

1 **Title**

2 Adapted “Break The Cycle for Avant Garde” Intervention to Reduce Injection Assisting and Promoting  
3 Behaviours in People Who Inject Drugs in Tallinn, Estonia: A Pre- Post Trial.

4

5 **Authors**

6 Uusküla A <sup>1¶</sup>, Raag M <sup>1¶</sup>, Barnes DM <sup>2&</sup>, Tross S <sup>3&</sup>, Talu A <sup>1&</sup>, Des Jarlais D <sup>2¶</sup>

7

8 <sup>1</sup> Department of Family medicine and Public Health, University of Tartu, Tartu, Estonia

9 <sup>2</sup> College of Global Public Health, New York University, New York, NY USA

10 <sup>3</sup> HIV Center for Clinical and Behavioural Studies, Department of Psychiatry, Columbia University  
11 Medical Center, New York, NY USA

12

13

14 **Corresponding author**

15 Anneli Uusküla

16 Email: [anneli.uuskula@ut.ee](mailto:anneli.uuskula@ut.ee)

17

18 ¶These authors contributed equally to this work.

19 &These authors also contributed equally to this work.

20

21

## 22 **Abstract**

23 In the context of established and emerging injection drug use epidemics, there is a need to prevent and  
24 avert injection drug use. We tested the hypothesis that an individual motivation and skills building  
25 counselling, adapted and enhanced from Hunt's Break the Cycle intervention targeting persons currently  
26 injecting drugs would lead to reduction in injection initiation-related behaviours among PWID in Tallinn,  
27 Estonia. For this quasi-experimental study, pre-post outcome measures included self-reported promoting  
28 behaviours (speaking positively about injecting to non-injectors, injecting in front of non-injectors,  
29 offering to give a first injection) and injection initiation behaviours (assisting with or giving a first  
30 injection) during the previous 6 months. Of 214 PWID recruited, 189 were retained (88.3%) for the  
31 follow-up at 6 months. The proportion of those who had injected in front of non-PWID significantly  
32 declined from 15.9% to 8.5%, and reporting assisting with 1st injection from 6.4% to 1.06%. Of the  
33 current injectors retained in the study, 17.5% reported not injecting drugs at the follow up. The  
34 intervention adapted for the use in the setting of high prevalence of HIV and relatively low prevalence of  
35 injection assisting, tested proved to be effective and safe.

### 36 **Key words**

37 Intervention, preventing injection drug use, injection initiation, experimental study, Estonia

38

39

40

## 41 **Introduction**

42 Injection drug use (IDU) is an important driver of the HIV epidemic worldwide. It is also a significant  
43 source of other morbidity (non-lethal overdose, attempted suicide, skin and soft tissue infections) and  
44 mortality [1,2]. According to a global review of injection drug use and HIV epidemiology at a regional  
45 level, prevalence of injection drug use varied from 0.09% (95% UI 0.07–0.11) in South Asia to 1.30%  
46 (0.71–2.15) in Eastern Europe [3]. According to a recent review, four countries (Russia, Brazil, China,  
47 and the United States) comprised 55% of the estimated global population of PWID living with HIV).  
48 However, injection drug use driven HIV epidemics are also occurring elsewhere. Over the last decade,  
49 HIV outbreaks occurred among PWID in Canada (southeastern Saskatchewan), Greece (Athens), Ireland  
50 (Dublin), Israel (Tel Aviv), Luxembourg, Romania (Bucharest), Scotland (Glasgow), and USA (Scott  
51 County, Indiana) [4].

52 It has been suggested that the most effective method of preventing injection-driven HIV  
53 epidemics was to shift resources upstream, towards the prevention of injection drug use itself [5].  
54 Injecting illicit drugs is a complicated, potentially fatal process. Almost every person who injects drugs  
55 needs the assistance of an experienced PWID with their first injection (initiation). The existing knowledge  
56 base on strategies to prevent injecting initiation is limited. Among a small number of studies, behavioural  
57 interventions, delivered by counsellors or peers in recovery, have been found to be effective [6-9]. Studies  
58 suggest that the majority of injection initiation events are facilitated, either directly or indirectly, by  
59 experienced PWID [8]. Although it is possible to learn to inject without the help of a PWID, this is  
60 difficult and rare [10-11].

61 Social cognitive theory [12] is a useful paradigm for understanding this. Social cognitive theory  
62 hypothesizes that people learn and modify behaviours through interaction, observation, behavioural  
63 experimentation, and reinforcement with others in their environments. Repeated exposure, either through  
64 verbal or visual modelling of a marginal or even feared behaviour, can make the behaviour seem normal  
65 and acceptable by desensitizing the observer to the possible risks of the behaviour. According to social

66 cognitive theory, three fundamental processes could drive initiation of injection. These are: (1) social  
67 modelling of injection, and concomitant interest in emulating one’s injecting friends; (2) development of  
68 outcome expectancies about injection – including both enhanced positive expectancies (e.g. that injecting  
69 will produce a more intense, more efficient, cheaper high) and decreased negative expectancies (e.g. that  
70 injecting will produce stronger need and greater harms to health and life); and (3) development of self-  
71 efficacy about injecting on one’s own.

