

Research Article

Prevalence and characteristics of hazardous and harmful drinkers receiving general practitioners' brief advice on and support with alcohol consumption in Germany: results of a population survey

Short title: General practitioners' brief advice on and support with alcohol consumption

25/04/2022

Authors: Sabrina Kastaun^{1,2}, Claire Garnett^{3,4}, Stefan Wilm², Daniel Kotz^{1,3}

¹Institute of General Practice, Addiction Research and Clinical Epidemiology Unit, Centre for Health and Society, Medical Faculty of Heinrich-Heine-University Düsseldorf, Germany

²Institute of General Practice, Patient-Physician Communication Research Unit, Centre for Health and Society, Medical Faculty of Heinrich-Heine-University Düsseldorf, Germany

³Department of Behavioural Science and Health, University College London, London, UK

⁴SPECTRUM Consortium, London, UK

*Corresponding author: PD Dr. Sabrina Kastaun, Institute of General Practice, Centre for Health and Society, Medical Faculty of Heinrich-Heine-University Düsseldorf, Germany, Postal address: P.O. Box 101007, 40001 Düsseldorf, Germany, Tel: 0049-211-81-19527, FAX: 0049-211-81-19527, Mail: Sabrina.Kastaun@med.uni-duesseldorf.de, Twitter: @KastaunS, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5590-1135>

EMAIL CO-AUTHORS

Claire Garnett: c.garnett@ucl.ac.uk, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6589-299X>

Stefan Wilm: stefan.wilm@med.uni-duesseldorf.de, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1266-5064>

Daniel Kotz: daniel.kotz@med.uni-duesseldorf.de, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9454-023X>

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 **Objective**

3 The German treatment guideline on alcohol-related disorders recommends that general practitioners
4 (GPs) offer brief advice on, and support with, reducing alcohol consumption to hazardous (at risk for
5 health events) and harmful (exhibit health events) drinking patients. We aimed to estimate the
6 implementation of this recommendation using data from the general population in Germany.

7 **Design**

8 Cross-sectional analysis of data (2021/2022) of a nationally representative household survey.

9 **Setting**

10 Population of Germany.

11 **Participants**

12 Representative sample of 2,247 adult respondents (≥ 18 years) who reported hazardous or harmful
13 drinking according to the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test-Consumption (AUDIT-C; score
14 females: 4-12, males: 5-12).

15 **Main outcome measure**

16 Ever receipt of “brief GP advice on, or support with, reducing alcohol consumption”. Differences in the
17 likelihood of ever receiving advice and/or support (yes/no) relative to respondents’ sociodemographic,
18 smoking, and alcohol consumption characteristics were estimated using logistic regressions.

19 **Results**

20 Ever receipt of GP advice on/support with reducing alcohol was reported among 6.3% (95%CI=5.3%-
21 7.4%), and the offer of support among 1.5% (95%CI=1.1%-2.1%) of the hazardous and harmful drinking
22 respondents. The likelihood of having ever received advice/support was positively associated with
23 being older (odds ratio (OR)=1.03 per year, 95%CI=1.01-1.04), a current or former (versus never)
24 smoker (OR=2.36, 95%CI=1.46-3.80; OR=2.17, 95%CI=1.23-3.81), and with increasing alcohol
25 consumption (OR=1.76 per score, 95%CI=1.59-1.95). One in two harmful drinking respondents (AUDIT-
26 C score 10-12) reported appropriate advice/support. The likelihood was negatively associated with
27 being female (e.g., OR=0.32, 95%CI=0.21-0.48), having a medium and high (versus low) education, and
28 with increasing household income.

29 **Conclusions**

30 A small proportion of people drinking at hazardous and harmful levels in Germany report having ever
31 received brief GP advice on, or support with, reducing alcohol consumption. The implementation of
32 appropriate advice or support seems to be strongly linked to specific sociodemographic
33 characteristics, tobacco smoking, and the alcohol consumption level.

34

35 **Keywords**

36 general practitioner, primary care, brief advice, hazardous drinking, alcohol

37

38

1 **Strengths and limitations of this study**

- 2 • The principal strength of this study is the large, nationally representative population sample.
- 3 • The cross-sectional study design and temporality issues with our measures (alcohol
- 4 consumption was measured with reference to the present and the outcome as “ever receipt
- 5 of GP advice or support”) limited our ability to explore causal relationships.
- 6 • The outcome measure had a complex, not entirely hierarchical structure, which may have led
- 7 to respondents being unsure of which response option to select.
- 8 • Data were collected during the COVID-19 pandemic, during which alcohol consumption in
- 9 Germany seemed to have changed. It is unclear how this might have influenced GPs’
- 10 behaviour.
- 11 • Due to the socially loaded topic, respondents may not have answered truthfully or repressed
- 12 a previous conversation with their GP on their alcohol consumption. We did not assess the
- 13 GPs’ view on the topic.

14

15

1 INTRODUCTION

2 Hazardous drinking is defined as a quantity or a repeated pattern of alcohol consumption that places
3 a person at risk for adverse health events, whereas harmful drinking verifiably results in such events.[1-
4 3] Alcohol dependence, on the other hand, is seen as a complex drinking pattern, characterised by
5 persistent consumption despite harmful consequences, craving, the prioritisation of drinking over
6 other activities, tolerance development, and withdrawal symptom.[1-3] Although this terminology is
7 now commonly used and acknowledges the spectrum of risk that tends to increase with increasing
8 drinking, universal cut-offs with regard to consumption levels and associated risks are missing, making
9 a clear distinction of these theoretical drinking patterns often difficult in practice.[1-3]

10 Alcohol misuse contributes to around 3 million deaths each year globally, and is responsible for around
11 5.1% of global disability-adjusted life-years.[4] Germany ranks above the average level in the European
12 Union of pure alcohol consumption per capita and year in the adult population (13.4 litres of pure
13 alcohol versus 9.8 litres).[4] Latest nationally representative prevalence data show that around 20% of
14 the adult population consume alcohol at least at a hazardous level,[5] including a smaller proportion
15 (approximately 3% per group,[6]) of harmful and alcohol dependent drinkers. There is strong evidence
16 of a dose-response relationship between alcohol consumption and alcohol-related harms,[7, 8]
17 whereby any person drinking at a hazardous level or above would benefit from reducing their alcohol
18 consumption.

