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Chapter 4 Preview

A substance use disorder is a medical illness characterized by clinically significant impairments in health, social function, and voluntary control over substance use. Substance use disorders range in severity, duration, and complexity from mild to severe. In 2015, 20.8 million people aged 12 or older met criteria for a substance use disorder. While historically the great majority of treatment has occurred in specialty substance use disorder treatment programs with little involvement by primary or general health care, a shift is occurring toward the delivery of treatment services in general health care practice. For those with mild to moderate substance use disorders, treatment through the general health care system may be sufficient, while those with severe substance use disorders (addiction) may require specialty treatment.

The good news is that a spectrum of effective strategies and services are available to identify, treat, and manage substance use problems and substance use disorders. Research shows that the most effective way to help someone with a substance use problem who may be at risk for developing a substance use disorder is to intervene early, before the condition can progress. With this recognition, screening for substance misuse is increasingly being provided in general health care settings, so that emerging problems can be detected and early intervention provided if necessary. The addition of services to address substance use problems and disorders in mainstream health care has extended the continuum of care, and includes a range of effective, evidence-based medications, behavioral therapies, and supportive services. However, a number of barriers have limited the widespread adoption of these services, including lack of resources, insufficient training, and workforce shortages. This is particularly true for the treatment of those with co-occurring substance use and physical or mental disorders.

See Chapter 6 - Health Care Systems and Substance Use Disorders.
This chapter provides an overview of the scientific evidence supporting the effectiveness of treatment interventions, therapies, services, and medications available to identify, treat, and manage substance use problems and disorders.

**KEY FINDINGS***

- Well-supported scientific evidence shows that substance use disorders can be effectively treated, with recurrence rates no higher than those for other chronic illnesses such as diabetes, asthma, and hypertension. With comprehensive continuing care, recovery is now an achievable outcome.

- Only about 1 in 10 people with a substance use disorder receive any type of specialty treatment. The great majority of treatment has occurred in specialty substance use disorder treatment programs with little involvement by primary or general health care. However, a shift is occurring to mainstream the delivery of early intervention and treatment services into general health care practice.

- Well-supported scientific evidence shows that medications can be effective in treating serious substance use disorders, but they are under-used. The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has approved three medications to treat alcohol use disorders and three others to treat opioid use disorders. However, an insufficient number of existing treatment programs or practicing physicians offer these medications. To date, no FDA-approved medications are available to treat marijuana, cocaine, methamphetamine, or other substance use disorders, with the exception of the medications previously noted for alcohol and opioid use disorders.

- Supported scientific evidence indicates that substance misuse and substance use disorders can be reliably and easily identified through screening and that less severe forms of these conditions often respond to brief physician advice and other types of brief interventions. Well-supported scientific evidence shows that these brief interventions work with mild severity alcohol use disorders, but only promising evidence suggests that they are effective with drug use disorders.

- Well-supported scientific evidence shows that treatment for substance use disorders—including inpatient, residential, and outpatient—are cost-effective compared with no treatment.

- The primary goals and general management methods of treatment for substance use disorders are the same as those for the treatment of other chronic illnesses. The goals of treatment are to reduce key symptoms to non-problematic levels and improve health and functional status; this is equally true for those with co-occurring substance use disorders and other psychiatric disorders. Key components of care are medications, behavioral therapies, and recovery support services (RSS).

- Well-supported scientific evidence shows that behavioral therapies can be effective in treating substance use disorders, but most evidence-based behavioral therapies are often implemented with limited fidelity and are under-used. Treatments using these evidence-based practices have shown better results than non-evidence-based treatments and services.

- Promising scientific evidence suggests that several electronic technologies, like the adoption of electronic health records (EHRs) and the use of telehealth, could improve access, engagement, monitoring, and continuing supportive care of those with substance use disorders.

*The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) summarizes strength of evidence as: “Well-supported”: when evidence is derived from multiple controlled trials or large-scale population studies; “Supported”: when evidence is derived from rigorous but fewer or smaller trials; and “Promising”: when evidence is derived from a practical or clinical sense and is widely practiced.*
Continuum of Treatment Services

Substance use disorders typically emerge during adolescence and often (but not always) progress in severity and complexity with continued substance misuse. Currently, substance use disorders are classified diagnostically into three severity categories: mild, moderate, and severe.

Substance use disorder treatment is designed to help individuals stop or reduce harmful substance misuse, improve their health and social function, and manage their risk for relapse. In this regard, substance use disorder treatment is effective and has a positive economic impact. Research shows that treatment also improves individuals’ productivity, health, and overall quality of life. In addition, studies show that every dollar spent on substance use disorder treatment saves $4 in health care costs and $7 in criminal justice costs.

Mild substance use disorders can be identified quickly and reliably in many medical and social settings. These common but less severe disorders often respond to brief motivational interventions and/or supportive monitoring, referred to as guided self-change. In contrast, severe, complex, and chronic substance use disorders often require specialty substance use disorder treatment and continued post-treatment support to achieve full remission and recovery. To address the spectrum of substance use problems and disorders, a continuum of care provides individuals an array of service options based on need, including prevention, early intervention, treatment, and recovery support (Figure 4.1). Traditionally, the vast majority of treatment for substance use disorders has been provided in specialty substance use disorder treatment programs, and these programs vary substantially in their clinical objectives and in the frequency, intensity, and setting of care delivery.

**KEY TERMS**

**Substance Use Disorder Treatment.** A service or set of services that may include medication, counseling, and other supportive services designed to enable an individual to reduce or eliminate alcohol and/or other drug use, address associated physical or mental health problems, and restore the patient to maximum functional ability.

**Continuum of Care.** An integrated system of care that guides and tracks a person over time through a comprehensive array of health services appropriate to the individual’s need. A continuum of care may include prevention, early intervention, treatment, continuing care, and recovery support.
Figure 4.1: Substance Use Status and Substance Use Care Continuum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Physical, Social, and Mental Health</th>
<th>Substance Misuse</th>
<th>Substance Use Disorder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A state of physical, mental, and social well-being, free from substance misuse, in which an individual is able to realize his or her abilities, cope with the normal stresses of life, work productively and fruitfully, and make a contribution to his or her community.</td>
<td>The use of any substance in a manner, situation, amount, or frequency that can cause harm to the user and/or to those around them.</td>
<td>Clinically and functionally significant impairment caused by substance use, including health problems, disability, and failure to meet major responsibilities at work, school, or home; substance use disorders are measured on a continuum from mild, moderate, to severe based on a person’s number of symptoms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Substance Use Status Continuum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enhancing Health</th>
<th>Primary Prevention</th>
<th>Early Intervention</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Recovery Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promoting optimum physical and mental health and well-being, free from substance misuse, through health communications and access to health care services, income and economic security, and workplace certainty.</td>
<td>Addressing individual and environmental risk factors for substance use through evidence-based programs, policies, and strategies.</td>
<td>Screening and detecting substance use problems at an early stage and providing brief intervention, as needed.</td>
<td>Intervening through medication, counseling, and other supportive services to eliminate symptoms and achieve and maintain sobriety, physical, spiritual, and mental health and maximum functional ability. Levels of care include: • Outpatient services; • Intensive Outpatient/ Partial Hospitalization Services; • Residential/ Inpatient Services; and • Medically Managed Intensive Inpatient Services.</td>
<td>Removing barriers and providing supports to aid the long-term recovery process. Includes a range of social, educational, legal, and other services that facilitate recovery, wellness, and improved quality of life.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chapter describes the early intervention and treatment components of the continuum of care, the major behavioral, pharmacological, and service components of care, services available, and emerging treatment technologies:

- *Early Intervention*, for addressing substance misuse problems or mild disorders and helping to prevent more severe substance use disorders.
- *Treatment engagement and harm reduction interventions*, for individuals who have a substance use disorder but who may not be ready to enter treatment, help engage individuals in treatment and reduce the risks and harms associated with substance misuse.
- *Substance use disorder treatment*, an individualized set of evidence-based clinical services designed to improve health and function, including medications and behavioral therapies.
- *Emerging treatment technologies* are increasingly being used to support the assessment, treatment, and maintenance of continuing contact with individuals with substance use disorders.
Early Intervention: Identifying and Engaging Individuals At Risk for Substance Misuse and Substance Use Disorders

Early intervention services can be provided in a variety of settings (e.g., school clinics, primary care offices, mental health clinics) to people who have problematic use or mild substance use disorders. These services are usually provided when an individual presents for another medical condition or social service need and is not seeking treatment for a substance use disorder. The goals of early intervention are to reduce the harms associated with substance misuse, to reduce risk behaviors before they lead to injury, to improve health and social function, and to prevent progression to a disorder and subsequent need for specialty substances use disorder services. Early intervention consists of providing information about substance use risks, normal or safe levels of use, and strategies to quit or cut down on use and use-related risk behaviors, and facilitating patient initiation and engagement in treatment when needed. Early intervention services may be considered the bridge between prevention and treatment services. For individuals with more serious substance misuse, intervention in these settings can serve as a mechanism to engage them into treatment.

Populations Who Should Receive Early Intervention

Early intervention should be provided to both adolescents and adults who are at risk of or show signs of substance misuse or a mild substance use disorder. One group typically in need of early intervention is people who binge drink: people who have consumed at least 5 (for men) or 4 (for women) drinks on a single occasion at least once in the past 30 days. Recent national survey data suggest that over 66 million individuals aged 12 or older can be classified as binge drinkers. Of particular concern are the 1.4 million binge drinkers aged 12 to 17, who may be at higher risk for future substance use disorders because of their young age.

Other groups who are likely to benefit from early intervention are people who use substances while driving and women who use substances while pregnant. In 2015, an estimated 214,000 women consumed alcohol while pregnant, and an estimated 109,000 pregnant women used illicit drugs.

Available research shows that brief, early interventions, given by a respected care provider, such as a nurse, nurse educator, or physician, in the context of usual medical care (for example, a routine medical exam or care for an injury or illness) can educate and motivate many individuals who are misusing substances to understand and acknowledge their risky behavior and to reduce their substance use.

Regardless of the substance, the first step to early intervention is screening to identify behaviors that put the individual at risk for harm or for developing a substance use disorder. Positive screening results should then be followed by brief advice or counseling tailored to the specific problems and interests of the individual and delivered in a non-judgmental manner, emphasizing both the importance of reducing substance use and the individual’s ability to accomplish this goal. Later follow-up monitoring should assess whether the screening and brief intervention were effective in reducing the substance use below risky levels or whether the person needs formal treatment.
Components of Early Intervention

One structured approach to delivering early intervention to people showing signs of substance misuse and/or early signs of a substance use disorder is through screening and brief intervention (SBI).\textsuperscript{22} Research has shown that several methods of SBI are effective in decreasing “at-risk” substance use and that they work for a variety of populations and in a variety of health care settings.\textsuperscript{22,23} As mentioned earlier, this research has demonstrated positive effects for reducing alcohol use,\textsuperscript{24,25} the research with SBI among those with other substance use disorders has shown mixed results.\textsuperscript{26-29}

In addition, research shows that SBI can be cost-effective. For example, a randomized study compared SBI to screening alone for alcohol and drug use disorders among patients covered by Medicaid in eight emergency medicine clinics in the State of Washington. A year later, investigators compared total Medicaid expenditures between the two groups and found that the costs per member, per month for the SBI group were $185 to $192 lower than the costs for the screening-only group. This added up to a savings of more than $2,200 per patient in one year.\textsuperscript{30}

**SBI: Screening**

Ideally, substance misuse screening should occur for all individuals who present in health care settings, including primary, urgent, psychiatric, and emergency care. Professional organizations, including the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, the American Medical Association, the American Academy of Family Physicians, and the American Academy of Pediatrics recommend universal and ongoing screening for substance use and mental health issues for adults and adolescents.\textsuperscript{31-36} Such screening practices can help identify the severity of the individual’s substance use and whether substance use disorder treatment may be necessary.

Within these contexts, substance misuse can be reliably identified through dialogue, observation, medical tests, and screening instruments.\textsuperscript{37} Several validated screening instruments have been developed to help non-specialty providers identify individuals who may have, or be at risk for, a substance use disorder. **Table 4.1** provides examples of available substance use screening tools, how they are used, and for which age groups. In addition to these tools, single-item screens for presence of drug use (“How many times in the past year have you used an illegal drug or used a prescription medication for nonmedical reasons?”) and for alcohol use (“How many times in the past year have you had X or more drinks in a day?”, where X is 5 for men and 4 for women) have been validated and shown in primary care to accurately identify individuals at risk for or experiencing a substance use disorder.\textsuperscript{38-42}
### Table 4.1: Evidence-Based Screening Tools for Substance Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screening Tool</th>
<th>Substance Type</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Screening and Brief Intervention for Adolescents and Youth: A Practitioner’s Guide</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test-C (AUDIT-C)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief Screener for Tobacco, Alcohol, and Other Drugs (BSTAD)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRAFFT</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRAFFT (Part A)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Abuse Screen Test (DAST-10)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAST-20: Adolescent version</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping Patients Who Drink Too Much: A Clinicians’ Guide</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIDA Drug Use Screening Tool</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIDA Drug Use Screening Tool: Quick Screen</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opioid Risk Tool</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2BI</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### SBI: Brief Interventions

Brief interventions (or brief advice) range from informal counseling to structured therapies. They often include feedback to the individual about their level of use relative to safe limits, as well as advice to aid the individual in decision-making.

Motivational interviewing (MI) is a client-centered counseling style that addresses a person’s ambivalence to change. A counselor uses a conversational approach to help their client discover their interest in changing their substance using behavior. The counselor asks the client to express their desire for change and any ambivalence they might have and then begins to work with the client on a plan to change their behavior and to make a commitment to the change process. The main purpose of MI is to examine and resolve ambivalence, and the counselor is intentionally directive in pursuing this goal. It is effective in reducing the substance misuse of patients who come to medical settings for other health-related conditions. In these settings, individuals who receive MI are more likely to adhere to a treatment plan and, subsequently, to have better outcomes.

---

**SAMHSA SBIRT Education**

SAMHSA offers free SBIRT Continuing Medical Education and Continuing Education courses for providers.
Adding Referral to Treatment When Necessary

When an individual’s substance use problem meets criteria for a substance use disorder, and/or when brief interventions do not produce change, it may be necessary to motivate the patient to engage in specialized treatment. This is called Screening, Brief Intervention, and Referral to Treatment (SBIRT). In such cases, the care provider makes a referral for a clinical assessment followed by a clinical treatment plan developed with the individual that is tailored to meet the person’s needs. Effective referral processes should incorporate strategies to motivate patients to accept the referral. Although the screening and brief intervention components of SBIRT are the same as SBI, referral to treatment helps the individual access, select, and navigate barriers to substance use disorder treatment.

The literature on the effectiveness of drug-focused brief intervention in primary care and emergency departments is less clear, with some studies finding no improvements among those receiving brief interventions. However, at least one study found significant reductions in subsequent drug use. Even if brief interventions are not found to be sufficient to address patients’ drug use disorders, general health care settings still have an important role to play in addressing drug use disorders, by providing medication-assisted treatment (MAT), providing more robust monitoring and care coordination, and actively promoting engagement in specialty substance use disorder treatment.

Trials evaluating different types of screening and brief interventions for drug use in a range of settings and on a range of patient characteristics are lacking. Recently, efforts have been made to adapt SBIRT for adolescents and for all groups with substance use disorders. The results of preliminary studies are promising, but gaps in knowledge about SBIRT for adolescents still need to be filled.

Treatment Engagement: Reaching and Reducing Harm Among Those Who Need Treatment

Populations Who Need Treatment but Are Not Receiving It

Despite the fact that substance use disorders are widespread, only a small percentage of people receive treatment. Results from the 2015 National Survey of Drug Use and Health (NSDUH) reveal that only about 2.2 million people with a substance use disorder, or about 1 in 10 affected individuals, received any type of treatment in the year before the survey was administered. This “treatment gap” is a large and costly concern for individuals, families, and communities. Of those who needed treatment but did not receive treatment, over 7 million were women and more than 1 million were adolescents aged 12 to 17. Some racial and ethnic groups experience disparities in entering and receiving substance use disorder treatment services. For example, approximately 13 million of those who did not receive treatment were non-Hispanic or non-Latino Whites, about 3 million were Hispanics or Latinos, and about 3 million were non-Hispanic Blacks or African Americans. Among all individuals who met criteria for a substance use disorder, alcohol was by far the most prevalent substance reported, followed by marijuana, misuse of prescription pain relievers, cocaine, and methamphetamines, and about 1 in
10 reported use of multiple substances.\textsuperscript{19} Additionally, over 8 million individuals, or about 40 percent of those with a substance use disorder, also had a mental disorder diagnosed in the year before the survey.\textsuperscript{19} Nonetheless, only 6.8 percent of these individuals received treatment for both conditions, and 52.0 percent received no treatment at all.\textsuperscript{19} Many individuals with substance use disorders also have related physical health problems. Substance use can contribute to medical issues, such as an increased risk of liver, lung, or cardiovascular disease, as well as infectious diseases such as Hepatitis B or C, and HIV/AIDS, and can worsen these health outcomes.\textsuperscript{56}

**Reasons for Not Seeking Treatment**

There are many reasons people do not seek treatment. The most common reason is that they are unaware that they need treatment; they have never been told they have a substance use disorder or they do not consider themselves to have a problem. This is one reason why screening for substance use disorders in general health care settings is so important. In addition, among those who do perceive that they need substance use disorder treatment, many still do not seek it. For these individuals, the most common reasons given are:\textsuperscript{19}

- Not ready to stop using (40.7 percent). A common clinical feature associated with substance use disorders is an individual’s tendency to underestimate the severity of their problem and to over-estimate their ability to control it. This is likely due to substance-induced changes in the brain circuits that control impulses, motivation, and decision making.
- Do not have health care coverage/could not afford (30.6 percent).
- Might have a negative effect on job (16.4 percent) or cause neighbors/community to have a negative opinion (8.3 percent).
- Do not know where to go for treatment (12.6 percent) or no program has the type of treatment desired (11.0 percent).
- Do not have transportation, programs are too far away, or hours are inconvenient (11.8 percent).

The costs of care and lack of insurance coverage are particularly important issues for people with substance use disorders. The 2015 NSDUH found that among individuals who needed and made an effort to get treatment but did not receive specialty substance use treatment, 30.0 percent reported that they did not have insurance coverage and could not afford to pay for treatment.\textsuperscript{19} Thus, a way to reduce health disparities is to increase the number of people who have health insurance. However, even if an individual is insured, the payor may not cover some types or components of substance use disorder treatments, particularly medications.\textsuperscript{57,58} These challenges are magnified further for those who live in rural areas, where substance use disorder treatment services can be distant and thus difficult to reach, as well as expensive because of travel time and cost.\textsuperscript{58}
Strategies to Reduce Harm

Strategies to reduce the harms associated with substance use have been developed as a way to engage people in treatment and to address the needs of those who are not yet ready to participate in treatment. Harm reduction programs provide public health-oriented, evidence-based, and cost-effective services to prevent and reduce substance use-related risks among those actively using substances, and substantial evidence supports their effectiveness. These programs work with populations who may not be ready to stop substance use – offering individuals strategies to reduce risks while still using substances. Strategies include outreach and education programs, needle/syringe exchange programs, overdose prevention education, and access to naloxone to reverse potentially lethal opioid overdose. These strategies are designed to reduce substance misuse and its negative consequences for the users and those around them, such as transmission of HIV and other infectious diseases. They also seek to help individuals engage in treatment to reduce, manage, and stop their substance use when appropriate.

Outreach and Education

Outreach activities seek to identify those with active substance use disorders who are not in treatment and help them realize that treatment is available, accessible, and necessary. Outreach and engagement methods may include telephone contacts, face-to-face street outreach, community engagement, or assertive outreach after a referral is made by a clinician or caseworker. These efforts often occur within or in collaboration with programs for intimate partner violence, homelessness, or HIV/AIDS. One study showed that 41 percent of referrals to treatment among substance-using individuals enrolled in a homelessness outreach project successfully resulted in treatment enrollment. This is notable and promising, but additional research is needed to validate that outreach efforts geared at identifying individuals who need treatment are successful at increasing substance use treatment enrollment and subsequent outcomes.

Educational campaigns are also a common strategy for reducing harms associated with substance use. Such campaigns have historically been targeted toward substance-using individuals, giving them information and guidance on risks associated with sharing medications or needles, how to access low or no-cost treatment services, and how to prevent a drug overdose death. Other education campaigns target the overall public to improve general understanding about addiction, community health and safety risks, and how to access available treatment services. Two examples are SAMHSA’s National Recovery Month, which seeks to increase awareness and understanding of mental and substance use issues, and the Anyone.Anytime. campaign in New Hampshire, which was implemented statewide to educate the public and professionals about addiction, emergency overdose medication, and accessibility to support services for those with opioid use disorders. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration’s (NHTSA’s) annual Drive Sober or Get Pulled Over campaign is another example, aimed at reducing drunk driving and preventing alcohol-impaired fatalities.

Needle/Syringe Exchange Programs

Drugs such as heroin and other opioids, cocaine, and methamphetamine are commonly used by injection, and this route of administration has been a major source of infectious disease transmission including HIV, Hepatitis B, Hepatitis C, and other blood-borne diseases. Data from the CDC reveal
that even though HIV among people who inject drugs is declining, it is still a significant problem: 7 percent (3,096) of the 47,352 newly diagnosed cases of HIV infection in the United States in 2013 were attributable to injection drug use, and another 3 percent (1,270) involved male-to-male sexual contact combined with injection drug use.\textsuperscript{73,74} Nearly 20,000 people died from Hepatitis C in 2014, and 3.5 million are living with Hepatitis C. New cases of Hepatitis C infection increased 250 percent between 2010 and 2014, and occur primarily among young White people who inject drugs.\textsuperscript{75}

Because of these data, providing sterile needles and syringes to people who inject drugs has become an important strategy for reducing disease transmission. The goal of needle/syringe exchange programs is to minimize infection transmission risks by giving individuals who inject drugs sterile equipment and other support services at little or no cost.\textsuperscript{76} Additional services from these programs often include HIV/AIDS counseling and testing; strategies and education for preventing sexually transmitted infections, including condom use and use of medications before or after exposure to HIV to reduce the risk of becoming infected (pre-exposure prophylaxis [PrEP] or post-exposure prophylaxis [PEP]); and other health care services. Needle/syringe exchange programs also attempt to encourage individuals to engage in substance use disorder treatment.\textsuperscript{77}

Evaluation studies have clearly shown that needle/syringe exchange programs are effective in reducing HIV transmission and do not increase rates of community drug use.\textsuperscript{78} However, most of the research has not examined the impact of these programs on Hepatitis C transmission, therefore currently available data are insufficient to address this question.\textsuperscript{79}

\textit{Naloxone}

Opioid overdose incidents and deaths, either from prescription pain relievers or heroin, are a serious threat to public health in the United States. Overdose deaths from opioid pain relievers and heroin have risen dramatically in the past 14 years,\textsuperscript{80} from 5,990 in 1999 to 29,467 in 2014, and most were preventable. Rates of opioid overdose deaths are particularly high among individuals with an opioid use disorder who have recently stopped their use as a result of detoxification or incarceration. As a result, their tolerance for the drug is reduced, making them more vulnerable to an overdose. Those who mix opioids with alcohol, benzodiazepines, or other drugs also have a high risk of overdose.\textsuperscript{59}

Opioid overdose does not occur immediately after a person has taken the drug. Rather, the effects develop gradually as the drug depresses a person’s breathing and heart rate. This eventually leads to coma and death if the overdose is not treated. This gradual progress means that there is typically a 1- to 3-hour window of opportunity after a user has taken the drug in which bystanders can take action to prevent the user’s death.\textsuperscript{59}

Naloxone is an opioid antagonist medication approved by the FDA to reverse opioid overdose in injectable and nasal spray forms. It works by displacing opioids from receptors in the brain, thereby blocking their effects on breathing and heart rate.

The rising number of deaths from opioid overdose has led to increasing public health efforts to make naloxone available to at-risk individuals and their families, as well as to emergency medical technicians, police officers, and other first responders, or through community-based opioid overdose prevention programs. Although regulations vary by state, some states have passed laws expanding access to
naloxyone without a patient-specific prescription in some localities.\textsuperscript{51,52} Additionally, some schools across the country are stocking naloxone for use by trained nurses.

Interventions that distribute take-home doses of naloxone along with education and training for those actively using opioids and their peers and family members, have the potential to help decrease overdose-related deaths.\textsuperscript{83,84} Current evidence from nonrandomized studies also suggests that family, friends, and other community members who are properly trained can and will administer naloxone appropriately during an overdose incident.\textsuperscript{85} And, despite concern that access to naloxone might increase the prevalence or frequency of opioid use, research demonstrates that neither of these problems has occurred.\textsuperscript{86}

### FDA Approval of Naloxone Nasal Spray

Naloxone, a safe medication that can quickly restore normal breathing to a person in danger of dying from an opioid overdose, is already carried by emergency medical personnel and other first responders. But by the time an overdosing person is reached and treated, it is often too late to save them. To solve this problem, several experimental Overdose Education and Naloxone Distribution (OEND) programs have given naloxone directly to opioid users, their friends or loved ones, and other potential bystanders, along with brief training on how to use this medication. These programs have been shown to be an effective, as well as cost-effective, way of saving lives.

Until recently, only injectable forms of naloxone were approved by the FDA. However, in November 2015, the FDA approved a user-friendly intranasal formulation of naloxone that matches the injectable version in terms of how much of the medication gets into the body and how rapidly. According to the CDC, more than 74 Americans die each day from an overdose involving prescription pain relievers or heroin. To reverse these trends, it is important to do everything possible to ensure that emergency personnel, as well as at-risk opioid users and their loved ones, have access to lifesaving medications like naloxone.

### Acute Stabilization and Withdrawal Management

Withdrawal management, often called "detoxification," includes interventions aimed at managing the physical and emotional symptoms that occur after a person stops using a substance. Withdrawal symptoms vary in intensity and duration based on the substance(s) used, the duration and amount of use, and the overall health of the individual. Some substances, such as alcohol, opioids, sedatives, and tranquilizers, produce significant physical withdrawal effects, while other substances, such as marijuana, stimulants, and caffeine, produce primarily emotional and cognitive withdrawal symptoms. Most periods of withdrawal are relatively short (3 to 5 days) and are managed with medications combined with vitamins, exercise, and sleep. One important exception is withdrawal from alcohol and sedatives/tranquilizers, especially if the latter are combined with heavy alcohol use. Rapid or unmanaged withdrawal from these substances can be protracted and can produce seizures and other health complications.\textsuperscript{86}

Withdrawal management is highly effective in preventing immediate and serious medical consequences associated with discontinuing substance use,\textsuperscript{86} but by itself it is not an effective treatment for any substance use disorder. It is best considered stabilization: The patient is assisted through a period of acute detoxification and withdrawal to being medically stable and substance-free. Stabilization includes
preparing the individual for treatment and involving the individual’s family and other significant people in the person’s life, as appropriate, to support the person’s treatment process. Stabilization is considered a first step toward recovery, much like acute management of a diabetic coma or a hypertensive stroke is simply the first step toward managing the underlying illness of diabetes or high blood pressure. Similarly, acute stabilization and withdrawal management are most effective when following evidence-based standards of care.87

Unfortunately, many individuals who receive withdrawal management do not become engaged in treatment. Studies have found that half to three quarters of individuals with substance use disorders who receive withdrawal management services do not enter treatment.88 One common result of not engaging in continuing care is rapid readmission to a detoxification center, an emergency department, or a hospital. For example, 27 percent of people who received detoxification services not followed by continuing care were readmitted within 1 year to public detoxification services in Delaware, Oklahoma, and Washington.89 Beginning substance use disorder treatment within 14 days of discharge from withdrawal management, however, has been shown to reduce readmission rates.90

One of the most serious consequences when individuals do not begin continuing care after withdrawal management is overdose. Because withdrawal management reduces much of an individual’s acquired tolerance, those who attempt to re-use their former substance in the same amount or frequency can experience physical problems. Individuals with opioid use disorders may be left particularly vulnerable to overdose and even death. It is critically important for health care providers to be prepared to properly assess the nature and severity of their patients’ clinical problems following withdrawal so that they can facilitate engagement into the appropriate intensity of treatment.56

Principles of Effective Treatment and Treatment Planning

Principles and Goals of Treatment

Treatment can occur in a variety of settings but most treatment for substance use disorders has traditionally been provided in specialty substance use disorder treatment programs. For this reason, the majority of research has been performed within these specialty settings.91 The following sections describe what is known from this research about the processes, stages of, and outcomes from traditional substance use disorder treatment programs.

The National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) has detailed the evidence-based principles of effective treatment for adults and adolescents with substance use disorders that apply regardless of the particular setting of care or type of substance use disorder treatment program (Table 4.2).85,92
Table 4.2: Principles of Effective Treatment for Substance Use Disorders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principles of Effective Treatment for Adults</th>
<th>Principles of Effective Treatment for Adolescents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Addiction is a complex but treatable disease that affects brain function and behavior.</td>
<td>1. Adolescent substance use needs to be identified and addressed as soon as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No single treatment is appropriate for everyone.</td>
<td>2. Adolescents can benefit from a drug abuse intervention even if they are not addicted to a drug.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Treatment needs to be readily available.</td>
<td>3. Routine annual medical visits are an opportunity to ask adolescents about drug use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Effective treatment attends to multiple needs of the individual, not just his or her drug abuse.</td>
<td>4. Legal interventions and sanctions or family pressure may play an important role in getting adolescents to enter, stay in, and complete treatment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Remaining in treatment for an adequate period of time is critical.</td>
<td>5. Substance use disorder treatment should be tailored to the unique needs of the adolescent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Behavioral therapies—including individual, family, or group counseling-- are the most commonly used forms of drug abuse treatment.</td>
<td>6. Treatment should address the needs of the whole person, rather than just focusing on his or her drug use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Medications are an important element of treatment for many patients, especially when combined with counseling and other behavioral therapies.</td>
<td>7. Behavioral therapies are effective in addressing adolescent drug use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. An individual’s treatment and services plan must be assessed continually and modified as necessary to ensure that it meets his or her changing needs.</td>
<td>8. Families and the community are important aspects of treatment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Many drug-addicted individuals also have other mental disorders.</td>
<td>9. Effectively treating substance use disorders in adolescents requires also identifying and treating any other mental health conditions they may have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Medically assisted detoxification is only the first stage of addiction treatment and by itself does little to change long-term drug abuse.</td>
<td>10. Sensitive issues such as violence and child abuse or risk of suicide should be identified and addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Treatment does not need to be voluntary to be effective.</td>
<td>11. It is important to monitor drug use during treatment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Drug use during treatment must be monitored continuously, as lapses during treatment do occur.</td>
<td>12. Staying in treatment for an adequate period of time and continuity of care afterward are important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Treatment programs should test patients for the presence of HIV/AIDS, Hepatitis B and C, tuberculosis, and other infectious diseases, provide risk-reduction counseling, and link patients to treatment if necessary.</td>
<td>13. Testing adolescents for sexually transmitted diseases like HIV, as well as Hepatitis B and C, is an important part of drug treatment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The goals of substance use disorder treatment are similar to those of treatments for other serious, often chronic, illnesses: reduce the major symptoms of the illness, improve health and social function, and teach and motivate patients to monitor their condition and manage threats of relapse. Substance use disorder treatment can be provided in inpatient or outpatient settings, depending on the needs of the patient, and typically incorporates a combination of behavioral therapies, medications, and RSS. However, unlike treatments for most other medical illnesses, substance use disorder treatment has traditionally been provided in programs (both residential and outpatient) outside of the mainstream health care system. The intensity of the treatment regimens offered can vary substantially across program types. The American Society of Addiction Medicine (ASAM) has categorized these programs into "levels" of care to guide referral based on an individual patient’s needs.
Despite differences in care delivery and differences in reimbursement, substance use disorder treatments have approximately the same rates of positive outcomes as treatment for other chronic illnesses. Relapse rates for substance use disorders (40 to 60 percent) are comparable to those for chronic diseases, such as diabetes (20 to 50 percent), hypertension (50 to 70 percent), and asthma (50 to 70 percent).\textsuperscript{12}

The general process of treatment planning and delivery for individuals with severe substance use disorders is described below, along with an explanation of the evidence-based therapies, medications, and RSS shown to be effective in treatment.

**Treatment Planning**

*Assessment and Diagnosis*

Among the first steps involved in substance use disorder treatment are assessment and diagnosis. The diagnosis of substance use disorders is based primarily on the results of a clinical interview. Several assessment instruments are available to help structure and elicit the information required to diagnose substance use disorders. The diagnosis of a substance use disorder is made by a trained professional based on 11 symptoms defined in the Fifth Edition of the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (DSM-5). These symptoms, which are generally related to loss of control over substance use,\textsuperscript{96} are presented in Table 15\textsuperscript{2} in Chapter 1. The number of diagnostic symptoms present defines the severity of the disorder, ranging from mild to severe (i.e., fewer than 2 symptoms = no disorder; 2 to 3 symptoms = mild disorder; 4 to 5 symptoms = moderate disorder; 6 or more symptoms = severe disorder).\textsuperscript{97}

Conducting a clinical assessment is essential to understanding the nature and severity of the patient’s health and social problems that may have led to or resulted from the substance use. This assessment is important in determining the intensity of care that will be recommended and the composition of the treatment plan.\textsuperscript{91} Several validated assessment tools can provide information about an individual’s substance use disorder. Table 4.3 gives a brief overview of some of the tools that are available.
### Table 4.3: Detailed Information on Substance Use Disorder Assessment Tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addiction Severity Index (ASI)</th>
<th>Substance Abuse Module (SAM)</th>
<th>Global Appraisal of Individual Needs (GAIN)</th>
<th>Psychiatric Research Interview for Substance and Mental Disorders (PRISM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Semi-structured interview.</td>
<td>• Expanded and more detailed version of the substance use section of the Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI).</td>
<td>• Series of measures (screener, standardized biopsychosocial intake assessment battery, follow-up assessment battery) which integrate research and clinical assessment.</td>
<td>• Semi-structured, clinician-administered interview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Addresses seven potential problem areas in substance using individuals: medical status, employment and support, drug use, alcohol use, legal status, family/social status, and psychiatric status.</td>
<td>• Designed to assess mental disorders as defined by the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition (DSM-IV).</td>
<td>• Contains 99 scales and subscales, that are designed to measure the recency, breadth, and frequency of problems and service utilization related to substance use (including diagnosis and course, treatment motivation, and relapse potential), physical health, risk/protective involvement, mental health, environment and vocational situation.</td>
<td>• Measures the major DSM-IV diagnoses of alcohol, drug, and psychiatric disorders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides an overview of problems related to substance, rather than focusing on any single area.</td>
<td>• Contains four diagnostic sections on tobacco, alcohol, drugs, and caffeine.</td>
<td>• Can assess change over time.</td>
<td>• Provides clear guidelines for differentiating between the effects of intoxication and withdrawal, substance-induced disorders, and primary disorders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Used extensively for treatment planning and outcome evaluation.</td>
<td>• Includes questions about when symptoms began and how recent they are, withdrawal symptoms, and the physical, social and psychological consequences of each substance assessed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A shorter, self-report version of the ASI called the ASI-Lite is also available.</td>
<td>• Assesses the respondent’s impairment and treatment seeking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can assess substance use disorders quickly and accurately in the clinical setting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Individualized Treatment Planning

After a formal assessment, the information is discussed with the patient to jointly develop a personalized treatment plan designed to address the patient’s needs. The treatment plan and goals should be person-centered and include strength-based approaches, or ones that draw upon an individual’s strengths, resources, potential, and ability to recover, to keep the patient engaged in care. Individualized treatment plans should consider age, gender identity, race and ethnicity, language, health literacy, religion/spirituality, sexual orientation, culture, trauma history, and co-occurring physical and mental health problems. Such considerations are critical for understanding the individual and for tailoring the treatment to his or her specific needs. This increases the likelihood of successful treatment engagement and retention, and research shows that those who participate more fully in treatment typically have better outcomes. Throughout treatment, individuals should be periodically reassessed to determine response to treatment and to make any needed adjustments to the treatment plan.
Maintaining Treatment Engagement and Retention

Treatment plans should be personalized and include engagement and retention strategies to promote participation, motivation, and adherence to the plan. Research has found that individuals who received proactive engagement services such as direct outreach and a specific follow-up plan are more likely to remain engaged in services throughout the treatment process.

Treatment providers can improve engagement and retention in programs by building a strong therapeutic alliance with the patient, effectively using evidence-based motivational strategies, acknowledging the patient’s individual barriers, making reminder phone calls, and creating a positive environment. Further, providers who can recommend and/or provide a broad range of RSS, such as child care, housing, and transportation, can improve retention in treatment.

Engaging, effective treatment also involves culturally competent care. For example, treatment programs that provide gender-specific and gender-responsive care are more likely to enhance women’s treatment outcomes. Tailoring treatment to involve family and community is particularly effective for certain groups. For example, American Indians or Alaska Natives may require specific elements in their treatment plan that respond to their unique cultural experiences and to intergenerational and historical trauma and trauma from violent encounters. Language and literacy (including health literacy) may also affect how a person responds to the treatment environment. Race and ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender identity, and economic status can play significant roles in treatment initiation, engagement, and completion.

Substance use disorder treatment programs also have an obligation to prepare for disasters within their communities that can affect the availability of services. A disaster can disrupt a program’s ability to provide treatment services or an individual’s ability to maintain treatment. Individuals in recovery, for example, may relapse due to sudden discontinuation of services or stress when having to cope with effects of a disaster. Individuals receiving MAT could be at risk of serious withdrawal symptoms if medications are stopped abruptly. Others may face challenges without their treatment program’s support. Therefore, planning for disasters and other large scale emergencies is critical to prevent or reduce the impact of interruptions in treatment services.

Treatment Setting and the Continuum of Care

As indicated above, the treatment of addiction is delivered in predominantly freestanding programs that differ in their setting (hospital, residential, or outpatient); in the frequency of care delivery (daily sessions to monthly visits); in the range of treatment components offered; and in the planned duration of care. In general, as patients progress in treatment and begin to meet the goals of their individualized treatment plan, they transfer from clinical management in residential or intensive outpatient programs to less clinically intensive outpatient programs that promote patient self-management.
A typical progression for someone who has a severe substance use disorder might start with 3 to 7 days in a medically managed withdrawal program, followed by a 1- to 3-month period of intensive rehabilitative care in a residential treatment program, followed by continuing care, first in an intensive outpatient program (2 to 5 days per week for a few months) and later in a traditional outpatient program that meets 1 to 2 times per month. For many patients whose current living situations are not conducive to recovery, outpatient services should be provided in conjunction with recovery-supportive housing.

In general, patients with serious substance use disorders are recommended to stay engaged for at least 1 year in the treatment process, which may involve participation in three to four different programs or services at reduced levels of intensity, all of which are ideally designed to help the patient prepare for continued self-management after treatment ends. This expected trajectory of care explains why efforts to maintain patient motivation and engagement are important. Brief summaries of the major levels of the treatment continuum are discussed below.

_Medically monitored and managed inpatient care_ is an intensive service delivered in an acute, inpatient hospital setting. These programs are typically necessary for individuals who require withdrawal management, primary medical and nursing care, and for those with co-occurring mental and physical health conditions. Treatment is usually provided by an interdisciplinary team of health care professionals, available 24 hours a day, who can address serious mental and physical health needs.

_Residential services_ offer organized services, also in a 24-hour setting but outside of a hospital. These programs typically provide support, structure, and an array of evidence-based clinical services. Such programs are appropriate for physically and emotionally stabilized individuals who may not have a living situation that supports recovery, may have a history of relapse, or have co-occurring physical and/or mental illnesses.

_Partial hospitalization and intensive outpatient services_ range from counseling and education to clinically intensive programming. Partial hospitalization programs are used as a step-down treatment option after completing residential treatment and are usually available 6 to 8 hours a day during the work week. These services are considered to be approximately as intensive but less restrictive than residential programs and are appropriate for patients living in an environment that supports recovery but who need structure to avoid relapse.

_Outpatient services_ provide both group and individual behavioral interventions and medications when appropriate. These components of care can be offered during the day, before or after work or school, or in the evenings and weekends. Typically, outpatient programs are appropriate as the initial level of care for individuals with a mild to moderate substance use disorder or as continuing care after completing more intensive treatment. Outpatient programs are also suitable for individuals with co-occurring mental health conditions.
Evidence-based Treatment: Components of Care

Regardless of the substance for which the individual seeks treatment or the setting or level of care, all substance use disorder treatment programs are expected to offer an individualized set of evidence-based clinical components. These components are clinical practices that research has shown to be effective in reducing substance use and improving health and functioning. These include behavioral therapies, medications, and RSS. Treatment programs that offer more of these evidence-based components have the greatest likelihood of producing better outcomes.

Medications and Medication-Assisted Treatment

Five medications, approved by the FDA, have been developed to treat alcohol and opioid use disorders. Currently, no approved medications are available to treat marijuana, amphetamine, or cocaine use disorders.\(^{117}\) Table 4.4 lists these medications and they are discussed individually in the text that follows.

Table 4.4: Pharmacotherapies Used to Treat Alcohol and Opioid Use Disorders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medication</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Dosage Form</th>
<th>DEA Schedule*</th>
<th>Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buprenorphine-Naloxone</td>
<td>Opioid use disorder</td>
<td>Sublingual film**,(^{118})</td>
<td>CIII</td>
<td>Used for detoxification or maintenance of abstinence for individuals aged 16 or older. Physicians who wish to prescribe buprenorphine, must obtain a waiver from SAMHSA and be issued an additional registration number by the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2mg/0.5mg, 4mg/1mg, 8mg/2mg, and 12mg/3mg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sublingual tablet:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4mg/0.36mg, 2mg/0.5mg, 2.9/0.71mg, 5.7mg/1.4mg, 8mg/2mg, 8.6mg/2.1mg, 11.4mg/2.9mg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Buccal film:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1mg/0.3mg, 4.2mg/0.7mg, 6.3mg/1mg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buprenorphine Hydrochloride</td>
<td>Opioid use disorder</td>
<td>Sublingual tablet:</td>
<td>CIII</td>
<td>This formulation is indicated for treatment of opioid dependence and is preferred for induction. However, it is considered the preferred formulation for pregnant patients, patients with hepatic impairment, and patients with sensitivity to naloxone. It is also used for initiating treatment in patients transferring from methadone, in preference to products containing naloxone, because of the risk of precipitating withdrawal in these patients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2mg, 4mg, 8mg, and 12mg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medication</td>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Dosage Form</td>
<td>DEA Schedule*</td>
<td>Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probuphine® implants: 80mgx4 implants for a total of 320mg</td>
<td>For those already stable on low to moderate dose buprenorphine. The administration of the implant dosage form requires specific training and must be surgically inserted and removed.</td>
<td>CII</td>
<td>Methadone used for the treatment of opioid addiction in detoxification or maintenance programs shall be dispensed only by Opioid Treatment Programs (OTPs) certified by SAMHSA and approved by the designated state authority. Under federal regulations it can be used in persons under age 18 at the discretion of an OTP physician.¹¹⁹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methadone</td>
<td>Opioid use disorder</td>
<td>Tablet: 5mg, 10mg</td>
<td>CII</td>
<td>Provided by prescription; naltrexone blocks opioid receptors, reduces cravings, and diminishes the rewarding effects of alcohol and opioids. Extended-release injectable naltrexone is recommended to prevent relapse to opioids or alcohol. The prescriber need not be a physician, but must be licensed and authorized to prescribe by the state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naltrexone</td>
<td>Opioid use disorder; alcohol use disorder</td>
<td>Tablets: 25mg, 50mg, and 100mg</td>
<td>Not Scheduled under the Controlled Substances Act</td>
<td>Provided by prescription; acamprosate is used in the maintenance of alcohol abstinence. The prescriber need not be a physician, but must be licensed and authorized to prescribe by the state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acamprosate</td>
<td>Alcohol use disorder</td>
<td>Delayed-release tablet: 333mg</td>
<td>Not Scheduled under the Controlled Substances Act</td>
<td>Provided by prescription; disulfiram causes severe physical reactions, including nausea, flushing, and heart palpitations. The knowledge that such a reaction is likely if alcohol is consumed acts as a deterrent to drinking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *For more information about the DEA Schedule and classification of specific drugs, see Appendix D - Important Facts about Alcohol and Drugs.

**This dosage form may be used via sublingual or buccal routes of administration; sublingual means placed under the tongue, buccal means applied to the buccal area (in the cheek).

Source: Adapted from Lee et al., (2015).¹²⁰
Like all other FDA-approved medications, those listed in Table 4.4 demonstrate “well-supported” experimental evidence of safety and effectiveness for improving outcomes for individuals with alcohol and opioid use disorders. At the same time, all of these medications have side effects; two (methadone and buprenorphine) have the potential to be misused, and methadone (and to a lesser extent buprenorphine) has the potential for overdose. For these reasons, only appropriately trained health care professionals should decide whether medication is needed as part of treatment, how the medication is provided in the context of other clinical services, and under what conditions the medication should be withdrawn or terminated.

The combination of behavioral interventions and medications to treat substance use disorders is commonly referred to as MAT. MAT is a highly effective treatment option for individuals with alcohol and opioid use disorders. Studies have repeatedly demonstrated the efficacy of MAT at reducing illicit drug use and overdose deaths, improving retention in treatment, and reducing HIV transmission.

Some medications used to treat opioid use disorders can be used to manage withdrawal and as maintenance treatment to reduce craving, lessen withdrawal symptoms, and maintain recovery. These medications are used to help a patient function comfortably without illicit opioids or alcohol while balance is gradually restored to the brain circuits that have been altered by prolonged substance use.

Prescribed in this fashion, medications for substance use disorders are in some ways like insulin for patients with diabetes. Insulin reduces symptoms by normalizing glucose metabolism, but it is part of a broader disease control strategy that also employs diet change, education on healthy living, and self-monitoring. Whether treating diabetes or a substance use disorder, medications are best employed as part of a broader treatment plan involving behavioral health therapies and RSS, as well as regular monitoring.

State agencies that oversee substance use disorder treatment programs use a variety of strategies to promote implementation of MAT, including education and training, financial incentives (e.g., linking funding to the provision of MAT), policy mandates, and support for infrastructure development. Nevertheless, multiple factors create barriers to widespread use of MAT. These include provider, public, and client attitudes and beliefs about MAT; lack of an appropriate infrastructure for providing medications; need for staff training and development; and legislation, policies, and regulations that limit MAT implementation.

Medication-Assisted Treatment for Opioid Use Disorders

MAT for patients with a chronic opioid use disorder must be delivered for an adequate duration in order to be effective. Patients who receive MAT for fewer than 90 days have not shown improved outcomes. One study suggested that individuals who receive MAT for fewer than 3 years are more likely to relapse than those who are in treatment for 3 or more years. Three medications are commonly used to treat opioid use disorders: methadone, buprenorphine, and naltrexone.
**Methadone** is a synthetic opioid agonist that has been used to treat the symptoms of withdrawal from heroin and other opioids.\(^{127}\) More than 40 years of research support the use of methadone as an effective treatment for opioid use disorder.\(^{121,128,129}\) It is also used in the treatment of patients with chronic, severe pain\(^{130}\) as a therapeutic alternative to morphine sulfate and other opioid analgesics.\(^{131}\) Any licensed physician can prescribe methadone for the treatment of pain, but methadone may only be dispensed for treatment of an opioid use disorder within licensed methadone treatment programs.

Long-term methadone maintenance treatment for opioid use disorders has been shown to be more effective than short-term withdrawal management,\(^{132}\) and it has demonstrated improved outcomes for individuals (including pregnant women and their infants) with opioid use disorders.\(^{133}\) Studies have also indicated that methadone reduces deaths, HIV risk behaviors, and criminal behavior associated with opioid drug seeking.\(^{134,135}\)

The use of methadone to treat opioid use disorders has much in common with treatments for other substance use disorders and other chronic illnesses. However, it has one significant structural and cultural difference. Under regulations dating back to the early 1970s, the federal government created special methadone programs for adults with opioid use disorders. Originally referred to as “methadone treatment programs,” these treatment facilities were created to provide special management of the medical and legal issues associated with the use of this potent, long-acting opioid.

The use of opioid agonist medications to treat opioid use disorders has always had its critics. Many people, including some policymakers, authorities in the criminal justice system, and treatment providers, have viewed maintenance treatments as “substituting one substance for another”\(^{65}\) and have adhered instead to an abstinence-only philosophy that avoids the use of medications, especially those that activate opioid receptors. Such views are not scientifically supported; the research clearly demonstrates that MAT leads to better treatment outcomes compared to behavioral treatments alone. Moreover, withholding medications greatly increases the risk of relapse to illicit opioid use and overdose death. Decades of research have shown that the benefits of MAT greatly outweigh the risks associated with diversion.

