

AN *IN VITRO* COMPARISON OF WORKING LENGTH DETERMINATION
BETWEEN A DIGITAL SYSTEM AND CONVENTIONAL FILM
WHEN SOURCE-FILM/SENSOR DISTANCE AND
EXPOSURE TIME ARE MODIFIED

by

Paul J. Ley

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the School of
Dentistry in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Science in Dentistry,
Indiana University School of Dentistry, 2009

Thesis accepted by the faculty of the Department of Endodontics, Indiana University School of Dentistry, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science in Dentistry.

Joseph Legan

Kenneth Spolnik

Susan Zunt

Ted Parks

Mychel Vail
Chair of the Research
Committee and Program
Director

Date _____

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thanks to Dr. Brown for the opportunity you have given me to join this great specialty. I truly wish I had more time to learn from you. And to Dr. Vail, thanks for doing the seemingly impossible every day. You have been an inspiration to always strive for the best and to never be satisfied. To Dr. Legan, thanks for your unwavering dedication to teaching endodontics. You are what we strive to be.

Thanks to Dr. Parks for your help in designing and executing this study. It has always been a pleasure to learn from you because of your unique way of simplifying complex concepts. Shane Christensen, you have been a great friend these past two years. Thank you for all your help; I truly enjoyed sharing the title of co-chief with you.

Thank you, Dad, for everything that you have given me. It seems like every other day a situation arises in which I remember advice you gave me several years ago. Your guidance has truly helped me reach this point in my life and my career.

Thanks to my brother, JD, for always letting me be his shadow when we were growing up. I have always looked up to you and I always will. Thanks for all of your support and encouragement.

I would like to thank my amazing wife, Diana, for her support throughout these past few years. If there is anyone in this world that truly understands my journey, it is she. She always knew what time it was; time to get your clock. Thank you for everything; I love you with all my heart.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Review of Literature.....	5
Methods and Materials.....	60
Results.....	67
Tables and Figures.....	69
Discussion.....	97
Summary and Conclusions.....	101
References.....	103
Abstract.....	120
Curriculum Vitae	

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

FIGURE 1	Summary of experimental design.....	70
FIGURE 2	File cemented into place and tooth mounted.....	71
FIGURE 3	All teeth mounted with files cemented in place.....	72
FIGURE 4	Schick digital Sensor.....	73
FIGURE 5	Custom fabricated jig.....	74
FIGURE 6	Custom fabricated jig with labeled Kodak Insight film and tooth.....	75
FIGURE 7	Custom fabricated jig with digital sensor and tooth.....	76
FIGURE 8	Siemens dental x-ray unit.....	77
FIGURE 9	Grid of images before randomization.....	78
FIGURE 10	Measurement from file tip to radiographic apex	79
FIGURE 11	Calibration tool with randomized grid on left	80
FIGURE 12	Light box, magnifying glass X4.0, calibrated ruler, conventional image.....	81
FIGURE 13	Light box, X4.0 magnifying glass, calibrated ruler, conventional image.....	82
FIGURE 14	Under-, ideally and overexposed radiographs of a maxillary incisor	83
TABLE I	Repeatability results.....	84
TABLE II	Analysis variable.....	85
TABLE III	Mean error and standard deviation.....	86
TABLE IV	ANOVA for tooth type.....	87
FIGURE 15	Mean error comparison of under-, ideally, and overexposed images and films.....	93
FIGURE 16	Hurter and Driffield characteristic curve.....	94

FIGURE 17	Mean error comparison of distances for digital and film with regard to distance.....	95
FIGURE 18	Mean error comparison of distances for digital and film combined.....	96