

Development and process evaluation of an educational intervention to support primary care of problem alcohol among drug users

Journal:	<i>Drugs and Alcohol Today</i>
Manuscript ID:	Draft
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	general practice, family medicine, alcohol, methadone, study & teaching, brief intervention

1
2
3 **Development and process evaluation of an educational intervention to support primary**
4
5 **care of problem alcohol among drug users**
6

7 **Abstract**
8

9 Purpose: This paper describes the development and process evaluation of an educational
10 intervention, designed to help general practitioners (GPs) identify and manage problem
11 alcohol use among problem drug users.
12
13
14

15 Methodology: The educational session was developed as part of a complex intervention
16 which was informed by the Medical Research Council framework for complex interventions.
17
18 A Cochrane review and a modified Delphi-facilitated consensus process formed the
19 theoretical phase of the development. The modelling phase involved qualitative interviews
20 with professionals and patients. The training's learning outcomes included alcohol screening
21 and delivery of brief psychosocial interventions and this was facilitated by demonstration of
22 clinical guidelines, presentation, video, group discussion and/or role play.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Findings: Participants (N=17) from three general practices and local medical school
32 participated in four workshops. They perceived the training as most helpful in improving
33 their ability to perform alcohol screening. Most useful components of the session were the
34 presentation, handout and group discussion with participants appreciating the opportunity to
35 share their ideas with peers.
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 Value: Training primary healthcare professionals in alcohol screening and brief psychosocial
43 interventions among problem drug users appears feasible. Along with the educational
44 workshops, the implementation strategies should utilise multi-level interventions to support
45 these activities among GPs.
46
47
48
49
50

51
52
53
54 *Key words:* general practice / primary care, alcohol, methadone, screening, brief intervention,
55
56 Study & teaching
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Development and process evaluation of an educational intervention to support primary**
4
5 **care of problem alcohol among drug users**
6
7
8

9
10 **Introduction**

11 This paper describes the development and process evaluations of an educational intervention
12 to help general practitioners (GPs) identify and manage problem alcohol use among problem
13 drug users. The educational intervention is part of a complex intervention to promote
14 screening, brief intervention and referral to treatment by GPs. It was developed within the
15 ‘PINTA’ programme aiming to establish feasibility of Psychosocial INTerventions for
16 Alcohol use among problem drug users in primary care. As a pilot study, the PINTA project
17 aims to establish feasibility and acceptability of the intervention to patients and professionals
18 by estimating rates of recruitment, consent and follow up for a definitive randomised
19 controlled evaluation (RCT). The future trial’s key outcome measure will be that GPs in the
20 eight intervention practices which receive the complex intervention will have higher
21 proportions of patients who are i) screened, ii) treated and/or iii) referred to a specialist
22 treatment and who are iv) negative for problem alcohol use, than those in the eight control
23 practices which do not receive the complex intervention.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Knowledge of addiction medicine among medical students, residents and doctors is low
42 (O’Brien and Cullen, 2011, Betterton et al., 2004), but can be improved with ‘interactive
43 didactics’ (Brown et al., 2013). A systematic review established the effectiveness of
44 interactive workshops for psychosocial addiction treatments and recommended this method
45 for future studies (Walters et al., 2005). Randomised trials tested various methods for helping
46 clinicians learn psychosocial interventions, including motivational interviewing and brief
47 alcohol interventions (Miller et al., 2004, Chossis et al., 2007). Subsequent studies continue
48 to show feasibility of training clinicians in interventions that should help their patients “make
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 healthy choices easier” (Baer et al., 2004, Smith et al., 2007, Brennan et al., 2013). None of
4
5 these studies, however, focussed specifically on alcohol among illicit drug users.
6
7

