

Interventions to reduce opioid use for patients with chronic non-cancer pain in primary care settings: a systematic review and meta-analysis.

¹Qian Cai*, ²Christos Grigoroglou, ²Thomas Allen, ³Teng-Chou Chen, ³Li-Chia Chen, ^{1,4}Evangelos Kontopantelis

¹ Division of Informatics, Imaging & Data Sciences, School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Biology, Medicine and Health, Manchester Academic Health Science Centre, University of Manchester, Manchester, the United Kingdom.

² Centre for Health Economics, Division of Population Health, Health Services Research and Primary Care, School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Biology, Medicine and Health, Manchester Academic Health Science Centre, University of Manchester, Manchester, the United Kingdom

³ Centre for Pharmacoepidemiology and Drug Safety, Division of Pharmacy and Optometry, School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Biology, Medicine and Health, University of Manchester, Manchester, the United Kingdom.

⁴ National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR) School for Primary Care Research, Division of Population Health, Health Services Research and Primary Care, School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Biology, Medicine and Health, Manchester Academic Health Science Centre, University of Manchester, Manchester, the United Kingdom.

*Corresponding author:

Qian Cai

Division of Informatics, Imaging & Data Sciences, School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Biology, Medicine, and Health, University of Manchester, Manchester, M13 9PL, the United Kingdom

Phone: (0)7419737634

Email: qian.cai@manchester.ac.uk

29 Abstract

30 **Objective:** This systematic review and meta-analysis aimed to assess interventions
31 to reduce opioid use for patients with chronic non-cancer pain (CNCP) versus usual
32 care or active controls in primary care settings.

33 **Methods:** In this registered study (PROSPERO: CRD42022338458), we searched
34 MEDLINE, Embase PsycInfo, CINAHL, and Cochrane Library from inception to
35 December 28th 2021, and updated on Dec 14th 2023 for randomized controlled trials
36 (RCTs) and cohort studies with no restrictions. Methodological quality was assessed
37 using the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool for RCTs and Newcastle Ottawa Scale for
38 cohort studies. Primary outcomes included mean reduction in morphine equivalent
39 daily dose (reported as mean differences [MDs] mg/day; 95% confidence intervals
40 [95%CI]) and/or opioid cessation proportion. Secondary outcomes were mean
41 changes in pain severity (reported as standardized mean difference [SMDs]; 95%CI)
42 and (serious) adverse events. Meta-analyses were performed using random-effects
43 models.

44 **Results:** We identified 3,826 records, of which five RCTs (953 participants) and six
45 cohort studies (967 participants) were included. Overall, opioid dosage was
46 significantly reduced in intervention groups compared to controls (MD: -24.88 mg/day,
47 95%CI: -36.40 to -13.36; $I^2=59.41\%$; nine studies). Subgroup analyses revealed
48 significant opioid dose reductions with mindfulness (MD: -29.36 mg/day 95%CI: -
49 40.55 to -18.17; $I^2=0.0\%$; two trials) and CBT-based multimodalities (MD: -41.68
50 mg/day; 95%CI: -58.47 to -24.89; $I^2=0.0\%$; two cohort studies), respectively,
51 compared to usual care. No significant differences were observed in opioid cessation
52 (Odds ratio: 1.55, 95%CI: 0.3 to 2.81, $I^2=50.79\%$; three studies) or pain severity
53 (SMD: -0.13, 95%CI: -0.37 to 0.11; $I^2=33.51\%$; three trials). Adverse events were
54 infrequently examined, with withdrawal symptoms commonly reported.

55 **Conclusions:** The studied interventions were effective in reducing opioid dosage for
56 people with CNCP in primary care. They highlighted the importance of

57 multidisciplinary collaboration. Large-scale RCTs measuring the long-term effects
58 and cost of these interventions are needed before their implementation.

59

60 **Introduction**

61 Opioids are primarily recommended by the World Health Organization pain ladder in
62 treating acute pain, cancer pain, and palliative care [1]. During the last two decades,
63 there has been a marked increase in opioid prescriptions issued for chronic non-
64 cancer pain (CNCP), predominantly in the United States (US) [2], Canada [3], and
65 several European countries [4-6] including the United Kingdom (UK) [7]. Despite the
66 widespread utilization of opioids, findings from randomized controlled trials and
67 systematic reviews suggest limited efficacy of these medications, yielding only
68 modest effects in pain relief in the short to medium term (less than 12 weeks) [8].
69 While the evidence supporting the long-term use of opioids remains sparse, the
70 associated harms of long-term opioid treatment (LTOT), including respiratory
71 depression, bone fractures, and opioid-related mortality, are well documented [9].
72 Moreover, prolonged opioid use introduces risks of dependence, addiction, and
73 abuse [10].

74

75 In response to these concerns, clinical guidelines [11-13] have prompted healthcare
76 providers (HCPs) to reassess their prescribing practices, emphasizing the need to
77 reduce opioid use when potential risks outweigh perceived benefits. However, the
78 endeavor to reduce opioid use encounters significant challenges, including patients'
79 fear of withdrawal symptoms, inadequate social and healthcare support, and limited
80 availability of non-opioid methods for pain management [14, 15]. Currently, there is a
81 lack of guidance and practical support to implement the reduction of LTOT. Therefore,
82 there is an urgent need for an evidence-based evaluation of interventions to assess
83 their effectiveness in reducing opioid utilization and evaluate their impact on clinical
84 outcomes, particularly in primary care settings, where opioids are mostly prescribed.

85

86 Previous systematic reviews [16-19] have provided valuable insights into
87 interventions aimed at reducing opioid use for chronic pain patients. However, their
88 inclusion criteria were broad, limiting their relevance to primary care settings. For
89 example, these reviews analyzed interventions (e.g., spinal cord stimulation) that are
90 not readily accessible in primary care settings, and they included studies that
91 evaluated abrupt or gradual opioid tapering protocols without incorporating additional
92 supportive therapies for patients. The provision of supplementary interventions is
93 crucial, as patients often express reluctance to reduce or cease opioids when
94 alternative treatments are not provided, given these medications constitute their
95 primary method of pain management in real-world practices. Furthermore, the
96 absence of additional interventions impedes the identification of the key components
97 contributing to the dose reduction outcomes. Some prior systematic reviews also
98 included pilot studies lacking clear objectives of opioid reduction. This is particularly
99 common for studies using pharmacological substitution, where the primary aim was
100 to address opioid withdrawal symptoms rather than reducing opioid dosage, despite
101 achieving a decrease in opioid dosage or an improvement in pain severity. In view of
102 these limitations and the emergence of new studies recently, there is a compelling
103 need for an updated evaluation of the current evidence.

