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Introduction

• The United States is currently experiencing an opioid epidemic, which claims 115 lives daily by overdose.
• Tools for identifying patient at increased risk for abuse: Screener and Opioid Assessment for Patients with Pain (SOAPP-R) and Opioid Risk Tool (ORT).
• However, there lacks studies which compare the two most commonly used opioid screen tools (SOAPP-R and ORT).
• We hope to compare the effectiveness of these screening tools for patients being discharged from hospital who have no “red flags” for abuse.

Background

• The awareness of opioid abuse/overdose for those at-risk patients is at all time high amongst providers.
• General medicine patient being discharged with an opioid prescription is mandated to complete ORT to assess their risk for potential abuse (Nevada law).
• ORT is a 10 question screening tool placing patient into three categories: low, moderate or high risk.
• SOAPP-R consists of 24 questions: low, moderate or high risk.
• We want to know which tool helps providers identify those who do not have obvious “red-flags” but are at increased risk for abuse.

Methods

• Identified eligible patients being discharged from the hospital with new opioid prescriptions.
• Those who consented to participate filled out both SOAPP-R and ORT with the researcher’s assistance.
• SOAPP-R and ORT were scored for each patient.
• Based on the score of each screening tool, patients were divided into low, moderate or high risk.
• PMP was checked for each patient and it was used as a gold standard for identifying high risk patients.
• PMP positive: 4 or more providers AND 4 or more prescriptions within the last 12 months.

Results

Preliminary results:
• 56 patients provided consent and enrolled in the study.
• SOAPP-R
  • Low risk: 37 (66.1%); moderate risk: 15 (26.8%); High risk: 4 (7.1%)
• ORT
  • Low Risk:49 (80.4%); Moderate risk: 5 (8.9%); High Risk: 2 (3.6%).
• PMP
  • High risk: 5 patients (8.9%). Characteristics shown below
• ORT had 2 counts of mislabeling patients, however not statistically significant.

Characteristics of PMP Positive Patients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>4 Females, 2 Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>50-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORT score</td>
<td>Low to Moderate Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOAPP-R score</td>
<td>Low to Moderate Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMP score</td>
<td>758-1355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of prescriptions</td>
<td>4-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOAPP-R and ORT both missed the same number of high risk patients and have same false positive rate (P >0.05)

Conclusion

• Both SOAPP-R and ORT missed some patients at increased risk of opioid abuse who did not have “red flags.”
• SOAPP-R had 4 counts of mislabeling low risk patients as high risk.
• A larger sample size may shed more light on the effectiveness of these two screening tools.
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