ORIGINAL ARTICLE

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN PHARMACEUTICAL SCIENCES

Published by JK Welfare & Pharmascope Foundation Journal Home Page: https://ijrps.com

Self etch adhesives - An update

Nishanthana Murali[1], Balaji Ganesh S[*2], Anitha Roy[3]

[1]Saveetha Dental College and Hospitals, Saveetha Institute of Medical and Technical Sciences, Saveetha University, Chennai – 77, Tamil Nadu, India
[2]Scientist, White Lab - Material Research Centre, Saveetha Dental College and Hospitals, Saveetha Institute of Medical and Technical Sciences, Saveetha University, Chennai – 77, Tamil Nadu, India
[3]Department of Pharmacology, Saveetha Dental College and Hospitals, Saveetha Institute of Medical and Technical Sciences, Chennai – 77, Tamil Nadu, India

Article History:

Received on: 26 Jul 2020
Revised on: 27 Aug 2020
Accepted on: 29 Aug 2020

Keywords:

Bond strength,
One-step,
Self etch,
Two-step.

ABSTRACT

Self etch adhesives are one of the most recent advancements the field of dentistry has seen recently. Adhesive frameworks today are either an "etch and rinse or total etch" or "self-etch" approach, which contrast by the way they interact with the tooth structures. Total etch frameworks include phosphoric etchants to pretreat the dental hard tissues before the ensuing use of a bonding agent. Self-etch type of adhesives are generally consisting of acid type monomers, that perform the actions of etching and rinsing the tooth structures at the same time. The former type of total etch adhesives are consistent with step frameworks, contingent upon the primer and bonding agent being independent or joined in a solitary container. Thus, self etch systems seem to be easily accessible as they are a couple of phase framework. Both the framework systems structure a mixed layer because the resin is infiltrating the permeable dentin or enamel. In spite of current patterns leaning in the direction of less straightforward clinical application steps, one-step holding frameworks seem to have lower bonding qualities and appear to be less foreseeable than multi-step etch and rinse, or self etch systems. They have a variety of advantages and disadvantages which are discussed in this article. They are more popular nowadays, and this review also includes its advantages over the etch and rinse system and as well as its disadvantages compared to the etch and rinse system. It also includes the types of self etch adhesives based on the steps and range of acidity as well as some of its properties.

*Corresponding Author

Name: Balaji Ganesh S
Phone: +91 8220713554
Email: balajiganeshs.sdc@saveetha.com

ISSN: 0975-7538

DOI: https://doi.org/10.26452/ijrps.v11iSPL3.2967

Production and Hosted by

IJRPS | https://ijrps.com

INTRODUCTION

The advancement of a solid attachment to enamel and dentin substrates alongside various adhesive specialists is a case of a change in perspective of the method of practice of dentistry. The capacity to bind in a sensibly predictable manner to both enamel and dentin structures empowers dental practitioners to put immediate and circuitous efforts in restoring the tooth. Truth be told, the life span and consistency of remedial strategies depend on the dental specialist's capacity to securely do effective treatment of the tooth structure. Adhesives frameworks had advanced enormously from the time when they

were initially found and ceaselessly advanced in the course of recent years. In contradiction toward these critical enhancements, the adhesive system remains the most fragile territory of the restorative aspects, and whenever performed in the oral cavity, peripheral discolouration, poor fine fixation abilities and lack of maintenance procedures such as repetitive caries and microleakage are among the clinical outcomes (Noor and Pradeep, 2016; Kumar and Antony, 2018). Additionally, the distinctions among veneer and dentin substrates as to morphology, histology and furthermore arrangement, make attachment of any material to tooth structure one of the significant difficulties in dentistry.

Current adhesive frameworks utilize two significant intends to accomplish a dependable adhesive to the tooth structure. The main strategy is known as total etch or etch and rinse procedure. In this strategy, the smear layer is evacuated totally, and the subsurface is demineralized by means of creating porosities with acids. The second strategy utilizes the smear layer as a holding substrate and is known as a self-etching adhesive framework. These are appealing as; hypothetically, they can fundamentally disentangle enamel conventions, take out the sensitive advance of total-etch and may speak to the following development in adhesive dentistry. Be that as it may, regardless of whether their viability is genuinely practically identical to etch and rinse framework is as yet an issue of examination (Manohar and Sharma, 2018; Jose *et al.*, 2020). Self etch adhesives are bonding systems that dissolve the smear layer and create porosities in the dental cultrate, which calls for no need of etching (Breschi, 2008). Self etch adhesives are the sixth and seventh generation of the generations of bonding agents. The eighth-generation contains nanofillers but are also self etch adhesives. Self etch adhesives are composed of several monomers, curing initiators, inhibitors or stabilizers, solvents and rarely an inorganic filler with each one having a specific and different function. Self etch adhesives perform the functions of an etchant, primer and bonding agent (Siddique and Jayalakshmi, 2019). Previously our team conducted numerous studies evaluating the properties and effects of various substances used regularly on the tooth structures and clinical trials (Ramamoorthi *et al.*, 2015; Nasim, 2018). As well as reviews on various dental advancements topics. (Ravinthar and Jayalakshmi, 2018).

