PRE-PRINT: INVESTIGATING SOCIAL DEPRIVATION AND COMORBID MENTAL HEALTH DIAGNOSIS AS PREDICTORS OF TREATMENT OUTCOMES AMONG PATIENTS WITH AN OPIATE USE DISORDER USING SUBSTANCE USE SERVICES: A PROSPECTIVE COHORT STUDY

Emma A Adams[1]*, Justin C Yang[2,3], Amy O'Donnell[1], Sarah Minot[3], David Osborn[2,3], James B Kirkbride[2]

Authors affiliations and addresses:

1. Population Health Sciences Institute, Faculty of Medical Science Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK
2. Division of Psychiatry, University College London, London UK
3. Camden & Islington NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK

Corresponding author:
Ms Emma A Adams
emma.adams@newcastle.ac.uk
Population Health Sciences Institute, Faculty of Medical Science, Newcastle University, Baddiley-Clark Building, Richardson Road, Newcastle NE2 4AX, UK

PRE-PRINT

Short running title: Deprivation, mental health, opioid care (35 characters)

Word count (excluding abstract, references, tables, and figures): 3500 words

Declarations of competing interest: No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Primary funding: EAA was supported by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) School for Public Health Research (SPHR) Pre-doctoral Fellowship, Grant Reference Number PD-SPH-2015.

ABSTRACT:

Aims
We investigated whether social deprivation and comorbid mental health diagnoses were predictors of subsequent engagement with substance use services or crisis and inpatient services amongst people with an opioid related disorder diagnosed in secondary mental health care.

Design
Prospective cohort study, using anonymised electronic health records from a substance use and secondary mental health care provider.

Setting
Camden and Islington, London, UK.

Participants
We followed 1,888 individuals with either an opioid use disorder diagnosis or prescription for methadone or buprenorphine for one-year after initial substance use service engagement between September 2015 and May 2020.

Measurements
Our primary outcomes were rates of subsequent engagement with substance use and crisis/inpatient services. Our secondary outcome was time to first contact with a crisis/inpatient service. Exposures were social deprivation quartile and comorbid mental health diagnoses. We assessed associations using Poisson regression and Cox proportional survival analyses.

PRE-PRINT

Results
Rates of subsequent engagement with substance use services were not associated with social deprivation but were increased for those with a single comorbid mental health diagnosis (incidence rate ratio [IRR]: 1.69; 95%CI: 1.24 to 2.31). Rates of contact with crisis/inpatient services were lower in those in the most versus least deprived quartile (IRR: 0.44; 95%CI: 0.31 to 0.61) but elevated for those with single (IRR: 3.41; 95%CI: 2.58 to 4.49) or multiple comorbid mental health diagnoses (IRR: 5.01; 95%CI 4.02 to 6.24). For our secondary outcome, deprivation did not predict time to first contact, but single (Hazard Ratio [HR]: 4.15; 95%CI 2.71 to 6.35) and multiple (HR: 4.49; 95%CI 3.15 to 6.39) comorbid mental health diagnoses led to earlier contact with crisis/inpatient services.

Conclusion
Our findings illustrate greater substance and secondary mental health care service use amongst opioid users with diagnosed comorbid mental health conditions.

Key words: prospective cohort; opioid-related disorders; social deprivation; dual diagnosis

INTRODUCTION

Opioids are the second mostly commonly used illicit substances globally. In 2020, there were an estimated 61.3 million people who used opioids in the past year (1). In England alone, between 2016 to 2017, there were an estimated 261,294 opiate users aged 15 to 64, 7.4 per thousand of the population (2). However rates of opioid use vary across England, with more deprived regions experiencing greater prevalence compared to less deprived areas(2). Since social deprivation is also strongly associated with risk of several psychiatric disorders, including psychotic disorders (3, 4), this raises the possibility of syndemic effects, where the co-occurrence of substance use disorders and mental health disorders in the same population (i.e. a syndemic) or same individuals (co-morbidity or dual diagnoses) share common causes. This possibility is reflected in estimates of comorbid opioid use and mental health diagnoses. For example, in England, approximately 57% of people accessing opiate treatment report a co-morbid mental health treatment need (2). This is consistent with estimates from North American studies which found rates of co-morbid mental health ranged from 45 to 80%, among patients seeking buprenorphine or methadone treatment for opioid dependence (5-9).

Opioid treatment can take place within the community, primary care, secondary care, and residential settings (i.e. supported accommodation) in the form of structured prescribing (e.g. buprenorphine or methadone) or psychosocial interventions (2). However abstinence rates after three and six months of treatment in England are nearly 20% lower (10) than average abstinence rates found in randomised control trials for opioid substitution treatment (11). Evidence suggests that several factors contribute to poor treatment outcomes in real-world settings including relapse, drop out from treatment, and death (10). Existing mental health disorders may also affect outcomes, although there is mixed evidence on the association between dual diagnosis and treatment outcomes, retention, and compliance (7, 8, 12). Whilst data show that social deprivation is negatively associated with access to healthcare services in general (13, 14), the limited previous research investigating social deprivation as a predictor of opiate misuse have tended to focus on prescribing, use, access to support, and patient profiles for opiate use (6, 10, 13-16). There are other important outcomes such as subsequent substance use service engagement, which may indicate ongoing treatment, or rates of subsequent crisis or inpatient care use, which may indicate relapse.

