## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Content		Page
ACKNOWLEDG	EMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT		iv
LIST OF TABLE	es S	х
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS		
CHAPTER I	INTRODUCTION	1
	Principles, theories and rationales	1
	Purposes of the study	2
	Hypotheses of the study	2
	Anticipated benefits	3
	Scope of the study	3
	Definitions	3
CHAPTER II	LITERATURE REVIEW	5
	Conventional phosphoric acid etching adhesive systems	5
	Self-etching adhesive system	9
	Shear bond strength	14
	Failure mode	19
CHAPTER III	METERIALS AND METHODS	23
	Materials A Company of the Company o	e 23
	Methods	29
	Statistical analyses	38
	Reliability of the measurements	39

viii

Content Page CHAPTER IV RESULTS 41 Shear bond strengths 2/02/03/19 41 Failure modes 44 DISCUSSION CHAPTER V 52 CHAPTER VI CONCLUSSIONS 59 **BIBLIOGRAPHY** 61 **APPENDIX** 69 CURRICULUM VITAE 73

ix

ลือสิทธิ์มหาวิทยาลัยเชียอใหม่ Copyright © by Chiang Mai University All rights reserved

## LIST OF TABLES

## Table

30

- 3.1 Twenty-four possible blocks that used for tooth allocation.
- 3.2 Means, standard deviations and correlations of the first and second measurements in determination the percentages of residual adhesives on the debonded enamel surface
- 4.1 Means, standard deviations and minimum to maximum values of shear bond strength at the point of bond failure of three self-etching (Xeno<sup>®</sup>III, ED PRIMER<sup>®</sup> and AdheSE<sup>®</sup>) and one conventional phosphoric acid etching adhesive systems
- 4.2 Comparison of mean shear bond strengths among three self-etching (Xeno<sup>®</sup>III, ED PRIMER<sup>®</sup> and AdheSE<sup>®</sup>) and one conventional phosphoric acid etching adhesive systems using one way analysis of variance (ANOVA)
- 4.3 Statistical comparison (p-value) of mean shear bond strengths among three self-etching (Xeno<sup>®</sup>III, ED PRIMER<sup>®</sup> and AdheSE<sup>®</sup>) and one conventional phosphoric acid etching adhesive systems using the Multiple comparisons test (Tukey's test)
  - .4 The numbers and percentages of failure sites of three self-etching (Xeno<sup>®</sup>III, ED PRIMER<sup>®</sup> and AdheSE<sup>®</sup>) and one conventional phosphoric acid etching adhesive systems
  - .5 Comparison of the percentages of failure sites at the adhesive/enamel interface among three self-etching (Xeno<sup>®</sup>III, ED PRIMER<sup>®</sup> and AdheSE<sup>®</sup>) and one conventional phosphoric acid etching adhesive systems using the Pearson Chi-square test

43

44

43

Х

40

42

- 4.6 Statistical comparison (p-value) of the percentages of failure sites at the adhesive/enamel interface among three self-etching (Xeno<sup>®</sup>III, ED PRIMER<sup>®</sup> and AdheSE<sup>®</sup>) and one conventional phosphoric acid etching adhesive systems using the Z-test
- 4.7 Comparison of the percentages of failure sites within the adhesive among three self-etching (Xeno<sup>®</sup>III, ED PRIMER<sup>®</sup> and AdheSE<sup>®</sup>) and one conventional phosphoric acid etching adhesive systems using the Pearson Chi-square test
- 4.8 Statistical comparison (p-value) of the percentages of failure sites within the adhesive among three self-etching (Xeno<sup>®</sup>III, ED PRIMER<sup>®</sup> and AdheSE<sup>®</sup>) and one conventional phosphoric acid etching adhesive systems using the Z-test
- 4.9 Mean Ranks of the amount of residual adhesives on the debonded enamel surface resulting from three self-etching (Xeno<sup>®</sup>III, ED PRIMER<sup>®</sup> and AdheSE<sup>®</sup>) and one conventional phosphoric acid etching adhesive systems
- 4.10 Comparison of mean ranks of the amount of residual adhesives on the debonded enamel surface among three self-etching (Xeno<sup>®</sup>III, ED PRIMER<sup>®</sup> and AdheSE<sup>®</sup>) and one conventional phosphoric acid etching adhesive systems using the Kruskal-Wallis Test
  4.11 Statistical comparison (p-value) of the mean ranks of the amount of
  - residual adhesives on the debonded enamel surface among three selfetching (Xeno<sup>®</sup>III, ED PRIMER<sup>®</sup> and AdheSE<sup>®</sup>) and one conventional phosphoric acid etching adhesive systems using the Mann-Whitney Test

