



Estimates of price and income elasticity in Greece: Greek debt crisis transforming cigarettes into a luxury good

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2013-004748
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	23-Dec-2013
Complete List of Authors:	Tarantilis, Filippos; National School of Public Health, Department of Health Economics Athanasakis, Kostas; National School of Public Health, Department of Health Economics Vozikis, Athanasios; University of Piraeus, Department of Economics Kyriopoulos, Ioannis; National School of Public Health, Department of Health Economics
Primary Subject Heading:	Health economics
Secondary Subject Heading:	Health economics, Health policy, Smoking and tobacco
Keywords:	HEALTH ECONOMICS, Health economics < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Health policy < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Estimates of price and income elasticity in Greece:**
4

5 **Greek debt crisis transforming cigarettes into a luxury good**
6

7
8 Tarantilis F¹, Athanasakis K¹, Vozikis A², Kyriopoulos J¹
9

10
11 ¹National School of Public Health, Athens, Greece
12

13
14 ²Department of Economics, University of Piraeus, Athens, Greece
15

16
17 Corresponding author: Filippos Tarantilis, Department of Health Economics, National School
18 of Public Health, 196 Alexandras Av., Athens, 11521, Greece, fil_t@hotmail.com, Phone No:
19 00302132010242, Fax No: 00302106449571
20
21
22

23
24 Kostas Athanasakis, National School of Public Health, Department of Health Economics,
25 Athens, Greece
26
27

28
29 Athanassios Vozikis, University of Piraeus, Department of Economics, Athens, Greece
30

31
32 Ioannis Kyriopoulos, National School of Public Health, Department of Health Economics,
33 Athens, Greece
34
35

36
37 Keywords: smoking, taxation, price elasticity, income elasticity
38

39
40 Word count: 3,041
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract

Objective: During the past decades, smoking prevalence in Greece was estimated near or over 40%. Following a sharp fall in newest data on cigarette consumption, our objective is to assess smokers' sensitivity to cigarette price and consumer income changes as well as to project health benefits of an additional tax increase.

Methods: Cigarette consumption was considered as the dependent variable, with Weighted Average Price as a proxy for cigarette price, GDP as a proxy for consumers' income and dummy variables reflecting smoking restrictions and antismoking campaigns. Values were computed to natural logarithms and regression was performed. Then, 4 scenarios of tax increase were distinguished in order to calculate potential health benefits.

Results: Addiction models were unable to provide statistically significant information due to a nearly 23.5% drop in consumption during 2012. Short-run price elasticity is estimated at -0.441 and short-run income elasticity is estimated at 1.040. Antismoking campaigns were found to have a statistically significant impact on consumption. Results indicate that, depending on the level of tax increase, annual per capita consumption could fall by at least 209.83 cigarettes; tax revenue could rise up by more than €0.74 billion, while smokers could be reduced by up to 530,568 and at least 465 smoking related deaths could be averted.

Conclusions: Price elasticity estimates are similar to previous studies in Greece, while income elasticity estimates are far greater. With cigarettes regarded as a luxury good, a great opportunity is presented for decision-makers to counter smoking. Increased taxation, along with focused antismoking campaigns, law reinforcement (to ensure compliance with smoking bans) and intensive control for smuggling could invoke a massive blow to the tobacco epidemic in Greece.

1
2
3 **Article Summary**
4

- 5
- 6 • The article offers information to policy makers regarding price elasticity, a key
7 measure to perform tobacco control policy
8
 - 9 • The article reports, for the first time, an income elasticity above 1, as evidence that
10 cigarettes tend to be considered a luxury good in Greece
11
 - 12 • The analysis treats qualitative variables and projects health and financial benefits
13 under extreme austerity
14
 - 15 • The analysis could not include dynamic (addiction) models, as no statistical
16 significance was reported
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Introduction

Country Profile

Globally, more than 5 million people die every year from tobacco use, while tobacco use is the second leading cause of death, representing the 8.7% of global annual mortality .[1] As global tobacco consumption in 2009 was estimated at 5884 billion cigarettes,[2] tobacco clearly reflects the global transition from traditional risks such as undernutrition, unsafe sex, unsafe water, poor sanitation and hygiene to modern risks like physical inactivity, behavior risks and air quality.[1] In Greece, WHO estimations attribute 17% of mortality for people aged 30 or more to smoking.[3] Death rate attributed to tobacco and the proportion of deaths attributable to tobacco for ages 30 and over is documented in the following table (Table 1).

Table 1: Estimated death rated (per 100.000) and proportion attributable to tobacco for ages 30 and over, 2004 in Greece[3]

Cause of death	Death rate attributed to tobacco	Proportion of deaths attributable to tobacco
Lower respiratory infections	3	23%
Malignant neoplasms	110	29%
Cardiovascular diseases	90	12%
Respiratory diseases	23	37%

Little less than half Greek citizens (41%) are smokers.[4] Youth smoking is also high, 11.3% for young men and 9% for young women.[2] Environmental Tobacco Smoke (ETS) also represents a serious problem in Greece, as documented by previous research.[5]

Concerning cigarette affordability, findings suggest that Greece is one of the few high-income European Union countries with relatively low cigarette prices.[6] Low prices can be recognized as a factor for the tobacco epidemic in Greece.[7] According to own calculations,

1
2
3 for the period 1992-2012, cigarette affordability, defined as the percentage of income
4
5 needed to purchase 100 packs of cigarettes, was estimated from 0.56% to 1.98%.
6
7

8 The first organized efforts to counter smoking in Greece were observed during 1979-1982.
9
10 At the moment, in Greece, tobacco advertising bans are complete, except for point-of-sale
11
12 advertising.
13

14
15 Tax revenue from tobacco products is arguably very important for the economic policy. In
16
17 1990, tax revenue accounted for 4.4% of GDP.[8] For the period 1998-2010 tobacco tax
18
19 revenue stood for an annual average 2% of GDP, but it seems to follow a downwards trend.
20
21

22
23 Official estimates measure the total annual direct cost of smoking a €2.14 billion, in an
24
25 environment where debt crisis and austerity measures set serious constraints to the health
26
27 system and resources should, now more than ever, be allocated properly. [9] Tobacco's
28
29 unfavorable consequences on the poor could become a factor, where unemployment rates
30
31 are estimated at 27.1% for the 2nd quarter of 2013, continuing to grow from under 900,000
32
33 to approximately 1,350,000 people in the last 24 months.[10] Moreover, 31% of the total
34
35 population is at risk of poverty or social exclusion.[11]
36
37

38 Tobacco Market and government interventions

39
40
41 Three market failures differentiate an individual's choice to smoke compared to the decision
42
43 to consume other goods: information failure on the health hazard of smoking, information
44
45 failure on the addiction caused by smoking and external burden to non-smokers.[12]
46
47

48 Therefore, government intervention is justified in order both to protect smokers from the
49
50 perilous habit and correct for externalities associated to smoking. From a basic economics'
51
52 standpoint, it can be claimed that smoking's immense social cost overtakes the excess
53
54 burden of taxation or else the loss of economic efficiency. The deadweight loss after the
55
56 introduction of tax is illustrated figures (Figure 1 and Figure 2).
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Tobacco taxation is imposed through a variety of structures but, in nearly all cases, includes
4
5 two main types of tax: Ad valorem tax, which represents a percentage of price and specific
6
7 tax, which is a fixed tax per cigarette. In Greece, following the 2010 restructure of tobacco
8
9 tax, total tax represents 86% of the retail price, significantly increased compared to the 2009
10
11 level and 2008 level when is represented 83% and 70% of the retail price respectively (WHO,
12
13 2011). In 2012, specific excise tax was regulated at 80€ per 1,000 cigarettes and ad valorem
14
15 tax at 20% of the retail price. Their minimum sum is required to be no less than 115€ per
16
17 1,000 cigarettes. Meanwhile, a specific excise tax was set at 153€ per kg of hand-rolled
18
19 tobacco. Sales tax for cigarettes is fixed at 23% of the retail price.
20
21

22
23 Price increases should not be regarded the only way to reduce consumption, as the impact
24
25 of income, advertising and health education are also important.[13] Manipulating these
26
27 variables will result to reduced consumption and eventually reduced mortality and
28
29 morbidity. Tobacco control programs and policies are found to be either cost-saving or cost-
30
31 effective, compared to other public health interventions such as cardiovascular risk
32
33 counseling and cancer screening.[14] Research on the impact of tobacco control showed
34
35 that during 1981-2000, increases in tobacco control program expenditures in the U.S.A. lead
36
37 to reduced cigarettes sales. Authors also suggest that expenditures have an even stronger
38
39 lagged influence on sales.[15] Smoking bans are adopted in order to limit exposure to smoke
40
41 but also cause a remarkable decrease in cigarette consumption, as smokers' opportunities to
42
43 smoke are lessened.[16] In Greece, the effort to restrict smoking in public places through
44
45 legislation has failed due to low compliance with law.[17] Youth exposed to secondhand
46
47 smoke at home are estimated at 89.8% of total youth population.[2] Public education
48
49 campaigns, if "hard-hitting, sophisticated and sustained", can be extremely effective.[18]
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Price and income elasticities

The term used to measure the impact of a change in price on consumption is price elasticity of demand, defined as the percentage change in consumption that results from 1 percent increase in price.[19] Similarly, the impact of a change in income on consumption is measured by income elasticity, defined as the percentage change in consumption resulting from 1 percent increase in income. Estimating elasticity is crucial to policy makers in order not only to anticipate an intervention's impact both on tobacco consumption and tobacco tax revenue. If the proportionate fall in tobacco consumption exceeds the proportionate increase of tax, revenue will fall. Otherwise, revenue will rise.[16]

Results from a meta-analysis,[20] indicate that short run elasticity (-0.40) is lower than long run elasticity (-0.44), while in studies that included smuggling demand was less sensitive (-0.36). These findings confirm the general notion that a 10% increase in price would lead to a 4% reduction in consumption in high-income countries.[18] Stavrinou estimated the short run price elasticity at -0.079 and the long run at -0.147, while income elasticity is estimated at 0.18 and 0.33, respectively.[21] Hondroyannis and Papapetrou, based on data over the period 1967-1990, calculated the short run price elasticity at -0.33 and the long run at -0.6, while income elasticity estimations are 0.35 and 0.54, respectively. The fact that demand is inelastic is explained by the authors through addiction and the absence of direct substitutes. Furthermore, it is claimed that health warnings are more effective in reducing consumption than price increases.[9] Raptou and colleagues conclude in an income elasticity of 0.28, consisting of initiation elasticity (0.21) and consumption elasticity (0.07), arguing that income is a more important determinant for initiation rather than consumption. Furthermore, smoking bans are illustrated as a factor discouraging tobacco consumption.[22] Nikolaou and Velentzas, based on data from 1960 to 1995, estimated the short run price elasticity at -0.24 and the long run at -0.48, while income elasticity is

1
2
3 estimated at 0.19 and 0.40, respectively. Advertising had a positive but insignificant effect
4 on demand and antismoking campaigns had a negative but insignificant effect on
5 demand.[23] On the other hand, health warnings on packs during 1987-1990 had a
6 significant negative impact on demand, lowering consumption by 4.2%. Dritsakis notes that
7 consumption is a negative function of price and health education expenditure and a positive
8 function of income as well.[24]
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17 As illustrated, there are no studies of price elasticity available for at least a decade. In the
18 light of the above, the purpose of the present study was to investigate cigarette demand in
19 Greece.
20
21
22

23 **Method**

24
25
26
27 The tobacco product used in analysis is cigarettes, widely accepted as the major tobacco
28 product. In order to account for population growth, annual consumption per person over 15
29 was preferred to aggregate annual consumption. The threshold age was set at 15, as youth
30 smoking in Greece is considered substantial. Data on cigarette consumption are available
31 from 1994 onwards.
32
33
34
35
36

37
38
39 Monthly (and quarterly) data on the quantities of taxed cigarettes were available from 2007
40 to 2011. As excise tax data were not available and MPPC (Most Popular Price Category)
41 shows inconsistency due to pricing policy, the measure chosen to reflect price was the
42 Weighted Average Price. Each pack consists of 20 cigarettes. The proxy used to deflate
43 nominal into real prices was calculated by comparing real and nominal values of GDP (Gross
44 Domestic Product) derived from World Bank. CPI (Consumer Price Index) was not selected as
45 a proxy due to a change in calculations by Hellenic Statistical Authority in 1995, when
46 General Harmonized Consumer Price Index was introduced. The base year set was 2005.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1
2
3 Deflation was not needed in that case, as real values were available. The base year set was
4
5 2005. Prior to 2008, national informative campaigns were not run in Greece at a national
6
7 level. We considered The National Action Plan for Cancer (2008) as an anti-smoking
8
9 campaign. A dummy variable was used to measure its influence on consumption.
10
11 Expenditure on tobacco control was not available. Regulation for smoking bans and
12
13 restrictions was only introduced in 2002 and amended in 2010. In order to measure its
14
15 influence on consumption, an adjusted version of a previous reliable index was constructed,
16
17 accounting not only for intensity of smoking restrictions but for compliance as well.[25]
18
19 Values attributed were between 0 (no restrictions) to 1 (total ban) escalating by 0.25.
20
21

22
23 Regression analysis includes only a static model, as dynamic models (incorporating models)
24
25 show limited statistical significance, due to the inclusion of 2012 data in the time series.
26
27

28
29 The functional form used in the analysis was Double-log. Testing for endogeneity of cigarette
30
31 prices was not possible as the annual tax rates were only available from 2008 onwards. Time
32
33 trend was found to be insignificant; therefore, it is excluded from the equations. The model
34
35 of demand was specified as follows.
36
37

38 *Conventional Demand Model*

39
40
41
$$\ln Q_t = b_0 + b_1 \ln P_t + b_2 \ln Y_t + b_3 SR_t + b_4 AsC_t + \epsilon_t$$

42
43
44 Where,

45
46
47 Q_t : consumption of cigarettes per person over 15 (000 cigarettes) in year t

48
49
50 P_t : real retail price per pack of 20 cigarettes in year t

51
52
53 Y_t : real per person over 15 disposable income (000 €) in year t

54
55
56 b_0 : intercept in year t
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 SR_t : index of smoking restrictions in year t
4

5
6 AsC_t : dummy checking the existence of an anti-smoking campaign each year t
7

8
9 ε_t : the error term
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

Results

Through the conventional model of demand, the demand equation was estimated as follows:

$$\ln Q_t = -1.757 - 0.441 \ln P_t + 1.040 \ln Y_t - 0.132 \text{AsC}_t$$

F-statistic: 27.765

R square: 0.847

Durbin-Watson: 1.980

Calculations were made stepwise. The variable created to capture the effect of smoking restrictions was found insignificant; thus, it is excluded from the model. P value at 5% confidence level is asymptotically equal to 0 for $\ln Y_t$, equal to 0.001 for $\ln P_t$ and equal to 0.021 for AsC_t . The F-statistic is high, showing a good level of fit, while the model explains a great part of the variation. The Durbin-Watson statistic is close to 2, suggesting that the model has no autocorrelation. The Variation Inflated Factor is low for all variables, implying that multicollinearity is a non-factor. Therefore, we accept a short-run price elasticity of demand at 0.441 and a short-run income elasticity of demand at 1.040.

Based on 2010 data, tax revenue per pack is calculated at 2.78€, a value verifying and corresponding to the fixed amount of tax (86% of the nominal retail price). We assume that the state maintains the existing ability to collect tribute. Government proclamations suggest that tobacco will be further taxed. Therefore, we distinct four scenarios, all with retail price increases as anticipated, each suggesting an additional price increase by 0.5€. Calculations are made only for the following year and accordingly only short run elasticity is taken into account. Scenarios capture the impact of the continuing fall in income at a rate of 4.8%. Based on Ross et al methodology and data concerning tobacco-related mortality in Greece

(Lower respiratory infections, Malignant neoplasms, Cardiovascular diseases and Respiratory diseases), we estimate reduction on smokers and mortality averted.[3,26]

Table 2: Impact of price increase and income constraints on consumption, tax revenue, number of smokers and smoking related deaths

Model scenarios	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4	
Price per pack	4.47 €	4.97 €	5.47 €	5.97 €	
Percent increase of price	12.59%	25.19%	37.78%	50.38%	
Fall in consumption due to price increase	-5.55%	-11.11%	-16.66%	-22.22%	
Fall in consumption due to income decrease	-4.99%	-4.99%	-4.99%	-4.99%	
Per capita consumption level	1,779.84	1,669.33	1,558.82	1,448.31	
Per capita consumption deterred	209.83	320.34	430.85	541.36	
Tax revenue per pack	3.84 €	4.27 €	4.70 €	5.13 €	
Tax revenue per cigarette	0.192 €	0.214 €	0.235 €	0.257 €	
Total tax revenue (€ billion)	3,336 €	3,478 €	3,575 €	3,625 €	
Incremental tax revenue (€ billion)	0,455 €	0,597 €	0,694 €	0,744 €	
Reduction in number of smokers	205,650	313,956	422,262	530,568	
Smoking related deaths averted	high(0,50)	930	1,420	1,911	2,401
	low(0,25)	465	710	955	1,200

-Differences in calculations may occur due to rounding

-Impact of price increase shared between prevalence and consumption

-High estimate indicates that 50% of smokers' deaths are attributable to tobacco use, whereas low estimate indicates that 25% of smokers' deaths are attributable to tobacco use

1
2
3 In all four scenarios, consumption is decreased substantially while tax revenue is still
4
5 increased thanks to the inelastic demand. Moreover, smokers are significantly reduced and
6
7 smoking related deaths are accordingly limited.
8
9

10 Discussion

11
12 Price elasticity estimates are greater than previous research in Greece,[8, 23-24] but
13
14 consistent with findings by Gallet and List.[20] Estimates for income elasticity are far greater
15
16 than estimates provided by literature in Greece.[8, 21-23] Regarding antismoking campaigns,
17
18 results are in agreement with previous testimony.[23-24] Smoking restrictions show no
19
20 statistical significance, confirming the claims by Joosens and Raw that compliance is low.[17]
21
22 Finally, results are in general agreement with Alpert et al,[27] though a different
23
24 methodology is followed.
25
26
27

28
29 Paired with the still high cigarette affordability, as documented in the current study and
30
31 reported by previous research,[6] the nature of demand in Greece presents a vast
32
33 opportunity for the policy makers to counter the tobacco epidemic and ensure revenue and
34
35 cash flows at the same time. Even supposing that other determinants of demand, such as
36
37 income, which is anticipated to fall, do not change, tobacco taxation proves to be a powerful
38
39 tool. Annual consumption per person over 15 would be no higher than 1,780 cigarettes,
40
41 even in the worst case (scenario1) and may fall to less than 1,448 cigarettes. On the other
42
43 hand, tax revenue would recover from the downwards trend, accounting again for more
44
45 than 1.80% of GDP, even in scenario1. In absolute values, excess tobacco tax revenue could
46
47 rejuvenate the dismantled public coffers. Results suggest that even with a modest 10% of
48
49 tax revenue allocated to offsetting the tobacco epidemic, there would be more than enough
50
51 disposable funds towards planning, implementing, evaluating and improving antismoking
52
53 efforts. Greeks seem to be in agreement with heavy taxation on cigarettes, but only if
54
55 respective revenue is attributed to tobacco control.[28] In terms of public health benefits,
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 smokers could be reduced by nearly 530,568 people, while up to 2,401 smoking related
4
5 deaths could be averted on an annual basis. Nonetheless, findings should be treated with
6
7 caution and increases in price should not be excessively increased from day one, as the
8
9 smokers' reaction is not easy to predict with confidence intervals widened. A stepwise
10
11 increase of tax would eliminate many of the risks associated with a sharp and sudden
12
13 increase in cigarette prices. Besides, Greece already performs better in tax collection than
14
15 countries such as Germany, France and Slovenia among others,[26] as the excise per smoker
16
17 ratio indicates, with 738.71€ collected for every smoker.
18
19

