

Increases in Naloxone Administrations by Emergency Medical Services Providers During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Retrospective Time-Series Study

Dalia Khoury, Alexander Preiss, Paul Geiger, Mohd Anwar, Kevin Paul Conway

Submitted to: JMIR Public Health and Surveillance
on: April 01, 2021

Disclaimer: © The authors. All rights reserved. This is a privileged document currently under peer-review/community review. Authors have provided JMIR Publications with an exclusive license to publish this preprint on its website for review purposes only. While the final peer-reviewed paper may be licensed under a CC BY license on publication, at this stage authors and publisher expressly prohibit redistribution of this draft paper other than for review purposes.

Table of Contents

Original Manuscript..... 4

Supplementary Files..... 21

 Figures 22

 Figure 1..... 23

 Figure 2..... 24

 Figure 3..... 25

 Figure 4..... 26

Increases in Naloxone Administrations by Emergency Medical Services Providers During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Retrospective Time-Series Study

Dalia Khoury¹ PhD; Alexander Preiss¹ MS; Paul Geiger¹ PhD; Mohd Anwar² PhD; Kevin Paul Conway³ PhD

¹RTI International Research Triangle Park US

²NC Agricultural and Technical State University Durham US

³National Institute of Mental Health Bethesda US

Corresponding Author:

Dalia Khoury PhD
RTI International
3040 East Cornwallis Road
Research Triangle Park
US

Abstract

Background: The opioid crisis in the United States may be exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic.

Objective: The current study examines changes in naloxone administrations during Emergency Medical Service (EMS) runs for opioid-related overdoses during the COVID-19 pandemic in Guilford County, North Carolina.

Methods: A period-over-period approach was used to explore EMS data from Guilford County, North Carolina on opioid overdose-related runs. We compared trends in the frequency of opioid-related EMS runs, naloxone administrations (NAs), and multiple naloxone administrations (MNAs) 29 weeks before and during the COVID-19 pandemic. Furthermore, past data were used to generate a quasi-control distribution of period-over-period changes to compare the change observed during the COVID-19 period to each 29-week period back to January 1, 2014.

Results: All outcomes increased during the COVID-19 period. Compared to the previous 29 weeks, we observed significant proportional increases in mean number of opioid-related EMS runs (37.4%), NAs (57.8%), and MNAs (84.8%). Compared to each previous 29-week period, the COVID-19 period saw increases across all outcomes that were greater than 91% of all past period-over-period changes.

Conclusions: The current study is the first to report increases in both incidence (NAs) and severity (MNAs) of opioid overdoses during the COVID-19 pandemic. For a host of reasons that need to be explored, the COVID-19 pandemic appears to markedly increase the occurrence and lethality of the opioid crisis in Guilford County, NC.

(JMIR Preprints 01/04/2021:29298)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2196/preprints.29298>

Preprint Settings

1) Would you like to publish your submitted manuscript as preprint?

✓ **Please make my preprint PDF available to anyone at any time (recommended).**

Please make my preprint PDF available only to logged-in users; I understand that my title and abstract will remain visible to all users.

Only make the preprint title and abstract visible.

No, I do not wish to publish my submitted manuscript as a preprint.

2) If accepted for publication in a JMIR journal, would you like the PDF to be visible to the public?

✓ **Yes, please make my accepted manuscript PDF available to anyone at any time (Recommended).**

Yes, but please make my accepted manuscript PDF available only to logged-in users; I understand that the title and abstract will remain visible to all users.

Yes, but only make the title and abstract visible (see Important note, above). I understand that if I later pay to participate in [a JMIR journal](#), my title and abstract will remain visible to all users.

Original Manuscript

Increases in Naloxone Administrations by Emergency Medical Services Providers During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Retrospective Time-Series Study

Dalia Khoury^a, Alexander Preiss^b, Paul Geiger^a, Mohd Anwar^c, and Kevin P. Conway^d

^a Research Triangle Institute International, Survey Research Division, 3040 East Cornwallis Road, Research Triangle Park, NC 27709; (corresponding author: dkhoury@rti.org)

^b Research Triangle Institute International, Center for Data Science, 3040 East Cornwallis Road, Research Triangle Park, NC 27709;

^c North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University, Department of Computer Science, 1601 East Market St., Greensboro, NC 27411

^d National Institute of Mental Health, Intramural Research Program, 35 Convent Drive, Building 35A, Bethesda, MD 20892-3720

This research was supported by funding from the Research Triangle Institute (RTI) Opioid Strategic Investment Fund. The funder had no role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; and decision to submit the manuscript for publication. This work was also supported in part by the Intramural Research Program of the National Institute of Mental Health (ZIAMH002953). The views and opinions expressed in this article are those of the authors and should not be construed to represent the views of any of the sponsoring organizations, agencies, or U.S. Government.

The authors would like to thank the Guilford County, NC EMS Department for sharing more than six years of EMS data, making this research possible.

