#### 1 Trends and Characteristics during 17 Years of Naloxone Distribution and Administration 2 through a Harm Reduction Program in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

- 3
- 4 Short title: Naloxone distribution time trends
- 5
- 6 Nabarun Dasgupta<sup>1,3\*</sup>
- 7 Alice Bell<sup>2</sup>
- 8 Malcolm Visnich<sup>2</sup>
- 9 Maya Doe-Simkins<sup>3</sup>
- 10 Eliza Wheeler<sup>3</sup>
- 11 Adams L. Sibley<sup>1</sup>
- 12 Maryalice Nocera<sup>1</sup>
- 13 Amy E. Seitz<sup>4</sup>
- 14 Dorothy Chang<sup>4</sup>
- 15 Summer Barlow<sup>4</sup>
- 16 Zachary Dezman<sup>4</sup>
- 17 Jana McAninch<sup>4</sup>
- 18
- 19
- 20 1. University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, USA
- 21 2. Prevention Point Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA
- 22 3. Remedy Alliance For The People, Berkeley, California, USA
- 23 4. US Food and Drug Administration, Silver Spring, Maryland, USA
- 24
- 25 \* Corresponding author
- 26 E-mail: nab@unc.edu (ND)
- 27
- 28
- 29 Abstract word count: 300/300
- 30 Manuscript word count: 14,439
- 31 Citation count: 86
- 32 Figure count: 13
- 33 Table count: 4
- 34 Supplemental material
- 35

#### ABSTRACT 37

38

39 **Objective:** Describe time trends during 17.6 years of community-based naloxone distribution. 40

41 **Methods:** Analysis of administrative records from a harm reduction program in Pittsburgh, 42 Pennsylvania, USA, collected during encounters for overdose education, naloxone dispensing 43 and refills. Monthly time trends were analyzed using segmented regression. Programmatic 44 context aided interpretation of quantitative findings. We also evaluated impacts of 2014 state 45 legislation loosening naloxone prescribing requirements and providing Good Samaritan 46 protections.

47

48 Results: From July 2005 to January 2023 there were 16,904 service encounters by 7,582 49 unique participants, resulting in 70,234 naloxone doses dispensed, with 5,521 overdose 50 response events (OREs), utilizing 8,756 naloxone doses. After legislation, new participants

- 51 increased from 10.4 to 65.9 per month. New participants tended to be older (46 vs. 37 years),
- 52 female (58% to 35%). White race, and more likely to be family/friends as opposed to people
- 53 who use drugs themselves. Consequently, ORE per participant fell from 1.46 to 0.47 in the year
- 54 after enactment. On average, 1.63 (95% CI: 1.60, 1.65) naloxone doses were administered per
- 55 ORE, which did not change substantially over 17 years ( $\chi^2=0.28$ , 3 df, p=0.60) during evolution 56 from prescription opioids, to heroin, to illicitly manufactured fentanyl. In 98.0% of OREs the
- person who experienced overdose "was okay", i.e., survived. Emergency medical services were 57 called in 16% of OREs overall, but <7% since 2019. There were 106 more emesis events per 58
- 59 1,000 OREs with 4mg nasal spray compared to intramuscular injection; and 48 per 1,000 more reports of anger. Titration of intramuscular naloxone was associated with lower rates of adverse
- 60 61 events.
- 62

**Conclusions:** While state legislation created the environment for expansion, reaching 63

64 previously underserved communities required intentional new programmatic development and

65 outreach. Long-term consistency of <2 doses per ORE, high survival rate, and robust utilization

- 66 all lend confidence in prioritizing naloxone distribution directly to people who use drugs and their
- social networks. 67

# 68 69 INTRODUCTION

70 In the United States (US), fatal overdose rates have increased over the past four decades. The 71 characteristics have changed from heroin dominance in the early 1990s to prescription opioids 72 in the late 1990s and 2000s, to heroin again around 2013 [1,2]. By 2015, the emergence of non-73 pharmaceutical fentanyl and analogues played the most prominent role in fatal overdoses, and 74 currently stimulant-opioid fatal overdoses are increasing [3,4]. After many years of unrelenting 75 increases, the latest national data appear to show a 3% decline in annual overdose deaths in 76 2023 [5,6]. However, at the state level the results are heterogeneous: some states posted 15% 77 reductions, and others showed marked increases.

78

79 Community-based distribution of the opioid overdose reversal agent, naloxone, has expanded 80 considerably since federal funding support in 2018 and is a critical strategy for preventing 81 fatalities [7]. Harm reduction programs train people who use drugs to recognize and respond to 82 opioid-induced respiratory depression. People who access these services, by the nature of their 83 ongoing drug use, are at the highest risk of overdose [8], yet there is a paucity of quantitative data characterizing peer reversal behaviors, particularly as the drug supply landscape has 84 85 evolved. Specifically, in the context of community-based naloxone distribution, there are few published studies detailing time trends of adverse events, formulation effects, titration practices, 86 87 changes during the COVID-19 pandemic, and infiltration of xylazine in the unregulated drug 88 supply. Over the last two decades, state laws have also evolved to reduce barriers to 89 community-based naloxone distribution. In the scientific literature, policy analyses of state laws 90 have lent support for this continued practice [9], localized evaluations have been published [10-91 13], as have evaluations of barriers [14,15]. What has been not been adequately described is the longitudinal evolution of harm reduction programs themselves. As harm reduction programs 92

become enduring and institutionalized with increased public health investment, it is imperative to
understand long-term programmatic trajectories, which can, in turn, inform future policy
decisions.

96

97 Specifically, there is limited documentation of how harm reduction programs adapt to changing 98 drug supply, laws, pharmaceutical formulations, and societal norms over an extended time. 99 Herein we describe trends and experiences over 17 years from one of the longest continuously 100 operating overdose prevention programs in the world, at Prevention Point Pittsburgh, a harm 101 reduction and syringe services program. With continuous data collection [16], this setting offers 102 a unique opportunity to understand long-term time trends in both community practice and 103 individual responses simultaneously.

104

105 Applying the Evidence-Making Intervention framework [17], this comprehensive manuscript 106 balances programmatic context with quantitative findings. The authors come from three 107 professional domains: harm reduction program staff, government and academic scientists, and 108 public health advocates. Some of the authors were the earliest innovators and implementors of 109 community-based naloxone distribution in the US [18–21]. Of note, Prevention Point Pittsburgh 110 has maintained institutional memory via staff retention; one co-author (AB) has been directing 111 the program in Pittsburgh for the entirety of the observation period and provided invaluable 112 canonical information on changes in service delivery. The length of the manuscript reflects 113 aspects that are of relevance to each of the three professional domains, and we encourage 114 readers to make use of section headings to follow the storyline that is of greatest interest.

115

116

117

# **About Naloxone**

119

120	Naloxone is a mu-opioid receptor antagonist that displaces or prevents binding of opioid
121	agonists such as heroin, fentanyl, and morphine. It was first synthesized in 1961 by Jack
122	Fishman and Harold Blumberg. Naloxone was approved as a human prescription medication by
123	the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) in 1971 to treat opioid-induced respiratory
124	depression ("overdose"), and is on the World Health Organization's List of Essential Medicines
125	[22]. It reverses opioid-induced respiratory depression rapidly but may also precipitate
126	withdrawal in people who have opioid tolerance. Community-based naloxone distribution has
127	become widely accepted in the US as a means of secondary prevention of overdose deaths,
128	albeit with heterogeneity in enabling state governmental laws and policies [23].
129	

# **Brief History of Community Naloxone Distribution**

131 Prevention Point Pittsburgh started distributing naloxone in 2005, after being inspired by 132 formative work by the Chicago Recovery Alliance. Previously naloxone had been used 133 exclusively in hospitals for managing anesthesia and by pre-hospital emergency medical service 134 providers to reverse opioid overdose. In 1996, fueled by rising fatal heroin overdose among 135 participants and staff, the Chicago Recovery Alliance [24] began distributing naloxone via their 136 syringe services program to people who use drugs and their immediate social networks, an 137 innovation marking the first known formal overdose education and naloxone distribution 138 program in the world [25,26].

139 For the first decade of operations, the naloxone distribution program at Prevention Point 140 Pittsburgh operated within a broader national context, which evolved from an environment of 141 little support to codified scientific and legal protections. Given limited funding during the first 18 142 years (1996 to 2014) of broader intervention evolution, the development and implementation of 143 new naloxone distribution initiatives within syringe services programs nationally was primarily 144 through peer-based mentoring and technical assistance between programs. This was the case 145 with Prevention Point Pittsburgh. Naloxone was purchased using smaller value unrestricted 146 funds from sources such as t-shirt sales and donations to memorial funds from families who had 147 lost a loved one to overdose. The staff time and cost to implement and deliver the services was 148 absorbed by syringe service programs, viewed as an ethical imperative regardless of funding. 149 Using this unfunded interorganizational mentoring model, there were 48 programs in the US by 150 2010 [18], and 140 by 2014 [27]. Because naloxone was a prescription medication, these 151 initiatives existed in a medico-legal gray area that generated onerous requirements on harm 152 reduction programs. For example, from 2005 to 2014, a documented in-person medical 153 encounter and individual prescription from a physician was required for Prevention Point 154 Pittsburgh to dispense naloxone to a participant. After coordinated national advocacy by public 155 health organizations, state level legislation, and accumulating scientific evidence, policies 156 supporting naloxone distribution were established starting around 2014 nationally, and directly 157 contributed to the expansion of the naloxone distribution initiative in Pittsburgh.

158

The advent of federal support for naloxone distribution also had an impact on Prevention Point Pittsburgh by creating an expanded community of harm reduction practice for innovation, diffusion, and communication. In 2014, a memo from the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) to the National Association of State and Territorial AIDS Directors (NASTAD) clarified that using federal funds for naloxone was an acceptable expenditure for state block grants [28]. The first new federal funding that explicitly allowed for

165 naloxone distribution was the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) 2015 166 Rural Opioid Overdose Reversal grant program [29]. Prior to federal funding, local governments 167 and harm reduction programs used local and philanthropic funds to support naloxone 168 distribution in Massachusetts [20], New York [14], New Mexico [30], San Francisco [31], Rhode 169 Island [32], North Carolina [21], Baltimore [33], and Pittsburgh [19]. Prevention Point Pittsburgh 170 operated within this community of practice, the activity of which centered around the listserv and 171 monthly meetings of the Opioid Safety and Naloxone Network, facilitated for over a decade by 172 co-author AB [34,35].

173

174 By the end of 2015, several key events paved the way for further development of Prevention 175 Point Pittsburgh's naloxone distribution program. Research emerged confirming that naloxone 176 distribution via syringe services programs was effective at reducing overdose mortality [36] and 177 was cost-effective [37,38]. Laws were passed in 43 states to support expansion [39,40]. Two 178 new branded naloxone products (nasal spray and auto-injector) were approved for prescription 179 use among lay persons [41] and heavily promoted by pharmaceutical manufacturers [42]. Harm 180 reduction programs also created a Buyers Club to obtain low cost injectable naloxone directly 181 from a different manufacturer [34]. The FDA supported development of nonprescription 182 naloxone formulations by conducting studies of labeling instructions [43] and expediting review 183 of new products [44]. Of direct relevance to Prevention Point Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania Act 139 184 was enacted on November 30, 2014, allowing standing orders and third-party naloxone 185 prescriptions. Prevention Point Pittsburgh's Medical Director issued a standing order for the 186 organization, enabling naloxone distribution without requiring individual prescriptions. Other 187 relevant contextual dates are cataloged in Supplemental Material Table S1.

188

189

# **Research Questions**

191		
192	Five re	esearch questions were specified in the public pre-registration [45].
193		
194	1.	Did the utilization rate of naloxone and demographics of participants change after
195		enabling state legislation was enacted?
196		
197	2.	After enactment of state legislation, what actions did the program take to focus uptake of
198		naloxone directly to networks of people who use drugs?
199		
200	3.	Were program adaptations (e.g., site expansion) effective in improving naloxone uptake
201		among communities of color in Pittsburgh?
202		
203	4.	Has the average number of doses of naloxone administered during an overdose
204		response event changed over time as the drug supply has changed? Specifically, was
205		more naloxone needed for reversing overdoses during the era of illicitly manufactured
206		fentanyl, compared to previous periods where overdoses were due to heroin [46]?
207		
208	5.	Is the number of doses administered per overdose response event impacted by type of
209		naloxone formulation?
210		
211	Three	additional questions were developed by the co-authors during the iterative analysis
212	proces	s and evaluated in accordance with the Evidence-Making Intervention (EMI) framework
213	(descr	ibed in Methods).

215	6.	Did enactment of the Pennsylvania "Good Samaritan" law impact the proportion of
216		overdoses response events in which 911 was called?
217		
218	7.	What were the circumstances of deaths reported after administration of naloxone?
219		
220	8.	Did adverse events differ by formulation of naloxone? And did titration of naloxone have
221		an impact on adverse event rates?
222		

# 223 **METHODS**

224

# 225 **Conceptual Framework**

226

227 This study was based on the EMI framework [17,47]. This framework shifts the locus of 228 evidence production away from universally generalizable knowledge, which is common in 229 traditional biomedical research. Instead, EMI prioritizes a more contextualized scientific process 230 in which data and conclusions are generated through localized public health interventions 231 serving immediate, applied needs. Therefore, the purpose of this analysis is not to present the 232 hypothetically universal experience of naloxone distribution, but rather to examine one location 233 in-depth to understand the forces that directly impacted service delivery and naloxone 234 utilization. The application of the framework to the current investigation can be summarized 235 using the six central tenets of EMI. In applying these principles in the Results section, 236 "Programmatic Context" follows "Quantitative Results" for each set of variables analyzed. 237

238 1. Material-discursive Process: Naloxone distribution in Pittsburgh is not expected to be 239 the same as anywhere else, yet there is value in understanding the local context. 240 State policies and local drug supply considerations are made when interpreting 241 quantitative data. 242 2. Emergent, Contingent, Multiple effects: Applied to this study, participant behaviors 243 were expected to change over time. Overdose response practices naturally evolved 244 over a 17-year period, instead of assumed to be static, as in shorter studies. 245 3. Practice-based Matter-of-concern: Of central relevance is how the concept of 246 naloxone distribution was interpreted by program staff and locally adapted. For 247 example, the program adapted to the COVID pandemic, and as new naloxone 248 products and street drugs shifted. Therefore, contemporaneous contextual details 249 are provided allow quantitative data to be interpreted with fidelity. 250 4. *Practice of Implementation:* How the intervention was delivered is of equal 251 importance to other outcomes (e.g., biomedical or pharmacological). Therefore, 252 logistical considerations and site expansion rationales are provided in detail, 253 especially in ways that impacted participant recruitment and training of participants, 254 and ultimately, the quantitative data. 255 5. Performative Work of Science: Administrative data were collected first and foremost 256 for service delivery, and the scientific knowledge generated from their review is an 257 added benefit. While data were collected with the intention of analysis, the questions 258 asked of participants were also designed to gather information on reversals that 259 would reveal opportunities for counselling and behavior change at the point of care. 260 6. Equality of Knowledge: Program staff's experience of service delivery is of equal 261 explanatory value as quantification of administrative records. Program staff were 262 included in each step of the analysis process, and their experiences are recorded in 263 the Results section, and they are co-authors of this manuscript.

264

265 The Equality of Knowledge principle, a recursive process for knowledge generation was applied, 266 starting with whole-team generation of the research questions. The data analyst (ND) generated 267 tabular and graphical representations of time trends for batches of variables. The team then 268 assembled to discuss patterns, aberrations, policy impacts, public health implications, and 269 topics for further investigation, including new research questions based on discussions of 270 programmatic context. After the initial discussion, the analyst would prepare follow-up tables, 271 developing statistical methods as the inquiry warranted, and refine time trend graphs, which 272 were then presented at the following meeting. This recursive process was applied to each set of 273 variables in the dataset until all variables had been analyzed and discussed. In addition to the 274 five research questions elaborated in the pre-registration, the recursive process resulted in three 275 additional research questions described above.

276

# 277 Data Source

278

279 We analyzed naloxone dispensing records and participant intake forms from a multi-site 280 comprehensive harm reduction program (e.g., syringe services provider) in Pittsburgh, 281 Pennsylvania, US. Datasets were anonymized by Prevention Point Pittsburgh prior to analysis. 282 Data were generated at either initial training encounters or refill requests by participants, the 283 latter of which included questions about the overdose that the naloxone had been used during. 284 Interviewers received training to ensure standardized data collection, and ongoing data quality 285 assessments were conducted. These administrative records span July 24, 2005 to January 24, 286 2023; initial naloxone distribution started in late July 2005 and the first reversal was reported in 287 August. Data were collected on standardized paper forms, with weekly manual data entry using 288 an electronic record system. Keystroke entry and missing corrections for early years of data

were necessary to standardize dates and syntactical conventions (e.g., comma versus semi colon for list delimiting) using natural language processing (described in Supplemental Material).

