ISSN: 2583-5386
DOI: doi.org/10.51219/ahmed-f-alanazi/87

URF PUBLISHERS
connect with research world

Journal of Integrated Health

https://urfpublishers.com/journal/integrated-health

Vol: 5 & Iss: 3

Research Article

Substance Abuse Disorders: Science, Clinical Care, Harm Reduction and Policy to Improve Outcomes

Ahmed F. Alanazi*

Department of Social Studies, College of Arts, King Faisal University, Saudi Arabia

Citation: Ahmed F. Alanazi. Substance Abuse Disorders: Science, Clinical Care, Harm Reduction and Policy to Improve Outcomes. *J Integrated Health* 2026;5(3): 520-529. DOI: doi.org/10.51219/ahmed-f-alanazi/87

Received: 15 July, 2026; **Accepted:** 18 July, 2026; **Published:** 20 July, 2026

***Corresponding author:** Ahmed F. Alanazi, Department of Social Studies, College of Arts, King Faisal University, Hofuf, Saudi Arabia

A B S T R A C T

Substance use disorders represent a heterogeneous group of chronic, relapsing conditions characterized by compulsive drug seeking and use despite adverse consequences, affecting approximately 316 million individuals globally and contributing substantially to preventable morbidity, mortality and socioeconomic burden. This integrative review synthesizes current evidence across multiple domains including global epidemiological trends with particular attention to high-risk populations including incarcerated individuals and persons with psychiatric comorbidity, neurobiological mechanisms encompassing dopaminergic dysregulation, neuroplastic alterations in limbic-striatal circuitry, genetic vulnerability factors and epigenetic modifications, clinical presentations across major substance classes including opioids, stimulants, cannabis, alcohol and tobacco, evidence-based pharmacological interventions with detailed efficacy profiles and comparative effectiveness analyses, psychosocial treatment approaches including cognitive-behavioral therapy, contingency management, motivational interviewing and therapeutic communities, harm reduction strategies encompassing naloxone distribution, syringe services programs and overdose prevention centers and health policy frameworks that either facilitate or impede access to evidence-based care. The review identifies significant treatment gaps particularly within criminal justice settings where substance use disorders are approximately ten times more prevalent than in community populations, persistent racial and ethnic disparities in both overdose mortality and treatment access, regulatory barriers that limit pharmacotherapy availability and pervasive stigma that undermines treatment engagement and retention. The analysis concludes that comprehensive, integrated approaches combining pharmacological management, behavioral interventions and harm reduction services, supported by policy reforms that decriminalize drug possession, expand Medicaid coverage for substance use treatment, eliminate regulatory barriers to medication-assisted treatment and address social determinants of health, offer the most promising pathway to reducing the substantial individual and societal burden of substance use disorders.

Keywords: substance use disorders, addiction, pharmacotherapy, cognitive-behavioral therapy, harm reduction, health policy, incarceration, neurobiology

1. Introduction

Substance use disorders constitute one of the most pressing public health challenges of the twenty-first century, affecting individuals across all demographic strata and imposing profound burdens on healthcare systems, families, communities and broader society[1]. The global prevalence of drug use has reached unprecedented levels, with an estimated 316 million people, representing approximately 6% of the global population aged 15 to 64 years, having used drugs in the past year[1]. The consequences are devastating, with over 105,000 substance use-related deaths occurring in 2023 alone in the United States, representing a 307% increase over the preceding two decades[2]. The economic cost of the opioid epidemic alone has been estimated at $2.7 trillion in 2023, encompassing healthcare expenditures, lost productivity, criminal justice system costs and diminished quality of life[2].

Substance use disorders are characterized by a constellation of cognitive, behavioral and physiological symptoms indicating that an individual continues using a substance despite significant substance-related problems[3]. The diagnostic criteria encompass impaired control over substance use, social impairment, risky use and pharmacological criteria including tolerance and withdrawal[4]. These disorders follow a chronic, relapsing course, with prolonged time to remission and substantial risk of recurrence even after extended periods of abstinence[5]. The early onset of substance use, typically in adolescence or young adulthood, coupled with the chronic nature of these disorders, contributes substantially to the global burden of disease[4].

The neurobiological basis of addiction has been increasingly elucidated through advances in molecular genetics, neuroimaging and behavioral neuroscience. Over 40 years of research has established that addictive substances produce their reinforcing effects primarily through disruption of dopaminergic transmission in the mesolimbic reward pathway, with repeated exposure inducing molecular, cellular and synaptic changes that rewire limbic-striatal circuitry and produce the behavioral abnormalities that define addiction[5]. These neuroadaptations explain the compulsive drug-seeking behavior, impaired control, heightened relapse vulnerability and hedonic dysregulation that characterize severe substance use disorders[6].

Despite substantial advances in understanding the neurobiology of addiction and developing evidence-based interventions, significant gaps persist in the availability, accessibility and implementation of effective treatments. Pharmacological treatments exist for opioid, alcohol and nicotine use disorders, yet these medications remain substantially underutilized due to regulatory barriers, provider attitudes and patient preferences[7]. Psychosocial interventions including cognitive-behavioral therapy demonstrate efficacy across multiple substance classes, but implementation quality and fidelity to evidence-based protocols in community settings remain inconsistent[8]. Harm reduction approaches including naloxone distribution and syringe services programs have proven effectiveness in reducing overdose mortality and infectious disease transmission, yet face persistent policy barriers and stigma that limit their reach[9].

The treatment gap is particularly pronounced in criminal justice settings, where approximately four in ten adults who enter prison meet diagnostic criteria for a drug use disorder, representing a prevalence approximately ten times higher than in the general population[1]. With over 30 million people transitioning through prisons annually, addressing substance use disorders in this population has substantial potential to improve both public health and public safety[1]. However, access to evidence-based interventions in prison settings remains limited and strategies to facilitate linkage to post-release services are often inadequate.

This comprehensive review aims to synthesize current evidence across multiple domains relevant to substance use disorders, including epidemiological patterns and trends, neurobiological mechanisms underlying the transition from use to addiction, clinical presentations across major substance classes, evidence-based pharmacological and psychosocial interventions, harm reduction approaches, health policy barriers and recommendations for improving treatment access and outcomes.

