Published in final edited form as:

J Endod. 2011 July ; 37(7): . doi:10.1016/j.joen.2011.04.002.

Impact of the quality of coronal restoration versus the quality of root canal fillings on success of root canal treatment: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Brian M. Gillen, DDS^{1,*}, Stephen W. Looney, PhD^{2,*}, Li-Sha Gu, DDS, MS, PhD³, Bethany A. Loushine, DMD¹, Roger N. Weller, DMD, MS¹, Robert J. Loushine, DDS¹, David H. Pashley, DMD, PhD⁴, and Franklin R. Tay, BSc (Hons), PhD^{1,4}

¹Department of Endodontics, Georgia Health Sciences University, Augusta, GA

²Department of Biostatistics, Georgia Health Sciences University, Augusta, GA

³Department of Operative Dentistry and Endodontics, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou, China

⁴Department of Oral Biology, Georgia Health Sciences University, Augusta, GA

Abstract

Introduction—Thorough cleaning and shaping of root canals are essential for periapical healing. Restoration of endodontically-treated teeth is also required for them to function and prevent coronal leakage. This study compared the impact of the quality of root canal treatment versus the quality of coronal restoration in treatment outcomes.

Methods—Literature search was conducted using the search terms “coronal restoration”, “root canal”, “periapical status” and “quality”. Articles that evaluated the effect of the quality of root filling and coronal restoration or both on the success of root canal treatment were selected. Nine articles were identified and were reviewed by three investigators. Data were collected based on pre-determined criteria. Percentages of teeth without apical periodontitis were recorded for each category: Adequate Root Canal Treatment (AE), Inadequate Root Canal Treatment (IE), Adequate Restoration (AR), Inadequate Restoration (IR). Data were analyzed using meta-analysis for odds ratios (ORs).

Results—After adjusting for significant covariates to reduce heterogeneity, the results were combined to obtain pooled estimates of the common OR for the comparison of AR/AE vs AR/IE (OR 2.734; 95% CI 2.61–2.88; $p < 0.001$) and AR/AE vs IR/AE (OR 2.808; 95% CI 2.64–2.97; $p < 0.001$).

Conclusion—On the basis of the current best available evidence, the odds for healing of apical periodontitis increase with both adequate root canal treatment and adequate restorative treatment. Although poorer clinical outcomes may be expected with adequate root filling-inadequate coronal restoration and inadequate root filling-adequate coronal restoration, there is no significant difference in the odds of healing between these two combinations.

Corresponding author: Dr. Franklin Tay, Department of Endodontics, School of Dentistry, Georgia Health Sciences University, Augusta, Georgia, 30912-1129, USA, TEL: (706) 7212152; FAX: (706) 7218184; ftay@georgiahealth.edu.

*Equal contributors to this work

The authors deny any conflict of interest.

Supplementary Information available online.

Keywords

coronal restoration; meta-analysis; obturation; periapical status; quality; root canal treatment; systematic review

INTRODUCTION

It is generally accepted that the outcome of root canal treatment is positively correlated with the technical quality of the root filling. Well-filled root canals are expected to provide a three-dimensional seal against bacteria ingress [1–5]. Under controlled clinical conditions, the potential for a favorable outcome for primary root canal treatment can be well above 90% in the absence of pre-operative apical periodontitis [6–8] and in the range of 75–80% in the presence of pre-operative apical periodontitis [8–12]. Nevertheless, epidemiological studies of root canal treatment performed in various cohorts outside a university-supported clinical setting revealed less favorable treatment outcomes, with high rates of inadequate root fillings and apical periodontitis (40–65%) associated with endodontically-treated teeth [13–26]. These studies highlighted the need to provide a coronal seal for these lesions to heal [27–29].

Although a coronal seal may be produced by a well-filled root filling, a coronal restoration with margins that prevent bacteria penetration or both, data derived from a retrospective clinical study [30] suggest that a favorable endodontic treatment outcome may be achieved even in poorly-filled root canals when the quality of the coronal restoration is adequate. Those results appear to be supported by epidemiologic data showing that inadequately filled root canals can remain in a normal state of periapical health [31]. The data produced by Ray and Trope [30] overtly challenged the rationale of endodontics and had stimulated intense discussions over the past 15 years on whether the quality of the coronal restoration is more significant than the quality of root canal treatment in eliminating apical periodontitis [32–44]. The conclusion from that study [30] also motivated clinicians to reconsider their clinical decision making - whether it is more preferable to place a high quality permanent restoration immediately after root canal treatment, or to insert a provisional restoration that has a greater chance to leak while waiting for the resolution of apical periodontitis [45–48].

Since the study by Ray and Trope [30], similar clinical studies have been conducted to confirm the validity of their results by correlating the qualities of both the filled root canals and the coronal restorations to the resolution of apical periodontitis. Most of these studies were retrospective in nature, employing radiographic examination alone. However, a few were prospective studies that utilized both clinical and radiographic examination as the evaluation criteria. Despite these efforts, the question of whether it is the root filling or the coronal restoration that contributes more significantly to endodontic success remains equivocal [49].

Thus, the aim of this systematic review and meta-analysis was to determine whether the quality of a coronal restoration or the quality of a root canal filling has a greater impact on the outcome of root canal treatment. The clinical question to be answered in this systematic review (a problem, intervention, comparison and outcome [PICO] question) may be framed as follows: in adult patients who have had nonsurgical root canal treatment, does the presence of an adequate root filling and an inadequate coronal restoration, compared with the presence of an inadequate root filling and an adequate coronal restoration, result in a worse clinical outcome?

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Literature Search

A search was undertaken to identify all clinical studies that reported co-association of the quality of root canal treatment and the quality of coronal restoration with endodontic treatment outcome. The MEDLINE (Ovid) database was searched for retrospective studies published between 1966 and 2010 (last access, November 2, 2010) using key words “root filling” OR “coronal restoration” OR “quality” OR “periapical status”. A Cochrane Library search was also conducted. A similar search was also conducted using Pubmed, EMBASE and Wiley Online Database. Four journals (Journal of Endodontics, International Endodontic Journal, Oral Surgery Oral Medicine Oral Pathology Oral Radiology and Endodontology, and Endodontics and Dental Traumatology) and the bibliography of all relevant papers and review papers were manual-searched. No language restriction was applied to the search. This resulted in the identification of 132 studies for preliminary analysis. Titles and abstracts, where available, were scanned, and the relevance of each study to the PICO question was determined. When the title and abstract of a study were inadequate for determining its relevance, the study was automatically included in subsequent analysis. This resulted in the exclusion of 101 papers from the list and the remaining 31 papers were subjected to stricter inclusion and exclusion criteria.

