Subjective Response to Opioids Predicts Risk for Opioid Use Disorder

Jean Gonzalez[1], Vinh Tran[2], John Meredith[1], Ivonne Xu[1], Ritviksiddha Penchala[1], Laura Vilar-Ribó[1], Natasia Courchesne-Krak[1], Daniel Zoleikhaeian[1], 23andMe Research Team[2], Matthew McIntyre[2], Pierre Fontanillas[2], Katelyn Kukar Bond[2], Eric O. Johnson[3,4], Alvin Jeffery[5,6], James MacKillop[7,8], Carla Marienfeld[1], Harriet de Wit[9], Abraham A. Palmer[1,10#], Sandra Sanchez-Roige[1,10,11#]

[1] Department of Psychiatry, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, CA, USA,
[2] 23andMe, Inc., Sunnyvale, CA, USA
[3] GenOmics and Translational Research Center, RTI International, Research Triangle Park, NC, United States
[4] Fellow Program, RTI International, Research Triangle Park, NC, United States,
[5] Vanderbilt University School of Nursing, Nashville, Tennessee
[6] Department of Biomedical Informatics, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, Tennessee
[7] Peter Boris Centre for Addictions Research, St. Joseph's Healthcare Hamilton, Hamilton, ON, Canada
[8] Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Neurosciences, McMasters University, Hamilton, ON, Canada
[9] Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Neuroscience, University of Chicago, Chicago IL 60637
[10] Institute for Genomic Medicine, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, CA, USA
[11] Division of Genetic Medicine, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, TN, USA

[#] **Co-corresponding authors:** Dr. Abraham A. Palmer (aap@ucsd.edu), Dr. Sandra Sanchez-Roige (sanchezroige@ucsd.edu)

ABSTRACT

Exposure to prescription opioids can lead to opioid use disorder (**OUD**) in some individuals, but we lack scalable tools to predict who is at risk. We collected retrospective data on the initial subjective effects of prescription opioids from 117,508 research participants, 5.3% of whom self-reported OUD. Positive subjective effects, particularly "Like Overall", "Euphoric", and "Energized", were the strongest predictors of OUD. For example, the odds-ratio for individuals responding “Extremely” for “Like Overall” was 36.2. The sensitivity and specificity of this single question was excellent (ROC=0.87). Negative effects and analgesic effects were much less predictive. We present a two-step decision tree that can identify a small high-risk subset with 77.4% prevalence of OUD and a much larger low-risk subset with 1.7% prevalence of OUD. Our results demonstrate that positive subjective responses are predictive of future misuse and suggest that vulnerable individuals may be identified and targeted for preventative interventions.

INTRODUCTION

Opioids are often first encountered in medical settings; one study found that 59% of individuals with opioid use disorder (**OUD**) had their initial exposure through a prescription.[1] Although a significant minority of people who receive an opioid prescription will later develop OUD, there is a need for better tools to predict who is at greatest risk.[2,3]

The initial subjective effects of drugs are thought to influence the use of many substances.[4–11] In general, positive subjective effects likely engender continued use, whereas negative effects limit use. We extended this idea to opioids by examining the initial positive and negative subjective effects of opioids in 117,508 research participants from 23andMe Inc., using a retrospective survey. Of these participants, 5.3% reported that they had been diagnosed, treated for OUD or suspected that they had OUD. We compared the subjective responses of individuals who did or did not report OUD to identify the optimal questions to predict the risk of OUD.

METHODS

Study Design and Cohort Acquisition

We used a cohort of 117,508 research participants that were drawn from the customer base of 23andMe, Inc., a consumer genetics and research company. Participants provided informed consent and volunteered to participate in the research online, under a protocol approved by the external AAHRPP-accredited Salus IRB (https://www.versiticlinicaltrials.org/salusirb).

