



<b>Title</b>	Development and process evaluation of an educational intervention for overdose prevention and naloxone distribution by general practice trainees
<b>Authors(s)</b>	Klimas, Jan, Egan, Mairead, Tobin, Helen, Coleman, Neil, Bury, Gerard
<b>Publication date</b>	2015-11
<b>Publication information</b>	Klimas, Jan, Mairead Egan, Helen Tobin, Neil Coleman, and Gerard Bury. "Development and Process Evaluation of an Educational Intervention for Overdose Prevention and Naloxone Distribution by General Practice Trainees." BioMed Central, November 2015. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-015-0487-y">https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-015-0487-y</a> .
<b>Publisher</b>	BioMed Central
<b>Item record/more information</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/10197/7355">http://hdl.handle.net/10197/7355</a>
<b>Publisher's version (DOI)</b>	10.1186/s12909-015-0487-y

Downloaded 2026-05-01 23:34:03

The UCD community has made this article openly available. Please share how this access benefits you. Your story matters! (@ucd\_oa)



© Some rights reserved. For more information

**Development and Process Evaluation of an Educational  
Intervention for Overdose Prevention and Naloxone  
Distribution by General Practice Trainees**

Jan Klimas, PhD<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Mairead Egan, BA<sup>1</sup>, Helen Tobin, BA<sup>1</sup>, Neil Coleman, HDip EMT-A<sup>1</sup>,  
Gerard Bury, MD<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Centre for Emergency Medical Science, School of Medicine and Medical Science, University  
College Dublin, Ireland

<sup>2</sup> British Columbia Centre for Excellence in HIV/AIDS, St. Paul's Hospital, 608 – 1081 Burrard  
Street, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, V6Z 1Y6

*Keywords:* overdose, feasibility study, naloxone, heroin, education, general practice

*Acknowledgement:* Work on this project was supported by the Research & Education Foundation grant from the Irish College of General Practitioners. We thank the members of the Naloxone Advisory Group.

\*c/o Coombe Family Practice, Dolphins barn, Dublin 8. E-mail: [jan.klimas@ucd.ie](mailto:jan.klimas@ucd.ie), Telephone:  
014730893, Fax: 014544469.

**2851 words, 3 Tables, 1 Figure (Article)**

**254 words (Abstract)**

*Email addresses:*

JK: [jan.klimas@ucd.ie](mailto:jan.klimas@ucd.ie)

ME: [mairead.egan@ucd.ie](mailto:mairead.egan@ucd.ie)

HT: [helen.tobin@ucd.ie](mailto:helen.tobin@ucd.ie)

NC: [neil.coleman@ucd.ie](mailto:neil.coleman@ucd.ie)

GB: [gerard.bury@ucd.ie](mailto:gerard.bury@ucd.ie)

2           **Development and Process Evaluation of an Educational Intervention for Overdose**  
3                           **Prevention and Naloxone Distribution by General Practice Trainees**

4   **Abstract**

5   **Background:** Overdose is the most common cause of fatalities among opioid users. Naloxone is  
6 a life-saving medication for reverting opioid overdose. In Ireland, it is currently available to  
7 ambulance and emergency care services but General Practitioners (GP) are in regular contact  
8 with opioid users and their families. This positions them to provide naloxone themselves or to  
9 instruct patients how to use it. The new Clinical Practice Guidelines of the Pre-hospital  
10 Emergency Council of Ireland allows trained bystanders to administer intranasal naloxone.  
11 We describe the development and process evaluation of an educational intervention, designed to  
12 help GP trainees identify and manage opioid overdose with intranasal naloxone.

13 **Results:** Knowledge of the risks of overdose, characteristics of overdose and appropriate actions  
14 to be taken increased significantly post-training [OOKS mean difference, 4.65 (standard  
15 deviation 4.13);  $P < 0.001$ ]; attitudes improved too [OOAS mean difference, 11.13 (SD 6.38);  
16  $P < 0.001$ ]. The most and least useful delivery methods were simulation and video, respectively.

17 **Methods:** Participants (N=23) from one postgraduate training scheme in Ireland participated in a  
18 one-hour training session. The repeated-measures design, using the validated Opioid Overdose  
19 Knowledge (OOKS) and Attitudes (OOAS) Scales, examined changes immediately after  
20 training. Acceptability and satisfaction with training were measured with a self-administered  
21 questionnaire.

22 **Conclusion.** Appropriate training is a key requirement for distribution of naloxone through  
23 general practice. In future studies, the knowledge from this pilot will be used to inform a train-

24 the-trainer model, whereby healthcare professionals and other front-line service providers will be  
25 trained to instruct opioid users and their families in overdose prevention and naloxone use.

