

1
2
3 Evaluation of an emergency safe supply drugs and managed alcohol program in COVID-19 isolation hotel
4 shelters for people experiencing homelessness

5
6 Thomas D. Brothers, MD^{1,2}; Malcolm Leaman, MMASc³; Matthew Bonn⁴; Dan Lewer, MSc²; Jacqueline
7 Atkinson, NP^{3*}; John Fraser, MD^{3,5,6*}; Amy Gillis, MD^{5*}; Michael Gniewek, MD^{5,7*}; Leisha Hawker, MD^{3,5*};
8 Heather Hayman, NP^{3*}; Peter Jorna, BScPh^{8*}; David Martell, MD^{5,7*}; Tiffany O'Donnell, MD^{3,5*}; Helen
9 Rivers-Bowerman, RN³; Leah Genge, MD^{3,5,7}

10
11 ¹Department of Medicine (General Internal Medicine & Clinician-Investigator Program), Faculty of
12 Medicine, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada
13 ²UCL Collaborative Centre for Inclusion Health, Institute of Epidemiology & Health Care, University
14 College London, London, UK
15 ³North End Community Health Centre, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada
16 ⁴Canadian Association of People who Use Drugs, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, Canada
17 ⁵Department of Family Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada
18 ⁶Department of Anesthesia, Pain Management & Perioperative Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Dalhousie
19 University, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada
20 ⁷Direction 180, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada
21 ⁸Nova Pharmacy, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada

22
23 *These authors listed in alphabetical order

24
25 **Address correspondence to:** Thomas D. Brothers, MD (thomas.brothers@dal.ca)

26
27

28 **ABSTRACT**

29 **Background:** During a COVID-19 outbreak in the congregate shelter system in Halifax, Nova Scotia,
30 Canada, a multidisciplinary health care team provided an emergency “safe supply” of pharmaceutical-
31 grade medications and beverage-grade alcohol to facilitate isolation in COVID-19 hotel shelters for
32 residents who are dependent on these substances. We aimed to evaluate (a) substances and dosages
33 provided, and (b) effectiveness and safety of the program.

34 **Methods:** We retrospectively reviewed medical records of all COVID-19 isolation hotel shelter residents
35 during May 2021. We extracted data on medication and alcohol dosages provided each day. The primary
36 outcome was residents prematurely leaving isolation against public health orders. Adverse events
37 included (a) overdose; (b) intoxication; and (c) diversion, selling, or sharing of medications or alcohol.

38 **Results:** Over 25 days, 77 isolation hotel residents were assessed (mean age 42 ± 14 years; 24% women).
39 Sixty-two (81%) residents were provided medications, alcohol, or cigarettes. Seventeen residents (22%)
40 received opioid agonist treatment medications (methadone, buprenorphine, or slow-release oral
41 morphine) and 27 (35%) received hydromorphone tablets. Thirty-one (40%) residents received stimulant
42 tablets with methylphenidate (27; 35%), dextroamphetamine (8; 10%), or lisdexamfetamine (2; 3%). Six
43 residents (8%) received benzodiazepines. Forty-two (55%) residents received alcohol, including 41 (53%)
44 with strong beer, three (3%) with wine, and one (1%) with hard liquor. Over 14 days in isolation, mean
45 daily dosages increased of hydromorphone (45 ± 32 to 57 ± 42 mg), methylphenidate (51 ± 28 to $77 \pm$
46 37 mg), dextroamphetamine (33 ± 16 to 46 ± 13 mg), and alcohol (12.3 ± 7.6 to 13.0 ± 6.9 standard
47 drinks). Six residents (8%) left isolation prematurely, but four of those residents returned. Over 1,059
48 person-days in isolation, there were zero overdoses. Documented concerns regarding intoxication
49 occurred six times (0.005 events/person-day) and medication diversion or sharing three times (0.003
50 events/person-day).

51 **Conclusions:** An emergency safe supply and managed alcohol program, paired with housing, was
52 associated with low rates of adverse events and high rates of successful completion of the 14-day
53 isolation period in COVID-19 isolation hotel shelters. This supports the effectiveness and safety of
54 emergency safe supply prescribing and managed alcohol in this setting.

55
56 **MESH Term Keywords:** Substance Use; Drug Addiction; Harm Reduction; Substance Abuse, Intravenous;
57 Substance-Related Disorders; Needle-Exchange Programs; Opiate Substitution Treatment; Coronavirus
58

59 **BACKGROUND**

60 The COVID-19 pandemic and associated public health restrictions have had a disproportionate impact on
61 people who use drugs and/or alcohol (1–3). Disruptions to drug supply routes have led to an increasingly
62 toxic and unpredictable drug supply, while physical distancing requirements cause more people to use
63 drugs alone (where they cannot be resuscitated if they overdose) and have reduced capacity and
64 operating hours at harm reduction and addiction treatment programs (4–6). People who are dependent
65 on substances may be unable to follow public health directives to isolate if they have been exposed to
66 COVID-19, due to withdrawal symptoms or compulsive use (1). For people who use drugs and/or alcohol
67 and are also experiencing homelessness, staying in congregate shelters increases risks of COVID-19
68 infection; people in this situation would be unable to isolate unless given a private place to stay (7,8).

69
70 To facilitate physical distancing and decrease risks of COVID-19 infection, withdrawal, and overdose,
71 Canadian clinicians developed rapid guidelines to provide a regular, safe supply of pharmaceutical-grade
72 drugs and of beverage-grade alcohol to people who are dependent on these substances (9–12). The
73 rationale for providing an alternative “safe supply” of substances to remove harms caused by reliance
74 on the criminalized, unregulated, and poisonous drug market was first advanced by the Canadian
75 Association of People who Used Drugs (CAPUD)(1,13,14) and developed clinically by Sereda and
76 colleagues(15) and by Tyndall and colleagues(16), before the COVID-19 pandemic. Provisional
77 prescribing of safe supply medications and managed alcohol to facilitate COVID-19 related physical
78 distancing or isolation has also been termed “risk mitigation” or “pandemic prescribing” (1,9,17–19).
79 The uptake of these prescribing guidelines on a population level is under evaluation (17,20), but the
80 clinical safety and effectiveness of this approach for people in COVID-19 isolation has not been
81 demonstrated.

82

83 In May 2021, there was a COVID-19 outbreak in the congregate shelter housing system in Halifax, Nova
84 Scotia, Canada, and all residents in shelters experiencing COVID-19 outbreaks were moved to isolation
85 hotel shelters for 14 days. A multidisciplinary health care team provided emergency, temporary safe
86 supply medications and beverage-grade alcohol to facilitate isolation for residents who are dependent
87 on these substances.

88
89 We aimed to describe the organization and delivery of an emergency, provisional safe supply drug and
90 managed alcohol program during a COVID-19 outbreak in the congregate shelter system in Halifax, Nova
91 Scotia, Canada. We evaluated safety of the program through the frequency of substance-related adverse
92 events (including fatal and non-fatal overdose), and effectiveness through the rate of premature
93 resident-initiated discharge from isolation against Public Health orders.

94

95 **METHODS**

96 **Setting and data sources**

97 This study comprises a retrospective case series of all COVID-19 isolation hotel shelter residents
98 admitted during the Spring 2021 COVID-19 outbreak in the congregate shelter system in Halifax, Nova
99 Scotia. This manuscript is reported in accordance with the Strengthening The Reporting of Observational
100 studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) checklist (21).

101

102 People who stayed at shelters identified to have COVID-19 outbreaks were moved to isolation in hotels
103 funded by the provincial government. At this stage in the pandemic, they were mandated to isolate for
104 14 days under authority of the Nova Scotia *Health Protection Act*. Isolation hotel shelters were in the city
105 centre, several blocks away from residents' usual congregate shelters. Residents of a given shelter
106 typically stayed on the same hotel floor, with shelter staff continuing to support them there.

107

108 Data were extracted from the shared electronic medical record, including progress notes, electronic
109 prescriptions, and messaging. Using structured chart review, each resident's information was extracted
110 in duplicate, once by a graduate student researcher (ML) and once by a clinician with experience
111 prescribing these medications (TDB, MG, or AG). Discrepancies were resolved by TDB.

112

113 **Program description**

114 Mobile Outreach Street Health (MOSH) organized a team of physicians and nurse practitioners with
115 experience in addiction medicine and harm reduction, established a weekly clinical care coverage
116 schedule, and provided access to a shared digital electronic medical record. MOSH was established in
117 2009 to provide outreach primary care to people experiencing homelessness and people who use drugs
118 in Halifax; the organization has long-standing relationships with the city's shelters and many of the
119 residents. All residents being moved to isolation were referred to the harm reduction prescribing team
120 for assessment. Nurses, nurse practitioners, and physicians performed intake assessments on substance
121 use and health history; most assessments were done over the phone, but some were done in person.
122 Prescribers had access to province-wide pharmacy information system to confirm patient reports of
123 prescribed medications, including opioid agonist treatment (OAT). Some patients were previously seen
124 by MOSH or the associated North End Community Health Centre, and in this case had existing medical
125 records the team could access.

126

127 Physicians and nurse practitioners prescribed pharmaceutical-grade substances generally following the
128 BC Centre on Substance Use (BCCSU) Guidelines: Risk Mitigation in the Context of Dual Public Health
129 Emergencies document (9), and beverage-grade alcohol according to MOSH managed alcohol program's
130 protocols. See Table 1 for a summary of prescribing guidance used by the MOSH team. Residents were

131 aware that both the hotel-based private housing and the safe supply medications would only be
132 provided for 14 days while they were isolating under Public Health orders.

133

134 The BCCSU guidelines were developed in British Columbia, which has a more potent and unpredictable
135 illicit drug supply than Nova Scotia; as a result, prescribers did not know whether the recommended
136 dosing ranges in the BCCSU guidelines would be required or appropriate. Compared to Nova Scotia,
137 British Columbia has much higher rates of illicitly manufactured fentanyl, fentanyl analogues, novel
138 benzodiazepines, and methamphetamine availability and use (22). People who use drugs in Nova Scotia
139 most often use hydromorphone tablets (immediate release or extended release) and cocaine, though
140 rates of illicitly manufactured fentanyl use are increasing (23–26). Largely due to these regional
141 differences in the illicit drug supply, British Columbia experienced a rate of opioid poisoning deaths (39.4
142 per 100,000 people) eight times higher than Nova Scotia (4.9 per 100,000) from January to June, 2021
143 (26).

144

145 Prescribed medications could be taken orally, or crushed and injected or snorted; prescribers reviewed
146 with residents that oral tablets were not designed to be crushed and injected, and provided guidance on
147 safer use within a harm reduction framework. Resident preferences as to specific brands or formulations
148 (e.g. those that might be more soluble in water to facilitate safer injecting) were followed as closely as
149 possible. Liquid hydromorphone for injection use is not included in the BCCSU guidelines and was not
150 considered here; this oversight has been criticized by people who use drugs because of the relatively
151 increased harms associated with injecting oral tablets (27). Cannabis withdrawal is not mentioned in the
152 BCCSU guidelines and the prescribing team initially underappreciated the importance of cannabis
153 cravings and withdrawal symptoms (28), once other needs were met. While trying to facilitate funding
154 for cannabis deliveries to the hotels, prescribers began to offer nabilone as an agonist replacement

155 therapy to residents with cannabis withdrawal symptoms and residents began to order their own
156 cannabis.

157
158 Medications were delivered daily by a local community pharmacist with experience with OAT and a
159 harm reduction philosophy of care. Alcohol was delivered daily by the MOSH managed alcohol program
160 outreach team or dispensed by shelter staff on site. For residents who reported intense binge drinking,
161 alcohol dispensing would be divided into two times per day. Prescribers performed frequent phone
162 follow-ups to adjust dosages, usually daily for the first three days and then as needed. MOSH nurses
163 and/or prescribers would assess residents in person if needed. The team communicated via mobile
164 secure messaging app and discussed challenging cases by phone and virtual video conferences. Mainline
165 Needle Exchange, a local harm reduction outreach organization, provided all residents receiving safe
166 supply medications with take-home naloxone kits, sterile drug preparation and injecting equipment, and
167 support. No dedicated safe consumption space was created; instead, residents were encouraged to try
168 “virtual spotting”(29) with friends or family or with the National Overdose Response Service (NORS)
169 phone line (30), or otherwise to let shelter staff know they were going to be using so they could check in
170 soon after.

171
172 There were no costs to residents at the COVID-19 isolation hotels. Medications were covered either
173 through public drug insurance plans (for those who were enrolled) or by Nova Scotia Public Health (for
174 those without insurance). Alcohol costs were initially covered by the MOSH managed alcohol program,
175 and then through provincial government funding. Sterile injecting equipment and take-home naloxone
176 kits are free to everyone in Nova Scotia, funded by the provincial government.

177

178 **Measures**

179 *Descriptive characteristics*

180 We extracted data on resident demographic characteristics including age and gender. Race and
181 Indigenous status were not routinely evaluated in the medical assessments and therefore were not
182 available for extraction in the medical record. We extracted data on dosages of medications dispensed
183 and calculated daily dosages and averages among patients receiving the medications. Alcohol was
184 converted into Canadian standard drink units (17.05mL or 0.5765oz of pure ethanol).(31)

185

186 *Primary outcome*

187 The primary outcome was the frequency of residents leaving the isolation hotel shelter against public
188 health orders before the mandatory 14 day isolation period was completed.

189

190 *Adverse events*

191 We extracted data on adverse events including documentation of (a) overdose; (b) intoxication; and (c)
192 diversion, sharing, or selling of safe supply medications or alcohol.

193

194 Overdose was defined as fatal or non-fatal drug or alcohol poisoning that would require basic life
195 support, administration of naloxone or oxygen, and/or transfer to the emergency department.

196 Intoxication and diversion, sharing, or selling was documented in medical records as part of prescribers'
197 assessment and plan to continue or change dosages of medications and alcohol, based on prescribers'
198 clinical impression (usually by telephone), by resident report, or by *ad hoc* descriptions by shelter
199 support staff, the pharmacist, or the managed alcohol program outreach team.

200

201 **Analysis**

202 We used Microsoft Excel for data management and to calculate summary statistics and R 3.6.3 for data
203 visualizations. We described individual trajectories by creating separate plots for each resident's daily
204 dosages of opioids, stimulants, and alcohol. To compare different substances on the same visual scale,
205 we transformed individual's daily dosages into a percentage of the maximum daily dosage of that
206 substance received across the whole sample; for example, the maximum daily hydromorphone dosage
207 across all residents was 158mg, so an individual resident receiving 48mg of hydromorphone in a day
208 would have a percentage value of $48\text{mg} \div 158\text{mg} \times 100\% = 30\%$ for that day.

209

210 **RESULTS**

211 **Participants**

212 Over 25 days, 77 residents were admitted to COVID-19 isolation hotel shelters and referred to the
213 medical team (Table 2). In total, there were 1,059 person-days in isolation after medical assessment.
214 Most participants were men, and average age differed by gender. Mean age for men was 46 ± 14 years,
215 and for women was 30 ± 10 years. After intake assessment, 15 residents (19%) were determined to have
216 no concerns about substance withdrawal or dependence while in isolation and were given no
217 medications, alcohol, or cigarettes. Sixty-two residents (81%) were provided medications, alcohol, or
218 cigarettes, summarized by day of isolation in Figure 1.

219

220 Cigarettes were the most commonly provided substance (64 residents; 83% of total sample), followed
221 by alcohol (42 residents; 55% of total sample), and hydromorphone tablets (27 residents; 35% of total
222 sample). Seventeen residents (22%) received any OAT, including eight who initiated OAT medications in
223 the isolation hotel shelters. All eight of these residents initiated SROM, and no residents initiated
224 methadone or buprenorphine-naloxone. Twelve residents received both OAT and hydromorphone
225 tablets on the same day (71% of residents receiving OAT); four of these residents were already on OAT

226 before isolation. Two residents accepted offers of nicotine replacement therapy, including one resident
227 who also had cigarettes delivered.

