Reducing Tobacco Use and Secondhand Smoke Exposure: Smoke-Free Policies

Summary Evidence Table - Economic Evidence

Author, Year Study Design Economic Method	Study Location Sample Size Population Characteristics Time horizon	Intervention Description	Effect size	Intervention Costs (2011 US\$)	Intervention Benefits (2011 US\$)	Economic summary measure (2011 US\$)
American Cancer Society (ACS) 2011 Model Healthcare costs averted	United States 27 states without current state-wide SF policies No characteristics given 5 years	Implementing state-wide comprehensive SF policies in states with no current policy. Policy would: cover all work places; make venues 100% SF with no exceptions; limit state-wide laws from preempting local authorities from enacting stronger SF laws	Decreases in the lung cancer, heart attacks, stroke, smoking related diseases in Medicaid population, and smoking-related pregnancies from literature; effect and sources not reported	N/A	Total healthcare costs averted: \$1.36 billion (States' Medicaid savings: \$44.1 million)	N/A
Hauri 2010 Model Healthcare costs averted	Switzerland Not reported (estimated population of Switzerland: 7.7 million*) 21% of population were exposed to ETS in public places for >7 hours/week For hospital days: 1 year; For YLL: lifetime	Hypothetical smoking ban in public places (restaurants, cafes, bars, events, workplaces, schools and universities)	Smoking ban reduced hospital admissions for ischemic heart disease by 0.84 (95% CI: 0.80, 0.88)	N/A	Hospital days from ischemic heart disease averted: 40,954 (30,528 – 50,882) YLL from ischemic heart disease averted: 15,409 (11,144 – 19,738) Total costs averted (healthcare + YLL): \$65 million	N/A

Author, Year Study Design Economic Method	Study Location Sample Size Population Characteristics Time horizon	Intervention Description	Effect size	Intervention Costs (2011 US\$)	Intervention Benefits (2011 US\$)	Economic summary measure (2011 US\$)
Herman 2011 Hospital database analysis Healthcare costs averted	Arizona Counties with no ban prior to May 1, 2007 (~17% of AZ's population) No characteristics given 1 year	Arizona's state- wide smoking ban implemented on May 1, 2007	Changes in number of AMI, unstable angina, acute stroke, acute asthma hospital discharges in no ban counties	N/A	Number of cases reduced: Acute MI: 159 Unstable Angina: 63 Acute Stroke: 198 Acute Asthma: 249 Estimated savings (hospital charges): Acute MI: \$7.5 million Unstable Angina: \$0.9 million Acute Stroke: \$5.1 million Acute asthma: \$4.0 million Total: \$17.6 million (Savings to Medicaid: \$2.4 million)	N/A

Author, Year Study Design Economic Method	Study Location Sample Size Population Characteristics Time horizon	Intervention Description	Effect size	Intervention Costs (2011 US\$)	Intervention Benefits (2011 US\$)	Economic summary measure (2011 US\$)
Hojgaard 2011 Model Cost- effective	Denmark Not reported (estimated population of Denmark: 5.5 million*) No characteristics given Steady state	Ban on smoking in enclosed public places	Primary aim of ban is to reduce passive smoking (assumed half of the exposure to ETS occurred at home and half in public) Base case scenario and worst and best case scenarios were conducted. Worst case scenario suggests changes were from social norms and ban had no impact. Effect on Smoking: Initiation Rate: No effect in base case; reduction of 20% in 11-16 yr olds in best case Quit Rate: No effect in base case; 8.2% in best case Effect on Health Outcomes: Reduced risk of dying due to reduced passive smoking: 250 deaths/yr fewer first 10 years, 375 deaths/yr fewer thereafter	Campaign costs and law enforcement costs of SF policies are both assumed to be very modest and to be \$0. Total intervention costs: \$0	All results are presented: undiscounted; 3.5% discount LYG: Base case: 0.33; 0.026 Best case: 0.37; 0.031 Healthcare costs averted: Base case: \$0 Best case: \$300; \$66 Non-healthcare costs averted: Base case: Increase of \$4,820;\$387 Best case: Increase of \$5,492; \$471 Productivity costs averted: Base case: \$1,583; \$169 Best case: \$2,007; \$241 Total costs averted: Base case: Increase of \$3,238; \$219 Best case: Increase of \$3,815; \$164	Base case: \$8,803; \$7,473 per LYG Best case: \$6890; \$4,241

