medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.13.21267739; this version posted December 16, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

TITLE

Estimating the population-level effects of Ontario's overdose prevention sites and consumption and treatment services: interrupted time series analysis with synthetic controls

Dimitra Panagiotoglou[1], PhD; Jihoon Lim[1], MS

[1]Department of Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Occupational Health, McGill University (Montreal, Canada)

Corresponding Author:

Dimitra Panagiotoglou
2001 McGill College Avenue Suite 1200
Montreal, Quebec H3A 1G1
Email: dimitra.panagiotoglou@mcgill.ca
Telephone: +1 514 398 8451

Word count: 2498 / 2520

Funding: Dr. Panagiotoglou is supported by a Junior 1 Scholar Award (#309818) from the Fonds de recherche du Québec – santé

ABSTRACT (247 / 250 words)

Background: Ontario recently implemented overdose prevention sites and consumption and treatment services (OPS/CTS) to stem the harms of the opioid epidemic. We tested whether operating any site improved local opioid-related health service use and mortality rates.

Methods: We used monthly counts of all opioid-related emergency department (ED) visits, hospitalizations, and deaths between January 2014 and December 2020 for our outcomes. For each public health unit (PHU) that implemented any OPS/CTS, we created a synthetic control as a weighted combination of unexposed PHU. We estimated the population-level effects of operating any site using controlled interrupted time series with segmented regression and adjusted for time varying confounders (i.e. OPS/CTS capacity, naloxone kits distributed, and persons receiving opioid agonist treatment per 100,000 population). We repeated the analysis using a multiple baseline approach to estimate province-wide effects.

Results: Between 2017 and 2020, nine out of 34 PHU implemented at least one OPS/CTS. ED visit (RR=0.96, 95%CI: 0.92 – 0.99) and hospitalization (RR=0.95, 95%CI: 0.92 – 0.98) trends declined faster among treated units. Improvements in local ED visit rate trends were observed for the majority of treated units. Hospitalization rates declined faster for London (RR=0.97, 95%CI: 0.95 – 0.99) and Niagara (RR=0.95, 95%CI: 0.92 – 0.98); while mortality rates declined faster for Hamilton (RR=0.93, 95%CI: 0.90 – 0.96), Niagara (RR=0.97, 95%CI: 0.94 – 0.99) and Guelph (RR=0.94, 95%CI: 0.88 – 1.00).

Conclusion: Although OPS/CTS are not sufficient to stem the harms of the opioid overdose epidemic on their own, they play a critical role in local harm reduction strategies.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.13.21267739; this version posted December 16, 2021. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

INTRODUCTION

Canada has an opioid overdose problem. Between January 2016 and March 2021, there were 22,828 opioid overdose deaths, and at least 26,134 opioid poisoning hospitalizations.(1) Although British Columbia is Canada's hardest hit province, Ontario is a close second in disease burden and health service use. Over a ten-year period (2007-2016, inclusive), Ontario's emergency department (ED) visits increased 50% to 55.3 per 100,000 population(2) and hospitalizations rose 12% to 14.8 per 100,000 population(3). For the first time in decades, male life expectancy at birth decreased as a consequence of the high opioid-related mortality observed in younger adults (25 – 44 years of age).(4)

Overdose prevention sites (OPS) and consumption and treatment services (CTS) are among a suite of harm reduction interventions (e.g., supervised injection facilities, needle and syringe programs, naloxone distribution programs, drug checking services, and opioid agonist treatment (OAT)) increasingly offered across Canada to mitigate the negative physical and social consequences of illicit drug use.(5) Historically unsanctioned, OPSs are nimble, grass-roots, peer-managed responses to the neglected needs of people who use illicit substances.(6) Aside from providing critical overdose reversal services, they offer overdose prevention education, Take Home Naloxone training and distribution, access to drug use equipment, and safe disposal of used equipment.(7) OPSs do not require the presence of professional medical staff (e.g. nurses) but are also unable to provide the wrap around health and social services found at CTSs.

In 2017, the federal government lifted exemption requirements under section 56.1 of Canada's Controlled Drugs and Substances Act to allow communities to implement OPS legally during the ongoing overdose emergency. Meanwhile, supervised consumption sites such as CTS in Ontario and safe injection facilities in British Columbia continued to require Health Canada approval – although the process was streamlined.

While evidence demonstrates supervised consumption sites (namely, safe injection facilities) reduce mortality and health service use, they remain politically controversial.(8) Much of the evidence is from the concentrated drug use epidemics of Vancouver's Downtown Eastside and Sydney's 'red light' district, relies on data and methods that overlap such that four of the nine best studies are superseded,(9) and is specific to injection drug use prior to the current opioid overdose epidemic.(8, 10, 11) These studies lack appropriate comparison groups or restrict analyses to select populations (e.g. frequent vs. infrequent clients), and fail to distinguish the effects of supervised consumption sites from other harm reduction interventions available concurrently.(9, 11) We aim to estimate the population-level effects of Ontario's supervised consumption sites (here, OPS/CTSs) implemented between 2017 and 2020 on opioid-related ED visit, hospitalization, and mortality rates while controlling for naloxone kits distributed and number of people receiving OAT. We hypothesize OPS/CTSs had no level and modest trend effects on health service use and mortality rates.

METHODS

Study Design

We conducted a retrospective cohort study to compare opioid-related health service use and outcomes in public health units (PHU) that implemented any OPS/CTS with those that did not.

Setting

Ontario is Canada's most populous province with approximately 14.75 million residents(12), 97% of whom are covered by the provincial health insurance program(13). Within the province, health promotion and disease prevention are administered by PHUs, which are mutually exclusive and exhaustive health boundaries. The 34 PHUs range from 33,166 residents in Timiskaming to 3,094,237 for Toronto.

Beginning in 2016, several provincial and federal harm reduction interventions were implemented to stem the rising rate of opioid-related overdose deaths. In June 2016, the Ontario Naloxone Program for Pharmacies (ONPP) began offering naloxone injection kits at no charge to individuals at risk of opioid-related overdose or persons in a position to assist someone at risk.(14, 15) Shortly thereafter, the federal government's Good Samaritan Drug Overdose Act became law (May 2017),(16) and PHUs began sub-distributing naloxone kits to community-based organizations much more widely through the Ontario Naloxone Program (ONP,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.13.21267739; this version posted December 16, 2021. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

September 2017)(17). Health Canada issued an exemption to Ontario to establish legally sanctioned temporary OPSs on December 7, 2017,(18) but beginning October 2018, the government of Ontario scaled back funding to OPSs(19).

Between June 2017 and December 2020, nine of the provincial PHUs began operating at least one OPS/CTS – with Toronto (n=9, 2 additional shelter-hotel sites) and Ottawa (n=5) operating multiple sites to meet local needs.(20) With the exception of Overdose Prevention Ottawa's Pop-up site, all sites that began as OPSs have since received Health Canada approval and transitioned to CTS. Thus, given no observable differences in the number of booth-hours offered or client health outcomes (i.e. no deaths reported on site for either OPSs or CTSs), we consider OPS/CTSs as variants of supervised consumption sites and examine their effects in this analysis together (for full list, implementation dates, and changes in services see Table 1).(21)

Data collection and measures

We used monthly counts of all opioid-related ED visits, acute care hospitalizations, and deaths that occurred between January 2014 and December 2020 per PHU, as reported in Ontario's publicly accessible Interactive Opioid Tool. The tool includes all opioid-related ED visits and acute care hospitalizations as captured in the province-wide National Ambulatory Care Reporting System and Discharge Abstract Database, and all fatal events where opioid poisoning from codeine, fentanyl (including carfentanil and other fentanyl analogues), heroin, hydrocodone, hydromorphone, methadone, morphine, or oxycodone was considered a contributing cause of death according to the Office of the Chief Coroner.(22) We converted event counts to incidence rates using the province's IntelliHealth population level estimates (2003-2016, extracted October 2017) and population projections (2017 – 2020, extracted August 2019) also available in the tool.(22)

We supplemented the PHU-level overdose event data with PHU-level population demographic estimates (percent of the population designated low income, without a high school diploma, immigrant, and visible minority; median household income); age- and sex-standardized rates of alcohol-related emergency department visits and hospitalizations; and monthly counts of concomitant interventions: persons receiving opioid prescriptions (overall, for pain, OAT) and naloxone kits distributed. To capture OPS/CTS intervention 'intensity' we included the total number of booth-hours (booths/seats/spaces) available for supervised consumption of illicit substances, per month.

Ethics approval

This study was exempt from ethics review by McGill University's Institutional Review Board.

Statistical analysis

All analyses were conducted using R version 4.0.5.(23) We used controlled interrupted time series with segmented regression to test whether PHUs that implemented any OPS/CTS observed improvements in opioid-related ED visit, hospitalization, or mortality rates compared with PHU that did not. Treated groups included all PHU that implemented at least one OPS/CTS during the study period. Synthetic controls were derived for each treated PHU per outcome from a donor pool of non-treated PHUs and their respective demographics, alcohol-related health service use, and concomitant intervention using Synth package(24) and its extensions(25). The pre-intervention period was restricted to three years to optimize prediction of the treatment group by the comparison group.(26)

We fitted quasi-Poisson generalized linear regression models with a log link to account for monthly event counts of zero (Supplement, pg. 2). These models adjusted for pre-intervention differences in treated vs. control outcome level and trends, time varying confounders (booth-hours, persons receiving OAT, and naloxone kits dispensed per hundred units), and seasonality using harmonic terms(27). We applied Newey-West standard errors to correct autocorrelation detected using plots of residuals. Since the initial OPS/CTS was implemented at different times across the nine PHU, we applied a multiple baseline approach to measure

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.13.21267739; this version posted December 16, 2021. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

the overall effect of any site on ED visit, hospitalization, and mortality rates across the province and report results for individual treated/synthetic control pairs in the supplement.

For sensitivity analysis, we tested the effects of the Good Samaritan Drug Overdose Act(16) across all treated/synthetic control pairs and terminated the observation period before March 2020's COVID-19 related service restrictions and border closures (not shown here).

RESULTS

We excluded two PHUs that merged during the study period (Southwestern and Huron-Perth) with a combined population of approximately 336,000 (2.3%) from subsequent analysis owing to the incomplete demographic data available and differences between public health unit and Statistics Canada jurisdictional boundaries. For the remaining 32 PHUs, between January 2014 and December 2020 there were 50,204 ED visits, 13,120 hospitalizations, and 8,648 mortalities for opioid-related overdose events.

Table 2 briefly summarizes the demographics of treated units and their synthetic controls for each outcome created using synthetic control predictor weights (Supplement Table 2) on donor public health units' outcomes (Supplement Table 3).

Monthly pre-intervention outcome trends were parallel for most treated/synthetic control unit pairs (Supplement Table 4), with modest differences observed for London (RR=1.02, 95%CI: 1.00 – 1.04) and Niagara (RR=1.01, 95%CI: 1.00 – 1.03) ED visit rates; Toronto (RR=1.02, 95% CI: 1.00 – 1.04) and Niagara (RR=1.01, 95%CI: 1.00 – 1.03) hospitalization rates; and Hamilton (RR=1.03, 95%CI: 1.01 – 1.05) mortality rate. Results from our multiple baseline analysis found similarly small differences in pre-intervention trends for ED visit (RR=1.01, 95%CI 1.00 – 1.01) and mortality (RR=1.01, 95%CI: 1.00 – 1.02) rates between aggregate treated and synthetic control units (Table 3).

The results from PHU-specific segmented regressions on the effects of OPS/CTS were mixed (Supplement Table 4). Overall, ED rate trends declined faster for most treated units compared with their synthetic controls post-intervention; and London (RR=0.80, 95%CI: 0.65 – 1.00) and Niagara (RR=0.38, 95%CI: 0.21 – 0.69) observed additional declines per hundred booth-hours of service provided. Table 3 shows the decreases in post-intervention ED visit rate level (RR=0.71, 95%CI: 0.60 – 0.84) and trend (RR=0.96, 95%CI: 0.92 – 0.99) in aggregate. Improvements in hospitalization trends were observed for London (RR=0.97, 95%CI: 0.95 – 0.99), Niagara (RR=0.95, 95%CI: 0.92 – 0.98) and in aggregate (RR=0.95, 95%CI: 0.93 – 0.98). Meanwhile, mortality rate trends declined for Hamilton (RR=0.93, 95%CI: 0.90 – 0.96), Niagara (RR=0.97, 95%CI: 0.94 – 0.99) and Guelph (RR=0.94, 95%CI: 0.88 – 1.00); with additional declines per hundred booth-hours in Niagara (RR=0.40, 95%CI: 0.19 – 0.83), Ottawa (RR=0.95, 95%CI: 0.90 – 1.00) and Thunder Bay (RR=0.75, 95%CI: 0.64 – 0.88). However, we observed no effect on mortality rates, overall.

For some PHUs, other interventions were associated with declines in outcome rates. For every hundred persons receiving OAT, Niagara's hospitalization (RR=0.83, 95%CI: 0.73 – 0.95) and mortality (RR=0.64, 95%CI: 0.46 – 0.89) rates declined; as did the aggregate mortality rate (RR=0.00, 95%CI: 0.00 – 0.19). For every hundred naloxone kits dispensed, London's hospitalization (RR=0.80, 95%CI: 0.71 – 0.91) rate declined; and Toronto (RR=0.69, 95%CI: 0.45 – 1.00) and Thunder Bay (R=0.87, 95%CI: 0.79 – 0.97) mortality rates declined; as did aggregate mortality rate (RR=0.01, 95%CI: 0.00 - 0.67).

Sensitivity analysis found these effects persisted, with improved outcome rate trends larger in the period between initial implementation and March 2020 (Supplement Figures 1 – 3).

DISCUSSION

Our results show that the effect OPS/CTSs across Ontario was generally positive, with significant improvements in ED visit and hospitalization rates in aggregate; and positive local spill-over effects for all three outcomes. Niagara appears to have benefitted the most consistently from the intervention with sizeable improvements across all outcomes, and per hundred booth-hours of service provided for ED visits and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.13.21267739; this version posted December 16, 2021. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

mortality rates. Waterloo, the last PHU to implement a CTS, was the only treated PHU that had no observable improvements in outcome trends – perhaps owing to the shorter observation period.

Extensive research on variations of SCSs has yet to show consistent population-level benefits. Some studies have demonstrated Vancouver's supervised injection facility, first implemented in 2003, significantly reduced local overdose mortality rates.(28) However, more recent work evaluating SCSs report no effect on mortality and hospitalization rates, despite some positive effects on overdose-related ED visit and paramedic attendance rates.(28-31) By comparing outcome rates between PHUs that implemented any OPS/CTS with comparable synthetic controls using a multiple baseline approach, and adjusting for modest differences between unit pairs and time-varying confounders (i.e. naloxone kits distributed, persons receiving OAT, and intervention scale-up/scale-back)– ours is the first rigorous, province-wide study on the causal effects(32-38) of variations of SCSs on a population outside British Columbia, and during the opioid overdose epidemic negatively impacting communities across Canada.

Our results suggest that the effects of SCSs are context specific, with no single intervention best to address the opioid overdose epidemic(39). They agree qualitatively with results from a mathematical model estimating the effects of BC's harm reduction interventions together and individually which found their Take Home Naloxone program accounted for the biggest reductions in opioid-related mortalities.(31)

The observed small effects of OPS/CTSs on opioid-related mortality rates may be a consequence of access barriers first described elsewhere. Work examining successful implementation and uptake of OPSs in British Columbia found persisting stigma and police presence reduced their social acceptability and use by at-risk populations.(40) Meanwhile, hours of operation, facility capacity, and absence of safe inhalation rooms limited their effectiveness.(30) Similar barriers have been described in qualitative work on Ontario's OPSs(41) and explain some of the design features of CTSs (e.g. permitting inhalation and other forms of drug consumption).

Our study had some limitations. We used reported hours of operation gleaned from OPS/CTS websites, online platforms (i.e. Facebook and Twitter) or reported by local media to estimate booth-hours provided per month. Where information was missing, we assumed the number of booths matched the number reported in public reports or plans prior to opening. Despite exhaustive searches, we were unable to confirm the number of booth-hours provided at Toronto's The Works' two recently implemented hotel-based resident sites, and for Ottawa's mobile site, and did not include these sites into our monthly booth-hour estimates. For COVID-19 related changes to services, if no explicit update on the number of booths was available, we assumed the number was adjusted to meet public health guidelines (e.g. where three booths normally operated side-by-side, we assumed the middle booth was temporarily unavailable until guidelines were revised). These assumptions and exclusions may underestimate the number of booth-hours per PHU and overestimate the marginal effect of each additional booth-hour. However, they do not detract from the overall observed effect that booth-hours improved hospitalization and mortality rates.

With respect to naloxone kits distributed by community-based organizations, we used annual reports for monthly counts whenever more granular data were not available (e.g. distribution campaign or blitz for a specific period). Again, this likely introduced error to the month-to-month number of kits distributed but should have minimal effect on the overall impact of naloxone kits readily available for private use.

The response to the COVID-19 pandemic introduced some challenges for our analysis. Although we adjusted for reduced service capacity and changes in naloxone distribution and OAT dispensing, we were unable to control for changes in toxicity of the illicit drug supply following border closures. Increases in drug toxicity along with temporary reductions in booth-hours may explain the spikes in ED and mortality rates observed beginning March 2020 (Supplement Figures 1 and 3, respectively).(42)

CONCLUSION

Supervised consumption services are among a set of harm reduction interventions increasingly implemented across Canada to stem the ongoing opioid overdose epidemic. Our study found positive effects on aggregate

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.13.21267739; this version posted December 16, 2021. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

ED visit and hospitalization rates and positive local effects for mortality rates. Although OPS and CTS do not appear sufficient to address the ongoing epidemic on their own, they are an effective option, particularly in conjunction with OAT and Take Home Naloxone programs. Alternative interventions including safer supply, should be rigorously explored in tandem with these harm reduction interventions. These findings are pertinent to other communities with population demographics and need distributions different from Vancouver's well studied Downtown.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.13.21267739; this version posted December 16, 2021. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 1. Overdose Prevention Site and Consumption and Treatment Services hours of operation and booths/spaces available

Site / Address	Hours	Booths	Date	Notes	Source
Toronto Public Health - The Works **277 Victoria St.** **Toronto**	M – S: 4pm – 10pm	3	Aug 21 2017	Closed Mar 18 – Apr 17 2020	(43-45)
	M – S: 10 am – 10pm	6	Nov 8 2017		(44, 46)
	M – S: 10 am – 10pm		Jul 12 2018		(47)
	Su: 11am – 5pm M – S: 10am – 10pm		Oct 14 2018		(45)
	Su: 11am – 5pm M – S: 10am – 10pm		May 24 2019		(48)
	Su: 11am – 6pm M – S: 1:30pm – 8pm	2	Apr 18 2020		(45, 46)
	Su: 11am – 5pm M – S: 10am – 10pm		May 11 2020		(49)
Fred Victor **145 Queen St. E** **Toronto**	Su – S: 6pm – 12am	3	Feb 21 2018	Assume change in hours/capacity began March 18 2020	(50)
	Su – S: 6pm – 12am		July 12 2018		(47)
	Su – S: 8:30am – 12am		May 24 2019		(48)
	Su – S: 8:30am – 11pm	2	Apr 6 2020		(51, 52)
	Su – S: 8:30am – 11pm		Aug 5 2020		(53)
Moss Park OPS **134 Sherbourne St.** **Toronto**	Su: 12pm – 6pm T – S: 12pm – 6pm	5	Aug 12 2017	Assume no change in hours but reduced capacity began with updated spring hours	(54-56)
	Su: 12pm – 6pm T – S: 12pm – 10pm		Jul 12 2018		(47, 55)
	Su: 12pm – 6pm T – S: 12pm – 10pm	3	Apr 18 2020		(46)
Parkdale Queen West CHC **168 Bathurst St.** **Toronto**	M, T, R: 10am – 6pm W: 1pm – 6pm F: 9am – 5pm	4	Mar 16 2018	Assume hours of operation match office hours at opening	(57, 58)
	M, W, R: 9:30 am – 8pm T: 1pm – 8pm F: 9:30am – 4:30pm		Jul 12 2018		(47)
	M, T, R: 9:30 am – 8pm W: 1pm – 8pm F: 9:30am – 4:30pm		May 24 2019		(48)
	M, T, R: 10am – 6pm W: 1pm – 6pm F: 9:30am – 4:30pm	2	Mar 18 2020		(46, 59,
Parkdale Queen West CHC **1229 Queen St. W**	Su – S: 12pm – 12am	3	Aug 16 2018		(61)
	M, T, R: 12pm – 8pm W : 1pm – 8pm F: 12pm – 5pm		May 24 2019		(48)
	M, T, R: 10am – 6pm W: 1pm – 6pm F: 9:30am – 4:30pm	2	March 2020		(46, 59,
	M, T, R: 10am – 8pm W: 1pm – 6pm F: 9am – 5pm		Dec 22 2020		(62)
Regent Park CHC **465 Dundas St. E** **Toronto**	M, W – F: 9:30am – 6:30 pm T: 12pm – 6:30pm	2	April 27 2018	Assume same hours as first listed for July 2018	(63)
	M, W – F: 9:30am – 6:30 pm T: 12pm – 6:30pm		July 12 2018		(47)
	M, W – F: 9am – 6:30pm T: 12pm – 6:30pm		May 24 2019		(48)
	M, W – F: 9:30am – 4:30pm T: 12pm – 4:30pm		Mar 2020		(59)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.13.21267739; this version posted December 16, 2021. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

	M, W – F: 9:30am – 4pm T: 12pm – 6:30pm		May 1 2020		(64)
South Riverdale CHC **955 Queen St. E** **Toronto**	M, T, R: 9:30am – 8pm W, F: 9:30 am – 5pm	4	Jul 12 2018		(47)
	M, T, R: 9:30am – 8pm W, F: 9:30 am – 5pm		May 24 2019		(48)
Street Health OPS **338 Dundas St. E** **Toronto**	M – F: 11am – 4pm	2	Jun 27 2018	Assume same hours as first listed for July 2018	(65, 66)
	M – F: 11 am – 4pm		Jul 12 2018		(47)
	M, W – F: 9:30am – 4pm T: 11am – 4pm		May 24 2019		(48)
St. Stephen's Community House OPS **260 Augusta St.** **Toronto**	M – F: 7:30am – 3:30pm	2	Apr 25 2018		(67, 68)
	Su: 8 am – 11:00am M – F: 7:30 am – 11:30am		Jul 12 2018		(47)
	Su – F: 8am – 2pm		May 24 2019		(48)
Urban Core **71 Rebecca St.** **Hamilton** (interim site 70 James St.)	Su: 4pm – 10:30pm M, T, R, F: 10:30am – 10:30pm W: 12:30 – 10:30pm S: 4pm – 10:30pm	3	Jun 5 2018	Assume change in booths beginning March 2020	(69, 70)
	S, S: 4pm – 10:30pm M, T, R, F: 10:30am – 10:30pm W: 12:30 – 10:30pm	2	Mar 18 2020		
	Su – S: 4pm – 10:30pm		Nov 30 2020		(71)
Street Health Centre and HARS Integrated Health Hub **661 Montreal St.** **Kingston**	Su – S: 4pm – 10pm	4	Jul 29 2018		(72, 73)
	Su – S: 11am – 7pm		Apr 2020		(74)
OPS /Carepoint CTS **#30 – 186 King St.** **London**	Su, S: 11am – 4pm M – F: 10 am – 4pm	4	Feb 12 2018	Assume changes in booths beginning March 2020	(75-77)
	Su – S: 9:30am – 9pm		Aug 5 2019		(75)
	Su – S: 9:30am – 9pm	2	Mar 18 2020		(78)
Positive Living Niagara **105 Queenston St.** **Niagara**	Su – S: 9:30am – 8:30pm	4	Dec 3 2018	Assume changes in booths beginning March 2020	(79)
	Su – S: 9:30am – 8:30pm		Apr 13 202		(80)
Overdose Prevention Ottawa **307 St. Patrick St.** **Ottawa** (never CTS)	Su – S: 6pm – 9pm	28	Aug 25 2017	8 injection spaces, 20 inhalation spaces Last day: Nov 9 2017	(81)
Ottawa Public Health SIS **179 Clarence St.** **Ottawa**	Su – S: 9am – 9pm	2	Sep 26 2017	Assume cuts to services began Jan 1 2020	(82)
	Su – S: 9am – 9pm	3	Feb 6 2017		(82)
	M – F: 9am – 5pm	2	Nov 6 2019		(83)
Sandy Hill CHC **221 Nelson St.** **Ottawa**	Su – S: 8am – 8pm	5	Apr 17 2018	Assume changes in booths beginning March 18 2020	(84)
	Su – S: 8am – 8pm	3	May 17 2020		(85)
Ottawa Inner City Health Inc. **230 Murray St.** **Ottawa** (Trailer 2.0 moved to 256 King Edward Av.)	24/7	8	Nov 1 2017	Assume additional booths added towards end of first year of operation (Aug 2018)	(86, 87)
	24/7	12	Jul 3 2019		(88)
	24/7	13	Nov 6 2019		(83)
	24/7	6	Mar 18 2020		(89)
	24/7	8	Nov 2020		(89)
Somerset West CHC OPS **55 Eccles St.** **Ottawa**	M – F: 9am – 4 pm	4	May 2 2018		(90, 91)
	Su – S: 8:30am – 7:30pm		Jun 2019		(20, 92)
Path 525 – NorWest Community	M – F: 9am – 5pm	4	Nov 27 2018	Assume number	(93)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.13.21267739; this version posted December 16, 2021. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Centre **525 Simpson St.** **Thunder Bay**	M – S: 10am – 6pm		Mar 24 2020	of booths planned are number in operation	(94, 95)
Guelph CHC **150 Duke St. W** **Guelph**	Su – S: 10am – 5pm	2	May 5 2018	Assume changes in hours beginning March 2020; No mention of fewer booths	(96, 97)
	Su – S: 9am – 4:30pm	4	Feb 22 2020		(98)
	M – F: 9am – 5pm		April 2020		(99)
Sanguen Health Centre **150 Duke St.** **Waterloo**	Su – S: 9am – 9pm	2	Oct 15 2019		(100)
	Su – S: 9am – 9pm	5	Oct 9 2020		(101)

CHC = Community Health Centre; CTS = Consumption and Treatment Service; SIS = Safe injection site; OPS=Overdose Prevention Site; Days of the week: Su=Sunday, M=Monday, T=Tuesday, W=Wednesday, R=Thursday, F=Friday, S=Saturday;

Monthly booth hours per treated public health unit are: $y_{it} = \sum_{n=1}^{N}(b_{nt} \times h_{nt})$

where *y* is the total booth-hours per treated public health unit *i* at month *t*, *b* is the number of booths in operation at a specific site *n*, and *h* is the number of hours operated that month.

Treated	Synthetic controls ED	Synthetic controls Hosp.	Synthetic controls Mort.	Sample Mean	Treated	Synthetic controls ED	Synthetic controls Hosp.	Synthetic controls Mort.	Sample Mean	Treated	Synthetic controls ED	Synthetic controls Hosp.	Synthetic controls Mort.	Sample Mean
Toronto					**Hamilton**					**Kingston**				
730.88	1250.9	350.54	470.39	687.34	661.01	910.17	660.82	572.12	729.64	714.4	590.88	713.78	725.54	733.7
198.03	274.20	221.28	314.86	283.35	242.58	350.91	390.57	331.24	288.61	250.68	360.04	250.73	347.7	288.96
19.88	27.06	22.04	32.33	40.42	39.74	40.39	39.74	42.13	39.76	37.10	41.32	37.12	37.84	39.64
2.02	3.56	1.88	3.02	4.68	4.36	5.87	4.96	5.54	4.97	4.74	5.65	5.74	4.79	5.00
0.14	0.10	0.03	0.09	0.1	0.52	0.47	0.41	0.43	0.33	0.51	0.46	0.44	0.46	0.37
0.25	0.69	0.30	0.49	0.87	0.55	1.06	0.84	0.77	0.97	0.75	0.81	0.86	0.94	0.98
65829	81680	88652	76616	70907	70395	71480	70401	72365	72252	71501	71518	74828	71928	72252
8.20	8.04	7.46	7.82	7.78	7.07	7.31	7.5	7.62	7.89	7.30	7.31	7.69	7.2	7.89
16.43	19.87	16.67	18.25	20.39	19.47	20.09	19.47	19.39	19.83	14.6	18.16	18.67	19.38	19.83
51.5	34.07	48.96	30.52	10.47	19.43	5.18	5.87	8.26	10.74	7.03	10.06	13.24	8.3	10.74
London					**Niagara**					**Ottawa**				
492.74	1778.06	1016.83	506.52	713.41	602.62	686.96	642.09	590.76	753.99	517.19	365.28	377.14	344.99	687.34
194.52	225.21	201.05	230.68	287.23	321.66	354.63	321.63	321.82	290.69	131.99	275.34	244.17	230.17	283.35
34.95	38.24	35.85	41.56	40.08	44.06	41.76	42.34	38.38	39.09	21.77	23.51	25.64	25.22	40.42
5.51	7.09	5.35	4.62	4.86	6.71	6.70	6.36	5.51	5.13	1.59	2.16	2.24	2.3	4.68
0.35	0.32	0.19	0.22	0.21	0.67	0.73	0.67	0.67	0.54	0.20	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.10
0.60	1.17	0.8	0.79	0.93	0.75	1.20	1.14	0.81	1.03	0.27	0.36	0.36	0.34	0.87
65733	71799	72070	67459.82	72252	66145	66324	66160	76077	72252	85981	88697	87928	87608	70907
7.53	9.09	8.2	7.56	7.89	7.53	7.54	7.54	7.54	7.89	7.20	7.19	7.19	7.03	7.78
16.40	21.16	20.33	18.7	19.83	17.7	17.74	18.85	17.73	19.83	12.23	16.81	16.43	16.92	20.39
17.50	12.42	17.32	9.81	10.74	9.13	5.00	5.51	10.86	10.74	26.3	40.48	38.64	39.44	10.47
Thunder Bay					**Guelph**					**Waterloo**				
2917.89	719.68	1720.01	2054.45	749.93	601.22	600.84	740.65	457.79	725.58	447.41	546.37	490.49	463.8	772.01
176.12	623.46	397.6	221.58	290.34	90.56	297.05	207.3	232.43	288.27	229.53	229.36	229.28	248.58	290.45
45.19	48.75	45.16	40.43	39.19	29.14	31.84	29.95	30.17	39.82	25.49	33.73	27.24	26.45	37.51
16.84	8.05	7.87	8.51	5.10	2.31	3.29	3.47	3.37	4.94	2.72	4.64	3.7	3.44	5.32
1.10	0.87	0.75	0.82	0.51	0.26	0.26	0.23	0.23	0.30	1.55	1.44	0.86	0.89	1.09
1.62	1.41	1.61	1.4	1.02	0.74	0.74	0.72	0.74	0.96	0.56	1.07	0.56	0.77	1.15
68755	65571	66373	69537	72252	84639	84633	84534	81698	72252	80131	80057	80290	93837	73597
8.40	8.90	9.02	8.4	7.89	5.50	6.68	7.03	6.33	7.89	6.47	6.86	8.22	6.5	7.99
22.40	20.21	22.41	22.41	19.83	17.93	17.27	17.82	18.11	19.83	17.73	17.68	17.76	14.71	19.28
3.6	3.54	2.93	4.58	10.74	11.90	13.33	16.57	22.55	10.74	20.00	10.38	37.19	20.3	11.00

Mort.=Mortality; pop.=population; prop.=proportion; w/o=without

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.13.21267739; this version posted December 16, 2021. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Emergency department visits				Hospitalizations				Deaths			
Crude (95% CI)	P-value	Adj. (95% CI)	P-value	Crude (95% CI)	P-value	Adj. (95% CI)	P-value	Crude (95% CI)	P-value	Adj. (95% CI)	P-value
.03 (1.02, 1.04)	<0.0001	1.03 (1.02, 1.04)	<0.0001	1.01 (1.00, 1.02)	0.1133	1.01 (1.00, 1.01)	0.0245	1.03 (1.02, 1.04)	<0.0001	1.03 (1.02, 1.04)	<0.0001
.36 (1.23, 1.49)	<0.0001	1.36 (1.17, 1.58)	<0.0001	1.49 (0.80, 2.79)	0.2070	1.49 (0.96, 2.31)	0.0721	2.14 (1.52, 3.03)	<0.0001	2.14 (1.49, 3.09)	<0.0001
.01 (1.00, 1.01)	0.0037	1.01 (1.00, 1.01)	0.0420	1.00 (1.00, 1.01)	0.6848	1.00 (1.00, 1.01)	0.5266	1.01 (1.00, 1.02)	0.0089	1.01 (1.00, 1.02)	0.0064
.07 (0.96, 1.19)	0.2070	1.07 (1.00, 1.15)	0.0550	0.88 (0.74, 1.04)	0.1414	0.88 (0.76, 1.01)	0.0700	0.95 (0.78, 1.15)	0.5912	0.95 (0.84, 1.07)	0.3815
.98 (0.97, 0.99)	0.0011	0.98 (0.97, 0.99)	<0.0001	1.00 (0.98, 1.02)	0.7380	1.00 (0.98, 1.01)	0.6352	1.00 (0.98, 1.02)	0.9995	1.00 (0.99, 1.01)	0.9989
.71 (0.57, 0.90)	0.0040	0.71 (0.60, 0.84)	<0.0001	0.99 (0.67, 1.46)	0.9597	0.99 (0.74, 1.33)	0.9473	1.15 (0.76, 1.74)	0.5062	1.15 (0.96, 1.38)	0.1255
.96 (0.93, 0.99)	0.0038	0.96 (0.92, 0.99)	0.0261	0.95 (0.91, 1.00)	0.0534	0.95 (0.92, 0.98)	0.0014	1.00 (0.95, 1.05)	0.9541	1.00 (0.96, 1.04)	0.9432
29 (1.26, 22.10)	0.0225	5.29 (1.03, 27.24)	0.0466	2.63 (0.25, 28.17)	0.4240	2.63 (0.57, 12.07)	0.2133	0.37 (0.03, 4.89)	0.4537	0.37 (0.09, 1.60)	0.1847
.04 (0.00, 8.97)	0.2484	0.04 (0.00, 23.39)	0.3278	0.08 (0.00, 191.72)	0.5232	0.08 (0.00, 23.37)	0.3818	0.00 (0.00, 0.47)	0.0346	0.00 (0.00, 0.15)	0.0162
73 (0.15, 20.31)	0.6625	1.73 (0.07, 40.03)	0.7322	4.51 (0.08, 249.64)	0.4619	4.51 (0.49, 41.28)	0.1822	0.01 (0.00, 1.06)	0.0531	0.01 (0.00, 1.05)	0.0528

using Newey-West method

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.13.21267739; this version posted December 16, 2021. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.13.21267739; this version posted December 16, 2021. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

REFERENCES

1. Special Advisory Committee on the Epidemic of Opioid Overdoses. Opioid- and Stimulant-related Harms in Canada. Ottawa: Public Health Agency of Canada; September 2021.
2. Tam T. Commentary - Building the evidence base for sustained public health response to the opioid epidemic in Canada. Health promotion and chronic disease prevention in Canada : research, policy and practice. 2018;38(6):221-2.
3. Canadian Institute for Health Information. Opioid-Related Harms in Canada, December 2018. Ottawa, ON: CIHI; 2018.
4. Statistics Canada. Life tables, 2016/2018. Ottawa: Statistics Canada; 2020 28 January 2020.
5. Strike C, Watson TM. Losing the uphill battle? Emergent harm reduction interventions and barriers during the opioid overdose crisis in Canada. International Journal of Drug Policy. 2019;71:178-82.
6. Wallace B, Pagan F, Pauly BB. The implementation of overdose prevention sites as a novel and nimble response during an illegal drug overdose public health emergency. The International journal on drug policy. 2019;66:64-72.
7. BC Ministry of Health. Overdose Prevention Victoria, BC: BC Ministry of Health; 2017 [Available from: https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/overdose/what-you-need-to-know/overdose-prevention.
8. Potier C, Laprévote V, Dubois-Arber F, Cottencin O, Rolland B. Supervised injection services: what has been demonstrated? A systematic literature review. Drug and alcohol dependence. 2014;1(145):48-68.
9. Pardo B, Caulkins JP, Kilmer B. Assessing the Evidence on Supervised Consumption Sites. RAND Corproation; 2018.
10. Kennedy MC, Hayashi K, Milloy MJ, Wood E, Kerr T. Supervised injection facility use and all-cause mortality among people who inject drugs in Vancouver, Canada: A cohort study. PLOS Medicine. 2019;16(11):e1002964.
11. Caulkins JP, Pardo B, Kilmer B. Supervised consumption sites: a nuanced assessment of the causal evidence. Addiction (Abingdon, England). 2019;114(12):2109-15.
12. Government of Ontario. Ontario Demographic Quarterly: Highlights of first quarter 2020 Toronto, ON: Queen's Printer for Ontario, 2012-21; 2020 [Available from: https://www.ontario.ca/page/ontario-demographic-quarterly-highlights-first-quarter-2020.
13. Izenberg D, Iroanyah N, Thompson S. Uninsured patients in Ontario: People get sicker, the system pays more. Healthy Debate. 2018.
14. Canadian Pharmacists Association. Environmental Scan: Access to naloxone across Canada. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Pharmacists Association; 2017.
15. Canadian Centre on Substance Abuse, Canadian Community Epidemiology Network on Drug Use. CCENDU Bulletin: The Availability of Take-Home Naloxone in Canada. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Centre on Substance Abuse; 2016.
16. Government of Canada. About the Good Samaritan Drug Overdose Act Ottawa, ON2018 [updated 03 August 2018. Available from: https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/substance-use/problematic-prescription-drug-use/opioids/about-good-samaritan-drug-overdose-act.html.
17. Gogolishvili D, Wasdell M. Effectiveness of take-home naloxone programs and availability of naloxone nasal spray in different jurisdictions. Toronto, ON: The Ontario HIV Treatment Network; 2020.
18. Ontario Ministry of Health, Ontario Ministry of Long-Term Care. Applications Now Open for Overdose Prevention Sites Toronto, ON: Queen's Publisher for Ontario, 2008-2018; 2018 [Available from: https://www.health.gov.on.ca/en/news/bulletin/2018/hb_20180111.aspx.
19. Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care. Consumption and treatment services: Application guide. Toronto, ON; 2018.
20. Pivot Legal Society. Canada's supervised consumption and overdose prevention sites Vancouver, BC: Pivot Legal Society; 2020 [Available from: https://www.pivotlegal.org/scs_ops_map.
21. Government of Canada. Supervised consumption sites: status of applications 2021 [Available from: https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/substance-abuse/supervised-consumption-sites/status-application.html.
22. Ontario Agency for Health Protection and Promotion (Public Health Ontario). Interactive Opioid Tool. Toronto, ON: Queen's Printer for Ontario; 2020.
23. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2014.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.13.21267739; this version posted December 16, 2021. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

24. Abadie A, Diamond A, Hainmueller J. Synth: An {R} Package for Synthetic Control Methods in Comparative Case Studies. Journal of Statistical Software. 2011;42(13):1-17.
25. Castanho Silva B, DeWitt M. SCtools: Extensions for Synthetic Controls Analysis. R package version 0.3.1. 2020.
26. Bilinski A. Goldilocks and the Pre-Intervention Time Series: How Long is 'Just Right' and the Parallel Trends Implications. 2021.
27. Sims CA. Seasonality in regression. J Am Stat Assoc. 1974;69:618-26.
28. Marshall BDL, Milloy MJ, Wood E, Montaner JS, Kerr T. Reduction in overdose mortality after the opening of North America's first medically supervised safer injecting facility: a retrospective population-based study. Lancet. 2011;377(9775):1429-37.
29. NCHECR. Sydney Medically Supervised Injecting Centre Evaluation Report No. 4: Evaluation of service operation and overdose-related events. Sydney, NSW: University of New South Wales; 2007.
30. The Evaluation of Overdose Prevention Sites Working Group, Lori Wagar. Evaluation of Overdose Prevention Sites: Campbell River, Courtenay, Cowichan Valley, and Port Alberni - FINAL REPORT. Victoria, BC: Island Health Authority; 2018 August 2018.
31. Irvine MA, Kuo M, Buxton JA, Balshaw R, Otterstatter M, Macdougall L, et al. Modelling the combined impact of interventions in averting deaths during a synthetic-opioid overdose epidemic. Addiction (Abingdon, England). 2019;114(9):1602-13.
32. Cook TD, DT C. Quasi-experimentation: design analysis issues for field settings. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company; 1979.
33. Zhang F, Wagner AK, Ross-Degnan D. Simulation-based power calculation for designing interrupted time series analyses of health policy interventions. J Clin Epidemiol. 2011;64(11):1252-61.
34. Bouttell J, Popham F, Lewsey J, Robinson M, Craig P. Use of synthetic control methodology for evaluating public health interventions: a literature review. The Lancet. 2017;390:S26.
35. Linden A. Challenges to validity in single-group interrupted time series analysis. Journal of evaluation in clinical practice. 2017;23(2):413-8.
36. Linden A. Persistent threats to validity in single-group interrupted time series analysis with a cross over design. Journal of evaluation in clinical practice. 2017;23(2):419-25.
37. Linden A. Conducting Interrupted Time-series Analysis for Single- and Multiple-group Comparisons. The Stata Journal. 2015;15(2):480-500.
38. Hawkins NG, Sanson-Fisher RW, Shakeshaft A, D'Este C, Green LW. The multiple baseline design for evaluating population-based research. American journal of preventive medicine. 2007;33(2):162-8.
39. Tyndall M. A safer drug supply: a pragmatic and ethical response to the overdose crisis. Canadian Medical Association Journal. 2020;192(34):E986-E7.
40. Collins AB, Boyd J, Mayer S, Fowler A, Kennedy MC, Bluthenthal RN, et al. Policing space in the overdose crisis: A rapid ethnographic study of the impact of law enforcement practices on the effectiveness of overdose prevention sites. International Journal of Drug Policy. 2019;73:199-207.
41. Foreman-Mackey A, Bayoumi AM, Miskovic M, Kolla G, Strike C. 'It's our safe sanctuary': Experiences of using an unsanctioned overdose prevention site in Toronto, Ontario. International Journal of Drug Policy. 2019;73:135-40.
42. Beard E, Marsden J, Brown J, Tombor I, Stapleton J, Michie S, et al. Understanding and using time series analyses in addiction research. Addiction (Abingdon, England). 2019;114(10):1866-84.
43. Medical Officer of Health. Toronto Overdose Action Plan: Status Report 2018. Toronto, ON: City of Toronto; 2018 4 June 2018.
44. CBC News. Toronto's first permanent supervised injection site opens downtown. CBC News. 2017 8 November 2017.
45. Surveillance & Epidemiology. Toronto Overdose Information System Toronto, ON: City of Toronto; 2021 [Available from: https://public.tableau.com/app/profile/tphseu/viz/TOISDashboard_Final/ParamedicResponse
46. Draaisma M, Lucs I. The Works superised injection site reopens with physical distancing measures in place. CBC News. 2020 18 April 2020.
47. Toronto Drop-In Network. Overdose Prevention Site, Supervised Injection Services and Safe Consumption Service Hours List. Toronto, ON2018.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.13.21267739; this version posted December 16, 2021. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

48. Harm Reduction TO. Supervised Consumption Services: OPS, SIS/SCS, & CTS 24 May 2019 [Available from: https://harmreductionto.ca/sis-ops-scs-cts.
49. Toronto Public Health. @TOPublicHealth Toronto, ON: Toronto Public Health; 2020 [Available from: https://twitter.com/topublichealth/status/1259885006396284929.
50. CBC News. Toronto opens new safe injection site at Fred Victor Centre. CBC News. 2018 21 February 2018.
51. Toronto Central Health Line. Queen and Jarvis Site - Supervised Consumption Service Toronto, ON2021 [Available from: https://www.torontocentralhealthline.ca/displayservice.aspx?id=182489.
52. Fred Victor. Fred Victor's response to the COVID-19 pandemic Toronto, ON2020 [Available from: https://www.fredvictor.org/fred-victors-response-to-the-covid-19-pandemic/.
53. Pride Toronto. Community Resources in Response to COVID-19. 2020.
54. Mullin M. Citing overdose 'crisis' police to allow unsanctioned Toronto injection site. CBC News. 2017 12 August 2017.
55. Contenta S. Toronto Star: Overdose prevention workers save thousands of lives, but who's saving theirs? Toronto, ON: South Riverdale Community Health Centre; 2019 [Available from: https://www.srchc.ca/news/tag/ops/.
56. CTVNews.ca Staff. Unsanctioned pop-up safe-injection site opens in Toronto. CTV News. 2017.
57. News Staff. Safe injection site opens in Parkdale. CityNews. 2018.
58. Parkdale Queen West Community Health Centre. Hours, Location & Phone Numbers 2018 [Available from: https://pqwchc.org/supervised-injection-service-open-house/
59. City of Toronto. Supervised Consumption Services Toronto, ON2021 [Available from: https://www.toronto.ca/community-people/health-wellness-care/health-programs-advice/supervised-injection-services/.
60. Parkdale Queen West Community Health Centre. Supervised Consumption Services (SCS) - Queen West Site Toronto, ON2020 [Available from: https://pqwchc.org/programs-services/harm-reduction/supervised-consumption-services-scs/.
61. Parkdale Queen West Community Health Centre. Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) about the Overdose Prevention Site at Parkdale. Toronto, ON: Parkdale Queen West Community Health Centre; 2018 16 August 2018.
62. Toronto Central Health Line. Parkdale Queen West Community Health Centre - Parkdale Site Toronto, ON2021 [Available from: https://www.torontocentralhealthline.ca/displayservice.aspx?id=167074.
63. Jones RP. New temporary safe injection sites open in Kensington, Regent Park. CBC News. 2018.
64. Regent Park Community Health Centre. OPS Pamphlet. In: Centre RPCH, editor. Toronto, ON2020.
65. Kolla G, Penn R, Long C. Evaluation of the Overdose Prevention Sites at Street Health and St. Stephen's Community House. Toronto, ON: Street Health and St. Stephen's Community House; 2019 November 2019.
66. Street Health Community Health Centre. Street Health Overdose Prevention Site. In: Health S, editor. 2018.
67. Toronto Drop-In Network. Evaluation of the Overdose Prevention Services at St. Stephen's Community House and Street Health Toronto, ON2020 [Available from: https://www.tdin.ca/resource.php?id=671.
68. St. Stephen's Community House. Temporary overdose prevention site at 260 Augusta Ave. Toronto, ON: St. Stephen's Community House Toronto; 2018 [Available from: https://www.sschto.ca/About-Us/In-The-News/News/Overdose-Prevention-Site-at-260-Augusta-Ave.
69. City of Hamilton. Consumption and Treatment Services (CTS) 2018 [Available from: https://www.hamilton.ca/city-initiatives/strategies-actions/consumption-and-treatment-services#:~:text=June%205%2C%202018%20Urban%20Core,Centre%20and%20Shelter%20Health%20Network.
70. Hamilton Urban Core Community Health Centre. Consumption & Treatment Service Hamilton, ON2018 [Available from:

http://hucchc.com/health-and-wellness-programs/harm-reduction/.
71. Hamilton Public Library. Overdose Prevention Site Hamilton, ON: Community Information by Hamilton Public Library; 2020 [Available from: https://redbook.hpl.ca/node/14141.
72. Hurdle L. Consumption and Treatment Services - Street Health Centre. Kingston, ON: City of Kingston; 2019. Contract No.: 19-008.
73. Ferguson E. Ministry to set up overdose prevention site. The Kingston Whig Standard. 2018 9 May 2018.
74. Kingston Frontenac Lennox and Addincton Public Health. Consumption and Treatment Services: KFLAPH; 2020 [Available from: https://www.kflaph.ca/en/healthy-living/consumption-and-treatment-services-site.aspx.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.13.21267739; this version posted December 16, 2021. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

75. Middlesex-London Health Unit. Temporary Overdose Prevention Site (TOPS) London, ON: Middlesex-London Health Unit; 2018 [Available from: https://www.healthunit.com/temporary-overdose-prevention-site.
76. CBC News. Take a tour of London's Temporary Overdose Prevention Site. CBC News. 2018 12 February 2018.
77. Kitching S. Overdose Prevention Site to Open Monday. 2018.
78. Lupton A. COVID-19 puts new focus on space constraints at London's drug-use site London, ON: CBC News; 2020 [Available from: https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/london/covid-19-puts-new-focus-on-space-constraints-at-london-s-drug-use-site-1.5590576.
79. Clementson L. St. Catharines home to first supervised consumption site in Niagara region St. Catherines, ON: CBC News; 2019 [Available from: https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/hamilton/st-catharins-consumption-sit-1.4963875.
80. The Welland Tribune. Positive living Niagara facing challenges during pandemic. Niagara Falls Review. 2020.
81. Ottawa Prevention. Overdose Prevention Ottawa Summary Report. Ottawa, ON; 2018.
82. Raymond T. Ottawa Public Health to expand supervised consumption services at Clarence Street. CTV News. 2018 6 February 2018.
83. CBC News. Injection site scaling back hours due to funding shortfall. CBC News. 2019 6 November 2019.
84. Crawford B. City's first permanent supervised injection site opens at Sandy Hill Community Health Centre. Ottawa Citizen. 2018 17 April 2018.
85. Jones RP. Injection sites scales back physical distancing rules to prevent ODs. CBC News. 2020 17 May 2020.
86. DelVillano S, de Groh M, Morrison H, Do MT. At-a-glance - Supervised Injection Services: a community-based response to the opioid crisis in the City of Ottawa, Canada. Health promotion and chronic disease prevention in Canada : research, policy and practice. 2019;39(3):112-5.
87. Payne E. Province supports new Inner City Health supervised injection site. Ottawa Citizen. 2017 30 October 2017.
88. Fagan L. ByWard Market supervised injeciton trailer to get permanent home. CBC News. 2019 3 July 2019.
89. Reynolds C. Supervised injection sites across Canada hampered by COVID-19. The Canadian Press. 2021 24 January 2021.
90. Whan C. New temporary overdose prevention site opens in Somerset West. Global News. 2018 2 May 2018.
91. Raymond T. Somerset West CHC launches new supervised drug consumption site. CTV News. 2018 2 May 2018.
92. Pivot Legal Society. Canada's Supervised Consumption and Overdose Prevention Sites Vancouver, BC2019 [Available from: https://www.pivotlegal.org/scs_ops_map.
93. Diaczuk D. Overdose prevention site now open. TBnewswatch. 2018 27 November 2018.
94. NorWest Community Health Centres. NorWest CHC is expanding its harm reduction services 24 March 2020 [Available from: https://www.norwestchc.org/locations/thunder-bay/programs/path-525.
95. 211 Ontario North. Norwest community health centres: Path 525 Thunder Bay, ON2020 [Available from: https://211north.ca/record/65782603/.
96. Groleau C. Overdose prevention site in Guelph logs 430 visits since opening. CBC News. 2018 5 July 2018.
97. Wellington-Duffering-Guelph PH. Where to get take-home naloxone kits 2018 [Available from: https://www.wdgpublichealth.ca/your-health/opioids-and-naloxone/local-opioid-resources.
98. Armstrong K. Guelph safe injection site to double its capacity. GuelphToday. 2020 22 February 2020.
99. Centre GCH. Reduced Health Services Hours Guelph, ON2020 [Available from: https://guelphchc.ca/reduced-health-service-hours/.
100. CBC News. Here's what Kitchener's consumption treatment site looks like. CBC News. 2019 4 October 2019.
101. Senoran H. Permanent CTS site coming to downtown Kitchener one year after temporary site opened. CTV News. 2020 9 October 2020.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.13.21267739; this version posted December 16, 2021. 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. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



Figure 1. Controlled interrupted time series plots of aggregate analyses