New Psychoactive Substances- A Review and Updates

Abstract

New psychoactive substances (NPS) are a heterogeneous group of substances. They are associated with a number of health and social harms on an individual and societal level. NPS toxicity and dependence syndromes are recognised in primary care, emergency departments, psychiatric inpatient and community care settings. One pragmatic classification system is to divide NPS into one of four groups: synthetic stimulants, synthetic cannabinoids, synthetic hallucinogens and synthetic depressants (which include synthetic opioids and benzodiazepines). We review these four classes of NPS, including their chemical structures, mechanism of action, modes of use, intended intoxicant effects, and their associated physical and mental health harms. The current challenges faced by laboratory testing for NPS are also explored, in the context of the diverse range of NPS currently available, rate of production and emergence of new substances, the different formulations, and methods of acquisition and distribution.

Keywords

New psychoactive substances, NPS, synthetic stimulants, synthetic cannabinoid receptor agonists, synthetic hallucinogens, synthetic opioids, laboratory testing.

Funding

The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and publication of this article.

Conflict of interest statement

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

Introduction

New psychoactive substances (NPS) are a complex and diverse group of substances often known as either designer or synthetic drugs, or by the more popular but misleading colloquial term of "*legal highs*"[1,2]. They tend to be either analogues of existing controlled drugs and pharmaceutical products or newly synthesised chemicals, created to mimic the actions and psychoactive effects of licensed medicines and other controlled substances[3-5]. By their number, nature and composition, NPS pose significant challenges for drug consumers, clinicians – both in drug services and more broadly - researchers, forensic toxicologists, healthcare systems and drug control policy globally, and have been described as a "*growing worldwide epidemic*" [6,7].

The United Nations Office for Drugs and Crime (UNODC) has defined NPS as "*substances of abuse, either in a pure form or a preparation, that are not controlled by the 1961 Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs or the 1971 Convention on Psychotropic Substances, but which may pose a public health threat*"[8]. However, definitions of NPS can vary between countries, reflecting differences in national legislation, rather than pharmacological or structural classification. Although some former NPS have been subject to international control under the UN Conventions (e.g. mephedrone in 2015; the synthetic cannabinoid ADB-FUBINACA in 2019), different approaches have been taken to legal control at national level[9-11]. This has included the use of existing controlled drug legislation, new NPS-specific legislation, or extension of generic public health and medicines legislation. In the United Kingdom, for example, the Psychoactive Substances Act 2016 introduced legislation which made it an offence to produce, supply, offer to supply, possess with intent to supply, possess on custodial premises, import or export psychoactive substances, but did not make it an offence to possess for personal use outside of a custodial setting[12]. In principle this created a "*blanket ban*" of all current and future NPS (with certain exemptions). However, the legislation has been criticised for the imprecise definition of psychoactivity, its blanket nature covering compounds with quite differing harm profiles, difficulties in enforcement, and exemptions which meant that popular NPS such as nitrous oxide can still be purchased[13-15]. Early evaluation of the Act suggested that whilst the availability of NPS had decreased, there was no evidence of a reduction in NPS-related harms[16].

By 2018, a total of 892 individual NPS, reported by 119 countries, were being monitored by the UNODC early warning system[17] and by the end of 2018, over 730 NPS had been notified to the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA)[18]. The rapid proliferation at which new NPS have emerged on the global drugs market is unparalleled[19] and it was estimated that at its peak in 2015, new NPS appeared at a rate of at least one new substance per week[20]. The number of new NPS detections has decreased in recent years, and in addition, the nature of the market has changed, with a relative decrease in the number of new stimulants and synthetic cannabinoids detected, and an increase in the numbers of new opioids and benzodiazepines available[18]. The rapidly changing profile of the NPS market raises concerns over uncertainty and ambiguity regarding their chemical, metabolic and toxicity profiles, and the associated physical, social, and mental health harms[21-23].

Despite a large number of NPS being detected and actively monitored, estimates of general population use are relatively low compared to other type of controlled drugs, and use has fallen over the previous five years as result of factors such as legal control, market dynamics, substance trends and fashions, and changes in the availability of other controlled drugs[24]. NPS epidemiology is under-developed, and differences in definition and methodologies means that it is difficult to gain accurate estimates of use. The 2018/19 Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW) reported around 0.5 per-cent of adults aged 16 to 59 years (approximately 152,000 people) had used NPS in the last year, and that around half of all NPS users were aged 16 to 24 years (encompassing approximately 86,000 young adults). Regarding frequency of use, of those who had consumed any NPS in the last year, about half had consumed at least twice that year, around one in four had used NPS two or more times a month and around eight per cent had used NPS daily[25]. Whilst individual NPS are not included in the CSEW, the most popular forms of substance were powders, crystals or tablets (31.0%); herbal smoking mixtures (24.1%); liquids (17.9%); or “another substance” (31.0%). Prevalence of nitrous oxide (“laughing gas”) has remained relatively high and stable over the past few years (despite legal control in 2016), and 2.3% of 16-59 year olds and 8.7% of 16-24 year olds report use in the previous year. Amongst 16-24 year olds, nitrous oxide is now the second most prevalent drug after cannabis (reported by 17.3% of 16-24 year olds)[25].

Although research suggests that NPS are associated with harms in key populations such as people who are homeless or prisoners[26], there are no robust estimates of levels of use. For example, the 2018/19 Crime Survey for England and Wales described above is based on self-reporting by users. Data on adult drug treatment in England suggests that whilst there has been a recent increase in presentations (1,223 in 2018 to 1,363 in 2019; 11% increase), this was largely in service users taking NPS alongside opioids (and not solely NPS); it only represents 1% of all service users in treatment; and numbers have fallen from a peak in 2015/16 (2,042; a 33% decrease)[27]. The Office for National Statistics (ONS) reported that there were 125 deaths registered in England and Wales in 2018 where NPS were mentioned on the death certificate. Although this represented only 2.9% of all drug related poisonings, it was the highest number yet recorded[28].

The term new psychoactive substance is a legal definition and there is no universally agreed way to categorise NPS[29]. Traditionally established recreational drugs and NPS have been functionally categorised into three broad categories (stimulants, hallucinogens and depressants) based on the features seen with acute unwanted effects; more recently with the evolution of the NPS they have often been considered in four, somewhat overlapping functional categories related to their chemical structure, and psychopharmacological desired and unwanted effects: stimulants, cannabinoids, hallucinogens and depressants[29-30].

This narrative review paper aims to provide a robust overview of the current trends and developments with NPS, including their chemical structures, mechanism of action, modes of use, intended intoxicant effects, and their associated physical and mental health harms. The current challenges faced by laboratory testing for NPS is also explored. The paper will adopt the ‘four category’ classification, with the caveat that some new compounds do not neatly fit into these and their effects cross these boundaries. However, it is the authors’ experience that this model provides a utilitarian framework, especially for the generalist and clinician, who can often find the scale and rapidity of change in the field of NPS overwhelming. Inevitably, in a paper of this scope, there are limitations to the amount of information that can be provided about individual compounds. References on further reading will be provided for the interested reader. A final caveat is that some authorities and experts do not

typically consider the compounds nitrous oxide and ketamine to fall under the definition of NPS; they do fall within the UNDOC definition, and thus the authors have kept them within this piece.

Synthetic Stimulants

Synthetic stimulants comprise of a diffuse group of base compounds, which include cathinones, aminoindanes, phenethylamines, piperazines, and tryptamines, of which synthetic cathinones are by far the largest group and the most studied[31]. Currently, they represent the largest group of NPS that are monitored by the UNODC[17] and EMCDDA[18]. They are designed to replicate the effects of traditional stimulant controlled drugs, such as cocaine, MDMA, and amphetamines[32]. They can be made into a variety of formulations and be insufflated, swallowed (often wrapped in paper, known as “bombing”), inhaled, smoked, injected or used rectally, the most common route being taken in pill/tablet form[33]. Synthetic stimulants promote an increase in synaptic availability of neurotransmitters, mainly dopamine (DA) and serotonin (5HT). DA plays an important role in motivation, arousal, learning and reward, whereas 5HT is a contributor to feelings of happiness and a sense of emotional connectedness (‘entactogenic’)[34]. Synthetic stimulants act on the two neurotransmitter systems to different extents, accounting for their differing range of desired and unwanted effects[28,35]. These include sought after experiences such as euphoria, increased feelings of empathy and compassion, sense of inner peace and relaxation, enhanced self-confidence, sociability and libido, and boosted energy and alertness[35,36]. Synthetic stimulants have also been associated with adverse effects such as high addiction potential, severe intoxications linked to cardiac, metabolic, neuropsychiatric and neurological complications and an increasing number of fatalities[37-39].

Chemical structures

Common first generation synthetic cathinones (natural cathinone being the main psychoactive compound found in khat leaves) include methcathinone, 4-methylmethcathinone (mephedrone, 4-MMC, and first developed in the 1920s), 3,4-methylenedioxy-N-methylcathinone (methylone) and 3,4-methylenedioxypyrovalerone (MDPV) followed by a second generation consisting of 4-methyl-N-ethylcathinone (4-MEC), 4-fluoromethcathinone (flephedrone, 4-FMC),

its positional isomer 3-fluoromethcathinone (3-FMC) and α-PVP (α-pyrrolidinopentiophenone). Synthetic cathinones are similar in structure to amphetamine type stimulants and are chemically referred to as β-ketone analogues because of the carbonyl (=O) group in β carbon[40,41]. The common pharmacophore group responsible for the psychoactive effect observed in synthetic stimulants is phenethylamine[42], and it's derivatives are reported to represent at least 37% of the NPS available on the illicit drug market[43].

Synthetic stimulants structurally similar to pyrovalerone (a psychoactive drug once used in the treatment of chronic fatigue and lethargy)[44] such as MDPV, are highly lipophilic compared with other synthetic stimulants, and so have a high blood-brain barrier penetration and volume of distribution, resulting in longer plasma and tissue half-lives[45,46]. The presence of electrophilic groups such as fluorine also increases the lipophilic nature of synthetic stimulants analogues thereby making them more potent, a quality sought after by users who want to experience the ultimate new "*party drug*" which is more potent, longer acting and delivers a better "*high*"[47].

Mechanism of action

Synthetic stimulants increase the monoamine neurotransmitters DA and 5HT and to a lesser extent noradrenaline (NE) concentration in the synaptic cleft, which then mediate the stimulatory effects[48]. Two distinct mechanisms are responsible for the increase in monoamine concentration in the synaptic cleft. Firstly there is stimulation of non-exocytotic neurotransmitter release by inhibiting the vesicular monoamine transporter-2 (VMAT2) and reversing the transporter influx, thereby stimulating neurotransmitter release from the cytosolic pool or synaptic vesicles[49]. Secondly, there is inhibition of the uptake of neurotransmitters from the synaptic cleft by inhibiting the plasma membrane transporters, which are responsible for the uptake of DA, 5HT and NE [50-53].

Harms and Adverse Effects

Historically synthetic stimulants were developed to treat patients with Parkinsonism, obesity, or depression, but these were soon withdrawn due to concerns regarding their abuse and harm potentials[54,55].Some have recently been reported to have been used as cognitive enhancers or 'nootropics' (classically to help students with their

exams, with some reports of professionals using them to maintain attention at work in stressful environments)[56] and as part of weight loss regimens[57]. The acute physical and mental health harms associated with the use of synthetic stimulants are due to sympathomimetic toxicity, which may present as agitation, nausea, vomiting, headache, palpitations, tachycardia, hypertension and hyperthermia, and less frequently as paranoia, hallucinations, seizures and collapse[58]. Less commonly, severe adverse effects such as significant peripheral organ damage and rhabdomyolysis have been reported, whilst deaths have been linked to hypertensive crises, hyperthermia, cardiac arrest, and/or serotonin syndrome[59]. Functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) of rodents has shown that administration of MDPV results in desynchronisation of functional connectivity between the pre-frontal cortex and striatum, nucleus accumbens and the insular cortex[60]. More recent in-vitro studies in neuronal, skeletal muscle and hepatic cells have demonstrated potentially cytotoxic effects of synthetic stimulant exposure, including mitochondrial dysfunction, glutathione depletion, oxidative stress, and apoptosis pathway activation, which are aggravated under hyperthermic conditions; however the extent to which these mechanisms are relevant to their effects in-vivo remains unclear[60-62].

