

- [2] DiMatteo MR. Variations in patients' adherence to medical recommendations: a quantitative review of 50 years of research. *Med Care* 2004;42:200–9.
- [3] Institute of Medicine of the National Academies. *Relieving pain in America*. The National Academies Press. Washington: 2011.
- [4] Minozzi S, Amato L, Davoli M. Development of dependence following treatment with opioid analgesics for pain relief: a systematic review. *Addiction* 2013;108:688–98.
- [5] Noble M, Tregear SJ, Treadwell JR, Schoelles K. Long-Term Opioid Therapy for Chronic Noncancer Pain: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Efficacy and Safety. Review Article. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 2008;35:214–28.
- [6] Vowles KE, Mindy L, McEntee ML, Julnes PS, Frohe T, Ney JP, Van der Goes DN. Rates of opioid misuse, abuse, and addiction in chronic pain: a systematic review and data synthesis. *PAIN* 2015;15:569–76.
- [7] World Health Organization. *Ensuring balance in national policies on controlled substances, guidance for accessibility and availability of controlled medicines*. World Health Organization. Geneva: 2011.

Willem Scholten^a

Jack E. Henningfield^{b,c}

^aConsultant – Medicines and Controlled Substances,
Lopik, the Netherlands

^bResearch, Health Policy, and Abuse Liability,
PinneyAssociates, Bethesda, MD, USA

^cProfessor of Behavioral Biology,
The Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine,
Baltimore, MD, USA

E-mail address: wk.scholten@xs4all.nl (W. Scholten).
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/j.pain.0000000000000213>

On the importance of clear comparisons and a methodologically rigorous empirical literature in evaluating opioid use in chronic pain: a response to Scholten and Henningfield

Reply:

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the letter of Scholten and Henningfield.⁷ Fundamentally, we find ourselves in agreement with much of what they write. In fact, let us reiterate the primary finding of our review: The literature on rates of problematic opioid use in chronic pain is not in a healthy state. Not only there is vast heterogeneity in estimates of problematic use of opioids, this literature also suffers from inadequate reporting of basic demographic and pain-related characteristics. There is clearly room for improvement, ideally through careful study design, assessment and analysis of problematic opioid use, and use of specific endpoint assessments.

In their critique, Scholten and Henningfield unfortunately fail to note the important differences between our work and that of Noble et al.⁵ and Minozzi et al.⁴; they also fail to report full details of these previous reports. It is relevant to highlight these issues to ensure that accurate and clear comparisons are made, as these are most likely to be of use to the scientific enterprise.

The meta-analysis by Noble et al.⁵ was primarily concerned with the longer term effectiveness of opioids and adverse events related to opioid use. It included 3 types of opioid administration (oral, transdermal, intrathecal), with the latter 2 comprising just over 50% of included studies. In contrast, our review focused solely on opioids administered orally, based on the frequency with which they are prescribed in clinical practice. Thus, comparisons between the 2 reviews are likely confounded. Importantly, of the 26 studies reviewed by Noble et al., only 2 (7.7%) reported rates of opioid addiction and those authors imputed (page 8) an addiction rate of zero in the other 24 studies (92.3%). Although there is clear utility in their broader findings, we would urge caution in assuming absence of any particular phenomenon simply because it is not reported.

Second, Minozzi et al.⁴ included acute cancer, headache, and noncancer/nonheadache chronic pain in their review; we reviewed only studies from the latter category. Minozzi et al. also included studies using any route of opioid administration. Furthermore, the findings of Noble et al.⁵ were included in problematic use calculations. While drawing comparisons between our findings and those of Minozzi et al. is consequently bound to be imprecise and unsound, the reported incidence range of “dependence syndrome,” 0%–24%, was similar to our reported range of opioid addiction, 3%–17%.

Scholten and Henningfield take particular umbrage with our definitions of misuse, abuse, and addiction. There are 3 considerations. First, these definitions were taken, almost verbatim, from statements of the ACTION⁸ (page 2289) and IMPACT⁶ (page 2326) groups. Second, Scholten and Henningfield note a preference for “patient noncompliance” rather than our term of “misuse” –given their note that these terms have identical definitions, their criticism seems distinctively semantic and thus is not likely to produce useful and productive scientific discussion. Third, in relation to our definition of addiction, Scholten and Henningfield note that the *ICD-10* provides a more adequate definition. Harmful consequences are clearly noted as a criterion for dependence syndrome by the *ICD-10* and for substance use disorder by the *DSM-V*. Consistent with the extant literature, we assume that tolerance and withdrawal in relation to opioids will occur with prolonged use,¹ meaning that harm likely represents a key distinction between expected natural consequences of protracted use and significantly problematic or harmful use. Therefore, classifying the most severe form of problematic use as addiction (opioid use associated with actual, or marked potential for, harm) still seems appropriate.