Today, methadone treatment programs, now called Opioid Treatment Programs (OTPs), must be certified by SAMHSA and registered by the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA). OTPs are predominantly outpatient programs (approximately 95 percent) that provide pharmacotherapy in combination with behavioral therapies and other RSS.\(^{136}\) OTPs incorporate principles of harm reduction and benefit both program participants and the community\(^{137}\) by reducing opioid use, mortality, crime associated with opioid use disorders, and infectious disease transmission. Buprenorphine and naltrexone may also be provided in OTPs.\(^{61}\)
Individuals receiving medication for opioid use disorders in an OTP must initially take their doses daily under observation. After a period of orientation, patients are typically started at a dose of 20 to 30 mg and gradually increased to 80 mg or more per day, until craving and opioid misuse are significantly reduced. During this period, all dosing occurs at the OTP, but following stabilization and initially positive results, the stabilized patient may be given a “take-home” supply of his or her dose to self-administer per the federal opioid treatment standard regulations 42 CFR 8.12(i).

**Buprenorphine** is available as a sublingual tablet and a sublingual or buccal film. In addition, in May 2016, an implantable formulation of buprenorphine was approved by the FDA. For individuals who are already on a stable low to moderate dose of buprenorphine, the implant delivers a constant low dose of buprenorphine for 6 months. Buprenorphine is associated with improved outcomes compared to placebo for individuals (including pregnant women and their infants) with opioid use disorders, and it is effective in reducing illegal opioid use.

Buprenorphine is a partial opioid agonist, meaning that it binds to and activates opioid receptors but with less intensity than full agonists. As a result, there is an upper limit to how much euphoria, pain relief, or respiratory depression buprenorphine can produce. However, buprenorphine still may result in overdose if used with tranquilizers and/or alcohol, and some diversion has been reported, although studies suggest most diverted buprenorphine is used therapeutically (e.g., to control cravings), not to get high.

Clinical experience and research protocols indicate that buprenorphine initiation and stabilization during the induction period is an important part of successful treatment for individuals with opioid use disorder. Buprenorphine can be prescribed alone or as a combination medication that includes naloxone, an opioid antagonist medication. If this combined medication is taken as prescribed, the naloxone has no appreciable effects. However, if the combined medication is injected, the naloxone component can precipitate an opioid withdrawal syndrome, and in this way serves as a deterrent to misuse by injection.

Buprenorphine may be prescribed by physicians who have met the statutory requirements for a waiver in accordance with the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 823(g)(2)(D)(iii)). However, physicians using the waiver are limited in the number of patients they can treat with this medication. This patient limit does not apply to OTPs that dispense buprenorphine on site because the OTP operating in this capacity is doing so under 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(1) and 42 CFR Part 8, and not under 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(2)(B).

When they first receive their waiver, physicians can provide buprenorphine treatment for only up to 30 individuals. After the first year they can request to treat up to 100. However, lack of physician availability to prescribe buprenorphine has been a significant limitation on access to this effective medication. Although approximately 435,000 primary care physicians practice medicine in the United States, only slightly more than 30,000 have a buprenorphine waiver, and only about half of those are actually treating opioid use disorders. To address this limitation and narrow the treatment gap, a final rule was published on July 8, 2016, expanding access to MAT by allowing eligible practitioners to request approval to treat up to 275 patients.
Additionally, on July 22, 2016, the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act (CARA) was signed into law. CARA temporarily expands eligibility to prescribe buprenorphine-based drugs for MAT for substance use disorders to qualifying nurse practitioners and physician assistants through October 1, 2021.

**Naltrexone** is an opioid antagonist that binds to opioid receptors and blocks their activation; it produces no opioid-like effects and is not abusable. It prevents other opioids from binding to opioid receptors so that they have little to no effect. It also interrupts the effects of any opioids in a person’s system, precipitating an opioid withdrawal syndrome in opioid-dependent patients, so it can be administered only after a complete detoxification from opioids. There is also no withdrawal from naltrexone when the patient stops taking it. Naltrexone may be appropriate for people who have been successfully treated with buprenorphine or methadone who wish to discontinue use but still be protected from relapse; people who prefer not to take an opioid agonist; people who have completed detoxifications and/or rehabilitation or are being released from incarceration and expect to return to an environment where drugs may be used and wish to avoid relapse; and adolescents or young adults with opioid dependence.151

Because naltrexone is not a controlled substance, it can be prescribed or administered by any physician, nurse practitioner, or physician assistant with prescribing authority. Naltrexone comes in two formulations: oral and extended-release injectable. Oral naltrexone can be effective for those individuals who are highly motivated and/or supported with observed daily dosing. Extended-release injectable naltrexone, which is administered on a monthly basis, addresses the poor compliance associated with oral naltrexone since it provides extended protection from relapse and reduces cravings for 30 days.152,153

**Medication-Assisted Treatment for Alcohol Use Disorders**

A number of factors should be weighed in determining the need for medication when treating an individual for an alcohol use disorder, such as the patient’s motivation for treatment, potential for relapse, and severity of co-existing conditions.120 Three FDA-approved medications are currently available to treat alcohol use disorder: disulfiram, naltrexone, and acamprosate.117 None of these medications carries a risk of misuse or addiction, and thus none is a DEA-scheduled substance. Each has a distinct effectiveness and side effect profile. Prescribing health care professionals should be familiar with these side effects and take them into consideration before prescribing.154 Providers can obtain additional information from materials produced by the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA) and SAMHSA.155,156

Research studies on the efficacy of medications to treat alcohol use disorders have demonstrated that most patients show benefit, although individual response can be difficult to predict.154,157 MAT interventions for alcohol use disorders can be provided in both non-specialty and specialty care settings and are most beneficial when combined with behavioral interventions and brief support.154
**Disulfiram** is a medication that inhibits normal breakdown of acetaldehyde which is produced by the metabolism of alcohol, thus rapidly increasing acetaldehyde in the blood which produces an aversive response. Thus, once disulfiram is taken by mouth, any alcohol consumed results in rapid buildup of acetaldehyde and a negative reaction or sickness results. The intensity of this reaction is dependent on the dose of disulfiram and the amount of alcohol consumed. Effects from a disulfiram–alcohol reaction include warmth and flushing of the skin, increased heart rate, palpitations, a drop in blood pressure, nausea and/or vomiting, sweating, dizziness, and headache. In this way, disulfiram essentially punishes alcohol consumption and indirectly rewards abstinence.

Disulfiram was the first medication approved by the FDA to treat alcohol use disorder and its efficacy has been widely studied. Most studies have demonstrated that disulfiram, when given under supervision, is more effective than placebo in treating alcohol use disorders. A major limitation of disulfiram is adherence, which is typically poor, thereby reducing the medication’s effectiveness. Disulfiram is most effective when its use is supervised or observed, which has been found to increase compliance. Negotiating with the patient to have a spouse or significant other provide supervision offers both the incentive to take the medication and the documentation that the medication is being taken. The best candidates for disulfiram are patients with motivation for treatment and a desire to be abstinent. Thus, an individual who wants to reduce, but not stop, drinking is not a candidate for disulfiram. Disulfiram should also be avoided in individuals with advanced liver disease.

**Naltrexone** is the opioid antagonist described above that is used to treat opioid use disorder. Because it blocks some opioid receptors, naltrexone counteracts some of the pleasurable aspects of drinking. Unlike disulfiram, naltrexone does not interact with alcohol to produce a severe reaction. As noted before, naltrexone comes in two formulations: oral and extended-release injectable.

Many studies have examined the effectiveness of naltrexone in treating alcohol use disorders. Several research reviews have found that it reduces the risk of heavy drinking in patients who are abstinent for at least several days at the time treatment begins. However, as with disulfiram, medication compliance can be a problem with the oral formulation. Adherence to taking the medication increases under conditions where it is administered and observed by a trusted family member or when the extended-release injectable, which requires only a single monthly injection, is used. Naltrexone should not be prescribed to patients with acute hepatitis, renal failure, or liver failure.

**Acamprosate** is a medication that normalizes the alcohol-related neurochemical changes in the brain glutamate systems and thereby reduces the symptoms of craving that can prompt a relapse to pathological drinking. Acamprosate has been found to be an effective medication when used concurrently with behavioral interventions and, as with other medications for alcohol use disorders, works best in motivated patients. Reviews show that acamprosate is effective in reducing relapse and effective when used to maintain abstinence from alcohol.
Behavioral Therapies

Behavioral therapies can be provided in individual, group, and/or family sessions in virtually all treatment settings.\textsuperscript{47,56} These structured therapies help patients recognize the impact of their behaviors – such as those dealing with stress or interacting in interpersonal relationships – on their substance use and ability to function in a healthy, safe, and productive manner. These therapies also teach and motivate patients in how to change their behaviors as a way to control their substance use disorders.\textsuperscript{56}

For evidence-based behavioral therapies to be delivered appropriately, they must be provided by qualified, trained providers. Despite this, many counselors and therapists working in substance use disorder treatment programs have not been trained to provide evidence-based behavioral therapies, and general group counseling remains the major form of behavioral intervention available in most treatment programs.\textsuperscript{168} Unfortunately, despite decades of research, it cannot be concluded that general group counseling is reliably effective in reducing substance use or related problems.\textsuperscript{169,170}

The following sections describe behavioral therapies that have been shown to be effective in treating substance use disorders. These therapies have been studied extensively, have a well-supported evidence base indicating their effectiveness, and have been broadly applied across many types of substance use disorders and across ages, sexes, and racial and ethnic groups.

Individual counseling is delivered in structured sessions to help patients reduce substance use and improve function by developing effective coping strategies and life skills.\textsuperscript{85,171} Individual counseling has been extensively studied in many specialty care settings but rarely within non-specialty settings. Most studies support the use of individual counseling as an effective intervention for individuals with substance use disorders.\textsuperscript{117,169} As indicated above, group counseling is a standard part of most substance use disorder treatments, but should primarily be used only in conjunction with individual counseling\textsuperscript{171} or other forms of individual therapy.\textsuperscript{85}

\textit{Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy}

The theoretical foundation for Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy (CBT) is that substance use disorders develop, in part, as a result of maladaptive behavior patterns and dysfunctional thoughts.\textsuperscript{117} CBT treatments thus involve techniques to modify such behaviors and improve coping skills by emphasizing the identification and modification of dysfunctional thinking.\textsuperscript{117} CBT is a short-term approach, usually involving 12 to 24 weekly individual sessions. These sessions typically explore the positive and negative consequences of substance use, and they use self-monitoring as a mechanism to recognize cravings and other situations that may lead the individual to relapse. They also help the individual develop coping strategies.\textsuperscript{85}

CBT may be the most researched and evaluated of all the therapies for substance use disorders.\textsuperscript{172,173} Research suggests that self-monitoring and craving-recognition skills can be learned during CBT and that those skills continue to be employed by the individual after treatment has concluded.\textsuperscript{85} CBT interventions have been found to be quite effective, and outcomes are enhanced when CBT is combined with other behavioral and/or pharmacologic components of care.\textsuperscript{174}
Research has shown that CBT is also an effective treatment for individuals with co-occurring mental disorders. Individuals with a substance use disorder and co-occurring mental disorder who received CBT had significantly improved outcomes on various measures of substance use and mental health symptoms as compared to those who did not receive CBT.101,175,176

**Contingency Management**

Behavior change involves learning new behaviors and changing old behaviors. Positive rewards or incentives for these changes can aid this process. Contingency management, which involves giving tangible rewards to individuals to support positive behavior change, has been found to be effective in treating substance use disorders.177 In this therapy, patients receive a voucher with monetary value that can be exchanged for food items, healthy recreational options (e.g., movies), or other sought-after goods or services when they exhibit desired behavior such as drug-free urine tests or participation in treatment activities. Clinical studies comparing voucher-based reinforcement to traditional treatment regimens have found that voucher-based reinforcement is associated with longer treatment engagement, longer periods of abstinence, and greater improvements in personal function.177 These positive findings, initially demonstrated with individuals with cocaine use disorders, have been reproduced in individuals with alcohol, opioid, and methamphetamine use disorders.177

Contingency management may be combined with other therapies or treatment components. For example, contingency management has been shown to improve outcomes for adults with cocaine dependence when added to CBT.178 Similarly, contingency management improves outcomes for young adults with marijuana dependence when included with Motivational Enhancement Therapy (described below) and CBT.179

**Community Reinforcement Approach**

Community Reinforcement Approach (CRA) Plus Vouchers is an intensive 24-week outpatient program that uses incentives and reinforcers to reward individuals who reduce their substance use. Individuals are required to attend one to two counseling sessions each week that emphasize improving relations, acquiring skills to minimize substance use, and reconstructing social activities and networks to support recovery. Individuals receiving this treatment are eligible to receive vouchers with monetary value if they provide drug-free urine tests several times per week. Research has demonstrated that CRA Plus Vouchers promotes treatment engagement and facilitates abstinence. Recent studies have also shown improvements in psychosocial functioning and abstinence among individuals who received CRA Plus Vouchers compared to those who received an intervention of standard care only.180

CRA without vouchers has been successfully adapted for adolescents. The Adolescent Community Reinforcement Approach (A-CRA) is a similar program targeting 12 to 22 year olds with substance use disorders. A-CRA, which has been implemented in outpatient and residential treatment settings, seeks to increase family, social, and educational and vocational supports to reinforce abstinence and recovery from substance use. The effectiveness of A-CRA has been supported in multiple randomized clinical trials with adolescents from different settings, sexes, and racial groups. Studies have found that A-CRA increased long-term abstinence from marijuana and alcohol and decreased frequency of other substance use.182
Motivational Enhancement Therapy

Motivational Enhancement Therapy (MET) is a counseling approach that uses motivational interviewing techniques to help individuals resolve any uncertainties they have about stopping their substance use. MET works by promoting empathy, developing patient awareness of the discrepancy between their goals and their unhealthy behavior, avoiding argument and confrontation, addressing resistance, and supporting self-efficacy to encourage motivation and change. The therapist supports the patient in executing the behaviors necessary for change and monitors progress toward patient-expressed goals.

MET has been shown to be an effective treatment in a range of populations and has demonstrated favorable outcomes such as reducing substance use and improving treatment engagement. As with other therapies reviewed, MET is often used concurrently with other behavioral interventions. However, the results of MET are mixed for people who use drugs such as heroin, cocaine, and nicotine, and for adolescents. The combination of MET and CBT has shown favorable results for adolescents for multiple substances.

The Matrix Model

The Matrix Model is a structured, multi-component behavioral treatment that consists of evidence-based practices, including relapse prevention, family therapy, group therapy, drug education, and self-help, delivered in a sequential and clinically coordinated manner. The model consists of 16 weeks of group sessions held three times per week, which combine CBT, family education, social support, individual counseling, and urine drug testing.

Several randomized controlled trials over the past 20 years have demonstrated that the Matrix Model is effective at reducing substance misuse and associated risky behaviors. For example, one study demonstrated the model’s effectiveness in producing sustained reductions in sexual risk behaviors among individuals who use methamphetamine, thus decreasing their risk of getting or transmitting HIV. The Matrix Model has also been adapted to focus more on relationships, parenting, body image, and sexuality in order to improve women’s retention in treatment and facilitate recovery.

Twelve-Step Facilitation Therapy

Twelve-Step Facilitation (TSF), an individual therapy typically delivered in 12 weekly sessions, is designed to prepare individuals to understand, accept, and become engaged in Alcoholics Anonymous (AA), Narcotics Anonymous (NA), or similar 12-step programs. As discussed in the next chapter, 12-step programs and other mutual-aid groups are not themselves medical treatments but fall under the category of RSS. Well-supported evidence shows that TSF interventions are effective in a variety of ways:

- As a stand-alone intervention
- When integrated with other treatments, such as CBT
- As a distinct component of a multi-treatment package, and
- As a modular appendage to treatment.

See Chapter 5 - Recovery: The Many Paths to Wellness.
Some substance use disorder treatment programs that employ TSF also typically encourage AA or NA participation through group counseling. However, TSF is quite different from generic group counseling, not only because it is an individual therapy, but also because it involves a systematic set of sequential sessions focused on three key ideas:25

- **Acceptance** - realizing that their substance use is part of a disorder, that life has become unmanageable because of alcohol or drugs, that willpower alone will not overcome the problem, and that abstinence is the best alternative;
- **Surrender** - giving oneself to a higher power, accepting the fellowship and support structure of other recovering individuals, and following the recovery activities laid out by a 12-step program; and
- **Active involvement in a 12-step program.**

TSF has been effective in reducing alcohol use during the first month of treatment for individuals with alcohol use disorders, but these effects disappeared rapidly following treatment completion.196 In one study, alcohol-dependent women were randomly assigned to TSF, CBT, or a standard counseling group. The women who received TSF and CBT over 12 weeks both had better outcomes on perceived social support from friends and on social functioning than those in the counseling group, and the differences between those receiving TSF and CBT were minimal.197

In another study, a randomized controlled trial compared a CBT treatment program alone to the same treatment combined with TSF. TSF in addition to CBT increased AA involvement and days of abstinence over a 12-month follow-up period as compared to CBT alone.190 Statistical analysis showed the benefits of the TSF stemmed from its ability to increase AA participation in the period after treatment ended. Further, another randomized controlled trial of outpatients with severe alcohol use disorder evaluated a treatment that aimed to change people’s social networks away from heavy drinkers and toward non-drinking individuals, including AA members.194 Those receiving the social network enhancement treatment had 20 percent more abstinent days and greater AA participation at 2-year follow-up than did patients assigned to receive standard case management. Again, AA participation and the number of abstinent friends in the social network were found to account for the treatment’s effectiveness.194

**Project MATCH**, the largest study of alcohol use disorder treatment ever conducted, found that TSF increased rates of continuous abstinence and sustained remission at the same rates as two other evidenced-based treatments—CBT and MET. All three treatments reduced the quantity and frequency of alcohol use immediately after treatment. Further, relative to the CBT and MET treatment conditions, significantly more of the patients receiving TSF treatment maintained continuous abstinence in the year following treatment.193 The same pattern of results was also evident at follow-up 3 years later.198 Like the other studies discussed, data analysis showed that the effectiveness of the TSF treatment was based on its differential ability to increase post-treatment participation in AA.196
The first clinical trial of TSF for patients in treatment for stimulant use disorder was recently completed. Individuals randomized to TSF had higher rates of attending groups such as Crystal Meth Anonymous and higher rates of abstinence at follow-up as well.200

Given the common group and social orientation and the similar therapeutic factors operating across different mutual aid groups,200–202 participation in mutual aid groups other than AA might confer similar benefits at analogous levels of attendance.203,204 Yet systematic efforts to facilitate entry into non-12-step mutual aid groups have rarely been studied.204 One exception is a clinical trial evaluating SMART Recovery, a cognitive-behavioral, evidence-based mutual aid group. Patients in treatment for “heavy drinking” were randomly assigned to receive face-to-face SMART Recovery meetings or to an online Web meeting. Both groups showed approximately equal rates of post-treatment participation in SMART Recovery and in abstinence.205

**Family Therapies**

Mainstream health care has long acknowledged the benefits of engaging family and social supports to improve treatment adherence and to promote behavioral changes needed to effectively treat many chronic illnesses.206 This is also true for patients with substance use disorders. Studies of various family therapies have demonstrated positive findings for both adults and adolescents.85 Family therapies engage partners and/or parents and children to help the individual achieve positive outcomes based on behavior change. Several evidence-based family therapies have been evaluated.

Family behavior therapy (FBT) is a therapeutic approach used for both adolescents and adults that addresses not only substance use but other issues the family may also be experiencing, such as mental disorders and family conflict.85 FBT includes up to 20 treatment sessions that focus on developing skills and setting behavioral goals. Basic necessities are reviewed and inventoried with the client, and the family pursues resolution strategies and addresses activities of daily living, including violence prevention and HIV/AIDS prevention.207

Family therapies used specifically for treating substance use disorders in adolescents include Multi-Systemic Therapy (MST), Multi-Dimensional Family Therapy (MDFT), Brief Strategic Family Therapy (BSFT), and Functional Family Therapy (FFT).85 Most of these therapies consist of sessions that include the adolescent and at least one other family member, although MDFT uses a combination of both individual and family sessions.85 These interventions use different approaches, ranging from addressing antisocial behaviors (MST) and unfavorable influences (MDFT) on adolescents to identifying patterns of negative behaviors and interactions within the family (BSFT and FFT).85

Perhaps the most widely studied and applied family therapy has been Behavioral Couples Therapy (BCT). A cardinal feature of BCT is the “daily sobriety contract” between the affected patient and his/her spouse in which the patient states his or her intent not to drink or use drugs, and the spouse expresses support for the patient’s efforts to stay abstinent. BCT also teaches communication and non-substance-associated positive activities for couples. Findings show that BCT produces more abstinence and better functioning relationships than typical individual-based treatment and that it also reduces social costs and intimate partner violence.208
Well-supported evidence demonstrates the effectiveness of substance use disorder therapies that engage the spouse or partner and the family in reducing substance use and/or misuse problems and addressing other issues, such as poor communication, neglect, conflict, and intimate partner violence. In a recent review of controlled studies with alcohol-dependent patients, marital and family therapy, and particularly behavioral couples therapy, was significantly more effective than individual treatments at inducing and sustaining abstinence; improving relationship functioning and reducing intimate partner violence; and reducing emotional problems of children. Similar findings have been shown with patients having opioid and cocaine use disorders and with gay and lesbian families.

__Tobacco Use Cessation Efforts in Substance Use Disorder Treatment Programs__

People with mental and/or substance use disorders account for 40 percent of all cigarettes smoked in the United States. Many substance use disorder treatment facilities and programs have adopted tobacco-free policies and tobacco cessation programs. Research has shown that incorporating tobacco cessation programs into substance use disorder treatment does not jeopardize treatment outcomes and is associated with a 25 percent increase in the likelihood of maintaining long-term abstinence from alcohol and drug misuse.

__Recovery Support Services__

Recovery support services (RSS), provided by both substance use disorder treatment programs and community organizations, help to engage and support individuals in treatment, and provide ongoing support after treatment. These supportive services are typically delivered by trained case managers, recovery coaches, and/or peers. Specific supports include help with navigating systems of care, removing barriers to recovery, staying engaged in the recovery process, and providing a social context for individuals to engage in community living without substance use. RSS can be effective in promoting healthy lifestyle techniques to increase resilience skills, reduce the risk of relapse, and help those affected by substance use disorders achieve and maintain recovery.

Individuals who participate in substance use disorder treatment and RSS typically have better long-term recovery outcomes than individuals who receive either alone. Further, active recovery and social supports, both during and following treatment, are important in maintaining recovery. This has also been demonstrated for adolescents; the combination of behavioral treatments with assertive continuing care has yielded positive results for this age group, beyond treatment alone.
Emerging Treatment Technologies

Technological advancements are changing not only the face of health care generally, but also the treatment of substance use disorders. In this regard, approximately 20 percent of substance use disorder treatment programs have adopted electronic health record (EHR) systems. With the growing adoption of EHRs, individuals and their providers can more easily access and share treatment records to improve coordination of care. In turn, information sharing through EHRs can lead to improved quality and efficiency of service delivery, reduced treatment gaps, and increased cost savings to health systems.

The use of telehealth to deliver health care, provide health information or education, and monitor the effects of care, has also rapidly increased. Telehealth can be facilitated through a variety of media, including smartphones, the Internet, videoconferencing, wireless communication, and streaming media. It offers alternative, cost-effective care options for individuals living in rural or remote areas or when physically travelling to a health care facility poses significant challenges.

Technology-based interventions offer many potential advantages. They can increase access to care in underserved areas and settings; free up time so that service providers can care for more clients; provide alternative care options for individuals hesitant to seek in-person treatment; increase the chances that interventions will be delivered as they were designed and intended to be delivered; and decrease costs. Further, studies show that most individuals already have access to the necessary tools to engage in technology-based care; about 92 percent of United States adults own a cell phone and 85 percent use the Internet.

Research on the effectiveness of technology-assisted care within substance use disorder treatment focuses on three main applications: (1) technology as an add-on to enhance standard care; (2) technology as a substitute for a portion of standard care; and (3) technology as a replacement for standard care. The current evidence base of technology-based interventions for substance use disorder treatment is limited, though it is growing. For this reason, these technologies can only be considered “promising” at this time. Table 4.5 shows the state of evidence supporting innovative technology-assisted interventions, several of which are discussed in the Electronic Treatment Interventions and Electronic Clinical and Recovery Support Tools sections.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Intervention Overview</th>
<th>Sample (at pretest)/Ethnicity/ Setting Design</th>
<th>Summary/Results</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addiction–Comprehensive Health Enhancement Support System (A-CHESS)</td>
<td>Smartphone-based application offering monitoring, information, communication, and support services.</td>
<td>N = 349 individuals with alcohol dependence entering treatment at residential programs Varied settings, multiethnic RCT</td>
<td>At 4-, 8- and 12-month follow-up, intervention group reported significantly fewer risky drinking days (1.39 vs. 2.75 days on average) and a higher likelihood of consistent abstinence (51.9% vs. 39.6%) as compared to the control group.</td>
<td>Gustafson et al., (2014)\textsuperscript{228}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBT4CBT</td>
<td>Six-module computer-based cognitive behavioral therapy training.</td>
<td>N = 101 cocaine-dependent individuals maintained on methadone Urban, multiethnic RCT</td>
<td>After completing an 8-week program, participants who received the intervention were significantly more likely to attain 3 or more consecutive weeks of abstinence from cocaine than were participants who did not receive the program (36% vs.17%). 6-month follow-up data indicated continued improvement for intervention group.</td>
<td>Carroll et al., (2014)\textsuperscript{229}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HealthCall</td>
<td>60 days of patient automated telephone interactive voice response (IVR) calls to self-monitor alcohol- and other health-related behaviors as adjunct to motivational interviewing.</td>
<td>N = 258 HIV-positive individuals reporting alcohol misuse Urban HIV primary care clinic, multiethnic RCT</td>
<td>After 60 days, members of intervention group with alcohol dependence reported significantly fewer drinks per drinking day as compared to control group (3.55 vs. 6.07). Lower rates of drinks per drinking day among intervention group maintained at 12-month follow-up.</td>
<td>Hasin et al., (2013)\textsuperscript{230}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Your Use</td>
<td>Self-guided web-based treatment program for cannabis use disorder based on cognitive, motivational, and behavioral principles.</td>
<td>N = 225 individuals looking to reduce or cease cannabis use Varied settings RCT</td>
<td>After 6 weeks, the intervention group reported significantly fewer days of cannabis use in the past month, significantly lower past-month quantity of cannabis use, and significantly fewer symptoms of cannabis abuse compared to the control group. Similar results at 3-month follow-up.</td>
<td>Rooke et al., (2013)\textsuperscript{231}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Intervention Overview

#### Self-Help for Alcohol and other Drug Use and Depression (SHADE)
- **Intervention:** Nine sessions of computer-delivered motivational interviewing and cognitive behavior therapy with brief therapist assistance.
- **Sample (at pretest):** N = 274 individuals with comorbid depression and alcohol/cannabis misuse.
- **Setting:** Community-based, Australia.
- **Design:** RCT.
- **Summary/Results:** At 3-month follow-up, the intervention group that received computer-delivered care achieved 4 times the reduction in alcohol consumption compared to the control group, and 2.5 times the reduction of the group who received therapist-delivered care.
- **Source:** Kay-Lambkin et al., (2011).

#### Therapeutic Education System (TES)
- **Intervention:** 62 computer-interactive modules teaching skills for achieving and maintaining abstinence, as well as prize-based motivational incentives based on abstinence and treatment adherence.
- **Sample (at pretest):** N = 507 adult men and women from outpatient addiction treatment programs.
- **Design:** RCT.
- **Summary/Results:** Compared to the control group, those receiving TES reduced dropout from treatment (Hazard Ratio=0.72) and increased abstinence (Odds Ratio=1.62).
- **Source:** Cambell et al., (2015).

### Electronic Assessments and Early Intervention

Several studies have been conducted on technology-assisted screening, assessment, and brief intervention for substance use disorders. Many of these studies focus on Internet-based assessments and brief interventions for at-risk, college-age populations. Examples of evaluated tools include the Check Your Drinking screener, electronic alcohol screening and brief intervention (e-SBI), Drinker’s Check-up, Alcohol electronic Check-Up to Go (e-CHUG), and Marijuana eCHECKUP TO GO. Other studies assessed interventions that can be implemented in general health care settings, including Project QUIT, a brief intervention in a primary care setting that also includes follow-up coaching calls for individuals who have been identified through screening as engaging in risky drug use, and use of kiosks in emergency departments to screen for alcohol and drug use. In the latter study, patients in the emergency department were found to be significantly more likely to disclose their substance use at a kiosk compared to a health care professional or other interviewer. Other studies focus on telephone-based assessments and brief interventions related to alcohol and drug use, including DIAL, and a telephone-based monitoring and brief counseling intervention. Preliminary evidence shows that Web- and telephone-based assessments and brief interventions are superior to no treatment in reducing substance use, and often result in similar or improved outcomes when compared to alternative brief intervention options.
Electronic Treatment Interventions

A larger pool of research studies has assessed the effectiveness of substance use disorder treatment approaches (largely outpatient) that incorporate Web- and telephone-based technology. These interventions focus on a wider range of substances, including alcohol (e.g., Drinking Less, HealthCall), opioids (e.g., Therapeutic Education System, CBT4CBT), and marijuana (e.g., Reduce Your Use, SHADE), and target various subpopulations, including veterans and individuals with co-occurring disorders and other chronic illnesses.

Many of these technology-enhanced treatment interventions are Web-based versions of evidence-based, in-person treatment components such as CBT and MET. Early research suggests the value of applying Web-based treatment approaches for moderate levels of substance misuse and for individuals who may not otherwise seek face-to-face treatment. Among studies evaluating Web-based intervention support as an add-on to standard in-person treatment, preliminary evidence shows reduced substance use, better retention, and higher motivation to change among the intervention group. One study explored replacing traditional in-person CBT with a Web-based version and found at least equivalent outcomes among the intervention group, indicating great potential for these Web-based interventions to broaden the dissemination of evidence-based treatments.

Recent studies of telephone-based interventions as adjuncts to or replacements for standard care interventions showed similarly promising results. For example, one study explored the effect of adding daily self-monitoring calls to an interactive voice response technology system with personalized feedback and compared it to standard motivational enhancement practice. Study results showed that those who received the intervention reduced the number of drinks they had on the days they did drink.

Electronic Clinical and Recovery Support Tools

Several studies have examined the application of technology-assisted tools to RSS. In general, Web- and telephone-based recovery support tools focus on providing remote support to individuals following substance use disorder treatment. Examples of e-recovery support tools include: A-CHESS, a smartphone application that provides monitoring, information, communication, and support services to patients, including ways for individuals and counselors to stay in contact; and MORE, a Web-based recovery support program that delivers assessments, clinical content, and access to recovery coaching support online. Preliminary evidence shows that technology-assisted recovery support approaches may be effective in helping individuals to maintain their recovery. In 2014, a study found that OTP participants receiving ongoing counseling services through Web-based videoconferencing technology experienced comparable rates of decreased drug use and program attendance as did individuals receiving in-person care.
Considerations for Specific Populations

Culturally Competent Care

A variety of treatment approaches have been developed to address the needs of individuals with substance use disorders. However, disparities exist in the outcomes and effectiveness of substance use treatment for different populations. Research has shown that treatment needs can differ across various populations, suggesting that treatment interventions should be individually tailored and incorporate culturally competent and linguistically appropriate practices relevant to specific populations and subpopulation groups.

Racial and Ethnic Groups

A study examining a culturally sensitive substance use disorder intervention program targeted at Hispanic or Latino and Black or African American adolescents called Alcohol Treatment Targeting Adolescents in Need (ATTAIN) found significant reductions in alcohol and marijuana use for all racial and ethnic groups. Cultural factors, including discrimination, acculturation, ethnic pride, and cultural mistrust, were associated with the pre-intervention levels of alcohol and drug use. The study concluded that accounting for these factors when tailoring a substance use disorder intervention is critical to meeting the needs of the community it is aiming to serve.

Many of the interventions developed for substance use disorder treatment services in general have been evaluated in populations that included Black or African American patients, and many of these interventions are as effective for Black or African American patients as they are for White patients. Some motivational interventions that are aligned with the cultural values of the population have been found to reduce substance use among Blacks or African Americans.

Dialectical Behavior Therapy (DBT) is an evidence-based therapy that teaches a skill called mindfulness. Multiple research studies have noted that mindfulness, an attentional exercise originally developed in Buddhist cultures, is potentially useful in helping people gain mastery over substance cravings. A study examining patients in a substance use disorder residential treatment center that incorporated DBT with specific cultural, traditional, and spiritual practices for American Indian or Alaska Native adolescents found that 96 percent of the adolescents in their sample either “recovered” or “improved.” Treatment included all aspects of comprehensive DBT and included consultation with tribal leaders from the governing body and a medicine man/spiritual counselor from a local tribe.

Asian patients tend to enter treatment with less severe substance misuse problems than do members of other racial or ethnic groups, place less value on substance use disorder treatment, and are less likely to use such services. Studies on Asians and Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders have identified culturally specific barriers and facilitators to entering and completing substance use treatment (e.g., family, peers, shame, and involvement in the criminal justice system). Assessing patient experience of shame is an important step when providing substance use disorder treatment to Asian patients because shame and humiliation can be significant barriers to treatment engagement for this population.
Combining Evidence-based Care with Traditional, Spiritual, and Cultural Beliefs

Agency or Organization:
Desert Visions Youth Wellness Center (Desert Visions), Indian Health Service, Sacaton, Arizona

Purpose:
Desert Visions is a federally-operated adolescent residential center whose purpose is to provide substance use and behavioral health treatment to American Indians and Alaska Natives. Desert Visions offers a multi-disciplinary treatment that includes bio-psychosocial, health, education, and cultural activities. Desert Visions uses Dialectical Behavior Therapy (DBT) as the treatment modality, and clients are taught to use the DBT skills to improve their quality of life.

Goals:
- Provide holistic care and treatment for the physical, spiritual, and emotional needs of American Indian and Alaska Native adolescents.
- Provide superior outcomes in treating substance use/co-occurring disorders.
- Utilize the DBT skill of mindfulness to allow for the introduction of cultural, spiritual, and traditional practices into treatment while still maintaining fidelity to this evidence-based approach. In essence, the goal of using DBT is to combine the best of “Western-Based” interventions with traditional American Indian/Alaska Native interventions.

Outcomes:
A 3-year program/statistical review of outcome data found that of 229 patients who were enrolled in the treatment program:
- 201 met the criteria for clinically significant change, (i.e., “recovered” or “reliable change” or “improved”) and 10 showed no change.
- None of the youth in treatment deteriorated during the treatment period.
- The findings represent a first investigation of the use of DBT within American Indian and Alaska Native populations.

“...the results demonstrated by the outcome data far exceeded expectations. DBT has dramatically improved the care of adolescents at our facilities. A serendipitous benefit has been the enhancement of the relationship with the multiplicity of referral sources. Our tribal partners have commented positively on the integration of DBT with those traditional, cultural, and spiritual practices that are common to the many tribal nations.”

– Rear Admiral Vincent Berkley, USPHS, Retired Medical Director, Youth Treatment Centers of Arizona and Nevada

Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Populations

Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) populations often enter treatment with more severe substance misuse problems,267 have a greater likelihood of experiencing a substance use disorder in their lifetime, and initiate alcohol consumption earlier than heterosexual clients,268 thus, developing effective treatment programs that address the specific needs of these populations is critical. For example, the 2013 National Health Interview Survey, conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau, found that a higher percentage of LGBT adults, aged 18 to 64, had five or more drinks on one day in the past year compared to heterosexual adults.269 Research has also shown that LGB adolescents report higher rates of substance use compared to heterosexual youth; on average substance use among LGB youth was 190 percent higher.
than for heterosexual youth, 340 percent higher for bisexual youth, and 400 percent higher for lesbians and bisexual females. Treatment programs with specialized groups for gay and bisexual clients have shown better outcomes for men compared to gay and bisexual men in non-specialized programs. According to one analysis, a significant minority of the nation’s substance use disorder treatment agencies indicated that they offer treatment services tailored to LGBT populations, although only a small portion (7.4 percent) offered a service that they could identify as an LGBT-specialized service.

Research has shown that treatment providers should be knowledgeable about sexuality, sexual orientation, and unique aspects of LGBT developmental and social experiences. For example, factors such as transphobia or homophobia (both internal and societal), violence, family issues, and social isolation, among other problems, may need to be addressed within the substance use disorder treatment environment for transgender people. It is also important to consider the types of treatment that have been shown effective with the LGBT population. Motivational interviewing, social support therapy, contingency management, and CBT have all demonstrated effectiveness specifically for gay or bisexual men with a substance use disorder.

Veterans

Being a veteran or an active member of the military is a unique way of life that involves experiences and sacrifices by the service member and the member’s family. Military service members, veterans, and their families have needs unlike other individuals that require culturally competent approaches to treatment and services. Veterans report high rates of substance misuse; between 2004 and 2006, 7.1 percent of all veterans met the criteria for a substance use disorder. Studies of female veterans have shown that between 4 and 37 percent of veterans reported alcohol misuse, 7 to 25 percent reported binge drinking, and between 3 and 16 percent reported substance use disorders. Much of the literature on substance use in the military examines the relationship between post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and alcohol and drug use. For example, a large study examined improvement in substance use outcomes among 12,270 veterans who were diagnosed with PTSD and a substance use disorder and treated in specialized intensive veterans’ treatment programs. The study found that treatment in longer-term programs, with prescribed psychiatric medication and planned participation in program reunions for post-discharge support, were all associated with improved outcomes. Reductions in substance use were also associated with improvements in PTSD symptoms and violent behavior. The findings suggested that intensive treatment combined with proper discharge planning for veterans with severe PTSD and a substance use disorder may result in better outcomes than traditional substance use disorder treatment. A study among homeless veterans with a diagnosis of a substance use disorder as well as a mental disorder found that those who took part in a low-intensity wrap-around intervention showed improvements in a number of substance use, mental health, and behavioral health outcomes from the beginning of the study to follow-up 12 months later.

Criminal Justice Populations

It has been estimated that half of the United States prison population has an active substance use disorder. Many incarcerated individuals will experience a lower tolerance for substances due to abstinence while in prison; upon release, many will return to dangerous use levels, not realizing their
tolerance is diminished. This is particularly important as it raises the risk of opioid overdose deaths after release from incarceration; one study found that 14.8 percent of all former prisoner deaths from 1999 to 2009 were related to opioids. There is typically insufficient pre-release counseling and post-release follow-up provided to this population to reduce these risks.

In a randomized controlled trial of methadone maintenance for prisoners, participants were randomly assigned to counseling with passive referral to methadone maintenance treatment (MMT) after release, counseling with transfer to MMT, or counseling with pre-release MMT. Prisoners who received counseling and MMT in prison prior to release and continued with community-based MMT after release were significantly less likely to use opioids and engage in criminal activity post-release. Increased access to opioid agonist maintenance may positively impact the needs of substance use disorders among incarcerated individuals.

Another randomized trial assigned some participants to extended-release naltrexone treatment and others to usual treatment, consisting of brief counseling and referrals to community treatment programs. Those who received extended-release naltrexone had a lower rate of relapse (43 percent vs. 64 percent), and a higher rate of opioid-negative urine samples (74 percent vs. 56 percent), and the average time between treatment and relapse was found to be longer—10.5 weeks, compared with 5.0 weeks for those who received usual treatment. Importantly, positive effects diminished after treatment with extended-release naltrexone was discontinued.

**Drug Courts**

Drug courts are a diverse group of specialized programs that focus on adult or juvenile offenders, as well as parents under child protective supervision who have substance use-related disorders. Drug courts provide treatment and other services, overseen by a judge, in lieu of being processed through the traditional justice system. By 2015, more than 3,400 drug courts were in operation across the United States. An estimated 55,000 defendants per year participate in adult drug courts, with each court serving a caseload of approximately 50 individuals each year. These interventions seek to harness the coercive power of the criminal justice system to persuade drug-involved offenders to cease their problematic drug use.

Existing research, including randomized controlled trials, have found positive effects of drug courts, including high rates of treatment completion and reduced rates of recidivism, incarceration, and subsequent drug use. Reviews of these evaluations have concluded that the average effect of adult drug court participation is analogous to a drop in recidivism from 50 percent to 38 percent, and that this effect lasts up to 3 years. Evaluations of driving under the influence (DUI) drug courts generally find similar reductions as adult drug courts and substantially smaller effects than are found in juvenile drug courts. Larger reductions in recidivism were found in adult drug courts that had high graduation rates and that accepted only nonviolent offenders, suggesting that this intervention may be more effective among that segment of the substance-using population.

Despite the rapid expansion of drug courts, the number of defendants who pass through such programs remains a small proportion of the more than 1 million offenders with substance use disorders who pass through the United States criminal justice system each year. Capacity constraints provide the most important limitation.
Drug court programs require random drug tests and other monitoring measures. Required abstinence involves making sanctions certain and immediate. Hawaii’s Opportunity Probation with Enforcement (HOPE) program has implemented coerced abstinence for the entire probation population. Promising results of a randomized trial have sparked interest in broader replication.\textsuperscript{293} Observed recidivism rates were dramatically lower than for the prior probation population, and the treatment group was incarcerated for roughly half as many days as the control group. Interventions such as HOPE do not necessarily involve substance use disorder treatment; this reflects the reality that many drug-involved offenders do not meet the criteria for substance use disorders. For many individuals, regular monitoring, alongside the adverse consequences of a failed urine test, provide powerful motivation to abstain.\textsuperscript{294}

A further example is the 24/7 Sobriety Project (24/7), a South Dakota innovative program to supervise individuals who were arrested in connection with alcohol-related offenses. It addresses problem drinking by imposing close monitoring, followed by swift, certain, yet modest sanctions when there is evidence of renewed alcohol use. Under 24/7, problem drinkers rearrested for DUI and selected other alcohol-related violations were subject to intensive monitoring and sanctions. As a condition of bail, participants were required to take morning and evening breathalyzer tests or wear continuous alcohol-monitoring bracelets. Between 2005 and 2010, 24/7 participants were ordered to take approximately 3.7 million breathalyzer tests, and achieved a pass rate of approximately 99.3 percent.\textsuperscript{295} A RAND Corporation program evaluation found that 24/7 tangibly improved public safety in counties where the program was implemented at scale.\textsuperscript{295} In counties where the number of 24/7 participants reached one-quarter of DUI arrests, the intervention was associated with a significant reduction in repeat DUI and intimate partner violence arrests. Similar results have been replicated in Montana.\textsuperscript{296}

**Recommendations for Research**

Although the field of treatment for substance use disorders has made substantial progress, additional types of research are needed. Research involving early interventions and various components of treatment must move from rigorously controlled trials to natural delivery settings and a broader mix of patient types. Because rigorously controlled trials must focus on specific diagnoses and carefully characterized patient types, it is often the case that the samples used in these trials are not representative of the real-world populations who need treatment. For example, many opioid medication trials involve “opioid-only” populations, whereas in practice most patients with opioid use disorders also have alcohol, marijuana, and/or cocaine use disorders. Rigorously controlled trials are necessary to establish efficacy, but interventions that seem to be effective in these studies too often cannot be implemented in real-world settings because of a lack of workforce training, inadequate insurance coverage, and an inability to adequately engage the intended patient population.

As has been documented in several chapters within this Report, the great majority of patients with substance use disorders do not receive any form of treatment. Nonetheless, many of these individuals do access primary or general medical care in community clinics or school settings and research is needed to determine the availability and efficacy of treatment in these settings and to identify ways in which access to treatment in these settings could be improved. The current failure to acknowledge and address substance use disorders in these settings has reduced the quality and increased the costs
of health care. Moreover, access and referral to specialty substance use disorder care from primary care settings is neither easy nor quick. Better integration between primary care and specialty care and additional treatment options within primary care are needed. Primary care physicians need to be better prepared to identify, assist, and refer patients, when appropriate. If treatment is delivered in primary care, it should be practical for delivery within these settings and attractive, engaging, accessible and affordable for affected patients.

Buprenorphine or naloxone treatment for opioid misuse should also be available in emergency departments. Here, the goals of treatment would be the reduction of substance use combined with better engagement in and adherence to treatment for any associated medical illness. Therefore, treatment research outside of traditional substance use disorder treatment programs is needed.

As of June 2016, four states, plus the District of Columbia, have legalized recreational marijuana, and many more have permitted medical marijuana use. The impact of the changes on levels of marijuana and other drug and alcohol use, simultaneous use, and related problems such as motor vehicle crashes and deaths, overdoses, hospitalizations, and poor school and work performance, must be evaluated closely. Accurate and practical marijuana screening and early intervention procedures for use in general and primary care settings are needed. Not only must it be determined which assessment tools are appropriate for the various populations that use marijuana, but also which treatments are generalizable from research to practice, especially in primary care and general mental health care settings.

Current research suggests that it is useful to educate and train first responders, peers, and family members of those who use opioids to use naloxone to prevent and reverse potential overdose-related deaths. However, more research is needed to identify strategies to encourage the subsequent engagement of those who have recovered from overdose into appropriate treatment. In this work, it will be important to consider contextual factors such as age, gender identity, race and ethnicity, sexual orientation, economic status, community resources, faith beliefs, co-occurring mental or physical illness, and many other personal issues that can work against the appropriateness and ultimately the usefulness of a treatment strategy.

Opioid agonist therapies are effective in stabilizing the lives of individuals with severe opioid use disorders. However, many important clinical and social questions remain about whether, when, and how to discontinue medications and related services. This is an important question for many other areas of medicine where maintenance medications are continued without significant change and often without attention to other areas of clinical progress.

At the same time, it is clear from many studies over the decades that detoxification following an arbitrary maintenance time period (e.g., 90 days, 180 days), or performed without continuing supports, is rarely effective in disengaging patients from opioid use disorders and may lead to relapse and overdose. Thus, more research is needed to explore if, when, and how patients can be transitioned from MAT to non-medication status within the context of “personalized medicine,” to provide both patients and clinical staff appropriate therapeutic guidance.
Regarding personalized medicine, research is needed on how to implement multidisciplinary, collaborative, and patient-centered care for persons with opioid use disorders and chronic pain, in a manner effectively treating both diseases together with any psychiatric comorbidities that may undermine recovery. Precision medicine research is also needed on how to individually tailor such interventions to optimize care management for patient groups in which there is overlap between pain-related psychological distress and stress-related opioid misuse. 298
CHAPTER 5.
RECOVERY: THE MANY PATHS TO WELLNESS

Chapter 5 Preview

On October 4, 2015, tens of thousands of people attended the UNITE to Face Addiction rally in Washington, D.C. The event was one of many signs that a new movement is emerging in America: People in recovery, their family members, and other supporters are banding together to decrease the discrimination associated with substance use disorders and spread the message that people do recover. Much of the success of the event hinged on the growing network of recovery community organizations (RCOs) that have proliferated across the country, creating cultures of recovery and advancing recovery-positive attitudes, programs, and prevention strategies. Recovery advocates have created a once-unimagined vocal and visible recovery presence, as living proof that long-term recovery exists in the millions of individuals who have attained degrees of health and wellness, are leading productive lives, and making valuable contributions to society. Meanwhile, policymakers and health care system leaders in the United States and abroad are beginning to embrace recovery as an organizing framework for approaching addiction as a chronic disorder from which individuals can recover, so long as they have access to evidence-based treatments and responsive long-term supports.1-4

Despite the growing popularity and importance of “recovery” as a concept, many people wonder what the term really means and why it matters. This chapter answers these questions by first defining the concept of recovery from substance use disorders and then reviewing the research on the methods and procedures used by mutual aid groups and recovery support services (RSS) to foster and sustain recovery.
KEY FINDINGS*

- Recovery from substance use disorders has had several definitions. Although specific elements of these definitions differ, all agree that recovery goes beyond the remission of symptoms to include a positive change in the whole person. In this regard, “abstinence,” though often necessary, is not always sufficient to define recovery.

- Remission from substance use disorders—the reduction of key symptoms below the diagnostic threshold—is more common than most people realize. “Supported” scientific evidence indicates that approximately 50 percent of adults who once met diagnostic criteria for a substance use disorder—or about 25 million people—are currently in stable remission (1 year or longer). Even so, remission from a substance use disorder can take several years and multiple episodes of treatment, RSS, and/or mutual aid.

- There are many paths to recovery. People will choose their pathway based on their cultural values, their socioeconomic status, their psychological and behavioral needs, and the nature of their substance use disorder.

- Mutual aid groups and newly emerging recovery support programs and organizations are a key part of the system of continuing care for substance use disorders in the United States. A range of recovery support services have sprung up all over the United States, including in schools, health care systems, housing, and community settings.

- The state of the science is varied in the recovery field.
  - Well-supported scientific evidence demonstrates the effectiveness of 12-step mutual aid groups focused on alcohol and 12-step facilitation interventions.
  - Evidence for the effectiveness of other recovery supports (educational settings, drug-focused mutual aid groups, and recovery housing) is promising.
  - Many other recovery supports have been studied little or not at all.