Only participants who endorsed the statement, *"Have you ever taken any opioid pain medications or narcotics regardless of whether they were prescribed to you or not? For example, codeine, hydrocodone, oxycodone, or morphine"*, were included in the study. These participants were asked 11 questions about their initial subjective responses to opioids, 9 questions about problematic opioid use, and 1 question about self-reported diagnosis of OUD (**Table S1**).[12]

The 11 questions captured initial subjective effects including 1 question about analgesia (e.g. "When you first took pain medication, to what extent did you feel less pain?"), 5 questions about positive effects (i.e. "Euphoric", "Energized", "Normal", "Relaxed or Calm", "Like the way you feel overall" ["Like Overall"]) and 5 questions about negative effects (i.e., "Nauseated", "Dizzy", "Tired", "Constipated", "Itchy"). Response options included: "Not at all", "Mildly", "Moderately", "Very much", "Extremely". These questions were adapted from the Opioid Checklist[13], the Addiction Research Center Inventory[14], and the History of Opioid Medical Exposure[15].

9 additional questions were intended to capture key aspects of lifetime prescription opioid misuse, which were summed to produce a score that ranged from 0 to 27 (see **Table S1** for the full set of questions). These questions were adapted from the Non-Medical Opioid Use scale, Opioid Risk Tool[16] (**ORT**) Current Opioid Misuse Measure[17], Prescription Opioid Misuse and Abuse Questionnaire[18], Prescription Opioid Misuse Index[19], and Addiction Severity Index[20].

Finally, we included 1 question that asked *"Have you ever felt that you might have a problem with, or have you ever been diagnosed with or treated for, addiction to opioids?"*, with response options including *"Yes, I felt I might have a problem but have never been diagnosed or treated"*, *"Yes, I have been diagnosed or treated"*, or *"No"*.[21] The primary analyses in this study treated both yes responses equivalently (OUD+).

Demographic information (**Table S2**) that was available from 23andMe included age, biological sex, education, income, and genetically defined ancestry.[22]

Participants were excluded if they had any missing responses (*n* = 20,120, 17.1%, **Figure S1**). To minimize misclassification errors, participants were also excluded if their total opioid misuse score was discordant with their response to the self-reported lifetime OUD question (**Figure S2**). Specifically, we excluded participants who indicated they had OUD but whose total opioid misuse score was below 3 (*n* = 1,526, 1.3%). We also excluded participants who responded that they did not have OUD but whose total opioid misuse score was above 5 (*n* = 5,349, 4.6%). Further exclusion criteria and number of participants excluded at each step are described in **Supplemental Methods**; after all exclusions, 84,396 participants remained (**Figure S1**).

Statistical Analyses

We used responses to subjective effects questions to predict OUD status with three classifiers: Logistic Regression, XGBoost, and Random Forest and aggregated the results to form an ensemble model.[23,24]

We evaluated model performance via: area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (**AUC-ROC**), summarizing the model's ability to discriminate between OUD and non-OUD; precision, measuring the proportion of correct positive predictions; recall (true positive rate), quantifying the proportion of actual positives correctly identified; and the F1 score, the harmonic mean of precision and recall. We also plotted precision-recall (**PR**) curves to visualize the trade-off between precision and recall, with the area under the PR curve (**PR-AUC**) providing an overall summary.

We assessed feature importance using SHapley Additive exPlanations[25] (**SHAP**) values, which were normalized and averaged across classifiers. Odds ratios (**ORs**) were calculated for a subset of questions, comparing participants who selected "Extreme" to those who selected other responses.

We trained a decision tree classifier using *sklearn*[24] to identify the minimal set of questions relevant to OUD that could be used in clinical settings.

To ensure robustness, we used 5-fold cross validation and averaged results across them. Additional details are shown in the **Supplemental Methods**.

RESULTS

The sample was 70.50% female with a mean age of 52.21±15.75 years. 11.13% of the sample had a household income of $100,000 or more. 88.61% of the sample had at least some college education. Full demographic information is presented in **Table S2**.

Figure 1a compares the mean responses and distributions of subjective effects at first opioid use for individuals self-reporting OUD versus those who did not self-report OUD. Questions are sorted by the degree to which individuals with OUD scored higher than individuals without OUD. Positive subjective effects, such as "Like Overall", "Euphoric", and "Energized", were much higher in individuals with OUD, suggesting that sensitivity to the hedonic effects of opioids is a risk factor for developing OUD. In contrast, for the negative effects, the differences between the groups were much less pronounced. Furthermore, the direction of the negative effects was not consistently lower in the individuals with OUD (**Figure 1b**). For example, “Tired” and "Dizzy" were higher in the individuals without OUD whereas “Itchy”, "Constipation", and "Nauseated" were higher in the individuals with OUD, suggesting that insensitivity to the negative effects of opioids is a less reliable risk factor for OUD. Finally, "Less Pain" was only slightly higher in individuals with OUD, suggesting that the analgesic effects of opioids, which could be construed as positive, are not strong risk factors of OUD. Full descriptive statistics are provided in **Table S3**. Correlation estimates for subjective effects are shown in **Figure S3**.