Author, Year Study Design Economic Method	Study Location Sample Size Population Characteristics Time horizon	Intervention Description	Effect size	Intervention Costs (2011 US\$)	Intervention Benefits (2011 US\$)	Economic summary measure (2011 US\$)
Juster 2007	New York State	New York's state-wide	Changes in number of AMI hospital discharges	N/A	Number of AMI averted: 3,813	N/A
Hospital database analysis/ Logistic regression Healthcare costs averted	Not reported (estimated population of NY: 19 million*) No characteristics given 1 year	comprehensive smoking ban that prohibited smoking in all workplaces including restaurants and bar enacted on July 24, 2003			Total healthcare costs averted: \$77.7 million	

Author, Year Study Design Economic Method	Study Location Sample Size Population Characteristics Time horizon	Intervention Description	Effect size	Intervention Costs (2011 US\$)	Intervention Benefits (2011 US\$)	Economic summary measure (2011 US\$)
Mudarri 1994 Model Cost-benefit	United States 1990 US Population not covered by SF Policies (n = 84.7 million) No characteristics given 1 year	Legislation that would require all non-residential buildings regularly entered by 10 or more persons in the course of a week adopt a policy that bans smoking inside the building or restricts it to separately ventilated and exhausted smoking rooms	3-6% of current smoker quit and 5-10% reduction in initiation (<i>Note</i> : The analysis does not account for the benefit or losses to smokers, only the savings in reduced smoker absenteeism) Decrease in lung cancer and heart disease deaths, tonsillitis and adenoids and tympanostomy operations, ear infections, asthma, physician visits for cough, and lower respiratory tract infections (all primarily among children) from ETS exposure at home and non-home 90% reduction of smoking-related fires in the non-residential sector with bans and 50% in those with smoking lounges 15% reduction in house-keeping	All results are discounted 3% Enactment costs which include: initial costs (develop the policy, assign responsibilities, print and distribute information, print and post signs, remove ashtrays and cigarette vending machines, provide outdoor receptacles, develop compliance procedures, and one time increase in smoking cessation programs); annual policy maintenance (based on managerial, administrative, and maintenance personnel time): \$186.7 million - \$450.8 million Enforcement costs which are based on costs for sting operations comparable for selling cigarettes to minors: \$116.9 million - \$584.4 million Construction and maintenance of smoking lounges in 10% - 20% of establishments; Construction of outdoor shelter for smokers at 10% of establishments (high estimate only): \$409.8 million - \$1,147.5 million Total annual costs: \$0.7 - \$2.2 billion	All results are discounted 3% Benefits from Reduced ETS (Premature death averted, improved health [in children]): \$52.9 - \$98.7 Savings in operating and maintenance costs (housekeeping and maintenance): \$6.1 - \$11.7 Savings in reduced smoker absenteeism: \$0.3 - \$0.5 Savings in smoking related fires (deaths + property damage):\$0.7 - \$1.1 Total Costs Averted: \$60.0 - \$112.0	Net Savings: \$59.2 - \$109.8 billion

Author, Year Study Design Economic Method	Study Location Sample Size Population Characteristics Time horizon	Intervention Description	Effect size	Intervention Costs (2011 US\$)	Intervention Benefits (2011 US\$)	Economic summary measure (2011 US\$)
Ong 2012 Survey Costs Averted (MUH)	California 343 MUH property owners answered the survey; results projected to the104,237 MUH properties in CA Average number of units per property: 38.8 (SD: 93.8); 27.1% experienced smoking- related costs; 33.5% completely SF, 20.3% partially SF, 46.2% no policy 1 year	Implementing a state-wide MUH SF policy (no smoking anywhere on the property)	If all MUH properties had complete SF policies, 8,339 properties would not incur smoking-related costs and 19,909 properties would save \$348 in smoking-related costs.	N/A	Total smoking-related costs averted: \$18 million	N/A

