

Health and Inequality Impacts of Tobacco Endgame Strategies in Aotearoa

Tobacco endgame intervention impacts on health gains and Māori:non-Māori health inequity: a simulation study of the Aotearoa-New Zealand Tobacco Action Plan

Authors:

Driss Ait Ouakrim, Senior Research Fellow, University of Melbourne, driss.aitouakrim@unimelb.edu.au

Tim Wilson, Research Fellow, University of Melbourne, tim.wilson@unimelb.edu.au

Andrew Waa, Lecturer, University of Otago, andrew.waa@otago.ac.nz

Raglan Maddox, Research Fellow, Australian National University, raglan.maddox@anu.edu.au

Hassan Andrabi, Research Assistant, University of Melbourne, hassan.andrabi@unimelb.edu.au

Shiva Raj Mishra, Research Fellow, University of Melbourne, shivraj.mishra@unimelb.edu.au

Jennifer Summers, Senior Research Fellow, University of Otago, jennifer.summers@otago.ac.nz

Coral Gartner, Associate Professor, University of Queensland, c.gartner@uq.edu.au

Raymond Lovett, Professor, Australian National University, raymond.lovett@anu.edu.au

Richard Edwards, Professor, University of Otago, richard.edwards@otago.ac.nz

Nick Wilson, Professor, University of Otago, nick.wilson@otago.ac.nz

Tony Blakely, Professor, University of Melbourne, ablakely@unimelb.edu.au, Level 3, 207 Bouverie Street, Carlton, VIC, Australia 3053 *

* Corresponding author

Health and Inequality Impacts of Tobacco Endgame Strategies in Aotearoa

1 **Abstract**

2 **Objective**

3 To estimate the health gains and Māori:non-Māori health inequality reductions of the
4 Aotearoa/New Zealand Government's proposed endgame strategy.

5 **Design**

6 Simulation modelling: a Markov model to estimate future yearly smoking and vaping
7 prevalence (for business-as-usual [BAU] and intervention scenarios) linked to a proportional
8 multistate lifetable model with 16 tobacco-related diseases to estimate future morbidity and
9 mortality rates, and health adjusted life years (HALYs).

10 **Setting**

11 Aotearoa.

12 **Participants**

13 Population alive in 2020 (5.08 million) simulated over the rest of their lifespan.
14

15 **Interventions**

16 1. Denicotinisation of all retail tobacco in 2023, 2. 1 plus media promotion, 3. 95% reduction
17 in tobacco retail outlets in 2023, 4. a tobacco free-generation whereby people born in 2006
18 and later are never legally able to purchase tobacco, 5. combined package of 2, 3 and 4.

19 **Main Outcome Measures**

20 Future smoking prevalence, deaths averted and HALYs by sex and ethnic group. Percent
21 reduction in Māori:non-Māori all-cause mortality rate difference in 2040 under interventions
22 compared to business as usual (BAU).

23 **Results**

24 The combined package of strategies was estimated to reduce adult smoking prevalence from
25 31.8% in 2022 to 7.3% in 2025 for Māori, and 11.8% to 2.7% for non-Māori. The 5%

Health and Inequality Impacts of Tobacco Endgame Strategies in Aotearoa

1 smoking prevalence target was forecast to be achieved in 2026 and 2027 for Māori males and
2 females, respectively.

3

4 The HALY gains for the combined package (compared to BAU) over the population's
5 remaining lifespan was estimated to be 594,000 (95% UI: 443,000 to 738,000; 3% discount
6 rate). The denicotinisation strategy alone achieved 97% of these HALYs, the retail strategy
7 19%, and tobacco-free generation 12%.

8

9 The future per capita HALY gains for the combined package for Māori were estimated to be
10 4.75 and 2.14 times higher than for non-Māori females and males, respectively. The absolute
11 difference between Māori and non-Māori all-cause mortality for 45+ year olds in 2040 was
12 estimated to be 23.4% (19.1% to 27.6%) less for females under the combined package
13 compared to BAU, and 9.5% (7.5% to 11.3%) less for males.

14 Conclusion

15 A tobacco endgame strategy, especially denicotinisation, could dramatically reduce health
16 inequities.

17 Funding

18 New Zealand Ministry of Health.

19

Health and Inequality Impacts of Tobacco Endgame Strategies in Aotearoa

1 **Statements**

2 **Ethics**

3 Ethics approval was not required for this study, as only secondary data sources were used.

4 **Transparency statement**

5 The lead author (DAO) and senior author (TB) jointly guarantee that the manuscript is an
6 honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study being reported. In addition, the authors
7 indicate that no important aspects of the study have been omitted, and that any discrepancies
8 from the study as originally planned (and, if relevant, registered) have been explained.

9

10 This research is funded by the NZ Ministry of Health and has the potential to dramatically
11 affect the health of people in Aotearoa, especially Māori. Accordingly, additional
12 transparency steps have taken place. These include: an extensive dialogue with the Ministry
13 of Health staff and the NZ Associate Minister of Health on findings (they have not
14 contributed to write-up), earlier results from this modelling have been used as a regulatory
15 impact statement accompanying a policy proposal to Cabinet, and early dissemination with
16 key Māori stakeholder groups in Aotearoa and international tobacco control researchers has
17 been undertaken.

18 **Contributorship**

19 Our team brings Māori lived experience (AW), Indigenous lived experience (RM, RL), and
20 experience in research on tobacco inequalities (AW, RM, CG, RL, RE, NW, TB).

21

22 DAO, JS, NW and TB led the conceptualisation of the computer simulation modelling with
23 data and other input specified by TW, HA and SRM. DAO and TW led the analyses and
24 production of outputs, tables and figures. All authors contributed to data interpretation. AW,
25 RM and RL initiated the drafting of the Introduction and Discussion, TB led the Methods and
26 Results, and DAO led the Appendix. All authors revised the draft manuscript critically for
27 important intellectual content.

Health and Inequality Impacts of Tobacco Endgame Strategies in Aotearoa

1 Role of the funding source

2 The views expressed in this report are solely the responsibility of the authors and they do not
3 necessarily reflect the views, decisions, or policies of the institutions with which they are
4 affiliated, of the NZ Ministry of Health or Government.

5

6 Specifically, the NZ Ministry of Health:

7 - funded the initial analyses

8 - did not contribute to drafting this paper

9 - did contribute to conceptualization of the interventions, as they are integral to the NZ
10 Action Plan

11 - did provide NZ Health Survey data to parametrise the smoking-vaping life history
12 Markov model.

13 Declarations of Interest

14 NA

15 Acknowledgements

16 NA

17

18 Exclusive Licence statement

19 I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the
20 Work (as defined in the [author licence](#)), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence
21 for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a
22 CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal
23 Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide,
24 perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd (“BMJ”) its licensees.
25

26 The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is
27 made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of
28 your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any
29 applicable article publishing charge (“APC”) for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting
30 Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the
31 relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative
32 Commons licence – details of these licences and which licence will apply to this Work are set
33 out in our licence referred to above.

Health and Inequality Impacts of Tobacco Endgame Strategies in Aotearoa

1 Summary boxes

2 What is already known on this topic

- 3 • Modelling of health gains and health inequality reductions for some tobacco endgame
4 strategies has been undertaken internationally, and specifically in Aotearoa (tobacco
5 free generation policy, substantial reductions in the number of tobacco outlets
6 including, a sinking lid that gradually phased out all tobacco supply between 2011 to
7 2025, restricting tobacco sales to pharmacies only with brief cessation advice
8 provided to consumers). All modelling suggested that these interventions improved
9 equity, of varying magnitude, in either smoking prevalence or health gain for Māori
10 compared to non-Māori.
- 11 • Endgame modelling of denicotinisation has not been undertaken, alone or in
12 combination with other interventions. The interplay of tobacco smoking and vaping
13 has not been explicitly included in endgame modelling. The package of endgame
14 strategies in the Aotearoa-New Zealand Government's Smokefree Action Plan (Dec
15 2021) have not been modelled.

16 What this study adds

- 17 • The Government's package (denicotinisation of retail tobacco, 95% reduction in the
18 number of tobacco retail outlets; and a tobacco-free generation) if implemented in
19 2023 is forecast to achieve less than 5% smoking prevalence by 2025 for non-Māori,
20 and by 2027 for Māori.
- 21 • Denicotinisation is estimated to achieve the majority of the health gains.
- 22 • A 95% retail outlet reduction and a tobacco-free generation, on their own, are unlikely
23 to achieve a 5% smoking prevalence for any sex by ethnic groups until at least 2040.
- 24 • The combined package, compared to BAU, is estimated to reduce the Māori:non-
25 Māori gap in 45+ year old all-cause mortality in 2040 by 22.9% (95% uncertainty
26 interval 19.9% to 26.2%) for females and 9.6% (8.4% to 11.0%) males.

27

28

Health and Inequality Impacts of Tobacco Endgame Strategies in Aotearoa

1 Introduction

2 Despite unequivocal evidence about the harm caused by commercial tobacco, it continues to
3 be a leading cause of avoidable morbidity and mortality.¹ Smoking prevalence in high income
4 countries with colonial histories has steadily decreased over recent decades, but prevalence
5 among Indigenous peoples is often substantially higher² than in the general population and is
6 a significant contributor to health inequities.³

7
8 Indigenous people's experiences of colonisation include imposition of alien societal
9 institutions, appropriation of economic resources and exposure to racism. Referred to as
10 'basic causes'^{4,5}, these affect access to social determinants of health (e.g., income, housing)
11 and, via health behaviours such as smoking rates, ultimately leading to racialised health
12 inequities. In many instances this has been compounded by the use of tobacco as a trade
13 commodity. Since the late 19th century, tobacco companies have actively exploited and
14 promote commercial tobacco to Indigenous peoples.^{2,6,7}

15
16 In 2020-21, 22.3% of Māori (the Indigenous peoples of Aotearoa/New Zealand [A/NZ]) 15
17 years and older smoked at least daily. This was 2.7 times the prevalence among
18 European/Others (8.3%; NZ Health Survey).⁸

19
20 Similar to other high-income countries, A/NZ's tobacco control programme includes:
21 restricting the promotion of tobacco products, providing cessation support, implementing
22 mass media campaigns, regular increases in tobacco excise tax, and smokefree area policies.⁹
23 Many of these measures have some reliance on individual capacity and access to resources
24 needed to carry out desired behaviours such as quitting cigarettes. These resources are
25 inequitably distributed across the A/NZ population, likely explaining a failure of A/NZs
26 tobacco control programme to address smoking disparities. Concern about the slow progress
27 in reducing smoking prevalence among Māori, led Māori political and tobacco control
28 leaders to propose a tobacco endgame in the mid-2000s. Instead of focusing on people who
29 smoke, they argued that the tobacco industry and the products they sell should be targeted. In
30 2011 the A/NZ Government committed to achieving a Smokefree country by 2025¹⁰
31 (commonly interpreted as less than 5% smoking prevalence among both Māori and non-

Health and Inequality Impacts of Tobacco Endgame Strategies in Aotearoa

1 Māori). Achieving this goal required a radical departure from business as usual (BAU)
2 approaches¹¹, but actual tobacco control policy remained relatively unchanged. The 2010s
3 coincided with the proliferation of alternative nicotine delivery devices and, in particular,
4 electronic cigarettes, and introduced a discourse about ‘harm minimisation’ to the tobacco
5 endgame debate.¹² A more holistic notion of ‘harm’ expressed among many Māori includes
6 addiction as well as health harm, meaning that achieving an end to both nicotine addiction as
7 well as tobacco smoking is the desired endgame.

8
9 The A/NZ Government launched an Action Plan in late 2021 to achieve the country’s
10 endgame objective.¹³ This plan focused on smoked tobacco and sought to bring about rapid
11 and profound reductions in smoking prevalence, and to do so equitably such that all
12 population groups (in particular Māori) achieve minimal smoking prevalence by 2025. Three
13 key (‘endgame’) strategies were identified in the Action Plan to achieve this goal:
14 denicotinising retail tobacco to non-addictive levels (e.g., ≤ 0.4 mg nicotine/cigarette)¹⁴
15 markedly reducing retail access to tobacco, and creating a ‘Tobacco-free Generation’. The
16 latter would be achieved by progressively raising the legal age at which tobacco can be sold
17 to young people. These measures do not directly address basic causes or social determinants
18 of smoking related inequities. However, they substantively circumvent the role of agency
19 (e.g., individual access to necessary social or economic resources) in being able to quit
20 smoking or resisting initiation. As such, they have strong potential to bring equitable change
21 in smoking behaviour.¹⁵ A challenge of these types of measures is that they would act against
22 Indigenous aspirations of empowerment and self-determination¹⁶ if they were enacted by a
23 predominantly non-Indigenous government ‘on’ Māori. The Action Plan has sought to
24 address this issue by seeking Māori engagement throughout the planning and policy
25 development stages, including establishing a Māori Governance group.

26
27 Internationally, there is growing interest in tobacco endgame goals and strategies, with an
28 increasing number of countries adopting endgame goals and a range of bold endgame
29 interventions proposed. Scotland, for example, has included a strong focus on equity within
30 their endgame goals and strategies,¹⁷ but, other than in A/NZ, a focus on Indigenous health
31 inequities has not been a key objective of endgame strategies. To date, the implementation of
32 endgame interventions has been minimal and, consequently, the evidence base of their

Health and Inequality Impacts of Tobacco Endgame Strategies in Aotearoa

1 potential effects is weak.¹⁸ For example, none of the endgame interventions included in the
2 A/NZ Action Plan have been implemented at country-level, with the possible exception of
3 substantial reductions in retail supply in Hungary.

4

5 This paper aimed to estimate the future tobacco smoking prevalence, mortality and health
6 adjusted life year (HALY) impacts (including changes in Māori/non-Māori inequalities) of
7 tobacco endgame strategies outlined in the A/NZ Government's proposed Action Plan.

8 Specific research questions were:

- 9 1. Which endgame strategies have the potential to reduce smoking prevalence to less
10 than 5% for all sex and ethnic groups by 2025?
- 11 2. Which endgame strategies maximally reduce Māori/non-Māori health inequalities?

12

13 We used simulation modelling to calculate these estimates, using a hierarchy of data inputs
14 ranging from trial evidence (e.g., for very low nicotine cigarettes) to observational evidence
15 (e.g., smokers response to what they would do in the face of policies proposed) to expert
16 knowledge elicitation when required. Forecasting the future is uncertain. Accordingly, all
17 input parameters have uncertainty related to them that the reader can inspect, all outputs
18 incorporate uncertainty due to the propagated input parameter uncertainty in Monte Carlo
19 simulation, and we tease apart which input parameter uncertainty drives most of the output
20 uncertainty. A key principle of this study is that even if as a research community we do not
21 have ideal data, decision makers and society need the best estimates we can produce, with
22 appropriate depiction and caveats about inevitable uncertainty.

23 **Methods**

24 We used an existing tobacco simulation model¹⁹⁻²¹ (rated as best of 25 tobacco models
25 globally²²), and expanded its capabilities to create a new model called Scalable Health
26 Intervention Evaluation (SHINE) tobacco, which includes a Markov smoking and vaping life
27 history model and functionality for outputting packages of interventions and mortality rates
28 by time.

29

Health and Inequality Impacts of Tobacco Endgame Strategies in Aotearoa

1 Smoking and vaping life history model

2 We developed a Markov model to simulate population smoking and vaping behaviours, based
3 on seven states (Supplementary Figure S1, Table S1): never smoker (NS), current smoker
4 (CS), never smoker current vaper (NSCV), dual user (DU), former smoker current vaper
5 (FSCV), former smoker and/or former vaper (FSFV), never smoker former vaper (NSFV).
6 Movement between states are determined by transition probabilities, which reflect BAU and
7 the potential effects of interventions (below). Initiation of smoking (transition from NS to CS
8 or DU) and vaping (transition from NS to NSCV) was assumed to occur at age 20 years.
9 From the age of 20 onwards, any quitting of smoking was assumed permanent, parameterised
10 as a 'net' cessation rate from CS and DU to either FSCV or FSFV. For proportions of the
11 cohort in the FSCV state, there was an annual net transition probability to FSFV, but no
12 return flow from FSFV to FSCV. The FSFV, FSCV and NSFV states were additionally
13 modelled as 20-year tunnel states that the cohort progressed through each year, allowing the
14 model to identify how many years each cohort was from quitting so as to incorporate
15 decaying impacts of smoking on disease incidence by time since quitting (see below).

