International Journal of Computational and Experimental Science and ENgineering (IJCESEN)

Vol. 10-No.4 (2024) pp. 2945-2954
http://www.ijcesen.com

ISSN: 2149-9144

Research Article

Clinical Management of Instrument Separation in Root Canal Treatment

Marwah Mohammed Ali Albalawi[1]*, Nada Abdalrahman Shokair[2], Mohammed Rezq Mohammed Alharbi[3], Khaled Soliman Hamed Alahmadi[4], Naif Faiz Hussein Naitah[5], Abdulhakim Farooq Abdulhakim Sindi[6], Abdulaziz Falah Mohammed Alharbi[7], Alrashdi, Ahmed Muslih K[8], Almajid Salman Saad S[9], Waad Abdulrahman Saeed Alzahrani[10], Habiba Marzoq Alroili[11]

[1]Süleyman Demirel Üniversity, Science and Arts Faculty, Physics Department, 32200, Isparta-Turkiye
* **Corresponding Author Email:** marwa2h@gmail.com- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5247-8850

[2]Senior Registrar – Restorative Dentistry – Specialized Dental Center, Ministry of Health (Tabuk Health Cluster) – Tabuk – Tabuk Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: nad2a@gmail.com - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-1047-7850

[3]General Dentist – Ministry of Health – AlMadinah AlMunawwarah – AlMadinah Region – Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
Email: rez2q@gmail.com - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-2047-7850

[4]General Dentist – Ministry of Health – AlMadinah AlMunawwarah – AlMadinah Region – Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
Email: khale2d@gmail.com - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-0447-7850

[5]General Dentist – Ministry of Health – Al Ahsa – Eastern Province – Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
Email: nai2f@gmail.com - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-3047-7850

[6]General Dentist – Ministry of Health – AlMadinah AlMunawwarah – AlMadinah Region – Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
Email: faroo2q@gmail.com - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-4047-7850

[7]General Dentist – Ministry of Health – AlMadinah AlMunawwarah – AlMadinah Region – Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
Email: fala2h@gmail.com - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5047-7850

[8]Dentist – Waerah Primary Healthcare Center, Madinah Health Cluster – AlMadinah AlMunawwarah – AlMadinah Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: musli2h@gmail.com - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-6047-7850

[9]General Dentist – Al-Khalidiyah Health Center, Al-Ahsa Health Cluster – Al-Hofuf – Al-Ahsa Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: salma2n@gmail.com - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-7047-7850

[10]Dental Assistant Technician – Specialized Dental Center, Ministry of Health (Taif Health Cluster) – Taif – Makkah Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: waa2d@gmail.com - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-9047-7850

[11]Dental Assistant – Prince Abdullah bin Musaad Specialized Dental Center, Northern Borders Health Cluster – Arar – Northern Borders Region – Saudi Arabia
Email: habib2a@gmail.com - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-3347-7850

Article Info:

DOI: 10.22399/ijcesen.4420
Received : 03 August 2024
Accepted : 29 August 2024

Keywords

Instrument separation,
root canal treatment,
clinical management,
endodontic therapy,
file breakage

Abstract:

Abstract should be about 100-250 words. It should be written times new roman and 10 punto. Instrument separation during root canal treatment is a challenging complication that can hinder successful endodontic therapy. This occurs when a file or another endodontic instrument breaks within the root canal system, creating an obstruction that may impede thorough cleaning and shaping of the canal. Early recognition of an instrument separation is crucial, as it enables clinicians to initiate appropriate management strategies. The clinician must assess the degree of separation, the location of the fractured piece, and whether the canal anatomy allows for potential retrieval or bypass. Techniques such as utilizing ultrasonic instruments, operating microscopes, and specialized retrieval kits are often employed to enhance visibility and facilitate the successful removal of fractured instruments. In certain cases, if retrieval is deemed

impossible, the focus may shift towards sealing and managing the inflamed pulpal tissue to prevent further complications. The management of instrument separation also requires a well-thought-out treatment plan, depending on the case's specifics. Options may include non-surgical approaches, such as bypassing the separated instrument to access the apical region or filling around the broken piece, or surgical techniques that may involve apicoectomy. While the prognosis for successful endodontic treatment with instrument separation may be reduced, advancements in endodontic technology and techniques provide clinicians with various tools and methods to improve outcomes. Proper patient communication about the potential risks and uncertainties in achieving a successful treatment outcome is essential. Ultimately, the goal remains to preserve the tooth, relieve discomfort, and maintain the integrity of the surrounding structures, ensuring long-term success in endodontic therapy.

