1	Alcohol Use among Emergency Medicine Department Patients in Tanzania: A
2	Comparative Analysis of Injury Versus Non-Injury Patients
3	
4	Authors and affiliations:
5	Alena Pauley MScGH <sup>1</sup> – <u>alena.pauley@duke.edu</u> (ORCID#: 0000-0002-7489-7469)
6	Emily C. Thatcher MPAS PA-C <sup>2</sup> – emily.thatcher@duke.edu
7	Joshua T. Sarafian <sup>1</sup> – joshua.sarafian@duke.edu
8	Siddhesh Zadey MScGH <sup>1,2</sup> - siddhesh.zadey@duke.edu
9	Frida Shayo MD MMED <sup>3,4</sup> – frishahappy@gmail.com
10	Blandina T. Mmbaga, MD PhD <sup>3,4,5</sup> – <u>blaymt@gmail.com</u>
11	Francis Sakita MD MMED <sup>3,4</sup> – francis.sakita@gmail.com
12	Judith Boshe MD MMED <sup>3,4</sup> – <u>jboshe@live.com</u>
13	João Ricardo Nickenig Vissoci MBA MSc PhD <sup>1,2</sup> – jnv4@duke.edu
14	Catherine A. Staton, MD MScGH <sup>1,2</sup> – catherine.lynch@duke.edu
15	
16	1 Duke Global Health Institute, Duke University, Durham, NC USA
17	2 Duke Department of Surgery, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, NC USA
18	3 Kilimanjaro Christian Medical Center, Moshi, Tanzania
19	4 Kilimanjaro Christian Medical University College, Moshi, Tanzania
20	5 Kilimanjaro Clinical Research Institute, Moshi, Tanzania
21	
22	Corresponding Author in event of publication: <u>catherine.lynch@duke.edu</u> (CAS)
23	ORCID#: 0000-0002-6468-2894
24	
25	Competing interests: The authors declare no competing interests
26	

### 27 Author contributions:

- 28 Conceptualization: CAS, FSh, FSa, JB
- 29 Methodology: AMP, CAS, JRNV
- 30 Formal analysis and investigation: CAS, FSh, FSa, JB
- 31 Data Collection: AMP, CAS
- 32 Writing original draft preparation: AMP, ECT, SZ, JTS
- 33 Writing review and editing: CAS, AMP, ECT, SZ, JTS
- 34 Funding acquisition: AMP, CAS

35 Supervision: CAS, JRNV, BTM

- 37 Funding: This project was funded by the Duke Global Health Institute Graduate Student funds, and the
- 38 Josiah Trent Foundation. Infrastructure built by NIH grant R01 AA027512 (PI Staton) was used to
- 39 support the data collection process for this grant to understand gender related aspects of alcohol use at
- 40 KCMC.
- 41

# 42 ABSTRACT

43 Background: Alcohol is a leading behavioral risk factor for death and disability worldwide. Tanzania has 44 few trained personnel and resources for treating unhealthy alcohol use. In Emergency Medicine 45 Departments (EMDs), alcohol is a well-known risk factor for injury patients. At Kilimanjaro Christian 46 Medical Center (KCMC) in Moshi, Tanzania, 30% of EMD injury patients (IP) test positive for alcohol 47 upon arrival to the ED. While the IP population is prime for EMD-based interventions, there is limited 48 data on if non-injury patients (NIP) have similar alcohol use behavior and potentially benefit from 49 screening and intervention as well. 50 **Methods:** This was a secondary analysis of a systematic random sampling of adult ( $\geq 18$  years old), 51 KiSwahili speaking, KCMC EMD patients surveyed between October 2021 and May 2022. When 52 medically stable and clinically sober, participants provided informed consent. Information on 53 demographics (sex, age, years of education, type of employment, income, marital status, tribe, and 54 religion), injury status, self-reported alcohol use, and Alcohol Use Disorder (AUD) Identification Test 55 (AUDIT) scores were collected. Descriptive statistics were analyzed in Rstudio using frequencies and 56 proportions. 57 **Results:** Of the 376 patients enrolled, 59 (15.7%) presented with an injury. The IP and NIP groups did 58 not differ in any demographics except sex, an expected difference as females were intentionally 59 oversampled in the original study design. The mean [SD] AUDIT score (IP: 5.8 [6.6]; NIP: 3.9 [6.1]), 60 drinks per week, and proportion of AUDIT ≥8 was higher for IP (IP:37%; NIP: 21%). However, alcohol 61 preferences, drinking quantity, weekly expenditure on alcohol, perceptions of unhealthy alcohol use, 62 attempts and reasons to quit, and treatment seeking were comparable between IPs and NIPs. 63 **Conclusion:** Our data suggests 37% of injury and 20% of non-injury patients screen positive for harmful 64 or hazardous drinking in our setting. An EMD-based alcohol treatment and referral process could be 65 beneficial to reduce this growing behavioral risk factor in non-injury as well as injury populations.

# 66 Introduction

Alcohol use is a significant contributor to death and disability globally, accounting for 67 68 approximately 3 million deaths and 5.1% of disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) annually (1). 69 This significant burden of global DALYs comes in part from the disproportionate effect on 70 young people; in 2016, alcohol use was the primary risk factor for premature death and disability 71 among those aged 15-49 years (1). These numbers are underpinned by alcohol's association with 72 injury and disease, having been linked as a causal factor in more than 200 acute and chronic 73 diseases and injury conditions, like liver disease, cardiovascular disease, and certain cancers (2-74 7). Alcohol misuse has also been associated with depression, anxiety, and phobias, with the co-75 occurrence of depression and alcohol misuse in particular linked to a more severe prognosis for 76 each (8,9). Additionally, beyond physical and mental harm, alcohol use can cause notable social and economic losses for individuals and the larger society, such as increased violence and 77 78 aggressive behaviors, unsafe sexual practices, and an estimated 2.6% reduction in the global 79 gross domestic product (10–14). Fortunately, alcohol intake is a modifiable risk factor, as such, 80 there is an opportunity to reduce much of the associated harm with social and behavioral 81 changes.

In low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), alcohol-related harm has been increasing, especially within Tanzania, a country that sits on the Eastern edge of the African continent. In Tanzania, alcohol use disorder (AUD) is prevalent in 6.8% of Tanzanian citizens, which is nearly double (3.7%) the WHO African Region overall(1). The burden associated with alcohol use is skewed by gender, with men experiencing approximately three times the attributable burden of disease compared to women (15,16) This proportion is seen in Tanzania as well. In 2016, the prevalence of AUDs among those aged 15 and older in Tanzania was 11.5% for men and 2.2%

for women(1). This is roughly 1.8 times the rate for men and more than 3 times the rate forwomen than in neighboring Malawi(1).

91 Moshi, a popular tourist town located at the base of Mount Kilimanjaro in Northern 92 Tanzania, has seen a higher prevalence of alcohol use and associated disease and injury statuses 93 in recent years (17-19). This increase in use is in part due to a strong drinking culture and 94 custom of early alcohol initiation in minors for members of the Chagga ethnic group, who 95 constitute the majority of local inhabitants (20,21). Standing also as contributing factors is alcohol's ready availability mixed with its low cost and recently more disposable income among 96 97 inhabitants of the region (17,20,22). In Moshi, high rates of alcohol use and alcohol-related 98 harm, in combination with the lack of trained health professionals and relevant resources, leads 99 to inadequate treatment availability (23).

100 As a means to reduce alcohol-related harm, alcohol-reduction interventions have been 101 implemented in Emergency Medicine Department (EMD) settings given the strong, well-102 established association between alcohol use and injuries (24). The consumption of alcohol 103 impairs cognitive functioning leading to an inhibition of perception, reflexes, and fine motor 104 skills (25). This inhibition can lead to more dangerous behaviors like driving under the influence, 105 interpersonal violence, and self-harm, thereby impacting the likelihood of both intentional and 106 unintentional injuries (24,26). EMDs typically stand as the first line of care for emergent injury 107 patients, and as such, EMDs tend to see a high proportion of patients with above-average regular 108 alcohol intake (27). At the Kilimanjaro Christian Medical Center (KCMC) in Moshi, 109 approximately 30% of EMD injury patients (IP) tested positive for alcohol use on arrival to the 110 EMD, a significantly larger proportion than the general population (28). As such, the EMD has

initiated a screening and culturally adapted brief intervention for treatment currently undergoingeffectiveness testing specifically for injury patients (29,30).