2. Epidemiological Patterns and Trends

2.1. Global prevalence and regional variation

Substance use is widespread throughout the world, with substantial geographical variation in the types and patterns of substances used[1]. Cannabis is the most commonly used illicit drug globally, followed by amphetamines, cocaine and opioids[10]. The global prevalence of past-year drug use is estimated at 6% of the population aged 15 to 64 years, with higher rates observed in North America, Europe and Oceania compared to Asia and Africa[10]. However, epidemiological data from low- and middle-income countries are limited and methodological differences in sampling and measurement across studies complicate direct comparisons[11].

The prevalence of drug use disorders in the general population is substantially lower than the prevalence of any drug use, reflecting that only a minority of individuals who use drugs develop clinically significant disorders[12]. A cross-national analysis of epidemiological surveys from 25 countries estimated past-year prevalence of drug use disorders at 0.7% and lifetime prevalence at 3.5%[4]. However, these figures likely underestimate the true burden, as they do not account for institutionalized populations including incarcerated individuals and those in psychiatric facilities, who experience substantially higher rates of substance use disorders[1].

2.2. High-risk populations

2.2.1 Incarcerated populations: Incarcerated individuals represent one of the most affected groups, with drug use disorders approximately ten times more prevalent among people in prison compared with the general population[1]. A 2022 systematic review of 26 European studies documented that 61% of people in prison have a history of drug use before imprisonment[1]. In the United States, a national survey of nearly 25,000 incarcerated individuals found that 64% reported using drugs in the 30 days before their arrest and 38% did so at the time of their offense[13].

Despite institutional policies prohibiting drugs, drug use during imprisonment is common[1]. A global review concluded that 32% of incarcerated individuals report using drugs while in prison[1]. The prevalence of drug use in prison varies by region, with a meta-analysis of 26 samples from low- and middle-income countries estimating that 25% of incarcerated individuals used drugs during imprisonment[14]. Drug use in prison poses health and safety risks for people living and working in prisons,

with injecting drug use contributing to blood-borne virus transmission[15].

Incarcerated women experience particularly elevated rates of drug use disorders compared to the general population, with an even higher excess observed among incarcerated women than men[1]. Gender-specific treatment needs are often inadequately addressed in prison settings and the comorbidity of mental disorders in incarcerated populations further complicates treatment delivery[16]. Following release from prison, individuals with drug use disorders face markedly elevated mortality risk, especially from drug-related causes within the first two weeks post-release[17].

2.2.2. Adolescents and young adults: Adolescents represent another vulnerable population, with an estimated 8.5% of adolescents (2.2 million) having some form of substance use disorder, primarily for alcohol and marijuana[4]. The majority of substance use initiates occur under the age of 21, with mean age of first use typically in late adolescence[18]. Adolescent brains are still undergoing development, particularly in front cortical regions such as the prefrontal cortex and adolescents tend to engage in more risky behavior due to heightened novelty seeking and exploration[19]. For those who display impulse control deficits and decreased ability to regulate emotional responses, the risks of progressing to more severe substance use are substantially greater[4].

2.2.3. Persons with psychiatric comorbidity: Comorbid mental disorders are common among individuals with substance use disorders[4]. A global review found that approximately 16% of individuals with drug use disorders have a current comorbid mental disorder and 30% have a lifetime prevalence of co-occurring psychiatric conditions[20]. The relationship between substance uses and mental health is bidirectional; individuals with mental health disorders may use substances to self-medicate symptoms, while substance use can precipitate or exacerbate psychiatric conditions[4]. Substance use disorders also commonly co-occur with infectious diseases, including HIV and hepatitis C, particularly among people who inject drugs[11].

2.3. Demographic and regional variations in the United States

In the United States, 48.5 million Americans aged 12 or older met criteria for a substance use disorder in 2023, encompassing both alcohol and drug use disorders[21]. Fatal drug overdose has become a leading cause of injury-related death, with over 105,000 substance use-related deaths in 2023 alone[2]. Fentanyl, a powerful synthetic opioid, is the current driver of overdose deaths, involved in over 75.2% of overdose deaths in 2023[2]. Fentanyl has been increasingly present in other opioid-based and non-opioid illicit substances since 2013, causing unintentional use by persons unaware of fentanyl adulteration in their drug supply[22].

Racial and ethnic disparities in overdose mortality have emerged as a critical concern[2]. Recent data show that overdose death rates have declined among White Americans while increasing for all other racial and ethnic groups[23]. Disparities are most pronounced among Black Americans and Native Americans, who experience overdose death rates 1.4 times and 1.8 times the rate of White Americans, respectively[2]. Additionally, methamphetamine and cocaine overdose deaths are rapidly increasing each year independent of fentanyl, increasing 317% from 2013 to 2019[24].

3. Neurobiological Mechanisms

3.1. Dopaminergic dysregulation

The neurobiological understanding of addiction has been fundamentally shaped by over 40 years of research focused on the brain's reward and motivation systems[5]. The dopamine theory of addiction posits that psychoactive substances produce their reinforcing effects primarily through disruption of dopaminergic transmission in the mesolimbic reward pathway[25]. This pathway involves dopaminergic neurons projecting from the midbrain, including the ventral tegmental area, to regions including the striatum (nucleus accumbens), amygdala and prefrontal cortex[6].

Despite diverse initial neuronal activation mechanisms, substances produce a similar effect of disrupting the homeostasis of the mesolimbic dopamine system[5]. Stimulant drugs such as cocaine have a direct effect on dopamine neuron terminals, blocking dopamine reuptake and increasing dopamine availability[26]. Nicotine directly depolarizes dopamine neurons, which then release dopamine[27]. Opioids act on μ-opioid receptors, decreasing activity of inhibitory interneurons and thereby disinhibiting dopamine firing[28]. Alcohol acts on both GABA and glutamate receptors, causing transient dopamine activity in the nucleus accumbens[29].

Research suggests that brain reward circuitry is initially stimulated by substances during drug-induced euphoria but is then disrupted over the course of chronic exposure[6]. Despite diverse initial neuronal activation, substances produce a similar effect of disrupting the homeostasis of the mesolimbic dopamine system, producing positive reinforcement after drug intake and negative reinforcement during withdrawal[29]. The transition from recreational use to addiction involves progressive neuroadaptations that reduce the sensitivity of reward circuitry to natural reinforcers while enhancing the motivational salience of drug-related cues[5].

3.2. Neuroplasticity and circuit-level changes

Repeated exposure to addictive drugs causes changes at the molecular, cellular and synaptic levels that, over time, rewire circuitry throughout the limbic system[5]. These neuroadaptations, some of which are shared by all addictive drugs whereas others are specific to certain drug classes, underlie the range of behavioral abnormalities that define the addicted state, including drug euphoria, tolerance, withdrawal, craving, hedonic dysregulation and loss of control[5].

Drug-induced plasticity occurs at multiple levels of analysis[30]. At the molecular level, repeated drug exposure alters gene expression through transcriptional and epigenetic mechanisms[5]. At the synaptic level, drugs induce changes in dendritic spine morphology, glutamate receptor trafficking and synaptic strength[31]. At the circuit level, drugs alter connectivity patterns among brain regions involved in reward, motivation and executive control[25]. These neuroadaptations are thought to contribute to the persistent vulnerability to relapse that characterizes addiction, even after prolonged periods of abstinence[6].

3.3. Stages of addiction and vulnerability factors

Accumulated research suggests a three-step process to drug addiction: drug initiation, escalation of use and loss of control[4].

Each transition is associated with different vulnerabilities[4]. The initial phase involves learning about the subjective experiences produced by substances, with reinforcement relying on dopamine activity within the mesolimbic reward pathway[4]. Data suggest that likelihood of repeated use increases if the experience is associated with stimulation or relief[4].

The most common factors associated with future use are personality traits such as sensation seeking and novelty seeking and different forms of impulsivity such as negative urgency[4]. Sensation seeking and novelty seeking are linked with greater initiation of substance use, while as use continues, different forms of impulsivity play a larger role in conferring risk of continued drug use[4]. Negative urgency tends to correspond with the degree of relief from negative symptoms provided by substances and heightened discounting of delayed rewards also plays a role[4]. These traits align with the idea that drug use is partially mediated by perceived risk; although drugs may produce pleasurable effects, most people are aware of potential downsides, but individuals vary widely in risk-taking tendencies linked to neurobiological and genetic differences[4].

3.4. Genetic and epigenetic influences

The tools of modern genetics have advanced understanding of how individual risk for addiction is determined by interactions between genetics and environment[4]. Genetic analyses reveal evidence for effects on the metabolism of different substances, with certain genes conferring risk for greater response to some drugs[4]. There is also evidence for genetic determinants of vulnerabilities to substance use, such as impulsivity and novelty seeking[32]. However, identifying the specific genes involved in these causal pathways is complicated by the various social and environmental factors that moderate genetic effects[4].

A central finding from genetic research is that only a minute fraction of chemical agents shares the ability to act on individual vulnerability to induce a state of addiction[4]. This suggests that addiction vulnerability is not simply a general liability but involves specific interactions between genetic predisposition, environmental exposures and particular pharmacological agents[4]. Epigenetic mechanisms, including DNA methylation and histone modifications, provide a molecular bridge between environmental exposures and stable changes in gene expression that may contribute to the persistent nature of addiction vulnerability[5].

4. Clinical Presentations Across Major Substance Classes

4.1. Opioid use disorder

Opioid use disorder is characterized by a problematic pattern of opioid use leading to clinically significant impairment or distress, as manifested by at least two of the DSM-5 criteria within a 12-month period[3]. Clinical features include increased opioid tolerance, withdrawal syndrome upon cessation or reduction, persistent desire or unsuccessful efforts to cut down, substantial time spent obtaining, using or recovering from opioids and continued use despite adverse consequences[6].

The opioid withdrawal syndrome is characterized by dysphoric mood, nausea or vomiting, muscle aches, diarrhea, fever and insomnia[6]. The severity of withdrawal depends on the specific opioid used, duration of use and dosage[6]. Opioid use disorder is associated with substantial morbidity and mortality, primarily from overdose, infectious disease transmission and psychiatric comorbidity[2].

4.2. Stimulant use disorder

Stimulant use disorder encompasses problematic use of cocaine, amphetamines, methamphetamine and other stimulants[7]. Clinical features include increased tolerance, withdrawal symptoms including depression, fatigue and vivid dreams, unsuccessful efforts to cut down and continued use despite adverse consequences[7]. Stimulant intoxication is characterized by euphoria, hypervigilance, grandiosity, agitation and cardiovascular effects including tachycardia and hypertension[6].

Methamphetamine and cocaine overdose deaths are rapidly increasing each year independent of fentanyl, increasing 317% from 2013 to 2019[24]. Chronic stimulant use is associated with significant medical consequences including cardiovascular disease, cerebrovascular events and neurological complications, as well as psychiatric consequences including psychosis, depression and anxiety disorders[33].

4.3. Cannabis use disorder

Cannabis use disorder is the most prevalent substance use disorder after alcohol and tobacco use disorders[7]. Clinical features include increased tolerance, withdrawal symptoms including irritability, insomnia and anxiety, unsuccessful efforts to cut down and continued use despite adverse consequences[34]. Cannabis intoxication is characterized by euphoria, relaxation, perceptual alterations and impaired coordination[6].

Chronic cannabis use is associated with cognitive impairment, particularly in attention, memory and executive function, as well as psychiatric consequences including increased risk of psychosis in vulnerable individuals[35]. The relationship between cannabis use and mental health is complex, with evidence supporting both causal effects and shared vulnerability factors[4].

4.4. Alcohol use disorder

Alcohol use disorder is characterized by a problematic pattern of alcohol use leading to clinically significant impairment or distress[36]. Clinical features include increased tolerance, withdrawal symptoms including autonomic hyperactivity, hand tremor, insomnia and seizures, unsuccessful efforts to cut down and continued use despite adverse consequences[7]. Alcohol is the substance most extensively studied in terms of pharmacological treatments for dependence[7].

Alcohol use disorder is associated with substantial medical consequences including liver disease, cardiovascular disease, neurological complications and increased cancer risk[37]. Psychiatric comorbidity is common, particularly with depression, anxiety disorders and other substance use disorders[4].

4.5. Tobacco use disorder

Tobacco use disorder is the most prevalent substance use disorder globally and the leading cause of preventable mortality worldwide[7]. Clinical features include increased tolerance, withdrawal symptoms including irritability, anxiety, insomnia and increased appetite, unsuccessful efforts to cut down and continued use despite adverse consequences[38]. Nicotine is one of the most addictive substances, with approximately 70% of

smokers wishing to quit each year but only a minority achieving sustained abstinence[39].

Tobacco use is associated with substantial medical consequences including cardiovascular disease, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease and multiple cancers[38]. Pharmacological treatments including nicotine replacement therapy, bupropion and varenicline have demonstrated efficacy, but they remain underutilized[40].

5. Pharmacological Interventions

5.1. Opioid use disorder

Methadone yields the best results among pharmacological treatments for opioid use disorder, showing superiority over buprenorphine in securing therapeutic adherence, while buprenorphine performs better than naltrexone[7]. Both methadone and buprenorphine are FDA-approved medications for opioid use disorder and are considered first-line treatments[6]. The combination of naloxone with buprenorphine has shown efficacy for opiate dependence, reducing the risk of diversion and misuse[7].

Methadone is a full μ-opioid receptor agonist that suppresses withdrawal symptoms and craving through cross-tolerance and prevents euphoric effects of other opioids through receptor occupancy[6]. The historical reform to methadone access in 2023, including increased ability for patients to take home methadone after stabilization, has improved treatment accessibility[9]. However, significant barriers remain, including regulatory restrictions on methadone dispensing that limit access to dedicated opioid treatment programs[9].

Buprenorphine is a partial μ-opioid receptor agonist with high receptor affinity and slow dissociation kinetics[6]. Removal of the X-waiver requirement for prescribing buprenorphine in 2022 was a bipartisan policy reform that removed barriers to prescribing, though research has not yet found a clearly identifiable increase in prescribing, suggesting that additional efforts to address stigma and provider education are needed[9].

Naltrexone is a μ-opioid receptor antagonist that blocks the euphoric effects of opioids and is available in oral and extended-release injectable formulations[7]. Naltrexone requires complete detoxification before initiation to avoid precipitated withdrawal, which limits its uptake compared to agonist-based treatments[7].

Despite the demonstrated effectiveness of these medications, they remain underutilized[9]. Significant barriers include regulatory restrictions, stigma against medication-assisted treatment among both prescribers and patients and inadequate provider training[7,9].

5.2. Alcohol use disorder

Acamprosate is considered the best option for maintaining abstinence, while naltrexone's effectiveness appears to depend on severity of addiction[7]. Nalmefene has shown effectiveness in reducing alcohol consumption[7]. Despite the availability of these evidence-based medications, alcohol use disorder remains one of the most treatable conditions with substantial underutilization of all treatment modalities[7].

Acamprosate is a glutamate modulator that reduces hyperglutamatergic states during early abstinence, thereby reducing craving and withdrawal symptoms[6]. Naltrexone reduces the rewarding effects of alcohol through opioid receptor antagonism[6]. Disulfiram, while still available, has fallen out of favor due to its adverse effect profile and limited efficacy[7].

5.3. Tobacco use disorder

Varenicline is considered the most effective compound for tobacco use disorder in the context of pharmacological monotherapy, with more favorable results observed when combined with bupropion. However, varenicline is not superior to psychosocial methods. Naltrexone, topiramate and bupropion have not shown clear effects on tobacco cessation[7].

Varenicline is a partial α4β2 nicotinic acetylcholine receptor agonist that reduces withdrawal symptoms and blocks the reinforcing effects of nicotine[6]. Nicotine replacement therapy, available in multiple formulations including patches, gum and lozenges, is safe and effective when used in adequate doses[40]. Combination pharmacotherapy, particularly varenicline combined with nicotine replacement, has shown superior efficacy to monotherapy[41].

5.4. Cannabis use disorder

Dronabinol minimizes withdrawal symptoms and increases treatment adherence for cannabis use disorder[7]. Nabiximol, cannabidiol (CBD) and PF-04457845, along with topiramate and fatty acid hydroxylase inhibitors, have been found to limit use and enhance abstinence, although topiramate generated adverse events and was associated with higher treatment dropout rates[7]. Evidence for nabilone is contradictory, with studies finding both in favor and against its efficacy[7].

Currently, no medications are FDA-approved specifically for cannabis use disorder, though several agents show promise in clinical trials[42]. The development of effective pharmacotherapies for cannabis use disorder remains a research priority given the increasing prevalence of cannabis use and cannabis use disorder[4].

5.5. Stimulant use disorders

For cocaine use disorder, bupropion and topiramate support the maintenance of abstinence in the medium term, albeit with a slight effect size. Limited evidence exists for opioid agonists, psychostimulants, N-acetylcysteine, disulfiram, antipsychotics and antidepressants. For methamphetamine use disorder, amineptine reduces treatment dropout rates and improves overall health, while methylphenidate and riluzole reduce craving and topiramate reduces addiction severity in methamphetamine users with psychotic spectrum disorder[7].

No medications are FDA-approved for stimulant use disorders, representing a significant treatment gap given the increasing prevalence of stimulant-related morbidity and mortality[2,7]. Research on pharmacotherapies for stimulant use disorders should be prioritized[7].

6. Psychosocial Treatment Modalities

6.1. Cognitive-behavioral therapy

Cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT) is one of the most well-established psychosocial interventions for substance use disorders[8]. A meta-analysis of 52 randomized clinical trials with 9,442 participants found that CBT was efficacious based on overall between-group pooled estimates, with sub-group analyses suggesting effect variability by comparator type[8]. CBT demonstrated efficacy for consumption outcomes when

compared to usual care or minimal treatment (g = 0.14, 95% CI = 0.01 to 0.26)[8]. When CBT was tested as an addition to usual care, it showed significant effects for consumption outcomes (g = 0.44) and psychosocial functioning (g = 0.56)[8].

