Hair toxicology identifies greater substance use than self-report in high-risk 9-13 year-olds in the ABCD Study

Natasha E. Wade[1], Susan F. Tapert[1], Krista M. Lisdahl[2], Marilyn A. Huestis[3], Frank Haist[1]

[1]*Department of Psychiatry, University of California, San Diego*

[2]*Department of Psychology, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee*

[3]*Institute of Emerging Health Professions, Thomas Jefferson University*

*Correspondence and reprint requests to:

Natasha E. Wade, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor, Department of Psychiatry
University of California, San Diego
9500 Gilman Drive, MC 0405
La Jolla, CA 92093
email: nwade@ucsd.edu

Acknowledgements: Data used in the preparation of this article were obtained from the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) Study (https://abcdstudy.org), held in the NIMH Data Archive (NDA). This is a multisite, longitudinal study designed to recruit more than 10,000 children age 9-10 and follow them over 10 years into early adulthood. The ABCD Study is supported by the National Institutes of Health and additional federal partners under award numbers U01DA041048, U01DA050989, U01DA051016, U01DA041022, U01DA051018, U01DA051037, U01DA050987, U01DA041174, U01DA041106, U01DA041117, U01DA041028, U01DA041134, U01DA050988, U01DA051039, U01DA041156, U01DA041025, U01DA041120, U01DA051038, U01DA041148, U01DA041093, U01DA041089, U24DA041123, U24DA041147. A full list of supporters is available at https://abcdstudy.org/federal-partners.html. A listing of participating sites and a complete listing of the study investigators can be found at https://abcdstudy.org/consortium_members/. ABCD consortium investigators designed and implemented the study and/or provided data but did not necessarily participate in analysis or writing of this report. This manuscript reflects the views of the authors and may not reflect the opinions or views of the NIH or ABCD consortium investigators. The ABCD data repository grows and changes over time. The ABCD data used in this report came from ABCD Release 3.0 (DOI: 10.15154/1519007). This work was also supported by K08 DA050779 (PI: Wade) and T32 AA013525 (PI: Riley/Tapert to Wade).

Abstract

Aim: A key aim of the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development℠ (ABCD) Study is to document substance use onset, patterns, and sequelae across adolescent development. However, substance use misreporting obscures accurate drug use characterization. Hair toxicology tests provide objective historical substance use data, but are rarely investigated in youth. Here, we compare objective hair toxicology results with self-reported substance use in youth.

Methods: A literature-based substance use risk algorithm identified 696 ABCD Study® participants for hair sample collections between baseline and 2-year follow-up (spanning ages 9-13) for laboratory analysis. Chi-square and t-tests assessed differences between participants' demographics, positive and negative hair tests, risk algorithm scores, and self-reported substance use.

Results: Hair testing confirmed that 17% of at-risk 9-13 year-olds had evidence of past 3-month use of one (n=99), two (n=17), three (n=3), or four (n=2) drug classes. After considering prescribed medication use, 11% had a positive test incongruent with self- or parent-report. No participant with a positive result self-reported substance use consistent with their toxicology results. Participants with positive tests under-reported use ($p<.001$), reported less sipping of alcohol ($p<.001$), and scored higher on the risk algorithm ($p<.001$) than those with negative hair toxicology.

Conclusions: An alarming 11% of tested samples in at-risk 9-13 year-olds were positive for at least one *unreported* substance, suggesting underreporting in this population when participating in a national healthy development study. The degree of underreporting cannot yet be calculated, as at-risk samples were prioritized for assays. Expanded toxicology testing is key to characterize substance use in youth.

Keywords: children; adolescents; hair toxicology; substance use; substance use onset; self-report; hair samples

Hair toxicology identifies greater substance use than self-report in high-risk 9-13 year-olds in the ABCD Study

1.

The Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development℠ (ABCD) Study is a landmark project of healthy development designed to follow primarily substance-naïve youth (9-10 years-old) prospectively for 10 years with the expectation that a proportion will initiate substance use (Lisdahl et al., 2018). The neurocognitive, psychosocial, psychiatric, and neurobiological predictors and sequelae of substance use are evaluated. The ABCD Study® employs the Timeline Follow-Back (Sobell and Sobell, 1992) gold standard for reporting substance use, a self-report semi-structured interview where participants are guided to recall their past year's substance use patterns including dose, estimated potency, and routes of administration (Lisdahl et al., 2018).

Retrospective self-report has significant limitations. Lack of accuracy, regardless of participant age, may be due to intentional or unintentional misreporting, due to perceived desirability, concerns regarding privacy (Johnson, 2014; Williams and Nowatzki, 2005), forgetting, and lack of knowledge of substances taken (Johnson, 2014). Some factors influencing reporting accuracy include demographics (Livingston and Callinan, 2015), mental health (Harris et al., 2008), age of first use (Harris et al., 2008), frequency of use (Livingston and Callinan, 2015), and guidance regarding standard units (Gilligan et al., 2019). Self-report accuracy in adolescents engaged in a healthy development study is not well understood. Many prior youth studies were conducted in treatment or juvenile detention settings, or as part of a community-based substance use study, settings carrying differential motivation to misrepresent their use. One study of a generally healthy population of male adolescents whose fathers had alcohol dependence revealed a 13% discordance rate between adolescent substance report and urinalysis

results (Williams and Nowatzki, 2005). Recently, advanced analyses utilizing data on misreporting estimated that self-reported cannabis use in Washington State adolescents is underreported, with an estimated 7% denying use who actually used cannabis in the past month (Murphy and Rosenman, 2019). A larger characterization of self-report accuracy in relation to objective substance use measurement is important, particularly in adolescents.