Figure 1. Distribution of subjective effects reported at first use for individuals with OUD and without OUD. a) The group with OUD (OUD+; orange) and without OUD (OUD-; blue) differed significantly on all measures shown (t-test, $p < 9.36e\text{-}03$). Shading of the orange and blue colors indicate the responses from “Not at all” to “Extremely”. Horizontal lines are centered around “Moderately”. The width of the bars indicates the proportion of individuals endorsing each response. **b**) Difference in mean response between OUD+ and OUD-. Responses were assigned a value such that “Not at all” was equal to 0 and “Extremely” was equal to 4. While the mean of most subjective responses was significantly higher in the OUD+ group, the mean of “Dizzy” and “Tired” were significantly lower.

The observation that initial positive subjective effects of opioids are strongly associated with OUD suggests the possibility that they could be used to predict OUD. To investigate this idea, we used three classifiers (Logistic Regression, XGBoost, and Random Forest) to build prediction models for OUD (**Figure 2**), which we then evaluated using a ROC (**Figure 2a**), PR-AUC (**Figure 2b**), SHAP (**Figure 2c**), and a more conventional method in OR (**Figure 2d**).

Figure 2a illustrates the predictive performance of subjective effects and demographic features using ROC curves. The combined feature set, which incorporates all subjective effects and demographic variables, achieves the strongest performance (ROC-AUC = 0.91). Among individual features, "Like Overall" performs nearly as well (ROC-AUC = 0.87), followed by "Euphoric" (ROC-AUC = 0.84) and "Energized" (ROC-AUC = 0.81). In contrast, negative subjective effects like "Dizzy" (ROC-AUC = 0.52) approached random classification performance. Similarly, demographic features such as "Sex" (ROC-AUC = 0.53) and "Ancestry" (ROC-AUC = 0.51) were also poor predictors of OUD status.

PR curves (**Figure 2b**) further demonstrate the predictive value of subjective effects. The combined feature set achieves the highest PR-AUC (PR-AUC = 0.61). "Like Overall" maintained strong predictive ability (PR-AUC = 0.49), with "Energized" and "Euphoric" contributing meaningfully (PR-AUCs = 0.40 and 0.38, respectively). Negative subjective effects such as "Constipated" (PR-AUC = 0.12), provided little predictive value (**Table S4**). Demographic features like "Ancestry" (PR-AUC = 0.10) and "Sex" (PR-AUC = 0.23) also provided little predictive value (**Table S4**). Additional predictive performance metrics for all features and feature sets are provided in **Table S4**.

SHAP analysis (**Figure 2c**) highlights the relative importance of subjective effects in predicting OUD status. The positive "Like Overall" again emerged as the strongest predictor, with "Euphoric" and the negative "Itchy" also showing significant contributions.

Another way of quantifying the likelihood of reporting an OUD diagnosis is an OR. We focused on the ORs for responding "Extremely" versus for all other responses (**Figure 2d**). The OR for responding “Extremely” for "Like Overall" and "Energized" were over 30, demonstrating an extraordinarily strong association between these questions and OUD. In contrast, negative subjective effects showed much smaller ORs (OR < 2).



Figure 2. Initial Subjective Response to Prescription Opioids Strongly Predicts Risk for Opioid Use Disorder. a) Receiver operator characteristic (**ROC**) curves and their area under curves (**AUC**) comparing the predictive performance in terms of sensitivity and specificity for individual questions and their combinations. The dashed line represents a random classifier (ROC-AUC= 0.50). **b)** Precision-Recall (**PR**) curves for comparing the predictive performance of individual questions and their combinations. The dashed line represents a random classifier (PR-AUC = 0.05). **c)** Normalized mean SHapley Additive exPlanations (**SHAP**) values showing the relative importance of questions in the predictive model. **d)** Odds ratios for a subset of questions comparing "Extremely" (orange) to all other responses (blue). Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals. The red dashed line marks an odds ratio of 1. All results are statistically significant (p < 1.94e-07; **Table S4-S5**). Including covariates (age, sex, relationship status, ancestry, income, educational level) did not alter the results (**Figure S4**).

