


## CORRECTION OPEN



# Correction: Articaine in dentistry: an overview of the evidence and meta-analysis of the latest randomised controlled trials on articaine safety and efficacy compared to lidocaine for routine dental treatment

Erica Martin , Alan Nimmo, Andrew Lee and Ernest Jennings

© The Author(s) 2021

*BDJ Open* (2021)7:2; <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41405-021-00085-2>

Correction to: *BDJ Open* <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41405-021-00082-5>, published online 17 July 2021

When originally published on 17 July 2021, there was an incorrect value in the 'Articaine safety' section: 'Malamed et al.'s 2001's multi-centre trial involving the comparison of 2% lidocaine with 4% articaine on 1325 patients aged 4–8 years of age found that articaine was well-tolerated and safe for use in routine clinical dentistry' should have read 'Malamed et al.'s 2001's multi-centre trial involving the comparison of 2% lidocaine with 4% articaine on 1325 patients aged 4–80 years of age found that articaine was well-tolerated and safe for use in routine clinical dentistry.'

The authors apologise for any inconvenience caused.



**Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

© The Author(s) 2021