



## LJMU Research Online

Holmes, J and Sumnall, H

**On risk in addiction science, policy and debate.**

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/id/eprint/7118/>

### Article

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

**Holmes, J and Sumnall, H (2017) On risk in addiction science, policy and debate. *Addiction*. ISSN 0965-2140**

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](mailto:researchonline@ljmu.ac.uk)

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

## On risk in addiction science, policy and debate

### Authors

John Holmes,

Harry Sumnall

The concept of risk should be used carefully in addiction science, policy and debate due to its complexity and its potential to inform, distort or otherwise shape the perspectives of stakeholders, including the general public. Recent high-profile examples from the United Kingdom demonstrate that such care is often not being taken.

The concept of risk plays a central role in addiction science, policy and debate. Risk is critical to our understanding of the harmfulness of addictive substances and behaviours and the design of appropriate preventative policies. However, risk is a complex concept. Its statistical malleability means presentation of risks in absolute or relative terms, or in comparison to potential harms of everyday activities, can inform, distort or otherwise stimulate debate [1]. Risks also do not exist only in numerical form. They are embodied through sensations of fear, apprehension, excitement and success. They are interpreted differently depending upon the communicator's credibility in the eyes of the recipient, such that past behaviours or institutional identities (e.g. industry or government) may undermine even robustly evidenced and appropriately communicated messages [2]. Professional and lay decision-making engage with risk but are subject to numerous biases and often limited statistical understanding [3]. Finally, risk is socially constructed through discourse, with reference to everyday activities, past experience and anomalous cases such as 'the old lady who smoked every day but lived to a hundred' [4].

Risk then, is to be treated carefully, perhaps more so in an age where political processes, journalism and scientific authority face major threats. Risk messages should be proportionately compelling and informed by an awareness of the probable and desired responses of recipients and conduits, such as news and social media. However, three high profile UK-based examples illustrate common failings:

E-cigarettes: debate around e-cigarettes is partly a disagreement in good faith about how to respond to an external shock to tobacco control policy. The stakes are heightened by threats to professional identity as influence partially shifts from public health actors to vapers, markets and the tobacco industry. Nonetheless, claims about the risks of e-cigarettes have been starkly inconsistent. For example, the consensus-based statement by Public Health England that e-cigarettes are '95% safer' than traditional cigarettes [5] has been attacked and defended in the *Lancet* and *BMJ*, with the dispute reported prominently in UK news outlets [6, 7].

Alcohol and cancer: in widely reported remarks, the Chief Medical Officer (CMO) for England told a UK parliamentary committee that people should decide each time they drink alcohol: 'do I want my glass of wine or do I want to raise my risk of breast cancer?' [8]. Setting aside the incorrectly stated choice and poor correspondence with evidence on the automatic and heuristically driven processes by which behavioural choices are typically made [9], similarly abstemious advice is offered by the World Cancer Research Fund (WCRF) who recommend 'Don't drink alcohol' as 'any amount increases your [cancer] risk' [10].

New psychoactive substances (NPS): the UK's Psychoactive Substances Act, 2016 subjects all non-exempt NPS to control due to their psychoactivity rather than their potential harmfulness. While we acknowledge there are gaps in scientific data, the Act also presents risks from a diverse range of drugs (e.g. novel opioids and nitrous oxide) as equivalent [11].

These examples illustrate four problems with contemporary addiction-related risk discourse.

First, there is a lack of attention to absolute levels of risk. Neither the CMO nor WCRF quantify risks alongside their statements. However, Cancer Research UK estimate that drinking a small glass of wine each day (approximately 12 g of alcohol) increases the average UK adult's absolute life-time risk of being diagnosed with mouth cancer from 0.5 to 0.6%, while the equivalent breast cancer risk for women would increase from 11.1 to 11.7% [12]. Given that a large proportion of drinkers consume less than this, that alcohol consumption at these levels may benefit cardiovascular health (albeit to a lesser extent and more selectively than some studies suggest) and that alcohol epidemiology is highly imprecise [13], the justification for alarmist or proscriptive guidance is unclear.

Secondly, risk acceptability is rarely discussed explicitly despite its importance for judging when risks are managed adequately and campaigns for additional controls should stop [14]. For example, the World Health Organization has noted that e-cigarettes are 'unlikely to be harmless' [15], but unquestioned everyday activities, such as sports, travel and showering, also entail risks, so the value of harmlessness as a standard for judging risks is questionable [16]. For illicit drugs, discussion of risk acceptability is limited by poor understanding among the public and policymakers of their potential pleasures and harms, alongside often narrow frames for considering risks (e.g. overdose, addiction). In contrast, alcohol drinking guidelines have been set recently with reference to levels of risk apparently accepted for other activities (e.g. driving), but little direct evidence is available on acceptable risks from alcohol [13, 17].