PRE-PRINT

In comparison to trial designs, routine electronic health data present an opportunity to investigate differences in real-world treatment outcomes across systems rather than individual services, by factors such as deprivation and comorbidity, while accounting for individual factors such as sex, age, and ethnicity. Here, we investigated the association between social deprivation and comorbid mental health diagnoses and subsequent contact with substance use, crisis or inpatient services in patients diagnosed with opioid-related disorders in a secondary mental health care service in inner-London between September 2015 and May 2020. In doing so, we addressed the following research questions:

1. Does area-level social deprivation predict subsequent engagement with these services? We hypothesised that greater deprivation would be associated with less engagement with such services.

2. Does a comorbid mental health diagnosis recorded at baseline predict subsequent

engagement with services? We hypothesised that comorbid mental health diagnoses would be associated with greater service engagement, and that the more comorbid diagnoses experienced, the stronger these associations would be.

In addition, we also addressed the following research questions concerning our secondary outcomes of interest concerning time to first contact with services following the initial contact:

3. Does area-level social deprivation predict time to first contact with crisis or inpatient services? We hypothesised that greater deprivation would be associated with shorter time to engagement.

4. Do comorbid mental health diagnoses recorded at baseline predict earlier contact with crisis or inpatient services? We hypothesised that comorbid mental health diagnoses would be associated with shorter time to engagement, and that the more comorbid diagnoses experienced, the stronger these associations would be.

METHODS

Data source

Anonymised electronic health records at Camden & Islington NHS Foundation Trust (C&I) were interrogated using the Clinical Record Interactive Search (CRIS) to conduct this prospective cohort study (17). C&I provides secondary mental health services (including substance use services) for a catchment area of approximately 470,000 residents within the two inner-city London boroughs of Camden and Islington. CRIS contains the anonymised full clinical records and notes, in both structured fields and unstructured clinical free-text, of over 160,000 mental health service users from 2009 onwards.

PRE-PRINT

Sample

We included participants, resident in the London Boroughs of Camden and Islington who had a first episode of care with a substance use service within C&I between September 1, 2015, and May 31, 2020, and had received a diagnosis of either an International Classification of Diseases, tenth revision, (ICD-10) F11 (mental and behavioural disorders due to opioid use) or F19 (mental and behavioural disorders due to multiple drugs or psychoactive substances) code as recorded in the structured diagnostic field of the clinical records. Additionally, we identified eligible participants who had a positive mention of a relevant substance use disorder or treatment for buprenorphine or methadone in their clinical notes, given the structured diagnostic field is not always completed during clinical care, particular at initial assessment. We excluded all participants who had a recorded diagnosis for an organic disorder (F00-F09), or who were resident outside of the catchment area during their care.

We followed all participants who met our inclusion criteria for one year from their first episode of care with a substance use service for evidence of an outcome of interest (see below). Substance use services included any drug service offered through C&I, which could involve one-to-one key working, day programmes, testing and treatment, assessments, residential detoxification, and rehabilitation centres.

Informed consent was not obtained as data were anonymised. Ethical approval for research using the database was granted by the East of England – Cambridge Central Research Ethics Committee (19/EE/0210).

Measures

Exposures

Social deprivation was measured using the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) for England (2015) (18), a composite measure of multiple deprivation for small areas based on 37 indicators across 7 domains. Prior to data anonymization for research, patients' most recent residential postcode, as recorded during clinical care, were geocoded to their corresponding lower super output area (LSOAs) which we linked to their IMD quartile (least deprived to most deprived) relative to all LSOA within the London Boroughs of Camden & Islington. LSOA information was not available for 17.2% of our study sample, who we chose to retain as a separate category since we reasoned that a substantial proportion of this group may have been of no fixed abode at the point of care.

We defined comorbid mental health diagnosis at baseline as an ICD-10 psychiatric diagnosis recorded in the structured diagnostic field that occurred prior to or within 30 days of their first episode of care with substance use services. This approach minimised misclassifying psychiatric diagnoses arising subsequent to the substance use disorder, which may be on the causal pathway from using opioids. Comorbid conditions included: other substance use (F10, F12-18), common mental disorders (F32-39, F40-49), severe mental illnesses (F20-29, F30, F31, F32.3, F33.3), personality disorders (F60-69), and other mental health conditions (F50, 52, F70-F79, F84.5, F89, F90, F91, F99). Participants were classified into four categories: 1) no comorbid diagnoses; 2) diagnosis in one of these broad sets of comorbid psychiatric conditions; 3) a non-opioid substance use comorbid disorder; and 4) diagnoses in two or more of these broad sets of comorbid substance use or psychiatric conditions.

PRE-PRINT

Clinical outcomes

Our two primary outcomes were (a) rates of subsequent engagement with C&I substance use services within one year of their first episode of care with substance use services and (b) rates of contact with C&I inpatient/crisis settings within one year of their first episode of care with substance use services. For each participant, we recorded the total count of these outcomes over the one-year follow-up period. Our secondary outcome was length of time to first contact with C&I crisis or inpatient settings. These included any acute mental health care settings where urgent medical treatment is sought (such as mental health emergency services) and services specifically designed to provide acute mental health crisis support.

