

Opioid Use in Canada: Preventing Overdose with Education Programs & Naloxone Distribution

March 2016

Opioid use in Canada

This document introduces the challenges related to opioids and their prescribed and non-prescribed use in Canada. It presents some recent overdose data and common risk and protective factors. It also briefly outlines naloxone prevention and education programs and presents the evidence for their efficacy in lowering opioid overdose rates.

OVERVIEW

Opioids are a class of drugs that include heroin, opium, and pharmaceutical pain killers such as codeine, fentanyl, hydrocodone, hydromorphone, methadone, buprenorphine, and oxycodone. Pharmaceutical opioids (POs) are increasingly used in both prescribed and non-prescribed ways, both of which can lead to overdoses that cause long term effects or death. Canada is the second-largest per capita consumer of prescribed POs (International Narcotics Control Board, 2013). Almost 15% of Canadians aged 15 and up used POs in 2013 (Health Canada, 2015).

From 2000 to 2004, the recorded use of prescribed opioids in Canada increased by 50% (Fischer, Rehm, Goldman, & Popova, 2008).

Data on non-prescribed opioid use¹ are difficult to collect. The illegal nature of drug use drives it underground and marginalizes those who use drugs. This impacts the ability to collect valid, consistent data (Gustafson, Goodyear, & Keough, 2008). Nevertheless, estimates are available. There are approximately 15.5 million opioid-dependent people worldwide (Degenhardt et al., 2014). In Canada, there are an estimated 321,000 to 914,000 non-prescribed PO users in

the general population and 72,000 consumers of non-prescribed POs and/or heroin among the street-drug using population (Popova, Patra, Mohapatra, Fischer, & Rehm, 2009). Non-prescribed POs are increasingly the most commonly injected drug in most parts of the country (Fischer & Rehm, 2007; Fischer, Patra, Firestone-Cruz, Gittins, & Rehm, 2008).

While there are no national data on opioid overdose deaths, some provinces have surveillance statistics. In British Columbia, PO overdoses accounted for 438 deaths between 2005 and 2010 (Chief Coroner, 2013). Between 2005 and 2009, there were 152 opioid-related deaths in Québec, making opioids the most common substance involved in all medication and drug overdose deaths during that period (41% of total drug-related deaths). Of those 152 deaths, 91% involved POs and 9% involved heroin (Gagné et al., 2013). In Ontario, a total of 3406 opioid-related deaths occurred between 1991 and 2004, during which time the rate doubled (Fischer, Jones, & Rehm, 2013).

It is noteworthy that among the deaths in Ontario, the majority occurred in individuals who had sought medical care for pain or who had received a mental health diagnosis within the four weeks prior their deaths. Similarly, a study conducted in Victoria and Toronto showed that most opioid users were introduced to the substance via a legitimate personal prescription (Fischer et al., 2009). It is often difficult to draw clear distinctions between medical and non-medical uses. A sizeable portion of those who use opioids without a prescription nevertheless do so to manage various forms of pain, and overdose can occur among those who hold a prescription as well (Zacny & Lichtor, 2008; Colliver & Gfroerer, 2008).

¹ Terminology is imperfect: in this document we refer to opioid drugs (both legally made and counterfeited) as *pharmaceutical opioids*. When such drugs are used by an individual in doses as prescribed by a physician, we refer to that as *prescribed use*; when they are consumed not as prescribed, either through non-prescribed doses or consumption modes, or by someone who was not prescribed the drug, we refer to that as *non-prescribed use*. For data that count the two forms of use together, we use the term *opioid-related*. However, sometimes these lines are blurry and can be difficult to distinguish.

Of those who do not hold a prescription, a variety of avenues are used to access opioids. In a study of Toronto opioid users, 37% reported receiving opioids solely from physician prescriptions, 26% from both a prescription and street dealings, and 21% from the street only (Sproule, Brands, Li, & Catz-Biro, 2009). Common PO sourcing tactics include diverting opioids from medical sources (known as ‘doctor-shopping’, ‘double doctoring’ or ‘over-scripting’), committing theft and robbery, using Internet sources, and buying from traditional drug dealers (Fischer et al., 2008; Fischer et al., 2009). Due to their ubiquity, however, many people can obtain POs, with or without express permission, from family, friends and acquaintances who do hold prescriptions. A study of youth in grades 7-12 in Ontario found that 14% had used POs non-medically at least once in the past year, coming in third only behind alcohol (55%) and cannabis (22%). Most (67%) obtained the opioids from someone within the home (Paglia-Boak, Adlaf, & Mann, 2011).

COMMON MORBIDITIES OF NON-FATAL OVERDOSES

The result of an overdose is not always death, but non-fatal overdoses deprive the brain of oxygen for extended periods of time. This can lead to potentially serious health consequences:

- Pulmonary conditions such as oedema and pneumonia (Duberstein & Kaufman, 1971);
- Cardiac complications such as arrhythmia and haemoglobinaemia (Ghuran & Nolan, 2000);
- Muscular problems such as rhabdomyolysis (Crowe, Howse, Bell, & Henry, 2000);
- Neurological disorders and cognitive impairment (Darke, Sims, McDonald, & Wickes, 2000).

