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RESEARCH QUESTION

What is the comparative clinical effectiveness of intranasal (IN) versus intravenous (IV) naloxone for the treatment of suspected or apparent opioid overdose in the pre-hospital setting?

KEY MESSAGE

Two non-randomized studies regarding the comparative clinical effectiveness of IN versus IV naloxone for the treatment of suspected or apparent opioid overdose in the pre-hospital setting were identified.

METHODS

A limited literature search was conducted on key resources including PubMed, The Cochrane Library (2014, Issue 6), University of York Centre for Reviews and Dissemination (CRD) databases, Canadian and major international health technology agencies, as well as a focused Internet search. Where possible, retrieval was limited to the human population. The search was also limited to English language documents published between January 1, 2009 and June 4, 2014.

The summary of findings was prepared from the abstracts of the relevant information. Please note that data contained in abstracts may not always be an accurate reflection of the data contained within the full article.

RESULTS

Rapid Response reports are organized so that the higher quality evidence is presented first. Therefore, health technology assessment reports, systematic reviews, and meta-analyses are presented first. These are followed by randomized controlled trials and non-randomized studies.

Disclaimer: The Rapid Response Service is an information service for those involved in planning and providing health care in Canada. Rapid responses are based on a limited literature search and are not comprehensive, systematic reviews. The intent is to provide a list of sources of the best evidence on the topic that CADTH could identify using all reasonable efforts within the time allowed. Rapid responses should be considered along with other types of information and health care considerations. The information included in this response is not intended to replace professional medical advice, nor should it be construed as a recommendation for or against the use of a particular health technology. Readers are also cautioned that a lack of good quality evidence does not necessarily mean a lack of effectiveness particularly in the case of new and emerging health technologies, for which little information can be found, but which may in future prove to be effective. While CADTH has taken care in the preparation of the report to ensure that its contents are accurate, complete and up to date, CADTH does not make any guarantee to that effect. CADTH is not liable for any loss or damages resulting from use of the information in the report.

Copyright: This report contains CADTH copyright material and may contain material in which a third party owns copyright. This report may be used for the purposes of research or private study only. It may not be copied, posted on a web site, redistributed by email or stored on an electronic system without the prior written permission of CADTH or applicable copyright owner.

Links: This report may contain links to other information available on the websites of third parties on the Internet. CADTH does not have control over the content of such sites. Use of third party sites is governed by the owners’ own terms and conditions.
Two non-randomized studies regarding the comparative clinical effectiveness of IN versus IV naloxone for the treatment of opioid overdose in the pre-hospital setting were identified. No relevant health technology assessment reports, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, or randomized controlled trials were identified.

Additional references of potential interest are provided in the appendix.

OVERALL SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Two non-randomized studies\(^1,2\) examined the comparative clinical effectiveness of IN versus IV naloxone for the treatment of opioid overdose in the pre-hospital setting. In both studies, IN naloxone demonstrated equal clinical effectiveness to IV naloxone for this indication.\(^1,2\) Time to onset of clinical response was longer following IN than IV naloxone administration, but treatment was initiated more rapidly in the IN group, thus balancing the total time from presentation to clinical response in both groups.\(^2\) The authors suggested that, given the similar effectiveness of both routes of administration and the risks associated with using needles to deliver drugs intravenously, IN naloxone was a good alternative to IV naloxone for the treatment of opioid overdose.\(^1,2\)
REFERENCES SUMMARIZED

Health Technology Assessments
No literature identified.

Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses
No literature identified.

Randomized Controlled Trials
No literature identified.
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