Current Draft: October 2024

Supply-Side Opioid Restrictions and the Retail Pharmacy Market

Anne M. Burton and Brandyn F. Churchill*

Abstract

Policymakers routinely limit the sale of goods thought to be of risk to public health. Despite a large literature studying how these supply-side interventions affect consumer outcomes, relatively less is known about whether and how these policies affect firm performance. Using 2000-2018 National Establishment Time-Series data and a difference-in-differences strategy, we show that state "pill mill" laws intended to reduce the overprescribing of opioids reduced retail pharmacy sales and employment. These reductions were driven by an increase in the number of pharmacy closures, particularly among standalone establishments, while surviving establishments experienced modest improvements in market outcomes.

JEL Codes: I18; K23; M20
Key words: opioids; pharmacy; pill mill

* Burton is an Assistant Professor at University of Texas at Dallas (anne.burton@utdallas.edu). Churchill is an Assistant Professor at American University (bchurchill@american.edu). Some of the results in this paper are based on restricted-use and/or proprietary data. Readers interested in obtaining access can contact the authors. We are grateful to Don Walls and Ken Perez for assistance with the NETS data. All interpretations, errors, and omissions are our own.

1. INTRODUCTION

Governments limit the sale of goods thought to be of risk to public health under the rationale that these products generate negative externalities that are otherwise not internalized by the consumers (Conlon and Rao 2023). To reduce consumption, policymakers have adopted numerous strategies, including raising prices through excise taxes (Cawley et al. 2019; DeCicca et al. 2022), requiring a license to buy, sell, or use a product (Dee et al. 2005; Depew and Swensen 2022), and outright prohibiting sale to at least some consumers (Carpenter and Dobkin 2011; Adda et al. 2012; Knight 2013; Dobkin et al. 2014). Despite the widespread adoption of these policies and large literatures studying how these interventions affect consumer outcomes (Carpenter and Dobkin 2009; Buchmueller and Carey 2018; Hansen et al. 2023), relatively less is known about whether and how these policies affect firm decisions and outcomes.

This paper provides new evidence on how supply-side drug interventions affect firms by studying the relationship between state laws intended to curtail excessive opioid prescribing by pain management clinics, known as "pill mills," and retail pharmacy market outcomes. Drug overdose is the leading cause of injury mortality in the U.S., and over 70 percent of these deaths are attributable to opioids (NCHS 2023). To combat this ongoing opioid epidemic, state and local officials have adopted a myriad of measures aimed at limiting the supply of prescription opioids. Broadly speaking, state pill mill laws establish legal authority for state inspections and set training requirements for clinic owners and associated physicians (Mallatt 2017; Maclean et al. 2021; Ziedan and Kaestner 2024). The goal of these policies is to reduce the supply of prescription opioids by (i) closing the most egregious pain management clinics and (ii) reducing the volume of prescribing at the remaining facilities. As such, we use the adoption of these state pill mill laws as natural experiments to study how firms are affected by government policies limiting product sales.

The relationship between state pill mill laws and pharmacy sales will depend on the extent to which establishments were previously filling inappropriate opioid prescriptions, whether the laws were effective at reducing inappropriate prescribing, and the whether the laws inadvertently discouraged medically justified prescribing. To the first point, a recent paper by Janssen and Zhang (2023) using data on opioid shipments found evidence of drug diversion among small, independent pharmacies, in part due to competitive pressures and the financial incentives of owner-operator pharmacists. Moreover, there is existing evidence that state pill mill laws reduced opioid prescribing (Kaestner and Ziedan 2023), and prior work suggests that policies discouraging inappropriate prescribing can also reduce the volume of prescriptions for legitimate medical reasons (Buchmueller et al. 2020; Sacks et al. 2021; Alpert et al. 2024).[1] So, while the existing literature suggests that state pill mill laws may have adversely affected pharmacies, the degree to which establishments were affected remains an open empirical question.

We examine the relationship between state pill mill laws and changes in the retail pharmacy industry using 2000-2018 National Establishment Time-Series (NETS) data and a difference-in-differences identification strategy accounting for the staggered adoption of the policies and potential dynamic treatment effects (Borusyak et al. forthcoming). First, we find that state pill mill laws were associated with approximately a 5 percent reduction in pharmacy sales and a 2 percent reduction in the number of pharmacy employees. The reductions were limited to the post-adoption period and are robust to alternative controls for time-varying spatial heterogeneity, sample restrictions, and difference-in-differences estimators. Second, we show that these reductions were

[1] Sacks et al. (2021) found that laws requiring physicians to utilize a prescription drug monitoring program reduced opioids dispensed to new users. Likewise, Buchmueller et al. (2020) found that Kentucky's prescription drug monitoring program led to substantial declines in opioids prescribed to single-use patients. However, Alpert et al. (2024) found that while these policies did reduce opioid prescriptions among patients presenting with diagnoses for which an opioid prescription would be inappropriate.

driven by an increase in pharmacy closures, particularly among standalone (i.e., non-chain) establishments, with surviving establishments appearing to have modestly benefited from these policies. This pattern is consistent with prior evidence that independent pharmacies were more likely than chain establishments to engage in drug diversion (Janssen and Zhang 2023).

This paper contributes to several notable literatures. By showing that state pill mill laws adversely affected the retail pharmacy industry, we add to existing research connecting public health interventions to changes in firm behaviors and outcomes (Adda et al. 2012; Cornelsen and Norman 2012; Nguyen et al. 2019; Butters et al. 2022; Dickson et al. forthcoming). Moreover, because we show that standalone pharmacies – but not chain establishments – were more likely to close following the adoption of a state pill mill law, we build on a broad literature studying the determinants of consolidation within the healthcare industry (Harrison 2007; Town et al. 2007; Bowblis 2011; Postma and Roos 2015; Wollmann 2020; Janssen and Zhang 2023). Finally, we most directly add to a literature studying policies intended to curtail the excessive prescribing of prescription opioids (Buchmueller and Carey 2018; Meinhofer 2018; Kim 2021; Mallatt 2022; Neumark and Savych 2023; Ukert and Polsky 2023; Kaestner and Ziedan 2023).

The rest of the paper proceeds as follows: Section 2 describes the existing evidence on the effects of state drug policies. Section 3 describes the National Establishment Time-Series data and our difference-in-differences identification strategy that accounts for the staggered adoption of state pill mill laws. Section 4 presents our results on the relationships between these laws and changes in retail pharmacy market outcomes. Finally, Section 5 discusses the policy implications and limitations of our results.