*The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) summarizes strength of evidence as: “Well-supported”: when evidence is derived from multiple controlled trials or large-scale population studies; “Supported”: when evidence is derived from rigorous but fewer or smaller trials; and “Promising”: when evidence is derived from a practical or clinical sense and is widely practiced.6

Recovery Definitions, Values, and Controversies

“Recovery” Has Many Meanings

The word “recovery” is used to mean a range of different things.4-7 For example, members of Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) may say they are “in recovery” or are “recovering alcoholics.” Substance use treatment program directors sometimes speak of their “recovery rate,” meaning the proportion of patients who have graduated and remained abstinent. Some activists describe themselves as being part of a “recovery movement.” One simple way to make sense of these different definitions of recovery is to divide them into those that describe individual people and their experience and those that describe a set of recovery values and beliefs that could be embraced by individuals, organizations, and activist movements.
**Recovery as a Term for Individuals**

Like any other chronic health condition, substance use disorders can go into remission. Among individuals with substance use disorders, this commonly involves the person stopping substance use, or at least reducing it to a safer level—for example, a student who was binge drinking several nights a week during college but reduced his alcohol consumption to one or two drinks a day after graduation. In general health care, treatments that reduce major disease symptoms to normal or “sub-clinical” levels are said to produce remission, and such treatments are thereby considered effective. However, serious substance use disorders are chronic conditions that can involve cycles of abstinence and relapse, possibly over several years following attempts to change.\(^4\)\(^-\)\(^11\) Thus, sustaining remission among those seriously affected typically requires a personal program of sustained recovery management.\(^12\)

For some people with substance use disorders, especially those whose problems are not severe, remission is the end of a chapter in their life that they rarely think about later, if at all. But for others, particularly those with more severe substance use disorders, remission is a component of a broader change in their behavior, outlook, and identity. That change process becomes an ongoing part of how they think about themselves and their experience with substances. Such people describe themselves as being “in recovery.”

Various definitions of individual recovery have been offered nationally and internationally.\(^13\)\(^-\)\(^17\) Although they differ in some respects, all of these recovery definitions describe personal changes that are well beyond simply stopping substance use. As such, they are conceptually broader than “abstinence” or “remission.” For example, the Betty Ford Institute Consensus Panel defined recovery as “a voluntarily maintained lifestyle characterized by sobriety, personal health, and citizenship.”\(^13\) Similarly, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) defines recovery as “a process of change through which individuals improve their health and wellness, live a self-directed life, and strive to reach their full potential.”\(^16\)

The specific meaning of recovery can also vary across cultures and communities. Among some American Indians, recovery is inherently understood to involve the entire family\(^18\) and to draw upon cultural and community resources (see, for example, the organization White Bison). On the other hand, European Americans tend to define recovery in more individual terms. Blacks or African Americans are more likely than individuals of other racial backgrounds to see recovery as requiring complete abstinence from alcohol and drugs.\(^19\) Within some communities, recovery is seen as being aligned with a particular religion, yet in other communities such as the AA fellowship, recovery is explicitly not religious but is instead considered spiritual. Still other communities, such as LifeRing Secular Recovery, SMART Recovery, and Secular Organization for Sobriety, view recovery as an entirely secular process.

Adding further to the diversity of concepts and definitions associated with recovery, in recent years the term has been increasingly applied to recovery from mental illness. Studies of people with schizophrenia, some of whom have co-occurring substance use disorders, have found that recovery is often characterized by increased hope and optimism, and greater life satisfaction.\(^20\) This same research...
revealed that whether someone experienced such benefits was strongly related to their experience with broader recovery benefits, such as improved health, improved finances, and a better social life.21

Recovery-Related Values and Beliefs

When people talk about the recovery movement, they often invoke a set of values and beliefs that may be embraced by individuals with substance use disorders, families, treatment professionals, and even entire health care systems. Some examples of these values and beliefs include:22

- People who suffer from substance use disorders (recovering or not) have essential worth and dignity.
- The shame and discrimination that prevents many individuals from seeking help must be vigorously combated.
- Recovery can be achieved through diverse pathways and should be celebrated.
- Access to high-quality treatment is a human right, although recovery is more than treatment.
- People in recovery and their families have valuable experiences and encouragement to offer others who are struggling with substance use.

Conceptual Controversies in Recovery

Most people who define themselves as being “in recovery” have experience with 12-step-oriented mutual aid groups such as AA and Narcotics Anonymous (NA), but many others enter recovery through professional treatment services, non-12-step mutual aid groups, or other routes of support, such as family, friends, or faith-based organizations.2 The diversity in pathways to recovery has sometimes provoked debate about the value of some pathways over others.

For example, people who achieve recovery with the support of medications (e.g., methadone, buprenorphine, disulfiram, acamprosate, naltrexone, or even antidepressants) have sometimes been denounced by those who do not take medications, based on assumptions that using medication is inconsistent with recovery principles or a form of drug substitutions or replacement. Nonetheless, members of the National Alliance for Medication Assisted Recovery or Methadone Anonymous refer to themselves as practicing medication-assisted recovery.23

Finally, some people who have had severe substance use disorders in the past but no longer meet criteria for a substance use disorder do not think of themselves as operating from a recovery perspective or consider themselves part of a recovery movement, even if they endorse some or all of the beliefs and values associated with recovery.

Perspectives of Those in Recovery

The most comprehensive study of how people define recovery recruited over 9,000 individuals with previous substance use disorders from a range of recovery pathways. Almost all (98 percent) reported characteristics that met formal medical criteria for a severe substance use disorder and three-quarters
labeled themselves as being “in recovery.”7 The study results shed light on how people vary in their understanding of recovery:

- **Abstinence**: 86.0 percent saw abstinence as part of their recovery. The remainder either did not think abstinence was part of recovery in general or felt it was not important for their recovery.7 Endorsement of abstinence as “essential” was most common among those who were affiliated with 12-step mutual aid groups.24 This finding was consistent with previous research showing that the great majority of people (about 6 in 7) who have experienced serious substance use disorders consider abstinence essential for recovery.19

- **Personal growth**: “Being honest with myself” was endorsed as part of recovery by 98.6 percent of participants.7 Other almost universally-endorsed elements included “handling negative feelings without using alcohol or drugs” and “being able to enjoy life without alcohol or drugs.” Almost all study participants viewed their recovery as a process of growth and development, and about two-thirds saw it as having a spiritual dimension.

- **Service to others**: Engaging in service to others was another prominent component of how study participants defined recovery, perhaps because during periods of heavy substance use, individuals often do damage to others that they later regret. Importantly, service to others has evidence of helping individuals maintain their own recovery.25,26 A survey of more than 3,000 people in recovery indicated that fulfilling important roles and being civically engaged, such as paying taxes, holding a job, and being a responsible parent and neighbor, became much more common after their substance use ended.27

**Estimating the Number of People “In Recovery”**

How much recovery one sees in the world depends on where one looks. Substance use disorders are highly variable in their course, complexity, severity, and impact on health and well-being. In the general population, many people who once met diagnostic criteria for low-severity, “mild” substance use disorders but who later drink or use drugs without related problems do not define themselves as being in recovery. This reality has two implications:

- **First**, the number of people who are in remission from a substance use disorder is, by definition, greater than the number of people who define themselves as being in recovery.

- **Second**, depending on how survey questions are asked and interpreted by respondents, estimates of recovery prevalence may differ substantially. Someone who once met formal criteria for a substance use disorder but no longer does may respond “Yes” to a question asking whether they had “ever had a problem with alcohol or drugs,” but may say “No” when asked “Do you consider yourself as being in recovery?”

Perhaps because of this definitional complexity, most clinical outcome studies and community studies of substance use disorders over the years have not included “recovery” as an outcome measure. Instead, abstinence or remission are usually the outcomes that are considered to indicate recovery.28
Summarizing data from six large studies, one analysis estimated that the proportion of the United States adult population that is in remission from a substance use disorder of any severity is approximately 10.3 percent (with a range of 5.3 to 15.3 percent). This estimate is consistent with findings from a different national survey, which found that approximately 10 percent, or 1 in 10, of United States adults say, “Yes,” when asked, “Did you once have a problem with drugs or alcohol but no longer do?” These percentages translate to roughly 25 million United States adults being in remission. It is not yet known what proportion of adolescents defines themselves as being in recovery.

Despite negative stereotypes of “hopeless addicts,” rigorous follow-up studies of treated adult populations, who tend to have the most chronic and severe disorders, show more than 50 percent achieving sustained remission, defined as remission that lasted for at least 1 year. Latest estimates from national epidemiological research using the Fifth Edition of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-5) criteria for substance use disorder show similar rates of remission. Despite these findings, widely held pessimistic views about the chances of remission or recovery from substance use disorders may continue to affect public opinion in part because sustained recovery lasting a year or longer can take several years and multiple episodes of treatment, recovery support, and/or mutual aid services to achieve. By some estimates, it can take as long as 8 or 9 years after a person first seeks formal help to achieve sustained recovery.

In studies published since 2000, the rate of sustained remission following substance use disorder treatment among adolescents is roughly 35 percent. This estimate is provisional because most studies used small samples and/or had short follow-up durations. Despite the potentially lower remission rate for adolescents, early detection and intervention can help a young person get to remission faster.

**Recovery-oriented Systems of Care**

Increasingly, RSS are being organized into a framework for infusing the entire health and social service system with recovery-related beliefs, values, and approaches. This transformation has been described as:

>a shift away from crisis-oriented, deficit-focused, and professionally-directed models of care to a vision of care that is directed by people in recovery, emphasizes the reality and hope of long-term recovery, and recognizes the many pathways to healing for people with addiction and mental health challenges.

Recovery-oriented Systems of Care (ROSC) embrace the idea that severe substance use disorders are most effectively addressed through a chronic care management model that includes longer term, outpatient care; recovery housing; and recovery coaching and management checkups. Recovery-oriented systems are designed to be easy to navigate for people seeking help, transparent in their operations, and responsive to the cultural diversity of the communities they serve. Treatment in recovery-oriented systems is offered as one component in a range of other services, including recovery supports. Treatment professionals act in a partnership/consultation role, drawing upon each person’s goals and strengths, family supports, and community resources. On a systems level, outcomes from Connecticut’s Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services (DMHAS) ROSC initiative have
demonstrated a 46 percent increase in individuals served, with 40 percent using outpatient care at lower costs, resulting in a decrease of 25 percent annual cost per client and a 24 percent decrease in overall treatment expenses. An example of a successful municipal ROSC has been evolving since 2004 in Philadelphia’s Department of Behavioral Health and Intellectual disAbility Services (DBHIDS). Three focus areas were aligned to achieve a complete systems transformation in the design and delivery of recovery-oriented services: a change in thinking (concept); a change in behavior (practice); and a change in fiscal, policy, and administrative functions (context). To achieve successful implementation, DBHIDS conducted ongoing activities with a variety of stakeholders including individuals in recovery and their family members, peer and professional providers, administrators and fiscal agents, and agency staff and leadership.

SAMHSA has been instrumental in setting the stage for the emergence of the organized recovery community and its role in the development of ROSC, as well as peer and other RSS. Beginning with the Recovery Community Support Program (RCSP) in 1998, SAMHSA’s Center for Substance Abuse Treatment introduced a number of grant initiatives that support recovery, such as Access to Recovery and Targeted Capacity Expansion grants for ROSC and Peer-to-Peer programs. These grants have given states, tribes, and community-based organizations resources and opportunities to create innovative practices and programs that address substance use disorders and promote long-term recovery. Valuable lessons from these grants have been applied to enhance the field, creating movement towards a strong recovery orientation, and highlight the need for rigorous research to identify evidence-based practices for recovery.

In 2010, SAMHSA rolled out Recovery Supports as one of its Strategic Initiatives, highlighting the importance of recovery as a valuable component in the continuum of care. Directly following the establishment of the Recovery Support Strategic Initiative, SAMHSA developed a five-year technical assistance contract to support recovery, known as BRSS-TACS (Bringing Recovery Supports to Scale – Technical Assistance Center Strategy). Through a series of actions and activities, this initiative has served to conceptualize and implement recovery-oriented services and systems across the country; examined the scope and depth of existing and needed recovery supports; supported the growth and quality of the peer workforce; enhanced and extended local, regional, and state recovery initiatives; and supported collaborations and capacity within the recovery movement.

**Recovery Supports**

Even after a year or 2 of remission is achieved—through treatment or some other route—it can take 4 to 5 more years before the risk of relapse drops below 15 percent, the level of risk that people in the general population have of developing a substance use disorder in their lifetime. As a result, similar to other chronic conditions, a person with a serious substance use disorder often requires ongoing monitoring and management to maintain remission and to provide early re-intervention should the person relapse. Recovery support services refer to the collection of community services that can provide emotional and practical support for continuing remission as well as daily structure and rewarding alternatives to substance use.
Just as the development of a substance use disorder involves profound changes in the brain, behavior, and social functioning, the process of recovery also involves changes in these and other areas. These changes are typically marked and promoted by acquiring healthy life resources—sometimes called “recovery capital.” These recovery resources include housing, education, employment, and social resources, as well as better overall health and well-being. Recovery support services have been evaluated for effectiveness and are reviewed in the following sections.

**Mutual Aid Groups**

Mutual aid groups, such as 12-step groups, are perhaps the best known type of RSS, and they share a number of features. The members share a problem or status and they value experiential knowledge—learning from each other’s experiences is a central element—and they focus on personal-change goals. The groups are voluntary associations that charge no fees and are self-led by the members.

Mutual aid groups focused on substance use differ from other RSS in important respects. First, they have been in existence longer, having originally been created by American Indians in the 18th century after the introduction of alcohol to North America by Europeans. The best-known mutual aid group today, AA, was founded in 1935. Other more recent RSS innovations and have yet to be studied extensively. Second, mutual aid groups advance specific pathways to recovery, in contrast to the general supports provided by other RSS. They have been studied extensively for problems with alcohol, but not with illicit drugs. For example, an experienced AA member will help new members learn and incorporate AA’s specific approach to recovery. In contrast, recovery coaches will support a variety of recovery options and support services, of which AA may be one of many. Third, mutual aid groups have their own self-supporting ecosystem that interacts with, but is fundamentally independent of, other health and social service systems. In contrast, other RSS are often part of formal health and social service systems.

**12-Step Mutual Aid Groups**

Mutual aid groups such as AA, Women for Sobriety, SMART Recovery, and many others are the historical precursors of RSS. Most mutual aid group research has been conducted on AA, because AA is the most widely accessed and best-known form of help for alcohol problems in the United States. Research on AA includes systematic reviews of its effectiveness and randomized controlled trials on AA-oriented interventions that actively link individuals with substance use disorders to mutual aid groups. Research suggests that professional treatment programs that facilitate involvement in AA and NA lower health care costs by reducing relapses and need for further treatment.

Beginning in the 1950s, the AA approach was adapted to illegal drugs by the founders of NA, and in later decades it was adapted to other drugs as well (e.g., Cocaine Anonymous, Marijuana Anonymous, Crystal Meth Anonymous). Alcoholics Anonymous and its derivative programs share two major components: A social fellowship and a 12-step program of action that was formulated based on members’ experiences of recovery from severe alcohol use disorders. These 12 steps are ordered in a logical progression, beginning with accepting that one cannot control one’s substance use, followed
by abstaining from substances permanently, and transforming one’s spiritual outlook, character, and relationships with other people.

Members of 12-step mutual aid groups tend to have a history of chronic and severe substance use disorders and participate in 12-step groups to support their long-term recovery. About 50 percent of adults who begin participation in a 12-step program after participating in a treatment program are still attending 3 years later.\(^6^6\) Rates of continued attendance for individuals who seek AA directly without first going to treatment are also high, with 41.6 percent of those who start going to meetings still attending 9 to 16 years later.\(^5^7\)

In the years since the Institute of Medicine called for more rigorous research on AA’s effects and mechanisms in its 1990 report *Broadening the Base of Treatment for Alcohol Problems*,\(^5^8\) research has moved from correlational studies with no control groups to carefully conducted randomized controlled trials. The most rigorous of these clinical trials have compared treatments that link patients to 12-step mutual aid groups to the same treatments without the AA linkage. Most of these trials have focused exclusively on AA, but some have involved mutual aid groups for drug use disorder as either an alternative or a supplement to AA.\(^5^2,5^9,6^0\) A substantial body of research indicates AA is an effective recovery resource;\(^6^1-6^5\) NA has been studied less extensively than AA, but evidence on its effectiveness is promising.\(^4^3\)

Research studying 12-step mutual aid groups, specifically those focused on alcohol, has shown that participation in the groups promotes an individual’s recovery by strengthening recovery-supportive social networks; increasing members’ ability to cope with risky social contexts and negative emotions; augmenting motivation to recover; reducing depression, craving, and impulsivity; and enhancing psychological and spiritual well-being.\(^6^6-6^9\) Thus, with perhaps the exception of spirituality, many of the same mechanisms of behavior change thought to operate in professional treatments also appear to be important benefits of AA participation.\(^7^0\)

A strength of 12-step mutual aid group research is that it has included many studies involving people of diverse racial backgrounds, as well as studies focused exclusively on women.\(^4^3\) For example, American Indian and Alaskan Native groups have adapted AA to incorporate Native spirituality and to allow attendance by entire families. These groups do not limit talking time and incorporate cultural traditions and languages.\(^7^1\) A culturally appropriate variation of AA\(^7^2\) includes *The Red Road to Wellbriety*, a Native adaptation of the basic text of AA.\(^1^8\) Similarly, AA adaptations by Latino immigrants incorporate languages and interaction styles from members’ countries of origin.\(^2^3,7^4\) Chapters focused on serving Black or African American or gay and lesbian participants also tailor 12-step mutual aid groups to a style that fits the culture of the participants.\(^4^6,7^5\) This cultural adaptability, combined with the fact that 12-step groups are easily available, free of charge, and require no paperwork or insurance company documentation to attend, helps explain why these groups are attractive to a remarkably diverse range of people.\(^7^6\)
Even though mutual aid groups are run by peers, professionals can and should play an important role in helping patients engage and participate. Multiple clinical trials have demonstrated that several clinical procedures are effective in increasing participation in mutual aid groups, and increase the chances for sustained remission and recovery. Health care professionals who help link patients with members of a mutual aid group can significantly increase the likelihood that the patients will attend the group. Also, the more time health care professionals spend introducing, explaining, discussing, and encouraging mutual aid group participation during treatment sessions, the more likely the patients will engage, stay involved, and benefit.

Non-12-step mutual aid group meetings are far less available than are 12-step mutual aid group meetings. This points to a need for more groups aimed at those not comfortable with the 12-step approach, as well as studies assessing their effectiveness.

**Al-Anon Family Groups**

Friends and family members often suffer when a loved one has a substance use disorder. This may be due to worry about the loved one experiencing accidents, injuries, negative social and legal consequences, diseases, or death, as well as fear of the loved one engaging in destructive behavior, such as stealing, manipulating, or being verbally or physically aggressive. Consequently, a number of mutual aid groups have emerged to provide emotional support to concerned significant others and families and to help them systematically and strategically alter their own unproductive behaviors that have emerged in their efforts to deal with the substance use problems of their affected loved one.

Al-Anon is a mutual aid group commonly sought by families dealing with substance use in a loved one. Like AA, Al-Anon is based on a 12-step philosophy and provides support to concerned family members, affected significant others, and friends through a network of face-to-face and online meetings, whether or not their loved one seeks help and achieves remission or recovery. More than 80 percent of Al-Anon members are women. The principal goal of Al-Anon is to foster emotional stability and “loving detachment” from the loved one rather than coaching members to “get their loved one into treatment or recovery.” Al-Anon includes Alateen, which focuses on the specific needs of adolescents affected by a parent’s or other family member’s substance use.

Clinical trials and other studies of Al-Anon show that participating family members experience reduced depression, anger, and relationship unhappiness, at rates and levels comparable to those of individuals receiving psychological therapies. Descriptive research suggests that about half of the newcomers to Al-Anon are still attending 6 months later. Many other family-focused mutual aid groups, such as Nar-Anon, Co-Anon, and Grief Recovery After Substance Passing, have not been researched.

**Recovery Coaching**

Voluntary and paid recovery coach positions are a new development in the addiction field. Coaches do not provide “treatment” per se, but they often help individuals discharging from treatment to connect to community services while addressing any barriers or problems that may hinder the recovery process. A recovery coach’s responsibilities may include providing strategies to maintain abstinence, connecting people to recovery housing and social services, and helping people develop personal skills that maintain recovery. Recovery coaches may or may not be in recovery themselves, but in either case they do not
presume that the same path toward recovery will work for everyone they coach. Some community-based recovery organizations offer training programs for recovery coaches, but no national standardized approach to training coaches has been developed. Because of the role that recovery coaches play in linking patients to RSS, they are increasingly becoming a part of formal clinical treatment teams.

Recovery coaching has the potential to become an important part of RSS and the recovery process. A descriptive study of 56 recently homeless veterans with substance use disorder suggested that supplementing psychotherapy with recovery coaching increased length of abstinence at follow-up 6 months later. Recovery coaches may complement, although not replace, professional case management services in the child welfare, criminal justice, and educational systems. One large randomized trial showed that providing recovery coaches to mothers with a substance use disorder who were involved in the child welfare system reduced the likelihood of the mother’s child being arrested by 52 percent. Other rigorous studies have found that providing recovery coaches for mothers with substance use disorder reduces subsequent births with prenatal substance exposure and also increases rates of family reunification.

Recovery Housing

Recovery-supportive houses provide both a substance-free environment and mutual support from fellow recovering residents. Many residents stay in recovery housing during and/or after outpatient treatment, with self-determined residency lasting for several months to years. Residents often informally share resources with each other, giving advice borne of experience about how to access health care, find employment, manage legal problems, and interact with the social service system. Some recovery houses are connected with affiliates of the National Alliance of Recovery Residences, a non-profit organization that serves 25 regional affiliate organizations that collectively support more than 25,000 persons in recovery across over 2,500 certified recovery residences.

A leading example of recovery-supportive houses is Oxford Houses, which are peer-run, self-sustaining, substance-free residences that host 6 to 10 recovering individuals per house and require that all members maintain abstinence. They encourage, but do not require, participation in 12-step mutual aid groups. A randomized controlled trial found that people with severe substance use disorders who were randomly assigned to live in an Oxford House after substance use disorder treatment were two times more likely to be abstinent and had higher monthly incomes and lower incarceration rates at follow-up 2 years later than similar individuals assigned to receive standard continuing care. Despite high intervention costs, the net cost benefit to the health care and criminal justice systems from the Oxford House assignment relative to standard care was estimated at approximately $29,000 per person over the 2-year follow-up period. Such beneficial effects of recovery housing may be further enhanced for patients with high levels of 12-step mutual aid group participation.

Sober living homes are another type of substance-free living environment. Many of these have a house manager or leader and mandate attendance by residents at 12-step mutual aid groups. An 18-month descriptive study found that residents in sober living homes reduced their alcohol and other.
PEER RECOVERY COACHES: WHAT THEY ARE AND WHAT THEY ARE NOT

While some RSS described in this chapter can be delivered by people who are not in recovery, peer recovery coaches identify as being in recovery and use their knowledge and lived experience to inform their work. Although research on peer RSS is limited, results so far are promising. The following are some important distinctions regarding peer recovery coaches.

Peer recovery coaches are...

- Individuals in recovery who help others with substance use disorders achieve and maintain recovery using four types of support:
  - Emotional (empathy, caring, concern);
  - Informational (practical knowledge and vocational assistance);
  - Instrumental (concrete assistance to help individuals gain access to health and social services);
  - Affiliational (introductions to healthy social contacts and recreational pursuits).
- Embedded in the community in a variety of settings, including recovery community organizations; community health, mental health, or addiction clinics; sober living homes and recovery residences; and recovery high school and collegiate recovery programs.
- Peer workers in various treatment and recovery contexts including primary care, emergency departments, mental health clinics, criminal justice, child welfare, homeless agencies, and crisis outreach teams.

They are not...

- Substance use disorder treatment counselors. They do not diagnose or provide formal treatment. Rather, they focus on instilling hope and modeling recovery through the personal, lived experience of addiction and recovery.
- Case managers. Case management typically involves professional or patient service delivery models. The terms “peer” and “recovery coach” are used purposely to reflect a mutual, peer-based collaboration to help people achieve sustained recovery.
- AA or NA sponsors. Peer recovery coaches do not espouse any specific recovery pathway or orientation but rather facilitate all pathways to recovery.
- Nationally standardized, with manuals describing their activities. Peer recovery coaches vary around the country. This stems from the newness of this practice and the diversity of the populations that recovery coaches serve. As use of this type of support expands, some national norms of practice and behavior will likely form over time, but with significant flexibility to enable sensitivity to local realities.

drug use as well as increased employment over time. However, unlike the clinical trial of Oxford House, this study had no comparison group, and individuals chose whether to reside in sober living homes rather than being randomly assigned to one. Therefore, residence in the sober living home cannot be assumed to have caused the better outcomes observed.

Taken together, these studies provide promising evidence to suggest that recovery-supportive housing can be both cost-effective and effective in supporting recovery.
Recovery Management

Recovery-oriented care often use long-term recovery management protocols, such as recovery management check-ups (RMCs), and telephone case monitoring. These models have only been studied with professionals, but similar protocols are also being used in peer-directed RSS, where they have yet to be formally evaluated.

Recovery Management Check-ups

The RMC model for substance use disorders draws heavily from monitoring and early re-intervention protocols used for other chronic diseases, such as diabetes and hypertension. With the core components of tracking, assessment, linkage, engagement, and retention, patients are monitored quarterly for several years following an initial treatment. If a relapse occurs, the patient is connected with the necessary services and encouraged to remain in treatment. The main assumption is that early detection and treatment of relapse will improve long-term outcomes.
A clinical trial showed that, compared with patients assigned to usual care, individuals receiving RMCs returned to treatment sooner after relapses, had fewer misuse problems, had more days of abstinence, and were less likely to need treatment at follow-up 2 and 4 years later.\textsuperscript{106,110} Recovery management check-ups have also been shown to be effective for people who have co-occurring substance use disorders and mental illnesses\textsuperscript{111} and for women with substance use disorders who have been released from jail.\textsuperscript{112} RMCs are also cost-effective.\textsuperscript{113} Although the check-ups add somewhat to annual care costs, a randomized study showed that they produce greater reductions in costs associated with health care and criminal justice.\textsuperscript{113}

**Telephone Case Monitoring**

Telephone case monitoring is another long-term recovery management and monitoring method for maintaining contact with patients without requiring an in-person appointment. It can be provided by professionals or by peers, although only the former approach has been rigorously studied. One example is an extended case monitoring intervention, which consisted of phone calls on a tapering schedule over the course of several years, with contact becoming more frequent when needed, such as when risk of relapse was high. This intervention was designed to optimize the cost-effectiveness of alcohol treatment through long-term engagement with clients beyond the relatively short treatment episodes.\textsuperscript{108}

In a randomized clinical trial, patients receiving telephone case monitoring were half as likely as those not receiving it to drink heavily at 3-year follow-up. Case monitoring also reduced the costs of subsequent outpatient treatment by $240 per person at 1-year follow-up, relative to patients who did not receive the telephone monitoring.\textsuperscript{114} Another clinical trial compared weekly telephone monitoring plus brief counseling with two other treatments: standard continuing care and individualized relapse prevention. Telephone monitoring produced the highest rates of abstinence from alcohol at follow-up 12 months later.\textsuperscript{115} Furthermore, at 24 months, participants who received telephone monitoring continued to have significantly higher rates of total abstinence than those in standard care.\textsuperscript{116} Adding telephone monitoring and counseling to intensive outpatient treatment also has been shown to improve alcohol use outcomes in a randomized clinical trial.\textsuperscript{117}

**Recovery Community Centers**

To further distinguish the peer-led services of these centers from professional treatment services, individuals using the center are referred to as “peers” or “members” and center staff hold positions such as “peer leaders” or “recovery mentors.”\textsuperscript{92,94}

These centers may host mutual aid group meetings and offer recovery coaching, recovery-focused educational and social events; access to resources, including housing, education, and employment; telephone-based recovery services; and additional recovery community education, advocacy, and service events.\textsuperscript{33,118} Some recovery community centers are sites in which community members can engage in advocacy to combat negative public attitudes, educate the community, and improve supports for recovery in the community. Many recovery community centers are typically operated by recovery community organizations.\textsuperscript{119}

Recovery community centers have yet to be studied in a rigorous fashion; therefore it is not possible to estimate their effectiveness. Evaluation studies currently underway may provide a more conclusive
judgment of whether and how recovery community centers benefit their members. Recovery community centers are different from professionally-operated substance use disorder treatment programs because they offer support beyond the clinical setting.

**Recovery-based Education**

High school and college environments can be difficult for students in recovery because of perceived and actual high levels of substance use among other students, peer pressure to engage in substance use, and widespread availability of alcohol and drugs. The emergence of high school and collegiate recovery support programs is an important response to this challenge in that they provide recovery-supportive environments, recovery norms, and peer engagement with other students in recovery.

**Recovery High Schools**

Recovery high schools help students in recovery focus on academic learning while simultaneously receiving RSS. Such schools support abstinence and student efforts to overcome personal issues that may compromise academic performance or threaten continued recovery. The earliest known program opened in 1979, and the number slowly increased to approximately 35 schools in 15 states by 2015.

A study of 17 recovery high schools found that most had small and rapidly changing enrollments, ranging from 12 to 25 students. Rates of abstinence from “all alcohol and other drugs” increased from 20 percent during the 90 days before enrolling to 56 percent since enrolling. Students’ opinions of the schools were positive, with 87 percent reporting overall satisfaction. A study of graduates from one recovery high school found that 39 percent reported no drug or alcohol use in the past 30 days and more than 90 percent had enrolled in college. These results are promising, pointing to the need for more research. A rigorous outcomes study is nearing completion that will give a better idea of the impact of recovery high schools.

**Recovery in Colleges**

Collegiate recovery support programs vary in number and type of RSS. Most provide some combination of recovery residence halls or recovery-specific wings, counseling services, on-site mutual aid group meetings, and other educational and social supports. These services are provided within an environment that facilitates social role modeling of sobriety and connection among recovering peers. The programs often require participants to demonstrate 3 to 6 months with no use of alcohol and drugs as a requirement for admission. Recovering college peers may help these new students effectively manage the environmental risks present on many college campuses.

Participants in collegiate recovery programs often have significant accompanying mental health problems, such as depression or an eating disorder, in addition to their substance use disorder, which can complicate recovery. Nevertheless, observational data from two model programs suggest that rates of return to use (defined as any use of alcohol or other substance) are only 4 to 13 percent in any given semester. Further, the academic achievement (grade point average and graduation rates) of students in collegiate recovery support programs is better than that of the rest of the undergraduates at the same institution. Although these results are promising, more research is needed on these programs to fully evaluate their effectiveness.
Social and Recreational Recovery Infrastructures and Social Media

In keeping with the need to support long-term remission and recovery from substance use disorders, social and recreational entities are emerging that make it easier for people in recovery to enjoy activities and social interaction that do not involve alcohol or drugs. Examples include recovery cafes and clubhouses, recovery sports leagues and other sporting activities, and a variety of recovery-focused creative arts, including music and musicians’ organizations, visual arts, and theatre and poetry events. Providing these positive alternatives is intended to support recovery as well as provide access to healthy, enjoyable activities. However, no research has yet examined whether participation in these activities produces a significant benefit beyond what might be obtained from other RSS.

Social media, mobile health applications, and recovery-specific online social networking and support sites are growing platforms for providing both intervention and long-term RSS for individuals with substance use disorders, as well as social interaction, friendship, and humor. These are easily accessible and have wide reach. Although research on the impact of these new tools is limited, studies are beginning to show positive benefits, particularly in preventing relapse and supporting recovery. Social media supports appear to be especially helpful for young people in particular.

Specific Populations and Recovery

As mentioned earlier, practice and research in the recovery field are relatively new. This has disadvantages in terms of how much is known from scientific research, but it has a compensating advantage: Most studies have been conducted recently and usually with diverse populations. Indeed, the majority of participants in many of the studies cited in this chapter have included Blacks or African Americans, Hispanics or Latinos, and American Indians or Alaska Natives.

Recovery-oriented policies have also supported diverse populations. For example, SAMHSA’s Recovery Community Services Program made advancing recovery in diverse communities a central goal and helped support organizations serving a broad range of ethnic, racial, and sexual minority communities. Further, 12-step fellowships such as AA and NA have a long history of supporting meeting spaces that are specific to women; Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) populations; young people; and other groups, including meetings that are conducted in other languages.

For all these reasons, the research and practice conclusions of this chapter can be assumed to be broadly applicable to a range of populations. However, not every single population has received comparable attention:

- Blacks or African Americans have been well represented in recovery research, including in the studies of ROSC, mutual aid groups, and recovery housing discussed in this chapter.
- American Indians or Alaska Natives have maintained recovery movements for centuries. More recently culturally-specific adaptations of recovery approaches (e.g., The Red Road to Wellbriety) have been developed. Hispanic or Latino adaptations of AA have been studied, and ROSC have been studied in areas with significant Hispanic or Latino populations (e.g., Philadelphia).
• Native Hawaiians or Other Pacific Islanders have not been studied by recovery researchers, probably because of their small number (one tenth of one percent of the population). They are a population that should be studied in the future.

• Asian-tailored recovery interventions have not been extensively studied and remain an important focus for future research.

• Research on the effectiveness of various recovery pathways within LGBT communities has been limited in quantity and comparability across studies.

Recommendations for Research

Health and social service providers, funders, policymakers, and most of all people with substance use disorders and their families need better information about the effectiveness of the recovery options reviewed in this chapter. Thus, a key research goal for the future is to understand and evaluate the effectiveness, and cost effectiveness, of the emerging range of mutual aid groups and RSS, particularly peer recovery support services and practices and recovery coaches. Another focus of research is new, culturally specific adaptations of long-existent recovery supports, such as AA and NA, as they evolve to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse membership. Such research could increase public and professional awareness of these potentially cost-effective recovery strategies and resources.

Research is also needed on how health care systems themselves can work best with RSS and the workforce that provides RSS. Professional and formal treatment services and RSS have different roots and represent different cultures historically. Creating a fluid, responsive, and more effective recovery-oriented “system” will require greater sensitivity and understanding of the strengths and benefits of each, including rigorous cross-site evaluations for professional RSS strategies. Research should determine the efficacy of peer supports including peer recovery support services, recovery housing, recovery chronic disease management, high school and collegiate recovery programs, and recovery community centers through rigorous, cross-site evaluations.

Although the professionally-led health and social service system should engage with peer-led service organizations, maintaining the informal, grassroots nature of many RSS may be central to their appeal and quite possibly their effectiveness. Thus, a diverse group of stakeholders in the recovery field should come together to create a strategic research agenda that includes:

• The establishment of recovery outcomes and measures;

• The development of a credible methodology for estimating the prevalence of those in recovery;

• Protocols on initiating, stabilizing, and sustaining long-term recovery; and

• Measuring the value of ROSC.
Chapter 6 Preview

Services for the prevention and treatment of substance misuse and substance use disorders have traditionally been delivered separately from other mental health and general health care services. Because substance misuse has traditionally been seen as a social or criminal problem, prevention services were not typically considered a responsibility of health care systems; and people needing care for substance use disorders have had access to only a limited range of treatment options that were generally not covered by insurance. Effective integration of prevention, treatment, and recovery services across health care systems is key to addressing substance misuse and its consequences and it represents the most promising way to improve access to and quality of treatment. Recent health care reform laws, as well as a wide range of other trends in the health care landscape, are facilitating greater integration to better serve individual and public health, reduce health disparities, and reduce costs to society.

This chapter describes the key components of health care systems; historical reasons substance use and its consequences have been addressed separately from other health problems; the key role that health care systems can play in providing prevention, treatment, and recovery support services (RSS) for substance use disorders; and the recent developments that are leading to improved integration of substance use-related care with the rest of medicine. This chapter also describes the challenges to effective integration, as well as promising trends, such as in health information technology (health IT) that will facilitate it. Because these changes are still underway, much

---

1 The World Health Organization defines a health care system as (1) all the activities whose primary purpose is to promote, restore, and/or maintain health, and (2) the people, institutions, and resources, arranged together in accordance with established policies, to improve the health of the population they serve. Health care systems may provide a wide range of clinical services, from primary through subspecialty care and be delivered in offices, clinics, and hospitals. They can be run by private, government, non-profit, or for-profit agencies and organizations.
of the relevant research is still formative and descriptive; information presented in this chapter often derives from reports and descriptive papers.

**KEY FINDINGS**

- Well-supported scientific evidence shows that the traditional separation of substance use disorder treatment and mental health services from mainstream health care has created obstacles to successful care coordination. Efforts are needed to support integrating screening, assessments, interventions, use of medications, and care coordination between general health systems and specialty substance use disorder treatment programs or services.

- Supported scientific evidence indicates that closer integration of substance use-related services in mainstream health care systems will have value to both systems. Substance use disorders are medical conditions and their treatment has impacts on and is impacted by other mental and physical health conditions. Integration can help address health disparities, reduce health care costs for both patients and family members, and improve general health outcomes.

- Supported scientific evidence indicates that individuals with substance use disorders often access the health care system for reasons other than their substance use disorder. Many do not seek specialty treatment but they are over-represented in many general health care settings.

- Promising scientific evidence suggests that integrating care for substance use disorders into mainstream health care can increase the quality, effectiveness, and efficiency of health care. Many of the health home and chronic care model practices now used by mainstream health care to manage other diseases could be extended to include the management of substance use disorders.

- Insurance coverage for substance use disorder services is becoming more robust as a result of the Paul Wellstone and Pete Domenici Mental Health Parity and Addiction Equity Act (MHPAEA) and the Affordable Care Act. The Affordable Care Act also requires non-grandfathered individual and small group market plans to cover services to prevent and treat substance use disorders.

- Health care delivery organizations, such as health homes and accountable care organizations (ACOs), are being developed to better integrate care. The roles of existing care delivery organizations, such as community health centers, are also being expanded to meet the demands of integrated care for substance use disorder prevention, treatment, and recovery.

- Use of Health IT is expanding to support greater communication and collaboration among providers, fostering better integrated and collaborative care, while at the same time protecting patient privacy. It also has the potential for expanding access to care, extending the workforce, improving care coordination, reaching individuals who are resistant to engaging in traditional treatment settings, and providing outcomes and recovery monitoring.

- Supported evidence indicates that one fundamental way to address racial and ethnic disparities in health care is to increase the number of people who have health insurance coverage.

- Well-supported evidence shows that the current substance use disorder workforce does not have the capacity to meet the existing need for integrated health care, and the current general health care workforce is undertrained to deal with substance use-related problems. Health care now requires a new, larger, more diverse workforce with the skills to prevent, identify, and treat substance use disorders, providing “personalized care” through integrated care delivery.

*The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) summarizes strength of evidence as: “Well-supported”: when evidence is derived from multiple controlled trials or large-scale population studies; “Supported”: when evidence is derived from rigorous but fewer or smaller trials; and “Promising”: when evidence is derived from a practical or clinical sense and is widely practiced.5
Key Components of Health Care Systems

In 2015, 20.8 million Americans had a substance use disorder. As discussed in Chapter 1 - Introduction and Overview, these disorders vary in intensity and may respond to different intensities of intervention. Diverse health care systems have many roles to play in addressing our nation’s substance misuse and substance use disorder problems, including:

- Screening for substance misuse and substance use disorders;
- Delivering prevention interventions to prevent substance misuse and related health consequences;
- Early intervention to prevent escalation of misuse to a substance use disorder;
- Engaging patients with substance use disorders into treatment;
- Treating substance use disorders of all levels of severity;
- Coordinating care across both health care systems and social services systems including criminal justice, housing and employment support, and child welfare;
- Linking patients to RSS; and
- Long-term monitoring and follow-up.

There is a great diversity of health care systems across the United States, with varying levels of integration across health care settings and wide-ranging workforces that incorporate diverse structural and financing models and leverage different levels of technology.

Health Care Settings

Health care systems are made up of diverse health care organizations ranging from primary care, specialty substance use disorder treatment (including residential and outpatient settings), mental health care, infectious disease clinics, school clinics, community health centers, hospitals, emergency departments, and others.

It is known that most people with substance use disorders do not seek treatment on their own, many because they do not believe they need it or they are not ready for it, and others because they are not aware that treatment exists or how to access it. But individuals with substance use disorders often do access the health care system for other reasons, including acute health problems like illness, injury, or overdose, as well as chronic health conditions such as HIV/AIDS, heart disease, or depression. Thus, screening for substance misuse and substance use disorders in diverse health care settings is the first step to identifying substance use problems and engaging patients in the appropriate level of care.

Mild substance use disorders may respond to brief counseling sessions in primary care, while severe substance use disorders are often chronic conditions requiring substance use disorder treatment like specialty residential or intensive outpatient treatment as well as long-term management through primary care. A wide range of health care settings is needed to effectively meet the diverse needs of patients.
Workforce

Just as a diversity of health care settings is needed to meet the needs of patients, a diversity of health care professionals is also critical. Health care services can be delivered by a wide-range of providers including doctors, nurses, nurse practitioners, psychologists, licensed counselors, care managers, social workers, health educators, peer workers, and others. With limited resources for prevention and treatment, matching patients to the appropriate level of care, delivered by the appropriate level of provider, is crucial for extending those resources to reach the most patients possible.

Structural and Financing Models

A range of promising health care structures and financing models are currently being explored for integrating general health care and substance use disorder treatment within health care systems, as well as integrating the substance use disorder treatment system with the overall health care system. As part of ongoing health reform efforts, both federal and state governments are investing in models and innovations ranging from health homes and ACOs, to managed care and Coordinated Care Organizations (CCOs), to pay-for-performance and shared-savings models. These new models are developing and testing strategies for effectively and sustainably financing high-quality care that integrates behavioral health and general health care.

Technology Integration

Technology can play a key role in supporting these integrated care models. Electronic health records (EHRs), telehealth, health information exchanges (HIE), patient registries, mobile applications, Web-based tools, and other innovative technologies have the potential to extend the reach of the workforce; support quality measurement and improvement initiatives to drive a learning health care system; electronically deliver prevention, treatment, and recovery interventions; efficiently monitor patients; identify population health trends and threats; and engage patients who are hesitant to participate in formal care.

The Promise of Integration

When health care is not well integrated and coordinated across systems, too many patients fall through the cracks, leading to missed opportunities for prevention or early intervention, ineffective referrals, incomplete treatment, high rates of hospital and emergency department readmissions, and individual tragedies that could have been prevented. For example, a recent study found that doctors continue to prescribe opioids for 91 percent of patients who suffered a non-fatal overdose, with 63 percent of those patients continuing to receive high doses; 17 percent of these patients overdosed again within 2 years. Effective coordination between emergency departments and primary care providers can help to prevent these tragedies.
Other tragedies occur when patients complete treatment and the health care system fails to provide adequate follow-up and coordination of the wrap-around services or recovery supports necessary to help them maintain their recovery, leading to relapse. The risk for overdose is particularly high after a period of abstinence, due to reduced tolerance—patients no longer know what a safe dose is for them—and this all too often results in overdose deaths. This is a common story when patients are released from prison without a coordinated plan for continuing treatment in the community. One study from the Washington State Department of Corrections found that during the first 2 weeks after release, the risk of death among former inmates was 12.7 times higher than among state residents of the same age, sex, and race. Health care systems play a key role in providing the coordination necessary to avert these tragic outcomes.7

### Substance Use Disorder Services Have Traditionally Been Separate From Mental Health and General Health Care

The separation of the treatment systems for substance use disorders, mental illness, and general health care has historical roots.8-10 For example, Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) was founded in 1935 in part because mainstream psychiatric and general medical providers did not attend to substance use disorders. If treated at all, alcoholism was most often treated in asylums, separate from the rest of health care. The separation of substance use disorder treatment and general health care was further influenced by social and political trends of the 1970s. At that time, substance misuse and addiction were generally viewed as social problems best dealt with through civil and criminal justice interventions such as involuntary commitment to psychiatric hospitals, prison-run “narcotic farms,” or other forms of confinement.11 However, when many college students and returning Vietnam veterans were misusing alcohol, using drugs, and/or becoming addicted to illicit substances, high numbers of arrests and other forms of punishment became politically and economically infeasible. At this time, there was a major push to significantly expand substance misuse prevention and treatment services.

Despite the compelling national need for treatment, the existing health care system was neither trained to care for, nor especially eager to accept, patients with substance use disorders. For these reasons, new substance use disorder treatment programs were created, ultimately expanding to programs in more than 14,000 locations across the United States. This meant that with the exception of withdrawal management in hospitals (detoxification), virtually all substance use disorder treatment was delivered by programs that were geographically, financially, culturally, and organizationally separate from mainstream health care.
Even though these programs were separate from the rest of health care, these new delivery sites were a critical step toward better addressing the growing problems related to substance misuse and substance use disorders. One positive consequence was the initial development of effective and inexpensive behavioral change strategies rarely used in the treatment of other chronic illnesses. However, the separation of substance use disorder treatment from general health care also created unintended and enduring impediments to the quality and range of care options available to patients in both systems. For example, it tended to reinforce the notion that substance use disorders were different from other medical conditions. Despite numerous research studies documenting high prevalence rates of substance use disorders among patients in emergency departments, hospitals, and general medical care settings, mainstream health care generally failed to recognize or address substance use-related health problems.8,12-15

The continued separation of substance use and general health care services has been costly, often harmful, and for some individuals even fatal. A recent study of world health settings showed that the presence of a substance use disorder often doubles the odds that a person will develop another chronic and costly medical illness, such as arthritis, chronic pain, heart disease, stroke, hypertension, diabetes, or asthma.16 Yet despite the impact of substance use on physical health, few medical, nursing, dental, or pharmacy schools teach their students how to identify, prevent, and treat substance use disorders;17-19 and, until recently, few insurers offered comparable reimbursement for substance use disorder treatment services.20-23

Even now, there are health care professionals who continue to be hesitant to provide patients with medication-assisted treatment (MAT), especially maintenance medications (methadone and buprenorphine) for opioid use disorders, because of deeply ingrained but erroneous misconceptions about these treatments, such as the idea that they “substitute one addiction for another.”24 This has hindered the adoption of these effective medications even by substance use disorder treatment facilities; and when they are used by substance use disorder treatment providers, they are often prescribed at insufficient doses, for insufficient durations, contributing to treatment failure and reinforcing a belief that they are not effective.25,26 In fact, ample research shows that, when used correctly, MAT can reduce or eliminate illicit drug use and associated criminality and infectious disease transmission and restore patients to healthy functioning.25,27,28

A Growing Impetus for Integration

An integrated system of prevention, early intervention, treatment, and recovery that can address the full spectrum of substance use-related health problems is a logical and necessary shift that our society must make to prevent substance misuse and its consequences and meet the needs of individuals with substance use disorders. Providing services to people with mild and moderate substance use disorders—by far the largest proportion of all those diagnosed—in general health care settings will likely lessen the need for intensive and costly substance use treatment.

**KEY TERMS**

**Inpatient treatment.** Intensive, 24-hour-a-day services delivered in a hospital setting.

**Residential treatment.** Intensive, 24-hour-a-day services delivered in settings other than a hospital.

**FOR MORE ON THIS TOPIC**

See Chapter 4 - Early Intervention, Treatment, and Management of Substance Use Disorders.
use disorder treatment services later, even though specialty care is still essential for people with serious substance use disorders, just as it is for patients with other severe diseases and conditions.

Beginning in the 1990s, a number of events converged to lay the foundation for integrated care. First, a number of IOM reports and other major articles established that substance use disorders are inherently health conditions that require a collaboration between general health care settings and specialty care\textsuperscript{29} to improve treatment\textsuperscript{10} and reduce gaps in quality for health care broadly\textsuperscript{31} and for mental disorders and substance use disorders in particular.\textsuperscript{26,32} This was followed, in more recent years, by legislation that aims to transform the way services are provided and to facilitate access to prevention and treatment services through expanded insurance coverage. The Paul Wellstone and Pete Domenici Mental Health Parity and Addiction Equity Act of 2008 (MHPAEA) requires the financial requirements and treatment limitations imposed by most health plans and insurers for substance use disorders be no more restrictive than the financial requirements and treatment limitations they impose for medical and surgical conditions.

Further, the Affordable Care Act, passed in 2010, requires that non-grandfathered health care plans offered in the individual and small group markets both inside and outside insurance exchanges provide coverage for a comprehensive list of 10 categories of items and services, known as “essential health benefits.” One of these essential health benefit categories is mental health and substance use disorder services, including behavioral health treatment. This requirement represents a significant change in the way many health insurers respond to these disorders. The Affordable Care Act also reaffirmed MHPAEA by requiring that mental health and substance use disorder benefits covered by plans offered through the exchanges be offered consistent with the parity requirements under MHPAEA.