26

27 *Keywords:* overdose, feasibility study, naloxone, heroin, education,

28 general practice

29

30           **Development and Process Evaluation of an Educational Intervention for Overdose**  
31           **Prevention and Naloxone Distribution by General Practice Trainees**

32

33   **Background**

34   Overdose is the most common cause of death among opioid users and its prevention and  
35   management are thus priorities for healthcare agencies [1]. Europe has on average 17 drug-  
36   related deaths per million people (15–64 years) per year, varying from country to country [2].  
37   With 70 drug-related deaths per million, Ireland has the third highest rate in Europe [2, 3].  
38   Ambulance services in Dublin attend to an opioid overdose every day [4]. The use of the opioid  
39   antagonist, naloxone, is well recognised as an effective treatment for opioid overdose, and  
40   constitutes standard medical treatment in such situations. However, to prevent death, naloxone  
41   must be given very soon after the opioid has caused respiratory depression or arrest [5]. To date,  
42   naloxone has generally been used in injectable form, given via intramuscular, intravenous or  
43   intraosseous routes. A number of systems to introduce naloxone to families, buddies and drug  
44   workers have been established in countries other than Ireland and report positive effects [1, 6, 7].  
45   Ireland currently has no such systems.

46   Bystanders, specifically frontline service providers, peers or family members of opioid users, are  
47   best positioned to intervene immediately, when symptoms of overdose first appear [8]. General  
48   Practitioners (GP) in Ireland are also in regular contact with opioid users (and their families)  
49   either via methadone maintenance treatment or other medical services in general practice. This  
50   access should allow GPs to provide naloxone themselves or to instruct patients or family  
51   members on how to use it. However, no structured provision of naloxone exists in Irish general  
52   practice and previous research elsewhere has shown that GPs lack skills and knowledge

53 regarding naloxone administration and require more training [9]. Our preliminary work  
54 suggested this training should include elements of the ‘Clinical Practice Guidelines (CPG)  
55 approved by the Pre-Hospital Emergency Care Council of Ireland in October 2013 (Emergency  
56 First Response)’, specifically initiating contact with emergency services, cardio-pulmonary  
57 resuscitation (CPR), and the administration of intranasal naloxone (INN) [10, 11]. However, the  
58 feasibility and acceptability of such training for GPs has not been previously reported. Therefore,  
59 the current study aimed:

- 60 - To develop an educational intervention that enables doctors in specialist training for GP  
61 to support bystander response to overdose (i.e., initiating contact with emergency  
62 services, CPR, etc.), and the administration of intranasal naloxone (INN),
- 63 - To determine the potential feasibility, acceptability and usefulness of this training to  
64 trainee GPs.

65

66

## Methods

67 **Design, sample and intervention.** Ireland’s population of 4.6m is served by approximately  
68 2,600 GPs; around 160 doctors enter one of 14 specialist-training programmes in GP each year.  
69 Each programme is accredited nationally and follows a standard four-year programme, the final  
70 two years of which are spent in supervised training practices. Participants (N=23) from the  
71 Dublin Mid Leinster Specialist Training Programme in GP, affiliated with University College  
72 Dublin in Ireland, were invited to participate in a one-hour training session. All accepted and  
73 took part in the study voluntarily. They were currently based in a designated training general  
74 practice, under the supervision of an accredited GP trainer.

75

76 Most practices were in Dublin (43%), with 1000 or more patients on their General Medical  
77 Services list (The GMS is a government subsidised health plan providing free point of care  
78 primary care and medicines for those on low incomes); only six practices (26%) prescribed  
79 methadone.

80 Most practices had one to three full-time GPs (16, 70%) and one to four part-time GPs (15,  
81 83%). More than half of the practices had a practice nurse. Trainees were on average 25-34 years  
82 old (91%), and mostly female (78%). Eight (35%) were trained methadone prescribers and 11  
83 (48%) have witnessed an opioid overdose (Table 1).

84

85 <insert Table 1 here>

#### 86 **Ethical considerations / Adherence to the International guidelines**

87 The Irish College of General Practitioners Research Ethics Committee approved this study  
88 (August 27<sup>th</sup>, 2014). Research carried out on humans in this study is in compliance with the  
89 Helsinki Declaration (<http://www.wma.net/en/30publications/10policies/b3/index.html>). This  
90 study adheres to the RATS guidelines on qualitative research

91 (<http://www.biomedcentral.com/ifora/rats>). We informed the trainees about the study and  
92 consented them to participate one week before the educational session. Our convenience sample  
93 is likely to be representative of the national profile of doctors in specialist training for GP.

94

#### 95 **Development of the educational session**

96 The educational session was developed as part of an evolving system of lay delivered INN. The  
97 key components of the system include:

- 98 1. One-year prospective audit of characteristics of opioid overdoses reported to ambulance  
99 services in Dublin [4, 12], and
- 100 2. Development and implementation of CPG-led lay administration of naloxone [13].
- 101 3. Exploration of mechanisms for roll-out of naloxone by registered Medical Practitioners,  
102 since it remains a prescription-only drug in Ireland.

103

104 As a first step, a national Naloxone Advisory Group was established. Secondly, a literature  
105 review on care options determined intervention of choice – – while the intranasal formulation  
106 appears to address safety, efficacy and utility criteria, it has not yet been approved by the Irish  
107 Department of Health for general use; intramuscular naloxone is currently available for  
108 prescription by doctors. However, an INN formulation is likely to become available in coming  
109 months and training oriented to INN was identified as the longer-term goal of the initiative. Our  
110 subsequent steps followed the Medical Research Council’s (MRC) framework, which advocates  
111 core phases in the development of health services interventions: preclinical, theoretical,  
112 modelling, exploratory trial, definitive trial and long-term implementation [14].