291

# 292 Naloxone Formulations

293

294 During the 210-month study period, three formulations of naloxone were predominantly 295 distributed. For both vial sizes of the liquid injectable, following product labelling, participants 296 were instructed that one dose is 1 mL administered intramuscularly. Intramuscular syringes 297 (typically 25 gauge x 1" or 0.5mm x 25 mm) were provided in the kit; intravenous delivery of 298 naloxone was almost never reported. Patient counselling and graphical printed cards advised 299 that intramuscular administration could be achieved directly through clothing, into the shoulder 300 or buttocks. These instructions have long been standardized among harm reduction programs 301 nationwide, with many reproducing the same graphic developed at Chicago Recovery Alliance, 302 and were consistent at Prevention Point Pittsburgh for the entire 17 years. In earlier years, one 303 10 mL vial could have been used in more than one overdose response event; by contrast, even 304 with fractional dosing, 1 mL vials were not reported to be reused. For the nasal spray, one dose 305 was defined as one full actualization in one nostril.

306

307 Naloxone provided in each kit:

- One 10 mL vial of 0.4 mg/mL naloxone hydrochloride: 2005 to 2015
- 309

Two 1 mL vials of 0.4 mg/mL naloxone hydrochloride: October 2012 to January 2023
Two units of 4 mg naloxone hydrochloride nasal spray: August 2016 to January 2023

311

310

Additional formulations available indirectly or briefly during the study period:

313	2 mL pre-filled needleless syringes of 1 mg/mL naloxone hydrochloride with aftermarket
314	nasal adaptor [20]. This combination was not distributed by Prevention Point Pittsburgh,
315	but some participants had received it elsewhere and reported using it when presenting
316	for refills.
317	• 2 mg naloxone in 400 $\mu$ L autoinjector. The autoinjector was briefly available in 2016
318	through a small donation of demonstration units from the manufacturer (Kaléo,
319	Richmond, Virginia, US).
320	
321	Definitions
322	
323	Dose was defined as the lowest single dose in approved labeling for overdose reversal. For 1
324	mL and 10 mL vials, a single dose was defined as 0.4 mg delivered intramuscularly, and 4 mg
325	intranasally (in one nare) for the nasal spray.
326	
327	Overdose response events (OREs) include any report of an attempted overdose reversal
328	regardless of the outcome of the event (successful resuscitation, death, or unknown outcome)
329	where naloxone was administered (or in one report attempted to be administered, see Death
330	Case Review). While the term "reversals" is commonly used in the literature, "ORE" was
331	considered a more accurate term in the context of these data.
332	
333	Cumulative utilization rates are a quantification of how many units of dispensed naloxone were
334	administered to reverse an overdose, during a specified calendar time period. They were
335	calculated in two ways, both with the number of overdose response events as the numerator.
336	The two denominators were either the number of units dispensed or standardized across
337	formulations by the number of doses in a packaged unit. While this provides a useful metric for

338 programmatic and financial planning, and as an input in modeling studies, it only accounts for 339 doses dispensed by and OREs reported to Prevention Point Pittsburgh. Specifically, naloxone 340 obtained via pharmacy or other harm reduction programs would not be accounted for in 341 utilization rate denominators, and OREs not reported to the program would not be accounted for 342 in the numerator. 343 344 "Felt sick" was understood by participants and staff to mean "dopesick" from precipitated opioid 345 withdrawal. This is a different semantic meaning than generalized malaise recorded in 346 spontaneous adverse event reporting systems. 347 348 Titration in the context of community distribution was the administration of fractional doses of 349 liquid injectable naloxone, as reported by the respondent (e.g., "one and half doses"). Since only 350 the total number of doses were recorded, there may have been instances of titration where two 351  $\frac{1}{2}$  doses were administered but would only appear as a single dose (1.0) in the data. Therefore, 352 this metric should be considered to have high specificity, but with misclassification resulting in 353 bias towards the null in adverse event analyses. Nasal spray and auto-injector formulations 354 were not capable of delivering fractional doses in the manner dispensed. 355

# 356 Statistical Analysis

357

In descriptive analyses, *t*-tests were used to assess between-group differences for continuous
variables, with the Satterthwaite approximation for degrees of freedom [48] employed when
unequal variance between groups was present, or Fisher's exact test for low cell counts. Twotailed chi-square distributions were used.

362

## 363 Time-series Modeling

364 Data were aggregated by calendar month. Changes over time were assessed in four ways. 365 First, smoothed monthly time trends (details in Data Visualization) were plotted along with 95% 366 confidence intervals of the mean. Second, to summarize macro time differences between the 367 beginning and end of the observation period, we calculated means within each level of 368 categorical variables which compared the first 24 months to the last six months (Table 2). These 369 timeframes were selected to balance the number of observations, as volume in later years was 370 considerably greater than at the start. Third, record-level data were aggregated by calendar 371 month for segmented regression, specifically piecewise linear regression, to identify abrupt 372 changes in time trends empirically. The model optimized data fitting to a single breakpoint 373 between two straight lines with differing slopes. It was implemented using 'nl hockey' in Stata 374 MP version 17 (College Station, TX, USA). Results are summarized in Table 2 and detailed 375 visualizations are in Supplemental Material. Fourth, based on programmatic context and policy 376 implication discussions, further time-trend modeling used linear splines at pre-specified dates if 377 a specific question about an expected changepoint was being evaluated, such as a law enacted 378 on a certain date or a major change in service delivery. Splines were modeled using 'mkspline' 379 and incorporated as mixed effects linear models using 'xtmixed' in Stata.

380

#### 381 **Relative Dose**

Relative dose was defined as a relative ratio of the number of doses of naloxone administered in an overdose response event, useful when comparing between formulations. First, average number of doses per ORE were calculated by formulation, reporting the arithmetic mean and 95% confidence interval of the mean. Consistently over 17 years, participants had been counselled that 1 mL equals one dose, regardless of whether it came from the 10 mL vial or 1 mL vial. Since the 1 mL vial had the lowest number of doses per ORE, it was selected as the

reference group. Relative doses by formulation are reported as percent higher doses per ORE,
 and population averages calculated using scaled Poisson regression, assessed using two-tailed

390 chi-square Wald tests.

391

#### 392 Rate Differences

393 To compare adverse event (AE) incidence rates (per 1,000 OREs), rate differences between 394 formulations were also estimated using Poisson regression in Stata, adjusting for the number of 395 doses as a linear continuous variable. Since the 1 mL vial had the lowest rates of adverse 396 events, it was treated as the reference group; the rate difference represents the number of 397 additional adverse events per 1,000 OREs that were observed with the 4 mg nasal spray or 398 multiple formulations, relative to the number of AEs for the 1 mL vial. This metric provides a 399 general measure of population level side effects for each of the major formulations; it is not 400 meant to be interpreted as counterfactual inference as would result from a causal 401 pharmacoepidemiology study where strength of conclusions could be drawn based on control 402 for confounding by formulation.

403

# 404 **Data Visualization**

405

In time series plots, calendar month is presented on the horizontal axis from July 2005 to January 2023 (n=211 months), except for adverse events in Figure 12 which are aggregated by year (2017-22) due to lower incidence and not having been collected in earlier years. The vertical axes are monthly arithmetic means. Overlaid scatterplots represent unadjusted data points. Time series were smoothed with locally estimated scatterplot smoothing (LOESS) and 95% confidence internal, with a 6-month window. In Supplemental Material for segmented regression, the two linear segments intervals are visualized instead. Because denominators for

time trends can be different across figures, sparklines below the main time trends panel are
provided to visualize fluctuations in monthly counts of new participants (Figures 2 and 5),
naloxone doses distributed (Figure 6) or administered (Figure 10), or number of ORE (Figure
11). For visualizing the number of doses per ORE by formulation in Figure 9, a Gaussian (three
sigma) smoother was applied. Figures were generated using Python 3.7 'matplotlib' within a
distributed Deepnote (deepnote.com) environment.

419

## 420 **Death Case Review**

421

422 Prevention Point Pittsburgh conducted a review of reports in which the person administered 423 naloxone was reported to have died. Paper records (encounter notes and written program logs) 424 with interview notes were retrieved for the 23 deaths that were reported by participants who had 425 been at the scene and who had administered naloxone (n=1,909) from 2020 to 2023; only one 426 of these records did not contain any additional contextual information, but circumstances of 427 death were present in the 22 others. Narratives of each death were constructed based on 428 available records and assessed on when naloxone was administered relative to likely time of 429 death, evidence of other causes of death described by health professionals, or other 430 circumstances.

431

# 432 Study Conduct

433

434 **Open Science Practices** 

- 436 Pre-registration: DOI osf.io/b2f4h. Codebook, data collection form, and analytic code: DOI
- 437 osf.io/sq5d6.
- 438

### 439 Institutional Ethics Review

- 440
- 441 This study was reviewed by the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill Office of Human
- 442 Research Ethics and deemed to be exempt, as anonymized secondary data research (22-
- 443 2714).
- 444

#### 445 **Data Access**

- 446
- 447 Data from Prevention Point Pittsburgh were provided to analysts on January 30, 2023. Data
- 448 were anonymized so no individually identifiable information was available to analysts.

449

#### 450 Participation of People with Lived Experience

451

452 People with lived experience of drug use, naloxone distribution, and overdose reversal were

- 453 involved in the design and conduct of the services provided by Prevention Point Pittsburgh, as
- 454 well as study conceptualization and interpretation of results. Results were to be reported back to
- 455 participants of Prevention Point Pittsburgh through posters at program sites, a dedicated
- 456 website, and a community presentation.

457

458 Role of the Funder

460	The US Food and Drug Administration is the governmental funder of this manuscript. FDA staff
461	were involved in study conceptualization, data interpretation, and contributed to manuscript
462	development, authorship, and review. The manuscript was reviewed through the FDA clearance
463	process. The contents of this article are solely the responsibility of the authors and do not
464	necessarily represent the official views of the US Food and Drug Administration.
465	
466	
467	RESULTS
468	
469	Overview
470	
471	Descriptive quantitative results and time trend analysis are presented for each variable analyzed
472	first. These are followed by programmatic context notes provided by Prevention Point Pittsburgh
473	staff.
474	
475	The first of five topic areas covers characteristics of participants receiving naloxone, which was
476	deemed of high importance by harm reduction program co-authors. The subsequent four
477	sections focus on biomedical and behavioral features: naloxone distribution, circumstances of
478	overdose response events, response behaviors, and adverse events.
479	
480	Trends in naloxone distribution and administration were examined from July 24, 2005 through
481	January 24, 2023, comprising an observation period of 211 consecutive calendar months
482	(inclusive), or 17.6 years. A total of 16,904 service encounters by 7,582 unique participants,
483	resulted in 70,234 doses of naloxone dispensed, with 5,521 OREs reported, utilizing 8,756
484	doses of naloxone.

485

# 486 New Participant Volume

487

#### 488 **Quantitative Results**

489 After a decade of steady volume (Figure 1), unique new participant intakes increased sharply

490 starting January 2015. Pennsylvania Act 139 allowed standing orders and third-party naloxone

491 prescriptions, and Prevention Point Pittsburgh's Medical Director issued a standing order for the

492 organization, enabling naloxone distribution without requiring individual prescriptions. Monthly

493 new participant intakes increased from an average of 10.4 per month (95% CI: 9.4, 11.4) to 65.9

494 per month (95% CI: 60.7, 71.1) after the law was enacted, translating to 56.2 (95% CI: 46.5,

495 65.8; Wald  $\chi^2$  510, 3 df, p<0.001) additional new participants per month (Figure S1).

496

497 <u>Figure 1.</u> Monthly volume of new participants trained, naloxone dispensed, and overdose response events 498 reported. Dots are raw monthly counts; lines are moving averages. Three time series are presented on two vertical 499 axes. The left vertical axis is the number of new participants trained and the number of monthly overdose response 600 events reported. The right vertical axis is the monthly count of doses of naloxone dispensed. The vertical red dashed 601 line at December 2014 represents the change in state legislation.

502

503 However, despite the immediate increase in new participants, the utilization of naloxone was 504 lower. Average ORE per new participant enrolled in 2014 was 1.46 (95% CI: 0.84, 2.1), but in 505 2015 after the law change, it fell to 0.47 (95% CI: 0.24, 0.70). This decrease mirrors, in part, a 506 downward secular trend in OREs from 2013-2015 following the emergence of illicitly 507 manufactured fentanyl in 2013, Figure 2. However, though a similar peak in overall OREs 508 occurred in 2016-2017 as carfentanil was known to be circulating, no concurrent spike in new 509 participant OREs occurred after enactment of state legislation. Overall, the trendline in OREs 510 reported by new participants following the law change no longer mirrored the overall trendline, a

decoupling that may suggest that new participants tended to be qualitatively different before andafter the legislation.

513

#### 514 Figure 2. Monthly Rates of Overdose Response Events per 100 Doses of Naloxone Dispensed and New

515 **Participants**. Dots are monthly rates; lines are moving averages. Monthly utilization rates of naloxone during

516 overdose response events (ORE) are presented using doses dispensed and new participants as denominators. Red

517 line at December 2014 represents the enactment of legislation enabling community based naloxone distribution.

518 Study dates: July 2005 to January 2023.

519

#### 520 **Programmatic Context**

521 Program staff verified the quantitative finding that the volume of new participants increased

522 immediately after the law was enacted. However, they also provided context that, compared to

523 previous years, new participants were demographically different: Increases were

524 disproportionately in patients more likely to be older, female and of White race. In early 2015,

525 the venues for overdose prevention trainings shifted from syringe services sites to fire houses

and community centers, where audiences were exclusively constituted of the concerned general

527 public, and not people who used drugs themselves. Program staff reported initial excitement at

528 the broader reach of the intervention, but a few months later began to realize that the newly

529 trained general community members were not reporting naloxone utilization or reversals.

530 Accordingly, program staff felt that demographic changes after enactment of the law were

531 crucial to document because they have direct implication on public health practice. Therefore,

532 we proceeded to quantify the programmatic observation that the law led to a change in the

533 underlying population receiving naloxone at Prevention Point Pittsburgh.

534

# 535 Participants: Age

## 537 **Quantitative Results**

- 538 The median age at the initial training was 40 years (IQR: 31 years, 53 years), Table 1.
- 539 Segmented regression (Table 2, Figure S3) identified a breakpoint in April 2015. From 2005 to
- 540 2015, average age increased in linear single-year increments during the first decade of
- naloxone distribution (Figure 3), so that the average age in 2005 was 31.6 years, and 41.5 in
- 542 2015, suggesting a possible birth-cohort influence if the source population is assumed to be
- 543 stable without replenishment. Immediately following the enactment of the legislation, new
- 544 participants were older: The average age increased from a baseline 37.0 years-old (95% CI:
- 545 36.3, 37.7) to 46.0 years-old (95% CI: 45.0, 46.9, *t*-test 14.9, 2048 df, *p*<0.001) the following
- 546 year.