20
21 Income sensitivity is larger than in any previous study either in Greece or internationally.
22
23 Thus, it is not exaggerating to argue that Greek smokers are shocked by the constraint on
24
25 their income. Besides, it is the first time in at least 40 years that income in Greece is falling at
26
27 this rate. The austerity measures should be viewed as a shift event in cigarette consumption,
28
29 among others.
30
31

32
33 Reducing the toll of tobacco in Greece is not an easy task. Decisions should include fostering
34
35 an antismoking-culture through well-planned national antismoking campaigns, raising the
36
37 cigarettes prices at an initial level no less than 4€ a pack and ensuring compliance with the
38
39 anti-smoking law, especially on the current occasion, when City Police (the main mechanism
40
41 of control on the matter) was recently abolished as an institution. Controlling illicit trade is
42
43 crucial to maximize the effect of interventions.
44
45

46
47 Possible future analysis of an even wider time series could provide even more reliable
48
49 results, as multicollinearity could be fully cured. Moreover, the current study is based on the
50
51 most popular price category in order to estimate the impact of prices changes on cigarette
52
53 demand. It is possible that a weighted average for all the brands sold in Greece could
54
55 eliminate unilateralism on prices data. Still, the anticipated but not fully documented switch
56
57 of Greek smokers from manufactured cigarettes to hand-rolled tobacco should be taken into
58
59
60

1
2
3 account in any future research. Yet, if the increase of contraband cigarettes in the Greek
4 market could be quantified, results would be more punctual. In addition, tobacco shows
5 synergistic effect with other substances, such as alcohol. Thus, it would be meaningful to
6 investigate the combined effect of tobacco and alcohol from an economic aspect. Finally,
7 researchers argue that the increased availability of nicotine substitutes will reduce demand
8 for tobacco products and increase the price sensitivity as well.[19] Under that scope, if
9 research included nicotine substitutes, accuracy would be improved.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 **Contributorship Statement:** FT and AV performed the calculations and analyses reported in
20 the text. FT and KA reviewed the literature for relevant data and documentation. FT and KA
21 drafted the manuscript which was edited and critically revised by KA and JK.
22
23
24
25

26 **Acknowledgements**

27
28
29 We would like to express our gratitude to Professor Frank Chaloupka for his valuable and
30 constructive suggestions towards planning and development of this research work. His
31 willingness to provide us his limited time has been very much appreciated.
32
33
34
35

36 **Funding:** None.
37
38

39 **Competing interests:** None.
40
41

42 **Data Sharing:** Extra data is available by emailing FT.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

1. WHO. Global Health Risks: Mortality and burden of disease attributable to selected major risks. Geneva: World Health Organization 2009
http://www.who.int/healthinfo/global_burden_disease/GlobalHealthRisks_report_full.pdf (Accessed 14 Nov 2011).
2. Eriksen M, Mackay J, Ross H. The Tobacco Atlas. Fourth Ed. Atlanta, GA, American Cancer Society, New York: World Lung Foundation 2012.
3. WHO. WHO Global report: Mortality Attributable to Tobacco. Geneva: World Health Organization 2012
http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2012/9789241564434_eng.pdf (Accessed 5 Oct 2012).
4. Filippidis FT, Vardavas CI, Loukopoulou A et al. Prevalence and determinants of tobacco use among adults in Greece: 4 year trends. Eur J Public Health 2013;23(5):772-776.
5. Vardavas CI, Kondilis B, Travers MJ et al. Environmental tobacco smoke in hospitality venues in Greece. BMC Public Health 2007;7(1):302.
6. Blecher EH, Van Walbeek CP. Cigarette affordability trends: an update and some methodological comments. Tobacco Control 2009;18(3):167-175.
7. Vardavas CI, Kafatos AG. Smoking policy and prevalence in Greece: an overview. The European Journal of Public Health 2007;17(2):211-213.
8. Hondroyannis G, Papapetrou E. Cigarette consumption in Greece: empirical evidence from cointegration analysis. Applied Economics Letters 1997;4:571-574
9. Ministry of Health and Social Solidarity. The Greek National Plan of Action against Cancer 2008-2012, Athens, 2008. http://ygeiamap.gov.gr/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/karkinos_teliko.pdf (Accessed 5 Oct 2011)
10. Hellenic Statistical Authority, Workforce research, Press release 19 September 2013,

1
2
3 <http://www.statistics.gr/portal/page/portal/ESYE/BUCKET/A0101/PressReleases/A0>
4
5 [101_SJO01_DT_QQ_02_2013_01_F_GR.pdf](http://www.statistics.gr/portal/page/portal/ESYE/BUCKET/A0101/PressReleases/A0101_SJO01_DT_QQ_02_2013_01_F_GR.pdf) (Accessed 7 November 2013)
6

- 7
8 11. Eurostat news release 26 February 2013, Eurostat press office
9
10 http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_STAT-13-28_en.htm (Accessed 27 February
11
12 2013)
- 13
14 12. Wilkins N, Yurekli A, Hu TW. Economic analysis of tobacco demand. Economics of
15
16 Tobacco Toolkit. Washington: World Bank 2004
17
18 <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTPH/Resources/3Demand.pdf> (Accessed 24
19
20 Nov 2011)
- 21
22 13. Godfrey C, Maynard A. Economic aspects of tobacco use and taxation policy. BMJ
23
24 1998;297(6644):339–343.
- 25
26 14. Kahende JW, Loomis BR, Adhikari B, Marshall L. A review of economic evaluations of
27
28 tobacco control programs. Int J Environ Res Public Health 2009;6(1):51-68.
- 29
30 15. Farrelly M, Bray J. Responses to cigarette tax increases by race/ethnicity, income
31
32 and age groups – United States, 1976–1993. Journal of the American Medical
33
34 Association 1999;280:1979-1980.
- 35
36 16. Chaloupka F, Warner E. The economics of smoking. Handbook of Health Economics,
37
38 2000;1:1539-1627.
- 39
40 17. Joossens L, Raw M. The tobacco control scale 2010 in Europe. Brussels: Association
41
42 of European Cancer Leagues 2011.
- 43
44 18. WHO. Report on the Global Tobacco Epidemic, 2008: The MPOWER package.
45
46 Geneva: World Health Organization 2008
47
48 http://www.who.int/tobacco/mpower/mpower_report_full_2008.pdf (Accessed 14
49
50 Nov 2011).
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 19. Chaloupka F, Pacula R. The impact of price on youth tobacco use. Changing
4 Adolescent Smoking Prevalence: Where It Is and Why, Smoking and Tobacco Control
5 Monograph 1999:14.
6
7
8
9
10 20. Gallet C, List J. Cigarette demand: A meta-analysis of elasticities. Health Econ
11 2003;12:821-835.
12
13
14 21. Stavrinou VG. The effects of an anti-smoking campaign on cigarette consumption:
15 empirical evidence from Greece. Applied Economics 1987;19:323-329.
16
17
18 22. Raptou E, Mattas K, Tsakiridou E et al. Factors affecting cigarette
19 demand. International Advances in Economic Research 2005;11(3):275-290.
20
21
22 23. Nikolaou A, Velentzas K. Estimating the Demand for Cigarettes in Greece: An Error
23 Correction Model, Agricultural Economics Review 2001;2(1):20-27.
24
25
26 24. Dritsakis E. Forecasting of cigarettes consumption in Greece: An empirical
27 investigation with cointegration analysis. Agricultural Economic Review
28 2003;4(2):47-56.
29
30
31 25. Wasserman J, Manning WG, Newhouse JP et al. The Effects of Excise Taxes and
32 Regulations on Cigarette Smoking. Journal of Health Economics 1991;10(1):43-64.
33
34
35 26. Ross HZ, Shariff S, Gilmore A. Economics of Tobacco Taxation in Russia. Paris:
36 International Union Against Tuberculosis and Lung Disease 2008.
37
38
39 27. Alpert HR, Vardavas CI, Chaloupka FJ et al. The recent and projected public health
40 and economic benefits of cigarette taxation in Greece. Tobacco Control 2013 Mar 6.
41 [Epub ahead of print]
42
43
44 28. Vardavas CI, Filippidis FT, Agaku I et al. Tobacco taxation: the importance of
45 earmarking the revenue to health care and tobacco control. Tobacco induced
46 diseases 2012;10(1):21.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figures

Figure 1: The demand curve before government intervention

Figure 2: The demand curve after government intervention

For peer review only




Figure 1: The demand curve before government intervention

review only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 2: The demand curve after government intervention

review only

BMJ Open

Estimates of price and income elasticity in Greece: Greek debt crisis transforming cigarettes into a luxury good - an econometric approach

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2013-004748.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	11-Apr-2014
Complete List of Authors:	Tarantilis, Filippos; National School of Public Health, Department of Health Economics Athanasakis, Kostas; National School of Public Health, Department of Health Economics Zavras, Dimitris; National School of Public Health, Department of Health Economics Vozikis, Athanasios; University of Piraeus, Department of Economics Kyriopoulos, Ioannis; National School of Public Health, Department of Health Economics
Primary Subject Heading:	Health economics
Secondary Subject Heading:	Health economics, Health policy, Smoking and tobacco
Keywords:	HEALTH ECONOMICS, Health economics < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Health policy < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Estimates of price and income elasticity in Greece:**
4

5 **Greek debt crisis transforming cigarettes into a luxury good - an econometric approach**
6

7
8 Tarantilis F¹, Athanasakis K¹, Zavras D¹, Vozikis A², Kyriopoulos I¹
9

10
11 ¹National School of Public Health, Athens, Greece
12

13
14 ²Department of Economics, University of Piraeus, Athens, Greece
15

16
17 Corresponding author: Filippos Tarantilis, Department of Health Economics, National School
18 of Public Health, 196 Alexandras Av., Athens, 11521, Greece, fil_t@hotmail.com, Phone No:
19 00302132010242, Fax No: 00302106449571
20
21
22

23
24 Kostas Athanasakis, National School of Public Health, Department of Health Economics,
25 Athens, Greece
26
27

28
29 Dimitris Zavras, National School of Public Health, Department of Health Economics, Athens,
30 Greece
31
32

33
34 Athanassios Vozikis, University of Piraeus, Department of Economics, Athens, Greece
35

36
37 Ioannis Kyriopoulos, National School of Public Health, Department of Health Economics,
38 Athens, Greece
39
40

41
42 Keywords: smoking, taxation, price elasticity, income elasticity
43
44

45
46 Word count: 2,909 (without abstract, article summary, headings, tables, contributorship
47 statement, acknowledgements, funding, competing interests and data sharing)
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract

Objective: During the past decades, smoking prevalence in Greece was estimated near or over 40%. Following a sharp fall in newest data on cigarette consumption, our objective is to assess smokers' sensitivity to cigarette price and consumer income changes as well as to project health benefits of an additional tax increase.

Methods: Cigarette consumption was considered as the dependent variable, with Weighted Average Price as a proxy for cigarette price, GDP as a proxy for consumers' income and dummy variables reflecting smoking restrictions and antismoking campaigns. Values were computed to natural logarithms and regression was performed. Then, 4 scenarios of tax increase were distinguished in order to calculate potential health benefits.

Results: Short-run price elasticity is estimated at -0.441 and short-run income elasticity is estimated at 1.040. Antismoking campaigns were found to have a statistically significant impact on consumption. Results indicate that, depending on the level of tax increase, annual per capita consumption could fall by at least 209.83 cigarettes; tax revenue could rise up by more than €0.74 billion, while smokers could be reduced by up to 530,568 and at least 465 smoking related deaths could be averted.

Conclusions: Price elasticity estimates are similar to previous studies in Greece, while income elasticity estimates are far greater. With cigarettes regarded as a luxury good, a great opportunity is presented for decision-makers to counter smoking. Increased taxation, along with focused antismoking campaigns, law reinforcement (to ensure compliance with smoking bans) and intensive control for smuggling could invoke a massive blow to the tobacco epidemic in Greece.

Strengths and limitations of this study

- The article offers information to policy makers regarding price elasticity, a key measure to perform tobacco control policy
- The article reports, for the first time, an income elasticity above 1, as evidence that cigarettes tend to be considered a luxury good in Greece
- The analysis treats qualitative variables and projects health and financial benefits under extreme austerity
- The analysis could not include dynamic (addiction) models, as no statistical significance was reported

Introduction

Country Profile

Globally, more than 5 million people die every year from tobacco use, while tobacco use is the second leading cause of death, representing the 8.7% of global annual mortality .[1] As global tobacco consumption in 2009 was estimated at 5884 billion cigarettes,[2] tobacco clearly reflects the global transition from traditional risks such as undernutrition, unsafe sex, unsafe water, poor sanitation and hygiene to modern risks like physical inactivity, behavior risks and air quality.[1] In Greece, WHO estimations attribute 17% of mortality for people aged 30 or more to smoking.[3] Death rate attributed to tobacco and the proportion of deaths attributable to tobacco for ages 30 and over is documented in the following table (Table 1).

Table 1: Estimated death rated (per 100.000) and proportion attributable to tobacco for ages 30 and over, 2004 in Greece [3]

Cause of death	Death rate attributed to tobacco	Proportion of deaths attributable to tobacco
Lower respiratory infections	3	23%
Malignant neoplasms	110	29%
Carciovascular diseases	90	12%
Respiratoty diseases	23	37%

Little less than half Greek citizens (41%) are smokers.[4] Youth smoking is also high, 11.3% for young men and 9% for young women.[2] Environmental Tobacco Smoke (ETS) also represents a serious problem in Greece, as documented by previous research.[5]

Concerning cigarette affordability, findings suggest that Greece is one of the few high-income European Union countries with relatively low cigarette prices.[6] Low prices can be

1
2
3 recognized as a factor for the tobacco epidemic in Greece.[7] According to own calculations,
4
5 for the period 1992-2012, cigarette affordability, defined as the percentage of income
6
7 needed to purchase 100 packs of cigarettes, was estimated from 0.56% to 1.98%.
8
9

10 The first organized efforts to counter smoking in Greece were observed during 1979-1982.
11
12 At the moment, in Greece, tobacco advertising bans are complete, except for point-of-sale
13
14 advertising.
15

16
17 Tax revenue from tobacco products is arguably very important for the economic policy. In
18
19 1990, tax revenue accounted for 4.4% of GDP.[8] For the period 1998-2010 tobacco tax
20
21 revenue stood for an annual average 2% of GDP, but it seems to follow a downwards trend.
22
23

24 Official estimates measure the total annual direct cost of smoking a €2.14 billion, in an
25
26 environment where debt crisis and austerity measures set serious constraints to the health
27
28 system and resources should, now more than ever, be allocated properly. [9] Tobacco's
29
30 unfavorable consequences on the poor could become a factor, where unemployment rates
31
32 are estimated at 27.1% for the 2nd quarter of 2013, continuing to grow from under 900,000
33
34 to approximately 1,350,000 people in the last 24 months.[10] Moreover, 31% of the total
35
36 population is at risk of poverty or social exclusion.[11]
37
38
39

40 Tobacco Market and government interventions

41

42
43 Three market failures differentiate an individual's choice to smoke compared to the decision
44
45 to consume other goods: information failure on the health hazard of smoking, information
46
47 failure on the addiction caused by smoking and external burden to non-smokers.[12]
48
49

50 Therefore, government intervention is justified in order both to protect smokers from the
51
52 perilous habit and correct for externalities associated to smoking. From a basic economics'
53
54 standpoint, it can be claimed that smoking's immense social burden overtakes the loss of
55
56 consumer's utility or else the loss of economic efficiency (deadweight loss).
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Tobacco taxation is imposed through a variety of structures but, in nearly all cases, includes
4 two main types of tax: Ad valorem tax, which represents a percentage of price and specific
5 tax, which is a fixed tax per cigarette. In Greece, following the 2010 restructure of tobacco
6 tax, total tax represents 86% of the retail price, significantly increased compared to the 2009
7 level and 2008 level when is represented 83% and 70% of the retail price respectively (WHO,
8 2011). In 2012, specific excise tax was regulated at €80 per 1,000 cigarettes and ad valorem
9 tax at 20% of the retail price. Their minimum sum is required to be no less than €115 per
10 1,000 cigarettes. Meanwhile, a specific excise tax was set at €153 per kg of hand-rolled
11 tobacco. Sales tax for cigarettes is fixed at 23% of the retail price.
12
13

14 Price increases should not be regarded the only way to reduce consumption, as the impact
15 of income, advertising and health education are also important.[13] Manipulating these
16 variables will result to reduced consumption and eventually reduced mortality and
17 morbidity. Tobacco control programs and policies are found to be either cost-saving or cost-
18 effective, compared to other public health interventions such as cardiovascular risk
19 counseling and cancer screening.[14] Research on the impact of tobacco control showed
20 that during 1981-2000, increases in tobacco control program expenditures in the U.S.A. lead
21 to reduced cigarettes sales. Authors also suggest that expenditures have an even stronger
22 lagged influence on sales.[15] Smoking bans are adopted in order to limit exposure to smoke
23 but also cause a remarkable decrease in cigarette consumption, as smokers' opportunities to
24 smoke are lessened.[16] In Greece, the effort to restrict smoking in public places through
25 legislation has failed due to low compliance with law.[17] Youth exposed to secondhand
26 smoke at home are estimated at 89.8% of total youth population.[2] Public education
27 campaigns, if "hard-hitting, sophisticated and sustained", can be extremely effective.[18]
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Price and income elasticity

The term used to measure the impact of a change in price on consumption is price elasticity of demand, defined as the percentage change in consumption that results from 1 percent increase in price.[19] Similarly, the impact of a change in income on consumption is measured by income elasticity, defined as the percentage change in consumption resulting from 1 percent increase in income. Estimating elasticity is crucial to policy makers in order not only to anticipate an intervention's impact both on tobacco consumption and tobacco tax revenue. If the proportionate fall in tobacco consumption exceeds the proportionate increase of tax, revenue will fall. Otherwise, revenue will rise.[16]

