



LJMU Research Online

Hearne, E, Alves, EA, van Hout, MC and Grund, JPC

Home Manufacture of Drugs: An Online Investigation and a Toxicological Reality Check of Online Discussions on Drug Chemistry

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/7644/>

Article

Citation (please note it is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from this work)

Hearne, E, Alves, EA, van Hout, MC and Grund, JPC (2017) Home Manufacture of Drugs: An Online Investigation and a Toxicological Reality Check of Online Discussions on Drug Chemistry. *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs*. 49 (4). pp. 279-288. ISSN 0279-1072

LJMU has developed **LJMU Research Online** for users to access the research output of the University more effectively. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in LJMU Research Online to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain.

The version presented here may differ from the published version or from the version of the record. Please see the repository URL above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information please contact researchonline@ljmu.ac.uk

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/>



HOME MANUFACTURE OF DRUGS: A NETNOGRAPHIC INVESTIGATION AND A TOXICOLOGICAL REALITY CHECK OF ONLINE DISCUSSIONS ON DRUG CHEMISTRY

Journal:	<i>Journal of Psychoactive Drugs</i>
Manuscript ID	Draft
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Homemade Drugs, Amphetamine, Opiate, gamma-hydroxybutyrate, Netnography, clandestine

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Pre-Only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ORCID ID:

Jean-Paul Grund, 0000-0003-2074-8406

Emanuele Alves, 0000-0003-1220-1443

For Peer Review Only

ABSTRACT

Public health concern is evident in current and emerging trends new psychoactive substance (NPS) use and markets, aside from the regulatory status. One novel area of investigation is the availability of homemade opioids, amphetamines and dissociatives, and the potential fueling of interest into clandestine home manufacture of drugs via the Internet. We conducted a netnographic study on home manufacture discussions of three commonly homemade drugs, methamphetamine and desomorphine – both scheduled drugs – and Gamma -hydroxybutyrate (GHB) hosted on publically available, English language drug fora located on the Surface Web. We investigated whether the communal folk pharmacology of homemade drugs on these fora may actually inform home manufacture practices or contribute to the reduction of harms associated with this practice. Additional work centered on the discrepancies between online information around purification and making homemade drugs safer, and the synthesis of the same substances in a proper laboratory environment. Of note was the moderation and shutdown of synthesis queries and discussions, with fora adhering to harm reduction principles by facilitating discussions around purification of homemade drugs only. The work is intended to contribute to ongoing discussions around online indigenous harm reduction discourse within cyber communities.

Keywords: Homemade drugs, (meth)amphetamines, opiates, desomorphine, gamma-hydroxybutyrate or GHB, netnography, clandestine.

1
2
3
4
5 *Alle Ding' sind Gift, und nichts ohn' Gift; allein die Dosis macht, daß ein Ding kein Gift ist.*

6
7 *Philippus Aureolus Theophrastus Bombastus von Hohenheim (1490-1541)*

8
9
10 *Some values must be universal, like human rights and the equal worth of every human being.*

11
12 *Björn Kristian Ulvaeus (1945)*

13
14
15 *Harm reduction is about working with the immediate goals and issues people have.*

16
17 *Anonymous*

18
19
20
21
22
23 **INTRODUCTION**

24
25
26
27 The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) and the European Union
28 (EU) define new psychoactive substances (NPS) as “Substances of abuse, either in a
29 pure form or a preparation, that are not controlled by the 1961 Single Convention on
30 Narcotic Drugs or the 1971 Convention on Psychotropic Substances, but which may
31 pose a public health threat” (UNODC 2013).. In 2014, 101 new substances were
32 notified to the EU Early Warning System (EWS), an increase of 25% compared to 2013
33 (UNODC 2013). But elsewhere UNODC (UNODC 2013, 2014) notes that, “*the term*
34 *‘new’* [psychoactive substance] *does not necessarily refer to new inventions but to*
35 *substances that have been recently become available,*” extending the concept of NPS
36 to *emerging drug trends*. But new drug trends may well concern substances which in
37 some countries are completely new, but well known in others, independent of their
38 scheduling status. For example, primarily used in the United States (US) (Maxwell and
39 Rutkowski 2008), the Czech Republic (Csemy, Kubicka, and Nociar 2002, Zabransky
40 2007) and the western parts of the former Soviet Union (Grund 2005, Grund et al.
41 2009), homemade methamphetamine emerged in Athens, Greece in 2011 under the
42 moniker of “Sisha” (Nikolaou et al. 2014). For the development of appropriate harm
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 reduction and treatment responses, actual scheduling status may be less relevant than
4 a proper understanding of new substances and the communities in which these
5 emerge. New, 'alien' drugs may provoke drastic changes in the risk environment of
6 drug use (Rhodes 2009) heralding a new set of drug related problems, untypical of the
7 period before its emergence.
8
9
10
11
12

13
14 Recently reports on home manufacture by people who use drugs (PWUD) of both
15 scheduled substances, including desomorphine and methamphetamine, and
16 unscheduled substances, such as Gammahydroxybutyrate (GHB), have surfaced from
17 an increasing number of countries, emphasizing the potential harms of these practices
18 (Van Hout 2014, Zabransky, Grund, et al. 2012, Zabransky, Latypov, et al. 2012). This
19 paper reports our netnographic investigation of experiential discussions in public,
20 English-language online drug fora on web on home manufacture of three commonly
21 homemade drugs, methamphetamine, desomorphine and GHB.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 **HOMEMADE DRUGS**

33
34
35

36 Methamphetamine, a psychostimulant, comes as a base, colorless, insoluble
37 volatile oil and as hydrochloride salt, a crystalline white powder that dissolves in water
38 (De-Carolis et al. 2015). Illegally produced, its color varies. The drug is taken orally,
39 inhaled or injected. Homemade methamphetamine is known in the Czech Republic and
40 in the western Soviet Union since the 1980s (Grund et al. 2009) and since the early
41 1990s in the US (De-Carolis et al. 2015) and in Asia (Farrell et al. 2002, McKetin et al.
42 2008).
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 Krokodil is the street name for an injectable opioid mixture containing
51 desomorphine and related morphinans (Alves, Grund, et al. 2015). Pharmaceutical
52 desomorphine is is ten times more potent than morphine (Alves, Grund, et al. 2015)
53 and colorless in solution. Krokodil is a dark yellow liquid that is mostly injected
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 intravenously (Alves, Grund, et al. 2015, Grund, Latypov, and Harris 2013, Grund et al.
4
5 2009). The color of homemade desomorphine and methamphetamine is generally an
6
7 indication of substandard synthesis.
8

9
10 Gamma hydroxybutyrate (GHB), a transparent, syrupy and salty liquid, is a central
11
12 nervous system depressant with euphoric and hypnotic properties. It is mostly ingested
13
14 for recreational purposes (Brennan and Van Hout 2014), but e.g. in the Netherlands
15
16 there are an estimated 2000-3000 people dependent on GHB (van Gaalen et al. 2015).
17
18 While banned in many countries, GHB's precursor, GBL, remains legal because of its
19
20 wide industrial use.
21