# Table 1. Participant Characteristics, Behaviors, and ServiceUtilization

PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS

<b>Age at Intake</b> Arithmetic mean (SD) Median (IQR) Missing Range	42 years (13.6) 40 years (31, 53) 119 (1.6%) 13 to 88 years		
Racial Identity White Black Latinae Multi-racial Asian-American Native American Pacific Islander Other Missing Total Participants	N 5,362 1,533 96 76 26 16 3 46 424 7,582	% 70.7% 20.2% 1.3% 1.0% 0.34% 0.21% 0.04% 0.61% 5.6% 100%	
<b>Gender Identity</b> Male Female Transgender Missing	3,920 3,480 62 120	51.7% 45.9% 0.82% 1.60%	

	Total Participants	7,582	100%
N	ALOXONE DISTRIB	UTION	
Encounter Type		7 567	11 90/
Rofill		0 337	44.0 % 55 2%
T C III	Total Encounters	16,904	100%
Naloxone Doses I	Dispensed by Encou	Inter Type	
Initial training		27,279	38.8%
Refill	<b>T</b> ( ) <b>D</b>	42,955	61.2%
	I otal Doses	70,234	100%
Reason(s) for Ref choice)	fill (multiple		
Used it		5,521	57.5%
Need extra kit		2,307	24.0%
Gave it away		1,009	10.5%
Expired		375	3.9%
Lost		264	2.7%
Taken by law en	forcement	37	0.4%
Other		89	0.9%
Т	otal Refill Reasons	9,602	100%
OVERDOS	E RESPONSE EVEN	ITS REPOR	TED
Who Administere	d Naloxone		
Person prescribe	ed naloxone	4,374	79.2%
Someone else (t	oystander)	1,077	19.5%
Missing		70	1.3%
	I otal Reversals	5,521	100%
Naloxone Used O	n		
Friend		4,483	81.2%
You (person rep	orting)	491	8.89%
Family member		268	4.85%
Stranger		240	4.35%
Missing		39	0.71%
	Total Reversals	5,521	100%
Doses Administe	red per ORE		
Arithmetic mean	(SD)	1.63 dos	es (0.99)
Median (IQR)	× /	1 dose	e (1, 2)
Missing		133 (2	2.4%)
Range		0.25 to 1	0 doses

<b>RESPONSE BEHAVIORS &amp; SERVICE UTILIZATION</b>						
<b>Rescue Breathing</b>						
No		2,768	50.1%			
Yes		2,419	43.8%			
Missing		334	6.0%			
		0	0%			
	Total Reversals	5,521	100%			
Chest Compression	ns*					
No		2,092	69.60%			
Yes		711	23.70%			
Missing		201	6.70%			
5	Total Reversals	3,004				
Called 911						
No		4 530	82.0%			
Yes		903	16.4%			
Missing		88	1.6%			
Wieenig	Total Reversals	5,521	100%			
Ambulance Arrived	After Calling					
911	Alter ealing					
No		456	50.5%			
Yes		444	49.2%			
Missing		3	0.33%			
5	Total 911 Calls	903	100%			
Hospital Transport						
No		5 209	94.3%			
Yes		274	4 96%			
Missing		38	0.69%			
Miconig	Total Reversals	5 521	100%			
*Collected Novem	ber 2015 to Decemb	per 2020	100 /0			

# Table 2. Participant characteristics, behaviors, and adverse reactions in first 24 month and last 6 months, with segmented regression breakpoints

	First 24 months		Last 6 months		Segmented Regression				
	Mean	95% CI	Mean	95% CI	Break Month	95% CI	Test	Slope Before	Slope After
Participants									
Participant volume per month									
Average Age of Participants	31.6 years	27.7, 35.5	41.5 years	39.9, 43.1	Apr 2015	Oct 2008, Feb 2017	10.8, 3 df, p<0.001	0.11	-0.01
Percent Female	34.9%	45.0% 6.0%	48.3%	57.3% 19.4%	None found				
Percent Non-White	11.3%	16.6%	29.8%	40.2%	Jan 2015	May 2012, Oct 2017	7.0, 3 df, p<0.001	0.07	0.29
Percent Black race	4.9%	1.5%, 8.3%	24.0%	31.7%	Dec 2015	Feb 2014, Nov 2017	63.9, 3 df, p<0.001	0.05	0.31
Refill Reason									
Percent of refills dispensed									
Expired	1.4%	0%, 4.3% 54.0%	0.80%	0.30%, 1.3% 24.0%	April 2010	Jul 2009, Jan 2011	12.7, 3 df, p<0.001	0.39	-0.13
Used It	71.1%	88.2%	27.8%	31.6% 15.8%.	Aug 2017	Jul 2016, Sep 2018	22.5, 3 df, p<0.001	0.01	-0.91
Gave Away	0%		20.5%	25.3% 19.2%,	Jul 2018	Jan 2018, Dec 2018	58.1, 3 df, p<0.001	0.004	0.35
Need Extra	0%	-	23.3%	27.1%	Jan 2012	Aug 2010, Jul 2013	8.8, 3 df, p<0.001	0.015	0.21
Taken By Police	2.7%	0%, 5.9%	0.7%	0%, 25%	Jun 2009		0.32, 3 df, p=0.75		
Naloxone Used on Whom									
Percent of reversals reported		/							
Friend	74.8%	62.0%, 87.6% 1.6%	72.4%	58.6%, 86.1% 8.8%	Jun 2013	Aug 2011, May 2015	8.3, 3 df, p<0.001	0.21	-0.15
You (person reporting)	7.6%	13.6%	16.3%	23.8%	May 2018	Dec 2016, Oct 2019	17.5, 3 df, p<0.001	-0.04	0.32
Family member	1.4%	0%, 4.3%	2.8%	0%, 6.0% 0.5%,	Jul 2018	Nov 2014, Feb 2022	7.0, 3 df, <0.001	0.02	-0.06
Stranger	0.95%	0%, 2.5%	7.9%	15.2%	None found	-			
Response Behaviors & Services									
Percent of reversals reported									
Rescue Breathing CPR Performed (percent of	52.1%	35.5%, 68.7% 22.0%.	34.3%	23.2%, 45.3% 6.1%.	Jan 2014	Oct 2009, Apr 2018	4.0, 3 df, p<0.001	0.013	-0.24
reversals)	35.80%	29.6%	9.0%	11.9%	Aug 2017	Feb 2016, Feb 2019	15.6, 3 df, p<0.001	0.31	-0.25
reversals)	6.9%	∠.4%, 11.5%	5.4%	4.6%, 6.3% 3.3%	Dec 2017	Apr 2016, Aug 2019	9.6, 3 df, p<0.001	0.06	-0.16
Hospital Transport*	0%		7.7%	12.0%	None found				
Doses Per ORE	1.30 doses	1.04, 1.55	1.78 doses	1.65, 1.92	None found		0.28, 3 df, p=0.60		

#### Adverse Reactions

"Felt sick"	3.9%	1.7%, 6.0%	1.5%	0%, 3.4%	Aug 2019	Apr 2019, Jan 2020	43, 3 df, p<0.001	0.006	-0.007
Angry	3.1%	1.2%, 4.9%	11.9%	19.4%	May 2020	Sep 2019, Dec 2020	35, 3 df, p<0.001	0.004	-0.003
Shaking	2.2%	0.9%, 3.5%	0%	-	Dec 2018	Sep 2016, Mar 2021	5.7, 3 df, p=0.0013	-0.0006	-0.0003
Confused	0.10%	0%, 0.3% 0.03%,	0.64%	0%, 1.7% 12.3%,	None found		0.18, 3 df, p=0.18		
Emesis	0.05%	0.08%	22.5%	32.8%	None found				
Diarrhea	0.09%	0%, 0.3%	0.28%	0%, 0.99%	None found				

\* Zero and low sample size values in first months may cause unstable arithmetic means. See supplemental material for plots.

550 Figure 3. Average age of new participants receiving overdose reversal training and naloxone. Dots represent 551 average age of new participants, by month. Time series of monthly average age for new participants receiving initial 552 overdose prevention training and naloxone dispensing. Time series line (orange) and shaded 95% confidence interval 553 of the mean (light blue) have been smoothed, and raw average age per month is depicted as dots. Inset plot is a 554 histogram of average age of new participants, by 5-year bin increment, during the entire observation period: July 555 2005 to January 2023.

556

### 557 **Programmatic Context**

Program staff observations corroborated quantitative findings. The immediate increase in age during 2015 was due to large-audience naloxone training events hosted by Prevention Point Pittsburgh that attracted parents concerned about their children. These events were often held in venues outside of Pittsburgh city limits [49], including suburban and rural areas of western Pennsylvania. In a departure from traditional service delivery, these large-audience events attracted more family and friends than people who use drugs.

564

This increase in terms of age leveled out by the end of 2016 as Prevention Point Pittsburgh 565 566 refocused outreach efforts to serve people who use drugs instead of concerned friends and 567 family. This change in focus was made intentionally by program staff in early 2016 because 568 there were fewer-than-expected ORE reports despite the large increase in new participants. 569 Program staff believed that naloxone distributed in the mass training events to friends and 570 family were less likely to be used, compared to when distributed directly to people who use 571 drugs. In the most recent data years (2022-3), the downward age trend was explained as being 572 due to programmatic expansion to mobile sites in previously underserved neighborhoods 573 drawing younger populations.

574

# 575 Participants: Gender Identity

576

### 577 Quantitative Results

- 578 Self-reported gender identity was 51.7% male, 45.9% female, and 0.82% (n=62) transgender
- 579 during the entire observation period. Although segmented regression did not identify a single
- 580 breakpoint, visual inspection of the timeline (Figure 4) and discussion with Prevention Point
- 581 Pittsburgh staff suggested that the percent of new participants identifying as female increased in
- 582 2015-16, immediately following the enactment of the aforementioned naloxone law. The percent
- 583 of female new participants increased from 34.6% (95% CI: 31.4%, 37.8%) to 58.1% (52.7%,
- 584 63.5%, *t*-test 8.0, 22 Satterthwaite df, *p*<0.001) in the calendar year before and after legislation.
- 585

586 Figure 4. New participant volume and self-reported gender for naloxone training and dispensing. Top frame 587 depicts timeline in new participant volume receiving naloxone at initial training encounters, by self-reported gender. 588 River plots are interpreted as stacked area graphs, with area above and below zero both being in the "positive" 589 direction by category. The vertical red dashed line at December 2014-to-January 2015 interface represents the 590 change in state legislation. Bottom frame is a smoothed sparkline of total volume of all new monthly participants. 591 Study dates: July 2005 to January 2023.

592

## 593 **Programmatic Context**

Quantification confirms observations by Prevention Point Pittsburgh staff that after the legislation there was increased representation of concerned females (often mothers of children who use opioids) who attended large training events. After 2016, Prevention Point Pittsburgh made the conscious decision to re-prioritize people who are actively using drugs for naloxone outreach, and the percent female new participants stabilized to around 40-50% per month. In recent years (2022-23), there was a noticeable uptick in the proportion of females to 50-60%, concurrent with the younger average age noted previously. This period is contemporaneous

- 601 with a shift to nasal naloxone formulations distributed and expansion of mobile sites to new
- 602 Pittsburgh neighborhoods, with the caveat that this association may be incidental.
- 603

# 604 Participants: Racialized Identity

605

#### 606 **Quantitative Results**

607 Self-reported racialized identity of participants was 70.7% White, 20.2% Black, 1.3% Latine, 1%

608 multiracial, with less than 1% each of others, Table 1. The racial distribution mirrored the

609 population of Allegheny County, with greater representation by individuals identifying as Black,

and fewer of Latine origin [50]. Unlike age and gender, the impact of the state legislation on race

611 was less immediately evident and more nuanced. Segmented regression identified an inflection

point in January 2015, showing an increase in non-White new participants (Table 2, Figure S4).

613 However, segmented regression revealed that the increase in Black new participants did not

actually start until a year later, after the end of December 2015 (Table 2, Figure 5).

615

Figure 5. Racial identity of new participants dispensed naloxone. Top frame depicts timeline in new participant
volume to naloxone training and dispensing, by self-reported racial identity. The vertical red dashed line at December
2014 represents the change in state legislation. Bottom frame is a smoothed sparkline of total volume of all new
monthly participants. Study dates: July 2005 to January 2023.

620

## 621 **Programmatic Context**

Prevention Point Pittsburgh staff noted that the increase in Black participants after 2015 was not
surprising and was planned. A retrospective analysis of the first ten years of service delivery was
conducted by staff in 2016 [16], which starkly quantified what up until then had been a casual

625 observation, namely that the predominant race of participants was White, and that different 626 strategies would be needed to engage people of color.

627

628 The statistical breakpoint in January 2016 conforms with a significant service change: In 629 February 2016, Prevention Point Pittsburgh intentionally increased outreach to a predominantly 630 Black neighborhood via mobile-based services and hiring community health advocates from the 631 community to do naloxone distribution. A second predominantly Black neighborhood was served 632 starting in late September 2019. While the law itself did not lead to a passive increase in Black 633 participants, Prevention Point Pittsburgh staff did credit the law in allowing them to distribute 634 naloxone in more places. For example, a barber shop in a predominantly Black neighborhood 635 served as an early expansion site for naloxone distribution, a partnership that was brokered with 636 the support of a local community leader identified by program staff. Staff further noted this active 637 outreach was different than inbound solicitations from community groups for naloxone trainings; 638 people who sought out Prevention Point Pittsburgh for group trainings tended to be serving 639 White communities.

640

### 641 Iterative Modeling and Further Contextualization

Based on explanations by Program staff, time trend analysis was refined. Spline models with knots at the dates of law enactment and the two outreach expansion dates demonstrated good fit for these inflection points; however, the period from September 2019 to January 2023 displayed non-linear temporal distribution (Figure S5). Visual inspection was corroborated empirically by the predicted output from the mixed effects model, which showed that the percent of Black new participants increased considerably after September 2019 ( $\hat{y}_{September} = 27.0\%$  to  $\hat{y}_{October} = 39.2\%$ ).

650 However, time-restricted segmented regression (Figure S4) identified a potential change point 651 of December 2020 after which a decline in the percent of Black participants accelerated through 652 the end of observation in January 2023, a result of expanded mobile services in another 653 Pittsburgh neighborhood with a younger, predominantly White population. This particular mobile 654 site was characterized by physicians who could start low-threshold buprenorphine inductions 655 (i.e., a flexible treatment approach with same-day initiation, relaxed adherence requirements, 656 and availability in non-traditional settings) [51] in the field. Low-threshold buprenorphine 657 provision also drew participants to the harm reduction service side of the program, where take-658 home naloxone was also provided. Therefore, the increase in younger, White participants was 659 the combined function of local demographics and the spillover effect stemming from providing 660 medications for opioid use disorder. 661 662 In summary, enactment of a law in Pennsylvania led to an immediate increase in naloxone

dispensed to concerned family and friends of people who use drugs. The law enabled
Prevention Point Pittsburgh to expand to underserved neighborhoods, but inclusion of more
racialized minorities also required service delivery innovation.

666

# 667 Naloxone Distribution

668

#### 669 **Quantitative Results**

670 During the 17-year period, half of all naloxone doses dispensed by Prevention Point Pittsburgh

671 were in 1 mL (0.4 mg/mL) vials (n=35,715; 50.8%), followed by 10 mL (0.4 mg/mL) vials

672 (n=18,420; 26.2%), and 4 mg nasal spray (n=16,063; 22.9%). Only 36 doses of the autoinjector

were dispensed during a one-month period in 2016 with donated product. During the first

#### decade of operation (Figure 6), Prevention Point Pittsburgh distributed the 10 mL vial

675 exclusively.

676

Figure 6. Major forms of naloxone distributed, July 2005 to January 2023. In the top panel, smoothed time series are displayed along with 95% confidence intervals of doses dispensed per month, by formulation. Colored dots represent raw counts of doses by month. The bottom panel is a sparkline showing total number of doses per month of naloxone distributed across all formulations. Initially only 10 mL vials were available for distribution. The vertical red dashed line at December 2014 represents the change in state legislation. The only other form of naloxone distributed by Prevention Point Pittsburgh was 36 units of an auto-injector in June 2016, which are not depicted. Study dates: July 2005 to January 2023.

684

#### 685 **Programmatic Context**

686 Program staff provided context for the two points where lines crossed. Initially the 10 mL vial 687 was the only formulation available, but the 10 mL vial was replaced by 1 mL vials starting in 688 October 2012 due to a new contract with the manufacturer. With this transition, by August 2013 689 all IM distribution was of 1 mL vials, packaged by the program as kits containing two 1 mL vials. 690 The other line crossing occurred in Spring 2021 when a manufacturing problem disrupted 1 mL 691 vial production. From May 2021 to September 2022, a manufacturing shortage of affordable 692 naloxone led to a shortage of the 1 mL vials. The State of Pennsylvania was able to increase 693 bulk nasal naloxone to Prevention Point, but the organization had to hire a part-time staff person 694 to help other community-based programs with accessing the state ordering portal. After the 695 shortage was resolved, 1 mL vial purchases resumed in late 2022. 696

## 697 **Reasons for Refill**

698

#### 699 **Quantitative Results**

700	Over the 17.6 years, there were 16,904 participant-encounters by Prevention Point Pittsburgh
701	staff, of which 44.8% (n=7,567) were initial trainings (Table 1). The remainder of dispensing
702	events occurred when refill requests participants who had previously been trained returned for a
703	refill.
704	
705	A total of 70,234 doses of naloxone were dispensed: 27,279 during initial training encounters
706	(38.8%) and 42,955 (61.2%) during refills. The average number of doses dispensed per
707	participant was 4.15, cumulatively.
708	
709	"Used it" was the most common reason for refill in 57.5% of refill requests (Table 1, Figure 7).
710	Segmented regression revealed that prior to August 2017, about 70% of refill requests were
711	after naloxone had been used (Table 2, Figure S8). After this date, participants increasingly
712	asked for refills for other reasons.
713	
714	Figure 7. Reasons for requesting naloxone refills. Smoothed sparklines depicting monthly proportion of refill
715	requests by reason for refill. Grey dots represent raw counts by month, while the colored lines are smoothed monthly
716	average. Study dates: July 2005 to January 2023.
717	
718	Obtaining a refill for naloxone because of expiration date was relatively rare, at 3.9% of refill
719	requests overall. Segmented regression found an initial decrease in expired naloxone after April
720	2010 (Table 2), but inspection of trendlines (Figure 7) reveal further peaks over time, finally
721	stabilizing in a lower proportion of refills from 2017 or 2018 onwards. Comparing these findings
722	to Figure 6, the likelihood of expired naloxone refill does not correspond to the switch from 10
723	mL vials to 1 mL vials in calendar years 2012 to 2013. The further decline in proportion of
724	expired naloxone in later years (2017 onwards) is somewhat contemporaneous with availability
725	of the nasal spray, but samples are too small to draw further conclusions.