Building on the findings from prior analyses, we sought to use computerized adaptive testing to identify the optimal set of questions to predict OUD status (**Figure 3**; **Table S6**). Consistent with the results shown in **Figure 2**, the response to "Like Overall" was the best

predictor of OUD status. After separating individuals based on how they responded to “Like Overall”, the follow up questions differed. Although negative subjective effects generally had low predictive power (**Figure 2**), among individuals who responded "Extremely" to “Like Overall”, the optimal follow up question was “Itchy”. In contrast, for all the other possible responses to “Like Overall” the optimal follow up question was “Energized”. These findings highlight that the positive subjective effects question "Like Overall" is highly discriminative, with the inclusion of the negative subjective question "Itchy" further refining classification among those who responded “Extremely”. Use of these questions separates the bulk of individuals (72,770; 86.2%), who have very low risk (1.7%) of OUD from a smaller subset (1,718; 2.0%) who have a much higher risk for OUD (77.4%).



Figure 3. Optimal two-step decision tree for predicting risk for OUD. Orange represents individuals self-reporting OUD while blue represents those not reporting OUD. See **Table S6** for a further breakdown of risk based on responses to these questions and **Figure S5** for cross-validated versions of the decision tree.

DISCUSSION

Using a large, non-ascertained cohort of 117,508 participants, we show that *positive* initial responses to prescription opioids strongly predict the risk of OUD. Although opioids are prescribed for their analgesic properties, one novel finding of our study was that these effects were only slightly higher in individuals reporting OUD, suggesting that the analgesic effects, which could be construed as positive, are in fact dissociable. This observation suggests that the

differences in positive response were not secondary to differences in overall sensitivity, metabolism, or differences in the dose or drug. Because of the size of our cohort, we were able to identify which individual questions best predicted OUD. The single question, "Like Overall", was highly predictive of OUD. In fact, “Like Overall” was almost as predictive as using all available questions. Using the full dataset, we created an optimized 2-step decision tree that identifies a small subset who are at high risk for OUD, which could be easily used in clinical settings.

There has been some controversy in the addiction field about the relationship between initial responses to drugs and the risk for future use and misuse. One line of research with alcohol indicates that insensitivity to initial effects of alcohol is a risk factor for alcohol use disorder (**AUD**)[11], but more recent work suggests that subjectively positive effects of alcohol[8] are predictive of future problematic alcohol use. Similarly, positive subjective drug effects have also been identified as risk factors for misuse of stimulants[4,7,10] and cannabis[5,6,9]. There is also prior evidence that initial positive subjective effects of opioids predict future misuse. Double blind, laboratory-based experimental studies in healthy subjects demonstrated that pleasurable opioid effects predict whether the subject would choose the drug over placebo.[26,27] Two retrospective studies examining initial responses to opioids showed that subjective effects differed in participants with and without OUD (n = 40) and in opioid misusing participants with and without OUD (n = 50).[28,29] Once OUD has developed, individuals with OUD were more likely to report positive subjective effects following acute morphine and heroin injections although it was not clear whether these individuals experienced more positive effects prior to developing OUD.[30–32] Our study differs from these prior studies by using an extremely large, non-ascertained population to identify the questions that best predicted OUD.

To facilitate clinical implementation, we developed a two-step decision tree that stratifies individuals based on their risk for OUD. Individuals who responded “Extremely” to the question "Like Overall" are next asked about sensitivity to itchiness. Surprisingly, individuals reporting more itchiness, which is a negative subjective effect, were at higher risk for OUD, contrasting with the alcohol literature in which sensitivity to negative effects is protective against AUD. While “Itchy” was poor predictor of OUD (**Figure 2d**), when used in combination with “Like Overall” it further stratified risk for OUD (30.2% vs 77.4%; **Figure 3**). Prior literature has highlighted the importance of itchiness as measure of greater sensitivity to opioids.[33–35] For individuals reporting lower levels of “Like Overall” the optimal second question is “Energized,” which allows stratification of risk for OUD ranging from 1.7% to 44.2% (**Figure 3**). Although other tools have been developed to estimate the risk of OUD, such as the Screener and Opioid Assessment for Patients with Pain (**SOAPP** and the **SOAPP-R**)[36,37]; and the ORT[16] they have not been validated in large, non-ascertained populations and are not widely used. We performed simulations (**Table S7**) that showed that our two-step decision tree could not have been optimized with a sample size lower than 10,000.