While there is data on this IP population, few, if any, studies provide data on alcohol
usage among non-injury patients (NIP) in comparison to IPs. Furthermore, how and if alcohol
use practices differ between IPs and NIPs is not well-studied. Given this gap in the literature, this
study aims to compare rates of alcohol use and alcohol-related behaviors between KCMC EMD

117 IPs and NIPs in order to guide future alcohol-related EMD interventions.

# 118 Methods

### 119 Study Design

This was a secondary analysis of a systematic random sampling study of KCMC EMD patients surveyed between October 2021 and May 2022. The primary study sought to describe gender differences in unhealthy alcohol use behaviors. As such, the EMD was chosen as a study location because of the high association between injuries and alcohol consumption (28,31). This current analysis seeks to compare alcohol consumption among IPs and NIPs who attend KCMC's EMD. Thus, demographic factors, self-reported alcohol use, and AUDIT scores were assessed between these two patient populations.

127 Study Sample

Patients were enrolled at the KCMC EMD study site, which is situated in Moshi,

129 Tanzania. All enrolled participants met the following eligibility criteria: 1) were 18 years of age

130 or older, 2) had the capacity to give informed consent, 3) received initial care at KCMC

131 Emergency Department, 4) were conversant in Kiswahili. Patients who were prisoners were

132 excluded from our study due to an increased medicolegal risk, concern for power dynamics

given their incarcerated state, and their current limited access to alcohol during incarceration. For the safety of the data collection team, patients who tested positive for COVID-19 were also not approached. A patient was determined capable of providing informed consent if they were medically stabilized, clinically sober, and well enough to complete the survey verbally on their own. Those who were extremely ill or injured upon initial presentation were re-evaluated by the research team within 24 hours of arriving at KCMC or before discharge, whichever came first. Those who remained unable to consent within this time frame were excluded from study

141 In addition to assessing gender differences, the original study aimed to compare rates of 142 unhealthy alcohol use among females in the EMD and the reproductive health center, which 143 required a higher proportion of female than male EMD subjects because of lower hypothesized 144 prevalence of alcohol misuse. Thus, the data analyzed here is representative of the EMD 145 population when separated by gender, but not when taken en masse. However, for this secondary 146 analysis, sufficient subjects were enrolled overall to estimate the prevalence of AUDIT scores > 147 8 (described more in-depth below) among both IPs and NIPs within a 10% margin of error and 148 90% confidence level. Ethical approval for this study was obtained from the Kilimanjaro 149 Christian Medical University College Ethics Review Board, the Tanzanian National Institute of 150 Medical Research, and the Duke University Institutional Review Board prior to the initiation of 151 data collection.

152 Data Collection

140

participation.

Patients seeking care at KCMC's EMD were enrolled Monday through Friday at peak
attendance hours, 10:00 am until 6:00 pm local time. Patients who came in overnight, or were
initially intoxicated or in critical condition were followed up over 24 hours to determine if they

were able to provide informed consent. If so, and if agreeing to study participation, these patients were likewise enrolled. During the data collection period, enrollment of female patients remained consistent, but enrollment of male patients was paused from January 1st, 2021 until March 31st, 2022, awaiting regulatory approval of increased male sample size. To maintain a representative, systematic random sample and meet planned enrollment goals, every female but every third male presenting to the EMD for care was approached about study participation since the EMD sees significantly more males than females.

163 If patients met eligibility criteria, they were screened and approached once medically 164 stabilized and offered study participation. Research assistants, who were IRB approved and 165 trained in Good Clinical Practices, explained the research protocol and informed consent to all 166 interested patients. Once enrolled, patients were asked questions related to their demographics, 167 current alcohol intake, alcohol-related behaviors, consequences of their drinking, and depressive 168 symptoms. All data were collected in Kiswahili by a team of three Tanzanian research assistants 169 (two female and one male). For data collection, the male research assistant surveyed all male 170 participants, and the female research assistants surveyed all female participants. This gender-171 matching was done to encourage open and honest reporting of patients' experiences with alcohol 172 based on local culture and research team experience (32). Regulatory approval for the primary 173 data collection project was obtained from the Kilimanjaro Christian Medical Center Ethics 174 Committee, the Tanzanian National Institution of Medical Research (NIMR), and the Duke 175 University Institutional Review Board. As much as possible, data was maintained in a de-176 identified manner and shared by data share agreement; personal health information was used for 177 screening and enrollment, but data were collected, stored and analyzed in an de-identified 178 manner.

# 179 Variables

180	Information on patients' demographics (sex, age, years of education, type of
181	employment, income, marital status, tribe, and religion), injury status, and self-reported alcohol
182	use were collected. All demographic and self-reported alcohol use questions had previously been
183	translated into Kiswahili by our Tanzanian research team. Additionally, the Alcohol Use
184	Disorder Identification Test (AUDIT), Drinkers' Inventory of Consequences, and the Patient
185	Health Questionnaire 9 (PHQ-9) were the three relevant scales administered.
186	AUDIT is a commonly used 10-question tool for measuring alcohol consumption and
187	alcohol-related problems (33,34). The AUDIT tool ranges from 0 to 40, with lower values
188	indicating low-risk consumption and higher values suggesting alcohol dependence. Both locally
189	and globally, scores greater than or equal to 8 are clinically significant for harmful or hazardous
190	drinking (HHD), meaning an individual is at risk for suffering adverse health outcomes as a
191	result of their alcohol intake, (34–39) and was thus used as a cut-off point in this analysis. DrInC
192	(which ranges from 0 - 50) is a 50-question survey that measures alcohol-related consequences
193	across five domains: interpersonal, intrapersonal, social consequences, impulse control, and
194	physical (40). While there is no clinically significant cut-off score, higher scores indicate more
195	significant consequences for an individual (41). Finally, PHQ-9 is a diagnostic tool used to
196	identify the existence and severity of depression (42). This scale ranges from 0 to 27, with higher
197	values indicating increasingly severe depressive symptoms. Scores of 9 or greater were found to
198	be the optimal cut-off score for identifying clinical depression in the KiSwahili-translated
199	version of the PHQ-9 (43) and thus was the cut-off point used here. All three scales had
200	previously been cross-culturally adapted, psychometrically validated, and clinically tested in the
201	local context (39,43,44).

# 202 Data Analysis

203	Data on patients' demographics, injury status, self-reported alcohol use, and AUDIT,
204	DrInC, and PHQ-9 scores were analyzed using descriptive frequencies and proportions. All
205	variables were categorical except for measures of income, education status, and the three survey
206	tools which were continuous. AUDIT and PHQ-9 scores were dichotomized according to the cut-
207	off values discussed previously; AUDIT scores of 8 and greater were categorized as HHD, while
208	scores less than 8 were classified as not HHD. PHQ-9 scores of 9 and greater were categorized as
209	a positive screen for depression and scores less than 9 were classified screening negative.
210	Missing data was minimal at 1 to 2 missing data points per variable with the exception of
211	personal and household income as several participants were hesitant to disclose their financial
212	status to research staff. All data were analyzed in RStudio (version 1.4) using user-created and
213	validated R-Packages.

# 214 Results

### 215 Patient Demographics

- 216 During the 8 months of data collection from October 1st until May 31st, 376 EMD
- 217 patients were surveyed, of which 59 (15.7%) presented with injuries and 317 (84.3%) presented
- 218 for non-injury-related reasons, including but not limited to fever, headache, stomach ache, body
- 219 numbness, or body swelling. As expected based on our sampling strategy, females account for
- 220 70.3% of the data collected. Across all groups, most patients were Christian and from the Chagga
- tribe (78% and 47%, respectively). Roughly half (46%) of participants were employed at the
- time of enrollment (10% were students and held no other employment, and 43% were
- unemployed). This demographic data can be seen in Table 1 below.

