One of the most useful parts of the book are the appendices to Chapter 4 where he develops not only the population attributable risk but also the population impact of eliminating a risk factor and useful concepts such as ‘number to be treated in your population (NTP)’ and ‘number of events prevented in your population (NEPP)’.

This is a very useful and clearly written book, which should be included in every public health course.

---


This is a really useful information pack produced by a prominent team of social and health geographers who have helped put inequalities on the map (so to speak) outside academia. It contains five posters and 10 short reports all looking at different aspects of inequality in contemporary Britain as recorded by the 2001 Census. These broadly reflect the five ‘Giant Evils’ identified by Beveridge when proposing the post-war welfare state: disease, ignorance, squalor, idleness, and want. A technical report is also included; this details the methods behind the project and provides additional data. It has been developed as part of a Joseph Rowntree Foundation funded project looking at place and social inequality. The pack will be of particular use to those who teach about inequality and the social determinants of health as it is very accessible and well presented.

The five posters on poverty, employment, housing, education, and health intersperse geographically mapped data from the 2001 Census with photographic representations and headline descriptive data. The colourful posters provide a clear pictorial image of the geographic nature of inequalities in the UK. The health poster focuses on the percentage of the population with poor health and limiting long-term illness, and also draws attention to the inverse care law. However, the posters are stand-alone items and this means that they are unfortunately unable to show the inter-connectedness of the different themes such as employment rates and poverty. The focus on geographic inequalities highlights the North–South divide, but the underlying socioeconomic class basis to this divide is less evident and there is little in the accompanying text to explain the dense pockets of inequality surrounding the former heavy industrial areas such as the North-East and South Wales.

The 10 short reports do provide more of this sort of inter-connectedness and offer a more detailed level of statistical information presented in a user friendly way. They cover healthcare provision, health, education, housing, work, car ownership, and informal care provision by young people. The two health reports focus on inequalities in paid healthcare, drawing attention to the inverse care law by correlating provision against need across the UK, and on the provision of informal care in which it is suggested a positive care law operates. While this perhaps makes for a neat comparison, the focus on informal care under the heading of ‘sickness and health’ is rather surprising, not least as one of the 10 reports is about young carers and the poverty poster similarly focuses on carers. Informal care is a dominant theme within the pack. In placing informal care under the heading of ‘healthcare’, whereas informal care is usually considered to be a substitute for social care. Nonetheless, the familiar patterns emerge and the contrasting levels of provision of formal and informal care are highlighted when the reports are read together. There is also a historical perspective to the reports—evidence from the 2001 Census is compared with that from the 1901 Census. This highlights the fact that while there have been overall improvements in living conditions in the UK, inequalities by area and socioeconomic class still persist.

Overall, the pack provides a good introductory teaching resource, which makes the findings of the 2001 Census available to a diverse audience, and the bold posters will certainly brighten up the walls of any seminar room.

---
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