104

105 The present systematic review and meta-analysis aimed to evaluate the
106 effectiveness of healthcare provider-directed interventions designed to reduce or
107 discontinue opioid use for patients with CNCP, with a particular focus on primary care
108 settings. Specifically, the objectives included comparing changes in morphine
109 equivalent daily dose (MEDD), evaluating the proportion of patients discontinuing
110 opioids, and assessing the change in pain severity and adverse events between
111 interventions and usual care or active controls.

112

113 **Methods**

114 This registered systematic review and meta-analysis (PROSPERO:
115 CRD42022338458) was conducted following the Cochrane Handbook [20] and the
116 Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA)
117 guidelines (S1 Appendix) [21].

118

119 **Eligibility criteria**

120 Eligible studies were full-scale randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and cohort studies
121 that examined primary care provider-directed interventions, designed to reduce or
122 discontinue opioids in adult patients (≥ 18 years) with CNCP (persists for ≥ 3 months).
123 Studies that concurrently used opioids with other analgesics (e.g., non-steroidal anti-
124 inflammatory drugs) were excluded, as distinguishing the analgesic effects of opioids
125 from those analgesics were challenging. Interventions implemented in hospital
126 settings or managed by patient themselves were not considered for inclusion.
127 Studies that solely focused on reducing opioids without offering patients alternate
128 treatments or replacements were excluded. Interventions were considered if they
129 explicitly aiming to reduce or cease opioid use, whereas those with a spillover effect
130 on opioid use were excluded. Any comparator was accepted, including usual care or
131 active controls (either pharmacological or non-pharmacological).

132

133 The primary outcomes of interest included: 1) opioid dose reduction, measured by
134 the mean changes in morphine milligram equivalent daily dose (MEDD) from pre- to
135 post-treatment. The homogeneity of this outcome measure allowed us to examine
136 our study objectives meta-analytically; 2) The proportion of participants for whom
137 opioid use was either ceased or declined. Secondary outcomes included the mean
138 change in pain severity (measured by pain rating scales on a range of 0-10, where 0
139 indicating no pain whilst 10 indicating severe pain) and the number of (serious)
140 adverse events related to opioid reduction. Case reports, cross-sectional studies,

141 case-control studies, pilot studies, reviews or meta-analyses were excluded.

142

143 **Data sources and search strategies**

144 We performed comprehensive searches in databases including MEDLINE, EMBASE,
145 PsycINFO, CINAHL, and Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials. Searches
146 were conducted from the inception of each database until December 28th 2021, and
147 updated on December 14th 2023, using structured search strategies (S2 Appendix)
148 that incorporated text words and medical subject headings related to “chronic pain”,
149 “opioids”, and “reduce/discontinue/cease/deprescribe/”. No language and geographic
150 restrictions were applied. Ongoing trials or unpublished studies were obtained from
151 ClinicalTrials.gov. To ensure literature saturation, we manually retrieved additional
152 studies from the reference lists of included studies and published systematic reviews.

153

154 **Study selection**

155 Two review authors (QC and CG) independently screened titles and abstracts of the
156 retrieved citations against pre-determined inclusion/exclusion criteria. When
157 necessary, full text of eligible records were reviewed for further eligibility assessment.
158 Where discrepancies occurred and remained unresolved by discussion, a third party
159 (EK, TA and LCC) was consulted for adjudication. The inter-rater agreement test
160 demonstrated a high level of consistency (99.64%) between QC and CG with a
161 Kappa coefficient equals to 0.7982 ($p < 0.001$).

162

163 **Data extraction and quality assessment**

164 Data extraction was undertaken independently by one review author (QC) and
165 verified by another reviewer (TCC) for accuracy. The study authors were also
166 contacted by email to request any necessary missing information. The following key
167 information was extracted:

- 168 • Study: first author, publication year, country, study design, settings.

- 169 • Patient characteristics: age, gender, sample size, pain duration and severity,
- 170 opioid use status, comorbidities.
- 171 • Intervention and comparator: key components, mode of administration,
- 172 frequency, treatment duration.
- 173 • Outcome: opioid dose, pain severity, adverse events.

174

175 **Risk of bias assessment**

176 The methodological quality of all included studies was independently appraised by
 177 QC. For RCTs, the Cochrane's Risk of Bias Tool 2.0 (RoB 2) [22] was employed to
 178 assess the risk of bias, including 1. sequence generation; 2. allocation concealment;
 179 3. masking of participants, staff and outcome assessors; 4. incomplete outcome data;
 180 and 5. selective outcome reporting. For cohort studies, a modified Newcastle-Ottawa
 181 Scale (NOS) [23] was used to evaluate bias risk, focusing on 1. the
 182 representativeness of the exposed cohort; 2. selection of the non-exposed cohort; 3.
 183 ascertainment of exposure; 4. absence of the outcome of interest at the start of the
 184 study; 5. comparable controls; 6. assessment of outcome; 7. sufficient follow-up
 185 length for outcomes to occur; and 8. adequacy of follow-up cohorts. For RCTs, high
 186 quality was defined as minimum 4 domains of low risk. As for cohort studies, the
 187 modified NOS adopted a star rating system. A study was deemed to be of good
 188 quality if it obtained ≥ 3 stars in selection domain (1-4), ≥ 1 star in comparability
 189 domain (5), and ≥ 2 stars in outcome/exposure domain (6-8).