Abstract

Background

The opioid crisis in the United States may be exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic. Increases in opioid use, Emergency Medical Service (EMS) runs for opioid-related overdoses, and opioid-overdose deaths have been reported. No study has examined changes in multiple naloxone administrations, an indicator of overdose severity, during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Objective

This study examined changes in the occurrence of naloxone administrations (NAs) and multiple naloxone administrations (MNAs) during EMS runs for opioid-related overdoses during the COVID-19 pandemic in Guilford County, North Carolina (NC).

Methods

Using a period-over-period approach, we compared the occurrence of opioid-related EMS runs, NAs, and MNAs during the 29-week period before (September 1, 2019 to March 9, 2020) and after NC's COVID-19 state-of-emergency declaration (i.e., the 'COVID-19 period' of 3/10/2020 to 9/30/2020). Furthermore, historical data were used to generate a quasi-control distribution of period-over-period changes to compare the occurrence of each outcome during the COVID-19 period to each 29-week period back to January 1, 2014.

Results

All outcomes increased during the COVID-19 period. Compared to the previous 29 weeks, the COVID-19 period experienced increases in the weekly mean number of opioid-related EMS runs (25.6 versus 18.6, $p<.001$), NAs (22.3 versus 14.1, $p<.001$), and MNAs (5.0 versus 2.7, $p<.001$) corresponding to proportional increases of 37.4%, 57.8%, and 84.8%, respectively. Additionally, the increases during the COVID-19 period were greater than 91% of all historical 29-week periods analyzed.

Conclusions

The occurrence of EMS runs for opioid-related overdoses as well as NAs and MNAs during EMS runs increased during the COVID-19 pandemic in Guilford County, NC. For a host of reasons that need to be explored, the COVID-19 pandemic appears to exacerbate the opioid crisis.

Introduction

The United States remains in an unrelenting opioid crisis. According to the latest official mortality data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), 49,860 Americans died from an opioid-related overdose in 2019 (~137 per day), a substantial increase from 2018 [1]. Furthermore, there is mounting concern that the 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic will exacerbate the crisis [2,3]. Provisional data indicate that 81,003 people died from a drug overdose during the 12 months ending in May 2020, the highest ever recorded in a one-year period in the United States (US), and a trend driven largely by heroin and synthetic opioids [4].

The magnitude and volatility of the opioid crisis warrants up-to-date data to monitor and guide intervention in the quickest manner possible, especially during potentially aggravating circumstances such as the COVID-19 pandemic [5]. However, the primary data used to track the opioid crisis in the U.S. (i.e., verified opioid-related mortality data from the CDC) are outdated by at least a year, a lag that greatly limits their value for surveillance purposes. Alternative timelier data have been leveraged by several studies to explore the opioid crisis generally [6, 7] and how it has shifted since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic. Niles et al. [8] analyzed national urine drug-testing patterns before and during the pandemic and reported a significant increase during the pandemic especially for fentanyl and heroin. Wainwright et al. [9] similarly reported a significant increase in positive urine tests during the pandemic for all drugs tested among a convenience sample of patients with or at risk for substance use disorders. Like Niles et al. [8], the proportional increase reported by Wainwright et al. [9] was greatest for fentanyl and heroin. Using data from the National EMS Information System (NEMSIS), a national registry of EMS agencies representing 80% of EMS dispatches across 47 states, Friedman et al. [10] reported an increase in overdose-related cardiac events from mid-March through August 1, 2020. This surge in cardiac events corresponded temporally with an increase in social distancing as measured by cell-phone mobility. Slavova and colleagues [11] examined changes in the number of EMS runs 52 days before and after the declaration of a state of emergency in Kentucky on March 6, 2020 and reported a significant increase in EMS runs in response to opioid overdoses after the declaration. The increase in opioid-overdose-related EMS runs during COVID-19 reported by both Friedman et al. [10] and Slavova et al. [11] is especially noteworthy in the context of an overall decrease in EMS responses across the US during the early part of the COVID-19 outbreak [12].

In addition to their timeliness, EMS data are also potentially valuable for studying the opioid epidemic because EMS providers increasingly utilize naloxone, an opioid antagonist medication, to treat respiratory depression in suspected opioid overdose patients [13-15]. Naloxone administrations have been shown to hold promise as a near real-time proxy of the opioid epidemic [16-20]. Positive associations between EMS naloxone administrations and fatal and non-fatal overdose events have been reported [21,13]. Furthermore, the percentage of patients receiving multiple naloxone administrations has increased over time and may reflect the increasing severity of the opioid epidemic [14, 22-23]. Although these studies suggest that analyzing EMS data on naloxone administrations may be a viable approach to monitor opioid overdoses, we are aware of only two studies comparing EMS naloxone administrations before and during the COVID-19 pandemic. Guber et al. [24] reported proportional increases in EMS runs for opioid overdoses (43%), EMS-administered naloxone for opioid overdoses (61%), and drug overdose deaths (47%) in Marion County (Indiana) as compared to either of two pre-pandemic periods. Ballesteros et al. [25] reported increases in both EMS-administered naloxone for opioid-related overdoses (28%) and opioid-overdose deaths (15%) in Michigan from March 1 to September 2020, as compared with the same period in 2019. To our knowledge, no study has examined changes in multiple naloxone administrations during the COVID-19 pandemic.