726

727 "Need an extra kit" was used by program staff to record when individuals who already had a kit 728 and wanted a second one. This comprised 24.0% of refill requests overall, and segmented 729 regression identified January 2012 as a change point (Table 2, Figure S7). Cumulatively, about 30% of refill requests were for this reason. This does not include people who used a kit and 730 731 were looking for a refill. 732 733 "Gave away" increased substantially starting around July 2018 (Table 2, Figure S6), as 734 suggested by segmented regression. While this reason was only 10.5% cumulatively, nearly a quarter of all refill requests were because of secondary distribution ("gave away"). Secondary 735 736 distribution is a well-documented phenomenon where participants directly accessing harm 737 reduction services obtain additional supplies for distribution among their peer networks 738 informally [52,53]. 739 740 Law enforcement confiscation of naloxone occurred mostly before the enactment of the 741 statewide standing order in December 2014, in 37 instances. Other reasons for refill were very 742 rarely reported (less than 1% combined), including only one or two reports of breakage of glass

743 vials.

744

#### 745 **Programmatic Context**

Program staff clarified that, following the law change, increased participant reports of sharing naloxone with others ("gave away") may not represent a true change in behavior, but rather a gradual increase in participants' level of comfort reporting giving away naloxone as a form of secondary distribution, a phenomenon documented elsewhere after law changes [54]. Prior to the law change and the official sanction of naloxone distribution, coded language was often

751	used by participants to emphasize the <i>personal</i> need for the naloxone because third-party
752	prescribing was not legally sanctioned. Program staff attributed the legacy of prescription status
753	and the requirement to have a documented clinical encounter as having conditioned participants
754	to only talk about needing naloxone for themselves. As third-party prescribing of naloxone
755	became less legally risky over time, participants became more willing to candidly discuss that
756	they were giving their naloxone kits away to others. Prevention Point Pittsburgh staff noted a de-
757	stigmatizing of naloxone after the passage of the law, an advance that was critical to enabling
758	more honest dialogue with participants about their experiences.
759	
760	Program staff provided more context for "need an extra kit" responses. This category often
761	refers to individuals wanting to have naloxone available in multiple locations, such as both at
762	home and in cars, or one for home and one to carry in a handbag.

763

# 764 Naloxone Administration

765

Naloxone administration reports were limited to those instances where naloxone had been used (n=5,521), instead of refill requests for other reasons. Naloxone was generally *administered* by the person to whom it had been prescribed and trained in 79.2% (n=4,374) of OREs, leaving 19.5% on average administered by "someone else" at the scene (Table 1). However, this was different (Wald  $\chi^2$ =218, df 5, p<0.001) by formulation: 33.2% of OREs with nasal sprays were done by someone else, whereas intramuscular formulations ranged from 10.1% to 16.4%. This suggested the necessity to examine to whom the naloxone was administered.

773

# 774 Naloxone Used on Whom

#### 776 **Quantitative Results**

The largest category represents 81.2% of ORE that were performed on friends and

acquaintances, which decreased slightly over time (Figure 8, Table 1). Segmented regression

yielded June 2013 as a change point after which other categories of people slightly increased in

- being administered naloxone instead of friends and acquaintances (Figure S10).
- 781

Figure 8. Person to whom naloxone was administered, monthly proportion of ORE reports. Dots represent monthly proportions for each exclusive category. Precents are based on total ORE reports as the denominator. The majority of naloxone administrations were performed on friends or acquaintances of the person reporting the overdose response event. "You" refers to the overdose having been experienced by the person who was reporting the overdose. Study dates: August 2005 to January 2023.

787

788 Naloxone was used on the person reporting the ORE ("you") in only 8.9% of cases. In these 789 cases, the person who had been prescribed naloxone was also the person who had 790 experienced the overdose and was self-reporting the ORE. Self-reported OREs were 7.6% in 791 the first two years of program operations and had continued to decline until May 2018 after 792 which they approximately doubled (Table 2, Figure S9). In the last 6 months of the observation 793 period, the person reporting the ORE was also the person who experienced the overdose in 794 16.3% of reports. Interestingly, the percent of OREs on the reporter themselves was twice as 795 high for nasal sprays (16.9%) than for injectable (8.5% 10 mL vial, 5.9% 1 mL vial) formulations. 796

Naloxone was administered on family and strangers rarely. OREs on family members were
4.8% overall (Table 1, Figure S11). In segmented regression, family OREs climbed gradually,
but July 2018 emerged as a possible change point after which OREs of family members
declined. Use on family members did not differ by formulation type (range across formulations:
4.4% to 5.3%), suggesting that both intramuscular and nasal formulations were equally likely tobe used on family.

803

During the first two years of operations, naloxone administration to strangers was less than 1% but increased to 7.9% of ORE reports in the last 6 months of observation. Cumulatively, there were 239 (4.4%) total OREs on strangers. No change point was detected in segmented regression models. The nasal spray was slightly more likely to be used on strangers (5.7%, n=78) than the 1 mL vial (4.2%, n=128), and ahead of the 10 mL vial (2.7%, n=23) distributed in early years.

810

#### 811 **Programmatic Context**

812 Prevention Point Pittsburgh staff offered a plausible explanation for the increase in "you" as the 813 person who had been revived from overdose with naloxone. In the latter two years of the 814 observation period, a community outreach worker had been specifically engaging with "trap 815 houses" where people congregated to use drugs [55,56]. Naloxone distribution in trap houses 816 followed a different pattern than other types of community distribution, in what amounted to 817 active case finding of people who had already experienced an overdose. The outreach worker 818 would bring naloxone for distribution to the trap house, ask if anyone had recently had an 819 overdose reversed with naloxone, and record these reversals. This practice was important for 820 targeting naloxone distribution to a population who had already experienced an overdose and 821 remained at elevated risk for subsequent overdoses. The corresponding data implication was 822 that trap house delivery resulted in more "you" reports because naloxone was being provided to 823 people after experiencing an overdose that had been reversed with naloxone by a peer. This 824 stands in contrast to other community outreach settings where naloxone was provided to people 825 before they had experienced an overdose.

826

827	Program staff did not have specific contextual or programmatic explanation for the increase in
828	administration on strangers, pointing to the small numbers and cautioning against drawing
829	conclusions. Staff emphasized that people use whichever formulation they have on hand, and
830	that differences in rates usage by formulation are not purely a function of device usability. At
831	Prevention Point Pittsburgh, where both intramuscular and nasal naloxone are equally available
832	and participants are given the choice of which naloxone to take with them, many participants
833	select intramuscular formulations if they believe themselves to be at risk of an overdose, and
834	conversely, choose the nasal formulation if they expect to administer it on acquaintances.
835	Therefore, when a stranger is encountered in an unresponsive state, participants administer
836	whichever formulation of naloxone they are carrying at the time. Staff emphasized the parity
837	between injectable and nasal formulations, in terms of usability and preference, as reported by
838	the participants; each has its place in community-based overdose response and there was no
839	strong preference for the nasal spray just based on its form factor.
840	
841	Naloxone Doses Administered

842

## 843 **Quantitative Results**

The cumulative number of naloxone doses administered was 8,756, leading to 5,521 ORE reports, Table 3. The frequency of administered dosage forms was: 52% as 1 mL vials (n=4,551.25 doses), 25.3% as 4 mg nasal sprays (n=2,216 doses), and 18% as 10 mL vials (n=1,555.25 doses). Multiple forms of naloxone were administered in 151 ORE reports (4.7%, n=408.5 doses, Table 3).

#### Table 3. Distribution, overdose responses, and dosing by naloxone formulation

NALOXONE DISTRIBUT	NALOXONE DISTRIBUTION				
Naloxone Formulation	Dispensed by Pre	vention Point			
	Units	Doses			
1 mL vial	35,715 vials	35,715			
Nasal spray (4 mg)	8,032 two-packs	16,063			
10 mL vial	1,842 vials	18,420			
Autoinjector	18 two-packs	36			
Nasal adaptor		0			
Multiple forms					
Missing		0			
Totals		70,234			

#### **OVERDOSE RESPONSE EVENTS**

			Utilization: OR	E per Unit or Dose
	Reversals	%	By Units	By Dose
1 mL vial	3,082	56	8.6%	8.63%
Nasal spray (4 mg)	1,373	25	17.1%	8.55%
10 mL vial	880	16	47.8%	4.78%
Autoinjector	14	0	77.8%	38.9%
Nasal adaptor	1	0		
Multiple forms	151	3		
Missing	20	0		
Totals	5,521	100		

#### DOSES ADMINISTERED

_	Doses per ORE					
	Doses	Mean	95% CI	<b>Relative Dose</b>	95% CI	Wald Test
1 mL vial	4,551.25	1.51	1.48, 1.54	ref		
Nasal spray (4 mg)	2,216	1.63	1.58, 1.68	+7.5%	3.7%, 11.5%	x2=3.9; p<0.001
10 mL vial	1,555.25	1.85	1.75, 1.94	+22.1%	15.6%, 28.9%	x2=7.1; p<0.001
Autoinjector	23	1.64	1.20, 2.08	+8.6%	-16.2%, 40.7%	x2=0.6; p=0.53
Nasal adaptor	2	2.00		+32.2%	29.7%, 34.7%	x2=28.8; p<0.001
Multiple forms	408.5	2.76	2.58, 2.94	+82.4%	70.3%, 95.4%	x2=17.1; p<0.001
Missing	153					
Totals	8,756					

Poisson regression, with x2-scaled residuals, and robust variance estimator, using complete case data (n=5,375). 1 mL vials used as referrent group.

Model-based Wald x2 test, df 4

\* Estimated under the assumption that doses administered were dispensed by Prevention Point Pittsburgh. As the presence of the nasal adaptor report suggests, some participants may have obtained naloxone from other sources, such as pharmacy or other harm reduction programs, and would not be accounted for in the denominator.

852

Cumulative utilization rates are a quantification of the number of dispensed doses used in
OREs. Dose-standardized utilization rates were similar for the 1 mL vial (8.6%) and nasal spray
(8.5%), and 4.8% for the 10 mL vial (Table 3).

856

857 The cumulative arithmetic average number of naloxone doses per overdose response event 858 was 1.63 (95% CI: 1.60, 1.65), and the geometric mean was 1.44 (95% CI: 1.42, 1.46). Time 859 trends presented in Figure 9 show two distinct patterns. The 1 mL vial and 4 mg nasal spray 860 were used mostly as one or two doses (roughly bimodal), whereas the 10 mL vial and multiple forms represent more continuous distributions, including titrated fractional doses and 861 862 administration of less than one full labeled dose to achieve reversal. When multiple forms of 863 naloxone were administered, the number of total doses was greater (median of two versus 864 median of one) than single formulation administrations.

865

Figure 9. Number of naloxone doses administered per overdose response event. Average number of naloxone doses administered per overdose response event are presented with the vertical axis, smoothed using Gaussian kernel density estimators. For 1 mL and 10 mL vials, fractional dosing was observed, with less than a single full dose (1 mL of 0.4 mg/mL) being administered; this was not possible for the nasal spray, resulting in the visible left-truncation of the kernel density plot. Box plots below each graph show median and interquartile range are presented horizontally; circles represent outlier observations. Study dates: August 2005 to January 2023.

872

The average doses per overdose response event was lowest for 1 mL vial with 1.51 doses (95% CI: 1.48, 1.54), Table 3. Using 1 mL vials as a reference group, the average number of doses per ORE was 7.5% higher (95% CI: 3.7%, 11.5% higher,  $\chi^2$ =3.9, Wald p<0.001) for the nasal spray with 1.63 doses per ORE (95% CI: 1.58, 1.68). For the 10 mL vial, doses were 22.1% (95% CI: 15.6%, 28.9% higher doses,  $\chi^2$ =7.1, p<0.001) higher than the 1 mL vial with 1.85

doses per ORE (95% CI: 1.75, 1.94). When multiple forms were used, the average doses were
2.76 doses per ORE (95% CI: 2.58, 2.94).

880

The overall rate of naloxone doses per overdose response event in Pittsburgh remained stable

over a 17-year period (Figure 10). Segmented regression did not yield any statistically verifiable

change points ( $\chi^2$  = 0.28, 3 df, p=0.60; Table 2) during the 17-year observation period of the

number of doses per overdose response event (Figure S13).

885

#### 886 Figure 10. Time trends in naloxone doses per overdose response event, cumulatively and by

887 formulation. Average number of naloxone doses administered per overdose response event for all formulations are

presented in the top frame. In the bottom frame the same data are broken out by the three dominant formulations.

889 The vertical axis corresponds to average monthly dose per overdose response event, with dots representing the raw

890 monthly average, and the trend lines depicting the Gaussian-smoothed rolling three-month rolling average. Shaded

fill areas represent the 95% confidence interval of the smoothed mean doses per overdose response event per

month. Study dates: July 2005 to January 2023.

893

#### 894 **Programmatic Context**

895 Program staff described that with the 10 mL vial it was easy for people to administer additional 896 doses, and that unit dosing with the 1 mL vial and nasal spray reduced this behavior. In 897 instances where many doses and/or multiple forms had been administered, program staff 898 described that it was common for people to receive additional doses of naloxone after police or 899 paramedics arrived, even if the person was already revived and was breathing. Therefore, 900 extreme numbers of reported doses administered may reflect circumstances beyond the 901 reporter's control, and doses not dispensed by Prevention Point Pittsburgh. Dose titration was 902 also identified by program staff and the rest of the study team as an important phenomenon for 903 exploration, and one that had not been previously characterized in scientific publications.

- 904 Program staff believed that titration would be associated with fewer or less severe withdrawal-
- 905 related adverse events, and this hypothesis was the basis for subsequent investigation.
- 906

# 907 Response Behavior: Rescue Breathing

908

#### 909 **Quantitative Results**

910 The percent of overdose response events in which rescue breathing was reported was 43.8%

911 (n=2,419 out of 5,521), Table 1. Segmented regression identified January 2014 (Figure 11) as a

- 912 possible changepoint after which the percent of ORE with rescue breathing declined (Figure
- S14). In the last 6 months of observation, 34% of overdose response events mentioned rescue
- breathing, down from 52% in the first 2 years of the observation period (Figure 11). The COVID-
- 915 19 pandemic did not appreciably accelerate the long-term temporal trend of declining rescue
- 916 breathing during overdose response events. Segmented regression with an imposed breakpoint
- 917 in March 2020 did not produce a meaningful statistical association, meaning that rescue
- 918 breathing continued to decline at a linear decay trajectory consistent with the immediately

919 preceding time period (Figure S14), independent of the pandemic.