72         Based on the theory and knowledge from behavioural interventions with experienced PWID to  
73 reduce injection initiation in non-injectors [6,8,13,14] we have proposed a multistage model of how a  
74 PWID comes to assist persons who do not inject with their first injections [15]. It is reasoned that  
75 interventions that equip experienced PWID with the skills and motivation to limit behaviours that help  
76 initiation can reduce initiation. There are two types of such behaviours: (1) “assisting” behaviours –  
77 including describing or demonstrating how to inject to a non-PWID, or actually injecting a non-PWID)  
78 and (2) “promoting” behaviours – including speaking positively about injecting to non-PWIDs, injecting  
79 in front of non-PWIDs, and offering to give a first injection to non-PWIDs) [15]. In particular, the  
80 “Break The Cycle” intervention, for coaching PWID to refrain from these behaviours, has been shown to  
81 be effective in reducing these behaviours. Originally conducted by counsellors or outreach workers  
82 [6,14], it has also since been conducted, as “Change The Cycle”, by PWID themselves [8].

83  
84 The objective of the current study is to assess changes to injection initiation assisting and promoting  
85 behaviours in participating PWID, during the six months following an adapted BTC session, using  
86 motivational interviewing and behavioural skills training.

87  
88 We have updated/adapted BTC for use in an Eastern European setting (Tallinn, Estonia). Estonia  
89 experienced a very large epidemic of injecting drug use beginning in the 1990s and a very high  
90 seroprevalence epidemic of HIV (> 50% prevalence) among PWID since in the 2000s [16], with new  
91 injectors continuously exhibiting high-risk behavior and correspondingly high HIV prevalence also in the

92 recent studies [17]. Community Needle and Syringe Program (NSP), methadone maintenance treatment,  
93 and naloxone distribution programs were operating in Tallinn at the time of the study execution. The  
94 proportion of PWID receiving ART in Tallinn has increased substantially over the years, reaching over  
95 70% among HIV-infected PWID [16]

96

## 97 **Methods**

### 98 **Study design**

99 We report data from a quasi-experimental study with pre-post design was used to assess potential change  
100 in assisting and promoting behaviours from baseline to 6-month follow-up in participating PWID. The  
101 same, standardized study protocol was implemented [9].

102

### 103 **Study setting and participants**

104 From December 2018 to April 2019 current PWID recruited by respondent driven sampling in Tallinn  
105 were enrolled. The NSP of NGO Convictus (fixed site) was the study site, given that: (1) It has  
106 established contacts and working experience with PWID; (2) It is providing HIV prevention services to  
107 and is trusted by the PWID community; (3) The site leader and staff have a track record of conducting  
108 research, including participation in international research teams, and have undergone extensive training in  
109 the conduct of scientific research.

110 Potential participants were eligible for the study if they: live in Tallinn or Harju County, were at least 18  
111 years of age, spoke Estonian or Russian, reported having injected in the previous two months, and were  
112 able and willing to provide informed consent and agreed to donate a blood sample for HIV testing.

113 Recruitment began with purposive selection of “seeds” (n = 8) known to the field team to represent PWID  
114 diverse by age, gender, ethnicity, main type of drug used, and HIV status, and length of injecting career.

115 After study participation, subjects were provided coupons for recruiting up to three peers (PWID).

116 Coupons were uniquely coded to link participants to their survey responses and to biological specimens,  
117 and for monitoring recruitment lineages. Participants received a primary incentive (a 10-euro grocery  
118 store voucher) for their time and effort and a secondary incentive (a 5-euro grocery store voucher) for  
119 each peer recruited. Peers had to come to the study site, be found eligible, and complete the study  
120 procedures for the recruiter to receive the secondary incentive.

121

## 122 **Study procedures**

123 After determining eligibility and securing informed consent, participants completed a face-to-face  
124 interviewer administered structured questionnaire of approximately 30–45 minutes' length in a private  
125 location in the NSP.

126 Venous blood was collected from participants and tested for the presence of HIV antibodies using  
127 commercially available test kits (ADVIA Centaur CHIV Ag/Ab Combo (SIEMENS)). Participants  
128 received pre- and post-HIV test counselling.

129 The intervention, that on average took 40 minutes, was delivered after blood collection.

130 At six months' post-baseline, the research coordinator reminded participants about their follow-up visit by  
131 phone, text message or email (according to participants' preference). At the follow-up visit, the data were  
132 collected in the same way as at baseline, and participants received a supermarket voucher with a 10-euro  
133 grocery store voucher for their time and effort.