Study Selection and Data Extraction

The full texts of the remaining 31 papers were obtained and reviewed independently by three reviewers (BG, SL and L-SG) based on the following inclusion criteria: 1) Clinical study, 2) Sample size given, 3) Success based on radiographic and/or clinical criteria, 4) Evaluated quality of root filling, 5) Evaluated quality of coronal restoration (fillings, crowns and/or posts), 6) Evaluated periapical status (absence or reduction in size of apical radiolucency), 7) Evaluation conducted at least one year after root canal treatment, and 8) Overall success rate given or could be calculated from the raw data. Exclusion criteria included: 1) Evaluation of non-endodontically treated teeth or when stratified information (i.e. dividing a sample or population into subgroups by race, gender, etc.) on endodontically-treated teeth was unavailable, 2) Association of the treatment outcome with a particular disease (e.g. diabetes or periodontal disease), 3) Coronal restorations reported only as present/absent or permanent/temporary, 4) No association of the quality of the coronal restoration with endodontic treatment outcome, 5) Overall poor quality of the endodontic treatment outcome, and 6) Could not establish whether the treatment outcome was contributed by a coronal restoration alone or the combined effects of a coronal restoration and an intracanal post. The reasons for study rejection at this stage or later were recorded. Data collection included publication date, location of study, sample size, statistical analysis methods, clinical and or radiographic evaluation of treatment, recall interval, and study outcome. To identify the potential sources of statistical heterogeneity among the selected studies, data were also collected on 4 dichotomous characteristics of those studies (covariates) that were thought to be potential confounders of the association between root canal treatment and absence of apical periodontitis: (1) Type of Evaluation (root canals were evaluated radiographically *vs* root canals were evaluated radiographically and clinically), (2) Calibration (evaluators were calibrated *vs* evaluators were not calibrated), (3) A 5-point Periapical Index [50] was used for radiographic assessment of periapical status (yes *vs* no), and (4) Seal and Length (both the quality of lateral seal and the length of root filling were evaluated *vs* only length was evaluated). Any disagreements on study inclusion were resolved by discussion.

Percentages of teeth without apical periodontitis were calculated and recorded for each category of root canal treatment: Adequate Restoration (AR), Inadequate Restoration (IR),

Adequate Root Canal Treatment (AE), Inadequate Root Canal Treatment (IE). Of the 6 possible comparisons, only AR/AE vs AR/IE, AR/AE vs IR/AE and IR/AE vs AR/IE were subjected to further analysis (Fig. 1).

Statistical Analysis

Data for three comparisons (AR/AE vs AR/IE, AR/AE vs IR/AE and IR/AE vs AR/IE) were analyzed using meta-analysis for odds ratios (ORs). For each comparison (e.g. AR/AE vs. AR/IE), the Breslow-Day-Tarone (BDT) test was used to test for heterogeneity among the odds ratios calculated from the data extracted from the selected studies. Logistic regression was used to reduce heterogeneity by adjusting for significant covariates that defined homogeneous subsets among the studies being compared. Once the heterogeneity among studies was reduced sufficiently using logistic regression (as indicated by a non-significant BDT test result), the results from the selected studies were combined using the Mantel-Haenszel (MH) method to obtain a pooled estimate of the overall OR, along with a 95% confidence interval. For each treatment group comparison, a forest plot [51] was used to display the odds ratio results for each study, along with the MH pooled estimate. L'Abbé plots [52] were used to illustrate the heterogeneity. The method proposed by Orwin [53] was used to ascertain if publication bias was present. A significance level of 0.05 was used for all statistical tests. Statistical analyses were performed using SAS 9.2 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC, 2008) and R 2.11.1 (The R Foundation for Statistical Computing, 2010)..

RESULTS

Of the 31 papers examined, 20 studies containing information on some aspects of coronal restorations [31, 45, 54–71] were excluded for various reasons (Table 1). Two studies were further excluded from the remaining 11 studies, yielding 9 [30, 72–79] for meta-analysis. One study was excluded based on comments by the authors that the quality of root canal treatment was very poor in the region where the study was conducted [80], and the other was excluded because the identity of treatment outcomes contributed by a coronal restoration alone or the combined effects of a coronal restoration and an intracanal post could not be established [81]. A summary of the 4 dichotomous characteristics used for identifying statistical heterogeneity for each of the 9 studies retained for meta-analysis is included in Table S-1 of the Supplementary Information. Those 9 studies were designated as Study 1 to Study 9 (arranged in chronological order): **1.** Ray and Trope (1995) [30]; **2.** Tronstad *et al.* (2000) [72]; **3.** Kirkevang *et al.* (2000) [73]; **4.** Hommez *et al.* (2002) [74]; **5.** Dugas *et al.* (2003) [75]; **6.** Segura-Egea *et al.* (2004) [76]; **7.** Siqueira *et al.* (2005) [77]; **8.** Georgopoulou *et al.* (2008) [78]; **9.** Tavares *et al.* (2009) [79]. Data extracted for the three comparisons (AR/AE vs AR/IE, AR/AE vs IR/AE and IR/AE vs AR/IE) are listed in Table S-2 of the Supplementary Information.. Odds ratios greater than 1 indicate that patients in the first treatment group (e.g. AR/AE) had lower odds of apical periodontitis; odds ratios less than 1 indicate that patients in the second treatment group (e.g. AR/IE) had lower odds.

For the comparison of AR/AE vs AR/IE (Fig. 1), significant heterogeneity among ORs was detected using the BDT test (chi-square = 32.96, d.f. = 8, $p < 0.001$) and was evident from the L'Abbé plot (Fig. S-1A of the Supplementary Information). Three covariates were statistically significant when included with AR/AE in the logistic regression model: Type of Evaluation, Calibration, and Seal and Length (Table S-3A of the Supplementary Information). The 9 studies were divided into 4 homogeneous subsets based on their pattern of values for these covariates: (1) Radiographic evaluation only + no calibration + length only [Study 1], (2) Radiographic evaluation only + calibration + seal and length evaluation [Studies 3 and 6], (3) Radiographic and clinical evaluation + calibration + length only [Studies 4 and 5], and (4) Radiographic evaluation only + calibration + length only [Studies

2, 7, 8, and 9]. After estimating a common OR for each of these homogeneous subsets (Table S-3A of the Supplementary Information), the BDT test was applied and indicated no significant heterogeneity among the adjusted ORs (chi-square = 5.53, d.f. = 3, $p = 0.137$). A L'Abbé plot for the adjusted ORs for each study is shown in Fig. S-1B of the Supplementary Information. The adjusted ORs were then combined to obtain an estimate of the overall OR for the comparison of AR/AE vs AR/IE (OR 2.73, 95% C.I. 2.40–3.11, $p < 0.001$). A forest plot showing the unadjusted OR and confidence interval for each of the 9 studies, along with the overall OR estimate obtained from the meta-analysis is given in Fig. 2.

