4. Jones H. Autonomy and paternalism: partners or rivals? Br J Nurs 1996; 10; 5(6):378–380
5. Seedhouse D. Liberating Medicine. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons, 1991
6. Family Law Reform Act 1969. London: HMSO, 1969 s 8 (2)
7. Children Act 1989. London: HMSO, 1991 s1 (1)(3)
8. Komrad MS. A defense of medical paternalism: maximising patients' autonomy. J Med Ethics 9: 38–44
9. Gallagher SM. Paternalism in healthcare decision-making. Ostomy Wound Manage 1998; 44(4): 22, 24–25
10. Gerber L. Ethics and caring: cornerstones of nursing geriatric case management. J Gerontol Nurs 1995; 21(12): 15–19
11. Gillon R. Philosophical Medical Ethics. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons, 1985
12. Savulescu J. Rational non-interventional paternalism: why doctors ought to make judgements of what is best for their patients. J Med Ethics 1995; 21(6): 327–331
13. Madder H. Existential autonomy: why patients should make their own choices. J Med Ethics 1997; 23(4): 221–225
14. Henson RH. Analysis of the concept of mutuality. Image J Nurs Sch 1997; 29(1): 77–81
15. Woodward VM. Caring, patient autonomy and the stigma of paternalism. J Adv Nurs 1998; 28(5): 1046–1052
16. Carpenter D. Advocacy. Nursing Times (open learning supplement) 1992; 88: 26
17. Kohnke M. Advocacy: risk and reality. St Louis: CV Mosby, 1982
18. The College of Radiographers: Code of Professional Conduct. London: College of Radiographers, 1994
19. Medical Defence Union Ltd. Consent to treatment. London, 1993
20. Bolam v Friern Hospital Management Committee [1957] 2 ALL ER 118, [1957] 1 WLR 582
21. Sidaway v Board of Govenors of the Bethlem Royal Hospital [1985] AC 871, [1985] 1 ALL ER 643
22. BMA. Medical Ethics Today: Its Practice and Philosophy. London: BMA Publishing Group, 1993

## ERRATUM

The publishers apologise for the following error in the article 'A survey of in vivo diode dosimetry in the UK' by R. Appleyard (Vol 1 (2): 73–82).

On line 14 of column 2, pp. 78:

*The sentence reads –*

'Although the proprietary brand of diode detectors used in this study is not those used by the vast majority of UK users it is recognised that although the design differs the size of buid up cap is comparable and thus results can be generalised.'

*This sentence should have read –*

'The proprietary brand of diode detectors used in this study is not those used by the vast majority of UK users and it is recognised that as a consequence of differences in design the perturbation effects of Scanditronix detectors are not as great as those reported here but still in the order of 5% under similar conditions.'



https://doi.org/10.1017/S1460396999000254 Published online by Cambridge University Press