

# Comparative effectiveness of residential versus outpatient treatment for pregnant substance abusers

### OBJECTIVE

The objective of this study was to compare effectiveness of outpatient versus residential substance abuse treatment for pregnant women with chemical dependency.

### BACKGROUND

There is evidence that treatment can be effective for female substance abusers. However, few (if any) data are available regarding the comparative effectiveness of residential versus outpatient treatment for pregnant women with substance abuse problems.

Residential treatment by definition, provides shelter and reduces availability of substances (such as alcohol) while delivering care for chemical dependency.

On the other hand, residential treatment removes clients from their usual home and work environments and is more expensive than outpatient care.

While not focusing on pregnant substance abusers, studies have generally found little difference in outcomes for residential versus outpatient chemical dependency treatment.

Some "matching" studies have suggested that residential services may be counterproductive for certain substance abuse patients.

However, research has also suggested that client factors (such as addiction severity) may moderate treatment impact so that sub-groups of substance abusers differentially benefit from residential (versus outpatient) care.

These issues have rarely (if ever) been addressed for pregnant female substance abusers. Randomized trials are unlikely because a typical treatment agency might serve (at most) a handful of pregnant clients each year. But observational studies must deal with non-random assignment to residential care (endogeneity). This project employed national data to address these issues.

### Data

Ο

im	Opt
tre	
tra	

- > death

### Predictors

### Sample

### Analyses

Anne E. Kovas MPH and Bentson H. McFarland MD PhD

Department of Psychiatry, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, Oregon



### RESULTS

Table 1 shows there were substantial differences in demographics, clinical characteristics, and chances of optimal discharge among pregnant women in residential versus outpatient programs. Bi-variate analyses suggested residential treatment favored optimal discharge.

Facility information (i.e., fraction of clients receiving residential care) from N-SSATS was a powerful predictor of residential versus outpatient treatment in TEDS-D (e.g., F (1,207) = 18.6 for 2007)

Table 2 shows that differences in optimal discharge (favoring residential care) persisted after adjustment for individual characteristics and lack of independence among facilities in multi-level models. However, when endogeneity was addressed in multi-level residual inclusion models these outcome differences were no longer statistically significant.

## Table 1. Pregnant female discharges

	Outpatient	Residential	
	(N = 28.012)	(N = 11.340)	
Age	(11 - 20,012)	(11 - 11,010)	p < 0.01
12-17	5.5%	2.1%	
18-29	67.3%	67.9%	
30-39	23.1%	26.6%	
40-49	3.6%	3.1%	
50 plus	0.5%	0.3%	
Race			p< 0.01
White	61.6%	59.4%	
Black	21.0%	21.5%	
Other	17.4%	19.1%	
Latina	16.6%	15.7%	p = 0.03
Married	10.3%	8.0%	p < 0.01
High school or more	52.9%	51.9%	p = 0.76
Employed (full or part)	16.8%	4.5%	p < 0.01
Census region			p < 0.01
Northeast	17.2%	13.9%	
Midwest	23.3%	19.5%	
South	25.0%	27.7%	
West	34.4%	38.9%	
Criminal justice referral	34.6%	30.7%	p < 0.01
Psychiatric problem	29.2%	30.4%	p = 0.02
Primary substance			p < 0.01
None	0.8%	0.1%	
Alcohol	16.6%	11.3%	
Cocaine/crack	14.4%	28.6%	
Marijuana/hashish	25.0%	13.3%	
Heroin/other opiates	20.3%	14.4%	
Methamphetamine	21.5%	30.5%	
Other	1.5%	1.6%	
First treatment episode	41.5%	36.2%	p < 0.01
Optimal discharge	54.1%	61.8%	p < 0.01

## Table 2. Multi-level logistic regression models

Multi-le Res Res Wor Prec

## Multi-le

Res

Models are all multi-level with discharge the bottom level and geographic area the top level. Geographic areas are Core Based Statistical Areas (formerly known as Metropolitan Statistical Areas) or rural parts of each state. All geographic areas have at least one pregnant female discharge during the study years.

Models are all adjusted at the level of the discharge for age, race, ethnicity, education, marital status, employment, census region, criminal justice referral, co-occurring psychiatric problem, primary substance of abuse, and first treatment episode (from TEDS-D).

Multi-level only models are also adjusted at the top level for geographic area fraction of residential clients (of residential plus outpatient clients), fraction of agencies in the area with special services for women, and fraction of agencies with special services for pregnant women in the geographic area (from N-SSATS).

Residual inclusion models are multi-level without top level predictors.

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration Center for Behavioral Health Statistics and Quality (formerly Office of Applied Studies) Substance Abuse and Mental Health Data Archive at the University of Michigan

Treatment Episode Data Set – Discharges 2006 through 2008 (41 states) National Survey of Substance Abuse Treatment Services 2006 through 2008

CONCLUSIONS In two-stage multi-level models addressing both endogeneity and dependency among agencies, it appears that residential treatment offers no differential improvement in chances of optimal discharge for pregnant women with substance abuse problems.

Policy makers and funders may wish to consider creation of outpatient programs tailored for the needs of this group.

	Odds Ratio	95% Confidence Interval	p-value
vel only			
idential treatment (bottom level)	1.37	(1.22, 1.54)	0.01
idential fraction (top level)	1.25	(0.50, 3.32)	NS
nen's services fraction (top level)	0.69	(0.37, 1.28)	NS
gnant services fraction (top level)	1.22	(0.53, 2.83)	NS
vel residual inclusion			
idential treatment (bottom level)	1.33	(0.70, 2.50)	NS

### Dependent variable (bottom level) is optimal versus other than optimal discharge

Data sources

## Supported by the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) grant number R21 HS019510

Corresponding author: Bentson H. McFarland MD PhD mcfarlab@ohsu.edu