Case reports have shown synthetic stimulants can induce acute intra-parenchymal and subarachnoid haemorrhages as well as ischemic infarction[62], and α-PVP has been implicated in ST-elevation myocardial infarction (STEMI) with multiple intra-cardiac thrombi[63]. Intravenous methcathinone (M-CAT) use has been associated with the rare syndrome of manganese-associated Parkinsonism (as the preparation of M-CAT involves use of potassium permanganate) and cognitive impairment, which has been termed "*ephedrone encephalopathy*". Persistent globi pallidi hyperintensities on T1-weighted MRI have also been reported in those with this rare syndrome, and M-CAT use for longer than six months correlated with significant disability that did not improve despite drug cessation[64].

A number of public health concerns associated with synthetic stimulants have been highlighted. The growing practice of "*slamming*" during ChemSex (sexual activity engaged with multiple partners and often without protection, while under the influence of stimulant drugs, often with co-use of drugs such gamma-hydroxybutyrate (GHB) and related analogues) in which mephedrone and/or other

stimulants are injected to enhance sexual activity has raised concerns regarding substance use disorders, and increased risk of injection site injury, blood borne virus transmission, and sexually transmitted diseases[65]. In Scotland, an increase in injection of NPS, including synthetic stimulants, was associated with contiguous increases in HCV infection[66]. Synthetic stimulants have been found in a number of products claiming to enhance "brain health" and cognitive ability[67], and those targeting athletes wanting to improve their performance[68]. Those with a diagnosis of ADHD have increasingly turned to the internet to source synthetic stimulants to help with their symptoms[69,70]. The harmful interactions between synthetic stimulants and prescription drugs, increasing the risk of drug toxicity or reducing the therapeutic efficacy of the drugs has also been highlighted[71].

Synthetic Cannabinoids

Synthetic cannabinoids emerged in the mid-2000s and were first formally identified and reported to the EMCDDA in 2008, initially being used as alternatives to herbal cannabis, particularly to avoid detection in those settings with forensic drug testing regimes such as prisons, sports programmes, and the military[72]. They have since proliferated worldwide in many different structures, forms and potencies, and currently represent the largest and most structurally diverse class of NPS[73-74]. The UNODC have reported approximately 280 synthetic cannabinoids had been identified by the end of 2019[75]. They are typically manufactured and transported from producer countries as bulk powders, and, after dissolving in solvents such as acetone or methanol, are most commonly sprayed onto inert plant material (resembling traditional cannabis) or paper (to minimise risk of detection and facilitate access to forensic settings such as prisons) and either mixed with tobacco or smoked directly - inhalation being the main route of use[76]. Synthetic cannabinoids have been missold (e.g. as delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol (d9-THC) or cannabidiol (CBD)), and have been detected in formulations such as powders and as liquids for use in vaping devices, or tablets and capsules resembling ecstasy[77].

Synthetic cannabinoids interact with the endocannabinoid system, which is involved in various physiological functions, including cognition, motor control, pain sensation, appetite, cardiovascular and respiratory performance, gastrointestinal motility, and immunoregulation[78]. Positive experiences from use include relaxation, euphoria, and

disinhibition, which are similar to the desired effects of d9-THC, the main psychoactive component of traditional cannabis[79].

However synthetic cannabinoids are associated with a wide range adverse effects, including cardiovascular and respiratory complications, haemodynamic embarrassment, renal injury and cerebrovascular accidents ("strokes")[80-84].There have been numerous reports of severe morbidity and mortality from synthetic cannabinoids , especially from use in prisons and other secure settings and in people who are homeless[85-90]. In England and Wales, synthetic cannabinoids comprised the largest proportion of NPS-related poisoning deaths in 2018[90], with large outbreaks of intoxications also being reported in Europe[91].

Chemical Structures

The main classes of synthetic cannabinoids can be divided into the following major chemical classes: classical cannabinoids, carbazoles, cyclohexyl-substituted phenols, naphthoylindoles, the URB-class and benzoylindoles[24,92]. New synthetic cannabinoids are regularly developed by both legitimate and clandestine chemists, and these differ by the addition or removal of a substituent group[93], making the pharmacological profiles of new compounds entering the market difficult to predict and monitor[94]. Synthetic cannabinoids demonstrate limited structural similarity to d9-THC, and are referred to as synthetic cannabinoids due to their pharmacological mechanisms[95]. Therefore, unless specifically included in reference databases they will typically not be detected in conventional drug screening procedures such as urine tests[96].

Mechanism of Action

Synthetic cannabinoids interact primarily with the endocannabinoid system, and its two specific G protein-coupled receptors: predominantly with the cannabinoid receptor type-1 (CB1) and less frequently with the cannabinoid receptor type-2 (CB2). The CB1 receptor is widespread throughout the brain, with particular concentration in the neocortex, basal ganglia and hippocampus, where they modulate pre-synaptic neurotransmitter release, and participate in a variety of brain function modulations, including executive, emotional, reward, and memory[97,98]. The CB2 receptor, initially thought to be confined to immune cells and peripheral tissues,

has recently also been found in cerebellum and brain stem neurons, where their roles remain an issue of active research[99]. Research into how synthetic cannabinoids modulate their effects via these receptors and the difference between the observed clinical effects of traditional cannabis and synthetic cannabinoids is ongoing, but current hypotheses include biased signalling at cannabinoid receptors or the disruption of mitochondrial homeostasis. Synthetic cannabinoids do not contain cannabidiol (the main neuro-protective compound found in natural cannabis which predominantly acts on CB2 receptors) and this may also be related to the increased toxicity observed with these compounds compared to natural cannabis[100,101].

Synthetic cannabinoids have a greater potency and binding affinity than d9-THC at the cannabinoid receptors. They are full agonists compared with the partial agonist properties of d9-THC, with potency of 10 to 200 times greater than that of d9-THC. These differences likely underpin the emerging greater incidence of major psychiatric complications and other adverse effects compared to traditional cannabis[101-104]. A self-reported survey of 80,000 illicit substance users revealed that those who used synthetic cannabinoids were thirty times more likely to end up in an emergency department than users of traditional cannabis[83].

Harms and Adverse Effects

There is currently no evidence for any therapeutic potential of synthetic cannabinoids with overwhelming reports of mild to severe adverse effects[105]. Most common mild to moderate adverse effects include nausea, protracted vomiting, agitation, drowsiness, dizziness, confusion, hypertension, tachycardia and chest pain, which typically have a limited duration and require only supportive treatment. There is growing evidence that renal injury is associated with a direct toxic effect upon the kidneys rather than an indirect effect due to dehydration (caused by vomiting) as was previously thought[106-7]. A wide range of serious physical health harms associated with synthetic cannabinoid use has also been reported. These include convulsions and seizures[108], rhabdomyolysis and hyperemesis syndrome[109,110], supraventricular and ventricular arrhythmias[111,112], pulmonary embolism[112,113], intracranial hemorrhage[114], delirium and multiple organ failure[109,115].Serious mental health harms include paranoia, psychosis, aggression and violence towards others, self-harm and suicide. A trend of

synthetic cannabinoid related toxicity has also been observed, with first generation compounds predominantly presenting with cannabis like unwanted effects, second generation compounds with cardiovascular/stimulant toxicity and third generation compounds with neurological toxicity associated with central nervous system depression[116-120].

Synthetic cannabinoid use has been associated with white matter abnormalities in adolescents and young adults, which may lead to cognitive impairment and vulnerability to psychosis[121]. MRI brain changes associated with synthetic cannabinoid toxicity reveal diverse findings, including embolic stroke, global hypoxic-ischaemic brain injury, demyelinating injury, and leptomeningeal enhancement[122]. These varied imaging findings may reflect the diverse actions of the endocannabinoid system, including its role in the regulation of cerebral perfusion, inflammatory responses and mitochondrial function[74]. Synthetic cannabinoids have been implicated in executive-function impairment either after acute or repeated consumptions[123]. Intense psychological withdrawal syndromes after use have also been described leading to a high addictive potential for synthetic cannabinoids, where users have been reported to use synthetic cannabinoids every thirty minutes to avoid feeling unwell[124-6].

Public health concerns have been raised around the use of synthetic cannabinoids in vaping devices or water pipes and the subsequent development of serious lung injuries including acute respiratory distress syndrome and the diffuse alveolar haemorrhage[127]. Termed EVALI (e-cigarette, or vaping, product use–associated lung injury), recent reports have highlighted the increasing association with either lipoid pneumonia, chemical pneumonitis or an organising pneumonia leading to respiratory complications including death[127,128].

Synthetic Hallucinogens

Synthetic hallucinogens (SH) include two main subcategories: hallucinogens and dissociatives.

Hallucinogens

Hallucinogens are typically further sub-divided into three classes: tryptamines, lysergamines and phenethylamines[129]. Most hallucinogens share a common mechanism of 5-HT2A receptor modulation of serotoninergic activity, although there is an increasing understanding of the role of the glutamatergic system, and some dissociative hallucinogens also have activity at κ opioid receptors[130]. Routes of use include inhalation, nasal insufflation, oral ingestion (pill or blotter paper), sublingual/buccal administration, and intravenous injection[131-133].

Distributed throughout the brain and spinal cord, serotonin is involved in the control of a wide range of behavioural, perceptual, and regulatory systems, including mood, hunger, body temperature, sexual behaviour, muscle control, and sensory perception. Common sought after experiences include euphoria and joy, alterations in time/space perception, increased creativity and insight, accelerating and broadening thought processes and content, promoting novel thought associations, and providing psychedelic, spiritual and mystical experiences[134]. Common adverse effects include complications associated with serotonergic and sympathomimetic toxicity[135], and a broad range of mental health crises[136].

Chemical structure

The largest group of synthetic hallucinogens are the phenethylamine derivatives which are 2,5-dimethoxyphenethylamines, and contain a small lipophilic substituent at the 4-position, known as the 2C series because they possess two carbon atoms between the benzene ring and amino group[137]. Further derivatives are mostly but not exclusively chemically modified at the phenyl ring. The introduction of an N-benzylmethoxy (‘‘NBOMe’’) group has resulted in an increase the potency of derivatives[138].

Tryptamines are a group of monoamine alkaloids that are synthesised through decarboxylation of the amino acid tryptophan, and include compounds such as alpha-methyltryptamine (AMT), N,N-dimethyltryptamine (DMT), N,N-diallyl-5-methoxytryptamine (5-MeO-DALT) and 5-methoxy-N,N-disopropyltyptamine (5-MeO-DIPT) “foxy methoxy”. They possess an indole ring structure, a bicyclical

combination of a benzene ring and a pyrrole ring, with an amino group attached to a 2-carbon side chain[139].

Synthetic derivatives of the ergot alkaloid derivative lysergic acid diethylamide (LSD) such as 1-acetyl-LSD (ALD-52), 1-propionyl-LSD (1P-LSD), and 1-butyryl-LSD (1B-LSD) have been shown to have very different pharmacological profiles and may differ significantly in their effects[140,141].

Mechanism of action

Phenethylamine derivatives mainly interact with cortical serotonin receptors, with the highest affinity for 5-HT2A receptors[142]. NBOMe derivatives have higher affinity for 5-HT2A and 5-HT2C receptors and lower affinity for 5-HT1A receptors compared with their 2C- analogues. Tryptamine derivatives have an affinity for 5-HT1A, 5-HT2A, and 5-HT2C receptors and can inhibit reuptake and increase the release of serotonin[139]. LSD analogues activate both 5-HT2A and 5-HT1A receptors[143]. Activation of 5-HT2A receptors causes glutamate release and activation of alpha-amino-3-hydroxy-methyl-5-4-isoxazolpropionic (AMPA) glutamatergic receptors, thus increasing cortical activity and information processing[144].

Harms and adverse effects

Over the last fifty years, there has been ongoing interest and research into the use of the hallucinogen base compounds and their synthetic derivatives in the treatment of anxiety, depression and substance misuse disorders, and as an adjunct in psychotherapy. Data are currently encouraging, but lacking adequate evidence for use outside of scientific trials at this time[145-8].

Common adverse effects primarily reported in studies of non-clinical use, shared across all three classes include tachycardia, hypertension, mydriasis, hyperthermia, agitation, aggression, hallucinations, drowsiness and confusion[149-153]. More serious adverse effects associated with phenethylamine derivatives, include multi-organ failure, psychosis, seizures, and serotonin syndrome[150]. Serious adverse effects of tryptamine derivatives include prolonged delusions[150], rhabdomyolysis and renal failure[155] and a number of reported fatalities[156]. LSD derivative adverse effects

include impaired thermoregulation, cardiovascular instability, difficulty concentrating, imbalance and exhaustion[157].

Case reports have highlighted serious but relatively uncommon complications associated with toxicity of synthetic hallucinogens including an "*excited delirium*" picture with severe agitation, aggression, and violence[158], hyperreflexia and clonus[130] and acute pulmonary oedema and hyperthermia leading to death[159].