The current study examined changes in naloxone administrations during EMS runs for opioid-related overdoses during the COVID-19 pandemic in Guilford County, the third-most populous county North Carolina (NC). We focused on Guilford County for two reasons. First, the confluence

of the opioid crisis and COVID-19 in Guilford County is evident. The number of opioid overdose deaths increased in the county during the study period (47 in 2015, 71 in 2016, 98 in 2017, 96 in 2018, and 108 in 2019) [26, 1]. Likewise, COVID-19 deaths in the county increased and, by the end of the study period, recorded a fatality rate (35.3 per 100,000) resembling the rate for NC (34.9 per 100,000) [27]. Second, one of the study investigators secured an ongoing data use agreement with the Guilford County EMS department to regularly share EMS data. For these reasons, we compared opioid overdose-related EMS runs, naloxone administrations, and multiple naloxone administrations before and during the COVID-19 pandemic in Guilford County.

Methods

Data. This study used data from the Guilford County, NC EMS department on opioid overdose-related EMS runs from January 1, 2014 to September 30, 2020. These dates correspond respectively to the earliest and latest data available to us prior to manuscript submission. Opioid overdose-related runs were identified using the fields "Primary Impression" and "Secondary Impression," as indicated by the EMS personnel for the reasons for the encounter. The dataset also included an observation for each treatment (e.g., naloxone) administered during an opioid overdose-related EMS run. Because the dataset was deidentified, we used a combination of the incident date, patient's birthdate, and patient's gender to generate a quasi-unique run identifier to identify runs that included multiple naloxone administrations. We then grouped the dataset to the unit of analysis of opioid overdose-related EMS runs, and calculated weekly counts by calendar week to allow for comparison over time.

Outcomes. We studied three weekly-count outcomes: (1) opioid overdose-related EMS runs; (2) naloxone administrations (NAs) during opioid overdose-related EMS runs; and (3) multiple naloxone administrations (MNAs) during opioid overdose-related EMS runs. Together, these outcomes permit the analyses of change in the occurrence (1 and 2) and severity (3) of opioid overdoses [14, 16-20, 22-23].

To measure change in these outcomes in the 29 weeks following NC's COVID-19 state of emergency declaration on March 10, 2020 (i.e., COVID-19 period), we calculated the mean of each outcome during the 29-week COVID-19 period, then expressed it as a percent change from the mean of the outcome during a comparison period.

Period-Over-Period Approach. We evaluated period-over-period change between the COVID-19 period and two other comparison periods. For the first, we compared the COVID-19 period to the 29 calendar weeks immediately preceding the state of emergency declaration (September 1, 2019 to March 9, 2020). For the second, we compared the COVID-19 period to the same 29 calendar weeks of the previous year (March 13 to October 5, 2019). The second comparison accounts for potential seasonality in opioid overdoses [28]. We chose to include the second comparison after time series decomposition showed yearly seasonality in opioid overdose-related EMS runs.

This period-over-period approach is a generalization of the year-over-year growth rate commonly used in finance and business analytics [29]. The period-over-period changes between the COVID-19 period and the comparison periods can be considered the absolute effect size. To test the hypothesis that the COVID-19 period and comparison periods had unequal means, we conducted Welch's unequal variances *t*-tests for each outcome and comparison period. We treated the means in each 29-week period as independent samples. We used a critical value of 0.05 and two-tailed tests. Although these comparisons depict the magnitude of change of the outcomes during the COVID-19 period, they alone cannot convey how unique such a change is compared to more distal past periods. What may seem like a large increase may not be noteworthy (nor connected to the

COVID-19 pandemic) if changes of similar magnitude occurred frequently in the past. Therefore, we used historical data to generate a quasi-control distribution of period-over-period changes to compare to the change observed during the COVID-19 period.

This produced 270 possible comparisons of a 29-week period to the previous 29 weeks, and 246 possible comparisons of a 29-week period to the same 29 weeks of the previous year. We repeated this process for both comparison periods. We then compared the change during the COVID-19 period to the distribution of past period-over-period changes. This provides a measurement of how extreme the change in outcomes during the COVID-19 period was, relative to past changes.

Illustration of Period-Over-Period Approach: Figure 1 depicts the process used to calculate these period-over-period changes for the COVID-19 period (shown in orange), as well as the comparison periods (shown in blue). In the top timeline, the period-over-period change for the COVID-19 period is calculated by comparing the outcome from March 10 to September 30, 2020 to the outcome during the previous 29 weeks. The next three timelines depict how the quasi-control distribution was generated for more distal periods. In the second timeline (Control Period 1), the first control observation was calculated by comparing the outcome from January 1 to July 18, 2015 with the outcome from July 19, 2015 to January 30, 2016. The ellipses indicate that from this starting point to the beginning of the COVID-19 state of emergency declaration, a control observation was calculated for each calendar week.