16
17 To specify the transition probabilities under BAU, we first estimated future daily smoking
18 (and vaping) rates by extrapolating trends in the 2013-14 to 2019-20 New Zealand Health
19 Survey (NZHS) data, using a two-step regression approach: 1) a best fit regression model to
20 historic data; and 2) a regression model on the former predictions by sex, age and ethnicity to
21 generate annual net cessation rates by cohort as they age, and annual trends in initiation.

22
23 We then calculated annual transition probabilities to achieve these projections, starting with
24 transition probabilities between the seven states from the United Kingdom as reported by
25 Doan et al.²³ (Supplementary Table S2), modifying them as required (with mathematical
26 optimisation using Excel Solver) to meet the above projections. We performed this operation
27 by sex and ethnicity for three age cohorts (20-24, 40-44, and 60-64), and interpolated other
28 age cohorts.

Health and Inequality Impacts of Tobacco Endgame Strategies in Aotearoa

1 Proportional multistate lifetable model

2 A proportional multistate life table (PMSLT) was used to estimate health impacts of smoking
3 and vaping under BAU and intervention scenarios (key input parameters in Table 1). A
4 detailed description of the model has been provided elsewhere.²⁴ Briefly, the PMSLT is
5 composed of a main cohort lifetable, which simulates the entire A/NZ population alive in
6 2020 until death using projected all-cause mortality and morbidity rates by sex, age, and
7 ethnicity (Māori, non-Māori). Thus, for the youngest people we are estimating HALYs as
8 far out as calendar years 2131; however, we focus on the next 20 years in much of the results.
9 In parallel, proportions of the cohort also reside in 16 subsidiary tobacco-related disease
10 lifetables according to prevalence at baseline (i.e., start of model), and in future years based
11 on BAU disease-specific incidence, case fatality and remission rates. Within each disease
12 lifetable, morbidity estimates (i.e. disability rates from the NZ Burden of Disease Study²⁵) are
13 attached to prevalent cases. The tobacco-related diseases included in the model are: coronary
14 heart disease, stroke, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), lower respiratory tract
15 infection (LRTI), and twelve cancers (lung, oesophageal, stomach, liver, head and neck,
16 pancreas, cervical, bladder, kidney, endometrial, melanoma, and thyroid).
17
18 Within each disease lifetable, an intervention is run in parallel to BAU with different disease
19 incidence rates given changes in smoking and vaping life histories (see next section). Each
20 disease lifetable estimates the difference between intervention and BAU in disease mortality
21 and morbidity rates that are then added to matching entities in the main lifetable.

22 Connecting the smoking-vaping life history model to the PMSLT – using 23 population impact fractions

24 For each sex by age by ethnic group, and each annual time step into the future, a population
25 impact fraction (PIF) is calculated for each tobacco-related disease. The generic formula²⁶ is:
26

$$PIF_{idt} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n P_{ijt} RR_{idj} - \sum_{j=1}^n P'_{jt} RR_{idj}}{\sum_{j=1}^n P_{ijt} RR_{idj}}$$

27 where: i subscripts each sex by age by ethnic group, d subscripts each disease, t subscripts
28 each time step or yearly cycle, j subscripts n states in the smoking-vaping life history model,

Health and Inequality Impacts of Tobacco Endgame Strategies in Aotearoa

1 RR is the incidence rate ratio for disease d and smoking-vaping state j , and possible varying
2 by demographics (e.g., by sex and age, but not by ethnic group (note the RR does not vary by
3 time step t), and $P(P')$ is the proportion of the demographic cohort (i) in each of j states in
4 each time step t . These PIFs are the percentage change in incidence rates for each smoking
5 related disease inputted to the PMSLT.

6

7 The source and values of the tobacco-related disease incidence rates and rate ratios are given
8 in Appendices A-B and Supplementary Tables S3-S19. Harm from vaping was modelled as
9 5% to 20% of tobacco harm following Mendez and Warner²⁷ (Beta distribution with median
10 11% and 95% uncertainty interval [UI] of 5% to 20%).

11 Interventions

12 To parameterise the intervention scenarios we adapted initial estimates by Wilson et al,²⁸
13 which derived their potential effects based on A/NZ-specific literature (including a
14 randomised trial of denicotinised cigarettes) and international literature; adaptation for this
15 paper included incorporating additional research and expert judgements by the authors. The
16 intervention specifications are shown in Table 2; below we give key parameters (and there
17 uncertainty intervals that are sampled from in Monte Carlo simulation). Briefly:

- 18 • Denicotinisation: initiation was estimated to reduce to 10% (95% UI 2.6% to
19 21.5%) of that in BAU by five years after implementation; cessation transition
20 probabilities were increased so that over five years the smoking prevalence in CS
21 and DU states was 15.2% (95% UI 3.7% to 32.9%) of that in BAU, and from the
22 sixth-year onward cessation transition probabilities were doubled.
- 23 • Denicotinisation plus mass media: as above, plus an extra increase in cessation
24 rates in the first five years of 2.1% (equivalent to twice the impact of past Quitline
25 media campaigns in A/NZ on net cessation rates).
- 26 • Retail outlet reduction: we used the average of two inputs: a) previous modelling
27 by ourselves²⁹ of increasing travel time, converted to cost and then through price
28 elasticities that estimates a 15.8% reduction in smoking prevalence in the year of
29 implementation, b) 23.0% of respondents (smokers) to the NZ International
30 Tobacco Collaboration study saying they would quit if outlets reduced by 95%.

Health and Inequality Impacts of Tobacco Endgame Strategies in Aotearoa

1 We used the average of these two (19.4%; 95% UI 12.9% to 26.9%) as the one-off
2 increase in net cessation in the year of the policy implementation. The same
3 magnitude reduction in initiation was included in the year of implementation and
4 all subsequent years.

- 5 • Tobacco-free generation: in theory, initiation will reduce to zero. In practice,
6 social supply is likely. The exact reduction in initiation is uncertain, so we
7 specified that future initiation rates will be 10% of BAU with wide uncertainty
8 (95%UI: 2.6% to 21.5%), achieved 10 years after the policy is introduced.

9 Analyses and parameter uncertainty

10 We produced the following outputs. First, deaths averted by time period. Second, health-
11 adjusted life years (HALYs; 3% annual discount rate) gained from each intervention, both the
12 total number and age-standardised (using Māori population 2020) per 1000 people. Third, we
13 calculated the age-standardised all-cause mortality rate differences between Māori and non-
14 Māori (by sex) for 45+ year old (by age in the future), under BAU and each intervention, and
15 presented the percentage difference in the rate difference for each intervention compared to
16 BAU.

17 The BAU and each intervention scenario were simulated 2000 times using Monte Carlo
18 simulation, drawing from the probability density functions specified in Tables 1 and 2.

19

20 To help understand the uncertainty in our modelling, we used univariate sensitivity analyses
21 to depict which input parameter uncertainty generates the most uncertainty in lifetime HALY
22 gains for all sex and ethnic groups combined for the combination endgame policy package
23 compared to BAU. The result is presented as a ‘Tornado Plot’ showing the changes in model
24 outputs for selecting the 2.5th and 97.5th percentile of each input parameter in turn (holding all
25 other inputs at their expected value).

26

27

Health and Inequality Impacts of Tobacco Endgame Strategies in Aotearoa

1 Results

2 Achieving < 5% prevalence

3 The modelled combined package achieves a profound and rapid reduction in smoking
4 prevalence (Figure 1 and Supplementary Table S23). In 2022, the year before policy
5 implementation, Maori age 20+ smoking prevalence is 31.8%, falling to 28.7% (95% UI:
6 25.5% to 30.4%) under BAU by 2025 (the year targeted to have smoking prevalence less than
7 5% by the A/NZ Parliament). Under the combined package Māori smoking prevalence
8 decreases to 7.3% (3.9% to 9.2%) in 2025 (females: 8.2%, 4.3% to 10.5%; males: 6.3%,
9 3.4% to 7.9%). For non-Māori, the smoking prevalence is 11.8% in 2022, falling to 10.8%
10 (95% UI: 9.6% to 11.2%) in 2025 under BAU and decreasing to 2.7% (1.4% to 3.5%) under
11 the combined package (females: 2.5%, 1.3% to 3.3%; males: 2.9%, 1.5% to 3.8%). The
12 combined package achieves the under 5% smoking prevalence target in 2026 and 2027 for
13 Māori males and females, respectively.

