

2012

# Screening, Brief Intervention, and Referral to Treatment: A Nursing Perspective

Chenit Ong-Flaherty

*University of San Francisco*, [congflaherty@usfca.edu](mailto:congflaherty@usfca.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: [http://repository.usfca.edu/nursing\\_fac](http://repository.usfca.edu/nursing_fac)

 Part of the [Nursing Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Ong-Flaherty, C. (2012). Screening, brief intervention, and referral to treatment: A nursing perspective. *Journal of Emergency Nursing: JEN : Official Publication of the Emergency Department Nurses Association*, 38(1), 54-56. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jen.2011.09.009>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Nursing and Health Professions at USF Scholarship: a digital repository @ Gleeson Library | Geschke Center. It has been accepted for inclusion in Nursing and Health Professions Faculty Research and Publications by an authorized administrator of USF Scholarship: a digital repository @ Gleeson Library | Geschke Center. For more information, please contact [repository@usfca.edu](mailto:repository@usfca.edu).



30 motivational interviewing is that it has been found to raise overall awareness on alcohol use as  
31 seen in the drop in alcohol use by controls in the short-term.<sup>4,6-8,11</sup>

32 The most important contribution to SBIRT is that universal screening allows for the  
33 collection of data on the extent of alcohol use in a community in the form of a needs assessment.  
34 With this data, public health policies can be more effectively tailored to the needs of the  
35 community. The power of information can also apply political pressure to fund preventive care  
36 versus shifting the money towards expensive down-stream care of trauma and chronic medical  
37 issues directly caused by alcohol use.

38 Among the challenges in SBIRT are

- 39
- 40 1. The flexibility in the interpretation of the components
  - 41 2. Long-term efficacy
  - 42 3. Staff buy-in of the concepts
  - 43 4. Difficulty in following patients
  - 44 5. Cost of staff education
  - 45 6. Consequences of screening
  - 46 7. The lack of recognition of other contributory factors in the use of and abstention from
  - 47 alcohol

48

49 While flexibility is an asset of SBIRT, numerous questions have been raised by the many  
50 studies conducted with variations to the interpretation of the SBIRT components. For example,  
51 it is still unclear how variations in the screening and brief intervention process might affect  
52 validity of the screening and its results: would patients be more inclined to self-report accurate  
53 alcohol use if the screening is done within a larger health assessment by a physician versus a  
54 separate “survey” by a non-physician? Does it matter if brief intervention is conducted at  
55 screening or in a separate appointment with another provider? Do the variations explain the lack  
56 of long-term efficacy of SBIRT identified? Another challenge identified is assuring staff training  
57 and buy-in of screening SBIRT.<sup>4,6-7</sup> The results of motivational interviewing depend on who  
58 does it and how it is done. Do discriminative views of “alcoholics” wasting precious emergency  
59 room time affect screener’s interactions with patients? The challenge of tracking patients and

60 attrition is also acknowledged by most authors contributing to the decreasing sample size as  
61 studies progressed.<sup>7-9,11</sup> The usefulness of SBIRT may be in “closed” integrated systems where  
62 electronic health records are shared and accessible across provider groups and referral sites.

63         Beyond the issues above, there is the concern of cost. In the environment of scarcity facing the  
64 U.S. health care system, who is to provide the training of staff, and who is to fund the long-term aspects  
65 of SBIRT to collect and analyze data, and to conduct follow-up interviews? If and when a patient is ready  
66 for treatment, is there a place readily accessible or will a long waiting period diminish the readiness of the  
67 patient to comply with recommended follow-up?

68         The final challenge of SBIRT is that it is not intended to address the wide spectrum of causes of  
69 alcohol use nor the many factors that contribute to sobriety. There is much to be learned on the  
70 pathophysiology of alcohol use, on the psychological aspects of addictive behaviors and personal  
71 readiness to change, and why certain cultures are more prone to the misuse of alcohol. Complex  
72 multivariate analysis within SBIRT has yet to include biological and social factors such as family history  
73 of drinking; supportive relationships/family life; state of employment; and other stresses or support  
74 systems contributing to the use of or abstinence from alcohol.

75 Clinical implications: to SBIRT or not to SBIRT

76         There are clearly concerns facing the implementation of SBIRT: mainly, its lack of long-  
77 term efficacy and uncertainty regarding realization of projected cost savings across different  
78 provider groups . In light of the U.S. health care situation of sky-rocketing costs, should SBIRT  
79 be universally implemented in emergency departments while long-term efficacy studies are still  
80 being conducted? Will future studies show that, “brief” interventions have limited success for  
81 patients with high-risk alcohol use, and further assessment and treatment are actually needed?  
82 The other ethical concern is accessibility to treatment—is it harmful to screen, raise hopes for  
83 treatment, and deny that hope when treatment is not available? Should funding target the causes  
84 of alcohol misuse, or be shifted to making treatment more available?

85           Contrary to these challenges are the positive public health aspects that can come from  
86 universal screening and learning the patterns of alcohol use within communities. The  
87 significance of preventive screening cannot be overstated in the management of any disease—and,  
88 there are many routine preventive services that have much less supporting evidence than SBIRT.  
89 We do know that an upstream high-risk screening early can prevent a critical trauma or chronic  
90 liver disease costing millions of dollars downstream.

91           The intentions of SBIRT are worthy but the long-term picture is incomplete. The decision  
92 to implement SBIRT must be carefully considered within the context of the overall burden of  
93 care due to alcohol-related injury and illness, the community needs assessment, and the resources  
94 available. The results of long-term studies will be a welcomed addition to help decide if SBIRT  
95 is suitable for every emergency department. In the meantime, those emergency departments  
96 already implementing SBIRT will also help contribute to that body of knowledge.

#### 97 References

- 98 1. Humeniuk R, Dennington V, & Ali R. The Effectiveness of brief intervention for illicit drugs  
99 linked to Alcohol, Smoking and Substance Involvement Screening Test (ASSIST) in primary  
100 health care settings: A technical report of phase III findings of the WHO ASSIST  
101 randomized controlled trial. Available at:  
102 [http://www.who.int/substance\\_abuse/activities/assist\\_technicalreport\\_phase3\\_final.pdf](http://www.who.int/substance_abuse/activities/assist_technicalreport_phase3_final.pdf).  
103 Accessed Sept 6, 2010.
- 104 2. Academic ED SBIRT Research Collaborative. An evidence-based alcohol screening, brief  
105 intervention and referral to treatment (SBIRT) curriculum for emergency (ED) providers  
106 improves skills and utilization. *Substance Abuse* 2007; 28:79-92
- 107 3. Bernstein E, Bernstein JA, Stein JB, Saitz R. SBIRT in emergency care settings: are we  
108 ready to take it to scale? *Academic Emergency Medicine* 2009; 16:1071-1077.

- 109 4. D'Onofrio G, Degutis LC. Integrating project ASSERT: A screening, intervention, and  
110 referral to  
111 treatment program for unhealthy alcohol and drug use in an urban emergency department.  
112 *Academic Emergency Medicine* 2010; 17:903-911.
- 113 5. Estee S, Wickizer T, He L, Shah MF, Mancuso D. Evaluation of the Washington state  
114 screening,  
115 brief intervention, and referral to treatment project. *Medical Care* 2010; 48:18-24.
- 116 6. Madras BK, Compton WM, Avula D, Stegbauer T, Stein JB, Clark HW. Screening, brief  
117 intervention, referral to treatment (SBIRT) for illicit drug and alcohol use at multiple  
118 healthcare sites: comparison at intake and 6 months later. *Alcohol and Drug Dependence*  
119 2009; 99:280-195.
- 120 7. Academic ED SBIRT Research Collaborative. The impact of screening, brief intervention and  
121 referral to treatment in emergency department patients' alcohol use. *Alcohol and Alcoholism* 2010;  
122 45:514-519.
- 123 8. Cherpital CJ, Korcha RA, Moskalewicz J, Swiatkiewicz G, Ye Y, Bond B. Screening, brief  
124 intervention and referral to treatment (SBIRT): 12 -month outcomes of a randomized  
125 controlled clinical trial in a Polish emergency department. *Alcoholism: Clinical and*  
126 *Experimental Research* 2010; 14:1922-1928.
- 127 9. Crawford MJ, Patton R, Drummond C, Byford S, Barrett B, Reece B, et al. Screening and  
128 referral for  
129 brief intervention of alcohol-misusing patients in an emergency department: a pragmatic  
130 randomized controlled trial. *Lancet* 2004; 364:1334-1339.
- 131 10. Daeppen JB, Gaume J, Bady P, Yersin B, Calmes JM, Givel JC, et al. Brief alcohol  
132 intervention and

133 alcohol assessment do not influence alcohol use in injured patients treated in the emergency  
134 department: a randomized controlled clinical trial. *Addiction* 2007; 102:1224-1233.  
135 11. Desy PM, Howard PK, Perhats C, Li S. Alcohol screening, brief intervention, and referral to  
136 treatment conducted by emergency nurses: an impact evaluation. *Journal of Emergency Medicine*  
137 2010; 36:538-545.

© 2012. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>