1. Introduction

The pursuit of endodontic health is fundamentally a pursuit of microbiological control. Root canal treatment stands as a definitive therapeutic intervention aimed at preserving the natural dentition by eradicating infection from the pulp space and establishing an environment conducive to periapical healing. This objective is achieved through a meticulously orchestrated sequence of procedures collectively known as chemomechanical preparation: the simultaneous shaping of the complex root canal system to facilitate the delivery of antimicrobial irrigants and the subsequent three-dimensional obturation of the debrided space with a biocompatible material [1]. The success of this intricate process is inextricably linked to the clinician's ability to navigate often microscopic, tortuous, and calcified pathways deep within the root structure. To meet this formidable challenge, modern endodontics has evolved a sophisticated array of technological tools, most notably the development of nickel-titanium (NiTi) rotary and reciprocating instrumentation systems. These instruments, celebrated for their superelasticity and resistance to torsion, have revolutionized clinical practice by enabling more predictable, efficient, and centered shaping of curved canals compared to traditional stainless-steel files [2].

However, this technological advancement operates within a domain of profound physical constraints and biological imperatives. The root canal system is not a passive, inert space but a dynamic anatomical entity characterized by fins, isthmuses, accessory canals, and apical deltas, all of which can harbor biofilms of remarkable resilience. The instruments themselves, while engineered for flexibility and strength, are subjected to extraordinary stresses as they rotate within the confined, often curved, and irregular walls of the root canal. It is within this confluence of demanding anatomy and mechanical limitation that one of the most disquieting complications in endodontic therapy can arise: the fracture and retention of an instrument within the canal, a phenomenon universally termed *instrument separation*. This event represents a critical juncture in treatment, transforming a controlled procedure into a complex clinical predicament that tests the skill, judgment, and resolve of the practitioner [3].

Despite monumental strides in metallurgy—from conventional NiTi to post-manufacturing thermal treatments producing M-Wire, CM Wire, and blue or gold alloys with enhanced cyclic fatigue resistance—and the refinement of clinical protocols emphasizing glide path creation and crown-down techniques, instrument separation has not been rendered obsolete. It persists as a statistically infrequent yet ever-present risk, a sobering reminder of the physical limits of our tools and the unpredictable nature of human anatomy. The moment of separation is often palpable: a sudden change in resistance, an unexpected sound, or the visual confirmation of a missing flute tip under the microscope. This instant precipitates a cascade of immediate concerns that extend far beyond the mere loss of a tool. The separated fragment, typically a segment of metal a few millimeters in length, ceases to be an instrument and becomes an iatrogenic obstruction, a foreign body lodged within the very space it was meant to prepare [4].

The clinical ramifications of this event are multidimensional and significant. From a biological perspective, the retained fragment introduces a non-biological, and frequently pre-contaminated, physical barrier into the root canal system. This obstruction can severely compromise the ultimate goal of treatment by preventing access to critical areas for debridement. The apical portion of the canal beyond the fragment, along with intricate anatomical features like isthmuses and lateral canals, may remain untouched by mechanical instrumentation and shielded from the convective flow and antibacterial action of irrigants such as sodium hypochlorite. Consequently, a reservoir of pathogenic microbiota may persist, elevating the risk of post-treatment disease and symptomatic failure. The fragment can act as a scaffold for biofilm reformation, undermining the chemomechanical efforts and potentially dooming the treatment from within [5].Beyond the biological

compromise, instrument separation engenders a formidable technical challenge. The presence of a metal fragment within the delicate root canal space complicates all subsequent procedures. It obstructs patency, impedes accurate working length determination, and can deflect other instruments, leading to procedural errors such as ledge formation, canal transportation, or even root perforation. The decision-making process for the clinician becomes immediately more complex, involving a rapid assessment of risks and benefits: Should an attempt be made to retrieve the fragment? Is bypass feasible? Or is the most prudent course to leave it in situ and attempt to treat around it? Each path carries its own set of potential complications, and the choice must be tailored to a multitude of factors including the fragment's location, the root's morphology, the pre-operative pulp status, and the stage of treatment at which the separation occurred [6].

The impact of this complication, however, transcends the clinical and technical domains, extending deeply into the psychological and ethical fabric of the patient-dentist relationship. For the patient, learning that a piece of a dental instrument has broken off inside their tooth can be a source of significant anxiety, confusion, and eroded trust. It may evoke feelings of vulnerability and raise concerns about safety, competence, and long-term prognosis. For the clinician, the event is often accompanied by frustration, self-doubt, and stress, particularly under the weight of potential medico-legal consequences. Instrument separation is a leading cause of litigation in endodontics, not necessarily because it occurred—as it is a known risk of treatment—but because of how it is managed in its aftermath. The ethical imperative of full and immediate disclosure to the patient, the clarity of communication regarding prognosis and options, and the thoroughness of documentation are all elevated to critical importance. The manner in which the clinician navigates this crisis of confidence can either mitigate or exacerbate its psychological toll [7].Therefore, a comprehensive, evidence-based, and systematic approach to the management of separated instruments is not merely a useful skill set; it is an indispensable component of competent, contemporary endodontic practice. Mastery in this area requires more than dexterity with retrieval devices; it demands a foundational understanding of the etiology and mechanisms of fracture to inform prevention, a strategic framework for risk assessment and decision-making, and a proficient, step-by-step protocol for intervention when required. It also necessitates a firm commitment to ethical principles, ensuring that the patient remains an informed partner in the revised treatment plan [8].

