REVIEW ARTICLE

Exploring the Differences, Advantages, and Limitations of Traditional Periapical Radiography Versus Digital Radiography in Endodontic Procedures

Nawaf Alotaibi[1], Ghazai Rubayyi Alotaibi[2], Turki Ismaeil K Alharthi[3]

1. *Saudi Board Family Residency Program, King Saud University Medical City,Riyadh,Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.*
2. *General dentist,Smile World Specialist Dental Center,Riyadh, Saudi Arabia*
3. *Saudi Board Endodontic Resident, Taif Specialized Dental Center, Saudi Arabia .*

Received: 12-11-2024 **Accepted:** 27-12-2024 **Published:** 04-01-2025

ABSTRACT

Endodontic treatment requires precise diagnostic imaging to guide practitioners in diagnosing, planning, and monitoring the outcomes of procedures. Traditionally, periapical radiography (PA) has been used as the standard method for obtaining images in endodontic cases. However, with the advent of digital radiography (DR), dental professionals now have an alternative that offers potential improvements in diagnostic accuracy, radiation exposure, workflow efficiency, and patient experience. This review aims to explore the differences between traditional and digital radiography, highlighting their advantages and limitations, and providing an in-depth understanding of their roles in endodontic practice. This review investigates critical aspects such as diagnostic accuracy, radiation safety, image quality, cost implications, and patient-centered factors, contributing to a comprehensive comparison that can provide informed clinical decisions in endodontic procedures.

KEYWORDS: :Traditional periapical radiography, digital radiography, endodontic procedures, root canal therapy, diagnostic accuracy, radiation dose

INTRODUCTION

In endodontics, clinical examination and diagnostic imaging are both essential components of the preoperative diagnosis (1). Among the various radiographic techniques available, periapical radiographs (PAs) are among the most commonly employed, providing detailed images of the tooth and surrounding structures. Traditionally, periapical radiography has utilized film-based technology, known as traditional periapical radiography (TPR), which has been the mainstay in clinical practice for many years.

Accurate diagnostic imaging supports the clinical diagnosis and allows the clinician to better visualize the area in question. Conventional 2-dimensional (2D) radiographs provide a cost-effective, high-resolution image, which continues to be the most popular method of imaging today. However, the diagnostic potential of periapical radiographs is limited. Information may be difficult to interpret, especially when the anatomy and background pattern are complex (2).

With the technological evolution of digital imaging, digital radiography (DR) has emerged as a modern alternative to TPR. Digital radiography offers advantages over traditional methods, including reduced radiation exposure, faster image acquisition, and the ability to enhance image quality using advanced software tools (3). However, despite these advantages, TPR continues to be used in many dental practices due to its lower initial costs and familiarity among practitioners. As endodontics continues to evolve, understanding the strengths and weaknesses of both traditional and digital radiographic techniques is essential for improving patient care, optimizing diagnostic outcomes, and guiding treatment decisions (4).

AIM

This review aims to compare traditional periapical radiography with digital radiography, specifically within the context of endodontic procedures. We analyzed key factors that affect clinical outcomes, including diagnostic accuracy, radiation exposure, image quality, cost, workflow, and patient experience. By doing so, we aim to provide a balanced assessment of both modalities, allowing clinicians to make informed decisions about the most appropriate imaging technique for their practice.

MATERIALS AND METHOD

This comparative review examined and analyzed the differences, advantages, and limitations of traditional periapical radiography (PR) and digital radiography (DR) in the context of endodontic procedures. A comprehensive literature search was conducted through online databases such as PubMed, Scopus, and Web of Science, utilizing keywords like "traditional periapical radiography," "digital radiography," "endodontics," and "comparative analysis." Studies published between 2000 and 2024 were included, with a focus on clinical trials, retrospective studies, and systematic reviews that compared both radiographic techniques in terms of diagnostic accuracy, radiation exposure, image quality, and procedural time.