22 23 24 **HARMS RELATED TO HOMEMADE DRUGS** 25

26
27
28 These three drugs are used for their euphoric, relaxing and energizing effects, but
29
30 compulsive use is associated with serious drug related health problems and increased
31
32 morbidity (Brennan and Van Hout 2014, Grund, Latypov, and Harris 2013, Van Gaalen,
33
34 De Bruin, and Grund 2015). Both desomorphine and GHB are potent CNS depressants
35
36 while methamphetamine is one of the most potent stimulants known.
37

38
39 Injecting homemade desomorphine and methamphetamine or (meth)cathinone is
40
41 associated with significant drug related harms including localized damage around
42
43 injection sites, systemic damage to internal organs, HCV and HIV infection, mental
44
45 health problems and fatal overdose (Alves et al. 2015, Biesk 2013, Chintalova-Dallas et
46
47 al. 2009, De-Carolis et al. 2015, Dinis-Oliveira et al. 2012, Grund 2002, 2005, Grund et
48
49 al. 2009, Grund et al. 2010, Grund, Latypov, and Harris 2013, Katselou et al. 2014,
50
51 Mueller et al. 2015, Soares, et al. 2015, Van Hout 2014). GHB, is generally used orally
52
53 but associated with equally disturbing harms, including mental health problems,
54
55 repeated comatose intoxication and lethal overdose (Brennan and Van Hout 2014,
56
57 Degenhardt, Darke, and Dillon 2003, Grund et al. n.d., Kohrs, Mann, and Greenberg
58
59
60

1
2
3 2004, Li, Stokes, and Woeckener 1998, Schep et al. 2012, van Amsterdam et al. 2014,
4
5 Zvosec et al. 2011, Van Gaalen, De Bruin, and Grund 2015).
6
7

8 9 **THE RISK ENVIRONMENT OF HOME DRUG PRODUCTION AND POTENTIAL FOR** 10 **DRUG RELATED HARM** 11

12
13
14
15
16 Homemade drug production and consumption entails an atypical risk environment
17 (Miovský et al. 2015, Rhodes 2009). They are mostly synthesized outside of a proper
18 laboratory environment, in kitchens and basements under primitive circumstances, with
19 substandard ingredients and equipment and in the absence of a formal synthesis
20 protocol (Chintalova-Dallas et al. 2009, David et al. 2010, De-Carolis et al. 2015, Grund
21 2002, Grund et al. 2009, Heimer 2013).
22
23
24
25
26

27
28 Prepared in small groups of PWID revolving around a 'drug cook,' precursors and
29 reactants are generally obtained collectively outside of traditional drug dealing
30 structures (Grund 2005, Grund et al. 2009, Miovsky 2007, Miovský et al. 2015). This
31 may decrease macro risk factors, e.g. exposure to law enforcement, but engenders
32 micro injecting risk factors (Grund et al. 1996, Grund et al. 1991, Jose et al. 1993)
33 (Koester et al. 2003) and has been associated with HIV infection among PWID in
34 Russia (Dumchev et al. 2009, Hagan et al. 2001, Rhodes et al. 2002).
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 The use of toxic reactants in the synthesis and absence of proper purification
43 methods may result in harmful concoctions that are potentially more damaging than
44 commercially produced NPS (Alves, Soares, et al. 2015, Grund, Latypov, and Harris
45 2013). The skills required for cooking drugs are learned from more experienced peers,
46 through oral instruction, observational learning and participation in cooking sessions
47 (Grund 2002, Grund et al. 2009). This 'master-apprentice' relationship has likely added
48 to the variations in homemade drug chemistry described in field (Van Hout 2014) and
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

laboratory studies (Alves, Soares, et al. 2015). The increasing influence of the Internet is bound to change that oral history and social learning process.

HOME DRUG MANUFACTURE, MEDIA AND INTERNET

Interest in the home manufacture of drugs whilst certainly not new, is driven by media reporting, drug user fora information exchange and availability of online advice (Van Hout and Hearne 2015b). Homemade drugs, clandestine drug production and drug trafficking are increasingly attracting media attention and featuring in popular TV series, such as “Breaking Bad,” (methamphetamine), “Weeds” (marijuana) or “The Wire” (crack). The Internet is now regarded as the main source of information about novel illicit drugs (Van Hout and Hearne 2015b, Zheluk, Quinn, and Meylakhs 2014) and information on the synthesis of various drugs is available widely on the Web.

Homemade drugs are an increasingly popular topic on various online drug discussion fora and this information is at the fingertips of everyone potentially interested. This will likely affect the master-apprentice relationship by which the knowledge and skills needed to produce these drugs was traditionally transferred. Various popular and public drug fora, such as bluelight.ru or drugsforum.com are considered “online harm-reduction communities” (Moro and Racz 2013, Soussan and Kjellgren 2014).

We utilized a netnographic approach to investigate user trend interest in home manufacture of GHB, opiate and amphetamine based drugs. Netnography is an increasingly popular and novel method of qualitative research underpinned by the adaptation of traditional ethnographic research techniques within the cyber world (Kozinets 2002). We investigated whether the communal folk pharmacology of homemade drugs on these fora may actually inform home manufacture practices themselves or contribute to the reduction of harms associated with this practice. Where

1
2
3 possible, we addressed discrepancies between the clandestine syntheses described
4 and the queries and advice offered online with the synthesis of the same substances in
5 a proper laboratory environment. Our objective was to contribute to an improved
6 understanding of the online discourse on home drug manufacture and to effective
7 public health responses to the significant harms associated therewith, to the peer
8 driven harm reduction potential of these *Leading edge* drug fora (Deluca et al. 2012) in
9 particular. Whilst reviews of home manufacture of drug solutions using widely available
10 pharmaceuticals have been published (Alves, Grund, et al. 2015, Van Hout 2014),
11 internet based studies on the home preparation of drugs remain scant (Van Hout and
12 Hearne 2015b). We present here the first known attempt to illustrate Internet activity as
13 underpinning the dissemination of information around the mounting practice of home
14 drug manufacture.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 **METHODOLOGY**

31
32
33
34 The internet is increasingly utilized to monitor trends in diverted pharmaceuticals,
35 novel psychoactive and, performance and image enhancement drugs, consumer
36 interest, patterns of use, communal folk pharmacology, user experiences and
37 indigenous harm reduction efforts. We adhered to a netnographic approach according
38 to Kozinet's protocols for conducting cyber-ethnographic research (Kozinets 2002).
39 Sampling of online data was grounded in principles relating to scale, interactivity, and
40 heterogeneity (Chenail 2011, Van Hout 2015). Systematic internet searches were
41 conducted using terms like '*Krokodil*', '*Desomorphine*', '*GHB*', '*Methamphetamine*',
42 '*Pervitin*', and '*Shake n bake meth*' in combination with the words '*homemade*' and
43 '*forum*'. The combined searches generated 977,900 hits associated with sites wherein
44 these terms have been quoted. The combined searches that discussed the use of and
45 production of these homemade substances were scrutinized in Table 1.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Five websites presenting forum activity discussing the use of and production of homemade substances were identified. Subsequent methodical searches for discussions relating to use of and production of these homemade substances were performed, through the internal search engine of the websites and by using the previous search terms. This search continued until no further information relating to use of and production of these homemade substances could be located. A total of 614 identified threads related to use of and production of these homemade substances, were generated as a result of this internal search. Following the application of exclusion criteria (incomprehensible language, polls, news or media reports) and elimination of any duplicates, 36 discussion threads remained. 104 distinct user pseudonyms were documented in the data set (Table 2).