2. Etiology and Mechanisms of Instrument Separation

Instrument separation is not a random occurrence but is the end result of specific mechanical and clinical factors. Understanding these causative agents is the first step in prevention. Separation is generally categorized into two primary mechanisms: torsional (fatigue) fracture and cyclic (flexural) fatigue fracture, often acting in concert.

Torsional fracture occurs when the tip or any part of the rotating instrument becomes locked or constrained within the canal (e.g., due to excessive dentinal contact, abrupt canal curvature, or inadequate glide path) while the shank continues to rotate. This creates a shear stress that exceeds the elastic limit of the metal, leading to fracture. Clinically, this is often associated with forcing an instrument, using instruments in canals without a proper glide path, or neglecting to use instruments in a sequential manner [1, 2]. The fracture surface in torsional failure typically appears twisted or deformed.Cyclic fatigue fracture, on the other hand, results from repeated tension-compression cycles as an instrument rotates within a curved canal. Each rotation induces stress at the point of maximum curvature, leading to the propagation of microscopic cracks within the metal's crystalline structure until catastrophic failure occurs [3]. Factors exacerbating cyclic fatigue include small radius of curvature, excessive canal curvature (acute angles), prolonged instrumentation time in a curved canal with a single instrument, and higher rotational speeds [4]. The fracture surface in this case often appears smooth.Contributing clinical factors include operator-related errors such as improper access cavity design leading to excessive coronal interference, inadequate irrigation and lubrication leading to increased friction, failure to discard instruments after visible signs of deformation or predetermined use cycles, and the misuse of instruments (e.g., using a size 25/.06 instrument to negotiate a calcified canal) [5, 6]. Furthermore, anatomical challenges like sclerotic canals, severe dilacerations, and merging canals significantly increase the risk of both types of fracture.

3. Prevention: The Cornerstone of Management

The most effective management of instrument separation is its prevention. A rigorous, disciplined clinical protocol can drastically reduce its

incidence. Prevention strategies are multi-faceted, encompassing case selection, instrument handling, and operative technique.Pre-operative assessment through high-quality, angled radiographs and, when indicated, cone-beam computed tomography (CBCT), is crucial for evaluating root curvature, calcifications, and anatomy, allowing for strategic treatment planning [7]. The creation of a conservative yet sufficient access cavity is fundamental; it must provide straight-line access to the canal orifices and the initial part of the canal, minimizing coronal interferences that place undue stress on instruments [8].The concept of a "glide path" is non-negotiable. A smooth, reproducible glide path from orifice to apical foramen, established using small, flexible hand files (e.g., sizes 08, 10, 15) or dedicated rotary glide path files, ensures that subsequent rotary instruments follow a pre-defined, centered trajectory, reducing torsional loads and the risk of ledge formation [9]. Instrumentation must follow a crown-down sequence, removing coronal interferences first to decrease the engagement length and binding of subsequent smaller instruments in the apical third.

Instrument care and inspection are paramount. A strict record of instrument use (number of canals, tooth type, sterilization cycles) should be maintained, and manufacturers' guidelines for maximum usage should be respected, though these are not absolute guarantees. Visual inspection under magnification (e.g., dental operating microscope) for signs of unwinding, deformation, pitting, or corrosion before and after each use is essential [10]. Instruments should be discarded at the first sign of plastic deformation. Furthermore, employing a single-use protocol for small-sized rotary instruments (especially those used in the apical third) is a highly effective preventive measure, albeit with cost implications [11].

Kinematics also play a role. Using electric motors with integrated torque control and auto-reverse features can prevent excessive torsional stress. Additionally, employing reciprocating motion systems, which are designed to distribute stress more evenly across the instrument, has been shown to increase resistance to cyclic fatigue compared to continuous rotation in some studies [12]. Finally, copious and frequent irrigation with sodium hypochlorite and the use of chelating agents as lubricants during instrumentation reduce friction and cutting loads, facilitating safer instrument movement.

4. Initial Response and Patient Communication

The moment an instrument separates, a deliberate and calm protocol must be initiated. The first action is to discontinue instrumentation immediately. Do not attempt to blindly "feel" for the fragment or force another instrument alongside it, as this will likely worsen the situation by impacting the fragment further apically, creating a ledge, or perforating the root.

The next critical step is to obtain a high-quality radiograph from multiple angles (e.g., straight-on, mesial, and distal horizontal angulations) to localize the fragment. A parallax technique using two radiographs with different horizontal tube shifts can help determine the fragment's position relative to the canal lumen (buccal or lingual) [13]. If available, an immediate limited-field CBCT scan provides unparalleled three-dimensional information regarding the fragment's location, length, the canal anatomy beyond it, and the root thickness, which is invaluable for decision-making [14].