Inclusion criteria consisted of studies that specifically addressed the use of periapical radiography and digital radiography in endodontic treatments such as root canal therapy, diagnosis of periapical lesions, and evaluation of post-treatment outcomes. Exclusion criteria eliminated studies that focused solely on general dental radiography or those that did not provide comparative data on both radiographic methods.

© 2024 by the authors. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) license.

The selected studies were reviewed for key parameters including image clarity, radiation dose, cost-effectiveness, patient comfort, and diagnostic performance. Data from these studies were synthesized qualitatively and quantitatively, where applicable, to identify trends and key differences between the two radiographic techniques. This synthesis allowed for an in-depth comparison of the advantages and limitations of PR and DR in endodontic practices, contributing to the overall understanding of their role in modern dental diagnostics.

Two independent reviewers assessed the studies for eligibility and extracted data. Discrepancies in data extraction were resolved through discussion and consensus.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Traditional Periapical Radiography (TPR)

Overview and Principles

Traditional periapical radiography utilizes film to capture images of the tooth and surrounding structures. The x-ray beam passes through the tissue and onto a photographic film, where a latent image is formed. The film is then chemically processed in a darkroom to produce a visible radiograph. This technology has been in use for decades and remains a mainstay in many dental practices, particularly in regions with limited access to digital equipment. TPR has been widely utilized for a variety of endodontic procedures, including the detection of root canal pathology, periapical lesions, and assessing the integrity of root structure (5).

Advantages of TPR

Cost-Effectiveness: Traditional periapical radiography is typically less expensive in terms of initial investment. The equipment required for film-based imaging (x-ray machine, film, and developing chemicals) is generally more affordable than the digital counterparts, making TPR a viable option for practices with limited budgets (6).

Widespread Availability: TPR is available in virtually all dental offices and does not require specialized equipment or software. Its use is widespread and familiar to most dental practitioners, who are accustomed to the film-based workflow.

Simplicity and Reliability: The process of taking and developing film is straightforward, and the method has been established for over a century. Clinicians are often more comfortable with traditional radiography because of its simplicity and long history in clinical practice (7).

Limitations of TPR

Higher Radiation Exposure: Traditional radiography generally requires higher doses of radiation compared to digital methods, which poses a significant concern regarding patient safety. Studies have shown that the radiation dose in film-based radiography can be two to five times higher than that in digital radiography.

Time-Consuming Development Process: The film-based process requires physical development in a darkroom, which introduces delays in obtaining diagnostic images. This slow process can be a significant limitation, especially in urgent clinical situations (8).

Image Quality Limitations: Image quality in traditional radiography can be influenced by several factors, such as film quality, exposure time, and chemical processing. Over time, films may degrade, and repeated exposures can reduce the clarity and sharpness of the images. In addition, TPR does not allow for image manipulation post-exposure, limiting its diagnostic value

Storage and Archiving Issues: Storing physical films takes up space, requires careful handling, and may degrade over time. In addition, retrieving specific films from an archive can be cumbersome, particularly in larger practices with extensive patient histories (9).

Digital Radiography (DR)

Overview and Principles

Digital radiography replaces traditional photographic film with digital sensors that convert the x-ray data directly into an electronic signal. This digital signal is then processed to generate a digital image, which is displayed on a computer screen. Digital sensors come in various forms, including direct digital sensors and phosphor plate systems, which vary in their sensitivity, resolution, and workflow integration. Digital radiography has become increasingly popular in modern dental practices due to its numerous advantages, including enhanced image quality, faster processing, and reduced radiation exposure (10).

Advantages of DR

Lower Radiation Exposure: One of the most notable benefits of digital radiography is the significant reduction in radiation exposure to the patient. Digital sensors are more sensitive than traditional film, requiring much less radiation to produce high-quality images, thereby minimizing the health risks associated with x-ray exposure.

Instant Image Availability: Digital radiography provides immediate feedback, with images available in seconds after exposure. This eliminates the need for film development, reducing waiting times and enabling quicker clinical decisions (11).

Superior Image Quality: DR produces high-resolution images with superior contrast and sharpness compared to traditional film-based radiography. Digital images can also be enhanced and manipulated (e.g., adjusting brightness, contrast, zooming in) to improve diagnostic accuracy, especially in challenging cases such as identifying subtle root fractures or periapical lesions.