134 Study data were managed anonymously, based on codes assigned to the participants for the study  
135 purposes.

136

## 137 **Measuring injection initiation assisting and promoting behaviours** 138 **and background variables**

139 In both years used an interview-administered structured questionnaire, containing multiple choice answer  
140 options and rating scales, based on the WHO Drug Injecting Study Phase II survey [18].

141  
142 Outcome variables: There were two types of injection initiation helping outcome variables. “Assisting”  
143 consisted of describing or demonstrating how to inject to a non-PWID who then injects for his/her first  
144 time in front of the participant, or actually injecting a non-PWID. Participants were asked about number  
145 of non-PWID they had assisted in the past six months. “Promoting” consisted of speaking positively  
146 about injecting to non-PWIDs, injecting in front of non-PWIDs, and offering to give a first injection to  
147 non-PWIDs. Participants were asked about number of non-PWID with whom they had promoted injection  
148 in the past six months. We note that assisting behaviours are distinct from promoting behaviours.  
149 Whereas the former by definition (see above) intentionally lead directly to someone’s first injection,  
150 promoting behaviours may or may not lead to someone’s first injection.

151  
152 Background variables: Questions also elicited information on PWIDs’ demographics, injection and other  
153 drug use, sexual risk behaviour, HIV- and addiction- related stigma, psychological and physical health,  
154 and use of various HIV/harm reduction-related services. Other questions elicited information on size of  
155 PWIDs’ injecting and non-injecting drug using peer networks (using standard RDS network questions  
156 [19]). To assess injection initiation helping peer norms, we asked participants to estimate the proportion  
157 of their PWID peers who have assisted with first injections in the last six months.

158

## 159 **Sample size calculation**

160 We assumed the proportion of those who start [assisting / any promoting] to be at most 20% and the  
161 proportion of those who stop [assisting / any promoting] to be at least 60% [9]. To achieve at least 80%  
162 power using 1-sided sign test the sample size needed was 160.

163

## 164 **Intervention - Break the Cycle for Avant Garde (BtCag)**

165 The intervention consisted of one individual session with a trained interventionist (social worker,  
166 psychologists, and harm reduction workers who were experienced in working with people who use  
167 drugs). They participated in two-day intervention training led by two clinical psychologists with extensive  
168 experience in motivational interviewing with drug using populations – combining didactic information,  
169 skill modelling, role playing, and feedback. At the end of training, the trainers assessed mock sessions for  
170 fidelity to the intervention. All interventionists were found to have demonstrated fidelity. Most  
171 interventionists also had formal training in Motivational Interviewing (MI) prior to the study.

172 The centrepiece of the intervention was the “Break the Cycle” (BTC) intervention [5] aimed at  
173 enhancing current injectors’ motivation and skills to avoid helping non-injecting drug users transition to  
174 injection drug use. It was based on two conceptualizations of behavior to behaviour change. One  
175 component was Social Cognitive Theory – which, as described earlier, explains behaviour change as the  
176 result of peer modelling, expectancies about the target behaviour, and perceived self-efficacy (to carry out  
177 the target behaviour). The second component was Motivational Interviewing [20]. It is a client-centred  
178 approach – which seeks to meet the individual where he/she is in the process of behaviour change.  
179 Because such behaviour change presents both positives and negatives for the individual, MI proceeds  
180 from the premise that ambivalence about behaviour change presses for action. MI is a process aimed at  
181 articulating that ambivalence, assessing positives and negatives and the disparity between them, and  
182 pinpointing a next action step.

183 Our enhanced BtCag intervention had seven main parts: 1) discussion of own first time injecting  
184 drugs; 2) discussion of injection helping (“assisting” and “promoting”) behaviours, experiences with and  
185 attitudes toward them; 3) discussion of the health, legal, social, and emotional risks of injection (including  
186 a module on safe injection practices); 4) role-plays of behaviours and scripts for avoiding or refusing  
187 requests to help non-PWID inject for the first time; 5) role-plays of talking with other PWID about not  
188 encouraging non-PWID to start injecting; 6) discussion of coaching non-PWID in safer injection



189 practices, should a helping situation take place; and 7) discussion of how naloxone can be used to reverse  
190 overdoses. Guided by prior qualitative interviews with PWID, we augmented the original BTC with parts  
191 5, 6, and 7 [21].

192 Intervention fidelity was maintained through audio recording and review of 10% of intervention  
193 sessions. In-group supervision meetings, the supervisor and team provided feedback, practical advice and  
194 support to the interventionists.

195

## 196 **Statistical analysis**

197 We used statistical environment R [22] for analyses. Compared to RDS sequential-sampling-weighted  
198 estimates, [23] the unweighted estimates did not vary significantly from the weighted estimates for our  
199 key variables, e.g., demographics, drug use behaviours, assisting others with a first injection, and  
200 injection promoting behaviours. We therefore used the unweighted values in order to facilitate  
201 comparisons with other Break the Cycle studies that did not use RDS recruitment.