Simultaneously, transparent and empathetic communication with the patient is mandatory. The event must be disclosed honestly and without delay. The explanation should be clear, using non-alarming language: a small piece of the cleaning tool has broken and remains inside the tooth. The implications—that it may complicate treatment but does not necessarily condemn it to failure—should be discussed. The patient must be informed of all potential subsequent management options, including retrieval, bypass, or leaving the fragment in situ with monitoring. This conversation forms the basis for informed consent for the next steps and must be thoroughly documented in the patient's records, including the date, time, instrument type and size, and the discussion held.

5. Prognostic Assessment and Decision-Making: To Retrieve, Bypass, or Leave?

Not every separated instrument requires retrieval. The decision is a critical judgment call based on a risk-benefit analysis of several prognostic factors. The primary goal remains the elimination of infection; the management of the fragment is a means to that end. Key factors influencing the decision include the preoperative pulpal and periapical status, the fragment's location and depth, the stage of treatment at which separation occurred, and the potential risks of retrieval attempts.

The preoperative diagnosis is paramount. In a tooth with vital pulp or irreversible pulpitis without apical periodontitis, the biofilm is largely confined to the main canal. If the fragment is small, located in the straight part of the canal, and can be effectively bypassed and sealed, the prognosis may

remain favorable. Conversely, in a tooth with established apical periodontitis (a necrotic pulp with a radiographically visible lesion), the biofilm is complex, extending into anatomical complexities like isthmuses, fins, and apical deltas. If the fragment obstructs access to these areas, preventing adequate debridement and disinfection, the risk of persistent infection is higher, making retrieval or bypass more imperative [15].

The fragment's location is arguably the most significant factor. A fragment in the coronal or middle third of a straight canal is generally more accessible for retrieval with less risk of procedural errors. A fragment in the apical third, especially in a curved canal, poses a much greater challenge. The risks of perforation, excessive dentin removal leading to root weakness, or pushing the fragment through the apical foramen often outweigh the potential benefits of retrieval [16]. The stage of treatment is also crucial. Separation occurring after the canal has been adequately cleaned, shaped, and disinfected (e.g., during obturation) is less consequential than separation occurring early in the shaping process, which leaves a significant portion of the canal untreated.

The length of the fragment matters. Shorter fragments (<3mm) may be more easily bypassed and incorporated into the filling. Longer fragments present a greater obstacle. Finally, the root morphology and remaining dentin thickness must be assessed via radiographs or CBCT. Thin roots (e.g., mandibular incisors, mesial roots of mandibular molars) may not withstand the dentin removal required for retrieval without risking perforation or future root fracture [17]. Based on this assessment, the clinician must choose between three main strategies: leaving the fragment in situ, bypassing it, or attempting retrieval.

6. Leaving the Instrument In Situ (Intention to Treat)

The decision to intentionally leave a separated instrument is a valid and often prudent treatment plan when the risks of removal outweigh the benefits. This approach is typically considered when the fragment is small, located in the apical third of a curved canal in a tooth with a vital pulp or a small, asymptomatic periapical lesion, and when the canal apical to the fragment is already clean and shaped. The principle is to treat the fragment as part of the root filling.

The clinical procedure involves first attempting to disinfect the canal coronal to the fragment as thoroughly as possible using ultrasonic activation of irrigants and possibly intracanal medicaments like calcium hydroxide. An attempt should be made to gently negotiate around the fragment with a small hand file (e.g., size 06, 08, or 10 K-file) to establish patency to the apical foramen. If bypass is not possible, the canal is oburated to the level of the fragment using a warm vertical condensation technique, effectively sealing the fragment in place. The fragment then becomes a non-biological, inert space-occupier within an adequately sealed system [18].

Long-term prognosis studies indicate that cases with retained fragments where the canal is effectively sealed show success rates comparable to standard treatment, provided the preoperative infection was controlled [19, 20]. However, this approach requires impeccable disinfection coronal to the fragment and must be accompanied by careful patient counseling and long-term radiographic monitoring. It is not a default option for lack of skill or equipment but a conscious, risk-assessed treatment choice.

7. The Bypass Technique

Bypassing a separated instrument involves negotiating a small hand file between the fragment and the canal wall to regain access to the apical segment of the canal. This is often attempted as an intermediate step, whether the ultimate goal is retrieval or simply to complete cleaning and obturation. Successful bypass can significantly improve the prognosis.

The technique requires patience, a delicate tactile sense, and copious lubrication with EDTA or other chelating gels to dissolve inorganic debris. Using pre-curved, small-sized hand files (e.g., size 06, 08, or 10 K-files), the clinician explores the potential pathways around the fragment. The file should be used with a gentle, watch-winding motion and minimal apical pressure to avoid binding. The use of the dental operating microscope is invaluable for visualizing the canal orifice and the coronal-most part of the fragment [21].