The second, more minor, area of disagreement pertains to the point that we used misuse and abuse interchangeably when providing results. We see one instance where abuse was used instead of misuse (page 572, second line). Although that is clearly an error in need of correction, it hardly constitutes “interchangeable” use. It seems possible for readers to spot the error and infer the intended meaning.

There are 2 final points. First, clinical guidelines consistently note the weak and/or limited evidence base for opioid use in chronic pain⁵ (American Pain Society/American Academy of Pain Medicine,³ British Pain Society²). The deficiencies in the problematic opioid use literature are not helped in any way by a problematic evidence base evaluating effectiveness. Clearly, this area is in need of focused attention and improvement. Second, we agree that opioid use is not *inherently* risky,⁹ most patients seem to use opioids without misuse or addiction,¹⁰ and access to *effective* interventions (including pain-relieving medications, but also including rehabilitative interventions aiming to restore effective functioning) is paramount.

Conflict of interest statement

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

This research was supported by a grant from the Center for Health Policy at the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation to K. E. Vowles and D. N. van der Goes.

References

- [1] Adriaensen H, Vissers K, Noorduin H, Meert T. Opioid tolerance and dependence: an inevitable consequence of chronic treatment? *Acta Anaesthesiol Belg* 2003;54:37–47.
- [2] British Pain Society. Opioids for persistent pain: good practice. A consensus statement prepared on behalf of the British Pain Society,

- the Faculty of Pain Medicine of the Royal College of Anaesthetists, the Royal College of General Practitioners and the Faculty of Addictions. London: British Pain Society, 2010.
- [3] Chou R, Fanciullo GJ, Fine PG, Adler JA, Ballantyne JC, Davies P, Donovan MI, Fishbain DA, Foley KM, Fudin J, Gilson AM, Kelter A, Mauskop A, O'Connor PG, Passik SD, Pasternak GW, Portenoy RK, Rich BA, Roberts RG, Todd KH, Miaskowski C; American Pain Society-American Academy of Pain Medicine Opioids Guidelines Panel. Clinical guidelines for the use of chronic opioid therapy in chronic noncancer pain. *J Pain* 2009;10:113–30.
- [4] Minozzi S, Amato L, Davoli M. Development of dependence following treatment with opioid analgesics for pain relief: a systematic review. *Addiction* 2013;108:688–98.
- [5] Noble M, Treadwell JR, Tregear SJ, Coates VH, Wiffen PJ, Akafomo C, Schoelles KM. Long-term opioid management for chronic noncancer pain. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2010;1:1–64.
- [6] O'Connor AB, Turk DC, Dworkin RH, Katz NP, Colucci R, Haythornthwaite JA, Klein M, O'Brien C, Posner K, Rappaport BA, Reisfield G, Adams EH, Balster RL, Bigelow GE, Burke LB, Comer SD, Cone E, Cowan P, Denisco RA, Farrar JT, Foltin RW, Haddock JD, Hertz S, Jay GW, Junor R, Kopecky EA, Leiderman DB, McDermott MP, Palmer PP, Raja SN, Rauschkolb C, Rowbotham MC, Sampaio C, Setnik B, Smith SM, Sokolowska M, Stauffer JW, Walsh SL, Zacny JP. Abuse liability measures for use in analgesic clinical trials in patients with pain: IMMPACT recommendations. *PAIN* 2013;154:2324–34.
- [7] Scholten W, Henningfield JE. A meta-analysis based on diffuse definitions and mixed quality literature is not a good fundament for decisions on treatment of chronic pain patients. *PAIN* 2015;156:1576–7.
- [8] Smith SM, Dart RC, Katz NP, Paillard F, Adams EH, Comer SD, Degroot A, Edwards RR, Haddock JD, Jaffe JH, Jones CM, Kleber HD, Kopecky EA, Markman JD, Montoya ID, O'Brien C, Roland CL, Stanton M, Strain EC, Vorsanger G, Wasan AD, Weiss RD, Turk DC, Dworkin RH. Classification and definition of misuse, abuse, and related events in clinical trials: ACTION systematic review and recommendations. *PAIN* 2013;154:2287–796.
- [9] Vowles KE, Ashworth J. Is opioid withdrawal necessary within comprehensive pain rehabilitation programs? *PAIN* 2011;152:10–12.
- [10] Vowles KE, McEntee ML, Siyahhan P, Frohe T, Ney JP, van der Goes DN. Rates of opioid misuse, abuse, and addiction in chronic pain: a systematic review and data synthesis. *PAIN* 2015;156:569–76.

Kevin E. Vowles^a
Mindy L. McEntee^a
Peter Siyahhan Julnes^a
Tessa Frohe^a
John P. Ney^b
David N. van der Goes^c

^a*Department of Psychology, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM, USA*

^b*Department of Neurology, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA*

^c*Department of Economics, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM, USA*

E-mail address: k.e.vowles@gmail.com (K. E. Vowles).
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/j.pain.0000000000000212>