Title: County by county estimation of possible deaths averted, infections averted, and cost savings of overdose prevention health centers in the United States from 2020-June 2024.

Authors: Mike Sportiello, MD-PhD[1], Rohith Palli MD-PhD [2]

1. Emory University School of Medicine Department of Medicine
2. University of Washington Department of Biomedical Informatics and Medical Education

Abstract

Overdose prevention health centers (OPHCs), also known as overdose prevention centers or safe injection centers, are an evidence-based strategy for people to use drugs in an environment monitored by health care professionals with access to drug use education, sterile supplies, and referral infrastructure to access higher levels of medical and behavioral health resources. Though still illegal under federal law throughout the United States, many legal or quasi-legal (including some in the United States) have operated since the 1980s (Beletsky, Baker et al. 2018). Using CDC overdose deaths and United States Census Bureau population data, we estimate 1,193 deaths could have been averted between 2020 and June 2024 if 1 out of 400 injections had taken place at an OPHC. At this rate, 22 HIV transmissions and 4,763 Hepatitis C Virus transmissions would have been averted. Over $1.5 billion in discounted lifetime costs to treat those infections could have been saved. This data supports OPHCs as one viable public health intervention to avert deaths and avoid infections. Furthermore, a web application was created to assist users explore this analysis, data visualizations, and even alter model assumptions, including variables like what percent of injections occur at an OPHC.

Introduction

Overdose prevention health centers (OPHCs), also known as overdose prevention centers or safe injection centers, are an evidence-based strategy for people to use drugs in an environment monitored by health care professionals with access to drug use education, sterile supplies, and referral infrastructure to access higher levels of medical and behavioral health resources. Though still illegal under federal law throughout the United States, many legal or quasi-legal (including some in the United States) have operated since the 1980s (Beletsky, Baker et al. 2018). Since this time, there have been reported overdoses, but no reported deaths in this supervised health care setting, as naloxone, an opioid overdose reversal agent as well as access to respiratory support such as supplemental oxygen or bag-mask ventilation is readily available. Many other studies have focused on assessing the impact of an OPHC in their community (Irwin, Jozaghi et al. 2016), but no study has modeled the likely impact across the country. Notably, many studies have focused on local areas in Canada and have shown reduction in deaths due to opioid overdose (Irvine, Kuo et al. 2019, Pauly, Wallace et al. 2020, Rammohan, Gaines et al. 2024, Scheidell, Townsend et al. 2024), and a recent meta-analysis demonstrated cost effectiveness of OPHC across North American cities (Behrends, Leff et al. 2024). In this manuscript, we analyze how many deaths averted, infections averted, and the cost savings accrued had the county adopted OPHCs during this time and present a web application for users to explore the data and alter model assumptions, with constraints.

Methods

Drug overdose deaths by month per county were accessed from the National Center for Health Statistics from 2020-June 2024. Population and age data were

downloaded from the United States Census Bureau. County names were standardized. For this analysis, we estimated 1.5% of adults were people who injected drugs (PWID) per others' work (Bradley, Hall et al. 2023). For each PWID, we estimated 508.8 injections per year, or just under 1.5 injections per day per other's work (Bradley, Hall et al. 2023).

Deaths averted

Deaths averted was calculated by assuming the total number of injections stayed constant. Secondly, we assumed that deaths cannot occur after an injection in the OPHC, as no overdose death has ever occurred in an OPHC. The *injections that would occur at OPHC* was calculated by modeling 0.25%, 0.5%, 0.75%, or 1% of injections taking place at the OPHC. This led to the following calculation:

$$\frac{Injections\ that\ would\ occur\ at\ OPHC}{PWID * Injections\ per\ person} * Overdose\ deaths = Deaths\ averted$$

With the fraction on the left simplifying to the frequency of total injections in the OPHC, multiplied by the number of deaths. If all the injections took place at the OPHC, the leftmost fraction would simplify to 1 and all deaths would be averted. If none did, the whole left term would simplify to 0 and no deaths would be averted.