190

191 **Data synthesis and analysis**

192 The study characteristics and details of opioid reduction interventions were presented
 193 descriptively. Effect sizes were reported using odds ratios (ORs) with their 95%
 194 confidence intervals (95%CI) for opioid cessation, mean differences (MDs) with
 195 95%CI for opioid dose reduction, and standardized mean differences (SMDs) with
 196 95%CI for pain severity, given the utilization of different scales for this outcome

197 measure. Magnitude of effect was defined as large (SMD > 0.8), medium (SMD 0.5-
198 0.8), small (SMD 0.2-0.5) or trivial (SMD < 0.2) [24].
199
200 Where between- or within-group SDs were not reported, relevant data such as
201 sample size, p values, t statistics, standard errors (SEs), or 95% CIs were used to
202 derive SDs using the formula recommended by the Cochrane Handbook (6.5.2.3) [20]
203 or the calculator embedded in Review Manager 5.4. Additionally, when outcomes
204 were assessed at multiple time points during long-term follow-up, data from the last
205 available time point were employed.
206
207 Heterogeneity was assessed using the I^2 statistics, with values below 50%
208 suggesting low heterogeneity, 50-75% moderate, above 75% substantial
209 heterogeneity [25]. Random effects meta-analyses with a non-parametric bootstrap
210 of DerSimonian Laird (DL) method were conducted for pooling the outcomes of
211 interest [26, 27] even if I^2 was low. Publication bias regarding the primary outcomes
212 was not assessed due to the small number of included studies.
213
214 Sensitivity analyses were conducted by sequentially removing one study at a time
215 and repeating the meta-analysis based on the remaining data to assess whether
216 pooled estimates were unduly influenced by specific studies. Furthermore,
217 multivariable random effects meta-regressions were conducted to explore potential
218 sources of heterogeneity, including patient mean age; gender; study period; sample
219 size; follow-up time point; intervention type and category. Subgroup analyses were
220 undertaken based on intervention types, which included mindfulness techniques, and
221 CBT-based multi-component strategies. All data analyses were conducted with
222 Stata/MP 17.0.

223 **Results**

224 **Study selection and patient characteristics**

225 The initial search retrieved 3,826 potentially relevant records, of which 1,126 duplicates
 226 were removed, yielding 2,770 unique records for eligibility assessment. By screening
 227 titles and abstracts against our predefined inclusion/exclusion criteria, 2739 studies
 228 were excluded. Of the remaining 31 records, eleven full-text articles including five RCTs
 229 (953 participants, female 557 [58.4%], mean age: 60.1±13.42) [28-32] and six
 230 retrospective cohort studies (patients 967, female 214 [22.1%], mean age: 54.2±13.52)
 231 [33-38] published between 2016 and 2023 were included in this systematic review and
 232 meta-analysis ([Fig 1. Selection of included studies](#)). All included studies reported the
 233 baseline opioid dosage (mean 87.4±131.8 mg/day), with three [31, 33, 37] indicating
 234 that participants consumed a mean MEDD of >120 mg/day. Most studies did not
 235 specify the exact CNCP conditions, except for one study that explicitly mentioned
 236 chronic musculoskeletal pain [38]. Studies were mainly conducted in the US (n=10),
 237 with one in the UK [30]. Both RCTs and retrospective cohort studies had a small
 238 sample size ranging between 35 and 608 (Table 1).

Table 1. Characteristics of included studies

Author, year and country	Study design	Population	interventions	Comparators	Outcomes of interest assessed	Quality
Randomized controlled trials (n=5)						
Sandhu <i>et al.</i> 2023 [30], UK	Non-blind, two-arm, RCT	CNCP (n=608) female 362 (60%)	Skill-based learning integrating education and mindfulness (n=305)	Usual care (n=303)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opioid cessation • Pain severity • Adverse events 	Good
Wartko <i>et al.</i> 2023 [32], USA	Non-blind, two-arm, RCT	CNCP (n=153) female 98 (64%)	CBT-based pain coping skills training, education and usual care (n=79)	Usual care (n=74)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opioid dose reduction • Pain severity • Adverse events 	Good
Hudak <i>et al.</i> 2021 [29], USA	Non-blind, two-arm, RCT	CNCP (n=62) female 9 (14.5%)	The MORE protocol: Mindfulness (n=34)	The supportive care (n=28)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opioid dose reduction 	Good
Garland <i>et al.</i> 2020 [28], USA	Non-blind, two-arm, RCT	CNCP (n=95) female 63 (66.3%)	The MORE protocol: Mindfulness (n=50)	The supportive care (n=45)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opioid dose reduction 	Fair
Sullivan <i>et al.</i> 2017 [31], USA	Non-blind, two-arm, RCT	CNCP (n=35) female 25 (71.4%)	CBT-based multimodality & self-care & pain education (n=18)	Standard of care (n=17)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opioid dose reduction • Opioid cessation • Pain severity 	Fair
Cohort studies (n=6)						
Montgomery <i>et al.</i> 2020 [35], USA	Retrospective cohort study	CNCP (n=47) female 5 (10.6%)	Acupuncture (n=24)	Standard of care (n=23)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opioid dose reduction • Pain severity 	Poor
Seal <i>et al.</i> 2019 [37], USA	Retrospective cohort study	CNCP (n=294) female 30 (10.2%)	Integrated multimodality including CBT, mindfulness, pain education, acupuncture and exercise (n=147)	Standard of care (n=147)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opioid dose reduction 	Good
Oldfield <i>et al.</i> 2018 [36], USA	Retrospective cohort study	CNCP (n=105) female 7 (6.7%)	Multimodality integrating CBT, exercise, and acupuncture (n=66)	Standard of care (n=39)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opioid dose reduction 	Good
Goodman <i>et al.</i> 2018 [33], USA	Retrospective cohort study	CNCP (n=41) female 22 (53.7%)	Opioid reduction program & consultation with GPs (n=27)	Usual care (n=14)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opioid dose reduction 	Fair

Author, year and country	Study design	Population	interventions	Comparators	Outcomes of interest assessed	Quality
Vigil <i>et al.</i> 2017 [38], USA	Retrospective cohort study	CMSK (n=66) female 26 (39.4%)	Medical cannabis & patient education (n=37)	Patient education (n=29)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opioid dose reduction • Opioid cessation • Pain severity 	Fair
Mehl-Madrona <i>et al.</i> 2016 [34], USA	Retrospective cohort study	CNCP (n=414) female 124 (59.9%)	Medical care and physical exercise (n=207)	Standard of care (n=207)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opioid dose reduction 	Good

240 Note: CNCP=Chronic Non-Cancer Pain, CMSK=Chronic Musculoskeletal Pain, MORE=Mindfulness-Oriented Recovery Enhancement, CBT=Cognitive Behavioral Therapy,
 241 GPs=general practitioner