### Medicaid Expansion under the Affordable Care Act

To more broadly cover uninsured individuals, the Affordable Care Act includes a provision that allows states to expand Medicaid coverage. In those states ("Medicaid expansion states"), individuals in households with incomes below 138 percent of the federal poverty level are eligible for Medicaid. Benefits include mental health and substance use disorder treatment services with coverage equivalent to that of general health care services.

Medicaid expansion is a key lever for expanding access to substance use treatment because many of the most vulnerable individuals with substance use disorders have incomes below 138 percent of the federal poverty level. As of fall 2015, an estimated 3 million adults have incomes that make them eligible for Medicaid under the Affordable Care Act but live in a state that has declined to expand Medicaid eligibility as permitted under the new law.\textsuperscript{36,37}

A major goal of the Affordable Care Act is to expand insurance coverage and reduce the number of uninsured individuals.\textsuperscript{33} As of March 2016, more than 20 million previously uninsured individuals (including children on parents’ plans) had new benefits under the Affordable Care Act.\textsuperscript{34} These enrollment figures include those who were previously uninsured, as well as 1 million who previously had employer-based coverage and 3 million who previously had non-group and other insurance coverage.\textsuperscript{33} Individuals with substance use disorders are overrepresented in the newly insured population (including children now on parents’ plans), because they were previously disproportionately uninsured, young adults without dependent children. They now are eligible for coverage under the Affordable Care Act, which will enable them to receive substance use disorder prevention, treatment, and RSS.\textsuperscript{35}
Most recently, Congress passed the Protecting Access to Medicare Act, which, in addition to its Medicare provisions, funds pilot programs to increase access to, and Medicaid payment for, community mental health and substance use disorder treatment services. This is an important opportunity for integration.

Other changes, described later in this chapter, are also helping to create momentum for integration. These include new or improved organizational structures, such as medical homes, health homes, and ACOs; improved health IT, such as EHRs; clinical approaches, such as new substance use disorder treatment medications that can be prescribed in primary care settings; and effective approaches to identifying and preventing substance misuse problems. In addition, organizations including the American College of Physicians and the American Society of Addiction Medicine (ASAM) now recommend integration of substance use-related and mental health services with primary care. Of historical note, although the World Health Organization and the American Medical Association have long identified alcohol and drug use disorders as medical conditions, it was only in 2016 that addiction medicine was formally recognized as a new subspecialty by the American Board of Medical Specialties under the American Board of Preventive Medicine.

Figure 6.1 summarizes a few of the key changes that are occurring as substance use disorder treatment services are integrated into mainstream health care.

**Figure 6.1: Substance Use Disorders Services: Past and Future**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Past</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substance use mainly ignored in primary care</td>
<td>Substance use screened and monitored in primary care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on the most severe problems</td>
<td>Addresses full spectrum of problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper charts: little contact between specialty</td>
<td>EHR, clinical coordination, patient portals, health IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>substance use disorders and health care</td>
<td>treatment options that focus on coordination of care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited use of health IT</td>
<td>Leveraging technologies including patient portals, HIEs,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>technology delivered treatments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little focus on physical health issues</td>
<td>Addresses medical problems with focus on whole person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wellness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medications seldom available</td>
<td>Medications readily available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate oversight structures and reporting</td>
<td>Performance and outcomes measurement, ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>quality improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-step programs</td>
<td>12-step and other RSS, social network innovations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Health care professionals are being encouraged to offer prevention advice, screen patients for substance misuse and substance use disorders, and provide early interventions in the form of motivational approaches, when appropriate.

Primary care has a central role in this process, because it is the site for most preventive and ongoing clinical care for patients—the patient’s anchor in the health care system. For example, primary care settings can serve as a conduit to help patients engage in and maintain recovery. Also, approaches such as screening, brief intervention, and referral to treatment (SBIRT) provide primary care providers with tools for addressing patients’ substance misuse. Based upon the strength of the evidence for their effectiveness, the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF) has recommended alcohol screening
and brief behavioral counseling interventions for adults in primary care and given the supporting evidence for these services a “B” grade. This is significant because under the Affordable Care Act, preventive services given a grade of A or B by the USPSTF must be covered by most health plans without cost-sharing.\(^{41-43}\) The USPSTF recommendation supports the expectation that primary care providers will soon routinely screen adults of all ages for unhealthy alcohol use as they now do for blood pressure and weight. Relatedly, the National Commission on Prevention Priorities of the Partnership for Prevention ranks primary care-based interventions to reduce alcohol misuse among the most valuable clinical preventive services.\(^{44,45}\)

The literature on the effectiveness of drug-focused brief intervention in primary care and emergency departments is less clear, with some studies finding no improvements among those receiving brief interventions.\(^{46,47}\) However, at least one study found significant reductions in subsequent drug use.\(^{48}\) Trials evaluating different types of screening and brief interventions for drug use in diverse settings with a range of patient groups are lacking. The USPSTF’s current rating for illicit drug screening and brief intervention remains “I” for insufficient evidence to support its use as a preventive service. However, assessment for drug use is recommended under numerous circumstances, including treating any condition for which drug use might interfere with the treatment; considering potential interactions with prescribed medications; supporting integration of behavioral health care; and monitoring patient risk when prescribing opioid pain medications or sedatives/tranquilizers.

It is also important to emphasize that brief primary care-based interventions by themselves are likely not sufficient to address severe substance use disorders. However, primary care providers can use other interventions with this population, including providing MAT, providing more robust monitoring and patient education,\(^{49,50}\) and importantly, referring individuals to specialty substance use disorder treatment. Effective referral arrangements that include motivating patients to accept the referral are critical elements to encourage individuals to engage in treatment for their substance use disorder.

### Reasons Why Integrating Substance Use Disorder Services and Mainstream Health Care Is Necessary

A number of strong arguments underpin the growing momentum to integrate substance use disorder services and mainstream health care. The main argument is that substance use disorders are medical conditions like any other—the overarching theme of much of this Report. Recognition of that fact means it no longer makes sense to keep substance use disorders segregated from other health issues. A number of other realities support the need for integration:\(^{63}\)

- Substance use, mental disorders, and other general medical conditions are often interconnected;
- Integration has the potential to reduce health disparities;
- Delivering substance use disorder services in mainstream health care can be cost-effective and may reduce intake/treatment wait times at substance use disorder treatment facilities; and
- Integration can lead to improved health outcomes through better care coordination.

See Chapter 4 - Early Intervention, Treatment, and Management of Substance Use Disorders.
Health Systems and Opioids

Physician prescribing patterns, patient drug diversion (selling, sharing, or using medications prescribed for another person), and doctor shopping behaviors have all contributed to the ongoing opioid overdose epidemic.\textsuperscript{51} For example, evidence indicates that chronic pain patients with substance use disorders are prescribed opioids more often than other individuals with chronic pain, with the trend increasing over time.\textsuperscript{52} Also, a study in two health systems found opioid prescription rates for older persons, particularly older women,\textsuperscript{53} to be higher over time than for other individuals with long-term chronic pain.

In March 2015, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) made addressing the opioid misuse crisis a high priority, announcing a national opioid initiative focused on three priority areas: (1) providing training and educational resources, including updated prescriber guidelines, to assist health professionals in making informed prescribing decisions; (2) increasing use of the opioid overdose reversal drug naloxone; and (3) expanding the use of MAT. Since then, HHS has initiated many efforts to help reduce prescription opioid misuse and use disorders. Improving prescribing practices is one of these important efforts.\textsuperscript{54} In March 2016, the CDC released the \textit{Guideline for Prescribing Opioids for Chronic Pain}, which provides recommendations about the appropriate prescribing of opioid pain relievers and other treatment options to improve pain management and patient safety.\textsuperscript{55} The guideline is not intended to regulate necessary and appropriate opioid prescribing. Rather, the guideline is meant to inform health care professionals about some of the consequences of treatment with opioids for chronic pain and to consider, when appropriate, tapering and changing prescribing practices, as well as considering alternative pain therapies. The same month, HHS also released the National Pain Strategy, which outlines the federal government’s first coordinated plan for addressing chronic pain that affects so many Americans.\textsuperscript{56} The goals of the National Pain Strategy will be achieved through a broad effort that includes improved pain care and safer prescribing practices, such as those recommended by the CDC Guideline.

The National Heroin Task Force, which consisted of law enforcement, doctors, public health officials, and education experts, was convened to develop strategies to confront the heroin problem and decrease the escalating overdose epidemic and death rate.\textsuperscript{57} In 2015, the Task Force developed a report outlining the steps being taken to address the opioid problem. This included a multifaceted strategy of enforcement and prevention efforts, as well as increased access to substance use disorder treatment and recovery services. Although only about 4 percent of those who misuse prescription opioids transition to using heroin, concern is growing that tightening restrictions on opioid prescribing could potentially have unintended consequences resulting in new populations using heroin.\textsuperscript{58} The Task Force states that “evidence shows that some people who misuse opioid medications migrate to heroin because heroin is more accessible and less costly than prescription opioids.”\textsuperscript{59} In fact, nearly 80 percent of recent heroin initiates reported that they began their opioid use through the nonmedical use of prescription opioid medications.”\textsuperscript{58}

The concern about opioid overdoses has also triggered efforts by health systems to increase access to naloxone, an opioid antagonist that prevents overdose fatalities by rapidly restoring normal respiration to a person whose breathing has slowed or stopped as a result of opioid use. Since 1996, community-based organizations in many states have implemented overdose education and naloxone distribution programs for people who use heroin or misuse pharmaceutical opioids and efforts are underway to expand access to naloxone to patients who are prescribed opioids for pain. Expanded access to naloxone through large health systems could prevent overdose fatalities in broad populations of patients, including patients who may experience accidental overdose from misusing their medications. The Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) has developed an easy-to-use toolkit to be distributed with naloxone.\textsuperscript{60} Prior research has suggested the potential to translate overdose education and naloxone distribution into routine primary care practice\textsuperscript{61} and examination of the perspectives of primary care providers on this practice revealed knowledge gaps about naloxone but also a willingness to follow standardized naloxone prescribing practices when they emerge.\textsuperscript{62}
Substance Use Disorders, Mental Disorders, and Other Medical Conditions Are Interconnected

Many individuals who come to mainstream health care settings, such as primary care, obstetrics and gynecology, emergency departments, and hospitals, also have a substance use disorder. In a study within one health plan, one third of the most common and costly medical conditions were markedly more prevalent among patients with substance use disorders than they were among similar health system members who did not have a substance use disorder. Similarly, many individuals who present at specialty substance use disorder treatment programs have other medical conditions, including hypertension, HIV/AIDS, coronary artery disease, hepatitis, chronic liver disease, and psychiatric disorders.

Because substance use complicates many other medical conditions, early identification and management of substance misuse or use disorders presents an important opportunity to improve health outcomes and reduce health care costs. Research shows that primary care patients with mild or moderate substance use have higher rates of other medical problems, including injury, hypertension, and psychiatric disorders, as well as higher costs. For example, cocaine use is associated with cardiovascular complications and neurological and psychiatric disorders, and long-term marijuana use has been associated with chronic bronchitis and cardiovascular problems. Alcohol misuse is associated with liver and pancreatic diseases; hypertension; reproductive system disorders; trauma; stroke; and cancers of the oral cavity, esophagus, larynx, pharynx, liver, colon, and rectum. Even one drink per day may increase the risk of breast cancer.

In addition to the health problems faced by individuals engaged in substance use mentioned above, substance use can adversely affect a developing fetus. In the United States, fetal alcohol spectrum disorders (FASD) remain highly prevalent and problematic, even though they are preventable. A study of children in public and private schools in a Midwestern community calculated rates of FASD to be as high as 6 to 9 per 1,000.

Opioid pain reliever use among pregnant women has also become a major concern due to neonatal abstinence syndrome (NAS), a treatable condition that newborns experience after exposure to drugs while in the mother’s womb. NAS may cause neurological excitability, gastrointestinal dysfunction, and autonomic dysfunction. Newborns with NAS are more likely than other babies to also have low birthweight and respiratory complications. The incidence of NAS has increased dramatically in the last decade along with increased opioid misuse. In 2012, an estimated 21,732 infants were born with NAS, a five-fold increase since 2000. Moreover, in 2012, newborns with NAS stayed in the hospital an average of 16.9 days, more than eight times the number of days other newborns stay in the hospital (2.1 days). These newborns with NAS cost hospitals an estimated $1.5 billion, and 81 percent of these costs were paid by state Medicaid programs. These data suggest the need to develop and test measures to reduce newborn exposure to opioids. For women who are considering getting pregnant or are already pregnant, abstaining from all substances is recommended, since NAS is not exclusively caused by opioids.

Adolescents with substance use disorders experience higher rates of other physical and mental illnesses, as well as diminished overall health and well-being. Sexually transmitted infections and HIV/AIDS, appetite changes and weight loss, dermatological problems, gastrointestinal problems, headaches, insomnia and chronic fatigue, and heart, lung, and abdominal abnormalities are only some of the
problems that affect the health of young people who misuse alcohol and drugs. A study of adolescents entering specialty substance use disorder treatment—as compared with age-matched adolescent patients without a substance use disorder—found higher rates of clinically diagnosed sinusitis, asthma, abdominal pain, sleep disorders, injuries and overdoses.

In addition to the physical health problems described above, mental health problems are also over-represented among adolescents with substance use disorders, particularly attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder, conduct disorders, anxiety disorders, and mood disorders. In addition, alcohol and drug use are associated with serious personal and social problems for users and for those around them including elevated rates of morbidity and mortality related to traffic crashes, intimate partner violence, risky sex, and unintentional injuries, including death from overdose.

**Integration Can Lead to Improved Health Outcomes through Better Care Coordination**

Treatment of substance use disorders has historically been provided episodically, when a person experiences a crisis or a relapse occurs. This is neither good quality nor efficient care, because severe substance use disorders are chronic health problems, similar to other health conditions and with similar outcomes. Studies conducted over extended periods of time have found that annual primary care visits were associated with better outcomes and reduced health care costs following substance use disorder treatment, but research on models of chronic care management is only beginning and thus far no consensus has emerged on the best approach. These types of long-term studies will be more informative as the substance use disorder treatment, health care, and mental health systems become more integrated and as researchers build on disease management models that are effective for other medical conditions.

In addition to chronic care management for severely affected individuals, coordinating services for those with mild or moderate problems is also important. Studies of various methods for integrating substance use services and general medical care have typically shown beneficial outcomes. The effectiveness of providing alcohol screening and brief counseling in primary care is supported by a robust evidence base, and a growing literature is showing its benefits as a first tool in managing chronic health conditions that may arise from, or be exacerbated by, alcohol use. Primary care-based alcohol use disorder case management involving pharmacotherapy and psychosocial support has been found to increase engagement in specialty substance use disorder treatment and to decrease heavy drinking.

Care coordination is an essential part of quality in all health care. The Healthcare Effectiveness Data and Information Set (HEDIS), The Joint Commission, and organizations such as the National Committee for Quality Assurance emphasize coordination and accountability and the use of evidence-based care and performance indicators to establish and monitor quality and value. This approach to care delivery proceeds on the assumption that services for the range of substance use disorders should be fully integrated components of mainstream health care.
Quality and Performance Measurement and Accountability

Publicly available quality measurement information helps consumers, health care purchasers, and other groups make informed decisions when choosing services, providers, and care settings. Performance measurement has the dual purpose of accountability and quality improvement.

A 2015 IOM study on Psychosocial Interventions for Mental and Substance Use Disorders recommended that the substance use disorder field develop approaches to measure quality, similar to approaches used for other diseases. This includes the development of performance measures, use of health IT for standardized measurement, and utilization of these measures to support quality improvement.127

Measures have been proposed by a variety of organizations, including SAMHSA, as part of its 2013 National Behavioral Health Quality Framework; by the ASAM, as part of its development of standards of care for specialist addiction medicine physicians; by the Behavioral Health Steering Committee of the National Quality Forum; and by accrediting bodies such as The Joint Commission. Many measures are being tested by public and private health plans, though most have not been adopted widely for quality improvement and accountability. The single substance use measure included in HEDIS is “initiation and engagement of alcohol and other drug dependence treatment.” Although the HEDIS measure is limited, it does provide health systems a beginning benchmark for tracking substance use disorders. A measure of care continuity after emergency department use for substance use disorders is in process.

Because substance use disorder treatment is currently not well integrated and services are often provided by multiple systems, it can be challenging to effectively measure treatment quality and related outcomes. The ability to track service delivery across these multiple environments will be critical for addressing this challenge. For example, community monitoring systems to assess risk and protection for adolescents are being developed.128-130

Pay-for-performance is an approach for improving quality and for incentivizing programs or health care professionals to produce particular outcomes (for example, treatment retention and treatment outcomes). It has been used more in general health care than in substance use disorder treatment. However, Delaware and Maine have experimented with it in their public substance use disorder treatment systems, and several studies have found improvement in retention and outcomes.131,132 Potential concerns with pay-for-performance are that treatment programs may not accept the most severe patients and that methods of risk adjustment to compensate programs that accept those patients are not well-established. Although pay-for-performance is a promising approach, more research is needed to address these concerns.

A fundamental concept in care coordination between the health care, substance use disorder treatment, and mental health systems is that there should be “no wrong door.”133 This means that no matter where in the health care system the need for substance use disorder treatment is identified the patient will be effectively linked with appropriate services.

Several models of coordination have been described by researchers. In one such model, coordination ranges from referral agreements to co-located substance use disorder, mental health, and other health care services. Onsite programs had the highest rates of treatment engagement.134 A recent meta-analysis concluded that integrated treatment of adolescent substance use disorders, along with mental disorders and medical care, produced better outcomes than when treatment was provided separately.135 Other observational research has found that co-location of specialty substance use disorder treatment and mental health care is associated with better outcomes in adolescents.93 SAMHSA and the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) have also developed a model with six levels of coordination (Figure 6.2).
Figure 6.2: A Continuum of Collaboration between Health Care and Specialty Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordinated</th>
<th>Co-located</th>
<th>Integrated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key Element: Communication</td>
<td>Key Element: Physical Proximity</td>
<td>Key Element: Practice Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 1</td>
<td>LEVEL 2</td>
<td>LEVEL 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Collaboration</td>
<td>Basic Collaboration at a Distance</td>
<td>Basic Collaboration Onsite</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Behavioral health, primary care, and other health care professionals work: |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| In separate facilities, where they: | In separate facilities, where they: | In same facility not necessarily same offices, where they: | In same space within the same facility, where they: | In same space within the same facility (some shared space), where they: |
| • Have separate systems | • Have separate systems | • Have separate systems | • Share some systems, like scheduling or medical records | • Have resolved most or all system issues, functioning as one integrated system |
| • Communicate about cases only rarely and under compelling circumstances | • Communicate periodically about shared patients | • Communicate regularly about shared patients, by phone or e-mail | • Communicate in person as needed | • Communicate consistently at the system, team, and individual levels |
| • Communicate, driven by specific patient issues | • Collaborate, driven by need for each other’s services and more reliable referral | • Collaborate, driven by need for consultation and coordinated plans for difficult patients | • Collaborate, driven by desire to be a member of the care team |
| • May meet as part of a larger community | • Meet occasionally to discuss cases due to close proximity | • Have regular face-to-face interactions about some patients | • Have regular team meetings to discuss overall patient care and specific patient issues |
| • Appreciate each other’s roles as resources | • Feel part of a larger yet non-formal team | • Have a basic understanding of roles and culture | • Have an in-depth understanding of roles and culture |


These models, as well as recovery-oriented systems of care, provide opportunities for substance use disorder services and mainstream health care to engage in various types of collaborative efforts to integrate their services at all stages: prevention, treatment, and recovery. Importantly, the models all emphasize the relationship between person-centered, high-quality care and fully integrated models. Innovative financing mechanisms now being explored also allow for formal arrangements to implement some of the models discussed above, including linking to off-site health professionals in specialty
substance use disorder treatment settings (and vice versa) when locating multiple services at one site is not feasible.

Integration Can Help Address Health Disparities

Integrating substance use services with general health care (e.g., in community health centers) provides opportunities to address longstanding health disparities. Prevalence of substance misuse and substance use disorders differs by race and ethnicity, sex, age, sexual orientation, gender identity, and disability, and these factors are also associated with differing rates of access to both health care and substance use disorder treatment. These differences are often exacerbated by socioeconomic variables. Some racial and ethnic groups experience disparities in entering and engaging in treatment. A study of a large health system found that Black or African American women but not Latina or Asian American women were less likely to attend substance use disorder treatment, after controlling for other factors; there were no ethnicity differences for men.

In addition, an analysis of longitudinal data from the National Epidemiologic Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions showed that individuals from most racial and ethnic groups were less likely to receive an alcohol intervention than were White individuals over a 3 year period. Controlling for socioeconomic status and clinical conditions increased the disparity, and Hispanic or Latino individuals were the least likely to receive services. Differences within the various racial and ethnic groups by sex were not studied.

A fundamental way to address disparities is to increase the number of people who have health coverage. The Affordable Care Act provides several mechanisms that broaden access to coverage. As a result, more low-income individuals with substance use disorders have gained health coverage, changed their perceptions about being able to obtain treatment services if needed, and increased their access to treatment. However, in states that have elected not to expand Medicaid, some low-income adults who need substance use disorder treatment, especially single childless adults, are unable to receive these services. Individuals whose incomes are too high to qualify for Medicaid but are not high enough to be eligible for qualified health plan premium tax credits also rarely have coverage for substance use disorder treatment. As Figure 6.3 shows, more Blacks or African Americans are in the coverage gap than other groups, and more Hispanics or Latinos are ineligible due to immigration status. One study conducted by The Pew Charitable Trusts reported that 14 percent of the low-income adults who are newly eligible for Medicaid under the Affordable Care Act have drug and alcohol addictions, compared to 10 percent in the general population. Because the new Medicaid population includes large numbers of young, single men—a group at much higher risk for alcohol and drug misuse—Medicaid enrollees needing treatment could more than double, from 1.5 million prior to the 2014 Medicaid expansion to about 4 million in the next five years.
Figure 6.3: Eligibility for Affordable Care Act Coverage Among the Nonelderly Uninsured by Race and Ethnicity, as of 2015

Notes: Totals may not sum to 100 percent due to rounding. Ineligible for Financial Assistance share includes those ineligible due to offer of employer sponsored insurance or income. Tax Credit Eligible share includes adults in MN and NY who are eligible for coverage through the Basic Health Plan.
Source: Kaiser Family Foundation analysis based on 2015 Medicaid eligibility levels and 2015 Current Population Survey.142

Another way to address disparities is to ensure that substance misuse prevention, interventions, treatments, and recovery services are tailored and relevant to the populations receiving them. Several interventions have been adapted explicitly to address differences in specific populations; they were either conducted within health care settings or are implementable in those settings. The list below provides examples of such programs that have been shown to be effective in diverse populations:

- An evidence-based prevention intervention focused on women who are at risk for an alcohol-exposed pregnancy because of risky drinking and not using contraception consistently and correctly.145 The program has been adapted to serve American Indian women of the Oglala Sioux Tribe.146 Implementation of this intervention in health care settings has high potential for improving outcomes.
- A study of a computerized screening and brief intervention in both Spanish and English used in a public health center’s obstetrics-gynecology department was shown to be feasible and accepted by patients.\(^{147}\)

- A small trial of Latino heavy drinkers compared culturally adapted motivational interviewing to motivational interviewing that was not culturally adapted. The trial suggested stronger results for the culturally adapted program.\(^{148}\)

- A study comparing rural and urban differences in screening for substance use disorders in mental health clinics did not find significant differences in screening outcomes. However, rural clinics did significantly less following up for substance use problems in their patients than their urban counterparts. Larger rural clinics did better than small ones.\(^{149}\)

Importantly, if health care systems systematically screen to identify individuals with risky use or potential substance use disorders, and respond appropriately to the level of the identified problem (with brief interventions, medications, and/or referral to specialty substance use disorder treatment), disparities in the use of treatment among those populations should lessen dramatically. In other words, it is expected that the number of people who seek treatment across all racial and ethnic groups will increase.

Few studies have directly compared treatment populations by race and ethnicity. However, some studies have examined race and ethnicity as predictors of outcomes in analyses controlling for many other factors (such as age, substance use disorder severity, mental health severity, social supports), and they showed that after accounting for these socioeconomic factors, outcomes did not differ by race and ethnicity. Some examples from an integrated health system include adolescent studies comparing Blacks or African Americans, American Indians or Alaska Natives, Hispanics or Latinos, and Whites.\(^{150-152}\) The same is true for short-term and long-term treatment outcomes of adults.\(^{112,153-155}\)

This body of research has some key caveats. For example, studies have found that matching programs and providers by race or ethnicity may produce better results for Hispanics or Latinos than for other racial and ethnic groups.\(^{156}\) However, this research also suggests that all racial and ethnic groups can benefit equally from substance use disorder treatment. At the same time, offering programs that are tailored to patient characteristics or that incorporate health care professionals who share similarities with their patients in sex, age, or race or ethnicity may improve willingness to enter and engage in treatment.\(^{157-159}\)

It should also be noted that civil rights laws, such as Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), and Section 1557 of the Affordable Care Act, protect many people with substance use disorders and impose requirements on substance use disorder treatment programs. These laws require individual assessment of a person with a disability, identifying and implementing needed reasonable modifications of policies and practices when necessary to provide an equal opportunity for a person with a disability to participate in and benefit from treatment programs. More generally, these laws prohibit programs from excluding individuals from treatment programs on the basis of a co-occurring disability, if the individual meets the qualifications for the program. Additionally, under Title
VI of the Civil Rights Act and Section 1557 of the Affordable Care Act, providers who receive federal financial assistance must address the needs of people with limited English proficiency. The ADA and Section 504 also apply to discriminatory zoning laws and decisions that operate as a barrier to providers seeking to open or expand substance use disorder treatment programs.¹⁶⁰

As the section on **Electronic Health Records and Health Information Technology** shows, health IT holds tremendous promise to provide culturally appropriate services in multiple languages and that incorporate health care professionals with characteristics similar to the target patients’ population. One example with cultural relevance is a pilot randomized trial of a computer-delivered brief intervention in a prenatal clinic, which matched health care professionals and patients on race/ethnicity; patients found the intervention to be easy to use and helpful.¹⁶¹ Such services have the potential to be cost-effective and to reach individuals in rural or urban settings and those who have difficulty attending treatment, including those with disabilities.

**Integration Can Reduce Costs of Delivering Substance Use Services**

With scarce resources and many social programs competing for limited funding, cost-effectiveness is a critical aspect of substance use-related services. Over the past 20 years, several comprehensive literature reviews have examined the economics of substance use disorder treatment.¹⁶²⁻¹⁶⁵

Although the United States spends roughly $35 billion across public and private payors to treat substance use disorders,¹⁶⁶,¹⁶⁷ the social and economic costs associated with these disorders are many times higher: Annual costs of substance misuse and substance use disorders in the United States are estimated at more than $400 billion.¹⁶⁸,¹⁶⁹ Thus, treating substance use disorders has the potential for positive net economic benefits, not just in regard to treatment services but also general health care.¹⁶²,¹⁷⁰⁻¹⁷² For example, on average individuals with chronic medical conditions incur health care costs two to three times higher when they have a comorbid substance use disorder compared with individuals without this comorbidity.¹⁷³ The net benefits of integrated treatment include improved health care outcomes and reduced health care costs, as well as reduced crime, improved child welfare, and greater employment productivity.¹²⁵,¹⁷⁴⁻¹⁷⁸ Major individual and societal savings also stem from fewer interpersonal conflicts, greater workplace productivity, reduced infectious disease transmission, and fewer drug-related accidents, including overdoses and deaths.¹⁷⁹

Evaluations of Medicaid expenditures for substance use disorder treatment show that the costs of treating substance use disorders are more than offset by the accompanying savings to Medicaid in reduced health care costs, such as reductions in future substance use disorder-related hospitalizations and residential treatment costs.¹⁸⁸⁻¹⁹⁰ For example, as discussed below, an analysis of Washington State Medicaid found that providing substance use disorder treatment resulted in aggregate net savings to the Medicaid program, in the millions of dollars.¹⁹⁰ These and other studies point out that investments in engaging people into effective treatment for substance use disorders will reduce costs in many areas.
Costs of Substance Use Disorders in Other Service Systems

Costs associated with substance use disorders are not limited to health care. The accumulated costs to the individual, the family, and the community are staggering and arise as a consequence of many direct and indirect effects, including compromised physical and mental health, loss of productivity, reduced quality of life, increased crime and violence, misuse and neglect of children, and health care costs.

Criminal Justice System

As described elsewhere in this Report, a substance use disorder is a substantial risk factor for committing a criminal offense. Reduced crime is thus a key component of the net benefits associated with prevention and treatment interventions. Overall, within the criminal justice system, more than two thirds of jail detainees and half of prison inmates experience substance use disorders. Many require treatment interventions, although only approximately 10 percent of prison inmates receive substance use disorder treatment services. Applying inflation-adjusted estimates of the costs of in-prison care, the public sector spends approximately $400 million on such prison-based services, with substantial additional costs for after-care.

Child Welfare and Related Service Systems

Substance use-related costs are also prominent within child welfare and related services. The estimated prevalence of substance use disorders among parents involved in the child welfare system varies across service populations, time, and place. One widely cited estimate is that between one-third and two-thirds of parents involved with the child welfare system experience some form of substance use problem. The National Survey of Child and Adolescent Well-Being found that caseworkers perceived substance misuse problems in 23 percent of cases, which was correlated with significantly higher probabilities of severe harm to children (24 percent), compared with parents with no such indication (5 percent). Consistent with these findings, caseworker-perceived substance misuse problems were associated with more than twice the risk of out-of-home, or foster care, placement (38 percent vs. 16 percent) within this sample. Children of parents with substance use problems were more likely than others to require child protective services at younger ages, to experience repeated neglect and abuse from parents, and to otherwise require more intensive and intrusive services. An estimated 19 percent of adolescents served by the child welfare system have experienced some substance use disorder, highlighting another challenge facing these service systems.

In fiscal year 2016, approximately $5.2 billion was proposed for Federal Title IV-B, IV-E, and child abuse prevention services. Substance use disorders appear to account for a large proportion of child welfare, foster care, and related expenditures in the United States.

Military Health System

The United States military health system includes Department of Defense (DoD), Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps programs as well as health care outside the direct care system (TRICARE) for military members and their dependents, both in the United States and abroad. It is one of the largest health care systems in the United States. The IOM conducted a comprehensive study of military prevention and treatment services for substance use disorders. As found in other health systems discussed in this Report, the prevalence of alcohol problems is high. A study of the economic impact of alcohol misuse among beneficiaries of the DoD’s TRICARE insurance program found that the DoD spent approximately $1.2 billion to address problems related to alcohol use in 2006: $425 million in medical costs and $745 million in reduced readiness and misconduct. In addition, opioid use disorders, often initiated when opioids are prescribed following injuries during deployment, are increasing at a high rate and are of high concern. Further, service members and veterans suffer from high rates of co-occurring health problems that pose significant treatment challenges, including traumatic brain injury, post-traumatic stress disorder, depression, and anxiety. Along with other recommendations, the IOM report recommended conducting routine screening, integrating substance use treatment with other health care, and implementing evidence-based treatments.
Costs of Substance Use Disorders in Other Service Systems, continued

These illustrative examples underscore that the costs associated with substance use disorders are incurred across diverse service systems that serve vulnerable populations. These expenditures might be reduced through more aggressive measures to address substance misuse problems and accompanying disorders. Moreover, many substance use-related services provided through criminal justice, child welfare, or other systems seek to ameliorate serious harms that have already occurred, and that might have been prevented with greater impact or cost-effectiveness through the delivery of evidence-based prevention or early treatment interventions.

Economic Analyses can Assess the Value of Substance Use Interventions

Different kinds of economic analyses can be particularly useful in helping health care systems, community leaders, and policymakers identify programs or policies that will bring the greatest value for addressing their needs. Two commonly used types of analyses are cost-effectiveness analysis and cost-benefit analysis. Both types of studies have been used to examine substance use disorder treatment and prevention programs. Studies have found a number of substance disorder treatments, including outpatient methadone, alcohol use disorder medications, and buprenorphine, to be cost-effective compared with no treatment. The same is true for outpatient services without MAT and residential levels of treatment.

Cost-effectiveness Analyses

Treatment Settings and Approaches. A 2003 study estimating the cost-effectiveness of four different treatment modalities—inpatient, residential, outpatient methadone, and outpatient without MAT—found that the treatment of substance use disorders is cost-effective compared to other health interventions, with outpatient programs without MAT being the most cost-effective. Estimated cost per abstinent case ranged from $11,411 for outpatient treatment without MAT to $28,256 in the inpatient setting, with an average cost across all modalities of $22,460 per abstinent study participant (adjusted to 2014 dollars).

Methadone Maintenance versus Methadone Detoxification. A 2004 study evaluating the incremental cost-effectiveness of sustained methadone maintenance relative to a 180-day methadone detoxification enriched with intensive psychosocial services followed by drug-free substance use disorder treatment found that methadone maintenance yielded better outcomes, including reduced opioid use and lower subsequent behavioral health care costs, and had a cost-effectiveness ratio of approximately $20,000 per life year gained.

Methadone Maintenance versus Maintenance with Other Medications. As the use of MAT options has grown, cost-effectiveness studies have compared alternative MAT interventions and MAT compared to medication-free behavioral therapies. For example, a 2015 study examining injectable, extended-release naltrexone compared with methadone maintenance treatment and buprenorphine maintenance treatment...
for opioid dependence found that extended release naltrexone was more effective among patients remaining in treatment but also more costly than the other options, totaling an additional $72 per opioid-free day. However, extended-release naltrexone is not off-patent, and therefore these cost findings will likely change when it becomes generic.

**Extended Buprenorphine-Naloxone Treatment versus Brief Detoxification.** A 2010 study of extended buprenorphine-naloxone treatment for opioid-dependent youth estimated that the cost-effectiveness ratio for buprenorphine compared to detoxification was $29,415 (outpatient treatment program costs for up to 12 weeks) per Quality-Adjusted Life Year (QALY). Results like this indicate that buprenorphine is highly cost-effective by the standard benchmarks often employed to evaluate clinical and population health interventions ($50,000 to $100,000 per QALY).

**Buprenorphine-Naloxone versus No Treatment.** A 2012 study examined individuals with opioid use disorders who had completed 6 months of buprenorphine-naloxone treatment within a primary care setting. It estimated that office-based buprenorphine-naloxone treatment for clinically stable patients has a cost-effectiveness ratio of $38,107 per QALY compared to no treatment after 24 months. The cost-effectiveness ratio was measured by calculating the difference in treatment costs between those receiving buprenorphine-naloxone treatment and those that did not and dividing them by the difference in patients’ health outcomes.

**SBI.** A 2014 review of cost-effectiveness studies for alcohol SBI in a primary care setting found considerable variability in the estimated cost-effectiveness ratios and cost savings across studies. However, almost all the studies found SBI to be cost-effective or to produce cost savings. For example, a 2008 analysis of alcohol SBI in primary care settings found an incremental cost-effectiveness ratio for SBI of $2,413 per QALY gained compared to a do-nothing scenario (in 2014 dollars). The authors compared the cost-effectiveness of alcohol SBI to 24 other preventive services that have been deemed effective by the USPSTF. Using that comparison, alcohol misuse screening achieved a combined score similar to screening for colorectal cancer, hypertension, or vision (for adults older than age 64), and to influenza or pneumococcal immunization. Because current levels of SBI delivery are much lower than desired, this service deserves special attention by health care professionals and care delivery systems. Importantly, all of the interventions that have proved to be cost-effective are appropriate for implementation in primary care.

**Cost-Benefit Analyses**
Interventions that prevent substance use disorders can yield an even greater economic return than the services that treat them. For example, a recent study of prevention programs estimated that every dollar spent on effective, school-based prevention programs can save an estimated $18 in costs related to problems later in life.

The Washington State Institute for Public Policy has used a standardized model to estimate the cost-benefit of diverse prevention, early intervention, and treatment programs. Benefit-per-dollar invested ratios for evidence-based interventions (EBIs) include $27.48 for every dollar invested in brief intervention in primary
How Much Does Alcohol or Drug Screening and Treatment Cost?

In a 2005 literature review of the economics of substance use disorder treatment, one study highlighted the variability in cost estimates for substance use disorder treatment delivered in specialty settings. For example, they reported per-patient weekly costs ranging from $90 to $208 for standard outpatient treatment; $682 to $936 for residential treatment; and $100 to $125 for methadone maintenance treatment.\(^ {192}\) Another study, estimated service costs in 170 methadone maintenance treatment programs and found that methadone dosing was $33 per patient per week, individual counseling was $49 per patient per session (approximately 43 minutes per session), and group counseling was $12 per patient per session (approximately 77 minutes per session).\(^ {191}\) A 2009 study estimated service costs for 70 standard outpatient programs and found that individual counseling was $75 per patient per hour and group counseling was $9 per patient per hour.\(^ {192}\)

A 2012 review of 17 studies on the cost of alcohol screening and brief intervention (SBI), found considerable variability, with costs ranging from $0.56 to $663.74 per screen and $3.76 to $268.16 per brief intervention.\(^ {193}\) Median costs were approximately $4 per screen and $53 per brief intervention. Costs were typically lower when activity-based costing (assigning the cost and amount of each activity that is part of the intervention) was employed and when the SBI occurred in a primary care setting or was performed by a provider who was not a physician. Additionally, variation was attributed to the wage of the person conducting the screening and the amount of time the screening took. A 2015 study examined costs of SBI for illicit drug use in primary care settings; they estimated that per-person costs were $16.43 for screening, $40.98 for a brief negotiated interview, and $265.49 for an adaptation of motivational interviewing.\(^ {194}\)

In recent years, use of MAT has increased. Recent studies have examined extended-release naltrexone, buprenorphine, and methadone for opioid use disorder treatment.\(^ {195-197}\) These studies found that health care costs were generally as low or lower for individuals receiving extended-release naltrexone compared to individuals receiving other treatments for opioid use disorder. Individuals with opioid use disorders who received extended-release naltrexone had $8,170 lower costs compared to those receiving methadone maintenance. Individuals receiving buprenorphine with counseling had significantly lower total health care costs than individuals receiving little or no treatment for their opioid use disorder ($13,578 compared to $31,055). However, those receiving buprenorphine plus counseling did not differ significantly in total health care costs when compared to those receiving only counseling (mean health care costs for those receiving counseling only were $17,017).\(^ {194}\) It is important to note, however, that while some treatments may be less costly, they may also be less effective.

Another study, the Combined Pharmacotherapies and Behavioral Interventions (COMBINE) trial, examined nine treatment alternatives for alcohol treatment, including MAT. They reported mean per-patient cost estimates of $631 for a combined behavioral intervention (CBI) without MAT, $766 for naltrexone with medical management, and $865 for acamprosate with medical management. Combining CBI with a MAT option increased cost estimates to $1,183 for naltrexone plus CBI and $1,285 for acamprosate plus CBI.\(^ {198}\) However, in the COMBINE study, naltrexone combined with medical management was found to be the most cost-effective treatment. While other treatments may be less costly, they are also somewhat less effective.

*All costs in this sidebar are calculated in 2014 dollars.
Financing Systems for Substance Use Disorder Services

In 2013, about three-quarters of all general health care purchased in the United States was paid for by private insurance, Medicare, or Medicaid. The rest was covered by consumers paying out-of-pocket, by other federal health grants, and by programs and other insurance provided by the DoD, Department of Veterans Affairs, and other state and local programs. In the case of treatment for substance use disorders, only about 45 percent of spending was through private insurance, Medicare, or Medicaid. In 2014, the largest share of substance use disorder treatment financing was from state (non-Medicaid) and local governments (29 percent).

Private Insurance

In 2014, 66.0 percent of individuals in the United States had private health insurance, either obtained through employers or individually. Approximately 9 percent of insured individuals met criteria for a diagnosis of substance use disorder, as defined by the Fourth Edition of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-IV). However, in 2013, only 7 percent of privately insured individuals aged 12 and older with a substance use disorder received treatment from specialty treatment providers, and total spending on treatment for substance use disorders makes up only 0.6 percent of overall private insurance spending.

Coverage of substance use disorder services under private insurance has waxed and waned over the past 30 years. During the 1980s, insurance benefits and specialty addiction providers expanded, and from 1986 to 1992, substance use disorder spending grew by 6.7 percent annually, a substantial increase but still significantly below the 10.3 percent annual growth rate of all health care spending over the same period. This expansion was followed by managed care restrictions on reimbursement for substance use disorder treatment in inpatient settings, such as limitations on length of residential rehabilitation stays (a common treatment regimen). As a result, inpatient substance use disorder treatment services declined from accounting for 50 percent of total spending for substance use disorder treatment in 1986 to only 19 percent in 2014 (Figure 6.4). Further, the share of substance use disorder financing from private insurance dropped dramatically between 1986 and 2014, from 32 percent in 1986 to 13 percent in 2005; this was followed by an increase to 18 percent in 2014, likely due to MHPAEA and qualified health plan coverage now being available through the Affordable Care Act.

Medicaid

Approximately 20 percent of people in the United States have health coverage through Medicaid, a joint federal and state health coverage program that provides medical assistance for children, families, and individuals with low income and limited resources; an estimated 12 percent of adult Medicaid beneficiaries have a substance use disorder. The federal government finances approximately 60 percent (national average) of Medicaid and the states finance the balance. The federal medical assistance percentages (or “match”) vary significantly among states, based on the state’s per capita income and other factors.
The federal government establishes basic requirements that states must follow in designing their Medicaid programs, including some mandated services that must be covered and guidance regarding payment rate-setting and contractual arrangements, eligibility and quality standards, and provision of optional services. However, state implementation decisions can have a significant impact on what services are covered and for whom. States can choose to cover or not cover specific treatments or to place restrictions on covered services. In the past, some states have not included certain critical substance use disorder treatment options in their benefit packages (e.g., methadone), or they have restricted the doses or length of treatment, or added requirements such as prior authorization processes to obtain some treatments (e.g., buprenorphine). In many states, Medicaid also does not cover residential treatment, especially for adults.

For those who are eligible and have substance use disorders, Medicaid is an extremely important program, as it can cover many services that such individuals may need, such as crisis services and many preventive services. In addition, while Medicaid does not provide payments for housing (e.g., rental subsidies) or other room and board costs in the community, states can supplement Medicaid coverage with supportive services to help people maintain housing in collaboration with housing authorities.

In states that did not expand Medicaid, racial and ethnic minorities are disproportionately affected. In addition, in these states, young adult single males—a group with high rates of substance use disorders—are ineligible for Medicaid benefits.

An estimated 14 to 15 percent of uninsured individuals nationwide who could be newly eligible for Medicaid coverage under the Affordable Care Act have a substance use disorder. If they obtain substance use disorder treatment, this will lead to an additional 450,000 previously uninsured individuals having access to affordable substance use disorder treatment.
Medicare

Medicare covers almost all individuals aged 65 or over as well as those eligible because of disabilities. Approximately 56.2 million, or 17 percent of individuals in the United States, have Medicare.\textsuperscript{224} Approximately 3 percent of Medicare beneficiaries and 6 percent of those who are eligible for both Medicare and Medicaid have a substance use disorder in any given year.\textsuperscript{226} Of these, 19.3 percent received specialty substance use disorder treatment, including individual, group, and/or family therapy.\textsuperscript{225} In general, Medicare Parts A and B (or private Medicare Advantage plans under Part C) cover inpatient (but not residential) and outpatient services for substance use disorders, as well as substance use disorder screening and brief intervention. Prescription drug treatment is generally covered for beneficiaries enrolled in Medicare Part D (or a Medicare Advantage plan that includes drug coverage). Medicare does not cover outpatient use of oral methadone for substance use disorders, but Part D can include coverage for medications, such as disulfiram, naltrexone, acamprosate, and buprenorphine.

Other Federal, State, and Local Funding

Although insurance coverage is critical to improving access to and integration of services for individuals with substance use disorders, it is unlikely to cover all the services that such individuals may need, such as crisis services (e.g., emergency treatment intervention), housing, supported employment, and many community prevention programs and services (e.g., school-based prevention programs). These services are often supported by federal, state, and local governments and non-profit organizations, financed through general revenues and the SAMHSA Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Block Grant (SABG).

Uninsured Individuals

Research has shown that uninsured individuals have higher unmet medical needs than do insured individuals, and those without insurance also have higher rates of substance use disorders than do individuals with insurance.\textsuperscript{226} Among uninsured individuals, 12 percent met DSM-IV criteria for a substance use disorder.\textsuperscript{214}
Financing Community Prevention

Federal Funding Streams

Funds from federal block grants to states for substance use disorder treatment services (such as the SABG, which is often used for prevention activities) and for maternal, child, and adolescent health services (Title V of the Maternal and Child Health Services Block Grant) may be used to fill the gaps in treatment services not covered by insurance. These funds also finance treatment for people without insurance and support community prevention activities.233

In addition, federal funding for certain community prevention programs encourages public-private partnerships and community collaboration to improve health outcomes. Grants are used to increase screening, counseling, workplace wellness programs, and community prevention. In addition, federal funding for community prevention programs is available through the Drug Free Communities Support Program, which is funded by the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy and administered by SAMHSA.234

Although investments in prevention have repeatedly demonstrated favorable economic returns,235 primary prevention for all health conditions still accounts for less than 5 percent of overall health spending in the United States. Prevention should be seen as an appropriate health cost to be covered by insurance. Current funding options for community prevention, described below, include grants from hospital and health system foundations, hospital-based community benefit programs, tax earmarks, and targeted state programs.

Hospital and Health System Foundation Grants

Foundations formed from the conversion of tax-exempt non-profit hospitals and health systems into for-profit entities are required by federal law to invest in health-related activities within the community area served by that hospital.236 These “health conversion foundations” or “new health foundations” now exist in more than 200 communities in the United States, and they are a potential source of funding for programs relating to the prevention and treatment of substance misuse.237

Non-profit Hospital Community Benefits

Beginning in 1994, tax-exempt hospitals have been required to provide benefits to the community in return for not paying taxes.238 The Affordable Care Act clarified community benefit expectations for all non-profit hospitals. Tax-exempt hospitals must: (1) conduct a community health needs assessment at least once every 3 years; (2) involve public health experts and representatives of the community served by the facility in the needs assessment; (3) make the results of the assessment available to the public; (4) develop an implementation strategy to address each of the community health needs identified through the assessment; and (5) report yearly to the Internal Revenue Service.239 The Secretary of the Treasury, in collaboration with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, must report annually to Congress on, among other things, hospitals’ levels of charity care, related costs, and community benefit activities.

Although hospitals have flexibility in their definition of “community served by the facility,” they are expected to define community by the geographic location, not by the demographic or geographic profiles, of patient discharges. Many states also have community benefit programs that must be synchronized with the requirements of the Affordable Care Act.240 The 1997 IOM report Improving Health in the Community outlined how multiple stakeholders can conduct a community health assessment and share accountability for health outcomes of specific populations.241

Local or State Substance Use Tax Earmarks

In certain jurisdictions, direct funds from a local or state tax can be earmarked for substance misuse prevention in the same way as tobacco taxes are currently used for public health and health programming in many states.242 Jackson County, Missouri, is an example of a local jurisdiction with a dedicated funding stream for substance use problem prevention.243
Challenges Facing the Integration of Substance Use Services and Health Care

It is clear that integrating substance use disorder services with mainstream health care is beneficial for individuals and communities and that health reform is encouraging this trend. However, several key challenges must be addressed if integration is to be fully successful. Specifically:

- The substance use disorder treatment system is underprepared to support care coordination;
- The primary care system has been slow to implement MAT as well as prevention, early identification, and other evidence-based recommendations;
- The existing health care workforce is already understaffed and often lacks the necessary training and education to address substance use disorders; and
- The need to protect patient confidentiality creates hurdles for sharing of information.

The Infrastructure of the Substance Use Disorder Treatment System Is Underdeveloped

The Congressional Budget Office currently estimates that by 2026, 24 million Americans who would otherwise be uninsured will obtain health insurance coverage as a result of the Affordable Care Act. For those insured by insurance plans sold to small employers and in the individual market, substance use disorder services are considered an essential health benefit. As a result, the Affordable Care Act, coupled with MHPAEA is projected to expand access to mental and behavioral health services to more than 60 million Americans.

