

 **Drug and Alcohol FINDINGS** Your selected document

This is the abstract of a study selected by Drug and Alcohol Findings as particularly relevant to improving outcomes from drug or alcohol interventions in the United Kingdom. It was not published by Drug and Alcohol Findings. Unless permission has been granted, we are unable to supply full text. Click on the [Title](#) to visit the publisher's or other document supplier's web site. Other links to source documents also in blue. Hover mouse over orange text for explanatory notes. Free reprints may be available from the authors - click [Request reprint](#) to send or adapt the pre-prepared e-mail message. The abstract is intended to summarise the findings and views expressed in the study. Below are some comments from Drug and Alcohol Findings.

Click [HERE](#) and enter e-mail address to be alerted to new studies and reviews

---

► [Primary care intervention to reduce alcohol misuse: ranking its health impact and cost effectiveness.](#)

Solberg L.I., Maciosek M.V., Edwards N.M. [Request reprint](#)

**American Journal of Preventive Medicine: 2008, 34(2), p. 143–152.**

In this comprehensive analysis, screening for risky drinking and brief advice was estimated to be among the most cost-effective preventive services GPs could offer, ranking alongside common interventions such as screening for high blood pressure or immunisation against influenza.

**Abstract** The US Preventive Services Task Force has recommended screening and behavioural counselling interventions in primary care to reduce alcohol misuse. This study was designed to develop a standardised rating for the clinically preventable burden and cost-effectiveness of complying with that recommendation that would allow comparisons across many recommended services. A systematic review of the literature from 1992 through 2004 to identify relevant randomised controlled trials and cost-effectiveness studies was completed in 2005. Clinically preventable burden (CPB) was calculated as the product of effectiveness times the alcohol-attributable fraction of both mortality and morbidity (measured in quality-adjusted life years or QALYs), for all relevant conditions. Cost effectiveness from both the societal perspective and the health-system perspective was estimated. These analyses were completed in 2006. The calculated CPB was 176,000 QALYs saved over the lifetime of a birth cohort of 4,000,000, with a range in sensitivity analysis from -43% to +94% (primarily due to variation in estimates of effectiveness). Screening and brief counselling was cost-saving from the societal perspective and had a cost-effectiveness ratio of \$1755/QALY saved from the health-system perspective. Sensitivity analysis indicates that from both perspectives the service is very cost effective and may be cost saving. Conclusions: These results make alcohol screening and counselling one of the highest-ranking preventive services among the 25 effective services evaluated using standardised methods. Since current levels of delivery are the lowest of comparably ranked services, this service deserves special attention by clinicians and care delivery systems.

 **Drug and Alcohol FINDINGS** The aim was to help US primary care practices prioritise preventive

interventions to gain the greatest extension in healthy life span across their patient caseload. Screening for risky drinking and offering brief advice was judged among the most cost-effective, ranking alongside widespread interventions such as screening for high blood pressure or immunisation against influenza. Calculations were based on alcohol interventions which could be implemented across the at-risk population of a busy practice, typically taking 10 minutes repeated annually up to age 54. Studies suggested that as a result, more than one in six extra problem drinkers would be in remission. Taking all costs and savings in to account (ie, not just those related to health or health services), society would save an estimated \$254 per person offered screening. Despite its high ranking, the authors noted that alcohol screening and advice are much less widely implemented than similarly cost-effective interventions. It follows that the greatest scope for improving health lies in extending their coverage. However, there are reasons why alcohol screening is relatively infrequent – notably, GPs' reluctance to 'artificially' introduce drinking in to consultations about other complaints. Given this, the big question mark is over [whether substantial extension is realistic](#). Also, gains varied widely when the authors varied assumptions about the impact of counselling on drink-related problems. Such variation has been noted in studies, suggesting that the anticipated health gains can't be guaranteed in any particular context.

Last revised 01 December 2008

► [Comment on this entry](#) ► [Give us your feedback on the site \(one-minute survey\)](#)

---

## **Top 10 most closely related documents on this site. For more try a [subject or free text search](#)**

[Reducing alcohol harm: health services in England for alcohol misuse](#) ABSTRACT 2008

[Family doctors' alcohol advice plus follow up cuts long-term medical and social costs](#) NUGGET 2003

[The impact of screening, brief intervention, and referral for treatment on emergency department patients' alcohol use](#) ABSTRACT 2007

[Identifying cost-effective interventions to reduce the burden of harm associated with alcohol misuse in Australia](#) REVIEW ABSTRACT 2008

[Screening, brief interventions, referral to treatment \(SBIRT\) for illicit drug and alcohol use at multiple healthcare sites: comparison at intake and 6 months later](#) ABSTRACT 2008

[Heavily drinking emergency patients cut down after referral for counselling](#) NUGGET 2005

[Controversy over screening primary care patients for risky drinking](#) OFFCUT 2004

[Measuring performance of brief alcohol counseling in medical settings: a review of the options and lessons from the Veterans Affairs \(VA\) health care system](#) ABSTRACT 2007

[Universal screening for alcohol problems in primary care fails in Denmark and no longer on UK agenda](#) NUGGET 2008

[Injury rate cut in heavy drinking accident and emergency patients](#) NUGGET 2003