Efficient Workflow and Record Keeping: Digital images can be easily stored, retrieved, and shared electronically, enhancing the workflow of dental practices. Integration with electronic health records (EHR) allows for seamless patient management, reducing the need for physical storage space and making it easier to track patient history over time.

Environmental Benefits: DR eliminates the use of harmful chemicals required in film development, making it a more environmentally friendly option compared to traditional methods. Additionally, the digital files can be backed up, reducing the risk of image loss due to physical damage (12).

Limitations of DR

High Initial Cost: While digital radiography offers many advantages, it requires a significant initial investment in digital sensors, software, and computer hardware. These costs can be prohibitive for small or start-up dental practices, especially in regions with limited access to financial resources.

Technical Issues and Maintenance: Digital radiography systems are dependent on software and hardware, which may require regular maintenance and updates. System failures, such as software crashes or sensor malfunctions, can disrupt clinical workflows and cause delays.

© 2025 by the authors. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) license.

Sensor Size and Patient Comfort: Digital sensors, particularly those used for intraoral imaging, may be bulkier than traditional film, which can lead to discomfort for patients, particularly those with smaller mouths or sensitive oral tissues. Positioning the sensor correctly may also be challenging in some clinical situations.
Learning Curve: The transition to digital radiography may require a learning curve for dental practitioners and staff. Familiarity with digital imaging software, sensor handling, and image interpretation takes time and additional training (13).

DISCUSSION

The comparison between traditional periapical radiography (TPR) and digital radiography (DR) in the context of endodontic procedures presents a nuanced examination of the strengths, limitations, and evolving role of these imaging modalities in modern dental practice. While both technologies aim to fulfill the critical function of providing diagnostic clarity and guiding treatment, digital radiography has become increasingly favored due to its distinct advantages in terms of diagnostic accuracy, radiation exposure, workflow efficiency, and patient experience. However, traditional radiography continues to maintain a strong presence, particularly in practices where budget constraints or equipment limitations persist. In this section, we will further elaborate on these factors and explore the broader implications for clinical practice, patient outcomes, and the future trajectory of endodontic imaging (14).

Diagnostic Accuracy: A Key Distinction Between TPR and DR

The primary goal of radiographic imaging in endodontics is to accurately assess the condition of the tooth and surrounding structures to guide treatment decisions. In this regard, digital radiography offers significant advantages over traditional periapical radiography. One of the most important benefits of DR is its ability to produce higher resolution images, which can highlight fine anatomical details such as root fractures, small periapical lesions, or subtle changes in bone density that might be overlooked in TPR. The higher spatial resolution of digital sensors allows for more accurate identification of these small but critical changes, which are crucial for determining the appropriate treatment plan for conditions such as root canal infections or apical periodontitis (13).
Moreover, the ability to adjust and manipulate digital images after they have been captured adds a significant layer of diagnostic flexibility. Digital radiographs can be enhanced with features such as contrast adjustment, zooming, and brightness manipulation. These adjustments can help reveal details in challenging cases, such as in patients with complicated root canal anatomy or advanced cases of periapical lesions. For example, enhancing contrast can make subtle differences in the periapical tissues more visible, providing a clearer view of infection or bone resorption that might otherwise be obscured. In contrast, traditional film-based radiographs offer no such post-capture flexibility. Once a film has been developed, it is final, and any diagnostic shortcomings due to underexposure, overexposure, or poor processing cannot be corrected.
Traditional periapical radiography, while still valuable, may struggle to provide the same level of detail in cases where precision is paramount. Small cracks in the tooth structure, which are critical to detect for proper endodontic management, might be harder to identify on film-based images due to lower resolution and less ability to fine-tune the image post-capture. Furthermore, the accuracy of traditional radiographs can be affected by various external factors, including inconsistent film exposure, improper film handling, and degradation over time, which can diminish the clarity and diagnostic value of the images (15).

