

# 1 How to quantify deaths averted derived from interrupted time-series 2 analyses

3 Huan Jiang, PhD <sup>1,2</sup>, Alexander Tran, PhD <sup>1</sup>, Gerhard Gmel, PhD <sup>1,3,4</sup>, Shannon Lange, PhD <sup>1,5</sup>,  
4 Jakob Manthey, PhD <sup>6-8</sup>, Robin Room, PhD <sup>9,10</sup>, Pol Rovira, MSc <sup>11</sup>, Mindaugas Štelemėkas, PhD  
5 <sup>12,13</sup>, Tadas Telksnys, PhD <sup>12</sup>, Jürgen Rehm, PhD <sup>1-2, 5-6, 11, 15-17</sup>

6  
7 <sup>1.</sup> Institute for Mental Health Policy Research, Centre for Addiction and Mental Health, 33  
8 Ursula Franklin Street, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, M5S 2S1

9 <sup>2.</sup> Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, 155 College Street, Toronto, ON,  
10 M5T 1P8, Canada

11 <sup>3.</sup> Addiction Medicine, Department of Psychiatry, Lausanne University Hospital and University  
12 of Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland

13 <sup>4.</sup> Department of Health and Social Sciences, University of the West of England, Bristol, UK

14 <sup>5.</sup> Campbell Family Mental Health Research Institute, Centre for Addiction and Mental Health,  
15 33 Ursula Franklin Street, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, M5T 2S1

16 <sup>6.</sup> Institute of Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy & Center of Clinical Epidemiology and  
17 Longitudinal Studies (CELOS), Technische Universität Dresden, Chemnitzer Str. 46, 01187  
18 Dresden, Germany

19 <sup>7.</sup> Center for Interdisciplinary Addiction Research (ZIS), Department of Psychiatry and  
20 Psychotherapy, University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf (UKE), Martinstraße 52,  
21 20246 Hamburg, Germany

- 22 <sup>8.</sup> Department of Psychiatry, Medical Faculty, University of Leipzig, Semmelweisstraße 10,  
23 04103 Leipzig, Germany
- 24 <sup>9.</sup> Centre for Alcohol Policy Research, Building NR-1, La Trobe University, Plenty Rd. x  
25 Kingsbury Rd., Bundoora, Victoria 3086, Australia
- 26 <sup>10.</sup> Centre for Social Research on Alcohol and Drugs, Department of Public Health Sciences,  
27 Stockholm University, 3rd floor, Sveavägen 160, 113 46 Stockholm, Sweden.
- 28 <sup>11.</sup> Program on Substance Abuse, Public Health Agency of Catalonia, 81-95 Roc Boronat St.,  
29 08005, Barcelona, Spain
- 30 <sup>12.</sup> Health Research Institute, Faculty of Public Health, Lithuanian University of Health Sciences,  
31 Tilžės str. 18, 47181 Kaunas, Lithuania
- 32 <sup>13.</sup> Department of Preventive Medicine, Faculty of Public Health, Lithuanian University of  
33 Health Sciences, Tilžės str. 18, 47181 Kaunas, Lithuania
- 34 <sup>14.</sup> World Health Organization / Pan American Health Organization Collaborating Centre,  
35 Centre for Addiction and Mental Health, 33 Ursula Franklin Street, Toronto, Ontario,  
36 Canada, M5S 2S1
- 37 <sup>15.</sup> Faculty of Medicine, Institute of Medical Science, University of Toronto, Medical Sciences  
38 Building, 1 King's College Circle, Room 2374, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, M5S 1A8
- 39 <sup>16.</sup> Department of Psychiatry, University of Toronto, 250 College Street, 8th floor, Toronto,  
40 Ontario, Canada, M5T 1R8
- 41 <sup>17.</sup> Department of International Health Projects, Institute for Leadership and Health  
42 Management, I.M. Sechenov First Moscow State Medical University, Trubetskaya str., 8, b.  
43 2, 119992, Moscow, Russian Federation

44

45 JR acknowledges funding from the Canadian Institutes of Health Research, Institute of  
46 Neurosciences, and Mental Health and Addiction (CRISM Ontario Node grant no. SMN-13950).  
47 Research reported in this publication was also supported by the National Institute on Alcohol  
48 Abuse and Alcoholism of the National Institutes of Health (NIAAA) [Award Number  
49 1R01AA028224-01].

50

51 Corresponding author: H. Jiang

52 Address: Centre for Addiction and Mental Health, 33 Ursula Franklin Street, Room T420,

53 Toronto, Ontario, Canada, M5S 2S1; Tel: + 416-535-8501 Ext 36173

54 Email: [hedy.jiang@utoronto.ca](mailto:hedy.jiang@utoronto.ca)

55

56 Abstract

57 Background

58 Interrupted time series (ITS) are an important tool for determining whether alcohol control  
59 policies, as well as other policy interventions, are successful over and above secular trends or  
60 chance. Subsequent to estimating whether a policy has had an effect, quantifying the key  
61 outcomes, such as the number of prevented deaths, is of primary practical importance. The  
62 current paper compares the results of two different methodological approaches to quantify  
63 deaths averted using different two standard populations.