Confidentiality measures included storage in a password-protected computer and removal of screen pseudonyms, URLs, country and city identifiers (Wilkinson and Thelwall 2011). The data set was transferred to a Word document, and 13,124 words were analyzed analysis using the Empirical Phenomenological Psychological (EPP) method. The EPP is a five step manual method underpinned by phenomenological principles illustrating the users 'lived real life' (Husserl 1970). This approach is increasingly utilized in the field of netnographic studies on NPS and PIEDs (Kjellgren, Henningsson, and Soussan 2013, Kjellgren and Jonsson 2013, Van Hout and Hearne 2014, Van Hout and Hearne 2015b, c, a). The process is cognizant of absence of preconceived hypotheses or generalizations (Wertz 2005). Four themes with 20 categories emerged from the analysis.

We subsequently compared the domestic chemistry and homemade drug discussion themes hosted online with the synthesis of the drugs under investigation in a controlled laboratory environment, explaining how domestic chemical drug synthesis may expose both consumers and producers (often the same people) to serious health hazards.

RESULTS

Home Manufacture of Methamphetamine, Desomorphine & GHB

The street synthesis of methamphetamine consists of a simple extraction of the active principle using pipe cleaning substances, its further extraction to an organic solvent and reduction to obtain the derivative. The process is known as the Nagai route and includes a simple reduction using hydriodic acid (HI) and red phosphorus as reagents (Alves, Grund, et al. 2015, Kunalan, Kerr, and Daeid 2012).

The second method most used is the *one-pot* method, also known as *shake n bake*. Mostly used in home methamphetamine manufacture, in this simplified variation of the Birch reduction, commercially available alkaline metals are mixed to ephedrine or pseudoephedrine in anhydrous ammonia to produce small quantities of low quality methamphetamine. All the ingredients are added into a PET bottle and multiple simultaneous chemical reactions convert the pseudoephedrine hydrochloride into methamphetamine. The methamphetamine base obtained is an insoluble oil and it is converted to its hydrochloride salt by funneling hydrogen chloride gas (Caldicott et al. 2005). The hydrochloride salt formed precipitates and is collected by filtration. Hydrochloric acid can be used in place of gas with almost no modification of the process.

The process of Krokodil synthesis is almost identical to that of methamphetamine synthesis from ephedrine. Indeed, PWID in the Russian speaking region have copied the Nagai reduction in illicit methamphetamine production (Alves, Grund, et al. 2015, Grund, Latypov, and Harris 2013, Kunalan, Kerr, and Daeid 2012) to cook up Krokodil. In Krokodil synthesis, codeine tablets are used as the starting material. Codeine based medications are basified and dissolved in a solvent (mostly gasoline, sometimes paint

1
2
3 thinner) (Alves, Grund, et al. 2015, Alves, Soares, et al. 2015). Subsequently the
4
5 codeine base is acidified precipitating codeine hydrochloride crystals. These crystals
6
7 are mixed with iodine and red phosphorus to form desomorphine. The resulting liquid
8
9 drug may or may not contain desomorphine or any of its derivates (Alves, Soares, et al.
10
11 2015), depending on the skills of the cook and the starting materials. The drug is
12
13 usually injected on the spot, right after the production.
14

15
16 In comparison, GHB production involves the simplest synthesis; it starts and ends
17
18 with mixing gamma butyrolactone (GBL) with sodium or potassium hydroxide and water
19
20 in equal parts at room temperature (Brennan and Van Hout 2014).
21
22

23 24 **Discussions Of Homemade Drugs In Online Drug Fora**

25
26
27
28 The netnographic research distinguished 614 drug forum threads centering on the
29
30 use of and production of homemade methamphetamine, desomorphine and GHB
31
32 posted on public internet drug discussion fora. Fora members offered harm reduction
33
34 advice based on their own personal experiences whether positive or negative, so as, to
35
36 inform others and influence harm reduction tactics (Table 3).
37
38
39

40 41 **Theme 1: Recipes and Cooking Experiences of Homemade Drugs**

42
43
44 This theme concerns information related to the production of homemade
45
46 substances: desomorphine, methamphetamine and GHB; recipes, ingredients and
47
48 precursors, and to how and where to obtain such products. Methamphetamine related
49
50 threads were primarily questions and/or warnings about the possibility of explosions
51
52 and dangers in the cooking of the methamphetamine and its cheaper street version,
53
54 “shake n bake”. Threads related to desomorphine were generally discussions centered
55
56 on ways in which to make desomorphine and not the more crude version, Krokodil, as
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

it was felt desomorphine was a “safer” drug *“When synthesized correctly with proper equipment and purified correctly it doesn't cause any damage”*. Threads on GHB were primarily centered on how to acquire the ingredient ‘gamma-butyrolactone’ which is less easily obtained nowadays. Otherwise GHB was noted as being *“quite easy to make at home, and the precursors are fairly easy to get”*.

Theme 2: Harm Reduction and Advice relating to physical harm and injuries incurred during the cooking process.

This theme illustrates how discussions centered on harm reduction in home manufacture of drugs amongst the online drug user community. Harm reduction guidance within the community also focused on the avoidance *and* reduction of negative outcomes that could occur during the production process. The more experienced users and long-standing members were quick to recommend those with less experience and knowledge not to attempt synthesis of home produced substances.

“Newbie synthing meth sounds like a recipe for disaster as well as the opposite of harm reduction”

The volatile nature of some of the products used in the synthesis of these substances, particularly methamphetamine or the *“shake n bake”* method, was highlighted by fora members and attempting to produce this substances was highly frowned upon by most.

“Picture a plastic bottle filled with deathly poisonous gas building up more and more pressure. Gas that can burn your skin and lungs on contact. Along with liquid that can burn you. Now imagine holding this bottle in your hands, shaking it vigorously while the pressure builds and you sit there praying it doesn't explode in your face and melt your lungs and skin. In other words, it's pretty safe” But practical advice for reducing the risks associated with home drug production was rare.

