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> – alena.pauley@duke.edu (ORCID#: 0000-0002-7489-7469) Emily C. Thatcher MPAS PA-C<sup>2</sup> – emily.thatcher@duke.edu 6 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> – blaymt@gmail.com 11 Francis Sakita MD MMED<sup>3,4</sup> – francis.sakita@gmail.com 12 Judith Boshe MD MMED<sup>3,4</sup> – jboshe@live.com 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: catherine.lynch@duke.edu (CAS) 23 ORCID#: 0000-0002-6468-2894 24 25 **Competing interests:** The authors declare no competing interests 26

27 **Author contributions:** Conceptualization: CAS, FSh, FSa, JB 28 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 36 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

### ABSTRACT

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

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

## Introduction

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

Alcohol use is a significant contributor to death and disability globally, accounting for approximately 3 million deaths and 5.1% of disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) annually (1). This significant burden of global DALYs comes in part from the disproportionate effect on young people; in 2016, alcohol use was the primary risk factor for premature death and disability among those aged 15-49 years (1). These numbers are underpinned by alcohol's association with injury and disease, having been linked as a causal factor in more than 200 acute and chronic diseases and injury conditions, like liver disease, cardiovascular disease, and certain cancers (2– 7). Alcohol misuse has also been associated with depression, anxiety, and phobias, with the cooccurrence of depression and alcohol misuse in particular linked to a more severe prognosis for 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 aggressive behaviors, unsafe sexual practices, and an estimated 2.6% reduction in the global gross domestic product (10–14). Fortunately, alcohol intake is a modifiable risk factor, as such, there is an opportunity to reduce much of the associated harm with social and behavioral 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 for women than in neighboring Malawi(1).

Moshi, a popular tourist town located at the base of Mount Kilimanjaro in Northern Tanzania, has seen a higher prevalence of alcohol use and associated disease and injury statuses in recent years (17–19). This increase in use is in part due to a strong drinking culture and custom of early alcohol initiation in minors for members of the Chagga ethnic group, who 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 inhabitants of the region (17,20,22). In Moshi, high rates of alcohol use and alcohol-related harm, in combination with the lack of trained health professionals and relevant resources, leads to inadequate treatment availability (23).

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

## Methods

### 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.

### Study Sample

Patients were enrolled at the KCMC EMD study site, which is situated in Moshi,
Tanzania. All enrolled participants met the following eligibility criteria: 1) were 18 years of age
or older, 2) had the capacity to give informed consent, 3) received initial care at KCMC
Emergency Department, 4) were conversant in Kiswahili. Patients who were prisoners were
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 participation.

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

#### **Data Collection**

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

157

158

159

160

161

162

163

164

165

166

167

168

169

170

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

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.

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

#### Variables

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

200

201

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

### Data Analysis

Data on patients' demographics, injury status, self-reported alcohol use, and AUDIT, DrInC, and PHQ-9 scores were analyzed using descriptive frequencies and proportions. All variables were categorical except for measures of income, education status, and the three survey tools which were continuous. AUDIT and PHQ-9 scores were dichotomized according to the cut-off values discussed previously; AUDIT scores of 8 and greater were categorized as HHD, while scores less than 8 were classified as not HHD. PHQ-9 scores of 9 and greater were categorized as a positive screen for depression and scores less than 9 were classified screening negative.

Missing data was minimal at 1 to 2 missing data points per variable with the exception of personal and household income as several participants were hesitant to disclose their financial status to research staff. All data were analyzed in RStudio (version 1.4) using user-created and validated R-Packages.

# Results

### **Patient Demographics**

During the 8 months of data collection from October 1st until May 31st, 376 EMD patients were surveyed, of which 59 (15.7%) presented with injuries and 317 (84.3%) presented for non-injury-related reasons, including but not limited to fever, headache, stomach ache, body numbness, or body swelling. As expected based on our sampling strategy, females account for 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.