19 The implementation of brief interventions in primary healthcare settings is both an effective [9-13]
20 and cost-effective [4] approach to reducing hazardous and harmful drinking. Brief interventions usually
21 include feedback on consumption, brief advice to reduce or quit drinking, motivational enhancement
22 and goal setting, and further support such as referral to specialised treatment or the development of
23 a personal reduction plan.[10, 14]

24 General practitioners (GPs) are well placed to address alcohol use disorders as they commonly see
25 patients of various ages with a broad range of (alcohol-related) health conditions,[14] and the long-
26 lasting patient-GP relationship can help to reduce feelings of stigmatisation and irritation in the
27 patient.[2] The current German clinical guideline on the treatment of alcohol-related disorders [2]
28 recommends that brief interventions should be offered to hazardous and harmful drinkers in the
29 primary care setting. Identification of patients can be carried out by means of screening and pragmatic
30 case-finding (i.e., when the issue is raised by the patient or when the GP notices alcohol-related
31 conspicuousness).[2] The latter seems to be common in the GP setting.[15]

32 For individuals with alcohol dependence, evidence on the effectiveness of brief interventions is
33 inconsistent, but according to the German treatment guideline, brief interventions can be a sensible
34 measure among this group for ethical and pragmatic reasons, if other and more intensive interventions
35 (e.g., specialised inpatient treatment) are rejected by the patient.[2]

36 Addressing a patient's alcohol consumption is still perceived as an emotionally difficult and socially
37 loaded issue. Despite strong evidence on the effectiveness of brief interventions, international data
38 suggest that its implementation in routine GP practice remains challenging.[16-19] A population survey
39 from England comparing GP advice on drinking with smoking found that only 6.5% of hazardous and
40 harmful drinkers received advice on their alcohol consumption during the past year, compared with
41 half of smokers that received advice on quitting smoking.[18] Although most primary care clinicians
42 report that they ask their patients about alcohol use, far fewer offer advice or recommend
43 treatment.[20] A survey which used routine GP data showed that GPs struggled more often at

1 identifying hazardous than dependent drinkers.[19] No representative, national data are available on
2 the implementation of the German clinical guideline on hazardous and harmful drinking in GP settings.
3 Only one study provides initial figures from a single federal state, Bremen, collected in 2016, where
4 2.9% of all hazardous drinking patients were screened by their GPs, and 1.4% received a brief
5 intervention.[21]

6 Up-to-date and representative national figures on the provision of brief alcohol interventions in GP
7 settings are needed to be able to precisely inform health policy and – if needed – the development of
8 interventions aiming at improving the implementation of treatment recommendations on brief alcohol
9 interventions in primary care. It is also important to report whether the provision of brief alcohol
10 interventions differs by recipients' characteristics in order to identify potentially underserved groups
11 of society. This study therefore aimed to explore the following questions using data from a nationally
12 representative sample of adults (aged ≥ 18) in Germany who self-report hazardous or harmful drinking
13 (operationalised using the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test-Consumption (AUDIT-C)).[22]

14

15 **RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

16 Among adults in the population of Germany drinking at hazardous and harmful levels:

- 17 1) What proportion reports that a GP ever asked about their alcohol consumption, advised them
18 to drink less, offered help or support with drinking less, and offered help with making use of
19 external medical or psychological support because of alcohol consumption?
- 20 2) What proportion report ever (versus never) receiving brief GP advice on, or support with,
21 reducing alcohol consumption stratified by person characteristics: age, sex, education, income,
22 smoking status, migration background, region of residence, and the overall alcohol
23 consumption?
- 24 3) Are there any differences in the likelihood of ever (versus never) receiving brief GP advice on,
25 or support with, reducing alcohol consumption within each measured recipient characteristic?

26 Since the clinical guideline does not provide a clear recommendation on the exact level of alcohol
27 consumption at which a brief intervention should take place,[2] our study will address individuals
28 consuming alcohol at least at a hazardous level. From a preventive medicine perspective, we most
29 likely expect an intervention from GPs among this group of risk.

30

31 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

32 **Study design**

33 We used data from the cross-sectional German Study on Tobacco Use (DEBRA: "Deutsche Befragung
34 zum Rauchverhalten"): an ongoing representative household survey on tobacco and nicotine product
35 use in Germany (www.debra-study.info).[23] The study is conducted by a market research institute,
36 has been registered at the German Clinical Trials Register ([DRKS00011322](https://www.clinicaltrialsregister.de/ct2/show/study/DRKS00011322), [DRKS00017157](https://www.clinicaltrialsregister.de/ct2/show/study/DRKS00017157)), and
37 received approval by the ethics committee of Heinrich-Heine-University Düsseldorf (HHU 5386R). Since
38 2016, the DEBRA study collects data every other month from computer-assisted, face-to-face
39 household interviews of people aged ≥ 14 .

40 **Study population**

41 Data were aggregated from seven survey waves (waves 28-34) collected between February 2021 and
42 February 2022 (N=14,327). Since January 2020, respondents are selected by using a dual frame design:

1 a composition of random stratified sampling (50% of the sample) and quota sampling (50% of the
2 sample). This sampling design has been described in detail elsewhere: osf.io/s2wxc/. Details on the
3 general sample selection have been published in a study protocol.[23]

4 Alcohol consumption was measured with the AUDIT-C;[22] a three-item measure including questions
5 on 1) frequency, 2) quantity, and 3) frequency of occasional heavy drinking; full details are given in
6 **Table 1**. The AUDIT-C overall score indicates the level of alcohol consumption and ranges from 0 to
7 12.[22] As recommended in the German treatment guideline on alcohol-related disorders [2] and in
8 underlying studies,[24, 25] a gender-specific AUDIT-C cut-off score of ≥ 5 in males, and of ≥ 4 in females
9 was used to operationalise “at least hazardous drinking”. Respondents who answered that they never
10 drink alcohol did not receive questions 2 and 3, and were excluded from the analysis. The study
11 population included all adults (aged ≥ 18 years, $n=14,026$) who reported at least hazardous drinking,
12 resulting in a total sample of $n=2,712$ (19.3%) hazardous or harmful drinkers. Respondents aged 14 to
13 17 were excluded from the analysis as 16 is the national legal age of sale for beverages containing
14 $<15\%$ of alcohol by volume (ABV), and 18 is the legal age of sale for beverages with $>15\%$ ABV.

