

The Novel Psychoactive Substances in the UK Project: empirical and conceptual review work to produce research recommendations

Noreen D Mdege,¹ Nick Meader,² Charlie Lloyd,¹ Steve Parrott¹ and Jim McCambridge^{1*}

¹Department of Health Sciences, University of York, York, UK

²Centre for Reviews and Dissemination, University of York, York, UK

*Corresponding author jim.mccambridge@york.ac.uk

Declared competing interests of authors: none

Published June 2017

DOI: 10.3310/phr05040

Scientific summary

The Novel Psychoactive Substances in the UK Project

Public Health Research 2017; Vol. 5: No. 4

DOI: 10.3310/phr05040

NIHR Journals Library www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

Scientific summary

Background

The Advisory Council on the Misuse of Drugs (ACMD) defined novel psychoactive substances (NPS) as 'psychoactive drugs which are not prohibited by the United Nations Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs or by the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971, and which people in the UK are seeking for intoxicant use' [Advisory Council on Misuse of Drugs. *Consideration of the Novel Psychoactive Substances ('legal highs')*. London: ACMD; 2011]. There are a number of grounds for concern in relation to NPS use, including technological advances that outstrip legal controls, cheap availability through the internet as well as from traditional drug dealers, high levels of cultural acceptability of NPS use in the UK by international standards and a large degree of uncertainty about the identity of individual substances purchased online and on the streets. Even when a new substance is clearly and accurately identified, there may be very little information on its effects, the risks posed by its use and how these may be reduced. There are systems in place to monitor the emergence of new drugs nationally and internationally. The key UK policy development has been the implementation of the Psychoactive Substances Act (Great Britain. *Psychoactive Substances Act 2016*. London: The Stationery Office; 2016) in the spring of 2016. Although the research literature is developing rapidly, it is unclear how far the NPS phenomenon has been considered in explicitly public health terms and, therefore, the extent to which existing evidence is able to inform public health responses is also unclear.

Objectives

Three specific objectives of the Novel Psychoactive Substances in the UK (NPS-UK) project were to:

1. summarise and evaluate what is known about NPS use and related harms and responses
2. develop a dedicated conceptual framework for a public health approach to NPS use
3. make recommendations on key evidence gaps and priorities for future research.

Methods

The project comprised two main study components: a review of existing research (objective 1) and the development of a conceptual framework (objective 2). The conceptual framework was developed in part to assist with the narrative synthesis of the data from the empirical review. It was then used for the construction of a robust assessment of key evidence gaps and research priorities, and an articulation of the key issues facing public health intervention research (objective 3).

Evidence synthesis

The following electronic databases were searched between 1 January 2006 and 29 June 2016 inclusive: MEDLINE, EMBASE, PsycINFO and Science Citation Index. Searches for grey literature included a Google (Google Inc., Mountain View, CA, USA) search for 'novel psychoactive substances', 'new psychoactive substances' and 'legal highs'; hand searching of relevant UK and US websites; and contacting experts. Primary studies, secondary studies involving the analysis and interpretation of primary research, and discussion papers with data on NPS use, problems or responses that were published in English were included.

We conducted a scoping review of all relevant material to map the available evidence. We used these data to conduct an evidence gap analysis based on a set of a priori research questions. The literature as a whole was judged to be at such an early stage of development that the benefits of conducting detailed

risk-of-bias assessments were not justified. The evidence gap analysis informed decision-making on the selection of bodies of evidence for narrative synthesis. The four selected areas were those pragmatically judged to be the most promising for syntheses (e.g. in terms of UK relevance and sufficient depth of data) that would support the development of research recommendations.

Conceptual framework development

This work was done iteratively in two main stages. We began by examining the nature of contemporary evidence-informed public health and possible similarities between NPS and other complex multisectoral public health challenges, such as public mental health, climate change and obesity, as well as tobacco, alcohol and illicit drug use. We then developed a preliminary hypothetical public health approach to NPS. We identified possible research data needs to complete the first stage of this work. We then utilised this first stage research to interpret the data from the empirical review. Following the completion of the review work, we updated the conceptual framework in light of the empirical data in stage 2. Because of the early stage of development of the empirical literature, we made few substantive changes to the conceptual framework and exercised caution in using it as a basis for research recommendations.