1
2
3
4
5 **Theme 3: Advice centered on chemistry and cooking of homemade**
6 **substances.**
7
8

9
10
11 This theme discusses chemistry related information and sharing within the drug
12 user fora community. Discussion threads mostly centered on how to correctly purify
13 homemade substances prior to using these.
14
15

16
17 *“How would you go about washing/purifying the meth that has accumulated to a*
18 *substance that’s clean enough where you would happily bang it?”*
19

20
21 Some fora members disputed the use of certain precursor chemicals particularly
22 the use of “kitchen” or “hardware store” chemicals as replacement for NaOH (Sodium
23 hydroxide/Caustic soda) in the production of GHB.
24
25

26
27 *“Red Devil Lye is _not_ suitable for making GHB or anything else you want to*
28 *ingest. Yes, it contains NaOH, but it’s not pure. You can get pure NaOH without*
29 *problems from several sources (Vegan Soapworks come to mind), so don’t bother with*
30 *the lye it’s bad, bad, bad.”*
31
32

33
34 Discussions and advice around the quality of the final product of some substances
35 was not deemed to be “not worth the effort”. It was suggested that the quality was only
36 for those who were desperate for profit or simply personal use.
37
38

39
40 *“Any teenager could pull off a shake n bake in his bathroom but the end result I*
41 *can’t imagine being all that significant. Shake n bake methods are used for quick,*
42 *cheap cookups for people wanting to make a quick buck.”* In fact, as we describe in the
43 next theme, the online drug fora in this work do not allow detailed discussions of drug
44 chemistry as they pertain to drug synthesis, and instead focus on purification
45 techniques and how to make homemade drugs safer.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Theme 4: Fora rules and guidelines centered on reducing harm by not permitting discussions of synthesis of any substances.

This theme focuses on general rules and guidelines of the fora that are aimed at maintaining the fora status as a “*harm reduction board*”. Discussion of synthesis of any substance is strictly prohibited, with fora moderators quickly “*closing*” any discussion related to this. Overall 14 threads in the dataset that related directly to synthesizing substances, were closed down.

“No synth questions allowed on BL so I suspect this thread will be closed soonest. Drug synthesis is not something to even attempt unless you know exactly what you're doing and it certainly ain't harm reduction hence, no synth discussion”

Fora members showed negative attitudes towards those who were enquiring about synthesizing a product. Many sarcastically replied to those requests and posts that clearly showed lack of knowledge and experience of the individual.

“If you have to ask a forum what drugs you could synthesize at home you really shouldn't synthesize drugs at home”

Fora members were also directed to other more suitable websites by moderators to find the information they required, however threads were still closed down.

“Due to recent attention we have been getting, and because you were very clear with ‘intent’ in your post, this must be closed. There are a number of chemistry sites online that can help you with your academic research, but we can't teach you how to make a CI [Class I-scheduled drug] drug... sorry.”

A Toxicological Reality Check

The outcomes of homemade drug synthesis – the purity of the drugs produced and their potential for harm – relies on various factors: the complexity of the synthesis and availability of suitable recipes; the technical skills of the producer; the purity of precursors and reagents used; the equipment and laboratory environment and purification techniques used in (and required for properly) synthesizing drugs.

The complexity of the synthesis. None of these reactions requires a high level of chemistry expertise and recipes are easily accessed online. Nonetheless, production under official laboratory standards includes precise quantities of the reactants, temperatures, varying reaction times and purification at each step of the process.

The technical skills of the producer. According to Caldicott et al. (2005) less than 5% of clandestine drug cooks had received any formal training in organic and synthetic chemistry and most of them were apprentices of older more experience cooks. Most methamphetamine cooks learn the process from friends and produce for personal use (Brzeczko, Leech, and Stark 2013). The same process underlies the skills of Krokodil or GHB cooks (Grund et al. 2013).

While producing GHB requires only mixing the ingredients in the right amounts and order, the production of a relatively pure methamphetamine or desomorphine does require a basic understanding of organic chemistry and, outside the laboratory context, a high level of creativity and flexibility.

Thread discussions around purification, potentially enhancing safety of bootleg drugs were evident. However, site moderators' discouragement of questions and threads on synthesis details appeared supported by more experienced site members, with members commenting, often in a derogatory manner, toward novice 'cooks' who wish to synthesize a drug. "[...] *if you know so little about chemistry, [...], than you will not be making any drugs anytime in your lifetime. It is also very dangerous, take some*

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

organic chemistry courses and lab courses, otherwise leave this type of thing to the experts.”

The purity of the precursors and reagents used. Chemical substances come in different purity grades. Legal laboratories and industries work only with laboratory or technical grade chemicals, depending on the reaction conducted. The precursors used in home drug production are commonly extracted from cleaning products, in which contain less purified substances and often various contaminants and additives, potentially resulting in very low purity precursors.

However, despite legislative controls, GHB's and its precursors “ γ -butyrolactone” (GBL) and “1,4-butanediol”(1,4-BD) remain available and can be easily synthesized from research chemicals and kits sold online, using online instructions. Forum postings and queries often concerned the purity grade and where to purchase high grade precursors and reagents. But once thread discussions moved into the specifics of drug synthesis, moderators intervened and threads were closed.

The equipment used in (and required for properly) synthesizing the drug. Professional laboratory equipment conforms to high quality standards and, manufactured by specialized companies, passes through extensive quality control to guarantee a safe (and efficient) laboratory environment. Used properly, certified laboratory equipment is resistant to reagents and does not contaminate the reaction media. But household bottles glass, plastics, pots and pans used in home drug production may not be reagent proof, harbor remnants of reactants and leave the final product impure. In particular the use of PET bottles in Shake ‘n Bake is criticized online and often warnings describe ghastly consequences in uncut terms: *“That's a huge fucking risk of the whole bottle failing and exploding sending all the chemicals everywhere and once that lithium is in the air long enough it will spark and you have a huge fire going.”* Perhaps well intended, few commenters go beyond giving general advice: *“Just don't fucking do anything stupid man. [...] I don't think it's ever a good*

1
2
3 *idea to make bathtub meth with redneck supplies, but if you're gonna do it at least take*
4 *as much precaution as you can man.*" Specific suggestions for safer equipment,
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

procedures and techniques were rare, which, as noted, is likely the result of forum policies.

Purification techniques used after the synthesis. Purification relies on resources, equipment and substances available. In a lab, preparative chromatographic columns and crystallization methodologies are standard for the purification of the chemicals produced. Well-equipped clandestine drug labs usually apply single crystallization methods for extracting psychoactive material – a relatively simple process based on the different melting points of drugs and reagents. But, with exceptions, people concocting drugs for personal use are drug *cooks*, not *chemists*. Most purification techniques standard in the lab environment are simply beyond their reach. Perhaps less of a risk in GHB production, the absence of proper purification in home manufacture of *bathtub meth* or *krokodil* would almost guarantee a contaminated final product. Forum discussions centered on purification and how to make drugs safer, with peripheral discussions relating to contemporary drug policy on home manufacture of drugs.

Laboratory environment. OSHA regulations stipulate laboratories to be properly ventilated and hazardous reactions should be conducted in separated environments, while lab staff wear protective clothing and eyewear. In contrast, homemade drugs are often synthesized in kitchens, living rooms or basements under rudimentary conditions, without proper ventilation, which is of particular concern in methamphetamine and *krokodil* production. These syntheses expose those present to toxic gasses and reactants and, with regular production, may result in environmental pollution of dwellings where the drug is cooked regularly or, worse, explosions and fires (Caldicott and Duff 2005). As one poster graphically noted: "*One mistake and you're dead and possibly those within 1000 ft of you as well.*"

DISCUSSION

We described the domestic production of methamphetamine, Krokodil and GHB and presented the first in depth examinations of activity pertaining to home manufacture of these three drugs. The internet acts as focal point for clandestine chemists, consumers and criminals to engage in sourcing of products, communal folk pharmacological knowledge exchange around drug use and cyber supported indigenous harm reduction (Moro and Racz 2013, Soussan and Kjellgren 2014, Van Hout and Hearne 2015b).

We showed where home drug manufacture deviates from laboratory standards and produces an atypical risk environment, and how, as a result, homemade drugs are likely to contain highly toxic reagent remnants, stimulants and opioids in particular (Alves, Soares, et al. 2015, Grund, Latypov, and Harris 2013). While not without risk, home production of GHB may be less of a health risk than domestic production of stimulants or opioids.

The netnographic study (Kozinets 2010) investigated and described drug user discussions on use and home manufacture of drugs through systematic collection and analysis of online phenomena (DiMaggio et al. 2001, Markham 2005, Wilson and Peterson 2002). Drug fora members illustrated interest in purification techniques and harm reduction practices involved in making generated drugs safer, with site moderation effective in discouraging the posting of interest in synthesis details. On balance, forum postings illustrated communal views around the inferiority of and toxicity potential of homemade drugs, and the potential risks relating to their production as a "recipe for disaster." Such discussions appear to be instigated by peoples' concerns for contamination in the synthesis process, which explains the resultant interest in purification techniques (Grund, Latypov, and Harris 2013, Harris 2013). This brings up

1
2
3 the uncomfortable question of whether and how to apply the harm reduction approach
4 to not only the use of homemade drugs, but also to their harmful production. In contrast
5 to studies highlighting the capacity of cyber communities of drug users to share '*best*
6 *practices*' within the contact of indigenous harm reduction (Moro and Racz 2013, Van
7 Hout and Hearne 2014, Van Hout and Hearne 2015b), parties interested in clandestine
8 chemistry were less willing to support and engage with 'novice home cooks on the
9 sharing of purification techniques or how to reduce the harms from domestic drug
10 syntheses. The quality of the harm reduction advice was actually of limited value to
11 those who are not deterred by the mostly graphic warnings against home drug
12 production and use, regularly couched in pejorative terms. Here we found a potent
13 effect of the moderation of drug fora. Moderators only permit threads around the
14 purification of particular products and shut down discussions relating to product
15 synthesis, which are not considered harm reduction. We illustrate this point using a
16 Bluelight moderation comment : "*it certainly ain't harm reduction hence, no synth*
17 *discussion.*"

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
But *the dose makes the poison* while values like human rights are not incremental
but universal. This equally applies to harm reduction, which considers the immediate
goals and issues people have as its starting point. Policies discouraging or banning
discussions on how to make home drug manufacture less hazardous seem therefore
actually at odds with the non-judgmental harm reduction mission of the fora.

Limitations of our study center on the restriction to English language drug fora
operating on the Surface Web, lack of participant detail and restrictions of publicly
available material, however, trustworthiness of the resultant data was optimized by
verification of extensive horizontal and vertical similarities across fora (Lincoln and
Guba 1985) pertaining to discussions on recipes, cooking experiences, harm reduction,
chemistry processes and fora rules and moderation of discussions. Validity in
employment of the EPP approach centered on horizontal and vertical consistency in

1
2
3 interpretation of data, and partial phenomenological psychological reduction (Karlsson
4
5 1995).
6

7
8 However, given the informational supremacy of the Internet, we cannot discount
9
10 the need for enhanced harm reduction tactics given displacement and diversion
11
12 between available pharmaceuticals and the required reagents and the lingering desire
13
14 to home manufacture stimulants, opioids and other drugs.
15

16 17 18 **CONCLUSIONS** 19

20
21 The research presents the first known attempt to investigate and illustrate DU
22
23 interest in home manufacture of opiate, stimulant and dissociative type drugs, harm
24
25 reduction moderation tactics to deter synthesis discussions, whilst permitting
26
27 purification and drug safety information exchange. The unfavorable reputation of
28
29 homemade drugs in this cyber context does not imply that factual discussions of ways
30
31 to reduce the harms in domestic drug production would lead to increases in their use
32
33 and the harms associated therewith in environments where access to other drugs is
34
35 less cumbersome. We therefore suggest that the potential for peer driven harm
36
37 reduction of these drug discussion fora is presently underutilized. These drug
38
39 discussion fora should consider reevaluating their policies on chemistry discussions in
40
41 aiming to reach people who cannot or will not refrain from cooking their own drugs with
42
43 credible information that may contribute to reductions in the harms associated with this
44
45 practice. Such a bold harm reduction approach may raise objections from opponents
46
47 but, considered the leading edge (Deluca et al. 2012), we think that these online drug
48
49 communities are best positioned to explore the boundaries of online peer driven harm
50
51 reduction.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Emanuele Alves acknowledges Brazilian agency Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq) (process 245844/2012-0) for research grants and scholarship.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The authors declare no conflict of interest, particularly no financial and personal relationships with other people or organizations that could inappropriately influence (bias) this work.

REFERENCES

- Alves, E. A., J. P. Grund, C. M. Afonso, A. D. Netto, F. Carvalho, and R. J. Dinis-Oliveira. 2015. "The harmful chemistry behind krokodil (desomorphine) synthesis and mechanisms of toxicity." *Forensic Sci Int* 249:207-13. doi: 10.1016/j.forsciint.2015.02.001.
- Alves, E. A., J. X. Soares, C. M. Afonso, J. C. Grund, A. S. Agonia, S. M. Cravo, A. D. Netto, F. Carvalho, and R. J. Dinis-Oliveira. 2015. "The harmful chemistry behind "krokodil": Street-like synthesis and product analysis." *Forensic Sci Int* 257:76-82. doi: 10.1016/j.forsciint.2015.07.042.
- Biesk, J. 2013. "Two more patients seek treatment at Joliet Hospital after injecting flesh-eating 'crocodile' drug.". Chicago Sun Times publications Accessed 28 March <http://southtownstar.suntimes.com/23081405-522/two-more-patients-seek-treatment-at-joliet-hospital-after-injecting-flesh-eating-crocodile-drug.html>.

- 1
2
3 Brennan, R., and M. C. Van Hout. 2014. "Gamma-hydroxybutyrate (GHB): a scoping
4 review of pharmacology, toxicology, motives for use, and user groups." *J Psychoactive*
5 *Drugs* 46 (3):243-51. doi: 10.1080/02791072.2014.921746.
6
7
8
9 Brzezcko, A. W., R. Leech, and J. G. Stark. 2013. "The advent of a new
10 pseudoephedrine product to combat methamphetamine abuse." *Am J Drug Alcohol*
11 *Abuse* 39 (5):284-90. doi: 10.3109/00952990.2013.821476.
12
13
14
15 Caldicott, D. G. E., and C. Duff. 2005. "Reducing drug-related harm: Australia leads the
16 way." *Medical Journal of Australia* 182 (3):140-140.
17
18
19
20 Caldicott, D. G. E., P. E. Pigou, R. Beattie, and J. W. Edwards. 2005. "Clandestine
21 drug laboratories in Australia and the potential for harm." *Australian and New Zealand*
22 *Journal of Public Health* 29 (2):155-162. doi: DOI 10.1111/j.1467-842X.2005.tb00066.x.
23
24
25
26 Chenail, R.J. 2011. "Qualitative researchers in the blogosphere: Using blogs as diaries
27 and data. ." *Qualitative Report* 16 (1):364-373.
28
29
30 Chintalova-Dallas, R., P. Case, N. Kitsenko, and Z. Lazzarini. 2009. "Boltushka: a
31 homemade amphetamine-type stimulant and HIV risk in Odessa, Ukraine." *Int J Drug*
32 *Policy* 20 (4):347-51. doi: 10.1016/j.drugpo.2008.09.003.
33
34
35
36 Csemy, L., L. Kubicka, and A. Nociar. 2002. "Drug scene in the Czech Republic and
37 Slovakia during the period of transformation." *Eur Addict Res* 8 (4):159-65. doi: 66134.
38
39
40 David, G. E., A. Coxon, R. D. Frew, and A. R. Hayman. 2010. "Isotope fractionation
41 during precipitation of methamphetamine HCl and discrimination of seized forensic
42 samples." *Forensic Sci Int* 200 (1-3):123-9. doi: 10.1016/j.forsciint.2010.03.043.
43
44
45
46 De-Carolis, C., G. A. Boyd, L. Mancinelli, S. Pagano, and S. Eramo. 2015.
47 "Methamphetamine abuse and "meth mouth" in Europe." *Med Oral Patol Oral Cir*
48 *Bucal* 20 (2):e205-10.
49
50
51
52 Degenhardt, L., S. Darke, and P. Dillon. 2003. "The prevalence and correlates of
53 gamma-hydroxybutyrate (GHB) overdose among Australian users." *Addiction* 98
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Deluca, P., Z. Davey, O. Corazza, L. Di Furia, M. Farre, L. H. Flesland, M. Mannonen,
4
5 A. Majava, T. Peltoniemi, M. Pasinetti, C. Pezzolesi, N. Scherbaum, H. Siemann, A.
6
7 Skutle, M. Torrens, P. van der Kreeft, E. Iversen, and F. Schifano. 2012. "Identifying
8
9 emerging trends in recreational drug use; outcomes from the Psychonaut Web
10
11 Mapping Project." *Progress in Neuro-Psychopharmacology & Biological Psychiatry* 39
12
13 (2):221-226. doi: 10.1016/j.pnpbp.2012.07.011.

14
15 DiMaggio, P., E. Hargittai, W. R. Neuman, and J. P. Robinson. 2001. "Social
16
17 implications of the Internet." *Annual Review of Sociology* 27:307-336. doi: DOI
18
19 10.1146/annurev.soc.27.1.307.

20
21 Dinis-Oliveira, R. J., F. Carvalho, R. Moreira, J. A. Duarte, J. B. Proenca, A. Santos,
22
23 and T. Magalhaes. 2012. "Clinical and forensic signs related to opioids abuse." *Curr*
24
25 *Drug Abuse Rev* 5 (4):273-90.

26
27 Dumchev, K. V., R. Soldyshev, H. Z. Qian, O. O. Zezyulin, S. D. Chandler, P.
28
29 Slobodyanyuk, L. Moroz, and J. E. Schumacher. 2009. "HIV and hepatitis C virus
30
31 infections among hanka injection drug users in central Ukraine: a cross-sectional
32
33 survey." *Harm Reduct J* 6:23. doi: 10.1186/1477-7517-6-23.

34
35 EMCDDA. 2015. European Drug Report. Luxemburgo: EMCDDA.

36
37 Farrell, M., J. Marsden, R. Ali, and W. Ling. 2002. "Methamphetamine: drug use and
38
39 psychoses becomes a major public health issue in the Asia Pacific region." *Addiction*
40
41 97 (7):771-2.

42
43 Grund, J. C. 2002. "'A Candle Lit from Both Sides.'" In *HIV and AIDS: A Global View*,
44
45 edited by Karen McElrath. Westport, Ct., USA: Greenwood Press.

46
47 Grund, J. C. 2005. "'The Eye of the Needle.'" In *Injecting Illicit Drugs*, edited by R.
48
49 Pates, A. McBride and K. Arnold. London: Blackwell.

50
51 Grund, J. P., D. De Bruin, S. van Gaalen. 2016. "Recurrent Comatose GHB Intoxication
52
53 in the Netherlands & Belgium – A Rural "Small Sub-Population Behavioural Trend" with
54
55 Important Health Concerns." *International Journal of Drug Policy*, [under review].
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Grund, J. P., S. R. Friedman, L. S. Stern, B. Jose, A. Neaigus, R. Curtis, and D. C. Des
4 Jarlais. 1996. "Syringe-mediated drug sharing among injecting drug users: patterns,
5 social context and implications for transmission of blood-borne pathogens." *Soc Sci*
6 *Med* 42 (5):691-703.

7
8
9 Grund, J. P., C. D. Kaplan, N. F. Adriaans, and P. Blanken. 1991. "Drug sharing and
10 HIV transmission risks: the practice of frontloading in the Dutch injecting drug user
11 population." *J Psychoactive Drugs* 23 (1):1-10.

12
13 Grund, J. P., A. Latypov, and M. Harris. 2013. "Breaking worse: the emergence of
14 krokodil and excessive injuries among people who inject drugs in Eurasia." *Int J Drug*
15 *Policy* 24 (4):265-74. doi: 10.1016/j.drugpo.2013.04.007.

16
17 Grund, J. P., P. Coffin, M. Jauffret-Routside, M. Dijkstra, D. de Bruin, and P. Blanken.
18 2010. "The fast and furious — cocaine, amphetamines and harm reduction." In *Harm*
19 *reduction: evidence, impacts and challenges*, edited by Tim Rhodes and Dagmar
20 Hedrich, 191-232. EMCDDA.

21
22 Grund, J. P., T. Zabransky, K. S. Irwin, and R. Heimer. 2009. "Stimulant use in Central
23 and Eastern Europe: How recent social history shaped current drug consumption
24 patterns." In *Interventions for Amphetamine Misuse*, edited by Richard Pates and
25 Diane Riley, 173-203. Wiley-Blackwell.

26
27 Hagan, H., H. Thiede, N. S. Weiss, S. G. Hopkins, J. S. Duchin, and E. R. Alexander.
28 2001. "Sharing of drug preparation equipment as a risk factor for hepatitis C." *Am J*
29 *Public Health* 91 (1):42-6.

30
31 Harris, M. 2013. "The "do-it-yourself" New Zealand injecting scene: Implications for
32 harm reduction", *Int J Drug Policy* 24 (4):281–3. Available at:
33 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22884541> [Accessed July 17, 2013].

34
35 Heimer, R. "Assessing Epidemiological Risks of Parenteral HIV Transmission in Drug
36 Users' study".

1
2
3 Heimer, R. 2013. "Patterns of new drug emergence: a comment in light of 'krokodil'."
4
5 *Int J Drug Policy* 24 (4):275-7. doi: 10.1016/j.drugpo.2013.06.003.

6
7 Husserl, E. . 1970. *Logical investigation*. New York: Humanities Press.

8
9 Jose, B., S. R. Friedman, A. Neaigus, R. Curtis, J. P. Grund, M. F. Goldstein, T. P.
10
11 Ward, and D. C. Des Jarlais. 1993. "Syringe-mediated drug-sharing (backloading): a
12
13 new risk factor for HIV among injecting drug users." *AIDS* 7 (12):1653-60.

14
15 Karlsson, G. . 1995. *Psychological qualitative research from a phenomenological*
16
17 *perspective*. Stockholm, Sweden: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

18
19 Katselou, M., I. Papoutsis, P. Nikolaou, C. Spiliopoulou, and S. Athanaselis. 2014. A
20
21 "Krokodil" emerges from the murky waters of addiction. Abuse trends of an old drug. In
22
23 *Life Sci. IN PRESS*.

24
25 Kjellgren, A., H. Henningsson, and C. Soussan. 2013. "Fascination and Social
26
27 Togetherness-Discussions about Spice Smoking on a Swedish Internet Forum." *Subst*
28
29 *Abuse* 7:191-8. doi: 10.4137/SART.S13323.

30
31 Kjellgren, A., and K. Jonsson. 2013. "Methoxetamine (MXE) - A Phenomenological
32
33 Study of Experiences Induced by a "Legal High" from the Internet." *Journal of*
34
35 *Psychoactive Drugs* 45 (3):276-286. doi: 10.1080/02791072.2013.803647.

36
37 Koester, S., R. Heimer, A. E. Baron, J. Glanz, and W. Teng. 2003. "Re: "Risk of
38
39 hepatitis C virus among young adult injection drug users who share injection
40
41 equipment"." *Am J Epidemiol* 157 (4):376; author reply 376-8.

42
43 Kohrs, F. P., C. Mann, and R. Greenberg. 2004. "The use of amphetamine in gamma-
44
45 hydroxybutyrate overdose: a case report." *J Psychoactive Drugs* 36 (3):401-2. doi:
46
47 10.1080/02791072.2004.10400040.

48
49 Kozinets, R. V. 2002. "The field behind the screen: Using netnography for marketing
50
51 research in online communities." *Journal of Marketing Research* 39 (1):61-72. doi: DOI
52
53 10.1509/jmkr.39.1.61.18935.

1
2
3 Kozinets, R.V. . 2010. *Netnography. Doing ethnographic research online*. Thousand
4
5
6
7 Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

8 Kunalan, V., W. J. Kerr, and N. N. Daeid. 2012. "Investigation of the reaction impurities
9 associated with methylamphetamine synthesized using the Nagai method." *Anal Chem*
10
11
12 84 (13):5744-52. doi: 10.1021/ac3009302.

13 Li, J., S. A. Stokes, and A. Woeckener. 1998. "A tale of novel intoxication: a review of
14 the effects of gamma-hydroxybutyric acid with recommendations for management."
15
16
17
18 *Ann Emerg Med* 31 (6):729-36.

19 Lincoln, Y.S., and E.G. Guba. 1985. *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage
20
21
22 Publications.

23 Markham, A. . 2005. "Reconsidering self and other: The methods, politics, and ethics of
24 representation in online ethnography." In *Handbook of qualitative research*, edited by
25
26
27 N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln, 101-124. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

28 Martinotti, G., M. Lupi, L. Carlucci, E. Cinosi, R. Santacroce, T. Acciavatti, E. Chillemi,
29
30
31
32 L. Bonifaci, L. Janiri, and M. Di Giannantonio. 2015. "Novel psychoactive substances:
33 use and knowledge among adolescents and young adults in urban and rural areas."
34
35
36
37 *Hum Psychopharmacol* 30 (4):295-301. doi: 10.1002/hup.2486.

38 Maxwell, J. C., and B. A. Rutkowski. 2008. "The prevalence of methamphetamine and
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
amphetamine abuse in North America: a review of the indicators, 1992-2007." *Drug*
Alcohol Rev 27 (3):229-35. doi: 10.1080/09595230801919460.

McKetin, R., N. Kozel, J. Douglas, R. Ali, B. Vicknasingam, J. Lund, and J. H. Li. 2008.
"The rise of methamphetamine in Southeast and East Asia." *Drug Alcohol Rev* 27
(3):220-8. doi: 10.1080/09595230801923710.

Miovsky, M. 2007. "Changing patterns of drug use in the Czech Republic during the
post-communist era: A qualitative study." *Journal of Drug Issues* 37 (1):73-102.

Miovský, M. , P.M. Miller, J.P. Grund, V. Beláčková, R. Gabrhelík, and J. Libra. 2015.
"Academic education in addictology (addiction science) in the Czech Republic: Analysis

1
2
3 of the (pre-1989) historical origins." *Nordic Studies on Alcohol and Drugs* 32 (5):in
4
5 press.

6
7 Moro, L., and J. Racz. 2013. "Online drug user-led harm reduction in Hungary: a review
8
9 of "Daath"." *Harm Reduction Journal* 10. doi: Artn 18
10
11 10.1186/1477-7517-10-18.

12
13 Mueller, S. R., A. Y. Walley, S. L. Calcaterra, J. M. Glanz, and I. A. Binswanger. 2015.
14
15 "A Review of Opioid Overdose Prevention and Naloxone Prescribing: Implications for
16
17 Translating Community Programming Into Clinical Practice." *Subst Abus* 36 (2):240-
18
19 53. doi: 10.1080/08897077.2015.1010032.

20
21 Nikolaou, P., S. Athanaselis, I. Papoutsis, A. Dona, C. Spiliopoulou, and M. Stefanidou.
22
23 2014. "Emergency Issues of Clandestine Production of Drugs: The Case of "Sisha"-
24
25 The Homemade Crystal Meth inGreece." *J. Forensic Toxicol Pharmacol* 3 (2).

26
27 Rhodes, T. 2009. "Risk environments and drug harms: a social science for harm
28
29 reduction approach." *Int J Drug Policy* 20 (3):193-201. doi:
30
31 10.1016/j.drugpo.2008.10.003.

32
33 Rhodes, T., C. Lowndes, A. Judd, L. A. Mikhailova, A. Sarang, A. Rylkov, M. Tichonov,
34
35 K. Lewis, N. Ulyanova, T. Alpatova, V. Karavashkin, M. Khutorskoy, M. Hickman, J. V.
36
37 Parry, and A. Renton. 2002. "Explosive spread and high prevalence of HIV infection
38
39 among injecting drug users in Togliatti City, Russia." *AIDS* 16 (13):F25-31.

40
41 Schep, L. J., K. Knudsen, R. J. Slaughter, J. A. Vale, and B. Megarbane. 2012. "The
42
43 clinical toxicology of gamma-hydroxybutyrate, gamma-butyrolactone and 1,4-
44
45 butanediol." *Clin Toxicol (Phila)* 50 (6):458-70. doi: 10.3109/15563650.2012.702218.

46
47 Soussan, C., and A. Kjellgren. 2014. "Harm reduction and knowledge exchange-a
48
49 qualitative analysis of drug-related Internet discussion fora." *Harm Reduct J* 11:25. doi:
50
51 10.1186/1477-7517-11-25.

52
53 UNODC. 2013. World Drug Report. New York: United Nations Publications.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 UNODC. 2014. Global Synthetic Drugs Assessment - Amphetamine-type stimulants
4 and new psychoactive substances. New York: United Nations.
5

6
7 van Amsterdam, J., T. Brunt, E. Pennings, and W. van den Brink. 2014. "Risk
8 assessment of GBL as a substitute for the illicit drug GHB in the Netherlands. A
9 comparison of the risks of GBL versus GHB." *Regul Toxicol Pharmacol* 70 (2):507-13.
10
11 doi: 10.1016/j.yrtph.2014.08.014.
12
13

14
15 Van Gaalen, S., D. De Bruin, and J. P. C. Grund. 2015. *GHB Overdose Prevention*
16 *among People Who Use GHB at Home in the Netherlands and Belgium (2014 - 2015).*
17 *An Exploration of the Characteristics Associated with Overdose and Opportunities for*
18 *Risk Reduction.* Amsterdam.
19
20

21
22 Van Hout, M. C. 2014. "Kitchen chemistry: A scoping review of the diversionary use of
23 pharmaceuticals for non-medicinal use and home production of drug solutions." *Drug*
24 *Test Anal* 6 (7-8):778-87. doi: 10.1002/dta.1622.
25
26
27

28
29 Van Hout, M. C. 2015. "Nod and wave: An Internet study of the codeine intoxication
30 phenomenon." *International Journal of Drug Policy* 26 (1):67-77. doi:
31
32 10.1016/j.drugpo.2014.06.016.
33
34

35
36 Van Hout, M. C., and E. Hearne. 2015a. "'Plant or Poison': a netnographic study of
37 recreational use of 1,3-Dimethylamylamine (DMAA)." *International Journal of Drug*
38 *Policy* Epub ahead of print.
39
40

41
42 Van Hout, M. C., and E. Hearne. 2015b. "'Vintage meds': a netnographic study of user
43 decision-making, home preparation, and consumptive patterns of laudanum." *Subst*
44 *Use Misuse* 50 (5):598-608. doi: 10.3109/10826084.2014.991408.
45
46
47

48
49 Van Hout, M. C., and E. Hearne. 2015c. "'Word of Mouse': Indigenous Harm
50 Reduction and Online Consumerism of the Synthetic Compound Methoxphenidine."
51 *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs* 47 (1):30-41. doi: 10.1080/02791072.2014.974002.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Van Hout, M.C., and E. Hearne. 2014. "Confessions of Contemporary English Opium-
4 Eaters: A netnographic study of consumer negotiation of over the counter morphine for
5 misuse." *Journal of Substance Use* Early Online:1-12.
6
7
8
9
10 Wertz, F. J. 2005. "Phenomenological research methods for counseling psychology."
11 *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 52 (2):167-177. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.52.2.167.
12
13
14 Wilkinson, D., and M. Thelwall. 2011. "Researching Personal Information on the Public
15 Web: Methods and Ethics." *Social Science Computer Review* 29 (4):387-401. doi:
16 10.1177/0894439310378979.
17
18
19
20 Wilson, S. M., and L. C. Peterson. 2002. "The anthropology of online communities."
21 *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31:449-467. doi:
22 10.1146/annurev.anthro.31.040402.085436.
23
24
25
26 Zabransky, T. 2007. "Methamphetamine in the Czech Republic." *J Drug Issues* 37
27 (1):155-180.
28
29
30 Zabransky, T., J.P. Grund, A. Latypov, D. Otiashvili, R. Stuiyte, O. Scutelnicuic, and
31 P. Smyrnov. 2012. "Harm Reduction in Central and Eastern Europe." In *Harm*
32 *Reduction in Substance Use and High-Risk Behaviour*, edited by R. Pates and D.
33 Riley, 301-321. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
34
35
36
37
38 Zabransky, T., A. Latypov, I. Varentsov, D. Otiashvili, and J.P. Grund. 2012. "Harm
39 Reduction in Russia, South West and Central Asia." In *Harm Reduction in Substance*
40 *Use and High-Risk Behaviour*, edited by & D. Riley R. Pates. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
41
42
43
44 Zheluk, A., C. Quinn, and P. Meylakhs. 2014. "Internet search and krokodil in the
45 Russian Federation: an infoveillance study." *J Med Internet Res* 16 (9):e212. doi:
46 10.2196/jmir.3203.
47
48
49
50 Zvosec, D. L., S. W. Smith, T. Porrata, A. Q. Strobl, and J. E. Dyer. 2011. "Case series
51 of 226 gamma-hydroxybutyrate-associated deaths: lethal toxicity and trauma." *Am J*
52 *Emerg Med* 29 (3):319-32. doi: 10.1016/j.ajem.2009.11.008.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1 Search Terms

Search Term used in combination with 'homemade' and 'forum'	Hits
Krokodil	562,000
Desomorphine	13,500
GHB	189,000
Methamphetamine	116,000
Pervitin	23,700
Shake n Bake Meth	73,700
Total	977,900

Table 2 Sites containing Trip Reports and Thread Discussions, and remaining records after application of exclusion criteria.

Website Link	Website name	Initial search result number of users reports/threads	Threads excluded	User Discussion Threads After exclusion	Distinct pseudonyms per site recorded
www.drugsforum.com	Drugs Forum	101	95	6	12
www.bluelight.org	Bluelight	177	154	23	79
www.partyvibe.org	Party Vibe	113	109	4	9
www.psychonaut.com	Psychonaut	43	43	0	0
www.shroomery.org	Shroomery	180	178	2	4
	Totals	614	578	36	104

Table 3 Themes and Categories emerging from the content textual analysis as per EPP protocols.

Theme	Categories
<p><i>Theme 1: Discussions centred on Recipes, and cooking experiences of home produced substances.</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What ingredients/precursors required? 2. Where to obtain ingredients/chemicals/precursors? 3. Cost of ingredients/chemicals/precursors? 4. Sharing of recipes. 5. Experiences shared of cooking. 6. Advantages and Disadvantages of home cooking.
<p><i>Theme 2: Harm Reduction and Advice relating to physical harm and injuries incurred during the cooking process.</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Harm Reduction Advice. 8. Harm & Injuries. 9. Explosions and Death.
<p><i>Theme 3: Advice centred on chemistry and cooking of homemade substances.</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 10. Chemistry advise re: Purification methods. 11. Equipment necessary for cooking. 12. Preferred Chemicals/Precursors particularly NaOH (sodium Hydroxide). 13. Poor quality substandard end product. 14. Advise and alternative methods/chemicals for cooking. 15. Potency Advice.
<p><i>Theme 4: Fora rules and guidelines centred on reducing harm by not permitting discussions of synthesis of any substances.</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 16. Community negative attitude and sarcasm at Fora users with no chemistry experience/knowledge enquiring about homemade drugs/recipes. 17. Synthesis Discussions not allowed. 18. Fora members adherence to "no synth

	<p><i>discussion</i>" rules.</p> <p>19. Threads Closed.</p> <p>20. Advised to go to other websites for recipes and information not allowed on drug user fora.</p>
--	---

For Peer Review Only