

EVALUATING AND COMMUNICATING

A study paper by the British Union
for the Abolition of Vivisection
has found:



19 of 20 substances judged to be safe in humans actually caused cancer in rodents.

Over 1000 potential treatments for stroke have been tested in animal models, only approximately 100 of these have been tested in human trials, and all of them failed.

A review by the drug industry of animal experiments found that tests on rats and mice only predicted 43% of human side effects.

The disastrous effects of a drug called thalidomide in the 1960s is often used as a strong reason why we have to test on animals. However, a review of these animal tests found that they only accurately predicted damage around 50% of the time. No better than flicking a coin.

We are bombarded with data every day; it is important that we can understand the data, and reflect on what it means to us.

What percentage of the substance judged to be safe in humans caused cancer in rodents?

The reference to 'flicking a coin' is used, can you think of a good reason for comparing in this way?

Why might we question some of the data given above?

In which other subjects would you extract and communicate data?