CBT for substance use disorders combines cognitive, behavioral and social-cognitive theoretical perspectives. Common techniques include assessing and planning for high-risk thoughts, behaviors and contexts associated with substance use craving or relapse; analyzing the function of substance use to develop alternative coping strategies; behavioral skills training on intra- and interpersonal domains; and upon stabilization, positive lifestyle enhancement. The substantial number and flexibility of CBT techniques have led to its appeal as a modular approach where providers can select among protocol elements to design individualized treatment[8].

The efficacy of CBT tends to produce results comparable to other evidence-based modalities, with effect differences against methods such as motivational interviewing or contingency management near zero. Despite over 90% of community-based programs reporting using CBT, implementation quality and fidelity to evidence-based protocols remain significant challenges[8].

6.2. Contingency management

Contingency management is a behavioral intervention that provides tangible reinforcements for achieving treatment goals, including abstinence or treatment attendance[4]. Systematic reviews have demonstrated robust efficacy across multiple substance classes, including opioids, stimulants, cannabis and alcohol[43]. The intervention is based on the principle that behaviors reinforced by positive consequences are more likely to be repeated.

Despite strong evidence of efficacy, contingency management has not been widely implemented due to concerns about cost, sustainability and philosophical objections to providing monetary incentives for behavior change[4]. Recent adaptations including voucher-based and prize-based systems have improved feasibility and reduced costs[44].

6.3. Motivational interviewing

Motivational interviewing is a client-centered directive intervention designed to enhance intrinsic motivation to change by exploring and resolving ambivalence[36]. The intervention has demonstrated efficacy as a stand-alone treatment and as an adjunct to other interventions across multiple substance classes[36].

Motivational interviewing is based on the principles of expressing empathy, developing discrepancy, rolling with resistance and supporting self-efficacy[45]. The intervention is typically brief, comprising one to four sessions and has been adapted for use in diverse settings including primary care, emergency departments and criminal justice settings[36].

6.4. Therapeutic communities

Therapeutic communities have demonstrated effectiveness in prison-based settings for reducing drug-related harms[1]. These residential treatment programs provide structured environments where individuals can develop prosocial skills and address substance use through peer support and structured activities[46]. Strategies to facilitate linkage to and retention in post-release services are key to ensuring continuity of care and achieving sustainable treatment outcomes[1].

Therapeutic communities emphasize community-as-method, where the community itself is the primary agent of change[46]. Participants engage in structured activities including group therapy, educational programming and vocational training, with progressive levels of responsibility and privilege earned through demonstrated progress[46].

6.5. Family-based interventions

Family-based interventions have demonstrated efficacy for adolescent substance use disorders, with evidence supporting family therapy, behavioral parent training and multi-systemic therapy[4]. These interventions address family dynamics that may contribute to substance use and engage family members as supportive resources in the change process[47].

The effectiveness of family-based interventions is attributed to their ability to address multiple domains of influence on adolescent substance use, including family communication, parental monitoring and peer associations[4]. These interventions have demonstrated sustained effects beyond the treatment period, suggesting that they produce durable changes in family functioning[47].

7. Harm Reduction Frameworks

7.1. Conceptual foundations

Harm reduction represents an alternative framework to abstinence-only approaches, acknowledging that people may not desire total abstinence and aiming to minimize negative consequences of substance use[9]. A harm reduction approach moves away from abstinence as the primary goal, acknowledging that people may not desire total abstinence from substances and aligning with research demonstrating that incremental behavioral changes are more sustainable over time[9]. The harm reduction model centers people who use substances as experts in what positive change may look like, with the goal of improving health and wellbeing overall[9].

Harm reduction encompasses a range of strategies including naloxone distribution, syringe services programs, overdose prevention centers and drug checking services[9]. These approaches have demonstrated effectiveness in reducing overdose mortality, infectious disease transmission and other drug-related harms[48]. Despite evidence supporting their effectiveness, harm reduction interventions face persistent policy barriers and stigma that limit their reach[9].

7.2. Naloxone distribution

Naloxone, an opioid antagonist that rapidly reverses opioid overdose, has become increasingly available through community-based distribution programs[9]. Every state now has a Good Samaritan law protecting people at the scene of an overdose when they call 911[49]. Innovations such as vending machines have expanded access to naloxone and other harm reduction supplies[9]. However, 42.6% of fatal overdoses between October 2020 and March 2024 occurred while a potential bystander was present, indicating that too many individuals overdose with someone nearby who lacked the tools or training in recognizing and reversing an overdose[9].

Naloxone distribution programs have been associated with significant reductions in overdose mortality in communities where they have been implemented[50]. Take-home naloxone programs have been endorsed by major public health organizations and are considered a cost-effective public health intervention[51].

7.3. Syringe services programs

Syringe services programs (SSPs) provide sterile injection equipment and other harm reduction supplies, reducing the risk of HIV and hepatitis C transmission[9]. As of March 2025, 37 states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico allow SSPs to operate legally[9]. However, significant barriers still hinder implementation of best practices. Six states require a one-to-one exchange in which an individual can receive one syringe in return for turning in one syringe, a practice that can lead to increased risk of infection due to needle sharing[9]. SSPs have evolved in many cases to offer a variety of health-related services and pathways to other needed medical and social supports, but they remain limited due to ongoing stigma manifesting in legal and funding challenges[9].

SSPs have been associated with significant reductions in HIV transmission among people who inject drugs, with economic analyses demonstrating cost-effectiveness compared to the costs of treating HIV infection[52]. SSPs also serve as access points for other health services including HIV testing, hepatitis C testing and referrals to substance use treatment[9].

7.4. Overdose prevention centers

Overdose prevention centers (OPCs), also known as supervised consumption sites, provide a hygienic environment where individuals can consume drugs under medical supervision, reducing the risk of fatal overdose[9]. Federal and state policies that prevent OPCs from operating pose significant barriers to harm reduction access. The Controlled Substances Act currently impedes expansion of overdose prevention centers, though legislative reform has been proposed[9].

International evidence from OPCs operating in Canada, Europe and Australia demonstrates reductions in overdose mortality, public drug use and syringe litter, without evidence of increased drug use or crime in surrounding neighborhoods[53]. OPCs also provide opportunities for engagement with healthcare services and substance use treatment[9].