202

203 We tested the hypotheses that participation in Break the Cycle will be associated with a decline, from six  
204 months prior to baseline to six months' post-intervention, in: (1) percentage of participants reporting  
205 “assisting” behaviours: and (2) percentage reporting “promoting” behaviours. Based on previous  
206 research [3,5], showing strong findings of such declines, we used one-tailed hypothesis testing. In  
207 addition, given the international importance of developing interventions to reduce initiation into injecting  
208 drug use, we believed it to be crucial to avoid type II error. We used the sign test to assess the probability  
209 of reduction in target behaviours compared to the probability of increase in target behaviours.

210

211 Ethical approvals for the studies were obtained from the Ethics Review Board of the University of Tartu,  
212 Estonia and from the Mount Sinai Beth Israel Medical Center, and New York University Institutional  
213 Review Boards in New York, USA (i.e., the home institution of the US collaborators). Written informed

214 consent was obtained from all participants. The study is registered at the ClinicalTrials.gov  
 215 (NCT03502525).

216

## 217 Results

### 218 Study sample characteristics (baseline)

219 The demographic, drug and injection use and HIV characteristics of sample recruited (n=214) are  
 220 presented in Table 1. The mean age of the sample was 35,9 (SD 7,0; sample median 35) years, ranging  
 221 from 21 to 60 years. Over two thirds (71.0%) of the PWID were men, and half had 10 or more years of  
 222 formal education and were employed (50.9%%), and 17.3% had unstable places of residence (e.g., they  
 223 lived primarily in the street, a park, or in a shelter). Overwhelming majority (94.4%) had injected drugs  
 224 for over five years, and reported non-injection drug use in parallel with injecting (94.9%). Amphetamine  
 225 was a main injection drug for 61.8%, and fentanyl for 37.4% of PWID participating. Receptive and  
 226 distributive sharing of syringes and needles (i.e., getting and giving) over the past six months were,  
 227 respectively, reported by 16.9% and 19.2%. Over half (51.4%) of participants were HIV infected, and a  
 228 large majority (93.0%) were seropositive for HCV antibodies. Of those HIV infected, 73.6% were on  
 229 ART.

230

231 **Table 1. Sample description (baseline and follow-up at 6 months), people who inject drugs, Tallinn,**  
 232 **Estonia 2018-2019.**

233

Variable	Categories	Baseline n (%)	Baseline (only those in follow-up) n (%)	Follow-up n (%)	p-value, baseline vs follow-up
<b>Socio-demographic characteristics</b>					
Age	> 30	161 (75,2%)	145 (76,7%)	145 (76,7%)	
	<= 30	53 (27,8%)	44 (23,3%)	44 (23,3%)	

Gender	Female	62 (29,0%)	61 (32,2%)	61 (32,2%)	
	Male	152 (71,0%)	128 (67,7%)	128 (67,7%)	
Education	<10 years	107 (50,0%)	95 (50,3%)	95 (50,3%)	
	>= 10 years	107 (50,0%)	94 (49,7%)	86 (45,5%)	
Employment	Not employed	105 (49,1%)	89 (47,1%)	79 (41,8%)	0,2120
	Employed	109 (50,9%)	100 (52,9%)	110 (58,2%)	
Place of residence	Unstable housing	37 (17,3%)	32 (16,9%)	43 (22,8%)	0,0455
	Stable housing	177 (82,7%)	157 (83,1%)	146 (77,2%)	
<b>Injection drug use (in the last 6 months)</b>					
Length of injection drug use (lifetime)	<= 5 years	12 (5,6%)	8 (4,2%)	8 (4,2%)	
	> 5 years	202 (94,4%)	181 (95,8%)	181 (95,8%)	
Main drug injected	Other	134 (62,6%)	118 (62,4%)	135 (71,4%)	0,0104
	Fentanyl	80 (37,4%)	71 (37,6%)	54 (28,6%)	
Does not injected drugs		na	na	33 (17,5%)	
Any non-injection drug use	No	11 (5,1%)	11 (5,8%)	2 (1,1%)	0,0265
	Yes	203 (94,9%)	178 (94,2%)	187 (98,9%)	
Injecting daily (in the last 4 weeks)	Daily	44 (23,5%)	37 (21,6%)	24 (20,5%)	0,6892
	Less frequent	143 (76,5%)	134 (78,4%)	93 (79,5%)	
Receptive sharing <sup>1</sup>	No	177 (83,1%)	156 (83,0%)	157 (85,8%)	0,5959
	Yes	36 (16,9%)	32 (17,0%)	26 (14,2%)	
Distributive sharing <sup>2</sup>	No	172 (80,1%)	153 (81,4%)	164 (89,6%)	0,0108
	Yes	41 (19,2%)	35 (18,6%)	19 (10,4%)	
<b>Sexual behaviour (in the last 6 months)</b>					
Any sex partners	Yes	182 (85,4%)	163 (86,2%)	149 (79,7%)	0,0093
	No	31 (14,4%)	26 (13,8%)	38 (20,3%)	
..Any unprotected sex	Yes	149 (81,9%)	136 (83,4%)	120 (79,5%)	0,8383
	No	33 (18,1%)	27 (16,6%)	31 (20,5%)	
<b>HIV infection</b>					
HIV seropositivity	Pos	110 (51,4%)	103 (54,5%)	104 (55,0%)	> 0,95
	Neg	104 (49,6%)	86 (44,5%)	85 (45,0%)	
<b>Services utilization</b>					

