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

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

6
7 ^{1.} Institute for Mental Health Policy Research, Centre for Addiction and Mental Health, 33
8 Ursula Franklin Street, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, M5S 2S1

9 ^{2.} Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, 155 College Street, Toronto, ON,
10 M5T 1P8, Canada

11 ^{3.} Addiction Medicine, Department of Psychiatry, Lausanne University Hospital and University
12 of Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland

13 ^{4.} Department of Health and Social Sciences, University of the West of England, Bristol, UK

14 ^{5.} Campbell Family Mental Health Research Institute, Centre for Addiction and Mental Health,
15 33 Ursula Franklin Street, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, M5T 2S1

16 ^{6.} 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 ^{7.} Center for Interdisciplinary Addiction Research (ZIS), Department of Psychiatry and
20 Psychotherapy, University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf (UKE), Martinistraße 52,
21 20246 Hamburg, Germany

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

55

Abstract

Background

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

Methods

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

Results

The increase in excise taxation was associated with a substantial decrease in all-cause mortality in all models considered. ITS methodology and using the age-distribution of Lithuania were consistently associated with higher estimates of deaths averted. Although confidence and prediction intervals were highly overlapping, the point estimates differed substantially. The taxation increase was associated with 1,155 deaths averted in the year following the 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

Introduction

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

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

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

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

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

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

The aim of this paper will be to quantify this effect into deaths averted in the year after its implementation, based on different methodologies.

Methods

Time of investigation and data sources

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

Age-standardization

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

Estimating the Intervention Effect

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Results

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

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

months following the taxation increases using the two different age standardization schemes
(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

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

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

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

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

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)

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

The proportional reductions from the prior year were 4.27% and 4.83% for men, and 0.82% and 0.84% for women for the WHO and Lithuanian standard population, respectively. The sensitivity analysis of a separate ITS of the total population rate corroborated the data: WHO standard averted deaths 949; 95% CI: 612; 1285; Lithuanian standard: 1202; 95% CI: 577-1811.

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

Discussion

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Finally, we return briefly to the implications of the Lithuanian experience, and of the particular intervention studied in this paper, for the World Health Organization's global public health strategy to reduce harms from alcohol, and its identification of "best buys" for national 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

References

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

NEUFELD, M., BOBROVA, A., DAVLETOV, K., STELEMEKAS, M., STOPPEL, R., FERREIRA-BORGES, C., BRED, J. & REHM, J. 2021. Alcohol control policies in Former Soviet Union countries: A narrative review of three decades of policy changes and their apparent effects. *Drug Alcohol Rev*, 40, 350-367.

RABINOVICH, L., BRUTSCHER, P. B., DE VRIES, H., TIESSEN, J., CLIFT, J. & REDING, A. 2009. The Affordability of Alcoholic Beverages in the European Union: Understanding the Link Between Alcohol Affordability, Consumption and Harms. RAND Technical Report. Cambridge, U.K.

REHM, J. & IMTIAZ, S. 2016. Alcohol consumption as a risk factor for global burden of disease. A narrative review. *Substance Abuse Treatment, Prevention and Policy*, 11, 37.

REHM, J., ŠTELEMĚKAS, M., FERREIRA-BORGES, C., JIANG, H., LANGE, S., NEUFELD, M., ROOM, R., CASSWELL, S., TRAN, A. & MANTHEY, J. 2021. Classifying Alcohol Control Policies with Respect to Expected Changes in Consumption and Alcohol-Attributable Harm: The Example of Lithuania, 2000–2019. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18, 2419.

SHADISH, W. R., COOK, T. D. & CAMPBELL, D. T. 2002. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference*, New York, U.S., Houghton Mifflin Company.

SHIELD, K., MANTHEY, J., RYLETT, M., PROBST, C., WETTLAUER, A., PARRY, C. D. H. & REHM, J. 2020. National, regional, and global burdens of disease from 2000 to 2016 attributable to alcohol use: a comparative risk assessment study. *The Lancet Public Health*, 5, e51-e61.

SORNPAISARN, B., SHIELD, K. D., ÖSTERBERG, E. & REHM, J. 2017. *Resource tool on alcohol taxation and pricing policies*, Geneva, World Health Organization.

STATISTICS CANADA. 2020. *Age-standardized Rates* [Online]. Ottawa, Canada: Statistics Canada. Available: <https://www.statcan.gc.ca/eng/dai/btd/asr> [Accessed 15/03/2021].

ŠTELEMĚKAS, M., MANTHEY, J., BADARAS, R., CASSWELL, S., FERREIRA-BORGES, C., KALĖDIENĖ, R., LANGE, S., NEUFELD, M., PETKEVIČIENĖ, J., RADIŠAUSKAS, R., ROOM, R., TELKSUNY, T., ZURLYTĖ, I. & REHM, J. 2021. Alcohol control policy measures and all-cause mortality in Lithuania: an interrupted time-series analysis. *Addiction*, Online ahead of print.

THE COMPREHENSIVE R ARCHIVE NETWORK (CRAN). 2021. *The Comprehensive R Archive Network Home Page* [Online]. CRAN. Available: <https://cran.r-project.org/> [Accessed 15/03/2021].

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION 2017. 'Best Buys' and Other Recommended Interventions for the Prevention and Control of Noncommunicable Diseases. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization.

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION. 2018. Global status report on alcohol and health 2018. Available: https://www.who.int/substance_abuse/publications/global_alcohol_report/en/ [Accessed 05/20/2019].

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 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 ¹	Rate (SD)	% change ¹	Rate (SD)	% change ¹		
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%

Note. Years in which alcohol policies with expected high impact were implemented are highlighted in grey and calculated as the percent change from the previous year¹.

Table A.2. Model results for the impact of different sets of alcohol policies on all-cause 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 ²		-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 ⁴			
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 ²	0.80	0.82	0.83
Autocorrelation ¹	MA(1)	AR(1)	AR(1)

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

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

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

Table A.3. Predictive model results on all-cause mortality for the impact of different sets of alcohol policies before February 2017, using the Lithuanian population from February 2017 as 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 ²		-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 ²	0.78	0.79	0.81
Autocorrelation ¹	MA(1)	AR(2)	AR(2)

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

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

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

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

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

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