14

15 Denicotinisation causes the majority of forecasted decreases in smoking. Retail outlet
16 reduction has a strong impact in its year of implementation (due to a large cessation impact),
17 but it then tracks largely as in BAU (as no ongoing increases in cessation are assumed, and
18 reductions in initiation take years to accrue). Neither the retail reduction nor the tobacco-free
19 generation strategies achieve less than 5% smoking prevalence by 2025 for any sex by ethnic
20 group.

21 Deaths averted

22 Under the combined policy package, deaths up to 2040 were 8,150 (95% UI: 6,450 to 9,890)
23 less than under BAU, with 27% to 30% of these averted deaths among each of female Māori,
24 female non-Māori and male non-Māori (Table 3).

25 HALYs gained

26 For the combined intervention compared to BAU, by sex and ethnic group, 28% to 30% of all
27 HALYs gained by the combined package were among female Māori, female non-Māori and
28 male non-Māori, with a lesser 14% among male Māori. For sexes and ethnic groups
29 combined, and for the remainder of the lifespan of the population alive in 2020, there was an

Health and Inequality Impacts of Tobacco Endgame Strategies in Aotearoa

1 estimated 594,000 HALYs gained (95% UI: 443,000 to 738,000: bottom right of Table 4).
2 The majority (90%) of these HALYs gained were after 2040.
3 The denicotinisation strategy alone achieves 97% of the HALYs of the combined package,
4 retail outlet reduction alone 19% and the tobacco-free generation alone 12%. For the tobacco-
5 free generation, the vast majority (98%) of HALYs gained over the lifespan of the population
6 occurred after 2040. Supplementary Figure S3 provides a comparison in terms of health gains
7 from the endgames strategies evaluated in this paper with other large scale public health
8 policies (modelled or already in place) in A/NZ.

9 Inequality impacts

10 Figure 2 shows the ratio of age-standardised per capita HALYs gains for Māori compared to
11 non-Māori. For the combined package, Māori females gained 4.75 times as many HALYs per
12 capita as non-Māori females, and Māori males gained 2.15 times as many as non-Māori
13 males. The Māori:non-Māori ratio of per capita HALY gains was similar for other
14 interventions, except it was higher for the tobacco-free generation (noting, though, that the
15 absolute gains were less for this strategy – see Supplementary Table S24).

16

17 Māori 45+ years mortality rates in 2040 are 11.6% and 5.2% lower under the combined
18 package than under BAU, for females and males respective. For non-Māori, these reductions
19 are less at 2.8% and 2.3%, for females and males respectively. The impact of the combined
20 endgame strategies on the Māori compared to non-Māori ‘gap’ (absolute difference) in
21 mortality rates by 2040 is shown in Figure 3. The rate difference is 23.4% (95% UI: 19.1% to
22 27.6%) less for females for the combined package compared to BAU, and 9.5% (95% UI:
23 7.5% to 11.3%) less for males. The denicotinisation policy alone achieves most of this
24 mortality rate inequality reduction, and the retail reduction strategy about a quarter of that for
25 the combination strategy.

26

27 Sensitivity analyses

28 Figure 4 shows a Tornado plot of how much variation in lifetime HALYs gained (combined
29 endgame policy; 3% discount rate) resulted from univariate sensitivity analyses about the key
30 intervention parameters. Uncertainty about the cessation rate due to denicotinisation was

Health and Inequality Impacts of Tobacco Endgame Strategies in Aotearoa

1 clearly the major source of overall uncertainty in HALYs gained: the 97.5th percentile value
2 of increased cessation leading to 32.9% of BAU smoking prevalence (or conversely a 67.1%
3 reduction in smoking prevalence due to increased cessation) led to 545,000 HALYs gained
4 (end of blue bar in Figure 4) compared to 653,000 HALYs gained (end of red bar) for the
5 2.5th percentile value of 3.7% of BAU smoking prevalence due to cessation (or conversely a
6 large 96.3% reduction in smoking prevalence due to increased cessation). Uncertainty about
7 other key input parameters generate considerably less uncertainty in the HALYs gained.

Health and Inequality Impacts of Tobacco Endgame Strategies in Aotearoa

1 Discussion

2 In Aotearoa-New Zealand (A/NZ), a post-colonial country with a high smoking rates among
3 the Indigenous Māori, we found that tobacco endgame strategies outlined in the December
4 2021 A/NZ Smokefree Plan¹³, in particular denicotinisation of commercial tobacco, could
5 have a profound positive impact on the health of Māori and notably reducing health inequity
6 between Māori and non-Māori. For example, by 2040, a combined package including
7 denicotinisation plus media, 95% reduction in retail outlets and a tobacco-free generation
8 would – we estimate – reduce the gap in the mortality rate of people aged 45 years and older
9 by 23.4% (95% UI 19.1% to 27.6%) for females and 9.5% (7.5% to 11.3%) for males,
10 compared to ongoing BAU. It is unlikely that any other feasible health intervention would
11 reduce ethnic inequalities in mortality by as much.

12

13 Our forecasts suggest mandating denicotinisation would have an immediate, marked and
14 enduring impact on smoking prevalence in A/NZ. Importantly the impacts of this measure
15 would make a significant contribution towards eliminating smoking prevalence inequities
16 between Māori and non-Māori populations. Reducing retail access would have a lesser
17 impact on overall prevalence and inequities and introducing a tobacco-free generation alone
18 would take many years to take full effect with impact on smoking prevalence and then health
19 gains. Nevertheless, the impacts of both of these measures are on par with tobacco tax
20 increases,³⁰ and greater than interventions such as mass media and quit programmes alone.³¹

21

22 The profound impact of tobacco endgame strategies on ethnic health inequalities in A/NZ
23 shown in the model is due to higher smoking rates among Māori (especially females), but
24 also because the smoking-related disease rates are higher among Māori (for both tobacco and
25 non-tobacco-related reasons). Such patterning by indigeneity, ethnicity and socioeconomic
26 position occurs in many other countries, suggesting tobacco endgame strategies will notably
27 reduce health inequities in other countries – as well as improving the health of all citizen
28 groups.

29

30 Tackling tobacco is not only a health issue, it has also a social and economic priority for
31 Indigenous peoples.³² Whilst not presented in this paper, modelling we conducted for the
32 A/NZ Government to underpin the Action Plan estimated income gains of US\$ 1.42 billion

Health and Inequality Impacts of Tobacco Endgame Strategies in Aotearoa

1 by 2040 (3% discount rate) due to the income gains occurring among those not dying
2 prematurely or developing chronic disease, a fillip to the A/NZ productivity and GDP overall
3 but also a pro-equity economic boost for Māori communities.

4

5 Colonisation is an underlying driver of ethnic inequalities in smoking behaviour. Māori
6 engagement and leadership throughout the process of developing and subsequent
7 implementation of A/NZs Action Plan has been essential to ensure the Plan itself is not a
8 further expression of coloniality. Legislation for the actual implementation of the Plan is
9 expected to happen during 2022 with different measures coming into force over the next few
10 years.

11

12 Other than a temporary ban on tobacco sales in Bhutan, no country has implemented any of
13 the endgame interventions proposed in the A/NZ Action Plan. This lack of evidence about the
14 real-world impacts of endgame strategies means that modelling studies' assumptions about
15 likely impact are based on theory, logic, expert views and simulation studies. It is therefore
16 imperative that where endgame strategies are implemented, they are robustly evaluated to
17 provide evidence to better inform decision-making and improve modelled estimates such as
18 in this current study. Second, such evaluations should include a thorough investigation of
19 equity issues, including where applicable, the exploration of intended and unintended impacts
20 on Indigenous peoples. Thirdly, the striking equity impacts of endgame interventions
21 estimated in this study underline that future tobacco control modelling studies should explore
22 impacts on inequities in smoking prevalence and smoking-related disease.

23 Strengths and limitations

24 Given data limitations, expert judgement and estimates from scenario studies were used in
25 specifying the impacts of endgame policies. We specified substantial uncertainty about most
26 of these inputs (Table 2), then used Monte Carlo simulations to generate uncertainty about
27 the outputs of HALYs gained and mortality impacts. The uncertainty intervals of the HALYs,
28 for example, are non-overlapping between the denicotinisation and retail interventions, and
29 with BAU, suggesting a strong degree of confidence in the likely magnitude of health gains
30 and inequality impacts. Univariate sensitivity analyses for the combined interventions policy
31 package (Figure 4) clearly show that uncertainty about how much cessation will reduce with

Health and Inequality Impacts of Tobacco Endgame Strategies in Aotearoa

1 a denicotinisation policy is the key uncertainty in our modelling. That said, even for this
2 cessation impact varying widely from a 67.1% to 96.3% reduction in prevalence, the lifetime
3 HALY gains were always substantial (range 545,000 to 653,000).