64 Methods

65 Time series methodologies were used to estimate the effect size in deaths averted of a  
66 substantial increase in excise taxation in Lithuania in 2017. We compare the impact of a) using  
67 ITS methodology vs. fitting the trend before the intervention to predict the following 12 months  
68 and comparing the predicted monthly estimates of deaths with the actual numbers; and b)  
69 adjusting the time series either using the World Health Organization standard or the age  
70 distribution of Lithuania in the month before the intervention. The effect was estimated by sex.

71 Results

72 The increase in excise taxation was associated with a substantial decrease in all-cause mortality  
73 in all models considered. ITS methodology and using the age-distribution of Lithuania were  
74 consistently associated with higher estimates of deaths averted. Although confidence and  
75 prediction intervals were highly overlapping, the point estimates differed substantially. The  
76 taxation increase was associated with 1,155 deaths averted in the year following the  
77 intervention (95% prediction interval: 729, 1,582), corresponding to 2.80% of all deaths in

78 Lithuania in the respective year, for the model selected as best for planning policy interventions  
79 in Lithuania.

80 Conclusions

81 Fitting a time series model for the time until the intervention, and then comparing the  
82 predicted time points with the actual mortality, standardizing to country-specific weights, was  
83 chosen as the best way to derive practically relevant effect sizes.

84 Keywords or phrases (max 5):

85 Alcohol – all-cause mortality – taxation – interrupted time series – effect size

86

87 Introduction

88 Alcohol use has been identified as a major risk factor for the global burden of mortality and  
89 morbidity in all comparative risk analyses to date ((Rehm and Imtiaz, 2016); for latest efforts,  
90 see (Shield et al., 2020, GBD 2019 Risk Factors Collaborators, 2020, World Health Organization,  
91 2018)). Fortunately, effective evidence-based alcohol control policies, such as the World Health  
92 Organization’s (WHO) “best buys” for alcohol (increase in taxation, reduction of availability of  
93 alcoholic beverages, and a ban on advertisement) (World Health Organization, 2017), can  
94 protect population health and save lives, thereby reducing health care costs and increasing  
95 productivity (Babor, 2010).

96         Given that the impact of regulatory and public policy initiatives cannot usually be tested  
97 through traditional randomized controlled trial designs, well-selected, -designed, and -analyzed  
98 natural experiments are the method of choice when examining the effects of such enactments  
99 on a variety of outcomes (Craig et al., 2017, Dunning, 2012, Shadish et al., 2002). The classic  
100 methodology for such evaluations is interrupted time-series analysis (ITS), which is considered  
101 as one of the quasi-experimental designs that use both pre- and post-policy data without  
102 randomization (Beard et al., 2019). Subsequent to estimating whether a policy has had an  
103 effect over and above secular trends and chance (Shadish et al., 2002), a quantification of the  
104 effect size in tangible units, such as the number of prevented cases/deaths, often is of primary  
105 practical importance, as this information is key for future decisions aiming to maximize public  
106 health promotion and mitigate alcohol-related harms. In time-series analyses, there are two

107 main types of effect-size estimates that describe the impact of the policy: first, level change,  
108 and second, slope change (Bernal et al., 2016).

109 In public health, the estimation of the number of prevented cases/deaths should take  
110 age into consideration, as most health indicators such as mortality rate or prevalence of disease  
111 are highly associated with age. However, the population structure often changes during the  
112 period used in the time-series analysis to evaluate the impact of an intervention, so age-  
113 standardization, i.e., weighting age-specific rates based on a synthetic or other standard  
114 population (Statistics Canada, 2020) is used to make the time points comparable. However, an  
115 estimate of deaths based on a standard population weighted heavily towards older age groups  
116 would result in a higher number of deaths, while an estimate of deaths based on a standard  
117 population weighted towards younger people would shift the results toward a lower number of  
118 deaths. Thus, the estimated effect of an intervention policy may be impacted by the standard  
119 population chosen.

120 In the current paper, we will focus on the translation of results from ITS into tangible  
121 results such as deaths averted. We will compare the impact of two different methodological  
122 approaches to quantify deaths averted using different standard populations, resulting in four  
123 different estimates. The example used will be the implementation of a substantial increase in  
124 excise taxes in Lithuania in 2017 and its effect on the reduction of adult (20+ years of age) all-  
125 cause mortality. In detail, on March 1, 2017, there were marked increases in excise taxes - 111-  
126 112% for fermented beverages, wines and beer; 91-94% for intermediate products (such as  
127 fortified wines); and 23% for ethyl alcohol (applying for spirits) - reducing the affordability of  
128 alcohol (Rehm et al., 2021). As shown elsewhere, this alcohol control policy resulted in a

129 substantial decrease in alcohol mortality rates, especially for men (Štelemėkas et al., 2021).

130 The aim of this paper will be to quantify this effect into deaths averted in the year after its

131 implementation, based on different methodologies.

132

## 133 Methods

### 134 Time of investigation and data sources

135 We used month-by-month age-standardized sex-specific mortality rates for Lithuania from  
136 January 2000 to December 2019 as the basis for the ITS. The number of deaths was obtained  
137 from the Lithuanian Institute of Hygiene, and the population breakdown by sex and age was  
138 obtained from Statistics Lithuania (Lithuanian Department of Statistics, 2021).

### 139 Age-standardization

140 In order to age-standardize all-cause mortality rates for people over 20 years of age, the age-  
141 specific Lithuanian mortality rates (in 10-year-intervals) were weighted by 1) the WHO global  
142 standard (Ahmad et al., 2001), and 2) the age distribution of the Lithuanian population in  
143 February 2017, the month before the taxation increase (obtained from Statistics Lithuania  
144 (Lithuanian Department of Statistics, 2021).