Results from a meta-analysis,[20] indicate that short run elasticity (-0.40) is lower than long run elasticity (-0.44), while in studies that included smuggling demand was less sensitive (-0.36). These findings confirm the general notion that a 10% increase in price would lead to a 4% reduction in consumption in high-income countries.[18] Stavrinou estimated the short run price elasticity at -0.079 and the long run at -0.147, while income elasticity is estimated at 0.18 and 0.33, respectively.[21] Hondroyannis and Papapetrou, based on data over the period 1967-1990, calculated the short run price elasticity at -0.33 and the long run at -0.6, while income elasticity estimations are 0.35 and 0.54, respectively. The fact that demand is inelastic is explained by the authors through addiction and the absence of direct substitutes. Furthermore, it is claimed that health warnings are more effective in reducing consumption than price increases.[9] Raptou and colleagues conclude in an income elasticity of 0.28, consisting of initiation elasticity (0.21) and consumption elasticity (0.07), arguing that income is a more important determinant for initiation rather than consumption. Furthermore, smoking bans are illustrated as a factor discouraging tobacco consumption.[22] Nikolaou and Velentzas, based on data from 1960 to 1995, estimated the short run price elasticity at -0.24 and the long run at -0.48, while income elasticity is

1
2
3 estimated at 0.19 and 0.40, respectively. Advertising had a positive but non-significant effect
4 on demand and antismoking campaigns had a negative but non-significant effect on
5 demand.[23] On the other hand, health warnings on packs during 1987-1990 had a
6 significant negative impact on demand, lowering consumption by 4.2%. Dritsakis notes that
7 consumption is a negative function of price and health education expenditure and a positive
8 function of income as well.[24]
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17 As illustrated, there are no studies of price elasticity available for at least a decade. In the
18 light of the above, the purpose of the present study was to investigate cigarette demand in
19 Greece.
20
21
22

23 **Method**

24
25
26
27 The tobacco product used in analysis is cigarettes, widely accepted as the major tobacco
28 product. In order to account for population growth, annual consumption per person over 15
29 was preferred to aggregate annual consumption. The threshold age was set at 15, as youth
30 smoking in Greece is considered substantial. Data on annual cigarette consumption are
31 available from 1994 onwards (1994-2012) from the Greek Ministry of Finance.
32
33
34
35
36
37

38
39 As excise tax data were not available and MPPC (Most Popular Price Category) shows
40 inconsistency due to pricing policy, the measure chosen to reflect price was the Weighted
41 Average Price. Each pack consists of 20 cigarettes. The proxy used to deflate nominal into
42 real prices was calculated by comparing real and nominal values of GDP (Gross Domestic
43 Product) derived from World Bank. CPI (Consumer Price Index) was not selected as a proxy
44 due to a change in calculations by Hellenic Statistical Authority in 1995, when General
45 Harmonized Consumer Price Index was introduced. The base year set was 2005. Disposable
46 income data were based at GDP. Again, the threshold age was set at 15. Deflation was not
47 needed in that case, as real values were available. The base year set was 2005. Prior to 2008,
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 national informative campaigns were not run in Greece at a national level. We considered
4
5 The National Action Plan for Cancer (2008) as an anti-smoking campaign. A dummy variable
6
7 was used to measure its influence on consumption. Expenditure on tobacco control was not
8
9 available. Regulation for smoking bans and restrictions was only introduced in 2002 and
10
11 amended in 2010. In order to measure its influence on consumption, an adjusted version of
12
13 a previous reliable index was constructed, accounting not only for intensity of smoking
14
15 restrictions but for compliance as well.[25] Values attributed were between 0 (no
16
17 restrictions) to 1 (total ban) escalating by 0.25.
18
19

20
21 Data were analyzed with the statistical software packages SPSS® 20 and STATA® 9. The
22
23 functional form used in the analysis was Double-log and values were transformed to natural
24
25 logarithms in order to increase reliability. The models of demand were specified as follows.
26
27

28 *Conventional Demand Model*

29
30
31
$$\ln Q_t = b_0 + b_1 \ln P_t + b_2 \ln Y_t + b_3 SR_t + b_4 AsC_t + \varepsilon_t$$

32
33
34 *Myopic Addiction Model*

35
36
37
$$\ln Q_t = b_0 + b_1 \ln P_t + b_2 \ln Y_t + b_3 SR_t + b_4 AsC_t + b_5 \ln Q_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$$

38
39
40 *Rational Addiction Model*

41
42
$$\ln Q_t = b_0 + b_1 \ln P_t + b_2 \ln Y_t + b_3 SR_t + b_4 AsC_t + b_5 \ln Q_{t-1} + b_6 \ln Q_{t+1} + \varepsilon_t$$

43
44 Where,

45
46
47 Q_t : consumption of cigarettes per person over 15 (000 cigarettes) in year t

48
49
50 Q_{t-1} : consumption of cigarettes per person over 15(000 cigarettes) in year t-1

51
52
53 Q_{t+1} : consumption of cigarettes per person over 15(000 cigarettes) in year t+1

54
55
56 P_t : real retail price per pack of 20 cigarettes in year t

57
58
59 Y_t : real per person over 15 disposable income (€000) in year t
60

b_0 : intercept in year t

SR_t : index of smoking restrictions or bans according to law in year t

AsC_t : dichotomous index reflecting the existence of an anti-smoking campaign each year t

ε_t : the error term

Results

Through the conventional model of demand, the demand equation was estimated as follows

(Table 2):

Table 2: Conventional model of demand equation

$\ln Q_t = -1.757 - 0.441 \cdot \ln P_t + 1.040 \cdot \ln Y_t - 0.132 \cdot AsC_t$		
F-statistic: 27.765	R square: 0.847	Durbin-Watson: 1.980
Skewness/Kurtosis tests for Normality: adj $\chi^2 = 5.10$, Prob> $\chi^2 = 0.0780$		
Breusch-Pagan / Cook-Weisberg test for heteroskedasticity: $\chi^2 = 2.56$, Prob> $\chi^2 = 0.1093$		
Dickey-Fuller test for unit root: Z(t)= -2.364, 1% critical value=-2.660, 5% critical value= -1.950, 10% critical value=-1.600		

A regression analysis was performed and calculations were made stepwise. The variable created to capture the effect of smoking restrictions was found non-significant (p value asymptotically equal to 0.303 at 5% confidence level); thus, it is excluded from the model. P value at 5% confidence level is asymptotically equal to 0 for $\ln Y_t$, equal to 0.001 for $\ln P_t$ and equal to 0.021 for AsC_t . The F-statistic is high, showing a good level of fit, while the model explains a great part of the variation. The Durbin-Watson statistic is close to 2, suggesting that the model has no autocorrelation. The Variation Inflated Factor is low for all variables, implying that multicollinearity is a non-factor. As evidenced by normality tests, standardized

1
2
3 residuals follow a normal distribution. Breusch-Pagan / Cook-Weisberg tests indicate that
4
5 residuals are homoscedastic. The Augmented Dickey-Fuller test for standardized residuals
6
7 confirms that there exist no unit roots. Therefore, the standardized residuals are stationary,
8
9 so the variables of the model are cointegrated (without constant and trend) and the
10
11 regression is not spurious. In the light of the above, we accept a short-run price elasticity of
12
13 demand at 0.441 and a short-run income elasticity of demand at 1.040.
14

15
16 Through the myopic addiction model, the additional variable ($\ln Q_{t-1}$) shows no statistical
17
18 significance. Therefore the model remains unchanged. Through the rational addiction
19
20 model, only the variable representing following year's consumption ($\ln Q_{t+1}$) is found
21
22 significant (p value asymptotically equal to 0), with substantially lower levels of fit (R
23
24 square). Thus, we conclude that addiction models fail to offer additional information on how
25
26 consumption is influenced. Based on 2010 data, nominal tax revenue per pack is calculated
27
28 at €2.78, a value verifying and corresponding to the fixed amount of tax (86% of the nominal
29
30 retail price). We assume that the state maintains the existing ability to collect tribute.
31
32 Government proclamations suggest that tobacco will be further taxed. Therefore, we
33
34 distinct four scenarios, all with retail price increases, as anticipated, and each suggesting an
35
36 additional price increase by €0.5. Calculations are made only for the following year and
37
38 accordingly only short run elasticity is taken into account. Scenarios capture the impact of
39
40 the continuing fall in income at a rate of 4.8%. Based on Ross et al methodology and data
41
42 concerning tobacco-related mortality in Greece (Lower respiratory infections, Malignant
43
44 neoplasms, Cardiovascular diseases and Respiratory diseases), we estimate reduction on
45
46 smokers and mortality averted.[3,26]
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 3: Impact of price increase and income constraints on consumption, tax revenue, number of smokers and smoking related deaths

Model scenarios	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4	
Price per pack	€4.47	€4.97	€5.47	€5.97	
Percent increase of price	12.59%	25.19%	37.78%	50.38%	
Fall in consumption due to price increase	-5.55%	-11.11%	-16.66%	-22.22%	
Fall in consumption due to income decrease	-4.99%	-4.99%	-4.99%	-4.99%	
Per capita consumption level	1,779.84	1,669.33	1,558.82	1,448.31	
Per capita consumption deterred	209.83	320.34	430.85	541.36	
Tax revenue per pack	€3.84	€4.27	€4.70	€5.13	
Tax revenue per cigarette	€0.192	€0.214	€0.235	€0.257	
Total tax revenue (€ billion)	€3,336	€3,478	€3,575	€3,625	
Incremental tax revenue (€ billion)	€0,455	€0,597	€0,694	€0,744	
Reduction in number of smokers	205,650	313,956	422,262	530,568	
Smoking related deaths averted	high(0,50)	930	1,420	1,911	2,401
	low(0,25)	465	710	955	1,200

-Differences in calculations may occur due to rounding

-Impact of price increase shared between prevalence and consumption

-High estimate indicates that 50% of smokers' deaths are attributable to tobacco use, whereas low estimate indicates that 25% of smokers' deaths are attributable to tobacco use

In all four scenarios, consumption is decreased substantially while tax revenue is still increased thanks to the inelastic demand. Moreover, smokers are significantly reduced and smoking related deaths are accordingly limited.

Discussion

Price elasticity estimates are greater than previous research in Greece,[8, 23-24] but consistent with findings by Gallet and List.[20] Estimates for income elasticity are far greater than estimates provided by literature in Greece.[8, 21-23] Regarding antismoking campaigns, results are in agreement with previous testimony.[23-24] Smoking restrictions show no statistical significance, confirming the claims by Joosens and Raw that compliance is low.[17] Finally, results are in general agreement with Alpert et al,[27] though a different methodology is followed.

Paired with the still high cigarette affordability, as documented in the current study and reported by previous research,[6] the nature of demand in Greece presents a vast opportunity for the policy makers to counter the tobacco epidemic and ensure revenue and cash flows at the same time. Even supposing that other determinants of demand, such as income, which is anticipated to fall, do not change, tobacco taxation proves to be a powerful tool. Annual consumption per person over 15 would be no higher than 1,780 cigarettes, even in the worst case (scenario1) and may fall to less than 1,448 cigarettes. On the other hand, tax revenue would recover from the downwards trend, accounting again for more than 1.80% of GDP, even in scenario1. In absolute values, excess tobacco tax revenue could rejuvenate the dismantled public coffers. Results suggest that even with a modest 10% of tax revenue allocated to offsetting the tobacco epidemic, there would be more than enough disposable funds towards planning, implementing, evaluating and improving antismoking efforts. Greeks seem to be in agreement with heavy taxation on cigarettes, but only if respective revenue is attributed to tobacco control.[28] In terms of public health benefits, smokers could be reduced by nearly 530,568 people, while up to 2,401 smoking related deaths could be averted on an annual basis. Nonetheless, findings should be treated with caution and increases in price should not be excessively increased from day one, as the

1
2
3 smokers' reaction is not easy to predict with confidence intervals widened. A stepwise
4
5 increase of tax would eliminate many of the risks associated with a sharp and sudden
6
7 increase in cigarette prices. Besides, Greece already performs better in tax collection than
8
9 countries such as Germany, France and Slovenia among others,[26] as the excise per smoker
10
11 ratio indicates, with €738.71 collected for every smoker.
12

13
14 Income sensitivity is larger than in any previous study either in Greece or internationally.
15
16 Thus, it is not exaggerating to argue that Greek smokers are shocked by the constraint on
17
18 their income. Besides, it is the first time in at least 40 years that income in Greece is falling at
19
20 this rate. The austerity measures should be viewed as a shift event in cigarette consumption,
21
22 among others.
23

24
25 Reducing the toll of tobacco in Greece is not an easy task. Decisions should include fostering
26
27 an antismoking-culture through well-planned national antismoking campaigns, raising the
28
29 cigarettes prices at an initial level no less than €4 a pack and ensuring compliance with the
30
31 anti-smoking law, especially on the current occasion, when City Police (the main mechanism
32
33 of control on the matter) was recently abolished as an institution. Controlling illicit trade is
34
35 crucial to maximize the effect of interventions.
36
37

38
39 As regards to the limitations of this study, it must be noted that addictions models were
40
41 unable to provide statistically significant information, possibly due to the inclusion of 2012
42
43 data in the time series. Possible future analysis of an even wider time series could provide
44
45 even more reliable results, as multicollinearity could be fully cured. Furthermore, the study
46
47 could be strengthened by employing statistical tests on more observations, regarding the
48
49 endogeneity of cigarette prices. Moreover, the current study is based on the most popular
50
51 price category in order to estimate the impact of prices changes on cigarette demand. It is
52
53 possible that a weighted average for all the brands sold in Greece could eliminate
54
55 unilateralism on prices data. Still, the anticipated but not fully documented switch of Greek
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 smokers from manufactured cigarettes to hand-rolled tobacco should be taken into account
4
5 in any future research. Yet, if the increase of contraband cigarettes in the Greek market
6
7 could be quantified, results would be more punctual. In addition, tobacco shows synergistic
8
9 effect with other substances, such as alcohol. Thus, it would be meaningful to investigate
10
11 the combined effect of tobacco and alcohol from an economic aspect. Finally, researchers
12
13 argue that the increased availability of nicotine substitutes will reduce demand for tobacco
14
15 products and increase the price sensitivity as well.[19] Under that scope, if research included
16
17 nicotine substitutes, accuracy would be improved.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Acknowledgements:** We would like to express our gratitude to Professor Frank Chaloupka
4
5 for his valuable and constructive suggestions towards planning and development of this
6
7 research work. His willingness to provide us his limited time has been very much
8
9 appreciated.
10

11
12 **Contributorship Statement:** FT, DZ and AV performed the calculations and analyses
13
14 reported in the text. FT and KA reviewed the literature for relevant data and documentation.
15
16 FT and KA drafted the manuscript which was edited and critically revised by KA, AV and IK.
17
18

19
20 **Funding:** This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public,
21
22 commercial or not-for-profit sectors.
23

24
25 **Competing interests:** None.
26

27
28 **Data Sharing:** Extra data is available by emailing FT.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

1. WHO. Global Health Risks: Mortality and burden of disease attributable to selected major risks. Geneva: World Health Organization 2009
http://www.who.int/healthinfo/global_burden_disease/GlobalHealthRisks_report_full.pdf (Accessed 14 Nov 2011).
2. Eriksen M, Mackay J, Ross H. The Tobacco Atlas. Fourth Ed. Atlanta, GA, American Cancer Society, New York: World Lung Foundation 2012.
3. WHO. WHO Global report: Mortality Attributable to Tobacco. Geneva: World Health Organization 2012
http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2012/9789241564434_eng.pdf (Accessed 5 Oct 2012).
4. Filippidis FT, Vardavas CI, Loukopoulou A et al. Prevalence and determinants of tobacco use among adults in Greece: 4 year trends. Eur J Public Health 2013;23(5):772-776.
5. Vardavas CI, Kondilis B, Travers MJ et al. Environmental tobacco smoke in hospitality venues in Greece. BMC Public Health 2007;7(1):302.
6. Blecher EH, Van Walbeek CP. Cigarette affordability trends: an update and some methodological comments. Tobacco Control 2009;18(3):167-175.
7. Vardavas CI, Kafatos AG. Smoking policy and prevalence in Greece: an overview. The European Journal of Public Health 2007;17(2):211-213.
8. Hondroyannis G, Papapetrou E. Cigarette consumption in Greece: empirical evidence from cointegration analysis. Applied Economics Letters 1997;4:571-574
9. Ministry of Health and Social Solidarity. The Greek National Plan of Action against Cancer 2008-2012, Athens, 2008. http://ygeiamap.gov.gr/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/karkinos_teliko.pdf (Accessed 5 Oct 2011)
10. Hellenic Statistical Authority, Workforce research, Press release 19 September 2013,

1
2
3 <http://www.statistics.gr/portal/page/portal/ESYE/BUCKET/A0101/PressReleases/A0>
4
5 [101_SJO01_DT_QQ_02_2013_01_F_GR.pdf](http://www.statistics.gr/portal/page/portal/ESYE/BUCKET/A0101/PressReleases/A0101_SJO01_DT_QQ_02_2013_01_F_GR.pdf) (Accessed 7 November 2013)
6

- 7
8 11. Eurostat news release 26 February 2013, Eurostat press office
9
10 http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_STAT-13-28_en.htm (Accessed 27 February
11 2013)
12
- 13 12. Wilkins N, Yurekli A, Hu TW. Economic analysis of tobacco demand. Economics of
14 Tobacco Toolkit. Washington: World Bank 2004
15
16 <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTPH/Resources/3Demand.pdf> (Accessed 24
17 Nov 2011)
18
19
- 20 13. Godfrey C, Maynard A. Economic aspects of tobacco use and taxation policy. BMJ
21 1998;297(6644):339–343.
22
- 23 14. Kahende JW, Loomis BR, Adhikari B, Marshall L. A review of economic evaluations of
24 tobacco control programs. Int J Environ Res Public Health 2009;6(1):51-68.
25
26
- 27 15. Farrelly M, Bray J. Responses to cigarette tax increases by race/ethnicity, income
28 and age groups – United States, 1976–1993. Journal of the American Medical
29 Association 1999;280:1979-1980.
30
31
- 32 16. Chaloupka F, Warner E. The economics of smoking. Handbook of Health Economics,
33 2000;1:1539-1627.
34
35
- 36 17. Joossens L, Raw M. The tobacco control scale 2010 in Europe. Brussels: Association
37 of European Cancer Leagues 2011.
38
39
- 40 18. WHO. Report on the Global Tobacco Epidemic, 2008: The MPOWER package.
41 Geneva: World Health Organization 2008
42
43 http://www.who.int/tobacco/mpower/mpower_report_full_2008.pdf (Accessed 14
44 Nov 2011).
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 19. Chaloupka F, Pacula R. The impact of price on youth tobacco use. Changing
4 Adolescent Smoking Prevalence: Where It Is and Why, Smoking and Tobacco Control
5 Monograph 1999:14.
6
7
8
9
10 20. Gallet C, List J. Cigarette demand: A meta-analysis of elasticities. Health Econ
11 2003;12:821-835.
12
13
14 21. Stavrinou VG. The effects of an anti-smoking campaign on cigarette consumption:
15 empirical evidence from Greece. Applied Economics 1987;19:323-329.
16
17
18 22. Raptou E, Mattas K, Tsakiridou E et al. Factors affecting cigarette
19 demand. International Advances in Economic Research 2005;11(3):275-290.
20
21
22 23. Nikolaou A, Velentzas K. Estimating the Demand for Cigarettes in Greece: An Error
23 Correction Model, Agricultural Economics Review 2001;2(1):20-27.
24
25
26 24. Dritsakis E. Forecasting of cigarettes consumption in Greece: An empirical
27 investigation with cointegration analysis. Agricultural Economic Review
28 2003;4(2):47-56.
29
30
31 25. Wasserman J, Manning WG, Newhouse JP et al. The Effects of Excise Taxes and
32 Regulations on Cigarette Smoking. Journal of Health Economics 1991;10(1):43-64.
33
34
35 26. Ross HZ, Shariff S, Gilmore A. Economics of Tobacco Taxation in Russia. Paris:
36 International Union Against Tuberculosis and Lung Disease 2008.
37
38
39 27. Alpert HR, Vardavas CI, Chaloupka FJ et al. The recent and projected public health
40 and economic benefits of cigarette taxation in Greece. Tobacco Control 2013 Mar 6.
41 [Epub ahead of print]
42
43
44 28. Vardavas CI, Filippidis FT, Agaku I et al. Tobacco taxation: the importance of
45 earmarking the revenue to health care and tobacco control. Tobacco induced
46 diseases 2012;10(1):21.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Estimates of price and income elasticity in Greece:

Greek debt crisis transforming cigarettes into a luxury good - an econometric approach

Tarantilis F¹, Athanasakis K¹, [Zavras D¹](#), Vozikis A², Kyriopoulos I¹

¹National School of Public Health, Athens, Greece

²Department of Economics, University of Piraeus, Athens, Greece

Corresponding author: Filippos Tarantilis, Department of Health Economics, National School of Public Health, 196 Alexandras Av., Athens, 11521, Greece, fil_t@hotmail.com, Phone No: 00302132010242, Fax No: 00302106449571

Kostas Athanasakis, National School of Public Health, Department of Health Economics, Athens, Greece

[Dimitris Zavras, National School of Public Health, Department of Health Economics, Athens, Greece](#)

Athanassios Vozikis, University of Piraeus, Department of Economics, Athens, Greece

Ioannis Kyriopoulos, National School of Public Health, Department of Health Economics, Athens, Greece

Keywords: smoking, taxation, price elasticity, income elasticity

Word count: [3,0412,909 \(without abstract, article summary, headings, tables, contributorship statement, acknowledgements, funding, competing interests and data sharing\)](#)

Abstract

Objective: During the past decades, smoking prevalence in Greece was estimated near or over 40%. Following a sharp fall in newest data on cigarette consumption, our objective is to

Field Code Changed

1
2
3
4
5
6 assess smokers' sensitivity to cigarette price and consumer income changes as well as to
7 project health benefits of an additional tax increase.
8

9
10 **Methods:** Cigarette consumption was considered as the dependent variable, with Weighted
11 Average Price as a proxy for cigarette price, GDP as a proxy for consumers' income and
12 dummy variables reflecting smoking restrictions and antismoking campaigns. Values were
13 computed to natural logarithms and regression was performed. Then, 4 scenarios of tax
14 increase were distinguished in order to calculate potential health benefits.
15
16
17
18
19

20
21 **Results:** ~~Addiction models were unable to provide statistically significant information due to~~
22 ~~a nearly 23.5% drop in consumption during 2012.~~ Short-run price elasticity is estimated at -
23 0.441 and short-run income elasticity is estimated at 1.040. Antismoking campaigns were
24 found to have a statistically significant impact on consumption. Results indicate that,
25 depending on the level of tax increase, annual per capita consumption could fall by at least
26 209.83 cigarettes; tax revenue could rise up by more than €0.74 billion, while smokers could
27 be reduced by up to 530,568 and at least 465 smoking related deaths could be averted.
28
29
30
31
32
33

34
35 **Conclusions:** Price elasticity estimates are similar to previous studies in Greece, while
36 income elasticity estimates are far greater. With cigarettes regarded as a luxury good, a
37 great opportunity is presented for decision-makers to counter smoking. Increased taxation,
38 along with focused antismoking campaigns, law reinforcement (to ensure compliance with
39 smoking bans) and intensive control for smuggling could invoke a massive blow to the
40 tobacco epidemic in Greece.
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 **Article Summary Strengths and limitations of this study**

- 48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- The article offers information to policy makers regarding price elasticity, a key measure to perform tobacco control policy

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, No underline

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- The article reports, for the first time, an income elasticity above 1, as evidence that cigarettes tend to be considered a luxury good in Greece
 - The analysis treats qualitative variables and projects health and financial benefits under extreme austerity
 - The analysis could not include dynamic (addiction) models, as no statistical significance was reported

Introduction

Country Profile

Globally, more than 5 million people die every year from tobacco use, while tobacco use is the second leading cause of death, representing the 8.7% of global annual mortality .[1] As global tobacco consumption in 2009 was estimated at 5884 billion cigarettes,[2] tobacco clearly reflects the global transition from traditional risks such as undernutrition, unsafe sex, unsafe water, poor sanitation and hygiene to modern risks like physical inactivity, behavior risks and air quality.[1] In Greece, WHO estimations attribute 17% of mortality for people aged 30 or more to smoking.[3] Death rate attributed to tobacco and the proportion of deaths attributable to tobacco for ages 30 and over is documented in the following table (Table 1).

Table 1: Estimated death rated (per 100.000) and proportion attributable to tobacco for ages 30 and over, 2004 in Greece [3]

Cause of death	Death rate attributed to tobacco	Proportion of deaths attributable to tobacco
Lower respiratory infections	3	23%
Malignant neoplasms	110	29%
Cardiovascular diseases	90	12%
Respiratory diseases	23	37%

Little less than half Greek citizens (41%) are smokers.[4] Youth smoking is also high, 11.3% for young men and 9% for young women.[2] Environmental Tobacco Smoke (ETS) also represents a serious problem in Greece, as documented by previous research.[5]

Concerning cigarette affordability, findings suggest that Greece is one of the few high-income European Union countries with relatively low cigarette prices.[6] Low prices can be recognized as a factor for the tobacco epidemic in Greece.[7] According to own calculations,

1
2
3
4
5
6 for the period 1992-2012, cigarette affordability, defined as the percentage of income
7 needed to purchase 100 packs of cigarettes, was estimated from 0.56% to 1.98%.

8
9
10 The first organized efforts to counter smoking in Greece were observed during 1979-1982.
11
12 At the moment, in Greece, tobacco advertising bans are complete, except for point-of-sale
13
14 advertising.

15
16
17 Tax revenue from tobacco products is arguably very important for the economic policy. In
18
19 1990, tax revenue accounted for 4.4% of GDP.[8] For the period 1998-2010 tobacco tax
20
21 revenue stood for an annual average 2% of GDP, but it seems to follow a downwards trend.

22
23
24 Official estimates measure the total annual direct cost of smoking a €2.14 billion, in an
25
26 environment where debt crisis and austerity measures set serious constraints to the health
27
28 system and resources should, now more than ever, be allocated properly. [9] Tobacco's
29
30 unfavorable consequences on the poor could become a factor, where unemployment rates
31
32 are estimated at 27.1% for the 2nd quarter of 2013, continuing to grow from under 900,000
33
34 to approximately 1,350,000 people in the last 24 months.[10] Moreover, 31% of the total
35
36 population is at risk of poverty or social exclusion.[11]

37 38 Tobacco Market and government interventions

39
40 Three market failures differentiate an individual's choice to smoke compared to the decision
41
42 to consume other goods: information failure on the health hazard of smoking, information
43
44 failure on the addiction caused by smoking and external burden to non-smokers.[12]
45
46 Therefore, government intervention is justified in order both to protect smokers from the
47
48 perilous habit and correct for externalities associated to smoking. From a basic economics'
49
50 standpoint, it can be claimed that smoking's immense social burden overtakes the loss of
51
52 consumer's utility or else the loss of economic efficiency (deadweight loss). -A hypothetical
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

example on how the deadweight loss emerges, after the introduction of tax, is illustrated in figures (Figure 1 and Figure 2).

Tobacco taxation is imposed through a variety of structures but, in nearly all cases, includes two main types of tax: Ad valorem tax, which represents a percentage of price and specific tax, which is a fixed tax per cigarette. In Greece, following the 2010 restructure of tobacco tax, total tax represents 86% of the retail price, significantly increased compared to the 2009 level and 2008 level when is represented 83% and 70% of the retail price respectively (WHO, 2011). In 2012, specific excise tax was regulated at €80 per 1,000 cigarettes and ad valorem tax at 20% of the retail price. Their minimum sum is required to be no less than €115 per 1,000 cigarettes. Meanwhile, a specific excise tax was set at €153 per kg of hand-rolled tobacco. Sales tax for cigarettes is fixed at 23% of the retail price.

Price increases should not be regarded the only way to reduce consumption, as the impact of income, advertising and health education are also important.[13] Manipulating these variables will result to reduced consumption and eventually reduced mortality and morbidity. Tobacco control programs and policies are found to be either cost-saving or cost-effective, compared to other public health interventions such as cardiovascular risk counseling and cancer screening.[14] Research on the impact of tobacco control showed that during 1981-2000, increases in tobacco control program expenditures in the U.S.A. lead to reduced cigarettes sales. Authors also suggest that expenditures have an even stronger lagged influence on sales.[15] Smoking bans are adopted in order to limit exposure to smoke but also cause a remarkable decrease in cigarette consumption, as smokers' opportunities to smoke are lessened.[16] In Greece, the effort to restrict smoking in public places through legislation has failed due to low compliance with law.[17] Youth exposed to secondhand smoke at home are estimated at 89.8% of total youth population.[2] Public education campaigns, if "hard-hitting, sophisticated and sustained", can be extremely effective.[18]

Price and income elasticities

The term used to measure the impact of a change in price on consumption is price elasticity of demand, defined as the percentage change in consumption that results from 1 percent increase in price.[19] Similarly, the impact of a change in income on consumption is measured by income elasticity, defined as the percentage change in consumption resulting from 1 percent increase in income. Estimating elasticity is crucial to policy makers in order not only to anticipate an intervention's impact both on tobacco consumption and tobacco tax revenue. If the proportionate fall in tobacco consumption exceeds the proportionate increase of tax, revenue will fall. Otherwise, revenue will rise.[16]

Results from a meta-analysis,[20] indicate that short run elasticity (-0.40) is lower than long run elasticity (-0.44), while in studies that included smuggling demand was less sensitive (-0.36). These findings confirm the general notion that a 10% increase in price would lead to a 4% reduction in consumption in high-income countries.[18] Stavrinou estimated the short run price elasticity at -0.079 and the long run at -0.147, while income elasticity is estimated at 0.18 and 0.33, respectively.[21] Hondroyannis and Papapetrou, based on data over the period 1967-1990, calculated the short run price elasticity at -0.33 and the long run at -0.6, while income elasticity estimations are 0.35 and 0.54, respectively. The fact that demand is inelastic is explained by the authors through addiction and the absence of direct substitutes. Furthermore, it is claimed that health warnings are more effective in reducing consumption than price increases.[9] Raptou and colleagues conclude in an income elasticity of 0.28, consisting of initiation elasticity (0.21) and consumption elasticity (0.07), arguing that income is a more important determinant for initiation rather than consumption. Furthermore, smoking bans are illustrated as a factor discouraging tobacco consumption.[22] Nikolaou and Velentzas, based on data from 1960 to 1995, estimated the short run price elasticity at -0.24 and the long run at -0.48, while income elasticity is

1
2
3
4
5
6 estimated at 0.19 and 0.40, respectively. Advertising had a positive but non-significant effect
7
8 on demand and antismoking campaigns had a negative but non-significant effect on
9
10 demand.[23] On the other hand, health warnings on packs during 1987-1990 had a
11
12 significant negative impact on demand, lowering consumption by 4.2%. Dritsakis notes that
13
14 consumption is a negative function of price and health education expenditure and a positive
15
16 function of income as well.[24]

17
18 As illustrated, there are no studies of price elasticity available for at least a decade. In the
19
20 light of the above, the purpose of the present study was to investigate cigarette demand in
21
22 Greece.

23 24 **Method**

25
26 The tobacco product used in analysis is cigarettes, widely accepted as the major tobacco
27
28 product. In order to account for population growth, annual consumption per person over 15
29
30 was preferred to aggregate annual consumption. The threshold age was set at 15, as youth
31
32 smoking in Greece is considered substantial. Data on annual cigarette consumption are
33
34 available from 1994 onwards [\(1994-2012\) from the Greek Ministry of Finance](#).

35
36
37 ~~Monthly (and quarterly) data on the quantities of taxed cigarettes were available from 2007~~
38
39 ~~to 2011.~~ As excise tax data were not available and MPPC (Most Popular Price Category)
40
41 shows inconsistency due to pricing policy, the measure chosen to reflect price was the
42
43 Weighted Average Price. Each pack consists of 20 cigarettes. The proxy used to deflate
44
45 nominal into real prices was calculated by comparing real and nominal values of GDP (Gross
46
47 Domestic Product) derived from World Bank. CPI (Consumer Price Index) was not selected as
48
49 a proxy due to a change in calculations by Hellenic Statistical Authority in 1995, when
50
51 General Harmonized Consumer Price Index was introduced. The base year set was 2005.
52
53 Disposable income data were based at GDP. Again, the threshold age was set at 15.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Deflation was not needed in that case, as real values were available. The base year set was 2005. Prior to 2008, national informative campaigns were not run in Greece at a national level. We considered The National Action Plan for Cancer (2008) as an anti-smoking campaign. A dummy variable was used to measure its influence on consumption. Expenditure on tobacco control was not available. Regulation for smoking bans and restrictions was only introduced in 2002 and amended in 2010. In order to measure its influence on consumption, an adjusted version of a previous reliable index was constructed, accounting not only for intensity of smoking restrictions but for compliance as well.[25] Values attributed were between 0 (no restrictions) to 1 (total ban) escalating by 0.25.

~~Regression analysis includes only a static model, as dynamic models (incorporating models) show limited statistical significance, due to the inclusion of 2012 data in the time series.~~

~~Data were analyzed with the statistical software packages SPSS® 20 and STATA® 9. The functional form used in the analysis was Double-log and values were transformed to natural logarithms in order to increase reliability. Testing for endogeneity of cigarette prices was not possible as the annual tax rates were only available from 2008 onwards. Time trend was found to be insignificant; therefore, it is excluded from the equations. The models of demand was/were specified as follows.~~

Conventional Demand Model

$$\ln Q_t = b_0 + b_1 \ln P_t + b_2 \ln Y_t + b_3 SR_t + b_4 ASC_t + \varepsilon_t$$

~~*Myopic Addiction Model*~~

~~$$\ln Q_t = b_0 + b_1 \ln P_t + b_2 \ln Y_t + b_3 SR_t + b_4 ASC_t + b_5 \ln Q_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$$~~

~~*Rational Addiction Model*~~

~~$$\ln Q_t = b_0 + b_1 \ln P_t + b_2 \ln Y_t + b_3 SR_t + b_4 ASC_t + b_5 \ln Q_{t-1} + b_6 \ln Q_{t+1} + \varepsilon_t$$~~

Where,

Formatted: Font: Italic, English (U.S.)

Formatted: Underline, English (U.S.)

Formatted: Underline

Formatted: Underline, English (U.S.)

Formatted: Underline

Formatted: Underline, English (U.S.)

Formatted: Underline

Formatted: Underline, English (U.S.)

Formatted: Underline

Formatted: Underline, English (U.S.)

Formatted: Underline

Formatted: Underline, English (U.S.)

Formatted: Underline

Formatted: Underline, English (U.S.)

Formatted: Font: Italic, English (U.S.)

Formatted: Underline, English (U.S.)

Formatted: Underline

Formatted: Underline, English (U.S.)

Formatted: Underline

Formatted: Underline, English (U.S.)

Formatted: Underline

Formatted: Underline, English (U.S.)

Formatted: Underline

Formatted: Underline, English (U.S.)

Formatted: Underline

Formatted: Underline, English (U.S.)

Formatted: Underline

Formatted: Underline, English (U.S.)

Formatted: Underline

Formatted: Underline, English (U.S.)

1
2
3
4
5
6 Q_t : consumption of cigarettes per person over 15 (000 cigarettes) in year t
7

8
9 Q_{t-1} : consumption of cigarettes per person over 15(000 cigarettes) in year t-1

Formatted: English (U.S.)

10
11 Q_{t+1} : consumption of cigarettes per person over 15(000 cigarettes) in year t+1

Formatted: English (U.S.)

Formatted: English (U.S.)

12
13 P_t : real retail price per pack of 20 cigarettes in year t
14

Formatted: English (U.S.)

Formatted: English (U.S.)

15
16 Y_t : real per person over 15 disposable income (€000-€) in year t
17

18
19 b_0 : intercept in year t
20

21
22 SR_t : index of smoking restrictions or bans according to law in year t
23

24
25 AsC_t : dummy checking dichotomous index reflecting the existence of an anti-smoking
26 campaign each year t
27

28
29 ε_t : the error term
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Results

Through the conventional model of demand, the demand equation was estimated as follows

(Table 2):

Table 2: Conventional model of demand equation

$\ln Q_t = -1.757 - 0.441 \cdot \ln P_t + 1.040 \cdot \ln Y_t - 0.132 \cdot \text{AsC}_t$		
F-statistic: 27.765	R square: 0.847	Durbin-Watson: 1.980
Skewness/Kurtosis tests for Normality: adj chi ² = 5.10, Prob>chi ² = 0.0780		
Breusch-Pagan / Cook-Weisberg test for heteroskedasticity: chi ² = 2.56, Prob>chi ² = 0.1093		
Dickey-Fuller test for unit root: Z(t) = -2.364, 1% critical value = -2.660, 5% critical value = -1.950, 10% critical value = -1.600		

Formatted: Superscript

Formatted: Superscript

Formatted: English (U.S.)

A regression analysis was performed and calculations were made stepwise. The variable created to capture the effect of smoking restrictions was found non-significant (p value asymptotically equal to 0.303 at 5% confidence level); thus, it is excluded from the model. P value at 5% confidence level is asymptotically equal to 0 for $\ln Y_t$, equal to 0.001 for $\ln P_t$ and equal to 0.021 for AsC_t . The F-statistic is high, showing a good level of fit, while the model explains a great part of the variation. The Durbin-Watson statistic is close to 2, suggesting that the model has no autocorrelation. The Variation Inflated Factor is low for all variables, implying that multicollinearity is a non-factor. As evidenced by normality tests, standardized residuals follow a normal distribution. Breusch-Pagan / Cook-Weisberg tests indicate that residuals are homoscedastic. The Augmented Dickey-Fuller test for standardized residuals confirms that there exist no unit roots. Therefore, the standardized residuals are stationary, so the variables of the model are cointegrated (without constant and trend) and the

1
2
3
4
5
6 regression is not spurious. In the light of the above, we accept a short-run price elasticity of
7
8 demand at 0.441 and a short-run income elasticity of demand at 1.040.