Statistical Analyses. The equations in Figure 1 show how period-over-period change was calculated for each period. This analytic approach is similar in concept to the common difference in difference (DID) quasi-experimental research design [30]. In DID terms, we treat each possible 29-week period as a unit p which is observed twice (t , $t-1$). For each period, p_t is the mean of the outcome during the primary period and p_{t-1} is the mean of the outcome during the comparison period (either the previous 29 weeks or the same 29 weeks of the previous year). We calculate the percent change in period p as $\Delta_p = (p_t - p_{t-1}) / p_{t-1}$. We can consider the COVID-19 period to be the treatment group, which is exposed to the treatment condition (the COVID-19 pandemic) in t and to the control condition in $t-1$. The distribution of past period-over-period changes forms the control group, which is exposed to the control condition in both t and $t-1$. This results in a control group of $n=270$ or $n=246$ (depending on the comparison period used) and a treatment group of $n=1$.


This treatment group of $n=1$ precluded the usual regression analysis and statistical inference used with DID study data. Instead, we used two simple heuristics to express how extreme the change in outcomes during the COVID-19 period was, relative to past changes. First, we calculated the percentile of the COVID-19 period Δ within the distribution of past changes. This allowed us to determine how often period-over-period changes of greater magnitude had occurred in the past. Then, we plotted period-over-period changes over time and graphically compared the change in outcomes during the COVID-19 period to the recent trend. The plot shows how each period forms one observation in a timeline where period-over-period change is calculated for each calendar week.

Finally, a series of figures further illustrates how the increases in outcomes during the COVID-19 period represent departures from historical trends. For each (Figure 2, Figure 3, Figure 4), the x-axis represents time from the first possible comparison period (02/08/2015) since the beginning of the dataset (01/01/2014) to the end of COVID-19 period (09/30/2020). The y-axis represents period-over-period change, or the percent change in each period relative to its comparison period. Each bar shows a 29-week period's change from its comparison period, one calendar week at a time as described above. The furthest-right bar (in orange) shows the outcome during the COVID-19 period. Period-over-period changes are shown for opioid overdose-related EMS runs (Figure 2), NAs (Figure 3) and MNAs (Figure 4).

All data analysis was conducted using Python 3.8 and the Python packages NumPy 1.19.0, SciPy

1.5.0, and pandas 1.0.5.

Figure 1: Illustration of Period-over-Period Change Method using Previous 29 Weeks as Comparison Period from January 1, 2015 to September 30, 2020



Results

All three outcomes increased sharply and significantly during the COVID-19 period (Table 1).

Table 1: Mean and Percent Change in Emergency Medical Services Runs Involving Opioid Overdoses, Naloxone Administrations, and Multiple Naloxone Administrations in Guilford County, North Carolina Before and After COVID-19 State-of-Emergency Declaration

COVID-19 Period ¹	Comparison Period			
	Previous 29 Weeks ²		Same 29 Weeks of Previous Year ³	
Mean (sd) ⁴	Mean (sd) ⁴	COVID-19 Period % Change (p-value) ^{5, 6}	Mean (sd) ⁴	COVID-19 Period % Change (p-value) ⁵

Outcomes					
Opioid overdose-related EMS runs	25.6 (5.6)	18.6 (6.6)	37.4% (<.001)	20.6 (6.5)	24.3% (.003)
Naloxone administrations	22.3 (6.2)	14.1 (6.0)	57.8% (<.001)	17.2 (6.9)	29.7% (.006)
Multiple naloxone administrations	5.0 (1.9)	2.7 (1.9)	84.8% (<.001)	3.3 (1.8)	51.5% (<.001)

¹ 03/10/2020 to 09/30/2020

² 09/01/2019 to 03/09/2020

³ 03/13/2019 to 10/05/2019

⁴ Weekly mean and standard deviation of outcome during period

⁵ (COVID-19 period mean - comparison period mean) / comparison period mean

⁶ The percentage changes shown may not correspond exactly to the values shown due to rounding

Table 1 shows that, compared to either 29-week comparison period, the mean number of opioid overdose-related EMS runs, NAs, and MNAs increased during the COVID-19 period. For each outcome, the magnitude of change during the COVID-19 period was greater when compared to the previous 29 weeks than when compared to the same 29 weeks of the previous year. This suggests that seasonality may account for some, but not all, of the increase from the previous 29 weeks.

Further, the increases in outcomes during the COVID-19 period were extreme historically. Table 2 shows, for both comparison periods, the COVID-19 period change expressed as a percentile of the quasi-control distribution of all past period-over-period changes. Across the three outcomes, the increase during the COVID-19 period was greater than 90% of all past 29-week period-over-period changes. When compared to the same 29 weeks of the previous year, the increase for each outcome during the COVID-19 period exceeded at least 63% of all past changes.