24	Table 1: Demographics of EMD Patients							
ED Demographics by Injury Status and Gender	Overall, N = 374 <sup>1</sup>	Injury Patients N = 59 <sup>1</sup>	Non-Injury Patients N = 315 <sup>1</sup>	Female Injury Patients, N = 26 <sup>1</sup>	Female Non- Injury Patients, N = 237 <sup>1</sup>	Male Injury Patients, N = 33 <sup>1</sup>	Male Non- Injury Patients, N = 78 <sup>1</sup>	
Years of Education, missing: 2	7.73 (5.05)	8.27 (4.82)	7.63 (5.10)	5.92 (3.95)	6.60 (4.56)	10.12 (4.68)	10.71 (5.41)	
Personal Income (TZS) per month, <i>missing: 58</i>	254,939.87 (439,577.43)	225,384.62 (316,503.07)	259,101.08 (454,532.08)	186,153.85 (270,692.84)	239,443.97 (442,816.79)	303,846.15 (393,139.89)	360,444.44 (503,929.81)	
Household Income (TZS) per month, <i>missing: 59</i>	435,968.25 (510,222.82)	397,763.16 (492,331.32)	441,209.39 (513,270.52)	362,115.38 (529,955.04)	433,276.60 (478,412.29)	475,000.00 (409,267.64)	485,595.24 (681,751.87)	
Religion Christian	290 / 374 (78%)	50 / 59 (85%)	240 / 315 (76%)	24 / 26 (92%)	187 / 237 (79%)	26 / 33 (79%)	53 / 78 (68%)	
Muslim	75 / 374 (20%)	8 / 59 (14%)	67 / 315 (21%)	2 / 26 (7.7%)	44 / 237 (19%)	6 / 33 (18%)	23 / 78 (29%)	
None Other	8 / 374 (2.1%) 1 / 374 (0.3%)	1 / 59 (1.7%) 0 / 59 (0%)	7 / 315 (2.2%) 1 / 315 (0.3%)	0 / 26 (0%) 0 / 26 (0%)	5 / 237 (2.1%) 1 / 237 (0.4%)	1 / 33 (3.0%) 0 / 33 (0%)	2 / 78 (2.6%) 0 / 78 (0%)	
Marital Status, <i>missing: 1</i>				. ,				
Divorced or Separated	23 / 373 (6.2%)	2 / 59 (3.4%)	21 / 314 (6.7%)	0 / 26 (0%)	14 / 237 (5.9%)	2 / 33 (6.1%)	7 / 77 (9.1%)	
Living together with a partner but not in a registered marriage	37 / 373 (9.9%)	9 / 59 (15%)	28 / 314 (8.9%)	2 / 26 (7.7%)	23 / 237 (9.7%)	7 / 33 (21%)	5 / 77 (6.5%)	
Living together with a partner in a registered marriage	181 / 373 (49%)	30 / 59 (51%)	151 / 314 (48%)	14 / 26 (54%)	110 / 237 (46%)	16 / 33 (48%)	41 / 77 (53%)	
Never Married or Single	77 / 373 (21%)	13 / 59 (22%)	64 / 314 (20%)	5 / 26 (19%)	49 / 237 (21%)	8 / 33 (24%)	15 / 77 (19%)	
Refused/Do not know	1 / 373 (0.3%)	0 / 59 (0%)	1 / 314 (0.3%)	0 / 26 (0%)	0 / 237 (0%)	0 / 33 (0%)	1 / 77 (1.3%)	
Widowed	54 / 373 (14%)	5 / 59 (8.5%)	49 / 314 (16%)	5 / 26 (19%)	41 / 237 (17%)	0 / 33 (0%)	8 / 77 (10%)	
<b>Employment Status</b>								
Employed	173 / 374 (46%)	31 / 59 (53%)	142 / 315 (45%)	11 / 26 (42%)	110 / 237 (46%)	20 / 33 (61%)	32 / 78 (41%)	
Unemployed	162 / 374 (43%)	22 / 59 (37%)	140 / 315 (44%)	11 / 26 (42%)	99 / 237 (42%)	11 / 33 (33%)	41 / 78 (53%)	
Student	39 / 374 (10%)	6 / 59 (10%)	33 / 315 (10%)	4 / 26 (15%)	28 / 237 (12%)	2 / 33 (6.1%)	5 / 78 (6.4%)	
Tribe								
Chagga	176 / 374 (47%)	31 / 59 (53%)	145 / 315 (46%)	14 / 26 (54%)	108 / 237 (46%)	17 / 33 (52%)	37 / 78 (47%)	
Iraq	13 / 374 (3.5%)	3 / 59 (5.1%)	10 / 315 (3.2%)	1 / 26 (3.8%)	8 / 237 (3.4%)	2 / 33 (6.1%)	2 / 78 (2.6%)	
Maasai	18 / 374 (4.8%)	2 / 59 (3.4%)	16 / 315 (5.1%)	0 / 26 (0%)	13 / 237 (5.5%)	2/33 (6.1%)	3 / 78 (3.8%)	

Mmeru	18 / 374 (4.8%)	4 / 59 (6.8%)	14 / 317 (4.4%)	3 / 26 (12%)	11 / 237 (4.6%)	1 / 33 (3.0%)	3 / 78 (3.8%)
Muha or Non-African	3 / 374 (0.8%)	1 / 59 (1.7%)	2 / 315 (0.6%)	1 / 26 (3.8%)	2 / 237 (0.8%)	0 / 33 (0%)	0 / 78 (0%)
Nyaturu	5 / 374 (1.3%)	0 / 59 (0%)	5 / 315 (1.6%)	0 / 26 (0%)	5 / 237 (2.1%)	0 / 33 (0%)	0 / 78 (0%)
Other African	64 / 374 (17%)	7 / 59 (12%)	57 / 315 (19%)	5 / 26 (19%)	50 / 237 (21%)	2 / 33 (6.1%)	7 / 78 (9.0%)
Pare	44 / 374 (12%)	8 / 59 (14%)	36 / 315 (11%)	2 / 26 (7.7%)	24 / 237 (10%)	6 / 33 (18%)	12 / 78 (15%)
Sambaa	15 / 374 (4.0%)	2 / 59 (3.4%)	13 / 315 (4.1%)	0 / 26 (0%)	6 / 237 (2.5%)	2 / 33 (6.1%)	7 / 78 (9.0%)
Sukuma	18 / 374 (4.8%)	1 / 59 (1.7%)	17 / 315 (5.4%)	0 / 26 (0%)	10 / 237 (4.2%)	1 / 33 (3.0%)	7 / 78 (9.0%)

## Alcohol Use Characteristics of EMD Patients

227 In following the intention of this paper to compare rates of alcohol use and alcohol-228 related behaviors across IPs and NIPs presenting to KCMC's EMD, differences in AUDIT, 229 PHO-9, and DrInC scores were examined across these two groups. IPs had higher average [SD] 230 AUDIT scores (5.76 [6.6]) than NIPs (3.93 [6.1]), although a sizeable proportion of individuals 231 with HHD (AUDIT  $\geq 8$ ) were present in both patient groups (37% of IPs and 21% of NIPs). 232 Average DrInC scores were higher in the IP population (12.92 [17.54]) than the NIP population 233 (9.19 [15,99]), but mean PHO-9 scores were greater among NIPs (6.60 [5.17]) than IPs (4.12) 234 [4.14]). Following this, a greater percentage of NIPs (22% of NIPs and of 8.5% of IPs) screened 235 positively for depression (PHO-9 > 9). 236 Other markers of alcohol use, including drinking frequency and drinking quantity, were

237 also explored. AUDIT scores were higher among IPs; however, a greater proportion of NIPs 238 appeared to drink more frequently (5.0% of NIPs but 1.7% of IPs reportedly drank every day or)239 multiple times per day), and in unhealthy quantities (5.1% of NIPs but 3.4% of IPs drank 5 or)240 more bottles per sitting). Other characteristics were comparable across both patient groups; 241 roughly half (47% of IPs and 52% of NIPs) had previously attempted to guit drinking, and a 242 tenth (14% of IPs and 8.9% of NIPs) had sought treatment for alcohol use, with personal reasons 243 (39% of IPs and 42% of NIPs) cited as the primary motivation to guit. Most participants noted 244 beer (31% of IPs and 24% of NIPs) as their alcoholic drink of choice, and 1.7% of IPs and 1.9% 245 of NIPs spent more than 50,000 TZS (\$21.42 USD) on alcohol per week. To put this amount into 246 context, the average reported personal income for the overall study population is 254,939.87 TZS 247 (\$109.32 USD) per month or 58,674.31 TZS (\$25.16 USD) per week.