2. EXISTING EVIDENCE

Our paper builds on a large literature studying supply-side drug policies (Dobkin and Nicosia 2009; Dobkin et al. 2014; Ruhm 2019; Maclean et al. 2021; Alpert et al. 2022), much of which has focused on the effects of these laws on consumers. For example, several studies have examined "must-access" prescription drug monitoring programs (PDMPs) requiring providers to access state-level databases with a patient's prescription history prior to prescribing controlled substances (Meinhofer 2018; Sacks et al. 2021; Shakya and Hodges 2022; Neumark and Savych 2023; Ukert and Polsky 2023). Using a five percent sample of Medicare Part D beneficiaries from 2007-2013, Buchmueller and Carey (2018) found that must-access PDMPs were associated with reductions in the likelihood that individuals obtained opioids from multiple prescribers or at multiple pharmacies. However, there is also evidence that PDMPs induced some individuals who would have otherwise abused prescription opioids to substitute towards cheaper alternatives, such as heroin (Balestra et al. 2021; Kim 2021).[2]

Though not studied as extensively as PDMPs, existing evidence indicates that state pill mill laws are highly effective at reducing excessive opioid prescribing (Rutkow et al. 2015; Chang et al. 2016; Lyapustina et al. 2016; Deiana and Giua 2018). Using a difference-in-differences identification strategy and data on shipments of prescription opioids from the DEA's Automated Reports and Consolidated Ordering System (ARCOS), Kaestner and Ziedan (2023) found that state pill mill laws were associated with a 15-20 percent reduction in prescription opioids, compared to a more modest 5-10 percent reduction attributable to PDMPs. However, there is also evidence that

[2] This substitution is consistent with evidence that opioid abusers responded to the reformulation of OxyContin in August 2010 by substituting toward heroin (Alpert et al. 2018; Evans et al. 2019).

these laws induced some individuals who would have otherwise used prescription opioids to substitute towards heroin (Mallatt 2022).[3]

Several studies have linked opioid use – and the policies intended to prevent it – to changes in labor market and firm outcomes, though not specifically among firms generating revenue through opioid sales. For example, prescription opioid use has been linked to lower rates of labor force participation (Aliprantis et al. 2023), business formation (Rietveld and Patel 2021), and firm performance (Kim et al. 2024; Langford and Feldman forthcoming). Relatedly, Beheshti (forthcoming) found that the Drug Enforcement Agency's decision to elevate hydrocodone to a Schedule II Controlled Substance improved labor market outcomes in zip codes with higher baseline rates of hydrocodone use compared to those with lower use rates, and Kaestner and Ziedan (2023) found that state pill mill laws were associated with labor market improvements.

There is a smaller literature examining how supply-side drug interventions affect the firms producing and selling these products. Studying recreational marijuana legalization, Wang and Chan (2024) documented increases in downstream innovation and patenting (i.e., products for recreational cannabis users) without any changes in upstream innovation (i.e., chemical aspects and other factors related to medical use). For opioids, Nguyen et al. (2019) found that pharmaceutical companies responded to state must-access PDMP laws by reducing direct-to-physician advertising (i.e., physician detailing). In the study perhaps most comparable to ours, a working paper by Mallatt (2017) found that state pill mill laws were associated with a 6.5 percent reduction in the number of

[3] In ongoing work, Donahoe (2024) does not find evidence that enforcement actions closing prescribers, dispensers, and distributors that inappropriately prescribed opioids led to large enough shifts to illicit alternatives to offset the public health improvements.

establishments categorized as "all other outpatient care centers" in the 2004-2015 Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages (QCEW) data.[4]

While well-executed, our use of the NETS data allows us to improve on the prior literature in several important ways. First, we can examine changes in important outcomes that were unavailable to prior researchers, including retail pharmacy sales and employment. Second, because we observe the same establishments over time, we are able to study the effects of these policies on both individual pharmacies and the industry as a whole. This proves to be an important contribution. While we show that state pill mill laws reduced the overall volume of sales and employment in the retail pharmacy industry by increasing establishment closures, we also find evidence that surviving firms saw modest sales improvements. Third, the NETS data allow us to show that the increase in pharmacy closures was driven by standalone establishments while pharmacies with multiple locations were seemingly unaffected.

3. DATA AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Pharmacy Outcomes: National Establishment Time-Series 2000-2018

To study the retail pharmacy market, we use data from the 2000-2018 National Establishment Time-Series (NETS). The NETS data include time-series information on over 60 million total establishments in the United States from the Duns Marketing Information file. For our purposes, a key feature of the NETS data is that they include Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes which allow us to identify retail pharmacies (SIC 5912). These data include the business name and street address, as well as estimated annual sales and employment for the establishment. Critically,

[4] Mallatt (2017) did not find evidence that OxyContin reformulation or state PDMP laws were related to changes in the number of retail pharmacies. While her QCEW estimates suggested that state pill mill laws were associated with a statistically insignificant 2.2-2.9 percent reduction in the number of pharmacies ($\hat{\beta}$ = -0.022 and SE = 0.014 in Table 4 column 7; $\hat{\beta}$ = -0.029 and SE = 0.022 in Table 5 column 7), she found a marginally significant *increase* when using 2004-2015 County Business Patterns data ($\hat{\beta}$ = 0.018 and SE = 0.009 in Table A2 column 7).

we can follow the same establishments over time which – in combination with information on the years the firm reports being active – allows us to examine pharmacy openings and closings. The NETS data have been used previously in studies such as ours (e.g., Neumark and Kolko 2010; Neumark et al. 2011; Kolko 2012; Orrenius et al. 2020; Carpenter et al. 2023).

Table 2 reports the summary statistics for our main outcomes of interest. Column 1 reports summary statistics for the full sample, while columns 2 and 3 limit the sample to include observations from states which did and did not adopt a pill mill law during our sample period. Column 4 reports the t-statistics and corresponding p-values from tests of whether the values in columns 2 and 3 are equal. Panel A shows outcomes that are measured at the establishment level (i.e., sales and employment), and Panel B shows outcomes that are measured at the county level (i.e., openings and closings). On average, we see that establishments in states which adopted pill mill laws during our sample period earned about $3.3 million per year, while establishments in states not adopting these laws earned approximately $3.8 million per year. Similarly, we find that establishments in states adopting pill mill laws had approximately 1.3 fewer employees than establishments located in the non-adopting states. We also find weaker evidence that states adopting pill mill laws had fewer pharmacy openings and more pharmacy closings. While these statistics do not speak to whether these changes occurred following the adoption of a state pill mill law, they indicate that pharmacies in states adopting such policies performed worse than those in states never adopting these laws.

3.2 Empirical Specification: Difference-in-Differences

We explore the relationship between state pill mill laws and pharmacy outcomes using the 2000-2018 NETS data and the following difference-in-differences imputation estimator (Borusyak et al. forthcoming):

$$Y_{isct} = \alpha + \beta \cdot \text{PILL MILL LAW}_{st} + Z_{sct}'\gamma + \theta_s + \tau_t + \varepsilon_{isct} \quad (1)$$

where the dependent variable, Y_{isct}, is the market outcome for establishment *i*, located in state *s* and county *c*, in year *t* (e.g., the natural log of the real value of annual sales). Our independent variable of interest, PILL MILL LAW_{st}, is an indicator variable taking on the value of one in years in which a state has an active pill mill law and is zero otherwise.

It is possible that states adopting pill mill laws may have also adopted other measures related to opioid prescribing and consumption. As such, the vector Z includes several state-level, time-varying drug policies, including whether the state had a prescription drug monitoring program (PDMP) and whether the state mandated the use of the PDMP (Buchmueller and Carey 2018; Meinhofer 2018). Given existing evidence linking changes in state policies to changes in opioid-related outcomes, Z also includes indicators for whether the state had a medical marijuana law, active medical marijuana dispensaries, a recreational marijuana law, and active recreational marijuana dispensaries (Hollingsworth et al. 2022; Powell et al. 2018).

To address the possibility that states may have chosen whether to adopt pill mill laws based on their local economic conditions, the vector Z also includes the state unemployment rate, the natural log of the value of initial unemployment claims, the natural log of the real value of residential building permits, and the natural log of real state product per capita. We also include the natural log of the real effective minimum wage, given the possible relationship between minimum wage changes and pharmacy employment. Finally, we account for demographic differences between states which did and did not adopt pill mill laws by controlling for the share of the state population comprised of Black individuals, the share of the state population comprised of Hispanic individuals, and the natural log of the county population.