4

5 We used 2013-14 to 2019-20 health survey data to parametrise our smoking-vaping life
6 history model. Since then, 2020-21 data has found a marked drop in smoking prevalence in
7 all socio-demographic groups. If this drop is not just a statistical anomaly, then we may have
8 over-estimated smoking rates in the base year and BAU in the future, therefore
9 overestimating HALY gains and mortality rate reductions arising from endgame strategies.
10 Second, we assumed all uptake occurred at age 20, and report smoking prevalence for 20+
11 year olds; had we used 15+ year olds as our denominator, the smoking prevalence results
12 reported would have been lower.

13

14 A/NZ has a fairly liberal access to alternative nicotine products, such as vaping. This meant
15 that in our modelling, some people quitting tobacco took up vaping for a while at least
16 (Supplementary Table S24). The generalisability of our study to other countries will depend
17 partly on their regulatory environment for vaping.

18

19 Homegrown tobacco for personal recreational use, and illicit supply, may provide some
20 alternative tobacco source in A/NZ with denicotinisation or substantial reduction in retail
21 access. However, homegrown tobacco is uncommon in A/NZ due to a non-ideal physical
22 environment in most of A/NZ for growing, and tight border security in an island nation with
23 no land borders reduces the potential of an illicit market.

24

25 We have highlighted the importance of Māori and Indigenous engagement in the
26 development and implementation of A/NZ's Action Plan. The Plan also draws attention to the
27 need for research and evaluation to provide an accountability mechanism to Māori. In this
28 paper we attempted to uphold Indigenous Data Sovereignty principles, including Māori and
29 other First peoples contributors (AW, RM and RL), providing data analysed against
30 Indigenous population norms and including Indigenous interpretations. But more should be
31 done in the future to engage Maori governance of research alongside the implementation of

Health and Inequality Impacts of Tobacco Endgame Strategies in Aotearoa

1 the Action Plan, facilitating Māori researchers undertaking that research where practicable,
2 and prioritizing dissemination of findings to Māori communities first.

3

4 Conclusion

5 Many countries have Indigenous, ethnic and socio-economic inequalities in tobacco use.

6 This modelling study suggests that tobacco endgame strategies could have major impacts

7 both on overall health status, and on reducing inequalities in health.

8

9

Health and Inequality Impacts of Tobacco Endgame Strategies in Aotearoa

1 References

- 2 1. WHO. Tobacco: Key Facts 2021 [Available from: [https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/tobacco)
3 [sheets/detail/tobacco](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/tobacco) accessed 17 Jan 2022.
- 4 2. Maddox R, Waa A, Lee K, et al. Commercial tobacco and indigenous peoples: a stock take
5 on Framework Convention on Tobacco Control progress. *Tobacco Control*
6 2019;28(5):574-81.
- 7 3. Blakely T, Disney G, Valeri L, et al. Socioeconomic and Tobacco Mediation of Ethnic
8 Inequalities in Mortality over Time: Repeated Census-mortality Cohort Studies, 1981
9 to 2011. *Epidemiol* 2018;29(4):506-16. doi: 10.1097/EDE.0000000000000842
10 [published Online First: 2018/04/12]
- 11 4. Williams DR, Mohammed SA. Racism and health I: Pathways and scientific evidence.
12 *American behavioral scientist* 2013;57(8):1152-73.
- 13 5. Waa A, Robson B, Gifford H, et al. Foundation for a Smoke-Free World and healthy
14 Indigenous futures: an oxymoron? *Tobacco Control* 2019;29:237-40. doi:
15 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2018-054792>
- 16 6. Maddox R, Bovill M, Waa A, et al. Reflections on Indigenous commercial tobacco
17 control: 'The dolphins will always take us home': BMJ Publishing Group Ltd, 2022.
- 18 7. Waa A, Maddox R, Henderson PN. Big tobacco using Trojan horse tactics to exploit
19 Indigenous peoples. *Tobacco Control* 2020;29(e1):e132-e33.
- 20 8. Ministry of Health. 2021. Annual Data Explorer 2020/21: New Zealand Health Survey
21 [Tobacco Use]. URL: [https://minhealthnz.shinyapps.io/nz-health-survey-2020-21-](https://minhealthnz.shinyapps.io/nz-health-survey-2020-21-annual-data-explorer/)
22 [annual-data-explorer/](https://minhealthnz.shinyapps.io/nz-health-survey-2020-21-annual-data-explorer/).
- 23 9. New Zealand Ministry of Health. Report back on New Zealand's Tobacco Control
24 Programme, 2016.
- 25 10. New Zealand Parliament. Government Response to the Report of the Māori Affairs
26 Committee on its Inquiry into the tobacco industry in Aotearoa and the consequences
27 of tobacco use for Māori (Final Response). Wellington: New Zealand Parliament,
28 2011.
- 29 11. van der Deen F, Ikeda T, Cobiac L, et al. Projecting future smoking prevalence to 2025
30 and beyond in New Zealand using smoking prevalence data from the 2013 Census.
31 *NZMJ* 2014;127(1406):1-9.
- 32 12. Cahn Z, Siegel M. Electronic cigarettes as a harm reduction strategy for tobacco control:
33 a step forward or a repeat of past mistakes? . *Journal of Public Health Policy*
34 2011;32(1):16-31.
- 35 13. Ministry of Health. Smokefree Aotearoa 2025 Action Plan. Wellington, NZ: Ministry of
36 Health, 2021.
- 37 14. Donny EC, Denlinger RL, Tidey JW, et al. Randomized Trial of Reduced-Nicotine
38 Standards for Cigarettes. *N Engl J Med* 2015;373(14):1340-9. doi:
39 10.1056/NEJMs1502403
- 40 15. McLaren L, McIntyre L, S. K. Rose's population strategy of prevention need not increase
41 social inequalities in health. *International Journal of Epidemiology* 2010;39(2):372-
42 77. doi: 10.1093/ije/dyp315
- 43 16. Charters C, Stavenhagen R, Translation E, et al. The United Nations Declaration on the
44 Rights of Indigenous Peoples. 2009
- 45 17. Scottish Government. Raising Scotland's Tobacco-free Generation Our Tobacco-Control
46 Action Plan. Edinburgh: Scottish Government, 2018.