OVERDOSE RISK AND PROTECTIVE FACTORS

“We need new medications for opioid addiction, and we need new medications for the treatment of pain that have less adverse affects and are less likely to be diverted” - Dr. Nora Volkow, Director, US National Institute on Drug Abuse (Summit on Heroin and Prescription Drugs: Federal, State, and Community Responses, June 19, 2014, Washington, DC).

Opioid overdose occurs when the brain’s opioid receptors become saturated with the amount of drug in the body, which causes respiratory depression (difficulty breathing). This is a complex phenomenon with biological, social and situational risk and protective factors. A recent systematic review of 47 studies (King, Fraser, Boikos, Richardson, &

Harper, 2014) has identified a number of intertwined factors associated with increased opioid mortality, grouped into three major themes, which are listed here alongside other factors found in additional literature:

Prescriber behaviour

- Higher-volume prescribing: Consumption of prescribed opioids in Canada doubled between 2000 and 2010 (Fischer & Argento, 2012; Kolodny et al., 2015);
- Dosage: Prescribed doses have also increased, and there is evidence of a dose-response relationship between daily prescribed dose and the risk of overdose, with significant risk increase at doses ranging from 40 to 200 mg/day (morphine equivalent), especially at >100mg/day (Bohnert, 2011; Dunn et al., 2010; Gomes, Mamdani, Dhalla, Paterson, & Juurlink, 2011; Gomes, Mamdani, Paterson, Dhalla, & Juurlink, 2014).

User behaviour, characteristics and history

- Behaviour: Polydrug use, especially mixing opioids with benzodiazepines or alcohol; diversion of pharmaceutical opioids to people for whom it was not prescribed, regardless of motive; and doctor/pharmacy shopping: visiting multiple sources to obtain prescriptions are behaviours that are related to opioid overdose (King et al., 2014);
- Characteristics: In general, opioid overdose is higher among white, middle-aged men of lower socioeconomic status in rural areas, but there is also considerable variety amid such patterns depending on time, place, and specific opioid (King et al., 2014);
- History : A history of substance abuse and/or experimentation with prescribed opioids, injecting frequently and/or alone and/or in public increases the risk of opioid-related overdose (Brugal et al., 2002; Fischer et al., 2004; Toronto Public Health, 2012); and having previously experienced a non-fatal overdose also is a factor (Kinner et al., 2012).

Situational, environmental, and systemic determinants

- Guidelines and policies endorsing the expansion of opioid prescription for chronic noncancer pain treatment (King et al., 2014);

Opioid Use in Canada: Preventing Overdose with Education Programs & Naloxone Distribution

- Living in areas of high income inequality and/or with high poverty rates (King et al., 2014);
- Being less educated and/or unemployed (Albert et al., 2011);
- Having been released from prison or detox (Binswanger et al., 2012; Clausen, Anchesen, & Wall, 2008; Wines et al., 2007; Zlodre & Fazel, 2012)
- Working in physical labour and injury-prone jobs (Paulozzi et al., 2012);
- Inadequate housing (Fischer et al., 2005; Pauly, Reist, Belle-Isle, & Schactman, 2013; Shannon, Ishida, Lai, & Tyndall, 2006).

Some suggested protective factors include:

- *Social Characteristics* such as having strong social and socioeconomic support (Binswanger et al., 2012; Williams & Latkin, 2007);
- *Medical Interventions* such as methadone maintenance treatment (Degenhardt et al., 2014), buprenorphine treatment (Bell, Trinh, Butler, Randall, & Rubin, 2009) and buprenorphine/naloxone treatment (Fudula et al., 2003);
- *Health Service Interventions* such as prescription drug monitoring programs (Mello et al., 2013), educating physicians on opioid risk, monitoring opioid patients, and prescribing alternative pain management methods (Kahan, Wilson, Mailis-Gagnon, & Srivastava, 2011), and identifying and dealing with problematic interactions between the pharmaceutical industry and medical training (Persaud, 2013);
- *Preventive Interventions* such as preventing or diverting users away from injection as the mode of consumption (Degenhardt et al., 2011), low-barrier housing (Havinga et al., 2014) and other low-threshold services (Marshall, Milloy, Wood, Montaner, & Kerr, 2011), and naloxone programming (Clark, Wilder, & Winstanley, 2014).

As these risk and protective factors illustrate, opioid use is an extremely complex matter. As such, many avenues can be taken to address its detrimental effects. Some of these avenues are long-term, large-scale projects. They entail cultivating collaborative and intersectoral strategies to address deep, systemic issues such as poverty and social marginalization, institutional norms such as medical protocols and prescribing practices, or market forces such as the pharmaceutical industry. On the other hand, and ideally in tandem with these larger

projects, one can work on a smaller scale to reduce mortality and morbidity through local harm-reduction programs that can be rolled out to suit specific populations. The next section focuses on one such harm reduction approach – naloxone programs – in more detail.