113

114 In the preclinical stage of the intervention development, we identified a need and targets for  
115 naloxone distribution by geo-locating the urban overdose hotspots – areas with high rates of  
116 overdoses [4]. They helped us to concentrate our efforts on general/ addiction care services in  
117 inner city, Dublin. The subsequent modelling phase formulated clinical practice guidelines  
118 (CPG). The Pre-hospital Emergency Care Council of Ireland approved it in October 2013  
119 (PHECC, i.e., the Statutory Regulator for Pre-Hospital Emergency Care in Ireland). UCD  
120 emergency medical science centre concurrently collaborated with PHECC and the Naloxone

121 Advisory Group to develop and pilot an educational session led by the guidelines. The guidelines  
122 allow for training of lay people and health professionals in overdose prevention and naloxone  
123 use, subject to previous CPR training.

124 Naloxone training in isolation is not considered best practice [15], and as such, should be  
125 provided as an overall emergency care package which includes Basic Life Support (BLS) skills  
126 training. There are two BLS levels prescribed by PHECC:

- 127 - Cardiac First Response - Community (CFR)
- 128 - Cardiac First Response - Advanced (CFR-A)

129  
130 All trainees were required to achieve the CFR standard as a prerequisite of the session (already  
131 held by all participants). After completion of this pilot study, the session will be evaluated with a  
132 group of community health professionals. Data from this feasibility evaluation will inform  
133 design of the final stage of development of the national implementation of the INN distribution.

134

### 135 **Content and delivery of the educational session**

136 We based the intervention on our previous work, pre-implementation assessments from Scotland  
137 and training of family members to manage heroin overdose and administer naloxone in England  
138 [6]. More specifically, factors enabling naloxone distribution and use were incorporated:

139 evidence of effectiveness, appropriate training, and developing a policy regulation – the CPG –  
140 that would allow intranasal administration [9, 16]. The intervention was facilitated by:

- 141 - a small group session,
- 142 - a practical exercise,

- 143 - a video clip using content from: a) the family work from England, and  
144 - b) the introduction of take-home IN naloxone within National Health Service (NHS)  
145 Highland [16], and  
146 - an anonymous evaluation/ feedback.

147

148

149 The video clip ensured fidelity and consistency of the information distribution. This was an  
150 evidence-based methodology in emergency care training, used with emergency services globally  
151 [17]. Multi-media theory was reinforced at each stage with practical application and exercises.

152 The video was three minutes long and its headings included:

- 153 - Recognition of overdose,  
154 - Assembly of the drug administration system,  
155 - INN administration.

156

157 The educational session was delivered by two facilitators in a group setting, and took  
158 approximately 45 minutes. It was held in the medical school. A manual for the trainers was  
159 developed before delivery of the session in collaboration with the Naloxone Advisory Group,  
160 formed in the pre-clinical stages  
161 ([http://drugs.ie/features/feature/naloxone\\_the\\_welsh\\_experience](http://drugs.ie/features/feature/naloxone_the_welsh_experience)).

162 The aims of the educational session, described in the current study, were to ensure that GP  
163 trainees had the skills to manage an overdose (i.e., initiating contact with emergency services,

164 CPR, using INN and acquired sufficient knowledge, understanding and motivation to be willing  
165 to undertake INN distribution and training. The key learning outcomes of the educational session  
166 were to teach GPs how to i) recognise opioid overdose, ii) assemble INN, and iii) administer  
167 INN (Figure 1).

168 <insert Figure 1 here>

169

### 170 **Data collection**

171

172 A repeated-measures design, using the validated Opioid Overdose Knowledge (OOKS) and  
173 Attitudes (OOAS) Scales, examined changes immediately before and after the training.

174 Acceptability and satisfaction with training were measured with a self-administered  
175 questionnaire (acceptability of the session, learning needs and suggested improvements).

176

177 OOKS has 45 items organised in four sub-scales (risks, signs, actions and naloxone use, range 0-  
178 45). The OOAS has 28 items grouped in three sub-scales (competence, concerns and readiness,  
179 range 28-140). Both scales were developed and psychometrically evaluated with a convenient  
180 sample of friends and family members of heroin users and healthcare professionals in England.

181 Both OOKS and OOAS were shown internally reliable (Cronbach's alpha = 0.83 and 0.90,  
182 respectively). Retest after 14 days also showed fair-to-excellent values (OOKS, ICC = 0.90 and  
183 OOAS, ICC = 0.82). Professionals scored significantly higher on both scales than family  
184 members [18]. We changed two questions about needles and deleted two items about injecting  
185 naloxone in the attitudes scale (new range 26-130).

186

187 *Acceptability* of the session to trainees was assessed with open-ended questions that asked  
188 trainees to write what was good or bad about each of the five training delivery methods. The  
189 trainees rated each session based on its usefulness (5-point Likert scales); the rating scales were  
190 taken from our previous study [19].

191

## 192 **Data analysis**

193 The means and standard deviations (SD) for perceived changes in knowledge and attitudes pre-  
194 /post-training were calculated and compared using non-parametric Wilcoxon Paired Signed-  
195 Rank Tests (IBM SPSS, version 20). For usefulness, the scores from the Likert scales were  
196 added together; the means and standard deviations (SD) calculated. Answers to open-ended  
197 questions were content analysed; similar responses were grouped and number of responses  
198 counted.

199

200

## **Results**

### 201 **Pre-training and post-training knowledge**

202 The educational session elicited significant changes in all four knowledge categories (i.e., risks,  
203 signs, actions and use of naloxone, see Table 2). Furthermore, the median composite knowledge  
204 score increased from 28 pre-training to 32 post-training ( $p < 0.001$ ).

205

<insert Table 2>

206

### 207 **Skills**

208 All participants were directly observed to have acquired the skills needed to assemble and  
209 effectively deliver the correct dose of naloxone, in a safe manner. All delivered INN using the  
210 standard patient assessment method taught, rather than as an isolated intervention.

211

### 212 **Pre-training and post-training attitudes**

213 There was a significant increase in all three categories (competencies, concerns and readiness) of  
214 positive attitudes towards overdose management (Table 2). The median composite score for  
215 attitudes increased from 96 pre-training to 108 post-training ( $p < 0.001$ ).

216

### 217 **Evaluation of the educational session**

218 The group mean for the session's usefulness score was 21.9 (out of 25); the most and the least  
219 useful delivery methods were simulation and video, respectively (see Table 3).

220 <insert Table 3 here>

221

222 Most of the participants (74%) felt their questions were answered and saw a potential for the  
223 INN or overdose prevention in their training practice. The part of the presentation that trainees  
224 liked the most was that it "*Provided answers to the questions I had just asked*". It could have  
225 been "*less rushed, more interactive*."

226 In the video, the trainees were able to "*actually see the device [Mucosal Atomiser Device]*". The  
227 sound could be improved. During the practical simulation it was "*helpful to see how easy it is*  
228 [*administration*]". More time could be spent on this. The trainees perceived the small-group  
229 discussion as an "*opportunity to ask questions*". One commented, "*Would be nice to discuss*  
230 *pros/cons of lay people having naloxone and where GP would avail of it.*"

231 Finally, trainees were given an opportunity to comment on their educational needs or provide  
232 suggestions for improvement of the session (Table 3). Several wanted more examples or real life  
233 situations to play with and two other trainees wished for more time or booster sessions: “*Very*  
234 *quick session so difficult to fully answer all Q's [questions], however, very useful and would*  
235 *definitely allow us/help us to know what to do in OD setting.*”

236

237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258

## Discussion

This educational session, informed by a Clinical Practice Guideline (CPG), has significantly improved knowledge of and positive attitudes towards overdose management among GP trainees. Most useful components of the training were simulation, presentation and group discussion, with trainees appreciating the opportunity to ask questions.

Our findings are consistent with the literature which highlights the effectiveness of education in improving knowledge of and attitudes towards overdose management [20]. Other studies successfully trained opioid users [5], their families or friends [6], needle exchange workers [21], staff in addiction clinics [22], police and fire-fighters [23]. The various lengths and formats of training reported in this literature suggests that less training may be needed than we thought [24]; for instance, participants in a recent UK trial saved a comparable number of people with naloxone regardless of whether they received the full training or information only (five vs three controls), over a three months follow up [6]. Our training produced slightly higher changes in positive attitudes, compared to the UK trial, it was linked with greater competence and confidence, but we could not demonstrate impact on the provider behaviour in an overdose situation. The changes in the attitudes towards and willingness to intervene in an opioid overdose suggest that our trainees would have used naloxone should they be provided with a take-home dose.

259 The feasibility and acceptability of our session for medical trainees were comparable with  
260 previous research in other groups [22, 23, 25, 26]. In this study, some aspects of the educational  
261 session were more helpful than has been reported in previous literature, *i.e.* hands-on experience  
262 with materials and access of GPs to INN kit [27].

263

264 Similar to previous initiatives developing and evaluating complex health interventions, the  
265 framework of Medical Research Council was efficiently applied to pilot-test a model for lay  
266 delivered IN naloxone for opioid overdose among drug users [28-30]. Intervention developed in  
267 this modelling phase built upon the hotspots mapping and qualitative exercises conducted in the  
268 pre-clinical stages [4, 12, 31].

269

270 The focus of the training developed in this pilot project was on intranasal naloxone and general  
271 practice (GP). This hasn't been done before. While the target population of the training was  
272 unusual, GP trainees clearly demonstrated improved skill, knowledge and willingness to  
273 intervene in a possible opioid overdose. Recognising this implication should shift our thinking  
274 about the role of GPs in the management and prevention of overdoses. In the literature, GPs tend  
275 to be overlooked as a possible training/ distribution avenue. This route may be a unique  
276 component of a national roll out of the naloxone strategy [32], and, as evident in our findings,  
277 one acceptable to primary health care professionals themselves. The decision to focus the  
278 educational session on the GP trainees was influenced mainly by a recent Scottish pre-  
279 implementation study [9], and the frequent contact that GPs have with patients in methadone  
280 maintenance treatment in Ireland [33], or elsewhere [34]. The Scottish pre-implementation study  
281 indicated that general practice may be a viable route for distributing naloxone in the community;

282 while half of the GPs were unsure about GP-based naloxone, the other half were willing to  
283 provide this drug to family or buddies of opioid users.

284

285 Intranasal naloxone (INN) is a needleless, safe and effective alternative to intramuscular  
286 formulations [10, 11, 35-37]. The next studies should use the INN for training and distribution,  
287 especially because of its safety for both bystanders (e.g. reduced fear of injury), and for opioid  
288 users (e.g. less suspicion from police if naloxone found). The challenge for future research and  
289 education is also to incorporate the INN training into medical education and engage other groups  
290 of service providers and clients to use INN and to prevent overdoses.

291

292 The current study is limited in several ways. Our findings are not generalizable to the larger  
293 population of GPs involved in addiction treatment. The GP trainees participated voluntarily, and  
294 were not obliged to take part in the training or to apply their learning in practice. Our core focus  
295 on application of a validated framework for development of health services interventions (MRC),  
296 together with the repeated-measures design, suggests a convincing potential value of the  
297 intervention for evaluation in future studies.

298

299

### **Conclusion**

300

301 General practice trainees can be trained to support bystander response to overdose with  
302 intranasal naloxone. Appropriate training is a key requirement for distribution of naloxone  
303 through general practice. In future studies, our educational session should be used to inform a  
304 train-the-trainer model, whereby healthcare professionals and other frontline service providers

305 will be trained to instruct opioid users and their families in overdose prevention and naloxone  
306 use. If feasible, such research can expand the role of general practice in the management of  
307 opioid overdose and distribution of naloxone to opioid users, buddies, families, frontline service  
308 providers and other professions.

309

310 **Abbreviations**

311 INN = Intranasal naloxone

312 GP = General Practice

313 MRC = Medical Research Council

314 OOKS = Opioid Overdose Knowledge Scale

315 OOAS = Opioid Overdose Attitudes Scale

316 SD = Standard Deviation

317 CPG = Clinical Practice Guidelines

318 CPR = cardio-pulmonary resuscitation

319 PHECC = The Pre-hospital Emergency Care Council of Ireland

320 UCD = University College Dublin

321 BLS = Basic Life Support

322 CFR= Cardiac First Response - Community (CFR)

323 CFR-A = Cardiac First Response - Advanced (CFR-A)

324 NHS = National Health Service

325 ICC =Intracluster correlation coefficient

326

327 **Availability of Supporting Data**

328 None.

329 **Competing interests**

330 None reported.

331 **Authors' contributions**

332 GB and JK designed the study. ME, HT, GB and JK composed the training manual and  
333 study instruments. HT and ME organized the session. GB and NC delivered the educational  
334 session. HT and JK entered data for analyses. JK conducted the statistical analyses. JK drafted  
335 the first draft of manuscript and incorporated suggestions from all coauthors. All authors have  
336 read and approved the final version of the article.

337 **Acknowledgements**

338 The authors wish to thank study participants and colleagues from UCD CEMS, Daragh  
339 O'Neil, Mary Headon, for help with organisation, the Ana Liffey Drug Project (ALDP), the  
340 'SafetyNet' Primary Care Network, and the Naloxone Advisory Group.

341

342 Work on this paper was supported by grants from the Irish College of General  
343 Practitioners, the Health Research Board of Ireland (Grant ID: HRA-HSR-2012-14), the Irish  
344 Research Council, Government of Ireland 'New Foundations' Scheme 2013 (PINTA-TOUR),  
345 and "ELEVATE: Irish Research Council International Career Development Fellowship – co-  
346 funded by Marie Cure Actions (ELEVATEPD/2014/6)".

347

348

349

350 **References**

- 351 1. Walley AY, Xuan Z, Hackman HH, Quinn E, Doe-Simkins M, Sorensen-Alawad A, Ruiz  
352 S, Ozonoff A: **Opioid overdose rates and implementation of overdose education and**  
353 **nasal naloxone distribution in Massachusetts: interrupted time series analysis.** *BMJ*  
354 2013, **346**.
- 355 2. EMCDDA: **Overall reduction in deaths but rises in some countries.** In: *Drugnet*  
356 *Europe*. vol. June. Lisbon: EMCDDA; 2014: 8.
- 357 3. HRB: **Drug-related deaths and deaths among drug users in Ireland: 2011 figures**  
358 **from the National Drug-Related Deaths Index.** In. Dublin: Health Research Board;  
359 2014.
- 360 4. Klimas J, O'Reilly M, Egan M, Tobin H, Bury G: **Urban Overdose Hotspots: A 12-**  
361 **Month Prospective Study in Dublin Ambulance Services.** *The American Journal of*  
362 *Emergency Medicine*.
- 363 5. Coffin PO, Sullivan SD: **Cost-Effectiveness of Distributing Naloxone to Heroin Users**  
364 **for Lay Overdose Reversal.** *Annals of Internal Medicine* 2013, **158**(1):1-9.
- 365 6. Williams AV, Marsden J, Strang J: **Training family members to manage heroin**  
366 **overdose and administer naloxone: randomized trial of effects on knowledge and**  
367 **attitudes.** *Addiction* 2013, **109**(2):250-259.
- 368 7. Merlin MA, Saybolt M, Kapitanyan R, Alter SM, Jeges J, Liu J, Calabrese S, Rynn KO,  
369 Perritt R, Pryor PW: **Intranasal naloxone delivery is an alternative to intravenous**  
370 **naloxone for opioid overdoses.** *The American journal of emergency medicine* 2010,  
371 **28**(3):296-303.

- 372 8. Kim D, Irwin KS, Khoshnood K: **Expanded access to naloxone: options for critical**  
373 **response to the epidemic of opioid overdose mortality.** *Am J Public Health* 2009,  
374 **99(3):402-407.**
- 375 9. Matheson C, Pflanz-Sinclair C, Aucott L, Wilson P, Watson R, Malloy S, Dickie E,  
376 McAuley A: **Reducing drug related deaths: a pre-implementation assessment of**  
377 **knowledge, barriers and enablers for naloxone distribution through general practice.**  
378 *BMC Family Practice* 2014, **15(1):12.**
- 379 10. McDermott C, Collins NC: **Prehospital medication administration: a randomised**  
380 **study comparing intranasal and intravenous routes.** *Emergency medicine*  
381 *international* 2012, **2012:476161.**
- 382 11. Sabzghabae AM, Eizadi-Mood N, Yaraghi A, Zandifar S: **Naloxone therapy in opioid**  
383 **overdose patients: intranasal or intravenous? A randomized clinical trial.** *Archives*  
384 *of medical science : AMS* 2014, **10(2):309-314.**
- 385 12. Cullen W, Bury G, Langton D: **Experience of heroin overdose among drug users**  
386 **attending general practice.** *Br J Gen Pract* 2000, **50(456):546-549.**
- 387 13. Pre-hospital Emergency Care Council: **Clinical Practice Guidelines.** Dublin: PHECC;  
388 2013.
- 389 14. Campbell M, Fitzpatrick R, Haines A, Kinmonth AL, Sandercock P, Spiegelhalter D,  
390 Tyrer P: **Framework for design and evaluation of complex interventions to improve**  
391 **health.** *BMJ* 2000, **321(7262):694-696.**
- 392 15. Bennett T, Holloway K: **The impact of take-home naloxone distribution and training**  
393 **on opiate overdose knowledge and response: An evaluation of the THN Project in**  
394 **Wales.** *Drugs: Education, Prevention, and Policy* 2012, **19(4):320-328.**

- 395 16. McAuley A, Best D, Taylor A, Hunter C, Robertson R: **From evidence to policy: The**  
396 **Scottish national naloxone programme.** *Drugs: Education, Prevention, and Policy*  
397 2012, **19**(4):309-319.
- 398 17. Soar J, Monsieurs K, Ballance J: **i dr.(2010) European Resuscitation Council**  
399 **Guidelines for Resuscitation 2010. Section 9. Principles of education in resuscitation.**  
400 *Resuscitation.*
- 401 18. Williams AV, Strang J, Marsden J: **Development of Opioid Overdose Knowledge**  
402 **(OOKS) and Attitudes (OOAS) Scales for take-home naloxone training evaluation.**  
403 *Drug and Alcohol Dependence* 2013, **132**(1-2):383-386.
- 404 19. Klimas J, Lally K, Murphy L, Crowley L, Anderson R, Meagher D, Smyth BP, Bury G,  
405 Cullen W: **Development and process evaluation of an educational intervention to**  
406 **support primary care of problem alcohol among drug users.** *Drugs and Alcohol*  
407 *Today* 2014, **14**(2):76-86.
- 408 20. Clark AK, Wilder CM, Winstanley EL: **A systematic review of community opioid**  
409 **overdose prevention and naloxone distribution programs.** *Journal of addiction*  
410 *medicine* 2014, **8**(3):153-163.
- 411 21. Maxwell S, Bigg D, Stanczykiewicz K, Carlberg-Racich S: **Prescribing naloxone to**  
412 **actively injecting heroin users: a program to reduce heroin overdose deaths.** *J Addict*  
413 *Dis* 2006, **25**(3):89-96.
- 414 22. McAuley A, Lindsay G, Woods M, Louttit D: **Responsible management and use of a**  
415 **personal take-home naloxone supply: A pilot project.** *Drugs: Education, Prevention,*  
416 *and Policy* 2010, **17**(4):388-399.

- 417 23. Davis CS, Ruiz S, Glynn P, Picariello G, Walley AY: **Expanded access to naloxone**  
418 **among firefighters, police officers, and emergency medical technicians in**  
419 **Massachusetts. *Am J Public Health* 2014, **104**(8):e7-9.**
- 420 24. Doe-Simkins M, Quinn E, Xuan Z, Sorensen-Alawad A, Hackman H, Ozonoff A, Walley  
421 AY: **Overdose rescues by trained and untrained participants and change in opioid**  
422 **use among substance-using participants in overdose education and naloxone**  
423 **distribution programs: a retrospective cohort study. *BMC Public Health* 2014,**  
424 **14(1):297.**
- 425 25. Strang J, Manning V, Mayet S, Best D, Titherington E, Santana L, Offor E, Semmler C:  
426 **Overdose training and take-home naloxone for opiate users: prospective cohort**  
427 **study of impact on knowledge and attitudes and subsequent management of**  
428 **overdoses. *Addiction* 2008, **103**(10):1648-1657.**
- 429 26. Bennett T, Holloway K, Bird SM: **Does take-home naloxone reduce non-fatal**  
430 **overdose? *Lancet* 2014, **383**(9912):124-125.**
- 431 27. Doe-Simkins M, Walley AY, Epstein A, Moyer P: **Saved by the nose: bystander-**  
432 **administered intranasal naloxone hydrochloride for opioid overdose. *Am J Public***  
433 ***Health* 2009, **99**(5):788-791.**
- 434 28. Paul G, Smith SM, Whitford D, O'Kelly F, O'Dowd T: **Development of a complex**  
435 **intervention to test the effectiveness of peer support in type 2 diabetes. *BMC Health***  
436 ***Services Research* 2007, **7**:136.**
- 437 29. Lester H, Tait L, Khera A, Birchwood M, Freemantle N, Patterson P: **The development**  
438 **and implementation of an educational intervention on first episode psychosis for**  
439 **primary care. *Med Educ* 2005, **39**(10):1006-1014.**

- 440 30. Cullen W, Stanley J, Langton D, Kelly Y, Staines A, Bury G: **Hepatitis C infection**  
441 **among injecting drug users in general practice: a cluster randomised controlled**  
442 **trial of clinical guidelines' implementation.** *Br J Gen Pract* 2006, **56**(532):848-856.
- 443 31. Cullen W, Griffin S, Bury G, Plunkett PK: **Opiate overdose in Dublin.** *Irish Journal of*  
444 *Medical Science* 2003, **172**(1):46.
- 445 32. Lyons S: **Preventing opiate-related deaths in Ireland: the naloxone demonstration**  
446 **project.** *Drugnet Ireland* 2014, **13**(49):13.
- 447 33. Keenan E, Barry J: **Managing drug misuse in general practice. Republic of Ireland**  
448 **has set up scheme to regulate methadone prescribing by GPs.** *BMJ* 1999,  
449 **319**(7223):1497.
- 450 34. Strang J, Sheridan J, Hunt C, Kerr B, Gerada C, Pringle M: **The prescribing of**  
451 **methadone and other opioids to addicts: national survey of GPs in England and**  
452 **Wales.** *Br J Gen Pract* 2005, **55**(515):444-451.
- 453 35. Kerr D, Kelly AM, Dietze P, Jolley D, Barger B: **Randomized controlled trial**  
454 **comparing the effectiveness and safety of intranasal and intramuscular naloxone for**  
455 **the treatment of suspected heroin overdose.** *Addiction* 2009, **104**:2067-2074.
- 456 36. Barton ED, Ramos J, Colwell C, Benson J, Baily J, Dunn W: **Intranasal administration**  
457 **of naloxone by paramedics.** *Prehospital Emergency Care* 2002, **6**(1):54-58.
- 458 37. Leavitt SB: **Intranasal Naloxone for At-Home Opioid Rescue.** *Practical Pain*  
459 *Management October 2010* 42 2010, **46**.
- 460
- 461

462 **Tables and Figures**

463 Table 1 Sample characteristics

464

	N	%
<b>PROFILES OF TRAINING PRACTICES</b>		
County of practice		
Dublin	10	43%
Wicklow	8	35%
Other	3	12%
Missing data	2	10%
GMS list size		
<500	1	4%
500-1000	4	17%
1000-1500	7	30%
1500-2000	2	9%
>2000	8	35%
Missing data	1	5%
Practice setting		
Urban	9	39%
Rural	5	22%
Mixed	8	35%
Missing data	1	5%
Mean number of GPs (excluding GP registrars)		
F/t	2.6	(SD 2.04)
P/t	1.6	(SD 1.21)
Practice nurse		
	12	52%
Active member of a Primary Care Team		
	11	48%
Ever attended a primary care team meeting		
	6	26%
Methadone prescribing		
	6	26%
Level of methadone prescribing		
Level 1	4	17%
Level 2	2	9%
N of patients receiving methadone in the practice		
0-5	1	4%
5-10	1	4%
10-15	2	9%
15-20	1	4%
Years prescribing methadone		
3 years	1	4%

	15+ years	2	8%
<b>TRAINEE PROFILE</b>			
<b>Age</b>			
	25-34 years	21	91%
	35+ years	2	9%
<b>Year of Graduation</b>			
	2008	5	22%
	2009	5	22%
	2010	4	17%
	2011	5	22%
	other	3	12%
<b>Training in addiction</b>			
	0 hours	1	4%
	<4 hours	3	13%
	4-10 hours	7	30%
	11-40 hours	2	9%
	>40 hours	1	4%
<b>Trained in methadone prescribing</b>			
	Level 1	8	35%
	None/ Planned during training	15	65%
<b>(i) Ever witnessed an opioid overdose</b>			
	Hospital	9	39%
	Community	2	9%
<b>(ii) No of Witnessed Hospital overdoses</b>		39+*	
<b>(iii) No of Witnessed Community overdoses</b>		2	
<b>(iv) Ever administered Naloxone outside of Emergency Department</b>		5	22%
<b>Knowledge on Drugs in Ireland</b>			
No of trainees who know how many people die due to overdose every year in Ireland		10	43%
No of trainees who know how many people are currently in methadone treatment in Ireland		8	35%

465 \*One trainee witnessed more than 10 hospital overdoses

466

467  
 468 Table 2 Self-reported change in knowledge and attitudes pre-/post-training, and usefulness of the  
 469 session

<i>Knowledge / attitudes</i>	Pre-training median/ mean (SD)	Post-training median/ mean (SD)	Mean diff (SD)	Wilcoxon Z/ P-value
Knowledge:	28/ 27 (4.1)	32/ 31.65 (1.11)	4.65 (4.13)	-4.03, 0.000
Risks	8/ 7.48 (1.93)	9/ 8.65 (.65)	1.17 (2.06)	-2.69, 0.007
Signs	5/ 4.87 (1.25)	6/ 5.7 (.45)	0.87 (1.39)	-2.75, 0.006
Actions	5/ 5.26 (1.1)	6/ 6.4 (.58)	1.13 (1.18)	-3.62, 0.000
INN use	10/ 9.39 (1.27)	11/ 10.8 (.34)	1.48 (1.2)	-3.80, 0.000
Attitudes:	96/ 97.4 (7.22)	108/ 108.57 (8.07)	11.13 (6.38)	-4.11, 0.000
Competencies	33/ 33.65 (4.68)	41/ 41 (3.96)	7.39 (5.02)	-4.11, 0.000
Concerns	22/ 22.1 (2.64)	24/ 24 (2.92)	2 (2.15)	-3.46, 0.001
Readiness	40/ 41.7 (3.33)	43/ 43.5 (3.85)	1.7 (2.77)	-2.63, 0.008
<i>The following were useful in education</i>	Completely agree / agree N (%)	Unsure	Completely disagree / disagree N (%)	Mean score post-training (SD)
Presentation	23 (100)	0	0	4.48 (.51)
Video	19 (82.6)	3 (13)	1 (4.3)	4.22 (.85)
Simulation	23 (100)	0	0	4.61 (.5)
Q & A	21 (91.3)	2 (8.7)	0	4.3 (.64)
Guideline demonstration	20 (87)	3 (13)	0	4.35 (.74)

470

471 Table 3 – Acceptability of the educational session

<b>How did you find each aspect of the session?</b>		
	<b>What was good about it?</b>	<b>How can it be improved?</b>
Presentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clear 4/15</li> <li>- Informative 7/15</li> <li>- Concise 8/15</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Less rushed, more interactive 2/3</li> <li>- Stimulating questions 1/3</li> </ul>
Video	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Visual 3/11</li> <li>- Practical or demonstrative 5/11</li> <li>- Easy to follow 2/11</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Audio 6/7</li> <li>- More time 1/7</li> </ul>
Simulation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Hands on experience of usage 13/18</li> <li>- Very/ good 2/18</li> <li>- Informative 2/18</li> <li>- Demonstrated ease of use, increased confidence 3/18</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- More time 2/6</li> <li>- Practice 1/6</li> <li>- Facilitators 1/6</li> <li>- Sound 1/6</li> </ul>
Q& A discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Opportunity to ask questions 4/6</li> <li>- Collaborative 1/6</li> <li>- Good/ clear 2/6</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No major questions asked 2/5</li> <li>- More time 1/5</li> <li>- Naloxone for lay people and access for GPs 1/5</li> </ul>
<p><i>Would any other educational interventions / activities help trainees?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Booster sessions 1/9</li> <li>• More simulations/ real life situations 3/9</li> <li>• More samples, syringes, differences between IN and exact-dose-dispenser 4/9</li> </ul>		

*Suggestions for improvement:*

- Booster sessions 3/8
- More time 2/8
- Scenarios 1/8
- Very/ good 2/8

472 \*Numbers in brackets indicate how many trainees reported about the particular item

473

474 Figure 1: Learning outcomes, delivery method / content and initial evaluation of the session

Figure 1: Learning outcomes, delivery method / content and initial evaluation of the session

<p><b>Learning outcomes</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• To recognise opioid overdose</li><li>• To assemble naloxone</li><li>• To administer INN</li></ul> <p><b>Delivery method</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Formal presentation</li><li>• Video demonstrations of how to i) recognise opioid overdose, ii) assemble naloxone, and iii) administer INN</li><li>• Practical exercises on how to assemble and administer INN</li><li>• Q&amp;A discussion</li><li>• Repeated measures assessment / feedback</li></ul> <p><b>Evaluation of education session</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Perceived changes in knowledge and attitudes</li><li>• Qualitative data on strengths / weaknesses</li><li>• Anonymous and confidential</li></ul>
---

**Additional files provided with this submission:**

Additional file 1: CL\_BMC\_09012015.docx, 117K

<http://www.biomedcentral.com/imedia/6115358781564201/supp1.docx>

Additional file 2: IN-Naloxone study\_extension\_27082014.pdf, 191K

<http://www.biomedcentral.com/imedia/6605567891569576/supp2.pdf>