HCV transmissions averted

Hepatitis C virus (HCV) is a highly transmissible virus in the setting of shared needle use, leading to significant morbidity, mortality, and health expenditures. While curative therapy now exists, it is expensive and requires weeks-long adherence, which is difficult for many who inject drugs as they are disproportionately housing insecure and have varied of trust in professional medical infrastructure. Similar to deaths averted, due to the supply of sterile drug use equipment including needles and cottons, transmission

of HCV has never been documented at an OPHC. Natural incidence of HCV within PWID varies widely, with studies with varying from 0.51 to 47 per 100 person years. For this analysis, we used a lower-end estimate of 10 per 100 person years (Gutfraind, Boodram et al. 2015), leading to the following equation:

$$\frac{Injections\ that\ would\ occur\ at\ OPHC}{PWID * Injections\ per\ person} * HCV\ incidence = HCV\ transmissions\ averted$$

HIV transmissions averted

Though the vast majority of HIV is not transmitted through injection drug use, it is still a meaningful target of HIV transmission prevention efforts. Others have calculated the incidence of HIV transmission in groups of people who inject drugs, stratifying their use as low, medium, and high risk depending on factors including how often they share needles with people they know and alternatively with strangers (Jarlais, Bobashev et al. 2022). Using these incidences, we calculated HIV transmissions averted with the following equations:

$$\frac{Injections\ that\ would\ occur\ at\ OPHC}{PWID * Injections\ per\ person} * HIV\ incidence\ [low\ risk]$$

$$= HIV\ transmissions\ averted$$

$$\frac{Injections\ that\ would\ occur\ at\ OPHC}{PWID * Injections\ per\ person} * HIV\ incidence\ [medium\ risk]$$

$$= HIV\ transmissions\ averted$$

$$\frac{Injections\ that\ would\ occur\ at\ OPHC}{PWID * Injections\ per\ person} * HIV\ incidence\ [high\ risk]$$

$$= HIV\ transmissions\ averted$$

Financial impact

Substantial health care dollars are spent treating preventable diseases. Infectious diseases are a particularly good target given how easily they can be prevented with appropriate education and low-cost materials. Others have estimated the discounted lifetime cost of an HIV infection to be $326,500 (after adjusting for inflation) (Schackman, Fleishman et al. 2015). We calculated the discounted lifetime cost of an HIV infection with the following equation:

$$\$326{,}500 * averted\ HIV\ transmission = Discounted\ cost\ of\ an\ averted\ HIV\ infection$$

Similar work has been done to calculate the discounted lifetime cost of HCV, calculated to $320,328 (after adjusting for inflation) (Liu, Barnett et al. 2016).

$$\$320{,}328 * averted\ HCV\ transmission = Discounted\ cost\ of\ an\ averted\ HCV\ infection$$

Finally, we calculated the total statistical costs of the lives to those who died from overdose, using the dollar mount the Federal Emergency Medical Agency $7,500,000 uses for their calculations, giving the following equation:

$$\$7{,}500{,}000 * Averted\ deaths = Statistical\ costs\ of\ deaths\ averted$$

Web application

A web application was created using the Shiny infrastructure and written R. All code is free and open source and can be found here: https://github.com/sportiellomike/OPHC-shiny. The most up to date version of the web app itself can be found here: https://sportiellomike.shinyapps.io/OPHC-shiny/. Minimal assistance in coding was provided by generative artificial intelligence. Anthropic's claude-3.5-sonnet model was used. All additions provided by AI were manually checked at the time of coding for both function and syntax.

Results

Analytic results

Deaths averted depends on what percentage of injections occur at the OPHC (Table 1). At the low end assuming 0.25% of injections occurred at OPHCs (1 injection out of 400, or one injection every 287 days [400/(508.8/365)]), 1,193 deaths would have been averted. At the higher end of 1% of injections occurring at the OPHC, almost 4,770 deaths could have been averted.

Table 1: Summary table of results

Percent injections at OPHC	0.25%	0.5%	0.75%	1%
Deaths averted	1192.54	2385.08	3577.62	4770.16
HCV averted	4763.19	9526.38	14289.57	19052.76
HIV-low averted	9.53	19.05	28.58	38.11
HIV-medium averted	21.91	43.82	65.73	87.64
HIV-high averted	26.67	53.35	80.02	106.70
Discounted lifetime cost infections	1.53E+09	3.07E+09	4.60E+09	6.13E+09
Cost of life	8.94E+09	1.79E+10	2.68E+10	3.58E+10
Total costs	1.05E+10	2.10E+10	3.14E+10	4.19E+10
Total costs (billions)	10.48	20.95	31.43	41.91

HCV infections averted range from just under 4,763 to just under 19,053 (Table 1). Dozens of HIV transmissions could have been averted (Table 1). Tens of billions of costs would have been averted with higher use, from relatively low rates of usage of OPHCs (Table 1).

Even if OPHCs were only instituted in the top 50 most populous counties (Table 2) or the top 50 deaths per capita (Table 3), a substantial impact would be seen. A list of these counties can be found in supplementary Tables 1 and 2 respectively.