Overdose prevention with education & naloxone distribution

Naloxone, commonly known in Canada by its trade name Narcan®, is an opioid antagonist that can be administered to reverse the physiological effects of opioids. Overdose-related deaths occur through a variety of mechanisms. High doses of opioids may saturate the brain's opioid receptors, causing respiratory depression (difficulty breathing). When opioids are taken with other prescribed or illegal drugs, or with alcohol, they may lead to life-threatening respiratory, neurological, or cardiac abnormalities. These effects may be more severe in people with other underlying health conditions. Naloxone is fast-acting and works by displacing opioids from their receptors and thereby reversing the physiological effects of opioids for about 45 minutes.

Naloxone programs are usually run by health departments and/or not-for-profit groups through hospitals, clinics, pharmacies, prisons, community offices, needle exchanges, or emergency services. They typically consist of training people who use opioids (and their friends and families who may be witnesses to overdoses) about high-risk drug use and ways to reduce risky behaviours (such as by never consuming alone), the signs and symptoms of an overdose, and first response measures including the proper administration of naloxone.

A number of reviews and policy analyses have attested to the safety and efficacy of naloxone programs for decreasing overdose mortalities, which presumably also indicates reductions in overdose-related morbidities. Many call for the expansion of such initiatives, including the Government of Canada, the World Health Organization (WHO), and the United Nations (Ambrose, 2014; Clark et al., 2014; Green, Heimer, & Grau, 2008; Kim, Irwin, & Khoshnood, 2009; Mello et al., 2013; Wheeler, Davidson, Jones, & Irwin, 2012; United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs, 2012; WHO, 2014). Such programs exist in many parts of the world, including the USA, the UK, parts of Europe and

Central Asia. Naloxone is fast-acting, has minimal side effects, has no pharmacological or adverse effects in the absence of exogenous opioids, and therefore has no potential problematic use and will not aggravate symptoms if mistakenly given to someone who is not overdosing on an opioid (Baca & Grant, 2005; Maxwell, Bigg, Stanczykiewicz, & Carlberg-Racich, 2006).

Depending on the level of participation in opioid-using populations, the incidence and gravity of the adverse consequences of overdose can be significantly reduced in a cost-effective manner. Early research suggested that peer naloxone programs could reduce opioid overdose deaths by two-thirds (Strang et al., 1999). A recent statistical modelling study (Coffin & Sullivan, 2013a) found that 6.5% of overdose deaths could be prevented for every 20% of opioid-users reached by a naloxone program, amounting to a number needed to treat (number of kits that must be distributed to prevent one overdose) of 164. Using more and less conservative estimates, the model produced a range of number needed to treat of 1:227 to 1:36, corresponding to a lifetime reduction in overdose deaths of 6% to 31%. This model produced an estimated cost per QALY gained (quality-adjusted life year saved) of \$438 USD. The financial cut-off considered 'cost-effective' is typically \$50,000. In a similar study, (Coffin & Sullivan, 2013b) the same authors found that were the program launched in Russia, where rates of injection drug use are very high, reaching 20% of heroin users could reduce overdose deaths by 13.4% in the first 5 years and 7.6% over a lifetime. The need to treat was only 1:89, and the cost per QALY gained was \$94 USD. The cost of naloxone programs, in the most pragmatic terms, can also be contrasted to the time, resources and personnel required of the health care system to intervene on and treat those who experience non-fatal overdoses.

Outside of statistical models, some programs have released data regarding their recorded uptake and overdose reversal successes. These numbers are promising, especially considering that additional overdoses may have been averted by clients who did not return to the site to refill their prescription, and thus may be missing from surveillance data:

- Une analyse septennale de 19 programmes de A seven-year review of 19 nasal naloxone programs in Massachusetts found a reduction in overdose deaths in those cities that implemented such programs versus those that did not.

Depending on whether enrolment was low (1-100 participants) or high (>100) overdose rates were reduced by 25% to 50% (Walley et al., 2013);

- A study of an overdose prevention program in Pennsylvania followed 426 participants; 89 individuals administered naloxone in 249 overdose episodes, reversing 96% of those (Bennett, Bell, Tomedi, Hulseley, & Kral, 2011);
- A program in San Francisco trained 1,942 individuals in naloxone administration. Of those, 24% returned to receive a naloxone refill, and 11% reported using naloxone during an overdose event. Of 399 overdose events where naloxone was used, participants reported that 89% were reversed (Enteen et al., 2010);
- Since January 2001 the Chicago Recovery Alliance has distributed more than 3,500 naloxone doses and received 319 reports of peer reversals. This is reflected in the county's rate of heroin overdoses, which steadily increased between 1991 and 2001 until a reverse in the trend was marked by a 20% decrease in 2001 and a 10% decrease in each of 2002 and 2003 (Maxwell et al., 2006);
- In 2005, 122 injection drug users in New York City were trained in overdose prevention and given a naloxone prescription. A review found naloxone was administered 82 times; 68 (83%) persons who had naloxone administered to them lived, and the outcomes of 14 (17%) overdoses were unknown. Ninety-seven of 118 participants (82.2%) said they felt comfortable to very comfortable using naloxone if indicated; 94 of 109 (86.2%) said they would want naloxone administered if overdosing (Piper et al., 2008);
- A comprehensive overdose prevention program in North Carolina, which included naloxone distribution among other interventions, saw the rate of overdose deaths decline from 46.6/100 000 to 29/100 000 in just one year (Albert et al., 2011).

