HTM 01-05 battle continues after BDA claims
British Dental Association calls for evidence to be examined by NICE

The British Dental Association (BDA) has made the bizarre claim that the Department of Health's (DH) chief dental officer has refused to publish documentation on contamination he has already committed to publishing in a letter to the British Dental Journal - to publishing if required.

In a letter to the DH, the BDA has renewed its 2007 request for a full review of the evidence-base for the HTM 01-05 guidance document on decontamination in dental surgeries.

The BDA claims that three areas of the guidance have been amended before printing the document, which includes permission to use potable water for the rinse stage of decontamination. The BDA claims this is a climb-down from the previously intended requirement for reverse osmosis and freshly distilled water.

The association also objects to an increase in the period during which instruments can be stored after processing in a validated vacuum sterilizer, from 50 to 60 days.

It also drew attention to the revision of the requirement for two sinks for decontamination, to allowing two bowls in a single unit.
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The association also claims that concern about these changes has been heightened by a consistent failure by the DH to publish references for the document's evidence-base.