920

921 Figure 11. Proportion of naloxone administration reports in which response behaviors were

922 reported. Smoothed time series depicting the percent of overdose response events in which response behaviors
923 were reported. The bottom panel shows monthly volume of total overdose response events (ORE). Study dates:

924 August 2005 to January 2023.

925

## 926 **Programmatic Context**

927 During the study period, Prevention Point Pittsburgh trainings recommended rescue breathing
928 during an overdose response event. However, this recommendation was not made strongly

during the height of the COVID-19 pandemic, but was re-emphasized in trainings starting in
2023, after xylazine started appearing in the local unregulated opioid supply in 2022 [57].
931

932 Program staff also noted that while rescue breathing was taught at the initial trainings, it was not 933 reinforced during refill encounters, with one exception: If participants reported needing to use 934 more than 2 doses of naloxone, they were counselled to use rescue breathing and count 935 respiration in future reversals. Therefore, the slight uptick in rescue breathing in 2022 may have 936 been influenced by this directive. In the same year, xylazine started to appear alongside 937 fentanyl in the local unregulated drug supply, complicating reversals because the person who 938 had overdosed may not become responsive to stimuli upon naloxone administration, even if 939 respiration was adequately restored. It was not until March 2023, beyond the end of 940 observation, that Prevention Point Pittsburgh formalized the recommendation to reemphasize 941 counting breaths after naloxone administration (and provide rescue breathing if needed) to 942 participants via handouts and flyers in the context of xylazine; the intent was to dissuade 943 unnecessarily high doses of naloxone being administered if the participant was breathing 944 adequately but did not become immediately reanimated. This was also contemporaneous with 945 the start of disposable xylazine test strip distribution. While this programmatic evolution was not 946 formalized until after the end of the observation period, Prevention Point Pittsburgh noted that 947 the same advice had been delivered to participants in less systematic ways in the months prior. 948 Staff also pointed out that the current over-the-counter label [43] for naloxone nasal sprays does 949 not include instructions for rescue breathing but that they provide the instructions themselves. 950

- 951 **Response Behavior: Chest Compressions**
- 952
- 953 **Quantitative Results**

954	Data on chest compressions (commonly called "CPR" for cardio-pulmonary resuscitation) were
955	recorded from 2016 to 2023. Chest compressions were reported to have been conducted in only
956	23.7% of OREs (n=711 out of 3,004 reports). Segmented regression identified February 2017
957	as a changepoint after which chest compressions declined (Table 2, Figure 11)
958	
959	Programmatic Context
960	Prevention Point Pittsburgh staff pointed out that in 2016, the New York State Health

961 Department convened a working group of physicians and scientists to establish the necessity of

962 recommending CPR for opioid overdose reversal. At the time, CPR was recommended widely in

963 Canada but not by the World Health Organization, and within the US instructions were

964 inconsistent. The onset of data collection at Prevention Point was intended to inform this

965 debate. The medical consensus of the New York State working group was that chest

966 compressions were not required [58]. As a result, Prevention Point Pittsburgh modified

967 recommendations to participants de-emphasizing chest compressions, which had been part of

the original training. They attribute the decline in CPR in 2017 to be related to this programmatic

969 shift.

970

## 971 Response Behavior: Calling 911

972

## 973 Quantitative Results

974 Overall, 911 was called in 16.4% (n=903 out of 5,521) of ORE reports (Table 1, Figure 11).

975 When 911 was called, EMS arrived half the time, or 49.2% of reports (n=444 out of 903, with

976 0.3% missing). Segmented regression identified December 2017 as a changepoint after which

977 calls to 911 decreased considerably; during the last 6 months of the observation period, 911

978 was called in only 5.4% of OREs.

979

## 980 Programmatic Context

981 Calling emergency medical services (EMS, i.e., 911) was universally recommended in trainings 982 by Prevention Point Pittsburgh. However, fear of criminal prosecution is expected to have 983 dampened the likelihood of this behavior. The Pennsylvania "Good Samaritan" Act 139 was 984 enacted in December 2014, offering limited criminal immunity for minor drug possession 985 charges when calling EMS during an overdose [59]. In spline regression, comparing before and 986 after the law change (Figure S17), there appears to have been a transitory increase in calls to 987 911, which was not sustained over time. Program staff also stated that people who do not use 988 drugs are more likely to call 911, and increases in dispensing naloxone outside of networks of 989 people who use drugs in the years after state legislation enactment could have contributed to 990 the transitory increase in 911 calls.

991

992 Program staff offered explanations to account for the surprisingly low rate of EMS arrival, based 993 on conversations during the ORE report intake that were not quantified on forms. The common 994 theme was wanting to avoid encountering first responders (which could include police) unless 995 absolutely necessary, especially in the context of drug-induced homicide laws as documented 996 elsewhere [60]. Successful reversals may have resulted in a follow-up call to 911 stating that 997 EMS were no longer required. The reporter may have called EMS, administered naloxone, and 998 then left the scene, and therefore may not know for certain if EMS arrived. For these reasons, 999 program staff cautioned in the interpretation of the seemingly low rate of EMS arrival in these 1000 data.

1001

# **1002 Response Behavior: Hospital Transport**

#### 1004 **Quantitative Results**

Among the 5,521 ORE reports, hospital transport was reported in 5.0% (n=274) of OREs. No temporal changepoint was detected in segmented regression, Table 2. Visual inspection of the time trend revealed heavy concentration of zeros (e.g., no hospital transport) in the first 11 years of the observation period (Figure 11). The last six months of the observation period suggested an uptick, with 7.7% (95% CI: 3.3%, 12.0%) of OREs having had hospital transport.

## **1011 Programmatic Context**

1012 Empirical data show that hospital transport had a sudden peak in 2017 [61]; program staff

1013 pointed out that this was the year with peak overdose deaths in Allegheny County, as well being

1014 contemporaneous with the brief emergence of carfentanil in the unregulated drug supply.

1015 Additionally, based on interviews during ORE reports, program staff suggested that emergence

1016 of xylazine in 2022 may have led to more hospital transport due to lack of reanimation.

1017

## 1018 Adverse Events

1019

Granular information on specific adverse events (AEs) was recorded systematically starting in 1020 1021 August 2016 and are thus available for 4,606 ORE reports, which constitutes the denominator 1022 for rate calculations. Any adverse event was noted in 31.4% (n=1,446/4,606) of OREs. Overall, 1023 emesis (vomiting), anger, and "feeling sick" were the most commonly reported adverse events. 1024 Annualized time trends in AE counts and rates per OREs are displayed in Figure 12 for the 6 1025 calendar years (2017-22) with complete reporting. The two most common AEs (Table 4) 1026 described in free text notes were confusion (n=11) and diarrhea (n=4), which only were reported 1027 with the 1 mL vial. There was no indication in free text fields for wooden chest syndrome,

- muscle rigidity, laryngospasm, or pulmonary edema, which are other adverse events of concern
  with illicitly manufactured synthetic opioids.
- 1030
- 1031
- 1032 **Figure 12. Annual counts and percents of adverse events following naloxone administration.** Vertical bars are
- 1033 counts of adverse event reports by year. Green lines are percents of overdose response events annually (N=4,606

total), enumerated on the right vertical axis.

- 1035
- 1036 OREs in which adverse events were reported had slightly higher average naloxone doses 1.66
- 1037 (95% CI: 1.62, 1.71) compared with all OREs 1.59 (95% CI: 1.56, 1.61). More than one dose of
- 1038 naloxone was associated with higher incidence of any reported adverse event, 47.3% of OREs
- 1039 (n=685/1,446), compared to 40.7% (n=1,287/3,160) of OREs when one or fewer doses were
- administered (Wald  $\chi^2$ =17.8, 1 df, p<0.001), a rate difference of 6.6 per 100 OREs (95% CI: 3.5,
- 1041 9.7).
- 1042

## 1043 Adverse Events: Emesis

1044

## 1045 **Quantitative Results**

1046 Emesis (vomiting or "puking") was reported in 13.2% (n=607) of OREs, but differed (Wald  $x^2$ 

1047 108, 2 df, *p*<0.001) considerably by formulation. OREs using the 4 mg nasal spray were twice

- as likely to result in emesis compared to the 1 mL vial (20.8% versus 9.6%), Table 4. After
- adjusting for doses administered, there were 106 (95% CI: 82, 130) more emesis events per
- 1050 1,000 OREs with the 4 mg nasal spray than the 1 mL vial at 0.4 mg/mL.
- 1051
- 1052

Table 4. Adverse events reported after naloxone administration, by formulation and dose, August 2016 to January 2023.

			Naloxone Formulation				Doses Administered		
		Total	1 mL vial	Nasal 4 mg	Multiple Forms	Wald Test*	Average Doses (95% Cl)	Cases >1 Dose	Percent of Cases > 1 Dose
	All Reversals	4,606	3,082	1,373	151		1.59 (1.56, 1.61)	1,972	43.6%
	Reversals with any AE recorded below	1,446	820	557	69		1.66 (1.62, 1.71)	685	47.8%
	_					x2 108,			50.7%
Emesis	Cases	607	296	284	31	p<0.001	1.73 (1.65, 1.81)	308	
	(Percent) or Rate per 1,000 Reversals	(13.2%)	96.2	207.6	205.3				
	Rate Difference per 1,000 reversals relative to 1 mL vial, adjusted for dose		ref	+106	+90.3				
	Rate difference 95% Cl			+82.0, +130	+22.6, +158				
						x2 31			
Angry	Cases	546	314	206	31	p<0.001	1.61 (1.53, 1.68)	237	43.4%
	(Percent) or Rate per 1,000 Reversals	(11.9%)	102.1	150.6	205.3				
	Rate Difference per 1,000 reversals relative to 1 mL vial, adjusted for dose		ref	+48.5	+103				
	Rate difference 95% CI			+47.8, +49.2	+101, +105				
						x2 1.1,			
Felt Sick	Cases	440	291	136	18	p=0.56	1.58 (1.50, 1.67)	186	42.3%
	(Percent) or Rate per 1,000 Reversals	(9.6%)	94.6	99.4	119.2				
	Rate Difference per 1,000 reversals relative to 1 mL vial, adjusted for dose		ref	+4.8	+24.6				
	Rate difference 95% CI			+4.2, +5.4	+22.8, +26.4				

Death	Cases (Percent) or Rate per 1,000 Reversals Rate Difference per 1,000 reversals	47 (1.02%)	24 7.8	20 14.6	3 2.0	x2 5.6, exact p=0.043	1.94 (1.63, 2.24)	29	61.7%
	Rate difference 95% CI			-2.6, +11.6	-14.9, +31.6				
Shaking	Cases (Percent) or Rate per 1,000 Reversals Rate Difference per 1,000 reversals relative to 1 mL vial	33 (0.7%)	27 8.8 ref	5 3.7 -5.1	1 6.6 -2.1	x2 10.5, exact p=0.005	1.97 (1.50, 2.43)	21	63.4%
Confusion**	Cases	11	11	0	0		2.36 (1.40, 3.32)	8	72.7%
	Rate per 1,000 Reversals		3.6						
Diarrhea**	Cases Rate per 1,000 Reversals	4	4 1.3	0	0		1.25 (0.45, 2.0)	1	25.0%

\* Model-based Wald chi-square test with 2 df. Fisher's Exact test was used if any cell count was less than 10.

\*\* Interpret with caution.Derived from free text notes, not recorded on structured form.

1054	In both absolute and relative (to OREs) rates, Figure 12, emesis increased as a reported
1055	adverse event from 2017 to 2022. In the era when only 1 mL vials were distributed, about 16%
1056	of ORE involved emesis, going up to about 23% when naloxone distribution included vials and 4
1057	mg nasal spray both, contemporaneous also with the advent of illicitly manufactured fentanyl.

## 1058

## 1059 **Programmatic Context**

1060 Prevention Point Pittsburgh staff noted that emesis was the most objectively observable

adverse event, and that it would be more likely to be reported than other more subjective

1062 adverse events, impacting interpretation of relative prevalence between AEs. But they did not

1063 identify a reason why reporting of emesis would be different between formulations, providing

1064 credence to inter-formulation comparisons.

1065

## 1066 Adverse Events: Anger

1067

#### 1068 **Quantitative Results**

1069 Anger was reported in 11.9% of OREs (n=546/4606) and differed by formulation (Wald  $\chi^2$  108,

1070 2 df, *p*<0.001). The 1 mL vial was associated with fewer angry AE reports, at 10.2%, compared

1071 to 15.1% of OREs with the 4 mg nasal spray, Table 4. After adjusting for doses administered,

1072 per 1000 OREs there were 48.5 (95% CI: 47.8, 49.2) additional cases of anger after

administration of the nasal spray.

1074

1075 In both absolute and relative measures, anger after naloxone administration was most reported

in 2020, during the phases of COVID-19 pandemic isolation. However, even though 4 mg nasal

- 1077 spray supplanted 1 mL vials during a sudden injectable naloxone supply shortfall in 2021-22
- 1078 (Figure 5), reports of anger after naloxone administration returned to pre-pandemic levels

- 1079 despite the formulation change. This shortfall was the result of manufacturing difficulties at the
- 1080 single manufacturer that supplied the Naloxone Buyers Club, resulting in nationwide lack of
- 1081 availability for harm reduction programs [62].
- 1082

### **1083 Programmatic Context**

1084 Prevention Point Pittsburgh staff cautioned that if someone was vomiting, they may not be able

to simultaneously express anger, and therefore the reported numbers are likely an undercount

1086 of experience. Perceptions of what constitutes anger could also be subjective, and in very rare

- 1087 cases extreme, with confrontational action against the person reversing the overdose. But they
- 1088 did not identify reasons why reporting would be different by formulation.
- 1089

## 1090 Adverse Events: "Felt Sick"

1091

## 1092 **Quantitative Results**

- 1093 "Felt sick" was understood by participants to mean "dopesick" from precipitated opioid
- 1094 withdrawal. Cumulatively, 440 cases of "feeling sick" were reported, in 9.6% of OREs (Table 4).

1095 The incidence rate difference between formulations was negligible.

1096

1097 Adverse events where the recipient "felt sick" were highest in 2019, in nearly 25% of OREs, but

- 1098 highest in terms of absolute number (about 175 per year) in 2020, Figure 12. There was a drop
- in reports of "feeling sick" in 2021-2.

1100

## 1101 **Programmatic Context**

1107	Adverse Events: Shaking
1106	
1105	providing the ORE report.
1104	may not be entirely or objectively observable by the person who administered naloxone and was
1103	in feeling sick. However, they pointed out that feeling dopesick was a subjective experience that
1102	Prevention Point Pittsburgh staff did not have a specific attribution to explain temporal variation

1108

## 1109 **Quantitative Results**

1110 Shaking was systematically collected, and was reported in n=33 OREs, and differentially by

1111 formulation: n=27 cases using the 1 mL vial, n=5 with nasal alone, and n=1 with multiple forms

1112 (Fisher's Exact 10.8, 2 df, p<0.005). The incidence rate difference of -5.1 cases (95% CI: -5.0, -

1113 5.3) per 1,000 OREs slightly favored the nasal spray over the 1 mL vial. Shaking was mostly

reported in 2017, Figure 12, with 9 cases, and three or fewer in subsequent years.

1115

## 1116 **Programmatic Context**

1117 Shaking was interpreted by Prevention Point Staff to be a sign of opioid withdrawal, as opposed

to seizures. No plausible explanation for this phenomenon was offered by Prevention Point

1119 Pittsburgh staff.

1120

## 1121 Adverse Events: "Was Okay" versus Death

1122

1123 **Quantitative Results** 

1124	Participants presenting for refills had been asked if the person on whom naloxone was
1125	administered "was okay" after the ORE, to the best of their knowledge, since the start of study
1126	observation. This category is conceptually understood to encompass survivorship, even if
1127	hospital transport or adverse events occurred, and serves as a contextual adjunct to deaths.
1128	Cumulatively, in 5,449 out of 5,521 reports (98.7%) from 2005 to 2023, the participant felt
1129	confident enough to respond. The person on whom naloxone had been used was judged to be
1130	"okay" 98.0% of the time (n=5,340/5,449 among the three dominant naloxone formulations).
1131	Differences by formulation were observed (Pearson $\chi^2$ 32.7, 3 df, p<0.001), but were small:
1132	98.5% okay with 1 mL vial, 99.2% with 10 mL vial, 96.4% with 4 mg nasal spray, and 95.4%
1133	with multiple forms.
1134	
1135	Death as an adverse event was collected from 2016 onwards. There were 47 out of 4,606
1136	reports (1.0%) of death following naloxone administration.
1137	
1138	Programmatic Context
1139	Program staff had strong cautions about interpretation of deaths following naloxone
1140	administration. The death case review provides additional context below. In addition, program
1141	staff felt that as the volume of naloxone distributed has increased within networks of people
1142	using drugs together, there should be increased likelihood of someone at the scene carrying
1143	naloxone. Therefore, they interpreted deaths following naloxone administration as an indirect
1144	indicator of people who had been using drugs alone. Forced isolation during the first year of the
1145	COVID pandemic provided an opportunity to test this hypothesis, as described below.