8
9 In summary, educational interventions that promote screening / treatment for problem alcohol
10
11 use have been evaluated and demonstrated as promising tools to help practitioners adopt
12
13 these new practices. However, disengagement of health care professionals from addiction
14
15 care has been also attributed to a lack of confidence, motivation or negative attitudes towards
16
17 alcohol or drug users (Babor and Higgins-Biddle, 2001, Klimas et al., 2012b). Several studies
18
19 effectively approached these deficits by utilising innovative approaches to resident skill-
20
21 building. Motivational enhancement therapy was used to increase resident physicians’
22
23 engagement in addiction education (Hettinger et al., 2009). Proficiency checklists provided
24
25 instant feedback boosting students’ confidence during educational sessions on brief
26
27 interventions (Cole et al., 2012). Vocational and training schemes with patients who are
28
29 homeless and patients with problem drug use helped to shift trainees’ attitudes towards
30
31 working with these populations (Betterton et al., 2004, Puskar et al., 2012). This effect seems
32
33 bidirectional, as another study showed that experiences and attitudes of residents and students
34
35 *influence* voluntary service with homeless populations (O’Toole et al., 1999).
36
37
38

39
40 Incorporating recommendations of the cited studies, our educational intervention was focused
41
42 on improving participants’ knowledge, skills and attitudes towards addressing alcohol among
43
44 problem drug users. The aims of this study were:
45
46

- 47
48 i. To develop an *educational intervention* that enables GPs to deliver brief psychosocial
49
50 interventions for problem alcohol use among problem drug users,
51
52
53 ii. To determine its feasibility, acceptability and usefulness in practice.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Methodology

Setting/ participants

In Ireland, addiction treatment is currently provided by specialist addiction treatment services and by primary care. Methadone substitution is the most common addiction treatment provided by GPs in primary care; currently 277 GPs prescribe methadone to 3199 patients nationwide (Farrell and Barry, 2010). To prescribe methadone, GPs are subject to clinical audit and must complete special training, with GPs providing methadone treatment for 15 or more patients subject to more regular audit and advanced training. GPs who prescribe methadone for less than 15 patients are referred to as 'level one' GPs, and those prescribing for 15 or more as 'level two' GPs (Ryder et al., 2009).

The study was conducted in two cities in Ireland with high social deprivation areas, Dublin and Limerick. We invited five GP Clinical Teachers, University of Limerick (UL), and three GP Principals at three teaching / research practices, affiliated with UL Graduate Entry Medical School (UL-GEMS), or University College Dublin, to participate.

Fifteen GPs, one practice nurse and one GP trainee took part in the sessions. There were five Level 1 methadone prescribers in our sample and two GPs stated that there were both Level 1 and Level 2 prescribers in their practices. The mean number of GPs in their practices was five (3-9). Ten participants described their practice as providing care to mostly GMS patients (eligibility for Ireland' General Medical Services, which provides free primary care determined on the basis of inability to pay) and two worked in a mixed practice. Seven participants had other healthcare professionals involved in the care of problem drug users in their practice, in two cases specified as a nurse/ nurse psychotherapist. They were from the practices at which the GP clinical teachers or GP principals worked at.

Description of the educational session as part of the complex PINTA intervention

1
2
3 Development of the complex intervention for the PINTA feasibility study was guided by the
4
5 Medical Research Council (MRC) framework for developing complex interventions
6
7 (Campbell et al., 2000), which advocates core phases to the development of health services
8
9 interventions. The preclinical and theoretical stages of the intervention development
10
11 established that opioid substitution treatment in primary care should also include
12
13 interventions that address problem use of alcohol and other illicit drugs. In particular, a
14
15 national cross sectional study reported 35% of patients attending GPs for methadone
16
17 treatment also had problem alcohol use (Ryder et al., 2009) while findings from a subsequent
18
19 qualitative study highlighted the need for an educational intervention to address this problem
20
21 in primary care (Field et al., 2011).
22
23
24

25
26 The subsequent, modelling phase brought about formulation of clinical guidelines, informed
27
28 by the findings of qualitative interviews, expert opinion through a Delphi-facilitated expert
29
30 consensus process and a Cochrane Systematic Review (Klimas et al., 2012a), which are being
31
32 evaluated in the PINTA feasibility study and the protocol was published elsewhere (Klimas et
33
34 al., 2013). Data from this feasibility evaluation will inform design of the final exploratory
35
36 stage, where effectiveness of the intervention in primary care will be tested by conducting a
37
38 cluster randomised controlled trial.
39
40
41

