An Estimation of Drug-Related Deaths in Iran, Using the Capture-Recapture Method (2014-2016)

Masoudeh Babakhanian¹, <u>Mehran Zarghami</u>², Abbas Alipour³, Ardeshir Khosravi⁴, Seyed Saeed Hashemi-Nazari⁵, Mehdi Saberi⁶, Mohammad Reza Ghadirzadeh⁷

Abstract

Original Article

Background: The Ministry of Health and Medical Education (MOHME) and the Legal Medicine Organization (LMO) are the 2 death registration systems in Iran for registering drug-related deaths. The aim of the present study was to assess the number of undercount and the overlap between the deaths registered by the 2 sources.

Methods: In this descriptive study, according to the 10th revision of the International Classification of Diseases (ICD-10), the registered data on drug-related deaths in the years 2014-2016, as recorded by the MOHME and the LMO, were collected and the number of deaths was estimated using 2-source capture-recapture method and Excel and SPSS software.

Findings: The total number of drug-related deaths, as registered by the 2 sources, was 8639 during the 3 years. A major part of the drug-related deaths (75% of the data) had been registered by the LMO and only 25% of deaths had been registered by the MOHME. There was also a small overlap (7.7% of deaths) between the data from the 2 sources. The final estimation from the capture-recapture model and analysis of sensitivity showed that, during the 3 years, the total number of drug-related deaths was 14517 [95% confidence interval (CI):14498-14558]. Based on the complete overlap assumption and 50% of unidentified individuals in the 2 sources, the number of deaths was estimated at 11341 and 12418, respectively. The largest number of drug-related deaths had occurred within the age range of 25-39 years and in men. Kermanshah, Hamedan, and Zanjan Provinces (Iran) had the largest number of cumulative incidences of drug-related deaths. Based on the data provided by the MOHME, the most common cause of death was Methadone poisoning.

Conclusion: There was a small overlap between the MOHME and the LMO in the registration of drug-related deaths. Failure to enter accurate and correct information has led to miscalculations of these deaths in Iran.

Keyword: Death; Substance-related disorders; Iran

Citation: Babakhanian M, Zarghami M, Alipour A, Khosravi A, Hashemi-Nazari SS, Saberi K, et al. **An Estimation of Drug-Related Deaths in Iran, Using the Capture-Recapture Method (2014-2016).** Addict Health 2020; 12(2): 87-97.

Received: 25.11.2019

Accepted: 16.01.2020

1- Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences Research Center, Addiction Institute, Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences, Sari, Iran 2- Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences Research Center, Addiction Institute AND Department of Psychiatry, School of Medicine, Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences, Sari, Iran

- 3- Department of Social Medicine, School of Medicine, Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences, Sari, Iran
- 4- Deputy for Public Health, Ministry of Health and Medical Education, Tehran, Iran

- University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran
- 6- Legal Medicine Organization, Tehran, Iran
- 7- Legal Medicine Research Center, Legal Medicine Organization, Tehran, Iran

Correspondence to: Mehran Zarghami; Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences Research Center, Addiction Institute AND Department of Psychiatry, School of Medicine, Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences, Sari, Iran; Email: mehran.zarghami@gmail.com

⁵⁻ Promotion and Injury Prevention Research Center AND Department of Epidemiology, School of Public Health, Shahid Beheshti

Introduction

Based on the World Health Organization estimations in 2015, about 450000 people have lost their lives due to illegal drug use, out of which about 160000 were directly related to disorders caused by drug use and 118000 were caused by opioids.¹

Despite the measures taken nationwide in Iran to reduce the consequences of illegal drug use, the prevalence of drug use has been growing in the last two decades particularly among men.² The results of a study carried out from 2006 to 2011 in Iran to determine drug-related fatality rate showed that fatality rate varied from 3.62 to 2.77 in every 100000 individuals in 2006 and 2011, respectively.³ One major reason for this might be Iran's neighboring countries; one of these neighboring countries, i.e., Afghanistan, is the largest producer of opium in the world, which makes easy access to drugs possible.⁴ Drug hospitalization overdose, in psychiatric departments, suicide, injective drug use, drug use in families, and imprisonment have been identified as the most important causes of druginduced deaths in Iran.5,6

Today, death registration has legal aspects and many uses in different fields. Accurate identification of the causes of death can be helpful in the development and execution of certain plans to decrease the risk factors associated with different The quality of death registration diseases. procedures varies across organizations, and this endangers the validity of information.7 Considering the fact that correct and accurate death registration provides a legally important document with many applications at the state and national levels in the disease tracking process, public health policies, and allocation of financial resources and research, it is important to exercise care both in death registration and in determining the cause of death.8,9

However, there is no specialized countrywide registration system in Iran for identifying suicide cases in addiction. Moreover, different organizations and sources provide different statistics in this regard. The capture-recapture technique is a cost-effective method to resolve this problem relying on two or more sources of incomplete, but independent information and, more importantly, their degree of overlap. This method assesses the number of reported deaths by integrating the number of deaths registered in different sources.¹⁰

Deaths and diseases caused by tobacco products, alcohol, and illegal drugs impose a heavy burden on public health in Iran. Accordingly, gathering comprehensive data to identify the target deceased population and evaluate the efficiency of different policies in the prevention and treatment of drug use and its harms is quite essential. The findings of the current study, and examination of the geographical distribution and the likely undercount of drug-induced deaths can be informative to the related authorities in terms of analyzing the likely changing trend of death causes and planning to improve both the quantity and quality of registration of drug-related deaths. The present study was conducted to assess the accuracy of drug-induced deaths registered from 2014 to 2016 in the 2 sources of death registration in Iran including the Health Department of the Ministry of Health and Medical Education (MOHME) and the Legal Medicine Organization (LMO).

Methods

In this descriptive study, the number of drugrelated deaths among the deceased individuals was separately calculated for each province in Iran in the years 2014-2016 based on the 2 sources of death registration, the Department of Health affiliated with the MOHME and LMO.

The drug-induced death codes were searched in accordance with the 10th revision of the International Classification of Diseases (ICD-10) based on type of drug causing the death with the codes T.40.0, T.40.3, T.50.9, T.51.9, T.43.6, and T.42.4 and the underlying cause of death with the codes X41, X42, X45, X61, X62, X65, Y11, Y12, Y15, Y40.0, Y49.7, and Y47.1. The underlying causes of drug-related overdose death in this classification¹¹ include fatal poisoning by alcohol (ethanol and methanol), opioid substances poisoning/overdose opium derivatives), sedatives (e.g., (e.g., barbiturates and benzodiazepines), stimulants (e.g., cocaine and amphetamines), nicotine, a combination of several substances, and medical drugs (e.g., tramadol).¹² However, if an individual dies in outpatient clinics, surgery centers, hospitals, or their house due to drug use, the corpse is transferred by the physician to the LMO for autopsy because the cause of these deaths are suspicious. Then, the information related to the deceased will be accessible from that organization in the form of a death certificate.

