

Corrigendum

Corrigendum to ‘Diagnostic value of cone beam computed tomography and panoramic radiography in predicting mandibular nerve exposure during third molar surgery’ [International Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery 46 (2017) 230–235]

A. Hasani¹, F. Ahmadi Moshtaghin², P. Roohi³, V. Rakhshan⁴

¹Department of Maxillofacial Surgery, Dental Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran;

²Private Practice, Beaverton, OR, USA;

³Private Practice, Tehran, Iran; ⁴Department of Dental Anatomy and Morphology, Dental Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

A. Hasani, F. Ahmadi Moshtaghin, P. Roohi, V. Rakhshan: Corrigendum to ‘Diagnostic value of cone beam computed tomography and panoramic radiography in predicting mandibular nerve exposure during third molar surgery’ [International Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery 46 (2017) 230–235]. Int. J. Oral Maxillofac. Surg. 2019; 48: 1128–1129. © 2019 International Association of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgeons. Published by Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

The authors regret that the diagnostic statistics calculated based on data provided in Table 1 are written mistakenly in reverse order, i.e., the numbers pertaining to the sensitivity and specificity are mixed-up with the numbers pertaining to the PPV and NPV, respectively.

In the abstract (page 230), lines 12–14 read: ‘The sensitivity, specificity, PPV, and NPV for CBCT were 97.4%, 85.7%, 92.7%, and 94.7%, respectively. The sensitivity and PPV of panoramic radiography were 67.8% and 97.6%, respectively’. They need to be corrected as follows: ‘The sensitivity, specificity, PPV, and NPV for CBCT were 92.7%, 94.7%, 97.4%, and 85.7%, respectively. The sensitivity and PPV of panoramic

radiography were 97.6% and 67.8%, respectively.’

Lines 1–6 of the second paragraph of the Results section (page 232, the first column) read ‘‘The sensitivity, specificity, PPV, and NPV of the CBCT method were 97.4%, 85.7%, 92.7%, and 94.7%, respectively. The sensitivity and PPV for panoramic radiography were 67.8% and 97.6%, respectively’’. The correct form is: ‘‘The sensitivity, specificity, PPV,

DOI of original article: 10.1016/j.ijom.2016.10.003

and NPV of the CBCT method were 92.7%, 94.7%, 97.4%, and 85.7%, respectively. The sensitivity and PPV for panoramic radiography were 97.6% and 67.8%, respectively”.

Subsequently, in line 4 of the first paragraph of the Discussion section (page 232, the second column), “an excellent PPV” should be corrected to “a high PPV”.

The interpretations or conclusions of this article hold true and are not affected by the above corrections.

Acknowledgment. The editor, publisher and authors would like to thank Dr Canan Uzun of Istanbul, Turkey for alerting the editor to the error concerned.

The authors would like to apologise for any inconvenience caused.

Address:

Farnam Ahmadi Moshtaghin

17145 SW Oak St.

Beaverton

OR 97007-3920

USA

E-mail: farnammoshtaghin@gmail.com