Confounders

We extracted sex, age, ethnicity, and marital status from CRIS as potential confounders. We also included two additional area-level measures (population density (people per hectare) and social fragmentation index) based on participants' LSOA. Data for social fragmentation and population density (people per hectare) were estimated using 2011 census data (19), and grouped into quartiles. Consistent with previous studies (20, 21), we estimated social fragmentation as the proportion of unmarried persons, people living at a different address 1 year ago, people living

alone, and people privately renting. These data were combined into a single index by summing z-scores for each indicator.

Analysis

We used Chi-squared tests to examine differences in the distribution of categorical exposure and confounder variables between those with and without subsequent mental health service use engagement, and Wilcoxon rank-sum tests for corresponding continuous variables. For our primary outcomes, we used Poisson regression models to compare rates of subsequent engagement/contact with substance use services and crisis/inpatient settings, respectively. For our secondary outcome, we used Cox proportional hazards regression for time to first contact with crisis or inpatient settings and undertook a test of proportional hazard assumption. Cohort entry was the date of first episode of care with a substance use service, and date of exit was first engagement with a crisis/inpatient service, or censorship after 365 days, otherwise. We presented incidence rate ratios (IRR) and Hazard Ratios (HR) for our primary and secondary analyses, respectively, alongside 95% confidence intervals (95% CI). For all analyses, we presented univariable (unadjusted), bivariable (mutually adjusted for the other exposure) and multivariable (fully adjusted for all confounders) results. Data were analysed using Stata 16 (22). Some small cell data (n<10) has been supressed to maintain anonymity.

RESULTS

Sample characteristics

We identified 1,888 patients who had a first episode of care with substance use services in Camden and Islington NHS Foundation Trust between 2015 and 2020. Of this sample, 368 (19.5%) participants re-engaged with a substance use service over the following 12 months (Table 1), and 195 (10.3%) patients had contact with crisis or inpatient settings (Table 2).

PRE-PRINT

Those who re-engaged with substance use services were younger than those who did not (median years: 40.0 versus 44.0, p<0.001; Table 1). Those who re-engaged with substance use services were less likely to have missing data on marital status, and more likely to have at least one comorbid diagnosis at first contact (49.7% vs 36.9%; p<0.001) and subsequent inpatient/crisis contact (16.3 vs 8.9%; p<0.001) but did not differ on other measured characteristics.

[Insert Table 1]

Those who had contact with crisis or inpatient settings during follow-up were also younger than those who did not (median: 39.0 versus 44.0 years, p<0.001; Table 2). As before, we observed differences by marital status associated with missing data. A substantially larger proportion of those who had contact with crisis/inpatient services had at least one comorbid diagnosis at first contact (68.2% versus 36.1%; p<0.001). Women, those of white ethnicity, and from less deprived quartiles were more likely to come into contact with crisis/inpatient services during follow-up (Table 2).

[Insert Table 2]

Rates of re-engagement with substance use services

We found no evidence that social deprivation was associated with rates of re-engagement with substance use services during follow-up, apart from those with no recorded LSOA (Table 3; IRR: 1.91: 95%CI: 1.11-3.30), after adjustment for confounders.

Comorbid mental health diagnoses were associated with higher rates of re-engagement with substance use services compared with those with no comorbidity (Table 3). This effect was most pronounced for those with a single mental health diagnosis (IRR: 1.69; 95%CI: 1.24-2.31) or multiple comorbid substance use or mental health diagnoses (IRR: 1.32; 95%CI: 1.01-1.72), after full adjustment for confounders, but not for those (solely) with and without other comorbid substance use disorders (IRR: 1.20; 95%CI: 0.92-1.56).

Supplement A provides the full set of regression coefficients from these models.

[Insert Table 3]

Rates of contact with crisis/inpatient services

Greater social deprivation was strongly associated with a lower rate of contact with crisis/inpatient services across all models (Table 4), such that those with no recorded LSOA (IRR: 0.39; 95%CI: 0.25-0.60) or in the most deprived quartile (IRR: 0.44; 95%CI: 0.31-0.66) had lowest rates of contact relative to those from the least deprived quartile. In contrast, those with one (IRR: 3.41; 95%CI: 2.58-4.49) or multiple (IRR: 5.01; 95%CI: 4.02-6.24) comorbid mental health diagnoses had substantially higher rates of contact with crisis/inpatient services than those without comorbidity. Rates of contact with crisis/inpatient services were similar between opioid users with and without comorbid non-opioid substance use only (IRR: 0.74; 95%CI: 0.50-1.10).

PRE-PRINT

Supplement B provides the full set of regression coefficients from these models.

[Insert Table 4]

Time to first contact with crisis/inpatient services

We found no evidence that social deprivation was associated with time to first contact with crisis/inpatient services (Table 5). In contrast, single (HR: 4.15; 95%CI: 2.71-6.35) or multiple (HR: 4.49; 95%CI: 3.15-6.39) comorbid mental health diagnoses at baseline were strongly associated with shorter time to contact with crisis/inpatient services all models. Supplement C provides the full set of regression coefficients from these models. Supplement D contains the results from the test of proportional hazards assumption.