The number of deaths was estimated using the 2-source capture-recapture method and data scrubbing was done manually in a Microsoft Excel file. The MOHME and LMO were requested to provide information about the deceased persons including their name, family name, national code, age, gender, province in which they lived, province in which they died, month of death, and type of drug causing the death. LMO did not have the information related to the type of drug causing the death. After obtaining the data, first, for the sake of homogeneity, unusual names were reviewed (the space between the letters was removed and the names that could be written in different forms were identified and homogenized). To calculate the overlap between the 2 sources, the cases with at least 5 similar characteristics including name, family name, age, gender, national code, and province in which they died were considered as common between the 2 sources.

Excel and SPSS software (version 23, IBM Corporation, Armonk, NY, USA) were used for recording and analyzing the collected data, respectively. Descriptive statistics were utilized for reporting the demographic information related to the deceased individuals such as their age, gender, type of drug consumed, and place of death. Cumulative incidence (Risk) of each related cause of death was assessed for provinces (the nominator was the number of deaths for each related cause and the denominator was the population in 2014 multiplied by 100000). The demographic characteristics data were obtained from the Statistical Center of Iran. To calculate the total number of drug-related deaths (N) at a confidence interval (CI) of 95%, the following formulas were used based on capture-recapture method: where "a" is the total number of deaths determined by LMO (primary source), "b" is the total number of cases determined by the Department of Health (secondary source), and "c" is the number of cases common between the 2 sources.^{13,14}

$$var(N) = \frac{[(a + 1)(b + 1)(b - c)(a - c)]}{(c + 1)^2(c + 2)}$$

95% CI = N ± Z\sqrt{var(N)}
N = $\left[\frac{(a + 1)(b + 1)}{(c + 1)}\right] - 1$

In the capture-recapture estimate (sensitivity analysis), 3 analyses were conducted. In the first analysis, all unidentified deceased persons (those without any information available regarding their name, family name, age, gender, and national code) were eliminated. In the second analysis, 50% of the unidentified deceased persons were considered. In the third analysis, all of them were included in the analysis. Then, the outcomes of the 3 analyses were reported with 95% CI.

The present study was approved and supported by the Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences Research Center of Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences, Iran, with the grant number 10295 and research ethics code IR.MAZUMS.REC.1398.445 in 2019.

Results

As shown in table 1, the total number of reported deaths in the 2 sources during the 3 years is 8639. A major part (6484 people, accounting for 75%) of the data related to drug-induced deaths belongs to the LMO and the share of MOHME in the registered deaths in the 3 years is 2155 individuals. Accordingly, only a small portion (665 individuals, accounting for 7.7%) of the data was common between the 2 sources.

The highest exposure to poisoning and drug-related death can be observed in both men and women and within the age range of 25 to 39 years and the biggest contributing cause of death is methadone (according to MOHME data). Due to the LMO's lack of reporting of the type of poisoning causing the death some cells are left empty in this table.

As shown in table 2, the highest cumulative drug-induced death incidence during the 3 years was in Kermanshah, Hamedan, and Zanjan (Iran) with 22.78, 20.56, and 18.55 deaths in every 100000 individuals, respectively.

As presented in table 3, in the final estimation of the capture-recapture model and analysis of sensitivity carried out based on the status of identified and unidentified individuals during the 3 years, the total number of drug-related deaths in Iran was calculated to be 14517 (at 95% CI: 14498-14558).

This estimate, taking into account all and half of the unidentified deceased persons, was 12418 and 11341 death as registered by the two mentioned sources, respectively. That is, in the most optimistic way (with all unidentified deceased and with half of the unidentified deceased) to calculate drug-related deaths in 2014-2016 with capture-recapture method.

