

# Editorial

## The primacy of politics: the rise and fall of evidence-based public health policy?

This editorial reflects on the apparent rise and the potential fall of the use of evidence in English public health policy. Over the last 20 years, there has been increasing reference to evidence within policy circles both nationally and locally. However, in 2013, a series of national decisions about plain packaging, alcohol pricing and the NHS Health Checks scheme, as well as the move of public health into local authorities, have acted as reminders of the long-standing cultural differences between researchers and policy-makers and the primacy of political priorities. This editorial reflects on these issues and concludes by discussing the future prospects of evidence-based public health policy and the normative relationship between evidence and politics in a democratic system.

Since 1997, the role of evidence in policy-making has increasingly been emphasized, at least rhetorically, by successive governments. For example, the ascendancy of evidence is apparent in a variety of government reports from the 1999 White Paper on *Modernising government*<sup>1</sup> to the 2011 public health White Paper *Healthy Lives, Healthy People*.<sup>2</sup> It was perhaps most evident in the establishment of the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence in 1999 which was initially just clinical in remit but then expanded to public health in 2005 and social care in 2013. This interest in evidence was reflected in an upsurge in public funding for evidence-based policy research<sup>3</sup> and academics were encouraged to produce the evidence required by policy-makers to inform their decisions about the development and implementation of public health policy interventions.<sup>4</sup>

Subsequently, there was a massive increase in the volume of university research into the effectiveness of policies and interventions across public health and other policy domains. By way of example, a simple search in the social science part of Web of Sciences for ‘evidence-based policy’ results in only 57 hits for the years 1869–1996 but 8742 hits for the years 1997–2013. The increased policy focus on evidence also helped underpin the emergence of a tentative public policy RCT base within the UK. Internationally, the EBP ‘movement’ was supported by a call from the World Health Organization (1998)<sup>5</sup> for ‘an evidence-based approach to health promotion policy and practice’ as well as the

development of the Campbell Collaboration and the establishment of the Cochrane Collaboration public health group.

Yet, despite the rise in evidence rhetoric and all the accompanying research activity, most analyses conclude that research still plays a very limited role in public health policy.<sup>6</sup> Why? Writing as early as 1979, Caplan<sup>7</sup> identified institutional, cultural and communicative gaps between research producers and research users in policy and practice as the problem and the reason for a lack of real EBP. Certainly, research into EBP in public health would confirm elements of this analysis with examples of differences over: (i) what constitutes ‘good’ evidence - with policy-makers highlighting the importance of ‘good stories’ whilst researchers focus on controlling for bias;<sup>8,9</sup> (ii) what evidence is ‘needed’ by policy-makers—where policy-makers emphasise timeliness and political relevance over quality<sup>8</sup> and (iii) how to deal with ‘inconclusive’ results—with researchers always wanting more research whilst waiting and ‘doing nothing is not an option’ for policy-makers.<sup>8</sup>

However, there are clearly more than ‘cultural differences’ behind the evidence façade. Policy-network theory argues that it is the political ‘relevance’ of evidence, which is the most important factor in whether it is heard, used, ignored or abused, with evidence that ‘goes against’ prevalent ideological imperatives or political priorities more likely to be marginalised.<sup>10</sup> In a democracy of course, decisions can never solely be made on evidence—they will be informed by ideology and values, public opinion and lobbying. There have been several prominent cases in public health in the summer of 2013 that really demonstrate this ‘primacy of politics’: minimum price for alcohol, plain tobacco packaging and NHS health checks.

In July 2013, the government announced that it had decided to scrap the proposed 40p minimum unit price for alcohol in England because there was ‘not enough concrete evidence’. This was despite strong economic modelling of likely effects and real-world evidence of effectiveness from Canada. There was huge press speculation about the influence of industry lobbyists on this decision. It may also have been influenced by more principled views about protecting personal choice. This was accompanied by the shelving of plans to introduce plain packs for tobacco. The cited reason was that we need to ‘see how it works in Australia’ but again; there was high speculation about the influence of industry lobbying. The third example from summer 2013 was the continued roll

out by Public Health England of the NHS Health Checks scheme because, whilst a Cochrane review<sup>11</sup> found no evidence that it was effective, 'there is nonetheless an urgent need to tackle the growing burden of disease which is associated with lifestyle behaviours and choices'. These political aspects of national public health policy-making are more likely to be replicated locally now following the move of public health responsibilities to local authority-led Health and Wellbeing boards in April 2013. This increases the democratic accountability of local public health—but it also introduces the potential pitfalls of party politics too.

So when it comes to the crunch, politics has primacy. This is not surprising but it perhaps poses a dilemma for those committed to EBP, as it limits the role of evidence in a democratic system. The pure EBP perhaps dreamed of by some in the movement is unrealistic as it 'requires a linear relationship and is dependent on an unrealistically simple account of policy making'<sup>10</sup> which would result in a mere technocracy of interpreting and implementing evidence. There is undoubtedly a need for principles, values, ideologies and struggle within any democratic process. Evidence should also be part of this, but politics will, and should, always be *ascendant*. Whilst this can be extremely frustrating on occasions for researchers—and this summer has been one of considerable discontent for public health—we can, and should, only ever aim for *evidence-informed* policy.

## Acknowledgements

Based on talk given to the eighth RCT in the Social Sciences conference, Durham University, September 2013.

Clare Bambra<sup>1,2,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Geography, Durham University, Durham, UK

<sup>2</sup>Wolfson Research Institute for Health and Wellbeing, Durham University, Stockton on Tees, UK

<sup>3</sup>*Fuse: The Centre for Translational Research in Public Health, Durham University, Stockton on Tees, UK*  
Address correspondence to Clare Bambra,  
E-mail: [clare.bambra@durham.ac.uk](mailto:clare.bambra@durham.ac.uk)

## References

- 1 Cabinet Office. *Modernising Government*. London: HMSO, 1999.
- 2 Department of Health. *Healthy Lives, Healthy People: Our strategy for public health in England*, 2011. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/healthy-lives-healthy-people-our-strategy-for-public-health-in-england> (10 September 2013, date last accessed).
- 3 Packwood A. Evidence-based policy: rhetoric and reality. *Soc Policy Soc*, 2002;**1**:267–74.
- 4 Bambra C. Reviewing the evidence: reflections from experience. *Evid Policy* 2005;**1**:241–53.
- 5 World Health Organization. World Health Assembly Resolution WHA51.12 on Health Promotion. Geneva: World Health Organization, 1998.
- 6 Smith KE. Health inequalities in Scotland and England: the contrasting journeys of ideas from research into policy. *Soc Sci Med*, 2007;**64**(7):1438–49.
- 7 Caplan N. The two-communities theory and knowledge utilization. *Am Behav Sci*, 1979;**22**(3):459–70.
- 8 Petticrew M, Whitehead M, MacIntyre S *et al*. Evidence for public health policy on inequalities I: the reality according to policymakers. *J Epidemiol Community Health*, 2004;**58**:811–16.
- 9 Whitehead M, Petticrew M, Graham H *et al*. Evidence for public health policy on inequalities II: assembling the evidence jigsaw. *J Epidemiol Community Health*, 2004;**58**:817–21.
- 10 Smith KE, Joyce K. Capturing complex realities: understanding efforts to achieve evidence-based policy and practice in public health. *Evid Policy* 2012;**8**:57–78.
- 11 Krogsbøll LT, Jørgensen KJ, Grønhoj Larsen C *et al*. General health checks in adults for reducing morbidity and mortality from disease. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2012;**10**:CD009009.