For the comparison of AR/AE vs IR/AE (Fig. 1), significant heterogeneity among ORs was detected using the BDT test (chi-square = 76.05, d.f. = 8, $p < 0.001$) and was evident from the L'Abbé plot (Fig. S-2A of the Supplementary Information). Three covariates were statistically significant when included with AR/AE in the logistic regression model: Calibration, Use of the 5-Point Periapical Index, and Seal and Length (Table S-4A of the Supplementary Information). The 9 studies were divided into 4 homogeneous subsets based on their pattern of values for these covariates: (1) no calibration + Periapical Index not employed + length only [Study 1], (2) calibration + Periapical Index employed + seal and length evaluation [Studies 3 and 65], (3) calibration + Periapical Index not employed + length only [Studies 2, 4, 7, and 8], and (4) calibration + Periapical Index employed + length only [Studies 5 and 9]. After estimating a common OR for each of these homogeneous subsets (Table S-4A of the Supplementary Information), the BDT test was applied and indicated no significant heterogeneity among the odds ratios (chi-square = 3.80, d.f. = 3, $p = 0.284$). A L'Abbé plot for the adjusted ORs for each study is shown in Fig. S-2B of the Supplementary Information. The adjusted ORs were then combined to obtain an estimate of the overall OR for the comparison of AR/AE vs IR/AE (OR 2.81, 95% C.I. 2.40–3.29, $p < 0.001$). A forest plot showing the unadjusted OR and confidence interval for each of the 9 studies, along with the overall OR estimate obtained from the meta-analysis is given in Fig. 3.

For the comparison of IR/AE vs AR/IE (Fig. 1), significant heterogeneity among odds ratios was detected using the BDT test (chi-square = 94.65, d.f. = 8, $p < 0.001$) and was evident from the L'Abbé plot (Fig. S-3A of the Supplementary Information). Note that 6 of the studies (2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9) found that IR/AE yielded greater odds of no apical periodontitis, whereas 3 of the studies (1, 4, 8) found that AR/IE yielded greater odds of no apical periodontitis. Two covariates were statistically significant when included with AR/IE in the logistic regression model: Type of Evaluation and Seal and Length (Table S-5A of the Supplementary Information). The 9 studies were divided into 3 homogeneous subsets based on their pattern of values for these covariates: (1) Radiographic evaluation only + length only [Studies 1, 2, 7, 8, and 9], (2) Radiographic evaluation only + seal and length evaluation [Studies 3 and 6], and (3) Radiographic and clinical evaluation + length only [Studies 4 and 5]. After estimating a common odds ratio for each of these homogeneous subsets (Table S-5B of the Supplementary Information), the BDT test was applied and indicated no significant heterogeneity among the odds ratios of the 3 subsets (chi-square = 0.0001, d.f. = 2, $p = 0.9999$). A L'Abbé plot for the adjusted ORs for each study is shown in Fig. S-3B of the Supplementary Information. The adjusted ORs were then combined to obtain an estimate of the overall OR for the comparison of IR/AE vs AR/IE (OR 1.04, 95% C.I. 0.90–1.20, $p = 0.598$). A forest plot showing the unadjusted OR and confidence interval for each of the 9 studies, along with the overall OR estimate obtained from the meta-analysis is given in Fig. 4.

To address the issue of publication bias, the method of Orwin [53] was used, after converting each of the adjusted ORs to an effect size using the method reported by Chinn [82]. To apply this method, one calculates the number of negative studies not included in the

meta-analysis (the “fail-safe” number) that would be required to reduce the estimated overall OR to a negligible value. In the present meta-analysis, 2 of the comparisons yielded a statistically significant overall OR: AR/AE vs AR/IE (OR = 2.73) and AR/AE vs IR/AE (OR = 2.81). Using OR = 1.44 (corresponding to Cohen’s value of 0.2 for a “small” effect size) [83] as our definition of “negligible,” Orwin’s method indicates that 17 negative “file drawer” studies would be required to reduce the estimated overall OR for the AR/AE vs AR/IE comparison from OR = 2.73 to OR = 1.44 and to reduce the estimated overall OR for the AR/AE vs IR/AE comparison from OR = 2.81 to OR = 1.44. It is highly unlikely that 17 negative studies examining the effect of the qualities of root filling and coronal restoration on the success of endodontic treatment were overlooked in our meta-analysis. The odds that these studies have been done but not published is further decreased by our observation that negative results do not necessarily preclude publication of a study evaluating the success of root canal treatment [6, 8, 84, 85]. Of the 9 studies included in this meta-analysis, 5 of them yielded results that were non-significant for at least one of the comparisons (Hommez *et al.* [74], Segura-Egea *et al.* [76], Siqueira *et al.* [77] for AR/AE vs IR/AE, and Kirkevang *et al.* [73], Hommez *et al.* [74], Dugas *et al.* [75], Segura-Egea *et al.* [76] for IR/AE vs AR/IE).

DISCUSSION

Endodontic treatment outcome has been the subject of investigation for many years with studies examining success rates using different protocols. The lack of standardization of study protocols and endpoints for determining success make comparisons difficult. Despite the presence of a host of factors that contribute to success or failure of root canal treatment, the fundamental biologic principle that determines clinical success remains unchanged. Kakahashi *et al.* [86] demonstrated that apical periodontitis will develop if the canal system is contaminated with bacteria. Multiple *in vitro* studies have shown that even the best root canal treatment can allow leakage of bacteria and their by-products through an apparently well-filled canal system. Yet, other studies have illustrated that even in the presence of obvious contamination, periapical disease does not necessarily develop in all patients [61, 87, 88]. The work of Ray and Trope [30] provided important insight into what may be conceived as a paradigm shift in endodontic treatment philosophy in their quest to determine which aspect of treatment had a greater impact on the outcome of root canal treatment. Their study found that the coronal restoration had a greater impact on success than the quality of root canal treatment. Naturally, as endodontists, we would like to think that a well-performed root canal treatment is more important. However, as research scientists, we welcomed and admired the candidness of these clinical scientists in alerting our profession to the potential impact of previously less-emphasized aspect of coronal contamination on the maintenance of periapical health [45, 89]. Thus, it is not surprising that other studies have been performed worldwide seeking to generate a larger body of evidence to either support or refute this paradigm shift.

