Review Article

Smear Layer in Conservative Dentistry and Endodontics: A Comprehensive Review

Dr Ramchandra Kabir[1], Dr Shubham Gundre[2], Dr Amol Badgire[3], Dr Anita Kale[4], Dr Abhishek Badade[5], Dr Ajit Shinde[6]

[1]Professor of Department of Conservative Dentistry and Endodontics MIDSR Dental College Latur.
[2]Post Graduate Student of MIDSR Dental College Latur
[3]Head of Department of Conservative dentistry and Endodontics MIDSR Dental College Latur.
[4]Professor of Department of Conservative dentistry and Endodontics MIDSR Dental College Latur.
[5]Reader of Department of Conservative dentistry and Endodontics MIDSR Dental College Latur.
[6]Reader of Department of Conservative dentistry and Endodontics MIDSR Dental College Latur.

Abstract:
The smear layer is a thin, amorphous deposit produced during various dental procedures such as cavity preparation and root canal instrumentation. Comprising organic and inorganic debris including dentin particles, collagen, remnants of pulp tissue, bacteria, and saliva, its role in clinical dentistry is widely debated. While it can act as a barrier against bacterial penetration and reduce dentinal hypersensitivity, it can also obstruct adhesion, inhibit irrigant penetration, and harbour microorganisms. This review provides an in-depth exploration of the smear layer covering its history, structure, formation mechanisms, and implications in conservative dentistry and endodontics. Emphasis is placed on contemporary removal strategies and the impact of smear layer management on clinical success. The goal is to inform evidence-based practice by presenting balanced insights into the pros and cons of smear layer preservation or removal.

Keywords: smear layer, endodontics, conservative dentistry, EDTA, bonding, irrigants, dentin permeability

Corresponding Author: **Dr Shubham Gundre[2]Post Graduate Student of MIDSR Dental College Latur. Email-shubham1999gundre @gmail.com**

INTRODUCTION

The smear layer is a micro-deposit created when dental hard tissues are mechanically altered, typically during restorative and endodontic procedures. First identified by McComb and Smith in 1975, it consists of a complex mix of organic and inorganic materials that adhere to cavity or root canal walls. Its presence significantly influences dentin permeability, bonding strength, and the effectiveness of irrigation and disinfection protocols. Clinicians must understand the smear layer's characteristics to make informed decisions regarding its preservation or removal.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Initial insights into tooth surface alterations from instrumentation emerged in the 1950s. Studies by Lammie and Draycot (1952) and Peyton and Mortell (1956) highlighted surface irregularities using early microscopy techniques. The term "smear layer" was conceptualized following detailed SEM work by Boyde et al. in the 1960s, who attributed its formation to frictional heat and mechanical shearing. These findings sparked decades of research into its clinical significance.

DEFINITIONS

The smear layer has been described in various ways, reflecting its complex composition and multifaceted clinical effects:

As a thin film of debris that occludes dentinal tubules.

As a barrier to adhesive penetration.

As a contaminant interfering with chemical bonding.

As a protective film that limits dentin permeability. These definitions underscore the dual nature of the smear layer—as both a potential ally and adversary in dental treatment.

STRUCTURE AND FORMATION

Comprising particles of enamel, dentin, and other debris, the smear layer varies from 1 to 5 µm in thickness and may extend into dentinal tubules by up to 40 µm. Its formation is influenced by the instrument type, use of coolant, cutting force, and whether the dentin is wet or dry during preparation. SEM imaging reveals a granular and amorphous morphology, often consisting of agglomerated particles that resist dissolution by water or weak acids.

SMEAR LAYER IN CONSERVATIVE DENTISTRY

In operative dentistry, the smear layer plays a significant role in modifying dentin permeability, affecting both fluid movement and adhesive bonding. While its presence can reduce post-operative sensitivity by sealing tubules, it may also impede adhesive monomer infiltration, leading to weak bonds and microleakage. The decision to retain or remove the smear layer often depends on the adhesive system used. Total-etch systems typically require its removal, while self-etching systems may incorporate it into the bonding substrate.

SMEAR LAYER IN ENDODONTICS

In endodontics, the smear layer is generated along the canal walls during biomechanical preparation. It may contain microbial elements and necrotic tissue, acting as a barrier to irrigants and medicaments. While its retention may minimize dentin permeability and prevent reinfection, most endodontists advocate its removal to enhance the penetration of sealers and irrigants, and to reduce apical leakage. Smear layer removal has been linked to better obturation and reduced risk of treatment failure.