Dissociatives

The two main classes of dissociatives are arylcyclohexylamine (to which ketamine, phencyclidine (PCP) and methoxetamine (MXE) belong) and diarylethylamine. PCP was first synthesised in 1956 as an anaesthetic but largely withdrawn from frontline use because of its unfavourable side effects and abuse potential. Ketamine remains an important medicine in both specialist anaesthesia and aspects of pain management and is currently being studied as a rapid-acting antidepressant[160]. Both classes of dissociatives act as antagonists on the N-methyl-D-aspartate receptor (NMDAR)[161].

Routes of use include inhalation, nasal insufflation, oral ingestion and intravenous injection[162]. The sought after experiences include the sense of a disconnection between thoughts, identity, memory and consciousness, as well as sensory and tactile distortions, euphoria, and depersonalisation. Common serious adverse effects include neurological impairment, renal and bladder injury[163].

Chemical structure

All first-generation dissociatives are simple derivatives of PCP. The arylcyclohexylamine structure contains three distinct regions: an aromatic ring, a substituted cyclohexane ring, and a basic amine function. The first-generation dissociatives involved an aryl or amino substitution, without alteration of the cyclohexane ring. Retention of the cyclohexane ring provides for NMDAR affinity and therefore potency[164]. The latest generation of dissociatives, diarylethylamines, include 1-(1,2-diphenethyl) piperidine (diphenidine) and 1-[1-(2-methoxyphenyl)-2-phenylethyl] piperidine (2-MeO-diphenidine), and are also similar in structure to PCP[165].

Mechanism of action

Similar to ketamine and PCP, dissociative arylcyclohexylamine and diarylethylamine drugs act as relatively selective non-competitive antagonists at the ionotropic glutamatergic NMDAR. Their NMDAR affinity is strongly correlated with their clinical potency in producing dissociative effects The NMDAR channels play an important role in synaptic plasticity and synapse formation underlying memory, learning and formation of neural networks during development in the central nervous system[166]. Ketamine has a predominant action at the NMDA receptors whereas PCP, methoxetamine, 3-MeO-PCP, 4-MeO-PCP and 3-MeO-PCE have actions at serotonin receptors which may explain some of their additional toxicity[167].

Harms and adverse effects

Current research into the use of dissociatives in the treatment of a number of conditions is ongoing, including depression, pain management and palliative care[168,169]. Common adverse effects shared across both classes include nausea, diaphoresis, hypertension, tachycardia, renal impairment, agitation, disorientation, confusion, nystagmus, slurred speech, hallucinations, amnesia, ataxia, and muscle rigidity[170]. Serious adverse effects include cerebellar toxicity, rhabdomyolysis, severe kidney and bladder damage and a number of fatal intoxications[171].

In-vitro studies have shown MXE to potently inhibit neuronal activity and alter monoamine metabolism[172]. Repeated parenteral administration of mMXE stimulates the mesolimbic dopaminergic transmission in rats, and affects brain functions and behaviour[173]. A similar study found that repeated parenteral administrations of MXE induced anxiety-like states and interfered with memory[174]. The same investigation also demonstrated that MXE induced persistent damage of dopaminergic neurons in the nigrostriatal and mesocorticolimbic systems, as well of serotonergic neurons in the nucleus accumbens core[174]. MXE use by humans has been associated with acute neurological impairment including psychomotor agitation and altered motor coordination[175], and chronic bladder and urinary tract toxicity reported in mice[176].

Case reports have reported serious adverse effects including seizures, hyponatremia, and sinus bradycardia[177], neurological impairment with significant cerebellar toxicity[178] and a number of fatalities associated with intoxication[179-83].

Synthetic Depressants

Synthetic depressants are broadly classified into two sub-categories, synthetic benzodiazepines and synthetic opiates. Their acute emergency presentations can appear similar – thought treatments are different - but they differ in their impact on mental health[26]. Furthermore, among high-risk opioid users, benzodiazepines, especially when injected, can prolong the intensity and duration of the opioid effects[184].

Synthetic benzodiazepines.

Synthetic benzodiazepines are commonly consumed for non-medical purposes. Primary motivations for use overlap with clinical utility, such as hypnotic and anxiolytic effects, and to manage the acute effects of stimulants or to self-treat withdrawal symptoms, but they also produce a subjective "high"[185] . Reports on internet forums also suggest that users experience anticonvulsant, muscle relaxant, and amnesic properties[186].

Chemical structure

The base structure is the fusion of a benzene ring and a diazepine ring, individual compounds varying widely according to additions to the base structure, e.g. 2-keto compounds (diazepam), 3-hydroxy compounds (temazepam), 7-nitro compounds (clonazepam), Triazolo compounds (alprazolam) and Imidazo compounds (midazolam)[187].

Mechanism of action

A contemporary hypothesis is that novel benzodiazpeines mediate their effects through interactions at gamma-aminobutyric acid-A (GABA-A) receptors similar to prescription benzodiazepines[188]. GABA-A receptors are ion channels that consist of different subunit compositions, responding to the inhibitory neurotransmitter GABA. Synthetic benzodiazepines may enhance the effects of GABA as positive allosteric modulators by binding to a receptor site that is different from the binding site of GABA [187,189], resulting in sedative, hypnotic (sleep-inducing), anxiolytic (anti-anxiety), anticonvulsant, and muscle relaxant properties. Another mechanism of action reported includes activation of the mitochondrial translocator protein (TSPO) 18 kDa, which stimulates synthesis of neuroactive steroids, including allopregnanolone. 4-

chlorodiazepam (Ro 5-4864) binds to this protein instead of GABA-A receptor, leading to anxiogenesis and an increased risk of seizures[190]. Some synthetic benzodiazepines have also been found to activate the AMPA glutamate receptor, leading to the rapid opening and closing of an ion channel that is permeable to cations (sodium, calcium and potassium); if inhibited this results in an inhibition of central nervous system fast excitatory synaptic transmission. Tofisopam is a competitive antagonist at this receptor (and doesn't have GABA-A activity) and may cause anxiolytic actions without the sedative effects seen with other benzodiazepines[191].

Harms and adverse effects

Data on the effects and harms of new synthetic benzodiazepines remains somewhat limited at this time, but early studies have shown anxiolytic, anticancer, anticonvulsant, antipsychotic, muscle relaxant, anti-tuberculosis, and antimicrobial actions[192,193].

Adverse effects include a sedative-hypnotic toxidrome and can include confusion, dizziness, drowsiness fatigue, as well as auditory and visual hallucinations, delirium, seizures, deep sleep, and coma[184] and atypical symptoms such as agitation, hyperthermia, and tachycardia[194]. Abrupt cessation may lead to withdrawal symptoms, such as anxiety, panic attacks, restlessness, insomnia, and convulsions[195]. A number of fatalities have been reported, as well as the added risk in relation to toxicity due to the slower onset of action and longer half-life of some of the synthetic benzodiazepines (slower onset users take more doses than required; longer half-life toxicity is more prolonged)[196-199]. Bentazepam has been associated with chronic hepatitis[200]

Synthetic Opioids

Opioids include opiates, semi-synthetic opioids and synthetic opioids. Opiates are natural substances that originate from *papaver somniferum* (opium poppy), which contain more than twenty different subtypes[201]. Two of these, morphine and codeine are two of the most common pain medications prescribed[202]. Synthetic opioids are created to bind to the same receptors in the brain as opiates, and produce similar effects such as euphoria, anxiolysis, feelings of relaxation, and drowsiness.

Undesirable side effects include nausea, dizziness, constipation, vomiting, tolerance, and respiratory depression[203].

The international opioid drug deaths epidemic is a source of much research and debate, but an examination of this is outside the scope of this review, and will be covered in a linked paper[203-6]. In Europe, 49 new synthetic opioids were detected between 2009 and 2018, 34 of which were fentanyl derivatives[18]. Whilst fentanyl itself is subject to international control, only some derivatives (e.g. carfentanil) are subject to international control at the time of writing. Recent evidence points to a problematic surge in the availability of heroin mixed with fentanyl (cheaper and easier to obtain than pure heroin) leading to an increased risked of morbidity and mortality for the user, who is normally unaware of the addition of the synthetic opioid[207-9].

Chemical structure

The chemical structure of opioids is subdivided into those based the 4,5-epoxymorphinan ring (e.g. morphine), the phenylpiperidines (e.g. fentanyl) and the diphenylheptylamines (e.g. methadone). Synthetic opioids are modifications of each of these base compounds[210].

Mechanism of action

Synthetic opioids analogues interact with G protein-coupled opioid receptors in the brain and spinal cord as partial to full agonists at mu, delta and kappa opioid receptor subtypes, with selectivity for the mu opioid receptor[211-212]. Agonism at mu opioid receptors is responsible for the main pharmacological effects of opioids, including euphoria, analgesia, respiratory depression, as well as the development of dependence[213]. Many synthetic opioids are considerably more potent than traditional opioids. The potency of fentanyl (acting on the mu opioid receptor) is 50 to 200 fold higher than morphine, and that of carfentanil (also on the mu opioid receptor) approximately 10,000 times higher than morphine[211,214].

Harms and adverse effects

Synthetic opioid adverse effects range from mild (pruritus, nausea, vomiting, constipation, dizziness) to severe (respiratory depression, apnoea, and central nervous system depression)[215-6]. Intoxication with synthetic opioids has been associated with non-cardiogenic pulmonary oedema, acute lung injury, diffuse alveolar haemorrhage and rhabdomyolysis[217-8]. Withdrawal from synthetic opioids may present with physiological and psychological distress[219]. Statistics on morbidity and mortality may not reflect the real life situation as users may recover, for example, from a mixed heroin/synthetic opioid overdose when naloxone is administered and the illicit drug documented will then be heroin and not a synthetic one[220-1]. In the STRIDA project from Sweden, it was reported that there were a number of cases of toxicity related to the use of MT-45 (a synthetic opioid) that in addition to typical opioid like toxicity was also associated with hearing loss and/or deafness[222-3].

Laboratory testing

Testing for NPS in clinical and forensic settings can be a complex task, as routine testing of such compounds in individuals who present with recreational drug toxicity is not typically undertaken, and the validity and reliability of test kits varies considerably in detecting these many new agents. Furthermore, in clinical practice patients are typically treated on the basis of the pattern of toxicity they present with, and the turn-around time for a standard and comprehensive NPS screen would often mean that the results are not available in a time-frame that would alter the clinical management of the patient[19]. Test designs also need to take into account that users of NPS will be likely to use additional over-the-counter medication, other illicit drugs[224-5] and that NPS preparations themselves may be contaminated with other illicit drugs[226], or dissolved in diluents[227].

The Novel Psychoactive Treatment UK Network (NEPTUNE) recognise the current limitations in the availability of timely clinical testing available during acute presentations of NPS toxicity, and currently recommend toxicity diagnoses are made primarily on clinical features, rather than by testing. However, NPS toxidromes may be highly non-specific (such as synthetic stimulant and synthetic cannabinoid toxicity), and, as noted, users may have taken multiple NPS or other substances

simultaneously, making identification of a likely causative NPS class(es) from clinical features alone difficult. As such, reliable and clinically validated testing for NPS from human samples are clearly of value. Colorimetric tests, immunoassays, and mass spectrometry-based techniques have been employed in the detection of NPS. A recent systematic review reported that relatively few tests are able to detect more than 50 NPS types[228]. Colorimetric methods are based on a target compound reacting with a reagent to produce a detectable colour change. They are easy to use, portable, point-of-use tests, with limited need for sample pre-preparation. The disadvantages include user variability in detecting colour-changes, cross-reactivity (associated with false-positive results), in addition to the limited range of individual NPS compounds that may be tested for in a single sample[228].

Immunoassays for NPS allow for potentially rapid testing, and are suitable for testing non-invasively obtained samples (typically urine samples, or dissolved drugs). Lateral flow immune-chromatographic assays have been used in harm-reduction trials where opiate users were encouraged to self-test drugs for the presence of fentanyl[229]. Commercially available immunoassays are limited to testing for relatively small selections of NPS. The sensitivity of commercially available immunoassay testing may also be limited, with a study of cross-reactivity amongst five commercially-available immunoassay kits reported to have failed to detect 13 of 94 (14%) NPS samples tested[230].

Gas and liquid chromatographic mass spectrometry-based methods offer more sensitive and specific identification of individual NPS, and allow for quantification of NPS within biological samples. These techniques can allow for sampling across a range of biological samples, including blood, urine, hair[231], saliva[232], urban wastewater[233] and dried blood samples[234]. Samples for analysis require laboratory pre-preparation before being used for these techniques, though so-called “dilute and shoot” techniques are being validated to allow for more rapid preparation of biological samples for liquid chromatography mass spectrometry[235-6]. Liquid chromatography with quadrupole time of flight mass spectrometry (LC-QTOF MS) has demonstrated some superiority to gas chromatography mass spectroscopy (GC MS) in detecting most forms of NPS within serum samples[235]. Databases of spectral information from known NPS chemical structures are currently being built and

validated, to allow for identification of known (and potentially unknown) substances based on the technique used [236-7].