We also conducted *in vitro* studies as a step towards discovering new technologies as well as newer innovations in the existing literature (Rajendran, 2019; Janani *et al.*, 2020). This study aims to summarize the current understanding of self etch adhesive system as an update in the adhesive systems currently in use and to present an overview of its merits, demerits, types and so on to get an understanding of its techniques and properties and use in clinical dentistry. Around 80 articles were collected in various bibliographic databases, and 44 articles related to the title were selected and explored to compile this review article titled self etch adhesives an update.

Types

The essential organization of self-etch primers and self-etch adhesive frameworks is an aqueous arrangement consisting of acidic functional monomers, with a pH moderately higher than that of corrosive phosphoric etchants. The role of water is to give the medium for ionization and activity of these acidic resin-based monomers. Self-etch adhesive frameworks likewise contain HEMA monomers on the grounds that the vast majority of the acidic monomers are low water-solvent and to expand the wettability of dentin surface. Bi-or multi-purpose monomers are added to give solidarity to the cross-connecting shape formed in the monomeric lattice. Self etch adhesives can be classified majorly based on their range of acidity. Their basic composition consists of an aqueous solution of acidic functional monomers that have a higher pH level than that of the phosphoric acid etchants (Sofan, 2017). Thus, they have been classified into strong, intermediate and mild (Munck, 2005).

Strong

In case of a strong type of self etch adhesives, the pH is less than or equal to 1. They demineralise dentin compared to total etch on par. They may cause post-operative pain on a higher probability than its counterparts.

Intermediate

In the case of intermediate type, the pH is 1.5. Their demineralization ability is slightly less when compared to strong and minimal hybrid layer formation.

Mild

In case of mild types of self etch adhesives, the pH is more than 2. They show shallow hybrid layer formation along with superficial demineralization, which leaves the possibility of having postoperative sensitivity (Kenshima *et al.*, 2006). Self etch adhesives can also be further classified based on the number of steps used for the application of the adhesives as

One-step

In case of on step Self etch adhesives, it contains all three components in one bottle making it easier to use.

Two-step

In case of two-step self etch adhesives, the etchant and primer come in one bottle while the adhesives are in another bottle.

Merits

Self etch adhesives systems are more moisture tolerant. In the case of self etch, the moisture provided by both water and saliva yielded a higher bond strength when compared to other adhesives systems (Prasad, 2014). Self etch systems eliminate the potential of over-etching because separate etchant is not used and hence prevents the deepening of the demineralization zone. It is less technique sensitive due to its minimal amount of steps for an application that is one-step or two-step. The essential favourable aspect of self-etching frameworks is that they stay away from the exposed period that is seen after conventional phosphoric corrosive etchant is washed from the tooth and preceding the resulting utilization of acrylic monomers (Ramesh *et al.*, 2018). As of now, uncovered collagen must be upheld by moisture. With self-etching frameworks, the acidic part isn't flushed from the tooth, therefore wiping out the exposure of the tooth structures during the time of collagen fibril breakdown. Another bit of leeway of these frameworks is that pervasion of the acrylic monomers to the profundity of the demineralized zone is guaranteed. With conventional etch and rinse frameworks, it is clinically conceivable to etch further than the current groundwork/adhesive can infiltrate, leaving a zone of unsupported, demineralized dentin that can debilitate the adhesive layer and leave it powerless against hydrolysis and untimely degradation (Ramanathan and Solete, 2015; Nasim and Nandakumar, 2018). This process doesn't happen with self-etch frameworks, and may perhaps upgrade their security after some time and hence cause an increase in the stability.