Our baseline specification accounts for time-invariant factors related to pharmacy sales using state fixed effects, θ_s, and national shocks to the pharmacy industry using year fixed effects, τ_t. However, in alternative models we replace the state fixed effects with more granular county- and establishment-level fixed effects. Given the recent literature highlighting potential pitfalls of including earlier treated units in the comparison group for later treated units (de Chaisemartin & D'Haultfoeuille 2020; Callaway & Sant'Anna 2021; Goodman-Bacon 2021; Sun & Abraham 2021), our imputation estimator fits the state and year fixed effects using only untreated observations (Borusyak et al. forthcoming). These fixed effects are then used to impute the untreated potential outcomes for each observation which are then aggregated. This procedure assures that our coefficient of interest, β, is being identified from "clean" comparisons between treated and untreated units. Finally, we cluster standard errors at the state level (Bertrand et al. 2004).

In the presence of the covariates and fixed effects, our identifying assumption is that – in absence of the policy change – outcomes among pharmacies in states adopting pill mill laws would have evolved similarly to the outcomes among pharmacies in states not adopting pill mill laws. We explore the validity of this assumption with the following event-study specification:

$$Y_{isct} = \alpha + \sum_{j=-5,\, j\neq -1}^{3} \beta^j I^j + Z'_{isct}\gamma + \theta_s + \tau_t + \varepsilon_{isct} \qquad (2)$$

where the coefficients, β^j, measure how the outcomes of interest differentially evolved in treated and never-treated states. Our first policy change occurred in 2005, so we can estimate 5 pre-periods and 14 post-periods for establishments in this state. Meanwhile, our final policy change occurred in 2016, so we can estimate 16 pre-periods and 3 post-periods for this group. Accordingly, we estimate event studies for a balanced state-year event window (i.e., 5 pre-periods and 3 post-

periods) to assure that our results are not being driven by changes in the states contributing to identification.

4. RESULTS

4.1 Results: Changes in Sales and Employment

We begin by exploring the relationship between the adoption of state pill mill laws and changes in the market outcomes for retail pharmacies. Figure 2 plots the event study estimates where the dependent variables are the natural log of the real value of annual sales (Panel A) and the natural log of the number of employees (Panel B). We also report these estimates in Table 3 (Panel A). There is no evidence that pharmacy market outcomes were differentially trending in treated states relative to the comparison states prior to the adoption of the laws. Indeed, the point estimates are small in magnitude and statistically insignificant. However, after states began cracking down on the overprescribing of opioids through pill mill laws, we find sizable reductions in both pharmacy sales and employment. In the years following the adoption of a pill mill law, we estimate a 5.1-5.8 percent reduction in annual sales and a 3.1-3.6 percent reduction in the number of employees.[5] Table 3 summarizes these patterns using the static difference-in-differences specification (Panel B). We continue to find a 5.1 percent reduction in annual sales and a 1.8 percent reduction in the number of employees, though the latter result is not statistically significant.[6]

In Table 4 we explore the robustness of the relationships between state pill mill laws and pharmacy market outcomes. The dependent variable in Panel A is the natural log of sales, and the

[5] We detect more modest reductions in the exact year of adoption, which is consistent with the fact that most of the policies were enacted mid-year and our outcomes are measured annually.

[6] Appendix Figure 1 shows how the estimates change when we iteratively exclude each treated state. Panel A shows larger sales reductions in specifications including Florida, which is consistent with evidence showing the large number of pill mill pain management clinics within the state (Meinhofer 2018). Panels A and B also indicate that the sales and employment reductions are more pronounced when we exclude Texas from the sample.

dependent variable in Panel B is the natural log of the number of employees. Column 1 reprints our baseline results. Because state pill mill laws were adopted in southern and midwestern states, columns 2 and 3 further account for time-varying spatial heterogeneity. Our results are largely unchanged after including Census region-by-year fixed effects. However, after including Census division-by-year fixed effects, we find that state pill mill laws were associated with a 7 percent reduction in sales and a 4.1 percent reduction in the number of employees, both of which are now statistically significant. Prior work has shown that the NETS data may be less reliable for establishments with the smallest and largest number of employees (Neumark et al. 2005; Barnatchez et al. 2017), though column 4 shows that our results are robust to excluding establishments in the bottom and top five percent of the employee distribution.[7] Finally, column 5 reports results using a traditional two-way fixed effects estimator. While the estimates are smaller in magnitude, as one would expect when comparing newly treated and previously treated states when the treatment effect grows over time, we continue to find a statistically significant 3.7 percent reduction in sales.

One benefit of the NETS data is that we observe the same establishments over time, so in Table 5 we test how our estimates change when including increasingly more granular levels of geographic fixed effects. All columns include location-invariant year fixed effects and our time-varying policy, economic, and demographic controls. Columns 1 and 2 include state fixed effects, columns 3 and 4 include county fixed effects, and columns 5 and 6 include establishment fixed effects. Relative to our baseline estimates, the results accounting for county fixed effects are larger in magnitude; we estimate that state pill mill laws were associated with a 5.5 percent reduction in

[7] Appendix Table 2 reports results where we exclude the bottom and top 10 percent of the distribution. We continue to find a statistically significant 6.0 percent reduction in sales. We also detect a statistically significant 3.0 percent reduction in the number of employees.

sales and a 2.1 percent reduction in the number of employees. Interestingly, though, the direction of the effect changes sign after including establishment fixed effects. Rather than reducing sales and employment, these models indicate that state pill mill laws were associated with a statistically insignificant 1.2 percent increase in sales and a statistically significant 1.3 percent increase in the number of employees. What might explain this change? One explanation is that estimates including establishment fixed effects are identified off within-establishment changes over time among those establishments that remained open. As such, Table 5 suggests that the reductions in sales and employment were driven by extensive-margin adjustments in whether establishments remained open, while surviving establishments appear to have modestly benefitted from these laws.

4.2 Results: Changes in Pharmacy Openings and Closings

In the prior section, we showed that state pill mill laws were associated with reductions in pharmacy sales and employment, and we provided suggestive evidence that these changes were driven by a reduction in the number of establishments. Using our NETS data, we now formally test whether these laws were associated with changes in the size of the retail pharmacy market by examining changes in the number of establishment openings and closings. Figure 3 plots the event study estimates where the dependent variables are the natural log of the number of county-level pharmacy openings + 1 (Panel A) and the natural log of the number of county-level pharmacy closures + 1 (Panel B). We also report these estimates in Table 6 (Panel A).[8]

Figure 3 does not reveal any evidence that state pill mill laws were associated with changes in pharmacy openings in either the pre-period or the post-period. Nor is there strong evidence of a differential pre-trend in pharmacy closures, though we do detect a marginally significant increase

[8] We show in Appendix Table 4 that the patterns are robust to replacing our dependent variable with (i) the inverse hyperbolic sine of the number of openings and closings and (ii) the number of openings and closings per 100,000.

in closures two years prior to adoption. Overall, the pre-period estimates are smaller in magnitude, inconsistently signed, and not statistically significant in four of the five years, including the year prior to adoption. However, following the adoption of a state pill mill law, we find an increase in the number of pharmacy closures. Summarizing these changes using the static difference-in-differences specification from equation (2), Table 6 shows that state pill mill laws were associated with a 5.8 percent increase in the number of pharmacy closures (Panel B). We show in Appendix Figure 2 that these patterns are robust to iteratively excluding each of the treated states.

