

This is a repository copy of Commentary on Grischott et al. (2019): Is the rising incidence of pulmonary disease among opioid-dependent patients an unintended consequence of inhalation of toxic substances?

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper: http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/143257/

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Mitchell, C. orcid.org/0000-0002-4790-0095 (2019) Commentary on Grischott et al. (2019): Is the rising incidence of pulmonary disease among opioid-dependent patients an unintended consequence of inhalation of toxic substances? Addiction, 114 (5). pp. 877-878. ISSN 0965-2140

https://doi.org/10.1111/add.14606

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Mitchell, C. A. (2019) Commentary on Grischott et al. (2019): Is the rising incidence of pulmonary disease among opioid-dependent patients an unintended consequence of inhalation of toxic substances? Addiction, 114: 877–878, which has been published in final form at https://doi.org/10.1111/add.14606. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



Commentary on Grischott et al: 'Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) among opioid dependent patients in agonist treatment. A diagnostic study.

Is the rising incidence of pulmonary disease amongst opioid-dependent patients an unintended consequence of inhalation of toxic substances?

Journal: Addiction

Date Submitted: 24-Feb-2019

Author: Mitchell, Caroline; University of Sheffield, Academic Unit of Primary Medical Care

Keywords:

opiates, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, primary care, multiple substances, service delivery

Commentary on Grischott et al:

Is the rising incidence of pulmonary disease amongst opioid-dependent patients an unintended consequence of inhalation of toxic substances?

Dr Caroline Anne Mitchell

MD FRCGP PGCertEd

Senior Clinical Lecturer and General Practitioner

Academic Unit of Primary Medical Care, University of Sheffield, Sam Fox House, Northern General Hospital, Sheffield S5 7AU, UK

Email: c.mitchell@sheffield.ac.uk Declaration of interests: none

Key words: opiates, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, primary care, multiple substances, service delivery

Abstract

Since the 1990s, there has been a shift from intravenous to inhaled use of illicit substances alongside a harm- minimisation policy change to promote 'safer' inhaled use. Interventions that legitimised this switch are of interest and may be linked to incident respiratory disease, a consequence which must now be addressed.

Commentary

Globally, there has been a significant shift from injected to inhaled heroin use since the 1990s¹. In 2010, the UK Advisory Council on the Misuse of Drugs (ACMD), recommended legalisation of the provision of 'foil' as a harm reduction measure in drug treatment settings stating: 'The ACMD finds that there is evidence of the benefits of foil provision but can find no evidence of the dis-benefits'.² The ACMD further outlined the benefits of providing foil, which included a reduction in injecting behaviour and thereby an anticipated reduction in the risk of fatal overdose, blood borne virus (BBV) transmission, venous thromboembolism and 'litter'. More recently, in 2014, an international 'Public

Health and International Drug Policy' consensus monograph highlighted 'foil' intervention studies which enabled the (desirable) switch from injected to inhaled use.³, ⁴

Whilst the overall individual and public benefits of a reduction in injecting drug use are clear, the diagnostic studies undertaken by all and researchers in other settings raise important concerns about how policy makers and clinicians should respond to evidence of very high prevalence rates (up to 39%) of early-onset chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) in opioid dependent patients ^{5,6}. There is uncertainty about how the interplay of multiple inhaled substances (heroin, crack cocaine, cannabis and tobacco) and 'cutting' agents (eg talcum powder, baking soda), high temperature inhalation, the use of aluminium foil and also infection contribute to irreversible pathophysiological changes in the lungs ^{7,8}. The high prevalence of respiratory symptoms in the Grischott et al study sub-group who did not have COPD further suggests that the association between opioid and/or other substance use and respiratory symptom burden is complex.

Active case finding of COPD will add another co-morbid long-term condition to the significant biopsychosocial illness burden already experienced by opioid dependent individuals ^{9,10}. In line with screening programme imperatives, effective interventions must be offered to those who screen positive ¹¹. COPD guidelines recommend primary care as the core focus of management following diagnostic spirometry assessment, ¹² while the most cost-effective interventions for COPD are influenza and pneumococcal vaccination, smoking cessation interventions, supported self-management and pulmonary rehabilitation ¹³. These latter interventions mostly require sustained, active engagement, which does not sit well with the study group's preference for inhaled or oral pharmaceutical treatments, which may improve symptoms but do not influence prognosis. For those who do not access early diagnosis and early intervention, the prognosis of COPD is poor. It is characterised by significant disability (with loss of employment and a need for social care) and escalation in the use of urgent care, including unscheduled hospital admission ¹⁴, ¹⁵.

Therefore, the key question is: How should health and social care services be configured to address predicted respiratory health needs of the opioid dependent patient? Unfortunately screening for COPD in opioid dependent patients will not improve outcomes unless this population access proactive, timely healthcare. A failure to access primary care for physical co-morbidities and an overreliance on the use of accident and emergency care is already reported in substance users ¹⁶. This reliance on urgent care may arise from a number of factors including stigmatising behaviours by non-specialist healthcare practitioners, a chaotic lifestyle including unstable housing (and frequent changes of address), and a lack of co-located physical healthcare in most substance use treatment centres ^{17,18}.

The authors sensibly suggest situating screening services and low intensity respiratory health interventions within the substance use clinic in order to optimise access to care. However, there are limitations in drawing this recommendation from a single centre study in Switzerland, a country which has made significant efforts to integrate public health, primary physical and specialist substance use care for this population who are vulnerable and at high risk of co-morbidities. Unfortunately, this Swiss model of holistic care is neither replicated nor alternatives resourced in most other OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) settings ¹⁹. The recovery of physical, mental and social well-being therefore remains an ever-elusive goal for many opioid dependent patients and their practitioners.

References

- 1. Strang J, Griffiths P, Gossop M. Heroin smoking by 'chasing the dragon': origins and history. Addiction. 1997;92(6):673-83; discussion 85-95.
- 2. Advisory Council on the Misuse of Drugs (ACMD November 2010: Consideration of the use of foil, as an intervention, to reduce the harms of injecting heroin. Accessed 10th February 2019;
 - https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment data/file/119107/foil-report.pdf
- 3. Stöver HJ, Schäffer D. SMOKE IT! Promoting a change of opiate consumption pattern-from injecting to inhaling. *Harm Reduct J* 2014; 11: 1–8.
- 4. Harm Csete J, Kamarulzaman A, Kazatchkine M, Altice F, Balicki M, Buxton J, Cepeda J, Comfort M, Goosby E, Goulão J, Hart C. Public health and international drug policy. The Lancet. 2016 Apr 2;387(10026):1427-80.
- 5. Grischott et al Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) among opioid dependent patients in agonist treatment. A diagnostic study
- 6. Burhan H, Young R, Byrne T, Peat R, Furlong J, Renwick S, et al. Screening Heroin Smokers Attending Community Drug Services for COPD. Chest. 2018.
- 7. Benson, M. & Bentley, A. M. (1995) Lung disease induced by drug addiction. *Thorax*, **50**, 1125–1127
- 8. Gotway MB, Marder SR, Hanks DK, Leung JW, Dawn SK, Gean AD, Reddy GP, Araoz PA, Webb WR. Thoracic complications of illicit drug use: an organ system approach. Radiographics. 2002 Oct;22(suppl 1):S119-35.
- 9. Hser YI, Gelberg L, Hoffman V, Grella CE, McCarthy W, Anglini MD. Health conditions among aging narcotics addicts: Medical examination results. J Behav Med. 2004;27(6):607-22.
- 10. Collaborators GBDCRD. Global, regional, and national deaths, prevalence, disability-adjusted life years, and years lived with disability for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease and asthma, 1990-2015: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2015. Lancet Respir Med. 2017;5(9):691-706.
- 11. UK National Screening Committee criteria for appraising the viability, effectiveness and appropriateness of a screening programme. Public Health England, last updated 23rd October 2015; accessed 16th February 2019 https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/evidence-review-criteria-national-screening-programmes
- 12. Global Initiative for Chronic Obstructive Lung Disease. GOLD 2017 Global strategy for the diagnosis, management and prevention of COPD. http://goldcopd.org/gold-2017-global-strategy-diagnosis-management-prevention-copd/.
- 13. The COPD cost Pyramid' Improving and Integrating Respiratory services; July 2012. The London Respiratory Network. ISDN 2040-2023; Accessed on line 16th February 2019 https://www.networks.nhs.uk/nhs-networks/impress-improving-and-integrating-respiratory/documents/IMPRESS%20COPD%20Relative%20Value%20Main%20Report.pdf
- 14. Collaborators GBDCRD. Global, regional, and national deaths, prevalence, disability-adjusted life years, and years lived with disability for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease and asthma, 1990-2015: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2015. Lancet Respir Med. 2017;5(9):691-706.
- 15. Rennard S, Decramer M, Calverley PM, Pride NB, Soriano JB, Vermeire PA, Vestbo J. Impact of COPD in North America and Europe in 2000: subjects' perspective of Confronting COPD International Survey. European Respiratory Journal. 2002 Oct 1;20(4):799-805.
- 16. De Alba I, Samet JH, Saitz R. Burden of medical illness in drug- and alcohol-dependent persons without primary care. Am J Addict. 2004;13(1):33-45
- 17. Neale J, Tompkins C, Sheard L. Barriers to accessing generic health and social care services: a qualitative study of injecting drug users. Health Soc Care Community. 2008;16(2):147-54.

- 18. van Boekel LC, Brouwers EP, van Weeghel J, Garretsen HF. Comparing stigmatising attitudes towards people with substance use disorders between the general public, GPs, mental health and addiction specialists and clients. International Journal of Social Psychiatry. 2015;61(6):539–49.
- 19. Switzerland Federal Office of Public Health. Current web-based resources: 'Substitution treatments for opioid dependence'; 'Heroin Assisted Treatment'. Accessed 16th February 2019.
 - http://www.bag.admin.ch/themen/drogen/00042/00629/00798/01191/index.html?lang=en