There are several major theories of the etiology of substance use disorder. One theory involves allosteric homeostasis, related to repeated cycles of intoxication and withdrawal[38], whereas others relate more to the positive or hedonic effects of drugs. [39,40] Our results support the idea that initial hedonic responses to opioids increase risk for OUD. Future research may suggest ways to integrate these apparently opposing ideas. For example, it is possible that

stronger hedonic response in at-risk individuals trigger stronger opposing responses that lead to intensifying cycles of intoxication and withdrawal.

This study is not without limitations. First, we used 23andMe research participants who are likely to have numerous unique characteristics. Notably, they were disproportionately female. Therefore, our results may not generalize to other populations. Second, our study relies on retrospective self-reported data, which may be susceptible to recall bias. Individuals with OUD may have inaccurate recollection of their earliest experience with prescription opioids, influenced by their long history of use. While future longitudinal studies could address this limitation, a recent study reported that many experienced opioid users take opioids for their positive subjective effects.[41] Finally, we did not capture factors like the specific opioid, dose, or route of administration associated with the initial experience with opioids, leaving open the possibility that the difference in the positive subjective responses between the groups may reflect these factors. However, the fact that both groups reported similar levels of analgesia does not support this concern.

Our findings show that two questions could be used to stratify risk for OUD. What to do once individuals have been stratified for OUD risk is a critical question for future studies. Individuals at higher risk may benefit from personalized counseling, reduced or different medications, or greater supervision.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by National Institutes of Health grant numbers DP1DA054394 (JG, JJM, SSR), R01DA061977 (AAP, SSR), P50DA037844 (EOJ, AAP, SSR), T32GM139790 (JG) and R25MH081482 (LV-R).

We would like to thank the research participants and employees of 23andMe for making this work possible.

The following members of the 23andMe Research Team contributed to this study: Stella Aslibekyan, Adam Auton, Elizabeth Babalola, Robert K. Bell, Jessica Bielenberg, Ninad S. Chaudhary, Zayn Cochinwala, Sayantan Das, Emily DelloRusso, Payam Dibaeinia, Sarah L. Elson, Nicholas Eriksson, Chris Eijsbouts, Teresa Filshtein, Pierre Fontanillas, Davide Foletti, Will Freyman, Zach Fuller, Julie M. Granka, Chris German, Éadaoin Harney, Alejandro Hernandez, Barry Hicks, David A. Hinds, M. Reza Jabalameli, Ethan M. Jewett, Yunxuan Jiang, Sotiris Karagounis, Lucy Kaufmann, Matt Kmiecik, Katelyn Kukar, Alan Kwong, Keng-Han Lin, Yanyu Liang, Bianca A. Llamas, Aly Khan, Steven J. Micheletti, Matthew H. McIntyre, Meghan E. Moreno, Priyanka Nandakumar, Dominique T. Nguyen, Jared O'Connell, Steve Pitts, G. David Poznik, Alexandra Reynoso, Shubham Saini, Morgan Schumacher, Leah Selcer, Anjali J. Shastri, Jingchunzi Shi, Suyash Shringarpure, Keaton Stagaman, Teague Sterling, Qiaojuan Jane Su, Joyce Y. Tung, Susana A. Tat, Vinh Tran, Xin Wang, Wei Wang, Catherine H. Weldon, Amy L. Williams, Peter Wilton.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

MM, VT, and KB are employed by and hold stock or stock options in 23andMe, Inc. NCK is consultant and holds stock options in CARI Health, Inc. CM is a consultant, scientific advisory board member, and stock options holder in CARI Health, Inc. HdW is a member of the Board of Directors in PharmAla Biotech (not related to this paper).

REFERENCES

1. Butler MM, Ancona RM, Beauchamp GA, et al. Emergency Department Prescription Opioids as an Initial Exposure Preceding Addiction. Ann Emerg Med 2016;68(2):202–8.

