

Czech Republic

Explanation of the table

The table considers a number of policy options, singly and when combined, listed in Column 1. Column 2 estimates their impact in terms of the number of healthy years gained for every one million people in the population. Column 3 provides the annual cost of implementing the policy (in Euros for the year 2005), both for the population as a whole and per person. Column 4 gives the cost effectiveness ratio (CER), which is the total cost of implementing the policy or action (compared to doing nothing), divided by the number of healthy years gained, again relative to no intervention. Thus, if we consider a comprehensive advertising ban, this is estimated to gain 932 healthy years of life per one million of the population (9,536 years for the whole population of the country). Implementing and monitoring an advertising ban is estimated to cost the country €5.1 million, equivalent to 50 cents per person. Thus, the cost-effectiveness ratio is €534 per healthy year of life gained (€5,100,000 / 9,536).


Column 1		Column 2	Column 3		Column 4
Country	Czech Republic	Annual healthy life years gained per 1 million population	Annual cost (Euros, 2005)		Cost per healthy year of life gained (Euros, 2005)
Population	10,235,800		Total	Per person	
Gross national income per person (Euros, 2005)	9,746				
Euro exchange rate (2005)	0.033				
Current taxation		1,918	€ 3,382,352	€ 0.33	€ 172
Increased taxation (Current + 25%)		2,174	€ 3,810,920	€ 0.37	€ 171
Increased taxation (Current + 50%)		2,386	€ 3,810,920	€ 0.37	€ 156
Reduced access to retail outlets (50% coverage)		219	€ 3,458,173	€ 0.34	€ 1,540
Comprehensive advertising ban (80% coverage)		932	€ 5,096,905	€ 0.50	€ 534
Brief advice in primary care (30% coverage)		1,241	€ 16,956,481	€ 1.66	€ 1,335
Roadside breath-testing (RBT; 80% coverage)		116	€ 7,552,154	€ 0.74	€ 6,343
Current Scenario - combination of interventions		2,396	€ 14,776,451	€ 1.44	€ 602
Combination 1: Increased tax and RBT		2,452	€ 10,794,921	€ 1.05	€ 430
Combination 2: Increased tax and Advertising Ban		3,251	€ 8,462,434	€ 0.83	€ 254
Combination 3: Increased tax and Brief advice		3,554	€ 20,207,677	€ 1.97	€ 555
Combination 4: Increased tax + Ad Ban + Brief advice		4,421	€ 24,606,749	€ 2.40	€ 544
Combination 5: Increased tax + Brief Advice + Ad ban + Reduced access		4,539	€ 27,892,013	€ 2.72	€ 600
Combination 6: Increased tax + Brief Advice + Ad ban + Reduced access + RBT		4,649	€ 35,066,559	€ 3.43	€ 737

What the table means

In preventing alcohol-related ill-health, available resources can be put to best use via enhanced taxation policies, since these have a large health impact, are relatively cheap to implement, and thus have the lowest cost per healthy year of life gained. A comprehensive advertising ban is also projected to be a highly cost-effective measure. Road-side breath testing and reduced access to retail outlets are estimated to generate less health gains, but are still very cost-effective. Brief interventions, by comparison, can have a big impact but are relatively costly to implement, so they are also not as cost-effective as taxation and advertising ban measures. However, all interventions - whether implemented alone or in combination - produce a favourable return for the cost incurred (that is, each extra year of healthy life can be secured for considerably less than the average annual income of persons living in the country).

Explanation of the figure

This figure plots the total costs and effects of each single and combined intervention for a 10-year period. The blue line plots the increasing cost of gaining an extra year of healthy life in the population as interventions become less cost-effective (as the gradient becomes steeper, so the cost per unit of effect increases). It shows the most efficient way of combining different strategies. Interventions to the left of this line are less effective and/or more costly than other, more efficient interventions. The most cost-effective single and then combined options are those that occur on the points of the blue line when it changes direction.



What the figure means - Czech Republic

The first point where the blue line changes direction is increased taxation (current + 50% increase), and thus this is the most cost-effective policy option. The second point where the blue line changes direction is increased tax plus a comprehensive advertising ban, and thus this is the best combination of two policy options from a cost-effectiveness point of view. The third point where the blue line changes direction is increased tax plus an advertising plan, plus brief interventions for hazardous drinkers, and thus this is the next best combination of policy options. The final point is a combination of increased tax, an advertising ban, brief advice programmes, reduced access and random breath-testing campaigns, which represents the combined effect and cost of all studied interventions. It should be noted that the current intervention mix (■) does not appear on the expansion path, indicating room for improvement from a cost-effectiveness point of view and that more health gains could be achieved by re-allocating existing resources.