Radiation Exposure: A Critical Concern for Patient Safety

The issue of radiation exposure has always been a critical concern in dental imaging. Traditional periapical radiography generally requires higher doses of radiation to produce a clear image due to the lower sensitivity of the film. This has led to ongoing concerns about the cumulative radiation exposure that patients receive over time, particularly those who require frequent imaging, such as pediatric or elderly patients. Although the radiation doses used in dental radiography are relatively low compared to other medical imaging modalities, minimizing exposure is an important principle in modern healthcare. The As Low As Reasonably Achievable (ALARA) principle is widely adopted to limit patient exposure to ionizing radiation.
Digital radiography significantly reduces radiation exposure, often by as much as 50% to 80% compared to traditional film-based methods. This reduction in radiation dose is made possible by the increased sensitivity of digital sensors. Digital sensors are more efficient at capturing x-rays and converting them into a digital signal, requiring less radiation to produce high-quality images. This is particularly important in endodontic procedures, where multiple radiographs may be necessary, such as during root canal therapy or the monitoring of periapical healing. The reduced radiation exposure not only enhances patient safety but also reduces the potential risks of long-term radiation-related health issues (16).
In clinical settings, especially those involving vulnerable patient groups, the lower radiation dose associated with digital radiography makes it the preferable option. Pediatric and geriatric patients, for example, are more susceptible to radiation-induced complications due to their age and higher sensitivity to radiation. As awareness of the potential risks of radiation exposure grows, digital radiography's lower dose profile continues to make it the preferred choice for modern dental practices.

Image Quality and Workflow Efficiency

Another key factor in evaluating the effectiveness of radiographic imaging in endodontics is image quality. As previously mentioned, digital radiography provides superior image quality compared to traditional periapical radiographs. The higher resolution of digital sensors, coupled with the ability to adjust contrast and brightness, makes digital images far more versatile and detailed. In endodontics, where precision is critical for accurate diagnosis and treatment planning, the ability to visualize small fractures, root canal anatomy, and periapical lesions is a significant advantage.
Additionally, the workflow efficiency associated with digital radiography cannot be overstated. Digital radiographs are available for review almost instantaneously after exposure, eliminating the time-consuming development process associated with traditional film-based radiography. This immediate availability of images allows clinicians to make faster treatment decisions, which is particularly beneficial in complex cases or during follow-up appointments. It also reduces the likelihood of having to retake images due to poor exposure, as images can be assessed immediately after capture and adjusted if needed (17).
The ability to instantly access digital images also improves the overall patient experience. Patients no longer need to

© 2025 by the authors. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) license.

wait for films to be developed, and the ability to review images with patients in real time enhances communication and education. Digital images can be displayed on a screen, allowing the clinician to explain the diagnosis and treatment options more effectively. This not only fosters a better understanding of the treatment plan but also contributes to a more patient-centered approach to care. Moreover, digital radiographs can be easily shared with specialists or stored in a patient's electronic health record (EHR), facilitating collaboration and long-term monitoring.

On the other hand, traditional radiography, while still capable of providing useful diagnostic information, is slower in terms of workflow. The process of developing the film requires several minutes and involves a series of manual steps in the darkroom. This introduces inefficiencies in a busy clinical environment, and the need for retakes due to underexposure or overexposure can further extend the wait time. Additionally, physical storage and retrieval of films can be cumbersome and space-consuming, especially in practices with a large patient base (18).

Cost Considerations: Balancing Initial Investment with Long-Term Savings

While the advantages of digital radiography are clear, the upfront costs associated with digital systems remain a significant barrier for many dental practices, particularly smaller or independent offices. The cost of purchasing digital sensors, software, and the necessary hardware for processing and storing digital images can be prohibitively expensive. Additionally, ongoing maintenance and updates to the digital system may require additional investment, which can be challenging for practices with limited financial resources (19).

