



AN EVIDENCE BRIEF

SUPERVISED CONSUMPTION SITES ARE NECESSARY PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES



University
of Victoria

Canadian Institute for
Substance Use Research



Purpose

This series provides plain language introductions to the evidence supporting critical substance use services and supports, including treatment and harm reduction programs that meet the needs of people who use drugs.

Objectives

- To promote evidence related to essential substance use services.
- To guide decision makers in making policies related to substance use services and supports.

About Co/Lab

Co/Lab is a collaborative network for research and knowledge exchange that aims to promote health and health equity for people who use drugs (including alcohol, other licit, and illicit drugs). Co/Lab activities are guided by collaborations with people who use drugs, families, health care providers, researchers and policy makers, and are focused on generating practical evidence that can be used to enhance substance use services and supporting policies.

Co/Lab is funded by Health Canada's Substance Use and Addictions Program. The views expressed herein do not necessarily represent the views of Health Canada. The views expressed in this brief are solely those of the authors.

Co/Lab Core Team (listed alphabetically)

Kiffer G. Card, PhD

Brittany Graham, MPH

Lacey Mesley, MPH

Bernie Pauly, RN, PhD

Timothy Stockwell, PhD

Heather Strosher, MA

Karen Urbanoski, PhD

Suggested Citation

KG. Card, K. Urbanoski, B. Pauly. (2020) "Supervised Consumption Sites Are Necessary Public Health Services." Canadian Institute for Substance Use Research.





Summary

Supervised consumption sites are being implemented across Canada as one public health measure to reduce the harms associated with substance use, including overdoses and infectious diseases such as HIV/AIDS and Hepatitis C (HCV). However, politically motivated attacks on supervised consumption sites have made it difficult for some policy makers and service providers to support this evidence-based public health intervention. This brief reviews the evidence on supervised consumption sites, with a focus on effectiveness and community impact. A wealth of evidence suggests that supervised consumption sites do reduce overdoses and other substance use harms, connect people with other health services, and reduce unsafe drug use practices. In addition, there is little support for the assertion that supervised consumption sites contribute to social disorder. In fact, there is evidence to suggest that they reduce needle debris and public intoxication. Based on this evidence we urge implementation of supervised consumption sites, and offer several recommendations for effective implementation to improve population health and reduce health inequities.

Background

Between January 2016 and September 2019, more than 14,700 Canadians died from apparent opioid-related overdoses and 19,490 were hospitalized for opioid-related poisonings.¹ Many of these individuals were experts in the use of drugs. Yet, contamination of the drug supply with fentanyl has dramatically increased the risk of dying.^{2,3}

Without a regulated drug supply, there are few methods by which governments can ensure that illicit drugs are safe.⁴ Therefore, pragmatic public health measures are essential to reduce harms arising from drug impurities.^{5,6} Supervised consumption sites are one such measure. The logic of a supervised consumption site is that people using drugs are safer if they use them under the supervision of harm reduction workers (e.g., people with lived experience and/or healthcare providers) who can intervene if they overdose.^{7,8} Supervised consumption sites also ensure that individuals have the necessary equipment to use drugs safely, including injection, inhalation, and smoking supplies.⁹⁻¹¹ These provisions prevent people from resorting to dangerous consumption practices (e.g., using alone in washrooms, sharing and reusing needles or pipes¹²) and allow for the proper disposal of drug paraphernalia.^{13,14}

Political attitudes towards drug use and people who use drugs are one of the main barriers to the successful implementation of supervised consumption sites in Canada.^{15,16} Those who oppose harm reduction generally bristle at the idea that a public health program would not explicitly aim to eliminate substance use.¹⁷ Some argue that illicit substance use is a criminal justice matter, not a public health one, and that supervised consumption sites encourage drug use and increase social disorder.¹⁸⁻²⁰ Others have argued that there is insufficient evidence supporting supervised consumption sites.²¹ Yet, people who use drugs and current research describe these sites as “sanctuaries” and extol their benefits.²²⁻²⁷

Problem Statement

Competing opinions about supervised consumption sites often distract from the evidence, making it increasingly difficult to gain support for opening new sites.²⁸⁻³¹ This brief aims to address this evidence gap in implementation and decision making by clearly outlining what the evidence says about supervised consumption sites and making recommendations regarding their operation.