Addict Health, Spring 2020; Vol 12, No 2

Year IMO MOINE MOINE Point 2016 Total [n (%)] 2361 (100) 224 (100) 541 (100) 3186 (100) 2016 Total male [n (%)] 2066 (88.8) 257 (90.5) 456 (84.3) 2809 (88.1) 2015 Total [n (%)] 0 (0) 0 (0) 0 (0) 0 (0) 0 (0) 2015 Total [n (%)] 1753 (88.3) 189 (89.6) 460 (85.0) 247 (45.0) 2014 Total [n (%)] 1753 (88.3) 189 (89.6) 460 (85.0) 247 (45.0) 2014 Total [n (%)] 128 (11.5) 22 (10.4) 90 (16.4) 340 (12.4) 2014 Total [n (%)] 194 (90.7) 12 (7.0) 66 (16.3) 272 (10.7) Unknown [n (%)] 4 (0.2) 0 (0) 0 (0) 4 (0.2) 2016 Age of men (year) (mean ± SD) 37.1 ± 12.8 38.4 ± 13.0 42.9 ± 17.7 39.4 ± 14.5 <25 [n (%)] 56 (17.0) 34 (13.3) 63 (13.0) 453 (14.2) 25.39 [n (%)] 66 (1 (30.5) 27 (11.8)	Т	ble 1. Characteristics of sample by registry sources				
2016 Total [n (%)] 236 (100) 244 (100) 541 (100) 318 (5 (100) Total female [n (%)] 2096 (88.8) 257 (90.5) 456 (84.3) 2809 (88.1) Total female [n (%)] 0 (0) 0 (0) 0 (0) 0 (0) 0 (0) 2015 Total [n (%)] 1985 (100) 274 (64 (100) 346 (12.4) Total male [n (%)] 228 (11.5) 22 (10.4) 90 (16.4) 340 (12.4) Unknown [n (%)] 4 (0.2) 0 (0) 0 (0) 4 (0.1) 2014 Total male [n (%)] 1940 (90.7) 158 (35.0) 333 (88.7) 2431 (89.1) Total female [n (%)] 194 (9.07) 12 (7.0) 66 (16.3) 272 (10.7) Unknown [n (%)] 40.2) 0 (0) 0 (0) 4 (0.2) Age of men (year) (mean ± SD) 37.1 ± 12.8 38.4 ± 13.0 42.9 ± 1.7.7 39.4 ± 14.5 <25 [n (%)] 356 (17.0) 34 (13.3) 63 (13.8) 453 (14.2) 25.3 [n (%)] 191 (57.7) 16 (6.43) 142 (13.1) 1211 (38.0) 25.5 [n (%)]			LMO	MOH	IME	Total
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			Only LMO	Only MOHM	Both	
$ \begin{array}{c cccc} Total [cn (%)] & 25 (11.2) & 27 (9.5) & 85 (15.7) & 377 (11.9) \\ Unknown [n (%)] & 1985 (100) & 211 (100) & 550 (100) & 2746 (100) \\ Total male [n (%)] & 1753 (88.3) & 189 (89.6) & 460 (83.6) & 2402 (87.5) \\ Total female [n (%)] & 228 (11.5) & 22 (10.4) & 90 (16.4) & 340 (12.4) \\ Unknown [n (\%)] & 2138 (100) & 170 (100) & 399 (100) & 2707 (100) \\ Total male [n (\%)] & 1940 (90.7) & 158 (93.0) & 333 (83.7) & 2431 (89.1) \\ Total female [n (\%)] & 1940 (90.7) & 158 (93.0) & 333 (83.7) & 2431 (89.1) \\ Total female [n (\%)] & 1940 (90.7) & 158 (93.0) & 333 (83.7) & 2431 (89.1) \\ Total female [n (\%)] & 1940 (90.7) & 158 (93.0) & 333 (83.7) & 2431 (89.1) \\ Total female [n (\%)] & 356 (17.0) & 34 (13.3) & 63 (13.8) & 453 (14.2) \\ & 225 [n (\%)] & 356 (17.0) & 34 (13.3) & 63 (13.8) & 453 (14.2) \\ & 225 39 [n (\%)] & 356 (17.0) & 34 (13.3) & 63 (13.8) & 453 (14.2) \\ & 22.5 39 [n (\%)] & 119 (5.7) & 166 (6.3) & 76 (16.7) & 211 (6.5) \\ & Unknown & 27 (1.3) & 12 (4.7) & 24 (5.3) & 157 (27.3) \\ & 260 [n (\%)] & 119 (5.7) & 166 (6.3) & 76 (16.7) & 211 (6.5) \\ & Unknown & 27 (1.3) & 12 (4.7) & 24 (5.3) & 63 (2.0) \\ & Age of women (year) (mean \pm SD) & 31.5 \pm 14.4 & 34.5 \pm 15.3 & 40.3 \pm 25.5 & 35.4 \pm 18.4 \\ & < 25 [n (\%)] & 85 (32.1) & 5 (18.5) & 27 (13.8) & 117 (3.7) \\ 25.39 [n (\%)] & 111 (42.2) & 2 (7.4) & 23 (27.1) & 36 (1.1) \\ Unknown [n (\%)] & 11 (4.2) & 1 (3.7) & 1 (1.2) & 14 (0.5) \\ & 260 [n (\%)] & 11 (4.2) & 1 (3.7) & 1 (1.2) & 14 (0.5) \\ & 260 [n (\%)] & 11 (4.2) & 1 (3.7) & 1 (1.2) & 14 (0.5) \\ & Age of women (year) (mean \pm SD) & 36.5 \pm 13.1 & 38.1 \pm 13.2 & 42.2.5 & 743 (30.9) \\ & \geq 60 [n (\%)] & 78 (4.4) & 11 (5.8) & 711 (15.5) & 160 (6.7) \\ & Unknown [n (\%)] & 79 (45.5) & 88 (46.6) & 160 (3.9) & 104 (53.4) \\ & 40-59 [n (\%)] & 79 (45.5) & 88 (4.6) & 10 (54.9) & 104 (53.4) \\ & 40-59 [n (\%)] & 60 (26.6) & 83 (6.4) & 10 (43.9) & 104 (53.4) \\ & 40-59 [n (\%)] & 60 (26.6) & 83 (6.4) & 10 (43.9) & 104 (53.5) \\ & 260 [n (\%)] & 60 (26.6) & 83 (6.4) & 10 (43.9) & 104 (53.5) \\ & 260 [n (\%)] & 60 (26.2) & 3 (13.6) & 18 (20.0) $						
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		Total male [n (%)]	2096 (88.8)	257 (90.5)	· · · ·	2809 (88.1)
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			265 (11.2)	· · · ·	` '	377 (11.9)
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		/-			· · · ·	
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $						
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $				· · · ·		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		/-		· · /		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					· · ·	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			· · ·			
Age 2016Age of men (year) (mean ± SD) < 25 [n (%)]			· · · ·			
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			4 (0.2)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0.2)
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		<25 [n (%)]	356 (17.0)	34 (13.3)	63 (13.8)	453 (14.2)
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		40-59 [n (%)]	641 (30.6)	78 (30.5)	151 (33.1)	870 (27.3)
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $						
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$. ,
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$					· · · ·	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $						
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$				· · ·		
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$				· · ·		
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		/-				· · · ·
Age of women (year) (mean \pm SD) 23.1 ± 13.6 36.4 ± 21.0 34.4 ± 23.9 23.6 ± 17.4 $< 25 [n (\%)]$ $60 (26.6)$ $8 (36.4)$ $36 (40)$ $104 (30.5)$ $25-39 [n (\%)]$ $99 (43.2)$ $6 (27.3)$ $21 (23.3)$ $126 (37.0)$ $40-59 [n (\%)]$ $60 (26.2)$ $3 (13.6)$ $18 (20.0)$ $81 (23.8)$ $\geq 60 [n (\%)]$ $5 (2.2)$ $5 (22.7)$ $13 (14.4)$ $23 (6.7)$ Unknown [n (\%)] $4 (1.7)$ $0 (0)$ $2 (2.2)$ $6 (1.2)$ Age of the whole population (year) (mean \pm SD) 36.6 ± 32.5 36.9 ± 14.2 41.3 ± 17.3 36.8 ± 14.1 2014Age of men (year) (mean \pm SD) 38.1 ± 32.8 36.8 ± 11.8 38.5 ± 19.1 37.8 ± 21.2 $< 25 [n (\%)]$ $304 (15.6)$ $20 (12.6)$ $56 (16.8)$ $380 (15.0)$ $25-39 [n (\%)]$ $655 (33.7)$ $42 (26.6)$ $103 (30.9)$ $800 (33.0)$ $\ge 60 [n (\%)]$ $87 (4.5)$ $8 (5.1)$ $45 (13.5)$ $140 (5.6)$ Unknown [n (\%)] $30 (1.6)$ $1 (0.6)$ $9 (2.8)$ $40 (1.5)$ Unknown [n (\%)] 38.4 ± 14.8 31.9 ± 18.9 31.2 ± 24.4 32.6 ± 19.2 Age of women (year) (mean \pm SD) $49 (24.9)$ $5 (41.7)$ $30 (45.5)$ $84 (31.0)$ $< 25 [n (\%)]$ $77 (39.1)$ $5 (41.7)$ $16 (24.2)$ $98 (36.02)$. ,			
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						
Age of the whole population (year) (mean \pm SD) 36.6 ± 32.5 36.9 ± 14.2 41.3 ± 17.3 36.8 ± 14.1 2014Age of men (year) (mean \pm SD) 38.1 ± 32.8 36.8 ± 11.8 38.5 ± 19.1 37.8 ± 21.2 < 25 [n (%)] 304 (15.6)20 (12.6) 56 (16.8) 380 (15.0)25-39 [n (%)]- 864 (44.6) 87 (55.1)120 (36.0) 1071 (45.0) $40-59$ [n (%)] 655 (33.7) 42 (26.6) 103 (30.9) 800 (33.0) ≥ 60 [n (%)] 87 (4.5) 8 (5.1) 45 (13.5) 140 (5.6)Unknown [n (%)] 30 (1.6) 1 (0.6) 9 (2.8) 40 (1.5)Unknown [n (%)] 38.4 ± 14.8 31.9 ± 18.9 31.2 ± 24.4 32.6 ± 19.2 Age of women (year) (mean \pm SD) 49 (24.9) 5 (41.7) 30 (45.5) 84 (31.0) < 25 [n (%)] 77 (39.1) 5 (41.7) 16 (24.2) 98 (36.02)						
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$					· · · ·	
$ \begin{array}{cccc} Unknown \left[n \left(\%\right)\right] & 30 \left(1.6\right) & 1 \left(0.6\right) & 9 \left(2.8\right) & 40 \left(1.5\right) \\ Unknown \left[n \left(\%\right)\right] & 38.4 \pm 14.8 & 31.9 \pm 18.9 & 31.2 \pm 24.4 & 32.6 \pm 19.2 \\ Age of women (year) (mean \pm SD) & 49 \left(24.9\right) & 5 \left(41.7\right) & 30 \left(45.5\right) & 84 \left(31.0\right) \\ < 25 \left[n \left(\%\right)\right] & 77 \left(39.1\right) & 5 \left(41.7\right) & 16 \left(24.2\right) & 98 \left(36.02\right) \\ \end{array} $		40-59 [n (%)]			103 (30.9)	800 (33.0)
$ \begin{array}{ccc} Unknown \left[n \left(\%\right)\right] & 38.4 \pm 14.8 & 31.9 \pm 18.9 & 31.2 \pm 24.4 & 32.6 \pm 19.2 \\ Age of women (year) (mean \pm SD) & 49 (24.9) & 5 (41.7) & 30 (45.5) & 84 (31.0) \\ < 25 \left[n \left(\%\right)\right] & 77 (39.1) & 5 (41.7) & 16 (24.2) & 98 (36.02) \end{array} $		≥ 60 [n (%)]	87 (4.5)	8 (5.1)	45 (13.5)	140 (5.6)
Age of women (year) (mean \pm SD)49 (24.9)5 (41.7)30 (45.5)84 (31.0)< 25 [n (%)]77 (39.1)5 (41.7)16 (24.2)98 (36.02)		Unknown [n (%)]	30 (1.6)	1 (0.6)	9 (2.8)	40 (1.5)
Age of women (year) (mean \pm SD)49 (24.9)5 (41.7)30 (45.5)84 (31.0)< 25 [n (%)]77 (39.1)5 (41.7)16 (24.2)98 (36.02)		Unknown [n (%)]	38.4 ± 14.8	31.9 ± 18.9	31.2 ± 24.4	32.6 ± 19.2
< 25 [n (%)] 77 (39.1) 5 (41.7) 16 (24.2) 98 (36.02)		Age of women (year) (mean \pm SD)	49 (24.9)		30 (45.5)	
$23-37 \prod (70)$] - $32(20.4) \cup (0) = 11(10.7) \cup 05(23.2)$		25-39 [n (%)]-	52 (26.4)	0 (0)	11 (16.7)	63 (23.2)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						
$ \geq 60 [n (\%)] \qquad \qquad 2 (2.5) \qquad 0 (0) \qquad 0 (0) \qquad 2 (0.7) $						
$Unknown [n (\%)]$ 37.7 ± 31.6 36.5 ± 12.4 38.5 ± 16.1 37.6 ± 21.0						