9
10
11 Through the myopic addiction model, the additional variable ($\ln Q_{t-1}$) shows no statistical
12 significance. Therefore the model remains unchanged. Through the rational addiction
13 model, only the variable representing following year's consumption ($\ln Q_{t+1}$) is found
14 significant (p value asymptotically equal to 0), with substantially lower levels of fit (R
15 square). Thus, we conclude that addiction models fail to offer additional information on how
16 consumption is influenced.

17
18
19
20 Based on 2010 data, nominal tax revenue per pack is calculated at €2.78, a value verifying
21
22 and corresponding to the fixed amount of tax (86% of the nominal retail price). We assume
23
24 that the state maintains the existing ability to collect tribute. Government proclamations
25
26 suggest that tobacco will be further taxed. Therefore, we distinct four scenarios, all with
27
28 retail price increases, as anticipated, and each suggesting an additional price increase by
29
30 €0.5. Calculations are made only for the following year and accordingly only short run
31
32 elasticity is taken into account. Scenarios capture the impact of the continuing fall in income
33
34 at a rate of 4.8%. Based on Ross et al methodology and data concerning tobacco-related
35
36 mortality in Greece (Lower respiratory infections, Malignant neoplasms, Cardiovascular
37
38 diseases and Respiratory diseases), we estimate reduction on smokers and mortality
39
40 averted.[3,26]
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, No underline

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, No underline

Formatted: Line spacing: 1.5 lines

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, No underline,
Subscript

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, No underline,
Subscript

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, No underline

Table 32: Impact of price increase and income constraints on consumption, tax revenue, number of smokers and smoking related deaths

Model scenarios	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4	
Price per pack	€4.47	€4.97	€5.47	€5.97	
Percent increase of price	12.59%	25.19%	37.78%	50.38%	
Fall in consumption due to price increase	-5.55%	-11.11%	-16.66%	-22.22%	
Fall in consumption due to income decrease	-4.99%	-4.99%	-4.99%	-4.99%	
Per capita consumption level	1,779.84	1,669.33	1,558.82	1,448.31	
Per capita consumption deterred	209.83	320.34	430.85	541.36	
Tax revenue per pack	€3.84	€4.27	€4.70	€5.13	
Tax revenue per cigarette	€0.192	€0.214	€0.235	€0.257	
Total tax revenue (€ billion)	€3,336	€3,478	€3,575	€3,625	
Incremental tax revenue (€ billion)	€0,455	€0,597	€0,694	€0,744	
Reduction in number of smokers	205,650	313,956	422,262	530,568	
Smoking related deaths averted	high(0,50)	930	1,420	1,911	2,401
	low(0,25)	465	710	955	1,200

-Differences in calculations may occur due to rounding

-Impact of price increase shared between prevalence and consumption

-High estimate indicates that 50% of smokers' deaths are attributable to tobacco use, whereas low estimate indicates that 25% of smokers' deaths are attributable to tobacco use

In all four scenarios, consumption is decreased substantially while tax revenue is still increased thanks to the inelastic demand. Moreover, smokers are significantly reduced and smoking related deaths are accordingly limited.

Discussion

Price elasticity estimates are greater than previous research in Greece,[8, 23-24] but consistent with findings by Gallet and List.[20] Estimates for income elasticity are far greater than estimates provided by literature in Greece.[8, 21-23] Regarding antismoking campaigns, results are in agreement with previous testimony.[23-24] Smoking restrictions show no statistical significance, confirming the claims by Joosens and Raw that compliance is low.[17] Finally, results are in general agreement with Alpert et al,[27] though a different methodology is followed.

Paired with the still high cigarette affordability, as documented in the current study and reported by previous research,[6] the nature of demand in Greece presents a vast opportunity for the policy makers to counter the tobacco epidemic and ensure revenue and cash flows at the same time. Even supposing that other determinants of demand, such as income, which is anticipated to fall, do not change, tobacco taxation proves to be a powerful tool. Annual consumption per person over 15 would be no higher than 1,780 cigarettes, even in the worst case (scenario1) and may fall to less than 1,448 cigarettes. On the other hand, tax revenue would recover from the downwards trend, accounting again for more than 1.80% of GDP, even in scenario1. In absolute values, excess tobacco tax revenue could rejuvenate the dismantled public coffers. Results suggest that even with a modest 10% of tax revenue allocated to offsetting the tobacco epidemic, there would be more than enough disposable funds towards planning, implementing, evaluating and improving antismoking efforts. Greeks seem to be in agreement with heavy taxation on cigarettes, but only if respective revenue is attributed to tobacco control.[28] In terms of public health benefits, smokers could be reduced by nearly 530,568 people, while up to 2,401 smoking related deaths could be averted on an annual basis. Nonetheless, findings should be treated with caution and increases in price should not be excessively increased from day one, as the

1
2
3
4
5
6 smokers' reaction is not easy to predict with confidence intervals widened. A stepwise
7
8 increase of tax would eliminate many of the risks associated with a sharp and sudden
9
10 increase in cigarette prices. Besides, Greece already performs better in tax collection than
11
12 countries such as Germany, France and Slovenia among others,[26] as the excise per smoker
13
14 ratio indicates, with €738.71 collected for every smoker.

15
16 Income sensitivity is larger than in any previous study either in Greece or internationally.
17
18 Thus, it is not exaggerating to argue that Greek smokers are shocked by the constraint on
19
20 their income. Besides, it is the first time in at least 40 years that income in Greece is falling at
21
22 this rate. The austerity measures should be viewed as a shift event in cigarette consumption,
23
24 among others.

25
26 Reducing the toll of tobacco in Greece is not an easy task. Decisions should include fostering
27
28 an antismoking-culture through well-planned national antismoking campaigns, raising the
29
30 cigarettes prices at an initial level no less than €4 a pack and ensuring compliance with the
31
32 anti-smoking law, especially on the current occasion, when City Police (the main mechanism
33
34 of control on the matter) was recently abolished as an institution. Controlling illicit trade is
35
36 crucial to maximize the effect of interventions.

37
38
39 As regards to the limitations of this study, it must be noted that addictions models were
40
41 unable to provide statistically significant information, possibly due to the inclusion of 2012
42
43 data in the time series. Possible future analysis of an even wider time series could provide
44
45 even more reliable results, as multicollinearity could be fully cured. Furthermore, the study
46
47 could be strengthened by employing statistical tests on more observations, regarding the
48
49 endogeneity of cigarette prices. Moreover, the current study is based on the most popular
50
51 price category in order to estimate the impact of prices changes on cigarette demand. It is
52
53 possible that a weighted average for all the brands sold in Greece could eliminate
54
55 unilateralism on prices data. Still, the anticipated but not fully documented switch of Greek
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 smokers from manufactured cigarettes to hand-rolled tobacco should be taken into account
7
8 in any future research. Yet, if the increase of contraband cigarettes in the Greek market
9
10 could be quantified, results would be more punctual. In addition, tobacco shows synergistic
11
12 effect with other substances, such as alcohol. Thus, it would be meaningful to investigate
13
14 the combined effect of tobacco and alcohol from an economic aspect. Finally, researchers
15
16 argue that the increased availability of nicotine substitutes will reduce demand for tobacco
17
18 products and increase the price sensitivity as well.[19] Under that scope, if research included
19
20 nicotine substitutes, accuracy would be improved.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 **Contributorship Statement:** FT, [DZ](#) and AV performed the calculations and analyses
7 reported in the text. FT and KA reviewed the literature for relevant data and documentation.
8

9
10 FT and KA drafted the manuscript which was edited and critically revised by KA, [AV](#) and IK.
11

12 **Acknowledgements**

13
14 We would like to express our gratitude to Professor Frank Chaloupka for his valuable and
15 constructive suggestions towards planning and development of this research work. His
16 willingness to provide us his limited time has been very much appreciated.
17
18
19

20
21 **Funding:** ~~None.~~ [This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the](#)
22 [public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.](#)
23
24

25
26 **Competing interests:** None.
27

28
29 **Data Sharing:** Extra data is available by emailing FT.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

1. WHO. Global Health Risks: Mortality and burden of disease attributable to selected major risks. Geneva: World Health Organization 2009
http://www.who.int/healthinfo/global_burden_disease/GlobalHealthRisks_report_full.pdf (Accessed 14 Nov 2011).
2. Eriksen M, Mackay J, Ross H. The Tobacco Atlas. Fourth Ed. Atlanta, GA, American Cancer Society, New York: World Lung Foundation 2012.
3. WHO. WHO Global report: Mortality Attributable to Tobacco. Geneva: World Health Organization 2012
http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2012/9789241564434_eng.pdf (Accessed 5 Oct 2012).
4. Filippidis FT, Vardavas CI, Loukopoulou A et al. Prevalence and determinants of tobacco use among adults in Greece: 4 year trends. Eur J Public Health 2013;23(5):772-776.
5. Vardavas CI, Kondilis B, Travers MJ et al. Environmental tobacco smoke in hospitality venues in Greece. BMC Public Health 2007;7(1):302.
6. Blecher EH, Van Walbeek CP. Cigarette affordability trends: an update and some methodological comments. Tobacco Control 2009;18(3):167-175.
7. Vardavas CI, Kafatos AG. Smoking policy and prevalence in Greece: an overview. The European Journal of Public Health 2007;17(2):211-213.
8. Hondroyiannis G, Papapetrou E. Cigarette consumption in Greece: empirical evidence from cointegration analysis. Applied Economics Letters 1997;4:571-574
9. Ministry of Health and Social Solidarity. The Greek National Plan of Action against Cancer 2008-2012, Athens, 2008. http://ygeiamap.gov.gr/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/karkinos_teliko.pdf (Accessed 5 Oct 2011)
10. Hellenic Statistical Authority, Workforce research, Press release 19 September 2013,

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

1
2
3
4
5
6 http://www.statistics.gr/portal/page/portal/ESYE/BUCKET/A0101/PressReleases/A0101_SJO01_DT_QQ_02_2013_01_F_GR.pdf (Accessed 7 November 2013)

Field Code Changed

10 11. Eurostat news release 26 February 2013, Eurostat press office
12 http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_STAT-13-28_en.htm (Accessed 27 February
13 2013)

Field Code Changed

15 12. Wilkins N, Yurekli A, Hu TW. Economic analysis of tobacco demand. Economics of
16 Tobacco Toolkit. Washington: World Bank 2004
17 <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTPH/Resources/3Demand.pdf> (Accessed 24
18 Nov 2011)

Field Code Changed

20 13. Godfrey C, Maynard A. Economic aspects of tobacco use and taxation policy. BMJ
21 1998;297(6644):339–343.

23 14. Kahende JW, Loomis BR, Adhikari B, Marshall L. A review of economic evaluations of
24 tobacco control programs. Int J Environ Res Public Health 2009;6(1):51-68.

26 15. Farrelly M, Bray J. Responses to cigarette tax increases by race/ethnicity, income
27 and age groups – United States, 1976–1993. Journal of the American Medical
28 Association 1999;280:1979-1980.

30 16. Chaloupka F, Warner E. The economics of smoking. Handbook of Health Economics,
31 2000;1:1539-1627.

33 17. Joossens L, Raw M. The tobacco control scale 2010 in Europe. Brussels: Association
34 of European Cancer Leagues 2011.

36 18. WHO. Report on the Global Tobacco Epidemic, 2008: The MPOWER package.
37 Geneva: World Health Organization 2008

39 http://www.who.int/tobacco/mpower/mpower_report_full_2008.pdf (Accessed 14
40 Nov 2011).

Field Code Changed

- 1
2
3
4
5
6 19. Chaloupka F, Pacula R. The impact of price on youth tobacco use. Changing
7 Adolescent Smoking Prevalence: Where It Is and Why, Smoking and Tobacco Control
8 Monograph 1999:14.
9
- 10
11 20. Gallet C, List J. Cigarette demand: A meta-analysis of elasticities. Health Econ
12 2003;12:821-835.
13
- 14
15 21. Stavrinou VG. The effects of an anti-smoking campaign on cigarette consumption:
16 empirical evidence from Greece. Applied Economics 1987;19:323-329.
17
- 18
19 22. Raptou E, Mattas K, Tsakiridou E et al. Factors affecting cigarette
20 demand. International Advances in Economic Research 2005;11(3):275-290.
21
- 22
23 23. Nikolaou A, Velentzas K. Estimating the Demand for Cigarettes in Greece: An Error
24 Correction Model, Agricultural Economics Review 2001;2(1):20-27.
25
- 26
27 24. Dritsakis E. Forecasting of cigarettes consumption in Greece: An empirical
28 investigation with cointegration analysis. Agricultural Economic Review
29 2003;4(2):47-56.
30
- 31
32 25. Wasserman J, Manning WG, Newhouse JP et al. The Effects of Excise Taxes and
33 Regulations on Cigarette Smoking. Journal of Health Economics 1991;10(1):43-64.
34
- 35
36 26. Ross HZ, Shariff S, Gilmore A. Economics of Tobacco Taxation in Russia. Paris:
37 International Union Against Tuberculosis and Lung Disease 2008.
38
- 39
40 27. Alpert HR, Vardavas CI, Chaloupka FJ et al. The recent and projected public health
41 and economic benefits of cigarette taxation in Greece. Tobacco Control 2013 Mar 6.
42 [Epub ahead of print]
43
- 44
45 28. Vardavas CI, Filippidis FT, Agaku I et al. Tobacco taxation: the importance of
46 earmarking the revenue to health care and tobacco control. Tobacco induced
47 diseases 2012;10(1):21.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 Figures
7

8
9 Figure 1: The demand curve before government intervention
10

11
12 Figure 2: The demand curve after government intervention
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

BMJ Open

Estimates of price and income elasticity in Greece: Greek debt crisis transforming cigarettes into a luxury good - an econometric approach

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2013-004748.R2
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	30-Jul-2014
Complete List of Authors:	Tarantilis, Filippos; National School of Public Health, Department of Health Economics Athanasakis, Kostas; National School of Public Health, Department of Health Economics Zavras, Dimitris; National School of Public Health, Department of Health Economics Vozikis, Athanasios; University of Piraeus, Department of Economics Kyriopoulos, Ioannis; National School of Public Health, Department of Health Economics
Primary Subject Heading:	Health economics
Secondary Subject Heading:	Health economics, Health policy, Smoking and tobacco
Keywords:	HEALTH ECONOMICS, Health economics < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Health policy < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Estimates of price and income elasticity in Greece:**
4

5 **Greek debt crisis transforming cigarettes into a luxury good - an econometric approach**
6

7
8 Tarantilis F¹, Athanasakis K¹, Zavras D¹, Vozikis A², Kyriopoulos I¹
9

10
11 ¹National School of Public Health, Athens, Greece
12

13
14 ²Department of Economics, University of Piraeus, Athens, Greece
15

16
17 Corresponding author: Filippos Tarantilis, Department of Health Economics, National School
18 of Public Health, 196 Alexandras Av., Athens, 11521, Greece, fil_t@hotmail.com, Phone No:
19 00302132010242, Fax No: 00302106449571
20
21
22

23
24 Kostas Athanasakis, National School of Public Health, Department of Health Economics,
25 Athens, Greece
26
27

28
29 Dimitris Zavras, National School of Public Health, Department of Health Economics, Athens,
30 Greece
31
32

33
34 Athanassios Vozikis, University of Piraeus, Department of Economics, Athens, Greece
35

36
37 Ioannis Kyriopoulos, National School of Public Health, Department of Health Economics,
38 Athens, Greece
39
40

41
42 Keywords: smoking, taxation, price elasticity, income elasticity
43
44

45
46 Word count: 2,909 (without abstract, article summary, headings, tables, contributorship
47 statement, acknowledgements, funding, competing interests and data sharing)
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract

Objective: During the past decades, smoking prevalence in Greece was estimated near or over 40%. Following a sharp fall in newest data on cigarette consumption, our objective is to assess smokers' sensitivity to cigarette price and consumer income changes as well as to project health benefits of an additional tax increase.

Methods: Cigarette consumption was considered as the dependent variable, with Weighted Average Price as a proxy for cigarette price, GDP as a proxy for consumers' income and dummy variables reflecting smoking restrictions and antismoking campaigns. Values were computed to natural logarithms and regression was performed. Then, 4 scenarios of tax increase were distinguished in order to calculate potential health benefits.

Results: Short-run price elasticity is estimated at -0.441 and short-run income elasticity is estimated at 1.040. Antismoking campaigns were found to have a statistically significant impact on consumption. Results indicate that, depending on the level of tax increase, annual per capita consumption could fall by at least 209.83 cigarettes; tax revenue could rise up by more than €0.74 billion, while smokers could be reduced by up to 530,568 and at least 465 smoking related deaths could be averted.

Conclusions: Price elasticity estimates are similar to previous studies in Greece, while income elasticity estimates are far greater. With cigarettes regarded as a luxury good, a great opportunity is presented for decision-makers to counter smoking. Increased taxation, along with focused antismoking campaigns, law reinforcement (to ensure compliance with smoking bans) and intensive control for smuggling could invoke a massive blow to the tobacco epidemic in Greece.

1
2
3 **Strengths and limitations of this study**
4
5

- 6 • The article offers information to policy makers regarding price elasticity, a key
7
8 measure to perform tobacco control policy
9
- 10 • The article reports, for the first time, an income elasticity above 1, as evidence that
11
12 cigarettes tend to be considered a luxury good in Greece
13
- 14 • The analysis treats qualitative variables and projects health and financial benefits
15
16 under extreme austerity
17
- 18 • The analysis could not include dynamic (addiction) models, as no statistical
19
20 significance was reported
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Introduction

Country Profile

Globally, more than 5 million people die every year from tobacco use, while tobacco use is the second leading cause of death, representing the 8.7% of global annual mortality .[1] As global tobacco consumption in 2009 was estimated at 5884 billion cigarettes,[2] tobacco clearly reflects the global transition from traditional risks such as undernutrition, unsafe sex, unsafe water, poor sanitation and hygiene to modern risks like physical inactivity, behavior risks and air quality.[1] In Greece, WHO estimations attribute 17% of mortality for people aged 30 or more to smoking.[3] Death rate attributed to tobacco and the proportion of deaths attributable to tobacco for ages 30 and over is documented in the following table (Table 1).