Research recommendations and public involvement

Research recommendations were developed from two distinct data sources. First, research recommendations made by authors of primary studies in the existing literature selected for narrative synthesis were thematically coded. Second, we used the conceptual framework (developed prior to the review work and informed by wider public health sources of evidence) developed by the authors to identify what may be missing from this literature. Data from these two sources were then combined. Both earlier parts of the process and the research recommendations themselves were discussed in public engagement work involving policy-makers, researchers and NPS users and user carers as stakeholders to inform the study design and processes, interpret the findings and validate the study recommendations.

Results

Scoping review

A total of 995 studies met the inclusion criteria. We mapped, and made extensive use of, cross-tabulation to characterise the literature according to a set of analytic categories developed a priori. We also assessed evidence gaps in the literature according to a priori research questions to prioritise those research areas that should be synthesised in more detail. We found few data on social and other risk factors, population-level risk factors, harms associated with long-term NPS use, the provision and effectiveness of prevention interventions, and treatment outcomes for NPS users. We undertook more detailed narrative syntheses on surveys on the prevalence and patterns of NPS use in the UK, on UK qualitative studies on the patterns and harms associated with NPS use, on systematic reviews (largely comprising data on harms associated with NPS use) and on evaluations of policy responses to NPS use.

Narrative synthesis

UK survey data

We identified 29 studies. The most robust nationally representative data were for mephedrone (the Crime Survey for England and Wales and the Scottish Crime and Justice Survey have been conducting national surveys since 2010–11). Lifetime mephedrone use is uncommon in adults (approximately 1–2%) but is about two to three times more prevalent in men than in women and in younger adults than in older adults. Prevalence rates of recent mephedrone use are declining substantially. Nationally representative data on NPS use as a whole and on use of particular NPS other than mephedrone are less developed, and comparisons across years are not yet possible. Nationally representative surveys of school children have found a similarly low prevalence for mephedrone and other NPS use as a whole. Data on particular sentinel populations that are likely to be at greater risk of NPS use are growing, although they remain quite limited. The key contributions are the collation of existing UK survey data from multiple sources on

multiple substances, and drawing attention to the diversity of prevalence rates and issues in interpreting reported findings.

Systematic reviews

Systematic reviews ($n = 10$) mainly comprise summaries of clinical presentation data. Side effects of NPS were wide ranging, with psychiatric, cardiovascular, renal and gastrointestinal symptoms being the most commonly reported. Treatment of these effects appears mostly to involve observation and supportive care and in severe cases may require hospitalisation. We did not find population-level data on acute health harms with dedicated attention to prevalence and policy issues, or data on chronic health or social harms in a longitudinal context.

Qualitative studies of novel psychoactive substance use in the UK

Qualitative studies on NPS use in the UK ($n = 7$) are at an early stage of development. Existing studies have the potential to provide useful information on issues such as drug effects and reasons for, and patterns of, use. Qualitative studies may make useful contributions to behavioural epidemiological studies and to studies of drug market functioning and policy issues.

Responses to novel psychoactive substance use and problems/harms

Quantitative studies ($n = 17$) evaluated the effects of legislative prohibitions of NPS use or supply on a number of outcomes including access, use, health-care use and self-reported exposure and toxicity. Reductions in use, presentations or other outcomes were generally observed, although not always. Studies typically utilised simple counts of routinely collected data, particularly poison centre and hospital admissions data. Study designs were mainly before-and-after comparisons, without controls, which limits the basis for attribution of effects. Further examination of the utility of routinely collected NPS data in different settings is needed to assess sources of information bias and to evaluate pharmacovigilance and other data.

Conceptual framework

Stage 1

Our conceptual framework seeks to build on concepts and approaches developed for drug use in general, as well as on evidence-informed responses to other public health challenges, which may be viewed as having similar features. Many contemporary public health challenges (such as the health effects of climate change or obesity) are commonly conceptualised as requiring complex adaptive system changes that differ throughout the life course. NPS may also be regarded in this way.