Currently on methadone	No	202 (94,4%)	177 (93,7%)	187 (98,9%)	0,0094
	Yes	12 (5,6%)	12 (6,3%)	2 (1,1%)	
Main source of new syringes in the last 6 months	Other	74 (34,6%)	57 (40,6%)	40 (26,1%)	0,5218
	NSP <sup>3</sup>	140 (66,4%)	129 (69,4%)	113 (73,9%)	
Currently on ART	Yes	81 (73,6%)	76 (73,8%)	79 (76,0%)	0,6464
	No	29 (26,4%)	27 (26,2%)	25 (24,0%)	
<b>Network size</b>					
Injecting drug users	<= 10	147 (68,7%)	129 (68,3%)	133 (70,4%)	0,6025
	> 10	67 (31,3%)	60 (31,7%)	56 (29,6%)	
Non-injecting drug users	> 3	51 (23,8%)	44 (23,3%)	34 (18,0%)	0,2120
	<= 3	163 (76,7%)	145 (76,7%)	155 (82%)	
<b>External norms</b>					
Any friends assisted injection initiation in the last 6 months	No	66 (52,0%)	56 (51,4%)	77 (69,4%)	0,0446
	Yes	61 (48,0%)	53 (48,6%)	34 (30,6%)	
<b>Initiation of others in the last 6 months: helping and promoting behaviours</b>					
Has been asked to assist with a 1 <sup>st</sup> injection	No	180 (84,1%)	159 (84,1%)	169 (89,4%)	0,1116
	Yes	34 (15,9%)	30 (15,9%)	20 (10,6%)	
... for how many	Mean (SD)	2,44 (3,01)	2,63 (3,15)	1,75 (1,12)	0,6160
	Min--Max	1—15	1—15	1—5	
Has talked positively	No	206 (96,3%)	182 (96,3%)	185 (97,9%)	0,5050
	Yes	8 (3,7%)	7 (3,7%)	4 (2,1%)	
... to how many	Mean (SD)	1,75 (0,71)	1,85 (0,69)	1 (0)	0,3173
	Min--Max	1—3	1—3	1—1	
Has injected in front of a non-injector	No	180 (84,1%)	159 (84,1%)	173 (91,5%)	0,0216
	Yes	34 (15,9%)	30 (15,9%)	16 (8,5%)	
... how many	Mean (SD)	1,94 (0,89)	1,87 (0,82)	2,81 (1,83)	0,2685
	Min--Max	1—4	1—4	1—7	
Has offered to give a 1 <sup>st</sup> injection	No	209 (97,7%)	184 (97,4%)	189 (100%)	0,0736
	Yes	5 (2,3%)	5 (2,6%)	0 (0%)	

... to how many	Mean (SD)	1,40 (0,89)	1,4 (0,89)	-	-
	Min--Max	1—3	1—3	-	
Has assisted with a 1 <sup>st</sup> injection	No	201 (93,9%)	176 (93,6%)	186 (98,4%)	0,0162
	Yes	13 (6,1%)	12 (6,4%)	3 (1,6%)	

234

235 <sup>1</sup> Receptive sharing – getting used syringes or needles to use for own injections

236 <sup>2</sup> Distributive sharing - giving, lending, renting, or selling syringes or needles, that the individual has

237 already used, to someone else to inject with

238 <sup>3</sup> NSP – Needle and syringe program

239

240

241 Of the 214 people who received the intervention, 189 were retained (88.3%). Attrition was associated  
 242 with sex (being male;  $p = 0.0035$ ), duration of injecting drugs (< 5 years;  $p = 0.0159$ ) and HIV status  
 243 (HIV-negative,  $p = 0.0129$ ). Attrition was not associated with injection promotion or assisting behaviors  
 244 reported at baseline.

245

246 Among current injectors retained in the study, 33 (17.5%) reported not injecting drugs at the follow up  
 247 (none of them were on methadone treatment).

248

249 Among the participants retained, in the six months prior to the baseline interview, 3.7% reported that they  
 250 had spoken positively about injection to a non-injector, 15.9% had injected in front of a non-injector, and  
 251 very few ( $n = 3$ ) reported offering to give a non-injector a first injection. One sixth (15.9%) had been  
 252 asked to assist with a first injection. Only a small minority ( $n = 12$ ; 6.4%) reported that they had assisted  
 253 someone with a first injection.