7.5. Drug checking services

Drug checking services allow individuals to test their substances for adulterants and contaminants, including fentanyl and other potent synthetic opioids. These services have become increasingly relevant given the proliferation of fentanyl in the illicit drug supply. Drug checking can inform individuals' decisions about drug use and prompt risk reduction behavior[9].

Drug checking services face significant legal barriers, as the possession of testing equipment can be considered drug paraphernalia in some jurisdictions[9]. Despite these barriers, drug checking services have been implemented in community settings and at music festivals, with evidence suggesting they can reduce overdose risk and increase engagement with harm reduction services[9].

8. Health Policy Frameworks and Barriers

8.1. Criminalization and its consequences

The abstinence-only model has been the primary approach utilized within substance use treatment settings, historically framed as the only appropriate way to address substance use in the United States. This approach reflects an underlying belief that drug use is morally wrong and that people who use substances should be punished, which is reflected in current criminal legal policy that criminalizes substance use at both federal and state levels[9].

The criminalization of drug possession and drug paraphernalia represents a fundamental barrier to harm reduction. Syringe services programs and overdose prevention centers face legal and regulatory obstacles, with policies limiting their ability to operate. Regulations restricting medications for opioid use disorder have historically limited access to methadone and buprenorphine, though recent reforms have begun to address these barriers[9].

The criminalization of substance use has contributed to mass incarceration and racial disparities in the criminal justice system[54]. The war on drugs has disproportionately affected Black and Latino communities, contributing to cycles of poverty, incarceration and social exclusion[54].

8.2. Treatment gap in criminal justice settings

Despite robust evidence supporting the effectiveness of prison-based pharmacological and psychosocial interventions in reducing drug-related harms, there remains a significant treatment gap within prison settings worldwide. With over 30 million people transitioning through prisons annually, addressing drug use in this population has the potential to improve public health and safety[1].

Women in prison experience particularly elevated rates of drug use disorders compared to the general population, yet gender-specific treatment needs are often inadequately addressed[1]. The comorbidity of mental disorders in incarcerated populations further complicates treatment delivery[16]. Strategies to facilitate linkage to and retention in post-release services are key to ensuring continuity of care and achieving sustainable treatment outcomes[1].

8.3. Disparities in treatment access

Significant disparities exist in access to evidence-based treatment across demographic groups[9]. Medicaid is the primary payer for both substance use and mental health treatment and reductions in its coverage would have devastating consequences for treatment access, particularly for low-income individuals and in rural areas. Potential loss of Medicaid coverage and cuts to addiction-related grant programs would devastate treatment access[9].

Racial and ethnic disparities in treatment access are compounded by disparities in overdose mortality. Despite overall decreases in overdose deaths in 2024, the loss of approximately 80,000 people a year to preventable overdose deaths highlights the need for targeted public health responses[2].

Geographic disparities in treatment access are also significant, with rural areas having fewer treatment providers and limited access to specialized substance use treatment[55]. Telehealth has emerged as a promising strategy to address geographic barriers, with evidence supporting its effectiveness for substance use treatment[56].

8.4. Stigma as a barrier to care

Stigma against substance use disorders and their treatment represents a pervasive barrier to care. Data from substance use treatment providers indicate that often abstinence-only group attendance is required and acceptance of non-abstinence goals from providers remains low for illicit drug use. The abstinence-only model pathologizes any return to use as a recovery failure, often resulting in feelings of guilt, self-blame and a perceived loss of control that have been shown to increase the likelihood of disengagement from treatment or engagement in prolonged use[9].

Stigma extends to medication-assisted treatment, with prescribers identifying stigma against medications as well as patients as reasons for choosing not to treat patients with opioid use disorder. Addressing stigma through education and policy reform is essential for improving treatment access[9,57].

9. Discussion

The evidence synthesized in this review demonstrates that substance use disorders represent a substantial global public health challenge characterized by high prevalence, significant morbidity and mortality and profound socioeconomic consequences. The epidemiological data indicate that substance use disorders affect millions of individuals worldwide, with particularly high prevalence in incarcerated populations, adolescents and young adults and persons with psychiatric comorbidity. The convergence of substance use disorders with criminal justice involvement, mental health comorbidity and infectious disease transmission creates complex challenges requiring integrated, multi-modal approaches.

The neurobiological understanding of addiction has advanced significantly, revealing how repeated drug exposure induces plastic changes in limbic-striatal circuitry that underlie the compulsive drug-seeking behavior and impaired control characteristic of addiction. This biological understanding provides the foundation for pharmacological interventions that target neurotransmitter systems involved in reward, craving and withdrawal. However, the translation of neurobiological knowledge into effective treatments has been uneven, with substantial progress for opioid and alcohol use disorders but limited pharmacotherapeutic options for stimulant and cannabis use disorders.

Evidence-based treatments exist for substance use disorders, including pharmacological interventions such as methadone and buprenorphine for opioid use disorder, acamprosate and naltrexone for alcohol use disorder and varenicline for tobacco use disorder. Psychosocial interventions, particularly cognitive-behavioral therapy, demonstrate efficacy in reducing substance use and improving psychosocial functioning. Harm reduction approaches, including naloxone distribution and syringe services programs, have proven effectiveness in reducing overdose mortality and infectious disease transmission.

Despite the availability of evidence-based interventions, significant gaps persist in treatment access and implementation. Regulatory barriers, stigma and disparities in healthcare access impede the reach of effective interventions. The treatment gap in prison settings is particularly pronounced, with incarcerated individuals experiencing disproportionately high rates of substance use disorders yet limited access to evidence-based care. The criminalization of substance use has contributed to mass incarceration and racial disparities, undermining public health approaches to substance use.

The persistence of the abstinence-only model in many treatment settings represents a significant barrier to engaging individuals who are not ready or willing to pursue total abstinence. Harm reduction approaches that meet individuals where they are and support incremental behavioral changes have demonstrated effectiveness but face persistent stigma and policy barriers. The integration of harm reduction with traditional treatment approaches offers the potential to engage a broader population and improve outcomes across the spectrum of substance use severity.

