

Description of Kratom Exposure Events in Wisconsin as Reported to the Wisconsin Poison Center — January 1, 2010–September 1, 2022

Peter DeJonge, PhD;^{1,2} David Gummin, MD;³ Nicholas Titelbaum, MD;⁴ Jonathan Meiman, MD²

¹ Epidemic Intelligence Service, Division of Scientific Education and Professional Development, U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, Georgia

² Wisconsin Department of Health Services, Madison, Wisconsin

³ Wisconsin Poison Center, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

⁴ Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, Atlanta, Georgia

Corresponding Author:

Peter DeJonge

Wisconsin Department of Health Services

Bureau of Environmental and Occupational Health, Room 150

1 West Wilson St, Madison WI, 53703

peter.dejonge@dhs.wisconsin.gov

(608) 698-4326

Disclaimer:

The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the views of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention/the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry.

ABSTRACT

Background: Consumption of kratom (*Mitragyna speciosa*), an herbal substance, can result in adverse health effects. We characterized kratom-associated adverse events in Wisconsin to provide pertinent recommendations for clinicians and public health practitioners.

Methods: Using Wisconsin Poison Center (WPC) data, we searched for and summarized all records associated with exposure to “kratom”, “electronic delivery device containing kratom”, or “mitragyna” during January 1, 2010–September 1, 2022.

Results: Kratom-associated exposure calls to WPC increased 3.75 times during 2016–2020. Among all 59 calls, 26 (44.1%) reported concomitant use of another substance, agitation was the most common symptom reported (23, 39%), and 7 persons required critical care. Three unintentional ingestions were reported in infants aged <2 years.

Discussion: Kratom-associated exposure calls to WPC have been generally increasing in frequency since 2011. Wisconsinites who choose to use kratom might benefit from education regarding health risks and safe storage practices to avoid unintentional pediatric exposure.

1 BACKGROUND

2 Kratom is an herbal substance derived from the leaves of *Mitragyna speciosa*, a tree native to
3 Southeast Asia, and is commonly consumed in a tea or as a dried powder.¹ Two principal kratom
4 alkaloids, mitragynine and 7-hydroxymitragynine, are responsible for kratom’s psychotropic
5 properties, which range from stimulant-like effects at low doses to opioid-like sedative effects at
6 higher doses.² Kratom is often ingested for self-management of pain, anxiety, depression and to
7 stop or reduce opioid use or alleviate withdrawal symptoms.³

8 Although considered a “drug of concern” by the U.S. Drug Enforcement Agency, kratom
9 remains unscheduled by the U.S. Controlled Substances Act and its legality is determined on a
10 state-by-state basis.⁴ Wisconsin is 1 of 6 states where possession of kratom is illegal statewide
11 and thus not subject to commercial regulation.³ However, kratom use still occurs in Wisconsin
12 and is therefore important to understand both clinically and from a public health perspective
13 given the range of kratom-associated adverse events reported in literature.¹ We examined data
14 from the Wisconsin Poison Center (WPC) during January 1, 2010–September 1, 2022, to
15 characterize kratom-associated adverse events in Wisconsin and provide pertinent
16 recommendations for clinicians and public health practitioners.

17 METHODS

18 WPC data are shared with the National Poison Data System (NPDS), a collection of data logged
19 by all poison centers in the United States and maintained by America’s Poison Centers.⁵ We
20 queried NPDS for all Wisconsin-originated records associated with “kratom” (generic code:
21 0310130, product code: 7224390), “electronic delivery device containing kratom” (product code:

22 8306048), or “mitragyna” (product code: 4271683). We searched all records generated during
23 January 1, 2010–September 1, 2022.

24 We only considered calls associated with substance exposure (i.e., calls for the purposes of drug
25 identification or information-gathering were excluded). Kratom-exposure calls were
26 characterized by year of exposure, county of caller, reason for call, demographic characteristics,
27 single vs polysubstance exposure, reported symptoms, highest level of healthcare received, and
28 overall medical outcome. These categories follow NPDS coding schemes developed by
29 America’s Poison Centers.⁵ Fisher’s exact test was used for unadjusted comparisons of
30 categorical variables. We also summarized narrative information from exposure calls associated
31 with the most severe medical outcomes. R was used to complete all data analyses and figures
32 (version 4.1).⁶ This activity was reviewed by CDC and was conducted consistent with applicable
33 federal law and CDC policy.[†]

34 **RESULTS**

35 During January 1, 2010–September 1, 2022, WPC received 59 calls associated with kratom
36 exposure (Table 1). Most exposed persons were self-reported male (37/59, 62.7%). One person
37 reported being pregnant at time of exposure. Of 52 (88.1%) calls with age information available,
38 the mean age of exposed persons was 35.3 years (standard deviation = 15.4 years). Three
39 exposures occurred among children aged <18 years; all 3 were among infants aged <2 years and
40 reported as unintentional ingestions. Each of these 3 pediatric exposures was recorded by WPC
41 staff as associated with little-to-no medical outcome; however, 1 infant was admitted to the
42 pediatric intensive care unit for observation.

[†] See e.g., 45 C.F.R. part 46, 21 C.F.R. part 56; 42 U.S.C. §241(d); 5 U.S.C. §552a; 44 U.S.C. §3501 et seq.

43 After zero calls reported in 2010, kratom exposure associated calls increased from 1 call in 2011
44 to a peak of 15 calls in 2020 (Figure 1); based on visual inspection there were no obvious
45 changes over time in the patterns of medical outcome or polysubstance exposure. Among
46 exposures with county information (N = 54), the majority were concentrated in southeastern
47 Wisconsin counties, containing the Madison and Milwaukee metropolitan areas (Figure 2).
48 Marinette County in northeast Wisconsin reported the highest number of kratom exposures (10,
49 18.5%), which were distributed over time (1 in 2018, 4 in 2019, 2 in 2020, 2 in 2021, and 1 in
50 2022).

51 Approximately half of callers reported kratom as the only exposure substance (N = 33, 55.9%).
52 Kratom exposure by itself, compared with polysubstance exposure, generally occurred in
53 younger persons (mean age = 31.9 years vs 38.7 years, respectively). Among persons reporting
54 polysubstance exposures, the most common co-substances were alcohol (N = 8, 30.8%) and
55 benzodiazepines (N = 3, 11.5%). Fisher's exact test for association indicated that compared with
56 exposures of kratom alone, polysubstance exposure was not significantly associated with medical
57 outcome reported ($P = .22$) nor level of healthcare received ($P = 1.0$), though these analyses are
58 limited by small numbers.

59 Agitation (N = 23; 39%), tachycardia (21; 35.6%), confusion (14; 23.7%), and generalized
60 central nervous system depression (13; 22.0%) were the most commonly reported clinical
61 findings. Among 50 calls with known medical outcome, 19 (38.0%) were reported with moderate
62 or major medical outcomes. Among 36 calls with known levels of healthcare received, critical
63 care was required for 7 persons (22.2%) although only 1 received laboratory confirmation of
64 kratom exposure; 5 presented with marked agitation and required sedation therapy and 3 required
65 mechanical ventilation.

66 Among critical care admissions, 1 was an infant with suspected kratom exposure. The infant,
67 presenting with tachycardia and vomiting, was kept overnight in the pediatric intensive care unit
68 for monitoring; the child was reported normal at discharge the following day. Additionally, in
69 different years and counties, 2 males in their early 30s were admitted to critical care. Both were
70 active weightlifters, presented with agitation, and reported co-ingestion of phenibut, a central
71 nervous system depressant unregulated in the United States and commonly marketed online as a
72 dietary supplement.

73 WPC also recorded 2 critical care admissions among females in their 70's. Both presented with
74 tachycardia, confusion, and marked agitation. One of the women died in the hospital with sepsis
75 complications, though postmortem toxicology identified kratom as contributory. During initial
76 presentation at a local emergency department, a family member reported the patient's recent use
77 of kratom for chronic pain—believed to be ≥ 18 mg kratom capsule daily. A capsule source was
78 not identified. A quantitative serum mitragynine level was obtained on hospital admission and
79 returned at 26 ng/ml.

80 **DISCUSSION**

81 In Wisconsin, kratom-associated exposure calls to WPC have been generally increasing in
82 frequency during the past decade—similar to the trend nationwide.⁷ Though the number of
83 studies on kratom use is increasing also, the literature still lacks a consensus as to the substance's
84 health benefits and risks.⁸ For one, analyses of U.S. kratom use are challenged by the limitations
85 of passive surveillance systems,^{7,9} which likely undercounts kratom-associated adverse events.
86 Neither traditional drug tests nor forensic toxicology assays generally screen for mitragynine.⁸
87 Secondly, in the absence of governmental or commercial kratom regulation, research is often
88 unable to categorize the potency, quality, or actual substance being consumed.¹⁰

89 An additional complication in our understanding of kratom-associated outcomes is the
90 considerable prevalence of polysubstance exposure—recorded in approximately half of WPC
91 calls in our project. Clinicians and public health practitioners may consider cautioning people
92 against use of kratom concomitant with other substances due to unknown possible harmful drug
93 interactions.^{2,7} This message is perhaps particularly relevant among older adults, such as the two
94 women in their 70's in our analysis, who are more at risk for adverse drug interaction outcomes
95 because of their high prevalence of prescription medication use.

96 Kratom use education may also consider prioritizing messaging among adults with children or
97 expectant parents. WPC recorded 1 woman being pregnant at time of exposure. Though national
98 incidence of prenatal kratom use is unknown, 5 peer-reviewed case reports describe maternal and
99 infant kratom withdrawal symptoms; two cases involved infants who were only exposed to
100 kratom during the prenatal period, and both required treatment with a morphine weaning
101 protocol to manage symptoms of neonatal abstinence syndrome.¹¹ WPC also received 3 calls
102 related to unintentional kratom ingestion in infants aged <2 years. As with any other
103 psychoactive substance, public health messaging and clinical guidance to adults who use kratom
104 should consider including information about safe storage practices to avoid unintentional
105 ingestion or misuse by children.

106 As a final point, we consider the high prevalence of agitation among persons admitted to critical
107 care to be worth noting. Again, extricating the role of kratom among these call data is
108 challenging given small numbers in our dataset and the concomitant use of other substances in 5
109 of 7 critical care admissions. However, clinicians and toxicologists should recognize that
110 although kratom does have sedative, opioid-like properties at higher doses, it also can act as a

111 significant stimulant at lower doses,^{2,3} which is perhaps evidenced by prevalent agitation
112 reported in WPC calls.

113 In conclusion, during January 1, 2010–September 1, 2022, in Wisconsin, kratom-associated
114 exposure calls to the WPC have been increasing in frequency, were commonly reported as
115 polysubstance exposures, and occasionally indicated intensive care unit admission. Continued
116 research may help to more fully define kratom’s risk-benefit profile. Meanwhile, Wisconsin
117 clinicians and public health experts can (i) be aware of its increasing prevalence, (ii) expand the
118 collection of data specific to kratom use and exposure among patients—during the clinical
119 documentation of patient history for example, and (iii) utilize available scientific literature to
120 promote education materials for adults who choose to use kratom, particularly if they do so
121 alongside other substances.

Table 1. Characteristics of All Kratom-Associated Exposure Calls (N = 59) to the Wisconsin Poison Center — January 1, 2010–September 1, 2022


Exposure characteristics	No. (%)
Female	22 (37.3)
Age in years, mean (sd)	35.3 (15.4)
Reason for call	
Adverse reaction to drug	8 (13.6)
Intentional — abuse, misuse, or unclear reason	38 (64.4)
Intentional — suspected suicide	6 (10.2)
Withdrawal symptoms	2 (3.4)
Unintentional	3 (5.1)
Unknown or missing	2 (3.4)
Symptom reported ^A	
Agitation	23 (39.0)
Tachycardia	21 (35.6)
Confusion	14 (23.7)
Central nervous system depression	13 (22.0)
Hypertension	9 (15.3)
Medical outcome ^B	
No effect	7 (11.9)
Mild effect	28 (47.5)
Moderate effect	16 (27.1)
Major effect	3 (5.1)
Death	1 (1.7)
Unable to assess, lost to follow-up	4 (6.8)
Highest level of healthcare facility care	
Unknown or refused treatment	23 (39.0)
Admit, treat and release	17 (28.8)
Admit, noncritical ^C	12 (20.3)
Critical care admission	7 (11.9)

^A Multiple symptoms were able to be reported by exposed persons. Here, the five most frequently reported symptoms are presented.

^B Defined by the National Poison Data System (NPDS) as the “Medical outcome of the patient following exposure based on all available information”. *No effect* reflects a combination of two NPDS outcome categories: “No effect” and “Unrelated effect, the exposure was probably not responsible for the effect(s)”. A *minor effect* was defined as “the patient exhibited some symptoms as a result of the exposure, but they were minimally bothersome to the patient”. A *moderate effect* was defined as “the patient exhibited symptoms as a result of the exposure which are more pronounced, more prolonged or of a more systemic nature than minor symptoms”. A *major effect* was defined as “the patient exhibited symptoms as a result of the exposure which were life-threatening or resulted in significant residual disability or disfigurement”.


^C Includes one exposed person who was recorded as “admitted to psychiatric facility”.

Figure 1. Timeline of Kratom-Associated Exposure Calls (N = 59) to the Wisconsin Poison Center — January 1, 2010–September 1, 2022



**The year 2022 is denoted with an asterisk given the incomplete nature of the data at time of analysis.*

Figure 2. Distribution of Kratom-Associated Exposure Calls with County Information (N = 54) Recorded by the Wisconsin Poison Center — January 1, 2010–September 1, 2022



REFERENCES

1. Swogger MT, Smith KE, Garcia-Romeu A, Grundmann O, Veltri CA, Henningfield JE, et al. Understanding Kratom Use: A Guide for Healthcare Providers. *Frontiers in pharmacology*. 2022;13.
2. Todd DA, Kellogg JJ, Wallace ED, Khin M, Flores-Bocanegra L, Tanna RS, et al. Chemical composition and biological effects of kratom (*Mitragyna speciosa*): In vitro studies with implications for efficacy and drug interactions. *Scientific reports*. 2020;10(1):19158.
3. Tobacyk J, Parks BJ, Lovelady N, Brents LK. Qualitative content analysis of public responses to an FDA inquiry on the impact of scheduling changes to kratom. *International Journal of Drug Policy*. 2022;108:103817.
4. Drug Fact Sheet: Kratom. In: U.S. Department of Justice DEA, editor. 2020.
5. National Poison Data System Arlington, VA: America's Poison Centers; 2022 [Available from: <https://aapcc.org/national-poison-data-system>].
6. R: A Language and environment for statistical computing. R Core Team. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2021.
7. Post S, Spiller HA, Chounthirath T, Smith GA. Kratom exposures reported to United States poison control centers: 2011–2017. *Clinical Toxicology*. 2019;57(10):847-54.
8. Striley CW, Hoeflich CC, Viegas AT, Berkowitz LA, Matthews EG, Akin LP, et al. Health Effects Associated With Kratom (*Mitragyna speciosa*) and Polysubstance Use: A Narrative Review. *Substance Abuse: Research and Treatment*. 2022;16:11782218221095873.
9. Smith KE, Dunn KE, Grundmann O, Garcia-Romeu A, Rogers JM, Swogger MT, et al. Social, psychological, and substance use characteristics of U.S. adults who use kratom: Initial findings from an online, crowdsourced study. *Experimental and Clinical Psychopharmacology*. 2021:No Pagination Specified-No Pagination Specified.
10. Williams RS, Nikitin D. The internet market for Kratom, an opioid alternative and variably legal recreational drug. *International Journal of Drug Policy*. 2020;78:102715.
11. Wright ME, Ginsberg C, Parkison AM, Dubose M, Sherbondy M, Shores E. Outcomes of mothers and newborns to prenatal exposure to kratom: a systematic review. *J Perinatol*. 2021;41(6):1236-43.