248	This data was separated further by males and females to account for how overarching
249	sex-based differences in alcohol use could impact trends among IPs and NIPs. Of those with
250	injuries, roughly half were females (44%), compared to the non-injury group, in which females
251	constituted the majority (75%). Overall, males had higher average AUDIT and DrInC scores but
252	lower PHQ-9 scores than female patients regardless of injury status. The average AUDIT score
253	was 7.58 [7.27] for male IPs and 6.68 [8.59] for male NIPs. This stands in comparison to
254	females; 3.46 [5.03] and 3.03 [4.76] were the average AUDIT score for female IPs and NIPs,
255	respectively. These trends are echoed in the proportion of patients who tested positive for HHD.
256	For males, 48% of those with injuries and 35% of those without injuries screened positively for
257	HHD, whereas for females, 23% of those with injuries and 16% of those without injuries had
258	AUDIT scores greater than or equal to 8.
259	Males also had average DrInC scores (16.30 [19.32] for male IPs and 14.28 [20.46] for
260	male NIPs) which were higher than their female counterparts. For females, average DrInC scores
261	were 8.62 [14.19] for female IPs and 7.49 [13.90] for female NIPs. While males had the highest
262	AUDIT and DrInC scores, females were more likely to screen positively for depression (those
263	with a PHQ-9 $\ge$ 9 constituted 15% of female IPs and 26% of female NIPs) compared to males
264	(3% of male IPs and 10% of male NIPs had a PHQ-9 $\ge$ 9). Of all groups, female NIPs had the
265	highest average PHQ-9 score (7.30 [5.16]), followed by female IPs with an average of 6.62
266	[3.94]. These reports and others can be seen in Table 2 below.

267	Table 2: Alcohol Use Characteristics of EMD Patients						
ED Demographics by Injury Status and Gender	Overall, N = 374 <sup>1</sup>	Injury Patients N = 59 <sup>1</sup>	Non-Injury Patients N = 315 <sup>1</sup>	Female Injury Patients, N = 26 <sup>1</sup>	Female Non- Injury Patients, N = 237 <sup>1</sup>	Male Injury Patients, N = 33 <sup>1</sup>	Male Non- Injury Patients, N = 78 <sup>1</sup>
AUDIT Score	4.22 (6.25)	5.76 (6.66)	3.94 (6.13)	3.46 (5.03)	3.03 (4.76)	7.58 (7.27)	6.68 (8.59)
DrInC Score	9.76 (16.30)	12.92 (17.54)	9.17 (16.01)	8.62 (14.19)	7.49 (13.90)	16.30 (19.32)	14.28 (20.46)
PHQ-9 Score	6.21 (5.11)	4.12 (4.14)	6.60 (5.18)	6.62 (3.94)	7.30 (5.16)	2.15 (3.15)	4.49 (4.68)
Alcohol Preferences							
Beer	93 / 374 (25%)	18 / 59 (31%)	75 / 315 (24%)	5 / 26 (19%)	59 / 237 (25%)	13 / 33 (39%)	16 / 78 (21%)
Changaa, Dadii, Gongo, Piwa	8 / 374 (2.1%)	0 / 59 (0%)	8 / 315 (2.5%)	0 / 26 (0%)	5 / 237 (2.1%)	0 / 33 (0%)	3 / 78 (3.8%)
Light Beer	39 / 374 (10%)	3 / 59 (5.1%)	36 / 315 (11%)	0 / 26 (0%)	20 / 237 (8.4%)	3 / 33 (9.1%)	16 / 78 (21%)
Liquor/Spirits	11 / 374 (2.9%)	2 / 59 (3.4%)	9 / 315 (2.9%)	0 / 26 (0%)	3 / 237 (1.3%)	2 / 33 (6.1%)	6 / 78 (7.7%)
Mbege	55 / 374 (15%)	10 / 59 (17%)	45 / 315 (14%)	5 / 26 (19%)	35 / 237 (15%)	5 / 33 (15%)	10 / 78 (13%)
None	111 / 374 (30%)	15 / 59 (25%)	96 / 315 (30%)	12 / 26 (46%)	86 / 237 (36%)	3 / 33 (9.1%)	10 / 78 (13%)
Other	2 / 374 (0.5%)	0 / 59 (0%)	2 / 315 (0.6%)	0 / 26 (0%)	2 / 237 (0.8%)	0 / 33 (0%)	0 / 78 (0%)
Refused/Do not know	5 / 374 (1.3%)	0 / 59 (0%)	5 / 315 (1.6%)	0 / 26 (0%)	0 / 237 (0%)	0 / 33 (0%)	5 / 78 (6.4%)
Ulanzi	4 / 374 (1.1%)	1 / 59 (1.7%)	3 / 315 (1.0%)	0 / 26 (0%)	2 / 237 (0.8%)	1 / 33 (3.0%)	1 / 78 (1.3%)
Wine	46 / 374 (12%)	10 / 59 (17%)	36 / 315 (11%)	4 / 26 (15%)	25 / 237 (11%)	6 / 33 (18%)	11 / 78 (14%)
Drinking Frequency, missing: 1							
0 times/week	119 / 373 (32%)	16 / 58 (28%)	103 / 315 (33%)	12 / 26 (46%)	87 / 237 (37%)	4 / 32 (12%)	16 / 78 (21%)
1-2 times/week	185 / 373 (50%)	24 / 58 (41%)	161 / 315 (51%)	6 / 26 (23%)	120 / 237 (51%)	18 / 32 (56%)	41 / 78 (53%)
3-4 times/week	47 / 373 (13%)	16 / 58 (28%)	31 / 315 (9.8%)	8 / 26 (31%)	18 / 237 (7.6%)	8 / 32 (25%)	13 / 78 (17%)
5-6 times/week	4 / 373 (1.1%)	1 / 58 (1.7%)	3 / 315 (1.0%)	0 / 26 (0%)	2 / 237 (0.8%)	1 / 32 (3.1%)	1 / 78 (1.3%)
Every day	14 / 373 (3.8%)	0 / 58 (0%)	14 / 315 (4.4%)	0 / 26 (0%)	10 / 237 (4.2%)	0 / 32 (0%)	4 / 78 (5.1%)
Multiple times a day	3 / 373 (0.8%)	1 / 58 (1.7%)	2 / 315 (0.6%)	0 / 26 (0%)	0 / 237 (0%)	1 / 32 (3.1%)	2 / 78 (2.6%)
Refused/Do not know	1 / 373 (0.3%)	0 / 58 (0%)	1 / 315 (0.3%)	0 / 26 (0%)	0 / 237 (0%)	0 / 32 (0%)	1 / 78 (1.3%)
Drinking Quantity, <i>missing: 1</i>							
0 drinks	119 / 373 (32%)	16 / 58 (28%)	103 / 315 (33%)	12 / 26 (46%)	88 / 237 (37%)	4 / 32 (12%)	15 / 78 (19%)
1-2 bottles	172 / 373 (46%)	24 / 58 (41%)	148 / 315 (47%)	8 / 26 (31%)	106 / 237 (45%)	16 / 32 (50%)	42 / 78 (54%)
3-4 bottles	62 / 373 (17%)	16 / 58 (28%)	46 / 315 (15%)	6 / 26 (23%)	35 / 237 (15%)	10 / 32 (31%)	11 / 78 (14%)
5-6 bottles	13 / 373 (3.5%)	1 / 58 (1.7%)	12 / 315 (3.8%)	0 / 26 (0%)	7 / 237 (3.0%)	1 / 32 (3.1%)	5 / 78 (6.4%)
>6 bottles	5 / 373 (1.3%)	1 / 58 (1.7%)	4 / 315 (1.3%)	0 / 26 (0%)	1 / 237 (0.4%)	1 / 32 (3.1%)	3 / 78 (3.8%)
Refused/Do not know	2 / 373 (0.5%)	0 / 58 (0%)	2 / 315 (0.6%)	0 / 26 (0%)	0 / 237 (0%)	0 / 32 (0%)	2 / 78 (2.6%)

..... ... . . . . . ~ . ..