### 145 Estimating the Intervention Effect

146 The time-series analyses were conducted using generalized additive models (GAMs (Beard et  
147 al., 2019, Hastie and Tibshirani, 1990); see also description in the Appendix), which were

148 adjusted for seasonality by smoothing splines. The association of all-cause mortality with the  
149 increase in excise taxes for alcohol was our main interest, but for comparison reasons we based  
150 our analyses on the paper of Štelemėkas and colleagues (Štelemėkas et al., 2021), where  
151 several policies were compared, and thus entered the same set into the model (for selection of  
152 policies, see (Rehm et al., 2021)). All policies were coded as abrupt permanent effects, i.e.,  
153 assigning a value of 0 for all months preceding the implementation and a value of 1 for months  
154 after. Potential confounding factors included centered monthly gross domestic product (GDP),  
155 centered unemployment rate, and a second-order polynomial of the time to account for the  
156 overall curvilinear trend in all-cause mortality. The final models were determined based on the  
157 following criteria: a) adjustment for at least one economic indicator (GDP or unemployment  
158 rate); b) independence and presence of non-stationarity in residuals (checked with residual  
159 plots and confirmed by the augmented Dickey-Fuller test); c) model-fitting statistics (AIC and  
160 BIC) and likelihood ratio test of nested models for superior models.

161 The policy intervention effect was estimated with two different methods. (1) We  
162 applied the standard way of a simple multiplication of the effect of the intervention in the ITS,  
163 where the beta-weight for the effect on the age-standardized mortality rate is multiplied by the  
164 average population for the 12 months following the intervention. (2) For the second method,  
165 we followed a three-step approach:

166 **Step 1:** Use the data **before** the intervention point to determine the optimal GAM model for  
167 the series.

168       **Step 2:** Use that GAM model to forecast mortality rates for 12 months after the  
169       intervention. For each month, the forecasted mortality rates and their 95% prediction  
170       intervals (PIs) were calculated assuming that the forecast errors were normally distributed.

171       **Step 3:** The differences in mortality rates between actual values and forecast values after  
172       the intervention were multiplied by the corresponding population, resulting in an estimate  
173       of the absolute numbers of deaths being averted for each month. The sum of those  
174       absolute numbers was considered to be the estimated averted death for the year after the  
175       intervention, whose standard deviation was calculated by taking the square root of the  
176       combined variances, assuming independence between monthly data points. The 95% PI  
177       was further calculated assuming the forecast errors being normally distributed.

178               Both methods were applied to women and men separately. The effect for the total  
179       population was estimated in two ways. First, by adding the results for women and men  
180       together (as reported in the Tables), and, second, for a sensitivity analysis by estimating the  
181       effect based on the time series of the total mortality rate. We used two underlying standard  
182       populations: the WHO standard population, which is based on the global age distribution with  
183       higher weights for younger age groups ((Ahmad et al., 2001); 87.41% of the age group 20 and  
184       older between ages 20 and 64), and the Lithuanian population distribution of the month before  
185       the intervention ((Lithuanian Department of Statistics, 2021); 75.79% of the age group 20 and  
186       older are between ages 20 and 64)). Both age-distributions used as a standard can be found in  
187       the Appendix Table A.4.

188 All analyses were performed using R version 4.0.4. (The Comprehensive R Archive  
189 Network (CRAN), 2021).


190

## 191 Results

192 Overall, all-cause mortality decreased during the period 2001 to 2018 (see Appendix  
193 Table A.1). As reported in detail elsewhere (Štelemėkas et al., 2021), when using the WHO  
194 standard population, the effect size of the 2017 policy was estimated to be -11.07 (95% CI: -  
195 18.88, -3.37) for men, compared to an estimate of -14.16 (95% CI: -26.65, -1.67) using the  
196 Lithuania population as of February 2017 as the standard (see Appendix Table A.4 for details).  
197 Simply applying these effect sizes to the average population of Lithuania in the year after the  
198 taxation increase (March 2017 to February 2018) resulted in 1,344 (95% CI: 397, 2,290), and  
199 1,718 (95% CI: 203, 3,232) averted deaths among men, respectively (Table 1).

200 When using the above-described methodology of fitting a time-series analysis until  
201 February 2017, and then deriving the number of deaths averted by subtracting the estimated  
202 deaths in each of the 12 months post-intervention (i.e., until and including February 2018) from  
203 the real number of deaths, the following results could be derived: 1) based on the WHO  
204 standard population, the averted number of deaths among men was estimated to be 864(95%  
205 PI: 651, 1077), while 2) using the Lithuania population of 2017 as the standard, the averted  
206 number of deaths among men was estimated to be 979(95% PI: 618, 1340). Figure 1 and 2  
207 show the predicted monthly all-cause mortality rates and the observed rates for men for the 12


208 months following the taxation increases using the two different age standardization schemes  
209 (the respective figures for women can be found in the Appendix).



210

211 *Figure 1 – Using the World Health Organization standard population: predicted and observed all-cause mortality rates for men*  
212 *for the period March 2017 – February 2018 in Lithuania. Black lines indicate the forecasted number of deaths without the 2017*  
213 *taxation intervention. Blue dots indicate observed deaths.*

214



215

216 *Figure 2 – Using Lithuanian population as the standard: predicted and observed all-cause mortality rates for men for the period*  
 217 *March 2017 – February 2018 in Lithuania. Black lines indicate the forecasted number of deaths without the 2017 taxation*  
 218 *intervention. Blue dots indicate observed deaths.*

219

220 The results for women and both sexes combined based on the ITS analyses with  
 221 estimates of averted mortality being derived from the beta weights are summarized in Table 1  
 222 and Table 2, along with the results for men. Details of the underlying models can be found in  
 223 the Appendix Table A.2, A.3, and in the publication of Štelemėkas and colleagues, already  
 224 mentioned above (Štelemėkas et al., 2021).

Standard Population		Women		Men		Total	
		Effect size	Averted deaths	Effect size	Averted deaths	Effect size	Averted deaths
WHO standard population	Estimate	-2.29	343	-11.07	1,344	-6.23	1,687
	95% CI	(-6.17, 1.58)	(-235, 920)	(-18.88, -3.27)	(397, 2,290)	(-10.33, -2.12)	(578, 2,795)
Lithuanian population 2017	Estimate	-2.90	433	-14.16	1,718	-7.95	2,151
	95% CI	(-9.56, 3.75)	(-560, 1427)	(-26.65, -1.67)	(203, 3,232)	(-14.65, -1.25)	(340, 3,962)

225 **Table 1 – ITS analysis: estimated effect sizes and confidence intervals for the period March 2017 – February 2018.**  
 226 *The results for the total population were based on the sex-specific results.*

227

228 The numbers of averted deaths for men, 1344 and 1718 deaths within a 1-year period,  
 229 depending on the standard population used, correspond to 6.64% and 8.48% of the total male  
 230 mortality in the prior year. For women, the proportions of death averted amounted to 1.64%  
 231 and 2.07% based on the WHO standard population and the Lithuanian population standard,  
 232 respectively.

233

Standard Population		Women	Men	Total
---------------------	--	-------	-----	-------

WHO standard population	Estimate	172	864	1,036
	95% PI	(58, 286)	(651, 1,077)	(794, 1,278)
Lithuanian population 2017	Estimate	176	979	1,155
	95% PI	(-51, 404)	(618, 1,340)	(729, 1,582)

234 **Table 2** – Prediction analyses: estimates of averted number of deaths and their prediction interval (PI) for the  
235 period of March 2017 – February 2018, based on a three-step approach. The results for the total population were  
236 based on the sex-specific results.

237

238 The proportional reductions from the prior year were 4.27% and 4.83% for men, and  
239 0.82% and 0.84% for women for the WHO and Lithuanian standard population, respectively.

240 The sensitivity analysis of a separate ITS of the total population rate corroborated the data:  
241 WHO standard averted deaths 949; 95% CI: 612; 1285; Lithuanian standard: 1202; 95% CI: 577-  
242 1811.

243 In sum, we found sizable decreases in all-cause mortality following the intervention with  
244 all methodologies, but the point estimates vary by almost a factor of two.

245

## 246 Discussion

247 Overall, the results of the models presented here support the findings of other studies  
248 on the effects of alcohol control policies ((Neufeld et al., 2021); for the impact of taxation in  
249 general, see (Sornpaisarn et al., 2017)), in that all analyses conducted suggest a sizable effect of  
250 taxation increases on all-cause mortality. The different methodologies resulted in point  
251 estimates that were substantially different, albeit with highly overlapping confidence intervals.  
252 Standardization to the Lithuanian population resulted in higher estimates than the

253 standardization to the WHO population, and the more complex comparison of the predicted  
254 mortality rate with the real numbers resulted in lower estimates than just applying the actual  
255 population to the beta-weights (see below for a discussion).

256           While the effect of the taxation increase was sizable under all scenarios, it needs to be  
257 reiterated that any effects of taxation legislation are, of course, dependent on the size of the  
258 tax increase; for Lithuania, the tax increase led to a clear decrease in affordability, which is the  
259 prerequisite for a sizable impact on alcohol consumption and harm (Neufeld et al., 2021,  
260 Grigoriev and Bobrova, 2020, Herttua et al., 2017), given the underlying economic theory of  
261 supply and demand (Sornpaisarn et al., 2017). Too often alcohol tax increases do not result in  
262 decreased affordability, and rarely consider inflation and increases in purchasing power. As a  
263 consequence, alcoholic beverages have become more affordable in many countries—not just  
264 European countries—over the past decades (Blecher et al., 2018, Rabinovich et al., 2009).  
265 However, when applied correctly, alcohol taxation constitutes a powerful tool that can result in  
266 sizable all-cause mortality reductions.