As most of the studies examined in the present systematic review were “outcomes” research derived from observational cohort studies, the level of evidence of is Level 2 based on the criteria given by the Oxford Centre for Evidence-based Medicine [90]. Meta-analysis of observational studies is as common as meta-analysis of controlled trials [91] and guidelines for “Meta-analysis of Observational Studies in Epidemiology” (MOOSE) have been issued since 2000 [92]. Data from observational studies provide an important source of information when randomized controlled trials (RCTs) cannot or should not be undertaken, provided that the data are analyzed and interpreted with special attention to bias [93]. Evidence-based endodontics stresses the examination of evidence from high-level clinical trials, in contrast to intuition, non-systematic clinical experience, and anecdotal case reports. While the importance of randomized trials is based on the concept of the hierarchy of clinical

evidence, much of the outcomes research generated in endodontics to-date remains observational in nature [94].

Reports on observational research are often not as detailed and clearly defined as those in RCTs, which hamper the assessment of their strengths and weaknesses and the universality of the results [92]. Thus, progress and innovations in health care are measured by systematic reviews and meta-analyses. A systematic review may be defined as the application of scientific strategies that limit bias by the systematic assembly, clinical appraisal, and synthesis of all relevant studies on a specific topic. Meta-analysis usually is the final step in a systematic review, provided that heterogeneity among the selected studies can be sufficiently controlled by identification of covariates that are potential confounders in the analysis [95, 96].

In the present systematic review, comparison of previous studies is difficult because of the wide variability of criteria evaluated. The potential sources of heterogeneity originated from variations of the participants and interventions (clinical heterogeneity), variations in study design and evaluation techniques (methodological heterogeneity) and variations in the analysis of the data derived from each study (statistical heterogeneity) [97]. Although many criteria are similar, none of the studies is exactly alike. This resulted in the highly significant heterogeneities identified for each of the three comparisons (Figs S-1A, S-2A, S-3A of Supplementary Information). Nevertheless, with the use of logistic regression, we were able to identify the potential sources of heterogeneity in each comparison and adjust for significant covariates among the studies by grouping the respective studies into homogeneous subsets. This enabled us to combine the data and calculate an overall OR for each comparison. Standardization of study criteria would make future analysis more manageable and produce a stronger impact.

For comparison of AR/AE vs IR/AE, the original study by Ray and Trope [30] presented with an unadjusted OR of 13.45, which is much higher than the other 8 studies (1.311 – 3.667; Fig. 3). In non-statistical terms, this means that in Ray and Trope's study, patients with both adequate restoration and root canal treatment (AR/AE) had odds of no persistent apical periodontitis that were 13.5 times as large as the odds for patients with inadequate restoration and adequate root canal treatment (IR/AE). Conversely, the odds of no apical periodontitis were only 1.3–3.7 times greater in patients with both adequate restoration and adequate root canal treatment in the other 8 studies. After reduction of heterogeneity, results of the meta-analysis indicate that the overall odds of having no apical periodontitis for patients with both adequate restoration and root canal treatment is 2.8 times greater than patients with inadequate restoration and adequate root canal treatment (IR/AE). A similar trend can be seen for the comparison of AR/AE vs AR/IE (Fig. S-1 of Supplementary Information). After reduction of heterogeneity, results of the meta-analysis indicate that the overall odds of having no apical periodontitis for patients with both adequate restoration and root canal treatment is 2.7 times greater than patients with adequate restoration and inadequate root canal treatment. Results from both comparisons clearly indicate that a better treatment outcome may be expected from patients receiving both high quality root canal treatment and restoration. The corollary to that statement is that one cannot simply place a good restoration over a poorly-obtured root canal, or vice versa, and expect the high degree of success that associated with performing both procedures adequately. Although one may be successful with individual cases (i.e. case studies – Level of Evidence 4 or case reports – Level of Evidence 5), one is unlikely to be successful in achieving consistently positive results for every patient in the long run.

As the aforementioned two comparisons do not completely answer the PICO question, meta-analysis was performed on the third comparison - IR/AE vs AR/IE. Data extracted from the

Ray and Trope study (unadjusted OR = 0.378) indicate that patients with adequate restoration and inadequate root canal treatment (AR/IE) have higher odds of preserving periapical health (i.e. no radiographic evidence of apical periodontitis), as compared to patients with inadequate restoration and adequate root canal treatment (IR/AE) (Fig. 4). Although a similar trend was supported by two additional studies (OR = 0.627 – 0.905) [74, 78], data from the other 6 studies indicated opposite results (OR = 1.339 – 3.079). After reduction of heterogeneity among the 9 studies, the results of the corresponding meta-analysis indicate that the presence of an adequate root filling and an inadequate restoration has equal odds of association with a suboptimal clinical outcome as the presence of an inadequate root filling and an adequate restoration. On the basis of the current best available evidence, one may answer the PICO question by stating that placing an inadequate coronal restoration over an adequately root-treated tooth does not produce a worse treatment outcome than placing an adequate coronal restoration over an inadequately root-treated tooth. In non-statistical terms, this means that trying to salvage a poorly performed root canal treatment by placing a well-sealed coronal restoration is as futile as placing an inadequate restoration over well-filled root canals in anticipating the resolution of apical periodontitis for every patient in the long run.

The most common methods for determining outcomes of root canal treatment are clinical and radiographic examinations. It must be stressed that data extracted from the majority of the studies examined were based on radiographic examinations. Radiographic interpretation is highly subjective [98] and can be influenced by a variety of factors, including changes in beam angulation. In a cross-sectional study, the pre-operative diagnosis of each case was often unknown and the presence of apical periodontitis *per se* may be indicative of either healing or failure [99]. It is well known that endodontic treatment outcomes are highly dependent upon the presence of pre-operative apical periodontitis [9–12]. Moreover, the time between the completion of root canal treatment and the placement of the restoration was unknown. There is also no clinical data to support that assessment of restoration quality can be adequately achieved based on examination of periapical radiographs alone. In a stratified study of the effect of permanent restorations on periapical health, the authors concluded that the presence of permanent restorations contributes minimally to the success of root canal treatment [48]. These clinical results appeared to be supported by a case-control study of matched tooth pairs with identical periapical status, with one filled root exposed to the oral environment and the other protected by a permanent restoration [100]. Taken together, these studies appeared to indicate that coronal leakage may not be of as much clinical significance as implicated by *in vitro* leakage examination. Despite the limitations of a meta-analysis based predominantly on radiographic interpretation, the unanimous result from the 9 studies examined that root-filled teeth with adequate restorations and root canal treatment produced better treatment outcomes reinforces the fundamental biologic principle of preventing bacteria ingress via the concerted efforts of the endodontist and the restorative dentist in providing the highest quality of care in saving functional teeth.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

This study was supported by Grants R01 DE015306-06 (PI. David H. Pashley) and R21 DE019213-02 (PI. Franklin R. Tay) from the National Institute of Dental and Craniofacial Research. We thank Peter Shipman for his literature search, Courtney McCracken for her assistance in developing the data collection forms, Kelly Miller and Lifang Zhang for their assistance in constructing the graphs, and Michelle Burnside for her secretarial support.