However, the specialty care substance use disorder treatment system faces challenges along with these new opportunities. That system is changing as health systems respond to new requirements, begin to provide services internally, and develop new contracting mechanisms. Public substance use disorder
systems are also changing as they are presented with new funding options under Medicaid and other funding sources.\textsuperscript{248}

Nationally representative data from the 2014 \textit{National Drug Abuse Treatment System Survey} underscore the importance (but also the difficulty) of integrated care efforts.\textsuperscript{250} Directors at only 15 percent of responding units reported signed contracts to work with a medical home, meaning that less than 50 percent of patients were receiving treatment in a program that was prepared to integrate general health care.\textsuperscript{250} These data showed particularly dramatic differences between Medicaid expansion and non-expansion states,\textsuperscript{250} with Medicaid expansion acting as a key driver of integrated care. Fifty-five percent of addiction treatment patients in expansion states are receiving care in organizations that at least have contractual linkages to some medical or health home arrangement.\textsuperscript{251}

Substance use disorder treatment organizations currently face significant challenges in engaging in care coordination with other types of providers. Because these organizations have traditionally been organized and financed separately from general health care systems, the two systems have not routinely exchanged clinical information. Efforts to increase HIE are constrained by the relatively low use of EHRs. In a 2012 survey of treatment programs to assess their readiness for health reform, 63 percent described their organizations’ adoption of EHRs as having not yet begun, or only in the early stages.\textsuperscript{252} A 2015 study reported that substance use disorder treatment organizations across the nation are poorly positioned to work effectively with health homes or other health professionals.\textsuperscript{253} Not surprisingly, organizations with annual budgets less than $5 million were less likely than larger ones to report high readiness.\textsuperscript{254} Some evidence also suggests that publicly funded substance use disorder treatment centers are less technically proficient and less responsive to making changes than for-profit treatment facilities. For example, private, for-profit treatment facilities were significantly more likely to be early adopters of buprenorphine therapies than were their public or private non-profit peers.\textsuperscript{255} Substantial technical assistance and investments in staff and information technology are needed, yet substance use disorder treatment providers receive relatively little assistance or resources from federal or state agencies to make these changes.\textsuperscript{253} However, a February 29, 2016 State Medicaid Director Letter outlined that states, subject to prior approval by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS), may use federal matching funds to connect Meaningful Use Eligible Medicaid Providers to other providers including substance use disorder treatment providers to support HIE and care coordination. This offers promise for increasing adoption and use of health IT by behavioral health providers.\textsuperscript{256}

Another challenge for effectively coordinating care relates to the need for specialty substance use disorder treatment programs to comply with substance abuse confidentiality regulations (42 CFR Part 2) and state privacy laws when implementing health IT systems. In addition, substance use disorder treatment organizations face the challenge of communicating with non-health care personnel including those in social service, criminal justice, and educational facilities and even when EHRs are in place these systems lack interoperability (the ability to effectively exchange digital health information from an EHR in a common format) with the information systems used by social service organizations, hindering communication.

Medical homes are most likely to pursue contractual arrangements with large and technologically sophisticated organizations that are best equipped to meet their needs for timely clinical and administrative information. The move toward integrated care is therefore likely to accelerate
consolidation of substance use disorder treatment programs, which may hasten the adoption of new technologies and processes among sophisticated providers. Particularly in combination with expanded insurance coverage, this trend may attract new partnerships, for example between ACOs, which are integrated delivery systems, and more sophisticated specialty addiction providers. Yet, the same patterns may harm smaller providers, some of whom offer the only culturally competent services for particular patient groups, such as services tailored for specific racial and ethnic populations, sexual and gender minorities, or women in need of trauma-related residential services.\textsuperscript{257-259}

**Slow Implementation of Pharmacotherapies for Use in Treatment**

One key challenge for integrating substance use treatment and health care is that implementation of pharmacotherapies (i.e., MAT) in primary care has been slow.\textsuperscript{260} In part, this is due to the fact that health insurers individually determine whether they cover substance use medications\textsuperscript{261} and treatment providers may not offer medications to patients with substance use disorders. A study of 2009–2010 national treatment center data found that only 25 percent of substance use disorder treatment centers offered medications for alcohol and/or drugs: 24.5 percent offered buprenorphine, 18.7 percent offered acamprosate, 17.3 percent offered tablet naltrexone, 15.9 percent offered disulfiram, 9.1 percent offered injectable naltrexone, and 9.0 percent offered methadone.\textsuperscript{262} Studies have found that only 25 percent of private, for-profit treatment centers used buprenorphine, 15.6 percent used acamprosate, and 15.7 percent used disulfram. Research suggests that whether treatment programs offer MAT is influenced by a number of organizational and state-level factors, including differences in organizational size, whether the treatment program is in a hospital setting, whether psychiatric medications are prescribed, whether the program has access to prescribing staff, and whether state Medicaid policies support the use of generic drugs.\textsuperscript{263-266}

Another medication, extended-release injectable naltrexone, approved by the FDA for use in treating individuals with opioid use disorders, is underutilized by programs. For example, one study found that only three percent of United States treatment programs used it for opioid use disorders.\textsuperscript{267} In contrast, buprenorphine for opioid use disorder is becoming more established, although it too is underused. One study found that between 2005 and 2011, its use for detoxification in specialty opioid treatment programs (OTPs) increased from 36 percent of programs in the sample to 46 percent; its use for maintenance increased from 37 percent of programs in the sample to 53 percent.\textsuperscript{268} One deterrent to rapid expansion of access to buprenorphine has been the limit on the number of patients a certified physician can treat with buprenorphine. A recent study found that raising this limit further, rather than increasing the number of specialty addiction programs or waived physicians, may be the most effective way to increase buprenorphine use.\textsuperscript{269} Up until July 2016, qualified practitioners were allowed to treat a maximum of 30 patients at a time the first year and up to 100 patients at a time thereafter. On July 6, 2016, HHS issued a final rule for “Medication Assisted Treatment for Opioid Use Disorders,” which increased access to buprenorphine medications in the office-based setting as authorized under the Controlled Substances Act 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(2).\textsuperscript{270} The rule allows eligible practitioners to request approval to treat up to 275 patients under section 303(g)(2) of the Controlled Substances Act.
Limited Implementation of Prevention, Early Identification, and Other Evidence-based Recommendations

Another key challenge is that primary care settings have not yet routinely implemented recommended preventive health and intervention services related to substance misuse. Currently, the Affordable Care Act requires that all non-grandfathered health plans must cover, without cost-sharing, certain preventive health services recommended by the USPSTF,271 and women’s preventive services and preventive services for infants, children, and adolescents in guidelines supported by HRSA. As discussed earlier, the USPSTF recommends alcohol screening and counseling for adults. However, none of the 22 women’s health guidelines, which are being updated at the time of this Report, or 26 children/adolescent guidelines supported by HRSA include a screening requirement related to alcohol use.42,43

Studies of SBIRT for alcohol use problems have identified many implementation challenges.272-277 Some of the most commonly noted challenges include the intense time constraints experienced in modern clinical settings,276 the multiple competing preventive and clinical priorities faced by providers,278 inadequate health care professional training on alcohol SBI techniques,277 and providers’ feelings that they are unable to address sensitive health issues adequately.279 Currently, only about one in six adults in the United States reports being asked about their drinking,280 and less than 10 percent of health plans verify that screening is performed.281 In pediatric health care settings, other issues, especially restrictions on disclosure of confidential information to parents (which varies by state), also pose challenges.282

The USPSTF currently considers the evidence to be insufficient to support screening or behavioral interventions for substance misuse problems in pediatrics.43,283 However, a number of studies, funded by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and foundations such as The Conrad N. Hilton Foundation, are currently underway that could add to the evidence base. Major pediatric medical organizations, including the American Academy of Pediatrics, strongly recommend addressing these issues regularly at each well-adolescent visit and appropriate urgent care visits.284 Bright Futures, a HRSA-funded program, sets Recommendations for Preventive Pediatric Health Care and includes alcohol and drug use screening within its recommended schedule for an annual clinical preventive visit for adolescents and young adults between the ages of 11 and 21. The Affordable Care Act requires health plans to cover, at no out-of-pocket cost to families, the preventive care services outlined in this schedule. Bright Futures discusses how to incorporate screening into the preventive services visit for these age groups. In addition, SAMHSA recommends universal screening and brief intervention and referral to treatment at each well-visit,285 and the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA) recommends universal screening for alcohol misuse.

Screening and brief intervention for substance misuse is also consistent with the prevention activities recommended in the 2009 IOM report Preventing Mental, Emotional, and Behavioral Disorders Among Youth: Progress and Possibilities.286 Yet screening is seldom addressed according to guidelines or with appropriate evidence-based practices,287,288 and even when screenings are conducted, appropriate follow-up is often not provided.289,290 However, SBIRT can be effectively implemented, both for adults and adolescents,291,292 and it is likely that many more systems will do so to comply with new requirements by
The Health Care Workforce Is Limited in Key Ways

**Workforce Shortages**

Data on the substance use workforce are incomplete. Although HRSA collects data on mental health workforce shortage areas, the agency does not collect similar data on the substance use disorder treatment workforce. Nevertheless, it is clear that the workforce is inadequate, as evidenced by its uneven geographic distribution (with rural areas underserved), access barriers for adolescents and children, and recruitment challenges across the treatment field. Moreover, the workforce is aging. For example, 46 percent of psychiatrists are older than age 65. As of June 2016, more than three-quarters of United States counties had severe shortages of psychiatrists and other types of health care professionals needed to treat mental health and substance use disorders. The scarcity of providers who can provide culturally competent services for minority populations and the high turnover rate, both noted in SAMHSA’s 2013 Report to Congress and other studies, exacerbate the workforce shortage.

Recent reforms may strain the current workforce in an already overstretched health care system working to address treatment and prevention strategies. A recent study documented staffing models in primary care practices and determined that, even among those designated as patient-centered medical homes, fewer than 23 percent employed health educators, pharmacists, social workers, nutritionists, or community service coordinators, and fewer than half employed care coordinators. The opioid epidemic has made the shortage of these types of health care professionals an even larger problem.

**Meeting Challenges in Primary Care**

Several large health systems, such as the Veterans Health Administration and Kaiser Permanente, have successfully implemented primary care-based alcohol SBI in a sustainable manner. They have used a variety of approaches to accomplish this goal, including:

- Integrating screening, assessment, and clinical decision support tools in the EHR;
- Establishing interdisciplinary (primary care, substance use disorder treatment, and mental health) teams to guide integration and collaboration;
- Ensuring health system leadership support; and
- Using training curricula, targeted communications materials, robust performance feedback reporting for physicians and other staff, and existing financial incentives.

These approaches can also be implemented in emergency departments and in obstetrics and gynecology departments.
Thus, it is crucial that health care professionals are given comprehensive training on the prevention and treatment of substance use disorders when patients present with comorbid conditions.\textsuperscript{32}

The IOM’s 2006 report \textit{Improving the Quality of Health Care for Mental and Substance Use Conditions},\textsuperscript{32} which adapted \textit{Crossing the Quality Chasm} to address mental and substance use conditions, noted that a critical concern in attracting a skilled workforce is the low salary structure of the substance use disorder treatment workforce. Much of the public treatment system is funded by Medicaid and SAMHSA’s SABG. In practice, the Block Grant is used broadly, and Medicaid less and only with a subset of providers. It is not yet clear whether the integration of substance use disorder treatments in general health care will help to address salary structure.

\textit{Composition and Education}

An integrated health and substance use disorder treatment system requires a diverse workforce that includes substance use disorder specialists, physicians, nurses, mental health treatment providers, care managers, and recovery specialists. This workforce also includes peer recovery coaches (a reimbursable service under some state Medicaid programs), health educators, social workers, and other staff who are trained to deliver timely mental health and substance use-related health interventions, such as SBI.\textsuperscript{32} However, Medicare, and in some states Medicaid, restricts “billable” health care professionals to physicians (including psychiatrists), nurse practitioners and clinical nurse specialists, physician’s assistants, clinical psychologists, clinical social workers, and certain other specified practitioners, and does not include as billable the multiple other licensed and certified professionals who are trained to provide services for substance use disorders.

As substance use disorder treatment and general health care become more integrated, clinical staff in both systems will need to expand their scope of work, operate in an integrated manner with a variety of populations, and shift their treatment focus as needed.\textsuperscript{313-315} Being able to assess substance use disorder severity and co-occurring mental health and physical health problems will be important in each setting. Health care professionals moving from the specialty workforce into integrated settings will require specific training on treatment planning and care coordination and an ability and willingness to work under the leadership of medical staff. This transition to a highly collaborative team approach, offering individually tailored treatment plans, presents challenges to the traditional substance use disorder treatment workforce that is used to administering standard “programs” of services to all patients. Working in teams with the broad mandate of improved health is not currently commonplace and will require collaboration among professional and certification bodies. Incorporating peer workers, who bring specific knowledge of patients’ experiences and needs and can encourage informed patient decision making, into teams will also require further adjustment.

\textit{Improving the Quality of Health Care for Mental and Substance Use Conditions} also discussed the shortage of skills both in specialty substance use disorder programs and in the general health care system.\textsuperscript{32} Of special concern was the inadequacy of substance use education as part of medical school training: Only 8 percent of medical schools had a separate required course on addiction medicine and 36 percent had an elective course;\textsuperscript{32,316} on average, the residency curriculum for psychiatrists included only 8 hours on substance use disorders.\textsuperscript{32,317} Schools of social work and psychology also provided little, and sometimes no, mandatory education on substance use-related problems.\textsuperscript{32} The situation does not appear to have
substantially changed since that report was released, although the recent recognition of addiction medicine as a subspecialty by the American Board of Medical Specialties should provide increased focus and perhaps attract more physicians to this field.

**Workforce Development and Improvement**

The Annapolis Coalition on the Behavioral Health Workforce provided a framework for workforce development in response to the challenges described above, focusing on broadening the definition of “workforce” to address needed changes to the health care system. Currently, 66 organizations license and credential addiction counselors, and although a consensus on national core competencies for these counselors exists, they have not been universally adopted. Credentialing for prevention specialists exists through the International Certification & Reciprocity Consortium, but core competencies for prevention professionals have not been developed. Without a comprehensive, coordinated, and focused effort, workforce expansion and training will continue to fall short of the challenge of meeting the needs of individuals across the continuum of service settings.

HRSA has taken a number of steps to address these workforce challenges as part of its mission to prepare a diverse workforce and improve the workforce distribution to increase access for underserved communities. Among its many programs, HRSA awards health professional and graduate medical education training grants and operates scholarship and loan repayment programs. Of particular note is the National Health Service Corps, where, as of September 2015, roughly 30 percent of its field strength of 9,683 was composed of behavioral health providers, meeting service obligations by providing care in areas of high need. HRSA is also putting increased emphasis on expanding the delivery of medication-assisted treatment, increasing SBI, and coordinating RSS. The development of the workforce qualified to deliver these services and services to address co-occurring medical and mental disorders will have significant implications for the national workforce’s ability to reach the full potential of integration.

**Protecting Confidentiality When Exchanging Sensitive Information**

Effectively integrating substance use disorder treatment and general health care requires the timely exchange of patient health care information. In the early 1970s, the federal government enacted Confidentiality of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Patient Records (42 U.S.C. § 290dd-2), and released regulations (42 CFR Part 2) to protect the confidentiality of substance use disorder treatment data. These privacy protections were motivated by the understanding that discrimination attached to a substance use disorder might dissuade people from seeking treatment, and were enacted in the context of patient methadone records being used in criminal cases. Due to its targeted population, 42 CFR Part 2 provides more stringent federal protections than most other health privacy laws, including the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA – 45 CFR Part 160 and 164). HIPAA does not require patient authorization to share health information for purposes of treatment, payment, or health care operations. With 42 CFR Part 2, patient consent is required to share and use patient identifying information and any information that could be used to identify someone as having, or having had, a substance use disorder, such as payment data.

Given the long and continuing history of discrimination against people with substance use disorders, safeguards against inappropriate or inadvertent disclosures are important. Disclosures to legal
Promising Innovations That Improve Access to Substance Use Disorder Treatment

Clearly, integrating health care and substance use disorder treatment within health care systems, as well as integrating the substance use disorder treatment system with the overall health care system, are complex undertakings. The good news, however, is that a range of promising health care structures, technologies,
and innovations are emerging, or are being refined and strengthened, under health reform. These developments are helping to address challenges and facilitate integration. In so doing, they are broadening the focus of interventions beyond just the treatment of severe substance use disorders to encompass the entire spectrum of prevention, treatment, and recovery. These promising developments include:

- Medicaid innovations;
- EHRs and health IT;
- Disease registries; and
- Substance misuse and substance use disorder prevention through a public health approach.

**Medicaid Innovations**

Medicaid is not only an increasing source of financing for substance use disorder treatment services, it has become an important incubator for innovative substance use disorder financing and delivery models that can help integrate substance use disorder treatment and mainstream health care systems. Within the substance use disorder treatment benefit, and in addition to providing the federally required set of services, states also may offer a wide range of recovery-oriented services under Medicaid’s rehabilitative services option. These services include therapy, counseling, training in communication and independent living skills, recovery support and relapse prevention training, skills training to return to employment, and relationship skills. Nearly all states offer some rehabilitative mental health services, and most states offer the rehabilitation option for substance use disorder services.\(^{328}\)

CMS provides various authorities by which states can structure their Medicaid programs, thus providing mechanisms for states to expand and improve their substance use disorder treatment delivery system: This includes authorities to:\(^{328-330}\)

- Offer coordinating, locating, and monitoring activities broadly and create incentive payments for providers who demonstrate improved performance on quality and cost measures (section 1905(t));
- Establish Alternative Benefit Plans (ABPs), which require that substance use disorder services are included and comply with mental health parity standards (section 1937);
- Establish voluntary or mandatory managed care plans, which require parity protections for enrolled individuals (sections 1915(a) and 1915(b) authorities, and section 1932 State Option to Use Managed Care);
- Provide home and community-based services and supports (sections 1915(c), 1915(i), 1915(j), and 1915(k));
- Develop health homes (section 1945 Health Home State Plan Option); and
- Conduct demonstrations to test policy innovations (section 1115).

Recently, CMS gave states new opportunities to design service delivery systems for substance use disorders through demonstration projects under section 1115. This initiative is designed to support states to provide coverage for the full continuum of care; ensure that care is delivered consistent with the ASAM Treatment Criteria; design strategies to coordinate and integrate care; and support quality
improvement programs. In 2014, CMS launched the Medicaid Innovation Accelerator Program, which aims to improve “health and health care for Medicaid beneficiaries by supporting states’ efforts to accelerate new payment and service delivery reforms.” CMS identified substance use disorders as the program’s first area of focus. The agency is providing technical and program support to states to introduce policy, program, and payment reforms to identify individuals with substance use disorders, expand coverage for effective treatment, expand access to services, and develop data collection, measurement, and payment mechanisms that promote better outcomes. Medicaid is also encouraging the trend to integration in other ways, including supporting new models for delivering primary care, expanding the role of existing community-based care delivery systems, enacting mental health and substance use disorder parity for Medicaid and Children’s Health Insurance Program (CHIP) as included in the final rule that CMS finalized in March 2016. This rule requires that Medicaid enrollees in managed care organizations (MCOs) and in ABPs have access to coverage for mental health and substance use services that is in parity to coverage of medical benefits and will benefit the over 23 million people enrolled in MCOs, Medicaid ABPs, and CHIP.

**Health Homes**

Health homes are grounded in the principles of the primary care medical home, which focuses on primary care-based coordination of diverse health care services, and patient and provider engagement. The Affordable Care Act created an optional Medicaid State Plan benefit allowing states to establish health homes to coordinate care for participants who have chronic health conditions. Health homes operate under a “whole-person” philosophy that involves integrating and coordinating all primary, acute, behavioral health, and long-term care services to address all the individual’s health needs.

Beneficiaries with chronic conditions are eligible to enroll in health homes if they experience (or are at risk for) a second chronic condition, including substance use disorders, or are experiencing serious and persistent mental health conditions. Such care arrangements are particularly pertinent to individuals with substance use disorders who experience severe co-occurring physical and/or mental disorders. These arrangements emphasize integration of care, targeting of health home services to high-risk populations with substance use and mental health concerns, and integration of social and community supports with general health services.

As of January 2016, 19 states and the District of Columbia had established Medicaid health home programs – covering nearly one million individuals – and nearly a dozen additional states had plans for establishing them. States such as Vermont, Maryland, and Rhode Island have implemented health home State Plan Amendments (SPAs) with substance use-related provisions. Seven other states specifically identify individuals with substance use disorders as a target population. Many other SPAs include behavioral health care arrangements that encompass substance use disorders.

States that implement Medicaid health homes receive substantial federal subsidies, including 90 percent federal matching rates for health home services during the first eight quarters after the effective date of health home coverage under the Medicaid state plan, covering comprehensive case management, coordinating services and health promotion, comprehensive transitional care from inpatient to other settings, individual and family support services, linkage and referrals to community-based services, and health IT.
In some settings, these integrated care models are associated with reduced cost and improved cost-effectiveness, and research is underway to test new models. Recognizing the important role that these kinds of integrated care arrangements can play, the American Academy of Family Physicians and SAMHSA have issued reports promoting the inclusion of substance use and mental health services in patient-centered medical homes and related efforts. Much remains to be implemented in both public and private systems, but health systems are responding in a variety of ways to address substance use issues and their efforts will be key in improving treatment quality and outcomes.

**Accountable Care Organizations**

Another Affordable Care Act provision created opportunities to encourage the integration of primary and specialty care, as well as community and public health systems, by establishing integrated delivery systems known as ACOs. ACOs include health care professionals and hospitals that are responsible, together, for the total health of their patient populations. The motivation behind ACOs is that by being responsible for the overall health of patients and coordinating the care they provide, the collaborating health systems can achieve the “three part aim” of better quality care for individuals, reduced per capita costs, and improved population health. Because ACOs can include a range of different types of providers across a defined region, they interpret “population health” in two broad ways: as a “panel population,” referring to all the patients participating in the health delivery system, and as a “geographic population,” referring to all who live in the ACO’s defined geographic catchment area.

An ACO that focuses on the larger community is called an accountable care community (ACC). ACCs are an important variation on the ACO model because, by focusing on the larger community, they can address the social determinants of health and health disparities that have such a profound impact on community members’ health and well-being, including their risks for substance misuse, substance use disorders, and related health consequences.

Initially developed as a model under Medicare, ACOs have now also been encouraged under Medicaid for its covered populations. The CMS State Innovation Models (SIM) Initiative supports the development and testing of state-based models for multi-payor payment and health care delivery system transformation for improving the performance of health systems. An underlying assumption of the new service delivery and payment models funded in the SIM states is that they will be more effective and produce better outcomes when implemented as part of a broad-based, statewide initiative that brings together multiple payors and stakeholders, and when they use the levers of state government to effect change.

The SIM states are leading the implementation of accountable care systems for Medicaid populations that embrace population health (for SIM states, this is defined as health of the community in a geographic area as opposed to the population of patients in the health delivery system). Several states have adopted ACC models that support integration of medical health care services with public health and community-based programs. For example, Akron in Summit County, Ohio, set up one of the first ACCs to implement community-wide public-private partnerships to improve the health of the overall population. Maine’s accountable communities, Oregon’s CCOs, and Minnesota’s accountable communities are partnering with local public health authorities and other community entities to achieve this goal.
Oregon’s CCOs are a network of all types of health care professionals (physical health care, addiction and mental health care, and dental care providers) who have agreed to work together to serve people who receive health care coverage under Oregon’s Medicaid plan, which is called Oregon Health Plan. The Oregon Health Authority publishes regular reports on quality, access, and progress toward benchmarks in both prevention and treatment. Oregon Medicaid CCOs are currently reporting, and showing progress on, three quality measures specific to substance use: use of SBIRT, initiation of substance use treatment, and engagement in treatment.

**Federally Qualified Health Centers**

Increased insurance coverage and other provisions of the Affordable Care Act have sparked important changes that are facilitating comprehensive, high-quality care for people with substance use disorders. For example, the Affordable Care Act provided mandatory funding for Federally Qualified Health Centers (FQHCs) receiving grants under section 330 of the public health service act, including community health centers, migrant health centers, health care for the homeless health centers, and public housing primary care centers that is supporting the expansion of their activities and numbers of patients served.

These community health centers emphasize coordinated primary and preventive services that promote reductions in health disparities for low-income individuals, racial and ethnic minorities, rural communities, and other underserved populations. Two-thirds of health centers have been designated as PCMHs. PCMHs emphasize care, coordination, and communication to improve health care quality, lower health care costs, and enhance both the patient and provider experience.

Community health centers provide primary and preventive health services to medically underserved areas and populations and may offer behavioral and mental health and substance use services as appropriate to meet the health needs of the population served by the health center. As such, they are well-equipped to address co-occurring physical, mental, and substance use disorders, and provide substance misuse prevention, treatment, and RSS to patients. Because they provide services regardless of ability to pay and are required to offer services on a sliding scale fee, they are well-positioned to serve low-income and economically vulnerable patients.

An example of the important role FQHCs can play in improving access to treatment for substance use disorders is their efforts in providing buprenorphine maintenance treatment for opioid-dependent patients within primary care. In 2016, $94 million was awarded by HRSA to 271 health centers in 45 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico with a focus on augmenting capacity to treat opioid use disorders in vulnerable populations. FQHCs have access to 340B drug pricing, making the purchase of substance use disorder medications less costly and thus more accessible than for providers who cannot take advantage of this pricing. Recent services research indicates that such arrangements can achieve comparable outcomes to those achieved within the specialty addiction treatment sector.

**Electronic Health Records and Health Information Technology**

EHRs and health IT have the potential to support better coordination of services across primary care and specialty substance use disorder treatment, greater safety by reducing harmful drug-drug interactions, and improved monitoring of treatment outcomes and relapse risk in general health care.
STRONG HEALTH IT SYSTEMS

Strong health IT systems improve the organization and usability of clinical data, thereby helping patients, health care professionals, and health system leaders coordinate care, promote shared decision-making, and engage in quality improvement efforts. These systems have the capacity to easily provide information in multiple languages and to put patients in touch with culturally appropriate providers through telehealth.

“Meaningful use” rules from CMS now provide incentives for the use of certified health IT to facilitate care coordination. Medicare and Medicaid EHR Incentive Programs have thus far paid more than $34.5 billion in incentive payments for providers who adopt, implement, upgrade, and use certified EHR technology. These incentives have worked: The National Electronic Health Record Survey found that as of 2014, more than 80 percent of primary care physicians had adopted an EHR, and more than half were using all basic functions. These were the highest rates of any physician type using certified EHRs.

Health IT has shown benefits in improving care for patients with chronic conditions, and use is expected to greatly increase because of the Affordable Care Act and related incentives, such as grants supporting health center networks with the implementation and adoption of health IT. To further heighten uptake and implementation, CMS issued new rules to “ease the reporting burden for providers, support interoperability, and improve patient outcomes,” including giving states and providers more time to comply with regulations and focusing on health information interoperability between providers and patients. Additionally, CMS recently published its proposed rule on the Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act (MACRA) of 2015, providing incentives for using health IT to report quality measure results.

Health IT also holds great potential for improving services for individuals with substance misuse problems because they can provide up-to-date medical histories of patients to providers, and they can support care coordination by facilitating communications between primary and specialty care providers across health systems. Clinical decision support tools can also help support improvements in care and include clinical guidelines, diagnostic support, condition-specific order sets, computerized alerts and reminders to care providers as well as patients, focused patient data reports and summaries, documentation templates, and contextually relevant reference information, among others. For example, educational and training materials including clinical guidelines for physicians (e.g., Helping Patients Who Drink Too Much: A Clinician’s Guide), can be made available through EHRs. Many health systems have additional information on wikis for patients and providers. Most have or will have patient portal websites, which can provide patients access to health, mental health, and substance use self-assessments; computerized interventions for reducing alcohol or drug use, anger management, dealing with depression, and other

**KEY TERMS**

**Meaningful Use.** Using certified EHR technology to improve quality, safety, efficiency, and reduce health disparities; engage patients and family; improve care coordination and population and public health; and maintain privacy and security of patient health information.

**Clinical Decision Support.** A system that provides health care professionals, staff, patients, or other individuals with knowledge and person-specific information, intelligently filtered or presented at appropriate times, to enhance health and health care.
problems; referral sources for smoking quit-lines and self-help groups; information on medications for substance use disorders; and general health information.

Although research suggests that patients with substance use disorders are not using patient portals as much as individuals with other conditions, they have great potential for reaching patients. In particular, because they can be culturally relevant, these innovations may be helpful in providing substance use disorder services to individuals who do not have access to, or are hesitant to participate in, traditional services, or to augment those services, thereby helping to reduce health disparities.

To foster systems change, efforts are needed to increase adoption of EHR technology in substance use disorder and mental health treatment organizations. These programs currently lag and are likely to continue to lag behind the rest of medicine. It will be critical to facilitate the uptake of EHRs within the specialty substance use disorder treatment system, to implement common data standards to support interoperability across specialty substance use disorder treatment and mainstream health care, and to coordinate care across systems. The federal interagency Behavioral Health Coordinating Council recently created a quality metrics subcommittee tasked with ensuring that substance use and mental health performance and quality measures are consistently and appropriately included across payment systems of HHS, including diverse programs within CMS. The National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) and NIADD have developed common data elements for inclusion in EHRs, and SAMHSA supports the development of data standards for collecting behavioral health data in EHRs through the international standards development organization, Health Level 7, though none of these standards has been widely implemented to date.

PDMPs are becoming an increasingly important health IT tool for preventing substance misuse and identifying patients with substance use disorders. As discussed above, PDMPs are state-run databases that collect prescribed and dispensed controlled prescriptions drug information and give providers and pharmacists access to information about a person’s controlled substance prescription history. They are designed to help identify patients (as well as providers) who are misusing or diverting (i.e., channeling drugs into illegal use) these medications who would benefit from early interventions. This technology represents a promising state-level intervention for improving opioid prescribing, informing clinical practice, and protecting patients at risk in the midst of the ongoing opioid overdose epidemic. A number of states have passed legislation requiring prescribers to check their PDMP before prescribing controlled substances. Additional research is needed to identify best practices and policies to maximize the efficacy of these programs.

Disease Registries

Databases related to specific diseases or combinations of diseases have long been used by health care professionals to manage chronic conditions such as diabetes or HIV/AIDS. Now these disease registries are being developed for substance use disorders, such as opioid use disorder. Although privacy concerns exist, disease registries can alert providers to the health care needs of those at risk because of substance misuse, including patients receiving opioids for chronic pain. Even low levels of alcohol and drug use are important factors in this population.
Prevention of Substance Misuse and Substance Use Disorders Through Public Health Approaches

Because substance use disorders often first come to light in the context of school, law enforcement, and employment, communities have many opportunities to expand the delivery of prevention and treatment services to include schools and school-based health care clinics, jails and prisons, and places of employment. Services provided in these settings can range from prevention education to SBIRT to treatment for substance use disorders. For example, law enforcement and emergency medical services in many communities are already collaborating in the distribution and administration of naloxone to prevent opioid overdose deaths.

These efforts require a public health approach and the development of a comprehensive community infrastructure, which in turn requires coordination across federal, state, local, and tribal agencies. A number of states are developing promising approaches to address substance use in their communities. One recent example is Minnesota’s 2012 State Substance Abuse Strategy, which includes a comprehensive strategy focused on strengthening prevention; creating more opportunities for intervening before problems become severe; integrating the identification and treatment of substance use disorders into health care reform efforts; expanding support for recovery; interrupting the cycle of substance use, crime, and incarceration; reducing trafficking, production, and sale of illegal drugs; and measuring the impact of various interventions.\(^7\)

---

**Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act (CARA)**

On July 22, 2016, President Obama signed the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act (CARA), into law. CARA aims to address the national epidemic of opioid addiction by creating and expanding federal grant programs to:

- Temporarily expand eligibility to prescribe buprenorphine-based drugs for MAT for substance use disorders to qualifying nurse practitioners and physician assistants, through October 1, 2021;
- Expand access to opioid overdose reversal drugs, by supporting the purchase and distribution of such medications and training for first responders;
- Increase awareness and educate the public regarding the misuse of prescription opioids;
- Reauthorize the National All Schedules Prescription Electronic Reporting (NASPER) Act, which provides grants to states to support and improve interoperability of PDMPs;
- Authorize Medicare prescription drug plans to develop a safe prescribing and dispensing program for beneficiaries that are at risk of misuse or diversion of drugs that are frequently abused or diverted;
- Create a comprehensive program at U.S. Department of Justice to improve efforts by law enforcement and the criminal justice system to address substance use disorders; and
- Establish an HHS-led task force to consolidate federal best practices for pain management.

These measures are important steps for reducing the impact of prescription drug misuse on America’s communities by preventing and responding to opioid addiction. However, given the large number of Americans with untreated or inadequately treated opioid use disorders and the current scarcity of treatment resources, there is concern that the lack of funding for the bill will prevent this new law from having a substantial impact on the nation’s ongoing opioid epidemic.
The opioid guideline published by the Washington State Agency Medical Directors’ Group is another useful example. This group is composed of medical directors from seven state agencies, including the Department of Labor and Industries, the Health Care Authority, the Board of Health, the Health Officer, the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Office of the Insurance Commissioner, and the Department of Corrections. In 2007, the group developed its first opioid prescribing guideline in collaboration with practicing physicians, with the latest update released in 2015. The guideline offers an approach to pain management that includes recommendations for appropriate opioid prescribing and management.

States’ and localities’ efforts to expand naloxone distribution provide another example of building a comprehensive, multipronged, community infrastructure. Many communities have recognized the need to make this potentially lifesaving medication more widely available. For example, community leaders in Wilkes County, North Carolina, implemented Project Lazarus, a model that expands access to naloxone for law enforcement, emergency services, education, and health services, and reduced the county overdose rate by half within a year. North Carolina also passed a law in 2013 that implemented standing orders, allowing naloxone to be dispensed from a pharmacy without a prescription.

States have also expanded training on naloxone use for opioid users and their families and friends, as well as for a wide range of social service agency personnel. Federal partners have been instrumental in expanding access to naloxone training. HRSA established the Rural Opioid Overdose Reversal program in fiscal year 2015, awarding grants of $100,000 to 18 recipients representing 13 states to increase access to naloxone and train health care professionals and other social service personnel to administer the drug. In 2016, SAMHSA also provided $11,000,000 in funding to prevent prescription drug/opioid overdose-related deaths among individuals aged 18 or older by training first responders and other community stakeholders on prevention strategies.

A few states have passed legislation to make naloxone more readily available without a prescription if certain procedures are followed. As of July 2015, 30 states have passed laws to provide legal protection to physician prescribers and to bystanders ("Good Samaritans") who administer naloxone when encountering an overdose situation. Additionally, 48 states allow pharmacists to enter into Collaborative Pharmacy Practice Agreements with prescribers, which allow naloxone to be dispensed to those who may be able to use it to save lives. For example, the Rhode Island Board of Pharmacy approved this type of agreement, which began in 2011 as a pilot program in five pharmacies. This program was expanded to all interested pharmacies in 2013 and formalized in regulation in 2014.

States have also expanded naloxone coverage under Medicaid. The CDC reported more than 26,000 overdose reversals by lay people between 1996 and 2014, all using naloxone. Health systems are developing protocols to dispense naloxone through primary care providers, pharmacies, and emergency departments. The need to engage individuals in services to address their opioid use is a critical next step following an overdose reversal. This becomes increasingly challenging as naloxone kits are distributed widely, rather than when distribution is limited to health care and substance use disorder treatment providers. In 2013, the State of Vermont implemented an innovative treatment system with the goal of increasing access to opioid treatment throughout the state. This model, called the “Hub and Spoke” approach, met this need by providing physicians throughout the state with training and supports for providing evidence-based buprenorphine treatment.
The result has been:\textsuperscript{383,384}

- An increase in the number of physicians providing buprenorphine treatment by over 40 percent;
- The transition of several hundred individuals served in traditional OTP programs to certified physicians in primary care settings;
- Better access throughout the state to opioid treatment due to the expansion of entry points, and physician/OTP coordination; and
- An increased integration of primary care and addiction treatment.

**Recommendations for Research**

A key finding from this chapter is that the traditional separation of specialty addiction treatment from mainstream health care has created obstacles to successful care coordination. Research is needed in three main areas:

- Models of integration of substance use services within mainstream health care;
- Models of providing ongoing, chronic care within health care systems; and
- Models of care coordination between specialty treatment systems and mainstream health care.

In each of these areas, research is needed on the development of interventions and strategies for successfully implementing them. Outcomes for each model should include feasibility, substance use and other health outcomes, and cost.

Although a great deal of research has shown that integrating health care services has potential value both in terms of outcomes and cost, only a few models of integration have been empirically tested. Mechanisms through the Affordable Care Act make it possible to provide and test innovative structural and financing models for integration within mainstream health care. This research should cover the continuum of care, from prevention and early intervention to treatment and recovery, and will help health systems move forward with integration. This research should explore innovative delivery models including telemedicine and other health IT, as well as health or wellness coaching. Studies should focus on patient-centered approaches and should address appropriate interventions for individuals across race and ethnicity, culture, language, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, disability, health literacy, and for those living in rural areas. So as not to limit health care systems to services for those with mild or moderate substance misuse problems and to offer support for individuals with severe problems who are not motivated to go to specialty substance use disorder treatment, it is also important to study how to implement medication and other evidence-based treatments across diverse health care systems.

This chapter pointed out that when substance use problems become severe, providing ongoing, chronic care is required, as is the case for many other diseases. Little research has studied chronic care models for the treatment of substance use disorders. Research is needed to develop and test innovative models of care coordination and their implementation. This research should use a more broadly
defined workforce in both health care and substance use disorder treatment, develop models to share information electronically, and support coordination of care between health systems using health IT.

Finally, the chapter pointed out the gap in our understanding of how to implement models of care coordination between specialty addiction treatment organizations and social service systems, which provide important wrap-around services to substance use disorder patients. Many models are in existence, but have not been empirically tested. This area of research should involve institutions that provide services to individuals with serious co-occurring problems (specialty mental health agencies), individuals with legal problems (criminal justice agencies and drug courts), individuals with employment or other social issues, as well as the larger community, determining how to most effectively link each of these subpopulations with a recovery-oriented systems of care.
CHAPTER 7.
VISION FOR THE FUTURE: A PUBLIC HEALTH APPROACH

Substance misuse and substance use disorders directly affect millions of Americans every year, causing motor vehicle crashes, crimes, injuries, reduced quality of life, impaired health, and far too many deaths. Throughout this Report, we have summarized the research demonstrating that:

- The problems caused by substance misuse are not limited to substance use disorders, but include many other possible health and safety problems that can result from substance misuse even in the absence of a disorder;
- Substance use has complex biological and social determinants, and substance use disorders are medical conditions involving disruption of key brain circuits;
- Prevention programs and policies that are based on sound evidence-based principles have been shown to reduce substance misuse and related harms significantly;
- Evidence-based behavioral and medication-assisted treatments (MAT) applied using a chronic-illness-management approach have been shown to facilitate recovery from substance use disorders, prevent relapse, and improve other outcomes, such as reducing criminal behavior and the spread of infectious diseases;
- A chronic-illness-management approach may be needed to treat the most severe substance use disorders; and
- Access to recovery support services can help former substance users achieve and sustain long-term wellness.

Embedding prevention, treatment, and recovery services into the larger health care system will increase access to care, improve quality of services, and produce improved outcomes for countless Americans.
Time for a Change

It is time to change how we as a society address alcohol and drug misuse and substance use disorders. A national opioid overdose epidemic has captured the attention of the public as well as federal, state, local, and tribal leaders across the country. Ongoing efforts to reform health care and criminal justice systems are creating new opportunities to increase access to prevention and treatment services. Health care reform and parity laws are providing significant opportunities and incentives to address substance misuse and related disorders more effectively in diverse health care settings. At the same time, many states are making changes to drug policies, ranging from mandating use of prescription drug monitoring programs (PDMPs) to eliminating mandatory minimum drug sentences. These changes represent new opportunities to create policies and practices that are more evidence-informed to address health and social problems related to substance misuse.

The moral obligation to address substance misuse and substance use disorders effectively for all Americans also aligns with a strong economic imperative. Substance misuse and substance use disorders are estimated to cost society $442 billion each year in health care costs, lost productivity, and criminal justice costs.\(^1\)\(^2\) However, numerous evidence-based prevention and treatment policies and programs can be implemented to reduce these costs while improving health and wellness. More than 10 million full-time workers in our nation have a substance use disorder—a leading cause of disability\(^3\)—and studies have demonstrated that prevention and treatment programs for employees with substance use disorders are cost effective in improving worker productivity.\(^4\)\(^5\) Prevention and treatment also reduce criminal justice-related costs, and they are much less expensive than alternatives such as incarceration. Implementation of evidence-based interventions (EBIs) can have a benefit of more than $58 for every dollar spent; and studies show that every dollar spent on substance use disorder treatment saves $4 in health care costs and $7 in criminal justice costs.\(^6\) Yet, effective prevention interventions are highly underused. For example, only 8 to 10 percent of school administrators report using EBIs to prevent substance misuse,\(^7\)\(^8\) and only about 11 percent of youth (aged 12 to 17) report participating in a substance use prevention program outside of school.\(^9\) Further, only 10.4 percent of individuals with a substance use disorder receive treatment,\(^9\) and only about a third of those individuals receive treatment that meets minimal standards of care.\(^10\)

The public health-based approach called for in this Report aims to address the broad individual, environmental, and societal factors that influence substance misuse and its consequences, to improve the health, safety, and well-being of the entire population. It aims to understand and address the wide range of interacting factors that influence substance misuse and substance use disorders in different communities and coordinates efforts across diverse stakeholders to achieve reductions in both.

The following five general messages described within the Report have important implications for policy and practice. These are followed by specific evidence-based suggestions for the roles individuals, families, organizations, and communities can play in more effectively addressing this major health issue.
1. Both substance misuse and substance use disorders harm the health and well-being of individuals and communities. Addressing them requires implementation of effective strategies.

Substance misuse is the use of alcohol or illicit or prescription drugs in a manner that may cause harm to users or to those around them. Harms can include overdoses, interpersonal violence, motor vehicle crashes, as well as injuries, homicides, and suicides—the leading causes of death in adolescents and young adults (aged 12 to 25). In 2015, 47.7 million Americans used an illicit drug or misused a prescription medication in the past year, 66.7 million binge drank in the past month, and 27.9 million self-reported driving under the influence (DUI) in the past year.

Substance use disorders are medical illnesses that develop in some individuals who misuse substances—more than 20 million individuals in 2015. These disorders involve impaired control over substance use that results from disruption of specific brain circuits. Substance use disorders occur along a continuum from mild to severe; severe substance use disorders are also called addictions. Because substances have particularly powerful effects on the developing adolescent brain, young adults who misuse substances are at increased risk of developing a substance use disorder at some point in their lives.

Implications for Policy and Practice

Expanding access to effective, evidence-based treatments for those with addiction and also less severe substance use disorders is critical, but broader prevention programs and policies are also essential to reduce substance misuse and the pervasive health and social problems caused by it. Although they cannot address the chronic, severe impairments common among individuals with substance use disorders, education, regular monitoring, and even modest legal sanctions may significantly reduce substance misuse in the wider population. Additionally, these measures are cost-effective. Many policies at the federal, state, local, and tribal levels that aim to reduce the harms associated with substance use have proven very effective in preventing and reducing alcohol misuse (e.g., binge drinking) and its consequences. More than 300,000 deaths have been avoided over the past decade simply from the implementation and enforcement of effective policies to reduce underage drinking and DUI. Needle/syringe exchange programs also represent effective and cost-effective prevention strategies that have been shown to reduce the transmission of HIV in communities implementing them, without increasing rates of injection drug use. These programs also provide the opportunity to engage people who inject drugs in treatment. These types of effective prevention policies can and should be adapted and extended to reduce the injuries, disabilities, and deaths caused by substance misuse.
2. Highly effective community-based prevention programs and policies exist and should be widely implemented.

This Report describes the significant advances in prevention science over the past two decades, including the identification of major risk and protective factors and the development of more than four dozen research-tested prevention interventions that can be delivered in households, schools, clinical settings, and community centers. Three key findings from the Report are especially important in this regard. First, science has shown that adolescence and young adulthood are major “at risk” periods for substance misuse and related harms. Second, most of the major genetic, social, and environmental risk factors that predict substance misuse also predict many other serious adverse outcomes and risks. Third, several community-delivered prevention programs and policies have been shown to significantly reduce rates of substance-use initiation and misuse-related harms.

Prevention programs and interventions can have a strong impact and be cost-effective, but only if evidence-based components are used and if those components are delivered in a coordinated and consistent fashion throughout the at-risk period. Parents, schools, health care systems, faith communities, and social service organizations should be involved in delivering comprehensive, evidence-based community prevention programs that are sustained over time.

Additionally, research has demonstrated that policies and environmental strategies are highly effective in reducing alcohol-related problems by focusing on the social, political, and economic contexts in which these problems occur. These evidence-based policies include regulating alcohol outlet density, restricting hours and days of sale, and policies to increase the price of alcohol at the federal, state, or local level.

Implications for Policy and Practice

To be effective, prevention programs and policies should be designed to address the common risk and protective factors that influence the most common health threats affecting young people. They should be tested through research and should be delivered continuously throughout the entire at-risk period by those who have been properly trained and supervised to use them. Federal and state funding incentives could increase the number of properly organized community coalitions using effective prevention practices that adhere to commonly defined standards. The research reviewed in this Report suggests that such coordinated efforts could significantly improve the impact of existing prevention funding, programs, and policies, enhancing quality of life for American families and communities.

3. Full integration of the continuum of services for substance use disorders with the rest of health care could significantly improve the quality, effectiveness, and safety of all health care.

Individuals with substance use disorders at all levels of severity can benefit from treatment, and research shows that integrating substance use disorder treatment into mainstream health care can improve the quality of treatment services. Historically, however, only individuals with the most severe substance use disorders have received treatment, and only in independent “addiction treatment programs” that were originally designed in the early 1960s to treat addictions as personality or character disorders. Moreover, although 45 percent of patients seeking treatment for substance use disorders have a co-
occurring mental disorder, most specialty substance use disorder treatment programs are not part of, or even affiliated with, mental or physical health care organizations. Similarly, most general health care organizations—even teaching hospitals—do not provide screening, diagnosis, or treatment for substance use disorders.

This separation of substance use disorder treatment from the rest of health care has contributed to the lack of understanding of the medical nature of these conditions, lack of awareness among affected individuals that they have a significant health problem, and slow adoption of scientifically supported medical treatments by addiction treatment providers. Additionally, mainstream health care has been inadequately prepared to address the prevalent substance misuse–related problems of patients in many clinical settings. This has contributed to incorrect diagnoses, inappropriate treatment plans, poor adherence to treatment plans by patients, and high rates of emergency department and hospital admissions.

The goals of substance use disorder treatment are very similar to the treatment goals for other chronic illnesses: to eliminate or reduce the primary symptoms (substance use), improve general health and function, and increase the motivation and skills of patients and their families to manage threats of relapse. Even serious substance use disorders can be treated effectively, with recurrence rates equivalent to those of other chronic illnesses such as diabetes, asthma, or hypertension. With comprehensive continuing care, recovery is an achievable outcome: More than 25 million individuals with a previous substance use disorder are estimated to be in remission. Integrated treatment can dramatically improve patient health and quality of life, reduce fatalities, address health disparities, and reduce societal costs that result from unrecognized, unaddressed substance use disorders among patients in the general health care system. However, most existing substance use disorder treatment programs lack the needed training, personnel, and infrastructure to provide treatment for co-occurring physical and mental illnesses. Similarly, most physicians, nurses, and other health care professionals working in general health care settings have not received training in screening, diagnosing, or addressing substance use disorders.

Implications for Policy and Practice

Policy changes, particularly at the state level, are needed to better integrate care for substance use disorders with the rest of health care. States have substantial power to shape the nature of care within these programs. State licensing and financing policies should be designed to better incentivize programs that offer the full continuum of care (residential, outpatient, continuing care, and recovery supports); offer a full range of evidence-based behavioral treatments and medications; and maintain working affiliations with general and mental health care professionals to integrate care. Within general health care, federal and state grants and development programs should make eligibility contingent on integrating care for mental and substance use disorders or provide incentives for organizations that support this type of integration.

But integration of mental health and substance use disorder care into general health care will not be possible without a workforce that is competently cross-educated and trained in all these areas. Currently, only 8 percent of American medical schools offer a separate, required course on addiction medicine and 36 percent have an elective course; minimal or no professional education on substance use disorders is available for other health professionals. Federal and state policies should require or incentivize medical, nursing, dental, pharmacy, and other clinical professional schools to provide
mandatory courses to properly equip young health care professionals to address substance misuse and related health consequences. Similarly, associations of clinical professionals should continue to provide continuing education and training courses for those already in practice.

4. Coordination and implementation of recent health reform and parity laws will help ensure increased access to services for people with substance use disorders.

The Paul Wellstone and Pete Domenici Mental Health Parity and Addiction Equity Act of 2008 (MHPAEA) and the 2010 Affordable Care Act increased access to coverage for mental health and substance use disorder treatment services for more than 161 million Americans. Even so, just 10.4 percent of people with substance use disorders who need treatment are accessing care. These pieces of legislation, besides promoting equity, make good long-term economic sense: Research reviewed in Chapter 6 - Health Care Systems and Substance Use Disorders highlights the extraordinary costs to society from unaddressed substance misuse and from untreated or inappropriately treated substance use disorders—more than $422 billion annually (including more than $120 billion in health care costs). However, there remains great uncertainty on the part of affected individuals and their families, as well as many health care professionals, about the nature and range of health care benefits and covered services available for prevention, early intervention, and treatment of substance use disorders.