2. Edlund MJ, Martin BC, Russo JE, DeVries A, Braden JB, Sullivan MD. The role of opioid prescription in incident opioid abuse and dependence among individuals with chronic noncancer pain: the role of opioid prescription. Clin J Pain 2014;30(7):557–64.

3. Kendler KS, Lönn SL, Ektor-Andersen J, Sundquist J, Sundquist K. Risk factors for the development of opioid use disorder after first opioid prescription: a Swedish national study. Psychol Med 2022;53(13):6223–31.

4. Davidson ES, Finch JF, Schenk S. Variability in subjective responses to cocaine: initial experiences of college students. Addict Behav 1993;18(4):445–53.

5. Davidson ES, Schenk S. Variability in subjective responses to marijuana: Initial experiences of college students. Addict Behav 1994;19(5):531–8.

6. Fergusson DM, Horwood LJ, Lynskey MT, Madden PAF. Early Reactions to Cannabis Predict Later Dependence. Arch Gen Psychiatry 2003;60(10):1033–9.

7. Haertzen CA, Kocher TR, Miyasato K. Reinforcements from the first drug experience can predict later drug habits and/or addiction: Results with coffee, cigarettes, alcohol, barbiturates, minor and major tranquilizers, stimulants, marijuana, hallucinogens, heroin, opiates and cocaine. Drug Alcohol Depend 1983;11(2):147–65.

8. King A, Vena A, Hasin DS, deWit H, O'Connor SJ, Cao D. Subjective Responses to Alcohol in the Development and Maintenance of Alcohol Use Disorder. Am J Psychiatry 2021;178(6):560–71.

9. Le Strat Y, Ramoz N, Horwood J, et al. First positive reactions to cannabis constitute a priority risk factor for cannabis dependence. Addiction 2009;104(10):1710–7.

10. Newton TF, Roache JD, De La Garza R, et al. Bupropion Reduces Methamphetamine-Induced Subjective Effects and Cue-Induced Craving. Neuropsychopharmacology 2006;31(7):1537–44.

11. Schuckit MA. Self-rating of alcohol intoxication by young men with and without family histories of alcoholism. J Stud Alcohol 1980;41(3):242–9.

12. Courchesne-Krak NS, Chandrasekaran A, Gonzalez J, et al. Prescription Opioid Medication Survey: A tool to collect deep phenotypic data on the multifactorial pathways to opioid use disorder in clinical and population-based cohorts.

13. Peachey JE, Lei H. Assessment of Opioid Dependence with Naloxone. Br J Addict 1988;83(2):193–201.

14. Haertzen CA, Hill HE, Belleville RE. Development of the Addiction Research Center Inventory (ARCI): Selection of items that are sensitive to the effects of various drugs. Psychopharmacologia 1963;4(3):155–66.

15. Bruehl S, Stone AL, Palmer C, et al. Self-reported cumulative medical opioid exposure and subjective responses on first use of opioids predict analgesic and subjective responses to placebo-controlled opioid administration. Reg Anesth Pain Med 2019;44(1):92–9.

16. Webster LR, Webster RM. Predicting Aberrant Behaviors in Opioid-Treated Patients: Preliminary Validation of the Opioid Risk Tool. Pain Med 2005;6(6):432–42.

17. Butler SF, Budman SH, Fernandez KC, et al. Development and validation of the Current Opioid Misuse Measure. Pain 2007;130(1–2):144–56.

18. Coyne KS, Barsdorf AI, Currie BM, et al. Construct validity and reproducibility of the Prescription Opioid Misuse And Abuse Questionnaire (POMAQ). Curr Med Res Opin 2021;37(3):493–503.

19. Knisely JS, Wunsch MJ, Cropsey KL, Campbell ED. Prescription Opioid Misuse Index: a brief questionnaire to assess misuse. J Subst Abuse Treat 2008;35(4):380–6.

20. McLellan AT, Luborsky L, Woody GE, O'Brien CP. An improved diagnostic evaluation instrument for substance abuse patients. The Addiction Severity Index. J Nerv Ment Dis 1980;168(1):26–33.