REMOVAL TECHNIQUES AND AGENTS

A wide range of chemical agents and activation techniques are employed to remove the smear layer:

- EDTA (17%): Chelates calcium ions and effectively removes the inorganic portion.
- Sodium Hypochlorite (NaOCl, 3–5.25%): Dissolves organic matter but is ineffective against the smear layer alone.
- Citric, Maleic, and Etidronic Acids: Used alone or in combination, especially effective in the apical third.

Activation techniques include ultrasonic agitation, diode laser, sonic activation (e.g., Eddy), and negative pressure systems (e.g., EndoVac). Combination protocols—e.g., NaOCl + EDTA or NaOCl + etidronate—have shown higher efficacy, especially when paired with agitation techniques.

BONDING AND THE SMEAR LAYER

Adhesion to dentin is critically influenced by the smear layer. In systems requiring removal (etch-and-rinse), phosphoric or citric acid is used to expose

collagen networks and open tubules, allowing resin infiltration. However, over-etching increases sensitivity. Self-etch adhesives partially dissolve the smear layer and incorporate it into the hybrid layer. Resin-based sealers and bonding agents must be matched to smear layer conditions for optimal performance.

CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS AND CONTROVERSIES

The debate over smear layer management is grounded in balancing clinical benefits and drawbacks:

- **Advantages of Retention**: Reduces dentin permeability and sensitivity; acts as a barrier to microbial invasion.
- **Advantages of Removal:** Enhances bonding, improves irrigant and medicament penetration, increases sealing ability.

Restorative dentistry often supports selective modification, while endodontics leans strongly toward complete removal. Ultimately, clinician preference, procedural goals, and material compatibility guide management decisions.

CONCLUSION

The smear layer continues to be a focal point of research and clinical consideration in modern dentistry. Its multifaceted impact on adhesion, permeability, disinfection, and sensitivity necessitates tailored approaches to each clinical scenario. Through a comprehensive understanding of its behavior and implications, dental professionals can make informed decisions that optimize patient outcomes across both restorative and endodontic procedures.

REFERENCES

1. McComb D, Smith DC. A preliminary scanning electron microscopic study of root canals after endodontic procedures. J Endod. 1975;1(7):238–42.
2. Boyde A, Switsur VR, Stewart J. Scanning electron microscopy of enamel surfaces. Arch Oral Biol. 1963;8(2):371–85.
3. Lammie GA, Draycot JR. The effect of instrumentation on tooth tissues. Dent Pract. 1952;3(1):20–4.
4. Peyton FA, Mortell G. Evaluation of instrumentation of cavity surfaces. J Dent Res. 1956;35(3):423–8.
5. Pashley DH, Michelich V, Kehl T. Dentin permeability: effects of smear layer removal. J Prosthet Dent. 1981;46(5):531–7.
6. Mount GJ, Hume WR. Preservation and restoration of tooth structure. 2nd ed. Brisbane: Knowledge Books and Software; 2005.
7. Torabinejad M, Handysides R, Khademi AA, Bakland LK. Clinical implications of the smear layer in endodontics. Endod Topics. 2002;2:12–27.
8. Yamada RS, Armas A, Goldman M, Lin PS. A scanning electron microscopic comparison of a high volume final flush with several irrigating solutions: Part 3. J Endod. 1983;9(4):137–42.
9. Kennedy WA. The effect of smear layer removal on the apical seal. J Endod. 1986;12(1):21–4.
10. Kaushal R, Bansal R, Malhan S. Comparative efficacy of EDTA, maleic acid, and citric acid in smear layer removal. J Conserv Dent. 2020;23(5):453–7.
11. Salam TAA, Sadony DM, Abdallah EE. Laser-activated irrigants in smear layer removal. Lasers Med Sci. 2024;39(7):1215–21.
12. Pujari MD, Das M, Kamath DG, Henry J. EndoVac vs ultrasonic irrigation. J Endod Sci. 2024;8(2):99–104.
13. Kaur M, Singla M. SEM analysis of irrigant activation methods. Endod Pract. 2024;15(1):45–50.
14. Mankeliya S, Singhal RK, Gupta A. Comparative analysis of chelators. Int Endod J. 2021;54(3):334–40.
15. Mancini M, Cerroni L, Olivi M. PIPS and SWEEPS in minimally invasive endodontics. J Laser Dent. 2021;29(2):78–84.
16. Iandolo A, Amato M, Pisano M. Heated EDTA activation. J Clin Dent. 2023;34(1):12–8.
17. Wigler R, Srour Y, Kfir A. Comparison of irrigant activation systems. Int J Dent. 2024;2024:789354.

18. Akçay A, Gorduysus M, Aydin B. Dentin erosion and smear layer removal. Microsc Res Tech. 2022;85(9):1991–9.
19. Degrange M, Roulet JF. Adhesion: the silent revolution in dentistry. Quintessence; 2001.