We provide a conceptual map of key individual-level risks and harms attributable to NPS adapted from those developed for other forms of drug use (*Figure a*). Apart from acute effects, most forms of risk of harm accumulate over time with continuing use. Harms to individuals, whether they are health-specific or wider harms, are strongly shaped by environmental and contextual influences that dynamically interact with life-course stages. Intervention targets for prevention need to extend beyond those proximal to acts of drug use and include those within the social structural influences that shape individual risk. Other drug use, both licit and illicit, is expected to be implicated in the production of harm where other drugs are being used (it is rare that other drugs are not used).

Problems also manifest themselves at levels beyond the individual user, for example involving family members and local communities. Harms to society include the costs of health care, crime and law enforcement. Health impacts incurred by NPS users can be aggregated with measures of physical and/or mental health, or lost quality-adjusted life-years.

Stage 2

The empirical review findings indicated that the existing body of literature, although large, is at an early stage of development, and there are currently few data to inform directly what we hypothesised to be an




FIGURE a A model of risks and harms attributable to NPS use.

evidence-informed public health strategic response to NPS. The hypothesised need for research to inform public health responses has not yet been met. The conceptual framework itself was thus not significantly altered in stage 2, as we found no reason to make major changes. We took account of the hypothesised nature of our conceptual data in making research recommendations.

Public involvement

Public involvement activities had demonstrable value in validating our study design, findings and research recommendations. The project was successful in engaging with policy-makers and researchers at different stages of the research process. However, we were less successful with NPS user involvement, in part because the short-term nature of the project offered restricted scope for investment in building relationships with NPS users over time.

Conclusions

There are 20 research recommendations presented as the principal conclusions of this study, of which there are nine key recommendations as follows.

Pharmacology-related research

1. Evaluate the effectiveness and sustainability of the existing pharmacovigilance system for NPS and the effects of planned innovations.
2. Evaluate the pharmacological, toxicological and related scientific base needed to inform the pharmacovigilance and public health surveillance systems.

Epidemiology and related research

3. Evaluate the effectiveness and sustainability of the existing public health surveillance system for monitoring NPS markets and other new online drug trends. This evaluation should cover monitoring actions, both quantitative and qualitative research, and associated commissioning arrangements, and be cognisant of opportunities for innovations such as test-purchasing new brands online as they become available.
4. Develop the behavioural epidemiology and related science of patterns and correlates of NPS use and problems in the context of alcohol, tobacco and other drug involvements.
5. Use cohort study designs to better understand the determinants of NPS use and related physical health, mental health and psychosocial problems, and how patterns of involvement and consequences change over time.

Interventions

6. Develop the science of prevention of NPS and other drug use. This should include the evaluation of existing interventions and the development and evaluation of novel interventions addressing both proximal and distal determinants of NPS and related drug use, and how risks should be communicated to different groups.
7. Evaluate the public health impacts of legislative prohibitions of NPS use or supply, and other major policy initiatives.

Recommendations for research commissioners

8. Consider using the research recommendations presented here as a possible basis for conducting a formal research priority-setting exercise using consensus development methods (such as those developed by the James Lind Alliance).
9. Evaluate existing strategic provision for, and develop as necessary, a long-term planning system for research on NPS and other drug use.

Study registration

The systematic review element of this study is registered as PROSPERO CRD42016026415.

Funding

Funding for this study was provided by the Public Health Research programme of the National Institute for Health Research.

Public Health Research

ISSN 2050-4381 (Print)

ISSN 2050-439X (Online)

This journal is a member of and subscribes to the principles of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (www.publicationethics.org/).

Editorial contact: journals.library@nihr.ac.uk

The full PHR archive is freely available to view online at www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/phr. Print-on-demand copies can be purchased from the report pages of the NIHR Journals Library website: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

Criteria for inclusion in the *Public Health Research* journal

Reports are published in *Public Health Research* (PHR) if (1) they have resulted from work for the PHR programme, and (2) they are of a sufficiently high scientific quality as assessed by the reviewers and editors.

Reviews in *Public Health Research* are termed 'systematic' when the account of the search, appraisal and synthesis methods (to minimise biases and random errors) would, in theory, permit the replication of the review by others.