[Insert Table 5]

DISCUSSION

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to use routinely-collected electronic health records to investigate social deprivation and comorbid mental health diagnosis as predictors of (re)engagement/contact with statutory substance use services, crisis or inpatient settings amongst opioid users following their first episode of treatment. Our study found social deprivation did not

influence rates of re-engagement to substance use services up to one year after diagnosis, but that greater deprivation was associated with lower rates of contact with crisis/inpatient service use in this period. Our study extends previous knowledge by finding large and robust increases in the rate of (re)engagement/contact with substance use services and crisis/inpatient services, as well as a shorter time to first contact with crisis services, in those with one or more comorbid psychiatric disorders at the time of their first episode of care with substance use services. We found no evidence of differences in any outcome between opioid users with and without other forms of comorbid non-opioid substance use only.

Comparison to prior findings

Given our findings did not show an influence of deprivation on frequency of re-engagement with substance use services, our results somewhat contrast with the preponderance of evidence that supports increased opioid prescribing for pain treatment in more deprived areas (14, 23-25) . One possible explanation is that our catchment area of inner-London is more deprived – on average – than the remainder of England. Further, within our sample, over 74% (n=1404/1888) of people with a substance use disorder lived in the most deprived half of Camden and Islington or were missing a residential address; this may be a potential marker of homelessness, and increased rates of homelessness have been observed among individuals with non-medical use of opioids (26, 27). Thus, the absence of differences in rates of subsequent substance use service re-engagement in this sample may be due to a 'floor effect', because most of our sample are already living in some of the most precarious and marginalised environments.

PRE-PRINT

Nonetheless, we did observe a strong gradient between greater deprivation and lower rates of subsequent contact with crisis or inpatient services. This warrants further investigation to understand whether the needs of this population are being assessed and supported earlier on in primary care or community settings or if they end up with more acute/adverse outcomes in expensive and inappropriate settings such as the criminal justice system or emergency care (13, 28). The way in which area-level deprivation and housing security interacts with care of individuals seeking treatment for opioid use disorder warrants further study and greater elucidation.

Nearly 40% of our cohort had at least one additional recorded mental health or substance use diagnosis in addition to their opioid use, within ranges of existing evidence within opioid using populations seeking treatment (5-9). Existing evidence does not suggest that comorbid psychiatric conditions are associated with continued opioid use (8). Our findings suggest that people with psychiatric comorbidities had increased rates of (re)engagement/contact with substance use services and crisis/inpatient settings. This highlights a potential contradiction in the role of comorbid psychiatric conditions in opioid use.

Results from a large globally representative, cross-sectional household survey of individuals using opioids found that the presence of at least one comorbid mental health condition (other than an additional substance use disorder) doubled the odds of accessing substance use disorder treatment (29) which aligns with our findings. However, that study did not differentiate between having one, or multiple comorbid mental health diagnoses. Here, we found that people with one comorbid mental health diagnosis had the greatest rate of re-engagement with substance use services compared with those without any comorbidity. In contrast, those with multiple comorbid

mental health diagnoses were more likely to seek treatment in crisis and inpatient settings. Given that those with multiple comorbid mental health conditions have complex health care needs, these individuals may face additional challenges (such as housing or child safeguarding) when being treated leading to less contact/engagement with services, as observed elsewhere (2). Certain psychiatric conditions (such as non-opioid substance use disorders, psychotic diagnosis, and mood disorders) have been found to be more strongly associated with continued opioid use and decreased treatment retention (8, 30), with implications on care planning and treatment design for patients with complex needs who might be at greater risk of poor treatment outcomes. Due to the size of the sample, we were unable to separate by specific psychiatric conditions and future studies should investigate this issue.

Limitations

The novelty of our study is in its use of secondary mental health care routine data to provide relevant insights into predictors of treatment usage for people who use opioids and access care in real-world clinical settings as opposed to trials to. Despite its strengths, our study has several limitations. The study relied on electronic health records that were not primarily designed for research purposes; consequently, the data are of an administrative and clinical nature. Due to changes in the electronic health care provider contracted by C&I, substance use diagnoses entered in structured fields were not available prior to August 2015, which restricted the case ascertainment period in our study design, even though CRIS records began in 2009. One further limitation of CRIS data is that residential address information is based on the latest clinical record with historical addresses overwritten by more recent ones. This means that we may have misclassified exposure to deprivation (and other area-level confounders) amongst any participants who moved between LSOA, or became homeless, during their care with C&I (up to 2020). We were unable to assess the extent of this bias in our study, but we cannot exclude reverse causality as an explanation of our results with respect to deprivation. Further we do not have information on cohort exit (such as death or emigration from the study region) so were unable to take this into account.

PRE-PRINT

The generalisability of our findings more broadly should be considered with several caveats. This study only reported on individuals with an opioid use disorder who were accessing substance use services through statutory secondary mental health care services; our results may not generalise to those who solely access substance use treatment in their community or through private or third sector organisations, or who have yet to seek treatment at all. Additionally, we did not have information on the nature of opioid use within our cohort (e.g. prescribed, illicit use). Furthermore, Camden and Islington are densely populated, inner-city boroughs within London with high levels of deprivation, which may not reflect service users in other regions of England or elsewhere. Missing data was an issue on some information (notably LSOA and marital status), something which is inherent to most electronic health records. Although we have discussed missingness in LSOA data in terms of homelessness, we cannot exclude the possibility that data were missing for other reasons.

