with the findings of Hill et al and Devereaux et al might reflect the difference in response rate, criteria for adequate concealment, readiness of the included trials, or the strategies for contacting and phrasing the questions to the investigators.

It is prudent to assume that a notable fraction of the overestimation of the treatment effect associated with unclear allocation concealment is caused by selection bias. This fraction can be reduced through several mechanisms. Journals should endorse and enforce the consolidated standards of reporting trials statement (www.consort-statement.org), which recommends explicit description of the allocation procedures in publications of trials, and the gatekeepers who sanction protocols for funding and approval should demand that adequate methods are described in protocols and implemented in trials. Furthermore, our study adds to the argument that protocols should be made publicly accessible,

because public access would increase the reliability of critical appraisal of the fraction of trials where the protocol does describe methods for allocation concealment.
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Correction: in the eighth Minerva item, we mistakenly moved Proimos reported cannabis as a class B drug, thus failing to reflect the recent reclassification of the drug (BMJ 2005;330:777-80, 2 Apr). The authors would like to make clear that their study was conducted over consecutive sessions during June and during December 2003 (not, as we stated, from June to December).

ABC of adolescence: Substance misuse: alcohol, tobacco, inhalants, and other drugs

This article by Yvonne Bonomo and Jenny Proimos reported cannabis as a class B drug, thus failing to reflect the recent reclassification of the drug. In January 2004, cannabis was reclassified as a class C drug across the United Kingdom.

Minerva

In the eighth Minerva item, we mistakenly moved the Swiss philosopher Charles Bonnet from Geneva to Genoa (BMJ 2005;330:777-80, 2 Apr). In January 2004, cannabis was reclassified as a class C drug across the United Kingdom.