**Implications for Policy and Practice**

Enhanced federal communication will help increase public understanding about individuals’ rights to appropriate care and services for substance use disorders. This communication could help eliminate confusion among patients, providers, and insurers. But, more will be needed to extend the reach of treatment and thereby reduce the prevalence, severity, and costs associated with substance use disorders. Within health care organizations, active screening for substance misuse and substance use disorders combined with effective communication around the availability of treatment programs could do much to engage untreated individuals in care. Screening and treatment must incorporate brief interventions for mildly affected individuals as well as the full range of evidence-based behavioral therapies and medications for more severe disorders, and must be provided by a fully trained complement of health care professionals.

5. A large body of research has clarified the biological, psychological, and social underpinnings of substance misuse and related disorders and described effective prevention, treatment, and recovery support services. Future research is needed to guide the new public health approach to substance misuse and substance use disorders.

Five decades ago, basic, pharmacological, epidemiological, clinical, and implementation research played important roles in informing a skeptical public about the harms of cigarette smoking and creating new and better prevention and treatment options. Similarly, research reviewed in this Report should eliminate many
of the long-held, but incorrect, stereotypes about substance misuse and substance use disorders, such as that alcohol and drug problems are the product of faulty character or willful rejection of social norms.

Thanks to scientific research over the past two decades, we know far more about alcohol and drugs and their effects on health than we knew about the effects of smoking when the first Surgeon General’s Report on Smoking and Health was released in 1964. For instance, we now know that repeated substance misuse carries the greatest threat of developing into a substance use disorder when substance use begins in adolescence. We also know that substance use disorders involve persistent changes in specific brain circuits that control the perceived value of a substance as well as reward, stress, and executive functions, like decision making and self-control.

However, although this body of knowledge provides a firm foundation for developing effective prevention, early intervention, treatment, and recovery strategies, achieving the vision of this Report will require redoubled research efforts. We still do not fully understand how the brain changes involved in substance use disorders occur, how individual biological and environmental risk factors contribute to those changes, or the extent to which these brain changes reverse after long periods of abstinence from alcohol or drug use.

Implications for Policy and Practice

Future research should build upon our existing knowledge base to inform the development of prevention and treatment strategies that more directly target brain circuit abnormalities that underlie substance use disorders; identify which prevention and treatment interventions are most effective for which patients (personalizing medicine); clarify how the brain and body regain function and recover after chronic drug exposure; and inform the development of evidence-based strategies for supporting recovery. Also critically needed are long-term prospective studies of youth (particularly those deemed most at risk) that will concurrently study changes in personal and environmental risks; the nature, amount, and frequency of substance use; and changes in brain structure and function.

To guide the important system-wide changes recommended in this Report, research to optimize strategies for broadly and sustainably implementing evidence-based prevention, treatment, and recovery interventions across the community is necessary. Within traditional substance use disorder treatment programs, research is needed on how to use new insurance benefits and financing models to enhance service delivery most effectively, how to form working alliances with general physical and mental health providers, and how to integrate new technologies and information systems to enhance care without compromising patient confidentiality.

Specific Suggestions for Key Stakeholders

Current health reform efforts and recent advances in technology are playing a crucial role in moving toward an effective public health-based model for addressing substance misuse and its consequences. But the health care system cannot address all of the major determinants of health related to substance misuse without the help of the wider community. This Report calls on a range of stakeholder groups to do their part to change the culture, attitudes, and practices around substance use and to keep the conversation going until this goal is met. Prejudice and discrimination have created many of the challenges that plague
the substance use disorder treatment field. These factors can have a profound influence on individuals’ willingness to talk to their health care professional about their substance use concerns; to seek or access treatment services; and to be open with friends, family, and coworkers about their treatment and recovery needs. Changing the culture is an essential piece of lasting reforms, creating a society in which:

- People who need help feel comfortable seeking it;
- There is “no wrong door” for accessing health services;
- Communities are willing to invest in prevention services, knowing that such investment pays off over the long term, with wide-ranging benefits for everyone;
- Health care professionals treat substance use disorders with the same level of compassion and care as they would any other chronic disease, such as diabetes or heart disease;
- People are celebrated for their efforts to get well and for their steps in recovery; and
- Everyone knows that their care and support can make a meaningful difference in someone’s recovery.

In addition to facilitating such a mindset, community leaders can work together to mobilize the capacities of health care organizations, social service organizations, educational systems, community-based organizations, government health agencies, religious institutions, law enforcement, local businesses, researchers, and other public, private, and voluntary entities that impact public health.

*Everyone has a role to play in addressing substance misuse and substance use disorders and in changing the conversation around substance use, to improve the health, safety, and well-being of individuals and communities across our nation.*

**Individuals and Families**

*Reach out, if you think you have a problem.*

In the past, many individuals and families have kept silent about substance-related issues because of shame, guilt, or fear of exposure or recrimination. Breaking the silence and isolation around such issues is crucial, so that individuals and families confronting substance misuse and its consequences know that they are not alone and can openly seek treatment. As with other chronic illnesses, the earlier treatment begins, the better the outcomes are likely to be.

*Be supportive (not judgmental) if a loved one has a problem.*

Recognizing that substance use disorders are medical conditions and not moral failings can help remove negative attitudes and promote open and healthy discussion between individuals with substance use disorders and their loved ones, as well as with their health care professionals. Overcoming the powerful drive to continue substance use can be difficult, and making the lifestyle changes necessary for successful treatment—such as changing relationships, jobs, or living environments—can be daunting. Providing sensitivity and support can ease this transition.

This can be challenging for partners, parents, siblings, and other loved ones of people with substance use disorders; many of the behaviors associated with substance misuse can be damaging to relationships. Being
compassionate and caring does not mean that you do not hold the person accountable for their actions. It means that you see the person’s behaviors in the light of a medical illness. Love and support can be offered while maintaining the boundaries that are important for your health and the health of everyone around you.

*Show support toward people in recovery.*

As a community, we typically show empathy when someone we know is ill, and we celebrate when people we know overcome an illness. Extending these kindnesses to people with substance use disorders and those in recovery can provide added encouragement to help them realize and maintain their recovery. It also will encourage others to seek out treatment when they need it.

*Advocate for the changes needed in your community.*

As discussed throughout this Report, many challenges need to be addressed to support a public health-based approach to substance misuse and related disorders. Everyone can play an important role in advocating for their needs, the needs of their loved ones, and the needs of their community. It is important that all voices are heard as we come together to address these challenges.

*Parents, talk to your children about alcohol and drugs.*

Parents have more influence over their children’s behavior, including substance use, than they often think. For instance, according to one study, young adults who reported that their parents monitored their behavior and showed concern about them were less likely to report misusing substances. Talking to your children about alcohol and drug use is not always easy, but it is crucial. Become informed, from reliable sources, about substances to which your children could be exposed, and about substance use disorders, and talk openly with your children about the risks. Some tips to keep in mind:

- Be a good listener;
- Set clear expectations about alcohol and drug use, including real consequences for not following family rules;
- Help your child deal with peer pressure;
- Get to know your child’s friends and their parents;
- Talk to your child early and often; and
- Support your school district’s efforts to implement evidence-based prevention interventions and treatment and recovery support.

*Educators and Academic Institutions*

*Implement evidence-based prevention interventions.*

Schools represent one of the most effective channels for influencing youth substance use. Many highly effective evidence-based programs are available that provide a strong return on investment, both in the well-being of the children they reach and in reducing long-term societal costs. Prevention programs for adolescents should target improving academic as well as social and emotional learning to address risk factors for substance misuse, such as early aggression, academic failure, and school dropout.
When combined with family-based and community programs that present consistent messages, these programs are even more powerful. Interventions that target youth who have already initiated use of alcohol or drugs should also be implemented to prevent escalation of use. Colleges, too, should implement EBIs to reduce student alcohol misuse.

**Provide treatment and recovery supports.**

Many students lack regular access to the health care system. For students with substance use problems, schools—ranging from primary school through university—can provide an entry into treatment and support for ongoing recovery. School counselors and school health care programs can provide enrolled students with screening, brief counseling, and referral to more comprehensive treatment services. Schools can also help create a supportive environment that fosters recovery. Many institutions of higher learning incorporate collegiate recovery programs that can make a profound difference for young people trying to maintain recovery in an environment with high rates of substance misuse.

**Teach accurate, up-to-date scientific information about alcohol and drugs and about substance use disorders as medical conditions.**

Teachers, professors, and school counselors play an obvious and central role as youth influencers, teaching students about the health consequences of substance use and misuse and about substance use disorders as medical conditions, as well as facilitating open dialogue. They can also play an active role in educating parents and community members on these topics and the role they can play in preventing youth substance use. For example, they can educate businesses near schools about the positive impact of strong enforcement of underage drinking laws and about the potential harms of synthetic drugs (such as K2 and bath salts), to discourage their sale. They can also promote non-shaming language that underscores the medical nature of addiction—for instance avoiding terms like “abuser” or “addict” when describing people with substance use disorders.21

**Enhance training of health care professionals.**

As substance use treatment becomes more integrated with the health care delivery system, there is a need for advanced education and training for providers in all health care roles and disciplines, including primary care doctors, nurses, specialty treatment providers, and prevention and recovery specialists. It is essential that professional schools of social work, psychology, public health, nursing, medicine, dentistry, and pharmacy incorporate curricula that reflect the current science of prevention, treatment, and recovery. Health care professionals must also be alert for the possibility of adverse drug reactions (e.g., co-prescribing of drugs with similar effects, drug overdoses), and co-occurring psychiatric conditions and infectious diseases, and should be trained on how to address these issues. These topics should also be covered in formal post-graduate training programs (e.g., physician residencies and psychology internships) as well as in board certification and continuing education requirements for professionals in these fields. Continuing education should include not only subject matter knowledge but the professional skills necessary to provide integrated care within cross-disciplinary health care teams that address substance-related health issues.
Health Care Professionals and Professional Associations

Address substance use-related health issues with the same sensitivity and care as any other chronic health condition.

All health care professionals—including physicians, physician assistants, nurses, nurse practitioners, dentists, social workers, therapists, and pharmacists—can play a role in addressing substance misuse and substance use disorders, not only by directly providing health care services, but also by promoting prevention strategies and supporting the infrastructure changes needed to better integrate care for substance use disorders into general health care and other treatment settings.

Support high-quality care for substance use disorders.

Professional associations can be instrumental in setting workforce guidelines, advocating for curriculum changes in professional schools, promoting professional continuing education training, and developing evidence-based guidelines that outline best practices for prevention, screening and assessment, brief interventions, diagnosis, and treatment of substance-related health issues. For example, to help address the current prescription opioid crisis and overdose epidemic, associations should raise awareness of the most recent guidelines for opioid prescribing and commend the use of PDMPs by providers. Associations also should raise awareness of the benefits of making naloxone more readily available without a prescription and providing legal protection to physician-prescribers and bystanders (“Good Samaritans”) who administer naloxone when encountering an overdose situation.

Health Care Systems

Promote primary prevention.

Health care systems can help prevent prescription drug misuse and related substance use disorders by holding staff accountable for safe prescribing of controlled substances, training staff on alternative ways of managing pain and anxiety, and increasing use of PDMPs by pharmacists, physicians, and other providers.

Promote use of evidence-based treatments.

Substance use disorders cannot be effectively addressed without much wider adoption and implementation of scientifically tested and proven effective behavioral and pharmacological treatments. The full spectrum of evidence-based treatments should be available across all contexts of care, and treatment plans should be tailored to meet the specific needs of individual patients. Health care systems should take every step to educate health care professionals and the public about the value of MAT for alcohol and opioid use disorders, correcting misconceptions that have barred their wider adoption in the past.


**Promote effective integration of prevention and treatment services.**

Effective integration of behavioral health and general health care is essential for identifying patients in need of treatment, engaging them in the appropriate level of care, and ensuring ongoing monitoring of patients with substance use disorders to reduce their risk of relapse. Implementation of systems to support this type of integration requires care and foresight and should include educating and training the relevant workforces; developing new workflows to support universal screening, appropriate follow-up, coordination of care across providers, and ongoing recovery management; and linking patients and families to available support services. Quality measurement and improvement processes should also be incorporated to ensure that the services provided are effectively addressing the needs of the patient population and improving outcomes.

**Work with payors to develop and implement comprehensive billing models.**

Consideration of how payors can develop and implement comprehensive billing models is crucial to enabling health care systems to sustainably implement integrated services to address substance use disorders. Coverage policies will need to be updated to support implementation of prevention measures, screening, brief counseling, and recovery support services within the general health care system, and to support coordination of care between specialty substance use disorder treatment programs, mental health organizations, and the general health care system.

**Implement health information technologies to promote efficiency and high-quality care.**

Health information technology—ranging from electronic health records to patient registries, computer-based educational systems, and mobile applications—has the power to increase efficiency, improve clinical decision making, supplement patient services, extend the reach of the workforce, improve quality measurement, and support a “learning health care system.” Health care systems should explore how these and other technologies can be used to support substance use disorder prevention, treatment, and recovery.

**Communities**

**Build awareness of substance use as a public health problem.**

Civic and advocacy groups, neighborhood associations, and community-based organizations can all play a major role in communication, education, and advocacy efforts that seek to address substance use-related health issues. These organizations provide community leadership and communicate urgent and emerging issues to specific audiences and constituencies. Communication vehicles such as newsletters, blogs, op-ed articles, and storytelling can be used to raise awareness and underscore the importance of placing substance use-related health issues in a public health framework. Community groups and organizations can host community forums, town hall meetings, listening sessions, and education and awareness days. These events foster public discourse, create venues in which diverse voices can be heard, and provide opportunities to educate the community. In addition, they can promote an awareness of the medical nature of addiction, to encourage acceptance of opioid treatment programs.
and other substance use disorder treatment services embedded in the community. Communities also can sponsor prevention and recovery campaigns, health fairs, marches, and rallies that emphasize wellness activities that bring attention to substance use-related health issues.

Invest in evidence-based prevention interventions and recovery supports.

Prevention research has developed effective community-based prevention programs that reduce substance use and delinquent behavior among youth. Although the process of getting these programs implemented in communities has been slow, resources are available to help individual communities identify the risk factors for future substance use among youth that are most prevalent within their community and choose evidence-based prevention strategies to address them. Research shows that for each dollar invested in research-based prevention programs, up to $10 is saved in treatment for alcohol or other substance misuse-related costs.22-25

Implement interventions to reduce harms associated with alcohol and drug misuse.

An essential part of a comprehensive public health approach to addressing substance misuse is wider use of strategies to reduce individual and societal harms, such as overdoses, motor vehicle crashes, and the spread of infectious diseases. Communities across the country are implementing programs to distribute naloxone to first responders, opioid users, and potential bystanders, preventing thousands of deaths.26 Others have implemented needle/syringe exchange programs, successfully reducing the spread of HIV and Hepatitis C without seeing an increase in injection drug use. These and other evidence-based strategies can have a profound impact on the overall health and well-being of the community.

Private Sector: Industry and Commerce

Promote only responsible, safe use of legal substances, by adults.

Companies that manufacture and sell alcohol and legal drugs, as well as products related to use of these substances, can demonstrate social responsibility by taking measures to discourage and prevent the misuse of their products. Companies can take steps to ensure that the public is aware of the risks associated with substance use, including the use of medications with addictive potential alone and in combination with alcohol or other drugs.

Support youth substance use prevention.

Manufacturers and sellers of alcohol, legal drugs, and related products have a role in reducing and preventing youth substance use. They can discourage the sale and promotion of alcohol and other substances to minors and support evidence-based programs to prevent and reduce youth substance use.

Continue to collaborate with the federal initiative to reduce prescription opioid- and heroin-related overdose, death, and dependence.

Pharmaceutical companies and pharmacies can continue to collaborate with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services to identify and implement evidence-informed solutions to the current opioid crisis. This collaboration may include examining and revising product labeling, funding continuing medical education for providers on the appropriate use of opioid medications, developing
abuse-deterrent formulations of opioids, prioritizing development of non-opioid alternatives for pain relief, and conducting studies to determine the appropriate dosing of opioids in children and safe prescribing practices for both children and adults.27

**Federal, State, Local, and Tribal Governments**

*Provide leadership, guidance, and vision in supporting a science-based approach to addressing substance use-related health issues.*

Coordinated federal, state, local, and tribal efforts are needed to promote a public health approach to addressing substance use, misuse, and related disorders. As discussed throughout this Report, widespread cultural and systemic issues need to be addressed to reduce the prevalence of substance misuse and related public health consequences. Government agencies have a major role to play in:

- Improving public education and awareness;
- Conducting research and evaluations;
- Monitoring public health trends;
- Providing incentives, funding, and assistance to promote implementation of effective prevention, treatment, and recovery practices, policies, and programs;
- Addressing legislative and regulatory barriers;
- Improving coordination between health care, criminal justice, and social service organizations; and
- Fostering collaborative initiatives with the private sector.

For example, federal and state agencies can implement policies to integrate current best practices—such as the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) *Guideline for Prescribing Opioids for Chronic Pain*19 or mandatory use of PDMPs—among federal and state supported service providers.

*Improve coordination between social service systems and the health care system to address the social and environmental factors that contribute to the risk for substance use disorders.*

Social service systems serve individuals, families, and communities in a variety of capacities, often in tandem with the health care system. Social workers can play a significant role in helping patients with substance use disorders with the wrap-around services that are vital for successful treatment, including finding stable housing, obtaining job training or employment opportunities, and accessing recovery supports and other resources available in the community. In addition, they can coordinate care across providers, offer support for families, and help implement prevention programs. Child and family welfare systems also should implement trauma-informed, recovery-oriented, and public health approaches for parents who are misusing substances, while maintaining a strong focus on the safety and welfare of children.

*Implement criminal justice reforms to transition to a less punitive and more health-focused approach.*

The criminal justice and juvenile justice systems can play pivotal roles in addressing substance use-related health issues across the community. These systems are engaged with a population at high-risk
for substance use disorders and often at a teachable moment—when individuals are more open to prevention messaging or to accepting the need for treatment. Less punitive, health-focused initiatives can have a critical impact on long-term outcomes. Sheriff’s offices, police departments, and county jails should work closely with citizens’ groups, prevention initiatives, treatment agencies, and recovery community organizations to create alternatives to arrest and lockup for nonviolent and substance use-related offenses. For example, drug courts have been a very successful model for diverting people with substance use disorders away from incarceration and into treatment.\textsuperscript{10} It is essential that these programs promote the delivery of evidence-based treatment services, including MAT.

Many prisoners have access to regular health care services only when they are incarcerated. Significant research supports the value of integrating prevention and treatment into criminal justice settings.\textsuperscript{31,32} In addition, community re-entry is a particularly high-risk time for relapse and overdose. Criminal justice systems can reduce these risks and reduce recidivism by coordinating with community health settings to ensure that patients with substance use disorders have continuing access to care upon release.

**Facilitate research on Schedule I substances**

Some researchers indicate that the process for conducting studies on Schedule I substances, such as marijuana, can be burdensome and act as disincentives. It is clear that more research is needed to understand how use of these substances affect the brain and body in order to help inform effective treatments for overdose, withdrawal management, and addiction, as well as explore potential therapeutic uses. To help ease administrative burdens, federal agencies should continue to enhance efforts and partnerships to facilitate research. Some of these efforts have already borne positive outcomes. For example, a recent policy change will foster research by expanding the number of U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) registered marijuana growers. Making marijuana available from new sources could both speed the pace of research and afford medication developers and researchers more options for formulating marijuana-derived investigational products.

**Researchers**

*Conduct research that focuses on implementable, sustainable solutions to address high-priority substance use issues.*

Scientific research should be informed by ongoing public health needs. This includes research on the basic genetic and epigenetic contributors to substance use disorders and the environmental and social factors that influence risk; basic neuroscience research on substance use-related effects and brain recovery; studies adapting existing prevention programs to different populations and audiences; and trials of new and improved treatment approaches. Focused research is also needed to help address the significant research-to-practice gap in the implementation of evidence-based prevention and treatment interventions. Closing the gap between research discovery and clinical and community practice is both a complex challenge and an absolute necessity if we are to ensure that all populations benefit from the nation’s investments in scientific discoveries. Research is needed to better understand the barriers to successful and sustainable implementation of evidence-based interventions and to develop implementation strategies that effectively overcome these barriers.
Researchers should collaborate with health care professionals, payors, educators, people in treatment and recovery, community coalitions, and others to ensure that real-world barriers, such as workforce issues and billing limitations, are taken into consideration. These collaborations should also help researchers prioritize efforts to address critical ongoing barriers to effective prevention and treatment of substance use disorders.

Consider how scientific research can inform public policy.

Effective communication is critical for ensuring that the policies and programs that are implemented reflect the state of the science and have the greatest chance for improving outcomes. Scientific findings are often misrepresented in public policy debates. Scientific experts have a significant role to play in ensuring that the science is accurately represented in policies and program.

Promote rigorous evaluation of programs and policies.

Many programs and policies are often implemented without a sufficient evidence base or with limited fidelity to the evidence base; this may have unintended consequences when they are broadly implemented. Rigorous evaluation is needed to determine whether programs and policies are having their intended effect and to guide necessary changes when they are not.

Conclusion

This Report is a call to all Americans to change the way we address substance misuse and substance use disorders in our society. Past approaches to these issues have been rooted in misconceptions and prejudice and have resulted in a lack of preventive care; diagnoses that are made too late or never; and poor access to treatment and recovery support services, which exacerbated health disparities and deprived countless individuals, families, and communities of healthy outcomes and quality of life. Now is the time to acknowledge that these disorders must be addressed with compassion and as preventable and treatable medical conditions.

By adopting an evidence-based public health approach, we have the opportunity as a nation to take effective steps to prevent and treat substance use-related issues. Such an approach can prevent the initiation of substance use or escalation from use to a disorder, and thus it can reduce the number of people affected by these conditions; it can shorten the duration of illness for individuals who already have a disorder; and it can reduce the number of substance use-related deaths. A public health approach will also reduce collateral damage created by substance misuse, such as infectious disease transmission and motor vehicle crashes. Thus, promoting much wider adoption of appropriate evidence-based prevention, treatment, and recovery strategies needs to be a top public health priority.

Making this change will require a major cultural shift in the way Americans think about, talk about, look at, and act toward people with substance use disorders. Negative public attitudes about substance misuse and use disorders can be entrenched, but it is possible to change social viewpoints. This has been done many times in the past: For example, cancer and HIV used to be surrounded by fear and judgment, but they are now regarded by most Americans as medical conditions like many others. This
has helped to make people comfortable talking about their concerns with their health care professionals, widening access to prevention and treatment. We can similarly change our attitudes toward substance use disorders if we come together as a society with the resolve to do so. With the moral case so strongly aligned with the economic case, and supported by all the available science, now is the time to make this change for the health and well-being of all Americans.
# Glossary of Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12-Step Program</td>
<td>A group providing mutual support and fellowship for people recovering from addictive behaviors. The first 12-step program was Alcoholics Anonymous (AA), founded in 1935; an array of 12-step groups following a similar model have since emerged and are the most widely used mutual aid groups and steps for maintaining recovery from alcohol and drug use disorders. It is not a form of treatment, and it is not to be confused with the treatment modality called Twelve-Step Facilitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstinence</td>
<td>Not using alcohol or drugs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addiction</td>
<td>The most severe form of substance use disorder, associated with compulsive or uncontrolled use of one or more substances. Addiction is a chronic brain disease that has the potential for both recurrence (relapse) and recovery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agonist</td>
<td>A chemical substance that binds to and activates certain receptors on cells, causing a biological response. Fentanyl and methadone are examples of opioid receptor agonists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antagonist</td>
<td>A chemical substance that binds to and blocks the activation of certain receptors on cells, preventing a biological response. Naloxone is an example of an opioid receptor antagonist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binge Drinking</td>
<td>For men, drinking 5 or more standard alcoholic drinks, and for women, 4 or more standard alcoholic drinks on the same occasion on at least 1 day in the past 30 days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Management</td>
<td>A coordinated approach to delivering health care, substance use disorder treatment, mental health care, and social services. This approach links clients with appropriate services to address specific needs and goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Decision</td>
<td>A system that provides health care professionals, staff, patients, or other individuals with knowledge and person-specific information, intelligently filtered or presented at appropriate times, to enhance health and health care.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Trial</td>
<td>Any research study that prospectively assigns human participants or groups of participants to one or more health-related interventions to evaluate the effects on health outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsivity</td>
<td>Repetitive behaviors in the face of adverse consequences, as well as repetitive behaviors that are inappropriate to a particular situation. People suffering from compulsions often recognize that the behaviors are harmful, but they nonetheless feel emotionally compelled to perform them. Doing so reduces tension, stress, or anxiety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuum of Care</td>
<td>An integrated system of care that guides and tracks a person over time through a comprehensive array of health services appropriate to the individual’s need. A continuum of care may include prevention, early intervention, treatment, continuing care, and recovery support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost-Benefit Study</td>
<td>A study that determines the economic worth of an intervention by quantifying its costs in monetary terms and comparing them with the benefits, also expressed in monetary terms. Total benefits divided by total costs is called a cost-benefit ratio. If the ratio is greater than 1, the benefits outweigh the costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost-Effectiveness Study</td>
<td>A comparative analysis of two or more interventions against their health and economic outcomes. These outcomes could be lives saved, illnesses prevented, or years of life gained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td>A state in which an organism only functions normally in the presence of a substance, experiencing physical disturbance when the substance is removed. A person can be dependent on a substance without being addicted, but dependence sometimes leads to addiction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination</td>
<td>The active distribution of evidence-based interventions (EBIs) to specific audiences, with the goal of increasing their adoption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Diversion</td>
<td>A medical and legal concept involving the transfer of any legally prescribed controlled substance from the person for whom it was prescribed to another person for any illicit use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity</td>
<td>The extent to which an intervention is delivered as it was designed and intended to be delivered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>The social, cultural, or community designations of masculinity or femininity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care System</td>
<td>The World Health Organization defines a health care system as (1) all the activities whose primary purpose is to promote, restore, and/or maintain health, and (2) the people, institutions, and resources, arranged together in accordance with established policies, to improve the health of the population they serve. The health care system is made up of diverse health care organizations ranging from primary care, specialty substance use disorder treatment (including residential and outpatient settings), mental health care, infectious disease clinics, school clinics, community health centers, hospitals, emergency departments, and others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Disparities</td>
<td>Preventable differences in the burden of disease or opportunities to achieve optimal health that are experienced by socially disadvantaged populations, defined by factors such as race or ethnicity, gender, education or income, disability, geographic location (e.g., rural or urban), or sexual orientation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Drinking</td>
<td>Defined by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) as consuming 8 or more drinks per week for women, and 15 or more drinks per week for men, and by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), for research purposes, as binge drinking on 5 or more days in the past 30 days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>A specified set of activities designed to put policies and programs into practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impulsivity</td>
<td>Inability to resist urges, deficits in delaying gratification, and unreflective decision-making. Impulsivity is a tendency to act without foresight or regard for consequences and to prioritize immediate rewards over long-term goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inpatient Treatment</td>
<td>Intensive, 24-hour-a-day services delivered in a hospital setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>The systematic coordination of general and behavioral health care. Integrating services for primary care, mental health, and substance use-related problems together produces the best outcomes and provides the most effective approach for supporting whole-person health and wellness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>A professionally delivered program, service, or policy designed to prevent substance misuse (prevention intervention) or treat a substance use disorder (treatment intervention).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Health Care System</td>
<td>As described by the IOM, a learning health care system is “designed to generate and apply the best evidence for the collaborative healthcare choices of each patient and provider; to drive the process of discovery as a natural outgrowth of patient care; and to ensure innovation, quality, safety, and value in health care.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal Study</td>
<td>A type of study in which data on a particular group of people are gathered repeatedly over a period of years or even decades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful Use</td>
<td>Using certified EHR technology to improve quality, safety, efficiency, and reduce health disparities; engage patients and family; improve care coordination and population and public health; and maintain privacy and security of patient health information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Reinforcement</td>
<td>The process by which removal of a stimulus such as negative feelings or emotions increases the probability of a response like drug taking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Economic Benefit</td>
<td>The value of total benefits minus total costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurobiology</td>
<td>The study of the anatomy, function, and diseases of the brain and nervous system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opioid Treatment Program (OTP)</td>
<td>SAMHSA-certified program, usually comprising a facility, staff, administration, patients, and services, that engages in supervised assessment and treatment, using methadone, buprenorphine, or naltrexone, of individuals who have opioid use disorders. An OTP can exist in a number of settings, including but not limited to intensive outpatient, residential, and hospital settings. Services may include medically supervised withdrawal and/or maintenance treatment, along with various levels of medical, psychiatric, psychosocial, and other types of supportive care.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacokinetics</td>
<td>What the body does to a drug after it has been taken, including how rapidly the drug is absorbed, broken down, and processed by the body.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Reinforcement</td>
<td>The process by which presentation of a stimulus such as a drug increases the probability of a response like drug taking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription Drug Misuse</td>
<td>Use of a drug in any way a doctor did not direct an individual to use it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence</td>
<td>The proportion of a population who have (or had) a specific characteristic—for example, an illness, condition, behavior, or risk factor—in a given time period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective Factors</td>
<td>Factors that directly decrease the likelihood of substance use and behavioral health problems or reduce the impact of risk factors on behavioral health problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health System</td>
<td>Defined as “all public, private, and voluntary entities that contribute to the delivery of essential public health services within a jurisdiction” and includes state and local public health agencies, public safety agencies, health care providers, human service and charity organizations, recreation and arts-related organizations, economic and philanthropic organizations, education and youth development organizations, and education and youth development organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality-Adjusted Life Year (QALY)</td>
<td>A measure of the burden of disease used in economic evaluations of the value of health care interventions that accounts for both the years of life lived and the quality of life experienced during those years, relative to quality associated with perfect health.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randomized Controlled Trial (RCT)</td>
<td>A clinical trial of an intervention in which people are randomly assigned either to a group receiving the intervention being studied or to a control group receiving a standard intervention, a placebo (a medicine with no therapeutic effect), or no intervention. At the end of the study, the results from the different groups are compared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery</td>
<td>A process of change through which individuals improve their health and wellness, live a self-directed life, and strive to reach their full potential. Even individuals with severe and chronic substance use disorders can, with help, overcome their substance use disorder and regain health and social function. This is called remission. When those positive changes and values become part of a voluntarily adopted lifestyle, that is called “being in recovery”. Although abstinence from all substance misuse is a cardinal feature of a recovery lifestyle, it is not the only healthy, pro-social feature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relapse</td>
<td>The return to alcohol or drug use after a significant period of abstinence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remission</td>
<td>A medical term meaning that major disease symptoms are eliminated or diminished below a pre-determined, harmful level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Treatment</td>
<td>Intensive, 24-hour a day services delivered in settings other than a hospital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Factors</td>
<td>Factors that increase the likelihood of beginning substance use, of regular and harmful use, and of other behavioral health problems associated with use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>The biological and physiological characteristics that define human beings as female or male.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Drink</td>
<td>Based on the 2015-2020 Dietary Guidelines for Americans, a standard drink is defined as 12 fl. oz. of regular beer, 8-9 fl. oz. of malt liquor, 5 fl. oz. of table wine, or 1.5 fl. oz. of 80-proof distilled spirits. All of these drinks contain 14 grams (0.6 ounces) of pure alcohol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance</td>
<td>A psychoactive compound with the potential to cause health and social problems, including substance use disorders (and their most severe manifestation, addiction).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Misuse</td>
<td>The use of any substance in a manner, situation, amount or frequency that can cause harm to users or to those around them. For some substances or individuals, any use would constitute as misuse (e.g., under-age drinking, injection drug use).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Misuse Problems or Consequences</td>
<td>Any health or social problem that results from substance misuse. Substance misuse problems or consequences may affect the substance user or those around them, and they may be acute (e.g., an argument or fight, a motor vehicle crash, an overdose) or chronic (e.g., a long-term substance-related medical, family, or employment problem, or chronic medical condition, such as various cancers, heart disease, and liver disease). These problems may occur at any age and are more likely to occur with greater frequency of substance misuse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Use</td>
<td>The use—even one time—of any substance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Use Disorders</td>
<td>A medical illness caused by repeated misuse of a substance or substances. According to the Fifth Edition of the <em>Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders</em> (DSM-5), substance use disorders are characterized by clinically significant impairments in health, social function, and impaired control over substance use and are diagnosed through assessing cognitive, behavioral, and psychological symptoms. Substance use disorders range from mild to severe and from temporary to chronic. They typically develop gradually over time with repeated misuse, leading to changes in brain circuits governing incentive salience (the ability of substance-associated cues to trigger substance seeking), reward, stress, and executive functions like decision making and self-control. Note: Severe substance use disorders are commonly called addictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Use Disorder Treatment</td>
<td>A service or set of services that may include medication, counseling, and other supportive services designed to enable an individual to reduce or eliminate alcohol and/or drug use, address associated physical or mental health problems, and restore the patient to maximum functional ability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telehealth</td>
<td>The use of digital technologies such as electronic health records, mobile applications, telemedicine, and web-based tools to support the delivery of health care, health-related education, or other health-related services and functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telemedicine</td>
<td>Two-way, real-time interactive communication between a patient and a physician or other health care professional at a distant site. Telemedicine is a subcategory of telehealth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>Alteration of the body's responsiveness to alcohol or a drug such that higher doses are required to produce the same effect achieved during initial use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal</td>
<td>A set of symptoms that are experienced when discontinuing use of a substance to which a person has become dependent or addicted, which can include negative emotions such as stress, anxiety, or depression, as well as physical effects such as nausea, vomiting, muscle aches, and cramping, among others. Withdrawal symptoms often lead a person to use the substance again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrap-Around Services</td>
<td>Wrap-around services are non-clinical services that facilitate patient engagement and retention in treatment as well as their ongoing recovery. This can include services to address patient needs related to transportation, employment, childcare, housing, legal and financial problems, among others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Alcoholics Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>Accountable Care Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACO</td>
<td>Accountable Care Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIDS</td>
<td>Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASAM</td>
<td>American Society of Addiction Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASI</td>
<td>Addiction Severity Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUDIT</td>
<td>Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAC</td>
<td>Blood Alcohol Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASICS</td>
<td>Brief Alcohol Screening and Intervention for College Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNST</td>
<td>Bed Nucleus of the Stria Terminalis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAIN</td>
<td>Brain Research through Advancing Innovative Neurotechnologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CADCA</td>
<td>Community Anti-Drug Coalitions of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARA</td>
<td>Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARPS</td>
<td>Computerized Alcohol-Related Problems Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBT</td>
<td>Cognitive Behavioral Therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCO</td>
<td>Coordinated Care Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDC</td>
<td>Centers for Disease Control and Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CeA</td>
<td>Central Nucleus of the Amygdala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHIP</td>
<td>Children’s Health Insurance Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDI</td>
<td>Composite International Diagnostic Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMCA</td>
<td>Communities Mobilizing for Change on Alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS</td>
<td>Centers for Medicare &amp; Medicaid Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRF</td>
<td>Corticotropin-Releasing Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>Controlled Substances Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC</td>
<td>Communities That Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEA</td>
<td>Drug Enforcement Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSM-IV</td>
<td>Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSM-5</td>
<td>Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUI</td>
<td>Driving Under the Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>Dorsal Striatum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBI</td>
<td>Evidence-Based Interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHR</td>
<td>Electronic Health Record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FASD</td>
<td>Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBT</td>
<td>Family Behavior Therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDA</td>
<td>Food and Drug Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FQHC</td>
<td>Federally Qualified Health Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GABA</td>
<td>Gamma-Aminobutyric Acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEDIS</td>
<td>Healthcare Effectiveness Data and Information Set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHS</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Health and Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPAA</td>
<td>Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV</td>
<td>Human Immunodeficiency Virus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRSA</td>
<td>Health Resources and Services Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCPUD</td>
<td>Interagency Coordinating Committee on the Prevention of Underage Drinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>Institute of Medicine, now known as the Health and Medicine Division of the National Academies of Science, Engineering, and Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT</td>
<td>Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LST</td>
<td>Life Skills Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MADD</td>
<td>Mothers Against Drunk Driving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MET</td>
<td>Motivational Enhancement Therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHPAEA</td>
<td>Paul Wellstone and Pete Domenici Mental Health Parity and Addiction Equity Act of 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLDA</td>
<td>Minimum Legal Drinking Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRI</td>
<td>Magnetic Resonance Imaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Narcotics Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAc</td>
<td>Nucleus Accumbens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASPER</td>
<td>National All Schedules Prescription Electronic Reporting Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFP</td>
<td>Nurse-Family Partnership Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHTSA</td>
<td>National Highway Traffic Safety Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIAAA</td>
<td>National Institute on National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIDA</td>
<td>National Institute on Drug Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIH</td>
<td>National Institutes of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NREPP</td>
<td>National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSDUH</td>
<td>National Survey on Drug Use and Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTP</td>
<td>Opioid Treatment Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDMP</td>
<td>Prescription Drug Monitoring Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PET</td>
<td>Positron Emission Tomography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFC</td>
<td>Prefrontal Cortex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRISM</td>
<td>Psychiatric Research Interview for Substance and Mental Disorders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROSPER</td>
<td>PROmoting School-community-university Partnerships to Enhance Resilience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTSD</td>
<td>Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QALY</td>
<td>Quality-Adjusted Life Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHC</td>
<td>Raising Healthy Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMC</td>
<td>Recovery Management Check-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSS</td>
<td>Recovery Support Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMHSA</td>
<td>Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBI</td>
<td>Screening and Brief Intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBIRT</td>
<td>Screening, Brief Intervention, and Referral to Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFP</td>
<td>Strengthening Families Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIM</td>
<td>State Innovation Models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>State Plan Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THC</td>
<td>$\Delta^2$-tetrahydrocannabinol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USPSTF</td>
<td>U.S. Preventive Services Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>Ventral Tegmental Area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A.
REVIEW PROCESS FOR PREVENTION PROGRAMS

Sources and Process

The review of published research primarily focused on refereed, professional journals, which were searched using PubMed and PsycINFO. Government reports, annotated bibliographies, and relevant books and book chapters also were reviewed. In addition, programs were searched on SAMHSA’s National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices (NREPP) and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) Guide to Community Preventive Services. From these collective sources, a set of 600 core prevention programs was identified for possible inclusion in this Report. Of those, 42 met the evaluation criteria listed below and were included.

Evaluation Criteria

Programs were included only if they met the program criteria of the Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development listed below. All of these programs fit within CDC’s well-supported category.

- **Experimental design:** All programs were evaluated using a randomized trial design or a quasi-experimental design that used an adequate comparison group. The prevention effects described compare the group or individuals that got the prevention intervention with those who did not.

- **Sample specification:** The behavioral and social characteristics of the sample for which outcomes were measured must have been specified.

- **Outcome assessments:** These assessments must have included pretest, posttest, and follow-up findings. The need for follow-up findings was considered essential given the frequently observed dissipation of positive posttest results. Follow-up data had to be reported more than
6 months beyond the time point at which the primary components of the intervention were delivered, in order to examine the duration and stability of intervention effects.

- **Effects:** Independent of whether the prevention intervention began prenatally, in the early years of life, or in adolescence or adulthood, programs were included only if they produced outcomes showing a measurable difference in substance use or substance use-related outcomes between intervention and comparison groups based on statistical significance testing. Level of significance and the size of the effects are reported in Appendix B - Evidence-Based Prevention Programs and Policies. Programs that broadly affected other behavioral health problems but did not show reductions in at least one direct measure of substance use were excluded.

- **Additional quality of evidence criteria:** The program provided evidence that seven quality of evidence criteria consistent with those of NREPP\(^i\) were met: (1) reliability of outcome measures, (2) validity of outcome measures, (3) pretest equivalence, (4) intervention fidelity, (5) analysis of missing data, (6) degree and evaluation of sample attrition, and (7) appropriate statistical analyses.

- **Operations Manual:** The program had a written manual that specified the procedures used in the intervention to increase likelihood that the prevention intervention would be replicated with fidelity.

**APPENDIX B.**

**EVIDENCE-BASED PREVENTION PROGRAMS AND POLICIES**

---

Table B.1: Evidence-Based Interventions for Children Under Age 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Type (Universal, Selective, Indicated)</th>
<th>Domain/Level (Family, School, Community, Multicomponent)</th>
<th>Sample (at pretest)/Ethnicity/Setting Design</th>
<th>Summary Results</th>
<th>Citations: Key Outcome Research/Program Information Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Nurse-Family Partnership Program (NFP)            | Selective                              | Family                                                   | Study 1: N = 300 rural, poor pregnant White women, first births | Study 1: At 13-year follow-up (age 15), parents in the nurse-visits intervention reported their children had fewer behavioral problems due to use of substances (0.15 vs. 0.34), and youth reported fewer days of alcohol consumption in past 6 months (1.09 vs. 2.49). No effects on binge drinking or illicit drug use at age 19. Study 2: N = 743 urban, poor pregnant African American women, first births All studies: RCT/NTC | Olds, et al. (1998)¹  
  Eckenrode, et al. (2010)²  
  Kitzman, et al. (2010)³ |

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Type (Universal, Selective, Indicated)</th>
<th>Domain/Level (Family, School, Community, Multicomponent)</th>
<th>Sample (at pretest)/Ethnicity/Setting Design</th>
<th>Summary Results</th>
<th>Citations: Key Outcome Research/Program Information Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raising Healthy Children (RHC) (Seattle Social Development Project elementary only)</td>
<td>Universal</td>
<td>Family and School</td>
<td>N = 18 urban, multiethnic schools; 810 students in Grades 1-5 QED/NTC RCT/NTC</td>
<td>At 6-year follow-up (age 18), reductions in heavy drinking (15.4% vs. 25.0%); high rates of attrition (quasi-experimental). At ages 21, 24, and 27, no significant effects on any form or drug or alcohol use. At grades 8-10, reduced growth of frequency of alcohol and marijuana use, no effects on initiation of alcohol, marijuana, and cigarettes ($d = .40$ for alcohol, $d = .57$ for marijuana).</td>
<td>Hawkins, et al. (1992)$^4$ and (1999)$^5$ Hawkins, et al. (2005)$^6$ and (2008)$^7$ Brown, et al. (2005)$^8$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Behavior Game</td>
<td>Universal</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>N = 864 large urban, multiethnic students in Grades 1-2 RCT/NTC</td>
<td>At ages 19 to 21, intervention males with high aggression in 1st grade (about 25% of boys) had lower rates of alcohol and drug abuse and dependence (65.6% vs. 28.1%). No effect for moderately or low aggressive males and no effect for females. Finding was not replicated in second cohort of the same study.</td>
<td>Kellam, et al. (2008)$^9$ and (2014)$^{10}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Centered Intervention</td>
<td>Universal</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>N = 9 urban, multiethnic schools; 576 students in Grades 1 and 2 RCT/NTC</td>
<td>At 6-year follow-up (Grade 8), reduced risk of starting to use other illegal drugs (heroin, crack, and cocaine powder; 7% vs. 2.6%). No effects on alcohol initiation or marijuana use.</td>
<td>Ialongo, et al. (2001)$^{11}$ Furr-Holden, et al. (2004)$^{12}$ Liu, et al. (2013)$^{13}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Type (Universal, Selective, Indicated)</td>
<td>Domain/Level (Family, School, Community, Multicomponent)</td>
<td>Sample (at pretest)/Ethnicity/Setting Design</td>
<td>Summary Results</td>
<td>Citations: Key Outcome Research/Program Information Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linking the Interests of Families and Teachers (LIFT)</td>
<td>Universal</td>
<td>Multicomponent</td>
<td>N = 6 schools; 348 primarily White students in Grade 5, college town RCT/NTC</td>
<td>At 2- and 3-year follow-up, effects on patterned alcohol use (OR = 1.49) across Grades 6-8. Lower risk of initiating alcohol use (7% reduction). Also reduced growth of illicit drug use, particularly for females.</td>
<td>Eddy, et al. (2003)(^{14}) DeGarmo, et al. (2009)(^{15})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast Track</td>
<td>Indicated</td>
<td>Multicomponent</td>
<td>N = 4 urban and rural multiethnic communities; 891 children with behavioral problems selected in kindergarten, Grades 1-10 RCT/TAU</td>
<td>No effects on substance use in Grades 9-12. At 10-year follow-up (age 25), decreased probability of DSM alcohol abuse (OR = 0.69), serious substance use (OR = 0.58). Lower drug crime conviction rate (34.7% reduction). No effect on binge drinking or heavy marijuana use.</td>
<td>Dodge, et al. (2015)(^{16})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventive Treatment Program (Montreal)</td>
<td>Selective</td>
<td>Multicomponent</td>
<td>N = 166 urban French Canadian students in Grades 1-2 with early behavioral problems RCT/TAU</td>
<td>At 7-year follow-up, effects on drinking to the point of being drunk at age 15. At 6- to 8- year follow-up, reduction in alcohol use at age 17 (ES = 0.48), and the slope of the number of drugs used between age 14 and 17 (ES = 0.70).</td>
<td>Tremblay, et al. (1996)(^{17}) Masse, (1996)(^{18})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: RCT - Randomized Controlled Trial, QED - Quasi-Experimental Design, TAU - Control Group Received Treatment As Usual, NTC - No Treatment Control, ES - Effect Size, OR - Odds Ratio
### Table B.2: Evidence-Based Interventions for Youth Aged 10 to 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Type (Universal, Selective, Indicated)</th>
<th>Domain/Level (Family, School, Community, Multicomponent)</th>
<th>Sample (at pretest)/Ethnicity/Setting/Design</th>
<th>Summary Results</th>
<th>Citations: Key Outcome Research/Program Information Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life Skills Training (LST)</td>
<td>Universal</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Study 1: N = 56 public schools; 5,954 White, urban students in Grade 7 (1985-1991)</td>
<td>Study 1: 6-year follow-up showed significantly lower incidence of drunkenness (33.5% vs. 40%) but not on rate of monthly, or weekly alcohol use; no effect on marijuana use. 66% reduction in weekly polydrug use (alcohol, marijuana, and tobacco).</td>
<td>Botvin, et al. (1995)¹⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Study 2a: N = 758 high-risk students from Study 2</td>
<td>Study 2a: At 1-year follow-up, high-risk participants (21% of sample) reported less drinking (ES = 0.22), inhalant use (ES = 0.14), and polydrug use (ES = 0.21).</td>
<td>Smith, et al. (2004)²²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Study 4: N = 36 rural schools; 1,650 primarily White students in Grade 7 (1998-2006)</td>
<td>Study 4: At 1.5-year follow-up, reduction in substance use for females, which became nonsignificant at 2.5-year follow-up. No significant effects for males.</td>
<td>Spoth, et al. (2008)²⁵ and (2006)²⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Type (Universal, Selective, Indicated)</td>
<td>Domain/Level (Family, School, Community, Multicomponent)</td>
<td>Sample (at pretest)/Ethnicity/Setting/Design</td>
<td>Summary Results</td>
<td>Citations: Key Outcome Research/Program Information Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventure/Adventure</td>
<td>Selective (by Personality Risk)</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Study 1: N = 13 UK secondary schools; 732 youth aged 13 to 16. Wave 2 youth only (N = 364) Study 2: N = 21 UK secondary schools; 1,210 high-risk students in Grade 9. Selected as in Study 1, lower risk sample = 1,433 students</td>
<td>Study 1: At 2-year follow-up, reduced initiation of l cocaine (OR = 0.20) and other drugs (OR = 0.50). No effect on marijuana use. Strongest effects on impulsive subsample. Effects on quantity and binge drinking fade after 6 months. A 24 months, still an effect on problem drinking (ES=0.33; Rutgers Scale). Study 2: At 24-month follow-up, high-risk students had lowered quantity of drinking (29% reduction), binge drinking (43% reduction), and problem drinking (29% reduction). Low risk students had lower quantity of drinking (29% reduction) and lower rates of binge drinking (35% reduction). At 24-month follow-up, effects on marijuana use fade and are unclear. 24-month effects maintained in the sensation-seeking subsample only (OR = 0.25).</td>
<td>Conrod, et al. (2010)28 and (2011)29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mahu, et al. (2015)31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Type (Universal, Selective, Indicated)</td>
<td>Domain/Level (Family, School, Community, Multicomponent)</td>
<td>Sample (at pretest)</td>
<td>Ethnicity/ Setting/Design</td>
<td>Summary Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study 3:</strong> N = 15 Schools in The Netherlands; 699 high-risk students aged 13 to 15 All Studies: RCT/NTC</td>
<td>Universal School</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>N = 170 schools in 7 European countries; 7,079 students aged 12 to 14</td>
<td>At 18-month follow-up, reductions in any drunkenness (3.8% reduction), frequent drunkenness (2.5% reduction), any cannabis use (2.9% reduction), and frequent cannabis use (2.2% reduction).</td>
<td>Faggiano, et al. (2010)²³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Type (Universal, Selective, Indicated)</td>
<td>Domain/Level (Family, School, Community, Multicomponent)</td>
<td>Sample (at pretest)/Ethnicity/Setting/Design</td>
<td>Summary Results</td>
<td>Citations: Key Outcome Research/Program Information Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening Families Program: For Parents and Youth 10-14</td>
<td>Universal</td>
<td>Family and School/Multicomponent</td>
<td>Study 1: N = 33 Midwestern public schools; 667 primarily White, rural students in Grade 6</td>
<td>Study 1: At 4-year follow-up, lower lifetime alcohol use (50% vs. 68%), drunkenness (26% vs. 44%), marijuana use (7% vs. 17%), and lower rates of amphetamine use (0% vs. 3.2%). At 6-year follow-up, lower rates of substance use initiation (OR = 2.34), lower drunkenness (41% reduction) and lower illicit drug use. At age 21, lower rates of substance use initiation (27.5% vs. 28.3%), drunkenness (19% reduction) and illicit drug use (31% reduction). Study 2: At 2.5-year follow-up, shows significantly less alcohol initiation (25.7% vs. 36.7%), marijuana initiation (4.1% vs. 7.9%), and slower growth in weekly drunkenness (39% reduction) when combined with Life Skills Training. At 5.5-year follow-up, lower rate of SU initiation, marijuana initiation (23% reduction), polydrug use, and lifetime methamphetamine use (2.5% vs. 7.6%) when combined with Life Skills Training. At age 25, lower rates of prescription opioid misuse (6.0% vs. 8.8%) and lifetime prescription drug misuse overall (6.3 vs. 9.4) when combined with Life Skills Training.</td>
<td>Spoth, et al. (2001)^19 Spoth, et al. (2004)^20 Spoth, et al. (2009)^45 and (2012)^42 Spoth, et al. (2002)^43 and (2005)^23 Spoth, et al. (2008)^25 Spoth, et al. (2013)^44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