Thirdly, a tension exists between population- and individual-level risk. Rose's influential prevention paradox demonstrates that small behavioural changes among low-risk individuals can produce large health gains for populations [18]. However, this logic of pooled risk reduction sits uneasily with the increased responsibility for health placed on individuals by policymakers in many high-income countries [19]. If individuals are to engage in, and be judged on, the active, life-long self-management of their health, it is unclear how they should make use of often contradictory and incomplete information about small and uncertain risks associated with particular patterns and levels of addictive substance use.

Finally, risk is experienced as well as measured. Lay epidemiological perspectives emphasize that public engagement with risk is not a statistical process but one rooted in biography, experience, context, discourse and bodily sensation [4]. Addictive substance use does not typically reflect a devil-may-care attitude, but pleasurable sensations, an occasional reward to oneself or an environment where health warnings are received sceptically, in competition with other information or not at all. Statements on risk which fail to account for this wider context may face rejection, distortion or being ignored.

Ultimately, these problems suggest a need for scientists, policymakers and public authorities to attend more to the complex nature of risk. The current focus on epidemiological statistics and persistence of normative practices which portray all risks as important to the public, irrespective of scale, certainty, nature and context, mean the greatest risks may be that people stop listening, that hard-earned scientific credibility is squandered and that policymaking staggers erratically between laissez-faire neglect and heavy-handed overkill.

#### Declaration of interests

J.H. was involved in the review of the UK low-risk drinking guidelines as a commissioned researcher providing a key report on alcohol-related risks and as a member of (and, after commissioning, an adviser to) the expert committee who proposed revisions to the guidelines. H.S. is a member of the UK Government Advisory Council on the Misuse of Drugs (ACMD). This editorial represents his personal opinions only.

#### References

1. Goldacre B. *Bad Science*. London: Harper Perennial; 2009.
2. Beck U. *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. London: Sage; 1986.
3. Kahneman D. *Thinking, Fast and Slow*. London: Penguin Books Ltd; 2011.
4. Frankel S., Davison C., Davey S. G. Lay epidemiology and the rationality of responses to health education. *Br J Gen Pract* 1991; 41: 428–430.
5. McNeill A., Brose L. S., Calder R., Hitchman S. C., McRobbie P. H. *E-cigarettes: an evidence update: a report commissioned by Public Health England*. London: Public Health England; 2015.
6. McKee M., Capewell S. Evidence about electronic cigarettes: a foundation built on rock or sand? *BMJ* 2015; 351: h4863.
7. *Lancet E-cigarettes: Public Health England's evidence-based confusion*. *Lancet* 2015; 386: 829.
8. BBC England's medical chief gives stark alcohol warning. 2016. Available at: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/health-35471958> (accessed 22 August 2017) (Archived at <http://www.webcitation.org/6t6KCqswF>).
9. Marteau T. M., Hollands G. J., Fletcher P. C. Changing human behavior to prevent disease: the importance of targeting automatic processes. *Science* 2012; 337: 1492–1495.
10. World Cancer Research Fund. Don't drink alcohol. 2017. Available at: <https://www.wcrf-uk.org/uk/preventing-cancer/cancer-prevention-recommendations/dont-drink-alcohol> (accessed 22 August 2017) (Archived at <http://www.webcitation.org/6t6KOoQeT>).

11. Stevens A., Fortson R., Measham F., Sumnall H. Legally flawed, scientifically problematic, potentially harmful: the UK psychoactive substance bill. *Int J Drug Policy* 2015; 26: 1167–1170.
12. Cancer Research UK. New alcohol guidelines to cut cancer risk. 2016. Available at: <http://scienceblog.cancerresearchuk.org/2016/01/08/new-alcohol-guidelines-to-help-cut-cancer-risk/> (accessed 22 August 2017) (Archived at <http://www.webcitation.org/6t6KTGUB2>).
13. Holmes J., Angus C., Buykx P., Ally A., Stone T., Meier P. Mortality and morbidity risks from alcohol consumption in the UK: analyses using the Sheffield Alcohol Policy Model (v.2.7) to inform the UK Chief Medical Officers' review of the UK lower risk drinking guidelines. Sheffield: SchARR, University of Sheffield; 2016.
14. Rehm J., Lachenmeier D. W., Room R. Why does society accept a higher risk for alcohol than for other voluntary or involuntary risks? *BMC Med* 2014; 12.
15. World Health Organization. Electronic nicotine delivery systems and electronic non-nicotine delivery systems (ENDS/ENNDS). Conference of the parties to the WHO Framework Convention on Tobacco Control, Seventh session, Delhi, India, 7–12 November 2016, Provisional agenda item 552; 2016.
16. Blastland M., Spiegelhalter D. *The Norm Chronicles: Stories and Numbers About Danger*. London: Profile Books; 2013.
17. Room R., Rehm J. Clear criteria based on absolute risk: reforming the basis of guidelines on low-risk drinking. *Drug Alcohol Rev* 2012; 31: 135–140.
18. Rose G. Sick individuals and sick populations. *Int J Epidemiol* 2001; 30: 427–432.
19. Ayo N. Understanding health promotion in a neoliberal climate and the making of health conscious citizens. *Critical Public Health* 2012; 22: 99–105.