15 **Outcome measure**

16 Respondents were asked about “ever receipt of GP advice on, or support with, reducing alcohol
17 consumption”, using a question that was adopted from previous studies on GP advice on smoking
18 cessation in the German,[26] and in the Dutch and English population,[27] and which was critically
19 reviewed by an experienced GP (see **Table 1**).

20 For further analyses, the response options for this question were dichotomised into ‘no’ (options 1-2;
21 0) and ‘yes’ (options 3-5; 1), see **Table 1**. Respondents who answered “I don’t remember” ($n=443$) or
22 refused to answer ($n=22$) were excluded from the analyses.

23 **Exposure variables**

24 The following sociodemographic characteristics were measured: age; sex (female versus male); region
25 of residence (rural versus urban setting), migration background (yes versus no), current tobacco
26 smoking status (current, former, never), and alcohol consumption as a continuous variable (AUDIT-C
27 score with a possible range of 4-12 among women and of 5-12 among men who drink at least
28 hazardously).

29 Alcohol consumption varies between regions of residence, with a majority of studies reporting higher
30 drinking rates in rural communities.[28] We assumed that this somehow affects the awareness and
31 behaviour of GPs with regard to advice on drinking. This variable was assessed by using the national
32 classification of regions (“BIK Regionsklassifizierung”,[29]), consisting of five categories (e.g.,
33 metropolitan area or subcentres) which were dichotomised for the analyses: urban versus rural
34 setting.

35 German population surveys suggest that individuals with migration background relative to those
36 without consume less alcohol.[30] Respondents were asked: “Was one of your parents born abroad?”.
37 Migration background applied if at least one parent did not have German nationality by birth.

38 Measured socioeconomic status (SES) variables were: educational qualification (low [9 years of
39 education, or no graduation], medium [≥ 10 years], high [≥ 12 years]), and monthly net household
40 income calculated per person (details on the calculation can be found here: <https://osf.io/387fg/>).
41 Income was entered as a continuous variable coded from 0 (€0 income/month) to 7 (\geq €7,000/month)
42 in the regression models. For descriptive purposes, income was categorised into: low (<20 th

1 percentile), medium (20th to 80th percentiles), and high (>80th percentile), approximately reflecting
2 the distribution in the German population.

3 **Statistical analyses**

4 The study protocol and analysis plan was written prior to analysing data and pre-registered on the
5 Open Science Framework: osf.io/3fe87.

6 Data were analysed and reported unweighted as information on true population parameters of the
7 population of hazardous drinkers were not available. Analyses were performed with IBM SPSS Statistics
8 for Windows, Version 27.0 (Armonk, NY: IBM Corp).

9 To address **research question 1**, we report descriptive prevalence data on the various levels of GP
10 advice on, or support with, reducing alcohol consumption as percentages together with 95%
11 confidence intervals (95%CI).

12 To address **research question 2**, we present prevalence data including 95%CI of the dichotomous
13 outcome variable “ever receipt of GP advice on, or support with, reducing alcohol consumption (=yes
14 versus no)” stratified by all categorical exposure variables. For the continuous scaled AUDIT-C score
15 we present a figure showing the prevalence of “ever receipt of GP advice/support (=yes)” in relation
16 to the range of possible AUDIT-C scores among the sample of hazardous and harmful drinkers.

17 To address **research question 3**, a series of univariate logistic regression models were conducted to
18 explore potential differences in the likelihood of ever (yes vs. no) receiving brief GP advice on, or
19 support with, reducing alcohol consumption for all exposure variables. Regression models were
20 adjusted for survey wave as a potential confounding variable.

21 A considerable number (16.3%) of respondents did not remember if a GP had ever addressed their
22 alcohol consumption and some refused to answer (0.8%). For the analyses of research questions 2 and
23 3, this group was excluded. We compared whether this group differed systematically from respondents
24 who provided an answer on our outcome question by using the chi-square test and Mann-Whitney U
25 test (**Supplemental Table 1**).

26 *Dealing with missing data*

27 Missing data were sparse (<0.6% for all variables except for income (2.9%) and migration background
28 (4.8%)), and data were analysed using complete cases. Due to an incorrect questionnaire instruction
29 in four survey waves (28-31), 22.6% of respondents who reported to the first AUDIT-C question with
30 “at least once a month or less” did not receive the AUDIT-C questions 2 and 3, and were not
31 interviewed on the primary outcome. However, an analysis of AUDIT-C data from earlier waves of the
32 DEBRA study [5] with the correct questionnaire instruction showed that only 1% of respondents who
33 provided the same answer, were identified as hazardous or harmful drinkers. We thus assume that
34 around 1% of hazardous or harmful drinkers were lost across four of the seven survey waves due to
35 this mistake. These missing data were assumed to be completely at random, and thus excluded from
36 the analyses.

37

38 **RESULTS**

39 The final analytic sample consisted of all adult respondents who reported at least hazardous drinking,
40 and provided an answer on, or could remember, whether or not a GP had advised them on reducing
41 alcohol consumption (n=2,247). The sample is described in **Table 2**. The mean age of this group was

1 49.5 years (standard deviation (SD)=17.0), and 45.0% (n=1012) of the respondents were female. The
2 mean AUDIT-C score was 5.9 (median: 6, standard deviation (SD)=1.3) for males and 4.8 (median: 4,
3 SD=1.1) for females.