REFERENCES

1. Strindberg LZ. The dependence of the results of pulp therapy on certain factors. *Acta Odontol Scand.* 1956; 14(Suppl 21):1–175.
2. Kerekes K, Tronstad L. Long-term results of endodontic treatment performed with a standardized technique. *J Endod.* 1979; 5:83–90. [PubMed: 296248]
3. Sjögren U, Hagglund B, Sundqvist G, Wing K. Factors affecting the long-term results of endodontic treatment. *J Endod.* 1990; 16:498–504. [PubMed: 2084204]
4. Sjögren U, Figdor D, Persson S, Sundqvist G. Influence of infection at the time of root filling on the outcome of endodontic treatment of teeth with apical periodontitis. *Int Endod J.* 1997; 30:297–306. [PubMed: 9477818]
5. Nair PN. On the causes of persistent apical periodontitis: a review. *Int Endod J.* 2006; 39:249–281. [PubMed: 16584489]
6. Friedman, S. Expected outcomes in the prevention and treatment of apical periodontitis. In: Ørstavik, D.; Pitt Ford, T., editors. *Essential Endodontology*. Vol. 33. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Munksgaard Ltd; 2008. p. 408–469.
7. Imura N, Pinheiro ET, Gomes BP, Zaia AA, Ferraz CC, Souza-Filho FJ. The outcome of endodontic treatment: a retrospective study of 2000 cases performed by a specialist. *J Endod.* 2007; 33:1278–1282. [PubMed: 17963946]
8. Ng YL, Mann V, Rahbaran S, Lewsey J, Gulabivala K. Outcome of primary root canal treatment: systematic review of the literature – Part 2. Influence of clinical factors. *Int Endod J.* 2008; 41:6–31. [PubMed: 17931388]
9. Friedman S, Abitbol S, Lawrence HP. Treatment outcome in endodontics: the Toronto Study. Phase 1: initial treatment. *J Endod.* 2003; 29:787–793. [PubMed: 14686806]
10. Farzaneh M, Abitbol S, Lawrence HP, Friedman S. Treatment outcome in endodontics-the Toronto Study. Phase II: initial treatment. *J Endod.* 2004; 30:302–309. [PubMed: 15107640]
11. Marquis VL, Dao T, Farzaneh M, Abitbol S, Friedman S. Treatment outcome in endodontics: the Toronto Study. Phase III: initial treatment. *J Endod.* 2006; 32:299–306. [PubMed: 16554199]
12. de Chevigny C, Dao TT, Basrani BR, Marquis V, Farzaneh M, Abitbol S, et al. Treatment outcome in endodontics: the Toronto study–phase 4: initial treatment. *J Endod.* 2008; 34:258–263. [PubMed: 18291271]
13. Petersson K, Lewin B, Hakansson J, Olsson B, Wennberg A. Endodontic status and suggested treatment in a population requiring substantial dental care. *Endod Dent Traumatol.* 1989; 5:153–158. [PubMed: 2635106]
14. Odesjö B, Helldén L, Salonen L, Langeland K. Prevalence of previous endodontic treatment, technical standard and occurrence of periapical lesions in a randomly selected adult, general population. *Endod Dent Traumatol.* 1990; 6:265–272. [PubMed: 2094601]
15. Eckerbom M. Prevalence and technical standard of endodontic treatment in a Swedish population. A longitudinal study. *Swed Dent J Suppl.* 1993; 93:1–45. [PubMed: 8503096]
16. De Cleen MJH, Schuurs AHB, Wesselink PR, Wu MK. Periapical status and prevalence of endodontic treatment in an adult Dutch population. *Int Endod J.* 1993; 26:112–119. [PubMed: 8330933]
17. Saunders WP, Saunders EM, Sadiq J, Cruickshank E. Technical standard of root canal treatment in an adult Scottish sub-population. *Brit Dent J.* 1997; 182:382–386. [PubMed: 9185356]
18. De Moor RJ, Hommez GM, De Boever JG, Delme KI, Martens GE. Periapical health related to the quality of root canal treatment in a Belgian population. *Int Endod J.* 2000; 33:113–120. [PubMed: 11307451]
19. Boucher Y, Matossian L, Rilliard F, Machtou P. Radiographic evaluation of the prevalence and technical quality of root canal treatment in a French subpopulation. *Int Endod J.* 2002; 35:229–238. [PubMed: 11985674]
20. Kabak Y, Abbott PV. Prevalence of apical periodontitis and the quality of endodontic treatment in an adult Belarusian population. *Int Endod J.* 2005; 38:238–245. [PubMed: 15810974]
21. Kirkevang LL, Vaeth M, Horsted-Bindslev P, Wenzel A. Longitudinal study of periapical and endodontic status in a Danish population. *Int Endod J.* 2006; 39:100–107. [PubMed: 16454789]

