Journal of Advanced Medical and Dental Sciences Research

@Society of Scientific Research and Studies *NLM ID: 101716117*

Journal home page: www.jamdsr.com doi: 10.21276/jamdsr Indian Citation Index (ICI) Index Copernicus value = 100

(e) ISSN Online: 2321-9599; (p) ISSN Print: 2348-6805

Review Article

The Functional Endodontic Volume Concept

[1]S P Mantri, [2]Mahima Masih, [3]Ninad Gharde

[1]Professor and Head, Department of Conservative Dentistry Endodontics, Hitkarini Dental College, Jabalpur, MP, India;
[2,3]PG Student, Department of Conservative Dentistry Endodontics, HDCH, Jabalpur, MP, India

ABSTRACT:
The Functional Endodontic Volume (FEV) concept represents a fundamental paradigm shift in root canal therapy, transitioning from a mechanical-centric, size- and taper-based approach to a biologically-driven, disinfection-focused strategy. The aim of this article is to analyse the FEV concept, tracing its origins from historical endodontic theories and grounding it in modern scientific principles of microbiology, fluid dynamics, and biomechanics. It also critically evaluates its clinical application and outcomes, addressing current debates and outlining future directions for research and practice. The FEV approach is poised to revolutionize how endodontic procedures are performed and assessed, providing a new framework for enhancing overall treatment outcomes.
Keyword: Functional Endodontic Volume; irrigation; minimal invasive dentistry.

Received: 22 August, 2025 Acceptance: 18 September, 2025 Published: 25 September, 2025

Corresponding Author: S P Mantri, Professor and Head, Department of Conservative Dentistry Endodontics, Hitkarini Dental College, Jabalpur, MP, India

This article may be cited as: Mantri SP, Masih M, Gharde N. The Functional Endodontic Volume Concept. J AdvMed Dent Scie Res 2025; 13(9):122-128.

INTRODUCTION

The Functional Endodontic Volume (FEV) concept philosophy redefines the objective of canal shaping as creating a volume and geometry that are optimally designed for the effective exchange and agitation of chemical irrigants, all while preserving the tooth's crucial structural integrity.

THE EVOLUTION OF ENDODONTIC PARADIGMS: FROM EMPIRICISM TO EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICE

The Foundational Era: Focal Infection and Mechanistic Beliefs

The origins of modern endodontics are inextricably linked to a series of foundational, yet ultimately flawed, theories. The late 19th and early 20th centuries were dominated by the controversial "focal infection" theory, which was championed by pioneers such as Willoughby D. Miller and Sir William Hunter.[1] This theory posited that bacteria from a localized oral infection, such as a necrotic tooth, could spread systemically and cause diseases in other parts of the body. Sir William Hunter's influential speech in 1910, later published in *Lancet* and *Dental Cosmos*, provided the impetus for this concept, and it was further fostered by the extensive two-volume work of Dr. Weston A. Price in the 1920s.[1]

This powerful, albeit scientifically unsubstantiated, belief system directly drove the clinical paradigm of the era. The primary goal of treatment became the complete and total removal of all pulpal tissue to eliminate any potential source of systemic infection. This was further reinforced by the "hollow tube" theory, popularized by Rickert and Dixon in 1931, which posited that even stagnant, necrotic tissue and bacteria within an unsealed root canal could lead to periapical lesions due to the constant irritation they caused.[1] The fear of systemic spread and localized irritation served as a powerful motivator for the push toward total debridement, no matter the cost to tooth structure. The genesis of the American Association of Endodontists (AAE) in 1943 was a direct result of this era, formed by a group of dentists who were committed to preventing the wholesale extraction of teeth that was then prevalent.[1] These early philosophies, while proven to be based on flawed science, established the mechanistic, total-debridement mind-set that would dominate endodontics for decades.