267           There are some potential limitations of the current study that should be acknowledged.  
268 First, as with all ITS analyses, where we conclude a causal effect of a policy or another event,  
269 we need to assume that no other important policy change or relevant event happened on  
270 March 1 2017, or close to this date, which could potentially explain the effects (Shadish et al.,  
271 2002). None of the Lithuanian experts consulted could list any such event, but we cannot  
272 exclude this possibility in an ecological design. In terms of policy changes, even though there  
273 were no additional alcohol policies implemented up until the end of 2017, several new alcohol  
274 control policies (an alcohol advertising ban; an increase in the legal alcohol purchase age; and

275 additional restriction on sale hours) came into effect on January 1, 2018, and therefore overlap  
276 in effects in two of the twelve months following the evaluated tax changes may have impacted  
277 the estimates. However, these policy effects were included as independent variables in the ITS  
278 and did not contribute to a further decrease in all-cause mortality (see Figure 1 and 2; see also  
279 Appendix Table A2). Second, our results assume that the time series modelling until February  
280 2017 represents a good approximation of the actual mortality rates. In our example, this  
281 appears to be the case, as our models explained around 80% of the variation (see (Štelemėkas  
282 et al., 2021) and Appendix). However, there is inherently some error in our estimates given  
283 that these statistical models are based on various assumptions. The major difficulty is that the  
284 PIs might be too narrow as a result of not accounting for all sources of uncertainty. For  
285 example, we assumed the predicted monthly mortality numbers were independent when  
286 constructing the PI, which may well not be accurate. It would thus be prudent to try different  
287 models with different assumptions, e.g., Bayesian models (de Vocht et al., 2020, de Vocht et al.,  
288 2017), and compare the results. Finally, this work focused on quantifying the deaths averted as  
289 a result by one policy intervention. In order to compare to published literature, we replicated a  
290 recent model from the literature which tried to measure the effects of several interventions.  
291 This may also have introduced bias.

292         Regardless, from the analyses presented, it may be concluded that comparing the actual  
293 number of deaths in each month to the forecasted number gives a more detailed and concrete  
294 estimate of the difference attributable to the intervention than using the beta-weight of the ITS  
295 analysis, which only gives a rough estimate. The higher estimated number of deaths averted by  
296 the classic ITS model may be the result of the modelling strategy, which assumed the same

297 effect size for the remainder of time period, i.e., for longer than one year. In other words: the  
298 ITS and the beta-weight method uses one model to describe the whole time series and assumes  
299 the continuation of the historical data-generating process over this period. On the contrary,  
300 the three-step approach uses a model to describe the historical time series before the  
301 intervention and potentially allows for different processes generating the data after the  
302 intervention. Therefore, it should be the preferred approach compared to the beta-weight  
303 method, if the objective is to quantify the size of the effect.

304         As for age-standardization, clearly the standard used made a sizable difference.  
305 Deciding on which standard should be used would depend on the objective of the research. If  
306 we want to compare across countries or globally, it is best to use the WHO standard (Ahmad et  
307 al., 2001), which is used in most comparative publications including the Global Burden of  
308 Disease Study (GBD 2019 Risk Factors Collaborators, 2020). However, if the objective is to get  
309 the best estimate for a specific country, in this case the number of deaths averted in Lithuania  
310 after the policy intervention of March 1, 2017, it is best to age-standardize based on a recent  
311 age-distribution for that country. With that being said, it should always be kept in mind that  
312 age-standardized rates are a hypothetical construct and should not be interpreted as reflecting  
313 actual risk. The use of a recent country-specific standard will lessen the extent of any such  
314 misinterpretation when evaluating policies in years close to those used in the standard.

315         Finally, we return briefly to the implications of the Lithuanian experience, and of the  
316 particular intervention studied in this paper, for the World Health Organization's global public  
317 health strategy to reduce harms from alcohol, and its identification of "best buys" for national  
318 alcohol policies (World Health Organization, 2017). Based on our best estimates using the

319 Lithuanian age distribution, reducing the overall adult mortality in a high-income country like  
320 Lithuania by 4.83% for men, 0.84% for women and 2.80% overall is a great achievement for a  
321 single intervention, and truly deserves the label of a “best buy”.

322

### 323 Acknowledgements

324 JR acknowledges funding from the Canadian Institutes of Health Research, Institute of  
325 Neurosciences, and Mental Health and Addiction (CRISM Ontario Node grant no. SMN-13950).  
326 Research reported in this publication was also supported by the National Institute on Alcohol  
327 Abuse and Alcoholism of the National Institutes of Health (NIAAA) [Award Number  
328 1R01AA028224-01].

329 Content is the responsibility of the authors and does not reflect official positions of NIAAA or  
330 the National Institutes of Health.