120

Table 2: Results for 50 most populous counties

Percent injections at OPHC	0.25%	0.5%	0.75%	1%
Deaths averted	358.60	717.20	1075.79	1434.39
HCV averted	1447.81	2895.62	4343.43	5791.24
HIV-low averted	2.90	5.79	8.69	11.58
HIV-medium averted	6.66	13.32	19.98	26.64
HIV-high averted	8.11	16.22	24.32	32.43
Discounted lifetime cost of infections	4.66E+08	9.32E+08	1.40E+09	1.86E+09
Cost of life	2.69E+09	5.38E+09	8.07E+09	1.08E+10
Total costs	3.16E+09	6.31E+09	9.47E+09	1.26E+10
Total costs (billions)	3.16	6.31	9.47	12.62

Table 3: Results for 50 counties with most deaths per capita

Percent injections at OPHC	0.25%	0.5%	0.75%	1%
Deaths averted	45.88	91.76	137.64	183.52
HCV averted	60.83	121.66	182.49	243.32
HIV-low averted	0.12	0.24	0.36	0.49
HIV-medium averted	0.28	0.56	0.84	1.12
HIV-high averted	0.34	0.68	1.02	1.36
Discounted lifetime cost of infections	1.96E+07	3.92E+07	5.87E+07	7.83E+07
Cost of life	3.44E+08	6.88E+08	1.03E+09	1.38E+09
Total costs	3.64E+08	7.27E+08	1.09E+09	1.45E+09
Total costs (billions)	0.36	0.73	1.09	1.45

Web application

These results are presented here in table format, but it may be of use to users to visualize results on a per-state or per-county basis. To assist in this process, a free and open-source interactive web application was constructed for users to investigate individual counties and create color-coded maps and tables with additional parameters not reported here (discounted costs broken down between HIV and HCV, for example)

specific to their applications (Figure 1). The most up to date version can always be found at: https://sportiellomike.shinyapps.io/OPHC-shiny/.



Figure 1: OPHC Data Explorer Web Application

Discussion

While it is difficult to estimate the rates of use of OPHCs by those injecting, this study supplies a framework to assist in estimating their impact on deaths, infections, and cost savings. Even at very low rates of use, assuming one out of every 400 injections occurs at OPHCs, hundreds of deaths and thousands of HCV transmissions would have been averted over the period studied. Dozens of HIV transmissions would have been averted. This study also analyzes the impact on if the 50 most populous (Table 2) or the 50 counties with the most deaths (Table 3) were to have constructed an OPHC, a potentially more realistic and cost-effective strategy. This study makes no

precise estimation on future deaths averted, infections averted, or costs, though it is likely to be favorable as it was during this studied time period.

Importantly, this analysis does not include secondary benefits of OPHCs like the association of people voluntarily joining detoxification programs, methadone initiation programs, or long-term addiction treatment initiation (Wood, Tyndall et al. 2007). It also doesn't include benefits that education has such as decreasing the rates of needle sharing (Kerr, Tyndall et al. 2005). Lastly, this analysis doesn't include the benefits of secondary social supports unrelated to drug use, including housing support, food support, or other programs.

This analysis doesn't include any secondary detriments of OPHCs, though it should be noted that most of those of concern (increase in overdoses, increase in new-onset illicit injection drug use) have not been borne out by studies that that have actually measured these important issues of concern. One important aspect not included in this analysis is the cost to build and maintain these OPHCs, which would require both direct costs of salaries of health and social workers, as well as maintaining these buildings over time. Another drawback of this analysis is that its precision is not forward facing: we do not make estimates on the impact of future OPHCs, just that OPHC construction would have had large benefits in the past. New and currently ongoing interventions to reduce deaths and infections, even without decreasing the rates of injection, would mitigate some of the greatest benefits of OPHCs.

Another caveat of this study is the difficulty in estimating how many injections would have occurred at the OPHCs had they been constructed. Likely, OPHC use would vary based on a particular area's infrastructure and culture in addition to the

capacity of the OPHC itself. Which drugs used by whom in what setting with what relationship to the healthcare and law enforcement institutions varies widely even within the same city and sometimes the same neighborhood. A rate of 1/400 injections occurring at the OPHC, for example, would more likely be achieved by some using the OPHC far more frequently than that rate and most using it far less frequently than that rate. No study has used an evidence-based estimate for likely uptake, so we present here a conservative and broad range of 0.25%-1% of injections occurring at an OPHC.

Overall, these data support the broad construction and initiation of OPHCs as a measure to prevent the mortality and morbidity associated with injection drug use. Our limitations highlight the importance of more empirical work in the area to enable more even more precise estimates.

References

Behrends, C. N., J. A. Leff, W. Lowry, J. M. Li, E. N. Onuoha, E. Fardone, A. M. Bayoumi, K. E. McCollister, S. M. Murphy and B. R. Schackman (2024). "Economic Evaluations of Establishing Opioid Overdose Prevention Centers in 12 North American Cities: A Systematic Review." Value Health **27**(5): 655-669.

Beletsky, L., P. Baker, J. Arredondo, A. Emuka, D. Goodman-Meza, M. E. Medina-Mora, D. Werb, P. Davidson, J. J. Amon, S. Strathdee and C. Magis-Rodriguez (2018). "The global health and equity imperative for safe consumption facilities." Lancet **392**(10147): 553-554.

Bradley, H., E. W. Hall, A. Asher, N. W. Furukawa, C. M. Jones, J. Shealey, K. Buchacz, S. Handanagic, N. Crepaz and E. S. Rosenberg (2023). "Estimated Number of People Who Inject Drugs in the United States." Clin Infect Dis **76**(1): 96-102.

Gutfraind, A., B. Boodram, N. Prachand, A. Hailegiorgis, H. Dahari and M. E. Major (2015). "Agent-Based Model Forecasts Aging of the Population of People Who Inject Drugs in Metropolitan Chicago and Changing Prevalence of Hepatitis C Infections." PLoS One **10**(9): e0137993.

Irvine, M. A., M. Kuo, J. A. Buxton, R. Balshaw, M. Otterstatter, L. Macdougall, M. J. Milloy, A. Bharmal, B. Henry, M. Tyndall, D. Coombs and M. Gilbert (2019). "Modelling the combined impact of interventions in averting deaths during a synthetic-opioid overdose epidemic." Addiction **114**(9): 1602-1613.

Irwin, A., A. Jozaghi, R. N. Bluthenthal and A. H. Kral (2016). "A Cost-Benefit Analysis of a Potential Supervised Injection Facility in San Francisco, California, USA." Journal of Drug Issues **47**(2).

Jarlais, D. D., G. Bobashev, J. Feelemyer and C. McKnight (2022). "Modeling HIV transmission among persons who inject drugs (PWID) at the "End of the HIV Epidemic" and during the COVID-19 pandemic." Drug Alcohol Depend **238**: 109573.

Kerr, T., M. Tyndall, K. Li, J. Montaner and E. Wood (2005). "Safer injection facility use and syringe sharing in injection drug users." Lancet **366**(9482): 316-318.

Liu, S., P. G. Barnett, M. Holodniy, J. Lo, V. R. Joyce, R. Gidwani, S. M. Asch, D. K. Owens and J. D. Goldhaber-Fiebert (2016). "Cost-Effectiveness of Treatments for Genotype 1 Hepatitis C Virus Infection in non-VA and VA Populations." MDM Policy Pract **1**(1).

Pauly, B., B. Wallace, F. Pagan, J. Phillips, M. Wilson, H. Hobbs and J. Connolly (2020). "Impact of overdose prevention sites during a public health emergency in Victoria, Canada." PLoS One **15**(5): e0229208.

Rammohan, I., T. Gaines, A. Scheim, A. Bayoumi and D. Werb (2024). "Overdose mortality incidence and supervised consumption services in Toronto, Canada: an ecological study and spatial analysis." Lancet Public Health **9**(2): e79-e87.

Schackman, B. R., J. A. Fleishman, A. E. Su, B. K. Berkowitz, R. D. Moore, R. P. Walensky, J. E. Becker, C. Voss, A. D. Paltiel, M. C. Weinstein, K. A. Freedberg, K. A. Gebo and E. Losina (2015). "The lifetime medical cost savings from preventing HIV in the United States." Med Care **53**(4): 293-301.

Scheidell, J. D., T. N. Townsend, Q. Zhou, P. Manandhar-Sasaki, R. Rodriguez-Santana, M. Jenkins, M. Buchelli, D. L. Charles, J. M. Frechette, J. I. Su and R. S. Braithwaite (2024). "Reducing

overdose deaths among persons with opioid use disorder in connecticut." Harm Reduct J **21**(1): 103.
Wood, E., M. W. Tyndall, R. Zhang, J. S. Montaner and T. Kerr (2007). "Rate of detoxification service use and its impact among a cohort of supervised injecting facility users." Addiction **102**(6): 916-919.