22. Skudutyte-Rysstad R, Eriksen HM. Endodontic status amongst 35-year-old Oslo citizens and changes over a 30-year period. *Int Endod J.* 2006; 39:637–642. [PubMed: 16872458]
23. Sunay H, Tanalp J, Dikbas I, Bayirli G. Cross-sectional evaluation of the periapical status and quality of root canal treatment in a selected population of urban Turkish adults. *Int Endod J.* 2007; 40:139–145. [PubMed: 17229120]
24. Chen CY, Hasselgren G, Serman N, Elkind MS, Desvarieux M, Engebretson SP. Prevalence and quality of endodontic treatment in the Northern Manhattan elderly. *J Endod.* 2007; 33:230–234. [PubMed: 17320702]
25. Eckerbom M, Flygare L, Magnusson T. A 20-year follow-up study of endodontic variables and apical status in a Swedish population. *Int Endod J.* 2007; 40:940–948. [PubMed: 17883402]
26. Frisk F, Hugoson A, Hakeberg M. Technical quality of root fillings and periapical status in root filled teeth in Jönköping, Sweden. *Int Endod J.* 2008; 41:958–968. [PubMed: 19133085]
27. Madison S, Wilcox LR. An evaluation of coronal microleakage in endodontically treated teeth. Part 3. In vivo study. *J Endod.* 1988; 14:455–458. [PubMed: 3273315]
28. Torabinejad M, Ung B, Kettering JD. In vitro bacterial penetration of coronally unsealed endodontically treated teeth. *J Endod.* 1990; 16:566–569. [PubMed: 2094758]
29. Magura ME, Kafrawy AH, Brown CE Jr, Newton CW. Human saliva coronal microleakage in obturated root canals: an in vitro study. *J Endod.* 1991; 17:324–331. [PubMed: 1779218]
30. Ray HA, Trope M. Periapical status of endodontically treated teeth in relation to the technical quality of the root filling and coronal restoration. *Int Endod J.* 1995; 28:12–18. [PubMed: 7642323]
31. Sidaravicius B, Aleksejuniene J, Eriksen HM. Endodontic treatment and prevalence of apical periodontitis in an adult population of Vilnius, Lithuania. *Endod Dent Traumatol.* 1999; 15:210–215. [PubMed: 10825828]
32. Saunders WP, Saunders EM. Coronal leakage as cause of failure in root-canal therapy: a review. *Dental Traumatol.* 1994; 10:105–108.
33. Chong BS. Coronal leakage and treatment failure. *J Endod.* 1995; 21:159–160. [PubMed: 7561661]
34. Bishop K, Briggs P. Endodontic failure-a problem from top to bottom. *Br Dent J.* 1995; 179:35–36. [PubMed: 7626336]
35. Begotka BA, Hartwell GR. The importance of the coronal seal following root canal treatment. *Va Dent J.* 1996; 73:8–10. [PubMed: 9540744]
36. Cheung GS. Endodontic failures – changing the approach. *Int Dent J.* 1996; 46:131–138. [PubMed: 8886865]
37. Saunders WP, Saunders EM. The root filling and restoration continuum. Prevention of long-term endodontic failures. *Alpha Omega.* 1997; 90:40–46.
38. De Moor R, Hommez G. The importance of apical and coronal leakage in the success or failure of endodontic treatment. *Rev Belge Med Dent.* 2000; 55:334–344.
39. Gale MS. Coronal microleakage. *Ann R Australas Coll Dent Surg.* 2000; 15:299–305. [PubMed: 11709960]
40. Heling I, Gorfli C, Slutzky H, Koplovic K, Zalkind M, Slutzky-Goldberg I. Endodontic failure caused by inadequate restorative procedures: review and treatment recommendations. *J Prosthet Dent.* 2002; 87:674–678. [PubMed: 12131891]
41. Sritharan A. Discuss that the coronal seal is more important than the apical seal for endodontic success. *Aust Endod J.* 2002; 28:112–115. [PubMed: 12510475]
42. De Moor R, Coppens C, Hommez G. Coronal leakage reconsidered. *Rev Belge Med Dent.* 2002; 57(3):161–185.
43. Adib V, Spratt D, Ng YL, Gulabivala K. Cultivable microbial flora associated with persistent periapical disease and coronal leakage after root canal treatment: a preliminary study. *Int Endod J.* 2004; 37:542–551. [PubMed: 15230907]
44. Hommez GM, Verhelst R, Claeys G, Vaneechoutte M, De Moor RJ. Investigation of the effect of the coronal restoration quality on the composition of the root canal microflora in teeth with apical periodontitis by means of T-RFLP analysis. *Int Endod J.* 2004; 37:819–827. [PubMed: 15548272]

45. Safavi KE, Dowden WE, Langeland K. Influence of delayed coronal permanent restoration on endodontic prognosis. *Endod Dent Traumatol*. 1987; 3:187–191. [PubMed: 3481569]
46. Iqbal MK, Johansson AA, Akeel RF, Bergenholtz A, Omar R. A retrospective analysis of factors associated with the periapical status of restored, endodontically treated teeth. *Int J Prosthodont*. 2003; 16:31–38. [PubMed: 12675452]
47. Lynch CD, Burke FM, Ní Ríordáin R, Hannigan A. The influence of coronal restoration type on the survival of endodontically treated teeth. *Eur J Prosthodont Restor Dent*. 2004; 12:171–176. [PubMed: 15691191]
48. Chugal NM, Clive JM, Spånberg LSW. Endodontic treatment outcome: effect of the permanent restoration. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod*. 2007; 104:5761–5826.
49. Williams JV, Williams LR. Is coronal restoration more important than root filling for ultimate endodontic success? *Dent Update*. 2010; 37:187–193. [PubMed: 20491221]
50. Ørstavik D, Kerekes K, Eriksen HM. The periapical index: a scoring system for radiographic assessment of apical periodontitis. *Endod Dent Traumatol*. 1986; 2:20–34. [PubMed: 3457698]
51. Lewis S, Clarke M. Forest plots: trying to see the woods and the trees. *BMJ*. 2001; 322:479–480.
52. L'Abbe KA, Detsky AS, O'Rourke K. Meta-analysis in clinical research. *Ann Intern Med*. 1987; 107:224–233. [PubMed: 3300460]
53. Orwin R. A fail-safe N for effect size in meta-analysis. *J Educ Stat*. 1983; 8:157–159.
54. Heling B, Tamshe A. Evaluation of the success of endodontically treated teeth. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol*. 1970; 30:533–536. [PubMed: 4917275]
55. Heling B, Tamshe A. Statistical evaluation of the success of endodontically treated teeth. *NY J Dent*. 1971; 41:69–82.
56. Heling B, Shapira J. Roentgenologic and clinical evaluation of endodontically treated teeth, with or without negative culture. *Quintessence Int*. 1978; 11:79–84. [PubMed: 397514]
57. Heling B, Kischinovsky D. Factors affecting successful endodontic therapy. *J Brit Endo Soc*. 1979; 12:83–89.
58. Swartz DB, Skidmore AE, Griffin JA. Twenty years of endodontic success and failure. *J Endod*. 1983; 9:198–202. [PubMed: 6574207]
59. Friedman S, Löst C, Zarrabian M, Trope M. Evaluation of success and failure after endodontic therapy using a glass ionomer cement sealer. *J Endod*. 1995; 21:384–390. [PubMed: 7499981]
60. Lilly JP, Cox D, Arcuri M, Krell KV. An evaluation of root canal treatment in patients who have received irradiation to the mandible and maxilla. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod*. 1998; 86:224–226. [PubMed: 9720099]
61. Ricucci D, Grondahl K, Bergenholtz G. Periapical status of root-filled teeth exposed to the oral environment by loss of restoration or caries. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod*. 2000; 90:354–359. [PubMed: 10982958]
62. Heling I, Bialla-Shenkman S, Turetzky A, Horwitz J, Sela J. The outcome of teeth with periapical periodontitis treated with nonsurgical endodontic treatment: a computerized morphometric study. *Quintessence Int*. 2001; 32:397–400. [PubMed: 11444074]
63. Hoskinson SE, Ng YL, Hoskinson AE, Moles DR, Gulabivala K. A retrospective comparison of outcome of root canal treatment using two different protocols. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod*. 2002; 93:705–715. [PubMed: 12142878]
64. Peters LB, Wesselink PR. Periapical healing of endodontically treated teeth in one and two visits obturated in the presence or absence of detectable microorganisms. *Int Endod J*. 2002; 35:60–67.
65. Boucher Y, Matossian L, Rilliard F, Machtou P. Radiographic evaluation of the prevalence and technical quality of root canal treatment in a French subpopulation. *Int Endod J*. 2002; 35:229–238. [PubMed: 11985674]
66. Cheung GS. Survival of first-time nonsurgical root canal treatment performed in a dental teaching hospital. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod*. 2002; 93:596–604. [PubMed: 12075211]
67. Farzaneh M, Abitbol S, Friedman S. Treatment outcome in endodontics: the Toronto study. Phases I and II: Orthograde retreatment. *J Endod*. 2004; 30:627–633. [PubMed: 15329565]

