

Chapter 11

Evaluation

The Working Group evaluated the strength of the evidence for drawing the conclusions shown in the accompanying table using categories defined as follows:

- **Sufficient evidence:** An association has been observed between the intervention under consideration and a given effect in studies in which chance, bias and confounding can be ruled out with reasonable confidence. The association is highly likely to be causal.

- **Strong evidence:** There is consistent evidence of an association, but evidence of causality is limited by the fact that chance, bias

or confounding have not been ruled out with reasonable confidence. However, explanations other than causality are unlikely.

- **Limited evidence:** There is some evidence of association between the intervention under consideration and a given effect, but alternative explanations are possible.

- **Inadequate/no evidence:** There are no available methodologically sound studies showing an association; the available studies are of insufficient quality, consistency or statistical power to permit a conclusion regarding the presence or absence of a causal association between the intervention

and a given effect. Alternatively, this category is used when no studies are available.

- **Evidence of no effect:** Methodologically sound studies consistently demonstrate the lack of an association between the intervention under consideration and a given effect.

	Concluding Statements	Sufficient Evidence	Strong Evidence	Limited Evidence	Evidence of No Effect	Inadequate / No Evidence
1	Increases in tobacco excise taxes that increase prices result in a decline in overall tobacco use.	X				
2	Increases in tobacco excise taxes that increase prices reduce the prevalence of adult tobacco use.	X				
3	Increases in tobacco excise taxes that increase prices induce current tobacco users to quit.	X				
4	Increases in tobacco excise taxes that increase prices lower the consumption of tobacco products among continuing users.	X				
5	Increases in tobacco excise taxes that increase prices reduce the prevalence of tobacco use among young people.	X				
6	Increases in tobacco excise taxes that increase prices reduce the initiation and uptake of tobacco use among young people, with a greater impact on the transition to regular use.	X				
7	Tobacco use among young people responds more to changes in tobacco product taxes and prices than does tobacco use among adults.	X				
8	The demand for tobacco products in lower-income countries is more responsive to price than is the demand for tobacco products in higher-income countries.			X		
9	In high-income countries, tobacco use among lower-income populations is more responsive to tax and price increases than is tobacco use among higher-income populations.		X			
10	In low- and middle-income countries, tobacco use among lower-income populations is more responsive to tax and price increases than is tobacco use among higher-income populations.			X		
11	Changes in the relative prices of tobacco products lead to some substitution to the products for which the relative prices have fallen.		X			
12	Tobacco tax increases increase tobacco tax revenues.	X				
13	Tobacco tax increases that increase prices improve population health.	X				
14	Tobacco tax increases do not increase unemployment.		X			
15	Tax avoidance and tax evasion reduce, but do not eliminate, the public health and revenue impact of tobacco tax increases.	X				
16	A coordinated set of interventions that includes international collaborations, strengthened tax administration, increased enforcement, and swift, severe penalties reduces illicit trade in tobacco products.		X			
17	Higher and more uniform specific tobacco excise taxes result in higher tobacco product prices and increase the effectiveness of taxation policies in reducing tobacco use.	X				
18	Tobacco industry price discounting strategies, price-reducing marketing activities, and lobbying efforts mitigate the impact of tobacco excise tax increases.	X				