Less research has been conducted on the few existing Canadian programs, but preliminary data show promising results:

- Since 2005, Street Works, in Edmonton Alberta, has trained 150 individuals in artificial respiration and naloxone administration, which led to nine recorded overdose reversals (Canadian AIDS Treatment Information Exchange [CATIE], 2010; Dong et al., 2012);

- The British Columbia initiative, Toward the Heart, began in 2012 and its Naloxone program, Take Home Naloxone has been named a leading public health practice by Accreditation Canada (Accreditation Canada, 2015). There are now 51 sites offering services through the program. Outside of Vancouver, over 1318 people have been trained in overdose prevention, recognition and response, 836 naloxone kits have been distributed, and 85 overdose reversals have been documented (Banjo et al., 2014). In Vancouver, the Take Home Naloxone program has trained 2000 people, has distributed 960 kits and documented 106 overdose reversals in 20 months of existence (Paré, 2014);
- Toronto's program, POINT, was launched in 2011 and has distributed 900 kits with a reported 115 overdose reversals (Eggertson, 2013).

Take-home naloxone programs are being developed in other municipalities and provinces, with outcome data as of yet unreported.

UNANTICIPATED EFFECTS

Studies of naloxone programs have determined a few unanticipated effects, both positive and negative.

- Participants in overdose prevention training have reported an improved sense of efficacy, self-determination, competency, and increased health consciousness (Maxwell et al., 2006; Sherman et al., 2008; Wagner et al., 2014)
- Some participants have reported decreased drug use following prevention training (Maxwell et al., 2006; Seal et al., 2005; Wagner et al., 2010).
- Some programs have reported that people who administer naloxone are less likely to contact Emergency Medical Services. Those who administer naloxone feel that overdose victims seem to be recovered after naloxone treatment, and/or they fear calling EMS and risking arrest (Davidson et al., 2002; Enteen et al., 2010; Tobin, Davey, & Latkin, 2005). This underscores the

need to establish cooperative relations with police and to develop and implement Good Samaritan policies, a position supported by the Minister of Health Rona Ambrose in response to the Standing Committee on Health's report entitled *Government's Role in Addressing Prescription Drug Abuse* (Ambrose, 2014).

- Participants' lessened drug use and/or feeling burdened by the stress of responding to overdoses can result in a network of people who use drugs losing some of its overall capacity to respond to overdoses because trained participants may socialize less with people who are high-risk for an overdose and thus be more likely to use drugs alone. As such, they may not be revived by a trained responder, and/or not be present to witness and respond to overdoses in others. This can be addressed by incorporating, formally or informally, a venue for psychosocial support of trainees; by including training on how to effectively communicate overdose risks within peer groups; and by expanding the scope of training to buffer against the loss of some trained individuals over time (Wagner et al., 2010).

Conclusion

Opioid use in Canada is elevated and increasing. It seems relevant to expand the reach of those interventions that show promising results. Overdose prevention programs using naloxone have shown themselves to be a cost-effective way to increase risk awareness and save lives. Naloxone is a safe and harmless substance and existing programs show few if any negative effects. These programs empower people who use opioids to be able to respond effectively in an emergency, reducing the chance of an overdose resulting in long-term disability or death. This can improve people's quality of life and can ultimately reduce the number of needless mortalities and morbidities due to opioid use.