254

255 At the post-intervention follow up, the proportion of those who within six months had injected in front of  
 256 non-PWID declined from 15.9% to 8.5%, and reporting assisting with a first injection from 6.4% to

257 1.06%. Number of PWID ceasing assisting and promoting was larger than number of PWID starting with  
 258 these behaviours (injecting in front of non-PWID: 30/189 vs 16/189, McNemar test  $p = 0,0216$ ; assisting  
 259 with 1st injection: 12/188 vs 2/188, McNemar test  $p = 0,0162$ ; data was missing for 1 person on the  
 260 assisting variable). Table 2 presents the frequencies and percentages of the sample reporting “assisting”  
 261 and “promoting” behaviours at baseline and six-month follow-up. As shown in Table 2, comparing the  
 262 “yes/no” column with the “no/yes” column (i.e., those dropping a behaviour compared with those taking  
 263 up a behaviour), fewer participants engaged in all five behaviours of interest at follow-up compared with  
 264 baseline. The reductions for injecting in front of non-PWID and assisting with first injections were  
 265 statistically significant. Of those who had injected in front of non-PWID at baseline, 76.7% (23/30)  
 266 reported not doing so at six-month follow-up. Of those who reported assisting with first injections at  
 267 baseline, 100% (12/12) reporting not doing so at follow-up.

268

269 **Table 2. Changes in injection promoting and initiation assisting behaviours from baseline to follow-**  
 270 **up among people who inject drugs, Tallinn, Estonia 2018-2019.**

271

	<b>Behaviour changes - baseline, follow-up</b>				Mcnemar test p- value
	n = 189*				
	No, No	Yes, No	No, Yes	Yes, Yes	
Has been asked to assist with a 1st injection	148	<b>21</b>	<b>11</b>	9	0,1116
<i>Promotion behaviour</i>					
Has talked positively	179	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	1	0,5050
Has offered to give a 1st injection	184	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	0	0,0736

Has injected in front of a non-injector	150	<b>23</b>	<b>9</b>	7	0,0216
<i>Assisting behaviour</i>					
Has assisted with a 1st injection	174	<b>12</b>	<b>2</b>	0	0,0162

272 \* Data was missing for 1 person on the assisting variable

273

## 274 Discussion

275 Over the past two decades, the North American countries have seen a dramatic increase and Europe a  
276 modest increase in the medical and non-medical use (misuse) of prescription opioids and related fatalities  
277 [24,25]. The US opioid epidemic has led to rising intravenous drug use and has created new public health  
278 epidemics of hepatitis C and deadly bacterial infections [26,27]. Stemming transitions to injection drug  
279 use is therefore an important public health goal. Our study contributes to the limited knowledge base on  
280 strategies to prevent injecting initiation.

281 Our results provide support for the study hypotheses that after receiving the intervention, there would be a  
282 reduction in the number of participants who report “assisting” with first injection, and “promoting”  
283 injection by injecting in front of non-PWID from baseline to follow-up. While assisting in the last 6  
284 months with a first injection was rarely reported among our PWID at baseline, we saw a significant  
285 reduction at follow-up. From baseline to follow-up, there was a significant decline in the most common  
286 “promoting” behaviour reported at baseline (i.e. in one-quarter of the sample): injecting in front of non-  
287 PWID. We did not see significant changes in the promoting behaviours that were rare (i.e. talking  
288 positively about injection, offering to give first injection to a non-PWID). Further, we saw both pre-post  
289 reductions in participants own drug. Among current injectors retained in the study, a close to one fifth  
290 (17.5%) reported not injecting drugs at the follow up. As a potential positive secondary effect of the

291 intervention, this finding warrants careful attention and evaluation in further studies. Our pre-post design  
292 for evaluating enhanced BtCag endorses this as a distinctly promising intervention.

293 Results reported here are generally consistent with previous data reported data reported from trials of  
294 Break the Cycle [6], and Change the Cycle [8]. Our intervention was adapted from the Break the Cycle  
295 intervention (Hunt et al [6]). In response to the recognised need the module on safe injection practices  
296 was included in the intervention tested in Tallinn and new modules on spreading norms to other PWID of  
297 refraining from assisting with first injections and on overdose prevention (including information on  
298 naloxone) were added.

299         There are great differences in injecting drug use epidemics throughout the world, including the  
300 size and stage of the epidemic the drugs being injected, the health services available to persons who use  
301 drugs and the characteristics of the persons injecting drugs. All of these factors could potentially  
302 influence the effectiveness of Break the Cycle type interventions to reduce initiation into injecting drug  
303 use. There was a dramatic change in injecting drug use in 2017 in Estonia. The clandestine laboratory  
304 that was the dominant source for fentanyl was shut down, leading to a severe shortage on fentanyl. The  
305 changes included increases in amphetamine injecting and increases in the use of “novel psychoactive  
306 substances” (NSPs), and discontinuation of medication-assisted (methadone) treatment. [28] We  
307 previously conducted a trial of Break the Cycle in 2016-2017 prior to the fentanyl shortage in Tallinn [8].  
308 The same RDS recruitment and follow-up methods, and intervention were used in both studies.  
309 Comparison of the results for these two trials highlights a very consistent effect of the intervention (in  
310 2016-2017 the percentages assisting with first injections declined from 4.7 to 1.3%, 73% reduction; in the  
311 current study 83% reduction) and in a way this accentuates the robustness of our intervention effect  
312 within the target population.