331 The authors have no conflict of interest to declare.

### 332 Acknowledgements

333 We would like to thank Ms. Astrid Otto for referencing and copy-editing the text.

334

335

336 References

- 337 AHMAD, O. B., BOSCHI-PINTO, C., LOPEZ, A. D., MURRAY, C. J. L., LOZANO, R. & INOUE, M. 2001.  
338 Age Standardization of Rates: A New WHO Standard. Available:  
339 <http://www.who.int/healthinfo/paper31.pdf> [Accessed 18/03/2021].
- 340 BABOR, T., CAETANO, R., CASSWELL, S., EDWARDS, G., GIESBRECHT, N., GRAHAM, K., GRUBE, J.,  
341 HILL, L., HOLDER, H., HOMEL, R., LIVINGSTON, M., ÖSTERBERG, E., REHM, J., ROOM, R.,  
342 & ROSSOW, I. 2010. *Alcohol: No ordinary commodity. Research and public policy (2nd*  
343 *ed.)*. Oxford University Press.
- 344 BEARD, E., MARSDEN, J., BROWN, J., TOMBOR, I., STAPLETON, J., MICHIE, S. & WEST, R. 2019.  
345 Understanding and using time series analyses in addiction research. *Addiction*, 114,  
346 1866-1884.
- 347 BERNAL, J. L., CUMMINS, S. & GASPARRINI, A. 2016. Interrupted time series regression for the  
348 evaluation of public health interventions: a tutorial. *International Journal of*  
349 *Epidemiology*, 46, 348-355.
- 350 BLECHER, E., LIBER, A., VAN WALBEEK, C. & ROSSOUW, L. 2018. An international analysis of the  
351 price and affordability of beer. *PloS one*, 13, e0208831.
- 352 CRAIG, P., KATIKIREDDI, S. V., LEYLAND, A. & POPHAM, F. 2017. Natural Experiments: An  
353 Overview of Methods, Approaches, and Contributions to Public Health Intervention  
354 Research. *Annu Rev Public Health*, 38, 39-56.
- 355 DE VOCHT, F., MCQUIRE, C., BRENNAN, A., EGAN, M., ANGUS, C., KANER, E., BEARD, E.,  
356 BROWN, J., DE ANGELIS, D., CARTER, N., MURRAY, B., DUKES, R., GREENWOOD, E.,  
357 HOLDEN, S., JAGO, R. & HICKMAN, M. 2020. Evaluating the causal impact of individual  
358 alcohol licensing decisions on local health and crime using natural experiments with  
359 synthetic controls. *Addiction*, 115, 2021-2031.
- 360 DE VOCHT, F., TILLING, K., PLIAKAS, T., ANGUS, C., EGAN, M., BRENNAN, A., CAMPBELL, R. &  
361 HICKMAN, M. 2017. The intervention effect of local alcohol licensing policies on hospital  
362 admission and crime: a natural experiment using a novel Bayesian synthetic time-series  
363 method. *J Epidemiol Community Health*, 71, 912-918.
- 364 DUNNING, T. 2012. *Natural Experiments in the Social Sciences: A Design-Based Approach*,  
365 Cambridge University Press.
- 366 GBD 2019 RISK FACTORS COLLABORATORS 2020. Global burden of 87 risk factors in 204  
367 countries and territories, 1990-2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of  
368 Disease Study 2019. *Lancet*, 396, 1223-1249.
- 369 GRIGORIEV, P. & BOBROVA, A. 2020. Alcohol control policies and mortality trends in Belarus.  
370 *Drug and alcohol review*, 39, 805-817.
- 371 HASTIE, T. J. & TIBSHIRANI, R. J. 1990. *Generalized additive models*, Boca Raton, CRC Press.
- 372 HERTTUA, K., ÖSTERGREN, O., LUNDBERG, O. & MARTIKAINEN, P. 2017. Influence of  
373 affordability of alcohol on educational disparities in alcohol-related mortality in Finland  
374 and Sweden: a time series analysis. *J Epidemiol Community Health*, 71, 1168-1176.
- 375 LITHUANIAN DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS. 2021. *Official Statistics Portal. Resident population*  
376 *in Lithuania at the beginning of the year* [Online]. Available:  
377 <https://osp.stat.gov.lt/statistiniu-rodikliu-analize/> [Accessed 16/03/2021].

- 378 NEUFELD, M., BOBROVA, A., DAVLETOV, K., STELEMEKAS, M., STOPPEL, R., FERREIRA-BORGES,  
379 C., BREDÁ, J. & REHM, J. 2021. Alcohol control policies in Former Soviet Union countries:  
380 A narrative review of three decades of policy changes and their apparent effects. *Drug*  
381 *Alcohol Rev*, 40, 350-367.
- 382 RABINOVICH, L., BRUTSCHER, P. B., DE VRIES, H., TIESSEN, J., CLIFT, J. & REDING, A. 2009. The  
383 Affordability of Alcoholic Beverages in the European Union: Understanding the Link  
384 Between Alcohol Affordability, Consumption and Harms. RAND Technical Report.  
385 Cambridge, U.K.
- 386 REHM, J. & IMTIAZ, S. 2016. Alcohol consumption as a risk factor for global burden of disease.  
387 A narrative review. *Substance Abuse Treatment, Prevention and Policy*, 11, 37.
- 388 REHM, J., ŠTELEMĚKAS, M., FERREIRA-BORGES, C., JIANG, H., LANGE, S., NEUFELD, M., ROOM,  
389 R., CASSWELL, S., TRAN, A. & MANTHEY, J. 2021. Classifying Alcohol Control Policies with  
390 Respect to Expected Changes in Consumption and Alcohol-Attributable Harm: The  
391 Example of Lithuania, 2000–2019. *International Journal of Environmental Research and*  
392 *Public Health*, 18, 2419.
- 393 SHADISH, W. R., COOK, T. D. & CAMPBELL, D. T. 2002. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental*  
394 *Designs for Generalized Causal Inference*, New York, U.S., Houghton Mifflin Company.
- 395 SHIELD, K., MANTHEY, J., RYLETT, M., PROBST, C., WETTLAUFRER, A., PARRY, C. D. H. & REHM, J.  
396 2020. National, regional, and global burdens of disease from 2000 to 2016 attributable  
397 to alcohol use: a comparative risk assessment study. *The Lancet Public Health*, 5, e51-  
398 e61.
- 399 SORNPAISARN, B., SHIELD, K. D., ÖSTERBERG, E. & REHM, J. 2017. *Resource tool on alcohol*  
400 *taxation and pricing policies*, Geneva, World Health Organization.
- 401 STATISTICS CANADA. 2020. *Age-standardized Rates* [Online]. Ottawa, Canada: Statistics  
402 Canada,. Available: <https://www.statcan.gc.ca/eng/dai/btd/asr> [Accessed 15/03/2021].
- 403 ŠTELEMĚKAS, M., MANTHEY, J., BADARAS, R., CASSWELL, S., FERREIRA-BORGES, C., KALĚDIENĚ,  
404 R., LANGE, S., NEUFELD, M., PETKEVIČIENĚ, J., RADIŠAUSKAS, R., ROOM, R., TELKSNYS,  
405 T., ZURLYTĚ, I. & REHM, J. 2021. Alcohol control policy measures and all-cause mortality  
406 in Lithuania: an interrupted time-series analysis. *Addiction*, Online ahead of print.
- 407 THE COMPREHENSIVE R ARCHIVE NETWORK (CRAN). 2021. *The Comprehensive R Archive*  
408 *Network Home Page* [Online]. CRAN. Available: <https://cran.r-project.org/> [Accessed  
409 15/03/2021].
- 410 WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION 2017. 'Best Buys' and Other Recommended Interventions for  
411 the Prevention and Control of Noncommunicable Diseases. Geneva, Switzerland: World  
412 Health Organization.
- 413 WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION. 2018. Global status report on alcohol and health 2018.  
414 Available:  
415 [https://www.who.int/substance\\_abuse/publications/global\\_alcohol\\_report/en/](https://www.who.int/substance_abuse/publications/global_alcohol_report/en/)  
416 [Accessed 05/20/2019].

