

**1. Do you agree that the revision to the standard will provide greater clarity and certainty for dental practitioners to work within their scope of practice? (Why or why not?)**

I believe it is important to have strict rules and guidelines set in place for all dental practitioners. This way there will be no confusion as to what practices each professional can undertake. Personally, I am quite concerned about this revised scope of practice for dental therapists. From my understanding, there is already an excess number of dental professionals. Surely this revision will just inundate the workforce even more?

I feel legal and ethical issues may arise.

**2. Do you agree that the introduction of the guidelines further supports this clarity for dental practitioners and the public? (Why or why not?)**

As discussed above, clarity is crucial. There needs to be a standardized system across all states.

**3. Do you agree with the list of skills in the guidelines relating to programs to extend scope? Are there additional skills which the National Board should consider adding to the list?**

The revision as the currently stand are not succinct or clear. When practicing, how will an OHT distinguish between extensive and non-extensive decay (as it is under-emphasised on diagnostic imaging devices)? Where will the lines be drawn? Currently it seems if an OHT feels competent, they would be able to perform surgical root planing and debridement.

Dentists have undergone more extensive training. Competency needs to be established prior to allowing OHT's to increase their scope of practice.

**4. Does the preferred proposal balance the need to protect the public with the needs of regulating the profession? (Why or why not?)**

I am concerned at what role general dentists will play in the management of general complaints of the public if this goes through in the near future.