Once a file negotiates past the fragment, a radiograph confirms its position apical to the fragment. The next step is to carefully enlarge this bypass channel using sequentially larger hand files, maintaining the pathway. It is critical to avoid forcing instruments or trying to drill alongside the fragment, as this can lead to ledge formation or fragment displacement. Once a size 15 or 20 file can freely reach working length, ultrasonic tips can be used cautiously to vibrate and potentially loosen the fragment, or the canal can be cleaned, shaped, and oburated with the fragment in place. If the fragment is loose after bypass, it may sometimes be retrieved simply by pulling it out with a small file or micro-forceps.

8. Retrieval Techniques: Principles and Armamentarium

When retrieval is deemed necessary and feasible, the procedure must be performed with meticulous care under high magnification and illumination, ideally using a dental operating microscope. The fundamental principle is to create a staging platform or "coronal space" around the fragment to engage it with a retrieval device without excessively removing radicular dentin. The basic armamentarium for retrieval includes ultrasonic tips, micro-tubes, and retrieval kits.

Ultrasonic instruments are the workhorses of fragment retrieval. Specially designed, non-cutting ultrasonic tips (like the CPR tips, or ProUltra tips) are used with a gentle, brushing motion against the dentin wall to create a small staging chamber around the coronal end of the fragment. The key is to use low power settings and to never apply the tip directly onto the fragment, as this can push it apically or fracture it further. The goal is to expose 1-2 mm of the fragment to allow for engagement [22]. The ultrasonic energy can also help loosen the fragment by breaking down debris and dentinal bonds holding it in place.

After creating a staging platform, various retrieval devices can be employed. The Masserann kit utilizes a series of hollow, trephining tubes that are placed over the fragment and rotated to engage it, followed by extraction. However, it is relatively invasive and requires significant dentin removal [23]. More modern and less invasive systems include the Endo Extractor and the Instrument Removal System (IRS), which use fine, hollow micro-tubes that are cemented onto the exposed fragment using a cyanoacrylate adhesive or are mechanically crimped onto it, allowing for its removal [24, 25].

Another common technique involves using modified Gates-Glidden drills or small Peeso reamers in a counter-clockwise rotation to trephine around the fragment, but this technique carries a high risk of perforation and should be used with extreme caution only in straight, wide canals. Regardless of the method, constant irrigation and frequent verification radiographs are essential to monitor progress and prevent procedural mishaps.

9. Step-by-Step Clinical Protocol for Retrieval

A systematic, step-by-step approach maximizes the chances of successful retrieval while minimizing risk. The following protocol assumes the use of a dental operating microscope.

Step 1: Re-establish Access and Straight-Line Path. Ensure the access cavity is optimally refined to provide an unobstructed, straight-line view and path to the fragment. This may involve slight further flaring of the coronal canal using hand files or safe-tipped rotary instruments.

Step 2: Bypass Attempt. Before attempting any aggressive removal, always attempt to bypass the fragment with a small hand file as described previously. This can loosen it and provide valuable information about the canal space around it.

Step 3: Creation of a Staging Platform. Select a suitable non-cutting ultrasonic tip. Under maximum magnification and with continuous irrigation, use the ultrasonic tip with gentle, lateral brushing strokes against the canal wall to carefully remove dentin around the coronal portion of the fragment. The goal is to create a small, funnel-shaped space exposing 1-2 mm of the fragment's length. This process must be intermittent, with frequent checks to assess progress and clean the field.

Step 4: Selection and Application of Retrieval Device. Based on the exposed fragment's size and shape, select an appropriate retrieval tool. For a loose fragment, a micro-forceps or a small file (size 10 or 15) hooked onto its flutes may suffice. For a tighter fragment, a micro-tube system is preferred. Apply a tiny amount of cyanoacrylate adhesive to the inside of the tube, guide it over the exposed fragment, and hold it steady for the adhesive to set, or use a mechanical crimping system according to the manufacturer's instructions.

Step 5: Fragment Removal. Once securely engaged, apply gentle, steady traction combined with a slight rotational movement to withdraw the fragment from the canal. Avoid excessive force. If resistance is met, re-evaluate the engagement or consider using ultrasonic vibration alongside the retrieval device to loosen it further.

Step 6: Post-Retrieval Assessment and Completion of Treatment. After successful retrieval, inspect the fragment and take a radiograph to confirm its complete removal. Re-evaluate the canal for perforations, ledges, or transportation. Then, complete the chemomechanical preparation, disinfection, and obturation of the canal as per standard protocol.

10. Management of Complications During Retrieval

Despite the best planning, complications can arise during retrieval attempts. The most common include pushing the fragment further apically, creating a ledge or canal transportation, and root perforation.

If the fragment is displaced apically, the prognosis for retrieval diminishes significantly. The clinician must reassess based on the new position. If it is now in a very apical location beyond safe retrieval limits, the decision may shift to leaving it in situ and attempting to disinfect and seal the canal coronal to it, as previously discussed [26].