Health and Inequality Impacts of Tobacco Endgame Strategies in Aotearoa

- 1 18. Puljevic C, Morphett K, Hefler M, et al. Closing the gaps in tobacco endgame evidence: a
2 scoping review. *Tob Control* 2022;31(2):365-75. doi: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2021-
3 056579 [published Online First: 2022/03/05]
- 4 19. Blakely T, Cobiac LJ, Cleghorn CL, et al. Health, health inequality, and cost impacts of
5 annual increases in tobacco tax: multistate life table modeling in New Zealand. *PLoS*
6 *medicine* 2015;12(7):e1001856.
- 7 20. Pearson AL, Cleghorn CL, van der Deen FS, et al. Tobacco retail outlet restrictions:
8 health and cost impacts from multistate life-table modelling in a national population.
9 *Tob Control* 2016 doi: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2015-052846 [published Online First:
10 20160922]
- 11 21. van der Deen FS, Wilson N, Cleghorn CL, et al. Impact of five tobacco endgame
12 strategies on future smoking prevalence, population health and health system costs:
13 two modelling studies to inform the tobacco endgame. *Tobacco control*
14 2018;27(3):278-86.
- 15 22. Huang V, Head A, Hyseni L, et al. Identifying best modelling practices for tobacco
16 control policy simulations: a systematic review and a novel quality assessment
17 framework. *Tob Control* 2022 doi: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2021-056825 [published
18 Online First: 2022/01/13]
- 19 23. Doan TTT, Tan KW, Dickens BSL, et al. Evaluating smoking control policies in the e-
20 cigarette era: a modelling study. *Tobacco control* 2020;29(5):522-30.
- 21 24. Blakely T, Moss R, Collins J, et al. Proportional multistate lifetable modelling of
22 preventive interventions: concepts, code and worked examples. *International Journal*
23 *of Epidemiology* 2020;49(5):1624-36. doi: 10.1093/ije/dyaa132
- 24 25. Ministry of Health. Health Loss in New Zealand 1990–2013: A report from the New
25 Zealand Burden of Diseases, Injuries and Risk Factors Study. Wellington: Ministry of
26 Health, 2016.
- 27 26. Murray C, Ezzati M, Lopez A, et al. Comparative quantification of health risks:
28 Conceptual framework and methodological issues. *Popul Health Metr* 2003;1(1):1.
- 29 27. Mendez D, Warner KE. A magic bullet? The potential impact of e-cigarettes on the toll of
30 cigarette smoking. *Nicotine and Tobacco Research* 2021;23(4):654-61.
- 31 28. Wilson N, Hoek J, Nghiem N, et al. Modelling the impacts of tobacco denicotinisation on
32 achieving the Smokefree 2025 goal in Aotearoa New Zealand. *NZ Med J*
33 2022;135(1548)
- 34 29. Pearson AL, Cleghorn CL, van der Deen FS, et al. Tobacco retail outlet restrictions:
35 health and cost impacts from multistate life-table modelling in a national population.
36 *Tob Control* 2017;26:579–85. doi: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2015-052846
- 37 30. Blakely T, Cobiac LJ, Cleghorn CL, et al. Health, Health Inequality, and Cost Impacts of
38 Annual Increases in Tobacco Tax: Multistate Life Table Modeling in New Zealand.
39 *PLoS Med* 2015;12(7):e1001856. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1001856
- 40 31. Nghiem N, Cleghorn CL, Leung W, et al. A national quitline service and its promotion in
41 the mass media: modelling the health gain, health equity and cost–utility. *Tobacco*
42 *Control* 2017;27(4):434-41. doi: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2017-053660
- 43 32. Anderson I, Robson B, Connolly M, et al. Indigenous and tribal peoples' health (The
44 Lancet–Lowitja Institute Global Collaboration): a population study. *The Lancet*
45 2016;388(10040):131-57. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(16\)00345-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(16)00345-7)
- 46 33. Blakely T, Barendregt JJ, Foster RH, et al. The association of active smoking with
47 multiple cancers: national census-cancer registry cohorts with quantitative bias

Health and Inequality Impacts of Tobacco Endgame Strategies in Aotearoa

- 1 analysis. *Cancer Causes Control* 2013;24(6):1243–55. doi: 10.1007/s10552-013-
2 0204-2 [published Online First: 2013/04/13]
- 3 34. Hunt D, Blakely T, Woodward A, et al. The smoking-mortality association varies over
4 time and by ethnicity in New Zealand. *Int J Epidemiol* 2005;34:1020-28.
- 5 35. Thun M, Apicella L, Henley S. Smoking vs other risk factors as the cause of smoking-
6 attributable deaths. Confounding in the courtroom. *JAMA* 2000;284:706-12.
- 7 36. Hoogenveen R, van Baal P, Boshuizen H, et al. Dynamic effects of smoking cessation on
8 disease incidence, mortality and quality of life: The role of time since cessation. *Cost*
9 *Eff Resour Alloc* 2008;6:1-15. doi: doi: 10.1186/1478-7547-6-1
- 10 37. Petrovic-Van Der Deen FS, Blakely T, Kvizhinadze G, et al. Restricting tobacco sales to
11 only pharmacies combined with cessation advice: A modelling study of the future
12 smoking prevalence, health and cost impacts. *Tobacco Control* 2019;28(6):643-50.
13 doi: 10.1136/tobaccocontrol-2018-054600 [published Online First: 2018/11/11]
- 14 38. Edwards R, Johnson E, Hoek J, et al. The Smokefree 2025 Action Plan: key findings
15 from the ITC New Zealand (EASE) project. In: Expert PH, ed. Public Health Expert.
16 Wellington: University of Otago, 2021.

17

Health and Inequality Impacts of Tobacco Endgame Strategies in Aotearoa

1 Tables and Figures

Health and Inequality Impacts of Tobacco Endgame Strategies in Aotearoa

Table 1: Baseline and business-as-usual parameters

Parameter	Data Source	Trend, Uncertainty, and Scenario Analyses
Demography		
Population	Statistics New Zealand (SNZ) population estimates for 2018 by sex, age-group, and ethnicity.	Uncertainty: nil
BAU – epidemiological parameters		
All-cause mortality rates (ACMR)	SNZ mortality rates by sex, age, and ethnicity for 2020	Trends in ACMR were estimated using GHDx data (IMME). The annual percentage change in the age-standardised all-cause mortality rates from 1990 to 2019 was -1.9% for sexes combined. Retaining the original BODE3 model assumption of a 0.5 percent point greater APC for Māori (due to long run trends of closing ethnic inequalities in mortality), we arrived at APC's for ACMR from 2020 to 2035 of: Māori = -2.0%; non-Māori = -1.5%. They were uniform by age. No trends applied beyond 2035. Uncertainty: nil.
All-cause morbidity rates	NZ Burden of Disease Study ²⁵	Data on years of life lived with disability (YLD) were obtained from the NZBDS for each sex and age group in 2016 and divided by the population in each sex by age by ethnic group to generate morbidity rates. No time trend was allowed.
Disease specific incidence, prevalence, and case-fatality rates	NZ Burden of Disease Study ²⁵	For each tobacco-related disease, coherent sets (by sex, age, and ethnicity) of incidence rates, prevalence, case-fatality rates (CFR), and remission rates (zero for non-cancers, the complement of the CFR for cancers to give the expected 5-y relative survival) were estimated using DISMOD II. Cancer incidence and CFR annual percentage change (APC) trends using Poisson regression historic trends of incidence and case-fatality rates of diseases. The APCs included as inputs to the PMSLT model out to year 2035 and held constant beyond (future prevalence changes dynamically with model). It was assumed that the APCs were constant by ethnicity. Uncertainty: starting in 2020, rates all +/- 5% standard deviation (SD), correlations 1.0 between four sex by ethnic group categories for all diseases. APC all +/- 0.5% SD normal, correlations 1.0 between four sex by ethnic groups for all diseases.
Disease specific morbidity	NZ Burden of Disease Study ²⁵	The sex and age specific disability rates were calculated as disease's YLD obtained divided by the prevalent cases. The same disability rate was assumed by ethnicity (i.e., those with disease are assumed

Health and Inequality Impacts of Tobacco Endgame Strategies in Aotearoa

Parameter	Data Source	Trend, Uncertainty, and Scenario Analyses
		to have same severity distribution across ethnicity). Uncertainty: +/- 5% SD (beta distribution)
Tobacco smoking and vaping		
Smoking (daily)	NZ Health Survey	Logistic regression of NZ Health Survey data for years 2011 to 2019 was undertaken to ‘predict’ the prevalence of daily smoking (at least one cigarette per day) for years 2020 to 2040. This ‘prediction file’ was then re-analysed from a sex by ethnicity by five-year age group perspective (i.e., 72 separate sex by age by ethnicity cohorts) to generate future BAU smoking prevalence – and a yearly (cohort aging) rate of decline – that was then used in the exposure model.
Vaping (daily e-cigarette use)	NZ Health Survey	Same as above for smoking, but for ‘vaping’ at least daily.
Association of smoking and vaping with disease incidence rates		
Smoking-disease incidence rate ratios	Relative risks of disease incidence for the association of current (or ex-smoker) with never smoker were sourced from NZ linked census-cancer ³³ and census-mortality ³⁴ (censuses include smoking question) and CPS II data for respiratory diseases. ³⁵ Attenuation over time since quitting for ex-smokers was modelled using equations and coefficients from Hoogenveen et al. ³⁶	Standard errors of regression coefficients as described in Appendix C