4 Respondents who didn't remember whether or not they received GP advice seem to be more often
5 current smokers and lower educated but did not systematically differ from respondents who did
6 remember (**Supplemental Table 1**).

7 **Proportion of hazardous or harmful drinking adults reporting various levels of GP advice/support**

8 Among hazardous or harmful drinkers, 82.2% (95%CI=80.5%-83.7%; n=1,846) reported that a GP had
9 never asked them about their alcohol consumption, 11.5% (95%CI=10.2%-12.9%; n=259) reported that
10 they had ever been asked about drinking by a GP, and 6.3% (95%CI=5.3%-7.4%; n=142) said that a GP
11 had ever advised them to drink less, or offered either help or support or advised or helped them to
12 make use of medical or psychological support to drink less (see **Figure 1**). Such support was reported
13 by 1.5% (95%CI=1.1%-2.1%) of the hazardous and harmful drinking respondents.

14 **Proportion of hazardous or harmful drinking adults reporting ever receipt of GP advice/support** 15 **stratified by recipients' characteristics**

16 Men (compared with women), respondents of higher age (65+ years), those with low (compared with
17 medium and high) education and household income, and current and former smokers (compared with
18 never smokers) reported relatively more often to have ever received brief GP advice on, or support
19 with alcohol consumption, see **Table 2**.

20 The higher the overall AUDIT-C score, the higher the rate of reporting ever receipt of GP advice on, or
21 support with, reducing alcohol consumption, see **Figure 2**. In persons with an AUDIT-C score >9 – which
22 is viewed as harmful or potentially dependent drinking pattern [37] – 51.5% (n=17/33) have ever
23 received GP advice on, or support with reducing alcohol consumption.

24 **Likelihood of ever receiving GP advice/support relative to recipients' characteristics**

25 The likelihood of ever receipt of brief GP advice on, or support with, reducing alcohol consumption
26 was positively associated with being older, being a former or a current smoker, and reporting a higher
27 alcohol consumption level at the time of the survey, see **Table 2**. The likelihood was negatively
28 associated with being female, having medium and high (compared with low) educational qualification,
29 and with increasing monthly household income.

30 No significant differences were detected relative to the respondents' migration background or region
31 of residence.

32

33 **DISCUSSION**

34 In a large representative sample of the general population of adults in Germany who report hazardous
35 or harmful drinking, about 12% reported having ever been asked by a GP about their alcohol
36 consumption, and about 6% reported having ever received GP advice to drink less, including 1.5% who
37 were also offered support to drink less or to make use of psychological or medical assistance for that
38 purpose. However, in the subgroup of people reporting harmful or potentially dependent drinking
39 (AUDIT-C score 10-12,[31]) around half had ever received brief GP advice on, or support with, reducing
40 alcohol consumption.

1 To our knowledge, this is the first nationwide study to estimate the implementation of the clinical
2 guideline recommendation on the provision of GPs' brief advice on, or support with alcohol
3 consumption in the population of Germany. Our findings are broadly consistent with a previous study
4 (not methodologically comparable) in a single federal state in Germany,[21] and a population survey
5 in England (with comparable methodology).[18] Both studies indicate insufficient implementation of
6 brief alcohol interventions in primary care.

7 In the current study there were significant differences in the likelihood of having ever received GP
8 advice or offer of support by personal characteristics. Hazardous and harmful drinkers of older age,
9 current or former smokers, and those with higher alcohol consumption had higher odds of reporting
10 ever receipt of GP advice on, or support with alcohol consumption, whereas females (versus males)
11 and respondents with higher income or medium and high (versus low) educational qualification had
12 substantially lower odds. Higher likelihood of receiving GP advice on alcohol consumption among older
13 respondents and among current or former smokers might be associated with awareness among GPs
14 of existing (alcohol-related) health conditions and of polysubstance use, as well as with demand for
15 treatment among patients. The implementation of alcohol screening and brief intervention in
16 individuals with co-morbidities seems to be largely accepted among GPs and higher than in those
17 without co-morbidities.[32-35]

18 Our findings suggest that hazardous and harmful drinking women and those with higher SES are under-
19 recognized by GPs when it comes to brief alcohol intervention. This is concerning as, although
20 prevalence of hazardous and harmful drinking is higher among men, yet around one in 10 women
21 report drinking at least at a hazardous level.[5] In addition, evidence is good that individuals with
22 higher compared to with lower SES may consume similar or even greater amounts of alcohol and show
23 higher prevalence rates of hazardous drinking.[5, 36] Gender gaps in GP-delivered alcohol
24 interventions have been reported before [18, 37, 38] but we can only speculate on underlying reasons.
25 This could be due to greater concerns about stigmatisation or shame, leading women and individuals
26 with higher SES less often admit alcohol use to their GPs. On the other hand, implicit cognitive bias and
27 stereotypes might influence the GPs' decision on who to screen for alcohol misuse.[39] Another
28 possible explanation might be that specific groups of society are less likely to consult a GP, which has
29 been reported for higher SES groups,[40, 41] though is not the case for women who tend to visit their
30 GP more often than men.[42]

31 **Implications for policy and practise**

32 GPs are a major force to improve the prevention of alcohol-related harm on a population level, and as
33 this study shows, they already intervene in about half of harmful drinking patients. However, from a
34 preventive medicine perspective, this study reveals a need to improve the implementation of guideline
35 recommendations for hazardous drinking in the GP setting. Whilst the clinical guideline does not
36 provide a clear recommendation on the exact level of alcohol consumption at which a brief
37 intervention should take place,[2] alcohol-related harms are dose-dependent and therefore it is
38 important to provide brief interventions for all individuals at alcohol-related risk. Previous studies
39 showed that education and post-graduate training predicts the GP delivery of brief alcohol
40 interventions to hazardous drinkers,[32] and that training GPs can significantly increase alcohol
41 screening and brief intervention rates in primary care.[43] This is particularly the case when being
42 tailored to the barriers and facilitators towards the implementation of such interventions in the GP
43 setting and when being developed on the basis of a behaviour change theory.[44] Further synergistic
44 effects have been shown when financial incentives, training and support were offered together.[45]