1146

1147

# **1148 Death Case Review**

#### 1149

### 1150 **Quantitative Results**

- 1151 From 2020 through 2022, encounter notes with contextual information were available for 22 out
- of 23 deaths. In 18 cases the person was found "too late" after death for naloxone to be
- 1153 effective, for example the morning after an overdose that had likely occurred the previous
- evening. In three cases, paramedics told the reporter that there was an alternative cause of
- 1155 death other than overdose. In one instance, a reporter said that police had not allowed her to
- administer the naloxone that she was carrying, and the person died.
- 1157
- 1158 Quantitative AE data allowed empiric corroboration that deaths increased during the height of
- pandemic isolation. Most years, 5 or fewer deaths were reported, Figure 13. However, in 2020,
- the annual reports tripled in both absolute and relative terms. This single-year increase

1161 paralleled the time-trend with AEs for anger, but with much lower sample size.

1162

Figure 13. Annual counts and percents of deaths reported. Vertical bars are counts of adverse event reports by
 year. Green lines are percents of overdose response events annually (N=4,606 total), enumerated on the right
 vertical axis.

1166

#### 1167 **Programmatic Context**

1168 Program staff posited that, under the assumption that using drugs alone was more common

1169 during forced social isolation and quarantine periods of the first year of the COVID-19

1170 pandemic, people who had overdosed may have been less likely to have been found for timely

1171 action. Alternatively, additional respiratory compromise stemming from viral infection could be a

1172 plausible contributory cause. Overwhelmed EMS during the early pandemic could also in part

- 1173 explain the single year increase in reported deaths. Program staff emphasized that they did not
- 1174 experience a drop in service provision during COVID and increased how much supplies were

- 1175 distributed per visit to reduce the need for return visits, as well as providing additional services
- 1176 (food, clothing, etc.) to meet community needs.
- 1177
- 1178

## **Adverse Events and Dose Titration**

1180

During the period where AE information was being systematically recorded (2016 onwards), the 1181 1182 1 mL vial offers a unique opportunity to conceptually explore dose-response between naloxone 1183 dose and adverse events. The expectation was that naloxone dose titration would result in 1184 fewer adverse events. Titration was defined as reporting fractional dosing (n=117 OREs), and 1185 non-titration was defined as integer doses of naloxone administered (n=2.953 OREs). This 1186 imperfect exploratory measure deserves reiteration of the caveat for misclassification: Two half 1187 doses administered separately would be reported as 1.0 dose, but in this simple metric would 1188 be misclassified integer dosing. This is expected to bias towards the null. 1189 1190 Titration of naloxone was recorded in only 4.0% of OREs, but titration of naloxone showed 1191 favorable incidence rate ratios (IRR) for the three most common adverse events (Table S2). 1192 Titration was associated with less emesis IRR=0.26 (95% CI: 0.084, 0.80; Wald  $\chi^2$  2.36, 1193 p=0.018), less anger IRR=0.081 (95% CI: 0.011, 0.57; Wald x<sup>2</sup> 2.5, p=0.012), and less "feeling 1194 sick" IRR=0.44 (95% CI: 0.186, 1.051; Wald X<sup>2</sup> 3.8, *p*=0.051). Death and shaking also showed 1195 favorable tabular distributions for titration, but model-based IRRs could not be computed due to 1196 zero cell counts. 1197

- 1198
- 1199 **DISCUSSION**

1200
------

1201	Community naloxone distribution at Prevention Point Pittsburgh resulted in more than five
1202	thousand reported overdose response events, over 17 years. However, previous studies of
1203	community naloxone distribution are of short duration, providing limited insight into program
1204	implementation and evolution. In addition, the preponderance of real-world data on overdose
1205	reversal with naloxone has originated from emergency medical settings and hospitals, leaving a
1206	gap in the increasingly common practice of community overdose response. Therefore, this
1207	comprehensive report includes key findings from both implementation and biomedical
1208	perspectives.
1209	
1210	In this sample of individuals returning to a harm reduction program for naloxone refills, the
1211	majority of reported OREs indicated success (i.e., the person survived), even in recent years
1212	with fentanyl, xylazine, and methamphetamine prevalent in the local drug supply. A minority, but
1213	not a trivial proportion, had adverse events suggesting precipitated withdrawal.
1214	
1215	Research Questions 1 & 2: Naloxone Utilization after Law
1216	Change
1217	
1218	State law changes at the end of 2014 were intended to remove barriers to naloxone distribution

1219 for harm reduction programs, thereby enabling the intervention to reach broader populations.

1220 The key programmatic finding was that enabling state legislation alone was insufficient to

1221 expand services to populations at greatest risk for overdose [45]. Before the law change, which

1222 expanded legal protections and relaxed prescribing policies, Prevention Point Pittsburgh served

- 1223 a predominantly White network of people who used heroin, a cohort that remained steady and
- aged over time. While enabling legislation in 2015 led to greater naloxone dispensing volume

1225 (10.4 doses per month to 65.9 per month in the year that followed), ORE report volume did not 1226 keep apace: ORE per new participant fell from 1.46 to 0.47 in the year before versus after the 1227 law change. Demographic characteristics offer explanations. In the year after the law was 1228 enacted, new participants were more likely to be older (average age increasing from 37 to 46 years-old), more female (increasing from 35% to 58%), and family or friends of people who use 1229 1230 drugs, a marked shift. Compared to a previous evaluation of Prevention Point data, our 1231 observations are consistent: After enabling legislation, the earlier analysis found that these 1232 demographically different new participants were only 0.04 times as likely to reverse an overdose 1233 compared to people who use drugs [16]. Instead, refocusing distribution directly to networks of 1234 people who use drugs required programmatic effort and intentionality including hiring people 1235 from target communities, providing safer smoking supplies, and starting mobile buprenorphine 1236 induction services.

1237

1238 During the first decade of naloxone distribution and before the 2015 enabling legislation, the 1239 most common response to whom naloxone was administered was "friend or acquaintance." This 1240 could reflect social desirability bias due to the stigmatized nature of the intervention at the time, 1241 and fear of revealing that the participant had transferred the naloxone to someone to whom it 1242 had not been prescribed. Naloxone reversals were concentrated within social networks: 81% of 1243 OREs were performed on friends and acquaintances, not the person to whom it had been 1244 prescribed. Less than 5% was used on family members or the individual who reported the ORE. 1245 Interestingly, the percent of reversals on the reporter themselves (i.e., the person prescribed the 1246 naloxone) was twice as high for nasal sprays (16.9%) than for injectable (8.5% 10mL vial, 5.9% 1247 1mL vial) formulations.

1248

Monthly ORE rates (per 100 doses dispensed, or number of new participants, Figure 3) offer
new possibilities for tracking the impact of policy or programmatic changes in naloxone

1251 distribution. ORE per new participants closely reflects the observations of program staff during 1252 corresponding time periods; although the metric is useful for retrospective analysis, it confirms 1253 what the program already knew from their direct care provision experience. In addition, time 1254 series of OREs per 100 doses dispensed also showed obvious peaks when there were 1255 fluctuations in the drug supply, namely the emergence of illicitly manufactured fentanyl and 1256 carfentanil. We suggest that these metrics may be useful in future epidemiologic studies and 1257 serve as a useful tool for programs to monitor. However, drawing from the research team's 1258 national experience providing technical assistance, we also acknowledge that reversal record 1259 keeping requirements from funders can be a considerable impediment to actual service delivery. 1260 Therefore, we feel that data utility should be secondary to naloxone distribution, and the former 1261 should not impede the latter.

1262

## **Research Question 3: Racial Identity of New Participants**

1264

1265 Addressing our third research question, as overdose death rates in underserved racialized 1266 minority communities began to increase, the program intentionally fostered new mobile outreach 1267 sites in January 2016, and started distributing safer smoking supplies that met the needs of that 1268 community. Black racial identity of new participants increased from 27% to 39%. These 1269 innovations led to significantly more naloxone distribution and ORE reports. However, time-1270 series evaluation identified an inflection point in December 2020 after which the share of White participants increased. Programmatic context revealed that this was due to expansion of mobile 1271 1272 services to additional neighborhoods to provide on-demand buprenorphine treatment for opioid 1273 use disorders, where take-home naloxone was also provided. Racial disparities in the uptake of 1274 buprenorphine services have been well-documented [63,64], and are known to have been 1275 exacerbated during the COVID pandemic [65]. These national trends and the experience at

- 1276 Prevention Point Pittsburgh are consistent. The findings suggest that new targeted
- 1277 programmatic strategies will be needed to expand medication assisted treatment to
- 1278 communities of color.
- 1279

## 1280 **Research Questions 4 & 5: Doses per Overdose Response**

- 1281 **Event**
- 1282

1283 Per our fourth and fifth research questions, we found that the average doses of naloxone 1284 needed to reverse an overdose has not changed over time (segmented regression change point 1285 p=0.60; however, formulation effects were also observed. In the first decade of operation when 1286 overdoses were predominantly due to heroin, distribution of 10 mL naloxone vials resulted in an 1287 average of 1.85 doses per ORE. When naloxone distribution shifted to single-unit packaging, 1288 coincident with the appearance of illicitly manufactured fentanyl in the local drug supply [46], 1289 average doses were lower: 1.51 doses per ORE with the 1 mL vials, and 1.63 doses with the 4 1290 mg nasal spray. Utilization implications for single-versus multi-dose packaging for liquid 1291 pharmaceuticals has been explored in the context of image contrast media [66] and vaccines 1292 [67], but has not been previously described for naloxone. However, studies on formulation 1293 preference between injectable and nasal forms of take-home naloxone have revealed mixed 1294 desires among the target population [68], and the current programmatic recommendation is to 1295 offer both. Programmatic context in our study revealed that preferences are not static within an 1296 individual and are related to how might be used: injectable for home and to be used on 1297 themselves, versus nasal spray for carrying in a purse to be used on others. Higher dose 1298 naloxone products were not evaluated in this study, but have been described elsewhere [69,70]. 1299 It is worth contextualizing dosing trends as the overdose epidemic evolved from one of 1300 prescription opioids to heroin, and from heroin to fentanyl – three periods defined as a "triple

wave" phenomenon [1]. Using state Allegheny County inflections in fatal and non-fatal
overdose to define these waves [71,72], average naloxone per ORE decreased from 1.92
(95%CI: 1.79, 2.05) in the first wave (2008-2011) to 1.57 (95% CI: 1.50, 1.64) in the second
wave (2012-2015), then remained stable between the second and third (2016-2023) waves
(1.60 doses, 95% CI: 1.57, 1.63). These data may be partly confounded by formulation trends
discussed above; further investigation into the relationship between the drug supply and ORE
behaviors is warranted.

1308

There was also an uptick in doses per ORE administered in 2022, as xylazine entered the local drug supply [73]. Average dose of naloxone in 2021 was 1.67 (95% CI: 1.58, 1.75) increasing to 1.75 (95% CI: 1.67, 1.84) in 2022. Additional doses may have been administered because lack of reanimation even if respiration was restored. Program staff adapted to this circumstance by emphasizing counting breaths before administering more naloxone, and specifically counselling respondents who reported using more than two doses. The influence of xylazine on communitybased naloxone administration practice needs further research.

1316

## 1317 **Research Question 6: Calling 911**

1318

We found that 911 was only called in 16% of ORE reports across the 17.6 year observation period. There was a transient increase in calls to 911 after enactment of the Good Samaritan law in January 2015, but by December 2017 the proportion dropped considerably, so much so that in the last 6 months of observation, less than 6% of OREs involved calling 911. There is ample evidence that people who use drugs remain fearful of arrests [74–77] when calling 911, despite the Good Samaritan law. Other possible factors that could be considered include the perception that there is no need for further treatment, fear of getting additional naloxone from

1326	uniformed first responders, stigma, cost, and wanting to use again because of withdrawal
1327	symptoms. The observed reluctance to call 911 also has implications when considering data
1328	derived from EMS and other medical encounters, given that these represent an unknown
1329	fraction of actual overdose reversals and are therefore a selected sample that may not be
1330	representative of all reversal events, in terms of formulations, doses, AEs, and outcomes.
1331	

## **1332** Research Question 7: Deaths

1333

1334 Research question 7, which addressed circumstances surrounding deaths, was examined using 1335 empirical findings and narrative review of reports of deaths. Most deaths (18 out of 23) occurred 1336 when the person was found "too late" to intervene. We were able to observe that deaths peaked 1337 in 2020 during the isolation phase of the COVID pandemic. Program staff emphasized that in all 1338 their years working in this program, they are not aware of any participants stating that they had 1339 administered naloxone but the person still died because they did not have enough naloxone. 1340 There were 4.5 per 1,000 OREs more deaths reported with the nasal spray than 1 mL vial; 1341 however, strong cautions are warranted about drawing conclusions because using alone and 1342 being discovered "too late" could confound the empirical observation. 1343

# **1344** Research Question 8: Adverse Events and Titration

1345

Per research question 8, concerning the relationship between formulation or dose titration and
adverse events, we found significant differences by formulation for the most common AEs,
emesis and anger. Per 1,000 OREs, there were 106 additional reports of emesis with the 4 mg
nasal spray compared to 1 mL vials; for anger, there were 48 additional reports per 1,000

1350 OREs. Events of wooden chest syndrome and stiffness, related to synthetic opioid exposure,

- 1351 were not reported in this study.
- 1352

## 1353 Limitations

1354

1355 This study has several limitations that should be considered. It represents the experience of a single harm reduction program and, per the EMI framework, study results are not generalizable 1356 1357 to other community settings or cities. Self-reported interview data are subject to recall bias, with 1358 respondents potentially more likely to remember extreme or negative events. Participant reports 1359 were from laypersons without medical training, and reporting of adverse events may have 1360 varying accuracy. Naloxone obtained from other sources in Pittsburgh are not captured in 1361 dispensing data. While it is possible that the same overdose event may be reported by the 1362 person who administered naloxone as well as the person to whom it was administered, this is 1363 unlikely because refills were recorded. It was not possible to link to hospital or vital statistics in 1364 this anonymized dataset. There was no way to observe the counterfactual, namely what would 1365 have happened if the antidote had not been administered; some overdoses may have been self-1366 resolving without naloxone administration. Despite these limitations, the detailed quantitative 1367 and programmatic context documented provide a broad historical perspective on naloxone 1368 distribution and use.

1369

Finally, we acknowledge that record keeping of OREs has been contentious among harm reduction programs because it can place substantial administrative burden on staff that detracts from their ability to distribute naloxone and provide other direct services. By adopting the collaborative EMI process, we present an alternative model whereby important programmatic

- 1374 considerations and quantitative insights are given equal credence, and where the research
- 1375 questions are mutually agreed upon.
- 1376

# 1377 **Policy Implications**

1378

1379 Our findings suggest five policy implications. First, enabling legislation to expand naloxone access is necessary but insufficient alone to reach those at highest risk for overdose. Laws and 1380 1381 policies intended to expand community-based naloxone distribution should consider what 1382 additional practical support is required to reach the underserved. In this example from 1383 Prevention Point Pittsburgh, outreach to underserved communities and high-risk populations 1384 represent deliberate strategies that were enabled by the legislation. Diversification of harm 1385 reduction services beyond naloxone and provision of sterile injecting equipment can also 1386 increase naloxone dispensing, such as occurred in this setting with the inclusion of safer 1387 smoking supplies and mobile buprenorphine services. These program adaptations are 1388 consistent with national trends; the Centers for Disease Control & Prevention recently reported 1389 that smoking has supplanted injection as the route of administration most often implicated in 1390 overdose death [78].

1391

Second, enabling legislation in Pennsylvania led to a decrease in naloxone being confiscated by law enforcement, but one death was reported following an incident in which someone carrying naloxone was prohibited by police from administering it. In addition, reports of excessive additional doses administered by EMS and police after successful revival by peers should be investigated. EMS policy and protocols should be re-evaluated in the context of bystander administration to ensure naloxone dosing conforms to evolving medical best practice.

1398

Third, the Good Samaritan law appeared to have an observable but time-limited effect on increasing calls to 911. These state laws may need to be revised if they are to be more effective. The very low rate of calling 911 in recent years bears further investigation [79], such as to clarify when support services are most medically necessary, and identify social and legal barriers including the impact of drug-induced homicide laws [80]. These investigations will be crucial in the context of over-the-counter naloxone, which has explicit instructions to call 911.