Author, Year Study Design Economic Method	Study Location Sample Size Population Characteristics Time horizon	Intervention Description	Effect size	Intervention Costs (2011 US\$)	Intervention Benefits (2011 US\$)	Economic summary measure (2011 US\$)
Ong 2005 Model Cost-Utility/ Cost- Effective	Minnesota MN indoor works not currently covered by SF policies (n = 565,000) Smoking prevalence: 22.2%; Smokers ready to attempt smoking cessation: 64%; Moderate to heavy smokers: 54.9% 1 year	State-wide SF indoor work environments	-3.7% absolute smoking prevalence; -16.7% in smokers (including quitters who quit without regard to SF policy); -14.2% (only SF policy); Compliance with SF policies: 90%; Smoking relapse: 35% Each sustained quitter generates 1.58 QALY	Includes the costs of enactment and enforcement - enactment costs based on FL campaign costs per capita; enforcement costs based on CA media campaign costs. Enactment costs: \$2.2 million Enforcement costs: \$8.2 million Total Costs: \$10.4 million	10,400 quitters; 16,400 QALYs gained	\$1,801 per quit \$1,138 per QALY

Ong 2004United StatesNational SF workplace policy-29% in total cigarette consumption (-3.8% in absolute smoking prevalence; 14.7% of smokers quit because of SF policies); -1.3 cigarette per day in daily consumption among continuing smokersN/ANumber of events averted: Initial Year: Stroke: 360 AMI: 1,540HealthcarePolicies (n = 33.2)Steady State:	N/A
Continuing sinders Continu	

Author, Year Study Design Economic Method	Study Location Sample Size Population Characteristics Time horizon	Intervention Description	E	ffect size	e		Intervention Costs (2011 US\$)	Intervention Benefits (2011 US\$)	Economic summary measure (2011 US\$)
Ong 2003 Model Healthcare costs averted	Florida FL Indoor works not currently covered by SF policies (n = 1.9 million) Smoking prevalence: 20.7%; Mean number of cigarettes smoked: 18.6 per day 1 year; steady state	Statewide SF workplace policy	-20.7% in smoking quitters); -13% in c smokers Transition Probabil Smoker Current 1 yr after quit Steady State Passive Smoker Current 1 yr after quit Steady State Never Smoker Events/1,000 PY Survival Probabil Short Term Mortality Rate 1st yr after event Low birth weight: Incidence: 0.0741 RR: Smokers: 2.0; sespiratory Illness RR reduction from SIDS: Pooled OR for	ities (RR	3.85 2.71 1.40 .30 .21 .11 0.89 0.167 0.765	2.80 2.16 1.42 1.37 0.043 0.663	N/A	Initial year: Number of events averted: AMI: 120 Stroke: 20 Low birth-weight births: 300 Asthma: 80 Total healthcare costs averted: \$8.9 million Steady state: Total healthcare costs averted: \$288.4 million annually	N/A

Author, Year Study Design Economic Method	Study Location Sample Size Population Characteristics Time horizon	Intervention Description	Effect size	Intervention Costs (2011 US\$)	Intervention Benefits (2011 US\$)	Economic summary measure (2011 US\$)
Roberts 2012 Hospital database analysis Healthcare costs averted	Rhode Island Not reported (estimated population of RI: 1 million*) No characteristics given 1 year	RI's Smoke Free Public Places and Workplaces Act— a comprehensive state-wide ban on smoking in all enclosed public places of business (restaurants and bars, healthcare facilities, shopping areas, and offices)	Changes in hospital discharge data	N/A	Number of events averted (2009 compared to 2003) AMI: 977 Asthma: Increase of 225 Total healthcare costs averted (2009 compared to 2003): \$4.2 million	N/A

^{*}Estimate not reported in publication; obtained from other sources based on information reported

AMI = acute myocardial infarction; ETS = environmental tobacco smoke; LYG: Life-Year Gained; MUH = multi-unit housing; RR: Relative Risk; SF = smoke-free policies; YLL: Years Life Loss