Ledge formation occurs when instruments abrade a deviation in the canal wall coronal to the fragment. Management involves attempting to relocate the original canal path using pre-curved small files with EDTA, often guided by the bubble of sodium hypochlorite when the original foramen is reached. Ultrasonic tips can also be used cautiously to smooth the ledge [27].

Perforation is a serious complication. Its management depends on its location and size. If a perforation occurs during retrieval, it must be sealed immediately to prevent communication with the periodontium and potential long-term failure. For small, sub-crestal perforations, sealing with mineral trioxide aggregate (MTA) or other bioceramic materials is the treatment of choice due to their excellent sealing ability, biocompatibility, and ability to set in a moist environment [28, 29]. The perforation must be cleaned with saline (not sodium hypochlorite, to avoid tissue irritation) and sealed from within the canal. The prognosis depends on the timeliness of repair and the prevention of bacterial leakage.

11. The Role of Adjunctive Technologies: CBCT and Ultrasonics

Modern technology has revolutionized the management of separated instruments. Cone-beam computed tomography (CBCT) has moved from a research tool to a vital clinical asset in complex cases. In the context of instrument separation, a limited-field, high-resolution CBCT scan provides critical three-dimensional data that periapical radiographs cannot [30]. It accurately reveals the fragment's position in the canal (buccal-lingual orientation), its relationship to the external root surface (remaining dentin thickness), the curvature of the canal beyond the fragment, and the presence of any pre-existing perforation or resorption. This information is indispensable for accurate risk assessment and deciding whether to attempt retrieval, bypass, or leave the fragment. It guides the direction of ultrasonic troughing and helps avoid catastrophic procedural errors like perforation [31].

Ultrasonic technology, beyond its use in retrieval, is essential for enhancing disinfection. After creating a staging platform, ultrasonic activation of sodium hypochlorite around the fragment can help dissolve organic tissue and biofilm, improving the biological outcome even if the fragment is not removed [32]. Passive ultrasonic irrigation (PUI) with small files or tips placed in the canal coronal to the fragment can significantly improve irrigant penetration and efficacy.

12. Prognosis and Long-Term Outcomes

The long-term prognosis of teeth with a history of instrument separation is contingent upon the initial preoperative diagnosis, the location of the fragment, the quality of the subsequent treatment, and the final obturation. Numerous long-term studies have provided valuable insights.

Teeth with vital pulps (no infection) where a fragment is retained but effectively sealed show success rates similar to standard endodontic treatment, often exceeding 90% [33, 34]. The fragment acts as an inert obstruction but does not inherently cause failure if the remaining canal space is properly treated.

In teeth with preoperative apical periodontitis (established infection), the prognosis is more guarded and directly linked to the ability to control the infection. If the fragment obstructs access to the apical biofilm and cannot be removed or bypassed, the likelihood of healing decreases. Studies indicate success rates in these scenarios can drop to between 66% and 78% [35, 36]. However, if the fragment can be bypassed or retrieved, allowing for thorough disinfection and sealing, success rates can return to levels comparable to non-complicated cases [37].

Therefore, the presence of a separated instrument is not an automatic predictor of failure. The critical factor is whether the clinician can achieve adequate infection control. Teeth with separated instruments require regular postoperative review with clinical and radiographic examination to monitor periapical healing over a period of 2-4 years.

13. Medicolegal and Ethical Considerations

Instrument separation is a potential source of litigation in dentistry. Ethical and legal obligations center on the principles of informed consent, standard of care, and proper documentation.

The standard of care does not mandate that separation never occurs, as it is a known risk of the procedure. However, it does require that the clinician practices within accepted guidelines to prevent it and manages it competently when it happens [38]. Failure to disclose the event to the patient, attempting retrieval beyond one's skill level without referral, or causing significant damage (like a large perforation) through negligence can constitute a breach of duty.

Informed consent is dynamic. While separation may be mentioned as a rare risk during initial consent, its actual occurrence creates a new situation requiring a new discussion. The patient must be informed of what happened, its implications, and the available management options, along with their associated risks and prognoses [39]. This discussion must be documented in detail.

Documentation is the clinician's best defense. The record should include: the preoperative diagnosis and risk assessment, the stage of treatment when separation occurred, the type and size of the instrument, the steps taken immediately after separation (including radiographs), the detailed discussion with the patient, the rationale for the chosen management strategy (retrieval, bypass, or leave), a step-by-step account of the procedure, any complications encountered, postoperative instructions given, and the follow-up plan [40]. Referral to an endodontic specialist should be offered if the clinician feels the case is beyond their expertise, and this offer should also be documented.

14. Future Perspectives

The future of managing instrument separation lies in continued advancements in prevention and minimally invasive retrieval. Metallurgical research is focused on developing more fatigue-resistant NiTi alloys, such as M-Wire, CM Wire, and Gold and Blue heat-treated instruments, which demonstrate significantly improved resistance to cyclic fatigue [41]. Improved manufacturing processes and surface treatments are also enhancing instrument longevity.