Evidence Base


Several supervised consumption sites have been established in North America – the first of which opened in Vancouver in 2003. Since that time, a wealth of research has been conducted at these sites.³²⁻³⁹ This research has shown that they reduce overdose deaths, improve access to other forms of health care, and reduce unsafe drug use behaviours.⁴⁰⁻⁴³ They can work in tandem with other harm reduction strategies (such as drug-checking services and take-home naloxone distribution), synergistically leading to positive outcomes for people who use drugs.^{43, 46} For others, they promote connections to withdrawal management services and counselling and medication assisted treatment.⁴⁸⁻⁵¹ They reduce the burden on emergency services.^{44,45} Multiple studies highlight that they are cost effective models for reducing overdose deaths, HIV, and Hepatitis C.⁵⁴⁻⁵⁷ This is consistent with broader analyses showing the cost-effectiveness of harm reduction programs.⁵⁸

Contrary to critics' concerns, supervised consumption sites do not appear to increase or encourage harmful use of drugs.⁵⁹ Most people who use these services report long term, high frequency use of injection drugs and are already at elevated risk for the outcomes that supervised consumption sites aim to address.⁶⁰⁻⁶³ Additionally, supervised consumption sites have actually been linked to improved public order.^{40,59} For example, Leon and colleagues reported that the number of intoxicated individuals in the public decreased by 28% after the opening of a supervised consumption site.⁶⁴ Similarly, Wood and colleagues (2004) reported that the number of people using drugs in public and the number of improperly discarded needles actually decreased after the opening of a supervised consumption site.⁶⁵

Supervised consumption sites are supported by existing evidence. Any supposed premise that there is insufficient support for supervised consumption sites largely rests on the absence of randomized control trials.⁶⁶ However, this is an improper standard given that many evidence-based public health interventions lack randomized control trials due to the ethical implications associated with withholding care in order to create a control group. Based on existing evidence from systematic reviews,^{40,41,59} it would be unethical to withhold these services from those who are at-risk of overdose and other harms of drug use.

The benefits of supervised consumption sites are recognized by numerous expert bodies both in Canada and internationally. Supervised consumption sites have been endorsed by multiple professional associations in Canada, including the Canadian Nurses Association, Registered Nurses Association of Ontario, Canadian Medical Association, Canadian Association of Family Physicians, Canadian Public Health Association, and more. More

specifically, statements released by registered nurses have clearly outlined how supervised consumption services are aligned with and help nurses to enact their professional ethical standards.⁶⁷ Canadian courts have upheld the continued operation of supervised consumption sites.⁶⁸ Finally, the World Health Organization has endorsed them as key public health services in response to HIV and other drug related harms.⁶⁹ From an evidence perspective, there is no controversy that supervised consumption sites are a necessary public health service.





Recommendations

Based on the evidence reviewed here, we urge implementation of supervised consumption sites as an evidence-based approach to reducing morbidity and mortality among people who use drugs. We offer the following recommendations to support the effective operation of supervised consumption sites.

Supervised consumption sites should:

- involve people who use drugs in the design and operation of services;^{70,71}
- have sufficient capacity so as to limit wait times and ensure availability of services throughout the day;⁷²
- establish connections to other community services so that clients are able to access withdrawal management and treatment services,⁷³ and care for HIV, Hepatitis C, and other health conditions;⁷⁴
- provide spaces for multiple forms of drug consumption (e.g., inhalation, injection, smoking);⁷⁵⁻⁷⁷
- provide comfortable, dignified, and fully-equipped spaces for people to consume drugs (e.g., bathrooms, private consumption cubicles);
- use mobile consumption services to ensure that clients are able to access supports regardless of their geographic location;^{78,79} and
- allow for peer-to-peer or provider-client injection assistance.⁸⁰⁻⁸³

Policy makers should:

- ensure that operational activities are not disrupted by policing activities;⁸⁴
- Collaborate with and educate the surrounding community about the benefits of supervised consumption sites in keeping neighbourhoods safe and identify concerns that can be mitigated by changes to operating procedures and practices;⁸⁵ and
- move towards a model of providing access to a safer supply of drugs rather than simply facilitating use of potentially contaminated drugs.⁸⁶⁻⁸⁸