1406 Fourth, consistent with previous analyses [16,19,81], we found that 1 mL vials injected 1407 intramuscularly were effectively used in thousands of reversals. Certain adverse events were 1408 lower than with the 4 mg nasal spray, but participants expressed a desire for both injectable and 1409 nasal formulations. Given historical fluctuations in funding for and availability of naloxone, 1410 program participants would be best served knowing how to use both types of naloxone, and 1411 policies, standing orders, and laws should allow parity in access between different formulations. 1412 Differences in adverse event profiles between naloxone formulations [69,70] may be of 1413 relevance to policymakers. The behavior of titrating doses of naloxone to prevent adverse 1414 events also suggests that there may be underrecognized demand for formulations that deliver 1415 smaller or fractional doses, and reinforces the policy importance of ensuring that multiple forms 1416 of naloxone are available. Education on dose titration within harm reduction programs may also 1417 be an opportunity to prevent or reduce adverse events.

1418

Fifth, sharing of naloxone between participants is a natural phenomenon, especially when provided at no cost to the participant. While secondary distribution of sterile syringes has been extensively studied in many countries [82–86], corresponding studies for naloxone distribution have not been published. Primary encounters with harm reduction staff provide opportunity for additional services to be offered (not just drug-related), a benefit that is attenuated through secondary distribution. Furthering this trend, over-the-counter versions of naloxone nasal sprays

1425 were approved by FDA in 2023, naloxone-dispensing vending machines are rapidly expanding 1426 [87], and mail order naloxone distribution has been established on a national scale [88], 1427 eschewing the direct human connection necessary for the comprehensive harm reduction 1428 services like Prevention Point Pittsburgh have traditionally provided. Concerted policy, 1429 technology, telehealth, and communication innovations could supplement these innovative 1430 distribution channels to re-establish more comprehensive care possibilities in an era where 1431 naloxone distribution is becoming more indirect. As demonstrated by the rich programmatic 1432 context in this paper, traditional harm reduction programs possess a depth of untapped applied 1433 experience that can inform broader policy and regulatory decisions.

1434

# 1435 Future Research Needs

1436

1437 Severe precipitated withdrawal should not be dismissed as an "unavoidable" adverse event 1438 expected to occur in some OREs using antagonists, but rather needs to be studied 1439 independently, especially as it could lead to short- and long-term changes in behavior that 1440 increase risk for subsequent overdose; further research is needed to determine how withdrawal-1441 related AEs can be reduced. For example, severe withdrawal can lead to immediate and 1442 repeated re-dosing with opioid agonists. In the weeks that follow an ORE, negative withdrawal 1443 experiences could also lead to use of street drugs alone. Co-author and Prevention Point Staff 1444 member MV shared testimony at a scientific conference articulating this connection. He had 1445 overdosed on heroin among strangers who administered 3 doses of naloxone, and he then 1446 received multiple unknown additional doses from uniformed first responders. He felt very 1447 anxious and was vomiting so frequently he had trouble breathing: "I tried to re-dose with heroin 1448 every 15 minutes to feel anything other than this horrible feeling. For months after that bad

overdose, I was super hesitant to use around others. I mostly wanted to use alone to avoid
something like that from happening again which put me at great risk." [89]

1451

1452 To empirically establish post-overdose behavioral consequences, validated and easy-to-use 1453 outcome measures for overdose severity and response could be developed. Randomized field 1454 studies, such as comparing formulations of opioid antagonists, could also provide empirical 1455 evidence to inform policy and local purchasing decisions. Further research may also be 1456 warranted into other factors at the pharmaceutical formulation level, in terms of 1457 pharmacokinetics or packaging. And finally, training on timing and titration of dose 1458 administration and rescue breathing all bear scientific scrutiny. Qualitative studies involving 1459 those with lived experience should be considered to bring light to dimensions of community-1460 based naloxone distribution and bystander naloxone administration that are not observable 1461 guantitatively [90,91]. Regardless of the method, there is pressing need for this type of work to 1462 more fully understand unmet needs in a changing environment.

1463

# 1464 CONCLUSION

1465

This comprehensive analysis of a harm reduction program reveals that while enabling state legislation can create the environment for expanded naloxone distribution, when naloxone is distributed to people not at risk of overdose or their immediate social networks, increases in dispensing volume can become negatively decoupled from actual administration and overdose reversal. Expanding services to underserved communities requires additional innovation. We also found that the long-term consistency of less than 2 doses per ORE, high survival rate, and robust utilization all lend confidence in prioritizing naloxone distribution directly to people who

- 1473 use drugs. Finally, we found lower rates of adverse events with lower doses of naloxone,
- 1474 titration, and with injectable intramuscular formulations. Collectively, these findings can help re-
- 1475 prioritize community-based naloxone distribution to those most likely to use the antidote to
- 1476 reverse an opioid overdose.

#### 1477 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

1478 We thank the participants of Prevention Point Pittsburgh for their work in reversing opioid

- 1479 overdoses. We are indebted to Dan Bigg and staff at the Chicago Recovery Alliance who
- 1480 provided free naloxone to Prevention Point Pittsburgh in early years of this study and originated
- 1481 this intervention. We thank LaMonda Sykes, Bridgette Mountain, and Natalie Sutton for
- 1482 administrative support at UNC. We thank Alex Bennett and Tiffany Fitzpatrick for helping to
- 1483 implement naloxone distribution guickly in 2005 when overdose deaths began to spike from
- 1484 fentanyl in the opioid supply. Additional FDA project workgroup members included Mallika
- 1485 Mundkur, Tamra Meyer, Candice Collins, Chi-Ming (Alice) Tu, Celia Winchell, Bic Nguyen,
- 1486 Nushin Todd, Srikanth Nallani, Rigoberto Roca, Blair Coleman, Sanae Cherkaoui.
- 1487

#### 1488 **TRIAL REGISTRATION**

- 1489 This investigation was pre-registered osf.io/b2f4h
- 1490

#### CODE AND DATA SHARING STATEMENT 1491

- 1492 Pre-registration: DOI osf.io/b2f4h. Codebook, data collection form, and analytic code: DOI
- 1493 osf.io/sq5d6. Data were provided by Prevention Point Pittsburgh and are used with permission.
- 1494 Due to the sensitive nature of syringe service provision, and the risk of deductive disclosure, the decision was made to not make the data public. Interested parties can contact Alice Bell at
- 1495
- 1496 Prevention Point Pittsburgh for collaboration and data requests. 1497

#### 1498 CONTRIBUTORSHIP STATEMENT

- 1499 ND, AB, MDS, EW, MN, AS, DC, ZD, and AM contributed to study conceptualization and
- 1500 design. AB and MV (and other Prevention Point Pittsburgh staff) conducted data collection and
- 1501 entry, and provided operational context. ND conducted the statistical analysis and is solely
- 1502 responsible for data integrity. All authors contributed to result interpretation and manuscript
- 1503 development.
- 1504
- 1505

#### 1506 REFERENCES 1507 1508 1. Dasgupta N, Beletsky L, Ciccarone D. Opioid Crisis: No Easy Fix to Its Social and Economic 1509 Determinants. Am J Public Health. 2018;108: 182–186. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2017.304187 1510 2. Dasgupta N, Creppage K, Austin A, Ringwalt C, Sanford C, Proescholdbell SK. Observed transition from opioid analgesic deaths toward heroin. Drug Alcohol Depend. 2014;145: 1511 1512 238-241. doi:10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2014.10.005 1513 3. Jones CM, Bekheet F, Park JN, Alexander GC. The Evolving Overdose Epidemic: Synthetic 1514 Opioids and Rising Stimulant-Related Harms. Epidemiol Rev. 2020;42: 154–166. doi:10.1093/epirev/mxaa011 1515 1516 D'Orsogna MR, Böttcher L, Chou T. Fentanyl-driven acceleration of racial, gender and 4. 1517 geographical disparities in drug overdose deaths in the United States. Nazif-Munoz JI, editor. PLOS Glob Public Health. 2023;3: e0000769. doi:10.1371/journal.pgph.0000769 1518 1519 Ovalle D. In grim milestone, U.S. overdose deaths top 100,000 for third straight year. 5. 1520 Washington Post. 15 May 2024. Available: https://www.washingtonpost.com/health/2024/05/15/opioid-deaths-100000/. Accessed 1521 1522 16 May 2024. 1523 6. Mann, Brian. U.S. drug deaths declined slightly in 2023 but remained at crisis levels. NPR. 15 May 2024. Available: https://www.npr.org/sections/health-1524 shots/2024/05/15/1251239829/us-drug-overdose-deaths-provisional-2023. Accessed 16 1525 May 2024. 1526 Razaghizad A, Windle SB, Filion KB, Gore G, Kudrina I, Paraskevopoulos E, et al. The Effect 1527 7. of Overdose Education and Naloxone Distribution: An Umbrella Review of Systematic 1528 1529 Reviews. Am J Public Health. 2021;111: e1-e12. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2021.306306 1530 Cuadros DF, Branscum AJ, Moreno CM, MacKinnon NJ. Narrative minireview of the spatial 8. epidemiology of substance use disorder in the United States: Who is at risk and where? 1531 1532 World J Clin Cases. 2023;11: 2374-2385. doi:10.12998/wjcc.v11.i11.2374 1533 Smart R, Pardo B, Davis CS. Systematic review of the emerging literature on the 9. effectiveness of naloxone access laws in the United States. Addiction. 2021;116: 6–17. 1534 1535 doi:10.1111/add.15163 10. Freiermuth CE, Ancona RM, Brown JL, Punches BE, Ryan SA, Ingram T, et al. Evaluation of a 1536 1537 large-scale health department naloxone distribution program: Per capita naloxone 1538 distribution and overdose morality. Haj-Mirzaian A, editor. PLoS ONE. 2023;18: e0289959.

Nolen S, Zang X, Chatterjee A, Behrends CN, Green TC, Linas BP, et al. Evaluating equity in
 community-based naloxone access among racial/ethnic groups in Massachusetts. Drug
 and Alcohol Dependence. 2022;241: 109668. doi:10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2022.109668

- Naumann RB, Durrance CP, Ranapurwala SI, Austin AE, Proescholdbell S, Childs R, et al.
   Impact of a community-based naloxone distribution program on opioid overdose death
   rates. Drug and Alcohol Dependence. 2019;204: 107536.
- 1546 doi:10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2019.06.038
- Patel SV, Wenger LD, Kral AH, Sherr K, Wagner AD, Davidson PJ, et al. Optimizing naloxone
   distribution to prevent opioid overdose fatalities: results from piloting the Systems
   Analysis and Improvement Approach within syringe service programs. BMC Health Serv
   Res. 2023;23: 278. doi:10.1186/s12913-023-09289-8
- Piper TM, Stancliff S, Rudenstine S, Sherman S, Nandi V, Clear A, et al. Evaluation of a
   Naloxone Distribution and Administration Program in New York City. Substance Use &
   Misuse. 2008;43: 858–870. doi:10.1080/10826080701801261
- Drainoni M-L, Koppelman EA, Feldman JA, Walley AY, Mitchell PM, Ellison J, et al. Why is it so hard to implement change? A qualitative examination of barriers and facilitators to distribution of naloxone for overdose prevention in a safety net environment. BMC Res Notes. 2016;9: 465. doi:10.1186/s13104-016-2268-z
- Bennett AS, Bell A, Doe-Simkins M, Elliott L, Pouget E, Davis C. From Peers to Lay
   Bystanders: Findings from a Decade of Naloxone Distribution in Pittsburgh, PA. Journal of
   Psychoactive Drugs. 2018;50: 240–246. doi:10.1080/02791072.2018.1430409
- 1561 17. Rhodes T, Lancaster K. Evidence-making interventions in health: A conceptual framing.
  1562 Social Science & Medicine. 2019;238: 112488.
- Wheeler E, Davidson PJ, Jones TS, Irwin KS. Community-based opioid overdose prevention
   programs providing naloxone United States, 2010. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.
   2012;61: 101–105.
- Bennett AS, Bell A, Tomedi L, Hulsey EG, Kral AH. Characteristics of an Overdose
   Prevention, Response, and Naloxone Distribution Program in Pittsburgh and Allegheny
   County, Pennsylvania. J Urban Health. 2011;88: 1020–1030. doi:10.1007/s11524-011 9600-7
- Doe-Simkins M, Walley AY, Epstein A, Moyer P. Saved by the nose: bystander administered intranasal naloxone hydrochloride for opioid overdose. Am J Public Health.
   2009;99: 788–791. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2008.146647
- 1573 21. Albert S, Brason FW, Sanford CK, Dasgupta N, Graham J, Lovette B. Project Lazarus:
  1574 community-based overdose prevention in rural North Carolina. Pain Med. 2011;12 Suppl
  1575 2: S77-85. doi:10.1111/j.1526-4637.2011.01128.x

1576 1577	22.	Kolbe L, Fins JJ. The Birth of Naloxone: An Intellectual History of an Ambivalent Opioid. Camb Q Healthc Ethics. 2021;30: 637–650. doi:10.1017/S0963180121000116
1578 1579 1580	23.	Bohler RM, Freeman PR, Villani J, Hunt T, Linas BS, Walley AY, et al. The policy landscape for naloxone distribution in four states highly impacted by fatal opioid overdoses. Drug and Alcohol Dependence Reports. 2023;6: 100126. doi:10.1016/j.dadr.2022.100126
1581 1582 1583	24.	Maxwell S, Bigg D, Stanczykiewicz K, Carlberg-Racich S. Prescribing Naloxone to Actively Injecting Heroin Users: A Program to Reduce Heroin Overdose Deaths. Journal of Addictive Diseases. 2006;25: 89–96. doi:10.1300/J069v25n03_11
1584 1585	25.	Campbell ND. Od: naloxone and the politics of overdose prevention. Cambridge, MA London, England: The MIT Press; 2020.
1586 1587	26.	Szalavitz M. Undoing drugs: the untold story of harm reduction and the future of addiction. 2021.
1588 1589 1590	27.	Wheeler E, Jones TS, Gilbert MK, Davidson PJ. Opioid overdose prevention programs providing naloxone to laypersons—United States, 2014. MMWR Morbidity and mortality weekly report. 2015;64: 631.
1591 1592 1593 1594	28.	Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. Expansion of naloxone in the prevention of opioid overdose FAQs. 2014 [cited 29 May 2024]. Available: https://www.samhsa.gov/sites/default/files/programs_campaigns/medication_assisted/e xpansion-of-naloxone-faq.pdf
1595 1596 1597 1598 1599	29.	Health Resources and Services Administration. Rural Access to Emergency Devices – Opioid Overdose Reversal Grant Program. In: Funding Cycle View [Internet]. 26 Jun 2015 [cited 29 May 2024]. Available: https://grants.hrsa.gov/2010/Web2External/Interface/FundingCycle/ExternalView.aspx?f CycleID=e80a781a-769e-4fcb-9372-4f5abbc7998b
1600 1601 1602	30.	Green TC, Heimer R, Grau LE. Distinguishing signs of opioid overdose and indication for naloxone: an evaluation of six overdose training and naloxone distribution programs in the United States. Addiction. 2008;103: 979–989. doi:10.1111/j.1360-0443.2008.02182.x
1603 1604 1605 1606	31.	Seal KH. Naloxone Distribution and Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation Training for Injection Drug Users to Prevent Heroin Overdose Death: A Pilot Intervention Study. Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine. 2005;82: 303–311. doi:10.1093/jurban/jti053
1607 1608	32.	Yokell MA, Green TC, Bowman S, McKenzie M, Rich JD. Opioid overdose prevention and naloxone distribution in Rhode Island. Med Health R I. 2011;94: 240–242.
1609 1610	33.	Sherman SG, Gann DS, Tobin KE, Latkin CA, Welsh C, Bielenson P. "The life they save may be mine": Diffusion of overdose prevention information from a city sponsored

- 1611 programme. International Journal of Drug Policy. 2009;20: 137–142.
- 1612 doi:10.1016/j.drugpo.2008.02.004
- 34. Doe-Simkins M, Wheeler EJ, Figgatt MC, Jones TS, Bell A, Davidson PJ, et al. Naloxone
  Buyers Club: Overlooked Critical Public Health Infrastructure for Preventing Overdose
  Deaths. 2021. doi:10.1101/2021.11.14.21266221
- 1616 35. LaSane K. For the People: Autonomy and Equity in Naloxone Distribution. [cited 29 May1617 2024]. doi:10.17615/FA7F-1T13
- 36. 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;346: f174–f174.
  doi:10.1136/bmj.f174
- 1622 37. Coffin PO, Sullivan SD. Cost-Effectiveness of Distributing Naloxone to Heroin Users for Lay
  1623 Overdose Reversal. Ann Intern Med. 2013;158: 1. doi:10.7326/0003-4819-158-11624 201301010-00003
- 1625 38. Coffin PO, Maya S, Kahn JG. Modeling of overdose and naloxone distribution in the setting
  1626 of fentanyl compared to heroin. Drug Alcohol Depend. 2022;236: 109478.
  1627 doi:10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2022.109478
- 39. Xu J, Davis CS, Cruz M, Lurie P. State naloxone access laws are associated with an increase
  in the number of naloxone prescriptions dispensed in retail pharmacies. Drug and Alcohol
  Dependence. 2018;189: 37–41. doi:10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2018.04.020
- 40. Gertner AK, Domino ME, Davis CS. Do naloxone access laws increase outpatient naloxone
  prescriptions? Evidence from Medicaid. Drug and Alcohol Dependence. 2018;190: 37–41.
  doi:10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2018.05.014
- 41. Morrone WR. President's message: Food and Drug Administration approved naloxone and continued use of improvised nasal naloxone: What is a treatment advocate and educator to do? Journal of Addictive Diseases. 2016;35: 339–345.
  1637 dei:10.1020/10550287.2016.1226582
- 1637 doi:10.1080/10550887.2016.1226582
- 1638 42. Frankel TC. How one company profited while delaying Narcan's drugstore debut.
- 1639 Washington Post. 18 Sep 2023. Available:
- 1640https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/2023/09/18/narcan-over-the-counter-delays-1641emergent-biosolutions/. Accessed 29 May 2024.
- 43. Cohen BR, Mahoney KM, Baro E, Squire C, Beck M, Travis S, et al. FDA Initiative for Drug
  Facts Label for Over-the-Counter Naloxone. N Engl J Med. 2020;382: 2129–2136.
  doi:10.1056/NEJMsa1912403
medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.21.24317731; this version posted November 22, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. This article is a US Government work. It is not subject to copyright under 17 USC 105 and is also made available for use under a CC0 license.

