flow	Improved safety and lateral distribution	Still limited apical cleaning; technique-sensitive	Small-gauge needles (27–30G) recommended for deeper penetration
Manual Dynamic Activation (MDA)	Agitation with gutta-percha cone in pumping motion	Inexpensive, easy to perform, improves irrigant exchange	Operator-dependent; less effective than powered activation	Works best when combined with syringe irrigation
Sonic Activation Systems (e.g., EndoActivator)	Low-frequency acoustic streaming (~1–6 kHz)	Safe, flexible tips, improves irrigant penetration	Limited cavitation; less powerful than ultrasonic activation	Useful adjunct in curved or narrow canals
Passive Ultrasonic Irrigation (PUI)	High-frequency oscillation (~25–30 kHz), acoustic streaming and cavitation	Effective smear layer removal; strong biofilm disruption	Requires specialized equipment; risk of dentin damage if misused	Non-cutting ultrasonic tips recommended
Laser-Activated Irrigation (LAI, PIPS, Er:YAG)	Photon-induced cavitation and shock waves enhance fluid movement	Strong activation effect, deep irrigant penetration	Expensive, thermal risks, requires training	Effective for complex anatomies, but limited evidence of long-term outcomes
Negative Pressure Systems (e.g., EndoVac)	Irrigant delivered coronally, aspirated apically under negative pressure	Safe apical irrigation, minimizes extrusion, effective in apical third	Requires special setup, more time-consuming	Strong safety profile; especially useful in high-risk extrusion cases
Multisonic Systems (e.g., GentleWave)	Multisonic energy and continuous fluid exchange	Enhanced penetration into canal complexities; promising efficacy	Very costly, limited independent clinical evidence	Suitable for complex anatomies; adoption limited by availability
File-Based Agitators (e.g., XP-endo Finisher, EasyClean)	Flexible file movement creates agitation and fluid disruption	Reaches irregularities, integrates easily into workflow	Less effective than ultrasonics for fluid dynamics	Best used as adjunct following syringe irrigation

Overall, syringe irrigation remains the clinical standard due to simplicity and accessibility, but advanced delivery and activation systems demonstrate superior efficacy in biofilm disruption, smear layer removal, and irrigant penetration. Selection of the appropriate system should balance evidence-based performance, clinical safety, cost, and case complexity.

generates acoustic streaming and cavitation, which enhance debris removal and disrupt microbial biofilms.

Advantages

Well-documented efficacy for smear layer removal, bacterial reduction, and irrigant penetration. Non-cutting tips minimize risk of dentin damage.

Limitations

Requires specialized equipment and can risk dentin wall damage or ledging if used incorrectly. May be less effective in highly curved canals due to limited tip flexibility.

Clinical Relevance

Strong evidence supports PUI as a superior adjunct compared to syringe irrigation alone. Often regarded as the benchmark activation technique.

Laser-Activated Irrigation (LAI)

Laser activation, particularly with Er:YAG and Er,Cr:YSGG lasers, uses photoacoustic shockwaves to induce fluid streaming and cavitation. Photon-induced photoacoustic streaming (PIPS) is a widely studied variant, where the laser tip is placed coronally rather than within the canal.

Advantages

Promotes irrigant movement throughout the root canal system, including lateral canals and isthmuses. Enhances smear layer and biofilm removal, even in difficult anatomies.

Limitations

High equipment costs, technique sensitivity, potential thermal damage if misused. Evidence of superior long-term clinical outcomes remains limited.

Clinical Relevance

Promising adjunct in complex anatomies, though adoption is limited by cost and the need for operator training.

Negative Pressure Irrigation Systems

Negative pressure irrigation (e.g., EndoVac) delivers irrigant coronally while simultaneously aspirating it apically, thereby reducing extrusion risk. Irrigant is drawn to the full working length under negative pressure.