In retrieval technology, the trend is toward ever-smaller, more precise ultrasonic tips and micro-engaging systems that require minimal dentin removal. The integration of real-time guidance systems, though still in its infancy for endodontics, holds promise for increasing the safety and predictability of retrieval procedures.

15. Conclusion

The separation of an endodontic instrument, while undesirable, is a manageable complication. Its successful clinical management is built upon a foundation of thorough knowledge, meticulous prevention strategies, honest patient communication, and a systematic, technologically-assisted approach. The clinician must engage in continuous risk assessment, weighing the benefits of fragment removal against the potential for iatrogenic damage. By adhering to the principles outlined—prioritizing infection control, employing magnification and ultrasonics, making evidence-based decisions, and maintaining scrupulous documentation—the dental practitioner can navigate this challenge effectively. Ultimately, the goal remains unchanged: to achieve a biologically successful outcome that ensures the long-term health of the periapical tissues and the retention of the natural tooth. A calm, methodical, and patient-centered approach transforms a potentially distressing incident into a professionally managed component of comprehensive endodontic care.

Author Statements:

- **Ethical approval:** The conducted research is not related to either human or animal use.
- **Conflict of interest:** The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper
- **Acknowledgement:** The authors declare that they have nobody or no-company to acknowledge.
- **Author contributions:** The authors declare that they have equal right on this paper.
- **Funding information:** The authors declare that there is no funding to be acknowledged.
- **Data availability statement:** The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

References

1. Ungerechts, C., Bårdsen, A. & Fristad, I. Instrument fracture in root canals - where, why, when and what? a study from a student clinic. Int. Endod. J.47, 183–190 (2014).
2. Ferreira, F. et al. Movement kinematics and cyclic fatigue of NiTi rotary instruments: a systematic review. Int. Endod. J.50, 143–152 (2017).
3. Spili, P., Parashos, P. & Messer, H. H. The impact of instrument fracture on outcome of endodontic treatment. J. Endod.31, 845–850 (2005).
4. Xu, Y. Q., Lin, J. Q. & Guan, W. Q. Cone-beam computed tomography study of the incidence and characteristics of the second mesiobuccal canal in maxillary permanent molars. Front Physiol.13, 993006 (2022).
5. Spagnuolo, G. et al. Effect of autoclaving on the surfaces of TiN -coated and conventional nickel-titanium rotary instruments. Int. Endod. J.45, 1148–1155 (2012).
6. Yilmaz, K., Uslu, G. & Ozyurek, T. Effect of multiple autoclave cycles on the surface roughness of HyFlex CM and HyFlex EDM files: an atomic