ED Demographics by Injury Status and Gender	Overall, N = 374 <sup>1</sup>	Injury Patients N = 59 <sup>1</sup>	Non-Injury Patients N = 315 <sup>1</sup>	Female Injury Patients, N = 26 <sup>1</sup>	Female Non- Injury Patients, N = 2371Male Injury Patients, N = 331		Male Non- Injury Patients, N = 78 <sup>1</sup>	
Weekly Alcohol Expenses (TZS)	), missing: 1							
0-10000	284 / 373 (76%)	38 / 58 (66%)	246 / 315 (78%)	21 / 26 (81%)	200 / 237 (84%)	17 / 32 (53%)	46 / 78 (59%)	
10001-50000	79 / 373 (21%)	19 / 58 (33%)	60 / 315 (19%)	5 / 26 (19%)	35 / 237 (15%)	14 / 32 (44%)	25 / 78 (32%)	
50001-100000	7 / 373 (1.9%)	1 / 58 (1.7%)	6 / 315 (1.9%)	0 / 26 (0%)	2 / 237 (0.8%)	1 / 32 (3.1%)	4 / 78 (5.1%)	
Refused/Do not know	3 / 373 (0.8%)	0 / 58 (0%)	3 / 315 (0.9%)	0 / 26 (0%)	0 / 237 (0%)	0 / 32 (0%)	3 / 78 (3.8%)	
Attempted Quitting, missing: 1								
No	170 / 373 (46%)	29 / 59 (49%)	141 / 314 (45%)	15 / 26 (58%)	113 / 236 (48%)	14 / 33 (42%)	28 / 78 (36%)	
Refused/Do not know	12 / 373 (3.2%)	2 / 59 (3.4%)	10 / 314 (3.2%)	0 / 26 (0%)	1 / 236 (0.4%)	2 / 33 (6.1%)	9 / 78 (12%)	
Yes	191 / 373 (51%)	28 / 59 (47%)	163 / 314 (52%)	11 / 26 (42%)	122 / 236 (52%)	17 / 33 (52%)	41 / 78 (53%)	
Reason for Quitting								
Family	13 / 191 (6.8%)	3 / 28 (11%)	10 / 163 (6.1%)	0 / 11 (0%)	8 / 122 (6.6%)	3 / 17 (18%)	2 / 41 (4.9%)	
Financial	19 / 191 (9.9%)	3 / 28 (11%)	16 / 163 (9.8%)	1 / 11 (9.1%)	6 / 122 (4.9%)	2 / 17 (12%)	10 / 41 (24%)	
Health	66 / 191 (35%)	8 / 28 (29%)	58 / 163 (36%)	5 / 11 (45%)	45 / 122 (37%)	3 / 17 (18%)	13 / 41 (32%)	
Other	1 / 191 (0.5%)	0 / 28 (0%)	1 / 163 (0.6%)	0 / 11 (0%)	1 / 122 (0.8%)	0 / 17 (0%)	0 / 41 (0%)	
Personal	79 / 191 (41%)	11 / 28 (39%)	68 / 163 (42%)	4 / 11 (36%)	56 / 122 (46%)	7 / 17 (41%)	12 / 41 (29%)	
Spiritual	13 / 191 (6.8%)	3 / 28 (11%)	10 / 163 (6.1%)	1 / 11 (9.1%)	6 / 122 (4.9%)	2 / 17 (12%)	4 / 41 (9.8%)	
Not Applicable	183 / 374 (43.9%)							
Alcohol Use perceived as Unhea	lthy, <i>missing: 1</i>							
No	86 / 373 (23%)	16 / 59 (27%)	70 / 314 (22%)	9 / 26 (35%)	64 / 236 (27%)	7 / 33 (21%)	6 / 78 (7.7%)	
Refused/Do not know	4 / 373 (1.1%)	0 / 59 (0%)	4 / 314 (1.3%)	0 / 26 (0%)	4 / 236 (1.7%)	0 / 33 (0%)	0 / 78 (0%)	
Yes	283 / 373 (76%)	43 / 59 (73%)	240 / 314 (77%)	17 / 26 (65%)	168 / 236 (71%)	26 / 33 (79%)	72 / 78 (92%)	
Sought Treatment for Alcohol U	Jse, missing: 2							
No	335 / 372 (90%)	51 / 59 (86%)	284 / 313 (91%)	24 / 26 (92%)	219 / 235 (93%)	27 / 33 (82%)	65 / 78 (83%)	
Refused/Do not know	1 / 372 (0.3%)	0 / 59 (0%)	1 / 313 (0.3%)	0 / 26 (0%)	1 / 235 (0.4%)	0 / 33 (0%)	0 / 78 (0%)	
Yes	36 / 372 (9.7%)	8 / 59 (14%)	28 / 313 (8.9%)	2 / 26 (7.7%)	15 / 235 (6.4%)	6 / 33 (18%)	13 / 78 (17%)	
Sought Psychiatric Treatment, <i>n</i>	missing: 2	~ /		× /	~ /	~ /	~ /	
No	340 / 372 (91%)	49 / 59 (83%)	293 / 313 (93%)	20 / 26 (77%)	217 / 236 (92%)	29 / 33 (88%)	74 / 77 (96%)	
Refused/Do not know	1 / 372 (0.3%)	0 / 59 (0%)	1 / 313 (0.3%)	0 / 26 (0%)	1 / 236 (0.4%)	0 / 33 (0%)	0 / 77 (0%)	
Yes	31 / 372 (8.3%)	10 / 59 (17%)	21 / 313 (6.7%)	6 / 26 (23%)	18 / 236 (7.6%)	4 / 33 (12%)	3 / 77 (3.9%)	
AUD Status (AUDIT $\geq$ 8)	87 / 374 (23%)	22 / 59 (37%)	65 / 315 (21%)	6 / 26 (23%)	38 / 237 (16%)	16 / 33 (48%)	27 / 78 (35%)	

ED Demographics by Injury Status and Gender	Overall, N = 374 <sup>1</sup>	Injury Patients N = 59 <sup>1</sup>	Non-Injury Patients N = 315 <sup>1</sup>	Female Injury Patients, N = 26 <sup>1</sup>	Female Non- Injury Patients, N = 237 <sup>1</sup>	Male Injury Patients, N = 33 <sup>1</sup>	Male Non- Injury Patients, N = 78 <sup>1</sup>
Depression Status (PHQ−9 ≥ 9)	74 / 374 (20%)	5 / 59 (8.5%)	69 / 315 (22%)	4 / 26 (15%)	61 / 237 (26%)	1 / 33 (3.0%)	8 / 78 (10%)
$1M_{een}$ (SD): n / N (%)							

<sup>1</sup>Mean (SD); n / N (%)

# 269 Discussion

Alcohol use is a leading and growing behavioral risk factor for poor health, injury, and 270 271 illness. Especially in low-resource settings, each patient who interfaces with the healthcare 272 system represents a chance to screen and initiate primary and secondary preventative health 273 measures (23). This is the first analysis to compare alcohol use and alcohol-related behaviors 274 between injury and non-injury EMD patients in Moshi, Tanzania, with the goal of describing 275 opportunities for initiation of screening and intervention opportunities. Our evidence 276 demonstrates that both injury and non-injury patients in Moshi have high rates of harmful and 277 hazardous alcohol use, and non-injured patients also have high rates of psychological 278 comorbidities. These findings indicate future screening and intervention initiatives should focus 279 on the EMD population as a whole rather than specific injury groups.

280 The data presented has shown that a large proportion of both IPs and NIPs presenting to 281 KCMC's EMD screened positive for HHD and exhibited unhealthy alcohol use behaviors. While 282 IPs (37%) overall had a higher prevalence of HHD than NIPs (21%), a higher proportion of NIPs 283 drank daily or drank 5 or more drinks per sitting than IPs. The higher rate of AUDIT  $\geq 8$  among 284 IPs likely stems from this group having a higher proportion of males (given males generally 285 consume more alcohol (16)), and the close association of alcohol use and injuries that prompt 286 EMD visits (27). For example, previous work by our group has found that 30% of IPs at 287 KCMC's EMD were ETOH positive upon admission (28). While the literature on alcohol use 288 among non-injury EMD patients is limited both globally and in Tanzania, one study based in 289 Belgium found that patients presenting with psychiatric problems had the highest incidence of 290 being intoxicated compared to other complaints (45). However, as EMDs in Tanzania and 291 Belgium are vastly different, this finding may not be generalizable to our study population.