417

418

## 419 Appendices

### 420 Generalized Additive Models (GAMs)

421 GAM model structure (Hastie and Tibshirani, 1990):  $g(E(Y)) = \alpha + s_1(x_1) + \dots + s_p(x_p)$

422  
423 where  $Y$  is the dependent variable,  $g(Y)$  denotes the link function, and the terms  $s_i(x_i)$  denote

424 smooth, non-parametric functions. The terminology “nonparametric” means that the shape of

425 predictor functions are fully driven by the data as opposed to parametric functions that are

426 defined by a typically small set of parameters from a certain distribution. This allow for more

427 flexible estimation of the underlying predictive patterns without knowing upfront what these

428 patterns look like. When there is substantial residual autocorrelation in the data, an ARMA

429 process is fit to the residuals.

430

431 Table A.1. Sex-stratified and total annual age-standardized all-cause mortality rates per

432 100,000, using the Lithuanian population from February 2017 as the standard population

Year	Women		Men		Total	
	Rate (SD)	% change <sup>1</sup>	Rate (SD)	% change <sup>1</sup>	Rate (SD)	% change <sup>1</sup>
2001	138.8 (13.4)	NA	243.9 (23.2)	NA	179.9 (16.7)	NA
2002	136.5 (16.9)	-1.70%	244.3 (24.7)	0.10%	178.2 (18.9)	-0.90%
2003	130.4 (16.2)	-4.50%	241.9 (25.5)	-1.00%	173.0 (19.1)	-2.90%
2004	128.6 (13.0)	-1.40%	234.9 (20.8)	-2.90%	170.0 (14.8)	-1.70%
2005	132.0 (12.5)	2.70%	248.5 (21.4)	5.80%	177.6 (14.7)	4.50%

2006	132.5 (13.4)	0.40%	249.7 (19.5)	0.50%	178.7 (15.3)	0.60%
2007	129.6 (15.6)	-2.20%	255.8 (23.2)	2.50%	178.9 (17.6)	0.10%
2008	126.8 (10.3)	-2.20%	239.4 (23.3)	-6.40%	170.7 (14.6)	-4.60%
2009	120.0 (11.5)	-5.30%	228.3 (19.6)	-4.60%	161.7 (14.0)	-5.20%
2010	120.2 (7.3)	0.20%	224.7 (13.3)	-1.60%	160.9 (9.2)	-0.50%
2011	115.6 (10.1)	-3.80%	216.7 (14.5)	-3.50%	154.9 (11.5)	-3.70%
2012	114.5 (8.5)	-1.00%	213.3 (14.3)	-1.60%	153.1 (10.4)	-1.20%
2013	115.5 (12.6)	0.80%	214.3 (20.8)	0.50%	153.9 (14.8)	0.50%
2014	111.0 (6.8)	-3.90%	207.1 (12.2)	-3.40%	148.2 (8.2)	-3.70%
2015	116.1 (10.8)	4.60%	211.6 (16.0)	2.10%	153.2 (12.2)	3.40%
2016	112.7 (10.2)	-2.90%	209.4 (13.3)	-1.00%	150.2 (11.4)	-2.00%
2017	112.1 (12.6)	-0.50%	201.0 (21.6)	-4.00%	146.1 (15.7)	-2.70%
2018	109.3 (13.4)	-2.50%	196.5 (21.6)	-2.20%	142.8 (15.8)	-2.20%

433 Note. Years in which alcohol policies with expected high impact were implemented are highlighted in grey and

434 calculated as the percent change from the previous year<sup>1</sup>.