313 The results presented here should be interpreted acknowledging the limitations of the study. This study  
314 had a modest sample size, which influenced its statistical power. Nevertheless, important differences over  
315 time were observed. Obtaining probability samples of PWID populations is challenging due to the hidden



316 nature of this group, their stigmatised behaviours and the absence of a sampling frame. Although, RDS  
317 surveys have demonstrated the ability to reach hidden population sub-groups, the representativeness of  
318 our samples cannot be verified. We achieved a moderate rate of attrition over time, and there is the  
319 potential for participant loss to follow-up to have biased results. Yet, attrition was not associated with  
320 promoting or helping behaviours at baseline. Another limitation is relying on participant self-report.  
321 Social desirability responses are a possible factor in our results.

322 We measured outcomes six months after the intervention and we do not know if and for how long any  
323 behavioural changes were sustained beyond this timeframe. Quasi-experimental design was chosen over  
324 the randomised control design to assess the effect of the intervention. We are fully aware of the strengths  
325 of randomisation but also considered possibility of contamination/diffusion of the intervention (as study  
326 sampling relied on social networks and our intervention included a component of talking with peers to  
327 discourage assisting with first injections) and ethical aspects (refraining from providing a potentially  
328 needed intervention from part of the study participants) to be important enough to consider. A stepped  
329 wedge cluster randomised trial would be important for future assessments of the BtCag intervention. If a  
330 stepped wedge randomized trial show an effect size similar to the effect size in the pre- versus post trials,  
331 then the intervention should be scaled up to study a community-wide effect.

332 In conclusion, in the context of established and emerging injection drug use epidemics, there is a need to  
333 prevent and avert injection drug use. Within the limits of our study, the enhanced BtCag intervention  
334 adapted for the use in the setting of high prevalence of HIV and moderate prevalence of injection  
335 assisting tested proved to be effective and safe.

336

### 337 **Acknowledgments**

338

339 This work was supported by grant 1DP1DA039542 from the National Institutes of Health, USA, and by  
340 grant # IUT34-17 from the Estonian Ministry of Education and Research.

341

342 **Conflict of interests**

343 None

344 **References**

- 345 1. Levitt A, Mermin J, Jones CM, See I, Butler JC. Infectious Diseases and Injection Drug Use: Public  
346 Health Burden and Response. *J Infect Dis.* 2020 Sep 2;222(Suppl 5): S213-S217.
- 347 2. European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (2021), European Drug Report 2021:  
348 Trends and Developments, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg.
- 349 3. Degenhardt L, Peacock A, Colledge S, et al. Global prevalence of injecting drug use and  
350 sociodemographic characteristics and prevalence of HIV, HBV, and HCV in people who inject drugs: a  
351 multistage systematic review. *Lancet Glob Health.* 2017;5: e1192–207.4.
- 352 4. Des Jarlais DC, Sypsa V, Feelemyer J, Abagiu AO, Arendt V, et al. HIV outbreaks among people who  
353 inject drugs in Europe, North America, and Israel. *Lancet HIV.* 2020;7(6): e434-e442.
- 354 5. Vlahov D, Fuller CM, Ompad DC, Galea S, Des Jarlais DC. Updating the infection risk reduction  
355 hierarchy: preventing transition into injection. *J Urban Health.* 2004;81(1): 14-9.
- 356 6. Hunt N, Stillwell G, Taylor C, Griffiths P. Evaluation of a brief intervention to prevent initiation into  
357 injecting. *Drugs Educ. Prev Policy.* 1998;5: 185–194.
- 358 7. Werb D, Buxton J, Shoveller J, Richardson C, Rowell G, Wood E. Interventions to prevent the  
359 initiation of injection drug use: a systematic review. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2013;133: 669-76.
- 360 8. Strike C, Rotondi M, Kolla G, et al. Interrupting the social processes linked with initiation of injection  
361 drug use: results from a pilot study. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2014;137: 48-54.
- 362 9. Des Jarlais D, Uuskula A, Talu A, et al. Implementing an Updated "Break the Cycle" Intervention to  
363 Reduce Initiating Persons into Injecting Drug Use in an Eastern European and a US "opioid epidemic"  
364 Setting. *AIDS Behav.* 2019;23(9): 2304-2314.