68. Stassen IG, Hommez GM, De Bruyn H, De Moor RJ. The relation between apical periodontitis and root-filled teeth in patients with periodontal treatment need. *Int Endod J.* 2006; 39:299–308. [PubMed: 16584493]
69. Kirkevang LL, Vaeth M, Hörsted-Bindslev P, Bahrami G, Wenzel A. Risk factors for developing apical periodontitis in a general population. *Int Endod J.* 2007; 40:290–299. [PubMed: 17284267]
70. Imura N, Pinheiro ET, Gomes BP, Zaia AA, Ferraz CC, Souza-Filho FJ. The outcome of endodontic treatment: a retrospective study of 2000 cases performed by a specialist. *J Endod.* 2007; 33:1278–1282. [PubMed: 17963946]
71. Touré B, Kane AW, Sarr M, Ngom CT, Boucher Y. Prevalence and technical quality of root fillings in Dakar, Senegal. *Int Endod J.* 2008; 41:41–49. [PubMed: 18005046]
72. Tronstad L, Asbjørnsen K, Døving L, Pedersen I, Eriksen HM. Influence of coronal restorations on the periapical health of endodontically treated teeth. *Endod Dent Traumatol.* 2000; 16:218–221. [PubMed: 11202885]
73. Kirkevang LL, Ørstavik D, Hörsted-Bindslev P, Wenzel A. Periapical status and quality of root fillings and coronal restorations in a Danish population. *Int Endod J.* 2000; 33:509–515. [PubMed: 11307254]
74. Hommez GM, Coppens CR, De Moor RJ. Periapical health related to the quality of coronal restorations and root fillings. *Int Endod J.* 2002; 35:680–689. [PubMed: 12196221]
75. Dugas NN, Lawrence HP, Teplitsky PE, Pharoah MJ, Friedman S. Periapical health and treatment quality assessment of root-filled teeth in two Canadian populations. *Int Endod J.* 2003; 36:181–192. [PubMed: 12657144]
76. Segura-Egea JJ, Jimenez-Pinzon A, Poyato-Ferrera M, Velasco-Ortega E, Rios-Santos JV. Periapical status and quality of root fillings and coronal restorations in an adult Spanish population. *Int Endod J.* 2004; 37:525–530. [PubMed: 15230905]
77. Siqueira JF Jr, Rôças IN, Alves FR, Campos LC. Periradicular status related to the quality of coronal restorations and root canal fillings in a Brazilian population. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod.* 2005; 100:369–374. [PubMed: 16122668]
78. Georgopoulou MK, Spanaki-Voreadi AP, Pantazis N, Kontakiotis EG, Morfis AS. Periapical status and quality of root canal fillings and coronal restorations in a Greek population. *Quintessence Int.* 2008; 39:e85–e92. [PubMed: 18560646]
79. Tavares PB, Bonte E, Boukpepsi T, Siqueira JF Jr, Lasfargues JJ. Prevalence of apical periodontitis in root canal-treated teeth from an urban French population: influence of the quality of root canal fillings and coronal restorations. *J Endod.* 2009; 35:810–813. [PubMed: 19482176]
80. Kayahan MB, Malkondu O, Canpolat C, Kaptan F, Bayirli G, Kazazoglu E. Periapical health related to the type of coronal restorations and quality of root canal fillings in a Turkish subpopulation. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod.* 2008; 105:e58–e62. [PubMed: 18155605]
81. Estrela C, Leles CR, Hollanda AC, Moura MS, Pécora JD. Prevalence and risk factors of apical periodontitis in endodontically treated teeth in a selected population of Brazilian adults. *Braz Dent J.* 2008; 19:34–39. [PubMed: 18438557]
82. Chinn S. A simple method for converting an odds ratio to effect size for use in meta-analysis. *Stat Med.* 2000; 19:3127–3131. [PubMed: 11113947]
83. Cohen, J. *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences.* New York: Academic Press; 1977.
84. Ng YL, Mann V, Rahbaran S, Lewsey J, Gulabivala K. Outcome of primary root canal treatment: systematic review of the literature – part 1. Effects of study characteristics on probability of success. *Int Endod J.* 2007; 40:921–939. [PubMed: 17931389]
85. Ng YL, Mann V, Gulabivala K. Outcome of secondary root canal treatment: a systematic review of the literature. *Int Endod J.* 2008; 41:1026–1046. [PubMed: 19133093]
86. Kakahashi S, Stanley HR, Fitzgerald RJ. The effects of surgical exposures of dental pulps in germ-free and conventional laboratory rats. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol.* 1965; 20:340–349. [PubMed: 14342926]
87. Ricucci D, Lin LM, Spångberg LS. Wound healing of apical tissues after root canal therapy: a long-term clinical, radiographic, and histopathologic observation study. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod.* 2009; 108:609–621. [PubMed: 19716731]