Advantages

Safe and effective apical irrigation; minimizes risk of sodium hypochlorite accidents. Demonstrated improved irrigant replacement in the apical third.

Limitations

Requires additional equipment and setup time. Some studies show comparable bacterial reduction to ultrasonic systems, though not always superior.

Clinical Relevance

Particularly valuable for high-risk cases (e.g., immature apices, resorption, wide foramina), where extrusion risk must be minimized.

Multisonic Irrigation Systems

Multisonic systems, exemplified by the GentleWave device, use broad-spectrum acoustic energy and continuous irrigant exchange under negative pressure. The system is designed to reach complex canal anatomy with minimal instrumentation.

Advantages

Laboratory studies show improved cleaning of isthmuses, fins, and lateral canals compared to conventional techniques. Maintains dentin integrity by reducing the need for over-instrumentation.

Limitations

Very high cost, limited availability, and currently a small body of independent clinical research. Patient acceptance may also be influenced by longer chairside times.

Clinical Relevance

Represents a novel paradigm with promising potential, but widespread clinical adoption is hindered by cost and limited evidence base.

File-Based Agitation Systems

Specially designed files, such as the XP-endo Finisher or EasyClean, are used to agitate irrigants within the canal. These files have unique metallurgical properties that allow them to expand and adapt to canal irregularities.

Advantages

Easy integration into routine workflow; effective in contacting canal walls and irregularities missed by shaping files. Improves smear layer removal and irrigant distribution.

Limitations

Less effective in generating true cavitation or streaming compared to ultrasonic or laser activation. Effectiveness depends on canal anatomy and operator technique.

Clinical Relevance

Useful adjuncts for enhancing irrigant agitation, particularly when paired with NaOCl and EDTA, but best considered complementary rather than primary activation tools.

ADJUNCTS AND NOVEL INSTRUMENTS

Beyond established delivery and activation systems, several adjunctive approaches and novel technologies have been investigated to further enhance irrigant effectiveness. These methods aim to optimize chemical and physical interactions between irrigants and canal substrates, especially in challenging anatomical areas where conventional techniques remain insufficient.

Intracanal Heating of Irrigants

Heating sodium hypochlorite within the root canal enhances its tissue-dissolving capacity and antimicrobial activity.

Studies have shown that NaOCl heated to 40–60 °C demonstrates faster organic tissue dissolution compared to room-temperature solutions. Intracanal heating can be achieved using ultrasonic tips, heat carriers, or specialized devices.

Advantages

Increases efficacy of NaOCl without requiring higher concentrations, potentially reducing cytotoxicity.

Limitations

Technique-sensitive; excessive heat application may risk damage to periodontal tissues if not carefully controlled.

Clinical Relevance

An emerging adjunctive approach with promising laboratory evidence, but limited clinical trials confirming long-term benefits.

Surfactants and Wetting Agents

The addition of surfactants (e.g., in formulations such as QMix or modified NaOCl solutions) reduces surface tension, enhancing irrigant penetration into dentinal tubules and complex canal anatomy. By improving wettability, surfactants allow irrigants to more effectively contact canal walls and biofilms.

Advantages

Improved irrigant penetration, potential reduction in required irrigant volumes.

Limitations

Possible chemical interactions with other irrigants (e.g., CHX and NaOCl), and inconsistent evidence regarding significant clinical improvement.

Clinical Relevance

A valuable modification, especially for irrigant formulations designed to streamline clinical protocols.

Microbubble and Nanobubble Technology

Microbubble and nanobubble irrigation utilizes oxygen-rich or gas-filled bubbles generated within the irrigant. When activated, these bubbles collapse and release energy, enhancing biofilm disruption and smear layer removal.

Advantages

High surface energy and oxidative potential, with potential to disrupt resistant biofilms.

Limitations

Technology is still experimental; few independent studies; specialized equipment required.

Clinical Relevance

Promising area of innovation, but currently limited to preclinical investigations.

