1. Which did you find most compelling about the "price of life" readings

a) unintended consequences of HIV testing the entire US population
b) unintended consequences of raising plane tickets to improve air traffic safety versus car accident statistics
c) costs per life saved of asbestos removal versus pap smears
d) poverty and lack of education can lead to reduced options/poorer decisions regarding personal health (and correlation to an earlier death)
e) personal risk—"weight, exercise, sex, drugs, smoking, and investments"

Deciding Public Policy

The problem with testing the entire US population for HIV is that

a) a positive result becomes relatively meaningless on its own because of all the false positives

b) other

Image Credit: Linda Cai http://cdn1.theodysseyonline.com/files/2015/07/20/

635730278800703110204526443_price-of-life-by-linda-cai.png

Deciding Public Policy

The problem with testing the entire US population for HIV is that

a) a positive result becomes relatively meaningless on its own because of all the false positives

b) other

What it does at least somewhat reveal is to change the probability that a person is HIV-positive from roughly 3 in 1000 (general population) to roughly 1 in 4 true positives in the test (but 3 in 4 would be false positives). Testing other populations would require a different analysis.

Image Credit: Linda Cai

- What are the pros and cons of HIV testing all of the US? all of Swaziland? of other populations?

  —If a test is 95% accurate for people who have a disease then it correctly tests positive 95% of the time, but incorrectly tests negative for them 100%-95%= 5% of the time (false negative). *Sensitivity* is .95.

  –If a test is 99% accurate for people who don't have a disease then it correctly tests negative 99% of the time, but incorrectly tests positive for them 1% of the time (false positive). *Specificity* is .99.

	Test+	Test-
Person is HIV +	HIV+ people $\times$ probability they test +	
Person is HIV -	# of false positives	
Total		