References

1. Special Advisory Committee on the Epidemic of Opioid Overdoses. National report: Opioid-related Harms in Canada Web-based Report. [Internet]. Ottawa: Public Health Agency of Canada; 2019 Dec [cited 2020 Jan 29].
2. Milloy M-JS, Kerr T, Mathias R, Zhang R, Montaner JS, Tyndall M, et al. Non-fatal overdose among a cohort of active injection drug users recruited from a supervised injection facility. *Am J Drug Alcohol Abuse*. 2008;34(4):499–509.
3. Prangnell A, Fairgrieve C, Nosova E, DeBeck K, Milloy M-J, Hayashi K. High Prevalence of Self-Reported Exposure to Adulterated Drugs Among People Who Experienced an Opioid Overdose in Canada. *Subst Use Misuse*. 2019;54(6):980–5.
4. Collins CLC, Kerr T, Tyndall MW, Marsh DC, Kretz PS, Montaner JS, et al. Rationale to evaluate medically supervised safer smoking facilities for non-injection illicit drug users. *Can J Public Health Rev Can Sante Publique*. 2005 Oct;96(5):344–7.
5. Wild TC, Pauly B, Belle-Isle L, Cavalieri W, Elliott R, Strike C, et al. Canadian harm reduction policies: A comparative content analysis of provincial and territorial documents, 2000–2015. *Int J Drug Policy*. 2017;45:9–17.
6. Stancliff S, Phillips BW, Maghsoudi N, Joseph H. Harm Reduction: Front Line Public Health. *J Addict Dis*. 2015;34(2–3):206–19.
7. Wood E, Tyndall MW, Spittal PM, Li K, Kerr T, Hogg RS, et al. Unsafe injection practices in a cohort of injection drug users in Vancouver: could safer injecting rooms help? *CMAJ Can Med Assoc J J Assoc Medicale Can*. 2001 Aug 21;165(4):405–10.
8. Wood E, Kerr T, Spittal PM, Li K, Small W, Tyndall MW, et al. The potential public health and community impacts of safer injecting facilities: evidence from a cohort of injection drug users. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 1999. 2003 Jan 1;32(1):2–8.
9. Strike C, Rotondi NK, Watson TM, Kolla G, Bayoumi AM. Public opinions about supervised smoking facilities for crack cocaine and other stimulants. *Subst Abuse Treat Prev Policy*. 2016 Feb 9;11:8.
10. Voon P, Ti L, Dong H, Milloy M-J, Wood E, Kerr T, et al. Risky and rushed public crack cocaine smoking: the potential for supervised inhalation facilities. *BMC Public Health*. 2016 07;16:476.
11. Bourque S, Pijl EM, Mason E, Manning J, Motz T. Supervised inhalation is an important part of supervised consumption services. *Can J Public Health Rev Can Sante Publique*. 2019;110(2):210–5.
12. Wolfson B, Bennett AS, Elliott L, Curtis R. Drug use in business bathrooms: An exploratory study of manager encounters. *Int J Drug Policy*. 2017;39:69–77.
13. Harris M, Scott J, Hope V, Wright T, McGowan C, Ciccarone D. Navigating environmental constraints to injection preparation: the use of saliva and other alternatives to sterile water among unstably housed PWID in London. *Harm Reduct J*. 2020 Apr 10;17(1):24.

