# INVESTIGATION OF THE ALCOHOL, SMOKING AND SUBSTANCE INVOLVEMENT SCREENING TEST (THE *ASSIST*) IN PREGNANCY

Elizabeth Dorothy Hotham, M.App.Sc. (Pharm), B.Pharm.

Discipline of Pharmacology
School of Medical Sciences
Faculty of Health Sciences
The University of Adelaide

November, 2009

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

# **Table of Contents**

Abstract	XV
Declaration	xvii
Acknowledgements	xviii
Publications in support of this thesis	xix
Chapters	
Substance Use in Pregnancy	1
2. Phase I Study: Substance Use in the Study Population	44
3. Screening Tools for Substance Use in Pregnancy	66
4. Phase II Methods: Investigation of the ASSIST in Pregnancy	103
5. Phase II Quantitative Results: Investigation of Use of the	
ASSIST in Pregnancy	125
6. Qualitative Data related to the ASSIST Version 3.0: Questions 2	
through to 7, and their Thematic Analysis	159
7. Conclusions	180

Chapter 1:	Substance Use in Pregnancy	1
	1.1: Impact of Substance Use on Health	1
	1.2: Impacts of Substance Use in Pregnancy	1
	1.2.1: An Historical Perspective	2
	1.2.2: Tobacco	6
	1.2.2.1 Mechanisms of Fetal Harm	9
	1.2.3: Alcohol	11
	1.2.3.1 Mechanisms of Fetal Harm	16
	1.2.4: Cannabis	17
	1.2.4.1 Mechanisms of Fetal Harm	19
	1.2.5: Other Substances	20
	1.3: Prevalence of Substance use in Pregnancy	25
	1.3.1: Australian Data	25
	1.3.2: United States Data	27
	1.3.3: Alcohol Prevalence	30
	1.4: Reduction in Use Associated with Pregnancy	35
	1.5: Screening for Substance Use by Obstetric Care Providers	36
	1.5.1 Interventions Post-Screening: Brief	38

	1.5.2 Interventions Post-Screening: Higher Intensity	39
	1.5.2.1 Motivational Interviewing	39
	1.5.3: Reasons for Lack of Intervention	40
	1.5.2: Current Screening in Antenatal Care	41
Chapter 2:	Phase I Study: Substance Use in the Study Population	44
	2.1: Methods	44
	2.1.1: Questionnaire	44
	2.1.2: Sample Size	45
	2.1.3: Study Duration	46
	2.1.4: Analysis of Data	46
	2.2: Results	47
	2.2.1: Trimester of Pregnancy	52
	2.2.2: Pregnancy History	52
	2.2.3: Age	52
	2.2.4: Hospital Attended	54
	2.3: Parameters Associated with Cessation of Use of Specified Substance	54
	2.4: Medical or Pregnancy-related Complications	56
	2.5: Discussion of Results	60
	2.5.1: Limitations to this Study	63

Chapter 3: Screening Tools for Substance Use in Pregnancy	66
3.1: Screening Tools: Self-Report	66
3.1.1: Alcohol	68
3.1.2: Tobacco	76
3.1.3: Other Substances	80
3.1.3.1: Cannabis	82
3.2: Screening by Using Biological Markers	88
3.2.1: Biomarkers to Detect Use While Pregnant	88
3.2.1.1: Tobacco	89
3.2.1.2: Alcohol	92
3.2.1.3: Cannabis	95
3.3: Conclusions from Review of Screening Tools for Pregnant Women	97
3.4: Recent Developments in the Primary Health Care Sector	98
3.4.1: The ASSIST Version 3.0 (Alcohol, Smoking and Substance Involvement Screening Test)	98
3.4.1.1: The <i>ASSIST</i> Version 3.0 in Primary Health Care Settings	100
3.4.1.2: Decision to Investigate the ASSIST Version 3.0 in Pregnancy	102
Chapter 4: Phase II Methods: Investigation of the ASSIS Version 3.0 in Pregnancy	103
4.1: Hypothesis	103

4.2: Aims of the Study	103
4.3: Methods	103
4.3.1: The ASSIST Version 3.0	103
4.3.2: Concept of Risk in Pregnancy	104
4.3.2.1: Risk to the Fetus	107
4.3.2.2: Risk to the Pregnant Women	108
4.3.3: Investigation of the ASSIST Version 3.0	109
4.3.3.1: Selection of Screening Tools for Co-administration	110
4.3.4: Biomarkers	113
4.3.5: Sample Size	114
4.3.5.1: Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria	115
4.3.6: Sociodemographic Questionnaire	116
4.3.7: Ethics Approval	116
4.4: Recruitment	116
4.4.1: Interview	118
4.5: Statistical Analyses (1): Risk to the fetus	118
4.5.1: Further Consideration of Phase II Sample	120
4.6: Statistical Analyses (2): Risk to the pregnant woman	n 121
4.6.1: Kappa coefficient	121
4.6.2: Bowker's Test of Symmetry	122
4.7: Other Statistical Associations	123