Year		LMO	MOH	MOHME	
		Only LMO	Only MOHM	Both	
Туре о	of drug (cause of death)				
2016	Methadone	-	190 (67.2)	275 (50.9)	-
	Alcohol	-	5 (1.8)	43 (8.0)	-
	Amphetamines	-	9 (2.2)	60 (11.0)	-
	Opioids	-	79 (28.0)	137 (25.3)	-
	Accidental consumption of pills and sedatives	-	1 (0.4)	23 (4.7)	-
2015	Methadone	-	101 (47.8)	275 (50.0)	-
	Alcohol	-	2 (1.0)	32 (5.8)	-
	Amphetamines	-	18 (8.6)	54 (9.9)	-
	Opioids	-	88 (41.7)	169 (30.7)	-
	Accidental consumption of pills and sedatives	-	22 (4.1)	1 (0.4)	-
2014	Methadone	-	94 (56.0)	132 (58.1)	-
	Alcohol	-	1 (0.6)	25 (6.4)	-
	Amphetamines	-	2 (5.3)	50 (12.4)	-
	Opioids	-	59 (34.5)	73 (18.3)	-
	Accidental consumption of pills and sedatives	-	$2(1.2)^{\prime}$	16 (4.1)	-

MOHME: Ministry of Health and Medical Education; LMO: Legal Medicine Organization; SD: Standard deviation

Discussion

A high discrepancy was observed in the death cases registered by the 2 methods of death registration in the LMO and MOHME of Iran during the 3 years with only a small portion of the data (i.e., 7.7%) being common between the 2 sources. The largest rate of drug poisoning was observed in the age range of 25-39 years and in men. Kermanshah, Hamedan, and Zanjan had the most cases of cumulative incidence of drugrelated death per population of 100 thousand. According to the results of the present study, the MOHME reports that the most common underlying cause of death was the consumption of methadone. Based on the final estimation of the capture-recapture model and sensitivity analysis in the examined period, the total number of drugrelated deaths in Iran was 14517 (at 95% CI: 14498-14558). This estimate, taking into account all and half of the unidentified deceased persons, was 12418 and 11341 deaths, respectively.

The findings revealed a small overlap between the data obtained from the 2 sources. There may be many reasons for the small overlap. First, many cases of deaths caused by drugs are discovered in different places such as houses, prisons, addiction treatment camps, drop-in centers, shelters, and other public places like streets, and thus, are directly transferred to LMO, rather than hospitals, for the identification of the underlying cause of death and an autopsy. In specifying the cause of death, LMO takes different factors into account, including examination of the death scene, toxicological analysis of the biological samples, drug use history of the individual, and police reports, and then, reports the cause of death.¹⁵ The second reason might be that when issuing the death certificate, the physicians at hospitals may not have reported drug use as the cause of death despite the fact that clinical case records had announced illegal drug use as the cause of death. In other words, LMO reports based on autopsy results may be more precise in specifying the cause of death.7 Another reason might be that the relatives may refuse to provide accurate information about the drug use history of the deceased to avoid the stigma of addiction to drugs.¹⁶ The problems of the electronic registration of death such as unfamiliarity, physicians' low experience in registering the death certificate and mistaking of the cause of death with death mechanism, inappropriate completion of the forms related to death registration, inappropriate use of identification codes, lack of sufficient training in the field of death registration, fatigue, time limitation, and lack of understanding of the importance of death registration can be mentioned as other reasons for the undercount.¹⁶⁻¹⁸ Moreover, during the 3 years, no feedback was given by the LMO to hospitals that referred suspicious deaths to the LMO.