42 The aim of the educational session, described in the current study, was to enable GPs /
43
44 practice nurses deliver alcohol screening / brief interventions. The key learning outcomes of
45
46 the educational session were to teach GPs how to screen for and deliver a brief psychosocial
47
48 intervention around problem alcohol use in problem drug users. A full list of the learning
49
50 outcomes can be found in Figure 1.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Content of the session was drawn from previous work of the research team, as well as from
4
5 two recent initiatives conducted among general patient population in UK (Kaner et al., 2013)
6
7 and US (Muench et al., 2012).
8
9

10 <insert Figure 1 here>
11
12

13
14 The four sessions were delivered by one or two of the co-authors of this paper (WC, JK, KL
15
16 or LM) in a group setting, taking approximately 45 minutes, with an average of four
17
18 participants in each. Three sessions were practice-based and one was delivered at the medical
19
20 school. Delivery methods utilised during the sessions included a formal presentation, a video
21
22 demonstration of how to screen using the AUDIT and deliver a brief intervention, a role play
23
24 exercise on how to screen using the AUDIT and deliver a brief intervention, a small group
25
26 discussion and an evaluation / anonymised feedback. A manual for the trainers was
27
28 developed before delivery of the session in collaboration with a member of the research team
29
30 (RA) who previously led the national alcohol aware practice service initiative (Anderson et
31
32 al., 2006). The sessions were accredited for Continued Medical Education (CME) purposes
33
34 by the Irish College of General Practitioners.
35
36
37
38

39 *Session evaluation*

40
41 Following each session, participants were asked to complete a structured evaluation, which
42
43 elicited quantitative (practice / practitioner characteristics, self-reported achievement of
44
45 learning outcomes, usefulness of the session) and qualitative data (acceptability of the
46
47 session, learning needs and suggested improvements).
48
49
50
51

52 **Findings**

53 *Evaluation of the educational session*

54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Perceived knowledge / ability of conducting alcohol screening and brief intervention was
4
5 measured using a five point likert-type scale (4= strongly agree – 0= strongly disagree) where
6
7 participants were asked to rate their ability/ understanding of 10 learning outcomes of the
8
9 session (e.g. *'As a result of the session, I am better able to outline the importance of*
10
11 *psychosocial interventions in primary care'*). The mean knowledge/ ability score was 30.9
12
13 (SD= 6.09), the highest rated learning outcome was “Perform screening for problem alcohol
14
15 use using AUDIT-C / AUDIT instruments” (3.65, SD= 0.49) the lowest was “Assess the
16
17 person's readiness to change” (3.17, SD= 0.72).
18
19

20
21
22
23 *Usefulness* of the session was evaluated using a five point likert-type scale (4= strongly agree
24
25 – 0= strongly disagree) where participants were asked to rate the usefulness of five delivery
26
27 methods utilised during the session (e.g. *'The following were useful in helping me achieve*
28
29 *these outcomes - presentation'*). The group mean for the usefulness score was 16.4 (SD=
30
31 2.35), the most useful delivery method was small-group discussion (3.53, SD= 0.51), the least
32
33 useful delivery method was simulation/ role-play (2.82, SD= 0.73; NB. Role play was not
34
35 conducted in two sessions). For a complete list of knowledge and usefulness ratings, see
36
37 Table 1.
38
39

40
41 <insert Table 1 here>
42
43

44
45 *Acceptability* of the session to participants was assessed with open-ended questions which
46
47 asked participants to write what was good (bad) about each of the five delivery methods
48
49 utilised during the session. The characteristic of the presentation which participants most
50
51 liked was “clarity and conciseness”. They had no negative feedback about presentation.
52
53 The characteristic of the video which participants most liked was that it was “good to see a
54
55 practical, realistic and visual example” and they also appreciated that it was “well played”.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Some suggested that the next role play is done “with a more relaxed introduction to put
4 patient at ease rather than going straight into questions”. The characteristic of the role play
5 which participants most liked was that it represented a “realistic and quick consultation”.
6
7