References

- Accreditation Canada. (2015). Take Home Naloxone (THN) program for overdose prevention and response. Consulted on June 16, 2014: <https://www.accreditation.ca/node/7753>
- Albert, S., Brason II, F.W., Sanford, C.K., Dasgupta, N., Graham, J., & Lovette, B. (2011). Project Lazarus: Community-based overdose prevention in rural North Carolina. *Pain Medicine, 12*, S77–S85.
- Ambrose, R. (2014). Government response: Second report of the Standing Committee on Health, “Government’s Role in Addressing Prescription Drug Abuse”. Consulted on June 16, 2014: <http://www.parl.gc.ca/HousePublications/Publication.aspx?DocId=6676682&Language=E&Mod>
- Baca, C.T. & Grant, K.J. (2005) Take-home naloxone to reduce heroin death. *Addiction, 100*, 1823–1831.
- Banjo, O., Tzemis, D., Al-Qutub, D., Amlani, A., Kesselring, S., & Buxton, J.A. (2014). A quantitative and qualitative examination of the British Columbia Take Home Naloxone program. *CMAJ Open, 2*(3), E153–E161.
- Bell, J., Trinh, L., Butler, B., Randall, D., & Rubin, G. (2009). Comparing retention in treatment and mortality in people after initial entry to methadone and buprenorphine treatment. *Addiction, 104*, 1193–1200.
- Bennett, A.S., Bell, A., Tomedi, L., Hulsey, E.G., & Kral, A.H. (2011). Characteristics of an overdose prevention and response and naloxone distribution program in Pittsburgh and Allegheny County, Pennsylvania. *Journal of Urban Health, 88*, 1020–1030.
- Binswanger, I.A., Nowels, C., Corsi, K.F., Glanz, J., Long, J., Booth, R.E., & Steiner, J.F. (2012). Return to drug use and overdose after release from prison: A qualitative study of risk and protective factors. *Addiction Science & Clinical Practice, 7*, 3.
- Bohnert, A.S.B. (2011). Association between opioid prescribing patterns and opioid overdose-related deaths. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 305*, 13.
- Brugal, M., Barrio, G., De, L.F., Regidor, E., Royuela, L., & Suelves, J.M. (2002). Factors associated with non-fatal heroin overdose: Assessing the effect of frequency and route of heroin administration. *Addiction, 97*, 319–327.
- CATIE. (2010). *Programming Connection* case study: Overdose prevention project, *StreetWorks*, Edmonton. Retrieved from: <http://www.catie.ca/en/pc/program/overdose-prevention-project>
- Chief Coroner. (2013). *BC Coroners Service: Prescription opiate-Related overdose deaths 2005–2010*. Ministry of Justice. Retrieved from: <http://www.pssg.gov.bc.ca/coroners/reports/docs/OpiateDeathsPrescription.pdf>
- Clark, A., Wilder, C.M., & Winstanley, E.L. (2014). A systematic review of community opioid overdose prevention and naloxone distribution programs. *Journal of Addiction Medicine, 8*, 153–163.
- Clausen, T., Anchersen, K., & Waal, H. (2008). Mortality prior to, during and after opioid maintenance treatment (OMT): A national prospective cross-registry study. *Drug Alcohol Dependence, 94*, 151–157.
- Coffin, P. & Sullivan, S. (2013a). Cost-effectiveness of distributing naloxone to heroin users for lay overdose reversal. *Annals of Internal Medicine, 158*, 1–9.
- Coffin, P. & Sullivan, S. (2013b). Cost-effectiveness of distributing naloxone to heroin users for lay overdose reversal in Russian cities. *Journal of Medical Economics, 16*, 1051–1060.
- Colliver, J.D. & Gfroerer, J.C. (2008). Motive for nonmedical use of prescription pain relievers in the National Survey on Drug Use and Health. *The Journal of Pain, 9*, 487–489.

Opioid Use in Canada: Preventing Overdose
with Education Programs & Naloxone Distribution

- Crowe, A., Howse, M., Bell, G., & Henry, J. (2000). Substance abuse and the kidney. *Quarterly Journal of Medicine*, 93, 147–152.
- Darke, S., Sims, J., McDonald, S., & Wickes, W. (2000). Cognitive impairment among methadone maintenance patients. *Addiction*, 95, 687–695.
- Davidson, P. J., Ochoa, K.C., Hahn, J.A., Evans, J.L., & Moss, A.R. (2002). Witnessing heroin-related overdoses: The experiences of young injectors in San Francisco. *Addiction*, 97, 1511–1516.
- Degenhardt, L., Bucello, C., Mathers, B., Briegleb, C., Ali, H., Hickman, M., & McLaren, J. (2011). Mortality among regular or dependent users of heroin and other opioids: A systematic review and meta-analysis of cohort studies. *Addiction*, 106, 32–51.
- Degenhardt, L., Charlson, F., Mathers, B., Hall, W.D., Flaxman, A.D., Johns, N., & Vos, T. (2014). The global epidemiology and burden of opioid dependence: Results from the global burden of disease 2010 study. *Addiction*, Epub ahead of print, doi:10.1111/add.12551.
- Dong, K.A., Taylor, M., Wild, C.T., Villa-Roel, C., Rose, M., Salvalaggio, G., & Rowe, B.H. (2012). Community-based naloxone: A Canadian pilot program. *Canadian Journal of Addiction Medicine*, 3(2), 4-9.
- Duberstein, J.L. & Kaufman, D.M. (1971). A clinical study of an epidemic of heroin intoxication and heroin-induced pulmonary edema, *American Journal of Medicine*, 51, 704–714.
- Dunn, K.M., Saunders, K.W., Rutter, C.M., Banta-Green, C.J., Merrill, J.O., ... & Von Korff, M. (2010). Overdose and prescribed opioids: Associations among chronic non-cancer pain patients. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 152, 85–92.
- Eggertson, L. (2013). Take-home naloxone kits preventing overdose deaths. *CMAJ News*, 186(17). doi:10.1503/cmaj.109-4663
- Enteen, L., Bauer, J., McLean, R., Wheeler, E., Hurliaux, Kral, A., & Bamberger, J.D. (2010). Overdose prevention and naloxone prescription for opioid users in San Francisco. *Journal of Urban Health*, 87, 931–941.
- Fischer, B. & Argento, E. (2012). Prescription opioid related misuse, harms, diversion and interventions in Canada: A review. *Pain Physician*, 15, S3, es191–es203.
- Fischer, B., Brissette, S., Brochu, S., Bruneau, J., el-Guebaly, N., Noël, L., ... & Baliunas, D. (2004). Determinants of overdose incidents among illicit opioid users in 5 Canadian cities. *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, 171(3).
- Fischer, B., De Leo, J.A., Allard, C., Firestone-Cruz, M., Patra, J., & Rehm, J. (2009). Exploring drug sourcing among regular prescription opioid users in Canada: Data from Toronto and Victoria. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 51, 55–72.
- Fischer, B., Jones, W., & Rehm, J. (2013). High correlations between levels of consumption and mortality related to strong prescription opioid analgesics in British Columbia and Ontario, 2005-2009. *Pharmacoepidemiology and Drug Safety*, 22, 438–442.
- Fischer, B., Patra, J., Firestone-Cruz, M., Gittins, J., & Rehm, J. (2008). Comparing heroin users and prescription opioid users in a Canadian multi-site population of illicit opioid users. *Drug & Alcohol Review*, 27, 625-632.
- Fischer, B., & Rehm, J. (2007). Illicit opioid use in the 21st century: Witnessing a paradigm shift? *Addiction*, 102, 499–501.
- Fischer, B. & Rehm, J. (2008). Nonmedical use of prescription opioids: Furthering a meaningful research agenda. *The Journal of Pain*, 9, 490–493.