242 **Characteristics of interventions**

243 The components, duration, frequency, and delivery mode of the interventions varied
 244 significantly across studies. One study used medicine substitution approach,
 245 transitioning opioids to cannabis [38]; Two studies focused on physical interventions,
 246 incorporating components such as yoga, Taichi, chiropractic therapy [34] and
 247 acupuncture [35]; Five studies involved psychological or behavioral changes,
 248 integrating key components such as cognitive behavior therapy (CBT), mindfulness
 249 techniques, patient education and pain coping skills training [28-30, 32, 33]; Three
 250 studies [31, 36, 37] employed mixed multimodal approaches delivered by a
 251 multidisciplinary team comprising physicians, nurses, psychologists, pharmacists, and
 252 social workers. These multimodal care programs typically combined CBT, mindfulness,
 253 acupuncture, chiropractic care, exercise, pharmacotherapies are the core components.
 254

255 The most common comparator was usual care, with the exception of one study that
 256 used patient education as the comparison group [38]. Treatment durations ranged from
 257 eight weeks to 12 months. Follow-up periods (median 6 months) varied from short (≤ 3
 258 months) [28, 29] to intermediate (6-9 months) [31, 33-37], with three studies reporting
 259 long-term outcomes of opioid reduction (≥ 12 months) . (See Table 2 for characteristics
 260 of interventions).

261

Table 2. The components and implementation procedures of each intervention

Studies	Interventions	Duration	Implemented by
Pharmacological substitution (n=1)			
Vigil <i>et al.</i> 2017 [38]	Medical cannabis & patient education	21 months	Physicians
Physical procedure (n=2)			
Montgomery <i>et al.</i> 2020 [35]	Battlefield Acupuncture: 5-point auricular acupuncture procedure implemented	9 months	Physicians
Mehl-Madrone <i>et al.</i> 2016 [34]	Twice monthly GMV (12 sessions) & weekly physical activity (yoga, exercise class, chiropractic therapy, osteopathic treatment, tai chi, or qigong)	6 months	Family doctor, nurse, and behavioral health specialist
Psychological or behavioral intervention (n=5)			
Sandhu <i>et al.</i> 2023 [30]	Weekly skill-based learning and education including mindfulness, relaxation, opioid education, consultation and followed by an opioid taper (weekly 10% reduction)	12 months	Nurse
Wartko <i>et al.</i> 2023 [32]	CBT-based pain coping skill training: 18 sessions (30 min for each on average), mainly including pain education, goal setting, relaxation skills and motivational interviews, conducted over one year.	12 months	Primary care provider, nurse, physician assistant
Hudak <i>et al.</i> 2021 [29]	The MORE protocol: 2-hour weekly training sessions in mindfulness, reappraisal and savoring pleasant events & a 15-min CD-guided mindfulness practice at home and 3-minute breathing before taking opioids	4 months	Clinical social workers
Garland <i>et al.</i> 2020 [28]	The MORE protocol: 2-hour weekly training sessions in mindfulness, reappraisal and savoring pleasant events & a 15-min CD-guided mindfulness practice at home and 3-minute breathing before taking opioids	3 months	Clinical social workers
Goodman <i>et al.</i> 2018 [33]	Family physician-patient's discussion of pain management guidelines and practice followed by an opioid tapering program (weekly 10% reduction to 25%-50% reduction every few days)	6 months	Family physician
Multimodalities (n=3)			
Sullivan <i>et al.</i> 2017 [31]	A weekly 10% reduction of the initial dose until 30% was reached. Then, a 10% was recalculated based on this dose and then proceeded by 10% of this new dose per week.) & 17 weekly 30-min consultations, CBT-modelled pain self-management,	8.5 months	Pain medicine/psychiatry physicians, psychologists and physician assistants

Studies	Interventions	Duration	Implemented by
	education & a book/CD-guided home practice		
Oldfield <i>et al.</i> 2018 [36]	Multidisciplinary ORC program including pharmacotherapy, CBT and other modalities (e.g., acupuncture, chiropractic, and yoga)	6 months	Physicians, pain specialists, pain psychologists and chemical dependency counsellors
Seal <i>et al.</i> 2019 [37]	Integrated Pain Team: an initial 60-min's biopsychosocial model of pain management (including CBT, mindfulness, acupuncture, chiropractic care, and exercise) & a 30-min follow-up visits	6 months	Medical provider, psychologist, and pharmacist

262 Note: MORE=Mindfulness-Oriented Recovery Enhancement, CBT=Cognitive Behavioral Therapy, ORC=Opioid Reassessment Clinic, GMV=Group Medical Visits

263 Risk of bias assessment

264 The Cochrane RoB-2 assessment indicated an overall risk of bias being low (n=3) to
 265 moderate (n=2) (Fig 2. Risk of Bias of included RCTs). Due to the impossibility of
 266 masking the interventions, participants and researchers were unblinded, which
 267 increased risk. The high dropout rate during follow-ups was another main reason
 268 contributing to the increased risk of bias. The NOS evaluation tool identified three
 269 cohort studies [34, 36, 37] with good quality, two [33, 38] with fair and one [35] with
 270 poor quality (Table 3). Uncontrolled confounders and limited representativeness of
 271 the study population were the main reasons that reduced the quality of these studies.

272

273 **Table 3. Quality assessment outcomes of cohort studies**

Author and year	Three domains of the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale			Quality
	Selection of participants	Comparability of study groups	Outcomes	
Montgomery <i>et al.</i> 2020 [35]	★ ★ ★	★	★	Poor
Seal <i>et al.</i> 2019 [37]	★ ★ ★ ★	★ ★	★ ★ ★	Good
Oldfield <i>et al.</i> 2018 [36]	★ ★ ★	★ ★	★ ★ ★	Good
Goodman <i>et al.</i> 2018 [33]	★ ★ ★	★	★ ★	Fair
Vigil <i>et al.</i> 2017 [38]	★ ★ ★	★	★ ★	Fair
Mehl-Madrone <i>et al.</i> 2016 [34]	★ ★ ★	★ ★	★ ★ ★	Good