Table 1: Estimated death rated (per 100.000) and proportion attributable to tobacco for ages 30 and over, 2004 in Greece [3]

Cause of death	Death rate attributed to tobacco	Proportion of deaths attributable to tobacco
Lower respiratory infections	3	23%
Malignant neoplasms	110	29%
Carciovascular diseases	90	12%
Respiratoty diseases	23	37%

Little less than half Greek citizens (41%) are smokers.[4] Youth smoking is also high, 11.3% for young men and 9% for young women.[2] Environmental Tobacco Smoke (ETS) also represents a serious problem in Greece, as documented by previous research.[5]

Concerning cigarette affordability, findings suggest that Greece is one of the few high-income European Union countries with relatively low cigarette prices.[6] Low prices can be

1
2
3 recognized as a factor for the tobacco epidemic in Greece.[7] According to own calculations,
4
5 for the period 1992-2012, cigarette affordability, defined as the percentage of income
6
7 needed to purchase 100 packs of cigarettes, was estimated from 0.56% to 1.98%.
8
9

10 The first organized efforts to counter smoking in Greece were observed during 1979-1982.
11
12 At the moment, in Greece, tobacco advertising bans are complete, except for point-of-sale
13
14 advertising.
15

16
17 Tax revenue from tobacco products is arguably very important for the economic policy. In
18
19 1990, tax revenue accounted for 4.4% of GDP.[8] For the period 1998-2010 tobacco tax
20
21 revenue stood for an annual average 2% of GDP, but it seems to follow a downwards trend.
22
23

24 Official estimates measure the total annual direct cost of smoking a €2.14 billion, in an
25
26 environment where debt crisis and austerity measures set serious constraints to the health
27
28 system and resources should, now more than ever, be allocated properly. [9] Tobacco's
29
30 unfavorable consequences on the poor could become a factor, where unemployment rates
31
32 are estimated at 27.1% for the 2nd quarter of 2013, continuing to grow from under 900,000
33
34 to approximately 1,350,000 people in the last 24 months.[10] Moreover, 31% of the total
35
36 population is at risk of poverty or social exclusion.[11]
37
38

39 40 41 Tobacco Market and government interventions

42
43 Three market failures differentiate an individual's choice to smoke compared to the decision
44
45 to consume other goods: information failure on the health hazard of smoking, information
46
47 failure on the addiction caused by smoking and external burden to non-smokers.[12]
48

49 Therefore, government intervention is justified in order both to protect smokers from the
50
51 perilous habit and correct for externalities associated to smoking. From a basic economics'
52
53 standpoint, it can be claimed that smoking's immense social burden overtakes the loss of
54
55 consumer's utility or else the loss of economic efficiency (deadweight loss).
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Tobacco taxation is imposed through a variety of structures but, in nearly all cases, includes
4 two main types of tax: Ad valorem tax, which represents a percentage of price and specific
5 tax, which is a fixed tax per cigarette. In Greece, following the 2010 restructure of tobacco
6 tax, total tax represents 86% of the retail price, significantly increased compared to the 2009
7 level and 2008 level when is represented 83% and 70% of the retail price respectively (WHO,
8 2011). In 2012, specific excise tax was regulated at €80 per 1,000 cigarettes and ad valorem
9 tax at 20% of the retail price. Their minimum sum is required to be no less than €115 per
10 1,000 cigarettes. Meanwhile, a specific excise tax was set at €153 per kg of hand-rolled
11 tobacco. Sales tax for cigarettes is fixed at 23% of the retail price.
12
13

14 Price increases should not be regarded the only way to reduce consumption, as the impact
15 of income, advertising and health education are also important.[13] Manipulating these
16 variables will result to reduced consumption and eventually reduced mortality and
17 morbidity. Tobacco control programs and policies are found to be either cost-saving or cost-
18 effective, compared to other public health interventions such as cardiovascular risk
19 counseling and cancer screening.[14] Research on the impact of tobacco control showed
20 that during 1981-2000, increases in tobacco control program expenditures in the U.S.A. lead
21 to reduced cigarettes sales. Authors also suggest that expenditures have an even stronger
22 lagged influence on sales.[15] Smoking bans are adopted in order to limit exposure to smoke
23 but also cause a remarkable decrease in cigarette consumption, as smokers' opportunities to
24 smoke are lessened.[16] In Greece, the effort to restrict smoking in public places through
25 legislation has failed due to low compliance with law.[17] Youth exposed to secondhand
26 smoke at home are estimated at 89.8% of total youth population.[2] Public education
27 campaigns, if "hard-hitting, sophisticated and sustained", can be extremely effective.[18]
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Price and income elasticity

The term used to measure the impact of a change in price on consumption is price elasticity of demand, defined as the percentage change in consumption that results from 1 percent increase in price.[19] Similarly, the impact of a change in income on consumption is measured by income elasticity, defined as the percentage change in consumption resulting from 1 percent increase in income. Estimating elasticity is crucial to policy makers in order not only to anticipate an intervention's impact both on tobacco consumption and tobacco tax revenue. If the proportionate fall in tobacco consumption exceeds the proportionate increase of tax, revenue will fall. Otherwise, revenue will rise.[16]

Results from a meta-analysis,[20] indicate that short run elasticity (-0.40) is lower than long run elasticity (-0.44), while in studies that included smuggling demand was less sensitive (-0.36). These findings confirm the general notion that a 10% increase in price would lead to a 4% reduction in consumption in high-income countries.[18] Stavrinou estimated the short run price elasticity at -0.079 and the long run at -0.147, while income elasticity is estimated at 0.18 and 0.33, respectively.[21] Hondroyannis and Papapetrou, based on data over the period 1967-1990, calculated the short run price elasticity at -0.33 and the long run at -0.6, while income elasticity estimations are 0.35 and 0.54, respectively. The fact that demand is inelastic is explained by the authors through addiction and the absence of direct substitutes. Furthermore, it is claimed that health warnings are more effective in reducing consumption than price increases.[9] Raptou and colleagues conclude in an income elasticity of 0.28, consisting of initiation elasticity (0.21) and consumption elasticity (0.07), arguing that income is a more important determinant for initiation rather than consumption. Furthermore, smoking bans are illustrated as a factor discouraging tobacco consumption.[22] Nikolaou and Velentzas, based on data from 1960 to 1995, estimated the short run price elasticity at -0.24 and the long run at -0.48, while income elasticity is

1
2
3 estimated at 0.19 and 0.40, respectively. Advertising had a positive but non-significant effect
4 on demand and antismoking campaigns had a negative but non-significant effect on
5 demand.[23] On the other hand, health warnings on packs during 1987-1990 had a
6 significant negative impact on demand, lowering consumption by 4.2%. Dritsakis notes that
7 consumption is a negative function of price and health education expenditure and a positive
8 function of income as well.[24]
9

10
11
12 As illustrated, there are no studies of price elasticity available for at least a decade. In the
13 light of the above, the purpose of the present study was to investigate cigarette demand in
14 Greece.
15
16

17 **Method**

18
19 The tobacco product used in analysis is cigarettes, widely accepted as the major tobacco
20 product. In order to account for population growth, annual consumption per person over 15
21 was preferred to aggregate annual consumption. The threshold age was set at 15, as youth
22 smoking in Greece is considered substantial. Data on annual cigarette consumption are
23 available from 1994 onwards (1994-2012) from the Greek Ministry of Finance.
24
25

26
27 As excise tax data were not available and MPPC (Most Popular Price Category) shows
28 inconsistency due to pricing policy, the measure chosen to reflect price was the Weighted
29 Average Price. Each pack consists of 20 cigarettes. The proxy used to deflate nominal into
30 real prices was calculated by comparing real and nominal values of GDP (Gross Domestic
31 Product) derived from World Bank. CPI (Consumer Price Index) was not selected as a proxy
32 due to a change in calculations by Hellenic Statistical Authority in 1995, when General
33 Harmonized Consumer Price Index was introduced. The base year set was 2005. Disposable
34 income data were based at GDP. Again, the threshold age was set at 15. Deflation was not
35 needed in that case, as real values were available. The base year set was 2005. Prior to 2008,
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

national informative campaigns were not run in Greece at a national level. We considered The National Action Plan for Cancer (2008) as an anti-smoking campaign. A dummy variable was used to measure its influence on consumption. Expenditure on tobacco control was not available. Regulation for smoking bans and restrictions was only introduced in 2002 and amended in 2010. In order to measure its influence on consumption, an adjusted version of a previous reliable index was constructed, accounting not only for intensity of smoking restrictions but for compliance as well.[25] Values attributed were between 0 (no restrictions) to 1 (total ban) escalating by 0.25.

Data were analyzed with the statistical software packages SPSS® 20 and STATA® 9. The functional form used in the analysis was Double-log and values were transformed to natural logarithms in order to increase reliability. The models of demand were specified as follows.

Conventional Demand Model

$$\ln Q_t = b_0 + b_1 \ln P_t + b_2 \ln Y_t + b_3 SR_t + b_4 AsC_t + \varepsilon_t$$

Myopic Addiction Model

$$\ln Q_t = b_0 + b_1 \ln P_t + b_2 \ln Y_t + b_3 SR_t + b_4 AsC_t + b_5 \ln Q_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$$

Rational Addiction Model

$$\ln Q_t = b_0 + b_1 \ln P_t + b_2 \ln Y_t + b_3 SR_t + b_4 AsC_t + b_5 \ln Q_{t-1} + b_6 \ln Q_{t+1} + \varepsilon_t$$

Where,

Q_t : consumption of cigarettes per person over 15 (000 cigarettes) in year t

Q_{t-1} : consumption of cigarettes per person over 15(000 cigarettes) in year t-1

Q_{t+1} : consumption of cigarettes per person over 15(000 cigarettes) in year t+1

P_t : real retail price per pack of 20 cigarettes in year t

Y_t : real per person over 15 disposable income (€000) in year t

b_0 : intercept in year t

SR_t : index of smoking restrictions or bans according to law in year t

AsC_t : dichotomous index reflecting the existence of an anti-smoking campaign each year t

ε_t : the error term

Results

Through the conventional model of demand, the demand equation was estimated as follows

(Table 2):

Table 2: Conventional model of demand equation

$\ln Q_t = -1.757 - 0.441 \cdot \ln P_t + 1.040 \cdot \ln Y_t - 0.132 \cdot AsC_t$		
F-statistic: 27.765	R square: 0.847	Durbin-Watson: 1.980
Skewness/Kurtosis tests for Normality: adj $\chi^2 = 5.10$, Prob> $\chi^2 = 0.0780$		
Breusch-Pagan / Cook-Weisberg test for heteroskedasticity: $\chi^2 = 2.56$, Prob> $\chi^2 = 0.1093$		
Dickey-Fuller test for unit root: Z(t)= -2.364, 1% critical value=-2.660, 5% critical value= -1.950, 10% critical value=-1.600		

A regression analysis was performed and calculations were made stepwise. The variable created to capture the effect of smoking restrictions was found non-significant (p value asymptotically equal to 0.303 at 5% confidence level); thus, it is excluded from the model. P value at 5% confidence level is asymptotically equal to 0 for $\ln Y_t$, equal to 0.001 for $\ln P_t$ and equal to 0.021 for AsC_t . The F-statistic is high, showing a good level of fit, while the model explains a great part of the variation. The Durbin-Watson statistic is close to 2, suggesting that the model has no autocorrelation. The Variation Inflated Factor is low for all variables, implying that multicollinearity is a non-factor. As evidenced by normality tests, standardized

1
2
3 residuals follow a normal distribution. Breusch-Pagan / Cook-Weisberg tests indicate that
4
5 residuals are homoscedastic. The Augmented Dickey-Fuller test for standardized residuals
6
7 confirms that there exist no unit roots. Therefore, the standardized residuals are stationary,
8
9 so the variables of the model are cointegrated (without constant and trend) and the
10
11 regression is not spurious. In the light of the above, we accept a short-run price elasticity of
12
13 demand at 0.441 and a short-run income elasticity of demand at 1.040.
14
15

16
17 Through the myopic addiction model, the additional variable ($\ln Q_{t-1}$) shows no statistical
18
19 significance. Therefore the model remains unchanged. Through the rational addiction
20
21 model, only the variable representing following year's consumption ($\ln Q_{t+1}$) is found
22
23 significant (p value asymptotically equal to 0), with substantially lower levels of fit (R
24
25 square). Thus, we conclude that addiction models fail to offer additional information on how
26
27 consumption is influenced. Based on 2010 data, nominal tax revenue per pack is calculated
28
29 at €2.78, a value verifying and corresponding to the fixed amount of tax (86% of the nominal
30
31 retail price). We assume that the state maintains the existing ability to collect tribute.
32
33 Government proclamations suggest that tobacco will be further taxed. Therefore, we
34
35 distinct four scenarios, all with retail price increases, as anticipated, and each suggesting an
36
37 additional price increase by €0.5. Calculations are made only for the following year and
38
39 accordingly only short run elasticity is taken into account. Scenarios capture the impact of
40
41 the continuing fall in income at a rate of 4.8%. Based on Ross et al methodology and data
42
43 concerning tobacco-related mortality in Greece (Lower respiratory infections, Malignant
44
45 neoplasms, Cardiovascular diseases and Respiratory diseases), we estimate reduction on
46
47 smokers and mortality averted.[3,26]
48
49
50

51
52 In all four scenarios, consumption is decreased substantially while tax revenue is still
53
54 increased thanks to the inelastic demand. Moreover, smokers are significantly reduced and
55
56 smoking related deaths are accordingly limited (Table 3).
57
58
59
60

Table 3: Impact of price increase and income constraints on consumption, tax revenue, number of smokers and smoking related deaths

Model scenarios	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4	
Price per pack	€4.47	€4.97	€5.47	€5.97	
Percent increase of price	12.59%	25.19%	37.78%	50.38%	
Fall in consumption due to price increase	-5.55%	-11.11%	-16.66%	-22.22%	
Fall in consumption due to income decrease	-4.99%	-4.99%	-4.99%	-4.99%	
Per capita consumption level	1,779.84	1,669.33	1,558.82	1,448.31	
Per capita consumption deterred	209.83	320.34	430.85	541.36	
Tax revenue per pack	€3.84	€4.27	€4.70	€5.13	
Tax revenue per cigarette	€0.192	€0.214	€0.235	€0.257	
Total tax revenue (€ billion)	€3,336	€3,478	€3,575	€3,625	
Incremental tax revenue (€ billion)	€0,455	€0,597	€0,694	€0,744	
Reduction in number of smokers	205,650	313,956	422,262	530,568	
Smoking related deaths averted	high(0,50)	930	1,420	1,911	2,401
	low(0,25)	465	710	955	1,200

-Differences in calculations may occur due to rounding

-Impact of price increase shared between prevalence and consumption

-High estimate indicates that 50% of smokers' deaths are attributable to tobacco use, whereas low estimate indicates that 25% of smokers' deaths are attributable to tobacco use

Discussion

Price elasticity estimates are greater than previous research in Greece,[8, 23-24] but consistent with findings by Gallet and List.[20] Estimates for income elasticity are far greater than estimates provided by literature in Greece.[8, 21-23] Regarding antismoking campaigns, results are in agreement with previous testimony.[23-24] Smoking restrictions show no statistical significance, confirming the claims by Joosens and Raw that compliance is low.[17] Finally, results are in general agreement with Alpert et al,[27] though a different methodology is followed.

Paired with the still high cigarette affordability, as documented in the current study and reported by previous research,[6] the nature of demand in Greece presents a vast opportunity for the policy makers to counter the tobacco epidemic and ensure revenue and cash flows at the same time. Even supposing that other determinants of demand, such as income, which is anticipated to fall, do not change, tobacco taxation proves to be a powerful tool. Annual consumption per person over 15 would be no higher than 1,780 cigarettes, even in the worst case (scenario1) and may fall to less than 1,448 cigarettes. On the other hand, tax revenue would recover from the downwards trend, accounting again for more than 1.80% of GDP, even in scenario1. In absolute values, excess tobacco tax revenue could rejuvenate the dismantled public coffers. Results suggest that even with a modest 10% of tax revenue allocated to offsetting the tobacco epidemic, there would be more than enough disposable funds towards planning, implementing, evaluating and improving antismoking efforts. Greeks seem to be in agreement with heavy taxation on cigarettes, but only if respective revenue is attributed to tobacco control.[28] In terms of public health benefits, smokers could be reduced by nearly 530,568 people, while up to 2,401 smoking related deaths could be averted on an annual basis. Nonetheless, findings should be treated with caution and increases in price should not be excessively increased from day one, as the

1
2
3 smokers' reaction is not easy to predict with confidence intervals widened. A stepwise
4
5 increase of tax would eliminate many of the risks associated with a sharp and sudden
6
7 increase in cigarette prices. Besides, Greece already performs better in tax collection than
8
9 countries such as Germany, France and Slovenia among others,[26] as the excise per smoker
10
11 ratio indicates, with €738.71 collected for every smoker.
12

13
14 Income sensitivity is larger than in any previous study either in Greece or internationally.
15
16 Thus, it is not exaggerating to argue that Greek smokers are shocked by the constraint on
17
18 their income. Besides, it is the first time in at least 40 years that income in Greece is falling at
19
20 this rate. The austerity measures should be viewed as a shift event in cigarette consumption,
21
22 among others.
23

24
25 Reducing the toll of tobacco in Greece is not an easy task. Decisions should include fostering
26
27 an antismoking-culture through well-planned national antismoking campaigns, raising the
28
29 cigarettes prices at an initial level no less than €4 a pack and ensuring compliance with the
30
31 anti-smoking law, especially on the current occasion, when City Police (the main mechanism
32
33 of control on the matter) was recently abolished as an institution. Controlling illicit trade is
34
35 crucial to maximize the effect of interventions.
36
37

38
39 As regards to the limitations of this study, it must be noted that addictions models were
40
41 unable to provide statistically significant information, possibly due to the inclusion of 2012
42
43 data in the time series. Possible future analysis of an even wider time series could provide
44
45 even more reliable results, as multicollinearity could be fully cured. Furthermore, the study
46
47 could be strengthened by employing statistical tests on more observations, regarding the
48
49 endogeneity of cigarette prices. Moreover, the current study is based on the most popular
50
51 price category in order to estimate the impact of prices changes on cigarette demand. It is
52
53 possible that a weighted average for all the brands sold in Greece could eliminate
54
55 unilateralism on prices data. Still, the anticipated but not fully documented switch of Greek
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 smokers from manufactured cigarettes to hand-rolled tobacco should be taken into account
4
5 in any future research. Yet, if the increase of contraband cigarettes in the Greek market
6
7 could be quantified, results would be more punctual. In addition, tobacco shows synergistic
8
9 effect with other substances, such as alcohol. Thus, it would be meaningful to investigate
10
11 the combined effect of tobacco and alcohol from an economic aspect. Finally, researchers
12
13 argue that the increased availability of nicotine substitutes will reduce demand for tobacco
14
15 products and increase the price sensitivity as well.[19] Under that scope, if research included
16
17 nicotine substitutes, accuracy would be improved.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Acknowledgements:** We would like to express our gratitude to Professor Frank Chaloupka
4
5 for his valuable and constructive suggestions towards planning and development of this
6
7 research work. His willingness to provide us his limited time has been very much
8
9 appreciated.
10

11
12 **Contributorship Statement:** FT, DZ and AV performed the calculations and analyses
13
14 reported in the text. FT and KA reviewed the literature for relevant data and documentation.
15
16 FT and KA drafted the manuscript which was edited and critically revised by KA, AV and JK.
17
18

19
20 **Funding:** This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public,
21
22 commercial or not-for-profit sectors.
23