Using data from the 2006-2012 Automation of Reports and Consolidated Orders System (ARCOS) maintained by the U.S. Drug Enforcement Agency, Janssen and Zhang (2023) showed that (i) independent pharmacies dispensed approximately 39 percent more opioids and 61 more OxyContin than chain pharmacies within the same zip code and (ii) nearly 40 percent of this difference was due to drug diversion. Given this finding, we would expect state pill mill laws to more adversely affect the sales of independent pharmacies. We test this possibility in Table 7 by leveraging the fact that the NETS data allow us to distinguish between standalone establishments and those connected to other establishments (i.e., headquarters and branches). Consistent with this prior evidence, we find that state pill mill laws were associated with a statistically significant 6.9 percent increase in the number of standalone pharmacy closures without any change for non-standalone establishments.[9] Collectively, these results suggest that state pill mill laws influenced the retail pharmacy market by increasing the number of standalone pharmacy closures.

[9] We also explored heterogeneity in sales and employment by standalone status. While the results were generally inconclusive, we report them in Appendix Table 5 for completeness.

5. CONCLUSION

This paper provides new evidence on how public policies limiting the sale of goods posing a risk to public health affect the market outcomes of establishments selling those goods. Over the last two decades, federal and state lawmakers have adopted a variety of policies aimed at reducing prescription opioid abuse and mortality (Alpert et al. 2018; Buchmueller and Carey 2018; Ruhm 2019; Alpert et al. 2024). One group of policies, known as pill mill laws, sought to reduce excessive opioid prescribing by closing the most egregious pain management clinics and reducing the volume of prescribing at the remaining facilities (Mallatt 2017; Maclean et al. 2021; Ziedan and Kaestner 2024). In this paper, we leverage the staggered adoption of these laws by 12 states from 2005-2016 to study how firms are affected by government policies limiting product sales.

Using establishment-level data from the 2000-2018 National Establishment Time-Series (NETS) and a difference-in-differences identification strategy, we show that state pill mill laws, which were intended to reduce excessive opioid prescribing by main management clinics, resulted in a 5 percent reduction in pharmacy sales and a 2 percent reduction in the number of pharmacy employees. These reductions were driven by an increase in pharmacy closures, particularly among standalone establishments that prior work has shown are more likely than chain pharmacies to engage in drug diversion (Janssen and Zhang 2023). We also find evidence that surviving establishments experienced modest improvements in market outcomes. These findings highlight a previously unknown role of policies limiting access to prescription opioids in explaining increases in independent pharmacy closures and industrywide consolidation that occurred throughout our sample period (Guadamuz et al. 2020).

This study is subject to some limitations. For one, we are unable to disentangle the extent to which the market changes are due to state pill mill laws reducing the number of opioid

prescriptions filled for illicit purposes versus medically justified reasons. However, prior evidence indicates that independent pharmacies dispense substantially more opioids than chain pharmacies due to drug diversion (Janssen and Zhang 2023), and the increases in pharmacy closures that we detect are concentrated among these standalone establishments. Additionally, we are unable to identify which specific aspects of state pill mill laws, or their subsequent enforcement, resulted in changes in retail pharmacy outcomes. Finally, we do not know the extent to which the reduction in revenue for retail pharmacies was replaced with revenue increases for those supplying prescription opioid alternatives, such as heroin and fentanyl. However, prior evidence has connected changes in prescription opioid access to changes in the illicit drug market (Mallatt 2022). Despite these limitations, this study offers important new evidence on how firms are affected by government efforts to limit the supply of their products.

6. REFERENCES

Act 128, 2013 Biennium, 2013 Regular Session (Georgia 2013). https://www.legis.ga.gov/api/document/docs/default-source/general-statutes/13sumdoc.pdf?sfvrsn=2df8a369_2.

Act 265, 2015 Biennium, 2015 Regular Session (Wisconsin 2015). https://docs.legis.wisconsin.gov/2015/related/acts/265.pdf.

Adda, Jérôme, Samuel Berlinski, and Stephen Machin (2012). "Market Regulation and Firm Performance: The Case of Smoking Bans in the United Kingdom," *Journal of Law and Economics,* 55(2): 365-391.

Aliprantis, Dionissi, Kyle Fee, and Mark E. Schweitzer (2023). "Opioids and the Labor Market," *Labour Economics*, 85: 102446.

Alpert, Abby E., David Powell, and Rosalie Liccardo Pacula (2018). "Supply-Side Drug Policy in the Presence of Substitutes: Evidence from the Introduction of Abuse-Deterrent Opioids," *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* 10(4): 1-35.

Alpert, Abby E., Bill Evans, Ethan Lieber, and David Powell (2022). "Origins of the Opioid Crisis and Its Enduring Impacts," *Quarterly Journal of Economics,* 137(2): 1139-1179.

Alpert, Abby, Sarah Dykstra, and Mireille Jacobson (2024). "Hassle Costs Versus Information: How Do Prescription Drug Monitoring Programs Reduce Opioid Prescribing?" *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 16(1): 87-123.

Balestra, Simone, Helge Liebert, Nicole Maestas, and Tisamarie B. Sherry (2021). "Behavioral Responses to Supply-Side Drug Policy During the Opioid Epidemic," *NBER Working Paper No*. 29596.

Barnatchez, Keith, Leland Dod Crane, and Ryan Decker (2017). "An Assessment of the National Establishment Time Series (NETS) Database," Finance and Economics Discussion Series 2017-110. Washington: Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Accessed at: https://doi.org/10.17016/FEDS.2017.110.

Beheshti, David (forthcoming). "The Impact of Opioids on the Labor Market: Evidence from Drug Rescheduling," *Journal of Human Resources,* forthcoming. Accessed at: https://doi.org/10.3368/jhr.0320-10762R1.

Beheshti, David (2019). "Adverse Health Effects of Abuse-Deterrent Opioids: Evidence from the Reformulation of OxyContin," *Health Economics,* 28(12): 1449-1461.

Bertrand, Marianne, Esther Duflo, and Sendil Mullainathan (2004). "How Much Should We Trust Difference-in-Differences Estimators?" *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 119(1): 249-275.

Borusyak, Kirill, Xavier Jaravel, and Jann Speiss (Forthcoming). "Revisiting Event Study Designs: Robust and Efficient Estimation," *The Review of Economic Studies*.

Bowblis, John R. (2011). "Ownership Conversion and Closure in the Nursing Home Industry," *Health Economics*, 20(6): 631-644.

Buchmueller, Thomas C. and Colleen Carey (2018). "The Effect of Prescription Drug Monitoring Programs on Opioid Utilization in Medicare," *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 10(1): 77-112.

Buchmueller, Thomas C., Colleen M. Carey, and Giacomo Meille (2020). "How Well Do Doctors Know Their Patients? Evidence from a Mandatory Access Prescription Drug Monitoring Program," *Health Economics*, 29(9): 957-974.

Butters, R. Andrew, Daniel W. Sacks, and Boyoung Seo (2022). "How Do National Firms Respond to Local Cost Shocks?" *American Economic Review*, 112(5): 1737-1772.

Callaway, Brantly, and Pedro H.C. Sant'Anna (2021). "Difference-in-Differences with Multiple Time Periods," *Journal of Econometrics*, 225(2): 200-230.

Carpenter, Christopher S., Brandyn F. Churchill, and Michelle M. Marcus (2023). "Bad Lighting: Effects of Youth Indoor Tanning Prohibitions," *Journal of Health Economics*, 88: 102738.

Carpenter, Christopher S. and Carlos Dobkin (2009). "The Effect of Alcohol Consumption on Mortality: Regression Discontinuity Evidence from the Minimum Drinking Age," *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 1(1): 164-182.

Carpenter, Christopher S. and Carlos Dobkin (2011). "The Minimum Legal Drinking Age and Public Health," *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 25(2): 133-156.