Demerits

Self etch adhesives have a decreased shelf life due to their chemical composition. They show increased bond strength and durability if stored below 20-degree celsius. They are incompatible with chemical cure composites. This may be due to frank composite uncoupling in the composite-adhesive link frontier, and this is seen because of the unpropitious chemical interaction between the two (Cheong, 2003). Water sorption increase will lead to a decrease of the ultimate tensile strength of the Self etch adhesives, and two-step Self etch adhesives seem to have lesser water sorption than their one-step counterparts. A few makers of self-etching adhesives have recommended that an extra phosphoric corrosive etching step is required when the enamel isn't functional. Studies have exhibited that enamel bonds with some self-etching adhesives are improved by etching of the enamel with a phosphoric acid etchant. The honeycomb-etch design seen after corrosive phosphoric moulding is increasingly articulated when contrasted with the example seen with self-etching frameworks. Be that as it may, quick shear bond strengths are equivalent. Beside holding orthodontic brackets and caries management, it is uncommon that general dental specialists will utilize self-etching frameworks on enamel (Rajakeerthi and Nivedhitha, 2019).

Hallmarks

Mechanical Properties

The chemical composition of different steps of application seems to have an effect on the mechanical properties of the self etch adhesives. The two-step self etch adhesives seem to have better mechanical properties than their one-step counterpart (Giannini, 2015).

In Vitro Bonding Effectiveness

The two-step self etch adhesives show less microleakage when compared to the one-step while both types showed lesser microleakage when the tooth was treated with phosphoric acid etchant beforehand (Nagpal, 2011).

Bond Strength

Two-step self etch adhesives showed a higher bond strength than the One-step (Vanajasan *et al.*, 2011). When comparing the mild, intermediate, and strong types of Self etch adhesives, the strong type has the least bond strength while the intermediate and mild types were similar in bond strength.

Clinical Effectiveness

In terms of the factors retention, marginal integrity, marginal discolouration, caries recurrence, postoperative sensitivity and preservation of tooth vitality, the one-step self etch adhesives seem to have a higher annual failure rate than the two-step self etch adhesives and hence have less clinical effectiveness making the two-step self etch adhesives more clinically efficient.

Self Etch Vs Total Etch

No major dissimilarities were observed in the properties of total etch or etch and rinse method and self etch adhesives. The bonding performance was similar in both modes of etching even though the mechanism followed by them may be different. There were no significant differences between them in regard to postoperative sensitivity and marginal discolouration (Perdigão *et al.*, 2003). Both systems show average biocompatibility. Both of them showed similar longevity. The adaptation of self etch mode of

etching to resin – dentin interface was better than total-etch. The various proof accessible today recommends that the decision regarding the utilisation among self etch adhesive system and etch and rinse frameworks is frequently an opinion based on individual inclination. When all is said in done, be that as it may, phosphoric acid etchant makes an increasingly articulated and retentive etching design in enamel and dentin. In this way, etch and rinse or total etch frameworks are regularly favoured for the restoration of the teeth and when enormous zones of enamel are still present and indicated. On the other hand, this newer generation of adhesives give better and unexpected binding ability with dentin and are thus suggested for direct composite resin restorations, particularly in the conditions where they are majorly upheld by dentin (Teja and Ramesh, 2019).

CONCLUSION

This article reviewed the types and properties of self etch adhesives. Self etch adhesives have more merits than demerits, and the importance of this study lies with the properties of Self etch adhesives and their increased practical efficiency. The Limitations of this study are the limited number of databases searched and the exclusion of the HEMA – containing and Non- containing class of self etch adhesives. Further research in multiple approach methods may help increase awareness among clinicians and help in providing quality patient care.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to acknowledge and especially thank our institution Saveetha Dental College and Hospitals, Saveetha University, Chennai for giving a platform to carry out this review project.; also thank all the authors and editors of the Journal which was a resource to compile this review article. The authors declare that they have no funding support for this review study.

Conflict of Interest

No potential conflict of interests relevant to this article was reported.

Funding Support

The authors declare that they have no funding support for this study.

REFERENCES

Breschi, L. 2008. Dental adhesion review: ageing and stability of the bonded interface. *Dental materials: official publication of the Academy of Dental Materials*, 24(1):90–101.

Cheong, C. 2003. Incompatibility of self-etch adhesives with chemical/dual-cured composites: two-step vs one-step systems. *Operative dentistry*, 28(6):747–755.

Giannini, M. 2015. Self-etch adhesive systems: a literature review. *Brazilian Dental Journal*, 26(1):3–10.

Janani, K., Palanivelu, A., Sandhya, R. 2020. Diagnostic accuracy of dental pulse oximeter with customized sensor holder, thermal test and electric pulp test for the evaluation of pulp vitality: an in vivo study. *Brazilian Dental Science*, 23(1).

Jose, J., Ajitha, P., Subbaiyan, H. 2020. Different Treatment Modalities followed by Dental Practitioners for Ellis Class 2 Fracture – A Questionnaire-based Survey. *The Open Dentistry Journal*, 14(1):59–65.