24
25 **Competing interests:** None.
26

27
28 **Data Sharing:** E Inputs of the analysis include aggregate cigarette consumption, population,
29
30 price and Gross Domestic Product. Moreover, dummy variables of the analysis are based on
31
32 the Greek National Plan against Cancer (<http://www.epaac.eu/national-cancer-plans>) and
33
34 the Greek legislation [Law 3730/2008, effective from 23/12/2008 onwards and Law
35
36 3868/2010, effective from 03/08/2010 onwards, both available at Government Gazettes
37
38 (<http://www.et.gr/>)]. Unfortunately, aggregate cigarette consumption and weighted average
39
40 price for the period 1994-2012 are official but remain unpublished by the Greek Ministry of
41
42 Finance. Therefore, they are available upon request from the lead author (Filippos Tarantilis,
43
44 fil_t@hotmail.com). Due to the Ministry's often changing policy in terms of providing
45
46 information to the public, we rejected the option to share data in Dryad data repository.
47
48 Finally, Greek population and Gross Domestic Product for the arementioned period derived
49
50 from the World Bank database (<http://data.worldbank.org/>). No additional data were used.
51
52 Thus no additional data are available.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

References

1. WHO. Global Health Risks: Mortality and burden of disease attributable to selected major risks. Geneva: World Health Organization 2009
http://www.who.int/healthinfo/global_burden_disease/GlobalHealthRisks_report_full.pdf (Accessed 14 Nov 2011).
2. Eriksen M, Mackay J, Ross H. The Tobacco Atlas. Fourth Ed. Atlanta, GA, American Cancer Society, New York: World Lung Foundation 2012.
3. WHO. WHO Global report: Mortality Attributable to Tobacco. Geneva: World Health Organization 2012
http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2012/9789241564434_eng.pdf (Accessed 5 Oct 2012).
4. Filippidis FT, Vardavas CI, Loukopoulou A et al. Prevalence and determinants of tobacco use among adults in Greece: 4 year trends. Eur J Public Health 2013;23(5):772-776.
5. Vardavas CI, Kondilis B, Travers MJ et al. Environmental tobacco smoke in hospitality venues in Greece. BMC Public Health 2007;7(1):302.
6. Blecher EH, Van Walbeek CP. Cigarette affordability trends: an update and some methodological comments. Tobacco Control 2009;18(3):167-175.
7. Vardavas CI, Kafatos AG. Smoking policy and prevalence in Greece: an overview. The European Journal of Public Health 2007;17(2):211-213.
8. Hondroyannis G, Papapetrou E. Cigarette consumption in Greece: empirical evidence from cointegration analysis. Applied Economics Letters 1997;4:571-574
9. Ministry of Health and Social Solidarity. The Greek National Plan of Action against Cancer 2008-2012, Athens, 2008. http://ygeiamap.gov.gr/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/karkinos_teliko.pdf (Accessed 5 Oct 2011)
10. Hellenic Statistical Authority, Workforce research, Press release 19 September 2013,

1
2
3 <http://www.statistics.gr/portal/page/portal/ESYE/BUCKET/A0101/PressReleases/A0>
4
5 [101_SJO01_DT_QQ_02_2013_01_F_GR.pdf](http://www.statistics.gr/portal/page/portal/ESYE/BUCKET/A0101/PressReleases/A0101_SJO01_DT_QQ_02_2013_01_F_GR.pdf) (Accessed 7 November 2013)
6

- 7
8 11. Eurostat news release 26 February 2013, Eurostat press office
9
10 http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_STAT-13-28_en.htm (Accessed 27 February
11
12 2013)
- 13
14 12. Wilkins N, Yurekli A, Hu TW. Economic analysis of tobacco demand. Economics of
15
16 Tobacco Toolkit. Washington: World Bank 2004
17
18 <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTPH/Resources/3Demand.pdf> (Accessed 24
19
20 Nov 2011)
- 21
22 13. Godfrey C, Maynard A. Economic aspects of tobacco use and taxation policy. BMJ
23
24 1998;297(6644):339–343.
- 25
26 14. Kahende JW, Loomis BR, Adhikari B, Marshall L. A review of economic evaluations of
27
28 tobacco control programs. Int J Environ Res Public Health 2009;6(1):51-68.
- 29
30 15. Farrelly M, Bray J. Responses to cigarette tax increases by race/ethnicity, income
31
32 and age groups – United States, 1976–1993. Journal of the American Medical
33
34 Association 1999;280:1979-1980.
- 35
36 16. Chaloupka F, Warner E. The economics of smoking. Handbook of Health Economics,
37
38 2000;1:1539-1627.
- 39
40 17. Joossens L, Raw M. The tobacco control scale 2010 in Europe. Brussels: Association
41
42 of European Cancer Leagues 2011.
- 43
44 18. WHO. Report on the Global Tobacco Epidemic, 2008: The MPOWER package.
45
46 Geneva: World Health Organization 2008
47
48 http://www.who.int/tobacco/mpower/mpower_report_full_2008.pdf (Accessed 14
49
50 Nov 2011).
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 19. Chaloupka F, Pacula R. The impact of price on youth tobacco use. Changing
4 Adolescent Smoking Prevalence: Where It Is and Why, Smoking and Tobacco Control
5 Monograph 1999:14.
6
7
8
9
10 20. Gallet C, List J. Cigarette demand: A meta-analysis of elasticities. Health Econ
11 2003;12:821-835.
12
13
14 21. Stavrinou VG. The effects of an anti-smoking campaign on cigarette consumption:
15 empirical evidence from Greece. Applied Economics 1987;19:323-329.
16
17
18 22. Raptou E, Mattas K, Tsakiridou E et al. Factors affecting cigarette
19 demand. International Advances in Economic Research 2005;11(3):275-290.
20
21
22 23. Nikolaou A, Velentzas K. Estimating the Demand for Cigarettes in Greece: An Error
23 Correction Model, Agricultural Economics Review 2001;2(1):20-27.
24
25
26 24. Dritsakis E. Forecasting of cigarettes consumption in Greece: An empirical
27 investigation with cointegration analysis. Agricultural Economic Review
28 2003;4(2):47-56.
29
30
31 25. Wasserman J, Manning WG, Newhouse JP et al. The Effects of Excise Taxes and
32 Regulations on Cigarette Smoking. Journal of Health Economics 1991;10(1):43-64.
33
34
35 26. Ross HZ, Shariff S, Gilmore A. Economics of Tobacco Taxation in Russia. Paris:
36 International Union Against Tuberculosis and Lung Disease 2008.
37
38
39 27. Alpert HR, Vardavas CI, Chaloupka FJ et al. The recent and projected public health
40 and economic benefits of cigarette taxation in Greece. Tobacco Control 2013 Mar 6.
41 [Epub ahead of print]
42
43
44 28. Vardavas CI, Filippidis FT, Agaku I et al. Tobacco taxation: the importance of
45 earmarking the revenue to health care and tobacco control. Tobacco induced
46 diseases 2012;10(1):21.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Estimates of price and income elasticity in Greece:

Greek debt crisis transforming cigarettes into a luxury good - an econometric approach

Tarantilis F¹, Athanasakis K¹, [Zavras D¹](#), Vozikis A², Kyriopoulos I¹

¹National School of Public Health, Athens, Greece

²Department of Economics, University of Piraeus, Athens, Greece

Corresponding author: Filippos Tarantilis, Department of Health Economics, National School of Public Health, 196 Alexandras Av., Athens, 11521, Greece, fil_t@hotmail.com, Phone No: 00302132010242, Fax No: 00302106449571

Kostas Athanasakis, National School of Public Health, Department of Health Economics, Athens, Greece

[Dimitris Zavras, National School of Public Health, Department of Health Economics, Athens, Greece](#)

Athanassios Vozikis, University of Piraeus, Department of Economics, Athens, Greece

Ioannis Kyriopoulos, National School of Public Health, Department of Health Economics, Athens, Greece

Keywords: smoking, taxation, price elasticity, income elasticity

Word count: [3,0412,909 \(without abstract, article summary, headings, tables, contributorship statement, acknowledgements, funding, competing interests and data sharing\)](#)

Abstract

Objective: During the past decades, smoking prevalence in Greece was estimated near or over 40%. Following a sharp fall in newest data on cigarette consumption, our objective is to

Field Code Changed

1
2
3
4
5
6 assess smokers' sensitivity to cigarette price and consumer income changes as well as to
7 project health benefits of an additional tax increase.
8

9
10 **Methods:** Cigarette consumption was considered as the dependent variable, with Weighted
11 Average Price as a proxy for cigarette price, GDP as a proxy for consumers' income and
12 dummy variables reflecting smoking restrictions and antismoking campaigns. Values were
13 computed to natural logarithms and regression was performed. Then, 4 scenarios of tax
14 increase were distinguished in order to calculate potential health benefits.
15
16
17
18
19

20
21 **Results:** ~~Addiction models were unable to provide statistically significant information due to~~
22 ~~a nearly 23.5% drop in consumption during 2012.~~ Short-run price elasticity is estimated at -
23 0.441 and short-run income elasticity is estimated at 1.040. Antismoking campaigns were
24 found to have a statistically significant impact on consumption. Results indicate that,
25 depending on the level of tax increase, annual per capita consumption could fall by at least
26 209.83 cigarettes; tax revenue could rise up by more than €0.74 billion, while smokers could
27 be reduced by up to 530,568 and at least 465 smoking related deaths could be averted.
28
29
30
31
32
33

34
35 **Conclusions:** Price elasticity estimates are similar to previous studies in Greece, while
36 income elasticity estimates are far greater. With cigarettes regarded as a luxury good, a
37 great opportunity is presented for decision-makers to counter smoking. Increased taxation,
38 along with focused antismoking campaigns, law reinforcement (to ensure compliance with
39 smoking bans) and intensive control for smuggling could invoke a massive blow to the
40 tobacco epidemic in Greece.
41
42
43
44
45

46
47 **Article Summary** Strengths and limitations of this study
48

- 49 • The article offers information to policy makers regarding price elasticity, a key
50 measure to perform tobacco control policy
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, No underline

- The article reports, for the first time, an income elasticity above 1, as evidence that cigarettes tend to be considered a luxury good in Greece
- The analysis treats qualitative variables and projects health and financial benefits under extreme austerity
- The analysis could not include dynamic (addiction) models, as no statistical significance was reported

Introduction

Country Profile

Globally, more than 5 million people die every year from tobacco use, while tobacco use is the second leading cause of death, representing the 8.7% of global annual mortality .[1] As global tobacco consumption in 2009 was estimated at 5884 billion cigarettes,[2] tobacco clearly reflects the global transition from traditional risks such as undernutrition, unsafe sex, unsafe water, poor sanitation and hygiene to modern risks like physical inactivity, behavior risks and air quality.[1] In Greece, WHO estimations attribute 17% of mortality for people aged 30 or more to smoking.[3] Death rate attributed to tobacco and the proportion of deaths attributable to tobacco for ages 30 and over is documented in the following table (Table 1).

Table 1: Estimated death rated (per 100.000) and proportion attributable to tobacco for ages 30 and over, 2004 in Greece [3]

Cause of death	Death rate attributed to tobacco	Proportion of deaths attributable to tobacco
Lower respiratory infections	3	23%
Malignant neoplasms	110	29%
Cardiovascular diseases	90	12%
Respiratory diseases	23	37%

Little less than half Greek citizens (41%) are smokers.[4] Youth smoking is also high, 11.3% for young men and 9% for young women.[2] Environmental Tobacco Smoke (ETS) also represents a serious problem in Greece, as documented by previous research.[5]

Concerning cigarette affordability, findings suggest that Greece is one of the few high-income European Union countries with relatively low cigarette prices.[6] Low prices can be recognized as a factor for the tobacco epidemic in Greece.[7] According to own calculations,

1
2
3
4
5
6 for the period 1992-2012, cigarette affordability, defined as the percentage of income
7 needed to purchase 100 packs of cigarettes, was estimated from 0.56% to 1.98%.

8
9
10 The first organized efforts to counter smoking in Greece were observed during 1979-1982.
11
12 At the moment, in Greece, tobacco advertising bans are complete, except for point-of-sale
13
14 advertising.

15
16
17 Tax revenue from tobacco products is arguably very important for the economic policy. In
18
19 1990, tax revenue accounted for 4.4% of GDP.[8] For the period 1998-2010 tobacco tax
20
21 revenue stood for an annual average 2% of GDP, but it seems to follow a downwards trend.

22
23
24 Official estimates measure the total annual direct cost of smoking a €2.14 billion, in an
25
26 environment where debt crisis and austerity measures set serious constraints to the health
27
28 system and resources should, now more than ever, be allocated properly. [9] Tobacco's
29
30 unfavorable consequences on the poor could become a factor, where unemployment rates
31
32 are estimated at 27.1% for the 2nd quarter of 2013, continuing to grow from under 900,000
33
34 to approximately 1,350,000 people in the last 24 months.[10] Moreover, 31% of the total
35
36 population is at risk of poverty or social exclusion.[11]

37 38 Tobacco Market and government interventions

39
40 Three market failures differentiate an individual's choice to smoke compared to the decision
41
42 to consume other goods: information failure on the health hazard of smoking, information
43
44 failure on the addiction caused by smoking and external burden to non-smokers.[12]

45
46 Therefore, government intervention is justified in order both to protect smokers from the
47
48 perilous habit and correct for externalities associated to smoking. From a basic economics'
49
50 standpoint, it can be claimed that smoking's immense social burden overtakes the loss of
51
52 consumer's utility or else the loss of economic efficiency (deadweight loss). -A hypothetical
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 example on how the deadweight loss emerges, after the introduction of tax, is illustrated in
7
8 figures (Figure 1 and Figure 2).
9

10 Tobacco taxation is imposed through a variety of structures but, in nearly all cases, includes
11 two main types of tax: Ad valorem tax, which represents a percentage of price and specific
12 tax, which is a fixed tax per cigarette. In Greece, following the 2010 restructure of tobacco
13 tax, total tax represents 86% of the retail price, significantly increased compared to the 2009
14 level and 2008 level when is represented 83% and 70% of the retail price respectively (WHO,
15 2011). In 2012, specific excise tax was regulated at €80 per 1,000 cigarettes and ad valorem
16 tax at 20% of the retail price. Their minimum sum is required to be no less than €115 per
17 1,000 cigarettes. Meanwhile, a specific excise tax was set at €153 per kg of hand-rolled
18 tobacco. Sales tax for cigarettes is fixed at 23% of the retail price.
19

20 Price increases should not be regarded the only way to reduce consumption, as the impact
21 of income, advertising and health education are also important.[13] Manipulating these
22 variables will result to reduced consumption and eventually reduced mortality and
23 morbidity. Tobacco control programs and policies are found to be either cost-saving or cost-
24 effective, compared to other public health interventions such as cardiovascular risk
25 counseling and cancer screening.[14] Research on the impact of tobacco control showed
26 that during 1981-2000, increases in tobacco control program expenditures in the U.S.A. lead
27 to reduced cigarettes sales. Authors also suggest that expenditures have an even stronger
28 lagged influence on sales.[15] Smoking bans are adopted in order to limit exposure to smoke
29 but also cause a remarkable decrease in cigarette consumption, as smokers' opportunities to
30 smoke are lessened.[16] In Greece, the effort to restrict smoking in public places through
31 legislation has failed due to low compliance with law.[17] Youth exposed to secondhand
32 smoke at home are estimated at 89.8% of total youth population.[2] Public education
33 campaigns, if "hard-hitting, sophisticated and sustained", can be extremely effective.[18]
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Price and income elasticities

The term used to measure the impact of a change in price on consumption is price elasticity of demand, defined as the percentage change in consumption that results from 1 percent increase in price.[19] Similarly, the impact of a change in income on consumption is measured by income elasticity, defined as the percentage change in consumption resulting from 1 percent increase in income. Estimating elasticity is crucial to policy makers in order not only to anticipate an intervention's impact both on tobacco consumption and tobacco tax revenue. If the proportionate fall in tobacco consumption exceeds the proportionate increase of tax, revenue will fall. Otherwise, revenue will rise.[16]

Results from a meta-analysis,[20] indicate that short run elasticity (-0.40) is lower than long run elasticity (-0.44), while in studies that included smuggling demand was less sensitive (-0.36). These findings confirm the general notion that a 10% increase in price would lead to a 4% reduction in consumption in high-income countries.[18] Stavrinou estimated the short run price elasticity at -0.079 and the long run at -0.147, while income elasticity is estimated at 0.18 and 0.33, respectively.[21] Hondroyannis and Papapetrou, based on data over the period 1967-1990, calculated the short run price elasticity at -0.33 and the long run at -0.6, while income elasticity estimations are 0.35 and 0.54, respectively. The fact that demand is inelastic is explained by the authors through addiction and the absence of direct substitutes. Furthermore, it is claimed that health warnings are more effective in reducing consumption than price increases.[9] Raptou and colleagues conclude in an income elasticity of 0.28, consisting of initiation elasticity (0.21) and consumption elasticity (0.07), arguing that income is a more important determinant for initiation rather than consumption. Furthermore, smoking bans are illustrated as a factor discouraging tobacco consumption.[22] Nikolaou and Velentzas, based on data from 1960 to 1995, estimated the short run price elasticity at -0.24 and the long run at -0.48, while income elasticity is

1
2
3
4
5
6 estimated at 0.19 and 0.40, respectively. Advertising had a positive but non-significant effect
7
8 on demand and antismoking campaigns had a negative but non-significant effect on
9
10 demand.[23] On the other hand, health warnings on packs during 1987-1990 had a
11
12 significant negative impact on demand, lowering consumption by 4.2%. Dritsakis notes that
13
14 consumption is a negative function of price and health education expenditure and a positive
15
16 function of income as well.[24]

17
18 As illustrated, there are no studies of price elasticity available for at least a decade. In the
19
20 light of the above, the purpose of the present study was to investigate cigarette demand in
21
22 Greece.

23 24 **Method**

25
26 The tobacco product used in analysis is cigarettes, widely accepted as the major tobacco
27
28 product. In order to account for population growth, annual consumption per person over 15
29
30 was preferred to aggregate annual consumption. The threshold age was set at 15, as youth
31
32 smoking in Greece is considered substantial. Data on annual cigarette consumption are
33
34 available from 1994 onwards [\(1994-2012\) from the Greek Ministry of Finance](#).

35
36
37 ~~Monthly (and quarterly) data on the quantities of taxed cigarettes were available from 2007~~
38
39 ~~to 2011.~~ As excise tax data were not available and MPPC (Most Popular Price Category)
40
41 shows inconsistency due to pricing policy, the measure chosen to reflect price was the
42
43 Weighted Average Price. Each pack consists of 20 cigarettes. The proxy used to deflate
44
45 nominal into real prices was calculated by comparing real and nominal values of GDP (Gross
46
47 Domestic Product) derived from World Bank. CPI (Consumer Price Index) was not selected as
48
49 a proxy due to a change in calculations by Hellenic Statistical Authority in 1995, when
50
51 General Harmonized Consumer Price Index was introduced. The base year set was 2005.
52
53 Disposable income data were based at GDP. Again, the threshold age was set at 15.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Deflation was not needed in that case, as real values were available. The base year set was 2005. Prior to 2008, national informative campaigns were not run in Greece at a national level. We considered The National Action Plan for Cancer (2008) as an anti-smoking campaign. A dummy variable was used to measure its influence on consumption. Expenditure on tobacco control was not available. Regulation for smoking bans and restrictions was only introduced in 2002 and amended in 2010. In order to measure its influence on consumption, an adjusted version of a previous reliable index was constructed, accounting not only for intensity of smoking restrictions but for compliance as well.[25] Values attributed were between 0 (no restrictions) to 1 (total ban) escalating by 0.25.