8
9
10 Three suggested “use of a different scenario to the video scenario”. The participants felt the
11 small-group discussion was very useful because “people had good suggestions”, “good
12 conversation and feedback”. One commented about the length of such discussion in a real
13 training situation with GPs.
14
15

16
17
18 The characteristic of the guideline demonstration which participants most liked was that it
19 was “always handy to check you are doing right thing”. Two needed the demonstration to be
20 more specific and more time for this to be allocated.
21
22

23
24
25 Finally, trainees were given an opportunity to comment on their educational needs or provide
26 suggestions for improvement of the session. Table 2 summarizes participants’ answers to
27 these questions.
28
29

30
31
32 <insert Table 2 here>
33
34
35

36
37 *Would any other educational interventions or activities help participants?*

38
39 Only six responded to this question, indicating that “more simulation or role play may be
40 helpful” and each should be given “a case example and feedback from others re suggestions
41 for improvement”. Other comments about additional educational activities are listed in Table
42
43
44
45 2.
46
47

48
49
50 *Suggestions for improvement of the education session in general*

51
52 While, four trainees reported that the session “was useful / don't feel any changes are
53 required”, one needed “more guidance with guidelines” and one suggested to “repeat this
54 after trial of AUDIT score / brief intervention” (See Table 2).
55
56
57
58
59
60

Discussion

A CME-approved educational workshop to enable GPs screen for or treat problem alcohol use among problem drug users was received favourably. Most useful components of the training were presentation, handout and group discussion with participants appreciating the opportunity to share their ideas with their peers.

Our findings support the literature which highlights the potential of educational workshops, using 'interactive didactics' and videos, as feasible and acceptable means of improving knowledge of addiction medicine among medical doctors and interns (Brown et al., 2013, Walters et al., 2005, Muench et al., 2012). Satisfaction and acceptability of our education by medical professionals was comparable with previous research (Hettema et al., 2009, Lester et al., 2005), attesting to the utility of involving GPs and nurses into the development of educational interventions. We've ensured that their views are included via qualitative interviews conducted in the pre-clinical and modelling stages of intervention development (Field et al., 2011). In this study, some aspects of the educational session were more helpful than has been reported in other literature, *i.e.* sharing ideas with peers *vs.* gaining new insights (Lester et al., 2005). It could be speculated that this was due to the specific focus of our session or a limited availability of addiction education workshops for GPs in Ireland (O'Brien and Cullen, 2011). Only a handful of GPs in the regions under study have been exposed to training in alcohol awareness (Anderson et al., 2006) and for many GPs in Ireland, talking about their ideas in a group format may be of great value in itself. The 'MRC framework for health service interventions was successfully applied to develop the complex intervention, as in previous studies conducted in primary care (Paul et al., 2007, Lester et al.,

1
2
3 2005, Cullen et al., 2006). The development procedure also showed feasibility of engaging
4
5 medical students in the design and evaluation of educational sessions for medical professions,
6
7 and thus bridging the gap between undergraduate and postgraduate medical education
8
9 (O'Regan et al.).
10

11
12
13
14 The brevity of the training developed in this pilot project is one of its novel and valiant
15
16 features. The decision to keep the educational session so brief was influenced mainly by the
17
18 prequel to this study, which used qualitative interviews with 68 primary care professionals
19
20 and patients, and found, consistently with international literature, that lack of time is a key
21
22 barrier to implementation of psychosocial interventions for problem alcohol use in primary
23
24 care (Babor and Higgins-Biddle, 2001, Field et al., 2011). The session aimed for attaining
25
26 the maximum possible transfer of knowledge, while keeping the time requirements minimal,
27
28 thus increasing acceptability of the intervention for professionals. That none of the
29
30 participants complained about the shortness of the session suggests that it was accepted well
31
32 and has delivered what it set out to do. On the other hand, the response to the role play was
33
34 somewhat tepid. Why might this be the case? Possibly, it could take people a little while to
35
36 warm up to role play in a group, and feel comfortable with it. However, this interpretation
37
38 should be taken with caution because not all participants were exposed to the role play and
39
40 only six provided feedback about this component.
41
42
43
44
45

