



Recent additions and changes to this site

[Cutting through the controversy about helmet effectiveness](#)

Analysis by Piet de Jong shifts the focus of the helmet debate onto the arguments about the degree to which the large health benefits of cycling outweigh the far smaller risks involved. de Jong uses mathematical modelling to show that even under the most optimistic predictions of helmet benefit, the net public health outcome of helmet promotion (or laws) is negative.

[Bias in older research, no net benefit from helmets in later studies](#)

Rune Elvik, from the Norwegian Institute of Transport Economics, uses the latest methodologies to identify bias and conflict of interest in older helmet research that has greatly exaggerated the benefits. Analysing more recent studies, any benefit vanishes entirely.

[Alberta law halves children's cycling but more than doubles the risk of injury](#)

Published data from across Alberta shows how the province's child helmet law has reduced child cycling by around 56% while at the same time the absolute number of injuries has gone up.

[Alcohol: obscuring the outcomes of helmet research?](#)

Could many of the predicted benefits of cycle helmets be more accurately attributed to staying sober, as links between drinking and serious injury become clearer? It just so happens that most drunk cyclists don't wear helmets.

[Bike hire schemes revisited](#)

An update on bike rental, with and without helmets

[The health benefits of cycling](#) More information added on health benefits versus risks, citing latest research. Also our commentary on [Health on the Move 2](#), a landmark report on transport and health that strongly promotes cycling as a low-risk activity that could do much to enhance public health.

[Cycling fatalities, Great Britain](#). Additional data and graph added.

What is the [relative risk of head injury](#) when cycling compared with other everyday activities?

[Why are Dutch cyclists more likely to be injured if they wear helmets?](#)

The Netherlands is the safest country in the world in which to cycle and very few people wear helmets. However, when cyclists go to hospital, they are much more likely to be helmeted. Why?

[Cost-benefit analysis of British Columbia law](#)

Analysis by John shows that the benefits of BC's helmet law would outweigh the costs only if the reduction in cycling brought about by the law was no more than 0.4% to 1.75%. In practice the deterrent to cycling has been much greater than this and costs have much exceeded the benefits.

[UK law would lead to 253 more deaths](#) according to assessment using WHO HEAT tool, while Government research finds [no reliable evidence of helmet benefit](#).

[Misleading research](#) – why it may be unwise to accept an author's conclusions at face value.

[Errors and omissions in Canadian research group's bicycle helmet papers](#)

Key research into helmet law impact on cycle use does not stand up to scrutiny.

The Bicycle Helmet Research Foundation (BHRF), an incorporated body with an international membership, exists to undertake, encourage and spread the scientific study of the use of bicycle helmets. Also to consider the effect of the promotion and use of helmets on the perception of cycling in terms of risk and the achievement of wider public health and societal goals.



BHRF strives to provide a resource of best-available factual information to assist the understanding of a complex subject, and one where some of the reasoning may conflict with received opinion. In particular BHRF seeks to provide access to a wider range of information than is commonly made available by those that take a strong helmet promotion stance. It is hoped that this will assist informed judgements about the pros and cons of cycle helmets.

For more information, please visit www.cyclehelmets.org.

Document downloaded 29 May 2017. The copyright in this document is owned by the Bicycle Helmet Research Foundation, but it may be reproduced or distributed freely so long as the content is not modified in any way.