~~Regression analysis includes only a static model, as dynamic models (incorporating models) show limited statistical significance, due to the inclusion of 2012 data in the time series.~~

~~Data were analyzed with the statistical software packages SPSS® 20 and STATA® 9. The functional form used in the analysis was Double-log and values were transformed to natural logarithms in order to increase reliability. Testing for endogeneity of cigarette prices was not possible as the annual tax rates were only available from 2008 onwards. Time trend was found to be insignificant; therefore, it is excluded from the equations. The models of demand was/were specified as follows.~~

Conventional Demand Model

$$\ln Q_t = b_0 + b_1 \ln P_t + b_2 \ln Y_t + b_3 SR_t + b_4 ASC_t + \varepsilon_t$$

~~*Myopic Addiction Model*~~

~~$$\ln Q_t = b_0 + b_1 \ln P_t + b_2 \ln Y_t + b_3 SR_t + b_4 ASC_t + b_5 \ln Q_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$$~~

~~*Rational Addiction Model*~~

~~$$\ln Q_t = b_0 + b_1 \ln P_t + b_2 \ln Y_t + b_3 SR_t + b_4 ASC_t + b_5 \ln Q_{t-1} + b_6 \ln Q_{t+1} + \varepsilon_t$$~~

Where,

Formatted: Font: Italic, English (U.S.)

Formatted: Underline, English (U.S.)

Formatted: Underline

Formatted: Underline, English (U.S.)

Formatted: Underline

Formatted: Underline, English (U.S.)

Formatted: Underline

Formatted: Underline, English (U.S.)

Formatted: Underline

Formatted: Underline, English (U.S.)

Formatted: Underline

Formatted: Underline, English (U.S.)

Formatted: Underline

Formatted: Underline, English (U.S.)

Formatted: Font: Italic, English (U.S.)

Formatted: Underline, English (U.S.)

Formatted: Underline

Formatted: Underline, English (U.S.)

Formatted: Underline

Formatted: Underline, English (U.S.)

Formatted: Underline

Formatted: Underline, English (U.S.)

Formatted: Underline

Formatted: Underline, English (U.S.)

Formatted: Underline

Formatted: Underline, English (U.S.)

Formatted: Underline

Formatted: Underline, English (U.S.)

Formatted: Underline

Formatted: Underline, English (U.S.)

1
2
3
4
5
6 Q_t : consumption of cigarettes per person over 15 (000 cigarettes) in year t
7

8
9 Q_{t-1} : consumption of cigarettes per person over 15(000 cigarettes) in year t-1

Formatted: English (U.S.)

10
11 Q_{t+1} : consumption of cigarettes per person over 15(000 cigarettes) in year t+1

Formatted: English (U.S.)

Formatted: English (U.S.)

Formatted: English (U.S.)

Formatted: English (U.S.)

12
13 P_t : real retail price per pack of 20 cigarettes in year t
14

15
16 Y_t : real per person over 15 disposable income (€000-€) in year t
17

18
19 b_0 : intercept in year t
20

21
22 SR_t : index of smoking restrictions or bans according to law in year t
23

24
25 AsC_t : dummy checking dichotomous index reflecting the existence of an anti-smoking
26 campaign each year t
27

28
29 ε_t : the error term
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Results

Through the conventional model of demand, the demand equation was estimated as follows

(Table 2):

Table 2: Conventional model of demand equation

$\ln Q_t = -1.757 - 0.441 \cdot \ln P_t + 1.040 \cdot \ln Y_t - 0.132 \cdot \text{AsC}_t$		
F-statistic: 27.765	R square: 0.847	Durbin-Watson: 1.980
Skewness/Kurtosis tests for Normality: adj chi ² = 5.10, Prob>chi ² = 0.0780		
Breusch-Pagan / Cook-Weisberg test for heteroskedasticity: chi ² = 2.56, Prob>chi ² = 0.1093		
Dickey-Fuller test for unit root: Z(t) = -2.364, 1% critical value = -2.660, 5% critical value = -1.950, 10% critical value = -1.600		

Formatted: Superscript

Formatted: Superscript

Formatted: English (U.S.)

A regression analysis was performed and calculations were made stepwise. The variable created to capture the effect of smoking restrictions was found non-significant (p value asymptotically equal to 0.303 at 5% confidence level); thus, it is excluded from the model. P value at 5% confidence level is asymptotically equal to 0 for $\ln Y_t$, equal to 0.001 for $\ln P_t$ and equal to 0.021 for AsC_t . The F-statistic is high, showing a good level of fit, while the model explains a great part of the variation. The Durbin-Watson statistic is close to 2, suggesting that the model has no autocorrelation. The Variation Inflated Factor is low for all variables, implying that multicollinearity is a non-factor. As evidenced by normality tests, standardized residuals follow a normal distribution. Breusch-Pagan / Cook-Weisberg tests indicate that residuals are homoscedastic. The Augmented Dickey-Fuller test for standardized residuals confirms that there exist no unit roots. Therefore, the standardized residuals are stationary, so the variables of the model are cointegrated (without constant and trend) and the

1
2
3
4
5
6 regression is not spurious. In the light of the above, we accept a short-run price elasticity of
7
8 demand at 0.441 and a short-run income elasticity of demand at 1.040.

9
10
11 Through the myopic addiction model, the additional variable ($\ln Q_{t-1}$) shows no statistical
12 significance. Therefore the model remains unchanged. Through the rational addiction
13 model, only the variable representing following year's consumption ($\ln Q_{t+1}$) is found
14 significant (p value asymptotically equal to 0), with substantially lower levels of fit (R
15 square). Thus, we conclude that addiction models fail to offer additional information on how
16 consumption is influenced.

17
18
19
20 Based on 2010 data, nominal tax revenue per pack is calculated at €2.78, a value verifying
21 and corresponding to the fixed amount of tax (86% of the nominal retail price). We assume
22 that the state maintains the existing ability to collect tribute. Government proclamations
23 suggest that tobacco will be further taxed. Therefore, we distinct four scenarios, all with
24 retail price increases, as anticipated, and each suggesting an additional price increase by
25 €0.5. Calculations are made only for the following year and accordingly only short run
26 elasticity is taken into account. Scenarios capture the impact of the continuing fall in income
27 at a rate of 4.8%. Based on Ross et al methodology and data concerning tobacco-related
28 mortality in Greece (Lower respiratory infections, Malignant neoplasms, Cardiovascular
29 diseases and Respiratory diseases), we estimate reduction on smokers and mortality
30 averted.[3,26]

31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42 In all four scenarios, consumption is decreased substantially while tax revenue is still
43 increased thanks to the inelastic demand. Moreover, smokers are significantly reduced and
44 smoking related deaths are accordingly limited (Table 3).

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, No underline

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, No underline

Formatted: Line spacing: 1.5 lines

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, No underline,
Subscript

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, No underline,
Subscript

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, No underline

Table 32: Impact of price increase and income constraints on consumption, tax revenue, number of smokers and smoking related deaths

Model scenarios	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4	
Price per pack	€4.47	€4.97	€5.47	€5.97	
Percent increase of price	12.59%	25.19%	37.78%	50.38%	
Fall in consumption due to price increase	-5.55%	-11.11%	-16.66%	-22.22%	
Fall in consumption due to income decrease	-4.99%	-4.99%	-4.99%	-4.99%	
Per capita consumption level	1,779.84	1,669.33	1,558.82	1,448.31	
Per capita consumption deterred	209.83	320.34	430.85	541.36	
Tax revenue per pack	€3.84	€4.27	€4.70	€5.13	
Tax revenue per cigarette	€0.192	€0.214	€0.235	€0.257	
Total tax revenue (€ billion)	€3,336	€3,478	€3,575	€3,625	
Incremental tax revenue (€ billion)	€0,455	€0,597	€0,694	€0,744	
Reduction in number of smokers	205,650	313,956	422,262	530,568	
Smoking related deaths averted	high(0,50)	930	1,420	1,911	2,401
	low(0,25)	465	710	955	1,200

-Differences in calculations may occur due to rounding

-Impact of price increase shared between prevalence and consumption

-High estimate indicates that 50% of smokers' deaths are attributable to tobacco use, whereas low estimate indicates that 25% of smokers' deaths are attributable to tobacco use

~~In all four scenarios, consumption is decreased substantially while tax revenue is still increased thanks to the inelastic demand. Moreover, smokers are significantly reduced and smoking related deaths are accordingly limited.~~

Discussion

Price elasticity estimates are greater than previous research in Greece,[8, 23-24] but consistent with findings by Gallet and List.[20] Estimates for income elasticity are far greater than estimates provided by literature in Greece.[8, 21-23] Regarding antismoking campaigns, results are in agreement with previous testimony.[23-24] Smoking restrictions show no statistical significance, confirming the claims by Joosens and Raw that compliance is low.[17] Finally, results are in general agreement with Alpert et al,[27] though a different methodology is followed.

Paired with the still high cigarette affordability, as documented in the current study and reported by previous research,[6] the nature of demand in Greece presents a vast opportunity for the policy makers to counter the tobacco epidemic and ensure revenue and cash flows at the same time. Even supposing that other determinants of demand, such as income, which is anticipated to fall, do not change, tobacco taxation proves to be a powerful tool. Annual consumption per person over 15 would be no higher than 1,780 cigarettes, even in the worst case (scenario1) and may fall to less than 1,448 cigarettes. On the other hand, tax revenue would recover from the downwards trend, accounting again for more than 1.80% of GDP, even in scenario1. In absolute values, excess tobacco tax revenue could rejuvenate the dismantled public coffers. Results suggest that even with a modest 10% of tax revenue allocated to offsetting the tobacco epidemic, there would be more than enough disposable funds towards planning, implementing, evaluating and improving antismoking efforts. Greeks seem to be in agreement with heavy taxation on cigarettes, but only if respective revenue is attributed to tobacco control.[28] In terms of public health benefits, smokers could be reduced by nearly 530,568 people, while up to 2,401 smoking related deaths could be averted on an annual basis. Nonetheless, findings should be treated with caution and increases in price should not be excessively increased from day one, as the

1
2
3
4
5
6 smokers' reaction is not easy to predict with confidence intervals widened. A stepwise
7
8 increase of tax would eliminate many of the risks associated with a sharp and sudden
9
10 increase in cigarette prices. Besides, Greece already performs better in tax collection than
11
12 countries such as Germany, France and Slovenia among others,[26] as the excise per smoker
13
14 ratio indicates, with €738.71 collected for every smoker.

15
16 Income sensitivity is larger than in any previous study either in Greece or internationally.
17
18 Thus, it is not exaggerating to argue that Greek smokers are shocked by the constraint on
19
20 their income. Besides, it is the first time in at least 40 years that income in Greece is falling at
21
22 this rate. The austerity measures should be viewed as a shift event in cigarette consumption,
23
24 among others.

25
26 Reducing the toll of tobacco in Greece is not an easy task. Decisions should include fostering
27
28 an antismoking-culture through well-planned national antismoking campaigns, raising the
29
30 cigarettes prices at an initial level no less than €4 a pack and ensuring compliance with the
31
32 anti-smoking law, especially on the current occasion, when City Police (the main mechanism
33
34 of control on the matter) was recently abolished as an institution. Controlling illicit trade is
35
36 crucial to maximize the effect of interventions.

37
38
39 As regards to the limitations of this study, it must be noted that addictions models were
40
41 unable to provide statistically significant information, possibly due to the inclusion of 2012
42
43 data in the time series. Possible future analysis of an even wider time series could provide
44
45 even more reliable results, as multicollinearity could be fully cured. Furthermore, the study
46
47 could be strengthened by employing statistical tests on more observations, regarding the
48
49 endogeneity of cigarette prices. Moreover, the current study is based on the most popular
50
51 price category in order to estimate the impact of prices changes on cigarette demand. It is
52
53 possible that a weighted average for all the brands sold in Greece could eliminate
54
55 unilateralism on prices data. Still, the anticipated but not fully documented switch of Greek
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 smokers from manufactured cigarettes to hand-rolled tobacco should be taken into account
7
8 in any future research. Yet, if the increase of contraband cigarettes in the Greek market
9
10 could be quantified, results would be more punctual. In addition, tobacco shows synergistic
11
12 effect with other substances, such as alcohol. Thus, it would be meaningful to investigate
13
14 the combined effect of tobacco and alcohol from an economic aspect. Finally, researchers
15
16 argue that the increased availability of nicotine substitutes will reduce demand for tobacco
17
18 products and increase the price sensitivity as well.[19] Under that scope, if research included
19
20 nicotine substitutes, accuracy would be improved.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 **Contributorship Statement:** FT, [DZ](#) and AV performed the calculations and analyses
7 reported in the text. FT and KA reviewed the literature for relevant data and documentation.
8

9
10 FT and KA drafted the manuscript which was edited and critically revised by KA, [AV](#) and IK.
11

12 **Acknowledgements**

13
14
15 We would like to express our gratitude to Professor Frank Chaloupka for his valuable and
16 constructive suggestions towards planning and development of this research work. His
17 willingness to provide us his limited time has been very much appreciated.
18
19

20
21
22 **Funding:** ~~None.~~ [This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the](#)
23 [public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.](#)
24

25
26 **Competing interests:** None.
27

28
29 **Data Sharing:** Extra data is available by emailing FT.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

1. WHO. Global Health Risks: Mortality and burden of disease attributable to selected major risks. Geneva: World Health Organization 2009
http://www.who.int/healthinfo/global_burden_disease/GlobalHealthRisks_report_full.pdf (Accessed 14 Nov 2011).
2. Eriksen M, Mackay J, Ross H. The Tobacco Atlas. Fourth Ed. Atlanta, GA, American Cancer Society, New York: World Lung Foundation 2012.
3. WHO. WHO Global report: Mortality Attributable to Tobacco. Geneva: World Health Organization 2012
http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2012/9789241564434_eng.pdf (Accessed 5 Oct 2012).
4. Filippidis FT, Vardavas CI, Loukopoulou A et al. Prevalence and determinants of tobacco use among adults in Greece: 4 year trends. Eur J Public Health 2013;23(5):772-776.
5. Vardavas CI, Kondilis B, Travers MJ et al. Environmental tobacco smoke in hospitality venues in Greece. BMC Public Health 2007;7(1):302.
6. Blecher EH, Van Walbeek CP. Cigarette affordability trends: an update and some methodological comments. Tobacco Control 2009;18(3):167-175.
7. Vardavas CI, Kafatos AG. Smoking policy and prevalence in Greece: an overview. The European Journal of Public Health 2007;17(2):211-213.
8. Hondroyiannis G, Papapetrou E. Cigarette consumption in Greece: empirical evidence from cointegration analysis. Applied Economics Letters 1997;4:571-574
9. Ministry of Health and Social Solidarity. The Greek National Plan of Action against Cancer 2008-2012, Athens, 2008. http://ygeiamap.gov.gr/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/karkinos_teliko.pdf (Accessed 5 Oct 2011)
10. Hellenic Statistical Authority, Workforce research, Press release 19 September 2013,

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

- 1
2
3
4
5
6 <http://www.statistics.gr/portal/page/portal/ESYE/BUCKET/A0101/PressReleases/A0>
7
8 [101_SJO01_DT_QQ_02_2013_01_F_GR.pdf](http://www.statistics.gr/portal/page/portal/ESYE/BUCKET/A0101/PressReleases/A0101_SJO01_DT_QQ_02_2013_01_F_GR.pdf) (Accessed 7 November 2013)
9
- 10 11. Eurostat news release 26 February 2013, Eurostat press office
11
12 http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_STAT-13-28_en.htm (Accessed 27 February
13 2013)
14
- 15 12. Wilkins N, Yurekli A, Hu TW. Economic analysis of tobacco demand. Economics of
16 Tobacco Toolkit. Washington: World Bank 2004
17
18 <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTPH/Resources/3Demand.pdf> (Accessed 24
19 Nov 2011)
20
- 21 13. Godfrey C, Maynard A. Economic aspects of tobacco use and taxation policy. BMJ
22 1998;297(6644):339–343.
23
- 24 14. Kahende JW, Loomis BR, Adhikari B, Marshall L. A review of economic evaluations of
25 tobacco control programs. Int J Environ Res Public Health 2009;6(1):51-68.
26
- 27 15. Farrelly M, Bray J. Responses to cigarette tax increases by race/ethnicity, income
28 and age groups – United States, 1976–1993. Journal of the American Medical
29 Association 1999;280:1979-1980.
30
- 31 16. Chaloupka F, Warner E. The economics of smoking. Handbook of Health Economics,
32 2000;1:1539-1627.
33
- 34 17. Joossens L, Raw M. The tobacco control scale 2010 in Europe. Brussels: Association
35 of European Cancer Leagues 2011.
36
- 37 18. WHO. Report on the Global Tobacco Epidemic, 2008: The MPOWER package.
38 Geneva: World Health Organization 2008
39
40 http://www.who.int/tobacco/mpower/mpower_report_full_2008.pdf (Accessed 14
41 Nov 2011).
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

19. Chaloupka F, Pacula R. The impact of price on youth tobacco use. *Changing Adolescent Smoking Prevalence: Where It Is and Why*, Smoking and Tobacco Control Monograph 1999:14.
20. Gallet C, List J. Cigarette demand: A meta-analysis of elasticities. *Health Econ* 2003;12:821-835.
21. Stavrinou VG. The effects of an anti-smoking campaign on cigarette consumption: empirical evidence from Greece. *Applied Economics* 1987;19:323-329.
22. Raptou E, Mattas K, Tsakiridou E et al. Factors affecting cigarette demand. *International Advances in Economic Research* 2005;11(3):275-290.
23. Nikolaou A, Velentzas K. Estimating the Demand for Cigarettes in Greece: An Error Correction Model, *Agricultural Economics Review* 2001;2(1):20-27.
24. Dritsakis E. Forecasting of cigarettes consumption in Greece: An empirical investigation with cointegration analysis. *Agricultural Economic Review* 2003;4(2):47-56.
25. Wasserman J, Manning WG, Newhouse JP et al. The Effects of Excise Taxes and Regulations on Cigarette Smoking. *Journal of Health Economics* 1991;10(1):43-64.
26. Ross HZ, Shariff S, Gilmore A. *Economics of Tobacco Taxation in Russia*. Paris: International Union Against Tuberculosis and Lung Disease 2008.
27. Alpert HR, Vardavas CI, Chaloupka FJ et al. The recent and projected public health and economic benefits of cigarette taxation in Greece. *Tobacco Control* 2013 Mar 6. [Epub ahead of print]
28. Vardavas CI, Filippidis FT, Agaku I et al. Tobacco taxation: the importance of earmarking the revenue to health care and tobacco control. *Tobacco induced diseases* 2012;10(1):21.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figures

Figure 1: The demand curve before government intervention

Figure 2: The demand curve after government intervention

For peer review only