21. Skinner HA. The drug abuse screening test. Addict Behav 1982;7(4):363–71.

22. Durand EY, Do CB, Wilton PR, et al. A scalable pipeline for local ancestry inference using tens of thousands of reference haplotypes [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2025 Jan 15];Available from: http://biorxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2021.01.19.427308

23. Chen T, Guestrin C. XGBoost: A Scalable Tree Boosting System [Internet]. In: Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery; 2016 [cited 2025 Jan 16]. p. 785–94.Available from: https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/2939672.2939785

24. Pedregosa F, Pedregosa F, Varoquaux G, et al. Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. Mach Learn PYTHON 2011.

25. Lundberg SM, Lee S-I. A Unified Approach to Interpreting Model Predictions [Internet]. In: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems. Curran Associates, Inc.; 2017 [cited 2024 Aug 7]. Available from: https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2017/hash/8a20a8621978632d76c43dfd28b67767-Abstract.html

26. Zacny JP. Characterizing the subjective, psychomotor, and physiological effects of a hydrocodone combination product (Hycodan) in non-drug-abusing volunteers. Psychopharmacology (Berl) 2003;165(2):146–56.

27. Zacny JP, Lichtor SA. Within-subject comparison of the psychopharmacological profiles of oral oxycodone and oral morphine in non-drug-abusing volunteers. Psychopharmacology (Berl) 2008;196(1):105–16.

28. Bieber CM, Fernandez K, Borsook D, et al. Retrospective accounts of initial subjective effects of opioids in patients treated for pain who do or do not develop opioid addiction: a pilot case-control study. Exp Clin Psychopharmacol 2008;16(5):429–34.

29. Agrawal A, Jeffries PW, Srivastava AB, et al. Retrospectively assessed subjective effects of initial opioid use differ between opioid misusers with opioid use disorder (OUD) and those who never progressed to OUD: Data from a pilot and a replication sample. J Neurosci Res 2022;100(1):353–61.

30. McAuliffe WE. A Second Look at First Effects: The Subjective Effects of Opiates on Nonaddicts. J Drug Issues 1975;5(4):369–97.

31. Lasagna L, Felsinger JM von, Beecher HK. DRUG-INDUCED MOOD CHANGES IN MAN: 1. OBSERVATIONS ON HEALTHY SUBJECTS, CHRONICALLY ILL PATIENTS, AND “POSTADDICTS.” J Am Med Assoc 1955;157(12):1006–20.

32. Von Felsinger JM, Lasagna L, Beecher HK. Drug-induced mood changes in man. II. Personality and reactions to drugs. J Am Med Assoc 1955;157(13):1113–9.

33. Angst MS, Lazzeroni LC, Phillips NG, et al. Aversive and Reinforcing Opioid Effects: A Pharmacogenomic Twin Study. Anesthesiology 2012;117(1):22–37.

34. Lipman ZM, Yosipovitch G. Substance use disorders and chronic itch. J Am Acad Dermatol 2021;84(1):148–55.

35. Reich A, Szepietowski JC. Opioid-induced pruritus: an update: Opioid-induced pruritus. Clin Exp Dermatol 2010;35(1):2–6.

36. Butler SF, Budman SH, Fernandez K, Jamison RN. Validation of a screener and opioid assessment measure for patients with chronic pain. PAIN 2004;112(1):65.

37. Butler SF, Budman SH, Fernandez KC, Fanciullo GJ, Jamison RN. Cross-Validation of a Screener to Predict Opioid Misuse in Chronic Pain Patients (SOAPP-R). J Addict Med 2009;3(2):66–73.

38. Koob GF, Le Moal M. Drug Addiction, Dysregulation of Reward, and Allostasis. Neuropsychopharmacology 2001;24(2):97–129.

39. Robinson TE, Berridge KC. The neural basis of drug craving: an incentive-sensitization theory of addiction. Brain Res Brain Res Rev 1993;18(3):247–91.

40. Wise RA, Bozarth MA. A psychomotor stimulant theory of addiction. Psychol Rev 1987;94(4):469–92.

41. Martinez S, Brandt L, Comer SD, Levin FR, Jones JD. The subjective experience of heroin effects among individuals with chronic opioid use: Revisiting reinforcement in an exploratory study. Addict Neurosci 2022;4:100034.