force microscopy study. Clin. Oral. Investig.22, 2975–2980 (2018).
7. Sobotkiewicz, T. et al. Effect of canal curvature location on the cyclic fatigue resistance of reciprocating files. Clin. Oral. Investig.25, 169–177 (2021).
8. Terauchi, Y., Ali, W. T. & Abielhassan, M. M. Present status and future directions: removal of fractured instruments. Int. Endod. J.55, 685–709 (2022).
9. Knowles, K. I., Hammond, N. B., Biggs, S. G. & Ibarrola, J. L. Incidence of instrument separation using light speed rotary instruments. J. Endod.32, 14–16 (2006).
10. Alapati, S. B. et al. SEM observations of nickel-titanium rotary endodontic instruments that fractured during clinical Use. J. Endod.31, 40–43 (2005).
11. Valois, C. R., Silva, L. P. & Azevedo, R. B. Multiple autoclave cycles affect the surface of rotary nickel-titanium files: an atomic force microscopy study. J. Endod.34, 859–862 (2008).
12. Grande, N. M., Castagnola, R., Minciacchi, I., Marigo, L. & Plotino, G. A review of the latest developments in rotary NiTi technology and root canal preparation. Aust. Dent. J.68, S24–S38 (2023).
13. Dioguardi, M. et al. Management of instrument sterilization workflow in endodontics: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Int J. Dent.2020, 5824369 (2020).
14. Capar, I. D. & Arslan, H. A review of instrumentation kinematics of engine-driven nickel-titanium instruments. Int. Endod. J.49, 119–135 (2016).
15. Wang, Y., Guo, J., Yang, H. B., Han, X. & Yu, Y. Incidence of C-shaped root canal systems in mandibular second molars in the native Chinese population by analysis of clinical methods. Int. J. Oral. Sci.4, 161–165 (2012).
16. Sonntag, D. & Peters, O. A. Effect of prion decontamination protocols on nickel-titanium rotary surfaces. J. Endod.33, 442–446 (2007).
17. Chai, R. et al. Different strategies for treating intracanal fractured instruments in a single tooth: a case report. Exp. Ther. Med.28, 411 (2024).
18. El Abed, R. et al. Fracture resistance of heat-treated nickel-titanium rotary files after usage and autoclave sterilization: an in vitro study. J. Endod.48, 1428–1433 (2022).
19. Cheung, G. S., Bian, Z., Shen, Y., Peng, B. & Darvell, B. W. Comparison of defects in ProTaper hand-operated and engine-driven instruments after clinical use. Int. Endod. J.40, 169–178 (2007).
20. Coelho, M. S., Rios, M. A. & Bueno, C. Separation of nickel-titanium rotary and reciprocating instruments: a mini-review of clinical studies. Open Dent. J.12, 864–872 (2018).
21. Hulsmann, M., Donnermeyer, D. & Schafer, E. A critical appraisal of studies on cyclic fatigue resistance of engine-driven endodontic instruments. Int. Endod. J.52, 1427–1445 (2019).
22. Wu, J. et al. Instrument separation analysis of multi-used ProTaper universal rotary system during root canal therapy. J. Endod.37, 758–763 (2011).
23. Alexandrou, G. B., Chrissafis, K., Vasiliadis, L. P., Pavlidou, E. & Polychroniadis, E. K. SEM observations and differential scanning calorimetric studies of new and sterilized nickel-titanium rotary endodontic instruments. J. Endod.32, 675–679 (2006).
24. Yang, L. et al. Variations of root and canal morphology of mandibular second molars in Chinese individuals: a cone-beam computed tomography study. BMC Oral. Health22, 274 (2022).
25. Zou, X. et al. Expert consensus on irrigation and intracanal medication in root canal therapy. Int J. Oral. Sci.16, 23 (2024).
26. Parashos, P. & Messer, H. H. Rotary NiTi instrument fracture and its consequences. J. Endod.32, 1031–1043 (2006).
27. Huang, D. et al. Expert consensus on difficulty assessment of endodontic therapy. Int. J. Oral. Sci.16, 22 (2024).
28. Kaul, R., Gupta, R., Chhabra, S. & Koul, R. Dental operating microscope-guided retrieval of broken instrument from a deciduous molar using ultrasonics. Int. J. Clin. Pediatr. Dent.15, S114–s118 (2022).
29. Al-Sudani, D. et al. Cyclic fatigue of Nickel-Titanium rotary instruments in a double (S-shaped) simulated curvature. J. Endod.38, 987–989 (2012).
30. Shen, Y., Coil, J. M., McLean, A. G., Hemerling, D. L. & Haapasalo, M. Defects in nickel-titanium instruments after clinical use. Part 5: single use from endodontic specialty practices. J. Endod.35, 1363–1367 (2009).
31. Zhao, D., Shen, Y., Peng, B. & Haapasalo, M. Effect of autoclave sterilization on the cyclic fatigue resistance of thermally treated Nickel-Titanium instruments. Int Endod. J.49, 990–995 (2016).
32. Terauchi, Y., Sexton, C., Bakland, L. K. & Bogen, G. Factors Affecting the removal time of separated instruments. J. Endod.47, 1245–1252 (2021).
33. Ragozzini, G. et al. Effect of autoclave sterilization on the number of uses and resistance to cyclic fatigue of waveone gold and four replica-like endodontic instruments. Int. J. Dent.2024, 6628146 (2024).
34. Iqbal, M. & Fillmore, E. Preoperative predictors of number of root canals clinically detected in maxillary molars: a PennEndo database study. J. Endod.34, 413–416 (2008).
35. Arias, A. & Peters, O. A. Present status and future directions: canal shaping. Int. Endod. J.55, 637–655 (2022).
36. Alexandrou, G., Chrissafis, K., Vasiliadis, L., Pavlidou, E. & Polychroniadis, E. K. Effect of heat sterilization on surface characteristics and microstructure of Mani NRT rotary nickel-titanium instruments. Int. Endod. J.39, 770–778 (2006).
37. Ba-Hattab, R. et al. Ethical aspects concerning instrument separation and perforations during

endodontic treatment: a cross-sectional study. Int. J. Dent.2020, 8849105 (2020).

38. Kang, Y. J., Kwak, S. W., Ha, J. H., Gambarini, G. & Kim, H. C. Fracture resistances of heat-treated Nickel-Titanium files used for minimally invasive instrumentation. BMC Oral. Health25, 126 (2025).
39. Iqbal, M. K., Kohli, M. R. & Kim, J. S. A retrospective clinical study of incidence of root canal instrument separation in an endodontics graduate program: a PennEndo database study. J. Endod.32, 1048–1052 (2006).
40. Plotino, G. et al. Experimental evaluation on the influence of autoclave sterilization on the cyclic fatigue of new nickel-titanium rotary instruments. J. Endod.38, 222–225 (2012).
41. Shen, Y., Zhou, H. M., Zheng, Y. F., Peng, B. & Haapasalo, M. Current challenges and concepts of the thermomechanical treatment of Nickel-Titanium instruments. J. Endod.39, 163–172 (2013).