PHR programme

The Public Health Research (PHR) programme, part of the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR), evaluates public health interventions, providing new knowledge on the benefits, costs, acceptability and wider impacts of non-NHS interventions intended to improve the health of the public and reduce inequalities in health. The scope of the programme is multi-disciplinary and broad, covering a range of interventions that improve public health. The Public Health Research programme also complements the NIHR Health Technology Assessment programme which has a growing portfolio evaluating NHS public health interventions.

For more information about the PHR programme please visit the website: <http://www.nets.nihr.ac.uk/programmes/phr>

This report

The research reported in this issue of the journal was funded by the PHR programme as project number 14/153/02. The contractual start date was in September 2015. The final report began editorial review in November 2016 and was accepted for publication in March 2017. The authors have been wholly responsible for all data collection, analysis and interpretation, and for writing up their work. The PHR editors and production house have tried to ensure the accuracy of the authors' report and would like to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments on the final report document. However, they do not accept liability for damages or losses arising from material published in this report.

This report presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR). The views and opinions expressed by authors in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the PHR programme or the Department of Health. If there are verbatim quotations included in this publication the views and opinions expressed by the interviewees are those of the interviewees and do not necessarily reflect those of the authors, those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the PHR programme or the Department of Health.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2017. This work was produced by Mdege et al. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This issue may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts (or indeed, the full report) may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Published by the NIHR Journals Library (www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk), produced by Prepress Projects Ltd, Perth, Scotland (www.prepress-projects.co.uk).

Public Health Research Editor-in-Chief

Professor Martin White Director of Research and Programme Leader, UKCRC Centre for Diet and Activity Research (CEDAR), MRC Epidemiology Unit, Institute of Metabolic Science, School of Clinical Medicine, University of Cambridge; Visiting Professor, Newcastle University; and Director, NIHR Public Health Research Programme

NIHR Journals Library Editor-in-Chief

Professor Tom Walley Director, NIHR Evaluation, Trials and Studies and Director of the EME Programme, UK

NIHR Journals Library Editors

Professor Ken Stein Chair of HTA Editorial Board and Professor of Public Health, University of Exeter Medical School, UK

Professor Andree Le May Chair of NIHR Journals Library Editorial Group (EME, HS&DR, PGfAR, PHR journals)

Dr Martin Ashton-Key Consultant in Public Health Medicine/Consultant Advisor, NETSCC, UK

Professor Matthias Beck Chair in Public Sector Management and Subject Leader (Management Group), Queen's University Management School, Queen's University Belfast, UK

Dr Tessa Crilly Director, Crystal Blue Consulting Ltd, UK

Dr Eugenia Cronin Senior Scientific Advisor, Wessex Institute, UK

Ms Tara Lamont Scientific Advisor, NETSCC, UK

Dr Catriona McDaid Senior Research Fellow, York Trials Unit, Department of Health Sciences, University of York, UK

Professor William McGuire Professor of Child Health, Hull York Medical School, University of York, UK

Professor Geoffrey Meads Professor of Health Sciences Research, Health and Wellbeing Research Group, University of Winchester, UK

Professor John Norrie Chair in Medical Statistics, University of Edinburgh, UK

Professor John Powell Consultant Clinical Adviser, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE), UK

Professor James Raftery Professor of Health Technology Assessment, Wessex Institute, Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton, UK

Dr Rob Riemsma Reviews Manager, Kleijnen Systematic Reviews Ltd, UK

Professor Helen Roberts Professor of Child Health Research, UCL Institute of Child Health, UK

Professor Jonathan Ross Professor of Sexual Health and HIV, University Hospital Birmingham, UK

Professor Helen Snooks Professor of Health Services Research, Institute of Life Science, College of Medicine, Swansea University, UK

Professor Jim Thornton Professor of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, University of Nottingham, UK

Professor Martin Underwood Director, Warwick Clinical Trials Unit, Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, UK

Please visit the website for a list of members of the NIHR Journals Library Board:
www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/about/editors

Editorial contact: journals.library@nihr.ac.uk