Cawley, John, David Frisvold, Anna Hill, and David Jones (2019). "The Impact of the Philadelphia Beverage Tax on Purchases and Consumption by Adults and Children," *Journal of Health Economics*, 67: 10225.

Chang, Hsien-Yen, Tatyana Lyapustina, Lainie Rutkow, Matthew Daubresse, Matt Richey, Mark Faul, Elizabeth A. Stuart, and G. Caleb Alexander (2016). "Impact of Prescription Drug Monitoring Programs and Pill Mill Laws on High-Risk Opioid Prescribers: A Comparative Interrupted Time Series Analysis," *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 165:1-8.

Conlon, Christopher and Nirupama L. Rao (2023). "The Cost of Curbing Externalities with Market Power: Alcohol Regulations and Tax Alternatives," NBER Working Paper No. 30896.

Cornelsen, Laura and Charles Normand (2012). "Impact of the Smoking Ban on the Volume of Bar Sales in Ireland – Evidence from Time Series Analysis," *Health Economics*, 21(5): 551-561.

de Chaisemartin, Clément and Xavier D'Haultfeuille (2020). "Two-Way Fixed Effects Estimators with Heterogeneous Treatment Effects," *American Economic Review*, 110(9): 2964-2996.

DeCicca, Philip, Donald Kenkel, and Michael F. Lovenheim (2022). "The Economics of Tobacco Regulation: A Comprehensive Review," *Journal of Economic Literature*, 60(3): 883-970.

Dee, Thomas S., David Grabowski, and Michael A. Morrisey (2005). "Graduated Driver Licensing and Teen Traffic Fatalities," *Journal of Health Economics*, 24(3): 571-589.

Deiana, Claudio and Ludovica Giua (2021). "The Intended and Unintended Effects of Opioid Policies on Prescription Opioids and Crime," *B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy*, 21(2): 751-792.

Depew, Briggs and Isaac Swensen (2022). "The Effect of Concealed-Carry and Handgun Restrictions on Gun-Related Deaths: Evidence from the Sullivan Act of 1911," *Economic Journal*, 132(646): 2118-2140.

Dickson, Alex, Markus Gehrsitz, and Jonathan Kemp (forthcoming). "Does a Spoonful of Sugar Levy Help the Calories Go Down? An Analysis of the UK Soft Drink Industry Levy," *Review of Economics and Statistics*, forthcoming, Accessed at: https://doi.org/10.1162/rest_a_01345.

Dobkin, Carlos and Nancy Nicosia (2009). "The War on Drugs: Methamphetamine, Public Health, and Crime," *American Economic Review*, 99(1): 324-349.

Dobkin, Carlos, Nancy Nicosia, and Matthew Weinberg (2014). "Are Supply-Side Drug Control Efforts Effective? Evaluating OTC Regulations Targeting Methamphetamine Precursors," *Journal of Public Economics*, 120: 48-61.

Donahoe, J. Travis (2024). "Supplier Enforcement and the Opioid Crisis," Working Paper, Accessed at: https://static1.squarespace.com/static/632f3a2e33b0e9116c23e95a/t/660c28dda996cc5781ba1336/1712072926680/Supplier+Enforcement.pdf (October 23rd, 2024).

Evans, William N., Ethan M.J. Lieber, and Patrick Power (2019). "How the Reformulation of OxyContin Ignited the Heroin Epidemic," *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 10(1): 1-15.

Goodman-Bacon, Andrew (2021). "Difference-in-Differences with Variation in Treatment Timing," *Journal of Econometrics*, 225(2): 254-277.

Guadamuz, Jenny S., G. Caleb Alexander, Shannon N. Zenk, and Dima M. Qato (2020). "Assessment of Pharmacy Closures in the United States from 2009 Through 2015," *JAMA Internal Medicine*, 180(1): 157-160.

Hansen, Benjamin, Joseph J. Sabia, Drew McNichols, and Calvin Bryan (2023). "Do Tobacco 21 Laws Work?" *Journal of Health Economics*, 92: 102818.

Harrison, Teresa D. (2007). "Consolidations and Closures: An Empirical Analysis of Exits from the Hospital Industry," *Health Economics*, 16(5): 457-474.

Hollingsworth, Alex, Coady Wing, and Ashley Bradford (2022). "Comparative Effects of Medical and Recreational Marijuana Laws on Drug Use Among Adults and Adolescents," *Journal of Law and Economics*, 65(3): 515-554.

Janssen, Aljoscha and Xuan Zhang (2023). "Retail Pharmacies and Drug Diversion During the Opioid Epidemic," *American Economic Review*, 113(1): 1-33.

Kaestner, Robert, and Engy Ziedan (2023). "Effects of Prescription Opioids on Employment, Earnings, Marriage, Disability, and Mortality: Evidence from State Opioid Control Policies," *Labour Economics*, 82: 102358.

Kim, Bokyung (2021). "Must-Access Prescription Drug Monitoring Programs and the Opioid Overdose Epidemic: The Unintended Consequences," *Journal of Health Economics*, 75: 102408.

Kim, Bokyung, Minseog Kim, and Geunyong Park (2024). "The Opioid Crisis and Firm Skill Demand: Evidence from Job Posting Data," Working Paper, Accessed at: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4825126.

Knight, Brian (2013). "State Gun Policy and Cross-State Externalities: Evidence from Crime Gun Tracing," *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 5(4): 200-229.

Kolko, Jed (2012). "Broadband and Local Growth," *Journal of Urban Economics*, 71(1): 100-113.

Langford, W. Scott and Maryann P. Feldman (forthcoming). "We're Not in Dreamland Anymore: The Consequences of Community Opioid Use on Local Industrial Composition," *Journal of Regional Science*, forthcoming. Accessed at: https://doi.org/10.1111/jors.12727.

Lyapustina, Tatyana, Lainie Rutkow, Hsien-Yen Chang, Matthew Daubresse, Alim F. Ramji, Mark Faul, Elizabeth A. Stuart, and G. Caleb Alexander (2016). "Effect of a "Pill Mill" Law on Opioid Prescribing and Utilization: The Case of Texas," *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 159: 190-197.

Maclean, Johanna Catherine, Justine Mallatt, Christopher J. Ruhm, and Kosali Simon (2021). "Economic Studies on the Opioid Crisis: Costs, Causes, and Policy Responses," *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Economics and Finance*.

Mallatt, Justine (2017). "The Effect of Supply-Side Opioid Legislation on Opioid-Related Business Establishments," Working Paper, Accessed at: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Odj8isoMU-F7uWC_rJkKjOmUv8jjiUWY/view

Mallatt, Justine (2022). "Policy-Induced Substitution to Illicit Drugs and Implications for Law Enforcement Activity," *American Journal of Health Economics*, 8(1): 30-64.

Meinhofer, Angélica (2018). "Prescription Drug Monitoring Programs: The Role of Asymmetric Information on Drug Availability and Abuse," *American Journal of Health Economics*, 4(4):

National Center for Health Statistics (2023). "Drug Overdose Deaths," Accessed at: https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/hus/topics/drug-overdose-deaths.htm (October 3rd, 2024).

Neumark, David and Jed Kolko (2010). "Do Enterprise Zones Create Jobs? Evidence from California's Enterprise Zone Program," *Journal of Urban Economics*, 68(1): 1-19.

Neumark, David and Bogdan Savych (2023). "Effects of Opioid-Related Policies on Opioid Utilization, Nature of Medical Care, and Duration of Disability," *American Journal of Health Economics*, 9(3): 331-373.