In contrast, traditional periapical radiography has a lower initial cost, making it more accessible for practices with tight budgets. The cost of purchasing x-ray machines, film, and chemicals is relatively low, and there is no need for specialized software or digital infrastructure. However, the ongoing costs of purchasing film and chemicals, as well as the labor associated with film development, can add up over time. Moreover, the physical storage of films requires space and careful management, and films may degrade over time, necessitating replacements.

When considering the long-term costs, digital radiography often proves to be more cost-effective. Although the initial investment is high, the savings from reduced radiation exposure, quicker image processing, and elimination of film-related expenses (e.g., chemicals and physical storage) can offset the upfront costs over time. Furthermore, digital images can be stored electronically, reducing the need for physical storage space and enabling easier access to patient records. The transition to digital imaging can, therefore, be viewed as a long-term investment that ultimately leads to both financial and operational efficiencies (20).

Patient Experience and Satisfaction

Patient experience plays a critical role in the adoption of any new technology. The experience of undergoing radiographic imaging can significantly impact a patient's overall perception of care. Digital radiography offers several advantages in terms of patient comfort and satisfaction. The elimination of film processing and the rapid acquisition of digital images result in a shorter procedure time, minimizing discomfort and reducing anxiety. Patients also benefit from the enhanced communication facilitated by digital images, as clinicians can easily explain the results and treatment options on a computer screen.

In contrast, traditional radiography can be less comfortable due to the longer procedure time, the handling of film packets in the mouth, and the potential for multiple exposures in order to capture the desired image. For patients with dental anxiety, this can contribute to a less-than-optimal experience. Furthermore, the reliance on film processing means that patients must wait for their images to be developed, which can prolong their visit to the clinic.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, while traditional periapical radiography remains a valuable tool in endodontics, digital radiography is increasingly becoming the gold standard in modern dental practices due to its numerous advantages. The superior image quality, reduced radiation exposure, enhanced workflow, and patient-centered benefits of digital radiography make it a compelling choice for endodontic procedures. However, the high initial costs and potential technical issues associated with digital radiography may present challenges for some practices, particularly those with limited resources.

As digital technology continues to advance and costs continue to decrease, digital radiography is likely to become even more accessible and integrated into everyday clinical practice. Both traditional and digital radiography have their respective roles to play in endodontic diagnostics, and the decision of which modality to use should be guided by clinical needs, available resources, and patient care priorities. Ultimately, the goal of both methods is the same: to ensure accurate diagnoses, improve treatment outcomes, and enhance patient satisfaction.

REFERENCES

1. Gümrü B, Tarçın B. Imaging in Endodontics: An Overview of Conventional and Alternative Advanced Imaging Techniques. Journal of Marmara University Institute of Health Sciences. 2013 Mar 1;3(1).
2. Ee J, Fayad MI, Johnson BR. Comparison of endodontic diagnosis and treatment planning decisions using cone-beam volumetric tomography versus periapical radiography. Journal of endodontics. 2014 Jul 1;40(7):910-6.
3. Raghav N, Reddy SS, Giridhar AG, Murthy S, Devi BY, Santana N, Rakesh N, Kaushik A. Comparison of the efficacy of conventional radiography, digital radiography, and ultrasound in diagnosing periapical lesions. Oral Surgery, Oral Medicine, Oral Pathology, Oral Radiology, and Endodontology. 2010 Sep 1;110(3):379-85.
4. Farida A, Maryam E, Ali M, Ehsan M, Sajad Y, Soraya K. A comparison between conventional and digital radiography in root canal working length determination. Indian Journal of Dental Research. 2013 Mar 1;24(2):229-33.
5. Kaur K, Saini RS, Vaddamanu SK, Bavabeedu SS, Gurumurthy V, Sainudeen S, Mathew VB, Khateeb SU, Mokhlesi A, Mosaddad SA, Heboyan A. Exploring Technological Progress in Three-Dimensional Imaging for Root Canal Treatments: A Systematic Review. International Dental Journal. 2024 Jul 19.

© 2025 by the authors. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) license.