	4.8: Further Exploration of the <i>ASSIST</i> :  Qualitative Analysis	124
Chapter 5:	Phase II Quantitative Results: Investigation of Use of the ASSIST Version 3.0 in Pregnancy	125
	5.1: Analysis of Quantitative Data	126
	5.1.1: Tobacco	126
	5.1.1.1: Statistical Analyses (1): Risk to the fetus	126
	5.1.1.2: Statistical Analyses (2): Risk to the pregnant woman	126
	5.1.2: Alcohol	128
	5.1.2.1: Statistical Analyses (1): Risk to the fetus	128
	5.1.2.1.1: Choice of cut-point on the ROC curve	130
	5.1.2.2: Statistical Analyses (2): Risk to the pregnant woman	134
	5.1.3: Cannabis	136
	5.1.3.1: Statistical Analyses (1): Risk to the fetus	136
	5.1.3.1.1: Choice of cut-point on the ROC curve	138
	5.1.3.2: Statistical Analyses (2): Risk to the pregnant woman	140
	5.1.4: Reconsideration of the ROC analysis for Alcohol in Light of Cannabis Findings	142
	5.1.5: Sociodemographic Factors and ASSIST Version 3.0 Scores	143
	5.1.5.1: Categorization by Ethnicity	144
	5.1.5.2: Categorization by Socioeconomic Status (SES)	145

	5.1.5.3: Sociodemographic Factors as Predictors of the ASSIST Version 3.0 Scores	146
	5.1.5.4: Discussion of Sociodemographic Factors Significantly Predictive of the <i>ASSIST</i> Version 3.0 Scores	152
	5.1.5.5: Further Analyses of the Quantitative Data:  Risk to the Pregnant Women	155
	5.2: Further Results: Tobacco Use by the Phase II Participants	156
Chapter 6:	Qualitative Data related to the ASSIST Version 3.0: Question 2 through to 7, and their Thematic Analysis	159
	6.1 Question 2: In the <u>past three months</u> , how often have you used the substances you mentioned (first drug, second drug, etc)?	159
	6.1.1 Changes Motivated by Pregnancy	159
	6.1.2 Continuing Use, but with Reservations	160
	6.1.3 Affirmation of Reality	160
	6.2 Question 3: During the <u>past three months</u> , how often have you had a strong desire or urge to use (first drug, second drug, etc)?	160
	6.2.1 Situations of substance availability	161
	6.2.2 Stress management	161
	6.2.3 Acknowledged part of drug habit	161
	6.2.4 Enhanced capacity to resist urges	162
	6.3 Question 4: During the <u>past three months</u> , how often has your use of (first drug, second drug, etc) led to health, social, legal or financial problems	162
	6.3.1 Health problems	162
	6.3.2 Social problems	165
	6.3.3 Financial problems	166

6.3.4 Legal problems	166
6.4 Question 5: During the <u>past three months</u> , how often have you failed to do what was normally expected of you because of your use of (first drug, second drug, etc)?	167
6.5 Question 6: Has a friend or relative or anyone else <u>ever</u> expressed concern about your use of (first drug, second drug, etc)?	168
6.5.1 Friends	168
6.5.2 Relatives	169
6.5.3 Anyone Else	170
6.5.4 Response if Negative Response to Question 6 Followed Up	172
6.6 Question 7: <i>Have you <u>ever</u> tried and failed to</i> control, cut down or stop using (first drug, second drug, etc)?	172
6.6.1 No, Never ('tried and failed')	173
6.6.2 Yes, (have tried and failed), in the past 3 months	174
6.6.3 Yes, (have tried and failed), but not in the past 3 months	174
6.7 Discussion on Qualitative Findings	175
6.7.1 Suitability of the Questions to this Cohort	175
6.7.1.1 Question 4	175
6.7.1.2 Question 7	176
6.7.1.3 Question 5	177
6.7.2 The Role of Health Care Providers	177
6.7.3 The 'Quit or Cut Down' Message	178
6.7.4 Discussion on Referral to External Treatment Services	178