Though the TLFB was validated with test-retest assessment and toxicology in adults (Crunelle et al., 2014; Hjorthoj et al., 2012; Smith et al., 2018), a new gold standard of combining self-report with objective measurement was proposed (Smith et al., 2018). Accordingly, the ABCD Study was designed to optimally measure substance use with both self-report and a range of toxicological measurement. Consistent with project goals, the vast majority of ABCD participants self-reported being substance naïve at baseline, except for caffeine (Lisdahl et al., 2021). Recent (24 hours) substance use is assessed with breathalyzer for alcohol, urinalysis for nicotine, and oral fluid for other drugs (Lisdahl et al., 2018; Uban et al., 2018). For longer three months substance use history, hair samples were analyzed (Taylor et al., 2017).

Hair testing measures specific drug analytes (e.g., cannabidiol, or CBD; Δ-9-tetrahydrocannabinol, or THC; Citti et al., 2018). Hair collection is (1) non-invasive (unlike blood), (2) not limited to recent consumption (unlike oral fluid or blood), (3) less susceptible to adulteration or dilution (unlike urine), (4) and evaluates intensity of substance use (Berthet et al., 2016; Huestis and Smith, 2018). On average, drugs are incorporated into hair after about 8 days since last use (Polettini et al., 2012; Scheidweiler et al., 2005). However, damaged or chemically-treated hair may have lower analyte concentrations, and must be considered for proper interpretation (Cuypers and Flanagan, 2018). Environmental exposure from smoke, dust or transfer from hands can also increase analyte concentrations, increasing the risk of false

positives unless proper hair wash procedures are employed (Cuypers and Flanagan, 2018; Hill et al., 2016). Highly sensitive and specific mass spectrometry is utilized for hair analysis testing (Cooper et al., 2012; Leghissa et al., 2018).

One challenge encountered by the ABCD Study is balancing study needs with participant burden and financial constraints. Toxicological measurements range from multiple dollars to over $200 per sample, making it cost prohibitive to test all 11,878 participants with all forms of measurement annually. Early in the ABCD study, a small percentage of participants were randomly assigned to oral fluid, breathalyzer, or nicotine-urine assessment. Although hair was collected from 70% of participants and stored for future analysis, currently only 696 participants were selected for hair analysis based on an expert devised literature-based algorithm prioritizing participants according to known risk factors for substance use onset. In addition, participants who self-reported substance intake underwent acute toxicological testing during their session(s) and, as financially permissible and warranted from the risk algorithm, by hair analysis.

We present initial ABCD cohort toxicological outcomes from findings in annual release 3.0 of the ABCD Study; consisting of baseline (9-10-year-olds), one-year (10-11-year-olds), and two-year (11-12-year-olds) data. First, we present basic descriptive toxicological and demographic information from a select high-risk sample. In addition, we investigated differences between self-report and toxicological hair findings. Given data suggesting adolescents underreport substance use, biological samples are useful for more accurately characterizing substance use. We hypothesized that hair analysis would identify additional substance use compared to self-report. Finally, we expected that higher scores on the “hair test” risk algorithm would significantly correlate with positive hair toxicology results.

Material and Methods

2.

The ABCD Study is a 21-site 10-year longitudinal study of 11,878 participants funded by the National Institutes of Health. Participants were identified predominately through school-based recruitment guided by epidemiological data. Full recruitment details were published previously (Garavan et al., 2018). The ABCD Study NDA 3.0 data release (Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development Study Consortium, 2020) provided toxicology results for 696 participants, and self- and parental reports. Parents provided written informed consent, while youth assented. Youth participants presented with one parent/guardian at baseline and year 2 follow-up for approximately seven hours of behavioral, neuroimaging, and biological assessment over one or two sessions. At year 1 follow-up, they returned for a 3-hour session. Parents and youth took part separately in the protocol, with all aspects approved by the Institutional Review Board.

2.1. Measures

2.1.1. Demographics.

Participants and their parents reported demographic characteristics, including the child's sex at birth, household annual income, highest parental education, parent marital status, and race/ethnicity (Barch et al., 2018). Importantly, some variables are social constructs requiring careful contextualization (Simmons et al., 2021), limiting interpretability of these factors in this small subsample.

2.1.2. Acute On-Site Toxicological Assessment.

Participants who reported any substance use in the past year were given a range of toxicological assessments; another subset (~10%) were randomly selected for toxicological testing of recent substance use. Given these selection methods for acute toxicological

assessment, less than 10% of participants from the present sample underwent any acute toxicological assessment. To assess for acute (within the past 12-72 hours) substance use, participants' oral fluid was subjected to the Dräger DrugTest® 5000 (DT5000) 7-panel drug screen for cocaine, opiates, cannabis, benzodiazepines, amphetamine, methamphetamine, and methadone (Dräger Inc., Houston, TX). A breathalyzer test confirmed abstinence from alcohol. NicAlert strips measured urinary cotinine concentrations (JANT Pharmacal, Encino, CA).

2.1.3. Toxicological Hair Analysis.

Hair samples were collected by research assistants (RAs) according to standardized procedures and stored for each participant who agreed to collection and had long enough hair. RAs noted hair length, hair damage or dye, and color, and shipped hair to Psychemedics (Culver City, CA). After receipt, hair was trimmed to 3.9cm from the root, giving an average window of past 3-months drug use. Hair samples underwent a 15-min wash procedure with 2mL isopropanol per 12 mg hair, followed by three 30-min phosphate buffer washes (Hill et al., 2016). This reduced possible false-positive test results, as hair washing removes most environmental drug residue. Hair was enzymatically digested, screened by immunoassays or LC-MS/MS (for THCCOOH and EtG) and each presumptive positive sample confirmed and quantified by LC-MS/MS analysis (Hill et al., 2014; Hill et al., 2016). Samples were tested to the limit of detection (e.g., for THCCOOH, 0.2pg/10mg) to maximize sensitivity, which were equivalent to the limits of quantification (see Table 1).

An adequate hair sample was 3.9cm long and 100mg to complete all screening and confirmatory analyses. Unfortunately, there were samples with insufficient hair amount, and in these cases, testing was performed for as many analytes as possible, with untested analytes'

results labeled “Quantity Not Sufficient” or QNS. Samples were labeled as QNS at either the screening or confirmation stage.

The core drug classes were cocaine, opiates, PCP, amphetamines, cannabinoids, alcohol, nicotine, and benzodiazepines, but other drugs and analytes were added as needed. Therefore, there are fewer results for some analytes (e.g., meta-hydroxycocaine).

2.1.4. Youth Substance Use Interview.

Youth participants completed an RA-administered substance use interview, with full details provided elsewhere (Lisdahl et al., 2018). Youth were first reminded of confidentiality and asked if they had “heard of” a list of substances. If a participant had not heard of a substance, they were not asked direct questions about that substance. Participants reported any substance use (including low level use such as alcohol sipping or nicotine/cannabis puffs/tastes) from each major drug category. Participants endorsing past-year substance use completed a detailed 12-month Timeline Follow-Back (TLFB) interview about alcohol, nicotine (cigarettes, electronic nicotine delivery systems (ENDS), smokeless tobacco, cigars, hookah, pipe, and nicotine replacement products), cannabis (smoked/vaped flower, smoked blunts, edibles, smoked/vaped concentrates, oral tinctures, and cannabis-infused alcohol drinks, synthetic cannabinoids), cocaine, cathinones, methamphetamine, ecstasy/MDMA, ketamine, gamma-hydroxy-butyrate (GHB), heroin, hallucinogens, psilocybin, salvia, anabolic steroids, inhalants, prescription stimulants, sedatives, and opioid pain relievers, and over the counter (OTC) cough/cold medicine use. Full reporting of substance use from ABCD’s baseline cohort can be reviewed in Lisdahl et al. (2021).

2.1.5. Peer and Familial Substance Use Measures.

Peer Substance Use. Youth reported the number of their peers who used cannabis (Johnston et al., 2015). **Family History of Substance Use**. The Family History Assessment Module Screener (FHAM-S; (Rice et al., 1995)) assessed drug or alcohol use problems of any biological family member of the youth as reported by the parent/guardian. **Parental Substance Use**. Parents/guardians completed the Achenbach Adult Self Report (Achenbach, 2009); individual items of interest include parental report of drinking too much, daily cigarette use, and illicit substance use.

2.1.6. Childhood Behavior Checklist (CBCL).

The CBCL (Achenbach, 2009) contains questions about youths' behavioral and mental health; it is completed by the parent/guardian. Normed externalizing symptoms (e.g., behavioral or social disturbances) were calculated.

2.2. Hair Test Risk Algorithm.

An evidence-based algorithm prioritized high-risk participants for hair testing (details in Supplement 1, full algorithm at https://osf.io/mtp4k/). The algorithm includes any lifetime substance use of cannabis, tobacco, prescription medications for non-medical purposes, CBD, any positive oral fluid or breathalyzer test, youth reporting they will try cannabis soon, youth reporting curiosity about trying cannabis, peer cannabis use, externalizing symptoms from the CBCL, parental self-report of drug use or drinking too much alcohol, parental self-reported amount of tobacco used per day, any biological family member with drug use problems, any biological family member with alcohol use problems, youth reported drinking without parents' approval, age and prior positive hair tests. Certain variables (i.e., positive acute toxicology test; reported CBD use) automatically selected the hair samples for testing, while having a prior positive hair test was scored at the maximum value to ensure sample analysis. Further,

participants who reported more than experimental drug use (e.g., more than a puff of nicotine; more than a sip of alcohol) were selected for hair analysis.

2.3. Statistical Analysis

SPSS 26 was utilized for all statistical analyses. Demographics (mean, SD, range, or percentage) were examined for the whole sample and by each positive substance. Both initial hair screening results as well as hair confirmation results are reported. Demographic and self-reported substance use group differences between those with positive confirmed hair toxicology results and those with negative results were assessed with chi-square and t-tests. While these analyses include assessment for differences in race/ethnicity, we note that race/ethnicity itself is a proxy for a number of different variables (e.g., educational opportunities; socioeconomic status; acculturation (Manly, 2006)); thus, race/ethnicity findings are reported but not discussed. Finally, we used Spearman's rank-order correlation to evaluate the association between the risk algorithm and positive toxicology results.

Results

3.1. Descriptive Data

3.1.1. Demographics.

Hair analysis was performed on 696 samples, including two samples for each of 19 participants. Mean±SD participant age was 10.65±1.02 years (9-13.3), with 47.1% (n=328) from females. Full demographic details are presented in Table 2, with 61% Baseline samples, 17% Year 1 Follow-Up, and 22% Year 2 Follow-Up. No participants reported using substances recreationally at a level that would be expected to be positive by hair analysis.

3.1.2. Hair Toxicology Results.

Positive screening results were obtained for 131 of 696 hair samples, with 116 of these confirmed by mass spectrometry and five samples having an insufficient amount of hair for confirmation and assumed to be positive, yielding 121 positive hair samples. Of these, 99 were positive for one, 17 for two, three for three drug classes and two for four drug classes. Frequency of positive results by drug class is reported in Table 3.

3.1.3. Hair Toxicology Relative to Self-Reported Prescription/OTC Medication Use.

We evaluated the data for reported prescription or over-the-counter medications that may explain positive toxicology results; 67 participants with positive hair tests also self-reported recent prescription or over-the-counter medication use (primarily amphetamine or methylphenidate). For positive amphetamines tests, 53 of 62 (85%) self-reported prescriptions, accounting for their positive amphetamine findings; four additional participants with positive hair results for other drugs (e.g., cannabinoids) also reported legitimate prescriptions for amphetamines or methylphenidates. An additional eight participants prescribed amphetamine or methylphenidate were *not* positive for amphetamines in hair. No other reported medications explained any positive result. Eleven percent (74/696) of participants' results identified substance use unexplained by self-reported prescription or OTC medication use.

3.2. Hair Toxicology Relative to Other Toxicology Results and Self-Report

All 121 participants with positive results were assessed for other toxicology and self-report data, as shown in Table 4. Full results by drug class, with specific analyte information, are available in Supplemental Table 2. Overall, 51% of participants with positive hair results reported some level of substance use. When comparing hair results to self-report using a paired t-test, results indicated a significantly higher rate of substance use based on hair testing than self-report (t_{120}=10.67, $p<.001$).

3.2.1. Multiple Time Points of Hair Toxicology Results.

Of the 19 participants whose hair was tested on more than one year of the study, five (26%) had at least one positive hair test and one (5%) was positive for the same drug both years. Fifteen participants (79%) had consistent results years 1 and 2, whether positive or negative, and four (21%) had inconsistent results, three were positive for amphetamines or cannabis one year, and the fourth positive for cannabis one year and cannabis and nicotine the other year. Two of these four were negative at Baseline and positive at Year 2 Follow-Up, while the other two were positive at Baseline only.

3.2.2. Group Differences between Positive and Negative Hair Samples.

Participants with positive hair tests were more likely to be male (χ^2=6.81, df = 1, p = .009, d = .20), have less educated parents (χ^2=42.2, df = 4, p < .001, v = .25), lower income (χ^2 = 30.78, df = 2, p < .001, v = .22), be black relative to white (χ^2=22.52, df = 4, p < .001, v = .018), and have unmarried parents (χ^2 = 18.17, df = 6, p < .001, v = .24). Those with positive hair tests (POS) did not differ by age or assessment time point from those with negative hair tests (NEG). In assessing alcohol sipping behavior, NEG participants were significantly more likely than POS participants to report sipping alcohol (χ^2 = 19.88, df = 1, p < .001, d = .34), even after controlling for demographic differences as listed above (β = -.127, t_{649} = -3.19, p = .002). In contrast, POS and NEG group members did not differ in self-reported low-level nicotine (cigarette or ENDS) (χ^2 = 3.17, df = 1, p = .075, d = .13) or cannabis use (χ^2 = 1.25, df = 1, p = .27, d = .08). Twelve percent (n=14) of POS participants reported using any drug as more than a sip or puff compared to 10% (n=58) of NEG participants (p = .63).

3.3. Hair Test Risk Algorithm.

Spearman's rank-order correlation assessed the relationship between a confirmed positive hair test and the hair test risk algorithm score. There was a significant positive correlation between hair risk score and positive toxicology results ($r_s = .23$, $p < .001$, d = .55).

Discussion

4.

Self-report of substance use has limitations due to intentional and unintentional misreporting. This may be even more the case in youth engaged in a healthy development study, though accuracy of report is understudied in adolescence and, particularly, pre-adolescence. This novel investigation assessed substance use self-report and objective hair toxicology analysis that permits a larger 3-month substance use window. Primarily, our findings show that 11% of youth in this sample are using substances in higher amounts and/or greater frequency than they are reporting, or they are timing their use to be outside the detection window for acute toxicology assessments. Second, the risk algorithm likely predicted youth who are more likely to use substances as measured through hair analysis. On balance, given this was a carefully curated algorithm and thus a non-random sample, the general prevalence of actual substance use among 9-13 year-olds may still remain underestimated, indicating greater toxicology testing of hair is needed both within the ABCD sample and in substance use research more broadly.

Results suggest that some youth are using substances that are detectable on highly specific hair analyses but denying it when queried. Even in youth who report some low-level substance use (e.g., alcohol sipping or nicotine puffing), based on their hair results, some participants appear to minimize self-reported use. Several dozen participants reported substance use levels as more than a sip or puff at baseline (ages 9-10), suggesting not all youth deny substance use on interview (Lisdahl et al., 2021). It is important to note that hair toxicology may

not detect low level substance use (Taylor et al., 2017), though detection of even single use occasions is possible (Kintz, 2018). Also, some youth may unknowingly consume a substance (e.g., believe they are vaping flavoring rather than nicotine, or smoke cannabis laced with a novel psychoactive substance) and thus unintentionally misreport their use. Toxicology tests and specifically hair tests with their much longer window of drug detection, provide the best means of capturing substance use onset. While results here suggest that the current hair selection algorithm for targeted testing of high-risk youth is useful, this does not guarantee that other ABCD youth have not also started using substances; nor are results representative of the full, generally healthy sample, as participants were not randomly selected for testing. Future years of ABCD data collection plan to broaden acute drug screens to all participants and analyze a larger subset of hair samples from participants, including participants randomly selected without regard to their hair risk score. Such expanded testing will better detail the effects of the onset of substance use and the general rate of substance use in a healthy development study.

Interestingly, several risk factors for early substance onset were more commonly identified in youth whose hair tested positive: being male (Donovan, 2007) and of lower socioeconomic status (Shah and Watson, 2020). Greater rates of male substance use is also consistent with the broader ABCD cohort, where males report higher levels of early substance experimentation (e.g., sipping, puffing) than females (Lisdahl et al., 2021). Further, the evidence-based algorithm developed to identify early onset based on common risk factors was significantly associated with positive hair results. This may be encouraging, as it further indicates that the field accurately identified risk factors for substance initiation that may be useful for preventive efforts. Interestingly, another common risk factor, reporting early alcohol sipping, was *not* related to positive hair toxicology results. It is unclear whether this is due to

early experimenters, but not frequent users, having less concerns regarding privacy, or due to the fairly common nature of sipping (Lisdahl et al., 2021; Watts et al., 2020), or some other factor. Together this suggests further refinement of the most salient risk factors in pre-adolescent youth are needed.

As the ABCD study is still in its early stages and youth are just entering the time of predicted early substance use onset, it will be important to carefully follow these selected youth, as well as the rest of the cohort, over time. For instance, the present data contained hair analysis results from multiple years from the same participants in only 3% of the hair analysis pool. Of those, only two youth were positive for at least one substance both years. As more hair is collected over time, those who were positive for a substance will be tested again, allowing for longitudinal hair analyses.

Hair samples are beneficial for confirming use over long periods of time and giving rough estimates of use. However, hair cannot reveal length of abstinence or date of last use, nor does it suggest the exact product used (e.g., cannabis flower v. dabs), route of administration (e.g., vaping v. smoking), frequency of use, co- or simultaneous-use, or other patterns (e.g., weekday v. weekend use). Importantly, use of hair samples does not negate the need for collection of other metrics, including self-report. Such factors are likely key to understanding the full impact of substance initiation on cognitive and other outcomes, and so it is important to collect self-report and objective substance measurement whenever possible. Hair samples also were correlated with self-reported use, urine, and oral fluid tests in another study (Meersseman et al., 2016).

4.1. Study Limitations.

Together, findings from the present analyses suggest robust, objective measurement of substance use is needed to ensure accuracy of self-report of substance initiation. However, these results are not without limitations. First, hair toxicology analyses may not be sensitive to low levels of substance use despite the low limits of detection in this study (Table 1). In a study of adults within a primary care setting, sensitivity of cannabinoid hair analysis was 52% with a specificity of 97% (Gryczynski et al., 2014). While this is beneficial for investigating onset of chronic substance use, hair samples may not identify early experimentation of use, as a minimal detectable dosage is not established for some drugs of abuse (Kintz, 2018). Though an extensive hair wash procedure was employed (Hill et al., 2016), there is the possibility of environmental drug exposure. Hair samples are also limited to the length of hair analyzed. Thus, as all hair sampled in the present study was trimmed to 3.9cm, results reflect only the past three months of substance use. Certain youth may be more likely to decline or be unable to contribute hair samples (e.g., those with short hair "fades", braids, or dreadlocks). In addition, there were a number of samples did not have sufficient quantity of hair (QNS) for analysis; labeling was not always clear as to whether the sample ran out during screening or confirmation, making it so that even the assumed positives may be an underestimate of the total number of positive results. Finally, given the financial cost of hair analyses, samples selected were restricted to those most likely to be underreporting substance use. For this reason, findings are not generalizable to the general population, or even to the overall ABCD cohort. More broad-based, randomized hair sampling is needed to better understand prevalence of underreporting in healthy developing youth.

4.2. Summary

In summary, initial hair toxicology results from the ABCD cohort suggest that 9-13 year-olds identified as most likely to initiate substance use may underreport substance use. An alarming 11% of those with assayed samples were positive for at least one substance, with some participants using three or more drug classes, including nicotine, cannabis, and cocaine, although few reported even minimal use. Thus, to accurately determine the consequences of substance use in youth, greater use of robust hair samples are needed.

References

Achenbach, T.M., 2009. The Achenbach System of Empirically Based Assessemnt (ASEBA): Development, Findings, Theory, and Applications., in: University of Vermont Research Center for Children, Y., & Families (Ed.). Burlington, VT.
Barch, D.M., Albaugh, M.D., Avenevoli, S., Chang, L., Clark, D.B., Glantz, M.D., Hudziak, J.J., Jernigan, T.L., Tapert, S.F., Yurgelun-Todd, D., Alia-Klein, N., Potter, A.S., Paulus, M.P., Prouty, D., Zucker, R.A., Sher, K.J., 2018. Demographic, physical and mental health assessments in the adolescent brain and cognitive development study: Rationale and description. Dev Cogn Neurosci 32, 55-66.
Berthet, A., De Cesare, M., Favrat, B., Sporkert, F., Augsburger, M., Thomas, A., Giroud, C., 2016. A systematic review of passive exposure to cannabis. Forensic Sci Int 269, 97-112.
Citti, C., Braghiroli, D., Vandelli, M.A., Cannazza, G., 2018. Pharmaceutical and biomedical analysis of cannabinoids: A critical review. J Pharm Biomed Anal 147, 565-579.
Consortium, A.B.C.D.S., 2020. ABCD Study's Curated Annual Release 3.0. https://nda.nih.gov/abcd.
Cooper, G.A., Kronstrand, R., Kintz, P., Society of Hair, T., 2012. Society of Hair Testing guidelines for drug testing in hair. Forensic Sci Int 218(1-3), 20-24.
Crunelle, C.L., Cappelle, D., Covaci, A., van Nuijs, A.L., Maudens, K.E., Sabbe, B., Dom, G., Michielsen, P., Yegles, M., Neels, H., 2014. Hair ethyl glucuronide as a biomarker of alcohol consumption in alcohol-dependent patients: role of gender differences. Drug Alcohol Depend 141, 163-166.
Cuypers, E., Flanagan, R.J., 2018. The interpretation of hair analysis for drugs and drug metabolites. Clin Toxicol (Phila) 56(2), 90-100.
Donovan, J.E., 2007. Really underage drinkers: the epidemiology of children's alcohol use in the United States. Prev Sci 8(3), 192-205.
Garavan, H., Bartsch, H., Conway, K., Decastro, A., Goldstein, R.Z., Heeringa, S., Jernigan, T., Potter, A., Thompson, W., Zahs, D., 2018. Recruiting the ABCD sample: Design considerations and procedures. Dev Cogn Neurosci 32, 16-22.
Gilligan, C., Anderson, K.G., Ladd, B.O., Yong, Y.M., David, M., 2019. Inaccuracies in survey reporting of alcohol consumption. BMC Public Health 19(1), 1639.
Gryczynski, J., Schwartz, R.P., Mitchell, S.G., O'Grady, K.E., Ondersma, S.J., 2014. Hair drug testing results and self-reported drug use among primary care patients with moderate-risk illicit drug use. Drug Alcohol Depend 141, 44-50.
Harris, K.M., Griffin, B.A., McCaffrey, D.F., Morral, A.R., 2008. Inconsistencies in self-reported drug use by adolescents in substance abuse treatment: implications for outcome and performance measurements. J Subst Abuse Treat 34(3), 347-355.
Hill, V., Loni, E., Cairns, T., Sommer, J., Schaffer, M., 2014. Identification and analysis of damaged or porous hair. Drug Test Anal 6 Suppl 1, 42-54.
Hill, V.A., Schaffer, M.I., Stowe, G.N., 2016. Carboxy-THC in Washed Hair: Still the Reliable Indicator of Marijuana Ingestion. J Anal Toxicol 40(5), 345-349.
Hjorthoj, C.R., Fohlmann, A., Larsen, A.M., Arendt, M., Nordentoft, M., 2012. Correlations and agreement between delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) in blood plasma and timeline follow-back (TLFB)-assisted self-reported use of cannabis of patients with cannabis use disorder and psychotic illness attending the CapOpus randomized clinical trial. Addiction 107(6), 1123-1131.
Huestis, M.A., Smith, M.L., 2018. Cannabinoid Markers in Biological Fluids and Tissues: Revealing Intake. Trends Mol Med 24(2), 156-172.

Johnson, T.P., 2014. Sources of Error in Substance Use Prevalence Surveys. Int Sch Res Notices 2014, 923290.
Johnston, L.D., O'Malley, P.M., Bachman, J.G., Schulenberg, J.E., 2015. Monitoring the Future National Survey Results on Drug Use, 1975–2014: Volume I, Secondary School Students. Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
Kintz, P., 2018. Hair analysis in forensic toxicology. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Forensic Science.
Leghissa, A., Hildenbrand, Z.L., Schug, K.A., 2018. A review of methods for the chemical characterization of cannabis natural products. J Sep Sci 41(1), 398-415.
Lisdahl, K.M., Sher, K.J., Conway, K.P., Gonzalez, R., Feldstein Ewing, S.W., Nixon, S.J., Tapert, S., Bartsch, H., Goldstein, R.Z., Heitzeg, M., 2018. Adolescent brain cognitive development (ABCD) study: Overview of substance use assessment methods. Dev Cogn Neurosci 32, 80-96.
Lisdahl, K.M., Tapert, S.F., Sher, K.J., Gonzalez, R., Nixon, S.J., Feldstein Ewing, S.W., Conway, K.P., Alex Wallace, R.S., Kelah Hatcher, Christine Kaiver, Wes Thompson, Chase Reuter, Hauke Bartsch, Natasha E. Wade, Joanna Jacobus, M.D. Albaugh, N. Allgaier, A.P. Anokhin, K. Bagot, F.C. Baker, M.T. Banich, D.M. Barch, A. Baskin-Sommers, F.J. Breslin, S.A. Brown, V. Calhoun, B.J. Casey, B. Chaarani, L. Chang, D.B. Clark, C. Cloak, R.T. Constable, L.B. Cottler, R. Dagher, M. Dapretto, A. Dick, E.K. Do, N.U.F. Dosenbach, G.J. Dowling, D.A. Fair, P. Florsheim, J.J. Foxe, E.G. Freedman, N. Friedman, H.P. Garavan, D.G. Gee, M.D. Glantz, P. Glaser, M.R. Gonzalez, K.M. Gray, S. Grant, F. Haist, S. Hawes, S.G. Heeringa, R. Hermosillo, M.M. Herting, J.M. Hettema, J.K. Hewitt, C. Heyser, E.A. Hoffman, K.D. Howlett, R.S. Huber, M.A. Huestis, L.W. Hyde, W.G. Iacono, A. Isaiah, M.Y. Ivanova, R.S. James, T.L. Jernigan, N.R. Karcher, J.M. Kuperman, A.R. Laird, C.L. Larson, K.H. LeBlanc, M.F. Lopez, M. Luciana, B. Luna, H.H. Maes, A.T. Marshall, M.J. Mason, E. McGlade, A.S. Morris, C. Mulford, B.J. Nagel, G. Neigh, C.E. Palmer, M.P. Paulus, D. Pecheva, D. Prouty, A. Potter, L.I. Puttler, N. Rajapakse, J.M Ross, M. Sanchez, C. Schirda, J. Schulenberg, C. Sheth, P.D. Shilling, E.R. Sowell, N. Speer, L. Squeglia, C. Sripada, J. Steinberg, M.T. Sutherland, R. Tomko, K. Uban, S. Vrieze, S.R.B. Weiss, D. Wing, D.A. Yurgelun-Todd, R.A. Zucker, Mary M. Heitzeg,, 2021. Substance use patterns in 9-10 year olds: Baseline findings from the adolescent brain cognitive development (ABCD) study. Drug and Alcohol Dependence.
Livingston, M., Callinan, S., 2015. Under-reporting in alcohol surveys: whose drinking is under-estimated? J Stud Alcohol Drugs 76, 158-164.
Manly, J.J., 2006. Deconstructing race and ethnicity: implications for measurement of health outcomes. Med Care 44, S10-16.
Meersseman, P., Vanhoutte, S., Van Damme, J., Maes, L., Lemmens, G., Heylens, G., Verstraete, A.G., 2016. A comparative study of screening instruments and biomarkers for the detection of cannabis use. Subst Abus 37(1), 176-180.
Murphy, S.M., Rosenman, R., 2019. The "Real" Number of Washington State Adolescents Using Marijuana, and Why: A Misclassification Analysis. Subst Use Misuse 54(1), 89-96.
Polettini, A., Cone, E.J., Gorelick, D.A., Huestis, M.A., 2012. Incorporation of methamphetamine and amphetamine in human hair following controlled oral methamphetamine administration. Anal Chim Acta 726, 35-43.

Rice, J.P., Reich, T., Bucholz, A.K., Neuman, R.J., Fishman, R., Rochberg, N., Begleiter, H., 1995. Comparison of direct interview and family history diagnoses of alcohol dependence. Alcohol Clin Exp Res 19, 1018-1023.
Scheidweiler, K.B., Cone, E.J., Moolchan, E.T., Huestis, M.A., 2005. Dose-related distribution of codeine, cocaine, and metabolites into human hair following controlled oral codeine and subcutaneous cocaine administration. J Pharmacol Exp Ther. 313, 909-915.
Shah, V., Watson, J., 2020. Relationship between Substance Use and Socioeconomic Variables in Pennsylvania Adolescents: 2009-2017. Subst Use Misuse 55(11), 1856-1866.
Simmons, C., Conley, M., Gee, D., Baskin-Sommers, A., Barch, D., Hoffman, E., Huber, R., Iacono, W., Nagel, B., Palmer, C., Sheth, C., Sowell, E., Thompson, W., Casey, B., 2021. Responsible Use of Open-Access Developmental Data: The Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) Study. Psychol Sci 32, 866-870.
Smith, M.J., Alden, E.C., Herrold, A.D., Roberts, A., Stern, D., Jones, J., Barnes, A.J., O'Connor, K.P., Huestis, M.A., Breiter, H.C., 2018. Recent Self-Reported Cannabis Use Is Associated With the Biometrics of Delta-9-Tetrahydrocannabinol. J. Stud. Alcohol Drugs 79, 441-446.
Sobell, L.C., Sobell, M.B., 1992. Timeline Follow-back: A technique for assessing self-reported ethanol consumption, Totowa, NJ.
Taylor, M., Lees, R., Henderson, G., Lingford-Hughes, A., Macleod, J., Sullivan, J., Hickman, M., 2017. Comparison of cannabinoids in hair with self-reported cannabis consumption in heavy, light and non-cannabis users. Drug Alcohol Rev 36(2), 220-226.
Uban, K.A., Horton, M.K., Jacobus, J., Heyser, C., Thompson, W.K., Tapert, S.F., Madden, P.A.F., Sowell, E.R., Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development, S., 2018. Biospecimens and the ABCD study: Rationale, methods of collection, measurement and early data. Dev Cogn Neurosci 32, 97-106.
Watts, A.L., Wood, P.K., Jackson, K.M., Lisdahl, K.M., Heitzeg, M.M., Gonzalez, R., Tapert, S.F., Barch, D.M., Sher, K.J., 2020. Incipient alcohol use in childhood: Early alcohol sipping and its relations with psychopathology and personality. Dev Psychopathol, 1-13.
Williams, R.J., Nowatzki, N., 2005. Validity of adolescent self-report of substance use. Subst Use Misuse 40(3), 299-311.

Table 1. Limits of detection for each drug analyte.

Drug Class	Analyte	Level of Detection/Level of Quantification
Cocaine		
	Cocaine	0.25 ng/10mg
	Benzoylecgonine	0.25 ng/10mg
	Cocaethylene	0.25 ng/10mg
	Norcocaine	0.25 ng/10mg
	Metahydroxycocaine	0.4 pg/mg
	Orthohydroxycocaine	0.4 pg/mg
	Parahydroxycocaine	0.4 pg/mg
Opiates		
	Codeine	0.5 ng/10mg
	Morphine	0.25 ng/10mg
	6-Acetylmorphine	0.25 ng/10mg
	Oxycodone	0.5 ng/10mg
	Oxymorphone	0.5 ng/10mg
	Hydrocodone	0.5 ng/10mg
	Hydromorphone	0.5 ng/10mg
PCP		
	Phencyclidine	1.0 ng/10mg
Amphetamines		
	Amphetamine	0.25 ng/10mg
	Methamphetamine	0.25 ng/10mg
	MDA	0.25 ng/10mg
	MDMA	0.25 ng/10mg
	MDEA	0.25 ng/10mg
Nicotine		
	Cotinine	10 pg/mg
Natural Cannabinoids		
	THC	5 pg/mg
	CBN	5 pg/mg
	CBD	5 pg/mg
	THCV	5 pg/mg
THCCOOH		
	Carboxy-THC	0.2 pg/10mg
Alcohol		
	Ethyl Glucuronide	1.0 pg/mg
Benzodiazepines		
	Temazepam	5 pg/mg
	Phenazepam	5 pg/mg
	Oxazepam	5 pg/mg

	Nordiazepam	5 pg/mg
	Midazolam	5 pg/mg
	Lorazepam	5 pg/mg
	Flunitrazepam	5 pg/mg
	Diazepam	5 pg/mg
	Clonazepam	5 pg/mg
	Alprazolam	5 pg/mg

Table 2. Demographics of ABCD participants with hair toxicology in contrast to the full ABCD sample at project baseline

	Full Baseline (N=11,878)	**Hair Toxicology Subsample (n=696)**	**Confirmed Positive via Hair (n=121)**
Age (years; range: 9-13)		10.65 years (SD=1.02)	10.8 (SD =0.99)
Female	48%	47%	36%
Parents Are Married	68%	63%	46%
Race/Ethnicity:			
Asian	2%	1%	0%
Black	15%	5%	13%
Hispanic	20%	18%	17%
White	52%	64%	16%
Other/Multiple	11%	12%	55%
Parent Education:			
Less than High School Diploma	5%	3%	7%
High School/GED	10%	8%	14%
Some College	26%	29%	45%
Bachelor's Degree	25%	27%	13%
Post Graduate Degree	34%	33%	22%
Yearly Household Income:			
<$50,000	30%	26%	46%
≧$50,000 and <$100,000	28%	27%	20%
≧$100,000	42%	40%	27%
Time Point:			
Baseline	-	-	57%
Year 1 Follow-Up	-	-	21%
Year 2 Follow-Up	-	-	22%

Note: Demographics of the present sample relative to the entire consortium from which this sample was drawn.

Table 3. Frequency of Screening and Confirmation Positives by Drug Class

	Positive Screening Results (N=128)	% of Sample	Positive Confirmation Results (N=121)	% of Sample	# QNS
Cocaine	13	1.9%	13	1.9%	--
Opiates	2	0.3%	2	0.3%	--
PCP	0	0%	--	--	--
Amphetamines	64	9.2%	63*	9.1%	4
THCCOOH	25	3.6%	25	3.6%	--
Natural Cannabinoids	25	3.6%	21	3%	--
Cannabis (either)	41	5.9%	37	5.3%	--
ETG	11	1.6%	10*	1.4%	1
Cotinine	28	4%	25*	3.6%	7
Benzodiazepines	0	0%	--	--	--
Fentanyl	0	0%	--	--	--

Notes: Frequency of each drug class is reported; % of Sample refers to the total number of hair samples available (n=696); # QNS refers to the number of samples which screened positive but did not have sufficient quantity for confirmation analysis and so were assumed positive (and included in the Positive Confirmation column); 53 participants whose hair was positive for amphetamines also reported having a prescription for amphetamines; 11-nor-9-carboxy-tetrahydrocannabinol (THCCOOH) is a Δ9-tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) metabolite; Natural cannabinoids refers to phytocannabinoids (THC, cannabidiol (CBD), cannabinol (CBN), or Δ9-tetrahydrocannabivarin (THCV); Cannabinoids (either) indicates a hair sample that is positive for either THCCOOH or Natural Cannabinoids, as participants may have been positive for either one or both; no drug class is mutually exclusive; PCP phencyclidine, ETG ethyl glucuronide. *Positive confirmation results include positive screened samples with insufficient quantity (QNS) to confirm results.

Table 4. Acute Toxicology and Self-Report Results in Participants with Positive Hair Toxicology Results

Method	**Number Tested**	**Findings**
Oral Fluid	43	33 for amphetamines; no other drugs indicated
NicAlert	6	1 indication of recent nicotine use
Breathalyzer	19	No indications of alcohol use
Self-Report	121	
Alcohol sip		55
Full alcohol drink		1
Nicotine puff		15
More than nicotine puff		5
Cannabis puff		4
More than cannabis puff		2
Inhalants		1
Non-prescription amphetamine		1