Health and Inequality Impacts of Tobacco Endgame Strategies in Aotearoa

Table 2: Intervention input parameter table

Parameter	Description
<i>Denicotinisation</i>	
NS→ CS (age 20 only) NS→ DU (age 20 only)	10% (SD 5%) of BAU initiation at age 20 by five years after implementation (X= Beta (3.6, 32.4), median 9.3%, 95% UI 2.6% to 21.5%). Implemented as $X^{(t/5)}$ scalar applied to the BAU initiation rates in years t (1 to 5) after introduction of the policy, then held at X% thereafter.
CS→ FSFV CS→ FSCV DU→ FSFV DU→ FSCV	Using an expert knowledge elicitation (see Appendix D), smoking prevalence (i.e. X=prevalence in states CS and DU) with mean 15.2% (SD 7.84%, X=Beta (3.19, 17.78), median 14.1%, 95% UI: 3.7% to 32.9%) of BAU smoking prevalence five years after low nicotine policy implementation, due to quitting or switching to vaping (i.e. disregarding initiation impacts that will additionally impact prevalence among 20-24 year olds in first five years of the model). Implementation was as $X^{(t/5)}$ scalar applied to BAU CS and DU prevalence where t is the 1 to 5 years after intervention. For the sixth and subsequent years, the transition probabilities were twice those in BAU (due to an ongoing higher NCR, given non-addictive levels of nicotine in tobacco).
NS→NSCV	No change.
<i>Denicotinisation plus Mass media</i>	
NS→ CS (age 20 only)	As above for low nicotine.
NS→ DU (age 20 only)	As above for low nicotine.
NS→ NSCV (age 20 only)	No change.
CS→ FSFV CS→ FSCV DU→ FSFV DU→ FSCV	As above for low nicotine from year 1 to 5 + twice the absolute contribution of the routine media/Quitline campaign to background net cessation (i.e. $1.055\% \times 2 = 2.1\%$) ³¹ Subsequent years: transition to quitting or vaping were twice those in BAU
<i>Retail outlet restriction to about 300 outlets (about 5% of current outlets; assumed supply of e-cigarettes reduces commensurately)</i> [†]	
NS→ CS	As per the increase in cessation probabilities (CS→FSFV, etc, below), we reduced the initiation rate by X= Beta (23.4, 97.2), median 19.2%, 95% UI: 12.9% to 26.9%. Applies in 2023 onwards (as youth contemplating initiating in the future confront lesser retail availability as well).

Health and Inequality Impacts of Tobacco Endgame Strategies in Aotearoa

Parameter	Description
NS → DU	As above for NS → CS.
CS → FSFV CS → FSCV DU → FSFV DU → FSCV	<p>As a low estimate of one-off quitting, we used that from studies modelling reducing retail outlets in terms of increased travel costs³⁷: a reduction in the prevalence of 15.6% for Māori, and 16.0% for non-Māori – or 15.8% overall.</p> <p>As a high estimate, we used that from the NZ ITC study where – in response to a question whether they would quit in response to a 95% reduction in retail outlets - 23.0% said they would quit (half quitting → FSFV, half switching to FSCV).³⁸</p> <p>Placing the mean at 19.4% (average of above 15.8% and 23%) and using 15.8% and 23% as one SD either side of the mean (SD = 3.6%), we parameterised the one-off increase in smoking net cessation as $X = \text{Beta}(23.4, 97.2)$, median 19.2% (i.e., percentage point increase), 95% UI: 12.9% to 26.9%. Note this increase was on top of BAU transition probabilities, and halved over CS → FSFV and CS → FSCV, and halved over DU → FSFV and DU → FSCV. E.g. if the CS → FSFV was 5%, the intervention CS → FSFV transition probability was $5\% + (1-5\%) \times 0.5 \times X\%$.</p> <p>This effect was in the year of intervention only – in years after the retail outlet restriction, the transition probabilities out of CS and DU reverted to BAU.</p>
NS → NSCV	Unchanged
<i>Tobacco-free generation</i>	
Smoking initiation rate (NS → CS; occurs only at age 20)	For two reasons, a tobacco-free generation proposal will not immediately achieve zero uptake at age 20; 1) our model for parsimony assumes all uptake at age 20, but the minimum legal age of purchasing is 18 years; 2) social supply will allow some young people to keep initiating. We therefore assumed that initiation at age 20 in our model (essentially an average of all initiation by [say] age 25) will asymptote to a mean of $X = 10\%$ (SD 5%) of BAU in 10 years (Beta (3.6, 32.4), median 9.3%, 95% UI: 2.6% to 21.5%), with the scalar of BAU initiation rate of $X^{(t/10)}$ for $t = 1$ to 10 years after the tobacco-free generation policy is implemented, then X of BAU initiation thereafter.
NS → DU	As above for NS → CS.
NS → NSCV	Unchanged [†]

Health and Inequality Impacts of Tobacco Endgame Strategies in Aotearoa

Parameter	Description
<i>Combined: Denicotinisation + retail + tobacco-free</i>	
NS→ CS (age 20 only)	Cumulative impact. If the % reduction in initiation in year t for denicotinisation, retail and tobacco-free was A%, B%, and C%, then the reduction in the combined intervention was $1 - (1-A)(1-B)(1-C)$.
NS→ DU (age 20 only)	As above for NS→CS.
CS→ FSFV CS→ FSCV DU→ FSFV DU→ FSCV	Cumulative impact. If the % increase in quitting or switching in year t for denicotinisation, media and retail was A% and B%, then the increase in the combined intervention was $1 - (1-A)(1-B)(1-C)$.
NS→ NSCV	Unchanged.

NS=never smoker; CS=current smoker (but not a dual user); DU=dual user; NSCV=never smoker, current vaper; FSFV=former smoker and/or former vaper; FSCV=former smoker current vaper.

†If the availability of alternative nicotine delivery systems (ENDS, e.g. e-cigarettes) does not reduce commensurately with these policy interventions, one would expect larger switched to ANDS which would reduce smoking prevalence further (but increase DU, FSCV and possibly NSCV state prevalence). We do not model this explicitly but consider it in the Discussion.

Health and Inequality Impacts of Tobacco Endgame Strategies in Aotearoa

Table 3: Deaths averted† during 2020-30 and 2031-40, in Aotearoa New Zealand by strategy

Population	Year	Denicotinisation		Denicotinisation + media		Retail reduction		Smokefree generation		Combined interventions	
		Est	95%UI	Est	95%UI	Est	95%UI	Est	95%UI	Est	95%UI
Female Māori (n= 428,948 in 2020)	2020 to 2030	261	(183 to 339)	265	(188 to 341)	87	(58 to 123)	1	(0.39 to 0.77)	300	(233 to 368)
	2031 to 2040	1,780	(1,360 to 2,210)	1,800	(1,380 to 2,220)	441	(285 to 643)	14	(10 to 17)	1,890	(1,500 to 2,300)
	2020 to 2040	2,040	(1,540 to 2,550)	2,060	(1,570 to 2,560)	528	(344 to 764)	14	(10 to 18)	2,200	(1,740 to 2,650)
Female Non-Māori (n=2,132,141 in 2020)	2020 to 2030	281	(196 to 367)	285	(201 to 370)	97	(64 to 138)	0	(0.31 to 0.62)	324	(252 to 401)
	2031 to 2040	1,940	(1,450 to 2,430)	1,960	(1,480 to 2,440)	496	(321 to 729)	9	(6.1 to 12)	2,070	(1,620 to 2,530)
	2020 to 2040	2,220	(1,650 to 2,800)	2,240	(1,680 to 2,810)	594	(384 to 867)	9	(6.4 to 12)	2,390	(1,870 to 2,920)
Male Māori (n= 425,740 in 2020)	2020 to 2030	140	(97 to 183)	142	(101 to 184)	49	(32 to 69)	0	(0 to 0.01)	163	(127 to 200)
	2031 to 2040	864	(651 to 1,070)	873	(661 to 1,080)	221	(145 to 321)	4	(2.6 to 4.8)	921	(726 to 1,120)
	2020 to 2040	1,000	(747 to 1,260)	1,010	(765 to 1,260)	270	(176 to 389)	4	(2.6 to 4.8)	1,080	(851 to 1,310)
Male Non-Māori (n= 2,099,493 in 2020)	2020 to 2030	329	(229 to 431)	333	(236 to 433)	113	(75 to 160)	0	(0.12 to 0.28)	380	(298 to 468)
	2031 to 2040	1,970	(1,500 to 2,440)	1,990	(1,520 to 2,450)	504	(330 to 734)	4	(2.6 to 5)	2,110	(1,670 to 2,540)
	2020 to 2040	2,300	(1,730 to 2,860)	2,320	(1,760 to 2,870)	617	(405 to 892)	4	(2.7 to 5.3)	2,490	(1,980 to 3,000)
All (n= 5,086,322 in 2020)	2020 to 2030	1,010	(707 to 1320)	1,020	(728 to 1,320)	346	(230 to 491)	1	(0.84 to 1.6)	1,170	(911 to 1,430)
	2031 to 2040	6,560	(4,990 to 8,160)	6,620	(5,060 to 8,190)	1,660	(1,080 to 2,420)	30	(22 to 37)	6,990	(5,520 to 8,470)
	2020 to 2040	7,570	(5,680 to 9,440)	7,640	(5,780 to 9,490)	2,010	(1,310 to 2,900)	31	(23 to 39)	8,150	(6,450 to 9,890)

†Deaths averted over the period, i.e., total deaths over each ten-year period in BAU minus intervention.