- 1645 44. Kuehn BM. Easy-to-Use Overdose Antidote Earns Fast-Track Approval. JAMA. 2014;311:
  1600. doi:10.1001/jama.2014.4483
- 1647 45. Dasgupta N. Analysis of 17 years of naloxone distribution and administration data from
  1648 Prevention Point Pittsburgh. 2023 [cited 22 Mar 2024]. doi:10.17605/OSF.IO/B2F4H
- 46. Creppage KE, Yohannan J, Williams K, Buchanich JM, Songer TJ, Wisniewski SR, et al. The
  Rapid Escalation of Fentanyl in Illicit Drug Evidence in Allegheny County, Pennsylvania,
  2010-2016. Public Health Rep. 2018;133: 142–146. doi:10.1177/0033354917753119
- Lancaster K, Rhodes T, Rosengarten M. Making evidence and policy in public health
  emergencies: lessons from COVID-19 for adaptive evidence-making and intervention.
  Evidence & Policy. 2020;16: 477–490. doi:10.1332/174426420X15913559981103
- 1655 48. Satterthwaite FE. An Approximate Distribution of Estimates of Variance Components.
  1656 Biometrics Bulletin. 1946;2: 110. doi:10.2307/3002019

49. Burfoot-Rochford I, Schafft KA. "This Is a Good Neighborhood. This Ain't No Pittsburgh!":
1658 Conflicting Narratives of Opioid Misuse within Rural School Districts and Communities.
1659 American Journal of Education. 2021;128: 1–28. doi:10.1086/716461

- 1660 50. US Census Bureau. Allegheny County, Pennsylvania Census Bureau Profile. [cited 29 May1661 2024]. Available:
- 1662https://data.census.gov/profile/Allegheny\_County,\_Pennsylvania?g=050XX00US42003#ra1663ce-and-ethnicity
- 1664 51. Jakubowski A, Fox A. Defining Low-threshold Buprenorphine Treatment. Journal of
   Addiction Medicine. 2020;14: 95–98. doi:10.1097/ADM.0000000000555
- 1666 52. Keane C, Egan JE, Hawk M. Effects of naloxone distribution to likely bystanders: Results of
  an agent-based model. International Journal of Drug Policy. 2018;55: 61–69.
  doi:10.1016/j.drugpo.2018.02.008
- 1669 53. Bazzi AR, Valasek CJ, Stamos-Buesig T, Eger WH, Harvey-Vera A, Vera CF, et al. Health,
  1670 harm reduction, and social service providers' perspectives on the appropriateness and
  1671 feasibility of peer distribution of HIV self-test kits among people who use drugs. Harm
  1672 Reduct J. 2024;21: 29. doi:10.1186/s12954-024-00950-x
- 1673 54. Hanson BL, Porter RR, Zöld AL, Terhorst-Miller H. Preventing opioid overdose with peeradministered naloxone: findings from a rural state. Harm Reduct J. 2020;17: 4.
  1675 doi:10.1186/s12954-019-0352-0
- 1676 55. Gittens RA. Atlanta's Pink Trap House: Reimagining the Black Public Sphere as an Aesthetic
  1677 Community. Theory & Event. 2021;24: 434–455. doi:10.1353/tae.2021.0021

1678 56. Curry SR, Samuels GM, Cerven C, Dworsky A. Navigating Housing Instability and Substance
1679 Use: Hidden Tensions Facing Youth in Small Town America. Journal of Social Service
1680 Research. 2020;46: 361–378. doi:10.1080/01488376.2019.1575322

- 1681 57. Jawa R, Murray S, Blakemore S, Ventura AS, Hristova T, Wilder A, et al. Xylazine and
  1682 Adulterants in the Evolving Drug Supply: Urgent Call for Responsive Education Models.
  1683 Substance Use & amp; Addiction Journal. 2024;45: 168–175.
- 1684 doi:10.1177/29767342241231114
- 1685 58. AIDS Institute, New York State Department of Health. New York State Technical Working
  1686 Group on Resuscitation Training in Naloxone Provision Programs, 2016 Report. Available:
  1687 https://www.health.ny.gov/diseases/aids/general/opioid\_overdose\_prevention/docs/resu
  1688 scitation\_training.pdf
- 1689 59. CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE, DRUG, DEVICE AND COSMETIC ACT DRUG OVERDOSE
   1690 RESPONSE IMMUNITY, Act of Sep. 30, 2014. PL 2487, SB 1164.

1691 60. Carroll JJ, Ostrach B, Wilson L, Dunlap JL, Getty R, Bennett J. Drug induced homicide laws
1692 may worsen opioid related harms: An example from rural North Carolina. International
1693 Journal of Drug Policy. 2021;97: 103406. doi:10.1016/j.drugpo.2021.103406

- 1694 61. Jalal H, Burke DS. Carfentanil and the rise and fall of overdose deaths in the United States.
  1695 Addiction. 2021;116: 1593–1599. doi:10.1111/add.15260
- 1696 62. Kornfield M. Naloxone supply issues threaten worsening drug overdose crisis. The
  1697 Washington Post. 11 Aug 2021. Available:
  1608 https://www.washington.act.com//washin
- 1698https://www.washingtonpost.com/health/2021/08/11/naloxone-demand/. Accessed 91699Sep 2024.
- Schuler MS, Dick AW, Stein BD. Growing racial/ethnic disparities in buprenorphine
  distribution in the United States, 2007-2017. Drug and Alcohol Dependence. 2021;223:
  108710. doi:10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2021.108710
- Hansen H, Siegel C, Wanderling J, DiRocco D. Buprenorphine and methadone treatment
  for opioid dependence by income, ethnicity and race of neighborhoods in New York City.
  Drug and Alcohol Dependence. 2016;164: 14–21. doi:10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2016.03.028
- 1706 65. Nguyen T, Ziedan E, Simon K, Miles J, Crystal S, Samples H, et al. Racial and Ethnic
  1707 Disparities in Buprenorphine and Extended-Release Naltrexone Filled Prescriptions During
  1708 the COVID-19 Pandemic. JAMA Netw Open. 2022;5: e2214765.
  1709 dei 10.1004 (in page de page 2022.11765)
- 1709 doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.14765
- 1710 66. Lindsey JS, Frederick-Dyer K, Carr JJ, Cooke E, Allen LM, Omary RA. Modeling the
  1711 Environmental and Financial Impact of Multi-dose vs. Single-dose Iodinated Contrast
  1712 Media Packaging and Delivery Systems. Academic Radiology. 2023;30: 1017–1023.
  1713 doi:10.1016/j.acra.2022.12.029

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.21.24317731; this version posted November 22, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. This article is a US Government work. It is not subject to copyright under 17 USC 105 and is also made available for use under a CC0 license.

1714 67. Lee BY, Norman BA, Assi T-M, Chen S-I, Bailey RR, Rajgopal J, et al. Single versus multi-dose
1715 vaccine vials: An economic computational model. Vaccine. 2010;28: 5292–5300.
1716 doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2010.05.048

- 1717 68. Neale J, Farrugia A, Campbell AN, Dietze P, Dwyer R, Fomiatti R, et al. Understanding
  1718 preferences for type of take-home naloxone device: international qualitative analysis of
  1719 the views of people who use opioids. Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy. 2022;29:
  1720 109–120. doi:10.1080/09687637.2021.1872499
- Payne ER, Stancliff S, Rowe K, Christie JA, Dailey MW. Comparison of Administration of 8Milligram and 4-Milligram Intranasal Naloxone by Law Enforcement During Response to
  Suspected Opioid Overdose New York, March 2022–August 2023. MMWR Morb Mortal
  Wkly Rep. 2024;73: 110–113. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7305a4
- 1725 70. Rock P, Slavova S, Westgate PM, Nakamura A, Walsh SL. Examination of naloxone dosing patterns for opioid overdose by emergency medical services in Kentucky during increased fentanyl use from 2018 to 2021. Drug and Alcohol Dependence. 2024;255: 111062.
  1728 doi:10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2023.111062
- 1729 71. Ciccarone D. The rise of illicit fentanyls, stimulants and the fourth wave of the opioid
  1730 overdose crisis. Curr Opin Psychiatry. 2021;34: 344–350.
  1731 doi:10.1097/YCO.0000000000717
- Pennsylvania Department of Health, Office of Drug Surveillance and Misuse Prevention.
   Fatal and Non-Fatal Drug Overdose Surveillance Interactive Data Report. Available:
   https://public.tableau.com/app/profile/pennsylvania.pdmp/viz/PennsylvaniaODSMPDrug
   OverdoseSurveillanceInteractiveDataReport/Contents
- 1736 73. Zagorski CM, Hosey RA, Moraff C, Ferguson A, Figgatt M, Aronowitz S, et al. Reducing the
  harms of xylazine: clinical approaches, research deficits, and public health context. Harm
  1738 Reduct J. 2023;20: 141. doi:10.1186/s12954-023-00879-7
- 1739 74. Van Der Meulen E, Chu SKH. "The Law Doesn't Protect Me": Examining the Effectiveness
  1740 of Good Samaritan Drug Overdose Legislation. Substance Use & Misuse. 2022;57: 1392–
  1741 1399. doi:10.1080/10826084.2022.2083173
- 1742 75. Latimore AD, Bergstein RS. "Caught with a body" yet protected by law? Calling 911 for
  1743 opioid overdose in the context of the Good Samaritan Law. International Journal of Drug
  1744 Policy. 2017;50: 82–89. doi:10.1016/j.drugpo.2017.09.010
- Ackermann E, Kievit B, Xavier J, Barbic S, Ferguson M, Greer A, et al. Awareness and
  knowledge of the Good Samaritan Drug Overdose Act among people at risk of witnessing
  an overdose in British Columbia, Canada: a multi-methods cross sectional study. Subst
  Abuse Treat Prev Policy. 2022;17: 42. doi:10.1186/s13011-022-00472-4

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.21.24317731; this version posted November 22, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. This article is a US Government work. It is not subject to copyright under 17 USC 105 and is also made available for use under a CC0 license.

77. Schneider KE, Park JN, Allen ST, Weir BW, Sherman SG. Knowledge of Good Samaritan 1749 1750 Laws and Beliefs About Arrests Among Persons Who Inject Drugs a Year After Policy 1751 Change in Baltimore, Maryland. Public Health Rep. 2020;135: 393–400. 1752 doi:10.1177/0033354920915439

1753 78. Tanz LJ, Gladden RM, Dinwiddie AT, Miller KD, Broz D, Spector E, et al. Routes of Drug Use Among Drug Overdose Deaths — United States, 2020–2022. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly 1754 1755 Rep. 2024;73: 124–130. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7306a2

- 1756 79. Wagner KD, Koch B, Bowles JM, Verdugo SR, Harding RW, Davidson PJ. Factors Associated 1757 With Calling 911 for an Overdose: An Ethnographic Decision Tree Modeling Approach. Am 1758 J Public Health. 2021;111: 1281–1283. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2021.306261
- 1759 80. Ostrach B, Hixon V, Bryce A. "When people who use drugs can't differentiate between medical care and cops, it's a problem." Compounding risks of law Enforcement 1760 Harassment & Punitive Healthcare Policies. Health Justice. 2024;12: 3. 1761 doi:10.1186/s40352-023-00256-3 1762
- 1763 Bell A, Bennett AS, Jones TS, Doe-Simkins M, Williams LD. Amount of naloxone used to 81. reverse opioid overdoses outside of medical practice in a city with increasing illicitly 1764 1765 manufactured fentanyl in illicit drug supply. null. 2019;40: 52–55. doi:10.1080/08897077.2018.1449053
- 1766
- 1767 82. Craine N. Hickman M. Parry JV. Smith J. McDonald T. Lyons M. Characteristics of injecting drug users accessing different types of needle and syringe programme or using secondary 1768 distribution. Journal of Public Health. 2010;32: 328–335. doi:10.1093/pubmed/fdp131 1769
- 1770 Noroozi A, Mirzazadeh A, Hajebi A, Farhoudian A, Sharifi H, Higgs P, et al. Comparing 83. profile of people who inject drugs (PWID) accessing different types of needle and syringe 1771 1772 programs or secondary distribution in Kermanshah, Iran. Journal of Substance Use. 2017;22: 304-309. doi:10.1080/14659891.2016.1195894 1773
- 84. Glass R, Hope VD, Nioroge J, Edmundson C, Smith J, McVeigh J, et al. Secondary 1774 1775 distribution of injecting equipment obtained from needle and syringe programmes by 1776 people injecting image and performance enhancing drugs: England and Wales, 2012-15. 1777 Drug and Alcohol Dependence. 2019;195: 40–44. doi:10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2018.11.021
- 1778 85. Sarang A, Rhodes T, Platt L. Access to syringes in three Russian cities: Implications for 1779 syringe distribution and coverage. International Journal of Drug Policy. 2008;19: 25–36. 1780 doi:10.1016/j.drugpo.2007.11.008
- 1781 86. Fisher DG, Wilson H, Bryant J. Harm reduction knowledge and information exchange among secondary distributors in Sydney, Australia. Drugs: Education, Prevention and 1782 1783 Policy. 2013;20: 67-73. doi:10.3109/09687637.2012.687793

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.21.24317731; this version posted November 22, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. This article is a US Government work. It is not subject to copyright under 17 USC 105 and is also made available for use under a CC0 license.

87. Russell E, Johnson J, Kosinski Z, Kaplan C, Barnes N, Allen S, et al. A scoping review of 1784 1785 implementation considerations for harm reduction vending machines. Harm Reduct J. 1786 2023;20: 33. doi:10.1186/s12954-023-00765-2 88. Yang C, Favaro J, Meacham MC. NEXT Harm Reduction: An Online, Mail-Based Naloxone 1787 1788 Distribution and Harm-Reduction Program. Am J Public Health. 2021;111: 667–671. 1789 doi:10.2105/AJPH.2020.306124 1790 89. Russell E, Lovitch N. Compassionate Overdose Response Summit: Highlights and Key 1791 Takeaways. Pittsburgh, PA, USA: Health Management Associates; 2024 May. Available: 1792 https://www.healthmanagement.com/wp-content/uploads/HMA-Report-Compassionate-Overdose-Response-Summit 5-1-FINAL.pdf 1793 1794 90. Marks C, Wagner KD. Supporting people responding to overdoses. The Lancet Public Health. 2022;7: e198-e199. doi:10.1016/S2468-2667(22)00011-1 1795 1796 91. Shearer D, Fleming T, Fowler A, Boyd J, McNeil R. Naloxone distribution, trauma, and 1797 supporting community-based overdose responders. International Journal of Drug Policy. 2019;74: 255-256. doi:10.1016/j.drugpo.2018.11.008 1798

1799



Figure 2



Figure 3





Figure 5











Figure 1