Chapter 7: Conclusions	180
7.1 Investigation of the ASSIST Version 3.0 in Pregnancy	180
7.1.1 Limitations of these Analyses	181
7.1.1.1 Analyses of Data on Alcohol Use	183
7.1.1.2 Analyses of Data on Cannabis Use	184
7.1.1.3 Analyses of Data on Tobacco Use	184
7.2 Key Issues Impacting on Screening Pregnant Women for Substance Use	184
7.2.1 Care Provider Intervention	185
7.2.1.1 Barriers to Screening	185
7.2.2 The Veracity of Self-Report	187
7.2.2.1 Possibility of Differential Self-Reporting of Focus Substances	189
7.3 The Way Forward	190
7.3.1 Tobacco Use as a Key Target for Intervention	192
7.3.2 Clinical Utility of <i>ASSIST Version 3.0</i> for Pregnant Women	194

## **Tables**

Phase I Study	
Table 1: Substance use before and during pregnancy: n =748	48
Table 2: Number of Days Tobacco Use/Month during Pregnancy in Relation to Trimester: n=722*	49
Table 3: Maximum Number of Cigarettes /Day during Pregnancy in Relation to Trimester: n = 125*	49
Table 4: Number of Days Alcohol Use/Month during Pregnancy in Relation to Trimester: n=722*	50
Table 5: Maximum Amount of Alcohol Consumed (standard drinks)  /Day during Pregnancy in Relation to Trimester: n = 87*	50
Table 6: Number of Days Cannabis Use/Month during Pregnancy in Relation to Trimester: n=722*	51
Table 7: Maximum Amount of Canabis Consumed (cones or joints)  /Day during Pregnancy in Relation to Trimester: n = 30*	51
Table 8: Substance Use during Pregnancy	53
Table 9: Cessation since Pregnant (Linked to Interview Parameters)	55
Table 10: Reported Pregnancy Complications in Current Pregnancy: Substance Use Last Month and Typical Month Prior to Pregnancy (n=7)	57
Table 11: Reported Complications in any Previous Pregnancy: Substance Use Last Month and Typical Month Prior to Pregnancy (n=35)	58
Phase II Study	
Table 12: Reasons Given for Declining Participation (n=46)	125
Table 13: Agreement between ASSIST Version 3.0 Tobacco	
and <i>RTQ</i> : Risk Groups: n = 98	127
Table 14: Kappa Statistics: The ASSIST Version 3.0 and the RTQ	127
Table 15: ASSIST Version 3.0 and the T-ACE: Dichotomous Risk	

: n = 37

132

Table 16: Relationships between sensitivity, specificity, PPV and NPV	
[shown for the ASSIST Version 3.0 and T-ACE	
(the 'gold standard'): Alcohol]	133
Table 17: Agreement between ASSIST Version 3.0 Alcohol and T-ACE	
Risk Groups: $n = 37$	134
Table 18: Kappa Statistics: the ASSIST Version 3.0 and T-ACE	135
Table 19: Bowker's Test of Symmetry: the ASSIST Version 3 and T-ACE	135
Table 20: ASSIST Version 3.0 and TLFB: Dichotomous Risk: n = 26	139
Table 21: Agreement between <i>ASSIST Version 3.0</i> Cannabis and <i>TLFB</i> risk groups: n = 26	140
Table 22: Kappa Statistics: the ASSIST Version 3.0 and the TLFB	141
Table 23: Bowker's Test of Symmetry: the ASSIST Version 3.0 and the TLFB	141
Table 24: ASSIST Version 3.0 and the T-ACE: Dichotomous Risk (revised): n = 37	143
Table 25: Sociodemographic Factors and <i>ASSIST Version 3.0</i> Tobacco Scores: n = 98	146
Table 26: Sociodemographic Factors and <i>ASSIST Version 3.0</i> Alcohol Scores: n = 37	148
Table 27: Sociodemographic Factors and <i>ASSIST Version 3.0</i> Cannabis Scores: n = 26	150
Table 28: Phase II study: Medical and Pregnancy-related Complication for Tobacco Users in Current Pregnancy; Data Shown Only Complications Associated with Tobacco Use: n = 29	