47

Page

+1

48

50

- The values of shear bond strengths of three self-etching (Xeno Render III, А ED Primer  $^{\mathbb{R}}$  and AdheSE  $^{\mathbb{R}}$ ) and conventional phosphoric acid etching 70 adhesive systems
- The failure sites of three self-etching (Xeno  $^{\ensuremath{\mathbb{R}}}$  III, ED Primer  $^{\ensuremath{\mathbb{R}}}$  and В AdheSE<sup>®</sup>) and conventional phosphoric acid etching adhesive systems 71 The percentages of the amount of residual adhesives on debonded С enamel surfaces of three self-etching ((Xeno  $^{\textcircled{R}}$  III, ED  ${\mbox{Primer}}^{\textcircled{R}}$  and  $\mathsf{AdheSE}^{(\!\!\!\mathrm{B})}$  and conventional phosphoric acid etching adhesive systems

72

Page

## LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure		Page
2.1	Non-conditioned enamel surface	6
2.2	Conditioned enamel surface with 37%phosphoric acid	6
2.3	Typical etching pattern of human enamel, showing enamel rods with	
	micro-porosities.	7
2.4	Re-etched human enamel prepared for re-bonding after bond failure.	
	Retained fragments of resin composite adhesive are indicated by the arr	ow. 6
2.5	Types of pattern of etched enamel A, Type 1. B, Type 2. C, Type 3.	7
2.6	SEM photograph of adhesive penetration into enamel surface etched	
	with phosphoric acid. A-Adhesive resin, B-Adhesive resin tag	10
2.7	SEM photograph of adhesive penetration into enamel surface etched	
	with the self-etching primer. A-Adhesive resin, B-Adhesive resin tag	11
2.8	SEM micrograph showing of enamel surface after application of 32%	
	phosphoric acid (A) and three self-etching primer agents: Clearfil Mega	
	Bond (B), Non-Rinse (C), and Prop L-Pop (D)	11
2.9	Fe-SEM micrograph showing enamel surface after application of	
	strong self-etching adhesives (A) and mild self-etching adhesives	
	(B) (A-Adhesive, E-Enamel)	12
2.10	Hybridized smear plug was created from using self-etching adhesive	
	system. Why Chiang Mai Univer	S 13
2.11	Direction of shear force that opposes the sliding of one plane on an	
	adjacent plane.	14
2.12	Adhesive failures. (A) Interface of the adhesive and enamel (B) Interface	
	of the adhesive and bracket	19

xiii

-			
F	IC	u	re
•	.9	~	

2.1	Cohesive failures. (A) Within the enamel (B) Within the adhesive	
	(C) Within the bracket	20
3.1	Conventional phosphoric acid etching adhesive system	24
3.2	Xeno <sup>®</sup> III self-etching adhesive system	24
3.3	ED PRIMER <sup>®</sup> self-etching adhesive system	25
3.4	AdheSE <sup>®</sup> self-etching adhesive system	25
3.5	Universal testing machine (Instron <sup>®</sup> )	26
3.6	Debonding plate	27
3.7	Mounting jig	27
3.8	Water bath	28
3.9	Nikon stereozoom microscope	28
3.1	0 Computerized transparent grid	29
3.1	1 A 0.018"X0.025" stainless steel wire was placed on the bracket slot by	
	ligating the elastic ligature to the body of the bracket.	33
3.1	2 Tooth embedded in polyvinylchloride ring	34
3.1	3 The debonding plate was fixed into the upper pneumatic grip and the	
	mounting jig was fixed into the lower pneumatic grip.	35
3.1	4 An apparatus assembled for testing shear bond strength	35
3.1	5 Photograph of debonded enamel surface area after debonding	37
3.1	6 The border of debonded enamel surface area was drawn on the	
	transparent paper.	37
<b>COD</b> 3.1	7 Residual Adhesives on the debonded enamel surface were determined	
	by using computerized transparent grid.	38