1 In Germany, appropriate training is not offered by default, neither during medical education nor as
2 post-graduate training for physicians. As a consequence, many GPs [46], as well as medical
3 students,[47] in Germany do not feel adequately trained to diagnose and treat patients with alcohol
4 problems. This lack of training had also been identified as a major barrier towards the routine
5 implementation of brief alcohol intervention in primary care in the United Kingdom.[16]

6 **Strengths and limitations**

7 A major strength of this study is the large, nationally representative sample. However, there are also
8 limitations. First, data was self-reported, introducing risk for recall bias that may have affected the
9 prevalence estimates, most likely resulting in an under estimate. Secondly, the cross-sectional study
10 design and that GP advice and support was measured as “ever receipt”, whereas alcohol consumption
11 was measured with approximate reference to the present, limited our ability to explore causal
12 relationships. Comparable temporality issues might also occur for some of the sociodemographic
13 characteristics such as income or place of residence. Based on this, we did not conduct multivariable
14 regression analyses, and our results are not adjusted for potential confounding through interaction
15 effects between the exposure variables. Future research should look to estimate the potential causal
16 effect of someone’s characteristics and the likelihood of ever receipt of GP advice on, or support with,
17 reducing alcohol consumption.

18 Thirdly, the question on “ever receipt of GP advice and support” had a complex structure (participants
19 are asked about GP advice on as well as different types of support with drinking less), which could have
20 led to difficulties in understanding. However, the face-to-face interview method and support available
21 from the interviewers may have mitigated this risk. In addition, this measure did not follow an exact
22 hierarchical structure and there was no clear distinction between "internal support" (e.g., offered by
23 the GP), and "external support" (e.g. psychosocial services). This may have led to respondents being
24 unsure of which response option to select. Fourthly, data were collected during the COVID-19
25 pandemic, during which alcohol consumption in Germany seemed to have decreased on average but
26 increased in specific subgroups of the population.[48, 49] It is unclear how this might have influenced
27 the behaviour of GPs. Finally, due to the socially loaded topic, respondents may not have answered
28 truthfully or repressed a previous conversation with their GP on the topic. It is therefore important to
29 also assess the GPs’ view on the topic, including in-depth information on barriers to the
30 implementation of the treatment guideline recommendations in their daily practice. Previous surveys
31 among GPs, however, usually only assessed how often, in general, GPs screen for alcohol or provide
32 brief intervention, but not in relation to the number of their hazardous drinking patients.[32, 50]

33

34 **Conclusion**

35 Our findings suggest that hazardous drinking – that places a person at risk for adverse health events –
36 does not seem to be adequately addressed by GPs in Germany, particularly among women and
37 individuals from higher SES groups. From a preventive medicine perspective, this results in missed
38 opportunities to reduce alcohol-related harm. However, the probability of having ever received brief
39 alcohol intervention by a GP increases with increasing drinking levels. Around every second harmful
40 drinking person seems to have ever received brief GP advice on, or support with, reducing alcohol
41 consumption. Although we did not analyse causal relationships, this study is a call for action in order
42 to further explore underlying reasons why clinical guideline recommendations on brief alcohol
43 interventions are not implemented more often in the German general practice setting, as well as to
44 explore potential approaches for improvement.

45

1 **Statements**

2 **Acknowledgements**

3 The authors thank Erika Baum for her constructive feedback on the outcome measure (the question
4 on GP advice on alcohol consumption) as well as on the first version of the analysis protocol. The
5 authors also thank Constanze Cholmakow-Bodechtel and Franziska Wenng from the market research
6 institute "Kantar" for the collection of the data.

7
8 **Competing Interests**

9 The authors have no competing interests to declare. CG is a paid scientific consultant for the behaviour
10 change and lifestyle organization, One Year No Beer.

11
12 **Funding**

13 From 2016 to 2019 (waves 1-18), the DEBRA study was supported by the Ministry of Innovation,
14 Science and Research of the German State of North Rhine–Westphalia (MIWF) in the context of the
15 "NRW Rückkehrprogramm" (the North Rhine–Westphalian postdoc return program). Since 2019 (wave
16 19 onwards), the study has been supported by the German Federal Ministry of Health.
17 CG is funded by Cancer Research UK and the National Institute for Health Research.

18 **Statement of Ethics**

19 The study protocol has been peer-reviewed and approved by the ethics committee of Heinrich-Heine-
20 University Duesseldorf, Germany (HHU 5386/R). The fieldwork is conducted by the market research
21 institute Kantar, Germany. Interviewers from Kantar make sure that all participants give oral informed
22 consent. This method of consent has been approved by the ethics committee.

23 **Patient and Public Involvement statement**

24 Patients or the public were not involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans
25 of this research.

26 **Author Contributions**

27 SK coordinates the DEBRA study, conceptualised and drafted the analysis protocol, drafted the
28 manuscript, analysed and interpreted the data. CG and SW: provided expert advice on the study
29 protocol and critically revised the analysis protocol and the manuscript. DK conceived the DEBRA study,
30 supervised the analyses, and critically revised the analysis protocol and the manuscript. All named
31 authors contributed substantially to the manuscript and agreed on its final version.

32
33 **Data Availability Statement**

34 The data underlying this study are third-party data and are available to researchers on reasonable
35 request from the corresponding author (sabrina.kastaun@med.uni-duesseldorf.de). All proposals
36 requesting data access will need to specify how it is planned to use the data, and all proposals will
37 need approval of the DEBRA study team before data release.