Province of	Year	LMO	MOI		rson) in the F Total	Total in	Cumulative incidence
death		Only MOHME	Both	Only LMO	-	three years	(per 100000 person)
East	2016	44 (1.9)	87 (30.7)	39 (7.2)	170 (5.3)	413 (4.8)	10.77
Azarbaijan	2015	40 (2.0)	24 (11.4)	48 (8.7)	112 (4.1)		
5	2014	56 (2.6)	31 (18.7)	44 (11.0)	131 (4.9)		
West	2016	32 (1.4)	2 (0.7)	11 (2.0)	45 (1.5)	117 (1.3)	3.66
Azarbaijan	2015	9 (0.5)	0(0)	30 (5.5)	39 (1.4)		
5	2014	8 (0.4)	5 (2.9)	20 (5.0)	33 (1.2)		
Ardabil	2016	18 (0.8)	18 (6.4)	22 (4.1)	58 (1.9)	131 (1.5)	10.38
	2015	8 (0.4)	0 (0)	30 (5.5)	38 (1.4)		
	2014	24 (1.1)	3 (1.8)	8 (2.0)	35 (1.2)		
Isfahan	2016	161 (6.8)	25 (8.8)	56 (10.4)	242 (7.6)	632 (7.3)	12.57
	2015	170 (8.6)	10 (4.7)	25 (4.5)	205 (7.5)	002 (110)	
	2014	162 (7.6)	4 (2.3)	19 (4.8)	185 (6.9)		
Alborz	2016	155 (6.6)	1(0.4)	2 (0.4)	158 (5.0)	419 (4.9)	16.10
noon	2015	137 (6.9)	0(0)	2 (0.4)	139 (5.1)	(1.))	10.10
	2013	119 (5.6)	2 (1.2)	1 (0.3)	122 (4.5)		
Ilam	2014	7 (0.3)	1(0.4)	8 (1.5)	16 (0.5)	44 (0.5)	7.70
Inum	2010	12 (0.6)	2(0.9)	5 (0.9)	19 (0.7)	11(0.5)	7.70
	2013	9 (0.4)	0(0)	0 (0)	9 (0.3)		
Bushehr	2014	6 (0.3)	2 (0.7)	1 (0.2)	9 (0.3)	25 (0.3)	2.25
Dushem	2010	7 (0.4)	2(0.7) 0(0)	5 (0.9)	12 (0.43)	25 (0.5)	2.25
	2013	2(0.1)	0 (0)	2(0.5)	4(0.1)		
Tehran	2014	668 (28.3)	6 (2.1)	2 (0.3) 46 (8.5)	720 (22.6)	1774 (20.5)	13.83
I CIII all	2010 2015	460 (23.2)	6 (2.1) 6 (2.8)	40 (8. <i>3</i>) 30 (5.5)	496 (18.1)	1774 (20.3)	15.65
	2013 2014	400 (23.2) 527 (24.6)	18 (10.5)	13 (3.3)	558 (20.6)		
Chahar-Mahal	2014 2016	52 (2.2)	18 (10.3)	2(0.4)	55 (1.7)	107 (1.3)	11.56
Bakhtiari	2010		0(0.4)			107 (1.5)	11.50
Dakiitiaii		19(1.0)		4(0.7)	23(0.83)		
Carrelle	2014	27 (1.3)	0(0)	2(0.5)	29 (1.0)	59 (0 7)	7.00
South	2016	12(0.5)	0(0)	0(0)	12(0.3)	58 (0.7)	7.69
Khorasan	2015	8 (0.4)	4 (1.9)	12 (2.2)	24 (0.9)		
	2014	10 (0.5)	3 (1.8)	9 (2.3)	22 (0.8)	021 (0, 6)	12.20
Razavi	2016	190 (8.0)	27 (9.5)	45 (8.3)	262 (8.2)	831 (9.6)	13.28
Khorasan	2015	254 (12.8)	19 (9.0)	52 (9.5)	325 (11.8)		
NT .1	2014	196 (9.2)	17 (9.9)	31 (7.7)	244 (9.0)		7.51
North	2016	21 (0.9)	3 (1.1)	6 (1.1)	30 (0.9)	65 (0.7)	7.51
Khorasan	2015	8 (0.4)	0(0)	3 (0.5)	11 (0.4)		
	2014	17 (0.8)	2 (1.2)	5 (1.3)	24 (0.9)		C 2 0
Khuzestan	2016	48 (2.0)	16 (5.7)	46 (8.5)	110 (3.5)	288 (3.3)	6.20
	2015	48 (2.4)	6 (2.8)	34 (6.2)	88 (3.2)		
_ .	2014	67 (3.1)	3 (1.8)	20 (5.0)	90 (3.0)		10 -
Zanjan	2016	41 (1.7)	4 (1.4)	11 (2.0)	56 (1.7)	193 (2.3)	18.55
	2015	44 (2.2)	6 (2.8)	11 (2.0)	61 (2.2)		
	2014	64 (3.0)	3 (1.8)	9 (2.3)	76 (2.8)		
Semnan	2016	15 (0.6)	9 (3.2)	7 (1.3)	31 (1.0)	83 (1.0)	12.33
	2015	20 (1.0)	3 (1.4)	5 (0.9)	28 (1.0)		
	2014	18 (0.8)	2 (1.2)	4 (1.0)	24 (0.9)		
Sistan and	2016	54 (2.3)	1 (0.4)	13 (2.4)	68 (2.1)	247 (2.9)	9.22
Balochistan	2015	67 (3.4)	8 (3.8)	15 (2.7)	90 (3.3)		
	2014	76 (3.6)	1 (0.6)	12 (3.0)	89 (3.3)		
Fars	2016	141 (6.0)	13 (4.6)	37 (6.8)	191 (6.0)	576 (6.6)	12.13
	2015	136 (6.9)	27 (12.8)	40 (7.3)	203 (7.4)		
	2014	127 (5.9)	10 (5.8)	45 (11.3)	182 (6.8)		

