

Exercise walk-through

1.6

Interpreting health-risk data and studies (statements 1.15–1.18)

Pearson Edexcel · International A-Level · Biology

Atheroma, clot, catastrophe

Damage : smoking, hypertension, LDL cholesterol harm the endothelium

Plaque : inflammation and LDL deposition narrow and stiffen the artery

Clot : thromboplastin converts prothrombin to thrombin; fibrinogen becomes fibrin

Read a health study like an examiner

Your turn

Gum disease correlates with endothelial damage. List three checks before claiming causation.

- A. Who was sampled, how selected, how many?
- B. Were confounders like smoking, age, diet controlled?
- C. Is there a mechanism and a dose-response pattern?

DNA copies itself semi-conservatively

Unzip : helicase breaks the hydrogen bonds between the strands

Template : each old strand pairs with free nucleotides by complementary base pairing

Join : DNA polymerase links the nucleotides into a new strand

Exercises 2.1·2.3

2.1 State the difference between correlation and causation. [2]

2.2 Give two examples of confounders in a study linking coffee drinking to heart disease. [2]

2.3 A study reports “30 % of participants who took vitamin C developed colds, compared with 32 % of those who did not.” Comment on the size of this difference. [2]

Exercises 2.1·2.3

2.1 State the difference between correlation and causation. [2]

2.1 Correlation: two variables change together in the data. Causation: changes in one directly produce changes in the other – which needs more evidence than association alone.

2.2 Give two examples of confounders in a study linking coffee drinking to heart disease.[2]

2.2 Any two of: smoking, age, stress, diet overall, income, physical activity – factors linked to both coffee habits and heart disease.

2.3 A study reports “30 % of participants who took vitamin C developed colds, compared with 32 % of those who did not.” Comment on the size of this difference. [2]

2.3 The difference (2 percentage points) is very small relative to the group sizes and is likely within chance variation; without confidence intervals or a significance test no conclusion can be drawn.

Exercise 3.1

3.1 The table shows deaths per 100 000 people from coronary heart disease in a country over four decades.

Decade	Men	Women
1980s	410	180
1990s	330	140
2000s	240	110
2010s	170	80

Calculate the percentage decrease for men between the 1980s and 2010s, compare it with the decrease for women over the same period, and suggest two explanations for the fall that a health authority could claim credit for.

[6]

Exercise 3.1

3.1 The table shows deaths per 100 000 people from coronary heart disease in a country over four decades.

Decade	Men	Women
1980s	410	180
1990s	330	140
2000s	240	110
2010s	170	80

Calculate the percentage decrease for men between the 1980s and 2010s, compare it with the decrease for women over the same period, and suggest two explanations for the fall that a health authority could claim credit for. [6]

3.1 Men: $(410 - 170)/410 \times 100 = 58.5 \approx 59\%$ decrease. Women: $(180 - 80)/180 \times 100 \approx 56\%$ – similar scale. Explanations: statin and blood-pressure treatment lowering LDL and hypertension at population scale; smoking bans and health education reducing smoking; (accept improved emergency treatment keeping people alive, or screening).

Exercises 3.2·3.3

3.2 A newspaper headline says “Eating breakfast cereal makes children taller.” The study behind it surveyed 2 000 children aged 7–11 and found cereal eaters were on average 3 cm taller. Give three questions you would ask about the study design before accepting the causal claim, and explain how each could produce the observed association without cereal causing growth. [6]

3.3 A trial of a new statin assigns 5 000 patients randomly to statin or identical placebo; neither patient nor doctor knows which. After five years, LDL-cholesterol is 32 % lower in the statin group and heart attacks are 18 % fewer. Explain why the random assignment and double-blinding allow a causal claim here, unlike the survey in 3.2. [5]

Exercises 3.2-3.3

3.2 A newspaper headline says “Eating breakfast cereal makes children taller.” The study behind it surveyed 2 000 children aged 7–11 and found cereal eaters were on average 3 cm taller. Give three questions you would ask about the study design before accepting the causal claim, and explain how each could produce the observed association without cereal causing growth. [6]

3.2 Any three well-explained: Who were the cereal eaters – richer families? Better overall nutrition would make them taller for reasons beyond cereal. Was total diet or income recorded? Cereal may simply mark a better-fed household. Height measured how, and by whom, with the same instrument for all? Measurement bias could inflate a small gap. Reverse timing: taller children may eat more breakfast, not vice versa.

3.3 A trial of a new statin assigns 5 000 patients randomly to statin or identical placebo; neither patient nor doctor knows which. After five years, LDL-cholesterol is 32 % lower in the statin group and heart attacks are 18 % fewer. Explain why the random assignment and double-blinding allow a causal claim here, unlike the survey in 3.2. [5]

3.3 Random assignment balances known and unknown confounders between the groups, so the groups differ only in treatment. Blinding prevents expectation effects – patients reporting differently and doctors treating differently. With LDL measured 32 % lower and events 18 % fewer against a matched control group, the difference is attributable to the statin.