274 Opioid dose reduction

275 Ten studies including four RCTs [28, 29, 31, 32] and six cohort studies [33-38] reported
 276 the outcomes of opioid dose reduction. Opioid dosage was significantly decreased in
 277 the intervention groups compared to controls (MD: -31.80 mg/day, 95%CI: -50.30 to -
 278 13.31; ten studies; [Fig 3. Forest plot of interventions vs controls in opioid dose](#)
 279 [reduction in ten studies](#)). However, considerable heterogeneity was noted ($I^2 = 91.14\%$,
 280 95%CI: 80.4% to 96.0%, $p=0.00$; [Fig 3](#)). A sensitivity analysis was conducted to
 281 investigate the source of heterogeneity and the Mehl-Madrone et al. (2016)'s study [34]
 282 was identified as an outlier ([Fig 4. Sensitivity analysis of included studies](#)). Upon its
 283 removal, the heterogeneity decreased from high ($I^2 = 91.14\%$) to medium ($I^2 =$
 284 59.41%), but the significance or direction of the pooled effects in our meta-analyses
 285 remained unchanged (MD: -24.88 mg; 95%CI: -36.40 to -13.36; nine studies; [Fig 5.](#)
 286 [Forest plot of interventions vs controls in opioid dose reduction in nine studies](#)).
 287 Furthermore, a multivariable meta-regression analysis was conducted, revealing that
 288 heterogeneity could be partially explained by differences in the longest follow-up time
 289 across studies ($p=0.014$).

290
 291 Within the four RCTs [28, 29, 31, 32] provided data that enabled the pooled calculation
 292 of change for opioid reduction among 181 participants receiving different interventions
 293 compared to 162 receiving usual care (MD: -24.40 mg; 95%CI: -36.32 to -12.47; $I^2 =$
 294 9.21% , $p=0.35$; [Fig 6. Forest plot of interventions vs controls in opioid dose reduction in](#)
 295 [four RCTs](#)), a subgroup meta-analysis of two trials [28, 29] using the MORE protocol
 296 (mindfulness) found a significant reduction in opioid dosage in 84 patients receiving this
 297 intervention, compared to 77 having supportive care (MD: -29.36 mg; 95%CI: -40.55 to
 298 -18.17; $I^2 = 0.00\%$, $p=0.37$; [Fig 6](#)). Similar decreases in opioid dose were reported by
 299 Wartko et al. (2023) [32] and Sullivan et al. (2017) [31] using CBT-based multi-
 300 component interventions. However, no between-group statistical significance was
 301 attained (MD: -10.10 mg; 95%CI: -33.61 to 13.40; $I^2 = 0.00\%$, $p=0.52$; [Fig 6](#)).

302

303 Within the six cohort studies [33-38], where various interventions were implemented, a
304 significant decrease in the use of opioid medications was observed in the intervention
305 groups (MD: -29.89 mg; 95%CI: -49.00 to -10.78; $I^2 = 72.72\%$, $p=0.01$; [Fig 7. Forest](#)
306 [plot of interventions vs controls in opioid dose reduction in five cohort studies](#)).
307 Subgroup analysis of Oldfield et al. (2018) and Seal et al. (2021) using CBT-based
308 interventions showed a significant reduction in opioid dose, compared to those in the
309 control group. (MD: -41.68 mg; 95%CI: -58.47 to -24.89; $I^2 = 0.00\%$, $p=0.76$; [Fig 7](#)).

310

311 **Opioid cessation**

312 No significant differences were observed in opioid cessation (Odds ratio: 1.55, 95%CI:
313 0.3 to 2.81; $I^2=50.79\%$, $p=0.13$; three studies; [Fig 8. Forest plot of interventions vs](#)
314 [controls in opioid cessation](#)) between intervention groups and controls. In the two RCTs
315 [30, 31], although the interventions had slight variations, both studies implemented a
316 weekly 10% dose reduction protocol combined with education and consultation as core
317 components of the interventions. In the Sandhu et al. (2023) study [30], patients
318 undergoing skill-based learning and education had a significantly higher cessation rate
319 than those receiving usual care (Odds ratio [OR]: 5.23; 95% CI 2.87 to 9.52; [Fig 8](#)).
320 However, pooled meta-analysis showed no statistically significant change in opioid
321 discontinuation (OR: 1.10; 95%CI -0.48 to 2.67; [Fig 8](#)). Moderate heterogeneity
322 ($I^2=58.59\%$, 95% CI 0% to 86.2%) was observed, primarily attributed to the small
323 sample size of the Sullivan et al. (2017) study [31].

324

325 In the cohort study [38] reporting opioid cessation, where 37 patients received
326 cannabis-assisted opioid replacement along with patient education. Among them, 15
327 patients completely discontinued the opioid use over a period of 21 months. When
328 compared to a control group receiving education alone, the cessation rate of opioid
329 was lower in the control group, with only 1 out of 29 patients achieving opioid cessation;

330 however, this difference was not statistically significant, primarily because of the very
331 small sample size (OR: 2.95, 95% CI 0.85 to 5.05; Fig 8).

332

333 **Pain severity**

334 Pain severity changes at different observation time points were reported in three trials
335 [30-32], all utilizing interventions grounded in behavior change and patient education.
336 Due to the variations in pain severity measurements across studies, standard mean
337 differences were used for pooling the estimates. While a decrease in pain severity was
338 observed in all three trials, the between-group difference was small and non-significant
339 (SMD -0.13; 95% CI -0.37 to 0.11, $I^2 = 33.51\%$, $p=0.22$; Fig 9. Forest plot of
340 interventions vs controls in pain severity improvement). It is worth noting that this 0.13-
341 point reduction in pain score might not have meaningful clinical implications.

342

343 Due to the poor study quality and high heterogeneity, meta-analysis was not feasible
344 for two cohort studies [35, 38] reporting the outcome of pain severity. Therefore, the
345 results were narratively reviewed. Compared with these behavioral, psychological and
346 physical interventions, the pharmacological intervention (cannabis) combined with
347 patient education, as used in the Vigil et al. (2017) study [38], showed a significant
348 decrease in pain intensity score (MD: -3.4 on a scale of 0-10, $p<0.001$), which
349 suggested a meaningful clinical implication. Acupuncture, as employed in the
350 Montgomery et al. (2020) study [35], exhibited an immediate effect in alleviating pain
351 (a reduction in pain intensity score of MD 1.3 on a scale of 0-10, $p<0.01$). However,
352 there were no significant differences after 9 months ($p = 0.15$), indicating acupuncture's
353 short-term effects.

