progressing to cirrhosis and of developing hepatocellular carcinoma. Tiredness was increased in individuals homozygous for the Cys282Tyr mutation that could have important repercussions in the workplace setting.

Health economic considerations are vital to decisions regarding screening programmes. An economic analysis of this programme is currently ongoing. If genetic screening is shown to be cost effective, it should be implemented since hereditary haemochromatosis can be prevented by simple measures and, as shown in our study, the risks of such screening are very low and genetic discrimination need not occur.
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Safer injection facility use and syringe sharing in injection drug users

Tom Kerr, Mark Tyndall, Kathy Li, Julio Montaner, Evan Wood

Safer injection facilities provide medical supervision for illicit drug injections. We aimed to examine factors associated with syringe sharing in a community-recruited cohort of illicit injection drug users in a setting where such a facility was independently associated with reduced syringe sharing (adjusted odds ratio 0·30, 0·11–0·82, p=0·02) after adjustment for relevant sociodemographic and drug-use characteristics. These findings could help inform discussions about the merits of such facilities.

Vancouver, Canada, like many urban centres, has been the site of continuing HIV and overdose epidemics in illicit injection drug users. In response to these public health problems, health officials in Vancouver opened North America’s first medically supervised safer injection facility in September, 2003. As previously described, injection drug users in the facility can access sterile injecting equipment, inject preobtained illicit drugs under the supervision of nurses, and access nursing care and addictions counselling. Although such facilities exist in several European settings and in Sydney, Australia, few formal epidemiological analyses have been done of their effects on reported HIV risk behaviours, such as syringe sharing. In Vancouver, a continuing prospective cohort study of injection drug users allowed us to examine factors associated with syringe sharing in local users after the opening of the safer injection facility.

We obtained data for these analyses from the Vancouver Injection Drug Users Study, a prospective cohort that has been described previously. The study has been approved by the University of British Columbia and Providence Health Care ethics review boards, and all study participants provided written consent before enrolment. To be consistent with earlier analyses, and to provide sufficient statistical power, syringe sharing was defined as borrowing or lending a used syringe in the
past 6 months. Data from participants seen between Dec 1, 2003, and June 1, 2004, were assessed in our study. We used univariate and multivariate statistics to determine factors associated with syringe sharing in the past 6 months. The associations between independent variables and the dependent variable were first analysed by univariate logistic regression. To adjust for potential confounding between use of the safer injection facility and syringe sharing, variables that were found to be significantly associated with syringe sharing (p<0.05) were then considered in a fixed logistic regression model, which included all variables that met this criteria as well as the facility use variable. We did all statistical analyses using SAS software version 8.0 (SAS, Cary, NC, USA).

We selected sociodemographic and drug use characteristics in these analyses on the basis of previous investigations of syringe sharing in injection drug users in Vancouver,6,7 including: age, HIV serostatus, limited access to sterile syringes, need for help with injections, binge drug use, frequency of cocaine and heroin injection, and methadone maintenance treatment. Variable definitions were consistent with previous analyses: individuals who reported using cocaine or heroin once a day or more were defined as frequent cocaine or heroin users.8 Bingeing was defined as periods in which drugs were used more often than usual. To evaluate the effect of needle exchange programme access on syringe sharing, we compared participants who did and did not report accessing sterile syringes from such a programme. To consider the effect of the safer injection facility, we compared participants who reported undertaking all, most, or some of their injections at the facility with those participants who reported undertaking few or none of their injections at the facility.

431 active injection drug users were seen for follow-up during the study period, of whom 90 (20.9%, 95% CI 17.1–24.7) reported that all, most, or some of their injections were at the safer injection facility. 49 (11.4%, 8.5–14.3) individuals reported sharing syringes during this same period. Univariate analyses showed that need for help with injecting (odds ratio [OR] 2.94, 95% CI 1.46, 5.92, p=0.01), bingeing (OR 2.04, 1.02–4.08, p=0.04) and need for help with injecting (OR 2.94, 95% CI 1.46, 5.92, p=0.01), bingeing (OR 2.04, 1.02–4.08, p=0.04) and need for help with injecting (OR 2.94, 95% CI 1.46, 5.92, p=0.01), bingeing (OR 2.04, 1.02–4.08, p=0.04) and need for help with injecting (OR 2.94, 95% CI 1.46, 5.92, p=0.01), bingeing (OR 2.04, 1.02–4.08, p=0.04) and need for help with injecting (OR 2.94, 95% CI 1.46, 5.92, p=0.01), bingeing (OR 2.04, 1.02–4.08, p=0.04) and need for help with injecting (OR 2.94, 95% CI 1.46, 5.92, p=0.01), bingeing (OR 2.04, 1.02–4.08, p=0.04). We realised that despite multivariate adjustment, our findings could be due to residual confounding if the safer injection facility had selected injection drug users who were inherently at a lower risk of syringe sharing. To test for this, we examined the rate of syringe sharing for those who did use the facility and those who did not during their follow-up visit immediately before its opening on Sept 22, 2003. Rates of syringe sharing were similar in these populations before the opening (χ² 0.46, 1 degree of freedom, p=0.50), and the differences only emerged during follow-up after the facility had opened.

We have shown that use of a medically supervised safer injection facility was independently associated with reduced syringe sharing in a community-recruited sample of injection drug users who had similar rates of syringe sharing before the facility’s opening. Our study has several limitations. First, although previous studies have indicated that the Vancouver Injection Drug Users Study cohort is representative of local users, it is not a random sample. Second, although it is highly plausible that provision of sterile injecting equipment and medical supervision of injection drug use could be causally related with reduced syringe sharing, our study is limited by its cross-sectional design and hence we caution against inferring such a causal relation. However, our prospective approach showed that differences in the rate of syringe sharing only emerged after the facility opened. It is noteworthy that ethical issues will probably prevent interventional study designs that could completely resolve the issues of selection effects and unmeasured confounding. It should also be noted that we probably underestimated rates of syringe sharing and borrowing because of socially desirable responding, and we were forced to use a combined endpoint of lending and borrowing to obtain adequate statistical power. We have justified this approach previously, and we applied a rigorous approach in our attempts to control for potential confounders.9 Future prospective analyses with nominal data about recent use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Adjusted odds ratio (95% CI)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (per year older)</td>
<td>0.95 (0.92–0.98)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of safer injection facility</td>
<td>0.30 (0.11–0.82)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for help injecting</td>
<td>2.95 (1.57–5.55)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binge drug use</td>
<td>2.04 (1.02–4.08)</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept (constant)</td>
<td>(–0.79)</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: Multivariate logistic regression of factors associated with syringe sharing


The protective effect of safer injection facility use remained independently associated with reduced syringe sharing when we further adjusted the model to include frequent heroin and cocaine injection (adjusted OR 0.29, 0.11–0.78, p=0.01). Although our logistic models included a small number of syringe sharing events, a goodness of fit test indicated that the estimated models fit the data.

We realised that despite multivariate adjustment, our findings could be due to residual confounding if the safer injection facility had selected injection drug users who were inherently at a lower risk of syringe sharing. To test for this, we examined the rate of syringe sharing for those who did use the facility and those who did not during their follow-up visit immediately before its opening on Sept 22, 2003. Rates of syringe sharing were similar in these populations before the opening (χ² 0.46, 1 degree of freedom, p=0.50), and the differences only emerged during follow-up after the facility had opened.

We have shown that use of a medically supervised safer injection facility was independently associated with reduced syringe sharing in a community-recruited sample of injection drug users who had similar rates of syringe sharing before the facility’s opening. Our study has several limitations. First, although previous studies have indicated that the Vancouver Injection Drug Users Study cohort is representative of local users, it is not a random sample. Second, although it is highly plausible that provision of sterile injecting equipment and medical supervision of injection drug use could be causally related with reduced syringe sharing, our study is limited by its cross-sectional design and hence we caution against inferring such a causal relation. However, our prospective approach showed that differences in the rate of syringe sharing only emerged after the facility opened. It is noteworthy that ethical issues will probably prevent interventional study designs that could completely resolve the issues of selection effects and unmeasured confounding. It should also be noted that we probably underestimated rates of syringe sharing and borrowing because of socially desirable responding, and we were forced to use a combined endpoint of lending and borrowing to obtain adequate statistical power. We have justified this approach previously, and we applied a rigorous approach in our attempts to control for potential confounders.9 Future prospective analyses with nominal data about recent use
Reduced intensity conditioning for allograft after cytoreductive autograft in metastatic breast cancer

Angelo M Carella, Germana Beltrami, Maria T Corsetti, Sandro Nati, Pellegrino Musto, Potito Scalzulli, Roberta Gonella, Alberto Ballestro, Franco Patrone

The benefits of allografting noted in some malignant diseases might be safely extended to metastatic breast cancer by a combination of cytoreduction with high-dose chemotherapy (HDT) and autologous stem-cell transplant (ASCT) with graft-versus-tumour effect mediated by transplanted donor immune cells with nonmyeloablative allografting (reduced intensity conditioning transplantation, RICT). 17 patients with heavily pretreated disease were given tandem transplants. 13 patients sustained donor engraftment. Three had partial remission after HDT and ASCT and complete remission after RICT; they achieved full chimerism and all developed graft-versus-host disease (GVHD) before regression of cancer. Another patient did not respond to HDT and ASCT but had partial remission after RICT, giving rise to evaluable disease but not brain metastases. At time of HDT/ASCT, the patients had received a median (range) of 3 (2–5) previous chemotherapies. 14 patients had received hormone therapy, and seven patients had undergone radiotherapy on bone lesions. The study was approved by the ethics committee of San Martino.

We aimed to use HDT and ASCT to achieve maximum tumour reduction in patients before proceeding to RICT. This tactic could provide the benefit of a conventional allograft, but with reductions in the typical acute toxicities and associated mortality of myeloablative therapy.

Between September, 1997, and April, 2004, we enrolled 17 patients with metastatic breast adenocarcinoma (table 1). Median age was 41 years. To be enrolled, patients had to have evaluable disease but not brain metastases. At time of HDT/ASCT, the patients had received a median of 3 (range 2–5) previous chemotherapies; 14 patients had received hormone therapy, and seven patients had undergone radiotherapy on bone lesions. The study was approved by the ethics committee of San Martino.