228

229 **Safe supply medication and managed alcohol dosages**

230 Among the 27 residents receiving hydromorphone, average dosages increased over residents' time in
231 isolation from day one (mean 45mg \pm 32mg; median 32mg; range 16 - 158mg daily) to day 14 (mean
232 57mg \pm 42mg; median 48mg; range 16 - 158mg daily) (Supplementary Figure S1). Three (12%) of these
233 27 residents were prescribed hydromorphone dosages above the BCCSU guideline suggested upper limit
234 of 112mg daily (14 x 8mg tablets). Individual daily dosage trajectories for hydromorphone and OAT are
235 visualized in Figure 2, plotted as percentages of the maximum daily dosage of each medication across
236 the whole sample. The maximum daily dosage for methadone was 195mg, for buprenorphine was 12mg,
237 for SROM was 800mg; and for hydromorphone was 158mg.

238

239 Among residents receiving stimulants, average dosages also increased over time (Supplementary Figure
240 S2). Methylphenidate daily dosages increased from day one (mean 51mg \pm 28mg; median 40mg; range
241 10 - 107mg) to day 14 (mean 77mg \pm 37mg; median 80mg; range 15 - 160mg). Dextroamphetamine daily
242 dosages increased from day one (mean 33mg \pm 16mg; median 30mg; range 20 – 60mg) to day 14 (mean
243 46mg \pm 13mg; median 40mg; range 30 – 60mg). Four (15%) of 27 residents receiving methylphenidate
244 were prescribed doses above the BCCSU guideline suggested upper limit of 100mg daily. Of eight
245 residents receiving dextroamphetamine, one (13%) required dosages above the guideline suggested
246 upper limit of 120mg daily. Individual daily dosage trajectories for stimulant medications are visualized
247 in Figure 3, plotted as percentages of the maximum daily dosage of each medication across the whole
248 sample (methylphenidate 160mg, dextroamphetamine 80mg, and lisdexamfetamine 60mg).

249

250 Average daily alcohol dosages increased slightly over time from day one (mean 12.3 ± 7.6 standard
251 drinks; median 11.25 standard drinks; range 1.25 - 33.75 standard drinks) to day 14 (mean 13.0 ± 6.9
252 standard drinks; median 13.1 standard drinks; range 1.25 - 30.75 standard drinks) (Supplementary
253 Figure S3). Individual daily dosage trajectories for alcohol are visualized in Figure 4, plotted as
254 percentages of the maximum daily dosage of alcohol across the whole sample (37.5 standard drinks).

255
256 Benzodiazepine dosages were relatively stable. Clonazepam increased slightly from day one (mean 1.67
257 ± 1.15 ; median 1mg; range 1 – 3mg) to day 14 (mean 2.00 ± 1.41 mg; median 1mg; range 1 - 4mg) and
258 the only lorazepam daily dosage was stable at 1mg. Nabilone dosages increased from mean $2\text{mg} \pm 0\text{mg}$
259 on day one to mean $2.79\text{mg} \pm 1.25\text{mg}$ on day 14, while an unknown number of residents had cannabis
260 delivered to the isolation hotel shelters.

261

262 **Primary outcome**

263 Among the 77 isolation hotel residents, six (8%) left against public health orders. Four of these six soon
264 returned and remained in isolation, resulting in two (3%) persistent premature discharges from
265 isolation.

266

267 **Adverse events**

268 Over 1,059 person-days in isolation, there were zero overdoses in the isolation hotel shelters. Concerns
269 regarding intoxication were documented six times (0.005 events per person-day); four of these residents
270 with documented intoxication were provided alcohol and four were provided opioids (three with OAT
271 plus hydromorphone, and one with hydromorphone only). Concerns regarding diversion, sharing, or
272 selling of medications was documented three times (0.003 events per person-day), including among two

273 residents who also had documented intoxication. All three of these residents were provided multiple
274 substances, including opioids, stimulants, and alcohol.

275

276 **DISCUSSION**

277 Among residents of a COVID-19 isolation hotel shelter for people experiencing homelessness, we found
278 that an emergency, provisional safe supply program (i.e. prescribing pharmaceutical-grade medications
279 and beverage-grade alcohol) was associated with low rates of adverse events and high rates of
280 successful completion of the 14-day isolation period. No shelter residents experienced an overdose
281 during their stay. We identified medication dosage ranges that generally fell within those recommended
282 in “risk mitigation” prescribing guidelines, which were urgently produced in response to evolving risks of
283 COVID-19. This supports the safety and effectiveness of this approach in this setting.

284

285 The safe supply drug and alcohol prescribing practices described in this evaluation are a recent
286 development. While the relative safety of medications and alcohol dispensed for unwitnessed
287 consumption has not been previously well-described in the literature, the practice is an extension of the
288 evidence from witnessed consumption settings (14,15,18,25,32,33). Witnessed injectable OAT (iOAT)
289 with liquid hydromorphone or diacetylmorphine (Heroin) has a robust evidence-based and has been
290 incorporated into Canadian clinical practice guidelines for opioid use disorder (34,35). Qualitative
291 studies have evaluated the benefits of witnessed hydromorphone tablet consumption, which is more
292 flexible and less resource-intensive than witnessed iOAT (36,37). A recent study from Ottawa, Canada,
293 describes positive outcomes for people with severe opioid use disorder who are provided
294 hydromorphone iOAT along with supported housing (38). Benefits of managed alcohol programs are
295 also clearly established for people with severe alcohol use disorder, and particularly people who drink

296 non-beverage alcohol (39–41). Some existing managed alcohol programs include daily and/or
297 unwitnessed ingestion (42).
298
299 The dosing strategy informed by the BCCSU guidelines were appropriate for most patients in this setting
300 (Halifax, Nova Scotia) where the illicit drug supply is comprised primarily of pharmaceutical
301 hydromorphone and of cocaine, with relatively little fentanyl and methamphetamine availability in the
302 community (23,24,43,44). In other settings, dosages may need to be higher than those recommended in
303 these guidelines or different medications may be for effective. For example, a recent survey of people
304 who use drugs in British Columbia, Canada, showed that in that province most would prefer heroin or
305 fentanyl safe supply over prescription opioids like hydromorphone (45). For the emergency safe supply
306 program in Halifax described in our study, many residents were able to report their usual daily use of
307 non-prescribed hydromorphone tablets which could be matched with the safe supply prescription.
308 While the mean dosages of hydromorphone, methylphenidate, and dextroamphetamine increased over
309 residents' 14 days in isolation, many patients stayed at the same dose throughout. As there were no
310 overdoses and very few premature discharges from isolation, this suggests that residents knew how
311 much medication they would need and were willing to work with the prescriber if started too low. While
312 these medications were not offered as substance use disorder treatment, the options available to
313 patients (in terms of medications, dosages, and brands or formulations) to help facilitate goals of
314 successful 14 day isolation represented elements of shared decision-making and patient-centered care
315 (25,46,47). It is notable that with the broad selection of options available to avoid reliance on the
316 criminalized drug supply, no residents chose to start methadone or buprenorphine OAT. This differs
317 from other settings like acute care hospitals, where patients with medical complications of opioid use
318 disorder may not initially be treatment-seeking, but are often motivated to engage in OAT when offered

319 (24,25,48). Prior research in the hospital setting has shown that offering SROM in addition to
320 methadone and buprenorphine may increase treatment uptake (25).
321
322 Descriptions of harm reduction practices in COVID-19 isolation shelters have been reported from
323 Toronto(49) and Hamilton(50,51), Canada; Boston(49,52) and San Francisco(53,54), USA; Lisbon,
324 Portugal (55); and Tshwane, South Africa (56). The other Canadian harm reduction programs are most
325 like the one described in our study. The Toronto program supported isolation shelter residents with an
326 emergency managed alcohol program, safe supply hydromorphone prescribing, opioid agonist
327 treatment, take-home naloxone kits, sterile injecting equipment, and telephone or in-person check-ins;
328 specific medication and alcohol dosages and frequencies are not reported. They established a
329 supervised consumption site for witnessed injections, after applying for federal approval. The Toronto
330 program reported 4 suspected overdose deaths among 1700 admissions (0.2%), which were all
331 unwitnessed (49). The Hamilton program supported residents isolating at a men’s congregate shelter
332 with sterile injecting equipment, take-home naloxone, a flexible OAT delivery model, and
333 hydromorphone safe supply prescribing (51). A community organization set up a supervised
334 consumption space within the shelter where residents could consume their prescribed hydromorphone.
335 The Hamilton program reported no fatal overdoses and three non-fatal overdoses during the month-
336 long intervention (all of which occurred outside the safe consumption site), compared to 20 non-fatal
337 overdoses in the month before the isolation period (51). The Hamilton program description did not
338 mention managed alcohol, and neither report includes the frequency of residents leaving isolation
339 prematurely.
340
341 In Boston, OAT was offered but safe supply prescriptions and alcohol were not (49,52). Naloxone and
342 sterile syringes were distributed at discharge from the isolation shelters, but not provided to residents

343 during their stay. In San Francisco, prescribers offered OAT (with buprenorphine or methadone), medical
344 cannabis, nicotine replacement therapy, and managed alcohol (53). Residents were provided with sterile
345 injecting equipment and naloxone, and \$20 gift cards for completing their stay. Opioids, stimulants, and
346 benzodiazepines were not offered. Some San Francisco shelter programs limited managed alcohol to a
347 maximum dosage of 10 standard drinks per day (54,54), which was below the mean and median dosages
348 for the residents in Halifax in our study. Nineteen percent of San Francisco residents left isolation
349 shelters prematurely (53), which was higher than the 3-8% in Halifax. In Lisbon, harm reduction
350 organizations provided support, sterile injecting equipment, naloxone, and a mobile drug consumption
351 room to shelter residents. Residents had access to benzodiazepines for alcohol withdrawal
352 management, but no safe supply or managed alcohol program was provided (55). In Tshwane,
353 prescribers provided methadone in the stadium-based emergency shelter. The local needle exchange
354 program was asked not to deliver sterile injecting equipment, as “municipal and national police were
355 actively confiscating needles and the city regarded the concurrent provision of needle and syringe
356 services and [opioid substitution treatment] as a form of mixed messaging” (56).

357
358 The decision to revoke hotel-based private housing and safe supply medications after 14 days, despite
359 the apparent benefits to individual residents and despite the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, raises
360 challenging ethical issues (57–59) and prevents evaluation of the potential long-term impact of these
361 housing and safe supply interventions. These decisions were made by government and public health
362 officials independent of the prescribers and study investigators.

363
364 Our study has important limitations. First, as the decision was made to offer all shelter residents this
365 program for drug and alcohol withdrawal management, there is no control group of residents without
366 this program to compare rates of adverse events or resident-initiated premature discharge from the

367 isolation shelters against public advice. Nevertheless, the rate of premature discharge was lower here
368 than reported in San Francisco, and our findings here of relatively safety are reassuring. Second, as our
369 study relied on retrospective evaluation of medical records, we may be missing data on events
370 (including medication diversion, sharing, or selling) that were not disclosed to shelter staff. The program
371 described here did not have a systemic approach to surveillance or of gathering information on
372 diversion, sharing, or selling from shelter staff. Other study designs, including qualitative interviews,
373 could be used to get a better sense of the scale of medication diversion, sharing, and selling, that was
374 not reported back to the medical team. Third, as our study occurred in a city with relatively little
375 fentanyl and crystal methamphetamine use, the dosing ranges here may not be sufficient in populations
376 with higher drug tolerance and this may limit generalizability.

377

378 *Conclusion*

379 We found that an emergency, provisional safe supply program providing pharmaceutical-grade
380 medications and beverage-grade alcohol in COVID-19 isolation hotel shelters was associated with low
381 rates of adverse events and of high rates of successful completion of the mandatory 14-day isolation
382 stay. This suggests this approach is safe and effective in this setting.

383 **Abbreviations**

384 ABV: Alcohol by volume

385 BCCSU: British Columbia Centre on Substance Use

386 MOSH: Mobile Outreach Street Health

387 NORs: National Overdose Response Service

388 OAT: Opioid agonist treatment

389 SROM: Slow-release oral morphine

390

391 **Declarations**

392 *Ethics approval and consent to participate*

393 Requirements for full ethics review and individual participant consent were waived by the Nova Scotia

394 Health Research Ethics Board, who determined this project to be quality assessment (REB FILE #:

395 1027156).

396

397 *Consent for publication*

398 Not applicable.

399

400 *Availability of data and materials*

401 All data generated or analysed during this study are included in this published article.

402

403 *Competing interests*

404 MB reports personal fees from AbbVie, a pharmaceutical research and development company, and

405 grants and personal fees from Gilead Sciences, a research-based biopharmaceutical company, outside of

406 the submitted work. The other authors declare that they have no competing interests.

407

408 *Funding*

409 This project had no dedicated funding. TDB is supported by the Dalhousie University Internal Medicine
410 Research Foundation Fellowship, a Canadian Institutes of Health Research Fellowship (CIHR-FRN#
411 171259), and through the Research in Addiction Medicine Scholars (RAMS) Program (National Institute
412 of Health/National Institute on Drug Abuse; R25DA033211). DL is funded by a National Institute of
413 Health Research Doctoral Research Fellowship (DRF-2018–11-ST2-016). Funders had no role in the in the
414 design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript
415 should be declared. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the
416 NHS, the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care.

417

418 *Author contribution*

419 TDB contributed to conceptualization, developed and piloted the data extraction form, performed
420 structured data extraction, validated data extraction, data curation, data analysis, data interpretation,
421 co-wrote the first draft, and project supervision. ML developed and piloted the data extraction form,
422 performed structured data extraction, data curation, and data analysis, and co-wrote the first draft. DL
423 contributed to data analysis and interpretation. AG and MG contributed to conceptualization, data
424 extraction, and interpretation. HR-B contributed to conceptualization, data entry, data curation, data
425 interpretation, and project administration. MB, JA, JF, LH, HH, SH, PJ, DM, TO, and LG contributed to
426 conceptualization and data interpretation. All authors provided critical intellectual input, contributed to
427 revised drafts, and approved the final draft for submission.

428

429 *Acknowledgements*

430 We acknowledge the essential and compassionate contributions of the wider MOSH team and shelter

431 staff to the success of the isolation hotels.

432

433 We thank Dr. Claire Bodkin (McMaster University) and Dr. Ashish Thakrar (University of Pennsylvania)

434 for helpful comments on earlier drafts.

435

436 **References**

- 437 1. Bonn M, Palayew A, Bartlett S, Brothers TD, Touesnard N, Tyndall M. Addressing the
438 Syndemic of HIV, Hepatitis C, Overdose, and COVID-19 Among People Who Use Drugs: The
439 Potential Roles for Decriminalization and Safe Supply. *J Stud Alcohol Drugs* [Internet]. 2020
440 Sep 1 [cited 2020 Nov 17];81(5):556–60. Available from:
441 <https://www.jsad.com/doi/full/10.15288/jsad.2020.81.556>
- 442 2. Gomes T, Kitchen SA, Murray R. Measuring the Burden of Opioid-Related Mortality in
443 Ontario, Canada, During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *JAMA Netw Open* [Internet]. 2021 May
444 26 [cited 2021 Jun 17];4(5):e2112865. Available from:
445 <https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamanetworkopen/fullarticle/2780379>
- 446 3. Dunlop A, Lokuge B, Masters D, Sequeira M, Saul P, Dunlop G, et al. Challenges in
447 maintaining treatment services for people who use drugs during the COVID-19 pandemic.
448 *Harm Reduct J* [Internet]. 2020 May 6 [cited 2020 Jul 29];17(1):26. Available from:
449 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12954-020-00370-7>
- 450 4. Cowan E, Khan MR, Shastry S, Edelman EJ. Conceptualizing the effects of the COVID-19
451 pandemic on people with opioid use disorder: an application of the social ecological
452 model. *Addict Sci Clin Pract* [Internet]. 2021 Jan 7 [cited 2021 Sep 30];16(1):4. Available
453 from: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13722-020-00210-w>
- 454 5. Gomes T, Murray R, Kolla G, Leece P, Bansal S, Besharah J, et al. Changing circumstances
455 surrounding opioid-related deaths in Ontario during the COVID-19 pandemic [Internet].
456 Ontario Drug Policy Research Network; 2021 May [cited 2021 Sep 30]. Available from:
457 [https://www.publichealthontario.ca/-/media/documents/c/2021/changing-](https://www.publichealthontario.ca/-/media/documents/c/2021/changing-circumstances-surrounding-opioid-related-deaths.pdf?sc_lang=en)
458 [circumstances-surrounding-opioid-related-deaths.pdf?sc_lang=en](https://www.publichealthontario.ca/-/media/documents/c/2021/changing-circumstances-surrounding-opioid-related-deaths.pdf?sc_lang=en)
- 459 6. Ali F, Russell C, Nafeh F, Rehm J, LeBlanc S, Elton-Marshall T. Changes in substance supply
460 and use characteristics among people who use drugs (PWUD) during the COVID-19 global
461 pandemic: A national qualitative assessment in Canada. *Int J Drug Policy* [Internet]. 2021
462 Jul 1 [cited 2021 Oct 1];93:103237. Available from:
463 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0955395921001420>
- 464 7. Lewer D, Braithwaite I, Bullock M, Eyre MT, White PJ, Aldridge RW, et al. COVID-19 among
465 people experiencing homelessness in England: a modelling study. *Lancet Respir Med*. 2020
466 Dec 1;8(12):1181–91.
- 467 8. Perri M, Dosani N, Hwang SW. COVID-19 and people experiencing homelessness:
468 challenges and mitigation strategies. *CMAJ* [Internet]. 2020 Jun 29 [cited 2021 Oct
469 14];192(26):E716–9. Available from: <https://www.cmaj.ca/content/192/26/E716>
- 470 9. BCCSU. Clinical Guidance Risk Mitigation in the Context of Dual Public Health Emergencies
471 [Internet]. 2020. Available from: [https://www.bccsu.ca/overview-covid-19-risk-mitigation-](https://www.bccsu.ca/overview-covid-19-risk-mitigation-interim-clinical-guidance/)
472 [interim-clinical-guidance/](https://www.bccsu.ca/overview-covid-19-risk-mitigation-interim-clinical-guidance/)

- 473 10. Brar R, Bruneau J, Butt P, Goyer M, Lim R, Poulin G, et al. Medications and other clinical
474 approaches to support physical distancing for people who use substances during the
475 COVID-19 pandemic: national rapid guidance [Internet]. Vancouver, B.C.: Canadian
476 Research Initiative on Substance Misuse (CRISM); 2020 Jun [cited 2021 Oct 13]. Available
477 from: [https://crism.ca/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/CRISM-Guidance-Medications-and-](https://crism.ca/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/CRISM-Guidance-Medications-and-other-clinical-approaches-22062020-final.pdf)
478 [other-clinical-approaches-22062020-final.pdf](https://crism.ca/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/CRISM-Guidance-Medications-and-other-clinical-approaches-22062020-final.pdf)
- 479 11. Hyshka E, K. Dong, K. Meador, K. Speed, B. Abele, S. LeBlanc, et al. Supporting people who
480 use substances in shelter settings during the COVID-19 pandemic: national rapid guidance
481 [Internet]. Edmonton, Alberta: Canadian Research Initiative on Substance Misuse (CRISM);
482 2020 May [cited 2021 Oct 13]. Available from: [https://crism.ca/wp-](https://crism.ca/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/CRISM-Guidance-Supporting-People-Who-Use-Substances-in-Emergency-Shelter-Settings-V1.pdf)
483 [content/uploads/2020/06/CRISM-Guidance-Supporting-People-Who-Use-Substances-in-](https://crism.ca/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/CRISM-Guidance-Supporting-People-Who-Use-Substances-in-Emergency-Shelter-Settings-V1.pdf)
484 [Emergency-Shelter-Settings-V1.pdf](https://crism.ca/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/CRISM-Guidance-Supporting-People-Who-Use-Substances-in-Emergency-Shelter-Settings-V1.pdf)
- 485 12. Bach P, Robinson S, Sutherland C, Brar R. Innovative strategies to support physical
486 distancing among individuals with active addiction. *Lancet Psychiatry* [Internet]. 2020 Sep
487 1 [cited 2021 Oct 13];7(9):731–3. Available from:
488 [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanpsy/article/PIIS2215-0366\(20\)30231-5/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanpsy/article/PIIS2215-0366(20)30231-5/fulltext)
- 489 13. Canadian Association of People Who Use Drugs (CAPUD). Safe Supply Concept Document
490 [Internet]. 2019 Feb. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5637607>
- 491 14. Bonn M, Palayew A, Bartlett S, Brothers TD, Touesnard N, Tyndall M. “The Times They Are
492 a-Changin’”: Addressing Common Misconceptions About the Role of Safe Supply in North
493 America’s Overdose Crisis. *J Stud Alcohol Drugs* [Internet]. 2021 Jan 1 [cited 2021 Oct
494 13];82(1):158–60. Available from:
495 <https://www.jsad.com/doi/full/10.15288/jsad.2021.82.158>
- 496 15. Hales, J., Kolla, G., Man, T., O’Reilly, E., Rai, N., Sereda, A. Safer Opioid Supply Programs
497 (SOS): A Harm Reduction Informed Guiding Document for Primary Care Teams [Internet].
498 2020 [cited 2020 Apr 19]. Available from:
499 [https://docs.google.com/document/d/1hXRmNaOTB60wbmNqhBi5P_xxktEZnXFDWKMKJ](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1hXRmNaOTB60wbmNqhBi5P_xxktEZnXFDWKMKJMu5ALM/edit?usp=embed_facebook)
500 [Mu5ALM/edit?usp=embed_facebook](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1hXRmNaOTB60wbmNqhBi5P_xxktEZnXFDWKMKJMu5ALM/edit?usp=embed_facebook)
- 501 16. Tyndall, Mark. An emergency response to the opioid overdose crisis in Canada: a regulated
502 opioid distribution program. *CMAJ Can Med Assoc J* [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2020 Feb
503 5];190(2):E35–6. Available from: <https://www.cmaj.ca/content/190/2/E35>
- 504 17. Glegg S, McCrae K, Kolla G, Touesnard N, Turnbull J, Brothers TD, et al. “COVID just kind of
505 opened a can of whoop-ass”: The rapid growth of safer supply prescribing during the
506 pandemic documented through an environmental scan of addiction and harm reduction
507 services in Canada. Submitted.

- 508 18. Tyndall M. Safer opioid distribution in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. *Int J Drug*
509 *Policy* [Internet]. 2020 Sep 1 [cited 2020 Nov 17];83:102880. Available from:
510 <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S095539592030219X>
- 511 19. Chang J, Agliata J, Guarinieri M. COVID-19 - Enacting a 'new normal' for people who use
512 drugs. *Int J Drug Policy* [Internet]. 2020 Jul 3 [cited 2020 Jul 29]; Available from:
513 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7332951/>
- 514 20. Nosyk B, Slaunwhite A, Urbanoski K, Hongdilokkul N, Palis H, Lock K, et al. Evaluation of
515 risk mitigation measures for people with substance use disorders to address the dual
516 public health crises of COVID-19 and overdose in British Columbia: a mixed-method study
517 protocol. *BMJ Open* [Internet]. 2021 Jun 1 [cited 2021 Oct 13];11(6):e048353. Available
518 from: <https://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/11/6/e048353>
- 519 21. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP. The
520 Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE)
521 Statement: Guidelines for Reporting Observational Studies. *Ann Intern Med* [Internet].
522 2007 Oct 16 [cited 2021 Oct 14];147(8):573–7. Available from:
523 <https://www.acpjournals.org/doi/full/10.7326/0003-4819-147-8-200710160-00010>
- 524 22. Biggar E, Papamihali K, Leclerc P, Hyshka E, Graham B, Taylor M, et al. Towards cross-
525 Canada monitoring of the unregulated street drug supply. *BMC Public Health* [Internet].
526 2021 Sep 15 [cited 2022 Jan 13];21(1):1678. Available from:
527 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-021-11757-x>
- 528 23. Brothers TD, Mosseler K, Kirkland S, Melanson P, Barrett L, Webster D. Unequal access to
529 opioid agonist treatment and sterile injecting equipment among hospitalized patients with
530 injection drug use-associated infective endocarditis. *PLOS ONE*. In press.
- 531 24. Brothers T, Fraser J, MacAdam E, Hickcox S, L Genge, T O'Donnell, et al. Implementation
532 and evaluation of a novel, unofficial, trainee-organized hospital addiction medicine
533 consultation service. *Subst Abuse*. 2020 Dec 17;1–8.
- 534 25. Brothers TD, Fraser J, MacAdam E, Morgan B, Webster D. Uptake of slow-release oral
535 morphine as opioid agonist treatment among hospitalised patients with opioid use
536 disorder. *Drug Alcohol Rev* [Internet]. 2021 Aug 4 [cited 2021 Aug 21]; Online ahead of
537 print. Available from: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/dar.13365>
- 538 26. Special Advisory Committee on the Epidemic of Opioid Overdoses. Opioid- and Stimulant-
539 related Harms in Canada [Internet]. Ottawa: Public Health Agency of Canada; 2021 Dec
540 [cited 2022 Jan 13]. Available from: [https://health-infobase.canada.ca/substance-related-](https://health-infobase.canada.ca/substance-related-harms/opioids-stimulants/)
541 [harms/opioids-stimulants/](https://health-infobase.canada.ca/substance-related-harms/opioids-stimulants/)
- 542 27. Canadian Association for Safe Supply (CASS). Informing your consent: Regarding issues of
543 the safe supply options for opioids in the "Risk Mitigation in the Context of Dual Public

- 544 Health Emergencies” guideline [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2021 Oct 13]. Available from:
545 [https://d3n8a8pro7vhmx.cloudfront.net/unitedforsafesupply/pages/1038/attachments/o](https://d3n8a8pro7vhmx.cloudfront.net/unitedforsafesupply/pages/1038/attachments/original/1590636393/Informing_Your_Consent_Regarding_Issues_of_the_Safe_Supply_Options_for_Opioids_in_the_Risk_Mitigation_in_the_Context_of_Dual_Public_Health_Emergencies_GuidelineBriefFinal.pdf?1590636393)
546 [riginal/1590636393/Informing_Your_Consent_Regarding_Issues_of_the_Safe_Supply_Opt](https://d3n8a8pro7vhmx.cloudfront.net/unitedforsafesupply/pages/1038/attachments/original/1590636393/Informing_Your_Consent_Regarding_Issues_of_the_Safe_Supply_Options_for_Opioids_in_the_Risk_Mitigation_in_the_Context_of_Dual_Public_Health_Emergencies_GuidelineBriefFinal.pdf?1590636393)
547 [ions_for_Opioids_in_the__Risk_Mitigation_in_the_Context_of_Dual_Public_Health_Eme](https://d3n8a8pro7vhmx.cloudfront.net/unitedforsafesupply/pages/1038/attachments/original/1590636393/Informing_Your_Consent_Regarding_Issues_of_the_Safe_Supply_Options_for_Opioids_in_the_Risk_Mitigation_in_the_Context_of_Dual_Public_Health_Emergencies_GuidelineBriefFinal.pdf?1590636393)
548 [rgencies__GuidelineBriefFinal.pdf?1590636393](https://d3n8a8pro7vhmx.cloudfront.net/unitedforsafesupply/pages/1038/attachments/original/1590636393/Informing_Your_Consent_Regarding_Issues_of_the_Safe_Supply_Options_for_Opioids_in_the_Risk_Mitigation_in_the_Context_of_Dual_Public_Health_Emergencies_GuidelineBriefFinal.pdf?1590636393)
- 549 28. Bahji A, Stephenson C, Tyo R, Hawken ER, Seitz DP. Prevalence of Cannabis Withdrawal
550 Symptoms Among People With Regular or Dependent Use of Cannabinoids: A Systematic
551 Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Netw Open* [Internet]. 2020 Apr 9 [cited 2021 Oct
552 14];3(4):e202370. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.2370>
- 553 29. Perri M, Kaminski N, Bonn M, Kolla G, Guta A, Bayoumi AM, et al. A qualitative study on
554 overdose response in the era of COVID-19 and beyond: how to spot someone so they
555 never have to use alone. *Harm Reduct J* [Internet]. 2021 Aug 5 [cited 2021 Oct
556 13];18(1):85. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12954-021-00530-3>
- 557 30. NATIONAL OVERDOSE RESPONSE SERVICE (NORS) [Internet]. NATIONAL OVERDOSE
558 RESPONSE SERVICE (NORS). [cited 2021 Oct 13]. Available from: <https://www.nors.ca>
- 559 31. Standard Drink Calculator [Internet]. [cited 2021 Sep 30]. Available from:
560 <http://aodtool.cfar.uvic.ca/index-stddt.html>
- 561 32. Bonn M, Touesnard N, Cheng B, Pugliese M, Comeau E, Bodkin C, et al. Barriers and
562 facilitators to accessing and providing a safe supply of drugs during COVID-19 and beyond:
563 a scoping review. Submitted.
- 564 33. Bonn M, Touesnard N, Cheng B, Pugliese M, Comeau E, Bodkin C, et al. Securing safe
565 supply during COVID-19 and beyond: Scoping review and knowledge mobilization
566 [Internet]. Ottawa: Canadian Institutes of Health Research; 2021 Jan [cited 2021 Oct 14].
567 Available from: [https://covid19mentalhealthresearch.ca/wp-](https://covid19mentalhealthresearch.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/HERDER_CMH-KS-Safe-Supply-scoping-review_manuscript_2020-11-23_FINAL.pdf)
568 [content/uploads/2021/01/HERDER_CMH-KS-Safe-Supply-scoping-](https://covid19mentalhealthresearch.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/HERDER_CMH-KS-Safe-Supply-scoping-review_manuscript_2020-11-23_FINAL.pdf)
569 [review_manuscript_2020-11-23_FINAL.pdf](https://covid19mentalhealthresearch.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/HERDER_CMH-KS-Safe-Supply-scoping-review_manuscript_2020-11-23_FINAL.pdf)
- 570 34. Oviedo-Joekes E, Guh D, Brissette S, Marchand K, MacDonald S, Lock K, et al.
571 Hydromorphone Compared With Diacetylmorphine for Long-term Opioid Dependence: A
572 Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Psychiatry* [Internet]. 2016 May 1 [cited 2020 Apr
573 19];73(5):447–55. Available from:
574 <https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamapsychiatry/fullarticle/2512237>
- 575 35. Fairbairn N, Ross J, Trew M, Meador K, Turnbull J, MacDonald S, et al. Injectable opioid
576 agonist treatment for opioid use disorder: a national clinical guideline. *CMAJ* [Internet].
577 2019 Sep 23 [cited 2021 Oct 13];191(38):E1049–56. Available from:
578 <https://www.cmaj.ca/content/191/38/E1049>

- 579 36. Ivsins A, Boyd J, Mayer S, Collins A, Sutherland C, Kerr T, et al. “It’s Helped Me a Lot, Just
580 Like to Stay Alive”: a Qualitative Analysis of Outcomes of a Novel Hydromorphone Tablet
581 Distribution Program in Vancouver, Canada. *J Urban Health* [Internet]. 2020 Oct 28 [cited
582 2020 Oct 31]; Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11524-020-00489-9>
- 583 37. Ivsins A, Boyd J, Mayer S, Collins A, Sutherland C, Kerr T, et al. Barriers and facilitators to a
584 novel low-barrier hydromorphone distribution program in Vancouver, Canada: a
585 qualitative study. *Drug Alcohol Depend* [Internet]. 2020 Nov 1 [cited 2022 Jan
586 13];216:108202. Available from:
587 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0376871620303677>
- 588 38. Harris MT, Seliga RK, Fairbairn N, Nolan S, Walley AY, Weinstein ZM, et al. Outcomes of
589 Ottawa, Canada’s Managed Opioid Program (MOP) where supervised injectable
590 hydromorphone was paired with assisted housing. *Int J Drug Policy* [Internet]. 2021 Dec 1
591 [cited 2021 Oct 1];98:103400. Available from:
592 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0955395921003054>
- 593 39. Stockwell T, Zhao J, Pauly B, Chow C, Vallance K, Wettlaufer A, et al. Trajectories of Alcohol
594 Use and Related Harms for Managed Alcohol Program Participants over 12 Months
595 Compared with Local Controls: A Quasi-Experimental Study. *Alcohol Alcohol* [Internet].
596 2021 Jan 9 [cited 2021 Oct 13];(agaa134). Available from:
597 <https://doi.org/10.1093/alcalc/agaa134>
- 598 40. Stockwell T, Pauly B (Bernie), Chow C, Erickson RA, Krysowaty B, Roemer A, et al. Does
599 managing the consumption of people with severe alcohol dependence reduce harm? A
600 comparison of participants in six Canadian managed alcohol programs with locally
601 recruited controls. *Drug Alcohol Rev* [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2021 Oct 13];37(S1):S159–66.
602 Available from: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/dar.12618>
- 603 41. Crabtree A, Latham N, Morgan R, Pauly B, Bungay V, Buxton JA. Perceived harms and harm
604 reduction strategies among people who drink non-beverage alcohol: Community-based
605 qualitative research in Vancouver, Canada. *Int J Drug Policy* [Internet]. 2018 Sep 1 [cited
606 2021 Oct 13];59:85–93. Available from:
607 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S095539591830183X>
- 608 42. Pauly B (Bernie), Vallance K, Wettlaufer A, Chow C, Brown R, Evans J, et al. Community
609 managed alcohol programs in Canada: Overview of key dimensions and implementation.
610 *Drug Alcohol Rev* [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2021 Oct 13];37(S1):S132–9. Available from:
611 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/dar.12681>
- 612 43. Lapointe-Gagner G. Heroin: it’s just not an East Coast thing [Internet]. *DavidMcKie.com*.
613 2016 [cited 2022 Jan 7]. Available from: <http://www.davidmckie.com/heroin-its-just-not-an-east-coast-thing/>
614

- 615 44. Schleihau E, Crabtree K, Dohoo C, Fleming S, McPeake H, Bowes M. Concurrent
616 monitoring of opioid prescribing practices and opioid-related deaths: the context in Nova
617 Scotia, Canada. *Health Promot Chronic Dis Prev Can* [Internet]. 2018 Sep [cited 2021 Nov
618 29];38(9):334–8. Available from: [https://www.canada.ca/en/public-](https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/services/reports-publications/health-promotion-chronic-disease-prevention-canada-research-policy-practice/vol-38-no-9-2018/at-a-glance-concurrent-monitoring-opioid-prescribing-practices-opioid-deaths-nova-scotia.html)
619 [health/services/reports-publications/health-promotion-chronic-disease-prevention-](https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/services/reports-publications/health-promotion-chronic-disease-prevention-canada-research-policy-practice/vol-38-no-9-2018/at-a-glance-concurrent-monitoring-opioid-prescribing-practices-opioid-deaths-nova-scotia.html)
620 [canada-research-policy-practice/vol-38-no-9-2018/at-a-glance-concurrent-monitoring-](https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/services/reports-publications/health-promotion-chronic-disease-prevention-canada-research-policy-practice/vol-38-no-9-2018/at-a-glance-concurrent-monitoring-opioid-prescribing-practices-opioid-deaths-nova-scotia.html)
621 [opioid-prescribing-practices-opioid-deaths-nova-scotia.html](https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/services/reports-publications/health-promotion-chronic-disease-prevention-canada-research-policy-practice/vol-38-no-9-2018/at-a-glance-concurrent-monitoring-opioid-prescribing-practices-opioid-deaths-nova-scotia.html)
- 622 45. Ferguson M, Parmar A, Papamihali K, Weng A, Lock K, Buxton JA. Investigating opioid
623 preference to inform safe supply services: A cross sectional study. *Int J Drug Policy*
624 [Internet]. 2022 Mar 1 [cited 2022 Jan 12];101:103574. Available from:
625 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0955395921004928>
- 626 46. Marchand K, Beaumont S, Westfall J, MacDonald S, Harrison S, Marsh DC, et al.
627 Conceptualizing patient-centered care for substance use disorder treatment: findings from
628 a systematic scoping review. *Subst Abuse Treat Prev Policy* [Internet]. 2019 Sep 11 [cited
629 2020 Jul 29];14(1):37. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13011-019-0227-0>
- 630 47. Brothers TD, Bonn M. Patient-centred care in opioid agonist treatment could improve
631 outcomes. *Can Med Assoc J* [Internet]. 2019 Apr 29 [cited 2020 Dec 16];191(17):E460–1.
632 Available from: <http://www.cmaj.ca/lookup/doi/10.1503/cmaj.190430>
- 633 48. Brothers TD, Fraser J, Webster D. Caring for people who inject drugs when they are
634 admitted to hospital. *CMAJ Can Med Assoc J*. 2021 Mar 22;193(12):E423–4.
- 635 49. Harris MTH, Young S, Barocas J, Bayoumi AM, Caudarella A, Laurence G, et al. A
636 Descriptive Comparison of Substance Use Services in Recovery and Isolation Sites for
637 People Experiencing Homelessness During the COVID-19 Pandemic, Boston and Toronto.
638 *Public Health Rep* [Internet]. 2021 Sep 1 [cited 2021 Sep 30];136(5):532–7. Available from:
639 <https://doi.org/10.1177/00333549211032974>
- 640 50. Scallan E, Bodkin C, Wiwcharuk J, O’Shea T, Lennox R. Finding stability amidst the COVID-
641 19 pandemic: The impact of emergency temporary housing for people who use drugs.
642 *Drug Alcohol Rev* [Internet]. 2021 Jun 16 [cited 2021 Oct 1];n/a(n/a). Available from:
643 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/dar.13335>
- 644 51. Lew B, Bodkin C, Lennox R, O’Shea T, Wiwcharuk G, Turner SD. The impact of an integrated
645 safer use space and safer supply program on non-fatal overdose among emergency shelter
646 residents during a COVID-19 Outbreak: A case study. Submitted.
- 647 52. Kimmel SD, Bazzi AR, Barocas JA. Integrating harm reduction and clinical care: Lessons
648 from Covid-19 respite and recuperation facilities. *J Subst Abuse Treat* [Internet]. 2020 Nov
649 1 [cited 2021 Oct 17];118:108103. Available from:
650 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0740547220303597>

- 651 53. Fuchs JD, Carter HC, Evans J, Graham-Squire D, Imbert E, Bloome J, et al. Assessment of a
652 Hotel-Based COVID-19 Isolation and Quarantine Strategy for Persons Experiencing
653 Homelessness. *JAMA Netw Open* [Internet]. 2021 Mar 2 [cited 2021 Oct 17];4(3):e210490.
654 Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.0490>
- 655 54. Ristau J, Mehtani N, Gomez S, Nance M, Keller D, Surlyn C, et al. Successful
656 implementation of managed alcohol programs in the San Francisco Bay Area during the
657 COVID-19 crisis. *Subst Abuse* [Internet]. 2021 Apr 3 [cited 2021 Oct 17];42(2):140–7.
658 Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/08897077.2021.1892012>
- 659 55. Fuertes R, Belo E, Merendeiro C, Curado A, Gautier D, Neto A, et al. Lisbon’s COVID 19
660 response: harm reduction interventions for people who use alcohol and other drugs in
661 emergency shelters. *Harm Reduct J* [Internet]. 2021 Jan 25 [cited 2021 Oct 17];18(1):13.
662 Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12954-021-00463-x>
- 663 56. Marcus TS, Heese J, Scheibe A, Shelly S, Lalla SX, Hugo JF. Harm reduction in an emergency
664 response to homelessness during South Africa’s COVID-19 lockdown. *Harm Reduct J*
665 [Internet]. 2020 Aug 24 [cited 2021 Oct 17];17(1):60. Available from:
666 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12954-020-00404-0>
- 667 57. Pisani E. Tilting at windmills and the evidence base on injecting drug use. *The Lancet*
668 [Internet]. 2010 Jul 24 [cited 2021 Oct 17];376(9737):226–7. Available from:
669 [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736\(10\)61132-4/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(10)61132-4/fulltext)
- 670 58. Gostin LO, Powers M. What Does Social Justice Require For The Public’s Health? *Public*
671 *Health Ethics And Policy Imperatives*. 2006;9.
- 672 59. DeBruin D, Liaschenko J, Marshall MF. Social Justice in Pandemic Preparedness. *Am J*
673 *Public Health* [Internet]. 2012 Apr [cited 2022 Jan 12];102(4):586–91. Available from:
674 <http://ajph.aphapublications.org/doi/10.2105/AJPH.2011.300483>

675

676

677 Table 1. Summary of prescribing guidelines used in emergency safe supply drug and managed alcohol
 678 program in COVID isolation hotels in Halifax.

Substance	Summary of prescribing guidance
Opioids	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offer OAT to all patients with opioid use disorder. • It is helpful to prescribe a long-acting opioid (e.g. slow-release oral morphine) in conjunction with a short-acting opioid for those not on OAT.
Stimulants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oral hydromorphone 8mg tablets, 1-3 tablets every hour as needed. • Maximum daily dose of 14 tablets (112mg).
Benzodiazepines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Methylphenidate SR 20-40mg tablets once daily and/or methylphenidate IR 10-20mg tablets twice daily. • Maximum daily dose of 100mg methylphenidate.
Alcohol	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dextroamphetamine SR 10-20mg tablets twice daily and/or dextroamphetamine IR 10-20mg tablets twice or thrice daily. • Maximum daily dose of 80-120mg dextroamphetamine.
Tobacco	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If temporary maintenance is being prescribed, generally consider switching to a long-acting benzodiazepine (e.g. diazepam or clonazepam) and reduce dose by 50% to start and then titrate daily.
Alcohol	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convert patient-reported alcohol consumption into “Canadian Standard Drinks”. • Most mouthwash estimated at 26% ABV, regular wine at 12% ABV, and fortified wine at 20%. • Prescribe managed alcohol dose in number of cans of strong beer (6% ABV; 1.25 standard drinks per can) or red wine (12% ABV; 5.2 standard drinks per 750mL bottle). Limited hard liquor (40% ABV; 0.69 standard drinks per ounce) was also available on a case-by-case basis. • Preference is to use beer, as it can be more easily spread throughout the day.
Tobacco	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offer nicotine replacement therapy (i.e., patch, gum, lozenge, inhaler). • Residents requiring tobacco would be delivered 1-2 packs of cigarettes daily by a local harm reduction organization outreach team.

679 SR: sustained-release formulation. IR: immediate release formulation. ABV: Alcohol by volume.

680
 681

682 Table 2. Descriptive characteristics of the sample of residents in COVID-19 isolation.

Sample size (n)	77
Age, years (mean ± standard deviation)	42 ± 14
Gender, women (%)	19 (25%)
Residents provided opioid agonist treatment (n)	
Any opioid agonist treatment	17 (22%)
Methadone	7 (9%)
Buprenorphine-naloxone	1 (1%)
Slow-release oral morphine	10 (13%)
Residents provided hydromorphone (n)	27 (35%)
Residents provided benzodiazepines (n)	
Any benzodiazepine	6 (8%)
Clonazepam	5 (6%)
Lorazepam	1 (1%)
Residents provided stimulants (n)	
Any stimulant	31 (40%)
Methylphenidate	27 (35%)
Dextroamphetamine	8 (10%)
Lisdexamfetamine	2 (3%)
Residents provided alcohol (n)	
Any alcohol	42 (55%)
Strong beer (6% ABV)	41 (53%)
Wine (12% ABV)	3 (4%)
Liquor (40% ABV)	1 (1%)
Residents provided nicotine replacement therapy (n)	2 (3%)
Residents provided cigarettes (n)	64 (83%)
Residents provided nabilone (n)	14 (18%)

ABV: alcohol by volume.

683

684

685 **Figure captions**

686 **Figure 1. Number of COVID-19 isolation hotel shelter residents receiving each category of safe supply**
687 **medications or managed alcohol during 14 days of isolation.** Benzodiazepines include clonazepam and
688 lorazepam. Stimulants include methylphenidate, dextroamphetamine, and lisdexamfetamine. Opioids
689 include opioid agonist treatment medications (methadone, buprenorphine, or slow-release morphine)
690 and hydromorphone. Alcohol includes strong beer, wine, or hard liquor.
691

692 **Figure 2. COVID-19 isolation hotel shelter residents' daily dosage trajectories for safe supply**
693 **hydromorphone and opioid agonist treatment medications.** Individual daily medication dosages are
694 plotted as percentages of the maximum daily dosages of each substance across the whole sample (i.e.,
695 methadone 195mg; buprenorphine 12mg; SROM 800mg; hydromorphone 158mg). Dark grey boxes
696 represent days where substances could not be provided, either because resident was away from
697 isolation or because of delayed medical assessment. SROM: slow-release oral morphine.
698

699 **Figure 3. COVID-19 isolation hotel shelter residents' daily dosage trajectories for safe supply stimulant**
700 **medications.** Individual daily medication dosages are plotted as percentages of the maximum daily
701 dosages of each substance across the whole sample (i.e., methylphenidate 160mg; dextroamphetamine
702 80mg; lisdexamfetamine 60mg). Dark grey boxes represent days where substances could not be
703 provided, either because resident was away from isolation or because of delayed medical assessment.
704

705 **Figure 4. COVID-19 isolation hotel shelter residents' daily dosage trajectories for managed alcohol.**
706 Individual daily standard drink dosages are plotted as percentages of the maximum daily dosage of
707 alcohol across the whole sample (i.e., 37.5 standard drinks). Dark grey boxes represent days where
708 substances could not be provided, either because resident was away from isolation or because of
709 delayed medical assessment.
710




Figure 1. Number of COVID-19 isolation hotel shelter residents receiving each category of safe supply medications or managed alcohol during 14 days of isolation. Benzodiazepines include clonazepam and lorazepam. Stimulants include methylphenidate, dextroamphetamine, and lisdexamfetamine. Opioids include opioid agonist treatment medications (methadone, buprenorphine, or slow-release morphine) and hydromorphone. Alcohol includes strong beer, wine, or hard liquor.




Figure 2. COVID-19 isolation hotel shelter residents' daily dosage trajectories for safe supply hydromorphone and opioid agonist treatment medications. Individual daily medication dosages are plotted as percentages of the maximum daily dosages of each substance across the whole sample (i.e., methadone 195mg; buprenorphine 12mg; SROM 800mg; hydromorphone 158mg). Dark grey boxes represent days where substances could not be provided, either because resident was away from isolation or because of delayed medical assessment. SROM: slow-release oral morphine.




Figure 3. COVID-19 isolation hotel shelter residents' daily dosage trajectories for safe supply stimulant medications. Individual daily medication dosages are plotted as percentages of the maximum daily dosages of each substance across the whole sample (i.e., methylphenidate 160mg; dextroamphetamine 80mg; lisdexamfetamine 60mg). Dark grey boxes represent days where substances could not be provided, either because resident was away from isolation or because of delayed medical assessment.




Figure 4. COVID-19 isolation hotel shelter residents' daily dosage trajectories for managed alcohol. Individual daily standard drink dosages are plotted as percentages of the maximum daily dosage of alcohol across the whole sample (i.e., 37.5 standard drinks). Dark grey boxes represent days where substances could not be provided, either because resident was away from isolation or because of delayed medical assessment.