Province of	Year	LMO	MOI	IME	Total	Total in	Cumulative incidence
death		Only MOHME	Both	Only LMO		three years	(per 100000 person)
Qazvin	2016	18 (0.8)	20 (7.1)	11 (2.0)	49 (1.5)	132 (1.5)	10.60
	2015	24 (1.2)	5 (2.4)	17 (3.1)	46 (1.7)		
	2014	29 (1.4)	2 (1.2)	6 (1.5)	37 (1.3)		
Qom	2016	47 (2.0)	0 (0)	2 (0.4)	49 (1.5)	128 (1.5)	10.37
	2015	33 (1.7)	0 (0)	0 (0)	33 (1.2)	. ,	
	2014	45 (2.1)	0 (0)	1 (0.3)	46 (1.7)		
Kurdistan	2016	41 (1.7)	1 (0.4)	5 (0.9)	47 (1.4)	104 (1.2)	6.67
	2015	22 (1.1)	2 (0.9)	6 (1.1)	30 (1.1)	. ,	
	2014	24 (1.1)	0 (0)	3 (0.8)	27 (1.0)		
Kerman	2016	78 (3.3)	1 (0.4)	11 (2.0)	90 (3.0)	217 (2.5)	7.06
	2015	29 (1.5)	2 (0.9)	16 (2.9)	47 (1.7)		
	2014	52 (2.4)	1 (0.6)	27 (6.8)	80 (3.0)		
Kermanshah	2016	137 (5.8)	14 (4.9)	24 (4.4)	175 (5.5)	444 (5.1)	22.78
	2015	83 (4.2)	32 (15.2)	23 (4.2)	138 (5.0)		
	2014	113 (5.3)	6 (3.5)	12 (3.0)	131 (4.8)		
Kohgilouyeh	2016	17 (0.7)	0(0)	4 (0.7)	21 (0.6)	51 (0.6)	7.38
and	2015	10 (0.5)	0(0)	3 (0.5)	13 (0.5)	01 (010)	100
Boyerahmad	2014	12 (0.6)	0 (0)	5 (1.3)	17 (0.6)		
Golestan	2016	19 (0.8)	1 (0.4)	14 (2.6)	34 (1.1)	92 (1.0)	5.02
Colostan	2015	15 (0.8)	0(0)	20 (3.6)	35 (1.2)	<i>y</i> ² (1.0)	5.62
	2013	16 (0.7)	0 (0)	7 (1.8)	23 (0.9)		
Gilan	2016	96 (4.1)	1 (0.4)	13 (2.4)	110 (3.5)	257 (3.0)	10.23
Shan	2010	66 (3.3)	2(0.9)	7 (1.3)	75 (3.0)	237 (3.0)	10.25
	2013	53 (2.5)	4 (2.3)	15 (3.8)	72 (2.7)		
Lorestan	2014	68 (2.9)	7 (2.5)	17 (3.1)	92 (3.0)	307 (3.5)	17.46
Lorestan	2010	103 (5.2)	3 (1.4)	4 (0.7)	110 (3.8)	507 (5.5)	17.40
	2013 2014	91 (4.3)	4 (2.3)	4(0.7) 10(2.5)	105 (4.0)		
Mazandaran	2014 2016	91 (4.3) 27 (1.1)	4(2.3) 1 (0.4)	23 (4.3)	51 (1.6)	127 (1.5)	3.97
wazanuaran	2010	24 (1.1)	2(0.9)	23 (4.3) 14 (2.5)	40 (1.5)	127 (1.3)	5.97
	2013 2014	24(1.2) 24(1.1)	2(0.9) 0(0)	14(2.3) 12(3.0)	40 (1.3) 36 (1.4)		
Markazi	2014 2016	16(0.7)	0 (0)	. ,	20 (0.6)	109 (1.3)	7.65
VIAIKAZI	2018	· · ·		4(0.7)	· · ·	109 (1.5)	7.05
		34 (1.7)	2(0.9)	4(0.7)	40 (1.5)		
	2014	45 (2.1)	2(1.2)	2(0.5)	49 (1.9)	147(17)	0.67
Hormozgan	2016	18 (0.8)	3(1.1)	22(4.0)		147 (1.7)	8.67
	2015	19 (1.0)	2(0.9)	22 (4.1)	43 (1.6)		
r T 1	2014	44 (2.1)	2(1.2)	15 (3.8)	61 (2.3)	250 (4.1)	20.56
Hamedan	2016	88 (3.7)	9 (3.2)	20 (3.7)	117 (3.6)	359 (4.1)	20.56
	2015	66 (3.3)	27 (12.8)	27 (4.9)	120 (4.4)		
.7 1	2014	56 (2.6)	45 (26.3)	21 (5.3)	122 (4.5)	70 (0.0)	7.00
Yazd	2016	8 (0.3)	7 (2.5)	14 (2.6)	29 (0.9)	79 (0.9)	7.29
	2015	2(0.1)	3 (1.4)	20 (3.6)	25 (0.9)		
	2014	14 (0.7)	0(0)	11 (2.8)	25 (1.0)	00 (1 0)	
Unknown	2016	18 (0.8)	2 (0.7)	5 (0.9)	26 (0.8)	83 (1.0)	-
	2015	8 (0.4)	14 (6.6)	16 (2.9)	38 (1.5)		
	2014	11 (0.5)	0 (0)	8 (2.0)	19 (0.7)		
Total	2016	2361 (100)	284 (100)	541 (100)	3186 (100)	8639 (100)	11.07
	2015	1985 (100)	211 (100)	550 (100)	2746 (100)		
	2014	2138 (100)	170 (100)	399 (100)	2707 (100)		

MOHME: Ministry of Health and Medical Education; LMO: Legal Medicine Organization

Estimation of drug-related deaths	Year	Both LMO and MOHME	Only MOHME	Only LMO	Estimate (upper-lower)	Total in the 3 years estimate (upper-lower)
With all	2016	384	641	2461	4104 (4117-4092)	11341
unidentified	2015	317	656	2091	4321 (4304-4339)	(11357-11332)
deceased	2014	335	417	2305	2707 (2701-2712)	
Without	2016	284	541	2361	4491 (4511-4471)	14517
unidentified	2015	211	550	1985	5161 (5126-5196)	(14498-14558)
deceased	2014	170	399	2138	5003 (4961-5044)	
With half of the	2016	334	591	2411	4646.3 (4670.3-4622.4)	12418.9
unidentified	2015	264	603	2038	4646.3 (4622.4-4670.3)	(12406.8-12442.7)
deceased	2014	262	408	2221	3454.5 (3440.1-3468.8)	

MOHME: Ministry of Health and Medical Education; LMO: Legal Medicine Organization

According to the reports by Iran's MOHME, methadone is the most common cause of death in fatal poisonings with drugs. Methadone is used as an alternative to opioids.¹⁹ Although it is an appropriate option as a replacement for heroin in order to reduce damage in individuals, its consumption for fun and treatment, incidentally, or for committing suicide or murder, even at low doses, can lead to death in both children and adults.^{20,21} In Iran, there have been reports indicating a considerable rise in the number of deaths caused by methadone.^{22,23} The Toxicology Center of the LMO has introduced this substance as a significant cause of death in Iran.²² One of the reasons for this increasing trend can be the growing tendency toward drugs, methadone overdose, low supervision over its prescription and disregard for protocols, inappropriate storage conditions, and incidental use of drugs by children out of curiosity.22-24