The Rise of a Microbiological Paradigm and its Limitations

As the 20th century progressed, the understanding of root canal disease became more sophisticated. Clinicians and researchers began to recognize that the demise of the dental pulp and the presence of necrotic tissue and microorganisms were the true primary causes of apical periodontitis.[1] While this was a step forward, the prevailing clinical philosophies remained heavily centered on mechanical shaping. Traditional techniques revolved around creating standardized apical sizes and tapers, with the belief that the mechanical action of files and reamers was sufficient to eliminate bacteria and prepare the canal for obturation.[2] The adage "clean and shape" was interpreted mechanistically, with the emphasis placed squarely on the "shape."

This approach, however, proved to be fundamentally insufficient. The core problem lies in the inherent mismatch between the simplicity of a standardized mechanical protocol and the profound complexity of root canal anatomy. Unlike the idealized conical shapes assumed in a mechanistic model, root canals are intricate, three-dimensional systems replete with lateral canals, fins, isthmuses, and cul-de-sacs that are impossible to fully debride with instruments alone.[3] Moreover, the primary diagnostic tool of the era, the two-dimensional dental radiograph, failed to accurately represent this complex three-dimensional reality.[4] This led to a false sense of security, as a well-obturated canal on a 2D image did not necessarily correspond to a well-debrided, hermetically sealed 3D volume. The limitations of this two-dimensional, mechanistic worldview created a compelling need for a new paradigm that could address the full volumetric complexity of the root canal system.

Evolution of Endodontic Paradigms

This table illustrates the progression of endodontic philosophies, highlighting the key shifts that led to the development of the Functional Endodontic Volume (FEV) concept.

Era	Key Proponents/Theories	Primary Objective	Principal Methodology	Corresponding Limitations	Modern Re-evaluation
Foundational Era	Willoughby D. Miller, Hunter, Weston A. Price, Rickert & Dixon	To eliminate a "focus of infection" to prevent systemic disease.	Total debridement through mechanical removal; extraction of teeth if necessary.	Flawed science (focal infection theory); excessive tooth structure loss.	The theory of systemic disease was largely disproven, but it created the foundation for endodontic practice.
Traditional Mechanistic Era	Standardized "size and taper" philosophies	To mechanically clean and shape the canal for a predictable obturation.	Adherence to fixed apical sizes and tapers using hand and early rotary files.	Inability to debride complex 3D anatomy; excessive dentin removal; lack of focus on irrigation efficacy.	Recognition that instrumentation alone is insufficient to address microbial biofilms in complex canals.
Modern Biologically-Driven Era (FEV)	Contemporary researchers in microbiology, fluid dynamics, and biomechanics	To create a biologically-driven, disinfection-driven canal volume.	Minimally invasive shaping to enhance irrigant dynamics and conserve tooth structure.	Ongoing clinical research is required to fully validate long-term outcomes and address technical challenges.	A holistic approach that integrates a nuanced understanding of biofilms, fluid dynamics, and biomechanics.

FUNCTIONAL ENDODONTIC VOLUME: A BIOLOGICALLY DRIVEN APPROACH

Defining the Functional Endodontic Volume (FEV)

The Functional Endodontic Volume (FEV) is a concept that redefines the purpose of root canal shaping. It is a biologically driven approach that places a central emphasis on volumetric preparation.[2] The core objective of this preparation is to enhance the dynamics of irrigation, ensure the mechanical safety of the procedure, and, most importantly, conserve the structural integrity of the tooth.[2] Unlike traditional methods that were fixated on the final apical size or the taper of the canal, FEV advocates for a comprehensive, three-dimensional shaping strategy. This is especially advantageous when dealing with the highly complex anatomies of root canal systems that are prone to procedural complications and incomplete debridement with conventional methods.[2]

The Core Principles of the FEV Paradigm

The FEV paradigm is built on two foundational principles that represent a significant departure from past practices.

Principle 1: Disinfection-Driven Shaping. The overarching goal is to achieve an "effective disinfection-driven canal volume" rather than simply adhering to fixed apical dimensions.[2] The purpose of shaping is not a final, static size but rather the dynamic creation of a space that facilitates the optimal exchange and agitation of chemical irrigants throughout the entire root canal system, including its most intricate and difficult-to-reach areas.[2] The mechanical action of instruments is therefore re-conceptualized; its primary role is to create a suitable conduit for the delivery of the chemical agents that are ultimately responsible for the true disinfection of the canal.

Principle 2: Biomechanical Conservation. FEV champions a minimally invasive technique that consciously conserves the structural framework of the tooth.[2] This approach is predicated on a modern understanding of dental biomechanics, which has demonstrated that a tooth's strength is compromised far more by the loss of coronal tissue (due to carious lesions, existing restorations, and traditional access cavities) than by the endodontic procedure itself.[6] By minimizing the removal of healthy dentin, particularly in the critical cervical region, the FEV concept aims to preserve the tooth's long-term fracture resistance and function.

Comparison of Traditional vs. FEV-Aligned Endodontic Principles

This table contrasts the fundamental principles of the traditional, mechanistic approach with those of the modern, FEV-aligned approach.

Attribute	Traditional Approach	FEV-Aligned Approach
Objective	Mechanically debride and plane canal walls.	Create a disinfection-driven canal volume.
Focus	Standardized apical size and taper.	Volumetric preparation to enhance irrigant dynamics.
Methodology	Mechanical shaping is the primary cleaning tool; irrigation is secondary.	Irrigation is the primary cleaning tool; instrumentation creates the conduit.
Instruments	Emphasis on rigid stainless steel files and standardized tapers.	Use of flexible NiTi instruments and reciprocating systems to respect anatomy.
Outcome Measure	Quality of the radiographic obturation.	Volumetric efficacy, disinfection, and long-term functional retention.

THE SCIENTIFIC IMPERATIVE: THE BROADER CONTEXT

The Biofilm Challenge and the Necessity for Chemical Disinfection

The scientific foundation for the FEV concept is rooted in the modern understanding of endodontic pathology, which identifies microbial biofilms as the primary cause of persistent infection. Infected root canal systems are characterized by resilient, multi-layered microbial communities that are attached to the canal walls and embedded within a self-produced matrix of polysaccharides and proteins.[9] This matrix provides a formidable defense against conventional antimicrobials and makes the biofilm highly resistant to simple mechanical debridement.[9] The FEV concept is a direct response to this challenge, acknowledging that mechanical instruments alone cannot completely eradicate these resilient communities, particularly in the complex, untouched areas of the root canal system.[3]

The persistence of endodontic infections is now understood to be not a problem of a few "robust" bacterial species, but a complex ecological and physiological problem of polymicrobial biofilm communities that have adapted to their environment.[12] The FEV concept's focus on volumetric preparation for irrigation is a sophisticated, evidence-based strategy to overcome this biological challenge. The central idea is that the primary role of instrumentation is to create a scaffold for the irrigant to act, not to mechanically remove the bacteria itself. This redefinition of the entire procedure places the emphasis on the chemical disinfection process, which is the only way to effectively penetrate the protected biofilm layers and address the complexities of the canal anatomy.

The Hydrodynamics of Irrigation

The efficacy of root canal disinfection is profoundly governed by the principles of fluid dynamics.[13] The success of an irrigant, such as the gold standard sodium hypochlorite or the demineralizing agent EDTA, is contingent upon its ability to flow, penetrate, and exchange throughout the entire root canal system, reaching the deep recesses of the apical third and the lateral tubules that are inaccessible to instruments.[14]

The volumetric preparation advocated by the FEV concept directly addresses these hydrodynamic requirements. By creating a larger and more consistent space, this approach allows for significantly deeper penetration and more effective agitation of the irrigants.[2] This is a crucial element of the FEV philosophy; it is a recognition that chemomechanical debridement is a two-part process in which the "mechanics" (instrumentation) are subservient to the "chemistry" (irrigation). This perspective flips the traditional hierarchy on its head, where instruments were the primary cleaning tool and irrigants were a secondary aid. It also explains why modern techniques, such as passive ultrasonic irrigation (PUI) and sonic activation, which use acoustic streaming and cavitation to agitate irrigants, are so central to the FEV paradigm.[15] These advanced methods transform the inert liquid irrigant into a dynamic, debriding force, ensuring that the chemical agents can reach and disrupt biofilms in areas where a mechanical file could never touch.

Biomechanical Preservation and Long-Term Tooth Strength

The FEV concept's focus on conserving tooth structure is supported by a foundational re-evaluation of dental biomechanics. For decades, it was a widely held belief that endodontically treated teeth became more brittle due to pulpal dehydration.[8] However, contemporary research has largely refuted this hypothesis, demonstrating that the primary reason for a tooth's decreased fracture resistance is not pulpal removal but the loss of tooth structure itself. This loss can result from carious lesions, previous restorations, and, most critically, the excessive removal of dentin during conventional access and preparation.[6]

The FEV concept directly addresses this issue by advocating for minimally invasive access cavity designs and instrumentation that preserves the integrity of the cervical dentin and marginal ridges, which are critical for long-term tooth strength and function.[6] The evidence shows that a minimally invasive approach, while not a silver bullet, significantly improves a tooth’s fracture resistance. The causal relationship is clear: a modern understanding of dentin properties leads to a shift toward minimally invasive endodontics, which in turn leads to the preservation of tooth structure and, ultimately, improved fracture resistance and long-term functional retention. This provides a compelling, evidence-based rationale for the FEV concept’s core principles of conservation.

CLINICAL APPLICATION AND ALIGNED TECHNIQUES

The Enabling Technologies: Imaging and Magnification

The clinical shift toward the FEV concept has been made possible by concurrent advancements in diagnostic and procedural technologies. Cone-beam computed tomography (CBCT) provides a high-resolution, three-dimensional view of the root canal system, allowing clinicians to "see" the intricate anatomy, including lateral canals, fins, and isthmuses, that are often impossible to discern on a standard two-dimensional radiograph.[4] This volumetric imaging is crucial for accurate diagnosis, treatment planning, and the post-operative assessment of the volumetric outcome of treatment. Furthermore, the advent of endodontic microscopes has provided the necessary magnification and illumination to perform minimally invasive access and precisely locate complex canal anatomies, such as the second mesiobuccal (MB2) canal in maxillary molars, which can be easily missed with limited visibility.[4]

Instrumentation for Volumetric Preparation

Instrumentation that aligns with the FEV concept moves away from the rigid, standardized designs of the past and toward flexible Nickel-Titanium (NiTi) instruments with advanced designs and heat treatments.[17] The use of rotary and reciprocating systems, such as Protaper and Anatomic Endodontic Technology (AET), allows for more predictable and efficient canal shaping.[17] These systems are specifically designed to respect the natural canal shape, minimize procedural errors like transportation and ledging, and selectively remove dentin. The AET system, for example, uses reciprocating action and non-cutting tips to follow the natural canal shape and prepare the coronal and middle thirds perimetrically, aligning perfectly with the FEV ethos of conservation and respect for anatomy.[20]

Advanced Irrigation Protocols

The FEV concept is inextricably linked to advanced irrigation. While manual syringe-and-needle irrigation is a common benchmark, it often fails to deliver irrigant into the deep aspects of complex canals, especially the apical third and lateral tubules.[14] FEV-aligned irrigation relies on techniques that actively agitate and exchange the irrigant throughout the entire canal volume. These include:

- Passive Ultrasonic Irrigation (PUI**):** This method uses an ultrasonically activated, non-cutting file or smooth wire placed within a previously shaped canal. The ultrasonic oscillation creates powerful fluid movement known as acoustic micro-streaming and cavitation, which effectively debrides hard-to-reach areas and disrupts resilient biofilms.[14]

- Sonic Irrigation: Similar to PUI but operating at a lower frequency (1-6 kHz), sonic activation also creates fluid movement and eddies that aid in debris removal and transport material coronally.[15]
- Laser-Assisted Irrigation: Erbium lasers can be used to create large vapour bubbles in the water-based irrigant. These bubbles expand and then rapidly implode, a process that creates a pressure wave that drives fluid movement and aids in disinfection.[15]

These technologies are not merely ancillary tools but are essential components of the FEV paradigm. They transform the root canal procedure from a purely mechanical process into a sophisticated, chemo mechanical one, where the focus is on creating the optimal environment for the most effective disinfection possible.

CLINICAL OUTCOMES AND EVIDENCE-BASED ASSESSMENT

Defining Endodontic Success: Healing vs. Functionality

The traditional definition of endodontic success has long centered on the radiographic healing of a periapical lesion, where a positive outcome meant the tooth was asymptomatic and a lesion did not appear on follow-up radiographs.[21] While this remains a crucial metric, a broader, more patient-centric definition of success now includes "functional retention" of the tooth.[21] Functional retention means the tooth remains asymptomatic, is not extracted, and serves its intended purpose in the dentition, even if some radiographic signs of a lesion persist.[22] Research has shown that endodontically treated teeth have a high rate of functional retention (91-97%) over long periods, even in cases with persistent radiographic lesions.[22] This distinction is critical for the FEV paradigm, as its focus on preserving tooth structure and long-term function inherently aligns with the metric of functional retention. It suggests that a successful outcome is not just the absence of disease but the preservation of the tooth as a biomechanically sound and functional unit over the patient’s lifetime, a powerful, patient-oriented argument for FEV-aligned protocols.

Volumetric Analysis of Obturation and its Clinical Implications

Advancements in Cone Beam Computed Tomography (CBCT) allow for a quantitative, volumetric analysis of obturation quality by detecting the presence of voids within the root canal filling.[25] These voids, which are a "constant finding" in root canal fillings regardless of the technique used, represent a significant challenge to the success of endodontic treatment.[27] The presence of voids can contribute to persistent low-grade infections and may have systemic health implications, as some research suggests a potential link between improperly sealed root canals and inflammatory conditions like tinnitus.[25]

This data reveals a critical gap between the theoretical goals of the FEV concept and its practical outcomes. While the philosophy of volumetric preparation is sound, the persistence of voids in the final obturation indicates that simply creating an optimal volume is not enough; the obturation techniques and materials must also be perfected to completely fill this volume. The volumetric analysis provided by CBCT therefore positions FEV not as a finished solution but as a guiding framework for future innovation in both shaping and obturation techniques, highlighting the need to address the challenge of achieving a true three-dimensional hermetic seal.[25]

Factors Influencing Endodontic Success

Endodontic success is a complex, multifactorial outcome. While the FEV concept provides a powerful new framework, it is important to recognize that it is one part of a larger treatment paradigm.

Factor	Description Supporting Evidence
Elimination of Microorganisms	The most critical factor for success is the significant reduction or elimination of inflamed or necrotic tissue and microorganisms from the canal system.[3]
Adequate Cleaning & Shaping	The foundation for a successful obturation and disinfection is a thoroughly cleaned and shaped canal.[3]
Three-Dimensional Obturation	Achieving a hermetic, three-dimensional seal is essential to prevent reinfection of the root canal space.[5]
Coronal Seal	A high-quality, leak-resistant final restoration is a critical element for preventing bacterial recontamination and ensuring long-term success.[21]
Tooth's Structural Integrity	The long-term survival of the tooth is heavily dependent on the conservation of its structural framework, especially the cervical dentin and marginal ridges.[6]
Restorability	The long-term prognosis is dependent on the tooth being periodontally sound and restorable after treatment.[22]

DEBATES, CONTROVERSIES, AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Critiques of the Minimally Invasive Approach

While FEV and the broader movement toward minimally invasive endodontics (MIE) aim to preserve tooth structure, a significant debate exists regarding the potential for compromised treatment efficacy. A key critique centers on the fact that a reduced access cavity can impair a clinician's vision, making it more challenging to detect all canals, especially the elusive MB2 canal in maxillary molars.[28] Furthermore, a constricted access cavity can reduce the effectiveness of instrumentation and disinfection and may increase the risk of instrument fracture and other procedural errors.[28]

This represents a classic clinical trade-off: a gain in biomechanical preservation may come at a loss in disinfection efficacy and procedural safety. The evidence suggests that a minimally invasive approach is not a clear-cut victory and must be implemented with a careful, individualized approach that balances the need for conservation with the need for thorough debridement. The future of the FEV concept will likely lie in a hybrid approach that leverages advanced technologies to mitigate these risks.

Inconsistent Terminology and Methodological Challenges

The advancement of endodontic research and clinical practice is hampered by inconsistent terminology, which can lead to confusion and misinterpretation.[2] The lack of a standardized categorization for complex anatomical structures like "apical canal bifurcation" and "accessory canal" makes it difficult to compare research findings and to communicate clearly among practitioners.

Furthermore, many of the clinical studies on endodontic outcomes are of low-level evidence, such as case series, which makes it difficult to draw definitive, evidence-based conclusions.[22] The vast diversity in materials, treatment procedures, and methodologies across published studies contributes to significant variability in reported outcomes, making an "undiscerning review of all the existing studies ineffective and even misleading".[22]

Recommendations for the Future

Based on the current state of the science, the following recommendations can guide the future trajectory of the FEV concept:

- Transition to High-Level Clinical Trials: Future research must move toward higher-level clinical trials, such as Randomized Controlled Trials (RCTs), with standardized metrics to validate the long-term outcomes of FEV-aligned protocols.[32] This will provide the robust evidence base needed to definitively assess the benefits and drawbacks of this new paradigm.
- Focus on Obturation Efficacy: The development of new instruments and irrigation systems must be guided by a focus on improving volumetric efficacy and addressing the persistent problem of obturation voids, as revealed by CBCT analysis.[25] Innovation in this area is a critical next step.
- Investigate Systemic Implications: Further research is needed to explore the potential systemic implications of endodontic treatment, as suggested by the links to conditions like tinnitus.[25] This provides a powerful motivation for achieving optimal, void-free outcomes.

CONCLUSION: THE PARADIGM REDEFINED

The Functional Endodontic Volume concept is more than a new technique; it is a holistic, evidence-based paradigm that fundamentally redefines the objectives of root canal therapy. By prioritizing a biologically-driven, disinfection-focused, and minimally invasive approach, FEV addresses the core challenges of complex anatomy, resilient microbial biofilms, and long-term tooth preservation. It represents a philosophical shift from a focus on the mechanical act of shaping to an emphasis on the biological outcome of disinfection.

While clinical debates and technical challenges remain—particularly regarding the potential trade-offs of a minimally invasive approach and the persistent problem of obturation voids—the FEV concept provides a valuable clinical and research framework for the future of endodontics. It guides the development of new instruments and protocols with the ultimate goal of enhancing overall treatment outcomes and ensuring the long-term functional retention of the natural dentition, aligning the practice of endodontics with the most current understanding of biological and biomechanical principles.

REFERENCES

1. Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on the Microbiological Aspects of Endodontics. *Dentistry Journal*. 2018; 6(4):49.
2. Turky M, Peters OA. Redefining Root Canal Shaping: From Size to Volume—The Functional Endodontic Volume Concept. *International Endodontic Journal*. 2025:iej.70029.
3. American Association of Endodontists. Cleaning and Shaping. 2006.
4. Chevy Chase Endodontics. Endodontic Diagnosis: The Third Dimension. 2025.
5. Endodontic Materials Used To Fill Root Canals. In: *StatPearls*. 2025.
6. Mandil OA, Ghoulah KT, Hazzam BM, Alhijji HS, Al Abbas AH, Rehan AK, Doumani M, Mandil AA. Modern versus Traditional Endodontic Access Cavity Designs. *J Pharm Bioallied Sci*. 2022; 14(Suppl 1):S24-S27.
7. Kuriakose AM, Joy BH, Mathew J, Hari K, Joy J, Kuriakose F. Modern Concepts in Endodontic Access Preparation: A Review. 2020.
8. Gluskin AH, Peters CI, Peters OA. Minimally invasive endodontics: challenging prevailing paradigms. *Br Dent J*. 2014; 216(6):347-53.