Neumark, David, Brandon Wall, and Junfu Zhang (2011). "Do Small Businesses Create More Jobs? New Evidence for the United States from the National Establishment Time Series," *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 93(1): 16-29.

Neumark, David, Junfu Zhang, and Brandon Wall (2005). "Employment Dynamics and Business Relocation: New Evidence from the National Establishment Time Series," NBER Working Paper No. 11647.

Nguyen, Thuy D., W. David Bradford, and Kosali I. Simon (2019). "How Do Opioid Prescribing Restrictions Affect Pharmaceutical Promotion? Lessons from the Mandatory Access Prescription Drug Monitoring Programs," NBER Working Paper No. 26356.

Orrenius, Pia M., Madeline Zavodny, and Alexander T. Abraham (2020). "The Effect of Immigration on Business Dynamics and Employment," *FRB of Dallas Working Paper* No. 2004.

Postma, Jeroen and Anne-Fleur Roos (2015). "Why Healthcare Providers Merge," *Health Economics, Policy, and Law*, 11(2): 121-140.

Powell, David, Rosalie Liccardo Pacula, and Mireille Jacobson (2018). "Do Medical Marijuana Laws Reduce Addictions and Deaths Related to Pain Killers?" *Journal of Health Economics*, 58: 29-42.

Public Act 257, 2013 Biennium, 2013 Regular Session (Alabama 2013). https://alison.legislature.state.al.us/summaries-2013-general-acts#act2013257

Responsibility in Drug Advertising Act of 2024, S. 4785, 118th Congress, (2024). https://www.congress.gov/bill/118th-congress/senate-bill/4785

Rietveld, Cornelius A. and Pankaj C. Patel (2021). "Prescription Opioids and New Business Establishments," *Small Business Economics*, 57: 1175-1199.

Ruhm, Christopher J. (2019). "Drivers of the Fatal Drug Epidemic," *Journal of Health Economics*, 64: 25-42.

Rutkow, Lainie, Hsien-Yen Chang, Matthew Daubresse, Daniel W. Webster, Elizabeth A. Stuart, and G. Caleb Alexander (2015). "Effect of Florida's Prescription Drug Monitoring Program and Pill Mill Laws on Opioid Prescribing and Use," *JAMA Internal Medicine*, 175(10): 1642-1649.

Sacks, Daniel W., Alex Hollingsworth, Thuy Nguyen, and Kosali Simon (2021). "Can Policy Affect Initiation of Addictive Substance Use? Evidence from Opioid Prescribing," *Journal of Health Economics*, 76: 102397.

Senate Enrolled Act 246, 2013 Biennium, 2013 Regular Session (Indiana 2013). https://archive.iga.in.gov/2013/bills/SE/SE0246.1.html

Shakya, Shishir and Collin Hodges (2022). "Must-Access Prescription Drug Monitoring Programs and Retail Opioid Sales," *Contemporary Economic Policy*, 41(1): 146-165.

Sun, Liyang, and Sarah Abraham (2021). "Estimating Dynamic Treatment Effects in Event Studies with Heterogeneous Treatment Effects," *Journal of Econometrics*, 225(2): 175-199.

Town, Robert J., Douglas Wholey, Roger Feldman, and Lawton R. Burns (2007). "Revisiting the Relationship Between Managed Care and Hospital Consolidation," *Health Services Research*, 42(1): 219-238.


Ukert, Benjamin and Daniel Polsky (2023). "How Do "Must-Access" Prescription Drug Monitoring Programs Address Opioid Misuse?" *American Journal of Health Economics*, 9(3):

Wang, Lucy Xiaolu, and Nathan W. Chan (2024). "Legalization and Innovation in the Cannabis Market," Working Paper, Accessed at: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4373615 (October 23rd, 2024).


Wollmann, Thomas G. (2020). "How to Get Away with Merger: Stealth Consolidation and Its Effects on US Healthcare," NBER Working Paper No. 27274.

Ziedan, Engy and Robert Kaestner (2024). "Effect of Prescription Opioid Control Policies on Infant Health," *Southern Economic Journal*, 90: 828-877.

Figure 1: Spatial and Temporal Variation in State Pill Mill Laws




(A) States with a Pill Mill Law




(B) Year of Pill Mill Law Adoption

Source: National Establishment Time-Series, 2000-2018
Note: Panel A denotes whether states did (darker shading) or did not (white) adopt pill mill laws during our sample period. Panel B shows when these laws were adopted.

Figure 2: Pharmacy Sales and Employment Fell Following the Adoption of a State Pill Mill Law




(A) Pharmacy Sales




(B) Pharmacy Employees

Source: National Establishment Time-Series, 2000-2018
Note: The dependent variable in Panel A is the natural log of the real value of annual sales, while the dependent variable in Panel B is the natural log of the number of employees. The figures plot the estimates from the event study specification, shown in equation (1). The circle markers denote the point estimates and the vertical bars the 95 percent confidence intervals. Standard errors are clustered at the state level.

Figure 3: Pharmacy Closures Increased Following the Adoption of a State Pill Mill Law



(A) Pharmacy Openings



(B) Pharmacy Closings

Source: National Establishment Time-Series, 2000-2018
Note: The dependent variable in Panel A is the natural log of the number of county-level pharmacy openings + 1, while the dependent variable in Panel B is the natural log of the number of county-level pharmacy closings + 1. The figures plot the estimates from the event study specification, shown in equation (1). The circle markers denote the point estimates and the vertical bars the 95 percent confidence intervals. Standard errors are clustered at the state level.

Table 1: Pill Mill Law Effective Dates

State	Effective Date
Alabama	May 2013
Florida	July 2011
Georgia	July 2013
Indiana	January 2014
Kentucky	July 2011
Louisiana	July 2005
Mississippi	September 2011
Ohio	May 2011
Tennessee	January 2012
Texas	June 2009
West Virginia	September 2014
Wisconsin	March 2016

Sources: Mallatt (2020), 2013 Alabama Public Act 257, 2013 Georgia Act 128, 2013 Indiana Senate Enrolled Act 246, and 2015 Wisconsin Act 265.

Table 2: Summary Statistics

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Sample →	All States	States Adopting a Pill Mill Law 2000-2018	States Not Adopting a Pill Mill Law 2000-2018	Test Whether Column 2 = Column 3
Panel A: Establishment-Level Outcomes				
Annual Sales	$3,597,599	$3,283,651	$3,765,428	t = 20.84
	($11,818,771)	($10,777,904)	($12,335,962)	p < 0.001
Employees	13.14	12.28	13.60	t = 15.81
	(42.73)	(40.76)	(43.74)	p < 0.001
Observations	1,150,789	400,882	749,907	1,150,789
Panel B: County-Level Outcomes				
Openings	1.44	1.36	1.49	t = 2.32
	(6.74)	(6.29)	(7.00)	p = 0.02
Closings	1.02	1.05	0.99	t = 1.64
	(4.70)	(4.74)	(4.63)	p = 0.10
Observations	59,668	23,085	36,583	59,668

Source: National Establishment Time-Series, 2000-2018

Note: Panel A reports the average value of annual sales and the number of employees at the establishment level. Panel B reports the average number of pharmacy openings and closings at the county level. Standard deviations are reported in parentheses. Column 1 reports the statistics for all states, column 2 limits the sample to states which adopted a pill mill law during the sample period, and column 3 limits the sample to states which did not adopt a pill mill law during the sample period. Finally, column 4 reports t-statistics and the corresponding p-values from testing whether the values in columns 2 and 3 are equal.

