1. “Hansen AER”. **Briefly summarize this paper**.

The motivation of this paper is that the authors are conscious that alcohol abuse is a mayor public health problem. Also, prior research indicates that lowering the BAC limit from 0.10 to 0.08 has reduced traffic fatalities by up to 7.2%. The thresholds of the BAC have change all over the second half of the 20th century.

**What is his research question?**

Do BAC limits as currently administered reduce future drunk driving?

Authors objective is to estimate the effect of having a BAC over the DUI or aggravated DUI threshold on recidivism (4 years of the initial traffic stop).

**What data does he use?**

512,964 DUI BAC tests in the state of Washington from 1995 to 2011.

However, some of the analysis is done with data from 1999 to 2007 because the BAC thresholds is constant. BAC 0.08 and BAC aggravate is 0.15

**What is his research design, or “identification strategy”?**

The DUI have clear cutoffs, this permits the usage of regression discontinuity design. All the analysis is done with RDD. Involving demographic characteristics and police ex information as controls.

**What are his conclusions?**

* Having a BAC above the 0.08 threshold decreases recidivism by 2 p.p during a four-year follow-up window and is statistically significant at 1 percent level.
* Across each panel, having a BAC over the 0.08 and legal 0.15 legal limits are associated with lower recidivism rates.
* Having a Bac above the aggravated DUI threshold reduces recidivism for all potential offenders by 1.1 p.p , the ones with no prior test by 0.9 p.p and the ones with prior test by 1.9 p.p.
* Having a BAC over the DUI threshold reduces the likelihood of being involved in a future accident. Take out the effect of the suspension of the license.
* The findings support the predictions of the model of Becker of the analysis.
* 10% increase in sanctions and punishments is associated with a 2.3 percent decline in drunk driving

**Reflections**

The debate between deterrence and specific deterrence is great. Intuitively I would say that specific deterrence has bigger effects in comparison with deterrence since in many cases “you have to burn so as not to play with fire again”. Also, because if you already have specific deterrence you also have the deterrence. All of us have the second one, because refers to the future.

Until what point does the state should toughen punishments? A question for future analysis