Every day thousands of individuals need to make critical decisions about their health based on numerical information, yet recent surveys have found that over half the population of the USA is unable to complete basic math problems. How does this lack of numerical ability (also referred to as low numeracy, quantitative illiteracy, or statistical illiteracy) impact healthcare? What can be done to help people with low numeracy skills? *Numerical Reasoning in Judgments and Decision Making about Health* addresses these questions by examining and explaining the impact of quantitative illiteracy on healthcare and in specific healthcare contexts, and discussing what can be done to reduce these healthcare disparities. This book will be a useful resource for professionals in many health fields including academics, policy makers, physicians, and other healthcare providers.
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