Re: Safety in Numbers

Source: http://newsgroups.derkeiler.com/Archive/Uk/uk.rec.cycling/2008−09/msg00726.html

- *From*: Mike Clark <mrc7@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Wed, 10 Sep 2008 11:48:21 +0100

In message <a3d607a3−903d−4633−ba2c−3b6986086b41@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
Toom Tabard <toom@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

[snip]

> But, since you refer to populations, does that safety assertion about
> walking hold when comparing the age and fitness range of the cyclist
> population with the figures for pedestrians of the same age and
> fitness, and in the places where most people walk?

It's clear that there are age related factors that affect many risks in life. For example young men are much more at immediate risk of death from violence than older men, whilst older men are more at immediate risk from disease. Sure, the individual risk varies over time, but do you really think that there is such a huge difference in the risks from cycling verses walking that it must all be accounted for by a huge difference in the age and fitness of the participants (given that the calculated risk at a population level is not very different)?

In the UK only a minority of people regularly cycle these days, but in some other countries such as Denmark the percentage of cyclists is much higher, and thus the population that cycles is similar to the population that walks. I'm not aware that the data from Denmark is markedly different when comparing risks for pedestrians versus cyclists, as compared to the UK.

Mike
−−
M.R. Clark PhD, Reader in Therapeutic and Molecular Immunology
Cambridge University, Department of Pathology
Tennis Court Road, Cambridge CB2 1QP
Tel +44 (0)1223 333705 Web http://www.path.cam.ac.uk/~mrc7/
.