9. Mohammadi Z, Palazzi F, Giardino L, Shalavi S. Microbial biofilms in endodontic infections: an update review. *Biomed J*. 2013; 36(2):59-70.
10. Endodontic Biofilms - A Review. *Int J Sci Res*. 2020; 9(12):512.
11. British Endodontic Society. A Guide to Good Endodontic Practice. 2022.
12. Chavez de Paz LE. Redefining the persistent infection in root canals: possible role of biofilm communities. *J Endod*. 2007; 33(6):652-62.
13. University of Misan, Iraq. IRRIGATION IN THE ENDODONTICS. 2025.
14. Irvine Endodontics. Mastering Irrigation Techniques in the Endodontic Field. 2025.
15. Advancements in Endodontic Irrigation Techniques. *Decisions in Dentistry*. 2025.
16. Current considerations concerning endodontically treated teeth: alteration of hard dental tissues and biomechanical properties following endodontic therapy. *PMC*. 2016; 5051483.
17. Dental Laboratorio. Classification and Fuction of Endodontic Instruments for Root Canal Preperation. 2025.
18. Alharbi YM, Alharby AG, Alyami AM, Salem RA, Alghamdi SA, Alrabiah AM, Alsakran HA, Alorabi AA, Jad YA, Zarei LA, Alshehri LS. Overview of instrumentation used in endodontics. *Int J Community Med Public Health*. 2022;10(1):408-12.
19. Dental Laboratorio. What Instruments Are Used In Root Canal Treatment? 2025.
20. Soujanya E, Majeti C. Anatomic Endodontic Technology: Listen to the needs of the tooth. *J Dent Probl Solut*. 2020; 7(1):056-058.
21. Evaluating the Outcome of Endodontic Treatment. *World J Dent*. 2013; 4(3):218-223.
22. The Success of Endodontic Therapy — Healing and Functionality. *J Calif Dent Assoc*. 2004; 32(6):493-503.
23. Alghamdi F, Alsulaimani M. Regenerative endodontic treatment: A systematic review of successful clinical cases. *Dent Med Probl*. 2021; 58(4):555-567.
24. Salehrabi R, Rotstein I. Endodontic treatment outcomes in a large patient population in the USA: an epidemiological study. *J Endod*. 2004; 30(12):846-50.
25. Volumetric Analysis of Root Canal Obturation Techniques Using CBCT: Potential Implications for Tinnitus and Systemic Health. *Tinnitus J*. 2025.
26. Volumetric Analysis of Root Canal Obturation Techniques Using CBCT: Potential Implications for Tinnitus and Systemic Health. *Tinnitus J*. 2025.
27. Evaluation of Root Canal Filling in Primary Teeth by Volumetric Analysis: In Vitro Study. *Int J Clin Pediatr Dent*. 2018; 11(5):386-392.
28. Chan MYC, Cheung V, Lee AHC, Zhang C. A Literature Review of Minimally Invasive Endodontic Access Cavities - Past, Present and Future. *Eur Endod J*. 2022; 7:1-10.
29. Minimally Invasive Access Cavities: A Benefit/Risk Analysis. 2024.
30. Controversial Terminology in Root and Canal Anatomy: A Comprehensive Review. *PubMed Central*. 2024.
31. Torabinejad M, Corr R, Handysides R, Shabahang S. Outcomes of nonsurgical retreatment and endodontic surgery: a systematic review. *J Endod*. 2009; 35:930-7.
32. Impact of minimally invasive root canal treatment on healing outcomes in a randomized clinical trial. *PubMed Central*. 2023.