354

355 **Adverse events**

356 Adverse events (AEs) were infrequently examined in included studies, with the majority
357 of reported AEs being associated with psychological and nervous system effects. In

Wartko et al. (2023)'s study [32], which involved 79 participants receiving CBT-based pain coping skills training plus usual care, six cases of increased pain, one case of withdrawal symptoms, and one case of anxiety were noted. No serious adverse events (SAEs) were documented in this study. In Sandhu et al. (2023) [30], adverse events such as sleep disturbance, suicidal ideation, headache, withdrawal symptoms were reported by 22 of 305 participants (7%) and 8 of 303 participants (3%), in the intervention and usual care groups, respectively. SAEs occurred in 8% (25/305) of the participants in the intervention group and 5% (16/303) in the usual care group, with the most common SAEs being gastrointestinal disorder, metastatic cancer, hospitalization due to increased pain, and unknown cause of death.

Discussion

Summary of main findings

In this systematic review and meta-analysis, we examined 11 studies (five RCTs and six cohort studies) assessing the effectiveness of opioid reduction interventions for patients with CNCP in primary healthcare settings. Despite methodological differences, both RCTs and observational studies yielded statistically similar results, allowing for the pooling of results across the full range of eligible studies. Overall, intervention groups exhibited significant reductions in opioid dosage compared to usual care or active control. Subgroup analyses revealed significant opioid dose reductions with mindfulness and CBT-based multimodalities, respectively, compared to usual care. No significant differences were observed in opioid cessation or pain severity. Adverse events were infrequently examined, with withdrawal symptoms commonly reported. Medium heterogeneity was observed across all studies for each outcome, likely stemming from variability in interventions, follow-up durations, and healthcare providers involved. Nevertheless, the I^2 values for subgroup analyses were low.

385 **Compare with existing literature**

386 Our study conclusion generally aligns with previous systematic reviews [16-19] that the
387 strength of evidence was insufficient to draw conclusions. However, our study extends
388 these reviews by providing an updated and comprehensive assessment of the literature,
389 adding one recent good-quality RCT. Supported by subgroup meta-analyses, we
390 elucidated the effectiveness of mindfulness in reducing LTOT. Meanwhile, we
391 highlighted key components such as CBT, patient education, mindfulness, exercise,
392 which may contribute to the successful opioid reduction and thus merit consideration
393 for future intervention development. Importantly, our study exclusively targeted primary
394 care settings, distinguishing it from others that included secondary and tertiary care
395 settings. Although de Kleijn et al. (2021) [17] solely focused on primary care settings,
396 their results were narratively synthesized, and they included studies using simple
397 opioid tapering protocols or interventions targeted at physicians.

398
399 Clinical guidelines [11, 12] recommend an initial reduction of opioid dosage by 10% per
400 week, with adjustments for high-dose users (> MEDD 120 mg/day) or those on LTOT
401 exceeding one year [39]. In our study, we observed a pooled mean opioid reduction of
402 24.88 mg/day from a baseline of 87.4 mg/day. Although this reduction was aggressive
403 and exceeded the guideline-recommended reduction rate, it did yield a clinically
404 meaningful decrease in opioid dosage without worsening pain severity. It is important to
405 acknowledge that adherence to guideline recommendations does not necessarily
406 guarantee optimal patient outcomes, as individual responses to opioid reduction
407 strategies may vary. In fact, the primary goal of CNCP management is to maintain body
408 function rather than achieve complete pain eradication. Therefore, efforts should
409 prioritize reducing opioids to minimize potential harms associated with LTOT.
410 Meanwhile, despite limited examination of adverse events in this study, our findings
411 align with existing evidence [40, 41], suggesting that opioid reduction may lead to
412 withdrawal symptoms, increased pain severity, suicides or all-cause mortality.

413 Therefore, close monitoring of patient responses to opioid reduction strategies is
414 essential for optimizing treatment outcomes while mitigating adverse effects.

415

416 Our findings highlighted the effectiveness of the MORE protocol, with mindfulness as
417 its core component, in reducing opioid dose for CNCP patients in the short term (3
418 months). Additionally, meta-analytic results indicated a significant and strong
419 association between mindfulness and pain reduction [42]. In another study [43]
420 conducted by the same author using the MORE protocol, participants reported
421 significantly greater improvements in psychological and physical function outcomes
422 (e.g., general activity, mood, walking ability, normal work, relationships, sleep, and
423 enjoyment of life.) compared to the support group during the three-month follow-up
424 period. In view of this evidence, mindfulness could be considered a potential
425 component in the development of opioid reduction strategies. However, before
426 recommending widespread implementation of this intervention, further validation
427 through replication in a second trial with a longer observation period (≥ 12 months)
428 within primary care settings is necessary.

429

430 Contrary to expectations, CBT-based interventions did not show a significant reduction
431 in opioid dosage in RCTs [31, 32]. This finding aligns with recent evidence from a
432 recent cluster RCT, indicating that although CBT significantly reduced pain severity, it
433 did not result in significant differences in opioid use between groups [43]. The reason
434 for this non-significant result may be twofold. First, the small sample size and variations
435 in interventions across studies may have contributed to the lack of statistical
436 significance. Second, the study conducted by Sullivan et al. (2017) [31] involved high-
437 dose users (207 ± 245 mg/day), suggesting that behavior changes might not be superior
438 to usual care in reducing opioids dosage for this population. However, the pain relief
439 achieved through CBT may contribute to a subsequent decrease in opioid utilization,
440 although this effect may take time to manifest. Two observational studies [36, 37]

employing similar CBT-based interventions reported significant reductions in opioid dosage compared to usual care. This inconsistency with findings from RCTs may be attributed to the variations in interventions. Additionally, observational studies may yield more promising results due to unadjusted confounders. Further investigation with long-term follow-up and larger sample sizes is warranted to elucidate the effects of CBT on opioid reduction.

Pharmacological interventions (cannabis-assisted opioid substitution) showed promising result, with a higher rate of opioid cessation and improved pain severity observed among the study population. This could be explained by the fact that patients often perceive pharmacotherapies as providing immediate pain relief, contrasting with non-pharmacological approaches which may require more time to yield noticeable effects. Consequently, patients may be more inclined towards pharmacological treatments, especially during episodes of exacerbated pain. This preference may be influenced by patients' desire to promptly alleviate pain [44], and the challenges associated with accessing non-pharmacological therapies [45], which further perpetuates the reliance on pharmacotherapy in managing CNCP symptoms. While cannabis demonstrates efficacy in replacing opioids for CNCP management, its long-term use may pose potential risks, including lower educational achievement, psychiatric illness, and residual cognitive impairment [46]. Therefore, careful consideration and monitoring are necessary when utilizing cannabis as a substitute for opioids in CNCP management.

