

outcome (this being the *application* of any knowledge gained) for whichever CPD activity, produces safer or better *treatment outcomes for patients*.

It seems bizarre that in some situations even when the majority of questions are wrongly answered based on a CPD programme on a computer (even with all the information straight in front of one) hours of verifiable CPD can still be rewarded. These rewards for failure can be gained with each issue of many journals. That seems to me to be not just wrong, but senseless and should not be allowed to

continue. It would do nothing to reassure a cynical public if they really knew that this sort of verifiable CPD tokenism was rife. The *BDJ* and other journals granting such certificates need to be very aware of potentially very real 'brand damage' if this practice is allowed to continue.

Various correspondents have questioned the daftness of the current position on several occasions and in different arenas over the years, making valid points which deserve to be widely debated and many of which should be adopted. That laudable approach would hopefully lead to a more

satisfactory outcome for all concerned by virtue of dentists being then able to better demonstrate that they at least comprehended the messages before, hopefully, applying these sound dental principles, learnt or reinforced, by whichever type of reliable or appropriate CPD activity that the individual chooses.

In that way, a cynical public might be more reassured of the general honesty, integrity and trustworthiness of the dental profession at large in relationship to CPD.

1. Hancocks S. Does D put the dilemma in CPD? *Br Dent J* 2012; 212: 461.

Erratum

Research article (*BDJ* 2012; 213: E6)

'NICE guideline and current practice of antibiotic prophylaxis for high risk cardiac patients (HRCP) among dental trainers and trainees in the United Kingdom (UK)'

In the above research article, all four mentions of the unit 'mg' relating to the dosage of amoxicillin should instead have read 'g', ie the amoxicillin dosages referred to throughout should have been grams not milligrams.