Health and Inequality Impacts of Tobacco Endgame Strategies in Aotearoa

Table 4: Health gain (in HALYs gained) for people alive in 2020 (base-year, N = 5,086,322) in Aotearoa New Zealand by the modelled policies, by timeline into the future (3% discount rate)

Population	Year	Denicotinisation		Denicotinisation + media		Retail reduction		Smokefree generation		Combined interventions	
		Estimate	95% UI	Estimate	95% UI	Estimate	95% UI	Estimate	95% UI	Estimate	95% UI
Female Māori	2020 to 2030	955	(679 to 1,260)	971	(699 to 1,260)	335	(221 to 475)	23	(16 to 31)	1,130	(884 to 1,380)
	2031 to 2040	10,600	(7,990 to 13,100)	10,700	(8,160 to 13,100)	2,800	(1,830 to 3,990)	325	(242 to 406)	11,500	(9,370 to 13,700)
	2041 to 2131	151,000	(111,000 to 188,000)	151,000	(112,000 to 189,000)	24,800	(15,900 to 36,700)	29,900	(19,400 to 40,600)	157,000	(116,000 to 195,000)
	All	162,000	(120,000 to 202,000)	163,000	(121,000 to 203,000)	27,900	(18,000 to 41,100)	30,300	(19,700 to 41,000)	170,000	(127,000 to 210,000)
Female Non-Māori	2020 to 2030	1,450	(1,030 to 1,940)	1,470	(1,050 to 1,950)	525	(346 to 745)	23	(16 to 32)	1,710	(1,330 to 2,130)
	2031 to 2040	14,700	(11,000 to 18,300)	14,800	(11,200 to 18,400)	3,990	(2,610 to 5,770)	334	(239 to 443)	16,000	(12,800 to 19,200)
	2041 to 2131	142,000	(104,000 to 182,000)	143,000	(105,000 to 182,000)	28,200	(17,800 to 42,800)	15,300	(9,950 to 22,400)	149,000	(109,000 to 189,000)
	All	159,000	(116,000 to 201,000)	160,000	(117,000 to 202,000)	32,700	(20,800 to 49,200)	15,600	(10,300 to 22,900)	166,000	(124,000 to 209,000)
Male Māori	2020 to 2030	596	(423 to 786)	606	(436 to 792)	214	(141 to 303)	17	(12 to 22)	707	(554 to 871)
	2031 to 2040	6,080	(4,570 to 7,520)	6,140	(4,670 to 7,560)	1,640	(1,070 to 2,350)	230	(171 to 291)	6,650	(5,360 to 7,940)
	2041 to 2131	70,100	(49,400 to 90,600)	70,500	(49,600 to 91,000)	12,400	(7,990 to 18,800)	12,800	(8,220 to 18,100)	73,600	(52,100 to 94,200)
	All	76,700	(54,800 to 98,300)	77,200	(55,300 to 98,800)	14,300	(9,240 to 21,400)	13,000	(8,450 to 18,300)	80,800	(58,200 to 103,000)
Male Non-Māori	2020 to 2030	1,620	(1,140 to 2,150)	1,640	(1,170 to 2,160)	585	(384 to 830)	24	(16 to 33)	1,910	(1,500 to 2,360)
	2031 to 2040	15,900	(12,000 to 19,700)	16,000	(12,200 to 19,800)	4,300	(2,810 to 6,180)	345	(249 to 455)	17,300	(14,000 to 20,800)
	2041 to 2131	151,000	(112,000 to 193,000)	152,000	(112,000 to 193,000)	29,500	(18,900 to 44,400)	16,300	(10,800 to 23,800)	158,000	(119,000 to 199,000)
	All	168,000	(126,000 to 214,000)	169,000	(127,000 to 214,000)	34,400	(22,100 to 51,400)	16,700	(11,100 to 24,300)	177,000	(134,000 to 221,000)
All population	2020 to 2030	4,630	(3,260 to 6,140)	4,690	(3,360 to 6,170)	1,660	(1,090 to 2,360)	88	(60 to 118)	5,460	(4,280 to 6,740)
	2031 to 2040	47,400	(35,700 to 58,500)	47,800	(36,400 to 58,700)	12,700	(8,300 to 18,300)	1,230	(909 to 1,590)	51,500	(41,500 to 61,600)
	2041 to 2131	514,000	(378,000 to 650,000)	517,000	(380,000 to 653,000)	94,800	(60,900 to 143,000)	74,200	(49,000 to 104,000)	537,000	(396,000 to 673,000)
	All	566,000	(421,000 to 711,000)	569,000	(424,000 to 714,000)	109,000	(70,200 to 163,000)	75,500	(50,200 to 105,000)	594,000	(443,000 to 738,000)

Health and Inequality Impacts of Tobacco Endgame Strategies in Aotearoa


Figure 1. Smoking prevalence (daily, 20+ year population) in Aotearoa New Zealand under business-as-usual and interventions



Note: Prevalences are not age-standardised and are calculated for the projected age-structure of each sex by ethnic group in future years.

Health and Inequality Impacts of Tobacco Endgame Strategies in Aotearoa


Figure 2: Ratios of per capita HALY gains over the remainder of the 2020 Aotearoa-New Zealand population's lifespan, for Māori compared to non-Māori



Calculated using cohorts defined by age in 2020, age standardised using the 2020 Māori population.

Health and Inequality Impacts of Tobacco Endgame Strategies in Aotearoa

Figure 3: Projected percentage changes in age-standardised all-cause mortality rate differences (≥ 45 years) between Māori and non-Māori, for endgame strategies [†] compared to BAU




SRD: Standardised rate difference. Rates are standardised to the Māori population

[†] We do not show the tobacco-free generation as there is no change in 45 plus year old mortality rates in this timeline.

Health and Inequality Impacts of Tobacco Endgame Strategies in Aotearoa

Figure 4: Tornado plots of total HALYs (3% discount, lifetime) showing the ranking of smoking initiation and cessation parameters by how much uncertainty their 2.5th and 97.5th percentiles cause for the combined intervention policy package compared to BAU, for:



Percentile values for sensitivity analyses (taken from Table 2):

- *Denicotinisation: annual smoking cessation rate.* Cessation rates in first five years after policy implementation set to achieve 3.7% (2.5th percentile) or 32.9% (97.5th percentile) of BAU smoking prevalence [median = 14.1%].
- *Retail reduction: annual smoking cessation rate.* One off (in year of implementation) increase in cessation rate of 12.9 percentage points (2.5th percentile) or 26.9 percentage points (97.5th percentile) [median = 19.2 percentage points]. Note: when combined with denicotinisation (above), it acts on top of the ‘new’ (not BAU) denicotinisation cessation rate.
- *Denicotinisation: annual smoking initiation rate.* Initiation rate five years after policy implementation reduced to 2.6% (2.5th percentile) or 21.5% (97.5th percentile) of BAU initiation rates [median = 9.3%].
- *Smokefree generation: annual smoking initiation rate.* Initiation rate five years after policy implementation reduced to 2.6% (2.5th percentile) or 21.5% (97.5th percentile) of BAU initiation rates [median = 9.3%]. Note: when combined with denicotinisation (above), it acts on top of the ‘new’ (not BAU) denicotinisation cessation rate.
- *Retail reduction: annual smoking initiation rate.* Permanent decrease in initiation rate of 12.9% (2.5th percentile) or 26.9% (97.5th percentile) [median = 19.2%]. Note: when combined with denicotinisation and smokefree generation (above), it acts on top of the ‘new’ (not BAU) initiation rate.

Note the vertical black line of 610,073 HALYs is for the median value of all input parameters. It differs modestly from the 594,000 central estimate of HALYs in the main analyses, which is the median across all iterations of the Monte Carlo analyses.