46
47 The current study is limited in several ways. Our sample was atypical in terms of its
48
49 composition, size and sampling method which all may have biased the generalisability of our
50
51 findings. They may not be generalizable to the larger population of GPs involved in
52
53 methadone treatment. The health care professionals participated voluntarily, were not obliged
54
55 to take part in the training or utilise the new learning in practice. Everybody in the
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 participating practices was invited to the sessions via a formal letter, but not all clinicians
4
5 took up the training opportunity and we did not measure practice attendance rates. Therefore,
6
7 we may have recruited only motivated 'enthusiasts' who felt more confident and competent
8
9 in addressing alcohol issues with patients. In the absence of a skills assessment before the
10
11 session, the true impact of the training on participants' knowledge and skills may have
12
13 remained hidden. Finally, the sessions were led by multiple facilitators which influenced the
14
15 content and format of sessions to a small degree. Our core focus on application of a validated
16
17 framework for development of complex interventions (MRC), together with acquisition of
18
19 both qualitative and quantitative feedback from participants, suggest a compelling potential
20
21 value of the intervention for evaluation in future feasibility studies and clinical trials.
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 **Conclusion**

29
30
31
32 Training GPs and other primary care professionals in screening, brief intervention and
33
34 referral to treatment for problem alcohol use among problem drug users is feasible. Along
35
36 with educational workshops, implementation strategies should utilise multi-level, multi-
37
38 faceted interventions to support these activities among GPs. Further research involving a
39
40 complex intervention which incorporates these elements is a priority; if feasible, such
41
42 research could have implications for the role of general practice in the management of
43
44 alcohol use disorders among problem drug users and other vulnerable groups.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank study participants and colleagues from UL GEMS, Jennifer Fitzgerald, Geoff McCombe and Laoise Hogan and PINTA project steering group. KL used this research for partial fulfilment of his Year 3 Special Study Module at the Graduate Entry Medical School, University of Limerick.

Source of funding

Health Research Board of Ireland funded the study (Grant ID: HRA-HSR-2012-14).

Conflicts of interest

None reported.

References

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7 ANDERSON, R. J., COLLINS, C., DALTON, Y., DORAN, G. & BOLAND, M. 2006.
8 *Alcohol aware practice service initiative. Final report - August 2006.*, Dublin, Irish
9 College of General Practitioners.
- 10
11 BABOR, T. F. & HIGGINS-BIDDLE, J. 2001. *Brief Intervention For Hazardous and*
12 *Harmful Drinking. A Manual for Use in Primary Care*, Geneva, WHO.
- 13
14 BAER, J. S., ROSENGREN, D. B., DUNN, C. W., WELLS, E. A., OGLE, R. L. &
15 HARTZLER, B. 2004. An evaluation of workshop training in motivational
16 interviewing for addiction and mental health clinicians. *Drug and Alcohol*
17 *Dependence*, 73, 99-106.
- 18
19 BETTERTON, J., HAYWOOD, J., HEAVERSEDGE, J. & GERADA, C. 2004. Developing
20 new roles for general practitioners: senior house officer posts caring for patients who
21 are homeless or have substance misuse problems. *Education for Primary Care*, 15,
22 58-63.
- 23
24 BRENNAN, C., NEWTON, M., WOOD, F., SCHUG, S. A., ALLSOP, S. & BROWNE, A.
25 L. 2013. Training general practitioners in remote Western Australia in a method of
26 screening and brief intervention for harmful alcohol use: A pilot study. *Australian*
27 *Journal of Rural Health*, 21, 72-79.
- 28
29 BROWN, A. T., KOLADE, V. O., STATON, L. J. & PATEL, N. K. 2013. Knowledge of
30 addiction medicine among internal medicine residents and medical students. *Tenn*
31 *Med*, 106, 31-3.
- 32
33 CAMPBELL, M., FITZPATRICK, R., HAINES, A., KINMONTH, A. L., SANDERCOCK,
34 P., SPIEGELHALTER, D. & TYRER, P. 2000. Framework for design and evaluation
35 of complex interventions to improve health. *BMJ*, 321, 694-6.
- 36
37 CHOSSIS, I., LANE, C., GACHE, P., MICHAUD, P. A., PECOUD, A., ROLLNICK, S. &
38 DAEPEN, J. B. 2007. Effect of training on primary care residents' performance in
39 brief alcohol intervention: a randomized controlled trial. *J Gen Intern Med*, 22, 1144-
40 9.
- 41
42 COLE, B., CLARK, D. C., SEALE, J. P., SHELLENBERGER, S., LYME, A., JOHNSON, J.
43 A. & CHHABRIA, A. 2012. Reinventing the Reel: An Innovative Approach to
44 Resident Skill-Building in Motivational Interviewing for Brief Intervention.
45 *Substance Abuse*, 33, 278-281.
- 46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 CULLEN, W., STANLEY, J., LANGTON, D., KELLY, Y., STAINES, A. & BURY, G.
4
5 2006. Hepatitis C infection among injecting drug users in general practice: a cluster
6
7 randomised controlled trial of clinical guidelines' implementation. *Br J Gen Pract*, 56,
8
9 848-56.
- 10 FARRELL, M. & BARRY, J. 2010. *The Introduction of the Opioid Treatment Protocol*,
11
12 Dublin, Health Service Executive.
- 13 FIELD, C. A., KLIMAS, J., CULLEN, W., BARRY, J., BURY, G., KEENAN, E., LYONS,
14
15 S. & SMYTH, B. P. 2011. Exploring healthcare professionals experience and attitudes
16
17 towards screening for and treatment of problem alcohol use among drug users
18
19 attending primary care. *ADEGS/AUDGPI Scientific Meeting, 20-21.1.2011*. Dublin,
20
21 Ireland.
- 22 HETTEMA, J. E., SORENSEN, J. L., UY, M. & JAIN, S. 2009. Motivational Enhancement
23
24 Therapy to Increase Resident Physician Engagement in Substance Abuse Education.
25
26 *Substance Abuse*, 30, 244-247.
- 27 KANER, E., BLAND, M., CASSIDY, P., COULTON, S., DALE, V., DELUCA, P.,
28
29 GILVARRY, E., GODFREY, C., HEATHER, N., MYLES, J., NEWBURY-BIRCH,
30
31 D., OYEFESO, A., PARROTT, S., PERRYMAN, K., PHILLIPS, T., SHEPHERD, J.
32
33 & DRUMMOND, C. 2013. Effectiveness of screening and brief alcohol intervention
34
35 in primary care (SIPS trial): pragmatic cluster randomised controlled trial. *BMJ*, 346.
- 36 KLIMAS, J., FIELD, C.-A., CULLEN, W., O'GORMAN CLODAGH, S. M., GLYNN
37
38 LIAM, G., KEENAN, E., SAUNDERS, J., BURY, G. & DUNNE, C. 2012a.
39
40 Psychosocial interventions to reduce alcohol consumption in concurrent problem
41
42 alcohol and illicit drug users. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* [Online].
43
44 Available:
45
46 <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/14651858.CD009269.pub2/abstract>.
- 47 KLIMAS, J., FIELD, C.-A., CULLEN, W., OGORMAN, C., GLYNN, L., KEENAN, E.,
48
49 SAUNDERS, J., BURY, G. & DUNNE, C. 2013. Psychosocial interventions to
50
51 reduce alcohol consumption in concurrent problem alcohol and illicit drug users:
52
53 Cochrane Reviewa. *Systematic Reviews*, 2, (12 January 2013).
- 54 KLIMAS, J., FIELD, C. A., BARRY, J., BURY, G., KEENAN, E., LYONS, S., SMYTH, B.
55
56 & CULLEN, W. 2012b. Commentary on 'The research translation problem: Alcohol
57
58 screening and brief intervention in primary care – Real world evidence supports
59
60 theory'. *Drugs: Education, Prevention, and Policy*, 19, 88-90.