88. Ricucci D, Siqueira JF Jr. Biofilms and apical periodontitis: study of prevalence and association with clinical and histopathologic findings. *J Endod.* 2010; 36:1277–1288. [PubMed: 20647081]
89. Marshall FJ, Massler M. The sealing of pulpless teeth evaluated with radioisotopes. *J Dent Med.* 1961; 16L:172–184.
90. Howick J. Oxford Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine Levels of Evidence in Level of Evidence and Grades of Recommendation [updated from the original report by Phillips B, Ball C, Sackett D, Badenoch D, Straus S, Haynes B, *et al.* 1998]. Oxford Centre for Evidence-based Medicine. (<http://www.cebm.net/index.aspx?o=1025>).
91. Egger M, Schneider M, Davey Smith G. Spurious precision? Meta-analysis of observational studies. *BMJ.* 1998; 316:140–144. [PubMed: 9462324]
92. Stroup DF, Berlin JA, Morton SC, Olkin I, Williamson GD, Rennie D, *et al.* Meta-analysis of observational studies in epidemiology: a proposal for reporting. Meta-analysis Of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) group. *JAMA.* 2000; 283:2008–2012. [PubMed: 10789670]
93. Sterne, JAC.; Egger, M. Regression methods to detect publication and other bias in meta-analysis. In: Rothstein, HR.; Sutton, AJ.; Borenstein, M., editors. *Publication bias in meta-analysis: prevention, assessment and adjustments*. Vol. Chapter 6. New Jersey, USA: Wiley-Blackwell; 2005. p. 99-110.
94. Torabinejad M, Kutsenko D, Machnick TK, Ismail A, Newton CW. Levels of evidence for the outcome of nonsurgical endodontic treatment. *J Endod.* 2005; 31:637–646. [PubMed: 16123698]
95. Thompson SG. Why sources of heterogeneity in meta-analysis should be investigated. *BMJ.* 1994; 309:1351–1355. [PubMed: 7866085]
96. Glasziou PP, Sanders SL. Investigating causes of heterogeneity in systematic reviews. *Stat Med.* 2002; 21:1503–1511. [PubMed: 12111916]
97. Deeks, JJ.; Higgins, JPT.; Altman, DG. Analysing and presenting results: heterogeneity. In: Higgins, JPT.; Green, S., editors. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* 4.2.5. Vol. 97. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.; 2005. p. 97-166.
98. Goldman, Pearson, Darzenta. Endodontic Success-Who's reading the radiograph. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol.* 1972; 33:432–437. [PubMed: 4501172]
99. Bergenholtz G, Spångberg L. Controversies in endodontics. *Crit Rev Oral Biol Med.* 2004; 15:99–114. [PubMed: 15059945]
100. Ricucci D, Bergenholtz G. Bacterial status in root-filled teeth exposed to the oral environment by loss of restoration and fracture or caries--a histobacteriological study of treated cases. *Int Endod J.* 2003; 36:787–802. [PubMed: 14641443]

Fig. 1.

A schematic of the comparisons made in the meta-analysis. AR: adequate restoration; AE: adequate root canal treatment; IR: inadequate restoration; IE: inadequate root canal treatment; Solid connection line: comparison performed; Dotted line: comparison not performed due to expected results.

Fig. 2.

Forest plot of odds ratios and 95% confidence limits (CL) based on data from 9 studies for the comparison of AR/AE vs AR/IE with regard to absence of apical periodontitis (AR: Adequate restoration; AE: Adequate root canal treatment; IE: Inadequate root canal treatment). Overall estimate is based on combined data from the 9 studies. The size of each rectangle is proportional to the total sample size for the AR/AE vs. AR/IE comparison in that study. The size of the diamond is proportional to the combined sample size for the 9 AR/AE vs. AR/IE comparisons. The solid line indicates an odds ratio of 1.0 and the dashed lines indicate odds ratios of 0.5, 10.0, and 30.0, respectively. OR: odds ratio; LCL: lower confidence level; UCL: upper confidence level.

Fig. 3.

Forest plot of odds ratios and 95% confidence limits (CL) based on data from 9 studies for the comparison of AR/AE vs IR/AE with regard to absence of apical periodontitis (AR: Adequate restoration; AE: Adequate root canal treatment; IR: Inadequate restoration). Overall estimate based on combined data from the 9 studies. The size of each rectangle is proportional to the total sample size for the AR/AE vs. IR/AE comparison in that study. The size of the diamond is proportional to the combined sample size for the 9 AR/AE vs IR/AE comparisons. The solid line indicates an odds ratio of 1.0 and the dashed lines indicate odds ratios of 0.5, 10.0, and 30.0, respectively. OR: odds ratio; LCL: lower confidence level; UCL: upper confidence level.

Fig. 4.

Forest plot of odds ratios and 95% confidence limits (CL) based on data from 9 studies for the comparison of IR/AE vs AR/IE with regard to absence of apical periodontitis (AR: Adequate restoration; IE: Inadequate root canal treatment; IR: Inadequate restoration; AE: Adequate root canal treatment). Overall estimate based on combined data from the 9 studies. Size of each rectangle is proportional to the total sample size for the IR/AE vs AR/IE comparison in that study. Size of the diamond is proportional to the combined sample size for the 9 IR/AE vs AR/IE comparisons. The solid line indicates an odds ratio of 1.0 and the dashed lines indicate odds ratios of 0.2 and 10.0, respectively. OR: odds ratio; LCL: lower confidence level; UCL: upper confidence level.

Table 1

Reasons for exclusion of studies from the meta-analysis

Excluded studies	Exclusion criteria
Heling and Tamshe (1970) [54]	4
Heling and Tamshe (1971) [55]	1,4
Heling and Shapira (1978) [56]	1
Heling and Kischinovsky (1979) [57]	1,3,4
Swartz et al. (1983) [58]	1
Safavi et al. (1987) [45]	1
Friedman et al. (1995) [59]	4
Lilly et al. (1998) [60]	3
Sidaravicius et al. (1999) [31]	1
Ricucci et al. (2000) [61]	4
Heling et al. (2001) [62]	5
Hoskinson et al. (2002) [63]	1
Peters and Wesselink (2002) [64]	5
Boucher et al. (2002) [65]	3
Cheung (2002) [66]	5
Farzaneh et al. (2004) [67]	4
Stassen et al. (2006) [68]	3
Kirkevang et al. (2007) [69]	2
Imura et al. (2007) [70]	4
Touré et al. [71]	4
Kayahan et al. (2008) [80]	5
Estrela et al. (2008) [81]	6

¹ Evaluation of non-endodontically treated teeth or when stratified information on endodontically-treated teeth was unavailable

² Association of the treatment outcome with a particular disease

³ Coronal restorations reported only as present/absent or permanent/temporary

⁴ No association of the quality of the coronal restoration with endodontic treatment outcome

⁵ Overall poor quality of the endodontic treatment outcome

⁶ Could not establish whether the treatment outcome was contributed by a coronal restoration alone or the combined effects of a coronal restoration and an intracanal post