^19 Spoth, et al. (2001)  
^45 Spoth, et al. (2009)  
^42 Spoth, et al. (2012)  
^43 Spoth, et al. (2002)  
^23 Spoth, et al. (2005)  
^25 Spoth, et al. (2008)  
^44 Spoth, et al. (2013)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Type (Universal, Selective, Indicated)</th>
<th>Domain/Level (Family, School, Community, Multicomponent)</th>
<th>Sample (at pretest)/Ethnicity/Setting/Design</th>
<th>Summary Results</th>
<th>Citations: Key Outcome Research/Program Information Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guiding Good Choices</td>
<td>Universal</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>N = 33 rural, Midwestern schools; 883 students in Grade 7 RCT/NTC</td>
<td>Effects on substance use initiation through high school and alcohol-related problems and illicit drug use through early adulthood. No effects on drunkenness. At age 22, lower rate of alcohol misuse for women (6% vs. 16%); no effect for men.</td>
<td>Spoth, et al. (2009)41 Mason, et al (2009)45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong African American Families</td>
<td>Universal</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>N = 667 Southern U.S. rural African American students in Grade 7 RCT/NTC</td>
<td>At 2-year follow-up, slower rate of initiation of alcohol (37% vs. 43%). Effect on growth trajectory of alcohol use through 4.5-year follow-up.</td>
<td>Brody, et al. (2006)46 and (2010)47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Type (Universal, Selective, Indicated)</td>
<td>Domain/Level (Family, School, Community, Multicomponent)</td>
<td>Sample (at pretest)/Ethnicity/Setting/Design</td>
<td>Summary Results</td>
<td>Citations: Key Outcome Research/Program Information Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Familias Unidas</strong></td>
<td>Universal/ Brief Version</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Study 1: N = 160 Hispanic students in Grade 8</td>
<td>Study 1: At 2-year follow-up, lower substance use initiation (28.6% vs. 65.2%) and substance use initiation (30.4% vs. 64.0%) among girls. Study 2: Significantly lower past 30-day substance use at 18-month (ES = 0.25) and 30-month follow-ups (25% vs. 34%).</td>
<td>Estrada, et al. (2015)52 Pantin, et al. (2009)53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bicultural Competence Skills Program (BCSP)</strong></td>
<td>Universal</td>
<td>Clinic/School</td>
<td>N = 27 public and tribal schools; 1,396 students from an American Indian Reservation in the Midwest (1986-1999) RCT/NTC</td>
<td>At 42-month follow-up, weekly alcohol use (22% vs. 30%) and weekly marijuana use (7% vs. 15%) was lower in BCSP-only group. Results for a BCSP plus community group were not significant.</td>
<td>Schinke, et al. (2000)54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Chill</strong></td>
<td>Universal</td>
<td>Primary Care</td>
<td>N = 7 urban health centers; 714 youth with no prior use aged 12 to 18 RCT/NTC</td>
<td>At 12-month follow-up, computer-based participants had lower rates of marijuana use at any point during the year (16.8% vs. 24.2%), but non-significant effect on 12 month use. No effects on alcohol.</td>
<td>Walton, et al. (2014)55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive Family Support (Family Check Up)</strong></td>
<td>Selective</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>N = 593 Grade 6-8 urban youth and their parents RCT/TAU</td>
<td>Lower rates of marijuana use through age 23. No effect on adult tobacco or alcohol use. For the 42% of families who engaged in the intervention, CACE analysis showed significantly less growth in tobacco, alcohol, and marijuana use across two years</td>
<td>Véronneau, et al. (in press)56 Stormshak, et al. (2011)57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Keep Safe</strong></td>
<td>Selective</td>
<td>School and Family</td>
<td>N = 100 girls in foster care entering middle school</td>
<td>At 18-month follow-up lower rate of substance use (ES = 0.47).</td>
<td>Kim et al (2011)58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Type (Universal, Selective, Indicated)</td>
<td>Domain/Level (Family, School, Community, Multicomponent)</td>
<td>Sample (at pretest)/ Ethnicity/ Setting/Design</td>
<td>Summary Results</td>
<td>Citations: Key Outcome Research/ Program Information Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Coping Power**                 | Selective                               | School                                                   | Study 1: N = 245 high-aggression African American and White students in Grade 5  
Study 2: N = 183 high-aggression African American and White students in Grade 5  
Study 3: N = 77 Dutch youth  
All Studies: RCT/ TAU | Study 1: At 1-year follow-up (7th grade), lower self-reported past-month use of substances (ES = 0.58).  
Study 2: At 1-year follow-up (7th grade), lower parent-reported substance use (ES = 0.31).  
Study 3: At 4-year follow-up, lower use of marijuana (13% vs. 35%), no differences in alcohol use. | Lochman & Wells (2003)\(^{59}\)  
Lochman & Wells (2004)\(^{60}\)  
Zonnevylle, et al. (2007)\(^{61}\) |
| **Project Toward No Drug Abuse (TND)** | Selective and Indicated                 | School                                                   | Study 1: N = 42 schools in Southern California; 2,468 high school students  
Study 2: N = 1,186 alternative high school students  
All studies: RCT/ TAU | Study 1: At 1-year follow-up, reduction in levels of alcohol use among baseline users.  
At 5-year follow-up, reduced hard drug use.  
Study 2: At 1-year follow-up, reductions in alcohol use (OR = 0.68), drunkenness (OR = 0.67), and hard drug use (OR = 0.68). | Sussman, et al. (2002)\(^{62}\)  
Sun, et al. (2006)\(^{62}\)  
Sussman, et al. (2012)\(^{63}\) |

Abbreviations: RCT - Randomized Controlled Trial, QED - Quasi-Experimental Design, TAU - Control Group Received Treatment As Usual, NTC - No Treatment Control, ES - Effect Size, OR - Odds Ratio
### Table B.3: Evidence-Based Interventions for Age 18+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Type (Universal, Selective, Indicated)</th>
<th>Domain/Level (Family, School, Workplace, Community, Multicomponent)</th>
<th>Sample (at pretest)/Ethnicity/Setting/Design</th>
<th>Summary Results</th>
<th>Citations: Key Outcome Research/Program Information Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BASICS</strong></td>
<td>Indicated</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Study 1: N = 508 heavy drinking college freshmen</td>
<td>Study 1: At 1- and 2-year follow-ups, reductions in drinking frequency., At 4 year follow-up, reduction in drinking consequences.</td>
<td>Marlatt, et al. (1998)(^64) and Baer, et al. (2001)(^65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Study 2: N = 159 Fraternity-connected college students (81% White)</td>
<td>Study 2: At 1-year follow-up, reductions in average drinks per week (ES = 0.42) and typical peak BAC levels (ES = 0.38).</td>
<td>Larimer, et al. (2001)(^66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Study 3: N = 550 heavy drinking college students</td>
<td>Study 3: At 1-year follow-up, lower typical drinking (ES = 0.11) and peak drinking (ES = 0.42), and alcohol problem (ES = 0.56) for both volunteer and mandated students.</td>
<td>Terlecki, et al. (2015)(^67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All studies: RCT/TAU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent Handbook</strong></td>
<td>Universal</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Study 1: N = 882 college-bound students (79% White)</td>
<td>Study 1: At 8-month follow-up, females were less likely to transition into heavy drinking status, but males were more likely to do so. No effects on rate of alcohol-related problems.</td>
<td>Ichiyama, et al. (2009)(^68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Study 2: N = 1,900 college-bound students (87% White)</td>
<td>Study 2: Reduced the odds of continuing to be a heavy drinker for the first two years of college for students who came to campus with prior high-risk drinking habits (OR = 0.05).</td>
<td>Turrisi, et al. (2013)(^69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Study 3: N = 1,275 college-bound students, high-risk, athletes (80% White)</td>
<td>Study 3: At 10-month follow-up, reduced alcohol peak consumption (ES = 0.26) . and alcohol-related consequences (ES = 0.20) for PH and BASICS combined. At 22 months, reduction in the onset of alcohol consequences (ES = 0.21). No effect for PH alone.</td>
<td>Turrisi, et al. (2009)(^70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All studies: RCT/NTC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wood, et al. (2010)(^71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Type (Universal, Selective, Indicated)</td>
<td>Domain/Level (Family, School, Workplace, Community, Multicomponent)</td>
<td>Sample (at pretest)/Ethnicity/Setting/Design</td>
<td>Summary Results</td>
<td>Citations: Key Outcome Research/Program Information Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief Motivational Intervention in Emergency Department</td>
<td>Universal and Selective</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>N = 539 injured patients treated in the ED; mostly males from urban, Southern New England (72% White) RCT/TAU</td>
<td>At 1-year follow-up, patients receiving brief intervention (BI) with booster reduced alcohol-related negative consequences and alcohol-related injuries; no differences were observed for heavy drinking days. No effects of BI without booster.</td>
<td>Longabaugh, et al. (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Awareness</td>
<td>Universal</td>
<td>Workplace</td>
<td>N = 235 employees in 28 restaurants RCT/NTC</td>
<td>At 1-year follow-up, the odds of recurring heavy drinking declined by 50%, and the number of work-related problem areas declined by one-third.</td>
<td>Broome and Bennett (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computerized Alcohol-Related Problems Survey (CARPS)</td>
<td>Universal</td>
<td>Primary Care</td>
<td>N = 771 Primary care patients aged 65 and older RCT/TAU</td>
<td>At 1-year follow-up, participants decreased their harmful drinking 23% and increased their nonhazardous drinking 12%.</td>
<td>Fink, et al. (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Share</td>
<td>Selective</td>
<td>Primary Care</td>
<td>N = 1,186 Primary care patients aged 60 or older screened for at-risk drinking patterns RCT/TAU</td>
<td>At 1-year follow-up, and reductions in at-risk drinking (56% vs. 67%), lower rates of alcohol consumption.</td>
<td>Ettner, et al. (2014)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: RCT - Randomized Controlled Trial, QED - Quasi-Experimental Design, TAU - Control Group Received Treatment As Usual, NTC - No Treatment Control, ES - Effect Size, OR - Odds Ratio
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Type (Universal, Selective, Indicated)</th>
<th>Domain/Level (Family, School, Community, Multicomponent)</th>
<th>Sample (at pretest)/Ethnicity/Setting/Design</th>
<th>Summary Results</th>
<th>Citations: Key Outcome Research/Program Information Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Communities That Care (CTC) | Universal | Multi-component | N = 24 communities in 7 States; 4,407 students in Grade 5 (20% Hispanic, 67% White, 3% African American) RCT/TAU | By Grade 10, students in CTC communities were less likely to initiate alcohol (OR = 0.62). At 10th grade there were no differences rates of binge drinking or in past-month alcohol, marijuana, prescription, or other illicit drug use. By Grade 12, fewer CTC students had initiated any drug (OR = 0.71), alcohol (OR = 0.70), or cigarette (OR = 0.80) use. There were no differences in past-month or past-year alcohol, marijuana, or other illicit drug use, with the exception of higher rate of ecstasy use in the CTC condition. | Hawkins, et al. (2012)\(^77\)  
Hawkins, et al. (2014)\(^78\) |
| PROmoting School-community-university Partnerships to Enhance Resilience (PROSPER) | Universal | Multi-component | N = 28 rural and small town communities in Pennsylvania and Iowa; 10,849 primarily White students in Grade 6 RCT/TAU | At 3.5-year and 4.5-year follow-up (Grades 11 and 12) youth in PROSPER communities showed lower past-year marijuana (13.5% reduction) and methamphetamine use (30.9% reduction). At Grade 12 only, PROSPER youth showed lower past-year inhalant use (28.3% reduction). Six-year growth curve effects lower for marijuana, amphetamine use, and drunkenness. By Grade 12, lower lifetime rates of prescription opioid misuse (22.1% vs. 27.8%) and lifetime prescription drug misuse overall (23.1% vs. 29.0%). | Spoth, et al. (2013a)\(^79\)  
and (2013b)\(^44\)  
Spoth, et al. (2013a)\(^79\) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Type (Universal, Selective, Indicated)</th>
<th>Domain/Level (Family, School, Community, Multicomponent)</th>
<th>Sample (at pretest)/Ethnicity/Setting/Design)</th>
<th>Summary Results</th>
<th>Citations: Key Outcome Research/Program Information Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Project Northland                 | Universal                               | Multi-component                                        | N = 24 multiethnic urban, rural, and tribal school districts in Northern Minnesota  
RCT/TAU                                                                                     | The Phase 1 intervention was conducted when the targeted cohort was in Grade 6 to Grade 8. At 2.5 years past baseline, lower past-month and past-week alcohol use.  
The Phase 2 intervention was conducted when the cohort was in Grade 11 to Grade 12. At 6.5 years past baseline, reductions in binge drinking. | Phase 1: Perry, et al. (1996)10  
and Klepp, et al. (1995)81  
Phase 2: Perry, et al. (2002)82 |
| Project Star (Midwestern Prevention Project) | Universal                               | School and Community/Multicomponent                     | N = 42 urban public middle and junior high schools in Kansas City, Missouri and Indianapolis, Indiana; 3,412 White and African American students  
RCT/TAU                                                                                     | At 1-year follow-up, lower proportion of students reporting past-week and past-month use of alcohol. Secondary prevention effects on baseline users were observed up to 1.5 years past baseline, not at 2.5 and 3.5 years past baseline. Reductions in growth of amphetamine use through age 28. | Report 1: Pentz, et al. (1989)83  
Report 2: Pentz & Valente (1993)84  
| Reducing Underage Drinking Through State Coalitions | Universal                               | Community                                                | N = National data from the Monitoring the Future Survey of students in Grades 8, 10, and 12 in ten states compared to all others  
QED                                                                                           | At posttest, significant effects in the proportion of Grade 8 and Grade 12 students reporting past month drunkenness (ES = 1.36; ES = 1.29) and in Grade 12 students reporting binge drinking (ES = 2.18) and past year drinking (ES = 0.75). | Wagenaar, et al. (2006)88 |
| Safer California Universities     | Universal                               | Community                                                | N=14 California universities; 19,791 students (49% White)  
RCT/TAU                                                                                     | At posttest, significant effects in the proportion of students reporting intoxication (ORs = 0.76 to 0.81).                                                                                             | Saltz, et al. (2010)89 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Type (Universal, Selective, Indicated)</th>
<th>Domain/Level (Family, School, Community, Multicomponent)</th>
<th>Sample (at pretest)/ Ethnicity/ Setting/Design)</th>
<th>Summary Results</th>
<th>Citations: Key Outcome Research/ Program Information Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saving Lives</td>
<td>Universal</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>N = 6 Massachusetts communities compared to all others in the state; 15,188 surveys of adults and youth aged 16 to 19 (90% White) QED</td>
<td>At posttest, a 42% reduction in fatal alcohol-related motor vehicle crashes and a 40% reduction in self-reported DUI among 16- to 19-year-olds.</td>
<td>Hingson, et al. (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities Mobilizing for Change on Alcohol</td>
<td>Universal</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Report 1: N = 15 Minnesota &amp; Wisconsin communities Report 2: N = 1,721-3,095 surveys of 18-20 year-olds (96% White) RCT/TAU</td>
<td>Report 1: At posttest, a 17% reduction in the proportion reporting that they provided alcohol to minors. Report 2: At posttest, a reduction in the number of arrests for DUI.</td>
<td>Wagenaar, et al. (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study to Prevent Alcohol Related Consequences (SPARC)</td>
<td>Universal</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>N = 10 colleges/universities in North Carolina; 3,811 students (80% White) RCT/TAU</td>
<td>At posttest, signification reductions in student reports of alcohol-related personal harms and causing injuries to others.</td>
<td>Wolfson, et al. (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento Neighborhood Alcohol Prevention Project (SNAPP)</td>
<td>Selective</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>N = 2 low-income communities compared to all others in the city (35% Hispanic, 18% African American) QED</td>
<td>At posttest, fewer arrests for assaults (ES = 0.48), Emergency Medical Services (EMS) calls for assaults (ES = 0.57), and car accidents (ES = 0.55).</td>
<td>Treno, et al. (2007)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: RCT - Randomized Controlled Trial, QED - Quasi-Experimental Design, TAU - Control Group Received Treatment As Usual, NTC - No Treatment Control, ES - Effect Size, OR - Odds Ratio
Table B.5: Community Preventive Services Task Force Recommendations for Preventing Alcohol Misuse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Interventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase Alcohol Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulate Alcohol Outlet Density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dram Shop (Commercial Host) Liability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid Further Privatization of Alcohol Sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain Limits on Days of Sale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain Limits on Hours of Sale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Enforcement of Laws Prohibiting Sales to Minors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Screening and Brief Intervention (e-SBI)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### APPENDIX C. RESOURCE GUIDE


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Target Audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADHD and Substance Use Disorders</td>
<td><a href="#">SAMHSA Advisory: Adults With Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder and Substance Use Disorders</a></td>
<td>This Advisory defines ADHD in adults. It discusses the interaction and relationship between ADHD and substance use disorders and provides information on screening for ADHD in adults, treatment of co-occurring ADHD and substance use disorders, and prevention of stimulant abuse in clients with ADHD.</td>
<td>Primary Care Doctors, Nurses, Drug and Alcohol Counselors, Mental Health Clinicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complementary Health Approaches</td>
<td><a href="#">SAMHSA Advisory: Complementary Health Approaches: Advising Clients About Evidence and Risks</a></td>
<td>This Advisory provides behavioral health practitioners a brief overview of complementary health approaches, gives examples of the types of practices and products considered complementary, and discusses how practitioners can offer guidance to clients regarding the benefits and risks of adopting such approaches.</td>
<td>Prevention Professionals, Public Health Professionals, People with Substance Use or Misuse Problems, People with Alcohol Use or Misuse Problems, People with Mental Health Problems, Patients</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Target Audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Competence</td>
<td><strong>TIP 59: Improving Cultural Competence</strong></td>
<td>This Treatment Improvement Protocol (TIP) uses a multidimensional model for developing cultural competence. Adapted to address cultural competence across behavioral health settings, this model serves as a framework for targeting three organizational levels of treatment: individual counselor and staff, clinical and programmatic, and organizational and administrative. The chapters target specific racial, ethnic, and cultural considerations along with the core elements of cultural competence highlighted in the model. These core elements include cultural awareness, general cultural knowledge, cultural knowledge of behavioral health, and cultural skill development.</td>
<td>Professional Care Providers, Program Planners, Administrators, Project Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster Planning</td>
<td><strong>TAP 34: Disaster Planning Handbook for Behavioral Health Treatment Programs</strong></td>
<td>This Technical Assistance Publication (TAP) offers guidance in creating a disaster preparedness and recovery plan for programs that provide treatment for mental illness and substance use disorders. It also covers the planning process, preparing for disaster, roles and responsibilities, training, and testing.</td>
<td>Professional Care Providers, Disaster Response Workers, Program Planners, Administrators, Project Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambling</td>
<td><strong>SAMHSA Advisory: Gambling Problems: An Introduction for Behavioral Health Services Providers</strong></td>
<td>This Advisory provides an introduction to pathological gambling, gambling disorder, and problem gambling; it also explores their links with substance use disorders. It describes tools available for screening and diagnosis of gambling disorder as well as strategies for treating people with gambling problems.</td>
<td>Drug and Alcohol Counselors, Mental Health Clinicians, Peer Counselors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness</td>
<td><strong>TIP 55: Behavioral Health Services for People Who Are Homeless</strong></td>
<td>This TIP is for behavioral health service providers and program administrators who want to work more effectively with people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness and who need, or are currently in, substance use disorder or mental health treatment. The TIP addresses treatment and prevention issues. The approach advocated by the TIP is integrated and is aimed at providing services to the whole person to improve quality of life in all relevant domains.</td>
<td>Public Officials, Public Health Professionals, Program Planners, Administrators, Project Managers, Professional Care Providers, Non-Profits &amp; Faith-Based Organizations, Community Coalitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Target Audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medication-Assisted</td>
<td><strong>CMCS Informational Bulletin: Medication Assisted Treatment for Substance Use Disorders</strong></td>
<td>This Bulletin highlights the use of FDA-approved medications in combination with evidence-based behavioral therapies, commonly referred to as “Medication Assisted Treatment” (MAT), to help persons with substance use disorders (SUD) recover in a safe and cost-effective manner. Specifically, the Bulletin provides background information about MAT, examples of state-based initiatives, and useful resources to help ensure proper delivery of these services.</td>
<td>People with Substance Use or Misuse Problems, People in Recovery, People in Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td><strong>DrugFacts: Treatment Approaches for Drug Addiction</strong></td>
<td>This website describes research findings on effective medication and behavioral treatment approaches for drug addiction and discusses special considerations for the criminal justice setting.</td>
<td>General public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medication-Assisted</td>
<td><strong>In Brief: Adult Drug Courts and Medication-Assisted Treatment for Opioid Dependence</strong></td>
<td>This In Brief highlights the use of MAT for opioid dependence in drug courts. It reviews effective medications, including methadone, buprenorphine, and naltrexone and provides strategies to increase the use of MAT in drug court programs.</td>
<td>Public Health Professionals, Program Planners, Administrators, Project Managers, Policymakers, Public Officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td><strong>MATx Mobile App</strong></td>
<td>This mobile app supports the practice of health care practitioners who provide MAT. MATx features include resources to support ongoing MAT practices, guidance on attaining a Drug Addiction Treatment Act of 2000 (DATA) waiver for treatment with buprenorphine, and tips for conducting effective patient assessments.</td>
<td>Physicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medication-Assisted</td>
<td><strong>Medication-Assisted Treatment of Opioid Use Disorder Pocket Guide</strong></td>
<td>This pocket guide offers guidelines for physicians using MAT for patients with opioid use disorder. It includes a checklist for prescribing medication, approved medications in the treatment of opioid use disorder, screening and assessment tools, and best practices for patient care.</td>
<td>Physicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td><strong>Medication for the Treatment of Alcohol Use Disorder: A Brief Guide</strong></td>
<td>This guide provides evidence on the effectiveness of available medications for the treatment of alcohol use disorder and guidance for the use of medications in clinical practice.</td>
<td>Physicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Target Audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opioid Prevention</td>
<td>CMCS Informational Bulletin: Best Practices for Addressing Prescription Opioid Overdoses, Misuse and Addiction</td>
<td>This Bulletin highlights emerging Medicaid strategies for preventing opioid-related harms and provides background information on overdose deaths involving prescription opioids, describes several Medicaid pharmacy benefit management strategies for mitigating prescription drug abuse and discusses strategies to increase the provision of naloxone to reverse opioid overdose, thereby reducing opioid-related overdose deaths. Wherever possible, the Bulletin provides examples of methods states can use to target the prescribing of methadone for pain relief, given the disproportionate share of opioid-related overdose deaths associated with methadone when used as a pain reliever.</td>
<td>People with Substance Use or Misuse Problems, People in Recovery, People in Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opioid Prevention</td>
<td>Opioid Overdose Prevention Toolkit (updated 2016)</td>
<td>This toolkit provides guidance to develop practices and policies to help prevent opioid-related overdoses and deaths.</td>
<td>Health Care Professionals, First Responders, Treatment Providers, Local Governments, Communities, Those Recovering from Opioid Overdose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opioid Prevention</td>
<td>Opioid and Pain Management CMEs/CEs: Safe Prescribing for Pain and Managing Pain Patients Who Abuse Rx Drugs</td>
<td>These CME courses developed by NIDA and Medscape Education, with funding from the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy provide practical guidance for physicians and other clinicians in screening pain patients for substance use disorder risk factors before prescribing, and in identifying when patients are abusing their medications.</td>
<td>Health Care Professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery</td>
<td>Motivation for Change: John’s Story—Consequences of His Heavy Drinking and His Recovery</td>
<td>This comic book/fotonovela uses photographs with captions to help the reader recognize the dangers people face when they have a substance use disorder. It tells the troubles of a family as the son, John, faces his substance use problem, enters treatment, and moves into recovery.</td>
<td>People with Alcohol Use or Misuse Problems, People With Substance Use or Misuse Problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Target Audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery</td>
<td>You Can Manage Your Chronic Pain To Live a Good Life: A Guide for People in Recovery from Mental Illness or Addiction</td>
<td>This consumer brochure equips people who have chronic pain and mental illness or addiction with tips for working with their health care professional to decrease their pain without jeopardizing their recovery. It also explores counseling, exercise, and alternative therapy, as well as medications.</td>
<td>People in Recovery, People in Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screening and Brief Intervention</td>
<td>Alcohol Screening and Brief Intervention for Youth: A Practitioner’s Guide</td>
<td>This Guide helps health care professionals who manage the health and well-being of children and adolescents conduct fast, effective alcohol screens and interventions with patients ages 9-18.</td>
<td>Health Care Professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screening and Referral to Treatment</td>
<td>SAMHSA Advisory: Hepatitis C Screening in the Behavioral Healthcare Setting</td>
<td>This Advisory explains why behavioral health services programs should consider screening clients for Hepatitis C if clients have known risk factors for Hepatitis C viral infection or if they have signs and symptoms of liver disease. The Advisory explains how onsite screening, or referral to screening, can be incorporated into existing intake and monitoring procedures. It also offers guidance on providing clients with viral hepatitis prevention education, counseling, and referral to follow-up evaluation and medical treatment as needed.</td>
<td>Public Health Professionals, Program Planners, Administrators, Project Managers, Health Care Professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screening and Referral to Treatment</td>
<td>NIDA Drug Use Screening Tool</td>
<td>This tool features a one-question Quick Screen as well as the full NIDA-Modified Alcohol, Smoking and Substance Involvement Screening Test.</td>
<td>Health Care Professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screening, Brief Intervention, and Referral to Treatment</td>
<td>TAP 33: Systems-Level Implementation of Screening, Brief Intervention, and Referral to Treatment (SBIRT)</td>
<td>This TAP describes core elements of SBIRT programs for people with or at risk for substance use disorders and also describes SBIRT services implementation, covering challenges, barriers, cost, and sustainability.</td>
<td>Public Health Professionals, Program Planners, Administrators, Project Managers, Professional Care Providers, Grant Seekers and Grantees, Public Officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Misuse and Mental Health</td>
<td>In Brief: An Introduction to Co-Occurring Borderline Personality Disorder and Substance Use Disorders</td>
<td>This In Brief Introduces professional care providers to borderline personality disorder. It covers signs and symptoms, with or without co-occurring substance use disorder; monitoring clients for self-harm and suicide; and referrals to treatment.</td>
<td>Professional Care Providers, Public Health Professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Target Audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Misuse and Mental Health</td>
<td>National Prevention Week</td>
<td>National Prevention Week is an annual health observance dedicated to increasing public awareness of, and action around, substance use and mental health issues.</td>
<td>Businesses, Communities, Educators, Health Care Professionals, Law Enforcement, Parents and Caregivers, Prevention Specialists, Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Misuse and Mental Health</td>
<td>No Longer Alone (A Story About Alcohol, Drugs, Depression, and Trauma): Addressing the Specific Needs of Women</td>
<td>This comic book tells the stories of three women with substance misuse and mental health problems who have received treatment and improved their quality of life. Featuring flashbacks, the fotonovela is culturally relevant and dispels myths around behavioral health disorders.</td>
<td>Adolescents, Young Adults, Mature Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Misuse Prevention</td>
<td>Alcohol Overdose: The Dangers of Drinking Too Much</td>
<td>This fact sheet provides information about the signs and symptoms of alcohol overdose.</td>
<td>Individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Misuse Prevention</td>
<td>Center for the Application of Prevention Technologies (CAPT)</td>
<td>SAMHSA’s CAPT is a national training and technical assistance (T/TA) system committed to strengthening prevention systems and building the nation’s behavioral health workforce.</td>
<td>SAMHSA Substance Use Prevention Grantees and Prevention Professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Misuse Prevention</td>
<td>CMCS Informational Bulletin: Prevention and Early Identification of Mental Health and Substance Use Conditions</td>
<td>This Bulletin helps inform states about resources available to help them meet the needs of children under Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnostic, and Treatment (EPSDT), specifically with respect to mental health and substance use disorder services.</td>
<td>Public Officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Misuse Prevention</td>
<td>Harmful Interactions</td>
<td>This resource provides information about medications that can cause harm when taken with alcohol and describes the effects that can result.</td>
<td>Adolescents, Young Adults, Mature Adults, Health Care Professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Misuse Prevention</td>
<td>Health Education Curriculum Analysis Tool (HECAT) and HECAT Module AOD</td>
<td>This tool can help school districts, schools, and others conduct a clear, complete, and consistent analysis of health education curricula based on the National Health Education Standards and CDC’s Characteristics of an Effective Health Education Curriculum. Results of the HECAT can help schools select or develop appropriate and effective health education curricula and improve the delivery of health education. The HECAT can be customized to meet local community needs and conform to the curriculum requirements of the state or school district.</td>
<td>Educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Target Audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Misuse Prevention</td>
<td>Marijuana Facts for Teens and Marijuana Facts Parents Need to Know</td>
<td>The teen booklet is presented in question-and-answer format and provides facts about marijuana and its potential harmful effects. The parent booklet provides important facts about marijuana and offers tips for talking with children about the drug and its potential harmful effects.</td>
<td>Teens, parents, caregivers, general public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Misuse Prevention</td>
<td>National Drug &amp; Alcohol Facts Week</td>
<td>This online guide gives organizers everything they need to plan, promote, and host their own National Drug &amp; Alcohol Facts Week (NDAFW) event. NDAFW is a national health observance for teens to promote local events that use NIDA science to SHATTER THE MYTHS about drugs.</td>
<td>Teens, parents, educators, general public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Misuse Prevention</td>
<td>Principles of Substance Abuse Prevention for Early Childhood</td>
<td>This guide begins with a list of 7 principles addressing the specific ways in which early interventions can have positive effects on development; these principles reflect findings on the influence of intervening early with vulnerable populations, on the course of child development, and on common elements of early childhood programs.</td>
<td>Parents, health care providers, and policymakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Misuse Prevention</td>
<td>Rethinking Drinking</td>
<td>This website is a tool for individuals who want to assess and/or change their drinking habits.</td>
<td>Individuals, Family Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Use Disorder Services</td>
<td>CMCS Informational Bulletin: Coverage of Behavioral Health Services for Youth with Substance Use Disorders</td>
<td>This Bulletin, based on evidence from scientific research and the results of a Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA)-supported technical expert panel consensus process, is intended to assist states to design a benefit that will meet the needs of youth with substance use disorders (SUD) and their families and help states comply with their obligations under Medicaid's Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnostic, and Treatment (EPSDT) requirements. The services described in this document are designed to enable youth to address their substance use disorders, to receive treatment and continuing care and to participate in recovery services and supports. This Bulletin also identifies resources that are available to states to facilitate their work in designing and implementing a benefit package for these youth and their families.</td>
<td>Public Officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Target Audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Use Disorder</td>
<td>New Service Delivery Opportunities for Individuals with a Substance Use Disorder</td>
<td>This State Medicaid Director Letter informs states of opportunities to design service delivery systems for individuals with substance use disorder (SUD), including a new opportunity for demonstration projects approved under section 1115 of the Social Security Act (Act) to ensure that a continuum of care is available to individuals with SUD.</td>
<td>Public Officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorder Services</td>
<td>In Brief: Treating Sleep Problems of People in Recovery From Substance Use Disorders</td>
<td>This In Brief discusses the relationship between sleep disturbances and substance use disorders and provides guidance on how to assess for and treat sleep problems for people in recovery. It also reviews nonpharmacological as well as over-the-counter and prescription medications.</td>
<td>Professional Care Providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Use Disorder</td>
<td>Principles of Adolescent Substance Use Disorder Treatment: A Research-Based Guide</td>
<td>This guide presents research-based principles of adolescent substance use disorder treatment; covers treatment for a variety of drugs including, illicit and prescription drugs, alcohol, and tobacco; presents settings and evidence-based approaches unique to treating adolescents.</td>
<td>Professional Care Providers, Administrators, Public Health Professionals, individuals and families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorder Treatment</td>
<td>Principles of Drug Abuse Treatment for Criminal Justice Populations - A Research-Based Guide</td>
<td>This guide presents research-based principles of addiction treatment that can inform drug treatment programs and services in the criminal justice setting.</td>
<td>Professional Care Providers, Administrators, Public Health Professionals, individuals and families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Use Disorder</td>
<td>SAMHSA Advisory: Diabetes Care for Clients in Behavioral Health Treatment</td>
<td>This Advisory reviews diabetes and its link with mental illness, stress, and substance use disorders, and it discusses ways to integrate diabetes care into behavioral health treatment, such as screening and intake, staff education, integrated care, and counseling support.</td>
<td>Professional Care Providers, Program Planners, Administrators, Project Managers, Public Health Professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorder Treatment</td>
<td>SAMHSA Advisory: Spice, Bath Salts, and Behavioral Health</td>
<td>This Advisory equips professional health providers with an introduction to spice and bath salts in the context of treating people with substance use disorders and mental illness. It discusses adverse effects of use, patient assessment, and abstinence monitoring, among other issues.</td>
<td>Prevention Professionals, Professional Care Providers, Public Health Professionals, Public Officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Target Audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Use Disorder Treatment</td>
<td>SAMHSA Advisory: Sublingual and Transmucosal Buprenorphine for Opioid Use Disorder: Review and Update</td>
<td>This Advisory provides an overview of data on the use of sublingual (medicine that dissolves under the tongues) and transmucosal (medicine that dissolves between the cheeks and gums) buprenorphine to treat opioid use disorder and discusses the implications of using MAT as a recovery support.</td>
<td>Primary Care Doctors and Nurses, Drug and Alcohol Counselors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Use Disorder Treatment</td>
<td>Seeking Drug Abuse Treatment: Know What To Ask</td>
<td>This guide offers guidance in seeking drug abuse treatment and lists five questions to ask when searching for a treatment program.</td>
<td>General Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Use Disorder Treatment</td>
<td>TIP 56: Addressing the Specific Behavioral Health Needs of Men</td>
<td>This TIP is a companion to TIP 51, Substance Abuse Treatment: Addressing the Specific Needs of Women. It examines how gender-specific treatment strategies can improve outcomes for men. It also covers differences between men and women in the effects of substance use and misuse and the implications these differences have in behavioral health services. It provides practical information based on available evidence and clinical experience that can help counselors more effectively treat men with substance use disorders.</td>
<td>Public Health Professionals, Program Planners, Administrators, Project Managers, Professional Care Providers, Prevention Professionals, Researchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Use Disorder Treatment</td>
<td>TIP 51: Substance Abuse Treatment: Addressing the Specific Needs of Women</td>
<td>This TIP assists treatment providers in offering treatment to adult women with substance use disorders. It reviews gender-specific research and best practices, such as common patterns of initiation of substance use among women and specific treatment issues and strategies.</td>
<td>Public Health Professionals, Program Planners, Administrators, Project Managers, Professional Care Providers, Prevention Professionals, Researchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Use Disorder Treatment</td>
<td>Treatment for Alcohol Problems: Finding and Getting Help</td>
<td>This guide is written for individuals, and their family and friends who are looking for options to address alcohol problems.</td>
<td>Individuals, Families, Friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicide Prevention</td>
<td>In Brief: Substance Use and Suicide: A Nexus Requiring a Public Health Approach</td>
<td>This In Brief summarizes the relationship between substance use and suicide and provides state and tribal prevention professionals with information on the scope of the problem, an understanding of traditional barriers to collaboration and current programming, and ways to work together on substance use and suicide prevention strategies.</td>
<td>State and Tribal Prevention Professionals working in the fields of substance use and suicide prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Target Audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicide Prevention</td>
<td>Suicide Prevention Resource Center (SPRC)</td>
<td>SAMHSA’s SPRC provides technical assistance, training, and materials to increase the knowledge and expertise of suicide prevention practitioners and other professionals serving people at risk for suicide. While multiple factors influence suicidal behaviors, substance use—especially alcohol use—is a significant factor that is linked to a substantial number of suicides and suicide attempts.</td>
<td>Professionals in a variety of settings (e.g., tribal communities, schools, colleges and universities, primary care, emergency departments, behavioral health care, workplace, and faith communities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology-Assisted Care</td>
<td>TIP 60: Using Technology-Based Therapeutic Tools in Behavioral Health Services</td>
<td>This TIP provides an overview of current technology-based behavioral health assessments and interventions, and it summarizes the evidence base supporting the effectiveness of such interventions. It also examines opportunities for technology-assisted care (TAC) in the behavioral health arena. It emphasizes use of TAC with clients who might not otherwise receive treatment or whose treatment might be impeded by physical disabilities, rural or remote geographic locations, lack of transportation, employment constraints, or symptoms of mental illness. The TIP covers programmatic, technological, budgeting, vendor selection, data management, privacy and confidentiality, and regulatory considerations likely to arise during adoption of technology-based interventions.</td>
<td>Program Planners, Administrators, Project Managers, Prevention Professionals, Professional Care Providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trauma-Informed Care</td>
<td>TIP 57: Trauma-Informed Care in Behavioral Health Services</td>
<td>This TIP presents fundamental concepts that behavioral health service providers and program administrators can use to initiate trauma-related screening and assessment, implement collaborative strengths-based interventions, learn the core principles and practices that reflect trauma-informed care, decrease inadvertent retraumatization, and evaluate and build a trauma-informed organization and workforce.</td>
<td>Professional Care Providers, Program Planners, Administrators, Project Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underage Drinking</td>
<td>College Alcohol Intervention Matrix (CollegeAIM)</td>
<td>This matrix is a resource to help colleges and universities address harmful and underage student drinking. Developed with leading college alcohol researchers and staff, it is an easy-to-use and comprehensive tool to identify effective alcohol interventions.</td>
<td>Higher Education Officials, particularly alcohol and other drug program and student life staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Target Audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underage Drinking</td>
<td>Stop Underage Drinking website</td>
<td>This interagency Web portal provides key federal resources targeting the prevention of underage alcohol use.</td>
<td>Businesses, Communities, Educators, Health Care Professionals, Law Enforcement, Parents and Caregivers, Prevention Specialists, Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underage Drinking</td>
<td>Talk. They Hear You. - Underage Drinking Prevention</td>
<td>This underage drinking prevention campaign sponsored by SAMHSA provides parents and caregivers with information and resources they need to start addressing the dangers of alcohol with their children, 9 to 15 years old.</td>
<td>Parents and Other Caregivers of Youth 9 to 15 years old</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D outlines important facts about the following substances:

- Alcohol
- Cocaine
- GHB (gamma-hydroxybutyric acid)
- Heroin
- Inhalants
- Ketamine
- LSD (lysergic acid diethylamide)
- Marijuana (Cannabis)
- MDMA (Ecstasy)
- Mescaline (Peyote)
- Methamphetamine
- Over-the-counter Cough/Cold Medicines (Dextromethorphan or DXM)
- PCP (Phencyclidine)
- Prescription Opioids
- Prescription Sedatives (Tranquilizers, Depressants)
- Prescription Stimulants
- Psilocybin
- Rohypnol® (Flunitrazepam)
- Salvia
- Steroids (Anabolic)
- Synthetic Cannabinoids (“K2”/“Spice”)
- Synthetic Cathinones (“Bath Salts”)
Sources cited in this Appendix are:

- Drug Enforcement Administration’s Drug Facts Sheets.
- Inhalant Addiction Treatment’s Dangers of Mixing Inhalants with Alcohol and Other Drugs.
- National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism’s (NIAAA’s) Alcohol’s Effects on the Body.
- National Institute on Drug Abuse’s (NIDA’s) Commonly Abused Drugs.
- NIDA’s Treatment for Alcohol Problems: Finding and Getting Help.
- National Institutes of Health (NIH) National Library of Medicine’s Alcohol Withdrawal.
- Rohypnol Abuse Treatment FAQs.
- Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration’s (SAMHSA’s) Keeping Youth Drug Free.
- SAMHSA’s Center for Behavioral Health Statistics and Quality’s (CBHSQ’s) Results from the 2015 National Survey on Drug Use and Health: Detailed Tables.

The substances that are considered controlled substances under the Controlled Substances Act (CSA) are divided into five schedules. An updated and complete list of the schedules is published annually in Title 21 Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) §§ 1308.11 through 1308.15. Substances are placed in their respective schedules based on whether they have a currently accepted medical use in treatment in the United States, their relative abuse potential, and likelihood of causing dependence when abused. A description of each schedule is listed below.

- **Schedule I (I):** Substances in this schedule have no currently accepted medical use in the United States, a lack of accepted safety for use under medical supervision, and a high potential for abuse.

- **Schedule II/IIN (2/2N):** Substances in this schedule have a high potential for abuse which may lead to severe psychological or physical dependence.

- **Schedule III/IIN (3/3N):** Substances in this schedule have a potential for abuse less than substances in Schedules I or II and abuse may lead to moderate or low physical dependence or high psychological dependence.

- **Schedule IV (4):** Substances in this schedule have a low potential for abuse relative to substances in Schedule III.

- **Schedule V (5):** Substances in this schedule have a low potential for abuse relative to substances listed in Schedule IV and consist primarily of preparations containing limited quantities of certain narcotics.
**Alcohol**

*Ethyl alcohol, or ethanol, is an intoxicating ingredient found in beer, wine, and liquor. Alcohol is produced by the fermentation of yeast, sugars, and starches.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Commercial Names</th>
<th>Street Names</th>
<th>Common Forms</th>
<th>Common Ways Taken</th>
<th>DEA Schedule / Legal Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Booze, Juice, Sauce, Brew</td>
<td>Beer, Wine, Liquor/ Spirits/Malt Beverages</td>
<td>Ingested by drinking</td>
<td>Not scheduled / Illegal for purchase or use by those under age 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Uses & Possible Health Effects**

**Short-term Symptoms of Use**

Injuries and risky behavior, memory and concentration problems, coma, breathing problems, slurred speech, confusion, impaired judgment and motor skills, drowsiness, nausea and vomiting, emotional volatility, loss of coordination, visual distortions, impaired memory, changes in mood and behavior, and depression. Impaired judgment can result in inappropriate sexual behavior, sexually transmitted infections, and reduced inhibitions.

**Long-term Consequences of Use and Health Effects**

Some studies have found benefits associated with moderate alcohol consumption, while other studies do not support a role for moderate alcohol consumption in providing health benefits. Studies have shown alcohol misuse use can lead to: an inability to control drinking; a high tolerance level; changes in mood and behavior; difficulty thinking clearly; impaired coordination; cardiovascular problems including heart muscle injury, irregular heartbeat, stroke, and high blood pressure; liver problems including steatosis (fatty liver), alcoholic hepatitis, fibrosis, and cirrhosis; pancreatitis; increased risk of various cancers (including of the mouth, esophagus, larynx, pharynx, liver, colon, and rectum); weakened immune system; depression; interference with personal relationships; coma, and death due to alcohol overdose. For breast cancer, even moderate drinking may increase the risk.

**Other Health-related Issues**


**In Combination with Alcohol**

N/A

**Withdrawal Symptoms**

Alcohol withdrawal symptoms usually occur within 8 hours after the last drink, but can occur days later. Symptoms usually peak by 24 to 72 hours, but may go on for weeks. Common symptoms include: anxiety or nervousness, depression, fatigue, irritability, jumpiness or shakiness, mood swings, nightmares, and not thinking clearly. Other symptoms may include: clammy skin, enlarged (dilated) pupils, headache, insomnia, loss of appetite, nausea and vomiting, pallor, rapid heart rate, sweating, and tremor of the hands or other body parts. A severe form of alcohol withdrawal called delirium tremens can cause: agitation, fever, hallucinations, seizures, and severe confusion.

---


ii. Most states prohibit possession and consumption of alcoholic beverages by those under age 21, though some make exceptions for possession or consumption in the presence, or with the consent, of family or on private property.

iii. Sources: NIDA, (2016) & NIAAA, (n.d.). The uses and possible health effects that are listed are illustrative examples and not exhaustive.


### Alcohol Treatment Options

| Medications | The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has approved three medications for treating alcohol dependence, and others are being tested to determine if they are effective.  
| • Naltrexone can help people reduce heavy drinking.  
| • Acamprosate makes it easier to maintain abstinence.  
| • Disulfiram blocks the breakdown (metabolism) of alcohol by the body, causing unpleasant symptoms such as nausea and flushing of the skin. Those unpleasant effects can help some people avoid drinking while taking disulfiram. |
| Behavioral Therapies | Also known as alcohol counseling, behavioral treatments involve working with a health professional to identify and help change the behaviors that lead to heavy drinking. Behavioral treatments share certain features, which can include:  
| • Developing the skills needed to stop or reduce drinking  
| • Helping to build a strong social support system  
| • Working to set reachable goals  
| • Coping with or avoiding the triggers that might cause relapse |

### Statistics as of 2015

| Prevalence | Lifetime: 217 million persons (81.0%) aged 12 or older have used alcohol in their lifetime.  
| Past Year: 176 million persons (65.7%) aged 12 or older have used alcohol in the past year. |
| Average Age of Initiation* | 17.6 |

---


x. Average age of initiation (for all substances) is based on respondents aged 12 to 49 years old.
Cocaine

A powerfully addictive stimulant drug made from the leaves of the coca plant native to South America.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Commercial Names</th>
<th>Street Names</th>
<th>Common Forms</th>
<th>Common Ways Taken</th>
<th>DEA Schedule / Legal Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cocaine hydrochloride topical solution (anesthetic rarely used in medical procedures)</td>
<td>Cocaine: Blow, Bump, C, Candy, Charlie, Coke, Crack, Flake, Rock, Snow, Toot, Dust</td>
<td>White powder, whitish rock crystal</td>
<td>Snorted, smoked, injected, orally, topically</td>
<td>Schedule II / Illegal, except for use in hospital settings (however it’s rarely used)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Uses & Possible Health Effects***

**Short-term Symptoms of Use**
- Narrowed blood vessels; enlarged pupils; increased body temperature, heart rate, and blood pressure; headache; abdominal pain and nausea; euphoria; increased energy, alertness; insomnia; restlessness, irritability, anxiety; erratic and violent behavior; panic attacks, paranoia, psychosis; heart rhythm problems, heart attack; stroke, seizure, coma; and death from cardiac arrest, respiratory arrest, or suicide.

**Long-term Consequences of Use and Health Effects**
- Loss of sense of smell, nosebleeds, nasal damage and trouble swallowing from snorting; infection and death of bowel tissue from decreased blood flow; poor nutrition and weight loss from decreased appetite; and severe depression.

**Other Health-related Issues**
- Risk of HIV, hepatitis, and other infectious diseases from shared needles.  
- Pregnancy-related: premature delivery, low birth weight, neonatal abstinence syndrome.  
- In combination with alcohol: greater risk of overdose and sudden death than from alcohol or cocaine alone.

**Withdrawal Symptoms**
- Depression, tiredness, increased appetite, insomnia, vivid unpleasant dreams, slowed thinking and movement, restlessness.

**Medical Use**
- Cocaine hydrochloride topical solution is indicated for the introduction of local (topical) anesthesia of accessible mucous membranes of the oral, laryngeal and nasal cavities.