Conclusion

NPS comprise a diverse and ever growing group of substances. There is much we still do not know, especially about the newest agents, and they can vary considerably in their desired effects and harms, even within drug classes. The classification system that has been used for this review has arisen for reasons of practicality and clinical utility, though this means that it inevitably has some limitations. The currently used four separate classification system groups together compounds with highly varied chemical structures (such as the synthetic cannabinoids), or mechanistically heterogeneous compounds (such as the hallucinogens and depressants) in a practical workable system for clinicians, scientists, law enforcement agencies and other interested parties.

Even with this broad classification system there remains considerable overlap between some groups of NPS (such as the 2-C series, 5-MeO DALT, and NBOMe-series), which may have characteristics in terms of their pharmacology, desired effects and/or unwanted effects that fit within more than one of the classification groups.

Much of the literature on health effects of NPS is derived from self-reports, and small case series, which are very likely to be subject to a variety of selection and recall biases. Given the nature of NPS and their use, the reliance on small case series and self-reports is unsurprising. In the UK, national advisory bodies such as the Novel Psychoactive Treatment UK Network (NEPTUNE) and UK National Poisons Information Service (NPIS) are likely to be able to monitor trends of NPS use in a more rigorous and prospective manner. A network of emergency departments in Europe have collaborated to form the European Drug Emergencies Network Plus (EuroDEN-Plus) project, to better understand the pattern of toxicity associated with NPS clinical presentations[238-241].

Clearly there is a need for healthcare and emergency professionals that are likely to encounter NPS use to remain up-to-date with clinical features of NPS use, and

evidence-based approaches to harm-minimisation and treatment of dependence syndromes need to be developed. These should ideally be developed in conjunction with the experiences of NPS users themselves. Whether the current popularity of NPS use will continue remains uncertain, and there is comparatively little evidence regarding NPS use in lower- or middle- income countries, where NPS use may be particularly likely to be associated with societal harm.

Clinicians treating individuals who present with harms related to the use of NPS may feel less confident in managing those patients compared to patients who present following the use of classical recreational drugs[242]. However, since the management of both groups of individuals is typically based on the presenting clinical features rather than the specific drug(s) involved, clinicians should feel more confident in utilising the knowledge, skills and experience in managing classical recreational drugs to any individual who presents with acute recreational drug/NPS toxicity.

Further research is needed on the neuropsychological consequences of NPS use, given the apparent neurotoxic effects associated with NPS use. Recently developed novel radiotracers for use in positron emission tomography (PET) for CB1 and CB2 receptors, as well as hydrolytic enzymes of the endocannabinoid system, may be of use in identifying changes in vivo in those with sustained and acute synthetic cannabinoid (and other NPS) use[243].

References

1. Luethi D, Liechti ME. Designer drugs: mechanism of action and adverse effects. Archives of toxicology. 2020 Apr 6:1-49.

2. Peacock A, Bruno R, Gisev N, Degenhardt L, Hall W, Sedefov R, White J, Thomas KV, Farrell M, Griffiths P. New psychoactive substances: challenges for drug surveillance, control, and public health responses. The Lancet. 2019 Oct 23.

3. Soussan C, Kjellgren A. The users of novel psychoactive substances: online survey about their characteristics, attitudes and motivations. International Journal of Drug Policy. 2016 Jun 1;32:77-84.

4. O'Hagan A, McCormack S. To what extent has the United Kingdom law on psychoactive substances been successful?. Forensic Research & Criminology International Journal. 2019 Jul 23;7(4):176-83.

5. Batisse A, Eiden C, Peyriere H, Djezzar S. Use of new psychoactive substances to mimic prescription drugs: The trend in France. Neuro Toxicology. 2020 Mar 30.

6. Griffiths P, Sedefov R, Gallegos AN, Lopez D. How globalization and market innovation challenge how we think about and respond to drug use: “Spice” a case study. Addiction. 2010 Jun;105(6):951-3.

7. Zawilska JB, Andrzejczak D. Next generation of novel psychoactive substances on the horizon–A complex problem to face. Drug and Alcohol Dependence. 2015 Dec 1;157:1-7.

8. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). Global Smart Update 2016. http://www.unodc.org/documents/scientific/Global-SMART-Update-2016-vol-16.pdf

9. Peacock A, Bruno R, Gisev N, Degenhardt L, Hall W, Sedefov R, White J, Thomas KV, Farrell M, Griffiths P. New psychoactive substances: challenges for drug surveillance, control, and public health responses. The Lancet. 2019 Oct 23.

10. Hill RG. Understanding the UK Psychoactive Substances Act. British journal of clinical pharmacology. 2019 Nov 20.

11. Corkery JM, Schifano F, Martinotti G. British Journal of Clinical Pharmacology Themed Issue on New psychoactive substances: Pharmacology influencing practice, policy and the law. British journal of clinical pharmacology. 2019 Nov 26.

12. Psychoactive Substances Act 2016. http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2016/2/contents/enacted

13. Nutt D. New psychoactive substances: Pharmacology influencing UK practice, policy and the law. British Journal of Clinical Pharmacology. 2020 Jan 9.

14. O'Hagan A, McCormack S. To what extent has the United Kingdom law on psychoactive substances been successful?. Forensic Research & Criminology International Journal. 2019 Jul 23;7(4):176-83.

15. Reuter P, Pardo B. Can new psychoactive substances be regulated effectively? An assessment of the British Psychoactive Substances Bill. Addiction. 2017 Jan;112(1):25-31.

16. Home Office. (2018). Review of the Psychoactive Substances Act 2016. London, UK: Home Office

17. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. Current NPS Threats. March 2019. https://www.unodc.org/documents/scientific/Current_NPS_Threats_Volume_I.pdf

18. European Drug Report 2019: Trends and Developments EMCDDA, Lisbon, June 2019. http://www.emcdda.europa.eu/system/files/publications/11364/20191724_TDAT19001ENN_PDF.pdf

19. Chung H, Lee J, Kim E. Trends of novel psychoactive substances (NPSs) and their fatal cases. Forensic Toxicology. 2016 Jan 1;34(1):1-1.

20. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. Understanding the synthetic drug market: the NPS factor. https://www.unodc.org/documents/scientific/Global_Smart_Update_2018_Vol.19.pdf

21. Al-Banaa I, Hawkins L, Hill SL, Lupton DJ, Jackson G, Sandilands EA, Bradberry SM, Thompson JP, Rushton S, Thomas SH. Effect of the UK Psychoactive Substances Act 2016 on episodes of toxicity related to new psychoactive substances as reported to the National Poisons Information Service. A time series analysis. International Journal of Drug Policy. 2020 Mar 1;77:102672.

22. Rinaldi R, Bersani G, Marinelli E, Zaami S. The rise of new psychoactive substances and psychiatric implications: A wide-ranging, multifaceted challenge that needs far-reaching common legislative strategies. Human Psychopharmacology: Clinical and Experimental. 2020 Mar 7:e2727.

23. Dinis-Oliveira RJ, Magalhães T. Abuse of licit and illicit psychoactive substances in the workplace: medical, toxicological, and forensic aspects. Journal of clinical medicine. 2020 Mar;9(3):770.

24. Potts AJ, Cano C, Thomas SH, Hill SL. Synthetic cannabinoid receptor agonists: classification and nomenclature. Clinical Toxicology. 2020 Feb 1;58(2):82-98.

25. Drugs Misuse: Findings from the 2018/19 Crime Survey for England and Wales. Statistical Bulletin: 21/19. 19 September 2019. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/832533/drug-misuse-2019-hosb2119.pdf

26. Ralphs, R., Williams, L., Askew, R., & Norton, A. (2017). Adding Spice to the Porridge: The development of a synthetic cannabinoid market in an English prison. International Journal of Drug Policy, 40, 57-69.

27. Public Health England. (2019). Adult substance misuse statistics 2018 to 2019: report. London, UK: Public Health England.

28. Deaths related to drug poisoning in England and Wales: 2018 registrations. https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/deaths/bulletins/deathsrelatedtodrugpoisoninginenglandandwales/2018registrations

29. Tracy DK, Wood DM, Baumeister D. Novel psychoactive substances: types, mechanisms of action, and effects. bmj. 2017 Jan 25;356:i6848.

30. Miliano C, Serpelloni G, Rimondo C, Mereu M, Marti M, De Luca MA. Neuropharmacology of new psychoactive substances (NPS): focus on the rewarding and reinforcing properties of cannabimimetics and amphetamine-like stimulants. Frontiers in neuroscience. 2016 Apr 19;10:153.

31. Valente MJ, De Pinho PG, de Lourdes Bastos M, Carvalho F, Carvalho M. Khat and synthetic cathinones: a review. Archives of toxicology. 2014 Jan 1;88(1):15-45.

32. Prosser JM, Nelson LS. The toxicology of bath salts: a review of synthetic cathinones. Journal of Medical Toxicology. 2012 Mar 1;8(1):33-42.

33. Karila L, Megarbane B, Cottencin O, Lejoyeux M. Synthetic cathinones: a new public health problem. Current neuropharmacology. 2015 Jan 1;13(1):12-20.

34. Banks ML, Worst TJ, Rusyniak DE, Sprague JE. Synthetic cathinones (“bath salts”). The Journal of emergency medicine. 2014 May 1;46(5):632-42.

35. German CL, Fleckenstein AE, Hanson GR. Bath salts and synthetic cathinones: an emerging designer drug phenomenon. Life sciences. 2014 Feb 27;97(1):2-8.

36. Coppola M, Mondola R. Synthetic cathinones: chemistry, pharmacology and toxicology of a new class of designer drugs of abuse marketed as “bath salts” or “plant food”. Toxicology letters. 2012 Jun 1;211(2):144-9.

37. Zawilska JB, Wojcieszak J. Novel psychoactive substances: classification and general information. In Synthetic Cathinones 2018 (pp. 11-24). Springer, Cham.

38. Weinstein AM, Rosca P, Fattore L, London ED. Synthetic cathinone and cannabinoid designer drugs pose a major risk for public health. Frontiers in psychiatry. 2017 Aug 23;8:156.

39. Archer T, Kostrzewa RM. Synthetic Cathinones: Neurotoxic Health Hazards and Potential for Abuse. In Synthetic Cathinones 2018 (pp. 1-10). Springer, Cham.

40. Angoa-Pérez M, Zagorac B, Winters AD, Greenberg JM, Ahmad M, Theis KR, Kuhn DM. Differential effects of synthetic psychoactive cathinones and amphetamine stimulants on the gut microbiome in mice. PloS one. 2020 Jan 24;15(1):e0227774.

41. Woźniak MK, Banaszkiewicz L, Wiergowski M, Tomczak E, Kata M, Szpiech B, Namieśnik J, Biziuk M. Development and validation of a GC–MS/MS method for the determination of 11 amphetamines and 34 synthetic cathinones in whole blood. Forensic Toxicology. 2020 Jan 1;38(1):42-58.

42. Banks ML, Worst TJ, Rusyniak DE, Sprague JE. Synthetic cathinones (“bath salts”). The Journal of emergency medicine. 2014 May 1;46(5):632-42.

43. Mercieca G, Odoardi S, Cassar M, Rossi SS. Rapid and simple procedure for the determination of cathinones, amphetamine-like stimulants and other new psychoactive substances in blood and urine by GC–MS. Journal of pharmaceutical and biomedical analysis. 2018 Feb 5;149:494-501.

44. Baumann MH, Partilla JS, Lehner KR. Psychoactive “bath salts”: not so soothing. European journal of pharmacology. 2013 Jan 5;698(1-3):1-5.

45. Eastlack SC, Cornett EM, Kaye AD. Kratom—Pharmacology, clinical implications, and outlook: a comprehensive review. Pain and Therapy. 2020 Jan 28:1-5.

46. Nóbrega L, Dinis-Oliveira RJ. The synthetic cathinone α-pyrrolidinovalerophenone (α-PVP): pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic clinical and forensic aspects. Drug metabolism reviews. 2018 Apr 3;50(2):125-39.

47. Altun B, Çok İ. Psychoactive Bath Salts and Neurotoxicity Risk. Turk J Pharm Sci. 2020;17(2):235-41.

48. Katz DP, Bhattacharya D, Bhattacharya S, Deruiter J, Clark CR, Suppiramaniam V, Dhanasekaran M. Synthetic cathinones: “a khat and mouse game”. Toxicology letters. 2014 Sep 2;229(2):349-56.

49. Cozzi NV, Sievert MK, Shulgin AT, Jacob III P, Ruoho AE. Inhibition of plasma membrane monoamine transporters by β-ketoamphetamines. European journal of pharmacology. 1999 Sep 17;381(1):63-9.

50. Marusich JA, Antonazzo KR, Wiley JL, Blough BE, Partilla JS, Baumann MH. Pharmacology of novel synthetic stimulants structurally related to the “bath

salts” constituent 3, 4-methylenedioxypyrovalerone (MDPV). Neuropharmacology. 2014 Dec 1;87:206-13.

51. Baumann MH, Ayestas MA, Partilla JS, Sink JR, Shulgin AT, Daley PF, Brandt SD, Rothman RB, Ruoho AE, Cozzi NV. The designer methcathinone analogs, mephedrone and methylone, are substrates for monoamine transporters in brain tissue. Neuropsychopharmacology. 2012 Apr;37(5):1192-203.

52. Cameron K, Kolanos R, Verkariya R, De Felice L, Glennon RA. Mephedrone and methylenedioxypyrovalerone (MDPV), major constituents of “bath salts,” produce opposite effects at the human dopamine transporter. Psychopharmacology. 2013 Jun 1;227(3):493-9.

53. Eshleman AJ, Wolfrum KM, Hatfield MG, Johnson RA, Murphy KV, Janowsky A. Substituted methcathinones differ in transporter and receptor interactions. Biochemical pharmacology. 2013 Jun 15;85(12):1803-15

54. Dal Cason TA, Young R, Glennon RA. Cathinone: an investigation of several N-alkyl and methylenedioxy-substituted analogs. Pharmacology Biochemistry and Behaviour. 1997 Dec 1;58(4):1109-16.

55. Valente MJ, De Pinho PG, de Lourdes Bastos M, Carvalho F, Carvalho M. Khat and synthetic cathinones: a review. Archives of toxicology. 2014 Jan 1;88(1):15-45.

56. Hupli A. Cognitive enhancement with licit and illicit stimulants in the Netherlands and Finland: what is the evidence?. Drugs and Alcohol Today. 2020 Jan 13.

57. Salahshour B, Sadeghi S, Nazari H, Soltaninejad K. Determining Undeclared Synthetic Pharmaceuticals as Adulterants in Weight Loss Herbal Medicines. International Journal of Medical Toxicology and Forensic Medicine. 2020 Mar 19;10(1):26253.

58. Drug Enforcement Administration. Drugs of abuse: A DEA resource guide. Drug Enforcement Administration, US Department of Justice. 2017 Jan 22.

59. Franzén L, Bäckberg M, Beck O, Helander A. Acute Intoxications Involving α-Pyrrolidinobutiophenone (α-PBP): Results from the Swedish STRIDA Project. Journal of Medical Toxicology. 2018 Dec 1;14(4):265-71.

60. Colon-Perez LM, Tran K, Thompson K, Pace MC, Blum K, Goldberger BA, Gold MS, Bruijnzeel AW, Setlow B, Febo M. The psychoactive designer drug and bath salt constituent MDPV causes widespread disruption of brain functional connectivity. Neuropsychopharmacology. 2016 Aug;41(9):2352-65.

61. Luethi D, Walter M, Zhou X, Rudin D, Krähenbühl S, Liechti ME. Para-Halogenation Affects Monoamine Transporter Inhibition Properties and Hepatocellular Toxicity of Amphetamines and Methcathinones. Frontiers in pharmacology. 2019;10:438.

62. Majchrzak M, Celiński R, Kowalska T, Sajewicz M. Fatal case of poisoning with a new cathinone derivative: α-propylaminopentiophenone (N-PP). Forensic toxicology. 2018 Jul 1;36(2):525-33.

63. Cherry SV, Rodriguez YF. Synthetic stimulant reaching epidemic proportions: flakka-induced ST-elevation myocardial infarction with intracardiac thrombi. Journal of cardiothoracic and vascular anaesthesia. 2017 Feb 1;31(1):e13-4.

64. Okujava M, Todua F, Janelidze M, Khatiashvili I. Pattern of MRI findings in ephedronic encephalopathy. In Movement Disorders 2017 Jun 1 (Vol. 32).

65. Trouiller P, Velter A, Saboni L, Sommen C, Sauvage C, Vaux S, Barin F, Chevaliez S, Lot F, Jauffret-Roustide M. Injecting drug use during sex (known as “slamming”) among men who have sex with men: Results from a time-location sampling survey conducted in five cities, France. International Journal of Drug Policy. 2020 May 1;79:102703.

66. McAuley, A., Yeung, A., Taylor, A., Hutchinson, S. J., Goldberg, D. J., & Munro, A. (2019). Emergence of Novel Psychoactive Substance injecting associated with rapid rise in the population prevalence of hepatitis C virus. International Journal of Drug Policy, 66, 30-37.

67. Crawford C, Boyd C, Avula B, Wang YH, Khan IA, Deuster PA. A Public Health Issue: Dietary Supplements Promoted for Brain Health and Cognitive Performance. The Journal of Alternative and Complementary Medicine. 2020 Apr 1;26(4):265-72.

68. Zahnow R, McVeigh J, Bates G, Winstock AR. Motives and Correlates of Anabolic-Androgenic Steroid Use With Stimulant Polypharmacy. Contemporary Drug Problems. 2020 Apr 22:0091450920919456.

69. Hinshaw SP, Scheffler RM. The ADHD explosion: Myths, medication, money, and today's push for performance. Oxford University Press; 2014 Feb 3.

70. Avellaneda-Ojeda A, Murtaza S, Shah AA, Moukaddam N. Stimulant Use Disorders. Psychiatric Annals. 2018 Aug 10;48(8):372-8.

71. Contrucci RR, Brunt TM, Inan F, Franssen EJ, Hondebrink L. Synthetic cathinones and their potential interactions with prescription drugs. Therapeutic Drug Monitoring. 2020 Feb 1;42(1):75-82.

72. Fattore L. Synthetic cannabinoids—further evidence supporting the relationship between cannabinoids and psychosis. Biological psychiatry. 2016 Apr 1;79(7):539-48.

73. Tait RJ, Caldicott D, Mountain D, Hill SL, Lenton S. A systematic review of adverse events arising from the use of synthetic cannabinoids and their associated treatment. Clinical toxicology. 2016 Jan 2;54(1):1-3.

74. Pacher P, Steffens S, Haskó G, Schindler TH, Kunos G. Cardiovascular effects of marijuana and synthetic cannabinoids: the good, the bad, and the ugly. Nature Reviews Cardiology. 2018 Mar;15(3):151.

75. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. Current NPS Threats. Volume II. January 2020. https://www.unodc.org/documents/scientific/Current_NPS_Threats_Volume_II_Web.pdf

76. Banister SD, Connor M. The chemistry and pharmacology of synthetic cannabinoid receptor agonists as new psychoactive substances: origins. InNew Psychoactive Substances 2018 (pp. 165-190). Springer, Cham.

77. Lefever TW, Marusich JA, Thomas BF, Barrus DG, Peiper NC, Kevin RC, Wiley JL. Vaping synthetic cannabinoids: a novel preclinical model of e-cigarette use in mice. Substance abuse: research and treatment. 2017 Mar 24;11:1178221817701739.

78. Murray RM, Quigley H, Quattrone D, Englund A, Di Forti M. Traditional marijuana, high-potency cannabis and synthetic cannabinoids: increasing risk for psychosis. World Psychiatry. 2016 Oct;15(3):195-204.

79. Le Boisselier R, Alexandre J, Lelong-Boulouard V, Debruyne D. Focus on cannabinoids and synthetic cannabinoids. Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics. 2017 Feb;101(2):220-9.

80. Zimmer DI, McCauley R, Konanki V, Dynako J, Zackariya N, Shariff F, Miller J, Binz S, Walsh M. Emergency department and radiological cost of delayed diagnosis of cannabinoid hyperemesis. Journal of addiction. 2019;2019.

81. Vandrey R, Dunn KE, Fry JA, Girling ER. A survey study to characterize use of Spice products (synthetic cannabinoids). Drug and alcohol dependence. 2012 Jan 1;120(1-3):238-41.

82. Berkowitz, E.A., Henry, T.S., Veeraraghavan, S., Staton, G.W. and Gal, A.A. (2014) Pulmonary Effects of Synthetic Marijuana: Chest Radiography and CT Findings. American Journal of Roentgenology

83. Winstock A, Lynskey M, Borschmann R, Waldron J. Risk of emergency medical treatment following consumption of cannabis or synthetic cannabinoids in a large global sample. Journal of Psychopharmacology. 2015 Jun;29(6):698-703.

84. Winstock, A.R. and Barratt, M.J. (2013) Synthetic Cannabis: A Comparison of Patterns of Use and Effect Profile with Natural Cannabis in a Large Global Sample. Drug Alcohol Depend, 131, 106

85. Ford LT, Berg JD. Analytical evidence to show letters impregnated with novel psychoactive substances are a means of getting drugs to inmates within the UK prison service. Annals of clinical biochemistry. 2018 Nov;55(6):673-8.

86. Ralphs R, Williams L, Askew R, Norton A. Adding spice to the porridge: The development of a synthetic cannabinoid market in an English prison. International Journal of Drug Policy. 2017 Feb 1;40:57-69.

87. Hvozdovich JA, Chronister CW, Logan BK, Goldberger BA. Case report: synthetic cannabinoid deaths in state of Florida prisoners. Journal of Analytical Toxicology. 2020 Apr 30;44(3):298-300.

88. Springer YP, Gerona R, Scheunemann E, Shafer SL, Lin T, Banister SD, Cooper MP, Castrodale LJ, Levy M, Butler JC, McLaughlin JB. Increase in adverse reactions associated with use of synthetic cannabinoids—Anchorage, Alaska, 2015–2016. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report. 2016 Oct 14;65(40):1108-11.

89. Joseph A, Lekas HM, Manseau M, Lewis C. A polydrug and psychosocial profile of synthetic cannabinoid use in a New York City community sample, 2016–2017. Substance use & misuse. 2019 Jan 28;54(2):282-7.

90. Ellsworth JT. Spice, vulnerability, and victimization: Synthetic cannabinoids and interpersonal crime victimization among homeless adults. Substance abuse. 2019 Nov 7:1-7.

91. Adamowicz P. Fatal intoxication with synthetic cannabinoid MDMB-CHMICA. Forensic science international. 2016 Apr 1;261:e5-10.

92. Fantegrossi WE, Moran JH, Radominska-Pandya A, Prather PL. Distinct pharmacology and metabolism of K2 synthetic cannabinoids compared to Δ9-THC: mechanism underlying greater toxicity?. Life sciences. 2014 Feb 27;97(1):45-54.

93. ElSohly MA, Gul W, Wanas AS, Radwan MM. Synthetic cannabinoids: analysis and metabolites. Life sciences. 2014 Feb 27;97(1):78-90.

94. Shevyrin V, Melkozerov V, Endres GW, Shafran Y, Morzherin Y. On a new cannabinoid classification system: a sight on the illegal market of novel psychoactive substances. Cannabis and Cannabinoid Research. 2016 Aug 1;1(1):186-94.

95. Chung H, Choi H, Heo S, Kim E, Lee J. Synthetic cannabinoids abused in South Korea: drug identifications by the National Forensic Service from 2009 to June 2013. Forensic toxicology. 2014 Jan 1;32(1):82-8.

96. Sobolevsky T, Prasolov I, Rodchenkov G. Detection of urinary metabolites of AM-2201 and UR-144, two novel synthetic cannabinoids. Drug testing and analysis. 2012 Oct;4(10):745-53.

97. Banister SD, Moir M, Stuart J, Kevin RC, Wood KE, Longworth M, Wilkinson SM, Beinat C, Buchanan AS, Glass M, Connor M. Pharmacology of indole and indazole synthetic cannabinoid designer drugs ab-fubinaca, adb-fubinaca, ab-pinaca, adb-pinaca, 5f-ab-pinaca, 5f-adb-pinaca, adbica, and 5f-adbica. ACS chemical neuroscience. 2015 Sep 16;6(9):1546-59.

98. Banister SD, Stuart J, Kevin RC, Edington A, Longworth M, Wilkinson SM, Beinat C, Buchanan AS, Hibbs DE, Glass M, Connor M, McGregor IS, Kassiou M. Effects of bioisosteric fluorine in synthetic cannabinoid designer drugs JWH-018, AM-2201, UR-144, XLR-11, PB-22, 5F-PB-22, APICA, and STS-135. ACS Chem Neurosci 6(8):1445–1458.

99. Banister SD, Adams A, Kevin RC, Macdonald C, Glass M, Boyd R, Connor M, McGregor IS, Havel CM, Bright SJ, Vilamala MV. Synthesis and pharmacology of new psychoactive substance 5F-CUMYL-P7AICA, a scaffold-hopping analog of synthetic cannabinoid receptor agonists 5F-CUMYL-PICA and 5F-CUMYL-PINACA. Drug testing and analysis. 2019 Feb;11(2):279-91.

100. Banister SD, Kevin RC, Martin L, Adams A, Macdonald C, Manning JJ, Boyd R, Cunningham M, Stevens MY, McGregor IS, Glass M. The chemistry and pharmacology of putative synthetic cannabinoid receptor agonist (SCRA) new psychoactive substances (NPS) 5F-PY-PICA, 5F-PY-PINACA, and their analogs. Drug testing and analysis. 2019 Jul;11(7):976-89.

101. Finlay DB, Manning JJ, Ibsen MS, Macdonald CE, Patel M, Javitch JA, Banister SD, Glass M. Do toxic synthetic cannabinoid receptor agonists have signature in vitro activity profiles? A case study of AMB-FUBINACA. ACS Chemical Neuroscience. 2019 Sep 12;10(10):4350-60.

102. Baumann MH, Garibay N, Partilla JS, Brandt SD. Structure-Activity Relationships for Cumyl-Containing Synthetic Cannabinoids to Induce Hypothermic, Cataleptic and Analgesic Effects in Mice. The FASEB Journal. 2020 Apr;34(S1):1-.

103. Darke S, Duflou J, Farrell M, Peacock A, Lappin J. Characteristics and circumstances of synthetic cannabinoid-related death. Clinical toxicology. 2020 May 3;58(5):368-74.

104. Takeda A, Doi T, Asada A, Suzuki T, Yuzawa K, Ando H, Kubo Y, Nagasawa A, Kaihoko F, Hasegawa Y, Tanaka K. Evaluation of carboxamide-type synthetic cannabinoids on the functional activities at cannabinoid receptors and biological effects via inhalation exposure test. Forensic Toxicology. 2020 Apr 22:1-0.

105. De Luca MA, Fattore L. Therapeutic use of synthetic cannabinoids: still an open issue?. Clinical therapeutics. 2018 Sep 1;40(9):1457-66.

106. Law R, Schier J, Martin C, Chang A, Wolkin A. Increase in reported adverse health effects related to synthetic cannabinoid use—United States, January–May 2015. MMWR. Morbidity and mortality weekly report. 2015 Jun 12;64(22):618.

107. Hoyte CO, Jacob J, Monte AA, Al-Jumaan M, Bronstein AC, Heard KJ. A characterization of synthetic cannabinoid exposures reported to the National Poison Data System in 2010. Annals of emergency medicine. 2012 Oct 1;60(4):435-8.

108. Bäckberg M, Tworek L, Beck O, Helander A. Analytically confirmed intoxications involving MDMB-CHMICA from the STRIDA project. Journal of medical toxicology. 2017 Mar 1;13(1):52-60.

109. Armstrong F, McCurdy MT, Heavner MS. Synthetic Cannabinoid-Associated Multiple Organ Failure: Case Series and Literature Review. Pharmacotherapy: The Journal of Human Pharmacology and Drug Therapy. 2019 Apr;39(4):508-13.

110. Argamany JR, Reveles KR, Duhon B. Synthetic cannabinoid hyperemesis resulting in rhabdomyolysis and acute renal failure. The American journal of emergency medicine. 2016 Apr 1;34(4):765-e1.

111. Davis C, Boddington D. Teenage cardiac arrest following abuse of synthetic cannabis. Heart, Lung and Circulation. 2015 Oct 1;24(10):e162-3.

112. Ozturk HM, Yetkin E, Ozturk S. Synthetic cannabinoids and cardiac arrhythmia risk: Review of the literature. Cardiovascular toxicology. 2019 Jun 15;19(3):191-7.

113. Yırgın G, Ateş İ, Katipoğlu B, Demir BF, Yılmaz N. Pulmonary embolism due to synthetic cannabinoid use: Case report. Archives of the Turkish Society of Cardiology. 2018 Jul 1;46(5):411-3.

114. Aydin G, Bakar B. Delayed Intracerebral Hemorrhage after Synthetic Cannabis (Bonsai) Abuse; Case Report and Literature Review. Bulletin of Emergency & Trauma. 2019 Jul;7(3):330.

115. Armenian P, Darracq M, Gevorkyan J, Clark S, Kaye B, Brandehoff NP. Intoxication from the novel synthetic cannabinoids AB-PINACA and ADB-PINACA: a case series and review of the literature. Neuropharmacology. 2018 May 15;134:82-91.

116. Akram H, Mokrysz C, Curran HV. What are the psychological effects of using synthetic cannabinoids? A systematic review. Journal of Psychopharmacology. 2019 Mar;33(3):271-83.

117. Nia AB, Mann CL, Spriggs S, DeFrancisco DR, Carbonaro S, Parvez L, Galynker II, Perkel CA, Hurd YL. The Relevance of Sex in the Association of Synthetic Cannabinoid Use With Psychosis and Agitation in an Inpatient Population. The Journal of clinical psychiatry. 2019 Jul;80(4).

118. Darke S, Duflou J, Farrell M, Peacock A, Lappin J. Characteristics and circumstances of synthetic cannabinoid-related death. Clinical toxicology. 2020 May 3;58(5):368-74.

119. Kraemer M, Fels H, Dame T, Musshoff F, Halter S, Mogler L, Hess C, Madea B, Maas A. Mono-/polyintoxication with 5F-ADB: A case series. Forensic science international. 2019 Aug 1;301:e29-37.

120. Mensen VT, Vreeker A, Nordgren J, Atkinson A, de la Torre R, Farré M, Ramaekers JG, Brunt TM. Psychopathological symptoms associated with synthetic cannabinoid use: a comparison with natural cannabis. Psychopharmacology. 2019 Sep 1;236(9):2677-85.

121. Hoffman AF, Hwang EK, Lupica CR. Impairment of Synaptic Plasticity by Cannabis, Δ9-THC, and Synthetic Cannabinoids. Cold Spring Harbor Perspectives in Medicine. 2020 Apr 27:a039743.

122. Creagh S, Warden D, Latif MA, Paydar A. The New Classes of Synthetic Illicit Drugs Can Significantly Harm the Brain: A Neuro Imaging Perspective with Full Review of MRI Findings. Clinical radiology & imaging journal. 2018;2(1).

123. Cohen K, Kapitány-Fövény M, Mama Y, Arieli M, Rosca P, Demetrovics Z, Weinstein A. The effects of synthetic cannabinoids on executive function. Psychopharmacology. 2017 Apr 1;234(7):1121-34.

124. Cooper ZD. Adverse effects of synthetic cannabinoids: management of acute toxicity and withdrawal. Current psychiatry reports. 2016 May 1;18(5):52.

125. Van Hout MC, Hearne E. User experiences of development of dependence on the synthetic cannabinoids, 5f-AKB48 and 5F-PB-22, and subsequent withdrawal syndromes. International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction. 2017 Jun 1;15(3):565-79.

126. White CM. The pharmacologic and clinical effects of illicit synthetic cannabinoids. The Journal of Clinical Pharmacology. 2017 Mar;57(3):297-304.

127. March R, Guentert P, Kloska-Kearney E, Kwak D, Yerger C, McBride M, Majewski JR, McCauley R, Hatch J, Speybroeck J, Betts A. Utilization of Extracorporeal Membrane Oxygenation for Pulmonary Toxicity Caused by Inhaled Synthetic Cannabinoid. A Harbinger of Future Complications

Associated with Inhaled Cannabinoid Products. International Journal of Clinical Medicine. 2020 Feb 11;11(2):53-61.

128. Duffy B, Li L, Lu S, Durocher L, Dittmar M, Delaney-Baldwin E, Panawennage D, LeMaster D, Navarette K, Spink D. Analysis of cannabinoid-containing fluids in illicit vaping cartridges recovered from pulmonary injury patients: identification of vitamin E acetate as a major diluent. Toxics. 2020 Mar;8(1):8.

129. Baumeister D, Barnes G, Giaroli G, Tracy D. Classical hallucinogens as antidepressants? A review of pharmacodynamics and putative clinical roles. Therapeutic advances in psychopharmacology. 2014 Aug;4(4):156-69.

130. Mohr AL, Friscia M, Yeakel JK, Logan BK. Use of synthetic stimulants and hallucinogens in a cohort of electronic dance music festival attendees. Forensic science international. 2018 Jan 1;282:168-78.

131. Lawn W, Hallak JE, Crippa JA, Dos Santos R, Porffy L, Barratt MJ, Ferris JA, Winstock AR, Morgan CJ. Well-being, problematic alcohol consumption and acute subjective drug effects in past-year ayahuasca users: a large, international, self-selecting online survey. Scientific reports. 2017 Nov 9;7(1):1-0.

132. Hill SL, Doris T, Gurung S, Katebe S, Lomas A, Dunn M, Blain P, Thomas SH. Severe clinical toxicity associated with analytically confirmed recreational use of 25I–NBOMe: case series. Clinical Toxicology. 2013 Jul 1;51(6):487-92.

133. Stellpflug SJ, Kealey SE, Hegarty CB, Janis GC. 2-(4-Iodo-2, 5-dimethoxyphenyl)-N-[(2-methoxyphenyl) methyl] ethanamine (25I-NBOMe): clinical case with unique confirmatory testing. Journal of Medical Toxicology. 2014 Mar 1;10(1):45-50.

134. Weaver MF, Schnoll SH. Hallucinogens and club drugs. In The American Psychiatric Publishing Textbook of Substance Abuse Treatment. 2008 Jun 15;4:191-200.

135. Whitmore CA, Hopfer C. Abuse of hallucinogens and dissociative drugs, prescription opioids and anxiolytics, and over-the-counter (OTC) medications is a significant problem among adolescents and young adults. The use of hallucinogenic and dissocia-tive substances, commonly referred to as “club drugs,” became popular during the 1990s. Despite the overall declining trend in adolescents’ use of club drugs. Clinical Manual of Youth Addictive Disorders. 2019 Oct 30:229.

136. Nisavic M, Lai-Becker MW. Management of Acute Substance Use Disorders: Hallucinogens and Associated Compounds. InSubstance Use and the Acute Psychiatric Patient 2019 (pp. 83-91). Humana, Cham.

137. Shulgin A, Shulgin A. PIHKAL: Phenethylamines I have known and loved. Transform Press; 1995.

138. Eshleman AJ, Wolfrum KM, Reed JF, Kim SO, Johnson RA, Janowsky A. Neurochemical pharmacology of psychoactive substituted N-benzylphenethylamines: High potency agonists at 5-HT2A receptors. Biochemical pharmacology. 2018 Dec 1;158:27-34.

139. Tittarelli R, Mannocchi G, Pantano F, Saverio Romolo F. Recreational use, analysis and toxicity of tryptamines. Current neuropharmacology. 2015 Jan 1;13(1):26-46.

140. Brandt SD, Kavanagh PV, Westphal F, Stratford A, Elliott SP, Dowling G, Wallach J, Halberstadt AL. Return of the lysergamides. Part V: Analytical and behavioural characterization of 1-butanoyl-d-lysergic acid diethylamide (1B-LSD). Drug testing and analysis. 2019 Aug;11(8):1122-33.

141. Wagmann L, Richter LH, Kehl T, Wack F, Bergstrand MP, Brandt SD, Stratford A, Maurer HH, Meyer MR. In vitro metabolic fate of nine LSD-based

new psychoactive substances and their analytical detectability in different urinary screening procedures. Analytical and bioanalytical chemistry. 2019 Jul 19;411(19):4751-63.

142. Kolaczynska KE, Luethi D, Trachsel D, Hoener MC, Liechti ME. Receptor interaction profiles of 4-alkoxy-substituted 2, 5-dimethoxyphenethylamines and related amphetamines. Frontiers in Pharmacology. 2019;10:1423.

143. Luethi D, Widmer R, Trachsel D, Hoener MC, Liechti ME. Monoamine receptor interaction profiles of 4-aryl-substituted 2, 5-dimethoxyphenethylamines (2C-BI derivatives). European journal of pharmacology. 2019 Jul 15;855:103-11.

144. Uthaug MV, Van Oorsouw K, Kuypers KP, Van Boxtel M, Broers NJ, Mason NL, Toennes SW, Riba J, Ramaekers JG. Sub-acute and long-term effects of ayahuasca on affect and cognitive thinking style and their association with ego dissolution. Psychopharmacology. 2018 Oct 1;235(10):2979-89.

145. dos Santos RG, Hallak JE. Therapeutic use of serotoninergic hallucinogens: A review of the evidence and of the biological and psychological mechanisms. Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews. 2020 Jan 1;108:423-34.

146. Ross S. Therapeutic use of classic psychedelics to treat cancer-related psychiatric distress. International Review of Psychiatry. 2018 Jul 4;30(4):317-30.

147. Nielson EM, May DG, Forcehimes AA, Bogenschutz MP. The psychedelic debriefing in alcohol dependence treatment: Illustrating key change phenomena through qualitative content analysis of clinical sessions. Frontiers in pharmacology. 2018 Feb 21;9:132.

148. Bogenschutz MP, Podrebarac SK, Duane JH, Amegadzie SS, Malone TC, Owens LT, Ross S, Mennenga SE. Clinical interpretations of patient experience in a trial of psilocybin-assisted psychotherapy for alcohol use disorder. Frontiers in pharmacology. 2018 Feb 20;9:100.

149. Iwersen-Bergmann S, Lehmann S, Heinemann A, Schröder C, Müller A, Jungen H, Andresen-Streichert H, Pueschel K, Vidal C, Mercer-Chalmers-Bender K. Mass poisoning with NPS: 2C-E and Bromo-DragonFly. International journal of legal medicine. 2019 Jan 14;133(1):123-9.

150. Srisuma S, Bronstein AC, Hoyte CO. NBOMe and 2C substitute phenylethylamine exposures reported to the National Poison Data System. Clinical toxicology. 2015 Aug 9;53(7):624-8.

151. Stoller A, Dolder PC, Bodmer M, Hammann F, Rentsch KM, Exadaktylos AK, Liechti ME, Liakoni E. Mistaking 2C-P for 2C-B: what a difference a letter makes. Journal of analytical toxicology. 2017 Jan 1;41(1):77-9.

152. Wood DM, Sedefov R, Cunningham A, Dargan PI. Prevalence of use and acute toxicity associated with the use of NBOMe drugs. Clinical toxicology. 2015 Feb 7;53(2):85-92.

153. Kamour A, James D, Spears R, Cooper G, Lupton DJ, Eddleston M, Thompson JP, Vale AJ, Thanacoody HK, Hill SL, Thomas SH. Patterns of presentation and clinical toxicity after reported use of alpha methyltryptamine in the United Kingdom. A report from the UK National Poisons Information Service. Clinical Toxicology. 2014 Mar 1;52(3):192-7.

154. Ikeda A, Sekiguchi K, Fujita K, Yamadera H, Koga Y. 5-methoxy-N, N-diisopropyltryptamine-induced flashbacks. American Journal of Psychiatry. 2005 Apr 1;162(4):815-.

155. Jovel A, Felthous A, Bhattacharyya A. Delirium due to intoxication from the novel synthetic tryptamine 5-MeO-DALT. Journal of forensic sciences. 2014 May;59(3):844-6.

156. Boland DM, Andollo W, Hime GW, Hearn WL. Fatality due to acute α-methyltryptamine intoxication. Journal of analytical toxicology. 2005 Jul 1;29(5):394-7.

157. Dolder PC, Schmid Y, Müller F, Borgwardt S, Liechti ME. LSD acutely impairs fear recognition and enhances emotional empathy and sociality. Neuropsychopharmacology. 2016 Oct;41(11):2638-46.

158. Dean BV, Stellpflug SJ, Burnett AM, Engebretsen KM. 2C or not 2C: phenethylamine designer drug review. Journal of Medical Toxicology. 2013 Jun 1;9(2):172-8.

159. Walterscheid JP, Phillips GT, Lopez AE, Gonsoulin ML, Chen HH, Sanchez LA. Pathological findings in 2 cases of fatal 25I-NBOMe toxicity. The American journal of forensic medicine and pathology. 2014 Mar 1;35(1):20-5.

160. Li L, Vlisides PE. Ketamine: 50 years of modulating the mind. Frontiers in human neuroscience. 2016 Nov 29;10:612.

161. Newcomer JW, Farber NB, Olney JW. NMDA receptor function, memory, and brain aging. Dialogues in clinical neuroscience. 2000 Sep;2(3):219.

162. Morris H, Wallach J. From PCP to MXE: a comprehensive review of the non-medical use of dissociative drugs. Drug testing and analysis. 2014 Jul;6(7-8):614-32.

163. Whitmore CA, Hopfer C. Abuse of hallucinogens and dissociative drugs, prescription opioids and anxiolytics, and over-the-counter (OTC) medications is a significant problem among adolescents and young adults. The use of hallucinogenic and dissociative substances, commonly referred to

as “club drugs,” became popular during the 1990s. Despite the overall declining trend in adolescents’ use of club drugs. Clinical Manual of Youth Addictive Disorders. 2019 Oct 30:229.

164. Wallach J, Kang H, Colestock T, Morris H, Bortolotto ZA, Collingridge GL, Lodge D, Halberstadt AL, Brandt SD, Adejare A. Pharmacological investigations of the dissociative ‘legal highs’ diphenidine, methoxphenidine and analogues. PLoS One. 2016;11(6).

165. Katselou M, Papoutsis I, Nikolaou P, Misailidi N, Spiliopoulou C, Athanaselis S. Diphenidine: a dissociative NPS makes an entrance on the drug scene. Forensic Toxicology. 2018 Jul 1;36(2):233-42.

166. Abiero A, Botanas CJ, Custodio RJ, Sayson LV, Kim M, Lee HJ, Kim HJ, Lee KW, Jeong Y, Seo JW, Ryu IS. 4-MeO-PCP and 3-MeO-PCMo, new dissociative drugs, produce rewarding and reinforcing effects through activation of mesolimbic dopamine pathway and alteration of accumbal CREB, deltaFosB, and BDNF levels. Psychopharmacology. 2020 Mar;237(3):757-72.

167. Roth BL, Gibbons S, Arunotayanun W, Huang XP, Setola V, Treble R, Iversen L. The ketamine analogue methoxetamine and 3-and 4-methoxy analogues of phencyclidine are high affinity and selective ligands for the glutamate NMDA receptor. PLoS One. 2013 Mar 19;8(3):e59334.

168. Botanas CJ, de la Peña JB, Kim HJ, Lee YS, Cheong JH. Methoxetamine: A foe or friend?. Neurochemistry international. 2019 Jan 1;122:1-7.

169. Guirguis A. New psychoactive substances: A public health issue. International Journal of Pharmacy Practice. 2017 Sep 12.

170. Hutton F. Cultures of Intoxication: ‘New’ Psychoactive Substances. In Cultures of Intoxication 2020 (pp. 87-110). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.

171. Hearne E, Van Hout MC. “Trip-sitting” in the black hole: a netnographic study of dissociation and indigenous harm reduction. Journal of psychoactive drugs. 2016 Aug 7;48(4):233-42.

172. Hondebrink L, Zwartsen A, Westerink RH. Effect fingerprinting of new psychoactive substances (NPS): What can we learn from in vitro data?. Pharmacology & therapeutics. 2018 Feb 1;182:193-224.

173. Zanda MT, Fadda P, Antinori S, Di Chio M, Fratta W, Chiamulera C, Fattore L. Methoxetamine affects brain processing involved in emotional response in rats. British journal of pharmacology. 2017 Oct;174(19):3333-45.

174. Costa G, Porceddu PF, Serra M, Casu MA, Schiano V, Napolitano F, Pinna A, Usiello A, Morelli M. Lack of Rhes increases MDMA-induced neuroinflammation and dopamine neuron degeneration: Role of gender and age. International journal of molecular sciences. 2019 Jan;20(7):1556.

175. Fassette T, Martinez A. An impaired driver found to be under the influence of methoxetamine. Journal of analytical toxicology. 2016 Oct 1;40(8):700-2.

176. Imbert L, Boucher A, Delhome G, Cueto T, Boudinaud M, Maublanc J, Dulaurent S, Descotes J, Lachaˆtre G, Gaulier JM. Analytical findings of an acute intoxication after inhalation of methoxetamine. Journal of analytical toxicology. 2014 Sep 1;38(7):410-5.

177. Dargan PI, Tang HC, Liang W, Wood DM, Yew DT. Three months of methoxetamine administration is associated with significant bladder and renal toxicity in mice. Clinical Toxicology. 2014 Mar 1;52(3):176-80.

178. Shields JE, Dargan PI, Wood DM, Puchnarewicz M, Davies S, Waring WS. Methoxetamine associated reversible cerebellar toxicity: three cases with analytical confirmation. Clinical Toxicology. 2012 Jun 1;50(5):438-40.

179. Johansson A, Lindstedt D, Roman M, Thelander G, Nielsen EI, Lennborn U, Sandler H, Rubertsson S, Ahlner J, Kronstrand R, Kugelberg FC. A non-fatal intoxication and seven deaths involving the dissociative drug 3-MeO-PCP. Forensic science international. 2017 Jun 1;275:76-82.

180. Krotulski AJ, Papsun DM, Friscia M, Swartz JL, Holsey BD, Logan BK. Fatality following ingestion of tetrahydrofuranylfentanyl, U-49900 and methoxy-phencyclidine. Journal of analytical toxicology. 2018 Apr 1;42(3):e27-32.

181. Kusano M, Zaitsu K, Taki K, Hisatsune K, Nakajima JI, Moriyasu T, Asano T, Hayashi Y, Tsuchihashi H, Ishii A. Fatal intoxication by 5F–ADB and diphenidine: detection, quantification, and investigation of their main metabolic pathways in humans by LC/MS/MS and LC/Q-TOFMS. Drug testing and analysis. 2018 Feb;10(2):284-93.

182. Hill SL, Harbon SC, Coulson J, Cooper GA, Jackson G, Lupton DJ, Vale JA, Thomas SH. Methoxetamine toxicity reported to the National Poisons Information Service: clinical characteristics and patterns of enquiries (including the period of the introduction of the UK's first Temporary Class Drug Order). Emergency Medicine Journal. 2014 Jan 1;31(1):45-7.

183. Wood DM, Davies S, Puchnarewicz M, Johnston A, Dargan PI. Acute toxicity associated with the recreational use of the ketamine derivative methoxetamine. European journal of clinical pharmacology. 2012 May 1;68(5):853-6.

184. EMCDDA Perspectives on Drugs. The misuse of benzodiazepines among high-risk opioid users in Europe. 2018. http://www.emcdda.europa.eu/topics/pods/benzodiazepines_en

185. Zawilska JB, Wojcieszak J. An expanding world of New Psychoactive Substances–Designer benzodiazepines. NeuroToxicology. 2019 Feb 23.

186. El Balkhi S, Monchaud C, Herault F, Géniaux H, Saint-Marcoux F. Designer benzodiazepines' pharmacological effects and potencies: How to find the information. Journal of Psychopharmacology. 2020 Jan 23:0269881119901096.

187. Moosmann B, Auwärter V. Designer benzodiazepines: another class of new psychoactive substances. In New Psychoactive Substances 2018 (pp. 383-410). Springer, Cham.

188. Waters L, Manchester KR, Maskell PD, Haegeman C, Haider S. The use of a quantitative structure-activity relationship (QSAR) model to predict GABA-A receptor binding of newly emerging benzodiazepines. Science & Justice. 2018 May 1;58(3):219-25.

189. Manchester KR, Lomas EC, Waters L, Dempsey FC, Maskell PD. The emergence of new psychoactive substance (NPS) benzodiazepines: A review. Drug testing and analysis. 2018 Jan;10(1):37-53.

190. Shoshan-Barmatz V, Pittala S, Mizrachi D. VDAC1 and the TSPO: expression, interactions, and associated functions in health and disease states. International journal of molecular sciences. 2019 Jan;20(13):3348.

191. Qneibi M, Jaradat N, Hawash M, Olgac A, Emwas N. Ortho versus Meta Chlorophenyl-2, 3-Benzodiazepine Analogues: Synthesis, Molecular Modeling, and Biological Activity as AMPAR Antagonists. ACS omega. 2020 Feb 13;5(7):3588-95.

192. Verma S, Kumar S, Kumar S. Design, synthesis, computational and biological evaluation of new benzodiazepines as CNS agents. Arabian Journal of Chemistry. 2020 Jan 1;13(1):863-74.

193. El Balkhi S, Monchaud C, Herault F, Géniaux H, Saint-Marcoux F. Designer benzodiazepines' pharmacological effects and potencies: How to find the information. Journal of Psychopharmacology. 2020 Jan 23

194. Carpenter JE, Murray BP, Dunkley C, Kazzi ZN, Gittinger MH. Designer benzodiazepines: a report of exposures recorded in the National Poison Data System, 2014–2017. Clinical toxicology. 2019 Apr 3;57(4):282-6.

195. Andersson M, Kjellgren A. The slippery slope of flubromazolam: experiences of a novel psychoactive benzodiazepine as discussed on a Swedish online forum. Nordic Studies on Alcohol and Drugs. 2017 Jun;34(3):217-29.

196. Koch K, Auwärter V, Hermanns-Clausen M, Wilde M, Neukamm MA. Mixed intoxication by the synthetic opioid U-47700 and the benzodiazepine flubromazepam with lethal outcome: Pharmacokinetic data. Drug testing and analysis. 2018 Aug;10(8):1336-41.

197. Domingo O, Roider G, Stöver A, Graw M, Musshoff F, Sachs H, Bicker W. Mitragynine concentrations in two fatalities. Forensic science international. 2017 Feb 1;271:e1-7.

198. Partridge E, Trobbiani S, Stockham P, Charlwood C, Kostakis C. A case study involving U-47700, diclazepam and flubromazepam—application of retrospective analysis of HRMS data. Journal of analytical toxicology. 2018 Nov 1;42(9):655-60.

199. Shearer K, Bryce C, Parsons M, Torrance H. Phenazepam: A review of medico-legal deaths in South Scotland between 2010 and 2014. Forensic science international. 2015 Sep 1;254:197-204.

200. Ren B, Suriawinata AA, Iwai M. Drug-Induced Liver Injury. In Diagnosis of Liver Disease 2019 (pp. 85-96). Springer, Singapore.

201. Labonville S. Opiate, opioid, narcotic-what's the difference. The Patient Advocate Pharmacy. 2017.

202. Bodnar RJ. Endogenous opiates and behavior: 2017. Peptides. 2020 Feb 1;124:170223.

203. Suzuki J, El-Haddad S. A review: fentanyl and non-pharmaceutical fentanyls. Drug and alcohol dependence. 2017 Feb 1;171:107-16.

204. Bucerius SM, Haggerty KD. Fentanyl behind bars: The implications of synthetic opiates on prisoners and correctional officers. International Journal of Drug Policy. 2019 Sep 1;71:133-8.

205. Solimini R, Pichini S, Pacifici R, Busardò FP, Giorgetti R. Pharmacotoxicology of non-fentanyl derived new synthetic opioids. Frontiers in pharmacology. 2018 Jun 20;9:654.

206. Toll L, Standifer KM, Massotte D. Current Topics in Opioid Research. Frontiers in psychiatry. 2019;10:586.

207. Drewes AM, Jensen RD, Nielsen LM, Droney J, Christrup LL, Arendt-Nielsen L, Riley J, Dahan A. Differences between opioids: pharmacological, experimental, clinical and economical perspectives. British journal of clinical pharmacology. 2013 Jan;75(1):60-78.

208. Armenian P, Vo KT, Barr-Walker J, Lynch KL. Fentanyl, fentanyl analogs and novel synthetic opioids: a comprehensive review. Neuropharmacology. 2018 May 15;134:121-32.

209. Baumann MH, Majumdar S, Le Rouzic V, Hunkele A, Uprety R, Huang XP, Xu J, Roth BL, Pan YX, Pasternak GW. Pharmacological characterization of novel synthetic opioids (NSO) found in the recreational drug marketplace. Neuropharmacology. 2018 May 15;134:101-7.

210. Charbogne P, Kieffer BL, Befort K. 15 years of genetic approaches in vivo for addiction research: Opioid receptor and peptide gene knockout in mouse models of drug abuse. Neuropharmacology. 2014 Jan 1;76:204-17.

211. Concheiro M, Chesser R, Pardi J, Cooper G. Postmortem toxicology of new synthetic opioids. Frontiers in pharmacology. 2018 Oct 26;9:1210.

212. Müller D, Neurath H, Neukamm MA, Wilde M, Despicht C, Blaschke S, Grapp M. New synthetic opioid cyclopropylfentanyl together with other novel synthetic opioids in respiratory insufficient comatose patients detected by toxicological analysis. Clinical Toxicology. 2019 Sep 2;57(9):806-12.

213. Wilde M, Sommer MJ, Auwärter V, Hermanns-Clausen M. Acute severe intoxication with cyclopropylfentanyl, a novel synthetic opioid. Toxicology letters. 2020 Mar 1;320:109-12.

214. Cole JB, Dunbar JF, McIntire SA, Regelmann WE, Slusher TM. Butyrfentanyl overdose resulting in diffuse alveolar hemorrhage. Pediatrics. 2015 Mar 1;135(3):e740-3.

215. Helander A, Bäckberg M, Signell P, Beck O. Intoxications involving acrylfentanyl and other novel designer fentanyls–results from the Swedish STRIDA project. Clinical toxicology. 2017 Jul 3;55(6):589-99.

216. Siddiqi S, Verney C, Dargan P, Wood DM. Understanding the availability, prevalence of use, desired effects, acute toxicity and dependence potential of the novel opioid MT-45. Clinical Toxicology. 2015 Jan 2;53(1):54-9.

217. Fels H, Lottner-Nau S, Sax T, Roider G, Graw M, Auwärter V, Musshoff F. Postmortem concentrations of the synthetic opioid U-47700 in 26 fatalities associated with the drug. Forensic science international. 2019 Aug 1;301:e20-8.

218. Nash C, Butzbach D, Stockham P, Scott T, Abroe G, Painter B, Gilbert J, Kostakis C. A fatality involving furanylfentanyl and MMMP, with presumptive identification of three MMMP metabolites in urine. Journal of analytical toxicology. 2019 May 1;43(4):291-8.

219. Kriikku P, Pelander A, Rasanen I, Ojanperä I. Toxic lifespan of the synthetic opioid U-47,700 in Finland verified by re-analysis of UPLC-TOF-MS data. Forensic science international. 2019 Jul 1;300:85-8.

220. Richeval C, Gaulier JM, Romeuf L, Allorge D, Gaillard Y. Case report: relevance of metabolite identification to detect new synthetic opioid intoxications illustrated by U-47700. International journal of legal medicine. 2019 Jan 14;133(1):133-42.

221. Belackova V, Vacek J, Janikova B, Mravcik V, Zabransky T, Ivanovova L, Csemy L. “Just another drug” for marginalized users: The risks of using synthetic cathinones among NSP clients in the Czech Republic. Journal of Substance Use. 2017 Nov 2;22(6):567-73.

222. Helander A, Bäckberg M, Beck O. Drug trends and harm related to new psychoactive substances (NPS) in Sweden from 2010 to 2016: Experiences from the STRIDA project. Plos one. 2020 Apr 23;15(4):e0232038.

223. Jannetto PJ, Helander A, Garg U, Janis GC, Goldberger B, Ketha H. The fentanyl epidemic and evolution of fentanyl analogs in the United States and the European Union. Clinical chemistry. 2019 Feb 1;65(2):242-53.

224. Abdulrahim D, Whiteley C, Moncrieff M, Bowden-Jones O. Club drug use among lesbian, gay, bisexual and trans (LGBT) people. London: Novel Psychoactive Treatment UK Network (NEPTUNE); 2016.

225. Graziano S, Anzillotti L, Mannocchi G, Pichini S, Busardò FP. Screening methods for rapid determination of new psychoactive substances (NPS) in conventional and non-conventional biological matrices. Journal of pharmaceutical and biomedical analysis. 2019 Jan 30;163:170-9.

226. Peiper NC, Clarke SD, Vincent LB, Ciccarone D, Kral AH, Zibbell JE. Fentanyl test strips as an opioid overdose prevention strategy: findings from a syringe services program in the Southeastern United States. International Journal of Drug Policy. 2019 Jan 1;63:122-8.

227. Regester LE, Chmiel JD, Holler JM, Vorce SP, Levine B, Bosy TZ. Determination of designer drug cross-reactivity on five commercial immunoassay screening kits. Journal of analytical toxicology. 2015 Mar 1;39(2):144-51.

228. Salomone A, Gazzilli G, Di Corcia D, Gerace E, Vincenti M. Determination of cathinones and other stimulant, psychedelic, and dissociative designer drugs in real hair samples. Analytical and bioanalytical chemistry. 2016 Mar 1;408(8):2035-42.

229. Ares AM, Fernández P, Regenjo M, Fernández AM, Carro AM, Lorenzo RA. A fast bioanalytical method based on microextraction by packed sorbent and UPLC–MS/MS for determining new psychoactive substances in oral fluid. Talanta. 2017 Nov 1;174:454-61.

230. Sulej-Suchomska AM, Klupczynska A, Dereziński P, Matysiak J, Przybyłowski P, Kokot ZJ. Urban wastewater analysis as an effective tool for monitoring illegal drugs, including new psychoactive substances, in the Eastern European region. Scientific reports. 2020 Mar 17;10(1):1-2.

231. Ambach L, Hernández Redondo A, König S, Weinmann W. Rapid and simple LC-MS/MS screening of 64 novel psychoactive substances using dried blood spots. Drug testing and analysis. 2014 Apr;6(4):367-75.

232. Grapp M, Kaufmann C, Streit F, Binder L. Systematic forensic toxicological analysis by liquid-chromatography-quadrupole-time-of-flight mass spectrometry in serum and comparison to gas chromatography-mass spectrometry. Forensic science international. 2018 Jun 1;287:63-73.

233. Kimble AN, DeCaprio AP. Systematic analysis of novel psychoactive substances. II. Development of a screening/confirmatory LC-QqQ-MS/MS method for 800+ compounds and metabolites in urine. Forensic Chemistry. 2019 Dec 1;16:100189.

234. Seither JZ, Hindle R, Arroyo-Mora LE, DeCaprio AP. Systematic analysis of novel psychoactive substances. I. Development of a compound database and HRMS spectral library. Forensic Chemistry. 2018 Jun 1;9:12-20.

235. Boileau I, Mansouri E, Williams B, Le Foll B, Rusjan P, Mizrahi R, Tyndale RF, Huestis MA, Payer DE, Wilson AA, Houle S. Fatty acid amide hydrolase binding in brain of cannabis users: imaging with the novel radiotracer [11C] CURB. Biological psychiatry. 2016 Nov 1;80(9):691-701.

236. Yamasaki T, Mori W, Zhang Y, Hatori A, Fujinaga M, Wakizaka H, Kurihara Y, Wang L, Nengaki N, Ohya T, Liang SH. First demonstration of in vivo mapping for regional brain monoacylglycerol lipase using PET with [11C] SAR127303. NeuroImage. 2018 Aug 1;176:313-20.

237. Sanabria-Bohórquez SM, Hamill TG, Goffin K, De Lepeleire I, Bormans G, Burns HD, Van Laere K. Kinetic analysis of the cannabinoid-1 receptor PET tracer [18 F] MK-9470 in human brain. European journal of nuclear medicine and molecular imaging. 2010 May 1;37(5):920-33.

238. Hospital emergency presentations and acute drug toxicity in Europe — update from the Euro-DEN Plus research group and the EMCDDA, Lisbon, August 2016. https://www.emcdda.europa.eu/publications/rapid-communications/2016/hospital-emergencies_en

239. Drug-related hospital emergency presentations in Europe: update from the Euro-DEN Plus expert network EMCDDA, Lisbon, February 2020. https://www.emcdda.europa.eu/publications/technical-reports/drug-related-hospital-emergency-presentations-in-europe

240. Wood DM, Heyerdahl F, Yates CB, Dines AM, Giraudon I, Hovda KE, Dargan PI. The European drug emergencies network (euro-DEN). Clinical toxicology. 2014 Apr 1;52(4):239-41.

241. Dines AM, Wood DM, Yates C, Heyerdahl F, Hovda KE, Giraudon I, Sedefov R, Dargan PI, Euro-DEN Research Group. Acute recreational drug and new psychoactive substance toxicity in Europe: 12 months data collection from the European Drug Emergencies Network (Euro-DEN). Clinical Toxicology. 2015 Oct 21;53(9):893-900.

242. Wood DM, Ceronie B, Dargan PI. Healthcare professionals are less confident in managing acute toxicity related to the use of new psychoactive substances (NPS) compared with classical recreational drugs. QJM: An International Journal of Medicine. 2016 Aug 1;109(8):527-9.

243. Gomes PM, Silva A, Silva VL. Pyrazoles as Key Scaffolds for the Development of Fluorine-18-Labeled Radiotracers for Positron Emission Tomography (PET). Molecules. 2020 Jan;25(7):1722.