292	The rates shown in our analysis are also comparable to or higher than other population-
293	wide alcohol use estimates in Moshi. In 2008, for example, Mitsunga and Larsen found that the
294	lowest rates of alcohol abuse in Moshi were in females with partners (7.0%), and the highest
295	rates in males (22.8%) (CAGE > 2 as the definition of alcohol abuse)(17). Further, AUDIT
296	screening at an outpatient primary health center in Moshi conducted by Mushi et al. showed that
297	23.9% of primary care patients reported AUDIT scores $\geq$ 8 (23). When stratifying and comparing
298	our data to Mushi's estimates by sex, a higher proportion of both EMD IPs and NIPs have HHD
299	than primary care patients. Mushi et al found that 38.7% of males and 13.1% of females had
300	AUDIT scores $\geq$ 8 (23). In our data set, 48% of male IPs and 35% of male NIPs had AUDIT $\geq$ 8,
301	and 23% of female IPs and 16% of female NIPs had AUDIT $\geq 8$ . These direct comparisons
302	suggest that within Moshi, KCMC EMD patients, both IPs and NIPs, have high proportions of
303	HHD/ AUDIT≥8 compared to other local populations, demonstrating an opportunity for
304	screening and intervention in a high-risk population.
305	In comparing regional data, Kenyatta National Hospital in Nairobi with a more sensitive
306	AUDIT-C, found 91.5% of male and 8.5% of female EMD IPs screened positive for HHD (46).
307	Concerningly, our higher AUDIT amongst women compared to this Kenya-based screening
308	suggests our AUD prevalence might be higher than this Kenya-based data. In comparison to data
309	from Uganda which found male primary care patients had a 5.8% had AUDIT screen (47), we
310	found a nearly 6-fold higher male AUDIT screen suggesting a very high concentration of HHD
311	in KCMC EMD. Across the continent in Ghana, 27% of injured patients in the EMD reported a
312	history of harmful alcohol use/ AUDIT $\ge$ 8(48). In both these studies, no comparison was made
313	to the rates in non-injured patients.

314	As in other settings (49,50), we found our patients have both AUD and other untreated
315	mental health comorbidities. Overall, 1 in 5 or 20% of patients (8.5% of IPs and 22% of NIPs)
316	sampled scored $\ge$ 9 on the PHQ9 (screening positive for depression) of which 91% had neither
317	sought nor received treatment. In comparison to our data, the WHO estimates the prevalence of
318	depression to be approximately 4.1% within the general population of Tanzania(51) and 5.0%
319	among the global adult population (52). These depression screenings are five times higher in our
320	EMD population and four times higher than the global population, highlighting the high mental
321	health burden this patient group experiences and calls for the expansion of clinical services to
322	support this high-risk group.
323	Accessing care for mental health disorders is limited by health literacy, stigma, and

324 knowledge of and availability of services in resource-limited settings both globally and within 325 Tanzania (53–56). It is unfortunately not surprising that over 90% of our population reports not 326 seeking (nor obtaining) treatment services for either mental health or alcohol treatment services. 327 The Tanzanian government's total expenditure on mental health comprises 4.0 % of the total 328 government health budget, and there are 1.31 total mental health professionals per 100,000 329 people in Tanzania compared to 15.32 mental health professionals per 100,000 in neighboring 330 Kenya (57). Aside from a lack of resources, stigma and negative perceptions about mental health 331 can limit patients seeking care. Within this already resource-strained setting, a KCMC-based 332 study found that 71% of providers either devalued or discriminated against their patients who 333 suffered from alcohol use disorders (58). Another study performed in Domoda, Tanzania, 334 showed that 58.9% of the surveyed population had negative attitudes toward people with mental 335 health problems (59). These stigmatizing perceptions and generalizations about Tanzanians with

336 mental health problems and substance use (including alcohol) will continue to limit cultural337 acceptance of seeking care.

338 Given the high rates of unhealthy alcohol use and mental health disorders found among 339 our KCMC EMD IPs and NIPs, there is an opportunity to improve screening and treatment 340 initiation for a more comprehensive screening system. The implementation of high-risk alcohol 341 use screening within LMICs like Tanzania has been recommended as a way to reduce alcohol-342 related harm (60). The Screening, Brief Intervention (BI), and Referral to Treatment (SBIRT) 343 model, in particular, is the most commonly implemented patient-level alcohol-reduction 344 intervention in LMICs (61). SBIRT screens patients for substance misuse, and for those 345 identified as needing further treatment, provides a BI, which is a short motivational interview 346 focused on increasing awareness of patients' substance misuse and inciting positive behavioral 347 changes (62,63). BIs have been shown to effectively reduce alcohol intake and related 348 consequences, especially among injury patients using comparatively few resources that would be 349 scarce in LMIC settings (64-67). Kenya and South Africa stand as the only other countries on 350 the African continent to have successfully used alcohol abuse SBIRT programs to their 351 EMDs(68), however, with an exclusive focus on IPs instead of the full EMD patient population. 352 KCMC is another institution that has implemented similar services among EMD IPs in recent 353 research-based intervention initiatives (29,30).

However, because alcohol use and psychiatric disorders are present at high rates in our study population and are commonly co-occurring (8), initiating both psychological and substance misuse-based screenings among all-comers in this setting represents an opportunity to better assist disordered patients as a whole. Similar models could be translated to this setting with a limited increase in resource utilization as basic screening measures are already being utilized

359 among EMD IPs. As seen in this KCMC EMD population, a high prevalence of alcohol use and 360 mental health disorders was found regardless of their injury status. Implementing screening 361 measures for both excessive alcohol consumption and depression at this clinical site could both 362 increase the identification of patients with high-risk alcohol and mental health needs and 363 subsequently facilitate the delivery of appropriate treatments for high-risk patients. Expanding 364 the scope of these current measures to incorporate NIPs at KCMC and screening for depression 365 could lead to improved health outcomes for more patients without having to expend significantly 366 more resources.

In summary, both IPs and NIPs presenting to KCMC's EMD in Moshi, Tanzania, have
higher rates of alcohol use disorder and depression than the general population. Given the heavy
detrimental effects these disorders have on patient health outcomes, more robust screening and
treatment services are needed at KCMC's EMD.

371

### Strengths and Limitations

372 Several important factors must be taken into account when interpreting this data. First, 373 we have no complete registry of all patients who present for services and, as such, our ability to 374 evaluate how representative this sample is of KCMC's EMD population as a whole is limited. 375 While this limitation is offset by our large sample size and systematic random sampling strategy, 376 it should still be taken into consideration when considering data accuracy. Second, our data set 377 has limited specifications on patients' chief complaints which restricts our ability to further 378 analyze or make comparisons between complaint-specific groups. Therefore, we recommend that 379 future studies look more closely at EMD patients' demographics and chief complaints in combination with their alcohol behavior as it might vary greatly with each unique setting. 380

381 This data was also collected throughout several waves of the COVID-19 pandemic. The 382 limited resources available to protect KCMC's EMD patients from the spread of COVID-19 may 383 have dissuaded those with lower acuity complaints from seeking care at the EMD. Therefore, the 384 data here may represent a more acute patient population than would otherwise be seen. Finally, 385 the data collected from participants was dependent upon the accuracy of their self-reported 386 demographic and alcohol intake. While several measures were taken throughout the study to 387 encourage truthful reporting of patients' typical alcohol intake (including gender-matching data 388 collectors with participants and collecting all data in private, confidential environments), there 389 may have been an underreporting of true alcohol consumption. This may be due to the societal 390 stigmatization surrounding heavy alcohol use in Tanzania, which encourages secretive alcohol 391 use behaviors, especially among females.

More research is needed to better identify treatments that would be effective for all EMD patients presenting with unhealthy alcohol use. Building upon the information presented here, to reduce the burden caused by alcohol in this region, more effective, evidence-based care options are urgently needed.

# 396 Conclusion

397Of all patients who presented to KCMC's EMD, we found that 37% of IP and 21% of398NIPs scored  $\geq 8$  on the AUDIT. As this score is clinically significant for hazardous or harmful399alcohol use, our findings suggest that a significant proportion of both patient populations could400benefit from an EMD-based alcohol treatment and referral process to reduce this growing401behavioral risk factor. This is especially important given the lack of alcohol-related treatment402options and trained personnel in this region. We hope that this data can be used to shape and403inform research and treatment programs related to alcohol and reduce the burden of use in

404 Moshi, Tanzania.

# 405 Funding Disclosure

- 406 This project was funded by the Duke Global Health Institute Graduate Student funds, and the
- 407 Josiah Trent Foundation. Infrastructure built by NIH grant R01 AA027512 (PI Staton) was used
- 408 to support the data collection process for this grant to understand gender related aspects of
- 409 alcohol use at KCMC.