38
39
40

REFERENCES

1. Saunders JB, Aasland OG, Babor TF et al. Development of the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT): WHO Collaborative Project on Early Detection of Persons with Harmful Alcohol Consumption-II. *Addiction* 1993;88(6):791-804.
2. Association of the Scientific Medical Societies (AWMF) [Arbeitsgemeinschaft der Wissenschaftlichen Medizinischen Fachgesellschaften (AWMF)] (2020). S3 Guideline "Screening, diagnostics, and treatment of alcohol use disorders" [S3-Leitlinie "Screening, Diagnostik und Behandlung alkoholbezogener Störungen"]. AWMF-Register Nr. 076-001 Retrieved from: https://www.awmf.org/uploads/tx_szleitlinien/076-001_S3-Screening-Diagnose-Behandlung-alkoholbezogene-Stoerungen_2021-02.pdf, accessed 13.02.2022.
3. Alcohol Change UK How do we talk about alcohol? . Retrieved from: <https://alcoholchange.org.uk/policy/policy-insights/how-do-we-talk-about-alcohol>, accessed 26.02.2022.
4. World Health Organization (2018). Global status report on alcohol and health 2018. Retrieved from: <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/274603>, accessed 13.02.2022.
5. Garnett C, Kastaun S, Brown J et al. Alcohol consumption and associations with sociodemographic and health-related characteristics in Germany: A population survey. *Addict Behav* 2022;125:107159.
6. Atzendorf J, Rauschert C, Seitz N-N et al. The Use of Alcohol, Tobacco, Illegal Drugs and Medicines. *Dtsch Arztebl Int* 2019;116(35-36):577-84.
7. Alcohol, Public Policy G. Alcohol: No Ordinary Commodity – a summary of the second edition. *Addiction* 2010;105(5):769-79.
8. University of Sheffield (2019). Mortality and morbidity risks from alcohol consumption in Australia: Analyses using an Australian adaptation of the Sheffield Alcohol Policy Model (v2.7) to inform the development of new alcohol guidelines. Retrieved from: <https://www.nhmrc.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/attachments/Alcohol/10-mortality-morbidity-risks-from-alcohol-cons.pdf>, accessed 13.03.2022.
9. Kaner EF, Dickinson HO, Beyer F et al. The effectiveness of brief alcohol interventions in primary care settings: a systematic review. *Drug Alcohol Rev* 2009;28(3):301-23.
10. Kaner EFS, Beyer FR, Muirhead C et al. Effectiveness of brief alcohol interventions in primary care populations. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2018, doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD004148.pub4(2).
11. Tanner-Smith EE, Parr NJ, Schweer-Collins M et al. Effects of brief substance use interventions delivered in general medical settings: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Addiction* 2022;117(4):877-89.
12. Elzerbi C, Donoghue K, Drummond C. A comparison of the efficacy of brief interventions to reduce hazardous and harmful alcohol consumption between European and non-European countries: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Addiction* 2015;110(7):1082-91.
13. Ghosh A, Singh P, Das N et al. Efficacy of brief intervention for harmful and hazardous alcohol use: a systematic review and meta-analysis of studies from low middle-income countries. *Addiction* 2022;117(3):545-58.
14. Whitlock EP, Polen MR, Green CA et al. Behavioral Counseling Interventions in Primary Care To Reduce Risky/Harmful Alcohol Use by Adults: A Summary of the Evidence for the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. *Ann Intern Med* 2004;140(7):557-68.
15. Lid TG, Malterud K. General practitioners' strategies to identify alcohol problems: a focus group study. *Scand J Prim Health Care* 2012;30(2):64-69.
16. Wilson GB, Lock CA, Heather N et al. Intervention against Excessive Alcohol Consumption in Primary Health Care: A Survey of GPs' Attitudes and Practices in England 10 Years On. *Alcohol Alcohol* 2011;46(5):570-77.
17. Geirsson M, Bendtsen P, Spak F. Attitudes of Swedish general practitioners and nurses to working with lifestyle change, with special reference to alcohol consumption. *Alcohol Alcohol* 2005;40(5):388-93.

18. Brown J, West R, Angus C et al. Comparison of brief interventions in primary care on smoking and excessive alcohol consumption: a population survey in England. *Br J Gen Pract* 2016;66(642):e1-e9.
19. Cheeta S, Drummond C, Oyefeso A et al. Low identification of alcohol use disorders in general practice in England. *Addiction* 2008;103(5):766-73.
20. Friedmann PD, McCullough D, Chin MH et al. Screening and intervention for alcohol problems. *J Gen Intern Med* 2000;15(2):84-91.
21. Manthey J, Lindemann C, Verthein U et al. Care for people with hazardous alcohol consumption and severe alcohol use disorder in Bremen: in line with needs and guidelines? [Versorgung von Personen mit riskantem Alkoholkonsum und schwerer Alkoholkonsumstörung in Bremen: bedarfsgerecht und leitlinienkonform?]. *Bundesgesundheitsblatt - Gesundheitsforschung - Gesundheitsschutz [German]* 2020;63(1):122-30.
22. Bradley KA, DeBenedetti AF, Volk RJ et al. AUDIT-C as a brief screen for alcohol misuse in primary care. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res* 2007;31(7):1208-17.
23. Kastaun S, Brown J, Brose LS et al. Study protocol of the German Study on Tobacco Use (DEBRA): a national household survey of smoking behaviour and cessation. *BMC Public Health* 2017;17(1):378.
24. Ganz T, Braun M, Laging M et al. Screening for hazardous drinking among German university students: Criterion validity and cut-off scores for the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test–Consumption [Erfassung des riskanten Alkoholkonsums bei Studierenden deutscher Hochschulen: Analysen zur Kriteriumsvalidität und zur Optimierung der Cut-Off-Werte des Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test(-Consumption)]. *Z Klin Psychol Psychother [German]* 2017;46(3):187-97.
25. Rumpf HJ, Hapke U, Meyer C et al. Screening for alcohol use disorders and at-risk drinking in the general population: psychometric performance of three questionnaires. *Alcohol Alcohol* 2002;37(3):261-8.
26. Kastaun S, Kotz D. Brief physician advice for smoking cessation: Results of the DEBRA study [Ärztliche Kurzberatung zur Tabakentwöhnung – Ergebnisse der DEBRA Studie]. *SUCHT [German]* 2019;65(1):34-41.
27. Kotz D, Willemsen MC, Brown J et al. Light smokers are less likely to receive advice to quit from their GP than moderate-to-heavy smokers: A comparison of national survey data from the Netherlands and England. *Eur J Gen Pract* 2013;19(2):99-105.
28. Friesen EL, Bailey J, Hyett S et al. Hazardous alcohol use and alcohol-related harm in rural and remote communities: a scoping review. *The Lancet Public Health* 2022;7(2):e177-e87.
29. BIK Aschpurwis +Behrens Market, Media and Regional Research [BIK Aschpurwis +Behrens Markt-, Media und Regionalforschung] BIK Regions [BIK Regionen 2020 (780er Systematik)]. Retrieved from: https://www.bik-gmbh.de/download/BIK-Regionen_780_Kurzbeschreibung.pdf, accessed 11.02.2022.
30. Rommel A, Saß AC, Born S et al. Health status of people with a migrant background and impact of socio-economic factors: First results of the German Health Interview and Examination Survey for Adults (DEGS1) [Die gesundheitliche Lage von Menschen mit Migrationshintergrund und die Bedeutung des sozioökonomischen Status]. *Bundesgesundheitsblatt Gesundheitsforschung Gesundheitsschutz [German]* 2015;58(6):543-52.
31. Khadjesari Z, White IR, McCambridge J et al. Validation of the AUDIT-C in adults seeking help with their drinking online. *Addict Sci Clin Pract* 2017;12(1):2-2.
32. Rehm J, Prieto JA, Beier M et al. The role of alcohol in the management of hypertension in patients in European primary health care practices - a survey in the largest European Union countries. *BMC Fam Pract* 2016;17(1):130.
33. Hanschmidt F, Manthey J, Kraus L et al. Barriers to Alcohol Screening Among Hypertensive Patients and the Role of Stigma: Lessons for the Implementation of Screening and Brief Interventions in European Primary Care Settings. *Alcohol Alcohol* 2017;52(5):572-79.

34. Kraus L, Schulte B, Manthey J et al. Alcohol screening and alcohol interventions among patients with hypertension in primary health care: an empirical survey of German general practitioners. *Addict Res Theory* 2017;25(4):285-92.
35. Rehm J, Allamani A, Elekes Z et al. Alcohol dependence and treatment utilization in Europe - a representative cross-sectional study in primary care. *BMC Fam Pract* 2015;16:90.
36. Pabst A, van der Auwera S, Piontek D et al. Decomposing social inequalities in alcohol consumption in Germany 1995–2015: an age–period–cohort analysis. *Addiction* 2019;114(8):1359-68.
37. Mauro PM, Askari MS, Han BH. Gender differences in any alcohol screening and discussions with providers among older adults in the United States, 2015 to 2019. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res* 2021;45(9):1812-20.
38. Delpech R, Bloy G, Panjo H et al. Physicians' preventive practices: more frequently performed for male patients and by female physicians. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2020;20(1):331.
39. O'Sullivan ED, Schofield SJ. Cognitive bias in clinical medicine. *J R Coll Physicians Edinb* 2018;48(3):225-32.
40. Krause L, Prütz F. Gynaecology and general practitioner services utilisation by women in the age group 50 years and older. *Journal of Health Monitoring* 2020;5(2):15-25.
41. Luppá M, Giersdorf J, Riedel-Heller S et al. Frequent attenders in the German healthcare system: determinants of high utilization of primary care services. Results from the cross-sectional German health interview and examination survey for adults (DEGS). *BMC Fam Pract* 2020;21(10):1-10.
42. Wang Y, Hunt K, Nazareth I et al. Do men consult less than women? An analysis of routinely collected UK general practice data. *BMJ Open* 2013;3(8):e003320.
43. Friedmann PD, Rose J, Hayaki J et al. Training primary care clinicians in maintenance care for moderated alcohol use. *J Gen Intern Med* 2006;21(12):1269-75.
44. Rosario F, Vasiljevic M, Pas L et al. Efficacy of a theory-driven program to implement alcohol screening and brief interventions in primary health-care: a cluster randomized controlled trial. *Addiction* 2021;n/a(n/a).
45. Anderson P, Bendtsen P, Spak F et al. Improving the delivery of brief interventions for heavy drinking in primary health care: outcome results of the Optimizing Delivery of Health Care Intervention (ODHIN) five-country cluster randomized factorial trial. *Addiction* 2016;111(11):1935-45.
46. Hoffmann T, Voigt K, Kugler J et al. Are German family practitioners and psychiatrists sufficiently trained to diagnose and treat patients with alcohol problems? *BMC Fam Pract* 2019;20(1):115.
47. Hoffmann T, Voigt K, Schließke L et al. How fit are medical students from Dresden to treat alcohol-related disorders? [Wie fit fühlen sich Dresdner Medizinstudierende, alkoholbezogene Störungen behandeln zu können?]. *ZFA [German]* 2015;91:315-20.
48. Manthey J, Kilian C, Schomerus G et al. Alcohol Use in Germany and Europe during the SARS-CoV-2 Pandemic [Alkoholkonsum in Deutschland und Europa während der SARS-CoV-2 Pandemie]. *SUCHT [German]* 2020;66(5):247-58.
49. Klosterhalfen S, Kotz D, Kastaun S. Did self-reported tobacco smoking, alcohol consumption, and physical activity change during the COVID-19 restrictions in Germany in spring 2020? Findings from a population survey (the DEBRA study). *Res Sq* 2022, doi: 10.21203/rs.3.rs-479652/v1.
50. Zaidi Touis L, Bolbrinker J, Riemer TG et al. Moderation of alcohol consumption as a recommendation in European hypertension management guidelines: a survey on awareness, screening and implementation among European physicians. *BMJ Open* 2018;8(10):e022026.

TABLES

TABLE 1. Measures of assessing alcohol consumption and ever receiving brief GP advice on/support with reducing alcohol consumption

Exposure measure: hazardous and harmful alcohol consumption (AUDIT-C items [22])	Outcome measure: Brief GP advice on alcohol consumption
<p>1. <i>How often do you have a drink containing alcohol?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - never (score 0) - at least once a month or less (score 1) - 2–4 times per month (score 2) - 2–3 times per week (score 3) - 4+ times per week (score 4) - no answer <p>2. <i>How many units of alcohol do you drink on a typical day when you are drinking?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1–2 (score 0) - 3–4 (score 1) - 5–6 (score 2) - 7–9 (score 3) - 10+ (score 4) - no answer <p>3. <i>How often have you had 6 or more units if female, or 8 or more if male, on a single occasion in the last year?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - never (score 0) - less than monthly (score 1) - monthly (score 2) - weekly (score 3) - daily or almost daily (score 4) - no answer 	<p><i>Has a GP ever asked you about your alcohol consumption and, if so, recommended something to you in this regard?</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No, a GP has never asked me about my alcohol consumption 2. Yes, a GP has asked me about my alcohol consumption at some point 3. Yes, a GP has advised me to drink less at some point 4. Yes, a GP has offered me help or support to drink less at some point 5. Yes, a GP has advised or helped me to make use of psychological or medical support because of my alcohol consumption at some point 6. I don't remember if a GP has ever addressed my alcohol consumption 7. No answer

TABLE 2. Characteristics of all adult hazardous or harmful drinking respondents (n=2,247), and prevalence estimates on the ever receipt of brief GP advice on/support with reducing alcohol consumption (=yes) relative to the respondents' characteristics; including results of univariate regressions models on associations between these characteristics and ever receipt of GP advice.

	Total adult sample of hazardous/harmful drinkers [§] , n=2,247 % (n)	Yes, ever GP advice on/support with alcohol consumption, n=142	
		% (n, 95%CI)	OR (95%CI)
Gender			
Male (reference)	55.0% (1235)	9.0% (111, 7.5%-10.7%)	1
Female	45.0% (1012)	3.1% (31, 2.8%-3.4%)	0.32 (0.21-0.48)***
Age in years^{§‡}			
18 – 24	9.9% (222)	1.8% (4, 0.5%-4.5%)	1
25 – 39	21.5% (482)	4.8% (23, 3.0%-7.1%)	1.03 (1.01-1.04)***
40 – 64	48.2 (1083)	6.5% (70, 5.1%-8.1%)	
65 +	20.5% (460)	9.8% (45, 7.2%-12.9%)	
Educational qualification[†]			
Low (ref.)	24.2% (543)	10.7% (58, 8.2%-13.6%)	1
Medium	40.6% (913)	5.5% (50, 4.1%-7.2%)	0.48 (0.33-0.72)***
High	34.6% (778)	4.4% (34, 3.0%-6.1%)	0.38 (0.25-0.59)***
Household income^{#‡}			
Low	9.3% (209)	14.8% (31, 10.3%-20.4%)	continuous
Medium	58.7% (1319)	5.9% (78, 4.7%-7.3%)	0.60 (0.48-0.76)***
High	29.1% (654)	4.6% (30, 3.1%-6.5%)	
Migration background			
No (ref.)	84.4% (1896)	5.3% (101, 4.4%-6.4%)	1
Yes	10.9% (244)	6.6% (16, 4.0%-10.4%)	1.27 (0.74-2.20)
Region of residence			
Urban setting (ref.)	63.7% (1431)	5.9% (85, 4.8%-7.3%)	1
Rural setting	36.3% (816)	7.0% (57, 5.3%-9.0%)	1.19 (0.84-1.67)
Tobacco smoking status			
Never smoker (ref.)	29.0% (652)	3.4% (22, 2.1%-5.1%)	1
Former smoker	19.0% (427)	7.0% (30, 4.8%-9.9%)	2.17 (1.23-3.81)**
Current smoker	51.9% (1166)	7.6% (89, 6.2%-9.3%)	2.36 (1.46-3.80)***
Alcohol consumption per AUDIT-C level^{§‡‡}			
			1.76 (1.59-1.95)***

Data are presented as column percentages (number), row percentages (number, 95% confidence interval (95%CI)), and as Odds Ratios (OR) together with 95% CI around OR. ORs were adjusted variable "survey wave" (as design factor);

***p<0.001, **p<0.01, *p<0.05.

Variables with missing data: educational qualification: 0.6%, household income: 2.9%, migration background: 4.8%, smoking status: 0.1%.

[§]According to the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test-Consumption (AUDIT-C) [22]; an AUDIT-C score of ≥ 5 in male respondents, and of ≥ 4 in female respondents was used to operationalise hazardous drinking [2, 24, 25].

[†]German educational qualification levels: low (9 years of education, or no graduation), medium (10 years of education), high (≥ 12 years of education).

[#]Monthly net household income per person in the household, based on the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)-modified equivalence scale [29]. The variable was categorised into three levels: low (<20th income percentile), medium (20th to 80th income percentiles), and high (>80th income percentile), approximately reflecting the distribution of income in the German population [30-32].

[‡]Entered as continuous variable in regression analysis.

^{‡‡}Gender-specific mean values (incl. median and standard deviation) for the sample are reported in the results section of this manuscript.

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1: Prevalence estimates on the various levels of GP advice on, or support with, reducing alcohol consumption (self-reported) among the total sample of adult hazardous or harmful drinkers (n=2,247) reported as percentages together with 95% confidence intervals.

Figure 2: Ever receipt of GP advice on, or support with, reducing alcohol consumption (yes, self-reported) relative to the total AUDIT-C score among the total sample of adult hazardous or harmful drinkers (n=2,247) reported as percentages together with 95% confidence intervals (black line; dotted line: trend line, polynomial function, $R^2=0.97$).