Implications for policy, practice, and research

Although we observed that opioid users living in areas with higher deprivation experienced lower rates of contact with crisis or inpatient settings, this is not necessarily indicative of a positive health outcome for those individuals. People with opioid use disorders who live in the

most deprived parts of our society – or who may experience prolonged periods of homelessness – may not be appropriately supported within formal health and care settings and may be less likely to seek ongoing treatment for their substance use and mental health issues. Relatedly, existing research shows strong associations between deprivation and death for people who use opioids (13), which could account for the decreased rates in contact with crisis/inpatient care observed in our study.

Interventions and support offered through substance use services could benefit from introducing broader psychiatric screening and targeting interventions to ensure individuals are better supported with their additional needs (31), particularly among those presenting with multiple mental health conditions. This could involve better connections between substance use and mental health services, or by creating more integrated treatment solutions. Understanding the mechanisms, particularly causal, of why and how mental health conditions interact with substance use disorders, including opioid use disorder, will provide stronger evidence to guide the care of these individuals. Further, understanding the trajectories of those receiving treatment substance use disorder, including the onset and diagnosis of secondary mental health conditions will allow for more timely recognition and management of these potential comorbid conditions in the clinical setting.

CONCLUSION

We found that individuals who use opioids with one or more comorbid mental health diagnoses had increased rates of (re)engagement with both substance use services and crisis/inpatient services within a year of their first episode of substance use service care. Time to first crisis/inpatient care was also over four times shorter for these comorbid groups than those solely with an opioid use disorder diagnosis. In our already deprived cohort, relative deprivation was associated with decreased rates of engagement with crisis/inpatient services. Given the common co-occurrence of deprivation and comorbid mental health among those who use opioids, further observational and interventional work is needed to better understand the needs to those group so people can be better supported in their treatment journeys. Future research should work with people who have lived experience of opioid use to investigate and explore different treatment outcomes potentially including those outside of statutory care.

PRE-PRINT

FUNDING STATEMENT

EAA and the research was supported by the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR) School for Public Health Research (SPHR) Pre-doctoral Fellowship, Grant Reference Number PD-SPH-2015. EAA is now supported by the NIHR Applied Research Collaboration (ARC) North East and North Cumbria (NENC) (NIHR200173). AO is an NIHR Advanced Fellow. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NIHR, the Department of Health and Social Care, or the NHS. JK and DO are supported by the UCLH NIHR Biomedical Research Centre.

DECLARATION OF INTEREST

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

REFERENCES

1. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. World Drug Report 2022: Booklet 3 Drug Market Trends Cannabis Opioids. United Nations publications; 2022. Available from: https://www.unodc.org/res/wdr2022/MS/WDR22_Booklet_3.pdf
2. Office for Health Improvement & Disparities. Adult substance misuse treatment statistics 2020 to 2021: report. 2021. Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/substance-misuse-treatment-for-adults-statistics-2020-to-2021/adult-substance-misuse-treatment-statistics-2020-to-2021-report
3. Lewis G, Dykxhoorn J, Karlsson H, Khandaker GM, Lewis G, Dalman C, et al. Assessment of the Role of IQ in Associations Between Population Density and Deprivation and Nonaffective Psychosis. JAMA Psychiatry. 2020;77(7):729-36. doi:10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2020.0103
4. Richardson L, Hameed Y, Perez J, Jones PB, Kirkbride JB. Association of Environment With the Risk of Developing Psychotic Disorders in Rural Populations: Findings from the Social Epidemiology of Psychoses in East Anglia Study. JAMA Psychiatry. 2018;75(1):75-83. doi:10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2017.3582
5. Rowe TA, Jacapraro JS, Rastegar DA. Entry into primary care-based buprenorphine treatment is associated with identification and treatment of other chronic medical problems. Addict Sci Clin Pract. 2012;7(1):22. doi:10.1186/1940-0640-7-22
6. Weinstein ZM, Kim HW, Cheng DM, Quinn E, Hui D, Labelle CT, et al. Long-term retention in Office Based Opioid Treatment with buprenorphine. J Subst Abuse Treat. 2017;74:65-70. doi:10.1016/j.jsat.2016.12.010
7. Simon CB, Tsui JI, Merrill JO, Adwell A, Tamru E, Klein JW. Linking patients with buprenorphine treatment in primary care: Predictors of engagement. Drug Alcohol Depend. 2017;181:58-62. doi: 0.1016/j.drugalcdep.2017.09.017
8. Rosic T, Naji L, Bawor M, Dennis BB, Plater C, Marsh DC, et al. The impact of comorbid psychiatric disorders on methadone maintenance treatment in opioid use disorder: a prospective cohort study. Neuropsychiatr Dis Treat. 2017;13:1399-408. doi:10.2147/NDT.S129480
9. Fareed A, Eilender P, Ketchen B, Buchanan-Cummings AM, Scheinberg K, Crampton K, et al. Factors affecting noncompliance with buprenorphine maintenance treatment. J Addict Med. 2014;8(5):345-50. doi:10.1097/ADM.0000000000000057
10. Burkinshaw P, Knight J, Anders P, Eastwood B, Musto V, White M, et al. An evidence review of the outcomes that can be expected of drug misuse treatment in England. London: Public Health England; 2017.
11. Mattick RP, Breen C, Kimber J, Davoli M. Methadone maintenance therapy versus no opioid replacement therapy for opioid dependence. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2003;2.Art. No.: CD002209. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD002209.
12. Hooker SA, Sherman MD, Lonergan-Cullum M, Sattler A, Liese BS, Justesen K, et al. Mental Health and Psychosocial Needs of Patients Being Treated for Opioid Use Disorder in a Primary Care Residency Clinic. J Prim Care Community Health. 2020;11:2150132720932017. doi:10.1177/2150132720932017
13. Macfarlane GJ, Beasley M, Jones GT, Stannard C. The epidemiology of regular opioid use and its association with mortality: Prospective cohort study of 466 486 UK biobank participants. EClinicalMedicine. 2020;21. doi:10.1016/j.eclinm.2020.100321