The results of the present study further showed that, not taking unidentified individuals into account, 14517 deaths have occurred due to drugs during the years 2014-2016. The rate of drug-related deaths is lower, however, in Iran compared to other countries. In America, for example, the results of analysis by the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) show that drug-related deaths in the United States have increased from 16849 in 1999 to 70237 in 2017.25 The results of similar cross-sectional studies carried out by the LMO in Iran show that in 1 year (from March 2014 to February 2015) 2986 drug-induced deaths have been referred to this organization. The number of deaths has been estimated to be 38.4 in every 100000.4 The number

of drug-related deaths referred to the LMO in the following year (from 25th of March 2015 to February 2016) was 2306, which is estimated to be 38.22 individuals in every 1000000 persons.⁵ However, although there is a lower rate of druginduced death in Iran compared to the United States, it should be noted that America has a larger population.²⁶

The findings of the present study are indicative of a higher rate of cumulative incidence of death in younger ages in Iran (age range: 20-40 years; mean age: 36) particularly in Kermanshah, Hamedan, and Zanjan Provinces. The results of similar studies confirm this; during recent years, the highest rate of drug-related death in Iran has been reported in Kermanshah, Hamedan, and Zanjan^{5,27} and within the age range of 20-40 years (mean age: 36) and this rate has been increasing.^{5,28-30} Lower rate in marriage rate in this age range, unemployment or lack of a good job, and lack of financial security and housing can be mentioned as the most important risk factors for drug-related deaths. Therefore, if the related authorities attend to these factors, the loss of young working force in the country will decrease. In addition, a large number of these individuals have consumed these substances intentionally and in order to commit suicide. Paving attention to the mental status of those who refer to addiction treatment camps and timely treatment of their illnesses which could lead to suicide such depression can play a significant and as preventive role in this respect.

Conclusion

There is a high discrepancy and a small overlap between the data from the MOHME and the LMO

concerning registration of drug-induced deaths and a large part of the data belongs to the LMO. Accordingly, there is a need to design a more accurate system for registering these deaths in Iran. During the examined period, the total number of deaths caused by drug use was 14517. The number of deaths registered by the 2 sources was estimated to be 11341 and 12418, respectively, based on the complete overlap assumption and 50% of the unidentified individuals. It is suggested that a similar study be carried out after informing the related authorities about the status quo to examine the effects of providing feedback. The necessary corrective measures are expected to be taken for preventing undercount and creating an interaction between different departments responsible for the registration of drug-induced deaths.

Limitations

The present study is the first in Iran to make an estimation of the number of drug-induced deaths using 2 official sources of death registration. However, the study suffers from certain limitations. One of the major limitations is that the existing reports about the number of drug-related deaths are likely to be lower than the real number. To avoid the stigma of addiction, many families refuse to provide exact information about the drug use history of the deceased. Moreover, many of the individuals who pass away due to drug use are buried in the same place and their death is not

References

- 1. World Health Organization. Information sheet on opioid overdose [Online]. [cited 2018]; Available from: URL: https://www.who.int/substance_abuse/informationsheet/en/
- Naghavi M, Shahraz S, Sepanlou SG, Dicker D, Naghavi P, Pourmalek F, et al. Health transition in Iran toward chronic diseases based on results of Global Burden of Disease 2010. Arch Iran Med 2014; 17(5): 321-35.
- Barzegar A, Shahbazi F, Mirtorabi D, Ghadirzadeh MR, Shojaei A, Hashemi Nazari SS. Quantification of Mortality Rate from Illicit Substance Abuse in Iran in 2016. International Int J Med Toxicol Forensic Med 2018; 8(4): 123-30.
- 4. Rostami M, Karamouzian M, Khosravi A, Rezaeian S. Gender and geographical inequalities in fatal drug overdose in Iran: A province-level study in 2006 and 2011. Spat Spatiotemporal Epidemiol 2018; 25: 19-24.

reported to official sources due to extreme poverty. Lack of reporting of the type of poisoning causing the death by the LMO is another limitation of the study. Furthermore, despite the agreement of Deputy of Treatment associated with the MOHME, the security department refused to provide the data related to drug-related deaths to researchers, which limits the information sources available and lowers their validity.

Conflict of Interests

The authors have no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgements

The present study was approved and supported by the Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences Research Center of Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences with the grant number of 10295 and research ethics code IR.MAZUMS.REC.1398.445 in 2019.

Authors' Contribution

MB, MZ and AA designed the study. MB and MZ conducted the study. SSHN, MS, MG and AK contributed to data collection. MB and AA conducted the statistical analysis. MB and MZ and AA wrote the first draft of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the content of the final manuscript.

- 5. Ghoreishi SMS, Shahbazi F, Mirtorabi SD, Ghadirzadeh MR, Hashemi Nazari SS. Epidemiological Study of Mortality Rate from Alcohol and Illicit Drug Abuse in Iran. J Res Health Sci 2017; 17(4): e00395.
- Shahbazi F, Mirtorabi S, Ghadirzadeh M, Ghoreishi S, Hashemi Nazari SS. Epidemiological study of mortality from drug abuse in bodies referred to Iranian Legal Medicine Organization in 2013-2014. Iran J Epidemiol 2018; 14(1): 9-18. [In Persian].
- Amundsen EJ. Lack of overlap and large discrepancies in the characteristics of the deceased in two sources of drug death. A linkage study of the Cause of Death and the Police Registries in Norway 2007-2009. Int J Drug Policy 2017; 41: 74-9.
- Brooks EG, Reed KD. Principles and pitfalls: A guide to death certification. Clin Med Res 2015; 13(2): 74-82.
- 9. Kotabagi RB, Chaturvedi RK, Banerjee A. Medical certification of cause of death. Med J Armed Forces

India 2004; 60(3): 261-72.