Current clinical guidelines from the UK NICE (National Institute for Health and Care Excellence) [13, 47] and NHS Oxford Hospital [12] advocate for a holistic approach beyond pharmacotherapy alone. Our research findings align with these recommendations, revealing that a combination of cognitive change strategies, acupuncture, exercise, patient education and pharmacotherapies, delivered by a

469 multidisciplinary team were more effective in opioid reduction. Central to this success is
470 the practice of shared decision making between patient and healthcare professionals.
471 The collaboration among diverse healthcare professionals (GPs, nurses, therapists,
472 pharmacists, etc) is crucial, as each contributes unique expertise and insights to the
473 table. Nevertheless, challenges remain in accessing to multimodal cares, particularly
474 for individuals unable to take time off work, those residing in regions with limited
475 services, and individuals from culturally and linguistically diverse communities.
476 Addressing these access barriers is essential to ensuring equitable healthcare delivery.

477

478 **Strengths and limitations**

479 To our knowledge, this is the first and most up-to-date systematic review and meta-
480 analysis, to evaluate the effectiveness of interventions on opioid dose reduction and
481 pain outcomes for patients with CNCP, with a particular emphasis on primary
482 healthcare settings. By conducting a comprehensive literature search and including
483 recently conducted studies in the UK, this research holds informative value for the
484 potential implementation of interventions outside the US primary care settings.
485 Moreover, several key subgroup analyses were conducted to identify which intervention
486 (components) are effective in achieving opioid reduction purpose.

487

488 Our study also had several limitations. First, the relatively small number of included
489 participants, short follow-up periods, and lack of blinding to interventions may have
490 introduced biases and impacted the overall quality of the included studies. Second,
491 data in observational studies were sourced from secondary databases or electronic
492 medical records, which could cause information bias. Third, funnel plots and the
493 Egger's test were not performed due to the small number of studies included in the
494 meta-analyses Fourth, the majority of the studies were conducted on white populations
495 in the US, likely influenced by the opioid crisis in that country, thus limited the
496 generalizability of our research findings to other ethnicities and regions. Lastly, data

497 was insufficient to support meta-analyses of quality of life or function.

498

499 **Conclusion**

500 Although according to prior studies, no specific interventions can be recommended
501 over one another, multidisciplinary opioid reduction strategies, incorporating
502 components such as CBT, pain education, mindfulness, exercise and acupuncture,
503 have demonstrated effectiveness and tolerability in reducing opioid doses and
504 improving pain severity among patients with CNCP in primary care settings. However,
505 robust evidence remains limited due to several factors, including a shortage of well-
506 designed research studies, inadequate long-term follow-up periods and absence of
507 QoL-related outcomes. Future studies should prioritize investigating the active
508 components within these interventions to gain a deeper understanding of the specific
509 strategies contributing to positive outcomes. Additionally, it is essential to assess the
510 cost-effectiveness and patient acceptability of these interventions before their
511 implementation in specific primary care contexts.

512

513 **Acknowledgments**

514 None.

515

516 **Contributors**

517 Conceptualization: LCC, EK, QC, TCC.

518 Data curation: QC, CG, TCC, EK.

519 Formal analysis: QC, EK.

520 Investigation: QC, CG, TCC.

521 Methodology: QC, EK.

522 Project administration: QC.

523 Supervision: EK TA CG LCC.

524 Validation: CG TCC.

525 Visualization: QC.

526 Writing – original draft: QC.

527 Writing – review & editing: QC CG TA TCC LCC EK.

528

529 **Funding source**

530 None.

References

1. Anekar, A.A. and M. Cascella, *WHO analgesic ladder*. 2020.
2. Boudreau, D., et al., *Trends in long-term opioid therapy for chronic non-cancer pain*. *Pharmacoepidemiology and drug safety*, 2009. **18**(12): p. 1166-1175.
3. Smolina, K., et al., *Patterns and trends in long-term opioid use for non-cancer pain in British Columbia, 2005–2012*. *Canadian Journal of Public Health*, 2016. **107**: p. e404-e409.
4. Werber, A., et al., *Opioid therapy in the treatment of chronic pain conditions in Germany*. *Pain Physician*, 2015. **18**(3): p. E323.
5. Kalkman, G., et al., *Practice variation in opioid prescribing for non-cancer pain in Dutch primary care: A retrospective database study*. *Plos one*, 2023. **18**(2): p. e0282222.
6. Hansen, C.A., et al., *Epidemiological Factors Associated with Prescription of Opioids for Chronic Non-Cancer Pain in Adults: A Country-Wide, Registry-Based Study in Denmark Spans 2004–2018*. *Journal of Pain Research*, 2023: p. 463-485.
7. Jani, M., et al., *Time trends and prescribing patterns of opioid drugs in UK primary care patients with non-cancer pain: a retrospective cohort study*. *PLoS Medicine*, 2020. **17**(10): p. e1003270.
8. Busse, J.W., et al., *Opioids for chronic noncancer pain: a systematic review and meta-analysis*. *Jama*, 2018. **320**(23): p. 2448-2460.
9. Gomes, T., et al., *The burden of opioid-related mortality in the United States*. *JAMA network open*, 2018. **1**(2): p. e180217-e180217.
10. Edlund, M.J., et al., *Risks for opioid abuse and dependence among recipients of chronic opioid therapy: results from the TROUP study*. *Drug and alcohol dependence*, 2010. **112**(1-2): p. 90-98.
11. Dowell, D., T.M. Haegerich, and R. Chou, *CDC guideline for prescribing opioids for chronic pain—United States, 2016*. *Jama*, 2016. **315**(15): p. 1624-1645.
12. NHS Oxford University Hospital. *Guidance for opioid reduction in primary care*. <https://www.ouh.nhs.uk/services/referrals/pain/documents/gp-guidance-opioid-reduction.pdf> [Accessed on 04 Feb 2024].
13. NICE. *Chronic Pain, management*. 2021. Available from: <https://cks.nice.org.uk/topics/chronic-pain/management/management/>. [cited on Feb 7th 2024].
14. Cross, A.J., et al., *Barriers and enablers to monitoring and deprescribing opioid analgesics for chronic non-cancer pain: a systematic review with qualitative evidence synthesis using the Theoretical Domains Framework*. *BMJ Quality & Safety*, 2022. **31**(5): p. 387-400.
15. Frank, J.W., et al., *Patients' perspectives on tapering of chronic opioid therapy: a qualitative study*. *Pain medicine*, 2016. **17**(10): p. 1838-1847.
16. Avery, N., et al., *Efficacy of interventions to reduce long term opioid treatment for chronic non-cancer pain: systematic review and meta-analysis*. *Bmj*, 2022. **377**.
17. de Kleijn, L., et al., *Opioid reduction for patients with chronic pain in primary care: systematic review*. *British Journal of General Practice*, 2022.
18. Frank, J.W., et al., *Patient outcomes in dose reduction or discontinuation of long-term opioid therapy: a systematic review*. *Annals of internal medicine*, 2017. **167**(3): p. 181-191.
19. Mathieson, S., et al., *Deprescribing opioids in chronic non-cancer pain: systematic review of randomised trials*. *Drugs*, 2020. **80**(15): p. 1563-1576.
20. Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Welch VA (editors). *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions version 6.3 (updated February 2022)*. *Cochrane*, 2022. Available from www.training.cochrane.org/handbook.
21. Page, M.J., et al., *The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews*. *International Journal of Surgery*, 2021. **88**: p. 105906.
22. Sterne, J.A., et al., *RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials*. *bmj*, 2019. **366**.
23. Wells, G.A., et al., *The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses*. 2000, Oxford.
24. Borenstein, M., et al., *A basic introduction to fixed-effect and random-effects models for meta-analysis*. *Research synthesis methods*, 2010. **1**(2): p. 97-111.
25. Higgins, J.P. and S. Green, *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions*. 2008.
26. Kontopantelis, E., D.A. Springate, and D. Reeves, *A re-analysis of the Cochrane Library data:*

