

Kent Academic Repository

Full text document (pdf)

Citation for published version

Costa Storti, Claudia, Bretteville Jensen, Anne Line, De Grauwec, Paul, Moller, Kim, Mountenay, Jane and Stevens, Alex (2021) The Double Effect of COVID-19 Confinement Measures and Economic Recession on High-Risk Drug Users and Drug Services. *European Addiction Research*, 27 . pp. 239-241. ISSN 1022-6877.

DOI

<https://doi.org/10.1159/000513883>

Link to record in KAR

<https://kar.kent.ac.uk/87061/>

Document Version

Publisher pdf

Copyright & reuse

Content in the Kent Academic Repository is made available for research purposes. Unless otherwise stated all content is protected by copyright and in the absence of an open licence (eg Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher, author or other copyright holder.

Versions of research

The version in the Kent Academic Repository may differ from the final published version.

Users are advised to check <http://kar.kent.ac.uk> for the status of the paper. **Users should always cite the published version of record.**

Enquiries

For any further enquiries regarding the licence status of this document, please contact:

researchsupport@kent.ac.uk

If you believe this document infringes copyright then please contact the KAR admin team with the take-down information provided at <http://kar.kent.ac.uk/contact.html>

The Double Effect of COVID-19 Confinement Measures and Economic Recession on High-Risk Drug Users and Drug Services

Claudia Costa Storti^a Anne Line Bretteville-Jensen^b Paul De Grauwe^c
Kim Moeller^d Jane Mounteney^a Alex Stevens^e

^aEuropean Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction, Lisbon, Portugal; ^bNorwegian Institute of Public Health, Oslo, Norway; ^cEuropean Institute, London School of Economics, London, UK; ^dDepartment of Criminology, Malmö University, Malmö, Sweden; ^eSchool of Social Policy, Sociology and Social Research, University of Kent, Medway, UK

Keywords

COVID-19 · Economic recession · High-risk drug use · Substance abuse · Opioids

Abstract

The ongoing COVID-19 pandemic is likely to have a profound impact on the lives of high-risk drug users and on the services responding to their needs in at least two important ways: first, through the restrictive measures introduced to mitigate the spread of the virus and, second, as a result of extensive economic downturn. Currently there is great uncertainty as to the future intensity and duration of the pandemic. In addition, the lessons we have been able to learn from previous economic downturns may be of limited applicability to the current situation, which differs in a number of significant respects. Experience nevertheless suggests that the potential consequences for drug users' health and well-being may be severe. The ongoing uncertainty serves to underline the importance of close monitoring of the drug situation and preparing flexible and innovative solutions to be able to meet new challenges which may arise.

© 2021 S. Karger AG, Basel

Introduction

COVID-19 containment measures have had a direct and documented impact on drug use and service responses [1–3]. In a European context, at the start of the pandemic, localized shortages of heroin were reported in some countries resulting in the use of replacement substances [3]; more generally, increases in consumption of alcohol and prescription medicines are noted, especially benzodiazepines [2]. There is evidence to suggest that in the first weeks of lockdown, some people with frequent or intensive patterns of drug use increased their consumption, while increased emergency presentations for mental health problems have been documented [2]. A decline in the availability of drug services and reduction in users seeking treatment were also observed in the early months of the pandemic. After the initial phase, however, there are many examples of services manifesting rapid, adaptive, and innovative responses to extraordinarily challenging circumstances [2].

In addition, the numerous mitigation and confinement measures implemented by governments in response to the pandemic are having marked and potentially long-lasting impacts on societies and economies. Gross Do-

mestic Product (GDP) is falling abruptly in many countries; governments are increasing their levels of indebtedness; temporary unemployment schemes are being widely implemented, and unemployment is rising. It is not so long, however, since the global economy last experienced an economic shock, and the impact of the 2008 recession on drug problems is still fresh in the minds of many. Studies suggest that the 2008 global recession was associated with a broad range of consequences for high-risk drug users (HRDU), including reports from some countries of the increases in use of heroin [4–6], increases in opioid users requiring clinical treatment, increased levels of drug injecting and HIV cases among people who inject drugs, higher HIV-related mortality [7, 8], decreasing median age of injecting drug users [9], and an increased risk of “deaths of despair” [10, 11]. The question many may now be asking is whether the developing economic crisis will result in similar consequences for drug-related harms and service provision this time around. Before answering, we wish to highlight some essential differences that will likely impact on the outcome.

How Does the COVID-19 Recession Differ from the 2008 Recession?

First, the intensity of the “COVID-19 recession” appears to be significantly greater. Preliminary estimates indicate that GDP in many countries may drop by 10% or more in 2020. This is approximately double the decline observed during the 2008 recession. Second, there is still uncertainty about its duration. It depends on how the coronavirus behaves as well as the effectiveness of our responses to it (a mutation of the virus? new outbreaks? availability of a vaccine?). Third, the “fear factor” differs from the past. Now, it is not only related to socioeconomic issues but also linked to the overall health status of populations. “Fear” impacts on the behaviour of individuals and nations, making a strong recovery more difficult. Fourth, the extensive economic implications of COVID-19 have forced governments to substantially increase spending on recovery plans in order to stop the downward deflationary spiral. This may lead to budget deficits that greatly exceed those of the previous recession. In particular, weaker economies could be forced to impose austerity measures to cover the spending on recovery programmes, precisely at a time when the economy should be stimulated. Finally, income inequality within and between countries is more pronounced now than in 2008. The confinement measures, hitting socioeco-

omic groups unequally, may widen this gap even further. In sum, the consequences of the current recession are likely to surpass previous experiences.