- 365 10. Kermode M, Longleng V, Singh BC, Hocking J, Langkham B, Crofts N. My first time: initiation into  
366 injecting drug use in Manipur and Nagaland, north-east India. *Harm Reduct J.* 2007;5: 19.
- 367 11. Rotondi NK., Strike C, Kolla G, et al. Transition to injection drug use: the role of initiators. *AIDS*  
368 *Behav.* 2014;18: 486-94.
- 369 12. Bandura A. *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory.* Englewood Cliffs,  
370 NJ: Prentice-Hall. 1986.
- 371 13. Des Jarlais CD, Casriel C, Friedman SR, Rosenblum A. AIDS and the transition to illicit drug  
372 injection: results of a randomized trial prevention program. *Br J Addict.* 1992;87: 6.
- 373 14. Gray R. Preventing IDU Initiation Among Drug-Curious Youth: An Attempt to Measurably Reduce  
374 IDU Initiation Among Youth in Central Asia. 19th International Harm Reduction Association  
375 Conference, 2008, Barcelona, Spain.
- 376 15. Des Jarlais DC, Arasteh K, Barnes DM, Feelemyer J, Berg H, Raag M, Talu A, Org G, Tross S,  
377 Uuskula A. A Multistage Process Model of How a Person Who Currently Injects Drugs Comes to Assist  
378 Persons Who Do not Inject with Their First Injections. *Front Sociol.* 2021;6: 619560.
- 379 16. Uuskula A, Vickerman P, Raag M, Walker J, Paraskevis D, Eritsyanyan K, Sypsa V, Lioznov D, Avi R,  
380 Des Jarlais D. Presenting a conceptual framework for an HIV prevention and care continuum and  
381 assessing the feasibility of empirical measurement in Estonia: A case study. *PLoS One.* 2020;15(10):  
382 e0240224.
- 383 17. Uuskula A, Raag M, Marsh K, Talu A, Vorobjov S, Des Jarlais D (2017) HIV prevalence and gender  
384 differences among new injection-drug-users in Tallinn, Estonia: A persisting problem in a stable high  
385 prevalence epidemic. *PLoS One.* 2017;12(2): e0170956.
- 386 18. Des Jarlais DC, Perlis TE, Stimson GV, Poznyak V; WHO Phase II Drug Injection Collaborative  
387 Study Group. Using standardized methods for research on HIV and injecting drug use in  
388 developing/transitional countries: case study from the WHO Drug Injection Study Phase II. *BMC Public*  
389 *Health.* 2006;6: 54.

- 390 19. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2012. National HIV Behavioural Surveillance System in  
391 Injecting Drug Users – Round 3: Operations Manual. Available at  
392 <https://www.cdc.gov/hiv/pdf/statistics/systems/nhbs/nhbs-idu3operationsmanual.pdf> (accessed on 28.  
393 June 2021).
- 394 20. Miller WR, Rollnick S. (2012) Motivational Interviewing: Preparing People For Change, 2nd Edition.  
395 New York, N.Y. Guilford.
- 396 21. Barnes DM, Des Jarlais DC, Wolff M, Feelemyer J, Tross S. A qualitative study of persons who inject  
397 drugs but who have never helped others with first injections: how their views on helping contrast with the  
398 views of persons who have helped with first injections, and implications for interventions. *Harm Reduct*  
399 *J.* 2018;15(1): 43.
- 400 22. R Core Team, 2016. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for  
401 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- 402 23. Gile KJ. Improved Inference for Respondent-Driven Sampling Data with Application to HIV  
403 Prevalence Estimation. *J Am Stat Assoc.* 2011;106: 135-146.
- 404 24. van Amsterdam J, van den Brink W. The Misuse of Prescription Opioids: A Threat for Europe? *Curr*  
405 *Drug Abuse Rev.* 2015;8: 3-14.
- 406 25. Helmerhorst GT, Teunis T, Janssen SJ, Ring D. An epidemic of the use, misuse and overdose of  
407 opioids and deaths due to overdose, in the United States and Canada: is Europe next? *Bone Joint J.* 2017;  
408 99-B: 856-864.
- 409 26. Stopka TJ, Donahue A., Hutcheson M, Green TC. Nonprescription naloxone and syringe sales in the  
410 midst of opioid overdose and hepatitis C virus epidemics: Massachusetts, 2015. *J Am Pharm Assoc.*  
411 2017;57: S34-S44.
- 412 27. Wurcel AG, Anderson JE, Chui KK, et al. Increasing Infectious Endocarditis Admissions Among  
413 Young People Who Inject Drugs. *Open Forum Infect Dis.* 2016;3: ofw157.

414 28. Uusküla A, Talu A, Vorobjov S, Salekešin M, Rannap J, Lemsalu L, Jarlais DD. The fentanyl  
415 epidemic in Estonia: factors in its evolution and opportunities for a comprehensive public health response,  
416 a scoping review. *Int J Drug Policy*. 2020;81: 102757.  
417