435

436

437 Table A.2. Model results for the impact of different sets of alcohol policies on all-cause  
438 mortality, using the Lithuanian population from February 2017 as the standard population

	Women	Men	Total
Intercept	126.30 (122.76, 129.83)***	271.81 (257.74, 285.88)***	185.57 (175.37, 195.78)***
Months <sup>2</sup>		-0.003 (-0.004, -0.002)***	-0.001 (-0.002, -0.0004)***
GDP <i>per capita</i> in 1,000s Euros (centered)	-7.19 (-10.58, -3.80)***	21.13 (9.05, 33.21)***	5.84 (-2.93, 14.62)
Policy implementation date <sup>4</sup>			
1-Jan-08	1.70 (-4.41, 7.81)	-10.91 (-22.95, 1.14)*	-3.80 (-12.62, 5.01)
1-Jan-09	-10.23 (-15.27, -5.19)***	1.37 (-13.17, 15.91)	-3.76 (-14.34, 6.83)
1-Apr-14	1.59 (-3.85, 7.04)	7.85 (-4.86, 20.57)	5.87 (-3.26, 15.00)
1-Mar-15	2.05 (-4.81, 8.91)	11.03 (-2.03, 24.10)*	6.00 (-3.39, 15.40)
1-Jan-16	0.71 (-5.92, 7.33)	10.75 (-2.49, 23.99)	6.35 (-3.32, 16.02)
1-Mar-17	-2.90 (-9.56, 3.75)	-14.16 (-26.65, -1.67)**	-8.62 (-17.63, 0.39)*
1-Jan-18	2.09 (-4.82, 9.00)	9.92 (-3.59, 23.42)	6.84 (-3.04, 16.71)
R <sup>2</sup>	0.80	0.82	0.83
Autocorrelation <sup>1</sup>	MA(1)	AR(1)	AR(1)

439 Note. \* p<.05 ; \*\* p<.01 ; \*\*\* p<.001.

440 Results from generalized additive models using the age-standardized all-cause mortality rates per 100,000 people  
441 as the dependent variable and adjusted for autocorrelation and seasonality.

442 <sup>1</sup>The terms used to correct for autocorrelation in the time-series: AR[number] = autoregressive term of order  
443 [number], MA[number] = moving average term of order [number]

444

445 Table A.3. Predictive model results on all-cause mortality for the impact of different sets of  
 446 alcohol policies before February 2017, using the Lithuanian population from February 2017 as  
 447 the standard population

	Women	Men	Total
Intercept	126.47 (122.94, 130.00)***	272.45 (257.95, 286.95)***	185.95 (174.69, 197.21)***
Months <sup>2</sup>		-0.003 (-0.004, -0.001)***	-0.001 (-0.002, - 0.0004)***
GDP <i>per capita</i> in 1,000s			
Euros (centered)	-7.06 (-10.45, -3.67)***	21.80 (9.33, 34.26)***	6.08 (-3.66, 15.82)
Policy implementation date			
1-Jan-08	1.57 (-4.50, 7.64)	-11.67 (-24.14, 0.81)*	-3.89 (-13.92, 6.14)
1-Jan-09	-10.20 (-15.19, -5.21)***	0.93 (-14.05, 15.91)	-3.82 (-15.64, 8.00)
1-Apr-14	1.51 (-3.90, 6.92)	7.12 (-5.86, 20.09)	5.81 (-3.93, 15.56)
1-Mar-15	2.03 (-4.77, 8.83)	10.76 (-2.54, 24.06)	5.71 (-4.33, 15.74)
1-Jan-16	0.53 (-6.04, 7.09)	10.69 (-2.99, 24.36)	7.17 (-3.74, 18.09)
R <sup>2</sup>	0.78	0.79	0.81
Autocorrelation <sup>1</sup>	MA(1)	AR(2)	AR(2)

448 Note. \* p<.05 ; \*\* p<.01 ; \*\*\* p<.001.

449 Results from generalized additive models using the age-standardized all-cause mortality rates per 100,000 people  
 450 as the dependent variable and adjusted for autocorrelation and seasonality.

451 <sup>1</sup>The terms used to correct for autocorrelation in the time-series: AR[number] = autoregressive term of order  
 452 [number], MA[number] = moving average term of order [number]


453

454 Table A.4. Standardization values for World Health Organization Standard and the Lithuanian  
455 population in February 2017 (ten-year intervals)


WHO Standard			LTU Population (February 2017)		
Age group	Total Weighting	20+ Weighting	Age group	Total Weighting	20+ Weighting
0-9	0.17515	-	0-9	0.102977	-
10-19	0.1707	-	10-19	0.098923	-
20-29	0.1615	0.246885	20-29	0.131529	0.164803
30-39	0.1476	0.225636	30-39	0.122113	0.153005
40-49	0.1263	0.193075	40-49	0.136919	0.171556
50-59	0.0992	0.151647	50-59	0.153043	0.191759
60-69	0.0668	0.102117	60-69	0.11431	0.143228
70-79	0.0373	0.057021	70-79	0.085306	0.106886
80+	0.01545	0.023618	80+	0.05488	0.068763

456

457



458  
459 *Figure A.2 – Predicted and observed all-cause mortality rates for females for the period March 2017 – February 2018 in*  
460 *Lithuania. Black lines indicate the forecast number of deaths without the 2017 taxation intervention, using the WHO standard*  
461 *population. Blue dots indicate observed mortality rates.*  
462



463  
464 *Figure A.2 – Predicted and observed all-cause mortality rates for females for the period March 2017 – February 2018 in*  
465 *Lithuania. Black lines indicate the forecast number of deaths without the 2017 taxation intervention, using the Lithuania*  
466 *population as standard. Blue dots indicate observed mortality rates.*

467