### 410 Bibliography

- World Health Organization (WHO). Global status report on alcohol and health 2018
   [Internet]. World Health Organization (WHO); 2018 [cited 2021 Nov 21]. Available from: https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/274603/9789241565639-eng.pdf
- 414 2. Rehm J, Gmel GE, Gmel G, Hasan OSM, Imtiaz S, Popova S, et al. The relationship
  415 between different dimensions of alcohol use and the burden of disease-an update.
  416 Addiction. 2017 Jun;112(6):968–1001.
- 417 3. Rehm J, Mathers C, Popova S, Thavorncharoensap M, Teerawattananon Y, Patra J. Global
  418 burden of disease and injury and economic cost attributable to alcohol use and alcohol-use
  419 disorders. Lancet. 2009 Jun 27;373(9682):2223–33.
- 420 4. Sterling SA, Palzes VA, Lu Y, Kline-Simon AH, Parthasarathy S, Ross T, et al.
  421 Associations between medical conditions and alcohol consumption levels in an adult
  422 primary care population. JAMA Netw Open. 2020 May 1;3(5):e204687.
- 5. Schwarzinger M, Thiébaut SP, Baillot S, Mallet V, Rehm J. Alcohol use disorders and
  associated chronic disease a national retrospective cohort study from France. BMC
  Public Health. 2017 Jul 21;18(1):43.
- 426 6. Rumgay H, Murphy N, Ferrari P, Soerjomataram I. Alcohol and cancer: epidemiology and
  427 biological mechanisms. Nutrients. 2021 Sep 11;13(9).
- 428 7. Piano MR. Alcohol's effects on the cardiovascular system. Alcohol Res. 2017;38(2):219–
  429 41.
- 430 8. McHugh RK, Weiss RD. Alcohol use disorder and depressive disorders. Alcohol Res.
  431 2019 Oct 21;40(1).
- Puddephatt J-A, Irizar P, Jones A, Gage SH, Goodwin L. Associations of common mental disorder with alcohol use in the adult general population: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Addiction. 2022 Jun;117(6):1543–72.
- 435 10. Steele CM, Southwick L. Alcohol and social behavior I: The psychology of drunken
  436 excess. J Pers Soc Psychol. 1985 Jan;48(1):18–34.
- 437 11. Thavorncharoensap M, Teerawattananon Y, Yothasamut J, Lertpitakpong C,
  438 Chaikledkaew U. The economic impact of alcohol consumption: a systematic review.
  439 Subst Abuse Treat Prev Policy. 2009 Nov 25;4:20.
- 440 12. Burke TR. The economic impact of alcohol abuse and alcoholism. Public Health Rep.
  441 1988 Dec;103(6):564–8.
- 442 13. Mohapatra S, Patra J, Popova S, Duhig A, Rehm J. Social cost of heavy drinking and
  443 alcohol dependence in high-income countries. Int J Public Health. 2010 Jun;55(3):149–57.
- 444 14. Manthey J, Hassan SA, Carr S, Kilian C, Kuitunen-Paul S, Rehm J. What are the

445 446		economic costs to society attributable to alcohol use? A systematic review and modelling study. Pharmacoeconomics. 2021 Jul;39(7):809–22.
447 448 449 450	15.	GBD 2016 Alcohol and Drug Use Collaborators. The global burden of disease attributable to alcohol and drug use in 195 countries and territories, 1990-2016: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016. Lancet Psychiatry. 2018 Dec;5(12):987–1012.
451 452 453	16.	GBD 2016 Alcohol Collaborators. Alcohol use and burden for 195 countries and territories, 1990-2016: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016. Lancet. 2018 Sep 22;392(10152):1015–35.
454 455	17.	Mitsunaga T, Larsen U. Prevalence of and risk factors associated with alcohol abuse in Moshi, northern Tanzania. J Biosoc Sci. 2008 May;40(3):379–99.
456 457 458	18.	Casey ER, Muro F, Thielman NM, Maya E, Ossmann EW, Hocker MB, et al. Analysis of traumatic injuries presenting to a referral hospital emergency department in Moshi, Tanzania. Int J Emerg Med. 2012 Jun 8;5(1):28.
459 460 461 462	19.	Staton CA, Msilanga D, Kiwango G, Vissoci JR, de Andrade L, Lester R, et al. A prospective registry evaluating the epidemiology and clinical care of traumatic brain injury patients presenting to a regional referral hospital in Moshi, Tanzania: challenges and the way forward. Int J Inj Contr Saf Promot. 2017 Mar;24(1):69–77.
463 464 465	20.	Staton CA, Zhao D, Ginalis EE, Hirshon JM, Sakita F, Swahn MH, et al. Alcohol Availability, Cost, Age of First Drink, and Its Association with At-Risk Alcohol Use in Moshi, Tanzania. Alcohol Clin Exp Res. 2020 Nov 10;44(11):2266–74.
466 467	21.	Castens V, Luginga F, Shayo B, Tolias C. Alcohol Abuse in Urban Moshi, Tanzania. 2012;
468 469 470	22.	Francis JM, Weiss HA, Mshana G, Baisley K, Grosskurth H, Kapiga SH. The Epidemiology of Alcohol Use and Alcohol Use Disorders among Young People in Northern Tanzania. PLoS ONE. 2015 Oct 7;10(10):e0140041.
471 472 473	23.	Mushi D, Moshiro C, Hanlon C, Francis JM, Teferra S. Missed opportunity for alcohol use disorder screening and management in primary health care facilities in northern rural Tanzania: a cross-sectional survey. Subst Abuse Treat Prev Policy. 2022 Jul 6;17(1):50.
474	24.	Chikritzhs T, Livingston M. Alcohol and the risk of injury. Nutrients. 2021 Aug 13;13(8).
475 476 477	25.	Brumback T, Cao D, McNamara P, King A. Alcohol-induced performance impairment: a 5-year re-examination study in heavy and light drinkers. Psychopharmacology (Berl). 2017 Jun;234(11):1749–59.
478 479 480	26.	Tzambazis K, Stough C. Alcohol impairs speed of information processing and simple and choice reaction time and differentially impairs higher-order cognitive abilities. Alcohol Alcohol. 2000;35(2):197–201.

Alcohol and Injury in Emergency Departments: Summary of the Report from the WHO 481 27. 482 Collaborative Study on Alcohol and Injuries, Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization; 2007. 483 484 28. Staton CA, Vissoci JRN, Toomey N, Abdelgadir J, Chou P, Haglund M, et al. The impact of alcohol among injury patients in Moshi, Tanzania: a nested case-crossover study. BMC 485 486 Public Health. 2018 Feb 21;18(1):275. 487 29. PRACT to Investigate Controlling Alcohol Related Harms in a Low-Income Setting; 488 Emergency Department BIs in Tanzania - Full Text View - ClinicalTrials.gov [Internet]. 489 [cited 2022 Dec 28]. Available from: 490 https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04535011?term=alcohol+AND+tanzania&draw=2 491 &rank=2 492 Staton CA, Zadey S, O'Leary P, Phillips A, Minja L, Swahn MH, et al. PRACT: a 30. 493 pragmatic randomized adaptive clinical trial protocol to investigate a culturally adapted 494 brief negotiational intervention for alcohol use in the emergency department in Tanzania. 495 Trials. 2022 Feb 5;23(1):120. 496 31. WHO. Alcohol and Injury in Emergency Departments. World Health Organization. 2007; 497 Meier BJ, El-Gabri D, Friedman K, Mvungi M, Mmbaga BT, Nickenig Vissoci JR, et al. 32. 498 Perceptions of alcohol use among injury patients and their family members in Tanzanian 499 society. Alcohol. 2020 Mar;83:9-15. 500 33. Skipsey K, Burleson JA, Kranzler HR. Utility of the AUDIT for identification of 501 hazardous or harmful drinking in drug-dependent patients. Drug Alcohol Depend. 1997 502 May 2;45(3):157–63. 503 Saunders JB, Aasland OG, Babor TF, de la Fuente JR, Grant M. Development of the 34. Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT): WHO Collaborative Project on Early 504 505 Detection of Persons with Harmful Alcohol Consumption--II. Addiction. 1993 506 Jun:88(6):791-804. 507 Nadkarni A, Garber A, Costa S, Wood S, Kumar S, MacKinnon N, et al. Auditing the 35. 508 AUDIT: A systematic review of cut-off scores for the Alcohol Use Disorders 509 Identification Test (AUDIT) in low- and middle-income countries. Drug Alcohol Depend. 510 2019 Sep 1;202:123-33. 511 Piccinelli M, Tessari E, Bortolomasi M, Piasere O, Semenzin M, Garzotto N, et al. 36. 512 Efficacy of the alcohol use disorders identification test as a screening tool for hazardous 513 alcohol intake and related disorders in primary care: a validity study. BMJ. 1997 Feb 514 8;314(7078):420-4. 515 37. Lundin A, Hallgren M, Balliu N, Forsell Y. The use of alcohol use disorders identification 516 test (AUDIT) in detecting alcohol use disorder and risk drinking in the general population: validation of AUDIT using schedules for clinical assessment in neuropsychiatry. Alcohol 517

518		Clin Exp Res. 2015 Jan;39(1):158–65.
519 520	38.	Conigrave KM, Hall WD, Saunders JB. The AUDIT questionnaire: choosing a cut-off score. Alcohol Use Disorder Identification Test. Addiction. 1995 Oct;90(10):1349–56.
521 522 523 524	39.	Vissoci JRN, Hertz J, El-Gabri D, Andrade Do Nascimento JR, Pestillo De Oliveira L, Mmbaga BT, et al. Cross-Cultural Adaptation and Psychometric Properties of the AUDIT and CAGE Questionnaires in Tanzanian Swahili for a Traumatic Brain Injury Population. Alcohol Alcohol. 2018 Jan 1;53(1):112–20.
525 526	40.	Miller WR, Tonigan JS, Longabaugh R. The Drinker Inventory of Consequences (DrInC). American Psychological Association (APA). 1995;
527 528	41.	Forcehimes AA, Tonigan JS, Miller WR, Kenna GA, Baer JS. Psychometrics of the drinker inventory of consequences (drinc). Addict Behav. 2007 Aug;32(8):1699–704.
529 530	42.	Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JB. The PHQ-9: validity of a brief depression severity measure. J Gen Intern Med. 2001 Sep;16(9):606–13.
531 532 533	43.	Smith Fawzi MC, Ngakongwa F, Liu Y, Rutayuga T, Siril H, Somba M, et al. Validating the Patient Health Questionnaire-9 (PHQ-9) for screening of depression in Tanzania. Neurol Psychiatry Brain Res. 2019 Feb;31:9–14.
534 535 536	44.	Zhao D, Staton CA, He Q, Mmbaga BT, Vissoci JRN. Cross-Culture Adaptation and Psychometric Properties of the DrInC Questionnaire in Tanzanian Swahili. Front Public Health. 2018 Nov 20;6:330.
537 538 539	45.	Calle PA, Damen J, De Paepe P, Monsieurs KG, Buylaert WA. A survey on alcohol and illicit drug abuse among emergency department patients. Acta Clin Belg. 2006 Aug;61(4):188–95.
540 541 542	46.	Lee JA, Ochola EO, Sugut J, Ngila B, Ojuka DK, Mello MJ, et al. Assessment of substance use among injured persons seeking emergency care in Nairobi, Kenya. Afr J Emerg Med. 2022 Dec;12(4):321–6.
543 544 545	47.	Nalwadda O, Rathod SD, Nakku J, Lund C, Prince M, Kigozi F. Alcohol use in a rural district in Uganda: findings from community-based and facility-based cross-sectional studies. Int J Ment Health Syst. 2018 Apr 3;12:12.
546 547 548	48.	Gardner A, Forson PK, Oduro G, Djan D, Adu KO, Ofori-Anti K, et al. Harmful alcohol use among injured adult patients presenting to a Ghanaian emergency department. Inj Prev. 2017 Jun;23(3):190–4.
549 550	49.	Shield KD, Parry C, Rehm J. Chronic diseases and conditions related to alcohol use. Alcohol Res. 2013;35(2):155–73.
551 552 553	50.	Zewdu S, Hanlon C, Fekadu A, Medhin G, Teferra S. Treatment gap, help-seeking, stigma and magnitude of alcohol use disorder in rural Ethiopia. Subst Abuse Treat Prev Policy. 2019 Jan 18;14(1):4.

- 554 51. World Health Organization. Depression and Other Common Mental Disorders: Global
  555 Health Estimates. Geneva: WHO; 2017.
- 556 52. WHO. Depression [Internet]. World Health Organization. 2021 [cited 2023 Jan 6].
  557 Available from: https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/depression
- 53. Saxena S, Thornicroft G, Knapp M, Whiteford H. Resources for mental health: scarcity,
  inequity, and inefficiency. Lancet. 2007 Sep 8;370(9590):878–89.
- 560 54. Muhorakeye O, Biracyaza E. Exploring barriers to mental health services utilization at
  561 kabutare district hospital of rwanda: perspectives from patients. Front Psychol. 2021 Mar
  562 22;12:638377.
- 563 55. Wainberg ML, Scorza P, Shultz JM, Helpman L, Mootz JJ, Johnson KA, et al. Challenges
  and Opportunities in Global Mental Health: a Research-to-Practice Perspective. Curr
  565 Psychiatry Rep. 2017 May;19(5):28.
- 566 56. Ambikile JS, Iseselo MK. Mental health care and delivery system at Temeke hospital in
  567 Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. BMC Psychiatry. 2017 Mar 23;17(1):109.
- 568 57. WHO. Mental Health Atlas 2014. World Health Organization. 2014;
- 569 58. Staton CA, Vissoci JRN, Wojcik R, Hirshon JM, Mvungi M, Mmbaga BT, et al.
  570 Perceived barriers by health care providers for screening and management of excessive
  571 alcohol use in an emergency department of a low-income country. Alcohol. 2018
  572 Sep;71:65–73.
- 573 59. Community Knowledge, Attitudes and Perception towards Mental Illness in Dodoma
  574 Municipality, Tanzania. ARC J Public Health Community Med. 2016;1(3).
- 575 60. Benegal V, Chand PK, Obot IS. Packages of care for alcohol use disorders in low- and
  576 middle-income countries. PLoS Med. 2009 Oct 27;6(10):e1000170.
- 577 61. Staton CA, Vissoci JRN, El-Gabri D, Adewumi K, Concepcion T, Elliott SA, et al.
  578 Patient-level interventions to reduce alcohol-related harms in low- and middle-income
  579 countries: A systematic review and meta-summary. PLoS Med. 2022 Apr
  580 12;19(4):e1003961.
- 581 62. Chapter 1—Introduction to Brief Interventions and Therapies Brief Interventions and
  582 Brief Therapies for Substance Abuse NCBI Bookshelf [Internet]. [cited 2021 Feb 8].
  583 Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK64950/
- 584 63. Bien TH, Miller WR, Tonigan JS. Brief interventions for alcohol problems: a review.
  585 Addiction. 1993 Mar;88(3):315–35.

# 586 64. Pringle JL, Rickard-Aasen S, Slain T, Venkat A. Implementation of screening, brief 587 intervention, and referral to treatment (SBIRT) in the emergency department without 588 additional resources. Addict Sci Clin Pract. 2013 Sep;8(S1).

65. 589 Gentilello LM, Rivara FP, Donovan DM, Jurkovich GJ, Daranciang E, Dunn CW, et al. 590 Alcohol interventions in a trauma center as a means of reducing the risk of injury 591 recurrence. Ann Surg. 1999 Oct;230(4):473-80; discussion 480. 592 Fleming MF, Barry KL, Manwell LB, Johnson K, London R. Brief physician advice for 66. 593 problem alcohol drinkers. A randomized controlled trial in community-based primary care 594 practices. JAMA. 1997 Apr 2;277(13):1039-45. D'Onofrio G, Fiellin DA, Pantalon MV, Chawarski MC, Owens PH, Degutis LC, et al. A 595 67. 596 brief intervention reduces hazardous and harmful drinking in emergency department 597 patients. Ann Emerg Med. 2012 Aug;60(2):181-92. van der Westhuizen C, Myers B, Malan M, Naledi T, Roelofse M, Stein DJ, et al. 598 68. Implementation of a screening, brief intervention and referral to treatment programme for 599 600 risky substance use in South African emergency centres: A mixed methods evaluation 601 study. PLoS ONE. 2019 Nov 15;14(11):e0224951.