

**NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR CLINICAL EXCELLENCE
SPECIAL HEALTH AUTHORITY
TENTH WAVE WORK PROGRAMME**

DRUG MISUSE

Psychosocial interventions in drug misuse

On 16th June 2004 the Department of Health and the Welsh Assembly Government formally requested the National Institute for Clinical Excellence to prepare a clinical guideline as described in the box below. Also attached is additional background information presented to the Advisory Committee on Topic Selection, plus any other relevant information.

Remit: To prepare a guideline for the NHS in England and Wales on the psychosocial management of, drug misusers in the community and prison settings

The guidance will:

- by using the evidence base examine the effectiveness and cost effectiveness of psychosocial interventions the management of opiate, stimulant and cannabis misusers;
- identify those groups of drug misusers who are most likely to benefit from psychosocial interventions; and
- identify the key components of the effectiveness of these treatments , within a wider package of pharmacological interventions, and the overall care provided for drug misusers.

Suggested working titles for NICE:

Full Title: Drug misuse: psychosocial management of drug misusers in the community and prison settings.

Short Title: Drug Misuse - Psychosocial Interventions.

Additional background

Source

Sexual Health and Substance Misuse Team (SHASM), Department of Health, agreed with Lord Warner and supported by Mary Agnew (No 10)

Overview

It is estimated that there are at least 280,000 problem drug users and approximately 145,000 in treatment in any year with a Government target of ensuring 200,000 are in effective treatment in 2008. The majority of those requiring treatment are opiate dependent (using illicit heroin). The number of illicit opiate users is largely stable. Many opiate dependent users regularly use cocaine.

Severe opiate dependence is a disorder of multi-factorial aetiology (with multiple and varied perpetuating factors). It has a central feature of psychological reinforcement of repeated drug-taking behaviour and it also has a marked withdrawal syndrome. Disturbances of the brain reward pathways (involving opoid receptors) are important underlying pathological mechanisms. For this reason it is usually considered that a range of interventions may be required in addition to drug treatments. For severely dependent opiate addicts the disorder has characteristics of a long-term chronic relapsing disorder with periods of remission and relapse, so whilst abstinence is a long-term goal for treatment this is not always easy to achieve and may be associated with periods of relapse.

The costs of opiate dependence may be due to individual health problems (bacterial infections, overdoses, HIV and hepatitis viral infections), criminal justice costs and other costs to family and wider society. The societal costs of problem drug users has been estimated at many billions of pounds, with opiate dependence and other Class A drugs constituting the main cause of these costs.

Opiate substitution therapies (methadone and buprenorphien and most commonly used) allow the addict to replace street heroin with a longer-acting, less euphoriant and safer drug whilst avoiding the withdrawal syndrome. Once stabilised many patients remain on maintenance treatment (with consequent improvements in illicit drug use, physical health, well-being, social stabilisation and very substantially reduced criminality and costs to society). Buprenorphien is substantially more expensive than oral methadone and it takes longer to supervise its consumption (as it is not swallowed).

Only a minority entering treatment choose abstinence initially and enforced abstinence appears highly ineffective. However, approximately one third entering treatment services generally are abstinent 5 years later (at least for a period of time).

Those drug users incarcerated in prison usually receive assistance with withdrawal symptoms and some receive a treatment programme in prison. Access to regular high levels of illicit drugs in prisons is limited so most dependent drug users lose tolerance and are at risk of overdose when they commonly relapse on release. Prison guidance is being developed indicating that methadone maintenance should be continued in some patients (e.g. short term or remand prisoners) when this has already been started in the community. Methadone maintenance treatment is rarely initiated in prison.

Evidence base

A number of high quality studies have examined the effectiveness of psychosocial interventions in opiate drug misuse (Mayet et al ,2004). These include Contingency Management, Brief Reinforcement Based Intensive Outpatient Therapy coupled with Contingency Management, Cue Exposure therapy, Alternative Program for Methadone Maintenance Treatment Program Drop-outs (MMTP) and Enhanced Outreach-Counselling Program. The main findings were that both Enhanced Outreach Counselling and Brief Reinforcement Based Intensive Outpatient Therapy coupled with Contingency Management had significantly better outcomes than standard therapy within treatment. The Alternative Program for MMTP Drop-outs and the behavioural therapies of Cue Exposure and Contingency Management alone were no better than the control (standard) therapy. However, follow up data is limited and for the more successful treatments evidence is so far lacking on their comparative effectiveness and which populations may gain most benefits from particular interventions. The guideline should help to address these important clinical questions.

Related guidance

1. The Task Force to review services for drug misusers, Department of Health, 1996, HMSO.
2. Tackling drugs to build a better Britain. Department of Health, 1998, HMSO.
3. Drug misuse and dependence guidelines on clinical management. Department of Health, 1999, HMSO.

Timing

Targets for updated drugs strategy are 2008. Maintenance prescribing is a key factor in engaging patients in effective treatment.

The interface between prison and community is a key opportunity to reduce relapse and enhance involvement in treatment.

Hence, action on both proposals is required quickly if NICE guidance is to affect delivery.

Peer review

The proposal was discussed with a number of leading addiction specialists during initial scoping and with the National Treatment Agency for Substance Misuse (NTA), with broad consensus on these topics.

Potential costs/workforce/management implications

There is increasing funding for drug treatment to deliver effective treatment to increased numbers. There is also guidance on developing more holistic care-planned approaches, so outputs from NICE are likely to enhance these meetings and to focus on and inform clinicians in a credible way the role of these specific drug interventions.

The guidance is likely to increase costs of psychosocial interventions if more appropriate, treatments are delivered but this should have a positive impact on outcomes and retention in treatment.

An analysis of what the evidence informs us about how these interventions sit within wider packages of care (rather than as stand-alone interventions) should support the current guidance on care planning and integrated care pathways that is already an expectation for development.

Proposed remit

Whilst the majority of evidence on the use of these treatments is in community populations, there is an emerging evidence base on criminal justice and prison populations, with international studies to support this. There is also a wide evidence base on effective components of psych-social care for problem drug users generally and in relation to these particular treatments. This can form the basis for the analysis to develop evidence-based clinical guidelines on the proposed treatments and care packages in both community and criminal justice populations.

The guideline should cover what the evidence tells us about the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of psychosocial interventions and the appropriate patient groups for each treatment and the appropriate psychosocial package of care in the context of the use of these drugs. This should include the role of such treatment in prisons and continuing after release (or on licence), as well as its more established role for community treatment.

Annex B

The York Study

More recently the University of York conducted a study on the costs of drug use on behalf of the Home Office that was presented to the HASc Drugs Inquiry in 2002.

The authors classified total number of drug misusers into different types:

- Problem users (PDU) – users of any age whose drug use is no longer controlled or undertaken for recreational purposes and where drugs have become a more essential element of the individual's life. A sub-group is injectors associated with additional health problems. Lowest estimate is 281,125.
- Young recreational – class A drug use for age under 25 but not PDU. A sub-group is young people considered to be a high risk of moving on to PDU. Lowest estimate is 399,000.
- Older regular users – regular use of class A drugs for age 35 or over but not PDU. Lowest estimate is 1,091,000.

Key points on costs from the York Study:

- PDUs account for about 99% of total costs of drug misuse.
- The annual economic costs of drug misuse (mainly to health service, criminal justice system and state benefits) are estimated at between £3.7bn and £6.8bn. Adding social costs (mainly victim costs of crime) increases figures to between £10.9bn and £18.8bn.
- Average economic costs range from under £20 for non-problematic, primarily recreational or older regular users to £11,000 for problematic users

It is not clear the number of PDUs estimated by the York study who met a clinical definition of problem drug use that would relate to need for, or suitability for, treatment, but it is likely to be a substantial majority of the group who will also be dependent.