

Amelia Woods^{1, 2}, Catherine Foley¹, Katherine Conigrave^{3,4}, Winifred Asare-Doku¹, Anthony Shakeshaft⁵, Michael Farrell¹, Michael Doyle³

Presenter email amelia.woods@unsw.edu.au

Background

Substance misuse is a widespread issue among individuals within criminal justice systems (CJS) around the world.

The CJS often serves as a crucial point of contact with the healthcare system for this population.

- Opioid use disorder (OUD) in CJS
- ~55% in an Australian sample.
 - Associated health impacts: blood-borne virus (1), overdose (2).

- Alcohol use disorder (AUD) in CJS
- ~24% per systematic review (3).
 - Health impacts: liver damage, accidental injuries and family violence.

After release from prison, there is a heightened risk of relapse and overdose, often with limited access to treatment.

- Relapse prevention pharmacotherapy
- Offers the potential to reduce physical, social, and economic harms cause by substance use (4, 5).
 - Includes: buprenorphine (OUD) and naltrexone (OUD + AUD).
 - Prev only daily dosing available, now extended release (XR) formulations.
 - XR formulations offer potential benefits within the CJS such as reduced diversion, enhanced acceptability and retention in treatment, overdose protection and economic advantages.

Introduction

Although there is evidence supporting the effectiveness of XR relapse prevention pharmacotherapy in general settings, a comprehensive review of their safety and effectiveness in the CJS is currently lacking.

Aim

To describe the evidence for effectiveness, safety and feasibility of extended-release medications for patients with substance use disorders in prison or within 3 months of release.

- We had 3 sub aims
- 1) to identify the refereed literature on the use of XR-BPN and XR-NTX for patients involved in the CJS.
 - 2) to describe the characteristics of the identified studies (inc year and country of publication, PDOC, participants characteristics [gender, age, ethnicity]).
 - 3) To critically appraise the methodological quality of these studies.

References

1. Dolan K, Khoei EM, Brentari C, Stevens A. Prisons and Drugs: A global review of incarceration, drug use and drug services. Report 12. 2007.

2. Farrell M, Marsden J. Acute risk of drug-related death among newly released prisoners in England and Wales. *Addiction*. 2008;103(2):251-5.

3. Fazel S, Yoon IA, Hayes AJ. Substance use disorders in prisoners: an updated systematic review and meta-regression analysis in recently incarcerated men and women. *Addiction*. 2017;112(10):1725-39.

4. World Health Organization. WHO/UNODC/UNAIDS position paper: Substitution maintenance therapy in the management of opioid dependence and HIV/AIDS prevention: World Health Organization; 2004.

5. Springer SA, Azar MM, Altice FL. HIV, alcohol dependence, and the criminal justice system: a review and call for evidence-based treatment for released prisoners. *The American journal of drug and alcohol abuse*. 2011;37(1):12-21.

6. Lee JD, McDonald R, Grossman E, McNeely J, Laska E, Rotrosen J, et al. Opioid treatment at release from jail using extended-release naltrexone: A pilot proof-of-concept randomized effectiveness trial. *Addiction*. 2015;110(6):1008-14.

Methods

Design
This systematic review followed the guidelines outlined in the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA).

Data sources: Proquest, OVID/ Embase, EBSCO, PubMed/Medline, CINCH, Cochrane, Scopus.

- Inclusion Criteria**
- Setting: Prison (or recently released [<3 months] from prison).
 - Participants/Cases: People with Substance Use Disorders.
 - Intervention: XR substance use relapse prevention pharmacotherapy (XR-BUP + XR-NTX).

Data collection: study, participants and treatment characteristics; outcome variables.

Results

Study Characteristics
N= 25 papers published from 792 found in search.


Studies were published in English between January 2000 and December 2022.
- Majority in the last 3 years (n=14).

Medication type: Predominantly XR-NTX (n= 16), some XR-BUP (n= 8) and one looking at both.

Geographical representation: US (n=18), Norway (n=2), Australia (n=2), Canada (n=1), UK (n=1) Germany (n=1).

Quality: Most studies had small to moderate sample sizes with variable retention and follow-up periods.

Figure 1: Methods of Included Studies



Key outcomes

- Retention in treatment
- XR-NTX
 - Two OUD papers showed no difference in compared to TAU (6) and placebo (7).
 - One reported better retention cf methadone (8)
 - XR-BUP studies didn't compare retention across arms.

- Substance use outcomes
- XR-NTX: results were inconclusive due to varying definitions and measures.
 - XR-BUP: mixed results, with one study showing a reduction over time (but was not compared to methadone) (9) and another showing no difference compared to sublingual buprenorphine (10).

- Overdose
- Low numbers of overdoses, but among limited number of participants.

- Adverse Events
- Effect assessment was challenging due to a wide variety of reporting mechanisms.
 - Were common across different samples (with up to 97% of participants reporting at least one) and mild.

- Recidivism
- XR-NTX: In the 3 studies with sufficient data to compare to other treatments (methadone, placebo and TAU), all found no significant effect (6, 7, 11).
 - XR-BUP: One paper found no significant difference cf SL-BUP (10).

- Qualitative findings (11)
- Benefits: no daily attendance, less urgency for FU care post release, increased access to employment, reduced interactions with corrections officers and more anonymity.
 - Negatives: apprehension about the novel formulation, opposition to needles, difficulties accessing XR-BUP in the community, loss of subjective 'boost' from daily sublingual dosing, injection site pain.

Implications

- Future directions
- Need for greater consistency across studies (definitions, measures, comparator groups)
 - A stronger focus on XR-NTX in AUD
 - Larger participant numbers

Conclusion

While the body of evidence regarding XR formulations in the CJS is growing, the heterogeneity of existing studies and limitations in study design restrict the ability to strongly endorse their use.

¹ National Drug and Alcohol Research Centre, UNSW Sydney, Sydney, Australia; ² Drug And Alcohol Service of South Australia; ³ University of Sydney, Australia; ⁴ Royal Prince Alfred Hospital, Sydney Local Health District, Camperdown, Australia; ⁵ Poche Centre, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia