This entry is our analysis of a document added to the Effectiveness Bank. The original document was not published by Findings; click Title to order a copy. Links in blue. Hover over orange text for notes. Clicking <u>underlined</u> text highlights passage referred to. The Summary conveys the findings and views expressed in the document. Below is a commentary from Drug and Alcohol Findings.



► Title and link for copying ► Comment/query to editor ► Tweet

▶ Screening and brief interventions (SBI) for unhealthy alcohol use: a step-by-step implementation guide for trauma centers.

Higgins-Biddle J., Hungerford D., Cates-Wessel K.

[US] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, 2009.

Based on research findings, a practical US government guide for trauma centres dealing with serious injuries on how to plan, implement and monitor a programme to identify risky drinking among their patients and to offer appropriate advice and referral.

SUMMARY This guide is intended to help US trauma departments plan, implement, and continually improve the new Committee on Trauma alcohol screening and brief intervention requirements under four headings:

- Getting started: preliminary steps for planning and implementing an alcohol screening and brief intervention programme.
- Developing the programme: identification and help for patients with alcohol-related risk.
- Implementing the programme: adapting these ideas to your specific centre, including training and start-up.
- Maintaining and improving the programme: ensuring the best implementation of the final, agreed-on programme.

In the absence of routine alcohol blood testing the guide says that a single question about whether the patient has recently drunk five US standard drinks (about 14gm alcohol each drink) for men or four for women effectively determine who needs and who does not need a brief intervention. To determine whether the patient is dependent (so needs more extensive help) and whether their drinking is causing themselves or others problems (useful in helping them to consider cutting back), centres will need to decide which more detailed instrument to use as a follow-up.

With respect to interventions for identified risky drinkers, the guide says research has shown that brief interventions of differing types and lengths can be effective. As little as 3–5 minutes of simple advice from a healthcare professional has been shown to help many patients reduce their drinking. More extensive 15–20-minute sessions using a motivational interviewing approach have also been effective. Delivering brief advice is relatively easy to learn and takes less time, but the service may not be reimbursed for such a short service. Using 15–20 minutes of motivational interviewing requires somewhat more skill and takes more training and more time to deliver, but centres may be able to bill for it. Centres may want to decide which style of intervention they use based on whether they have staff experienced in motivational interviewing or willing to learn and provide the service.

Such programmes should be routinely monitored in terms of the proportion of patients targeting for screening who actually are screened, how many screen positive, how many of these are advised about their drinking, and what proportion who should have been referred for more extensive help actually were.

FINDINGS COMMENTARY Unlike the fleeting contacts typical in emergency departments dealing mainly with minor conditions, US trauma centre patients have suffered life-changing events and injuries often associated with drinking, and are typically admitted for several days to the centre which organises their ongoing care. More so than in an emergency department, the situation patients find themselves in might in any event prompt a rethink about their drinking, and offers opportunities for effective alcohol interventions and for building therapeutic relationships with staff which may affect drinking. A major US study has investigated whether these advantages lead to extra reductions in drinking and related problems from a brief motivational intervention compared to minimal advice. For more on brief interventions and UK policy see this Effectiveness Bank hot topic.

Last revised 28 September 2015. First uploaded 08 May 2012

- Comment/query to editor
- ▶ Give us your feedback on the site (two-minute survey)
- Open Effectiveness Bank home page
- Add your name to the mailing list to be alerted to new studies and other site updates

Top 10 most closely related documents on this site. For more try a subject or free text search

STUDY 2014 The effectiveness of alcohol screening and brief intervention in emergency departments: a multicentre pragmatic cluster randomized controlled trial

STUDY 2011 An evaluation to assess the implementation of NHS delivered alcohol brief interventions: final report

STUDY 2012 Alcohol screening and brief intervention in emergency departments

STUDY 2009 Does implementation of clinical practice guidelines change nurses' screening for alcohol and other substance use?

STUDY 2010 The impact of screening, brief intervention and referral for treatment in emergency department patients' alcohol use: a 3-, 6- and 12-month follow-up

STUDY 2010 Alcohol screening, brief intervention, and referral to treatment conducted by emergency nurses: an impact evaluation

STIINY 2012 Tayt-massage-based drinking assessments and brief interventions for young adults discharged from the

STODY 2012 Text-message-based drinking assessments and brief intervendors for young addits discharged from the emergency department

DOCUMENT 2011 Services for the identification and treatment of hazardous drinking, harmful drinking and alcohol dependence in children, young people and adults

HOT TOPIC 2015 Can brief alcohol interventions improve health population-wide?

REVIEW 2011 Barriers and facilitators to implementing screening and brief intervention for alcohol misuse: a systematic review of qualitative evidence