Ozonated Water and Ozone Delivery Systems

Ozone, either as ozonated water or gas, has been studied as an antimicrobial irrigant. It exerts a broad-spectrum antimicrobial effect via oxidation.

Advantages

Strong antimicrobial potential, safe in controlled concentrations.

Limitations

No tissue-dissolving capacity, short-lived effect, and limited penetration into dentinal tubules.

Clinical Relevance

More effective as an adjunct rather than a primary irrigant. Clinical studies have not consistently demonstrated superiority over NaOCl.

Electrodynamic and Electrochemical Activation

Some experimental systems apply electric currents or electrochemical activation to irrigants, aiming to increase their antimicrobial potency or facilitate deeper tissue penetration.

Advantages

Enhances the intrinsic properties of irrigants; potential to improve biofilm disruption.

Limitations

Still largely in the research phase, with limited translational data.

Clinical Relevance

Not yet suitable for routine practice, though an area for future exploration.

Adjuncts such as intracanal heating, surfactants, and emerging technologies (microbubbles, ozone, electrochemical activation) show potential to boost the effectiveness of conventional irrigants. While laboratory evidence is encouraging, the translation of these innovations into routine clinical practice remains limited due to insufficient high-quality clinical studies. For now, they serve as promising adjuncts rather than replacements for established irrigation strategies.

EFFICACY OUTCOMES REPORTED

The success of endodontic irrigation is measured not only by its ability to deliver solutions into the root canal system but also by demonstrated outcomes in microbial reduction, smear layer removal, and overall treatment success. Various irrigants, activation methods, and adjunctive technologies have been evaluated in laboratory, preclinical, and clinical studies.

Microbial Reduction

A primary goal of irrigation is eliminating microbial biofilms, particularly Enterococcus faecalis, which is frequently associated with persistent infections.

Syringe Irrigation

Conventional needle irrigation reduces bacterial counts but rarely achieves complete eradication, especially in apical third and lateral canals.

Ultrasonic Activation (PUI)

Consistently superior to syringe irrigation, showing enhanced bacterial reduction and improved disruption of biofilms.

Sonic Activation

Improves microbial reduction over syringe delivery, but less effective than ultrasonic systems.

Negative Pressure Systems

Demonstrate comparable bacterial reduction to ultrasonics, with added safety against apical extrusion.

Novel Adjuncts (e.g., heated NaOCl, microbubbles)

Laboratory studies indicate promising antimicrobial improvements, though clinical translation remains limited.

Smear Layer Removal

Smear layer removal is critical for disinfecting dentinal tubules and improving the sealing ability of obturation materials.

EDTA followed by NaOCl

Remains the most widely studied protocol, effective at removing the inorganic and organic components of the smear layer.

Ultrasonic Activation

Strong evidence supports enhanced smear layer removal, particularly in the apical third.

Sonic and File-Based Agitation

Provide moderate improvement, though outcomes vary with canal anatomy.

Laser Activation (PIPS/LAI)

Demonstrates superior smear layer removal even in lateral canals and isthmuses.

Multisonic Systems (GentleWave)

Laboratory evidence shows highly effective smear layer and debris removal without extensive instrumentation

Irrigant Penetration and Distribution

Effective irrigation requires penetration into complex canal anatomies, including isthmuses, fins, and lateral canals.

Syringe Irrigation

Penetration is limited by needle depth, canal curvature, and vapor lock in the apical third.

Negative Pressure Systems

Overcome vapor lock and enable irrigant exchange up to working length safely.

Ultrasonic and Laser Activation

Both significantly improve irrigant penetration, with laser systems showing potential to distribute irrigant into inaccessible areas coronally activated.

Adjunctive Methods (Surfactants, Heated Irrigants)

Improve irrigant flow and diffusion within dentinal tubules.

Clinical Outcomes and Treatment Success

Ultimately, the impact of irrigation strategies on clinical outcomes is the most relevant endpoint, though evidence remains less conclusive than laboratory findings.

