Questo sito utilizza cookie di Google per erogare i propri servizi e per analizzare il traffico. Il tuo indirizzo IP e il tuo agente utente sono condivisi con Google, unitamente alle metriche sulle prestazioni e sulla sicurezza, per garantire la qualità del servizio, generare statistiche di utilizzo e rilevare e contrastare eventuali abusi.

i ne Grumpy Economist

John Cochrane's blog

Friday, March 27, 2020

Daily testing

What's the perfect answer? Larry Kotklikoff has a good candidate: Daily testing.

Imagine everybody gets a test every day. Positive? Stay home and isolate. Negative? Off to work you go. It's over in a month. Nobody who is sick gets anyone else sick.

Testing includes

temperature scans, a quick chest exam by stethoscope, a quick questionnaire about Coronavirus (CV) related symptoms, multiple PCR (swab) tests, antibody tests (as soon as they are available), and saliva and urine tests if such become available.

Larry has a pretty intrusive regime in mind,

Anyone who is negative on all indicators/tests would be given a badge to wear during the day that would permit them to go work, frequent restaurants, shop, etc. Anyone who is positive on the indicators/tests would be quarantined together with their family members and have their contacts be subject to immediate tracing.

The passive voice (would be) hides a lot of questions -- who is going to do all this and how much interaction does that mean? But one needn't be so intrusive. At home tests, tests done by employers to everyone who shows up, and proper incentives would do a great deal. (If you are positive you get a free two weeks in a local empty hotel, and full salary.)

More generally, if we really can stop transmission, 100%, for just about three weeks -- so everyone who has got it now is over it -- then it's over. Full stop.

Why not? Well, because we don't have enough tests.

Like all perfect answers, I think this focuses the mind. The shutdown is costing us a trillion dollars a month. Daily testing of everyone would solve it. Why don't we have more tests? Why is the Federal government spending a trillion dollars handing out checks here and sunder, rather than a trillion dollars on one thing, test kits? (Ok, and masks, shields, and ventilators. \$500 billion each.)

More realistically still, any public health response has to include lots of random testing, so we know how many people really have it, in each town or neighborhood. If you don't have enough tests so you have to lock down, well, at least do it smart based on real data.

My understanding is that the piece, 3 hours old as I write, is out of date in its claim that the Administration does not want to test. The new letter from the Administration to governors will emphasize random testing as soon as possible, to isolate hot spots.

Posted by John H. Cochrane at 3:53 PM Labels: Commentary, pandemic

1 comment:

Pabloria March 27, 2020 at 5:53 PM

A trillion dollars? 5% of GDP? Seems excessive, is that figure correct? What do you mean by "cost"? Reply

Enter your comment	
	11
Comment as: Google Accoun	
Publish Preview	

Comments are welcome. Keep it short, polite, and on topic.

Thanks to a few abusers I am now moderating comments. I welcome thoughtful disagreement. I will block comments

About Me and This Blog

John H. Cochrane



This is a blog of news, views, and commentary, from a humorous freemarket point of view. After one too many rants at the dinner table, my kids

called me "the grumpy economist." and

hence this blog and its title. In real life I'm a Senior Fellow of the Hoover Institution at Stanford. I was formerly a professor at the University of Chicago Booth School of Business. I'm also an adjunct scholar of the Cato Institute. I'm not really grumpy by the way! View my complete profile

Subscribe To

Posts

Comments

Follow On Twitter

Follow @iohnhcochrane

Follow by Email

Email address... Submit

Follow with Feedly



Find posts by label

- Academic Articles (159)
- art (7)
- Banking (106)
- Commentary (711)
- Cronyism (53)
- Debt (12)
- econometrics (13)
- Economists (246)
- Energy (23)
- Environment (22)
- Euro (51)
- European Debt Crisis (53)
- Finance (137)
- Financial Reform (124)
- Freedom (11)
- Growth (75)
- Health economics (87)
- housing (15)
- Immigration (14)
- Inequality (50)Inflation (155)
- Interesting Papers (71)
- Interviews (16)
- Labor (13)
- Language (4)
- Macro (96)
- Micro vs. macro (37)
- Monetary Policy (248)
- negative interest rates (10)
- nepotism (9)
- Nobel (14)
- off-topic (9)

with insulting or abusive language. I'm also blocking totally inane comments. Try to make some sense. I am much more likely to allow critical comments if you have the honesty and courage to use your real name.

Home

Links to this post

Create a Link

Newer Post

Subscribe to: Post Comments (Atom)

• Op-eds (40)

- pandemic (24)Podcasts (3)
- Politics and economics (190)
- Posts to other blogs (2)
- Real Estate (2)
- Regulation (240)
- Social Programs (5)
- Stimulus (86)
- Talks (21)

Older Post

- Taxes (146)
- Teaching (11)
- Thesis topics (59)
- Trade (31)
- Trading (6)
- Unemployment (33)Videos (13)
- writing (8)

Blog Archive

- ▼ 2020 (62) ▼ March (30) Group testing Bailouts v Bankruptcy Road to Recovery: A Grumpy Virus Podcast Daily testing Reopen the economy -- but carefully! Hoover "Virtual Policy Briefing" Virus crisis tidbits -- get out of the way and dem Strategic Review and Beyond: Rethinking Monetary P... Fed Bombshell Unsung hero Needed: the reopening plan. Fast. New Virus Podcast Implementing Federal lending Groundhog Day virus plan. WSJ oped on virus policy Airline bailouts and capital regulation Unemployment insurance pandemic conundrum Monetary policy and coronavirus -- French edition The market to the rescue pandemic and protection Area 45 pandemic podcast Pandemic Podcast From pandemic to financial crisis? Bugs Rajan on Piketty Stimulus or stimu-lend? Politically allocated (aka "affordable") housing Pandemic plan Growth and Free Soloing Podcast Corona virus monetary policy February (14) January (18) ▶ 2019 (62)
- 2018 (91)
- 2017 (112)
- ► 2016 (102)
- 2015 (130)
- 2014 (131)
- 2013 (114)
- 2012 (127)
- ► 2011 (6)

Favorites and collections

- Milton Friedman Institute. (2009) A response to the faculty protest at U of C. Fun.
- Response to Paul Krugman's New York Times
 article blasting modern economics

- Writing Tips for Ph.D. Students. Do as I say not as I do
- Collections (Op-eds and similar):
- European Debt Crisis
- Asset Markets
- Financial Crisis, Regulation
- Monetary Policy, inflation • Fiscal stimulus
- Health insurance

Favorite links

- My academic webpage
 - Research
- Opeds, blog posts, media, etc.
- Teaching materials
- My soaring writing
- ssa.org Soaring, my favorite pastime
- Nepotism department:
 - elizabethfama.com Favorite children's book author
 - Sally Fama Cochrane Art Webpage
- Art, animation, comics, and music
- Booth School of Business Best business school, coincidentally my former employer
- Cato Institute My second-favorite think tank
- Economics blogs:
 - Greg Mankiw
- Econbrowser Jim Hamilton and Menzie Chinn
- Marginal Revolution Tyler Cowen
- Supply and Demand Casey Mulligan
- The last embassy Great health policy blog
- Steve Williamson A lot more than "new monetarism."

Followers



Total Pageviews

15,466,959

Copyright John H. Cochrane. Simple theme. Powered by Blogger.