Table 3: State Pill Mill Laws Were Associated with Reductions in Pharmacy Sales and Employment

	(1)	(2)
Outcome is →	ln(Sales)	ln(Employees)
Panel A: Event Study Estimates		
5 Years Before	-0.010	-0.007
	(0.016)	(0.015)
4 Years Before	-0.009	-0.007
	(0.020)	(0.018)
3 Years Before	0.002	0.001
	(0.031)	(0.028)
2 Years Before	0.012	0.011
	(0.028)	(0.027)
1 Year Before	0.001	0.008
	(0.028)	(0.027)
Policy Change	-0.024	-0.014
	(0.017)	(0.012)
1 Year After	-0.051**	-0.031*
	(0.023)	(0.016)
2 Years After	-0.058**	-0.036**
	(0.025)	(0.017)
Panel B: Static Difference-in-Differences		
Pill Mill Law	-0.051**	-0.018
	(0.021)	(0.014)
Observations	1,150,789	1,150,789

Source: National Establishment Time-Series, 2000-2018

Note: The dependent variable in column 1 is the natural log of the real value of annual sales, while the dependent variable in column 2 is the natural log of the number of employees. Panel A reports the estimates from the event study specification, shown in equation (1), while Panel B reports the estimates from the static difference-in-differences specification, shown in equation (2). Standard errors, shown in parentheses, are clustered at the state level.

*** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.10$

Table 4: The Relationships Are Robust to Additional Controls for Spatial Heterogeneity, Sample Restrictions, and Estimation Strategies

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Specification →	Baseline	(1) + Census Region-by-Year Fixed Effects	(1) + Census Division-by-Year Fixed Effects	(1) Excluding the Smallest and Largest Establishments	(1) Using a Two-Way Fixed Effects Estimator
Panel A: Dependent Variable is ln(Sales)					
Pill Mill Law	-0.051**	-0.059***	-0.070***	-0.054**	-0.037*
	(0.021)	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.021)	(0.019)
Observations	1,150,789	1,150,789	1,150,789	1,016,333	1,150,789
Panel B: Dependent Variable is ln(Employees)					
Pill Mill Law	-0.018	-0.014	-0.041**	-0.022*	-0.017
	(0.014)	(0.018)	(0.017)	(0.012)	(0.013)
Observations	1,150,789	1,150,789	1,150,789	1,016,333	1,150,789

Source: National Establishment Time-Series, 2000-2018

Note: The dependent variable in Panel A is the natural log of the real value of annual sales, while the dependent variable in Panel B is the natural log of the number of employees. Column 1 reports the estimates from the static difference-in-differences specification, shown in equation (2). Column 2 augments this specification with Census region-by-year fixed effects, and column 3 augments the specification with Census division-by-year fixed effects. Column 4 excludes establishments in the bottom and top five percent based on employment. Finally, column 5 uses a two-way fixed effects estimator. Standard errors, shown in parentheses, are clustered at the state level.

*** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.10$

Table 5: Alternative Levels of Fixed Effects Indicate the Reductions Were Due to Changes at the Extensive Margin

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	ln(Sales)	ln(Employees)	ln(Sales)	ln(Employees)	ln(Sales)	ln(Employees)
Pill Mill Law	-0.051**	-0.018	-0.055***	-0.021*	0.012	0.013***
	(0.021)	(0.014)	(0.020)	(0.013)	(0.014)	(0.004)
Observations	1,150,789	1,150,789	1,150,789	1,150,789	1,150,789	1,150,789
Drug Policy Controls?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Business Cycle Controls?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Demographic Controls?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
State & Year FE	Y	Y				
County & Year FE?			Y	Y		
Establishment & Year FE?					Y	Y

Source: National Establishment Time-Series, 2000-2018

Note: The dependent variable in the odd numbered columns is the natural log of the real value of annual sales, while the dependent variable in the even numbered columns is the natural log of the number of employees. Columns 1 and 2 use the difference-in-differences specification from equation (2) that includes state fixed effects, year fixed effects, and additional state- and county-level time-varying covariates. Columns 3 and 4 replace the state fixed effects with county fixed effects. Finally, columns 5 and 6 replace the county fixed effects with establishment-level fixed effects, such that the relationships are identified off within establishment changes over time. Standard errors, shown in parentheses, are clustered at the state level.

*** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.10$

Table 6: State Pill Mill Laws Were Associated with Increases in Pharmacy Closures

	(1)	(2)
Outcome is →	ln(Openings)	ln(Closures)
Panel A: Event Study Estimates		
5 Years Before	-0.009	0.005
	(0.026)	(0.014)
4 Years Before	-0.004	-0.006
	(0.020)	(0.014)
3 Years Before	-0.017	-0.023
	(0.022)	(0.024)
2 Years Before	-0.027	0.043*
	(0.019)	(0.026)
1 Year Before	0.003	-0.007
	(0.031)	(0.017)
Policy Change	-0.028	0.025*
	(0.018)	(0.014)
1 Year After	-0.002	0.028*
	(0.013)	(0.016)
2 Years After	0.002	0.076**
	(0.021)	(0.032)
Panel B: Static Difference-in-Differences		
Pill Mill Law	0.001	0.058***
	(0.015)	(0.016)
Observations	59,668	59,668

Source: National Establishment Time-Series, 2000-2018

Note: The dependent variable in column 1 is the natural log of the number of county-level pharmacy openings + 1, while the dependent variable in column 2 is the natural log of the number of county-level pharmacy closings + 1. Panel A reports the estimates from the event study specification, shown in equation (1), while Panel B reports the estimates from the static difference-in-differences specification, shown in equation (2). Standard errors, shown in parentheses, are clustered at the state level.

*** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.10$

Table 7: State Pill Mill Laws Were Associated with Increases in Closures of Standalone Establishments

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Standalone Pharmacies		Non-Standalone Pharmacies	
	ln(Openings)	ln(Closings)	ln(Openings)	ln(Closings)
Pill Mill Law	0.004	0.069***	0.002	-0.011
	(0.011)	(0.016)	(0.015)	(0.013)
Observations	59,668	59,668	59,668	59,668


Source: National Establishment Time-Series, 2000-2018

Note: The dependent variable in column 1 is the natural log of the number of county-level standalone pharmacy openings + 1, the dependent variable in column 2 is the natural log of the number of county-level standalone pharmacy closings + 1, the dependent variable in column 3 is the natural log of the number of county-level non-standalone pharmacy openings + 1, and the dependent variable in column 4 is the natural log of the number of county-level non-standalone pharmacy closings + 1. The estimates are obtained using the difference-in-differences specification, shown in equation (2). Standard errors, shown in parentheses, are clustered at the state level.


*** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.10$

7. APPENDIX

Appendix Figure 1: The Relationship Between State Pill Mill Laws and Pharmacy Sales and Employment When Iteratively Excluding Each Treated State



(A)




(B)


Source: National Establishment Time-Series, 2000-2018

Note: The dependent variable in Panel A is the natural log of the real value of pharmacy sales, and the dependent variable in Panel B is the natural log of the number of employees. The figures plot the estimates from the static difference-in-differences, shown in equation (2). The circle markers denote the point estimates and the vertical bars the 95 percent confidence intervals. Each regression is obtained by excluding one of the treated states, shown on the horizontal axis. Standard errors are clustered at the state level.