14. Harris M, Scott J, Wright T, Brathwaite R, Ciccarone D, Hope V. Injecting-related health harms and overuse of acidifiers among people who inject heroin and crack cocaine in London: a mixed-methods study. *Harm Reduct J*. 2019 13;16(1):60.
15. Watson TM, Kolla G, van der Meulen E, Dodd Z. Critical studies of harm reduction: Overdose response in uncertain political times. *Int J Drug Policy*. 2020;76:102615.
16. Frydl KJ. The unmaking of "evil": claiming space for rational discourse on US drug policy. *Addict Abingdon Engl*. 2019;114(12):2119–20.
17. Hilton BA, Thompson R, Moore-Dempsey L, Janzen RG. Harm reduction theories and strategies for control of human immunodeficiency virus: a review of the literature. *J Adv Nurs*. 2001 Feb;33(3):357–70.
18. Small D. Fools rush in where angels fear to tread: Playing God with Vancouver's Supervised Injection Facility in the political borderland. *Int J Drug Policy*. 2007 Jan 1;18(1):18–26.
19. Barry CL, Sherman SG, Stone E, Kennedy-Hendricks A, Niederdeppe J, Linden S, et al. Arguments supporting and opposing legalization of safe consumption sites in the U.S. *Int J Drug Policy*. 2019;63:18–22.
20. Smith CBR. Socio-spatial stigmatization and the contested space of addiction treatment: remapping strategies of opposition to the disorder of drugs. *Soc Sci Med* 1982. 2010 Mar;70(6):859–66.
21. May T, Holloway K, Bennett T. The need to broaden and strengthen the evidence base for supervised consumption sites. *Addict*. 2019;114(12):2117–8.
22. Foreman-Mackey A, Bayoumi AM, Miskovic M, Kolla G, Strike C. "It's our safe sanctuary": Experiences of using an unsanctioned overdose prevention site in Toronto, Ontario. *Int J Drug Policy*. 2019;73:135–40.
23. McCann E, Temenos C. Mobilizing Drug Consumption Rooms: inter-place networks and harm reduction drug policy. *Health Place*. 2015 Jan;31:216–23.
24. McNeil R, Small W. "Safer environment interventions": a qualitative synthesis of the experiences and perceptions of people who inject drugs. *Soc Sci Med* 1982. 2014 Apr;106:151–8.
25. Dovey K, Fitzgerald J, Choi Y. Safety becomes danger: dilemmas of drug-use in public space. *Health Place*. 2001 Dec;7(4):319–31.
26. Hunter K, Park JN, Allen ST, Chaulk P, Frost T, Weir BW, et al. Safe and unsafe spaces: Non-fatal overdose, arrest, and receptive syringe sharing among people who inject drugs in public and semi-public spaces in Baltimore City. *Int J Drug Policy*. 2018;57:25–31.
27. Davidson PJ, Lopez AM, Kral AH. Using drugs in un/safe spaces: Impact of perceived illegality on an underground supervised injecting facility in the United States. *Int J Drug Policy*. 2018;53:37–44.
28. Cameron Wild T, Koziel J, Anderson-Baron J, Hathaway J, McCurdy A, Xu X, et al. Media coverage of harm reduction, 2000–2016: A content analysis of tone, topics, and interventions in Canadian print news. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 2019 Dec 1;205:107599.

29. Cruz MF, Patra J, Fischer B, Rehm J, Kalousek K. Public opinion towards supervised injection facilities and heroin-assisted treatment in Ontario, Canada. *Int J Drug Policy*. 2007 Jan;18(1):54–61.
30. McGinty EE, Barry CL, Stone EM, Niederdeppe J, Kennedy-Hendricks A, Linden S, et al. Public support for safe consumption sites and syringe services programs to combat the opioid epidemic. *Prev Med*. 2018;111:73–7.
31. McGinty EE, Stone EM, Kennedy-Hendricks A, Sanders K, Beacham A, Barry CL. U.S. news media coverage of solutions to the opioid crisis, 2013-2017. *Prev Med*. 2019;126:105771.
32. Bouvier BA, Elston B, Hadland SE, Green TC, Marshall BDL. Willingness to use a supervised injection facility among young adults who use prescription opioids non-medically: a cross-sectional study. *Harm Reduct J*. 2017 20;14(1):13.
33. Cortina S, Kennedy MC, Dong H, Fairbairn N, Hayashi K, Milloy M-J, et al. Willingness to use an in-hospital supervised inhalation room among people who smoke crack cocaine in Vancouver, Canada. *Drug Alcohol Rev*. 2018;37(5):645–52.
34. Kennedy MC, Scheim A, Rachlis B, Mitra S, Bardwell G, Rourke S, et al. Willingness to use drug checking within future supervised injection services among people who inject drugs in a mid-sized Canadian city. *Drug Depend*. 2018 01;185:248–52.
35. O’Rourke A, White RH, Park JN, Rodriguez K, Kilkenny ME, Sherman SG, et al. Acceptability of safe drug consumption spaces among people who inject drugs in rural West Virginia. *Harm Reduct J*. 2019 31;16(1):51.
36. Kerr T, Oleson M, Tyndall MW, Montaner J, Wood E. A description of a peer-run supervised injection site for injection drug users. *J Urban Health Bull N Y Acad Med*. 2005 Jun;82(2):267–75.
37. Patterson T, Bharmal A, Padhi S, Buchner C, Gibson E, Lee V. Opening Canada’s first Health Canada-approved supervised consumption sites. *Can J Public Health Rev Can Sante Publique*. 2018;109(4):581–4.
38. Wallace B, Pagan F, Pauly BB. The implementation of overdose prevention sites as a novel and nimble response during an illegal drug overdose public health emergency. *Int J Drug Policy*. 2019;66:64–72.
39. Kennedy-Hendricks A, Bluestein J, Kral AH, Barry CL, Sherman SG. Establishing Sanctioned Safe Consumption Sites in the United States: Five Jurisdictions Moving the Policy Agenda Forward. *Psychiatr Serv Wash DC*. 2019 01;70(4):294–301.
40. Kennedy MC, Karamouzian M, Kerr T. Public Health and Public Order Outcomes Associated with Supervised Drug Consumption Facilities: a Systematic Review. *Curr HIV/AIDS Rep*. 2017 Oct 1;14(5):161–83.
41. Magwood O, Salvalaggio G, Beder M, Kendall C, Kpade V, Daghmach W, et al. The effectiveness of substance use interventions for homeless and vulnerably housed persons: A systematic review of systematic reviews on supervised consumption facilities, managed alcohol programs, and pharmacological agents for opioid use disorder. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(1):e0227298.

42. Tyndall MW. Impact of supervised injection facilities on community HIV levels: a public health perspective. *Expert Rev Anti Infect Ther.* 2003 Dec;1(4):543–9.
43. Irvine MA, Kuo M, Buxton JA, Balshaw R, Otterstatter M, Macdougall L, et al. Modelling the combined impact of interventions in averting deaths during a synthetic-opioid overdose epidemic. *Addict Abingdon Engl.* 2019;114(9):1602–13.
44. Madah-Amiri D, Skulberg AK, Braarud A-C, Dale O, Heyerdahl F, Lobmaier P, et al. Ambulance-attended opioid overdoses: An examination into overdose locations and the role of a safe injection facility. *Subst Abuse.* 2019;40(3):383–8.
45. Salmon AM, van Beek I, Amin J, Kaldor J, Maher L. The impact of a supervised injecting facility on ambulance call-outs in Sydney. *Addict.* 2010 Apr;105(4):676–83.
46. Karamouzian M, Dohoo C, Forsting S, McNeil R, Kerr T, Lysyshyn M. Evaluation of a fentanyl drug checking service for clients of a supervised injection facility, Vancouver, Canada. *Harm Reduct J.* 2018 10;15(1):46.
47. Wood E, Tyndall MW, Montaner JS, Kerr T. Summary of findings from the evaluation of a pilot medically supervised safer injecting facility. *CMAJ Can Med Assoc J J Assoc Medicale Can.* 2006 Nov 21;175(11):1399–404.
48. Tyndall MW, Kerr T, Zhang R, King E, Montaner JG, Wood E. Attendance, drug use patterns, and referrals made from North America's first supervised injection facility. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2006 Jul 27;83(3):193–8.
49. Wood E, Tyndall MW, Zhang R, Montaner JSG, Kerr T. Rate of detoxification service use and its impact among a cohort of supervised injecting facility users. *Addict Abingdon Engl.* 2007 Jun;102(6):916–9.
50. Kennedy MC, Klassen DC, Dong H, Milloy M-JS, Hayashi K, Kerr TH. Supervised Injection Facility Utilization Patterns: A Prospective Cohort Study in Vancouver, Canada. *Am J Prev Med.* 2019;57(3):330–7.
51. Vipler S, Hayashi K, Milloy M-J, Wood E, Nosova E, Kerr T, et al. Use of withdrawal management services among people who use illicit drugs in Vancouver, Canada. *Subst Abuse Treat Prev Policy.* 2018 05;13(1):27.
52. Milloy M-JS, Kerr T, Zhang R, Tyndall M, Montaner J, Wood E. Inability to access addiction treatment and risk of HIV infection among injection drug users recruited from a supervised injection facility. *J Public Health Oxf Engl.* 2010 Sep;32(3):342–9.
53. Kerr T, Stoltz J-A, Tyndall M, Li K, Zhang R, Montaner J, et al. Impact of a medically supervised safer injection facility on community drug use patterns: a before and after study. *BMJ.* 2006 Jan 28;332(7535):220–2.
54. Jozaghi E, Vancouver Area Network of Drug Users. A cost-benefit/cost-effectiveness analysis of an unsanctioned supervised smoking facility in the Downtown Eastside of Vancouver, Canada. *Harm Reduct J.* 2014 Nov 13;11(1):30.

55. Jozaghi E, Reid AA, Andresen MA, Juneau A. A cost-benefit/cost-effectiveness analysis of proposed supervised injection facilities in Ottawa, Canada. *Subst Abuse Treat Prev Policy*. 2014 Aug 4;9:31.
56. Hood JE, Behrends CN, Irwin A, Schackman BR, Chan D, Hartfield K, et al. The projected costs and benefits of a supervised injection facility in Seattle, WA, USA. *Int J Drug Policy*. 2019;67:9–18.
57. Behrends CN, Paone D, Nolan ML, Tuazon E, Murphy SM, Kapadia SN, et al. Estimated impact of supervised injection facilities on overdose fatalities and healthcare costs in New York City. *J Subst Abuse Treat*. 2019 Nov;106:79–88.
58. Wilson DP, Donald B, Shattock AJ, Wilson D, Fraser-Hurt N. The cost-effectiveness of harm reduction. *Int J Drug Policy*. 2015 Feb;26 Suppl 1:S5-11.
59. Potier C, Lapr evote V, Dubois-Arber F, Cottencin O, Rolland B. Supervised injection services: what has been demonstrated? A systematic literature review. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 2014 Dec 1;145:48–68.
60. Kerr T, Tyndall MW, Zhang R, Lai C, Montaner JSG, Wood E. Circumstances of first injection among illicit drug users accessing a medically supervised safer injection facility. *Am J Public Health*. 2007 Jul;97(7):1228–30.
61. Wood E, Tyndall MW, Li K, Lloyd-Smith E, Small W, Montaner JSG, et al. Do supervised injecting facilities attract higher-risk injection drug users? *Am J Prev Med*. 2005 Aug;29(2):126–30.
62. Bravo MJ, Royuela L, De la Fuente L, Brugal MT, Barrio G, Domingo-Salvany A, et al. Use of supervised injection facilities and injection risk behaviours among young drug injectors. *Addict Abingdon Engl*. 2009 Apr;104(4):614–9.
63. Hadland SE, DeBeck K, Kerr T, Nguyen P, Simo A, Montaner JS, et al. Use of a Medically Supervised Injection Facility Among Street Youth. *J Adolesc Health*. 2014 Nov 1;55(5):684–9.
64. Le on C, Cardoso LJP, Johnston S, Mackin S, Bock B, Gaeta JM. Changes in public order after the opening of an overdose monitoring facility for people who inject drugs. *Int J Drug Policy*. 2018;53:90–5.
65. Wood E, Kerr T, Small W, Li K, Marsh DC, Montaner JSG, et al. Changes in public order after the opening of a medically supervised safer injecting facility for illicit injection drug users. *CMAJ*. 2004 Sep 28;171(7):731–4.
66. Belackova V, Salmon AM, Jauncey M, Day CA. Safer injecting facilities-is the research there? A comment on Caulkins et al. (2019). *Addict Engl*. 2020;115(4):784–5.
67. Lightfoot B, Panessa C, Hayden S, Thumath M, Goldstone I, Pauly B. Gaining insight: harm reduction in nursing practice. *Can Nurse*. 2009;105(4):16-22.
68. Canada (Attorney General) v. PHS Community Services Society, 2011 SCC 44, [2011] 3 S.C.R. 134
69. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, International Network of People Who Use Drugs, Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS, United Nations Development Programme, United Nations Population Fund, World Health Organization, United States Agency for International Development. Implementing comprehensive HIV and HCV programmes with people who inject drugs: practical

guidance for collaborative interventions. Vienna: United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime; 2017. World Health Organization. Implementing Comprehensive HIV and HCV Programmes with People Who Inject Drugs. Practical Guidance for Collaborative interventions.

70. Mitra S, Rachlis B, Scheim A, Bardwell G, Rourke SB, Kerr T. Acceptability and design preferences of supervised injection services among people who inject drugs in a mid-sized Canadian City. *Harm Reduct J*. 2017 14;14(1):46.
71. Young S, Fairbairn N. Expanding supervised injection facilities across Canada: lessons from the Vancouver experience. *Can J Public Health*. 2018;109(2):227–30.
72. Petrar S, Kerr T, Tyndall MW, Zhang R, Montaner JSG, Wood E. Injection drug users' perceptions regarding use of a medically supervised safer injecting facility. *Addict Behav*. 2007 May;32(5):1088–93.
73. Gaddis A, Kennedy MC, Nosova E, Milloy M-J, Hayashi K, Wood E, et al. Use of on-site detoxification services co-located with a supervised injection facility. *J Subst Abuse Treat*. 2017;82:1–6.
74. Fernando S, McNeil R, Closson K, Samji H, Kirkland S, Strike C, et al. An integrated approach to care attracts people living with HIV who use illicit drugs in an urban centre with a concentrated HIV epidemic. *Harm Reduct J*. 2016 22;13(1):31.
75. Watson TM, Strike C, Kolla G, Penn R, Jairam J, Hopkins S, et al. Design considerations for supervised consumption facilities (SCFs): preferences for facilities where people can inject and smoke drugs. *Int J Drug Policy*. 2013 Mar;24(2):156–63.
76. Collins CLC, Kerr T, Kuyper LM, Li K, Tyndall MW, Marsh DC, et al. Potential uptake and correlates of willingness to use a supervised smoking facility for non-injection illicit drug use. *J Urban Health Bull N Y Acad Med*. 2005 Jun;82(2):276–84.
77. DeBeck K, Buxton J, Kerr T, Qi J, Montaner J, Wood E. Public crack cocaine smoking and willingness to use a supervised inhalation facility: implications for street disorder. *Subst Abuse Treat Prev Policy*. 2011 Feb 23;6:4.
78. Mema SC, Frosst G, Bridgeman J, Drake H, Dolman C, Lappalainen L, et al. Mobile supervised consumption services in Rural British Columbia: lessons learned. *Harm Reduct J*. 2019 10;16(1):4.
79. DelVillano S, de Groh M, Morrison H, Do MT. Supervised Injection Services: a community-based response to the opioid crisis in the City of Ottawa, Canada. *Health Promot Chronic Dis Prev Can Res Policy Pract*. 2019 Mar;39(3):112–5.
80. Kolla G, Kenny KS, Bannerman M, Boyce N, Chapman L, Dodd Z, et al. Help me fix: The provision of injection assistance at an unsanctioned overdose prevention site in Toronto, Canada. *Int J Drug Policy*. 2020;76:102617.
81. Salmon AM, Dwyer R, Jauncey M, van Beek I, Topp L, Maher L. Injecting-related injury and disease among clients of a supervised injecting facility. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 2009 Apr 1;101(1–2):132–6.

82. Olding M, Werb D, Guise A, Small W, McNeil R. Navigating social norms of injection initiation assistance during an overdose crisis: A qualitative study of the perspectives of people who inject drugs (PWID). *Int J Drug Policy*. 2019;69:24–33.
83. Fairbairn N, Small W, Van Borek N, Wood E, Kerr T. Social structural factors that shape assisted injecting practices among injection drug users in Vancouver, Canada: a qualitative study. *Harm Reduct J*. 2010 Aug 31;7:20.
84. Watson TM, Bayoumi AM, Hopkins S, Wright A, Naraine R, Khorasheh T, et al. Creating and sustaining cooperative relationships between supervised injection services and police: A qualitative interview study of international stakeholders. *Int J Drug Policy*. 2018;61:1–6.
85. Roth AM, Kral AH, Mitchell A, Mukherjee R, Davidson P, Lankenau SE. Overdose Prevention Site Acceptability among Residents and Businesses Surrounding a Proposed Site in Philadelphia, USA. *J Urban Health*. 2019 Jun;96(3):341–52.
86. Saulle R, Vecchi S, Gowing L. Supervised dosing with a long-acting opioid medication in the management of opioid dependence. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2017 Apr 27;4:CD011983.
87. Gartry CC, Oviedo-Joekes E, Laliberté N, Schechter MT. NAOMI: The trials and tribulations of implementing a heroin assisted treatment study in North America. *Harm Reduct J*. 2009 Jan 21;6:2.
88. Bansback N, Guh D, Oviedo-Joekes E, Brissette S, Harrison S, Janmohamed A, et al. Cost-effectiveness of hydromorphone for severe opioid use disorder: findings from the SALOME randomized clinical trial. *Addict Abingdon Engl*. 2018;113(7):1264–73.