# **Figures**

Phase II Study	
Figure 1: Dichotomous Risk: <i>T-ACE</i> and <i>ASSIST Version 3.0</i>	
Scores for Alcohol: $n = 37$	128
Figure 2: Dichotomous Risk: TLFB and ASSIST Version 3.0	
Scores for Cannabis: $n = 26$	136
Text Boxes	
Phase II Study	
Text Box 1: Area under the ROC Curve as a Measure of Performance of a Test	119
Text Box 2: Phase I study: Data on Tobacco Use during Pregnancy	121
Text Box 3: Strength of Agreement between two variables based	
on <i>kappa</i> values	122
Text Box 4: Specificity and Sensitivity at Cut-offs (Data Points)	
on the ROC Curve (Alcohol)	129
Text Box 5: Specificity and Sensitivity at Cut-offs (Data Points)	
on the ROC Curve (Cannabis)	137

# **Appendices**

196
197
198
199
202
203
204
210
211
215
217
219
220
222
225

#### **Abstract**

Screening pregnant women for substance use appears unworthy of debate given the harmful impacts on the fetus, pregnancy outcomes, the woman herself and her offspring to adulthood. However while screening is routine for conditions such as impaired glucose control, obstetric care providers are often reluctant to intervene with substance use, citing knowledge deficits and a lack of effective screening tools. General negativity about the value of intervention and stereotypical views of substance users have also been identified. This study examined existing screening tools and investigated the World Health Organization's ASSIST (Alcohol, Smoking and Substance Involvement Screening Test) Version 3.0, focussed on tobacco, alcohol and cannabis, the substances most used in the targetted public hospital clinics. The ASSIST Version 3.0's performance in pregnancy was assessed using a two-pronged harm categorization: risk to the fetus and risk to the woman as an individual user. For the latter, levels of risk concordant with cut-offs for the general population were utilized. The ASSIST Version 3.0 performed only moderately well versus established self-report tools: the Revised Fagerstrom Tolerance Questionnaire (RTQ) for tobacco, the T-ACE for alcohol, and the Timeline FollowBack (TLFB) for cannabis. Most participants used tobacco (98 of 104); predominance of tobacco use was likely linked to the recognized difficulty in stopping, despite cessation of other substances. Kappa analyses of Specific Substance Involvement Scores (SSIS) on ASSIST Version 3.0 for tobacco did not support changing cut-offs for the woman as an individual user; however, ROC curves delineated an SSIS of 4 as indicative of fetal risk for both alcohol and cannabis. As all 98 tobacco users were 'high risk' users, a cut-off indicative of fetal risk for tobacco could not be determined but may be feasible by further research with first trimester women. Identifying tobacco use with an

established tobacco-specific tool should be the first screening for pregnant women. If tobacco use is identified, screening for other substance use can be initiated and there may be a place for the *ASSIST Version 3.0* in that context. Obstetric care providers need to then be willing and competent to address identified use, whilst avoiding unhelpful stereotyping.

**Declaration** 

This work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any

other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution and, to

the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published

or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in

the text.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University

Library, being available for loan and photocopying.

Elizabeth Dorothy Hotham

Date

### **Acknowledgements**

Firstly, I would like thank my supervisors- Robert Ali, Jason White and Jeffrey Robinson- for the privilege of working and interacting with them, leaders in their fields. This research is indebted to the antenatal patients who were willing to share their experiences with me and to the staff at the Women's and Children's Hospital and the Lyell McEwin Hospital who welcomed me into their work environment and encouraged my research.

I would like to acknowledge the continuing interest and support of colleagues at the WHO Collaborating Centre, Discipline of Pharmacology, and the highly effective assistance of staff at the Drug and Alcohol Services Library. I would like to thank Rod Irvine for his support along the way and for Pharmacology staff who have been part of my intellectual journey. I owe thanks to Tom Sullivan in the Discipline of Public Health for all his assistance and for his willingness to cope with the slow dawning of my statistical understanding. I have appreciated my links with my fellow postgraduate students and hope their lives will be happy and fruitful when their current studies are complete.

A special thank you is due to Allan Evans for allowing me time-release from my busy academic life to work on my thesis. To other colleagues at the University of South Australia, who gave me support at different times when I most needed it, thank you.

I am very blessed with friends who have given me their unwavering support and for this I am very grateful. I would like to thank my children and their partners who never seemed to doubt I would get there, and my nephew who has been a constant supporter. And finally to Neil, who having accompanied me through one postgraduate degree, didn't hesitate when I decided to go again. Only you and I know the love and support you have given me in this latest adventure. Thank you.

# Publications in support of this thesis

Hotham E, Ali R, White J, Robinson J (2008), Pregnancy-related changes in tobacco, alcohol and cannabis use reported by antenatal patients at two public hospitals in South Australia, *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology*, 48(3):248-54.