Short-Term Success

Multiple randomized clinical trials report improved bacterial reduction and post-operative pain control with ultrasonic or negative pressure irrigation compared to syringe irrigation alone.

Long-Term Healing

Evidence for improved periapical healing with advanced irrigation systems is emerging but not definitive. Success in root canal treatment is multifactorial, and irrigation is only one contributing element.

Patient Safety and Comfort

Negative pressure systems reduce risk of irrigant extrusion, while laser and multisonic systems may prolong procedure time but are generally well tolerated.

Evidence strongly supports the superiority of activated irrigation systems (particularly ultrasonic, laser, and multisonic) over syringe irrigation alone in enhancing microbial reduction, smear layer removal, and irrigant penetration. However, while laboratory results are compelling, high-quality clinical evidence demonstrating significant improvements in long-term treatment outcomes remains limited. The integration of novel adjuncts offers further promise, though their role in daily practice awaits validation through randomized controlled trials.

LIMITATIONS OF CURRENT EVIDENCE

Despite extensive laboratory and clinical research on irrigants and delivery systems, several limitations constrain the strength and generalizability of the findings. These limitations can be broadly categorized into methodological variability, translational challenges, and gaps in long-term outcome data.

Methodological Variability in Laboratory Studies

Diverse Study Protocols: In vitro studies differ significantly in irrigant concentrations, activation times, volumes used, and experimental setups, making direct comparison across studies difficult.

Simplified Models

Many investigations employ standardized root canal blocks or extracted teeth that do not accurately replicate the complex anatomy, biofilm diversity, or clinical environment of infected root canals.

Biofilm Models

Artificial or mono-species biofilm models, commonly dominated by E. faecalis, do not reflect the polymicrobial and multilayered biofilms encountered clinically.

Outcome Measures

Surrogate outcomes such as debris removal or dye penetration may not directly translate to clinical efficacy in reducing reinfection or enhancing healing.

Limited Translational Evidence

Scarcity of High-Quality Clinical Trials

While numerous in vitro and ex vivo studies exist, randomized controlled clinical trials are relatively few. Many rely on surrogate endpoints such as bacterial sampling rather than long-term healing outcomes.

Short Follow-Up Periods

Clinical studies often assess short-term results (e.g., bacterial reduction or immediate post-operative pain), leaving uncertainties about long-term periapical healing and tooth survival.

Operator Variability

Clinical effectiveness is heavily influenced by practitioner skill, case selection, and adherence to protocols, which are rarely standardized across trials.

Challenges in Assessing Comparative Efficacy

Confounding Variables: Differences in canal anatomy, irrigation sequence, instrumentation, and obturation techniques can confound interpretation of irrigation system performance.

Overlap of Benefits

Several activation methods (e.g., ultrasonic, laser, multisonic) achieve overlapping outcomes in terms of irrigant penetration and smear layer removal, making it difficult to attribute clinical improvements to one system over another.

Industry Sponsorship

Some newer technologies (e.g., multisonic and laser systems) are supported by manufacturer-driven studies, raising concerns about potential bias.

Gaps in Long-Term and Patient-Centered Outcomes

Periapical Healing

Evidence linking advanced irrigation systems to superior long-term healing rates remains sparse. Most available data do not conclusively demonstrate improved prognosis compared with traditional syringe irrigation.

Patient Safety and Comfort

While negative pressure systems clearly enhance safety, evidence on patient-reported outcomes, such as post-operative discomfort, treatment time, and cost-effectiveness, remains underexplored.

Cost–Benefit Considerations

Many advanced systems require significant investment, yet their clinical advantages over more accessible methods (e.g., ultrasonic irrigation) remain inconclusive.