Table 2. Magnitude of Period-Over-Period Change in Emergency Medical Services Runs Involving Opioid Overdoses, Naloxone Administrations, and Multiple Naloxone Administrations in Guilford County, North Carolina Before the COVID-19 State-of-Emergency Declaration

	Comparison Period	Percentile ¹
Opioid overdose-related EMS runs	Previous 29 Weeks ²	94.8
	Same 29 Weeks of Previous Year ³	81.7
Naloxone administrations	Previous 29 Weeks ²	91.1
	Same 29 Weeks of Previous Year ³	63.0

Multiple naloxone administrations	Previous 29 Weeks ²	98.1
	Same 29 Weeks of Previous Year ³	76.8

¹ Percentile of COVID-19 period-over-period change within quasi-control distribution of all past period-over-period changes

² 09/01/2019 to 03/09/2020

³ 03/13/2019 to 10/05/2019

Figure 2: Historical Period-Over-Period Change in Emergency Medical Services Runs Involving Opioid Overdoses in Guilford County, North Carolina Before and After the COVID-19 State-of-Emergency Declaration




Figure 3: Historical Period-Over-Period Change in Emergency Medical Services Runs Involving Naloxone Administrations in Guilford County, North Carolina Before and After the COVID-19 State-of-Emergency Declaration





Figure 4: Historical Period-Over-Period Change in Emergency Medical Services Runs Involving Multiple Naloxone Administrations in Guilford County, North Carolina Before and After the COVID-19 State-of-Emergency Declaration



All outcomes showed mostly positive period-over-period changes from 2015 to 2017. An inflection point occurred in mid to late 2017 when NAs and MNAs started to drop (in July 2017) followed by a drop in opioid overdose-related runs (in November 2017). From 2018 to 2020, the outcomes continued to decrease, and most period-over-period changes were negative. Then, in the COVID-19 period, a sharp increase occurred for all outcomes. The large, positive period-over-period changes in the COVID-19 period are thus an abrupt and large departure from the recent trend of mostly negative period-over-period changes. Most notably, MNAs increased by 84.8% when compared to the previous 29 weeks, and by 53.7% when compared to the same 29 weeks of 2019.

Discussion

This study detected increases in the occurrence of EMS runs for opioid-related overdoses as well as NAs and MNAs during EMS runs in the course of the COVID-19 pandemic in Guilford County, NC. The findings confirm and extend research on the convergence of the opioid epidemic and the COVID-19 pandemic. The study replicates previous research [11, 24, 25] by showing increases in opioid overdose-related EMS runs and EMS-administered naloxone during the COVID-19 pandemic in a large metropolitan county in NC. The sharp increase in MNAs, an indicator of the potential lethality of opioid overdoses [13, 21-22], constitutes new evidence linking COVID-19 to an increase in the severity of the overdose crisis. Moreover, the period-over-period analytic approach demonstrates unequivocally that the increases observed for each outcome were historically uncharacteristic of prior periods dating back to 2014 and not explained by seasonality effects. Together, these findings indicate that opioid overdoses have increased in occurrence and severity in Guilford County during COVID-19 to a great extent, thereby contributing to growing empirical support for the hypothesis that the COVID-19 pandemic exacerbates the opioid epidemic [31, 32].

To help interpret the findings reported here and elsewhere, we refer to a host-agent-vector-environment model to synthesize the multifactorial evolution of the opioid overdose crisis in the United States [33]. Based upon a modification of the epidemiological triangle model of disease for chronic health conditions [34-36], the model posits that the risk of opioid overdose results from an interaction of risk factors associated with the *host* (i.e., individual-level factors such as addiction

susceptibility or opioid tolerance), the *agent* (i.e., external factors such as heroin or fentanyl), the *vector* (i.e., purveyors of licit and illicit drugs), and the environment (i.e., contextual external factors such as the economy or geography). With this model in mind, the current study offers compelling evidence that the COVID-19 pandemic serves as a potent environmental factor that increases the risk of opioid overdoses, perhaps by augmenting the risk-conferring nature of other factors in the model.

There are a variety of ways by which the environmental strain of the COVID-19 pandemic could interact with host, agent, and vector factors to potentiate opioid-overdose risk. Host factors (e.g., CNS depression) associated with overdose risk may intensify under conditions of social isolation by using opioids alone and without the availability of a bystander to administer naloxone [3]. Indeed, Friedman et al [10] reported increases in EMS runs for opioid-overdose cardiac arrests that corresponded with decreases in mobility, an indicator of social isolation. Other host factors (e.g., tolerance to opioids) may temporarily decrease due to pandemic-related barriers that limit acquiring and using opioids, only to be supplanted with an escalation of overdose risk when opioids become more available and used at pre-hiatus dosage [3, 37]. Consistent with this notion, Currie et al. [38] reported an initial fentanyl-fueled spike in opioid overdose deaths in Ohio approximately six weeks following the declaration of a national public health emergency on March 13th, 2020. Notably, opioid overdose deaths returned to comparable historical levels within approximately three months. Regarding agent factors, it is evident that the COVID-19 pandemic began during the third wave of the opioid epidemic when overdoses were increasingly attributable to the use of heroin and fentanyl [39]. With its estimated 50-times potency of heroin, fentanyl and other synthetic opioids greatly intensify the risk of fatal and non-fatal overdoses [40]. Additionally, polysubstance abuse increases overdose risk [41] and has now been empirically linked to risk of opioid overdoses during COVID-19 [26]. Regarding vector factors, COVID-19 may potentiate supply-side pressures that intensify overdose risk [42,3]. Fentanyl increasingly dominates the illegal drug market [43] and remains highly prevalent in drugs tested during the pandemic [9]. National drug-positivity rates increased especially for fentanyl and heroin despite a decrease in overall positivity during the study period [8], suggesting a net increase in lethality due to greater exposure of fentanyl in the drugs that were used.

Regarding specific environmental factors, reduced access to treatment and other services for opioid use disorders likely contributed to overdoses [44]. Opioid use disorder treatment and harm reduction services have been drastically impacted by COVID-19 social-distancing regulations due to limits on face-to-face contact [45]. Historically, harm reduction services such as syringe exchange programs, drug consumption rooms, naloxone distribution, and fentanyl test strips have been provided in an in-person capacity. In fact, Schlosser and Harris [46] argue that harm reduction services are predicated on the “physical, social, and emotional intimacies” associated with drug use, conditions that were limited after social-distancing regulations were introduced. Bartholomew et al. [47] found that 15% of needle and syringe programs across nine states closed during COVID-19, 72% were operating at limited capacity, and 25% eventually pivoted to provide virtual harm-reduction services. These trends in closures, reduced hours, and service modifications are reflected across the US [48] and 25 countries in Europe [49].

Our study has several limitations. The use of a convenience sample of EMS records in a single county limits the generalizability of the findings. Although our finding of increased NAs during COVID-19 replicates a study conducted in Marion County (Indiana) [24], investigations in other geographical locations are needed. By using only EMS data, the use of naloxone by bystanders or other first respondents (e.g., law enforcement) are not included. Furthermore, part of the increase in opioid-related EMS runs during the pandemic may be driven by temporary redirection of other treatment-access points, perhaps due to a disincentive to seek care at hospitals during the pandemic. There is also a potential for misclassification of overdose events, as EMS responders may overuse naloxone in some cases. Because of their anonymized nature, EMS data were not linked to death records; doing so would help verify MNA as a proxy for severity. It also remains

unclear the extent to which the increases in NAs and MNAs reported here are attributable to the COVID-19 pandemic independent of the effect of fentanyl; research on this is needed.

To our knowledge, the current study is the first to report an increase in both occurrence and severity of opioid overdoses during the COVID-19 pandemic. Our study also encourages additional research on the use of EMS data on NAs and MNAs to monitor opioid overdoses. The timeliness, ubiquity, and specificity to the opioid crisis make EMS data on naloxone administrations especially viable proxy measures of the evolving opioid epidemic, even during public health disasters such as the COVID-19 pandemic. More broadly, our study reiterates the value of data sharing among public health and safety, research, community, and academic organizations for tracking the opioid crisis [5, 7, 50, 51]. The global sharing of COVID-19 data clearly shows that this is possible.



References

1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics. Multiple Cause of Death 1999-2019 on CDC WONDER Online Database. (Internet). (cited 2021 01 15). Available from: <https://wonder.cdc.gov/mcd.html>
2. Becker WC, Fiellin DA. When epidemics collide: Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) and the opioid crisis. *Ann Intern Med*. 2020; M20-1210. <https://doi.org/10.7326/M20-1210>.
3. Wakeman SE, Green TC, Rich J. An overdose surge will compound the COVID-19 pandemic if urgent action is not taken. *Nat Med*. 2020;26(6):819-820. doi:[10.1038/s41591-020-0898-0](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-0898-0)
4. Ahmad FB, Rossen LM, Sutton P. Provisional drug overdose death counts. National Center for Health Statistics. 2021.
5. Blanco C, Compton WM, Volkow ND. Opportunities for research on the treatment of substance use disorders in the context of COVID-19. *JAMA Psychiatry*. doi:10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2020.3177
6. Anwar M, Khoury D, Aldridge AP, Parker SJ, Conway KP. Using Twitter to Surveil the Opioid Epidemic in North Carolina: An Exploratory Study. *JMIR Public Health Surveill*. 2020;6(2):e17574. Published 2020 Jun 24. doi:10.2196/17574
7. Zibbell JE, Aldridge AP, Cauchon D, DeFiore-Hyrmer J, Conway KP. Association of Law Enforcement Seizures of Heroin, Fentanyl, and Carfentanil With Opioid Overdose Deaths in Ohio, 2014-2017. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2019;2(11):e1914666. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2019.14666
8. Niles JK, Gudín K, Radcliff J, Kaufman HW. (2021). The opioid epidemic within the COVID-19 pandemic: Drug testing in 2020. *Population Health Management*, S-43-S-51. <http://doi.org/10.1089/pop.2020.0230>
9. Wainwright JJ, Mikre M, Whitley P, et al. Analysis of drug test results before and after the US declaration of a national emergency concerning the COVID-19 outbreak. *JAMA*. doi:[10.1001/jama.2020.17694](https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.17694)
10. Friedman J, Beletsky L, Schriger DL. Overdose-Related Cardiac Arrests Observed by Emergency Medical Services During the US COVID-19 Epidemic. *JAMA Psychiatry*. Published online December 03, 2020. doi:10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2020.4218
11. Slavova S, Rock P, Bush HM, Quesinberry D, Walsh SL. Signal of increased opioid overdose during COVID-19 from emergency medical services data. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 2020;214:108176. doi:10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2020.108176
12. Lerner EB, Newgard CD, Mann NC. Effect of the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic on the U.S. emergency medical services system: a preliminary report. *Acad Emerg Med*. 2020; doi:[10.1111/acem.14051](https://doi.org/10.1111/acem.14051)
13. Cash RE, Kinsman J, Crowe RP, Rivard MK, Faul M, Panchal AR. Naloxone administration frequency during emergency medical service events – United States, 2012-2016. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2018, 67(31):850–3. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6731a2.
14. Faul M, Lurie P, Kinsman JM, Dailey MW, Crabaugh C, Sasser SM. Multiple naloxone administrations among emergency medical service providers is increasing. 2017. *Prehospital Emergency Care*, 21(4), 411–419. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10903127.2017.1315203>
15. Rzasa Lynn, R., & Galinkin, J. L. (2018). Naloxone dosage for opioid reversal: current evidence and clinical implications. *Therapeutic advances in drug safety*, 9(1), 63–88. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2042098617744161>
16. Faul M, Dailey MW, Sugerman DE, Sasser SM, Levy B, Paulozzi LJ. Disparity in naloxone administration by emergency medical service providers and the burden of drug overdose in US rural communities. *Am J Public Health*. 2015; 105(Suppl 3):e26–32. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2014.302520
17. Knowlton A, Weir BW, Hazzard F, Olsen Y, McWilliams J, Fields J, Gaasch W. EMS runs for suspected opioid overdose: implications for surveillance and prevention. *Prehospital Emergency Care*, 2015;17(3), 317-329.
18. Lindstrom HA, Clemency BM, Snyder R, Consiglio JD, May PR, Moscati RM. Prehospital


- naloxone administration as a public health surveillance tool: A retrospective validation study. *Prehosp Disaster Med.* 2015;30(4):385–9. doi: 10.1017/S1049023X15004793
19. Moore PQ, Weber J, Cina S, Aks S. Syndrome surveillance of fentanyl-laced heroin outbreaks: Utilization of EMS, Medical Examiner and Poison Center databases. *Am J Emerg Med.* 2017 Nov;35(11):1706-1708. doi: 10.1016/j.ajem.2017.05.003. Epub 2017 May 8. PMID: 28506507.
 20. Ray BR, Lowder EM, Kivisto AJ, Phalen P, Gil H. EMS naloxone administration as non-fatal opioid overdose surveillance: 6-year outcomes in Marion County, Indiana. *Addiction.* 2018;3(12):2271–9. doi: 10.1111/add.14426
 21. Lasher L, Rhodes J, Viner-Brown S. Identification and Description of Non-Fatal Opioid Overdoses using Rhode Island EMS Data, 2016-2018. *Rhode Island Medical Journal.* 2019;102(2), 41-45.
 22. Klebacher R, Harris MI, Ariyaprakai N, et al. Incidence of naloxone redosing in the age of the new opioid epidemic. *Prehospital Emergency Care.* 2017;21(6), 682–687. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10903127.2017.1335818>
 23. Somerville NJ, O'Donnell J, Gladden RM, et al. Characteristics of Fentanyl Overdose — Massachusetts, 2014–2016. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2017;66:382–386. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6614a2
 24. Globler N, Mohler G, Huynh P, et al. Impact of COVID-19 Pandemic on Drug Overdoses in Indianapolis. *J Urban Health* 97, 802–807 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11524-020-00484-0>
 25. Ballesteros A, Roche J, Myers M, Carter P, Cunningham R, Goldstick J. Changes in suspected overdoses following the start of the COVID-19 pandemic: results from the Michigan system for opioid overdose surveillance. *Inj Prev.* 2021; suppl 3: A1-A35. 10.1136/injuryprev-2021-SAVIR.38
 26. North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services. COVID-19 North Carolina Dashboard. <https://covid19.ncdhhs.gov/dashboard#by-counties-map>. Accessed February 28, 2021.
 27. Precision for COVID. Community Vulnerability to COVID-19: Explore the U.S. Data. <https://www.precisionforcoviddata.org/>, accessed April 22, 2021.
 28. Dasgupta N. Opioid analgesic prescribing and overdose mortality in North Carolina. Dissertation. University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill; 2013. <https://cdr.lib.unc.edu/downloads/8623hz362>. Accessed April 17, 2021.
 29. Amadeo, K. (2020, May 28). Year-over-year explained with its pros and cons. *The Balance.* May 28, 2020. <https://www.thebalance.com/year-over-year-yoy-growth-calculation-definition-3305970>. Accessed March 3, 2021.
 30. Wing C, Simon K, Bellow-Gomez RA. Designing difference in difference studies: Best practices for public health policy research. *Annual Review Public Health.* 2018; 39(1); 453-469.
 31. Kuehn BM. Accelerated Overdose Deaths Linked With COVID-19. *JAMA.* 2021;325(6):523. doi:10.1001/jama.2021.0074wa
 32. Alexander GC, Stoller KB, Haffajee RL, Saloner B. An epidemic in the midst of a pandemic: opioid use disorder and COVID-19. *Ann Intern Med.* 2020;M20-1141. <https://doi.org/10.7326/M20-1141>
 33. Compton WM, Jones CM. Epidemiology of the U.S. opioid crisis: the importance of the vector. *Ann N Y Acad Sci.* 2019;1451(1): 130–143. doi:10.1111/nyas.14209
 34. Giovino GA. Epidemiology of tobacco use in the United States. *Oncogene.* 2002;21:7326–7340. (PubMed: 12379876)
 35. Merikangas KR, McClair VL. Epidemiology of substance use disorders. *Human genetics.* 2012;131(6), 779–789. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00439-012-1168-0>
 36. Merikangas KR, Nakamura EF, Kessler RC. Epidemiology of mental disorders in children and adolescents. *Dialogues Clin Neurosci.* 2009;11(1); 7-20.
 37. Binswanger IA, Stern MF, Deyo RA, et al. Release from Prison — A High Risk of Death for Former Inmates. *The New England Journal of Medicine.* 2007;356(2), 157–165.

- <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMsa064115>
38. Currie JM, Schnell MK, Schwandt H, Zhang J. Trends in Drug Overdose Mortality in Ohio During the First 7 Months of the COVID-19 Pandemic. *JAMA Network Open* 2021; 4(4):e217112. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.7112
 39. Dasgupta N, Beletsky L, Ciccarone D. Opioid Crisis: No Easy Fix to Its Social and Economic Determinants. *Am J Public Health* 2018 Feb;108(2):182-186. (doi: [10.2105/ajph.2017.304187](https://doi.org/10.2105/ajph.2017.304187))
 40. O'Donnell J, Gladden RM, Goldberger BA, Mattson CL, Kariisa M. Notes from the field: opioid-involved overdose deaths with fentanyl or fentanyl analogs detected—28 states and the District of Columbia, July 2016–December 2018. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2020;69(10):271-273. doi:[10.15585/mmwr.mm6910a4](https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6910a4)
 41. Compton WM, Valentino RJ, DuPont RL. Polysubstance use in the U.S. opioid crisis. *Mol Psychiatry* 2020;26, 41–50 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41380-020-00949-3>
 42. Ciccarone D. The triple wave epidemic: Supply and demand drivers of the US opioid overdose crisis. *Int J Drug Policy*. 2019;71:183-188. doi:10.1016/j.drugpo.2019.01.010
 43. Althoff KN, Leifheit KM, Park JN, Chandran A, Sherman SG. Opioid-related overdose mortality in the era of fentanyl: Monitoring a shifting epidemic by person, place, and time. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 2020 Nov 1;216:108321. doi: 10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2020.108321. Epub 2020 Sep 25. PMID: 33007700; PMCID: PMC7606594.
 44. Harm Reduction International. The global state of harm reduction 2020. 2021. <https://www.hri.global/global-state-of-harm-reduction-2020>. [accessed March 1, 2021].
 45. Dietze P, Peacock A. Illicit drug use and harms in Australia in the context of COVID-19 and associated restrictions: Anticipated consequences and initial responses. *Drug Alcohol Review*, 2020;39, 297–300.
 46. Schlosser A, Harris S. Care during COVID-19: Drug use, harm reduction, and intimacy during a global pandemic. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 2020;83, 102896.
 47. Bartholomew TS, Nakamura N, Metsch LR, Tookes HE. Syringe services program (SSP) operational changes during the COVID-19 global outbreak. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 2020;83, 102821.
 48. Glick N, Prohaska SM, LaKosky PA et al. The Impact of COVID-19 on Syringe Services Programs in the United States. *AIDS Behav* 2020;24, 2466–2468. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10461-020-02886-2>
 49. European Drug Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction. Impact of COVID-19 on drug services and help-seeking in Europe. EMCDDA Trendspotter briefing. 2020. https://www.emcdda.europa.eu/publications/ad-hoc/impact-of-covid-19-on-drug-services-and-help-seeking-in-europe_en [accessed February 28, 2021]
 50. Alter A, Yeager C. The Consequences of COVID-19 on the Overdose Epidemic: Overdoses Are Increasing. 2020. <http://odmap.org/Content/docs/news/2020/ODMAP-Report-May-2020.pdf>. [accessed April 30, 2021].
 51. Guilford County Solution to the Opioid Problem (GCSTOP). 2019. <https://gcstop.uncg.edu/> [accessed April 30, 2021].


Supplementary Files

Figures


Illustration of Period-over-Period Change Method using Previous 29 Weeks as Comparison Period from January 1, 2015 to September 30, 2020.



Historical Period-Over-Period Change in Emergency Medical Services Runs Involving Opioid Overdoses in Guilford County, North Carolina Before and After the COVID-19 State-of-Emergency Declaration.



Historical Period-Over-Period Change in Emergency Medical Services Runs Involving Naloxone Administrations in Guilford County, North Carolina Before and After the COVID-19 State-of-Emergency Declaration.



Historical Period-Over-Period Change in Emergency Medical Services Runs Involving Multiple Naloxone Administrations in Guilford County, North Carolina Before and After the COVID-19 State-of-Emergency Declaration.