Kenshima, S., Francci, C., Reis, A., Loguercio, A. D., Filho, L. E. R. 2006. Conditioning effect on dentin, resin tags and hybrid layer of different acidity self-etch adhesives applied to thick and thin smear layer. *Journal of Dentistry*, 34(10):775–783.

Kumar, D., Antony, S. D. P. 2018. Calcified Canal and Negotiation-A Review. *Research Journal of Pharmacy and Technology*, 11(8):3727–3727.

Manohar, M., Sharma, S. 2018. A survey of the knowledge, attitude, and awareness about the principal choice of intracanal medicaments among the general dental practitioners and nonendodontic specialists. *Indian Journal of Dental Research*, 29(6):716–716.

Munck, J. D. 2005. One-day bonding effectiveness of new self-etch adhesives to bur-cut enamel and dentin. *Operative dentistry*, 30(1):39–49.

Nagpal, R. 2011. In vitro bonding effectiveness of self-etch adhesives with different application techniques: A microleakage and scanning electron microscopic study. *Journal of conservative dentistry: JCD*, 14(3):258–263.

Nasim, I. 2018. Clinical performance of resin-modified glass ionomer cement, flowable composite, and polyacid-modified resin composite in non-carious cervical lesions: One-year follow-up. *Journal of Conservative Dentistry*, pages 510–510.

Nasim, I., Nandakumar, M. 2018. Comparative evaluation of grape seed and cranberry extracts in preventing enamel erosion: An optical emission spectrometric analysis. *Journal of Conservative Dentistry*, 21(5):516–516.

Noor, S. S. S. E., Pradeep 2016. Chlorhexidine: Its properties and effects. *Research Journal of Phar-*

macy and Technology, 9(10):1755–1755.

Perdigão, J., Geraldeli, S., Hodges, J. S. 2003. Total-etch versus self-etch adhesive: effect on postoperative sensitivity. *Journal of the American Dental Association*, 134(12):1621–1629.

Prasad, M. 2014. Effect of moisture, saliva, and blood contamination on the shear bond strength of brackets bonded with a conventional bonding system and self-etched bonding system. *Journal of natural science*, 5(1):123–129.

Rajakeerthi, R., Nivedhitha, M. S. 2019. Natural Product as the Storage medium for an avulsed tooth – A Systematic Review. *Cumhuriyet Dental Journal*, 22(2):249–256.

Rajendran, R. 2019. Comparative Evaluation of Remineralizing Potential of a Paste Containing Bioactive Glass and a Topical Cream Containing Casein Phosphopeptide-Amorphous Calcium Phosphate: An in Vitro Study. *Pesquisa Brasileira em Odontopediatria e Clínica Integrada*, pages 1–10.

Ramamoorthi, S., Nivedhitha, M. S., Divyanand, M. J. 2015. Comparative evaluation of postoperative pain after using endodontic needle and EndoActivator during root canal irrigation: A randomised controlled trial. *Australian Endodontic Journal*, 41(2):78–87.

Ramanathan, S., Solete, P. 2015. Cone-beam Computed Tomography Evaluation of Root Canal Preparation using Various Rotary Instruments: An in vitro Study. *The Journal of Contemporary Dental Practice*, 16(11):869–872.

Ramesh, S., Teja, K., Priya, V. 2018. Regulation of matrix metalloproteinase-3 gene expression in inflammation: A molecular study. *Journal of Conservative Dentistry*, 21(6):592–592.

Ravinthar, K., Jayalakshmi 2018. Recent Advancements in Laminates and Veneers in Dentistry. *Research Journal of Pharmacy and Technology*, 11(2):785–785.

Siddique, R., Jayalakshmi, S. 2019. Assessment of Precipitate Formation on Interaction of Chlorhexidine with Sodium Hypochlorite, Neem, Aloevera and Garlic: An in vitro Study. *Indian Journal of Public Health Research & Development*, 10(11):3648–3648.

Sofan, E. 2017. Classification review of dental adhesive systems: from the IV generation to the universal type. *Annali di stomatologia*, 8(1):1–17.

Teja, K. V., Ramesh, S. 2019. Shape optimal and clean more. *Saudi Endodontic Journal. Medknow Publications and Media Pvt. Ltd*, 9(3):235–235.

Vanajasan, P. P., Dhakshinamoorthy, M., Rao, C. S. 2011. Factors affecting the bond strength of self-etch adhesives: A meta-analysis of literature. *Journal of Conservative Dentistry*, 14(1):62–62.