Table 1: Demographics of EMD Patients

| ED Dama anankias ka   | OII                              |  | Non Internet                                   |   | Esmala Nav  | Mala Indus                                      | Mala Na   |
|---|----------------------------------|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| ED Demographics by<br>Injury Status and Gender                  | Overall,<br>N = 374 <sup>1</sup> | Injury Patients<br>N = 59 <sup>1</sup> | Non-Injury<br>Patients<br>N = 315 <sup>1</sup> | Female Injury Patients, N = 26 <sup>1</sup> | Female Non-<br>Injury Patients,<br>N = 237 <sup>1</sup> | Male Injury<br>Patients,<br>N = 33 <sup>1</sup> | Male Non-<br>Injury<br>Patients,<br>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<br>(439,577.43)       | 225,384.62<br>(316,503.07)             | 259,101.08<br>(454,532.08)                     | 186,153.85<br>(270,692.84)                  | 239,443.97<br>(442,816.79)                              | 303,846.15<br>(393,139.89)                      | 360,444.44<br>(503,929.81)                              |
| Household Income (TZS) per month, missing: 59                   | 435,968.25<br>(510,222.82)       | 397,763.16<br>(492,331.32)             | 441,209.39<br>(513,270.52)                     | 362,115.38<br>(529,955.04)                  | 433,276.60<br>(478,412.29)                              | 475,000.00<br>(409,267.64)                      | 485,595.24<br>(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  | 8 / 374 (2.1%)                   | 1 / 59 (1.7%)                          | 7 / 315 (2.2%)                                 | 0 / 26 (0%)                                 | 5 / 237 (2.1%)  | 1 / 33 (3.0%)                                   | 2 / 78 (2.6%)   |
| Other   | 1 / 374 (0.3%)                   | 0 / 59 (0%)                            | 1 / 315 (0.3%)                                 | 0 / 26 (0%)                                 | 1 / 237 (0.4%)  | 0 / 33 (0%)                                     | 0 / 78 (0%)   |
| Marital Status, missing: 1                                      |                                  |  |  |   |   |   |   |
| 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

226

227

228

229

230

231

232

233

234

235

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243

244

245

246

247

In following the intention of this paper to compare rates of alcohol use and alcoholrelated behaviors across IPs and NIPs presenting to KCMC's EMD, differences in AUDIT, PHO-9, and DrInC scores were examined across these two groups. IPs had higher average [SD] AUDIT scores (5.76 [6.6]) than NIPs (3.93 [6.1]), although a sizeable proportion of individuals with HHD (AUDIT  $\geq 8$ ) were present in both patient groups (37% of IPs and 21% of NIPs). Average DrInC scores were higher in the IP population (12.92 [17.54]) than the NIP population (9.19 [15.99]), but mean PHO-9 scores were greater among NIPs (6.60 [5.17]) than IPs (4.12) [4.14]). Following this, a greater percentage of NIPs (22% of NIPs and of 8.5% of IPs) screened positively for depression (PHO-9 > 9). Other markers of alcohol use, including drinking frequency and drinking quantity, were also explored. AUDIT scores were higher among IPs; however, a greater proportion of NIPs appeared to drink more frequently (5.0% of NIPs but 1.7% of IPs reportedly drank every day or multiple times per day), and in unhealthy quantities (5.1% of NIPs but 3.4% of IPs drank 5 or more bottles per sitting). Other characteristics were comparable across both patient groups; roughly half (47% of IPs and 52% of NIPs) had previously attempted to quit drinking, and a tenth (14% of IPs and 8.9% of NIPs) had sought treatment for alcohol use, with personal reasons (39% of IPs and 42% of NIPs) cited as the primary motivation to guit. Most participants noted beer (31% of IPs and 24% of NIPs) as their alcoholic drink of choice, and 1.7% of IPs and 1.9% of NIPs spent more than 50,000 TZS (\$21.42 USD) on alcohol per week. To put this amount into context, the average reported personal income for the overall study population is 254,939.87 TZS (\$109.32 USD) per month or 58,674.31 TZS (\$25.16 USD) per week.

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

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

Table 2: Alcohol Use Characteristics of EMD Patients

| ED Demographics by Injury      | Overall,<br>N = 374 <sup>1</sup> | Injury<br>Patients<br>N = 59 <sup>1</sup> | Non-Injury<br>Patients<br>N = 315 <sup>1</sup> | Female Injury<br>Patients,<br>N = 26 <sup>1</sup> | Female Non-<br>Injury Patients,<br>N = 237 <sup>1</sup> | Male Injury<br>Patients,<br>N = 33 <sup>1</sup> | Male Non-<br>Injury<br>Patients,<br>N = 78 <sup>1</sup> |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| Status and Gender              |                                  |   |  |   |   |   |   |
| 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, missing: 1  |                                  |   |  |   |   |   |   |
| 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<br>Status and Gender | Overall,<br>N = 374 <sup>1</sup> | Injury<br>Patients<br>N = 59 <sup>1</sup> | Non-Injury<br>Patients<br>N = 315 <sup>1</sup> | Female Injury Patients, N = 26 <sup>1</sup> | Female Non-<br>Injury Patients,<br>N = 237 <sup>1</sup> | Male Injury Patients, N = 33 <sup>1</sup> | Male Non-<br>Injury<br>Patients,<br>N = 78 <sup>1</sup> |
|--|----------------------------------|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| Weekly Alcohol Expenses (TZS                   | S), 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                 | althy, <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                   | Use, 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,                  | , ,                              | , ,                                       | ,  | ` '   | ,   | ,   |   |
| 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 ≥ 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<br>Status and Gender | Overall,<br>N = 374 <sup>1</sup> | Injury<br>Patients<br>N = 59 <sup>1</sup> | Non-Injury<br>Patients<br>N = 315 <sup>1</sup> | Female Injury Patients, N = 26 <sup>1</sup> | Female Non-<br>Injury Patients,<br>N = 237 <sup>1</sup> | Male Injury<br>Patients,<br>N = 33 <sup>1</sup> | Male Non-<br>Injury<br>Patients,<br>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%)  |

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

## Discussion

269

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

285

286

287

288

289

290

291

Alcohol use is a leading and growing behavioral risk factor for poor health, injury, and illness. Especially in low-resource settings, each patient who interfaces with the healthcare system represents a chance to screen and initiate primary and secondary preventative health measures (23). This is the first analysis to compare alcohol use and alcohol-related behaviors between injury and non-injury EMD patients in Moshi, Tanzania, with the goal of describing opportunities for initiation of screening and intervention opportunities. Our evidence demonstrates that both injury and non-injury patients in Moshi have high rates of harmful and hazardous alcohol use, and non-injured patients also have high rates of psychological comorbidities. These findings indicate future screening and intervention initiatives should focus on the EMD population as a whole rather than specific injury groups. The data presented has shown that a large proportion of both IPs and NIPs presenting to KCMC's EMD screened positive for HHD and exhibited unhealthy alcohol use behaviors. While IPs (37%) overall had a higher prevalence of HHD than NIPs (21%), a higher proportion of NIPs drank daily or drank 5 or more drinks per sitting than IPs. The higher rate of AUDIT  $\geq 8$  among IPs likely stems from this group having a higher proportion of males (given males generally consume more alcohol (16)), and the close association of alcohol use and injuries that prompt EMD visits (27). For example, previous work by our group has found that 30% of IPs at KCMC's EMD were ETOH positive upon admission (28). While the literature on alcohol use among non-injury EMD patients is limited both globally and in Tanzania, one study based in Belgium found that patients presenting with psychiatric problems had the highest incidence of being intoxicated compared to other complaints (45). However, as EMDs in Tanzania and Belgium are vastly different, this finding may not be generalizable to our study population.

293

294

295

296

297

298

299

300

301

302

303

304

305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

313

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

315

316

317

318

319

320

321

322

323

324

325

326

327

328

329

330

331

332

333

334

335

As in other settings (49,50), we found our patients have both AUD and other untreated mental health comorbidities. Overall, 1 in 5 or 20% of patients (8.5% of IPs and 22% of NIPs) sampled scored > 9 on the PHO9 (screening positive for depression) of which 91% had neither sought nor received treatment. In comparison to our data, the WHO estimates the prevalence of depression to be approximately 4.1% within the general population of Tanzania (51) and 5.0% among the global adult population (52). These depression screenings are five times higher in our EMD population and four times higher than the global population, highlighting the high mental health burden this patient group experiences and calls for the expansion of clinical services to support this high-risk group. Accessing care for mental health disorders is limited by health literacy, stigma, and knowledge of and availability of services in resource-limited settings both globally and within Tanzania (53–56). It is unfortunately not surprising that over 90% of our population reports not seeking (nor obtaining) treatment services for either mental health or alcohol treatment services. The Tanzanian government's total expenditure on mental health comprises 4.0 % of the total government health budget, and there are 1.31 total mental health professionals per 100,000 people in Tanzania compared to 15.32 mental health professionals per 100,000 in neighboring Kenya (57). Aside from a lack of resources, stigma and negative perceptions about mental health can limit patients seeking care. Within this already resource-strained setting, a KCMC-based study found that 71% of providers either devalued or discriminated against their patients who suffered from alcohol use disorders (58). Another study performed in Domoda, Tanzania, showed that 58.9% of the surveyed population had negative attitudes toward people with mental health problems (59). These stigmatizing perceptions and generalizations about Tanzanians with

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

336

337

338

339

340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

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

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

### Strengths and Limitations

Several important factors must be taken into account when interpreting this data. First, we have no complete registry of all patients who present for services and, as such, our ability to evaluate how representative this sample is of KCMC's EMD population as a whole is limited. While this limitation is offset by our large sample size and systematic random sampling strategy, it should still be taken into consideration when considering data accuracy. Second, our data set has limited specifications on patients' chief complaints which restricts our ability to further analyze or make comparisons between complaint-specific groups. Therefore, we recommend that 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.

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

# Conclusion

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

Moshi, Tanzania.

# Funding Disclosure

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

- 410 Bibliography
- 411 1. World Health Organization (WHO). Global status report on alcohol and health 2018
- 412 [Internet]. World Health Organization (WHO); 2018 [cited 2021 Nov 21]. Available from:
- 413 https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/274603/9789241565639-eng.pdf
- 2. Rehm J, Gmel GE, Gmel G, Hasan OSM, Imtiaz S, Popova S, et al. The relationship
- 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
- 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
- primary care population. JAMA Netw Open. 2020 May 1;3(5):e204687.
- 423 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
- 425 Public Health. 2017 Jul 21;18(1):43.
- 426 6. Rumgay H, Murphy N, Ferrari P, Soerjomataram I. Alcohol and cancer: epidemiology and
- 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).
- 432 9. 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-
- 434 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,
- Chaikledkaew U. The economic impact of alcohol consumption: a systematic review.
- 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
- 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

- economic costs to society attributable to alcohol use? A systematic review and modelling study. Pharmacoeconomics. 2021 Jul;39(7):809–22.
- 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 16. GBD 2016 Alcohol Collaborators. Alcohol use and burden for 195 countries and
   452 territories, 1990-2016: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016.
   453 Lancet. 2018 Sep 22;392(10152):1015–35.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- Castens V, Luginga F, Shayo B, Tolias C. Alcohol Abuse in Urban Moshi, Tanzania.
   2012;
- 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 23. Mushi D, Moshiro C, Hanlon C, Francis JM, Teferra S. Missed opportunity for alcohol
   472 use disorder screening and management in primary health care facilities in northern rural
   473 Tanzania: a cross-sectional survey. Subst Abuse Treat Prev Policy. 2022 Jul 6;17(1):50.
- 24. Chikritzhs T, Livingston M. Alcohol and the risk of injury. Nutrients. 2021 Aug 13;13(8).
- 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.
- 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.

- 481 27. Alcohol and Injury in Emergency Departments: Summary of the Report from the WHO
- 482 Collaborative Study on Alcohol and Injuries. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health
- 483 Organization; 2007.
- 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
- 486 Public Health. 2018 Feb 21;18(1):275.
- 487 29. PRACT to Investigate Controlling Alcohol Related Harms in a Low-Income Setting;
- 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 30. Staton CA, Zadey S, O'Leary P, Phillips A, Minja L, Swahn MH, et al. PRACT: a
- 493 pragmatic randomized adaptive clinical trial protocol to investigate a culturally adapted
- 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 32. Meier BJ, El-Gabri D, Friedman K, Mvungi M, Mmbaga BT, Nickenig Vissoci JR, et al.
- 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
- hazardous or harmful drinking in drug-dependent patients. Drug Alcohol Depend. 1997
- 502 May 2;45(3):157–63.
- 503 34. Saunders JB, Aasland OG, Babor TF, de la Fuente JR, Grant M. Development of the
- Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT): WHO Collaborative Project on Early
- Detection of Persons with Harmful Alcohol Consumption--II. Addiction. 1993
- 506 Jun:88(6):791–804.
- 507 35. Nadkarni A, Garber A, Costa S, Wood S, Kumar S, MacKinnon N, et al. Auditing the
- AUDIT: A systematic review of cut-off scores for the Alcohol Use Disorders
- Identification Test (AUDIT) in low- and middle-income countries. Drug Alcohol Depend.
- 510 2019 Sep 1;202:123–33.
- 511 36. Piccinelli M, Tessari E, Bortolomasi M, Piasere O, Semenzin M, Garzotto N, et al.
- Efficacy of the alcohol use disorders identification test as a screening tool for hazardous
- 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
- 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

- 518 Clin Exp Res. 2015 Jan;39(1):158–65.
- 519 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 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.
- 524 Alcohol Alcohol. 2018 Jan 1;53(1):112–20.
- 40. Miller WR, Tonigan JS, Longabaugh R. The Drinker Inventory of Consequences (DrInC).
   American Psychological Association (APA). 1995;
- 527 41. Forcehimes AA, Tonigan JS, Miller WR, Kenna GA, Baer JS. Psychometrics of the 528 drinker inventory of consequences (drinc). Addict Behav. 2007 Aug;32(8):1699–704.
- 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 43. Smith Fawzi MC, Ngakongwa F, Liu Y, Rutayuga T, Siril H, Somba M, et al. Validating
   532 the Patient Health Questionnaire-9 (PHQ-9) for screening of depression in Tanzania.
   533 Neurol Psychiatry Brain Res. 2019 Feb;31:9–14.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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 47. Nalwadda O, Rathod SD, Nakku J, Lund C, Prince M, Kigozi F. Alcohol use in a rural 544 district in Uganda: findings from community-based and facility-based cross-sectional 545 studies. Int J Ment Health Syst. 2018 Apr 3;12:12.
- 546 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 548 Prev. 2017 Jun;23(3):190–4.
- 549 49. Shield KD, Parry C, Rehm J. Chronic diseases and conditions related to alcohol use. Alcohol Res. 2013;35(2):155–73.
- 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 Health Estimates. Geneva: WHO; 2017.
- 556 52. WHO. Depression [Internet]. World Health Organization. 2021 [cited 2023 Jan 6]. 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 kabutare district hospital of rwanda: perspectives from patients. Front Psychol. 2021 Mar 22;12:638377.
- 563 55. Wainberg ML, Scorza P, Shultz JM, Helpman L, Mootz JJ, Johnson KA, et al. Challenges
   564 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 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.
- Perceived barriers by health care providers for screening and management of excessive
- 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 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.
- 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].
- 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.
- Pringle JL, Rickard-Aasen S, Slain T, Venkat A. Implementation of screening, brief
   intervention, and referral to treatment (SBIRT) in the emergency department without
- additional resources. Addict Sci Clin Pract. 2013 Sep;8(S1).

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