SUMMARY

The allocation of resources to prevent alcohol-related injuries should address different risk groups within the population as well as hazardous alcohol products and drinking environments. Because of the high prevalence of hazardous drinking behavior, universal strategies that reduce the alcohol consumption of all drinkers should be a priority, particularly those targeting the price and physical availability of alcohol. Targeting the cheap, high-strength alcohol often preferred by hazardous drinkers through policy interventions (e.g., by setting a minimum price per standard drink) should also be a priority. The risk of alcohol-related injury is highly context-specific, and some drinking environments are especially high risk for injury. There are proven strategies for limiting the risk of injury both in public drinking venues such as bars and nightclubs and on the roads. For example, drinking environments may be modified and staff trained to reduce risk of injury independent of drinking behavior per se. Policing strategies, which can help to reduce risk of alcohol-related violence at drinking venues, and deter impaired driving, can also be implemented. Targeted strategies that screen, identify, and provide brief intervention to hazardous drinkers can also be effective. These types of interventions have been successfully implemented in emergency departments, resulting in reductions in alcohol consumption and related injuries. Evidence that school education and public alcohol awareness campaigns work is weak. However, it is recommended that alcohol education be re-conceptualized as a means to raising awareness of both alcohol-related harms and the availability of effective strategies to increase public support for effective measures to reduce alcohol-related injury. A sea change in public opinion on alcohol and alcohol-related problems is required so that the yawning gap between what is known about the prevention of alcohol-related injuries and what is actually implemented can begin to be closed.

INTRODUCTION

When strategies to address alcohol-related problems are considered, it is tempting to focus initiatives and resources only on those sectors of the tion focus, and 2) once focused, convincing persons consumption than there are with dependence, so who are habituated or dependent on alcohol to dramatically change their behavior. On the other hand, at the societal level, there may be public or administrative resistance to implementing measures that do not target those who frequently drink large quantities, so population-level interventions or policies may face the challenge of persuading policy makers that bringing about modest change in many indi-pursuing. Of particular relevance to alcohol-relat ed injury are analyses of the prevention paradox in relation to alcohol use showing that "acute" alcohol-related harms in general are mostly experienced by occasional heavy drinkers (10-12 This perspec tive may be helpful in overcoming theoretical political resistance to the implementation of effective prevention measures that target this common drink ing pattern, especially in hazardous settings (e.g., when driving or operating machinery). Based on the theory of the prevention paradox, population-wide measures such as random breath testing, increased pricing and reduced physical availability of alcohol offer the promise of greater impact (5-none of which depend on moderate drinkers being internally "motivated" to reduce their occasional excessive consumption.

ferent contexts, including binge drinking among college students (13, general populations of Norway and Sweden (14, adolescents in 23 European countries (15), and a household survey in Brazil (16 A report by Spurling and Vinson (17) based on a population-based case-control and case-crossover study in three emergency departments in a U.S. county estimated the population-attributable fraction (PAF) associated with drinking in the six-hour period before injury. Based on their results, "the PAF that was due to what is usually considered less hazardous alcohol consumption (fewer than 5 standard drinks for men and fewer than 4 for women on one occasion) was $v\ddot{a}w\ddot{a} \leftarrow -\check{S} + ... f + \check{a} + ... \ddot{a} + \check{a} + ... \ddot{a} +$ case-control analysis. The PAF that was due to alco-Š 'Ž † ‡ ' ‡ • † ‡ • ... ‡ ™ f p. 447a).rThóe chi6ical point here is that there are substantially larger num-

bers of individuals consuming at the lower levels of

This concept has been examined in several dif-

after these attributable fractions are applied there are many more preventable cases among lower-risk versus high-risk drinkers.

Given their differences in scope and goal, these strategies are not mutually exclusive; neither is fully adequate alone in a comprehensive approach, and both population-level and the more focused interventions are needed (18. Action on the former is essential"to make substantial progress in reducing hazardous drinking and alcohol-related harm, and supportive action in the latter area is required in a comprehensive approach.

In generic terms, eight strategies have been shown to be effective in reducing alcohol-related harm: four types of population-level policies, and four types of targeted policies. All have the potential for reducing the incidence of cases that come to emergency room services. They are presented below by category.

Population-level policies

lated harm such as injury.

Risk by beverage type

Low-risk drinking guidelines are promoted in many countries and many of these provide separate advice recommending various upper limits of consumption to minimize risk of short-term or acute-risk harm (injuries and poisonings) as opposed to longer-term risk of serious illnesses (3). In Canada (3)2 and the United States (33, the suggested upper limits to reduce risk of short-term harm such as injury are 1) three "standard drinks" (12-14 g of ethanol in the US, 13.45g in Canada) in one day for a female and also reported marked and similar variations in risk four standard drinks in one day for males. In Canada,

(by one drink in each case) recommended for young $f \uparrow - \check{Z} - \bullet$ 'tw $\Rightarrow \ddagger f " \bullet$ ' $\check{Z} \uparrow f \bullet \uparrow$ ' \ddagger '' $\check{Z} \ddagger \times \times \times \to \ddagger f " \bullet$ ' $\check{Z} \uparrow$ 31 Additional advice is provided regarding low-risk drinking environments and drinking speeds, including suggestions about drinking alcohol with meals and avoiding combined use with other mood-alter ing drugs. Applying these criteria, Zhao et al. (34 analyzed national Canadian survey data to assess the extent to which different types of beverages were consumed in daily quantities inconsistent with

showed that on days when guidelines for avoiding $f\ldots --$ ‡ Šf"• $^{\mathsf{TM}}$ ‡"‡ ‡š \ldots ‡‡†‡†á ww"'^ -Ї fŽ \ldots 'Š'Ž \ldots '•-•—•‡† TM f • (• -Ї ^'"• '^ "‡‡" f • † uu" (• -Ї ^'"• of spirits. However, there were marked gender dif ferences in these trends, with a much higher proper tion of males drinking beer versus spirits on risky consumption occasions, and a reverse pattern for females.

as the Yesterday Method (35, 36 Zhao et al. (34)

Klatsky et al. (37) studied correlates of wine, spirits, or beer preference among 53 172 white men and women in a U.S. prepaid health plan. A preference for wine was more likely to be expressed by women, light drinkers, young or middle-aged people, nonsmokers, people with higher education, and those who were free of symptoms or risk of illness. Persons who preferred spirits were likely to be men, heavier drinkers, middle-aged or older, less educat-

cheap alcohol increase the risk of acute alcohol-re- $\ddagger \dagger \acute{a} f \cdot \dagger f \cdot \eth \check{Z} \cdot ... - \ddagger \dagger \check{T} \cdot (-\check{S} \cdot) \cdot (-\dot{S} \cdot$ major illnesses. Persons who preferred beer were likely to be younger, male, and intermediate between wine and spirits drinkers on level of consumption and health.

> $\check{S} \ddagger f, \check{a} = \check{D} \cdot \bullet \uparrow \cdot \bullet \cdot \bullet \cdot \bullet \cdot - \cdot \bullet \cdot \check{Z} - \check{S} f$ nol in beer or spirits is intrinsically more risky than wine, for example, do suggest that due to a constellation of factors and beverage preferences, the consumption of some beverages is more associated with injury risk than others, a conclusion that has policy and prevention implications in relation to marketing and pricing of alcohol in particular. Earlier research

$$-\check{S} \ddagger \ \% - (\dagger \ddagger \check{Z} \cdot \bullet \ddagger \bullet \ f \ "\ddagger \ "-f \ \check{Z} \cdot \bullet (+ + \ ") \ f \ \% \ddagger \acute{T} \ (-\check{S} \ \check{Z} \cdot TM \ddagger " \ \check{Z} \cdot \bullet (-\bullet)$$
(by one drink in each case) recommended for young
$$f + -\check{Z} - \bullet \quad (t \ W \) \ddagger f \ "\bullet \ (\check{Z} + f \bullet + \ ' \ddagger ') \ \check{Z} \ddagger \ \cdot \ \times V \) \ddagger f \ "\bullet \ (\check{Z} + 31)$$

-Ї•‡ ‰ — ⟨†‡Ž⟨•‡•ä •⟨•‰
$$f$$
 •'‡...⟨Đ⟨... −‡...Š•⟨"—‡ ••'™• as the Yesterday Method (35, 36 Zhao et al. (3) showed that on days when guidelines for avoiding f ...—-‡ Š f "• $^{\text{TM}}$ ‡ ‡ \mathring{s} ...‡‡†‡ \mathring{a} ww" '^ -Ї \mathring{f} Ž...'Š'Ž ...'•-•—•‡† $^{\text{TM}}$ f • ⟨• -Ї ^'"• '^ "‡‡" f •† uu" ⟨• -Ї ^'"• of spirits. However, there were marked gender differences in these trends, with a much higher propertion of males drinking beer versus spirits on risky consumption occasions, and a reverse pattern for females.

drinks more available increases risk of harm is well illustrated in a U.S. college drinking study that compared drinking behavior and enjoyment at fraternity parties with free, unmarked beer, provided under - $^{\text{TM}}$ ' $" \ddagger " - \check{S} f - TM f \bullet '" `` († \ddagger † TM f \bullet ' \bullet \check{Z})$ -•‡á f•† ‹• -Ї •‡...'•† ...'•†‹-‹' there were only minor differences in the quantities of high- and low-strength beer consumed, partygoers indicated similar levels of enjoyment and, most $\langle \bullet' , "-f \bullet - \check{Z} \rangle \acute{a} \dots , \bullet \bullet - \bullet \ddagger " \bullet , - \check{S} \ddagger$ stantially lower blood alcohol concentration (BAC) readings than those who consumed the stronger beer (41). This implies that if the same scenario had occurred in a commercial setting, the same (or \ddagger \ddagger \bullet % " \ddagger f - \ddagger " ' \ni \leftarrow \frown TM ' \longrightarrow \check{Z} \dagger \check{S} fretailers on sales of the weaker beer, but the risk of adverse health and safety effects would have been much lower with the reduced-alcohol drinks. A more recent Canadian study found that young beer drinkers could not reliably tell the difference between high- and low-strength beer in terms of enjoyment or level of intoxication (42), suggesting that beverage strength (at least in relation to beer) • f > ", ‡ f • ' † < Ð < f ", Ž ‡ " < • • ^ f ... - ' " and safety outcomes.

dZ'd/E', • ZKh^{\wedge} $Es/ZKEDEd^{\wedge}$

Prevention strategies and policies can also target the environment. This can involve making drinking venues, roads, and workplaces safer. There is extensive research on policing of licensed premises, server training and intervention, and enforcement of laws against service to intoxicated patrons and those under-age, which is highly relevant to promoting a safer drinking environment (5, 43, 49). The design of licensed premises is also relevant. For example, in drinking establishments, poor lighting, steep staircases without proper railings, or physical arrangements that encourage crowding can contribute to accidents or inter-personal violence (43). Furthermore, if staff at these drinking establishments are prone to over-service (continuing to provide alcohol when a customer is obviously intoxicated), the

risk of injury is further enhanced (5). Precautionary serving practices in a well-lit, well-designed venue can reduce risk.

In many countries, there has been a decline in crashes, injuges, and deaths involving drivers un-cusing on preventing drink-driving it is also partly attributable to improvements in road and motor .vehicle safety. These include but are not limited to better lighting and signage; more effective and better placement of roadside barriers; clearer and illu minated road markings; and electronic warnings of weather conditions and other hazards. Given these positive developments, someone driving under the $(\bullet \overset{\bullet}{\mathbf{D}}\overset{\bullet}{\mathbf{Z}}\overset{\bullet}{-} \overset{\bullet}{\mathbf{D}}\overset{\bullet}{\mathbf{D}}\overset{\bullet}{\mathbf{Z}}\overset{\bullet}{-} \overset{\bullet}{\mathbf{Z}}\overset{\bullet}{\mathbf{Z}}\overset{\bullet}{-} \overset{\bullet}{\mathbf{Z}}\overset{\bullet}{\mathbf{Z}}\overset{\bullet}{-} \overset{\bullet}{\mathbf{Z}}\overset{\bullet}{\mathbf{Z}$ avoiding a crash, or surviving, should it occur. Changes in automobile design are also relevant, including better braking systems; airbags; mandatory seatbelts; and center-high mount stop lamps (CHMSLs; central brake light mounted higher than the regular left/right brake lamps, sometimes referred to as the "eye-level" or "third" brake light), among others.

 department could be used as a surrogate measure of alcohol-related injuries. In line with the prevention paradox theory, it is important to recognize that

Use of targeted strategies that screen, identify, and provide brief intervention to individuals drinking above low-risk guidelines is recommended based on encouraging evidence that these types of approaches can result in reduced consumption and related harms (4). Such interventions have also been mounted in emergency departments, with some showing success in reducing consumption and alcohol-related injuries (50).

cause the evidence that school education and pub as well as the need for them (52 Q

lic alcohol-awareness campaigns are effective is weak, at best (4, 5, they can also be used to help reduce alcohol-related injury, mainly as a complementary approach to those described above. There is some evidence that public information campaigns can help support the effectiveness of other, prov en strategies to reduce alcohol-related injury, such as random breath testing or enforcement of liquor laws (48, 51). Alcohol education strategies should be Finally, although educational strategies were re-conceptualized to focus on raising awareness of • '- ... '~ + " + + • ' + ... \ D \ ... f Ž Ž \ \ \ (• - Š \ • Š ... \$ # ^ D + ... f • ... • - Ž \ -, \$ + • + ' - Š + " a • ' " + + ^

Ζ & Ζ Ε

- Shield K, Rlett M, Gmel G, Gmel G, Kehoe-Chan T, Rehm J. Global alcohol exposure estimates by country, territory and region for 2005—a contribution to the Comparative Risk Assessment for the 2010 Global Burden of Disease Study. Addiction. 2013;108(5):912-22.
- Giesbrecht N Cukier S, Steeves D. Collateral damage from alcohol: implications of 'second-hand effects of 2010;105(8):1323-5.
- Laslett AM, Catalano P, Chikritzhs, Dale C, Doran C, \ddagger "" \leftarrow á \ddagger - f Ž ä Š \ddagger "f \bullet % \ddagger f \bullet † \bullet f % \bullet \leftarrow to others. Deakin West, ACT: Foundation for Alcohol Research and Education; 2010.
- Anderson P, Chisholm DFuhr DC. Effectiveness and costeffectiveness of policies and programs to reduce the harm caused by alcohol. Lancet. 2009;373(9682):2234-46.
- Babor T, Caetano R, Cassell S, Edwards G, Giesbrecht N, Graham K, et al. Alcohol: no ordinary commodityresearch and public policy. 2nd. ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2010.
- Butt P, Beirness D, Cesar F, Gliksman L, Paradis C, Stockwell T. Alcohol and health in Canada: a summary of evidence and guidelines for low-risk drinking. Ottawa: Canadian Centre on Substance Abuse; 2011.
- Kreitman N. Alcohol consumption and the preventive paradox. Br J Addict. 1986;81(3):353-63.
- Hunt K, Emslie C. Commentary: the pvention paradox in lay epidemiology—Rose revisited. Int J Epidemiol. 2001;30(3):442-6.

- Stockwell T, Hawks D, Lang E, Rydon P. Unravelling the preventive paradox for acute alcohol problems. Drug Alcohol Rev. 1996;15(1):7-15.
- 10. Gmel G, Klingemann S, Müller R, Brenner Devisiting the preventive paradox: the Swiss case. Addiction. 2001;96(2):273-84.
- 11, Skög OJ, Alcohol and the so-called expention paradox: how does it look today? Addiction. 2006;101(2):155–8.
- 12. Weitzman ER, Nelson T. College student binge drinking and the "prevention paradox"; implications of prevention Tand harm reduction. J Drug Educ. 2004;34(3):247–65.
- 13. Rossow I, Romelsjö A. The extent of the 'prevention 'f"f†'šï ‹• fŽ...'Š'Ž '"'"އ•• f• f drinking patterns. Addiction. 2006;101(1):84-90.
- 14. Danielsson AK, Wennbegr P, Hibell B, Romelsjö A. Alcohol use, heavy episodic drinking and subsequent problems among adolescents in 23 European countries: does the prevention paradox apply? Addiction. 2011;107(1):71–80.
- 15. Caetano R, Mills B, Pinsky I, Zaleski M, and Lanjeira R. The distribution of alcohol consumption and the prevention paradox in Brazil. Addiction. 2012;107(1):60-8. doi: 10.1111/j.1360-0443.2011.03567.x. Epub 2011 Oct 7.
- 16. Spurling MC, Vinson DC. Alcohoelated injuries: evidence for the prevention paradox. Ann Fam Med. 2005;3(1):47-52.
- 17. Giesbrecht N Stockwell T, Kendall P, Strang J, Thomas G. Alcohol in Canada: reducing the toll through focused interventions and public health policies. CMAJ. 2011;183(4):450-5. doi: 10.1503/cmaj.100825.

- Wagenaar AC, Salois MJ, Komro KA. Effects of beverage alcohol price and tax levels on drinking: a metaanalysis of 1003 estimates from 112 studies. Addiction. 2009;104(2):179–90.
- 19. Wagenaar AC, Tobler AL, Komro KA. Effects of alcohol tax and price policies on morbidity and mortality: a systematic review. Am J Public Health. 2010;100(11):2270–8.
- 20. Patra J, Giesbrecht N, Rehm J, Bekmuradov D, Popova S. Are alcohol prices and taxes an evidence-based approach to reducing alcohol-related harm and promoting public health and safety? A literature review. Contemp Drug analC7d>kw0 9 67.797 595.1895 Tm ()Tj5.084 J,8.678mur G4 Macdo.80d S, Vbno A, e Tm . Minimum14.9(v D)24.7(, P)18outle TA lit]1 19.

40.