PRE-PRINT

14. Nowakowska M, Zghebi SS, Perisi R, Chen L-C, Ashcroft DM, Kontopantelis E. Association of socioeconomic deprivation with opioid prescribing in primary care in England: a spatial analysis. Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health. 2020:jech-2020-214676. doi:10.1136/jech-2020-214676
15. Cantone RE, Garvey B, O'Neill A, Fleishman J, Cohen D, Muench J, et al. Predictors of Medication-Assisted Treatment Initiation for Opioid Use Disorder in an Interdisciplinary Primary Care Model. J Am Board Fam Med. 2019;32(5):724-31. doi:10.3122/jabfm.2019.05.190012
16. Morton CM. Community social deprivation and availability of substance use treatment and mutual aid recovery groups. Subst Abuse Treat Prev Policy. 2019;14(1):33. doi:10.1186/s13011-019-0221-6
17. Werbeloff N, Osborn DPJ, Patel R, Taylor M, Stewart R, Broadbent M, et al. The Camden & Islington Research Database: Using electronic mental health records for research. PLOS ONE. 2018;13(1):e0190703. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0190703
18. Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government. English indices of deprivation 2015. 2015. Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/english-indices-of-deprivation-2015
19. Official census and labour market statistics. 2011 Census. 2011. Available from: https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/sources/census_2011.
20. Allardyce J, Gilmour H, Atkinson J, Rapson T, Bishop J, McCreadie R. Social fragmentation, deprivation and urbanicity: relation to first-admission rates for psychoses. The Br J Psychiatry. 2005;187(5):401-6. doi:10.1192/bjp.187.5.401
21. Kirkbride JB, Jones PB, Ullrich S, Coid JW. Social Deprivation, Inequality, and the Neighborhood-Level Incidence of Psychotic Syndromes in East London. Schizophr Bull. 2012;40(1):169-80. doi:10.1093/schbul/sbs151
22. StataCorp. Stata statistical software: release 16. College Station, TX: StataCorp LLC; 2019.
23. Chen TC, Chen LC, Kerry M, Knaggs RD. Prescription opioids: Regional variation and socioeconomic status - evidence from primary care in England. Int J Drug Policy. 2019;64:87-94. doi:10.1016/j.drugpo.2018.10.013
24. Curtis HJ, Croker R, Walker AJ, Richards GC, Quinlan J, Goldacre B. Opioid prescribing trends and geographical variation in England, 1998-2018: a retrospective database study. Lancet Psychiatry. 2019;6(2):140-50. doi:10.1016/S2215-0366(18)30471-1
25. Mordecai L, Reynolds C, Donaldson LJ, de CWAC. Patterns of regional variation of opioid prescribing in primary care in England: a retrospective observational study. Br J Gen Pract. 2018;68(668):e225-e33. doi:10.3399/bjgp18X695057
26. Yamamoto A, Needleman J, Gelberg L, Kominski G, Shoptaw S, Tsugawa Y. Association between homelessness and opioid overdose and opioid-related hospital admissions/emergency department visits. Soc Sci Med. 2019;242:112585. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2019.112585
27. Milaney K, Passi J, Zaretsky L, Liu T, O'Gorman CM, Hill L, et al. Drug use, homelessness and health: responding to the opioid overdose crisis with housing and harm reduction services. Harm Reduct J. 2021;18(1):92. doi:10.1186/s12954-021-00539-8
28. Bennett T, Holloway K, Farrington D. The statistical association between drug misuse and crime: A meta-analysis. Aggression and Violent Behavior. 2008;13(2):107-18. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2008.02.001

PRE-PRINT

29. Harris MG, Bharat C, Glantz MD, Sampson NA, Al-Hamzawi A, Alonso J, et al. Cross-national patterns of substance use disorder treatment and associations with mental disorder comorbidity in the WHO World Mental Health Surveys. Addiction. 2019;114(8):1446-59. doi:10.1111/add.14599
30. Bharat C, Larney S, Barbieri S, Dobbins T, Jones NR, Hickman M, et al. The effect of person, treatment and prescriber characteristics on retention in opioid agonist treatment: a 15-year retrospective cohort study. Addiction. 2021;116(11):3139-52. doi:10.1111/add.15514
31. Griffin ML, Dodd DR, Potter JS, Rice LS, Dickinson W, Sparenborg S, et al. Baseline characteristics and treatment outcomes in prescription opioid dependent patients with and without co-occurring psychiatric disorder. Am J Drug Alcohol Abuse. 2014;40(2):157-62. doi:10.3109/00952990.2013.842241.

PRE-PRINT

Table 1. Socio-demographic and clinical characteristics of the total sample in relation to re-engagement with substance use services

	Substance use service re-engagement		
	No re-engagement (N=1,520)	Re-engagement (N=368; 19.5%)	p-value [a]
Age (median, interquartile range)	44.0 (36.0-51.0)	40.0 (32.0-48.0)	<0.001
Gender			0.73
Female	428 (28.2%)	107 (29.1%)	
Male	1,092 (71.8)	261 (70.9)	
Ethnicity			0.084
White	1,038 (68.3%)	260 (70.7%)	
Black	129 (8.5)	36 (9.8)	
Asian	51 (3.4)	<10 (<3) [c]	
Mixed	82 (5.4)	26 (7.1)	
Other	48 (3.2)	<20 (<5) [c]	
not recorded	172 (11.3)	24(6.5)	
Marital status			<0.001
single	924 (60.8%)	259 (70.4%)	
married	97 (6.4)	26 (7.1)	
divorced, separated, or widowed	99 (6.5)	29 (7.9)	
Not recorded/disclosed/unknown	400 (26.3)	54 (14.7)	
Social deprivation [d]			0.29
Q1 (least deprived)	114 (7.5%)	21 (5.7%)	
Q2	281 (18.5)	68 (18.5)	
Q3	404 (26.6)	89 (24.2)	
Q4 (most deprived)	471 (31.0)	114 (31)	
No LSOA	250 (16.4)	76 (20.7)	
Recorded mental health comorbidity			<0.001
No recorded diagnosis	959 (63.1%)	185 (50.3%)	
One recorded mental health diagnosis [e]	107 (7.0)	43 (11.7)	
Non-opioid substance use diagnosis	244 (16.1)	67 (18.2)	
Multiple recorded comorbid diagnoses	210 (13.8)	73 (19.8)	
Population density [b]			0.062
Q1 (least populated)	287 (18.9%)	50 (13.6%)	
Q2	326 (21.4)	74 (20.1)	
Q3	334 (22.0)	91 (24.7)	
Q4 (most populated)	323 (21.3)	77 (20.9)	
No LSOA	250 (16.4)	76 (20.7)	
Social fragmentation index [b]			0.17
Q1 (least fragmented)	257 (16.9)	53 (14.4)	
Q2	372 (24.5)	98 (26.6)	
Q3	307 (20.2)	73 (19.8)	
Q4 (most fragmented)	334 (22.0)	68 (18.5)	
No LSOA	250 (16.4)	76 (20.6)	
Inpatient or crisis contacted			<0.001
No	1385 (91.1)	308 (83.7)	

PRE-PRINT

	Substance use service re-engagement		
	No re-engagement (N=1,520)	Re-engagement (N=368; 19.5%)	p-value [a]
Yes	135 (8.9)	60 (16.3)	

[a] Statistical significance for all categorical variables is based on pearson's chi-square tests; continuous variables used Wilcoxon rank-sum; [b] area level deprivation measures are based on data from 2011; [c] data censored; [d] social deprivation based on IMD 2015 data and quartiles are proportionate to Camden Islington area; [e] reflective of one F-code for any non-substance use disorder, including common mental health disorders, severe mental health disorders, personality disorders, and others.

PRE-PRINT

Table 2. Socio-demographic and clinical characteristics of the total sample in relation to contact with crisis or inpatient services

	Inpatient or crisis contact		
	No contact (N=1,693)	Contacted (N=195)	p-value [a]
Age (median, interquartile range)	44.0 (36.0-51.0)	39.0 (30.0-45.0)	<0.001
Gender			0.032
Female	467 (27.6%)	68 (34.9%)	
Male	1,226 (72.4)	127 (65.1)	
Ethnicity			0.035
White	1,159 (68.5%)	139 (71.3%)	
Black	143 (8.4)	11.3% (22)	
Asian	53 (3.1)	<10 (<5) [c]	
Mixed	95 (5.6)	13 (6.7)	
Other	54 (3.2)	<10 (<5) [c]	
not recorded	189 (11.2)	<10 (<5) [c]	
Marital status			<0.001
single	1,035 (61.1%)	148 (75.9%)	
married	113 (6.7)	10 (5.1)	
divorced, separated, or widowed	109 (6.4)	19 (9.7)	
Not recorded/disclosed/unknown	436 (25.8)	18 (9.2)	
Social deprivation [d]			0.020
Q1 (least deprived)	117 (6.9%)	18 (9.2%)	
Q2	298 (17.6)	51 (26.2)	
Q3	445 (26.3)	48 (24.6)	
Q4 (most deprived)	533 (31.5)	52 (26.7)	
no LSOA	300 (17.7)	26 (13.3)	
Recorded mental health comorbidity			<0.001
No recorded diagnosis	1,082 (63.9%)	62 (31.8%)	
One recorded mental health diagnosis [e]	112 (6.6)	38 (19.5)	
Non-opioid substance use diagnosis	294 (17.4)	17 (8.7)	
Multiple recorded diagnosis	205 (12.1)	78 (40.0)	
Population density [b]			0.21
Q1 (least populated)	305 (18.0%)	32 (16.4%)	
Q2	347 (20.5)	53 (27.2)	
Q3	382 (22.6)	43 (22.1)	
Q4 (most populated)	359 (21.2)	41 (21.0)	
no LSOA	300 (17.7)	26 (13.3)	
Social fragmentation index [b]			0.25
Q1 (least fragmented)	280 (16.5%)	30 (15.4%)	
Q2	425 (21.5)	45 (23.1)	
Q3	331 (19.6)	49 (25.1)	
Q4 (most fragmented)	357 (21.1)	45 (23.1)	
no LSOA	300 (17.7)	26 (13.3)	
Re-admission to substance use support			<0.001
Yes	308 (18.2%)	60 (30.8%)	

PRE-PRINT

No	1385 (81.8)	135 (69.2)	

[a] Statistical significance for all categorical variables is based on person's chi-square tests; continuous variables used Wilcoxon rank-sum; [b] area level deprivation measures are based on data from 2011; [c] data censored; [d] social deprivation based on IMD 2015 data and quartiles are proportionate to Camden Islington area; [e] reflective of one F-code for any non-substance use disorder, including common mental health disorders, severe mental health disorders, personality disorders, and others.

PRE-PRINT

Table 3. Re-engagement rates with substance use services in the one-year follow-up period

	Unadjusted regression		Partially adjusted regression [a]		Fully adjusted regression [b]	
	IRR	95% CI	IRR	95% CI	IRR	95% CI
Social deprivation						
Q1 (least deprived)	1		1		1	
Q2	1.16	[0.73,1.83]	1.19	[0.75,1.88]	1.10	[0.69,1.75]
Q3	1.09	[0.70,1.70]	1.13	[0.73,1.77]	1.02	[0.64,1.61]
Q4 (most deprived)	1.21	[0.79,1.87]	1.25	[0.81,1.92]	1.03	[0.65,1.64]
no LSOA	1.52	[0.97,2.39]	1.66*	[1.05,2.60]	1.91*	[1.11,3.30]
Recorded mental health comorbidity						
No recorded diagnosis	1		1		1	
One recorded mental health diagnosis	1.78***	[1.32,2.40]	1.86***	[1.37,2.51]	1.69***	[1.24,2.31]
Non-opioid substance use diagnosis	1.28	[0.99,1.65]	1.26	[0.98,1.63]	1.20	[0.92,1.56]
Multiple recorded diagnosis	1.50**	[1.16,1.93]	1.54***	[1.20,1.98]	1.32*	[1.01,1.72]

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

x colinear with no LSOA group

[a] Partially adjusted for the other exposure variable

[b] Fully adjusted for the other exposure and confounders (age, sex, ethnicity, marital status, population density, and social fragmentation)

PRE-PRINT

Table 4. Contact with crisis and inpatient settings in the one-year follow-up period

	Unadjusted regression		Partially adjusted regression [a]		Fully adjusted regression [b]	
	IRR	95% CI	IRR	95% CI	IRR	95% CI
Social deprivation						
Q1 (least deprived)	1		1		1	
Q2	0.62**	[0.46,0.84]	0.71*	[0.53,0.97]	0.66*	[0.48,0.91]
Q3	0.50***	[0.37,0.67]	0.55***	[0.41,0.74]	0.48***	[0.35,0.66]
Q4 (most deprived)	0.43***	[0.32,0.58]	0.47***	[0.35,0.63]	0.44***	[0.31,0.61]
no LSOA	0.33***	[0.23,0.47]	0.47***	[0.33,0.68]	0.39***	[0.25,0.60]
Recorded mental health comorbidity						
No recorded diagnosis	1		1		1	
One recorded mental health diagnosis	4.82***	[3.68,6.30]	4.49***	[3.42,5.88]	3.41***	[2.58,4.49]
Non-opioid substance use diagnosis	0.82	[0.56,1.21]	0.83	[0.57,1.23]	0.74	[0.50,1.10]
Multiple recorded diagnosis	7.01***	[5.68,8.66]	6.98***	[5.65,8.63]	5.01***	[4.02,6.24]

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

x colinear with no LSOA group

[a] Partially adjusted for the other exposure variable

[b] Fully adjusted for the other exposure and confounders (age, sex, ethnicity, marital status, population density, and social fragmentation)

PRE-PRINT

Table 5. Cox regression/survival analysis appearance at crisis/inpatient

	Unadjusted regression		Partially adjusted regression [a]		Fully adjusted regression [b]	
	HRR	95% CI	HRR	95% CI	HRR	95% CI
Social deprivation						
Q1 (least deprived)	1		1		1	
Q2	1.03	[0.60, 1.76]	1.22	[0.71,2.1]	1.19	[0.68,2.09]
Q3	0.66	[0.39,1.14]	0.75	[0.43,1.29]	0.74	[0.42,1.30]
Q4 (most deprived)	0.60	[0.35,1.02]	0.66	[0.39,1.14]	0.69	[0.38,1.25]
no LSOA	0.56	[0.30,1.01]	0.83	[0.45,1.53]	0.85	[0.41,1.76]
Recorded mental health comorbidity						
No recorded diagnosis	1		1		1	
One recorded mental health diagnosis	5.14***	[3.43,7.70]	4.98***	[3.31,7.49]	4.15***	[2.71,6.35]
Non-opioid substance use diagnosis	0.95	[0.56,1.62]	0.93	[0.55,1.60]	0.89	[0.52,1.54]
Multiple recorded diagnosis	5.59***	[4.01,7.81]	5.70***	[4.08,7.98]	4.49***	[3.15,6.39]

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

x colinear with no LSOA group

[a] Partially adjusted for the other exposure variable

[b] Fully adjusted for the other exposure and confounders (age, sex, ethnicity, marital status, population density, and social fragmentation

PRE-PRINT