Appendix Figure 2: The Relationship Between State Pill Mill Laws and Pharmacy Openings and Closings When Iteratively Excluding Each Treated State



(A)



(B)

Source: National Establishment Time-Series, 2000-2018

Note: The dependent variable in Panel A is the natural log of the number of county-level pharmacy openings, and the dependent variable in Panel B is the natural log of the number of county-level pharmacy closings. The figures plot the estimates from the static difference-in-differences, shown in equation (2). The circle markers denote the point estimates and the vertical bars the 95 percent confidence intervals. Each regression is obtained by excluding one of the treated states, shown on the horizontal axis. Standard errors are clustered at the state level.

Appendix Table 1: Summary Statistics for the Covariates

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Sample →	All States	States Adopting a Pill Mill Law 2000-2018	States Not Adopting a Pill Mill Law 2000-2018
Any PDMP	0.808 (0.394)	0.769 (0.422)	0.828 (0.377)
Must Access PDMP	0.112 (0.315)	0.112 (0.316)	0.111 (0.315)
Medical Marijuana Law	0.331 (0.471)	0.070 (0.256)	0.471 (0.499)
Recreational Marijuana Law	0.041 (0.198)	0.000 -	0.027 (0.162)
Active Medical Dispensaries	0.233 (0.423)	0.042 (0.201)	0.117 (0.072)
Active Recreational Dispensaries	0.018 (0.132)	0.000 -	0.027 (0.162)
Unemployment Rate	6.114 (2.077)	6.108 (1.950)	6.117 (2.142)
ln(Unemployment Claims)	13.157 (0.996)	13.047 (0.660)	13.215 (1.131)
ln(Residential Permits)	15.574 (1.066)	15.839 (1.126)	15.432 (1.004)
ln(State Product Per Capita)	10.955 (0.184)	10.849 (0.131)	11.012 (0.183)
ln(Minimum Wage)	2.061 (0.117)	2.009 (0.076)	2.089 (0.125)
Percent Black	0.136 (0.081)	0.171 (0.086)	0.117 (0.072)
Percent Hispanic	0.151 (0.122)	0.151 (0.135)	0.152 (0.115)
ln(County Population)	12.804 (1.689)	12.465 (1.619)	12.985 (1.697)

Appendix Table 2: Robustness Tests Excluding the Largest and Smallest Establishments

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Outcome →	ln(Sales)		ln(Employees)	
Restriction →	Excluding the Top and Bottom 5%	Excluding the Top and Bottom 10%	Excluding the Top and Bottom 5%	Excluding the Top and Bottom 10%
Pill Mill Law	-0.054**	-0.060***	-0.022*	-0.030**
	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.012)	(0.012)
Observations	954,973	853,639	954,973	853,639

Source: National Establishment Time-Series, 2000-2018

Note: The dependent variable in columns 1 and 2 is the natural log of the real value of annual sales, while the dependent variable in columns 3 and 4 is the natural log of the number of employees. The estimates are obtained using the static difference-in-differences specification, shown in equation (2). Columns 1 and 3 exclude establishments in the bottom and top five percent based on employment. Columns 2 and 4 exclude establishments in the bottom and top 10 percent based on employment. Standard errors, shown in parentheses, are clustered at the state level.

*** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.10$

Appendix Table 3: Robustness Tests Examining the Effects of State Pill Mill Laws on Pharmacy Openings and Closings

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Specification →	Baseline	(1) + Census Region-by-Year Fixed Effects	(1) + Census Division-by-Year Fixed Effects	(1) Using a Two-Way Fixed Effects Estimator
Panel A: Dependent Variable is ln(Openings)				
Pill Mill Law	0.001	-0.004	-0.004	-0.005
	(0.015)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.013)
Observations	59,668	59,668	59,668	59,668
Panel B: Dependent Variable is ln(Closures)				
Pill Mill Law	0.058***	0.041**	0.021	0.045**
	(0.016)	(0.020)	(0.015)	(0.019)
Observations	59,668	59,668	59,668	59,668

Source: National Establishment Time-Series, 2000-2018

Note: The dependent variable in Panel A is the natural log of the number of county-level pharmacy openings, and the dependent variable in Panel B is the natural log of the number of county-level pharmacy closures. Column 1 reports the estimates from the static difference-in-differences specification, shown in equation (2). Column 2 augments this specification with Census region-by-year fixed effects, and column 3 augments the specification with Census division-by-year fixed effects. Finally, column 4 uses a two-way fixed effects estimator. Standard errors, shown in parentheses, are clustered at the state level.

*** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.10$

Appendix Table 4: The Relationship Between State Pill Mill Laws and Pharmacy Openings and Closings is Robust to More Granular Fixed Effects and Alternative Ways of Measuring the Dependent Variable

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Standalone Pharmacies		Non-Standalone Pharmacies	
	ln(Openings)	ln(Closings)	ln(Openings)	ln(Closings)
Panel A: Replace State Fixed Effects with County Fixed Effects				
Pill Mill Law	0.003	0.068***	0.002	-0.011
	(0.011)	(0.015)	(0.014)	(0.012)
Observations	59,668	59,668	59,668	59,668
Panel B: Replace the Natural Log with the Inverse Hyperbolic Sine				
Pill Mill Law	0.004	0.087***	0.002	-0.014
	(0.013)	(0.019)	(0.018)	(0.016)
Observations	59,668	59,668	59,668	56,526
Panel C: Replace the Natural Log with the Rate per 100,000				
Pill Mill Law	0.021	0.325***	-0.003	-0.021
	(0.050)	(0.046)	(0.027)	(0.024)
Observations	59,668	59,668	59,668	59,668

Source: National Establishment Time-Series, 2000-2018

Note: The dependent variable in column 1 is the natural log of the number of county-level standalone pharmacy openings. The dependent variable in column 2 is the natural log of the number of county-level standalone pharmacy closings. The dependent variable in column 3 is the natural log of the number of county-level non-standalone pharmacy openings. The dependent variable in column 4 is the natural log of the number of county-level non-standalone pharmacy closings. The estimates are obtained using the difference-in-differences specification from equation (2). Panel A replaces the state fixed effects with county fixed effects. Panel B replaces the dependent variables with the inverse hyperbolic sine of the outcomes. Panel C replaces the dependent variables with the rate of openings and closings per 100,000. Standard errors, shown in parentheses, are clustered at the state level.

*** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.10$

Appendix Table 5: State Pill Mill Laws Were Inconclusively Related to Changes in Sales and Employment When Separately Examining Standalone and Non-Standalone Pharmacies

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Standalone Pharmacies		Non-Standalone Pharmacies	
	ln(Sales)	ln(Employees)	ln(Sales)	ln(Employees)
Panel A: State FE, Year FE, and Additional Covariates				
Pill Mill Law	0.006	0.017	0.004	0.015
	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.023)	(0.019)
Observations	636,056	636,056	514,733	514,733
Panel B: County FE, Year FE, and Additional Covariates				
Pill Mill Law	0.006	0.015	0.005	0.016
	(0.013)	(0.012)	(0.023)	(0.018)
Observations	636,056	636,056	514,733	514,733
Panel C: Establishment FE, Year FE, and Additional Covariates				
Pill Mill Law	0.016***	0.024***	0.007	0.001
	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.019)	(0.006)
Observations	636,056	636,056	514,733	514,733

Source: National Establishment Time-Series, 2000-2018

Note: The dependent variable in columns 1 and 3 is the natural log of the real value of annual sales, while the dependent variable in columns 2 and 4 is the natural log of the number of employees. Columns 1 and 2 limit the sample to standalone establishments, while columns 3 and 4 limit the sample to non-standalone establishments. The estimates in Panel A are obtained using the difference-in-differences specification in equation (2). Panel B augments this specification with county fixed effects, and Panel C further includes establishment fixed effects. Standard errors, shown in parentheses, are clustered at the state level.

*** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.10$