What Are the Potential Consequences for High-Risk Drug Users and Services?

Negative effects of the confinement measures are likely to exacerbate existing socioeconomic problems. And while the impact of the confinement measures is likely to be more immediate, the effects of the COVID-19 recession will undoubtedly endure over a longer time period and continue to negatively impact on the lives of HRDU. Rising unemployment and economic hardship have the clear potential to increase levels of poverty, marginalization, and social exclusion. In practical terms, reduced personal income will mean less money for food, housing and health care. Poor and diminished health status in turn potentially impact on an already exaggerated mortality rates (up to 15 times higher for injecting drug users than for the general population) [12].

In some countries, COVID-19 mitigation measures have already resulted in the closure and reduction of drug treatment and harm reduction services, and it appears inevitable that tougher budget constraints will jeopardize future investment in and potentially the long-term survival of some interventions. Consequently, any failure to protect essential drug services from this double blow of mitigation plus recession measures may have severe repercussions for the health and well-being of HRDU populations. Nevertheless, while continuing to assess risks and evaluate possible unintended consequences, it will be important to support best practices emerging as a response to these challenges. Many examples have been documented including expanded take-home schemes for opioid substitution medicines; increased use of long-acting depot buprenorphine; extended prescription periods; and the home delivery of medicines and clean injection equipment. Across the board, health services, including drug services, have demonstrated flexible use of digital health care/telemedicine for improving access and availability of essential services throughout the pandemic.

Conclusion

Following the 2008 recession, drug-related spending either stagnated or declined in many countries [13]. In 2020, we suggest that a safeguarding of drug-related bud-

gets is required, especially for financing proven cost-effective interventions [14]. Already in 2014, the Commission on Narcotic Drugs of the United Nations encouraged countries to ensure that responses to economic downturns do not disproportionately affect people suffering from drug-related problems and diseases [15]. Now is the time to act upon the request.

The economic consequences are likely to dramatically amplify the effects of COVID-19 mitigation measures on the lives of HRDU, on their consumption patterns and on the survival chances of responding services. The situation needs to be closely monitored and flexible and innovative solutions prepared. It will be crucial to protect core drug-related health services, in addition to harm reduction and prevention measures [2].

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Marica Ferri for her valuable contribution with her comments on earlier versions of this manuscript.

References

- 1 Carpenter C, McClellan CB, Rees DI. Economic conditions, illicit drug use, and substance use disorders in the United States. *J Health Econ*. 2017;52:63–73.
- 2 Compton W, Gfroerer J, Conway K, Finger MS. Unemployment and substance outcomes in the United States 2002–2010. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 2014 Sep 1;142(142):350–3.
- 3 Dow W, Godøy A, Lowenstein C, Reich M. Can economic policies reduce deaths of despair? 2019.
- 4 Nikolopoulos G, Fotiou A, Kanavou E, Richardson C, Detsis M, Pharris A, et al. National income inequality and declining GDP growth rates are associated with increases in HIV diagnoses among people who inject drugs in Europe: a panel data analysis. *PLoS One*. 2015;10(4):e0122367.
- 5 Hollingsworth A, Ruhm C, Simon K. Macroeconomic conditions and opioid abuse. *J Health Econ*. 2017;56:222.
- 6 Hines LA, Trickey A, Leung J, Larney S, Peacock A, Degenhardt L, et al. Associations between national development indicators and the age profile of people who inject drugs: results from a global systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Global Health*. 2020;8(1):e76–91.
- 7 Shanahan L, Hill SN, Gaydos LM, Steinhoff A, Costello EJ, Dodge KA, et al. Does despair really kill? A roadmap for an evidence-based answer. *Am J Public Health*. 2019;109(6):854–8.
- 8 Ruhm C. “Deaths of despair or drug problems?.”: National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.; 2018.
- 9 Mathers BM, Degenhardt L, Bucello C, Lemon J, Wiessing L, Hickman M. Mortality among people who inject drugs: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Bull World Health Organ*. 2013;91(2):102–23.
- 10 Murphy SM, Polsky D. Economic evaluations of opioid use disorder interventions. *Pharmacoeconomics*. 2016 Sep;34(9):863–87.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare. The work described in this article does not express the views of the European Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction. The views and opinions expressed are those of the authors.

Funding Sources

The authors did not receive any funding.

Author Contributions

C.C.S. and A.L.B.J. were the principal investigators who wrote the study and coordinated the manuscript. J.M. was always involved in the analysis, management, writing, and scientific editing of the study. P.D.G. wrote the macroeconomic analysis and commented and approved the various versions of the manuscript. K.M. contributed with the criminologist perspective of the phenomena and commented and approved the various versions of the manuscript. A.K. contributed to the conceptualization of the project and contributed to the manuscript, within the limits of his current medical condition.