**Treatment Options***

**Medications**
- There are no FDA-approved medications to treat cocaine addiction.

**Behavioral Therapies**
- Cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT)
- Community reinforcement approach plus vouchers
- Contingency management, or motivational incentives
- The Matrix Model
- 12-Step facilitation therapy

---

* Neonatal abstinence syndrome is a group of problems that occur in a newborn who was exposed to addictive opioid drugs while in the mother’s womb. At birth, the baby is still dependent on the drug. Because the baby is no longer getting the drug after birth, symptoms of withdrawal may occur.  
Cocaine
Statistics as of 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevalence</th>
<th>Lifetime:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cocaine: 38.7 million persons (14.5%) aged 12 or older have used cocaine in their lifetime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Crack: 9.0 million persons (3.4%) aged 12 or older have used crack cocaine in their lifetime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Year:</td>
<td>• Cocaine: 4.8 million persons (1.8%) aged 12 or older have used cocaine in the past year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Crack: 833,000 persons (0.3%) aged 12 or older have used crack cocaine in the past year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Average Age of Initiation | Cocaine: 21.5 |
|                          | Crack: 21.3 |

### GHB (gamma-hydroxybutyric acid)

*A depressant approved for use in the treatment of narcolepsy, a disorder that causes daytime “sleep attacks”.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Commercial Names</th>
<th>Street Names</th>
<th>Common Forms</th>
<th>Common Ways Taken</th>
<th>DEA Schedule / Legal Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gamma-hydroxybutyrate or sodium oxybate (Xyrem®)</td>
<td>G, Georgia Home Boy, Goop, Grievous Bodily Harm, Liquid Ecstasy, Liquid X, Soap, Scoop</td>
<td>Colorless liquid, white powder</td>
<td>Ingested (often combined with alcohol or other beverages)</td>
<td>Schedule I / Illegal; GHB products such as Xyrem®, are Schedule III substances</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Uses & Possible Health Effects

**Short-term Symptoms of Use**
- Euphoria, drowsiness, decreased anxiety, confusion, memory loss, hallucinations, excited and aggressive behavior, nausea, vomiting, unconsciousness, seizures, slowed heart rate and breathing, lower body temperature, coma, and death.

**Long-term Consequences of Use and Health Effects**
- Unknown.

**Other Health-related Issues**
- Sometimes used as a date rape drug.

**In Combination with Alcohol**
- Nausea, problems with breathing, greatly increased depressant effects.

**Withdrawal Symptoms**
- Insomnia, anxiety, tremors, sweating, increased heart rate and blood pressure, and psychosis.

**Medical Use**
- Sodium Osybate (Xyrem®) is approved for use in the treatment of narcolepsy, a disorder that causes daytime “sleep attacks.”

#### Treatment Options

**Medications**
- Benzodiazepines

**Behavioral Therapies**
- More research is needed to determine if behavioral therapies can be used to treat GHB addiction.

#### Statistics as of 2015

**Prevalence**
- *Lifetime:* 1.2 million persons (0.4%) aged 12 or older have used GHB in their lifetime.
- *Past Year:* 136,000 persons (0.1%) aged 12 or older have used GHB in the past year.

**Average Age of Initiation**
- Sedatives in general: 28.3

---

iii. Sources: NIDA, (2016).
**Heroin**

An opioid drug made from morphine, a natural substance extracted from the seed pod of the Asian opium poppy plant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Commercial Names</th>
<th>Street Names</th>
<th>Common Forms</th>
<th>Common Ways Taken</th>
<th>DEA Schedule / Legal Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No commercial uses</td>
<td>Brown sugar, China White, Dope, H, Horse, Junk, Skag, Skunk, Smack, White Horse With OTC cold medicine and antihistamine: Cheese</td>
<td>White or brownish powder, or black sticky substance known as “black tar heroin”</td>
<td>Injected, smoked, snorted</td>
<td>Schedule I / Illegal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Uses & Possible Health Effects

**Short-term Symptoms of Use**
- Euphoria; warm flushing of skin; dry mouth; heavy feeling in the hands and feet; clouded thinking, impaired coordination; alternate wakeful and drowsy states; itching; nausea; vomiting; slowed breathing and heart rate; and fatal overdose.

**Long-term Consequences of Use and Health Effects**
- Collapsed veins; abscesses (swollen tissue with pus); infection of the lining and valves in the heart (endocarditis); constipation and stomach cramps; liver or kidney disease; and pneumonia.

**Other Health-related Issues**

**In Combination with Alcohol**
- Dangerous slowdown of heart rate and breathing, coma, and death.

**Withdrawal Symptoms**
- Restlessness, muscle and bone pain, insomnia, diarrhea, vomiting, and cold flashes with goose bumps.

### Treatment Options

**Medications**
- Methadone, Buprenorphine, and Naltrexone.

**Behavioral Therapies**
- Contingency management, or motivational incentives
- 12-Step facilitation therapy

### Statistics as of 2015

**Prevalence**
- **Lifetime:** 5.1 million persons (1.9%) aged 12 or older have used heroin in their lifetime.
  - Heroin needle use: 2.2 million persons (0.8%)
  - Smoked heroin: 2.0 million persons (0.7%)
  - Sniffed or snorted heroin: 3.3 million persons (1.2%)
- **Past Year:** 828,000 persons (0.3%) aged 12 or older have used heroin in the past year.

**Average Age of Initiation**
- 25.4

---


iii. Sources: NIDA, (2016).
Inhalants

Solvents, aerosols, and gases found in household products such as spray paints, markers, glues, and cleaning fluids; also nitrites (e.g., amyl nitrite), which are prescription medications for chest pain. Precise categorization of inhalants is difficult, however one classification system lists four general categories of inhalants — volatile solvents, aerosols, gases, and nitrites — based on the forms in which they are often found in household, industrial, and medical products.¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Commercial Names</th>
<th>Street Names</th>
<th>Common Forms</th>
<th>Common Ways Taken</th>
<th>DEA Schedule / Legal Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solvents (paint thinners, gasoline, glues, organic solvents, nail polish remover); gases (butane, propane, aerosol propellants), nitrous oxide, hair spray; and nitrites (isoamyl, isobutyl, and cyclohexyl)</td>
<td>Poppers, snappers, whippets, laughing gas</td>
<td>Paint thinners or removers, degreasers, dry-cleaning fluids, gasoline, lighter fluids, correction fluids, permanent markers, electronics cleaners and freeze sprays, glue, spray paint, hair or deodorant sprays, fabric protector sprays, aerosol computer cleaning products, vegetable oil sprays, butane lighters, propane tanks, whipped cream aerosol containers, refrigerant gases, ether, chloroform, halothane, nitrous oxide</td>
<td>Inhaled through the nose or mouth</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Uses & Possible Health Effects

**Short-term Symptoms of Use**

While symptoms vary by chemical, potential symptoms include: confusion; nausea or vomiting; slurred speech; loss of coordination; euphoria; dizziness; drowsiness; loss of inhibition, lightheadedness, hallucinations/delusions; headaches; sudden sniffing death due to heart failure (from butane, propane, and other chemicals in aerosols); death from asphyxiation, suffocation, convulsions or seizures, coma, or choking.

**Nitrites:** Enlarged blood vessels, enhanced sexual pleasure, increased heart rate, brief sensation of heat and excitement, dizziness, and headache.

**Long-term Consequences of Use and Health Effects**

Liver and kidney damage; damage to cardiovascular and nervous systems; bone marrow damage; nerve damage; and brain damage from lack of oxygen that can cause problems with thinking, movement, vision, and hearing.

**Nitrites:** Increased risk of pneumonia.

**Other Health-related Issues**


**In Combination with Alcohol**²

Intensifies the toxic effects of inhalants; serious mental impairment can result, leading the user to engage in deadly behavior; and may lead to coma or death.

**Nitrites:** Dangerously low blood pressure.

**Withdrawal Symptoms**

Nausea, loss of appetite, sweating, tics, problems sleeping, and mood changes.

**Medical Use**³

Nitrous oxide only, for anesthesia: amyl nitrate indicated for rapid relief of angina pectoris.

### Treatment Options

**Medications**

There are no FDA-approved medications to treat inhalant addiction.

---

¹ Source: NIDA, (2016).
² Sources: NIDA, (2016).
³ Source: Inhalant Addiction Treatment, (n.d.).
⁵ Source: NIDA, (2016).
### Inhalants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioral Therapies</th>
<th>More research is needed to determine if behavioral therapies can be used to treat inhalant addiction.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevalence</th>
<th>Statistics as of 2015&lt;sup&gt;vi&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lifetime:</strong> 25.8 million persons (9.6%) aged 12 or older have used inhalants in their lifetime.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Amyl Nitrite, Poppers, Locker Room Odorizers, or Rush: 7.4 million persons (2.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Computer Cleaner/Air Duster: 3.0 million persons (1.1 %)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Correction Fluid, Degreaser, or Cleaning Fluid: 1.6 million persons (0.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Felt-Tip Pens, Felt-Tip Markers, or Magic Markers: 6.8 million persons (2.5 %)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gasoline or Lighter Fluid: 3.2 million persons (1.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Glue, Shoe Polish, or Toluene: 3.2 million persons (1.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Halothane, Ether, or Other Anesthetics: 809,000 persons (0.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lacquer Thinner or Other Paint Solvents: 1.5 million persons (0.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lighter Gases (Butane, Propane): 767,000 persons (0.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Nitrous Oxide or Whippits: 12.4 million persons (4.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Spray Paints: 1.9 million persons (0.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other Aerosol Sprays: 1.5 million persons (0.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Past Year:</strong> 1.8 million persons (0.7%) aged 12 or older have used inhalants in the past year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Average Age of Initiation | 17.4 |

<sup>vi</sup> Source: CBHSQ (2016).
Ketamine

A dissociative drug, hallucinogen, which causes the user to feel detached from reality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Commercial Names</th>
<th>Street Names</th>
<th>Common Forms</th>
<th>Common Ways Taken</th>
<th>DEA Schedule / Legal Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ketalar</td>
<td>Cat Valium, K, Special K, Vitamin K</td>
<td>Liquid, white powder</td>
<td>Injected, snorted, smoked (powder added to tobacco or marijuana cigarettes), ingested</td>
<td>Schedule III / Legal by prescription only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Uses & Possible Health Effects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short-term Symptoms of Use</th>
<th>Problems with attention, learning, and memory; dreamlike states, hallucinations; sedation; confusion and problems speaking; memory loss; stiffening of the muscles and numbness; problems moving, to the point of being immobile; increased blood pressure; nausea; unconsciousness; slowed breathing (respiratory depression) that can lead to death.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-term Consequences of Use and Health Effects</td>
<td>Ulcers and pain in the bladder; kidney problems; stomach pain; depression; flashbacks; and poor memory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Health-related Issues</td>
<td>Sometimes used as a date rape drug. Risk of HIV, hepatitis, and other infectious diseases from shared needles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Combination with Alcohol</td>
<td>Increased risk of adverse effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal Symptoms</td>
<td>Unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Use</td>
<td>Used as an anesthetic agent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Treatment Options**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medications</th>
<th>There are no FDA-approved medications to treat addiction to ketamine or other dissociative drugs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Therapies</td>
<td>More research is needed to determine if behavioral therapies can be used to treat addiction to dissociative drugs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statistics as of 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevalence</th>
<th>Lifetime: 3.0 million persons (1.1%) aged 12 or older have used ketamine in their lifetime. Past Year: Data not collected.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Age of Initiation</td>
<td>Hallucinogens in general: 19.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**LSD (lysergic acid diethylamide)**

A hallucinogen manufactured from lysergic acid, which is found in ergot, a fungus that grows on rye and other grains. LSD is an abbreviation of the scientific name lysergic acid diethylamide.¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Commercial Names</th>
<th>Street Names</th>
<th>Common Forms</th>
<th>Common Ways Taken</th>
<th>DEA Schedule / Legal Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No commercial uses</td>
<td>Acid, Blotter, Blue Heaven, Cubes, Microdot, Yellow Sunshine, A, Windowpane</td>
<td>Tablet; capsule; clear liquid; small, decorated squares of absorbent paper that liquid has been added to</td>
<td>Ingested, absorbed through mouth tissues (paper squares)</td>
<td>Schedule I / Illegal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Uses & Possible Health Effects

**Short-term Symptoms of Use**
- Rapid mood swings; distortion of a person’s ability to recognize reality, think rationally, or communicate with others; raised blood pressure, heart rate, body temperature; dizziness and insomnia; loss of appetite; dry mouth; sweating; numbness; weakness; tremors; enlarged pupils; and impulsive behavior.

**Long-term Consequences of Use and Health Effects**
- Frightening flashbacks (called Hallucinogen Persisting Perception Disorder [HPPD]); ongoing visual disturbances, disorganized thinking, paranoia, mood swings; and prolonged depression.

**Other Health-related Issues**
- Unknown.

**In Combination with Alcohol**
- May decrease the perceived effects of alcohol.

**Withdrawal Symptoms**
- Unknown.

### Treatment Options

**Medications**
- There are no FDA-approved medications to treat addiction to LSD or other hallucinogens.

**Behavioral Therapies**
- More research is needed to determine if behavioral therapies can be used to treat addiction to hallucinogens.

### Statistics as of 2015

**Prevalence**
- *Lifetime:* 25.3 million persons (9.5%) aged 12 or older have used LSD in their lifetime.
- *Past Year:* 1.5 million persons (0.6%) aged 12 or older have used LSD in the past year.

**Average Age of Initiation**
- 19.6

---

¹ Source: NIDA, (2016).


Marijuana (Cannabis)

Marijuana is Cannabis sativa, a plant with psychoactive properties. The main psychoactive (mind-altering) chemical in marijuana is delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol, or THC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Commercial Names</th>
<th>Street Names</th>
<th>Common Forms</th>
<th>Common Ways Taken</th>
<th>DEA Schedule / Legal Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Various brand names in states where the sale of marijuana is legal</td>
<td>Marijuana: Blunt, Bud, Dope, Ganja, Grass, Green, Herb, Joint, Mary Jane, Pot, Reefer, Sinsemilla, Skunk, Smoke, Trees, Weed Hashish: Boom, Gangster, Hash, Hemp, THC</td>
<td>Greenish-gray mixture of dried, shredded leaves, stems, seeds, and/or flowers; resin (hashish) or sticky, black liquid (hash oil)</td>
<td>Smoked, ingested (mixed in food or brewed as tea)</td>
<td>Schedule I/ Illegal for both marijuana and THC, the active ingredient in marijuana, which is listed separately from marijuana. Marinol®, containing THC as synthetically-derived dronabinol, is an FDA-approved drug product, controlled in Schedule III / Legal by prescription only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Uses & Possible Health Effects**

**Short-term Symptoms of Use**
Enhanced sensory perception and euphoria followed by drowsiness/relaxation; disinhibition, increased sociability; dry mouth; slowed reaction time; time distortion; impaired balance and coordination; increased heart rate and appetite; decreased blood pressure; problems with learning and memory; heightened imagination, hallucinations and delusions; anxiety; panic attacks; and psychosis.

**Long-term Consequences of Use and Health Effects**
Mental health problems, chronic cough, frequent respiratory infections, increased risk for cancer, and suppression of the immune system.

**Other Health-related Issues**
Breathing problems and increased risk of cancer of the head, neck, lungs, and respiratory tract.
Youth: Possible loss of IQ points when repeated use begins in adolescence.
Pregnancy-related: Babies born with problems with attention, memory, and problem solving.

**In Combination with Alcohol**
Increased heart rate, blood pressure; further slowing of mental processing and reaction time.

**Withdrawal Symptoms**
Irritability, trouble sleeping, decreased appetite, anxiety.

**Medical Uses**
Marinol® is indicated for the treatment of:
- Anorexia associated with weight loss in patients with AIDS; and
- Nausea and vomiting associated with cancer chemotherapy in patients who have failed to respond adequately to conventional antiemetic treatments.

**Treatment Options**

**Medications**
There are no FDA-approved medications to treat marijuana addiction.

**Behavioral Therapies**
- Behavioral treatments tested with adolescents
- Cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT)
- Contingency management, or motivational incentives
- Motivational Enhancement Therapy (MET)
| Prevalence    | **Lifetime:** 117.9 million persons (44.0%) aged 12 or older have used marijuana in their lifetime.  
**Past Year:** 36.0 million persons (13.5%) aged 12 or older have used marijuana in the past year. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Age of Initiation</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


ii. As of this writing, 25 states and the District of Columbia have legalized medical marijuana use, four states have legalized retail marijuana sales, and the District of Columbia has legalized personal use and home cultivation (both medical and recreational). See Chapter 3 - Prevention Programs and Policies for more detail on this issue.


MDMA (Ecstasy)

A synthetic, psychoactive drug that has similarities to both the stimulant amphetamine and the hallucinogen mescaline. MDMA is an abbreviation of the scientific name 3,4-methylenedioxy-methamphetamine.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Commercial Names</th>
<th>Street Names</th>
<th>Common Forms</th>
<th>Common Ways Taken</th>
<th>DEA Schedule / Legal Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No commercial uses</td>
<td>Adam, Clarity, Eve, Lover’s Speed, Peace, Uppers, E, X, XTC, Molly</td>
<td>Colorful tablets with imprinted logos, capsules, powder, liquid</td>
<td>Ingested, snorted</td>
<td>Schedule I / Illegal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Uses & Possible Health Effects**

**Short-term Symptoms of Use**
Lowered inhibition and coordination; sleep disturbances; enhanced sensory perception; confusion; depression; sleep problems; anxiety; increased heart rate and blood pressure; muscle tension; teeth clenching; increased motor activity, alertness; nausea; blurred vision; faintness; chills or sweating; sharp rise in body temperature leading to liver, kidney, or heart failure and death.

**Long-term Consequences of Use and Health Effects**
Long-lasting confusion; depression; damage to the serotonin system; problems with attention, memory, and sleep; increased anxiety, impulsiveness, and aggression; loss of appetite; and less interest in sex.

**Other Health-related Issues**
Unknown.

**In Combination with Alcohol**
May increase the risk of cell and organ damage.

**Withdrawal Symptoms**
Fatigue, loss of appetite, depression, and trouble concentrating.

**Treatment Options**

**Medications**
There is conflicting evidence about whether MDMA is addictive. There are no FDA-approved medications to treat MDMA addiction.

**Behavioral Therapies**
More research is needed to determine if behavioral therapies can be used to treat potential MDMA addiction.

**Statistics as of 2015**

**Prevalence**
- Lifetime: 18.3 million persons (6.8%) aged 12 or older have used ecstasy in their lifetime.
- Past Year: 2.6 million persons (1.0%) aged 12 or older have used ecstasy in the past year.

**Average Age of Initiation**
20.7

---


Mescaline (Peyote)

A hallucinogen found in disk-shaped “buttons” in the crown of several cacti, including peyote, and can also be created synthetically.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Commercial Names</th>
<th>Street Names</th>
<th>Common Forms</th>
<th>Common Ways Taken</th>
<th>DEA Schedule / Legal Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No commercial uses</td>
<td>Buttons, Cactus, Mesc, Peyote</td>
<td>Fresh or dried buttons, capsule</td>
<td>Ingested (chewed or soaked in water and drunk) or smoked</td>
<td>Schedule I / Illegal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Uses & Possible Health Effects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short-term Symptoms of Use</th>
<th>Enhanced perception and feeling; hallucinations; euphoria; anxiety; increased body temperature, heart rate, blood pressure; sweating; headaches; and impaired motor coordination.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-term Consequences of Use and Health Effects</td>
<td>Unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Health-related Issues</td>
<td>Unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Combination with Alcohol</td>
<td>Unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal Symptoms</td>
<td>Unknown.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Treatment Options**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medications</th>
<th>There are no FDA-approved medications to treat addiction to mescaline or other hallucinogens.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Therapies</td>
<td>More research is needed to determine if behavioral therapies can be used to treat addiction to hallucinogens.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statistics as of 2015**

| Prevalence | Lifetime:  
• Mescaline: 8.0 million persons (3.0%) aged 12 or older have used mescaline in their lifetime.  
• Peyote: 5.5 million persons (2.0%) aged 12 or older have used peyote in their lifetime.  
Past Year: 4.7 million persons (1.8%) aged 12 or older have used hallucinogens in the past year. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Age of Initiation</td>
<td>Hallucinogens in general: 19.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Methamphetamine

**An extremely addictive stimulant amphetamine drug.**¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Commercial Names</th>
<th>Street Names</th>
<th>Common Forms</th>
<th>Common Ways Taken</th>
<th>DEA Schedule / Legal Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desoxyn®</td>
<td>Crank, Chalk, Crystal, Fire, Glass, Go Fast, Ice, Meth, Speed</td>
<td>White powder or pill; crystal meth looks like pieces of glass or shiny blue-white “rocks” of different sizes</td>
<td>Ingested, snorted, smoked, injected</td>
<td>Schedule II / Illegal (except for Desoxyn® by prescription only)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Uses & Possible Health Effects

**Short-term Symptoms of Use**
Increased wakefulness and physical activity; decreased appetite; hyperthermia; increased breathing, heart rate, blood pressure, temperature; irregular heartbeat; and death from cardiac arrest, stroke, or suicide.

**Long-term Consequences of Use and Health Effects**
Anxiety, confusion, insomnia, mood problems, violent behavior, paranoia, hallucinations, delusions, weight loss, severe dental problems (“meth mouth”), memory loss, intense itching leading to skin sores from scratching and high-risk for addiction.

**Other Health-related Issues**
Sharing needles increases the risk of contracting infectious diseases like HIV and Hepatitis B and C.
Pregnancy-related: premature delivery; separation of the placenta from the uterus; low birth weight; lethargy; heart and brain problems.

**In Combination with Alcohol**
Masks the depressant effect of alcohol, increasing risk of alcohol overdose; may increase blood pressure and jitters.

**Withdrawal Symptoms**
Depression, anxiety, tiredness.

**Medical Uses**
Desoxyn® is indicated for the treatment of:
- Attention Deficit Disorder with Hyperactivity
- Exogenous Obesity

#### Treatment Options

**Medications**
There are no FDA-approved medications to treat methamphetamine addiction.

**Behavioral Therapies**
- Cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT)
- Contingency management or motivational incentives
- The Matrix Model
- 12-Step facilitation therapy

#### Statistics as of 2015

**Prevalence**
- Lifetime: 14.5 million persons (5.4%) aged 12 or older have used methamphetamine in their lifetime.
- Methamphetamine needle use: 1.9 million persons (0.7%)
- Past Year: 1.7 million persons (0.6%) aged 12 or older have used methamphetamine in the past year.

**Average Age of Initiation**
25.8

---

¹ Source: NIDA, (2016).


# Over-the-counter Cough/Cold Medicines (Dextromethorphan or DXM)

*Psychoactive when taken in higher-than-recommended amounts.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Commercial Names</th>
<th>Street Names</th>
<th>Common Forms</th>
<th>Common Ways Taken</th>
<th>DEA Schedule / Legal Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Various (many brand names include “DM”)</td>
<td>Robotripping, Robo, Triple C</td>
<td>Suspension, capsule</td>
<td>Ingested</td>
<td>Cough medicines with codeine are Schedule V. DXM is not Scheduled and is an over-the-counter medication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Uses & Possible Health Effects

| Short-term Symptoms of Use | Euphoria; slurred speech; increased heart rate, blood pressure, and body temperature; numbness; dizziness; nausea; vomiting; confusion; hallucinations; paranoia; agitation; altered visual perceptions; loss of coordination, problems with movement; buildup of excess acid in body fluids; liver damage; seizures; and coma. |
| Long-term Consequences of Use and Health Effects | Unknown. |
| Other Health-related Issues | Breathing problems, seizures, and increased heart rate may occur from other ingredients in cough/cold medicines. |
| In Combination with Alcohol | Increased risk of adverse effects. |
| Withdrawal Symptoms | Unknown. |
| Medical Use | Used for cough suppression. |

## Treatment Options

| Medications | There are no FDA-approved medications to treat addiction to over-the-counter cough/cold medicines. |
| Behavioral Therapies | More research is needed to determine if behavioral therapies can be used to treat addiction to over-the-counter cough/cold medicines. |

## Statistics as of 2015

| Prevalence | Lifetime: Data not collected. |
|            | Past Year: Data not collected. |
| Average Age of Initiation | Stimulants in general: 22.3 |

---


### PCP (Phencyclidine)

*A dissociative drug developed as an intravenous anesthetic that has been discontinued due to serious adverse effects. Dissociative drugs are hallucinogens that cause the user to feel detached from reality.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Commercial Names</th>
<th>Street Names</th>
<th>Common Forms</th>
<th>Common Ways Taken</th>
<th>DEA Schedule / Legal Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No commercial uses</td>
<td>Angel Dust, Boat, Hog, Love Boat, Peace Pill, Angel Mist</td>
<td>White or colored powder, tablet, or capsule; clear liquid</td>
<td>Injected, snorted, ingested, smoked (powder added to mint, parsley, oregano, or marijuana)</td>
<td>Schedule I, II / Illegal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Uses & Possible Health Effects
| Short-term Symptoms of Use | Delusions, hallucinations, paranoia, problems thinking, a sense of distance from one’s environment, anxiety.  
*Low doses*: slight increase in pulse and breathing rate; increased blood pressure and heart rate; shallow breathing; face redness and sweating; numbness of the hands or feet; and loss of coordination.  
*High doses*: lowered blood pressure, heart rate, and breathing; nausea; vomiting; blurred vision; flicking up and down of the eyes; drooling; loss of balance; dizziness; violence; suicidal thoughts; seizures, coma, and death. |
| Long-term Consequences of Use and Health Effects | Memory loss, problems with speech and thinking, depression, psychosis, weight loss, anxiety. |
| Other Health-related Issues | PCP has been linked to self-injury.  
Risk of HIV, hepatitis, and other infectious diseases from shared needles. |
| In Combination with Alcohol | Increased risk of coma. |
| Withdrawal Symptoms | Headaches and sweating. |

### Treatment Options

**Medications**

There are no FDA-approved medications to treat addiction to PCP or other dissociative drugs.

**Behavioral Therapies**

More research is needed to determine if behavioral therapies can be used to treat addiction to dissociative drugs.

### Statistics as of 2015

**Prevalence**

*Lifetime*: 6.3 million persons (2.4%) aged 12 or older have used PCP in their lifetime.  
*Past Year*: 120,000 persons (<0.1%) aged 12 or older have used PCP in the past year.

**Average Age of Initiation**

15.3

---


Prescription Opioids

Pain relievers with an origin similar to that of heroin. Opioids can cause euphoria and are sometimes used nonmedically, leading to overdose deaths.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Commercial Names</th>
<th>Street Names</th>
<th>Common Forms</th>
<th>Common Ways Taken</th>
<th>DEA Schedule / Legal Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Codeine (various brand names)</td>
<td>Captain Cody, Cody, Lean, Schoolboy, Sizurp, Purple Drank With glutethimide: Doors &amp; Fours, Loads, Pancakes and Syrup</td>
<td>Tablet, capsule, liquid</td>
<td>Injected, ingested (often mixed with soda and flavorings)</td>
<td>Schedule II, III, V / Legal by prescription only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fentanyl (Actiq®, Duragesic®, Sublimaze®)</td>
<td>Apache, China Girl, China White, Dance Fever, Friend, Goodfella, Jackpot, Murder 8, Tango and Cash, TNT</td>
<td>Lozenge, sublingual tablet, film, buccal tablet</td>
<td>Injected, smoked, snorted</td>
<td>Schedule II / Legal by prescription only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrocodone or dihydrocodeinone (Vicodin®, Lortab®, Lorcet®, and others)</td>
<td>Vike, Watson-387</td>
<td>Capsule, liquid, tablet</td>
<td>Ingested, snorted, injected</td>
<td>Schedule II / Legal by prescription only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydromorphone (Dilaudid®)</td>
<td>D, Dillies, Footballs, Juice, Smack</td>
<td>Liquid, suppository</td>
<td>Injected, rectally inserted</td>
<td>Schedule II / Legal by prescription only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meperidine (Demerol®)</td>
<td>Demmies, Pain Killer</td>
<td>Tablet, liquid</td>
<td>Ingested, snorted, injected</td>
<td>Schedule II / Legal by prescription only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methadone (Dolophine®)</td>
<td>Amidone, Fizzies With MDMA: Chocolate Chip Cookies</td>
<td>Tablet</td>
<td>Ingested, injected</td>
<td>Schedule II / Legal by prescription only for pain indication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphine, various brand names</td>
<td>M, Miss Emma, Monkey, White Stuff</td>
<td>Tablet, liquid, capsule, suppository</td>
<td>Ingested, injected, smoked</td>
<td>Schedule II, III / Legal by prescription only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxycodone (OxyContin®, Percodan®, Percocet®, and others)</td>
<td>O.C., Oxycet, Oxycotton, Oxy, Hillbilly Heroin, Percs</td>
<td>Capsule, liquid, tablet</td>
<td>Ingested, snorted, injected</td>
<td>Schedule II / Legal by prescription only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxymorphone (Opana®)</td>
<td>Biscuits, Blue Heaven, Blues, Mrs. O, O Bomb, Octagons, Stop Signs</td>
<td>Tablet</td>
<td>Ingested, snorted, injected</td>
<td>Schedule II / Legal by prescription only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Prescription Opioids

### Uses & Possible Health Effects

| Short-term Symptoms of Use                                                                 | Uses & Possible Health Effects
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pain relief, drowsiness, nausea, constipation, altered judgment and decision making, sedation, euphoria, confusion, clammy skin, muscle weakness, slowed breathing, lowered heart rate and blood pressure, coma, heart failure, and death. For oxycodone specifically: Pain relief, sedation, respiratory depression, constipation, papillary constriction, and cough suppression. For fentanyl specifically: Fentanyl is about 100 times more potent than morphine as an analgesic and results in frequent overdoses.</td>
<td>Use for pain relief. Methadone is also used to treat opioid use disorders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long-term Consequences of Use and Health Effects</th>
<th>Other Health-related Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heart or respiratory problems. Extended or chronic use of oxycodone containing acetaminophen may cause severe liver damage. Abuse of opioid medications can lead to psychological dependence.</td>
<td>Pregnancy-related: Miscarriage, low birth weight, neonatal abstinence syndrome. Older adults: higher risk of accidental misuse or abuse because many older adults have multiple prescriptions, increasing the risk of drug-drug interactions, and breakdown of drugs slows with age; also, many older adults are treated with prescription medications for pain. Risk of HIV, hepatitis, and other infectious diseases from shared needles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Combination with Alcohol</th>
<th>Withdrawal Symptoms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dangerous slowing of heart rate and breathing leading to coma or death.</td>
<td>Restlessness, anxiety, muscle and bone pain, insomnia, diarrhea, vomiting, cold flashes with goose bumps, and muscle tremors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medical Use</th>
<th>Treatment Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Used for pain relief. Methadone is also used to treat opioid use disorders.</td>
<td>Behavioral therapies that have helped treat addiction to heroin may be useful in treating prescription opioid addiction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Statistics as of 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevalence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lifetime: 36 million persons (13.6%) aged 12 or older have misused pain relievers in their lifetime. Past Year: 12.5 million persons (4.7%) aged 12 or older have misused pain relievers in the past year. OxyContin®: 1.7 million persons (0.7%) aged 12 or older have used OxyContin® non-medically in the past year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Age of Initiation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prescription Opioids: 25.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

# Prescription Sedatives (Tranquilizers, Depressants)

*Medications that slow brain activity, which makes them useful for treating anxiety and sleep problems.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Commercial Names</th>
<th>Street Names</th>
<th>Common Forms</th>
<th>Common Ways Taken</th>
<th>DEA Schedule / Legal Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbiturates: pentobarbital (Nembutal®), phenobarbital (Luminal®)</td>
<td>Barbs, Phennies, Red Birds, Reds, Tooies, Yellow Jackets, Yellows</td>
<td>Pill, capsule, liquid</td>
<td>Ingested, injected</td>
<td>Schedule II, III, IV / Legal by prescription only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzodiazepines: alprazolam (Xanax®), chlorodiazepoxide (Limbitrol®), diazepam (Valium®), lorazepam (Ativan®), triazolam (Halicon®)</td>
<td>Candy, Downers, Sleeping Pills, Tranks</td>
<td>Pill, capsule, liquid</td>
<td>Ingested, snorted</td>
<td>Schedule IV / Legal by prescription only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleep Medications: eszopiclone (Lunesta®), zaleplon (Sonata®), zolpidem (Ambien®)</td>
<td>Forget-me Pill, Mexican Valium, R2, Roche, Roofies, Roofinol, Rope, Rophies</td>
<td>Pill, capsule, liquid</td>
<td>Ingested, snorted</td>
<td>Schedule IV / Legal by prescription only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Uses & Possible Health Effects

**Short-term Symptoms of Use**
Drowsiness, sedation; slurred speech; poor concentration, confusion, dizziness; clammy skin; impaired judgment, coordination and memory; reduced anxiety; lowered blood pressure; slowed breathing and central nervous system; coma, and death.

**Long-term Consequences of Use and Health Effects**
Increased risk of respiratory distress.

**Other Health-related Issues**
Sleep medications are sometimes used as date rape drugs. Risk of HIV, hepatitis, and other infectious diseases from shared needles.

**In Combination with Alcohol**
Dangerous slowdown of heart rate and breathing, coma, and death.

**Withdrawal Symptoms**
Must be discussed with a health care professional; barbiturate withdrawal can cause a serious abstinence syndrome that may even include seizures.

**Medical Use**
For tranquilization, sedation, and sleep.

## Treatment Options

**Medications**
There are no FDA-approved medications to treat addiction to prescription sedatives; lowering the dose over time must be done with the help of a health care professional.

**Behavioral Therapies**
More research is needed to determine if behavioral therapies can be used to treat addiction to prescription sedatives.

## Statistics as of 2015

**Prevalence**
*Lifetime:* Data not collected.
*Past Year:*
  - 1.5 million persons (0.6%) aged 12 or older have misused sedatives in the past year.
  - 6.1 million persons (2.3%) aged 12 or older have misused tranquilizers in the past year.

**Average Age of Initiation**
Sedatives: 28.3
Tranquilizers: 25.9

---

### Prescription Stimulants

*Medications that increase alertness, attention, energy, blood pressure, heart rate, and breathing rate.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Commercial Names</th>
<th>Street Names</th>
<th>Common Forms</th>
<th>Common Ways Taken</th>
<th>DEA Schedule / Legal Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amphetamine (Adderall®, Benzedrine®)</td>
<td>Bennies, Black Beauties, Crosses, Hearts, LA Turnaround, Speed, Truck Drivers, Uppers</td>
<td>Tablet, capsule</td>
<td>Ingested, snorted, smoked, injected</td>
<td>Schedule II / Legal by prescription only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methylphenidate (Concerta®, Ritalin®)</td>
<td>JIF, MPH, R-ball, Skippy, The Smart Drug, Vitamin R</td>
<td>Liquid, tablet, chewable tablet, capsule</td>
<td>Ingested, snorted, smoked, injected, chewed</td>
<td>Schedule II / Legal by prescription only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Uses & Possible Health Effects

**Short-term Symptoms of Use**

- Increased alertness, attention, energy; euphoria; insomnia, wakefulness; increased blood pressure and body temperature, metabolism, and heart rate; narrowed blood vessels; increased blood sugar; agitation; opened-up breathing passages; and violent and erratic behavior.
- High doses: dangerously high body temperature and irregular heartbeat; seizures; and death from heart failure or suicide.
- For amphetamines specifically: Paranoia, picking at the skin, preoccupation with one’s own thoughts, and auditory and visual hallucinations.

**Long-term Consequences of Use and Health Effects**

- Heart problems, psychosis, anger, paranoia, addiction, and chronic sleep problems.

**Other Health-related Issues**

- Risk of HIV, hepatitis, and other infectious diseases from shared needles.

**In Combination with Alcohol**

- Masks the depressant action of alcohol, increasing risk of alcohol overdose; may increase blood pressure and jitters.

**Withdrawal Symptoms**

- Depression, tiredness, and sleep problems.

**Medical Use**

- For narcolepsy, obesity, and hyperkinesis.

#### Treatment Options

**Medications**

- There are no FDA-approved medications to treat stimulant addiction.

**Behavioral Therapies**

- Behavioral therapies that have helped treat addiction to cocaine or methamphetamine may be useful in treating prescription stimulant addiction.

#### Statistics as of 2015

**Prevalence**

- *Lifetime:* Data not collected.
- *Past Year:* 5.3 million (2.0%) aged 12 or older have misused stimulants in the past year.

**Average Age of Initiation**

- Stimulants in general: 22.3

---

Psilocybin

A hallucinogen in certain types of mushrooms that grow in parts of South America, Mexico, and the United States.¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Commercial Names</th>
<th>Street Names</th>
<th>Common Forms</th>
<th>Common Ways Taken</th>
<th>DEA Schedule / Legal Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No commercial uses</td>
<td>Little Smoke, Magic Mushrooms, Purple Passion, Shrooms</td>
<td>Fresh or dried mushrooms with long, slender stems topped by caps with dark gills</td>
<td>Ingested (eaten, brewed as tea, or added to other foods)</td>
<td>Schedule I / Illegal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Uses & Possible Health Effects**²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short-term Symptoms of Use</th>
<th>Hallucinations, altered perception of time, inability to tell fantasy from reality, panic, muscle relaxation or weakness, loss of coordination, enlarged pupils, nausea, vomiting, and drowsiness.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-term Consequences of Use and Health Effects</td>
<td>Risk of flashbacks, psychosis, and memory problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Health-related Issues</td>
<td>Risk of poisoning if a poisonous mushroom is accidentally used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Combination with Alcohol</td>
<td>May decrease the perceived effects of alcohol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal Symptoms</td>
<td>Unknown.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Treatment Options**³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medications</th>
<th>It is not known whether psilocybin is addictive. There are no FDA-approved medications to treat addiction to psilocybin or other hallucinogens.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Therapies</td>
<td>More research is needed to determine if psilocybin is addictive and whether behavioral therapies can be used to treat addiction to this or other hallucinogens.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statistics as of 2014**⁴

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevalence</th>
<th>Lifetime: 22.8 million persons (8.5%) aged 12 or older have used psilocybin in their lifetime. Past Year: Data not collected.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Age of Initiation</td>
<td>Hallucinogens in general: 19.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

¹ Source: NIDA, (2016).
**Rohypnol® (Flunitrazepam)**

A benzodiazepine chemically similar to prescription sedatives such as Valium® and Xanax®. Teens and young adults tend to abuse this drug at bars, nightclubs, concerts, and parties. It has been used to commit sexual assaults due to its ability to sedate and incapacitate unsuspecting victims.¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Commercial Names</th>
<th>Street Names</th>
<th>Common Forms</th>
<th>Common Ways Taken</th>
<th>DEA Schedule / Legal Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flunitrazepam, Rohypnol®</td>
<td>Circles, Date Rape Drug, Forget Pill, Forget-Me Pill, La Rocha, Lunch Money, Mexican Valium, Mind Eraser, Pingus, R2, Reynolds, Rib, Roach, Roach 2, Roaches, Roachies, Roapies, Rochas Dos, Roofies, Rope, Rophies, Row-Shay, Ruffles, Trip-and-Fall, Wolfies</td>
<td>Tablet</td>
<td>Ingested (as a pill or as dissolved in a drink), snorted</td>
<td>Schedule IV / Rohypnol® is not approved for medical use in the United States; it is available as a prescription sleep aid in other countries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Uses & Possible Health Effects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short-term Symptoms of Use</th>
<th>Drowsiness, sedation, sleep; amnesia, blackout; decreased anxiety; muscle relaxation, impaired reaction time and motor coordination; impaired mental functioning and judgment; confusion; aggression; excitability; slurred speech; headache; slowed breathing and heart rate.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-term Consequences of Use and Health Effects</td>
<td>Physical and psychological dependence; cardiovascular collapse; and death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Health-related Issues</td>
<td>Sometimes used as a date rape drug.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Combination with Alcohol</td>
<td>Exaggerated intoxication, severe sedation, unconsciousness, and slowed heart rate and breathing, which can lead to death.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal Symptoms</td>
<td>Headache; muscle pain; extreme anxiety, tension, restlessness, confusion, irritability; numbness and tingling of hands or feet; hallucinations, delirium, convulsions, seizures, or shock.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Treatment Options**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medications</th>
<th>There are no FDA-approved medications to treat addiction to Rohypnol® or other prescription sedatives.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Therapies</td>
<td>More research is needed to determine if behavioral therapies can be used to treat addiction to Rohypnol® or other prescription sedatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statistics as of 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevalence</th>
<th>Lifetime: Data not collected.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Past Year: Data not collected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Age of Initiation</td>
<td>Sedatives in general: 23.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

¹ Source: NIDA, (2016).
³ Source: Rohypnol Abuse Treatment, (n.d.).
⁴ Source: NIDA, (2016).
Salvia

A dissociative drug (Salvia divinorum) that is an herb in the mint family native to southern Mexico. Dissociative drugs are hallucinogens that cause the user to feel detached from reality.¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Commercial Names</th>
<th>Street Names</th>
<th>Common Forms</th>
<th>Common Ways Taken</th>
<th>DEA Schedule / Legal Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sold legally in most states as Salvia divinorum</td>
<td>Magic mint, Maria Pastora, Sally-D, Shepherdess’s Herb, Diviner’s Sage</td>
<td>Fresh or dried leaves</td>
<td>Smoked, chewed, or brewed as tea</td>
<td>Not scheduled; labeled drug of concern by DEA / Illegal in some states</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Uses & Possible Health Effects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short-term Symptoms of Use</th>
<th>Short-lived but intense hallucinations; loss of coordination, dizziness, slurred speech; altered visual perception, mood, body sensations; mood swings, feelings of detachment from one’s body; sweating; uncontrollable laughter; and paranoia.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-term Consequences of Use and Health Effects</td>
<td>Unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Health-related Issues</td>
<td>Unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Combination with Alcohol</td>
<td>Unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal Symptoms</td>
<td>Unknown.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Treatment Options**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medications</th>
<th>It is not known whether salvia is addictive. There are no FDA-approved medications to treat addiction to salvia or other dissociative drugs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Therapies</td>
<td>More research is needed to determine if salvia is addictive, but behavioral therapies can be used to treat addiction to dissociative drugs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statistics as of 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevalence</th>
<th>Lifetime: 5.1 million persons (1.9%) aged 12 or older have used salvia in their lifetime. Past Year: Data not collected.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Age of Initiation</td>
<td>Hallucinogens in general: 19.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Source: NIDA, (2016).
### Steroids (Anabolic)

*Man-made substances used to treat conditions caused by low levels of steroid hormones in the body and abused to enhance athletic and sexual performance and physical appearance.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Commercial Names</th>
<th>Street Names</th>
<th>Common Forms</th>
<th>Common Ways Taken</th>
<th>DEA Schedule / Legal Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nandrolone (Oxandrin®), oxandrolone (Anadrol®), oxymetholone (Winstrol®), stanozolol (Durabolin®), testosterone cypionate (Depo-testosterone®)</td>
<td>Juice, Gym Candy, Pumpers, Roids</td>
<td>Tablet, capsule, liquid drops, gel, cream, patch, injectable solution</td>
<td>Injected, ingested, applied to skin</td>
<td>Schedule III / Legal by prescription only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Uses & Possible Health Effects

#### Short-term Symptoms of Use
- Headache, acne, fluid retention (especially in the hands and feet), oily skin, yellowing of the skin and whites of the eyes, and infection at the injection site.

#### Long-term Consequences of Use and Health Effects
- Kidney damage or failure; liver damage; high blood pressure, enlarged heart, or changes in cholesterol leading to increased risk of stroke or heart attack, even in young people; hostility and aggression; extreme mood swings; anger (“roid rage”); paranoid jealousy; extreme irritability; delusions; impaired judgment.

#### Other Health-related Issues
- Risk of HIV, hepatitis, and other infectious diseases from shared needles.
- **Males:** shrunken testicles, lowered sperm count, infertility, baldness, development of breasts, increased risk for prostate cancer.
- **Females:** facial hair, male-pattern baldness, menstrual cycle changes, enlargement of the clitoris, deepened voice.
- **Adolescents:** stunted growth.

### In Combination with Alcohol
- Increased risk of violent behavior.

### Withdrawal Symptoms
- Mood swings; tiredness; restlessness; loss of appetite; insomnia; lowered sex drive; depression, sometimes leading to suicide attempts.

### Medical Use
- Used to treat conditions caused by low levels of steroid hormones in the body.

### Treatment Options
- **Medications:** Hormone therapy
- **Behavioral Therapies:** More research is needed to determine if behavioral therapies can be used to treat steroid addiction.

### Statistics as of 2015
- **Prevalence:** Data not collected.
- **Average Age of Initiation:** Data not collected.

---

### Synthetic Cannabinoids ("K2"/"Spice")

A wide variety of herbal mixtures containing man-made cannabinoid chemicals related to THC in marijuana but often much stronger and more dangerous. Sometimes misleadingly called “synthetic marijuana” and marketed as a “natural,” “safe,” legal alternative to marijuana.¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Commercial Names</th>
<th>Street Names</th>
<th>Common Forms</th>
<th>Common Ways Taken</th>
<th>DEA Schedule / Legal Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No commercial uses</td>
<td>K2, Spice, Black Mamba, Bliss, Bombay Blue, Fake Weed, Fire, Genie, Moon Rocks, Skunk, Smacked, Yucatan, Zohai</td>
<td>Dried, shredded plant material that looks like potpourri and is sometimes sold as “incense”</td>
<td>Smoked, ingested (brewed as tea)</td>
<td>Schedule I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Uses & Possible Health Effects

| **Short-term Symptoms of Use** | Increased heart rate and blood pressure; vomiting; agitation; confusion; hallucinations, anxiety, paranoia; euphoria, relaxation; headache; numbness and tingling; reduced blood supply to the heart; heart attack; and seizures. |
| **Long-term Consequences of Use and Health Effects** | Kidney damage and psychosis. |
| **Other Health-related Issues** | Use of synthetic cannabinoids has led to an increase in emergency department visits in certain areas. |
| **In Combination with Alcohol** | Unknown. |
| **Withdrawal Symptoms** | Headaches, anxiety, depression, irritability. |

#### Treatment Options

| **Medications** | There are no FDA-approved medications to treat K2/Spice addiction. |
| **Behavioral Therapies** | More research is needed to determine if behavioral therapies can be used to treat synthetic cannabinoid addiction. |

#### Statistics as of 2015

| **Prevalence** | Data not collected. |
| **Average Age of Initiation** | Data not collected. |

---

¹ Source: NIDA, (2016).


### Synthetic Cathinones ("Bath Salts")

An emerging family of drugs containing one or more synthetic chemicals related to cathinone, a stimulant found naturally in the khat plant. Examples of such chemicals include mephedrone, methylone, and 3,4-methylenedioxyamphetamine (MDPV).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Commercial Names</th>
<th>Street Names</th>
<th>Common Forms</th>
<th>Common Ways Taken</th>
<th>DEA Schedule / Legal Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No commercial names for “bath salts”</td>
<td>Bloom, Cloud Nine, Cosmic Blast, Ivory Wave, Lunar Wave, Scarface, Vanilla Sky, White Lightning MDPV and mephedrone: Meow meow, MCAT, drone, plant feeder, bubbles, bliss, blue silk, cloud nine, energy-1, ivory wave, lunar wave, ocean burst, pure ivory, purple wave, red dove, snow leopard, stardust, vanilla sky, white dove, white night, and white lightning</td>
<td>White or brown crystalline powder sold in small plastic or foil packages labeled “not for human consumption” and sometimes sold as jewelry cleaner; tablet, capsule, liquid</td>
<td>Ingested, snorted, injected, ingested, smoked</td>
<td>Schedule I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Uses & Possible Health Effects

**Short-term Symptoms of Use**

- Increased heart rate and blood pressure; euphoria; increased sociability and sex drive; paranoia, agitation, and hallucinations; psychotic and violent behavior; nosebleeds; sweating; headaches; teeth grinding; nausea, vomiting; insomnia; irritability; dizziness; depression; suicidal thoughts; panic attacks; reduced motor control; and cloudy thinking.

**Long-term Consequences of Use and Health Effects**

- Breakdown of skeletal muscle tissue, kidney failure, psychosis, and death.

**Other Health-related Issues**

- Risk of HIV, hepatitis, and other infectious diseases from injecting with shared needles.

**In Combination with Alcohol**

- Unknown.

**Withdrawal Symptoms**

- Depression, anxiety, problems sleeping, tremors, paranoia.

#### Treatment Options

**Medications**

- There are no FDA-approved medications to treat addiction to bath salts.

**Behavioral Therapies**

- Behavioral treatments geared to teens
- Cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT)
- Contingency management, or motivational incentives
- Motivational Enhancement Therapy (MET)

#### Statistics as of 2015

**Prevalence**

- Data not collected.

**Average Age of Initiation**

- Data not collected.

---
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