6. Ardila CM, Vivares-Builes AM, Pineda-Vélez E. Image Quality, Radiation Dose, and Patient Comfort Associated with Wireless Sensors in Digital Radiography: A Systematic Review. Dentistry Journal. 2024 Aug 20;12(8):267.
7. Khorasani MM, Ebrahimnejad H. Comparison of the accuracy of conventional and digital radiography in root canal working length determination: An invitro study. Journal of dental research, dental clinics, dental prospects. 2017;11(3):161.
8. Khan AY, Afridi FA, Iqbal K. Effect of working length measurement by electronic apex locater and digital radiography on post-operative pain dissipation. dimensions. 2021;5(5):5.
9. Goel T, Indushekar KR, Saraf BG, Sheoran N, Sardana D, Chawla M. Comparative evaluation of working length using conventional radiographic method, radiovisiography, and apex locator in single-rooted permanent teeth. Journal of Oral Health and Community Dentistry. 2021 May;15(2):50.
10. Almanei K, Alsulaimani R, Alfadda S, Albabtain S, Alsulaimani R. Digitally scanned radiographs versus conventional films for determining clarity of periapical lesions and quality of root canal treatment. The Scientific World Journal. 2017;2017(1):2427060.
11. Sharma S, Bansal M, Karol M, Singh G, Kumawat S, Akashraj P. Comparative evaluation of accuracy of cone beam computed tomography versus digital radiography in diagnosis of vertical root fractures in single rooted teeth, with different thickness parameters.
12. Akarslan ZZ, Peker I. Advances in radiographic techniques used in dentistry. InEmerging Trends in Oral Health Sciences and Dentistry 2015 Mar 11. IntechOpen.
13. Singh R, Sawnhy A, MuktaBansal SS, Paul S, Priyadarshi P. Advanced Imaging Techniques in Endodontology: A Review. History of Medicine. 2022 Sep 30;8(1):167-82.
14. Cotti E, Schirru E. Present status and future directions: Imaging techniques for the detection of periapical lesions. International Endodontic Journal. 2022 Oct;55:1085-99.
15. Karobari MI, Adil AH, Basheer SN, Murugesan S, Savadamoorthi KS, Mustafa M, Abdulwahed A, Almokhatieb AA. Evaluation of the diagnostic and prognostic accuracy of artificial intelligence in endodontic dentistry: A comprehensive review of literature. Computational and Mathematical Methods in Medicine. 2023;2023(1):7049360.
16. Alshargawi W, Toras F, Almutairi W, Fatiny F, Alhabashi Y, Alyahya F, Felimban A, Alshehri A, Almalki S. The Use of Digital Technologies in Endodontic Diagnosis and Restorative Planning.
17. Ramis-Alario A, Soto-Peñaloza D, Tarazona-Alvarez B, Peñarrocha-Diago M, Peñarrocha-Oltra D (2021) Comparison of the diagnostic efficacy of 2D radiography and cone beam computed tomography in persistent apical periodontal disease: a PRISMA-DTA systematic review and meta-analysis. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol 132:153–168.
18. Mahasneh SA, Al-Hadidi A, Kadim Wahab F, Sawair FA, AL-Rabab'ah MA, Al-Nazer S, Bakain Y, Nardi C, Cunliffe JA (2023) Cone beam CT study on the correlation between crestal bone loss and periapical disease. J Clin Med 12:2423.
19. Nardi C, Calistri L, Grazzini G, Desideri I, Lorini C, Occhipinti M, Mungai F, Colagrande S (2018) Is panoramic radiography an accurate imaging technique for the detection of endodontically treated asymptomatic apical periodontitis? J Endod 44(10):1500–1508.
20. Kanagasingam S, Lim CX, Yong CP, Mannocci F, Patel S (2017) Diagnostic accuracy of periapical radiography and cone beam computed tomography in detecting apical periodontitis using histopathological findings as a reference standard. Int Endod J 50(5):417–426.

How to Cite: Alotaibi N, Alotaibi GR, Alharthi TIK. Exploring the differences, advantages, and limitations of traditional periapical radiography versus digital radiography in endodontic procedures. *Radiol Med* 2025 Jan;19(1): 7-10

© 2025 by the authors. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) license.