- White GC. Capture-recapture and removal methods for sampling closed populations. Los Alamos, NM: Los Alamos National Laboratory; 1982.
- 11. World Health Organization. The ICD-10 Classification of Mental and Behavioural Disorders: Clinical Descriptions and Diagnostic Guidelines. Geneva, Switzerland: WHO; 2013.
- 12. World Health Organization. The ICD-10 Classification of Mental and Behavioural Disorders: Diagnostic Criteria for Research. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization; 1993.
- 13. Whitfield K, Kelly H. Using the two-source capture-recapture method to estimate the incidence of acute flaccid paralysis in Victoria, Australia. Bull World Health Organ 2002; 80(11): 846-51.
- 14. Cochi SL, Edmonds LE, Dyer K, Greaves WL, Marks JS, Rovira EZ, et al. Congenital rubella syndrome in the United States, 1970-1985. On the verge of elimination. Am J Epidemiol 1989; 129(2): 349-61.
- 15. Akhgari M, Jokar F, Etemadi Aleagha A. Drug related deaths in Tehran, Iran: Toxicological, death and crime scene investigations. Iran J Toxicol 2011; 5(12-13): 402-9.
- 16. Haque AS, Shamim K, Siddiqui NH, Irfan M, Khan JA. Death certificate completion skills of hospital physicians in a developing country. BMC Health Serv Res 2013; 13: 205.
- 17. Lakkireddy DR, Basarakodu KR, Vacek JL, Kondur AK, Ramachandruni SK, Esterbrooks DJ, et al. Improving death certificate completion: A trial of two training interventions. J Gen Intern Med 2007; 22(4): 544-8.
- 18. Pritt BS, Hardin NJ, Richmond JA, Shapiro SL. Death certification errors at an academic institution. Arch Pathol Lab Med 2005; 129(11): 1476-9.
- 19. Bart G. Maintenance medication for opiate addiction: The foundation of recovery. J Addict Dis 2012; 31(3): 207-25.
- 20. Paul ABM, Simms L, Mahesan AM. The toxicology of methadone-related death in infants under 1 year: Three case series and review of the literature. J Forensic Sci 2017; 62(5): 1414-7.

- Sheibani M, Zamani N, Hassanian-Moghaddam H. Electrocardiographic findings in mortalities due to pure methadone toxicity. Cardiovasc Toxicol 2019; 19(1): 62-71.
- 22. Akhgari M, Amini-Shirazi N, Iravani FS. Forensic toxicology perspectives of methadone-associated deaths in Tehran, Iran, a 7-year overview. Basic Clin Pharmacol Toxicol 2018; 122(4): 436-41.
- Gharehdaghi J, Takalloo-Bakhtiari A, Hassanian-Moghaddam H, Zamani N, Hedayatshode MJ. Suspected methadone toxicity: From hospital to autopsy bed. Basic Clin Pharmacol Toxicol 2017; 121(6): 531-9.
- 24. Allameh Y, Akrami F S, Mohammadi G, Molavi N, Babakhanian M. Methadone poisoning in children: a systematic review and meta-analysis in Iran. J Pediatr Rev 2017; 5(2): e10133.
- 25. National Institute on Drug Abuse. Overdose Death Rates [Online]. [cited 2019]; Available from: URL: https://www.drugabuse.gov/related-topics/trendsstatistics/overdose-death-rates
- 26. United States Population 2020 [Online]. [cited 2020]; Available from: URL: https://worldpopulationreview.com/countries/united -states-population/
- 27. Shahbazi F, Mirtorabi S, Ghadirzadeh M, Ghoreishi S, Hashemi Nazari SS. Epidemiological study of mortality from drug abuse in bodies referred to Iranian Legal Medicine Organization in 2013-2014. Iran J Epidemiol 2018; 14(1): 9-18. [In Persian].
- 28. Eizadi-Mood N, Sharifi L, Yaraghi A, Moghaddas A, Soleimanpour A, et al. Typical features of opioid-intoxicated corpses in Isfahan, Iran. Int J High Risk Behav Addict 2018; 7(1): e67596.
- 29. Shahbazi F, Mirtorabi SD, Ghadirzadeh MR, Hashemi-Nazari SS, Barzegar A. Characterizing mortality from substance abuse in Iran: An epidemiological study during March 2014 to February 2015. Addict Health 2017; 9(3): 166-74.
- 30. Hejazi A, Zare G, Zeid Abadinejad M, Shakeri M. Epidemiologic study of deaths related to opiate abuse in Khorasan Legal Medicine Center from March 20, 2004 to March 20, 2006. Med J Mashad Univ Med Sci 2009; 52(2): 101-6.

برآورد مرگ به علت مصرف مواد در ایران با روش صید بازصید طی سالهای ۹۵-۱۳۹۳

مسعوده باباخانیان¹0، مهران ضرغامی¹0، عباس علیپور^۳، اردشیر خسروی^۴، سید سعید هاشمی نظری^۵، مهدی صابری^۶، محمدرضا قدیرزاده^۷

مقاله پژوهشی

چکیدہ

مقدمه: ثبت مرگ بر اثر مواد در ایران، به طور انحصاری توسط وزارت بهداشت، درمان و آموزش پزشکی و پزشکی قانونی انجام میشود. پژوهش حاضر با هدف برآورد مرگ به علت مصرف مواد و بررسی میزان همپوشانی و کمثبتی در بین این دو منبع انجام شد.

روشها: آمارهای ثبت شده مرگ ناشی از مصرف مواد مطابق با ۱۰-ICDInternational Classification of Diseases) طی سالهای ۹۵–۱۳۹۳ از دو منبع مذکور (وزارت بهداشت و پزشکی قانونی) جمعآوری گردید و سپس تعداد موارد مرگ و میر با استفاده از روش صید بازصید دو منبعی در نرمافزارهای Excel و SPSS مورد تجزیه و تحلیل قرار گرفت.

یافته ها: مجموع تمامی مرگ ها بر اثر مصرف مواد در طول سه سال در دو منبع، ۸۶۳۹ نفر گزارش شد. بخش بزرگی از دادههای ثبت مرگ بر اثر مواد، متعلق به مرکز پزشکی قانونی کشور بود (حدود ۲۵ درصد) و سهم وزارت بهداشت ایران در دادههای ثبت شده، ۲۵ درصد بود. تنها سهم کوچکی از دادهها بین دو منبع مشترک بود (حدود ۲۷ درصد). برآورد نهایی از مدل صید بازصید در حالت کلی و آنالیز حساسیت انجام شده نشان داد که در طی سه سال، همه مرکز پزشکی قانونی کشور بود (حدود ۲۵ درصد) و سهم وزارت بهداشت ایران در دادههای ثبت شده، ۲۵ درصد بود. تنها سهم کوچکی از مادهها بین دو منبع مشترک بود (حدود ۲۷ درصد). برآورد نهایی از مدل صید بازصید در حالت کلی و آنالیز حساسیت انجام شده نشان داد که در طی سه سال، همه مرگ ها به دلیل مصرف مواد در کشور (با حدود اطمینان ۹۵ درصد برابر با ۲۵۵۸–۱۴۴۹) ۱۴۵۱۷ نفر برآورد گذرور با در طرف است ۲۵ می به سال، همه مرگ ها به دلیل مصرف مواد در کشور (با حدود اطمینان ۹۵ درصد برابر با ۲۵۵۸–۱۴۴۹) ۱۴۵۱۷ نفر برآورد گذرور با سه سال، همه مرگ ما به دلیل مصرف مواد در کشور (با حدود اطمینان ