

Full title: Virtual and remote opioid poisoning education and naloxone distribution programs: a scoping review

Short title: Scoping review on virtual opioid poisoning education

Authors

[Bruna dos Santos](#)^{1¶}, [Rifat Farzan Nipun](#)^{1¶}, [Anna Maria Subic](#)¹, [Alexandra Kubica](#)¹, Nick Rondinelli^{1,2}, [Don Marentette](#)⁵, Joanna Muise⁵, Kevin Paes⁵, [Meghan Riley](#)⁵, Samiya Bhuiya⁵, Jeannene Crosby⁵, Keely McBride^{5,6}, [Joe Salter](#)^{5,6}, [Aaron M. Orkin](#)^{1,3,4*}

¹ Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada

² Heart to Heart First Aid CPR Services Inc., Toronto, Canada

³ Department of Family and Community Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada

⁴ Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute of Unity Health Toronto, Toronto, Canada

⁵ The Canadian Red Cross Society, Canada

⁶ Canadian Red Cross Opioid Harm Reduction Advisory Council, Canada

¶ These authors contributed equally to this work

* Corresponding author: aaron.orkin@utoronto.ca

1 **Abstract**

2 The opioid poisoning crisis is a complex and multi-faceted global epidemic with far-reaching
3 public health effects. Opioid Poisoning Education and Naloxone Distribution (OPEND)
4 programs destigmatize and legitimize harm reduction measures while increasing
5 participants' ability to administer naloxone and other life-saving interventions in opioid
6 poisoning emergencies. While virtual OPEND programs existed prior to the COVID-19
7 pandemic and were shown to be effective in improving knowledge of opioid poisoning
8 response, they were not widely implemented and evaluated. The COVID-19 pandemic
9 brought both urgent and sustained interest in virtual health services, including harm
10 reduction interventions and OPEND programs.

11 We aimed to assess the scope of literature related to fully virtual OPEND programming, with
12 or without naloxone distribution, worldwide. A search of the literature was conducted and
13 yielded 7,722 articles, of which 31 studies fit the inclusion criteria. Type and content of the
14 educational component, duration of training, scales used, and key findings were extracted
15 and synthesized. Our search shows that virtual and remote OPEND programs appear
16 effective in increasing knowledge, confidence, and preparedness to respond to opioid
17 poisoning events while improving stigma regarding people who use substances. This effect
18 is shown to be true in a wide variety of populations but is significantly relevant when focused
19 on laypersons. Interventions ranged from the use of videos, websites, telephone calls, and
20 virtual reality simulations. A lack of consensus was found regarding the duration of the
21 activity and the scales used to measure its effectiveness. Despite increasing efforts, access
22 remains an issue, with most interventions addressing White people in urban areas. These
23 findings provide insights for planning, implementation, and evaluation of future virtual and
24 remote OPEND programs.

25 **Author Summary**

26 Facing a global health challenge, the opioid poisoning crisis affects individuals across all
27 communities, ages, and socioeconomic groups, leading to high fatality rates. Educational
28 programs addressing opioid poisoning have emerged as life-saving and cost-effective
29 interventions. This review focuses on these programs conducted in a virtual setting,
30 eliminating the need for in-person contact between staff and participants. We have identified
31 and summarized evidence about the outcomes of these programs, which may include
32 naloxone distribution. Our findings offer valuable insights for planning, implementing, and
33 evaluating such programs. Furthermore, we highlight gaps in current knowledge, paving the
34 way for future research.

35 **Introduction**

36 The opioid poisoning crisis is a global health challenge with high fatality rates. The highest
37 rates of opioid poisoning fatality are seen in the United States, followed by Estonia, Canada,
38 and Lithuania(1–3). Opioid-related fatalities have been exacerbated by the increasingly toxic
39 and unregulated drug supply market, contaminated by fentanyl and other substances such
40 as benzodiazepines(2,4). Non-fatal opioid poisonings occur at an even higher rate than fatal
41 opioid poisonings, adding to the social, health, and economic costs of the global opioid
42 poisoning epidemic(5). Opioid-related harms can affect people in all communities, ages, and
43 socioeconomic groups, including family members, friends, healthcare professionals and
44 community members of people with lived or living experience (PWLLE) of opioid use(6,7).
45 Opioid Poisoning Education and Naloxone Distribution (OPEND) programs train and equip
46 people to provide life-saving interventions, including naloxone administration(8–11). OPEND
47 has been shown to save lives, improve knowledge and attitudes, and reduce stigma(8–13).
48 However, rigorously evaluated OPEND programs have generally been limited to
49 interventions involving in-person training and distribution, which can limit access to rural and
50 remote populations and others who are unable or unwilling to access in-person

51 services(14,15). As numerous programs pivoted away from in-person OPEND offerings
52 during the COVID-19 pandemic, it brought a strong and sustained interest in the
53 effectiveness and implementation of virtual OPEND programming(16).

54 This scoping review aims to assess the range of literature concerning opioid poisoning
55 education programming conducted entirely without in-person interaction. In compiling a
56 cohesive overview of existing virtual OPEND programs reported in the literature, we aim to
57 support the development and evaluation of future programs.

58 **Methods**

59 **Objective and Review Question**

60 We synthesized the literature concerning virtual OPEND programming for people who may
61 witness an opioid poisoning. We structured our scoping review question based on the
62 Participants, Concept, Context framework for scoping reviews(17).

- 63 • Participants: People at risk of opioid poisoning or likely to witness opioid
64 poisoning or otherwise interested in OPEND program participation.
- 65 • Concept: Any opioid poisoning education programming with or without naloxone
66 distribution that is conducted entirely at a distance, without in-person interaction
67 between participants and program personnel.
- 68 • Context: Worldwide.

69 **Language and Terminology**

70 Although 'overdose' is a common term, we use 'opioid poisoning' throughout this paper.
71 'Overdose' suggests that the primary cause for the health emergency is a matter of incorrect
72 dose, which can place stigmatizing blame on people who experience opioid poisoning.
73 'Poisoning' draws attention to the broader social context leading to these emergencies and
74 the epidemic of toxic drug harms. We also prefer the term 'opioid poisoning education and

75 naloxone distribution' over 'take-home naloxone' because the latter does not fully
76 acknowledge the circumstances of the many people who experience opioid poisoning and
77 homelessness and does not sufficiently acknowledge the educational and non-
78 pharmacological elements of these programs.

79 **Approach and Protocol**

80 The design and methods for this review are reported in accordance with the Preferred
81 Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses Extension for Scoping Reviews
82 (PRISMA-ScR)(18). Further guidance was gained from an adapted version of Arksey and
83 O'Malley's methodological framework on scoping reviews(19) and the Joanna Briggs
84 Institute methodological guidance for conducting systematic scoping reviews(20). A search
85 of MEDLINE and the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews was conducted and no
86 current or underway literature reviews on the topic were identified. We developed a review
87 protocol and registered it on Open Science Framework (osf.io/ew9rq)(21).

88 **Search Strategy**

89 An initial limited search on MEDLINE was undertaken to identify papers on the topic using
90 terms according to the Participants, Concept, Context framework(17), including the terms
91 'virtual', 'education', 'opioids', and related terminology. A University of Toronto health science
92 librarian provided expertise in optimizing the search strategy according to project objectives.
93 The text words contained in the titles and abstracts of relevant papers and index terms were
94 used to develop a full search strategy for OVID MEDLINE, OVID Embase, EBSCO CINAHL,
95 OVID PsycINFO, The Cochrane Library, SCOPUS, and ERIC (S1 Table). The search
96 strategy, including all identified keywords and index terms, was adapted for each included
97 database. Scholarly database searches were conducted on June 1, 2023. The grey literature
98 search was conducted on July 27, 2023, including the Canadian Agency for Drugs and
99 Technologies in Health's (CADTH) Grey Matters website, the System for Information on
100 Grey Literature in Europe (OpenGrey), and TRIP Pro. We screened the references of

101 included papers to identify additional papers. All supplementary searches are documented in
102 S1 Table.

103 **Source of Evidence Selection**

104 Following deduplication, titles and abstracts were screened independently by four reviewers
105 (BDS, RFN, AK, and AMS) based on the inclusion criteria. The full-text review of the
106 selected citations was undertaken by BDS and RFN. Reasons for exclusion during full text
107 review were recorded in a PRISMA flow diagram ([Fig 1](#))(18). Any disagreements between
108 the reviewers at any stage of the selection process were resolved through discussion and
109 consensus.

110 **Data Extraction**

111 Data were extracted in Covidence from included sources by two independent reviewers
112 (BDS and RFN) using a data extraction tool developed by the reviewers and modified from
113 the JBI Manual for Evidence Synthesis(22). The data extracted included publication details
114 (year of publication, country, and type of paper), information about the target population
115 (demographics such as age, gender, and race/ethnicity), intervention components (e.g.,
116 internet-based, telephone-based), educational components (topics addressed by the
117 educational portion), key findings, and other details relevant to the review question. All
118 variables extracted are provided (S2 Table). The data extraction tool was first piloted and
119 modified as necessary with ten papers divided between the two reviewers. Any
120 disagreements between the reviewers were resolved through discussion and consensus.

121 **Data Synthesis**

122 The extracted data are synthesized and summarized in narrative and tabular format. When
123 appropriate, findings were grouped based on themes.


124 **Results**

125 After deduplication, 7,722 out of the initial 10,003 papers were identified for further review.

126 After title and abstract screening, 7,631 papers were excluded, and 91 were reviewed in full
127 text ([Fig 1](#)). Full text review elicited 32 papers for inclusion within this scoping review. Sisson
128 et al., 2023 conducted a single study that was reported in two papers and were, therefore,
129 treated and reported here as a single study(23,24).

130 **Figure 1. PRISMA flowchart.**

131 This figure depicts studies that were included in the scoping review at each stage of the
132 review process.



134 Characteristics of included papers are specified in [Table 1](#). Seventeen studies have a quasi-
135 experimental pre-post design, eleven are descriptive, two are randomized controlled trials,
136 and one is a non-randomized controlled trial. The publication period extended from 2016 to
137 2023, peaking notably in 2022 (25%, n=8). Of the studies included in our analysis, 30 (97%)
138 were based in the United States of America; one was conducted in Australia.

139 **Table 1. Characteristics of included papers.**

140 This table shows the characteristics of papers included in this scoping review.

Authors, Year	Country	Type of Study	Participants	n	Sex or Gender ^a	Age in Years
Adams, 2020(25)	USA	Pre-post	Law enforcement officers	54	Male 54.2%	40+ 58.3%
Beiting, 2022(26)	USA	Pre-post	Health professionals	51	Female 92%	35-64 79%
Bergeria, 2019(27)	USA	Pre-post	People with lived or living experience	Presentation: 61 Presentation and Quiz: 58	Presentation: Male 57% Presentation and Quiz: Male 56%	Presentation: Mean 34,7 (SD 11.4) Presentation and Quiz: Mean 35 (SD 10.8)
Berland, 2019(28)	USA	Pre-post	Medical students	In-person: 130 Online: 127	N/A	N/A
Brown, 2023(29)	USA	Descriptive	Undergraduate and graduate students	N/A	N/A	N/A
Castillo, 2022(30)	USA	Pre-post	Nurse practitioners	7	N/A	N/A
Cerles, 2021(31)	USA	Pre-post	First responders	Pilot: 9 Intervention: 18	Pilot: Male 78%, Female 22% Intervention: Male 61%, Female 39%	Pilot: 25-44 56% Intervention: 25-44 72%
Eukel, 2020(32)	USA	Pre-post	Health professionals	187	Female 78.5%, Male 21.5%	N/A
Farrugia, 2022(33)	Australia	Descriptive	Anyone interested	N/A	Female 60.7%, Male 35.2% Non-binary 1.9%, Other 3.9%	30+ 90.3%
French, 2021(34)	USA	Descriptive	Anyone interested	422	Cisgender women 54%	Mean 33.3 (SD 11.8)
Galiher & Huffman, 2022(35)	USA	Pre-post	Anyone interested	219	Male 28.8%, Female 71.2%	25-34 31.5%
Giordano, 2020(36)	USA	Pre-post	Nursing students	Hybrid simulation: 31 Virtual reality: 19	Hybrid simulation: Female 93.5% Virtual Reality: Female 94.7%	Hybrid simulation: Mean 21.06 Virtual Reality: Mean 21.06
Giordano, 2023(37)	USA	Pre-post	Nursing students	Virtual reality: 11 Videoconferencing: 6	Virtual reality: Male 0%, Female 91%, Other 9% Videoconferencing: Male 17%, Female 83%, Other 0%	Virtual reality: Mean 26.7 Videoconferencing: Mean 25.9

Authors, Year	Country	Type of Study	Participants	n	Sex or Gender ^a	Age in Years
Goss, 2021(38)	USA	Pre-post	Medical students	In-person: 97 Online: 62	2018 (in-person): Ratio Male:Female 0.75 + 1 prefer not to say 2019 (in-person): Ratio Male:Female 0.81 + 1 prefer not to say 2020 (online): Ratio Male:Female 1.38	2018 (in-person): Mean 23.3 2019 (in-person): Mean 23.7 2020 (online): Mean 24.5
Hohmann, 2022(39)	USA	RCT	Pharmacists	Control: 32 Intervention: 32	Control: Male 19.4%, Female 80.6% Intervention: Male 19.4%, Female 77.4%	Control: Mean 40.4 (SD 10.3) Intervention: Mean 43.7 (SD 9.1)
Hughes, 2022(40)	USA	Descriptive	People with lived or living experience	90	N/A	N/A
Huhn, 2018(41)	USA	Pre-post	People currently prescribed an opioid medication	Presentation: 97 Presentation and Quiz: 100	Presentation: Female 39.2% Presentation and Quiz: Female - 51.0%	Presentation: Mean 32.7 (SD 11.1) Presentation and Quiz: Mean 33.7 (SD 11.6)
Jensen, 2019(42)	USA	Descriptive	Veterans	In-person: 313 Videoconferencing: 84	In-person: Female 6%, Male 94% Videoconferencing: Female 5.8, Male 94.2%	In-person: 60+ 53.6% Videoconferencing: 60+ 55.3%
Kim, 2016(43)	USA	Non-randomized CT	Medical residents	Reading-only: 11 Intervention: 12	Reading-only: Female 45% Intervention: Female 33%	N/A
Mathias, 2023(44)	USA	Descriptive	Anyone interested	1,982	Women 57.8%, Men 15.5%, Other 0.4%, Unknown 26.3%	25-34 18.2% Unknown 26.5%
Millikan, 2021(45)	USA	Pre-post	Adolescents	8	Female 50%, Male 25%, Unknown 25%	Range 11-17 Mean 14.3
Moses, 2021(46)	USA	Pre-post	First-year medical students	In-person: 124 Online: 238	In-person: Female 50% Online: Female 49.6% Female 65%	In-person: Mean 23.4 (SD 2.2) Online: Mean 23.3 (SD 2.5) 35+ 57%
Roe & Banta-Green, 2016(47)	USA	Descriptive	Anyone interested	422	Female 65%	35+ 57%
Rothbauer, 2022(48)	USA	Descriptive	Veterans with specified opioid prescription risk factors	160	Male 90%	Mean 65
Simmons, 2016(49)	USA	Pre-post	Professional first responders	1,697	N/A	N/A
Simmons, 2018(50)	USA	Pre-post	Anyone interested	311	N/A	N/A

Authors, Year	Country	Type of Study	Participants	n	Sex or Gender ^a	Age in Years
Sisson, 2023a and 2023b(23,24)	USA	RCT	People with lived or living experience	2023a (completed the opioid use questionnaire): 304	2023a: Female 53%, Male 47%	2023a: Mean 37.5 (SD 9.55)
				2023b (completed training): Opioid poisoning education and naloxone distribution (OPEND): 48	2023b: OPE: Female 30.6%, Male 19.8%	2023b: OPE: Mean 38.5 (SD 10.5)
				Opioid poisoning education: 50	OPEND: Female 31.5%, Male 18%	OPEND: Mean 37.4 (SD 9.1)
Waldron, 2022(51)	USA	Pre-post	School workers	28	Female 67.9%, Male 28.6% Unknown 3.6%	Range 26-62 Mean 46.33 (SD 10.05)
Wu, 2021(52)	USA	Descriptive	Patients receiving prescription opioids	164	Male 92%, Female 8%	60-69 39%
Yang, 2021(53)	USA	Descriptive	People with lived or living experience, their friends and family	3,926	Male - 34%, Female 61%, Gender nonconforming or nonbinary 4%, Transgender 1%	26-45 60%
Yates et al., 2018(54)	USA	Descriptive	Veterans receiving prescription opioids	41	Male 97.6%	Mean 61

141 ^aAll papers reported 'biological sex' except for Mathias 2023, Farrugia 2022, French 2021, and Yang 2021.

142 **Participant Demographics**

143 Eight of the included studies (26%) referred to interventions that were designed specifically for
144 people with lived or living experiences (PWLLE) of opioid use, six (19%) broadened to anyone
145 interested in participating, including laypersons, and other six (19%) focused on medical,
146 nursing and pharmacy students. The remainder of the studies involved health professionals
147 (n=5), family members or friends of PWLLE (n=2), first responders (n=2), school workers (n=1),
148 and law enforcement officers (n=1).

149 Of the 31 studies analyzed, fourteen (45%) reported on the mean age of the participants. The
150 ages ranged from 11 to 69 years old, with most of the participants aged between 25 and 64
151 years. Of the included studies, 21 (68%) reported biological sex and not gender, with ten of
152 these which reported male and female options. There was notable variation in participation
153 based on biological sex, with thirteen studies (42%) primarily comprised of female participants,
154 and nine (29%) of male participants. Four studies (13%) included an option for participants to
155 report their gender, while six (19%) did not report any sex or gender information.

156 Data on race or ethnicity were not reported in thirteen (42%) of the studies. Three studies (10%)
157 reported the percentage of one racial identity in their results, with Beiting et al, 2022 reporting
158 the percentage of Black individuals, while Yates et al., 2018 and Moses et al., 2021 reported the
159 percentage of White individuals. It is worth noting that all of the 18 studies reporting race or
160 ethnicity identity, and had White or Caucasian participants as the majority(23,25,26,31,34–
161 37,39,42,44–46,52–55).

162 No papers provided information on participants' socioeconomic status. However, Huhn et al.,
163 2018 reported that the median household income of participants was US\$52,500, while Sisson
164 2023a reported that most participants had an annual household income between US\$10,000
165 and US\$49,000. Participants educational level was available in six (19%) studies, with three

166 reporting most participants had a high school degree(23,27,55), two reporting most had a
167 college degree(35,51), and two reporting most had a graduate degree or higher(32,39). The
168 geographical area in which the participants resided was mentioned in six studies. Most
169 participants were from urban areas(28,36,37,39), while two studies focused on rural
170 areas(30,51).

171 **Intervention Approaches**

172 Several strategies were employed for conducting remote and virtual OPEND. A summary of
173 intervention approaches is specified in [Table 2](#). A significant number of these studies (n=25,
174 81%) delivered interventions over the internet, including videos (n=9), videoconferencing (n=7),
175 courses (n=5), slide presentations (n=3), and content on websites (n=3). Of these, four studies
176 additionally provided naloxone by mail. There were four telephone-based interventions, all of
177 which were coupled with mail-delivered naloxone.

178 **Table 2. Intervention characteristics and key findings.**

179 This table shows details and key findings of the interventions addressed in this review.

Authors, Year	Intervention Details ^a	Duration in minutes ^b	Scales used	Findings
Asynchronous interventions				
Adams, 2020(25)	Video and quiz with corrected feedback	15 to 25	Self-developed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased knowledge about opioids and opioid use disorder Increased confidence in working with people who use opioids Improved attitudes around opioid use disorder Decreased stigma around opioid use disorder Participants found the training easy and interesting, and would share with others
Bergeria, 2019(27)	Slide presentation (or presentation and quiz with corrected feedback)	Presentation: M=27.4 Presentation and quiz: M=36.4	BOOK ^a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased knowledge about opioid poisoning Decreased some opioid poisoning-risk behaviours No significant differences in intervention acceptability
Berland, 2019(28)	Course with four online modules (or in-person intervention)	Not mentioned	OOKS ^b (adapted) OOAS ^c (adapted) MCRS ^d (adapted)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Knowledge and Preparedness increased significantly in both groups No significant change in Attitudes scores in either group Participants from both groups were satisfied with the training
Castillo, 2022(30)	Slide presentation	20	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased confidence in discussing naloxone as a harm reduction strategy and in identifying patients who may be at risk of opioid poisoning Increased motivation and intent to use naloxone Perceived barriers did not have an impact on willingness to prescribe naloxone Decreased stigma around prescribing naloxone Participants enjoyed the intervention
Cerles, 2021(31)	Video series (available at rb.gy/sqiyo)	20	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Immediate increase in knowledge and confidence Knowledge was not sustained at the three-month follow-up Videos received an average rating of 4.9 out of 5
Eukel, 2020(32)	On-demand course with five modules (available at one-program.org)	180	Not mentioned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased knowledge Change in pharmacists' practice behaviours Significant impacts on performance up to 12 months Overall training rating was 2.7 out of 3 Naloxone was prescribed to 18.2% of patients based on risk stratification, with 60% acceptance rate

Authors, Year	Intervention Details ^a	Duration in minutes ^b	Scales used	Findings
Farrugia, 2022(33)	Website (available at overdoselivesavers.org)	Not reported	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased knowledge and confidence in discussing opioid poisoning emergencies Strong dissemination and reach Most participants visited the website for professional reasons The most helpful section was the personal stories Endorsement from alcohol and other drug sectors
French, 2021(34)	Video + mail-delivered naloxone (available at nextdistro.org)	Not mentioned	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most participants had proximity to opioid poisoning Most frequently reported barriers to access naloxone through other means were COVID quarantine, lack of knowledge on how to access, cost, transportation, COVID-related health concerns, and stigma Most common ways individuals learned about the program were through social media and word of mouth
Galiher & Huffman, 2022(35)	Video (available at rb.gy/lwrjs)	6.5	OOAS ^e (adapted)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved self-perception of ability to manage opioid poisoning emergencies Virtual programming could potentially decrease accessibility issues
Giordano, 2020(36)	Virtual reality video (or hybrid)	20	OOKS ^d OOAS ^e	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was no change in knowledge and attitudes Participants in both groups performed similarly regarding knowledge and attitudes towards providing care during an opioid poisoning
Giordano, 2023(37)	Virtual reality video (available at virtualinnovation.org) (or videoconference)	Video: 9 Videoconferencing: 90	OOKS ^d OOAS ^e	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both groups improved their attitudes and knowledge about responding to opioid poisoning Both groups decreased stigma toward people with opioid use disorder Both groups improved preparedness No statistically significant difference between methods
Goss, 2021(38)	Video (or in-person) + Q&A via Zoom	Video: 50 Zoom: 30	OOKS ^d OOAS ^e (adapted)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both groups improved knowledge and attitudes toward opioid use and poisoning Both groups decreased stigma toward people with opioid use disorder
Huhn, 2018(41)	Slide presentation (or presentation and quiz with corrective feedback)	Presentation: M=21.5 SD=12.3 Presentation and Quiz: M=34.7 SD=14	BOOK ^c	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased knowledge in both groups High level of acceptability for the intervention in both groups Participants in the Presentation group were more likely than participants in the Presentation and Quiz group to complete the intervention
Kim, 2016(43)	Course with one module (or reading-only)	Mdn=22.5	Self-developed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased knowledge for both groups, with internet-based participants scoring better than the control group No statistical difference between the groups in the global assessment

Authors, Year	Intervention Details ^a	Duration in minutes ^b	Scales used	Findings
Roe & Banta-Green, 2016(47)	Website (available at stopoverdose.org)	Not reported	Self-developed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most respondents were able to correctly identify basic signs of opioid poisoning and appropriate responses No differences in knowledge scores between respondents indicating professional or personal interest Respondents from the personal interest group were more likely to report being very likely to obtain naloxone Respondents had poor understanding of the local Good Samaritan law Great number of respondents reached with only a month's worth of paid advertising
Simmons, 2016(49)	Course (available at getnaloxonenow.org)	45	OOKS ^d (adapted) OOAS ^e (adapted)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> After the training, 88.1% of participants felt they had the knowledge and skills to intervene in a poisoning emergency Most trainees were satisfied or very satisfied with the training content, format, and mode of delivery Increased preparedness to administer naloxone Increased motivation to administer naloxone After the training, participants administered naloxone in 88 emergencies, with a 78.4% success rate of reversal
Simmons, 2018(50)	Course (available at getnaloxonenow.org)	20	OOKS ^d (adapted) OOAS ^e (adapted)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> After the training, 89% of participants felt they had the knowledge and confidence to intervene in a poisoning emergency More than 80% of participants were highly satisfied with the training While 71.7% of the participants expressed interest in obtaining naloxone post-training, 30.2% reported attempting to do so Reported barriers to obtaining naloxone included: not being sure how to obtain it, inability to get a prescription, lack of availability, and cost
Sisson, 2023a and 2023b(23,24)	Video + mail-delivered naloxone (or video-only)	20	OOKS ^d (adapted) OOAS ^e (adapted)	<p>2023a:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong retention rates Mean satisfaction score of 94.63% Most participants in the OPEND group expressed high satisfaction upon receiving a naloxone kit, while a considerably smaller portion in the education-only group were equally content with just receiving information on how to obtain naloxone <p>2023b:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased knowledge of opioid poisoning and naloxone 42% individuals in the education-only group reported obtaining their own naloxone kit 16 participants reported using their naloxone over the three-month follow-up period, and utilization was evenly split between groups Most kits were used on friends or family members experiencing opioid poisoning All opioid poisoning reversals resulted in survival No difference in reported poisonings between groups at months 1, 2, or 3

Authors, Year	Intervention Details ^a	Duration in minutes ^b	Scales used	Findings
Waldron, 2022(51)	Video (available at rb.gy/60j32)	60 to 90	New General Self-Efficacy Scale (adapted)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased knowledge of how to recognize and respond to an opioid emergency Increased confidence in recognizing and responding to an opioid emergency Almost all participants were highly satisfied with the content and methods
Yang, 2021(53)	Website + mail-delivered naloxone (available at nextdistro.org)	Not reported	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Substantial volume of new requests for naloxone via the website, most of which were fulfilled Instances of naloxone use during this period were largely successful in opioid poisoning reversal
Synchronous interventions				
Beiting, 2022(26)	Videoconference + mail-delivered naloxone	Not reported	Self-developed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased knowledge regarding the opioid epidemic Increased confidence in recognizing poisoning and administering naloxone More participants would prefer in-person training, but most were comfortable with a virtual format
Hohmann, 2022(39)	Videoconference (or no intervention)	90	OOKS ^d (adapted) OOAS ^e (adapted)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No difference in knowledge about naloxone, perceived barriers to implementation of naloxone, and attitudes towards naloxone Improved confidence regarding naloxone implementation and logistics Increased intention to provide naloxone Increased naloxone prescriptions only in the intervention group
Hughes, 2022(40)	Telephone + mail-delivered naloxone	Not mentioned	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 33% of potential participants were reached 55% accepted the educational intervention 93% agreed to receive a naloxone kit
Jensen, 2019(42)	Videoconference (or in-person)	60	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 21% of naloxone prescriptions were acquired because of the videoconference group during the first 6 months of the service, and 78% of these were attending online sessions Effective at reaching patients who were deemed high-risk and lived in remote locations
Mathias, 2023(44)	Videoconference	120	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased participation Reached urban population centres, rural areas, and substantial racial/ethnic diversity
Millikan, 2021(45)	Videoconference	45	Not mentioned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased knowledge and awareness about opioids, opioid misuse, opioid poisoning risks, and how to recognize the signs of opioid poisoning 100% of participants stated they were less likely to misuse prescription opioids or heroin 87.5% of participants reported they were more likely to talk to someone if they are concerned about themselves or others

Authors, Year	Intervention Details ^a	Duration in minutes ^b	Scales used	Findings
Moses, 2021(46)	Videoconference (or in-person)	60	OOKS ^d OOAS ^e MCRS ^f NaRRC-B ^g	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased knowledge overall, with greater knowledge improvement in the in-person group Improved attitudes toward naloxone use and distribution in both groups A 'hands-on' component was still desired by many students 97.2% of participants from both groups enjoyed the training and 99.4% believed future classes should receive a similar training
Rothbauer, 2022(48)	Telephone + mail-delivered naloxone	M=5 Mdn=5	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 73.8% of potential participants were reached on the first or second attempt; of those, 78% accepted the naloxone kit The most common reason to not accept the kit was feeling naloxone was unnecessary Pharmacy students conducting the calls reported satisfaction with the program and expressed interest in continuing
Wu, 2021(52)	Telephone + mail-delivered naloxone	M=14	Not mentioned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 67% of potential participants were reached; of those, 73% accepted naloxone Most patients were reached within one attempt
Yates, 2018(54)	Telephone + mail-delivered naloxone	Not mentioned	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most participants were successfully contacted within 3 attempts; of those, 63.4% accepted naloxone Participants preferred the nasal formulation instead of intramuscular

180 ^aWhen available, hyperlinks and URLs to interventions are provided.

181 ^bDuration is approximate.

182 ^cBrief Opioid Overdose Knowledge (BOOK) Questionnaire.

183 ^dOpioid Overdose Knowledge Scale (OOKS).

184 ^eOpioid Overdose Attitudes Scale (OOAS).

185 ^fMedical Condition Regard Scale (MCRS).

186 ^gNaloxone-Related Risk Compensation Beliefs Scale (NaRRC-B).

187 Among the 27 studies that reported on the duration of the intervention, the educational
 188 components ranged from five minutes to two hours, with interventions typically lasting 20
 189 minutes (n=6, 19%). Four studies (13%) used a self-directed approach, in which participants
 190 could complete the intervention in their own time(30,32,33,47). Of the self-directed
 191 interventions, one reported the average amount of time taken for participants to complete their
 192 training, and none reported drop-out rates.

193 The 31 studies analyzed in this review incorporated a variety of educational elements in their
 194 interventions. The predominant theme among the educational components analyzed was how to
 195 respond to, followed by how to recognize, and how to prevent opioid poisoning emergencies.
 196 Typical opioid poisoning response steps were sporadically mentioned across different
 197 interventions, with the most often mentioned being naloxone administration and calling 911.
 198 Other themes found within the interventions included history and statistics on opioid poisoning,
 199 laws and law enforcement, specifics on naloxone use, and stigma. An overview of the
 200 educational components can be seen in [Table 3](#).

201 **Table 3. Thematic Analysis of Educational Components.**

202 This table shows a thematic analysis of the topics mentioned in the educational portion of the
 203 interventions.

Major Themes ^a	Subthemes	References
Statistics and History of Opioid Poisoning		8
Prevention of Opioid Poisoning	Opioid poisoning risks	8
	Contamination by fentanyl and/or other substances	2
Recognizing an Opioid Poisoning		19
Responding to an Opioid Poisoning	PPE and situational awareness	2
	Calling 911	7
	Airway and circulation assessment	1
	Sternal rub	1
	Naloxone administration	22
	Rescue breathing	3
	Recovery positioning	4
	Opioid withdrawal management	3
Continued monitoring until EMS arrives	3	

Laws and Law Enforcement	Barriers to calling 911	2
	Good Samaritan Law	5
	Naloxone Access Law	2
Naloxone Specifics	Intranasal vs. intramuscular use	1
	Mechanism of action	2
	Access and availability	1
	Storage and expiration	1
Stigma about Opioid Poisoning		6

204 ^aThemes were identified based on information reported in papers, or through direct revision of
 205 original educational materials, when available.

206 Most studies utilized a pre-post design or post-training questionnaires. Out of the 31 studies
 207 analyzed, 19 (61%) reported on the level of knowledge individuals possessed regarding opioid
 208 poisoning response, followed by 12 (39%) on attitudes and behaviour towards opioid poisoning
 209 emergencies, 11 (36%) on qualitative feedback about the intervention, and 10 (33%) on the
 210 number of naloxone kits that were distributed, prescribed, or obtained during the intervention.
 211 Other outcomes assessed were confidence in responding to an opioid poisoning emergency,
 212 comparisons between different modalities, accessibility of OPEND, changes in stigma, barriers
 213 to accessing or prescribing naloxone, preparedness, familiarity with virtual learning, and opioid
 214 use.

215 The Opioid Overdose Knowledge Scale (OOKS) and the Opioid Overdose Attitudes Scale
 216 (OOAS) were used in 10 out of 31 studies (32%). Eight studies used both scales, while two
 217 used either one of them. Three studies developed their own assessment tools, some drawing
 218 from various sources in the literature. The Brief Opioid Overdose Knowledge Questionnaire
 219 (BOOK) and the Medical Conditions Regard Scale (MCRS) were each used by two studies
 220 (6%).

221 **Key Findings**

222 Findings are summarized in [Table 2](#).

223 **Videos (n=9)**

224 Six studies reported an increase in knowledge immediately after the training(24,25,31,37,38,51).
225 One of these collected longitudinal data, and knowledge was not sustained at the three-month
226 follow-up(31). Three of the video interventions reported on attitudes around opioid use disorder
227 (OUD) or providing care during an opioid poisoning(25,36,37), with one of them reporting no
228 change(36) and the other two reporting an increase in positive attitudes. All four studies that
229 assessed overall satisfaction and/or qualitative feedback reported high satisfaction rates
230 regarding the content, teaching methods, format, and/or mode of delivery of the intervention
231 (23,25,31,51). Other reported outcomes were increased confidence, self-perception of ability to
232 manage opioid poisoning emergencies, and preparedness to recognize and respond to opioid
233 poisoning, and decreased stigma around OUD.

234 **Videoconferencing (n=7)**

235 Four studies reported an increase in knowledge about the use of naloxone and the opioid
236 poisoning epidemic(26,37,45,46), and one reported no difference(39). Two papers reported
237 improved attitudes toward naloxone use and distribution(37,46), while another reported no
238 difference after the training(39). Two papers reported that most participants are comfortable with
239 a virtual format but would prefer in-person training(26,46).

240 **Courses (n=5)**

241 All studies reported increased knowledge and awareness about opioid
242 poisoning(28,32,43,49,50). While one study reported a positive change in behaviour after the
243 intervention(32), another study found no significant changes for attitudes pertaining to opioid

244 poisoning, as measured using the validated OOAS tool(28). Four papers that assessed
245 satisfaction with the training reported high satisfaction rates(28,32,49,50). Simmons et al., 2016
246 reported that participants surveyed up to 9 months after the intervention successfully reversed
247 an opioid poisoning with the use of naloxone in 78.4% of cases(49).

248 **Slide presentations (n=3)**

249 All studies reported high levels of satisfaction and acceptability for their interventions(27,30,41).
250 Two studies reported increased knowledge and one increased confidence about opioid use and
251 poisoning after the intervention(27,30,41). One study found that the training was effective in
252 decreasing stigma around prescribing naloxone(30). One study reported less opioid poisoning-
253 risk behaviours after the intervention(27).

254 **Websites (n=3)**

255 The types of assessments used in website interventions varied significantly. One study reported
256 increased knowledge and confidence in discussing opioid poisoning(33), and another showed
257 that most participants correctly identified basic signs of opioid poisoning and appropriate
258 responses(47). One of the interventions reported that of the participants visiting the website, a
259 majority indicated that they visited for professional reasons(33). Another intervention showed no
260 difference in knowledge between participants that indicated professional or personal interest,
261 with the personal interest group were more likely to obtain naloxone(47).

262 **Telephone (n=4)**

263 All telephone-based interventions reported the percentage of participants successfully contacted
264 through the intervention. In three of them, more than half were reached within one or two
265 attempts(48,52,54).

266 **Mail-delivered naloxone (n=8)**

267 Of the interventions that offered naloxone by mail, four were telephone-based(40,48,52,54), two
268 used videos(23,24,34), one used videoconference(26), and one used a website(53). Four
269 studies reported acceptability rates for naloxone kits ranging from 73% to 93%(40,48,52,54).
270 Among participants that did not accept naloxone, one study reported the most common reason
271 was feeling it was unnecessary(48). One study reported on barriers to accessing naloxone
272 through means other than the intervention, with the most frequently reported barriers being the
273 COVID-19 epidemic, lack of knowledge on how to access naloxone, cost, transportation, and
274 stigma(34). Two papers reported the result of participants' naloxone use – both papers reported
275 that most or all opioid poisoning reversals resulted in survival, and one paper reported that a
276 majority of kits were used on friends or family members(24,53).

277 **Comparison between different modalities (n=12)**

278 [Table 2](#) indicates which studies had comparison groups. Four studies had a control group
279 involving in-person training(28,38,42,46), and one study had a hybrid group(36). Of these, three
280 showed no significant differences on preparedness, attitudes, satisfaction, and stigma scores
281 between formats(28,36,38), and one reported greater knowledge in the in-person group(46).
282 One study reported a significantly higher number of naloxone prescriptions obtained by
283 participants in the virtual group(42). For papers with other comparison groups, there was no
284 significant differences in Kim et al., 2016 between reading-only and course groups, in Bergeria
285 et al., 2019 for slide presentation and slide plus quiz groups, and in Giordano et al., 2023
286 between virtual reality video and videoconference groups(27,37,43). Huhn et al., 2018 showed
287 the presentation-only group were more likely to complete the intervention compared to the
288 group that received the same presentation coupled with a quiz, but there were no differences in
289 knowledge and intervention acceptability(41). Sisson et al., 2023a reported higher satisfaction in
290 the naloxone distribution group compared to the group without naloxone distribution(55). Sisson

291 et al, 2023b reported that 42% of individuals in the group without naloxone distribution obtained
292 their own kit(24). In a comparison between a videoconference intervention and no intervention,
293 Hohmann at al., 2022 showed an increase in the number of naloxone prescriptions obtained by
294 participants only in the intervention group, but there was no difference related to other
295 outcomes(39).

296 **Limitations**

297 The included studies reported on limitations in their designs. Commonly reported limitations
298 included lack of generalizability of their study results, reported in 21 studies(23–31,36–39,44–
299 50,52,54). A frequent obstacle reported in 12 studies is small sample size, which ranged from
300 six to 313 participants per group(25–27,30,31,36,37,42,45,48,51). Other limitations include the
301 absence of longitudinal data(26,34,39,41,45,47,52), self-reported bias for
302 questionnaires(23,24,46,49,50), the lack of comparison to an in-person
303 intervention(35,38,41,44), no follow-up on the number of participants who responded to an
304 opioid poisoning post-intervention(34,42,44,52), lack of validity of the tools used(25,30,32), low
305 response rates, which were of 21.2% and 33.7%(32,50), and the lack of randomization(43,44).

306 Discussion

307 This scoping review identified that there is considerable research and innovation underway in
308 the development and evaluation of virtual OPEND, particularly since the start of the COVID-19
309 pandemic. Overall, virtual OPEND appears to be acceptable to participants and effective in
310 increasing knowledge on how to respond to an opioid poisoning, as well as improving attitudes
311 and decreasing stigma about people who use opioids. Especially when coupled with naloxone
312 distribution, programs appear to impact the motivation and willingness of people to respond to
313 these emergencies. Two studies demonstrated successful resuscitations and decreased
314 poisoning death rates(23,24,49), showing that virtual OPEND can be a life-saving intervention.

315 Our analysis indicates that most interventions are primarily targeted at PWLLE of opioid use and
316 potential bystanders, defined as individuals who could potentially witness an opioid poisoning. A
317 cross-sectional web-based survey and a mixed-methods study have demonstrated the unique
318 position of bystanders in reversing opioid poisonings and saving lives, provided they are
319 equipped with naloxone and the knowledge to administer it effectively(56,57).

320 However, the bulk of these studies are based in the USA, with only one study conducted in
321 Australia(33). Opioid poisoning is a global concern, demonstrating a pressing need to
322 implement and evaluate virtual OPEND programs worldwide to increase access to this
323 intervention(2). There is also a need for more randomized trials, since only two included studies
324 used this design. Few studies had a longitudinal design; however, it is essential to assess the
325 attrition of knowledge acquired in these interventions and the potential need for retraining.

326 In addition, only 42% of studies utilized validated scales to measure outcomes related to opioid
327 poisoning, and 62% of those studies modified already validated tools for their study. The
328 validated scales were originally designed to assess illicit opioid poisoning risk factors and do not

329 include knowledge about naloxone(58,59). Therefore, there is a critical demand for updated and
330 validated survey instruments to effectively evaluate these interventions(58,59).

331 Few studies reported sociodemographic variables and focused on the inclusion of historically
332 marginalized populations. Yet, those more likely to be impacted by the opioid poisoning crisis
333 include people living in rural and remote areas, individuals experiencing homelessness, those
334 living in poverty, incarcerated individuals, and Black, Indigenous, and People of Colour(60).

335 Without sociodemographic information, it is unknown whether sampling and selection biases
336 and issues with representativeness have occurred, limiting the effectiveness of these
337 interventions in addressing health inequities(61).

338 Most interventions did not make their training materials publicly available, and some of them did
339 not specify the educational content included in the intervention, hindering the potential for public
340 dissemination and research replication. Among the studies that reported the content of their
341 training, stigma reduction and policies pertaining to witness protection and naloxone permission
342 for opioid poisoning reversal were frequently not addressed, which if included, could have
343 bolstered the outcomes(62,63).

344 This is the first scoping review on the outcomes of fully virtual OPEND interventions. Other
345 reviews have explored opioid poisoning interventions and their effectiveness. Pellegrino et al.,
346 2021 has conducted a scoping review on first aid educational interventions for opioid poisoning
347 published until 2019, showing the potential of these programs despite the sparsity and lack of
348 quality of the studies reviewed(11). Razaghizad et al., 2021, an umbrella review on OPEND,
349 demonstrated that there is credible evidence that opioid poisoning education programs improve
350 knowledge and attitudes, enable participants to use naloxone safely and effectively, and reduce
351 opioid-related mortality(10). Additionally, Tas et al., 2022 reviewed technological interventions
352 that prevent, detect, or respond to opioid poisoning emergencies, with promising approaches
353 that were still under development(64). Our findings suggest the potential effectiveness of virtual

354 OPEND interventions and can assist researchers and public health practitioners to design,
355 implement, and evaluate future virtual and remote OPEND programs. Moreover, our findings
356 suggest the urgent need for more rigorous research of virtual OPEND programs, which have the
357 potential to save lives. Our recommendation includes providing resources and conditions to
358 amplify these educational programs coupled with naloxone distribution as a health care tool to
359 reduce opioid-related harms and inequities worldwide. Future research is recommended,
360 especially in developing relevant evaluation tools that can better assess OPEND's effectiveness
361 for diverse outcomes. Longitudinal clinical trials are also encouraged to address the attrition of
362 knowledge and more controlled settings.

363 **Limitations**

364 Our review has limitations. One such limitation is the lack of extensive critical appraisal of the
365 studies included. Despite our best efforts to design a comprehensive search strategy without
366 imposing any limitations, the constant updates and rapid publication of new research on
367 technology-based interventions may result in the unintentional omission of significant studies.
368 We also acknowledge that many impactful programs addressing the opioid poisoning crisis are
369 currently available online but did not involve a research design or share publicly available data
370 on these interventions, therefore were not suitable for this review. Additionally, the lack of
371 detailed information about the interventions in many studies may have impacted the accuracy of
372 our synthesis, as we did not reach out to the authors for additional information.

373 **Conclusion**

374 This review synthesizes the literature on virtual and remote Opioid Poisoning Education and
375 Naloxone Distribution (OPEND) programs, and underscores gaps in program implementation
376 and evaluation. Currently, it is difficult to draw substantial conclusions on OPEND effectiveness

377 due to the variety of study designs and the lack of updated and validated evaluation methods.
378 However, existing evidence points to the potential to increase knowledge, decrease stigma, and
379 ultimately reduce morbidity and mortality due to opioid-related harms. This life-saving
380 knowledge can significantly and positively impact populations who are not currently being
381 adequately reached by in-person OPEND interventions.

382 **Authors' Contributions**

383 Conceptualization: AMS, AK, AO, NR, DM, JM, KP, MR, SB, JC, KM, JS

384 Methodology: AMS, AK, AO, BDS, RFN

385 Formal analysis: BDS, RFN

386 Investigation: BDS, RFN

387 Data curation: BDS, RFN

388 Writing – original draft: BDS, RFN

389 Writing – review and editing: AMS, AK, AO

390 Visualization: BDS, RFN

391 Supervision: AMS, AK, AO

392 Project administration: AMS, AK

393 Funding acquisition: AO, DM, JM, KP, MR, SB, JC, KM, JS

394 **Acknowledgements**

395 We acknowledge the time and efforts of Eden Kinzel, Liaison and Education Librarian at the
396 University of Toronto, who provided expertise in the development of the research question and
397 search strategy.

398 **Conflicts of interest**

399 The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. United Nations : Office on Drugs and Crime [Internet]. [cited 2023 Oct 23]. Online World Drug Report 2023 - Latest data and trend analysis. Available from: [//www.unodc.org/unodc/en/data-and-analysis/wdr-2023-online-segment.html](http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/data-and-analysis/wdr-2023-online-segment.html)
2. Krausz RM, Westenberg JN, Ziafat K. The opioid overdose crisis as a global health challenge. *Curr Opin Psychiatry*. 2021 Jul;34(4):405.
3. Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation. Global Burden of Disease Study 2019 (GBD 2019) [Internet]. [cited 2023 Aug 9]. Available from: <https://ghdx.healthdata.org/gbd-2019>
4. Special Advisory Committee on the Epidemic of Opioid Overdoses. Opioid- and Stimulant-related Harms in Canada [Internet]. Ottawa: Public Health Agency of Canada; 2022 Jun [cited 2022 Sep 15]. Available from: <https://health-infobase.canada.ca/substance-related-harms/opioids-stimulants/>
5. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Annual Surveillance Report Of Drug-related Risks And Outcomes. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; 2019.
6. Public Health Agency of Canada. Highlights from phase one of the national study on opioid and illegal substance-related overdose deaths: insights from coroners and medical examiners [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2022 Sep 29]. Available from: <https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/services/publications/healthy-living/highlights-phase-one-national-study-opioid-illegal-substance-related-overdose-deaths.html>
7. Shannon O, Vera G, Krista L. At-a-glance - Hospitalizations and emergency department visits due to opioid poisoning in Canada. *Health Promot Chronic Dis Prev Can Res Policy Pract*. 2018 Jun;38(6):244–7.
8. Riazi F, Toribio W, Irani E, Hughes TM, Huxley-Reicher Z, McBratney E, et al. Community Case Study of Naloxone Distribution by Hospital-Based Harm Reduction Program for People Who Use Drugs in New York City. *Front Sociol* [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2022 Oct 2];6. Available from: <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fsoc.2021.619683>
9. Walley AY, Xuan Z, Hackman HH, Quinn E, Doe-Simkins M, Sorensen-Alawad A, et al. Opioid overdose rates and implementation of overdose education and nasal naloxone distribution in Massachusetts: interrupted time series analysis. *BMJ*. 2013 Jan 31;346:f174.
10. Razaghizad A, Windle SB, Fillion KB, Gore G, Kudrina I, Paraskevopoulos E, et al. The Effect of Overdose Education and Naloxone Distribution: An Umbrella Review of Systematic Reviews. *Am J Public Health*. 2021 Aug;111(8):e1–12.
11. Pellegrino JL, Krob JL, Orkin A, Pellegrino JL, Krob JL, Orkin A. First Aid Education for Opioid Overdose Poisoning: Scoping Review. *Cureus* [Internet]. 2021 Jan 3 [cited 2023 Apr 26];13(1). Available from: <https://www.cureus.com/articles/46368-first-aid-education-for-opioid-overdose-poisoning-scoping-review>

12. Winograd RP, Werner KB, Green L, Phillips S, Armbruster J, Paul R. Concerns that an opioid antidote could “make things worse”: Profiles of risk compensation beliefs using the Naloxone-Related Risk Compensation Beliefs (NaRRC-B) scale. *Subst Abuse*. 2020 Apr 2;41(2):245–51.
13. Irvine MA, Buxton JA, Otterstatter M, Balshaw R, Gustafson R, Tyndall M, et al. Distribution of take-home opioid antagonist kits during a synthetic opioid epidemic in British Columbia, Canada: a modelling study. *Lancet Public Health*. 2018 May 1;3(5):e218–25.
14. Bardwell G, Lappalainen L. The need to prioritize research, policy, and practice to address the overdose epidemic in smaller settings in Canada. *Can J Public Health Rev Can Santé Publique*. 2021 Mar 29;112(4):733–6.
15. Pijl EM, Alraja A, Duff E, Cooke C, Dash S, Nayak N, et al. Barriers and facilitators to opioid agonist therapy in rural and remote communities in Canada: an integrative review. *Subst Abuse Treat Prev Policy*. 2022 Aug 26;17:62.
16. Canadian Centre on Substance Use and Addiction. *Impacts of the COVID-19 Pandemic on People Who Use Substances*. Ottawa, ON, CA: Canadian Centre on Substance Use and Addiction; 2020.
17. 11.2.4 Inclusion criteria - JBI Manual for Evidence Synthesis - JBI Global Wiki [Internet]. [cited 2023 Oct 17]. Available from: <https://jbi-global-wiki.refined.site/space/MANUAL/4687714/11.2.4+Inclusion+criteria>
18. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O’Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Ann Intern Med*. 2018 Oct 2;169(7):467–73.
19. Westphaln KK, Regoeczi W, Masotya M, Vazquez-Westphaln B, Lounsbury K, McDavid L, et al. From Arksey and O’Malley and Beyond: Customizations to enhance a team-based, mixed approach to scoping review methodology. *MethodsX*. 2021;8:101375.
20. JBI Manual for Evidence Synthesis. Scoping reviews [Internet]. [cited 2023 Jun 26]. Available from: <https://jbi-global-wiki.refined.site/space/MANUAL/4687342/Chapter+11%3A+Scoping+reviews>
21. Dos Santos B, Nipun R farzan, Subic AM, Kubica A, Rondinelli N, Marentette D, et al. Remote Opioid Poisoning Education and Naloxone Distribution Programs: A Scoping Review Protocol. 2023 Jun 14 [cited 2023 Jun 26]; Available from: <https://osf.io/ew9rq>
22. JBI Manual for Evidence Synthesis. Data extraction [Internet]. [cited 2023 Jun 28]. Available from: <https://jbi-global-wiki.refined.site/space/MANUAL/4687700>
23. Sisson ML, Azuero A, Chichester KR, Carpenter MJ, Businelle MS, Shelton RC, et al. Feasibility and acceptability of online opioid overdose education and naloxone distribution: Study protocol and preliminary results from a randomized pilot clinical trial. *Contemp Clin Trials Commun*. 2023 Jun 1;33:101131.
24. Sisson ML, Azuero A, Chichester KR, Carpenter MJ, Businelle MS, Shelton RC, et al. Preliminary effectiveness of online opioid overdose and naloxone administration training

and impact of naloxone possession on opioid use. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2023 Aug 1;249:110815.

25. Adams N. Beyond narcan: comprehensive opioid training for law enforcement. *J Subst Use.* 2021 Aug;26(4):383–90.
26. Beiting KJ, Molony J, Ari M, Thompson K. Targeted virtual opioid overdose education and naloxone distribution in overdose hotspots for older adults during COVID-19. *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 2022 Sep 28;jgs.18037.
27. Bergeria CL, Huhn AS, Dunn KE. Randomized comparison of two web-based interventions on immediate and 30-day opioid overdose knowledge in three unique risk groups. *Prev Med.* 2019;128(pm4, 0322116):105718.
28. Berland N, Lugassy D, Fox A, Goldfeld KK, Oh SY, Tofighi B, et al. Use of Online Opioid Overdose Prevention Training for First Year Medical Students: A Comparative Analysis of Online vs In-Person training. *Subst Abuse.* 2019;40(2):240–6.
29. Brown M, Tran C, Dadiomov D. Lowering barriers to naloxone access through a student-led harm reduction program. *J Am Pharm Assoc JAPhA.* 2023;63(1):349–55.
30. Castillo E. Engaging healthcare providers to coprescribe naloxone to prevent opioid-induced mortality in Arizona. *Diss Abstr Int Sect B Sci Eng.* 2022;83(7-B):No-Specified.
31. Cerles AA, Dinh NNL, MacMillan L, Kemp DC, Rush MA. Development of Novel Video-Based First Responder Opioid Hazard Refresher Training. *New Solut J Environ Occup Health Policy NS.* 2021;31(3):298–306.
32. Eukel H, Steig J, Frenzel O, Skoy E, Werremeyer A, Strand M. Opioid Misuse and Overdose: Changes in Pharmacist Practices and Outcomes. *J Contin Educ Health Prof.* 2020;40(4):242–7.
33. Farrugia A, Treloar C, Fraser S. Overdoselivesavers.org: A mixed-method evaluation of a public information website on experiences of overdose and using take-home naloxone to save lives. *Drugs Educ Prev Policy.* 2022;29(1):43–53.
34. French R, Favaro J, Aronowitz SV. A free mailed naloxone program in Philadelphia amidst the COVID-19 pandemic. *Int J Drug Policy.* 2021 Aug;94:103199.
35. Galiher MV, Huffman M. Attitude changes following short-form opioid overdose video education: a pilot study. *Harm Reduct J.* 2022 Oct 14;19(1):114.
36. Giordano NA, Whitney CE, Axson SA, Cassidy K, Rosado E, Hoyt-Brennan AM. A pilot study to compare virtual reality to hybrid simulation for opioid-related overdose and naloxone training. *Nurse Educ Today.* 2020 Feb 10;88:104365.
37. Giordano NA, Febres-Cordero S, Baker H, Pfeiffer KM, Walsh LM, Gish A, et al. Opioid-involved overdose trainings delivered using remote learning modalities. *Nurs Open.* 2023;10(6):4132–6.

38. Goss NC, Haslund-Gourley B, Meredith DM, Friedman AV, Kumar VK, Samson KR, et al. A Comparative Analysis of Online Versus in-Person Opioid Overdose Awareness and Reversal Training for First-Year Medical Students. *Subst Use Misuse*. 2021;56(13):1962–71.
39. Hohmann L, Phillippe H, Marlowe K, Jeminiwa R, Hohmann N, Westrick S, et al. A state-wide education program on opioid use disorder: influential community members' knowledge, beliefs, and opportunities for coalition development. *BMC Public Health*. 2022;22(1):886.
40. Hughes TM, Kalicki A, Huxley-Reicher Z, Toribio W, Samuels DL, Weiss JJ, et al. A medical student-led model for telephone-based opioid overdose education and naloxone distribution during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Subst Abuse*. 2022;43(1):988–92.
41. Huhn AS, Garcia-Romeu AP, Dunn KE. Opioid Overdose Education for Individuals Prescribed Opioids for Pain Management: Randomized Comparison of Two Computer-Based Interventions. *Front Psychiatry* [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2022 Nov 17];9. Available from: <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsy.2018.00034>
42. Jensen AN, Beam CM, Douglass AR, Brabson JE, Colvard M, Bean J. Description of a pharmacist-led clinical video telehealth group clinic for opioid overdose prevention and naloxone education. *Ment Health Clin*. 2019;9(4):294–7.
43. Kim H, Heverling H, Cordeiro M, Vasquez V, Stolbach A. Internet Training Resulted in Improved Trainee Performance in a Simulated Opioid-Poisoned Patient as Measured by Checklist. *J Med Toxicol Off J Am Coll Med Toxicol*. 2016 Sep;12(3):289–94.
44. Mathias CW, Cavazos DM, McGlothen-Bell K, Crawford AD, Flowers-Joseph B, Wang Z, et al. Opioid overdose prevention education in Texas during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Harm Reduct J*. 2023 Mar 24;20(1):37.
45. Millikan MD. A quality improvement project: Implementing the this is not about drugs program in southwest Kansas. *Diss Abstr Int Sect B Sci Eng*. 2021;82(8-B):No-Specified.
46. Moses TEH, Moreno JL, Greenwald MK, Waineo E. Training medical students in opioid overdose prevention and response: Comparison of In-Person versus online formats. *Med Educ Online*. 2021 Jan 1;26(1):1994906.
47. Roe SS, Banta-Green CJ. An Initial Evaluation of Web-Based Opioid Overdose Education. *Subst Use Misuse*. 2016 Jan 28;51(2):268–75.
48. Rothbauer K, Genisot A, Frey T, Johnson Pharmacy William S Middleton Memorial Veterans Hospital D. Integration of Pharmacy Student Interns into a Naloxone Telephone Outreach Service. *J Pain Palliat Care Pharmacother*. 2022 Dec;36(4):208–15.
49. Simmons J, Rajan S, Goldsamt L, Elliott L. Implementation of online opioid overdose prevention, recognition and response trainings for professional first responders: Year 1 survey results. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 2016 Dec 1;169:1–4.
50. Simmons J, Rajan S, Goldsamt LA, Elliott L. Implementation of Online Opioid Prevention, Recognition and Response Trainings for Laypeople: Year 1 Survey Results. *Subst Use Misuse*. 2018 Oct 15;53(12):1997–2002.

51. Waldron AC. Opioid and naloxone training in a rural school district. *Diss Abstr Int Sect B Sci Eng.* 2022;83(4-B):No-Specified.
52. Wu S, Frey T, Wenthur CJ. Naloxone acceptance by outpatient veterans: A risk-prioritized telephone outreach event. *Res Soc Adm Pharm RSAP.* 2021;17(5):1017–20.
53. Yang C, Favaro J, Meacham MC. NEXT Harm Reduction: An Online, Mail-Based Naloxone Distribution and Harm-Reduction Program. *Am J Public Health.* 2021 Apr;111(4):667–71.
54. Yates D, Frey T, Montgomery JC. Utilizing risk index for overdose or serious opioid-induced respiratory depression (RIOSORD) scores to prioritize offer of rescue naloxone in an outpatient veteran population: A telephone-based project. *Subst Abuse.* 2018;39(2):182–4.
55. Sisson ML. Increasing naloxone access for persons who use opioids: An online recruitment and training approach to opioid overdose education and naloxone distribution. *Diss Abstr Int Sect B Sci Eng.* 2023;84(4-B):No-Specified.
56. Abdelal R, Raja Banerjee A, Carlberg-Racich S, Darwaza N, Ito D, Shoaff J, et al. Real-world study of multiple naloxone administration for opioid overdose reversal among bystanders. *Harm Reduct J.* 2022;19(1):49.
57. Keane C, Egan JE, Hawk M. Effects of naloxone distribution to likely bystanders: Results of an agent-based model. *Int J Drug Policy.* 2018;55(9014759):61–9.
58. Shoup JA, Mueller SR, Binswanger IA, Williams AV, Strang J, Glanz JM. Modifying and Evaluating the Opioid Overdose Knowledge Scale for Prescription Opioids: A Pilot Study of the Rx-OOKS. *Pain Med Off J Am Acad Pain Med.* 2020 Aug 22;21(10):2244–52.
59. Franklin Edwards G, Mierisch C, Mutcheson B, Horn K, Henrickson Parker S. A review of performance assessment tools for rescuer response in opioid overdose simulations and training programs. *Prev Med Rep.* 2020 Oct 21;20:101232.
60. Friesen EL, Kurdyak PA, Gomes T, Kolla G, Leece P, Zhu L, et al. The Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Opioid-Related Harm in Ontario [Internet]. Ontario COVID-19 Science Advisory Table; 2021 Sep [cited 2022 Sep 15]. Available from: <https://covid19-sciencetable.ca/sciencebrief/the-impact-of-the-covid-19-pandemic-on-opioid-related-harm-in-ontario>
61. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. Race, Ethnicity, and Language Data: Standardization for Health Care Quality Improvement [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2023 Aug 10]. Available from: <https://www.ahrq.gov/research/findings/final-reports/iomracereport/reldata1.html>
62. Jakubowski A, Kunins HV, Huxley-Reicher Z, Siegler A. Knowledge of the 911 Good Samaritan Law and 911-calling behavior of overdose witnesses. *LawAtlas B GrantKJ, Banta Green, CJ, KuszlerPC, CoffinPO, SchoeppeJA, CerdaM, RansomeY, KeyesKM, et al, DarkeS, RossJ, ZadorD, SunjicS, DavidsonPJ, McLeanRL, KralAH, GleghornAA, EdlinBR, MossAR, HernanMA, Hernan, A, JonesJD, CampbellA, MetzVE, ComerSD, LankenauSE, WagnerKD, SilvaK, et al, LevyB, SpelkeB, PaulozziLJ, et al, PolliniRA, McCallL, MehtaSH, CelentanoDD, VlahovD, StrathdeeSA, Rudd, RA, AleshireN, ZibbellJE, GladdenRM, ShermanSG, GannDS, ScottG, CarlbergS, BiggD, HeimerR, SieglerA, Huxley Reicher*

MaldjianL, JordanR, OliverC, JakubowskiA, KuninsHV, SieglerA, TuazonE, Bradley O'BrienD, PaoneD, TobinKE, DaveyMA, LatkinCA, TracyM, PiperTM, OmpadD, et al, editor. *Subst Abuse*. 2018;39(2):233–8.

63. Sellen K, Markowitz B, Parsons JA, Leece P, Handford C, Goso N, et al. Considerations for the design of overdose education and naloxone distribution interventions: results of a multi-stakeholder workshop. *BMC Public Health*. 2023 May 15;23(1):888.
64. Tas B, Lawn W, Traykova EV, Evans RAS, Murvai B, Walker H, et al. A scoping review of mHealth technologies for opioid overdose prevention, detection, and response. [Internet]. *PsyArXiv*; 2022 [cited 2023 May 24]. Available from: <https://psyarxiv.com/trfbc/>

Supporting information

S1 Appendix. Search strategy.

S2 Appendix: Data extraction instrument.