

FORMING PDU REVISION: PRELIMINARY RESULTS OF LITERATURE REVIEW

Project CT.12.EPI.0.046.1.0 to assist the EMCDDA in some aspects of the process of Problem drug use key indicator revision and re-conceptualization.

Literature review to derive theoretical case definitions broken down by substance

Detailed analysis of POU estimates in MS and of European total POU estimate, with possibilities to fill existing gaps

Review of studies on characteristics of problem drug users and consolidation of reporting to the EMCDDA

Key indicator revision and re-conceptualization

Theoretical definition: drug use is causing harms to the person or placing the person at risk of such harms

Operationalized as intensive use, use by dangerous routes of administration and in dangerous combinations

Clear case definitions by drug?

Need for consolidation of reporting on already collected information on POU/PDU

Existing country estimates

Characteristics of “problem drug users”

to identify break points between experimental and
severe forms of use in terms of frequency of use
cut-off points on diagnostic tools (ASI, SDS)

step: original PDU drugs (OPI/heroin,
amphetamines, cocaine/crack-cocaine) and injecting

Databases: PubMed; EBSCO Host (Academic Search Complete, PsycARTICLES, PsycINFO, SocINDEX with Full Text); ScienceDirect, ScholarGoogle, Google

Search strings: combinations of substances, indicators of level of use, routes of administration, terms describing risks

Original time frame: 2000 and newer

Inclusion criteria: written in English, peer-reviewed, only healthy human subjects, linking level of use to level of harm

Prevalence studies following the EMCDDA PDU definition were excluded

heterogeneity of research

inconsistent measures of level of use (categories, time frames)

often comparing ever-users versus never-users

no specific cut-off points (level of use as an independent variable)

heterogeneity in adverse effects (single condition of varying severity versus complex measures)

inconsistent use of standardized tools (e.g. SDS, DSM)

very little reasoning

complicated/impossible pooling

Level of use expressed as criteria for inclusion of participants in the study (i.e. heavy opioid users) - cut-off point precisely specified

Level of use included within description of sample characteristics (i.e. users of amphetamines) - no cut-off, only averages)

Level of use not specified (i.e. limited information in representative samples)

least advanced analysis

comorbidities instead of harms associated
heroin use

daily, almost daily use of heroin

DSM criteria for dependence

weekly frequency of use

binges (continuous use for 48 hours and more)

Crack cocaine use more harmful than cocaine snorting (regardless frequency of use)

Smoking cocaine linked to higher frequency use

Weekly frequency of use, similar but less frequent is
evidence for monthly

bingeing, linked to transition to injecting

Crystal-meth smoking is linked to higher frequency of
use, bingeing and higher levels of dependence

Poly-drug use often involved

Injecting as a main factor explaining harm regardless the drug used, main risks involve transmission of blood-borne viruses and overdose

Harm related to routes of administration of stimulants is often explained by frequency of use and related lifestyle

Frequency of injecting is drug dependent: being most frequent for cocaine and heroin and less frequent for amphetamines

Assess recent research on harms related to heroin use
Following interest towards stimulants, prescription opioids,
and cannabis

Most research from AU, standard time frame of past 6
months

Medical diagnosis (ICD/DSM) across substances

Weekly frequency of use and bingeing of stimulants

Injecting, smoking, snorting (ordered by level of harm)

DOs

systematic pooling

new search on heroin and OST substances

review of literature on cannabis

Thank you for your kind attention

Terina Skarupova

Senior Researcher

skarupova@resad.cz

www.resad.cz