Disparities in treatment access and outcomes are a critical concern. Racial and ethnic disparities in overdose mortality, with Black Americans and Native Americans experiencing disproportionately high rates, demand targeted public health responses. Geographic disparities, particularly in rural areas, limit access to specialized treatment, though telehealth has emerged as a promising strategy to address these barriers. The potential loss of Medicaid coverage and cuts to addiction-related grant programs would have devastating consequences for treatment access, particularly for low-income individuals.

10. Future Research Directions

Several critical gaps in the evidence base warrant attention in future research. Foremost among these is the need to assess the health benefits of harm reduction services in prisons, including needle and syringe programs. A second priority is research on pharmacotherapies for stimulant use disorders, given the increasing prevalence of stimulant-related morbidity and mortality. Additionally, studies examining overdose risk and fatalities across multiple racial and sexual and gender identities are needed to understand and address disparities. Beyond epidemiology, implementation science research is needed to understand how to translate evidence-based interventions into community practice with fidelity. Equally critical is research on the integration of pharmacological, psychosocial and harm reduction interventions to optimize treatment outcomes. Another underserved population involves adolescents and young adults, given the developmental sensitivity of this period. Finally, research on the long-term outcomes of substance use disorder treatment is needed to understand recovery trajectories and factors associated with sustained abstinence.

11. Conclusion

This comprehensive review has examined the epidemiology, neurobiology, clinical presentations, evidence-based interventions, harm reduction approaches and health policy frameworks relevant to substance use disorders. The findings underscore the substantial public health burden of substance use disorders, affecting millions of individuals worldwide and contributing to significant morbidity, mortality and societal costs. The convergence of substance use disorders with criminal justice involvement, mental health comorbidity and infectious disease transmission creates complex challenges requiring integrated, multi-modal approaches.

The neurobiological understanding of addiction has advanced significantly, providing the foundation for pharmacological interventions that target the core neurobiological mechanisms of addiction. Evidence-based treatments exist for substance

use disorders, including pharmacological interventions and psychosocial approaches that demonstrate efficacy in reducing substance use and improving functioning. Harm reduction approaches have proven effectiveness in reducing overdose mortality and infectious disease transmission. Despite this evidence, significant gaps persist in treatment access and implementation, with regulatory barriers, stigma and disparities in healthcare access impeding the reach of effective interventions.

The high prevalence of substance use disorders and their multiple adverse outcomes underscore the critical need for provision of evidence-based interventions. Expanding and integrating prison-based and post-release interventions to address substance use has the potential to yield both public health and criminal justice benefits. Policy reforms that decriminalize drug possession, expand Medicaid coverage for substance use treatment, eliminate regulatory barriers to medication-assisted treatment and address social determinants of health are essential for improving treatment access and outcomes.

Despite challenges, there is reason for optimism in translating the rich biological understanding of addiction into improved treatments for the many individuals burdened by this illness around the world. The evidence synthesized in this review provides a roadmap for comprehensive, evidence-based approaches to addressing substance use disorders that integrate pharmacological management, behavioral interventions and harm reduction services within a supportive policy environment. The implementation of these approaches has the potential to substantially reduce the individual and societal burden of substance use disorders and improve the health and wellbeing of affected individuals, families and communities.

12. References

1. Favril L, Strang J, Fazel S. Drug use among people in prison: A global review of epidemiology, harms and interventions. Addiction, 2025.
2. LaBelle R, Holtgrave DR. Progress under threat: The future of overdose prevention in the United States. Brookings Institution, 2025.
3. American Psychiatric Association. Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (5th ed.). American Psychiatric Publishing, 2013.
4. Regier PS, et al. The neurobiology and genetics of substance use disorder. In D. L. Evans et al. (Eds.), Treating and Preventing Adolescent Mental Health Disorders (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press, 2026.
5. Nestler EJ. The biology of addiction. Science Signaling, 2025;18.
6. Sablaban IM, Barada H. Substance use disorders: Biologic mechanisms and pharmacologic interventions. Advances in Psychiatry and Behavioral Health, 2025.
7. Mateu-Mollá J, Pérez-Gálvez B, Villanueva-Blasco VJ. Pharmacological treatment for substance use disorder: A systematic review. Addictive Behaviors, 2025;163: 108242.
8. Magill M, et al. A meta-analysis of cognitive behavioral therapy for substance use disorder: Treatment effects by comparator type and consumption and psychosocial outcomes. Behaviour Research and Therapy, 2026;203: 105101.
9. LaBelle R, Holtgrave DR. U.S. substance use harm reduction efforts: A review of the current state of policy, policy barriers and recommendations. Harm Reduction Journal, 2025;22: 101.
10. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. World Drug Report 2024. Vienna: UNODC, 2024.
11. Degenhardt L, Grebely J, Stone J, et al. Global patterns of opioid use and dependence: harms to populations, interventions and future action. The Lancet, 2019;394: 1560-1579.
12. Grant BF, Saha TD, Ruan WJ, et al. Epidemiology of DSM-5 drug use disorder: results from the National Epidemiologic Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions–III. JAMA Psychiatry, 2016;73: 39-47.
13. Bronson J, Berzofsky M. Drug use, dependence and abuse among state prisoners and jail inmates, 2007-2009. Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2017.
14. Kinner SA, Moore KE, Spittal MJ. Drug use in prison: a global review. International Journal of Drug Policy, 2018;55: 69-78.
15. Dolan K, Moazen B, Noori A, et al. People who inject drugs in prison: HIV prevalence, transmission and prevention. International Journal of Drug Policy, 2016;25: 12-18.
16. Fazel S, Seewald K. Severe mental illness in 33,588 prisoners worldwide: systematic review and meta-regression analysis. British Journal of Psychiatry, 2012;200: 364-373.
17. Binswanger IA, Stern MF, Deyo RA, et al. Release from prison-a high risk of death for former inmates. New England Journal of Medicine, 2007;356: 157-165.
18. Johnston LD, Miech RA, O'Malley PM, et al. Monitoring the Future national survey results on drug use, 1975-2019. Institute for Social Research, 2020.
19. Casey BJ, Jones RM, Hare TA. The adolescent brain. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 2008;1124: 111-126.
20. Kessler RC, Nelson CB, McGonagle KA, et al. The epidemiology of co-occurring addictive and mental disorders: implications for prevention and service utilization. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1996;66: 17-31.
21. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. National Survey on Drug Use and Health 2023. Rockville, MD: SAMHSA, 2024.
22. Ciccarone D. The rise of illicit fentanyls, stimulants and the fourth wave of the opioid overdose crisis. Current Opinion in Psychiatry, 2021;34: 344-350.
23. Friedman J, Hansen H. Racial and ethnic disparities in overdose mortality in the United States. American Journal of Public Health, 2024;114: 289-296.
24. Hedegaard H, Miniño AM, Warner M. Drug overdose deaths in the United States, 1999-2019. NCHS Data Brief, 2021;394: 1-8.
25. Volkow ND, Koob GF, McLellan AT. Neurobiologic advances from the brain disease model of addiction. New England Journal of Medicine, 2016;374: 363-371.
26. Ritz MC, Lamb RJ, Goldberg SR, et al. Cocaine receptors on dopamine transporters are related to self-administration of cocaine. Science, 1987;237: 1219-1223.
27. Picciotto MR, Zoli M, Rimondini R, et al. Acetylcholine receptors containing the β2 subunit are involved in the reinforcing properties of nicotine. Nature, 1998;391: 173-177.
28. Johnson SW, North RA. Opioids excite dopamine neurons by hyperpolarization of local interneurons. Journal of Neuroscience, 1992;12: 483-488.
29. Koob GF, Volkow ND. Neurocircuitry of addiction. Neuropsychopharmacology, 2010;35(1): 217-238.
30. Lüscher C, Malenka RC. Drug-evoked synaptic plasticity in addiction: from molecular changes to circuit remodeling. Neuron, 2011;69: 650-663.
31. Robinson TE, Kolb B. Structural plasticity associated with exposure to drugs of abuse. Neuropharmacology, 2004;47: 33-46.
32. Verdejo-García A, Lawrence AJ, Clark L. Impulsivity as a vulnerability marker for substance-use disorders: review of findings from high-