- 1
2
3 LESTER, H., TAIT, L., KHERA, A., BIRCHWOOD, M., FREEMANTLE, N. &
4 PATTERSON, P. 2005. The development and implementation of an educational
5 intervention on first episode psychosis for primary care. *Med Educ*, 39, 1006-14.
6
7
8 MILLER, W. R., YAHNE, C. E., MOYERS, T. B., MARTINEZ, J. & PIRRITANO, M.
9
10 2004. A randomized trial of methods to help clinicians learn motivational
11 interviewing. *J Consult Clin Psychol*, 72, 1050-62.
12
13 MUENCH, J., JARVIS, K., BOVERMAN, J., HARDMAN, J., HAYES, M. & WINKLE, J.
14
15 2012. Tilling the Soil While Sowing the Seeds: Combining Resident Education with
16 Medical Home Transformation. *Substance Abuse*, 33, 282-285.
17
18 O'REGAN, A., CULHANE, A., DUNNE, C., GRIFFIN, M., MCGRATH, D., MEAGHER,
19
20 D., O'DWYER, P. & CULLEN, W. Integrating postgraduate and undergraduate
21 general practice education: qualitative study. *Education for Primary Care*, 24, 158-
22
23 164.
24
25 O'TOOLE, T. P., HANUSA, B. H., GIBBON, J. L. & BOYLES, S. H. 1999. Experiences and
26 attitudes of residents and students influence voluntary service with homeless
27 populations. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 14, 211-216.
28
29 O'BRIEN, S. & CULLEN, W. 2011. Undergraduate medical education in substance use in
30 Ireland: a review of the literature and discussion paper. *Irish Journal of Medical
31 Science*, 180, 787-792.
32
33
34 PAUL, G., SMITH, S. M., WHITFORD, D., O'KELLY, F. & O'DOWD, T. 2007.
35
36 Development of a complex intervention to test the effectiveness of peer support in
37 type 2 diabetes. *BMC Health Services Research*, 7, 136.
38
39 PUSKAR, K., GOTHAM, H. J., TERHORST, L., HAGLE, H., MITCHELL, A. M.,
40
41 BRAXTER, B., FIORAVANTI, M., KANE, I., TALCOTT, K. S., WOOPER, G. R.
42 & BURNS, H. K. 2012. Effects of Screening, Brief Intervention, and Referral to
43 Treatment (SBIRT) Education and Training on Nursing Students' Attitudes Toward
44 Working With Patients Who Use Alcohol and Drugs. *Substance Abuse*, 34, 122-128.
45
46 RYDER, N., CULLEN, W., BARRY, J., BURY, G., KEENAN, E. & SMYTH, B. P. 2009.
47
48 Prevalence of problem alcohol use among patients attending primary care for
49 methadone treatment. *BMC Fam Pract*, 10, 42.
50
51
52 SMITH, T., BOTELHO, R. & MATHERS, N. 2007. Making healthy choices easier: an
53 evaluation of a motivational practice workshop. *Education for Primary Care*, 18, 76-
54
55 83.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 WALTERS, S. T., MATSON, S. A., BAER, J. S. & ZIEDONIS, D. M. 2005. Effectiveness
4 of workshop training for psychosocial addiction treatments: a systematic review. *J*
5 *Subst Abuse Treat*, 29, 283-93.
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review

Tables and Figures

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

Learning outcomes

- Outline the importance of psychosocial interventions in primary care
- Outline the concept of zones / levels of risks and drinking patterns
- Describe clinical guidelines for managing problem alcohol use among drug users
- Describe why problem alcohol use is an important issue among problem drug users
- Approach the conversation about alcohol with patients
- Perform screening for problem alcohol use using AUDIT-C / AUDIT instruments
- Interpret screening for problem alcohol use using AUDIT-C / AUDIT instruments
- Establish a person's readiness to change
- Outline the 'FRAMES' approach to delivering brief interventions
- Deliver brief interventions using the 'FRAMES' outline

Delivery method

- Formal presentation
- Video demonstration of how to screen using the AUDIT and deliver a brief intervention
- Role play exercises on how to screen using the AUDIT and deliver a brief intervention
- Small group discussion
- Evaluation / anonymised feedback

Evaluation of education session

- How well were learning outcomes achieved
- Qualitative data on strengths / weaknesses
- Anonymous and confidential

Table 1 Self-reported ratings of knowledge or ability of conducting alcohol screening and brief intervention and usefulness of the session

<i>As a result of the session, I am better able to</i>	Strongly agree / agree N (%)	Neither	Strongly disagree / disagree N (%)	Mean score
Outline the importance of psychosocial intervention in primary care	16 (92%)	1 (6%)	0	3.41
Outline the concept of zones / levels in risks and drinking patterns	17 (100%)	0	0	3.53
Describe the clinical guidelines for managing problem alcohol use among drug users	15 (88%)	2 (12%)	0	3.18
Describe why problem alcohol use is an important issue among problem drug users	15 (88%)	2 (12%)	0	3.47
Approach the conversation about alcohol with patients	16 (92%)	1 (6%)	0	3.35
Perform screening for problem alcohol use using AUDIT-C / AUDIT instruments	17 (100%)	0	0	3.65
Interpret screening for problem alcohol use using AUDIT-C / AUDIT instruments	17 (100%)	0	0	3.53
Assess the person's readiness to change	10 (88%)	2 (17%)	0	3.17
Outline the 'FRAMES' approach to delivering brief interventions	10 (88%)	2 (17%)	0	3.25

Deliver brief interventions using the 'FRAMES' outline	10 (88%)	2 (17%)	0	3.25
<i>The following were useful in helping me achieve these outcomes</i>	Strongly agree / agree N (%)	Neither	Strongly disagree / disagree N (%)	Mean score
Presentation	16 (94%)	1 (6%)	0	3.47
Video	15 (88%)	2 (12%)	0	3.41
Simulation / Role play	11 (65%)	6 (35%)	0	2.82*
Q & A	17 (100%)	0	0	3.53
Guideline demonstration	15 (88%)	2 (12%)	0	3.18

* NB. Role play was not conducted in two sessions

Table 2 – Acceptability of the educational session

How did you find each aspect of the session?		
	What was good about it?	How can it be improved?
Presentation	clear, concise (6)* ; hand-outs (2); relevant to everyday practice (2); varied training modes, delivery (2); good overview (2); space for questions (1); very informative, increased awareness (2);	No comments
Video	good to see practical/ realistic/ visual example (6); demonstrated easiness, feasibility, simplicity of BI (2); relevant, appropriate for GPs (2); very good, well played (4)	update upper limit of low-risk drinking for male (1); do [role play] with a more relaxed introduction to put patient at ease rather than going straight into questions (1); use more difficult patient (1);
Simulation/ role play	better understanding of concept (2); good, realistic, quick consultation (4);	use a different scenario to the video scenario (3); update role-play info to state AUDIT-C done first and then full AUDIT done (1); little additional benefit (1);
Small group discussion	very useful, people had good suggestions (8); good conversation/ feedback (2); very good and beneficial (2); highlighted difficulties/ needs (2);	quantify "units" (1); in a group scenario with GPs, you could get 10-15 mins of discussions (1)

Guidelines demonstration	becoming familiar again (3); good to have hand out, clear flow charts (3); useful summary (3), e.g. "very helpful as would not get time to source guidelines myself";	make more obvious/ specific (2); not done/ more time for discussing guidelines (2); use traffic light to illustrate process (1);
<i>Would any other educational interventions / activities help participants?</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • each give a case example and feedback from others re suggestions for improvement • more simulation / role play may be helpful • not sure/ no (2x) • an up to date list of local alcohol services & telephone Nos. Already have many of them; [Are they] still current services / tel. numbers? Also number for private alcohol counsellors if any known (or, if not, as a lot to ask for any of above my jobs to sources them really) • interactive online learning with maybe MCQ [Multi-choice questions] 		
<i>Suggestions for improvement:</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it was useful / don't feel any changes are required (4x) • more guidance with guidelines • repeat this after trial of AUDIT score / brief intervention 		

*Numbers in brackets indicate how many participants reported about the particular item