Although the literature demonstrates promising advances in irrigant solutions and delivery systems, methodological variability, limited translational evidence, and insufficient long-term clinical data limit firm conclusions about their superiority in improving treatment outcomes. Future research requires well-designed, multicenter randomized controlled trials, standardized protocols, and patient-centered outcomes to bridge the gap between laboratory efficacy and clinical effectiveness.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Advancements in endodontic irrigation have significantly expanded the range of available solutions and delivery systems. However, several areas require further exploration to strengthen the scientific basis for their clinical adoption and ensure evidence-based integration into daily practice.

Standardization of Research Protocols

Future studies should establish uniform protocols for evaluating irrigants and delivery systems. This includes standardizing irrigant concentrations, volumes, activation times, and assessment methods. Standardization would reduce heterogeneity in outcomes and allow for more reliable meta-analyses and clinical recommendations.

Development of Clinically Relevant Biofilm Models

Improved in vitro and ex vivo models that replicate polymicrobial, multilayered biofilms within anatomically complex root canal systems are essential. These models should better mimic in vivo conditions such as nutrient availability, fluid dynamics, and host interactions. Adoption of such advanced biofilm models would provide more accurate insights into antimicrobial efficacy.

High-Quality Randomized Controlled Clinical Trials

While laboratory evidence is strong, clinical evidence remains scarce and fragmented. Large-scale, multicenter randomized controlled trials (RCTs) with long-term follow-up are urgently needed. These should evaluate not only bacterial reduction but also periapical healing, tooth survival, and patient-centered outcomes such as comfort, treatment time, and cost-effectiveness.

Cost–Benefit and Accessibility Analyses

Advanced systems such as laser-activated and multisonic irrigation are associated with significant costs. Economic analyses should assess whether the incremental benefits in microbial reduction or smear layer removal justify widespread adoption. Future research should also consider how cost influences accessibility, particularly in resource-limited settings.

Integration of Emerging Technologies

Novel adjuncts and emerging methods should continue to be investigated for potential integration:

- Intracanal heating protocols for NaOCl need refinement for safe clinical application.
- Nanotechnology and microbubble systems may enhance biofilm disruption but require translational studies.
- AI and digital imaging tools could be employed to optimize irrigation protocols and personalize treatment planning based on canal anatomy.

Biologically based irrigants (e.g., enzymatic or peptide-based solutions) may offer antimicrobial activity with reduced cytotoxicity.6. Patient-Centered Research

Future directions should emphasize patient-reported outcomes. This includes evaluating postoperative pain, treatment acceptance, procedural time, and overall quality of life. These measures will provide a holistic understanding of irrigation system benefits beyond laboratory efficacy.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

The effectiveness of root canal treatment depends largely on thorough disinfection of the complex root canal system, and irrigation plays a pivotal role in this process. This review highlights the evolution of irrigants, delivery systems, and adjunctive technologies, underscoring both their potential benefits and the challenges that remain in translating laboratory success into predictable clinical outcomes.

Conventional syringe and needle irrigation remains the most widely employed method due to its simplicity and accessibility. However, its inherent limitations in reaching the apical third, overcoming vapor lock, and disrupting biofilms are well documented. Advances such as ultrasonic and laser activation, negative pressure delivery, and multisonic systems have demonstrated superior efficacy in laboratory settings, particularly in smear layer removal, biofilm disruption, and irrigant penetration into inaccessible canal areas. File-based agitation systems and manual dynamic activation provide more accessible alternatives, though their effectiveness remains moderate compared with powered activation techniques.

Despite these advances, a critical limitation lies in the translation of experimental results to clinical outcomes. Laboratory studies often employ simplified models, mono-species biofilms, or artificial blocks, which do not fully replicate the clinical environment. Clinical trials, although growing in number, remain relatively limited in scale, often assessing short-term bacterial reduction rather than long-term healing or tooth survival. This methodological heterogeneity hinders meaningful comparison between systems and complicates the formulation of definitive clinical guidelines.