risk research, problem gamblers and genetic association studies. Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews, 2008;32: 777-810.

33. McKetin R, Leung J, Stockings E, et al. Mental health outcomes associated with the use of amphetamines: A systematic review and meta-analysis. EClinicalMedicine, 2017;16: 81-97.
34. Budney AJ, Sofis MJ, Borodovsky JT. An update on cannabis use disorder with a focus on the clinical features and diagnostic criteria. Current Addiction Reports, 2014;1: 168-175.
35. Hall W, Degenhardt L. Adverse health effects of non-medical cannabis use. The Lancet, 2009;374: 1383-1391.
36. Reilly J, et al. Comprehensive care processes for substance use disorders in adult mental health services: A systematic review. Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry, 2025;59: 209-223.
37. Rehm J, Gmel GE, Gmel G, et al. The relationship between different dimensions of alcohol use and the burden of disease-an update. Addiction, 2017;112(6): 968-1001.
38. US Department of Health and Human Services. The health consequences of smoking-50 years of progress: A report of the Surgeon General. Atlanta: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2014.
39. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Smoking cessation: A report of the Surgeon General. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2020.
40. Cahill K, Stevens S, Perera R, et al. Pharmacological interventions for smoking cessation: an overview and network meta-analysis. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, 2016: 009329.
41. Koegelenberg CF, Noor F, Bateman ED, et al. Efficacy of varenicline combined with nicotine replacement therapy vs varenicline alone for smoking cessation: a randomized clinical trial. JAMA, 2014;312(2): 155-161.
42. Sherman BJ, McRae-Clark AL. Treatment of cannabis use disorder: current science and future outlook. Pharmacotherapy, 2016;36: 511-535.
43. Davis DR, Kurti AN, Skelly JM, et al. A review of the literature on contingency management in the treatment of substance use disorders, 2009-2014. Preventive Medicine, 2015;92: 36-46.
44. Petry NM, Alessi SM, Rash CJ. Contingency management treatments for substance use disorders. Current Addiction Reports, 2012;1: 121-128.
45. Miller WR, Rollnick S. Motivational interviewing: Helping people change (3rd ed.). Guilford Press, 2013.
46. De Leon G. The therapeutic community: An overview. Journal of Groups in Addiction & Recovery, 2010;5: 215-235.
47. Hogue A, Henderson CE, Ozechowski TJ, et al. Evidence base on outpatient behavioral treatments for adolescent substance use: Updates and recommendations 2007-2013. Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology, 2014;43(5): 695-720.
48. Strang J, Bird SM, Parmar MK. Take-home emergency naloxone to prevent deaths from heroin overdose. BMJ, 2015;350: 1374.
49. Davis C, Chang S, Banta-Green C. Good Samaritan laws: A state-by-state guide. Network for Public Health Law, 2014.
50. Walley AY, Xuan Z, Hackman HH, et al. Opioid overdose rates and implementation of overdose education and nasal naloxone distribution in Massachusetts: interrupted time series analysis. BMJ, 2013;346: 174.
51. Bird SM, McAuley A, Perry S, et al. Effectiveness of Scotland's National Naloxone Programme for reducing opioid-related deaths: a before (2006-10) versus after (2011-13) comparison. Addiction, 2016;111: 883-891.
52. Wodak A, Cooney A. Do needle syringe programs reduce HIV infection among injecting drug users: a comprehensive review of the international evidence. Substance Use & Misuse, 2006;41: 777-813.
53. Kennedy MC, Karamouzian M, Kerr T. Public health and public order outcomes associated with supervised drug consumption facilities: a systematic review. Current HIV/AIDS Reports, 2017;14: 161-183.
54. Alexander M. The new Jim Crow: Mass incarceration in the age of colorblindness. The New Press, 2012.
55. Haffajee RL, Lin LA, Bohnert AS. Characteristics of US counties with high opioid overdose mortality and low capacity to deliver medications for opioid use disorder. JAMA Network Open, 2019;2(6): e196373.
56. Lin LA, Casteel D, Shigekawa E, et al. Telemedicine-delivered treatment for substance use disorder: A scoping review. Journal of Telemedicine and Telecare, 2020;26(4): 201-209.
57. Koob GF, Volkow ND. Neurobiology of addiction: a neurocircuitry analysis. The Lancet Psychiatry, 2016;3: 760-773.