27. *the dangers of unobserved heterogeneity in meta-analyses*. PloS one, 2013. **8**(7): p. e69930.
28. Petropoulou, M. and D. Mavridis, *A comparison of 20 heterogeneity variance estimators in statistical synthesis of results from studies: a simulation study*. Statistics in medicine, 2017. **36**(27): p. 4266-4280.
29. Garland, E.L., et al., *Mindfulness-oriented recovery enhancement reduces opioid dose in primary care by strengthening autonomic regulation during meditation*. American Psychologist, 2020. **75**(6): p. 840.
30. Hudak, J., et al., *Endogenous theta stimulation during meditation predicts reduced opioid dosing following treatment with Mindfulness-Oriented Recovery Enhancement*. Neuropsychopharmacology, 2021. **46**(4): p. 836-843.
31. Sandhu, H.K., et al., *Reducing opioid use for chronic pain with a group-based intervention: a randomized clinical trial*. JAMA, 2023. **329**(20): p. 1745-1756.
32. Sullivan, M.D., et al., *Prescription opioid taper support for outpatients with chronic pain: a randomized controlled trial*. The journal of pain, 2017. **18**(3): p. 308-318.
33. Wartko, P.D., et al., *STRategies to Improve Pain and Enjoy life (STRIPE): results of a pragmatic randomized trial of pain coping skills training and opioid medication taper guidance for patients on long-term opioid therapy*. Pain, 2023.
34. Goodman, M.W., T.P. Guck, and R.M. Teply, *Dialing back opioids for chronic pain one conversation at a time*. J Fam Pract, 2018. **67**(12): p. 753-757.
35. Mehl-Madrona, L., B. Mainguy, and J. Plummer, *Integration of complementary and alternative medicine therapies into primary-care pain management for opiate reduction in a rural setting*. The Journal of Alternative and Complementary Medicine, 2016. **22**(8): p. 621-626.
36. Montgomery, A.D. and R. Ottenbacher, *Battlefield acupuncture for chronic pain management in patients on long-term opioid therapy*. Medical Acupuncture, 2020. **32**(1): p. 38-44.
37. Oldfield, B.J., et al., *Multimodal treatment options, including rotating to buprenorphine, within a multidisciplinary pain clinic for patients on risky opioid regimens: A quality improvement study*. Pain Medicine, 2018. **19**(suppl_1): p. S38-S45.
38. Seal, K.H., et al., *Opioid reduction and risk mitigation in VA primary care: Outcomes from the integrated pain team initiative*. Journal of general internal medicine, 2020. **35**: p. 1238-1244.
39. Vigil, J.M., et al., *Associations between medical cannabis and prescription opioid use in chronic pain patients: a preliminary cohort study*. PloS one, 2017. **12**(11): p. e0187795.
40. Chou, R., et al., *Best practices, research gaps, and future priorities to support tapering patients on long-term opioid therapy for chronic non-cancer pain in outpatient settings*. NAM perspectives, 2020. **2020**.
41. Hallvik, S.E., et al., *Patient outcomes after opioid dose reduction among patients with chronic opioid therapy*. Pain, 2022. **163**(1): p. 83-90.
42. Metz, V.E., et al., *Prescription opioid dose reductions and potential adverse events: a multi-site observational cohort study in diverse US health systems*. Journal of general internal medicine, 2023: p. 1-8.
43. Garland, E.L., et al., *Mind-body therapies for opioid-treated pain: A systematic review and meta-analysis*. JAMA internal medicine, 2020. **180**(1): p. 91-105.
44. Garland, E.L., E. Thomas, and M.O. Howard, *Mindfulness-oriented recovery enhancement ameliorates the impact of pain on self-reported psychological and physical function among opioid-using chronic pain patients*. Journal of pain and symptom management, 2014. **48**(6): p. 1091-1099.
45. Lewis, P.J., *Uncomfortable Prescribing Decisions in Secondary Care*. 2007, The University of Manchester (United Kingdom): Ann Arbor. p. 302.
46. Elsharydah, A., J. Wu, and F.C. Li, *Decreasing waiting time for new patients at a community pain clinic*. Proc (Bayl Univ Med Cent), 2022. **35**(3): p. 315-318.
47. Iversen, L., *Long-term effects of exposure to cannabis*. Current opinion in Pharmacology, 2005. **5**(1): p. 69-72.
48. NICE. *Analgesics*. 2022. Available from: <https://bnf.nice.org.uk/treatment-summaries/analgesics/>. [Cited on 2024 Feb 7th].