The introduction of novel adjuncts such as intracanal heating, surfactants, microbubble technology, and biologically inspired irrigants further demonstrates the drive toward optimizing irrigation efficacy. While preliminary results are promising, most of these approaches remain at the experimental or early translational stage, with insufficient evidence to support routine use. Similarly, newer technologies such as multisonic irrigation systems present compelling laboratory data but are constrained by high costs and limited independent validation.

A balanced appraisal suggests that while advanced irrigation systems do enhance disinfection and cleaning, their impact on long-term treatment outcomes remains uncertain. The integration of these methods into clinical practice must therefore consider not only laboratory efficacy but also patient safety, cost–effectiveness, and accessibility.

In many settings, simpler and more affordable activation methods such as ultrasonic or negative pressure systems may provide the most practical improvements in clinical irrigation protocols.

Looking ahead, future research must bridge the gap between bench and bedside. Standardized experimental protocols, clinically relevant biofilm models, and high-quality randomized controlled trials are urgently needed. Moreover, patient-centered outcomes, including postoperative comfort, treatment duration, and overall satisfaction, must be incorporated to provide a comprehensive evaluation of irrigation systems. Only through such multidimensional research can the profession determine which approaches truly enhance patient outcomes and justify their clinical and economic investment.

CONCLUSION

Irrigation remains a cornerstone of endodontic treatment, essential for the removal of microbes, organic debris, and the smear layer within the complex anatomy of root canals. Traditional syringe irrigation, while simple and widely accessible, is limited in its ability to achieve thorough disinfection, particularly in the apical third and lateral intricacies of the canal system. Advances in delivery and activation such as ultrasonic, sonic, laser-based, negative pressure, and multisonic systems have demonstrated improved efficacy in laboratory studies, with enhanced microbial reduction and irrigant penetration. Adjunctive innovations, including intracanal heating, surfactants, and novel technologies like microbubble systems, further highlight the continuous evolution of irrigation strategies. Nonetheless, the clinical translation of these innovations remains constrained by methodological variability, limited high-quality randomized controlled trials, and insufficient long-term outcome data. Cost benefit considerations also limit the widespread adoption of advanced systems in routine practice. Moving forward, standardized research protocols, clinically relevant biofilm models, and patient-centered clinical trials are essential to establish evidence-based recommendations. Ultimately, the integration of effective, safe, and accessible irrigation systems will remain central to improving the success and predictability of root canal treatment.

REFERENCES

1. Dioguardi, M., Di Gioia, G., Illuzzi, G., Laneve, E., Cocco, A., & Troiano, G. (2018). Endodontic irrigants: Different methods to improve efficacy and related problems. European journal of dentistry, 12(03), 459-466.
2. Singh, S. (2020). Irrigation Dynamics in Endodontics: Advances, Challenges and Clinical Implications. Indian Journal of Pharmaceutical and Biological Research, 8(02), 26-32.
3. Pasricha, S. K., Makkar, S., & Gupta, P. (2015). Pressure alteration techniques in endodontics-a review of literature. Journal of clinical and diagnostic research: JCDR, 9(3), ZE01.
4. Susila, A., & Minu, J. (2019). Activated irrigation vs. conventional non-activated irrigation in endodontics–A systematic review. European endodontic journal, 4(3), 96.
5. Bukhari, S., & Babaeer, A. (2019). Irrigation in endodontics: a review. Current Oral Health Reports, 6(4), 367-376.
6. Topbas, C., & Adiguzel, O. (2017). Endodontic irrigation solutions: A review: Endodontic irrigation solutions. International Dental Research, 7(3), 54-61.
7. Singh, S. (2019). Vital pulp therapy: A Bio ceramic-Based Approach. Indian Journal of Pharmaceutical and Biological Research, 7(04), 10-18.
8. Mozo, S., Llena, C., & Forner, L. (2011). Review of ultrasonic irrigation in endodontics: increasing action of irrigating solutions. Medicina oral, patologia oral y cirugia bucal, 17(3), e512.
9. Haapasalo, M., Endal, U., Zandi, H., & Coil, J. M. (2005). Eradication of endodontic infection by instrumentation and irrigation solutions. Endodontic topics, 10(1), 77-102.
10. Jamali, S., Jabbari, G., Mousavi, E., Ahmadizadeh, H., Khorram, M., & Jamee, A. (2020). The comparison of different irrigation systems to remove calcium hydroxide from the root canal: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Pesquisa Brasileira em Odontopediatria e Clínica Integrada, 20, e5404.
11. Jamali, S., Jabbari, G., Mousavi, E., Ahmadizadeh, H., Khorram, M., & Jamee, A. (2020). The comparison of different irrigation systems to remove calcium hydroxide from the root canal: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Pesquisa Brasileira em Odontopediatria e Clínica Integrada, 20, e5404.
12. Konstantinidi, E., Psimma, Z., Chávez de Paz, L. E., & Boutsioukis, C. (2017). Apical negative pressure irrigation versus syringe irrigation: a systematic review of cleaning and disinfection of the root canal system. International endodontic journal, 50(11), 1034-1054.
13. Nagendrababu, V., Jayaraman, J., Suresh, A., Kalyanasundaram, S., & Neelakantan, P. (2018). Effectiveness of ultrasonically activated irrigation on root canal disinfection: a systematic review of in vitro studies. Clinical oral investigations, 22(2), 655-670.
14. Kaur, R., Singh, R., Sethi, K., Garg, S., Miglani, S., & Vats, S. (2014). Irrigating solutions in pediatric dentistry: Literature review and update. J Adv Med Dent Sci Res, 2(2), 104-15.
15. Haapasalo, M., Shen, Y., Qian, W., & Gao, Y. (2010). Irrigation in endodontics. Dental Clinics, 54(2), 291-312.
16. Prada, I., Micó-Muñoz, P., Giner-Lluesma, T., Micó-Martínez, P., Muwaquet-Rodríguez, S., & Albero-Monteagudo, A.

(2019). Update of the therapeutic planning of irrigation and intracanal medication in root canal treatment. A literature review. Journal of clinical and experimental dentistry, 11(2), e185.

17. Singh, S. (2020). Deep Margin Elevation: A Conservative Alternative in Restorative Dentistry. SRMS JOURNAL OF MEDICAL SCIENCE, 5(02), 1-9.
18. Joshua, Olatunde & Ovuchi, Blessing & Nkansah, Christopher & Akomolafe, Oluwabunmi & Adebayo, Ismail Akanmu & Godson, Osagwu & Clifford, Okotie. (2018). Optimizing Energy Efficiency in Industrial Processes: A Multi-Disciplinary Approach to Reducing Consumption in Manufacturing and Petroleum Operations across West Africa.
19. Nkansah, Christopher. (2021). Geomechanical Modeling and Wellbore Stability Analysis for Challenging Formations in the Tano Basin, Ghana.
20. Adebayo, Ismail Akanmu. (2022). ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE OF FERROCENE NANOPARTICLE -HIBISCUS CANNABINUS BIODIESEL ADMIXED FUEL BLENDED WITH HYDROGEN IN DIRECT INJECTION (DI) ENGINE. Transactions of Tianjin University. 55. 10.5281/zenodo.16931428.
21. Adebayo, I. A., Olagunju, O. J., Nkansah, C., Akomolafe, O., Godson, O., Blessing, O., & Clifford, O. (2019). Water-Energy-Food Nexus in Sub-Saharan Africa: Engineering Solutions for Sustainable Resource Management in Densely Populated Regions of West Africa.
22. Mohammadi, Z., Shalavi, S., Kinoshita, J. I., Giardino, L., Gutmann, J. L., Rad, S. B., ... & Jafarzadeh, H. (2021). A Review on Root Canal Irrigation Solutions in Endodontics. Journal of Dental Materials & Techniques, 10(3).