- Fischer, B., Rehm, J., Brissette, S., Brochu, S., Bruneau, J., el-Guebaly, N., ... & Baliunas, D. (2005). Illicit opioid use in Canada: Comparing social, health, and drug use characteristics of untreated users in five cities. *Journal of Urban Health*, 82, 250–266.
- Fischer, B., Rehm, J., Goldman, B., & Popova, S. (2008). Non-medical use of prescription opioids and public health in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Public Health*, 99, 182–184.
- Fudula, P.J., Bridge, P., Herbert, S., Williford, W.O., Chiang, C.N., ... & Tusel, D. (2003). Office-based treatment of opiate addiction with a sublingual-tablet formulation of buprenorphine and naloxone. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 349, 949–958.
- Gagné, M., Dubé, P.-A., Perron, P.-A., Langlois, É., Légaré, P., Sirois, M.-J., ... St-Laurent, D. (2013). *Décès attribuables aux intoxications par opioïdes au Québec. 2000-2009*. Québec : Institut national de santé publique du Québec. Retrieved from: https://www.inspq.qc.ca/pdf/publications/1738_DecesAttribIntoxOpioïdesQc_2000-2009.pdf
- Ghuran, A. & Nolan, J. (2000). Recreational drug misuse: Issues for the cardiologist, *Heart*, 83, 627–633.
- Gomes, T., Mamdani, M.M., Dhalla, I.A., Paterson, J.M., & Juurlink, D.N. (2011). Opioid dose and drug-related mortality in patients with nonmalignant pain. *Archives of Internal Medicine*, 171, 686–691.
- Gomes, T., Mamdani, M.M., Paterson, J.M., Dhalla, I.A., & Juurlink, D.N. (2014). Trends in high-dose opioid prescribing in Canada. *Can Fam Physician*, 60(9), 826-32
- Green, T.C., Heimer, R., & Grau, L.E. (2008). Distinguishing signs of opioid overdose and indication for naloxone: an evaluation of six overdose training and naloxone distribution programs in the United States. *Addiction*, 103, 979–989.
- Gustafson, D.L., Goodyear, L., & Keough, F. (2008). When the dragon's awake: A needs assessment of people injecting drugs in a small urban centre. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 19, 189–194.
- Havinga, P., van der Velden, C., de Gee, A., & van der Poel, A. (2014). Differences in sociodemographic, drug use and health characteristics between never, former and current injecting, problematic hard-drug users in the Netherlands. *Harm Reduction Journal*, 11, 6.
- Health Canada. (2015). *Canadian tobacco, alcohol and drugs survey (CTADS)*. Ottawa (Ontario): Government of Canada. Retrieved from: <http://healthycanadians.gc.ca/science-research-sciences-recherches/donnees/ctads-ectad/index-eng.php>
- International Narcotics Control Board. (2013). Annual reports. Retrieved from: <https://www.incb.org/incb/en/publications/annual-reports/annual-report.html>
- Kahan, M., Wilson, L., Mailis-Gagnon, A., & Srivastava, A. (2011). Canadian guideline for safe and effective use of opioids for chronic noncancer pain: Clinical summary for family physicians. Part 2: Special populations. *Canadian Family Physician*, 57, 1269–1276.
- Kim, D., Irwin, K.S., & Khoshnood, K. (2009). Expanded access to naloxone: Options for critical response to the epidemic of opioid overdose mortality. *American Journal of Public Health*, 99, 402–407.
- King, N.B., Fraser, V., Boikos, C., Richardson, R., & Harper, S. (2014). Determinants of increased opioid-related mortality in the United States and Canada, 1990–2013: A systematic review. *American Journal of Public Health*, Epub ahead of print, doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2014.301966
- Kinner, S.A., Milloy, M.J., Wood, E., Qi, J., Zhang, R., & Kerr, T. (2012). Incidence and risk factors for non-fatal overdose among a cohort of recently incarcerated illicit drug users. *Addictive Behaviour*, 37, 691–696.

Opioid Use in Canada: Preventing Overdose
with Education Programs & Naloxone Distribution

- Kolodny, A., Courtwright, D.T., Hwang, C.S., Kreiner, P., Eadie, J.L., Clark, T.W., & Alexander, G.C. (2015). The Prescription Opioid and Heroin Crisis: A Public Health Approach to an Epidemic of Addiction. *Annual Review of Public Health, 36*(25), 1-25.
- Marshall, B.D., Milloy, M.J., Wood, E., Montaner, J.S., & Kerr, T. (2011). Reduction in overdose mortality after the opening of North America's first medically supervised safer injecting facility: A retrospective population-based study. *Lancet, 377*, 1429–1437.
- Maxwell, S., Bigg, D., Stanczykiewicz, K., & Carlberg-Racich, S. (2006). Prescribing naloxone to actively injecting heroin users: A program to reduce heroin overdose deaths. *Journal of Addictive Diseases, 25*, 89–96.
- Mello, M.M., Wood, J., Burris, S., Wagenaar, A., Ibrahim, J.K., & Swanson, J.W. (2013). Critical opportunities for public health law: A call for action. *American Journal of Public Health, 103*, 1979–1988.
- Paglia-Boak, A., Adlaf, E.M., & Mann, R.E. (2011). Drug use among Ontario students, 1977-2011: Detailed OSDUHS findings (CAMH Research Document Series No. 32). Toronto, Ontario: Centre for Addiction and Mental Health. Retrieved from: http://www.camh.ca/en/research/news_and_publications/ontario-student-drug-use-and-health-survey/Documents/2013%20OSDUHS%20Docs/2013OSDUHS_Detailed_DrugUseReport.pdf
- Paré, I. (2014). Le Québec privé d'un antidote qui sauve des vies à Vancouver. *Le Devoir*, July 12. Retrieved from: <http://www.ledevoir.com/societe/actualites-en-societe/410730/surdoses-le-quebec-prive-d-un-antidote-qui-sauve-des-vies-a-vancouver-et-aux-etats-unis>
- Paulozzi, L.J., Kilbourne, E.M., Shah, N.G., Nolte, K.B., Desai, H.A., ... & Loring, L.D. (2012). A history of being prescribed controlled substances and risk of drug overdose death. *Pain Medicine, 13*, 87–95.
- Pauly, B., Reist, D., Belle-Isle, L., & Schactman, C. (2013). Housing and harm reduction: What is the role of harm reduction in addressing homelessness? *International Journal of Drug Policy, 24*, 284–290.
- Persaud, N. (2013). Questionable content of an industry-supported medical school lecture series: A case study. *Journal of Medical Ethics*, doi:10.1136/medethics-2013-101343.
- Piper, T.M., Stancliff, S., Rudenstine, S., Sherman, S., Nandi, V., Clear, A., & Galea, S. (2008). Evaluation of a naloxone distribution and administration program in New York City. *Substance Use and Misuse, 43*, 858–870.
- Popova, S., Patra, J., Mohapatra, S., Fischer, B., & Rehm, J. (2009). How many people in Canada use prescription opioids non-medically in general and street drug using populations? *Canadian Journal of Public Health, 100*, 104–108.
- Seal, K.H., Thawley, R., Gee, L., Bamberger, J., Kral, A.H., ... & Edlin, B.R. (2005). Naloxone distribution and cardiopulmonary resuscitation training for injection drug users to prevent heroin overdose death: A pilot intervention study. *Journal of Urban Health, 82*, 303–311.
- Shannon, K., Ishida, T., Lai, C., & Tyndall, M.W. (2006). The impact of unregulated single room occupancy hotels on the health status of illicit drug users in Vancouver. *International Journal of Drug Policy, 17*, 107–114.
- Sherman, S. G., Gann, D., Scott, G., Carlberg, S., Bigg, D., & Heimer, R. (2008). A qualitative study of overdose responses among Chicago IDUs. *Harm Reduction Journal, 5*(2).
- Sroule, B., Brands, B., Li, S., & Catz-Biro, L. (2009). Changing patterns in opioid addiction. *Canadian Family Physician, 55*, 68–69.
- Strang, J., Powis, B., Best, D., Vingoe, L., Griffiths, P., ... & Gossop, M. (1999). Preventing opiate overdose fatalities with take-home naloxone: Pre-launch study of possible impact and acceptability. *Addiction, 94*, 199–204.

- Summit on Heroin and Prescription Drugs: Federal, State, and Community Responses. June 19, 2014, South Court Auditorium, Eisenhower Executive Office Building, Washington, DC.
- Tobin, K.E., Davey, M.A., & Latkin, C.A. (2005). Calling emergency medical services during drug overdose: an examination of individual, social and setting correlates. *Addiction*, *100*, 397–404.
- Toronto Public Health. (2012). *The POINT (Preventing Overdose in Toronto) Program: A harm reduction approach to overdose prevention*. Toronto. Retrieved from : <http://www.cpso.on.ca/uploadedFiles/members/Meth-conf-POINT-PP.pdf>.
- United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs. (2012). *Resolution 55/7: promoting measures to prevent drug overdose, in particular opioid overdose*. Vienna: United Nations Economic and Social Council.
- Wagner, K.D., Valente, T.W., Casanova, M., Partovi, S.M., Mendenhall, B.M., ... & Unger, J.B. (2010). Evaluation of a comprehensive overdose prevention and response training programme for injection drug users in the Skid Row area of Los Angeles, CA. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, *21*, 186–193.
- Wagner, K.D., Davidson, P.J., Iverson, E., Washburn, R., Burke, E., ... & Lankenau, S.E. (2014). "I felt like a superhero": The experience of responding to drug overdose among individuals trained in overdose prevention. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, *25*, 157–165.
- Walley, A.Y., Xuan, Z., Hackman, H.H., Quinn, E., Doe-Simkins, M., ... & Ozonoff, A. (2013). Opioid overdose rates and implementation of overdose education and nasal naloxone distribution in Massachusetts: Interrupted time series analysis. *BMJ*, *346*, f174.
- Wheeler, E., Davidson, P.J., Jones, S., & Irwin, K.S. (2012). Community-based opioid overdose prevention programs providing naloxone — United States, 2010. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, *61*, 101–105.
- Williams, C.T., & Latkin, C.A. (2007). Neighborhood socioeconomic status, personal network attributes, and use of heroin and cocaine. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, *32*, s203–s210.
- Wines, J.D. Jr., Saitz, R., Horton, N.J., Lloyd-Travaglini, C., & Samet, J.H. (2007). Overdose after detoxification: A prospective study. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, *89*, 161–169.
- World Health Organization (WHO). (2014). *Community management of opioid overdose*. Retrieved from: http://www.who.int/substance_abuse/publications/management_opioid_overdose/en/
- Zacny, J. & Lichtor, S. (2008). Nonmedical use of prescription opioids: Motive and ubiquity issues. *The Journal of Pain*, *9*, 473–486.
- Zlodre, J. & Fazel, S. (2012). All-cause and external mortality in released prisoners: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *American Journal of Public Health*, *102*, e67–75.

March 2016

Author: Valerie Webber, National Collaborating Centre for Healthy Public Policy

With the collaboration of: François Gagnon, National Collaborating Centre for Healthy Public Policy

Editing: Michael Keeling and Marianne Jacques, National Collaborating Centre for Healthy Public Policy

SUGGESTED CITATION

Webber, V. (2016). *Opioid Use in Canada: Preventing Overdose with Education Programs & Naloxone Distribution*. Montréal, Québec: National Collaborating Centre for Healthy Public Policy.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The NCCHPP would like to thank Dr. Lori Kiefer, Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services of Ontario, Ashraf Amlani, British Columbia Centre for Disease Control, Dr. Jane Buxton, British Columbia Centre for Disease Control, Dr. Marie-Ève Goyer, Centre de recherche et d'aide pour narcomanes, Nicolas Hamel, Centre intégré universitaire de santé et de services sociaux du Centre-Sud-de-l'île-de-Montréal, as well as a group of anonymous reviewers for their thoughtful comments on an earlier version of this document.

The National Collaborating Centre for Healthy Public Policy (NCCHPP) seeks to increase the expertise of public health actors across Canada in healthy public policy through the development, sharing and use of knowledge. The NCCHPP is one of six centres financed by the Public Health Agency of Canada. The six centres form a network across Canada, each hosted by a different institution and each focusing on a specific topic linked to public health. In addition to the Centres' individual contributions, the network of Collaborating Centres provides focal points for the exchange and common production of knowledge relating to these topics. The National Collaborating Centre for Healthy Public Policy is hosted by the Institut national de santé publique du Québec (INSPQ), a leading centre in public health in Canada.

Production of this document has been made possible through a financial contribution from the Public Health Agency of Canada through funding for the National Collaborating Centre for Healthy Public Policy (NCCHPP). The views expressed herein do not necessarily represent the views of the Public Health Agency of Canada.

Publication N°: XXXX

This document is available in its entirety in electronic format (PDF) on the National Collaborating Centre for Healthy Public Policy website at: www.ncchpp.ca/.

La version française est disponible sur le site Web du Centre de collaboration nationale sur les politiques publiques et la santé au : www.ccnpps.ca/.

Information contained in the document may be cited provided that the source is mentioned.



Centre de collaboration nationale
sur les politiques publiques et la santé

National Collaborating Centre
for Healthy Public Policy

Institut national
de santé publique

Québec

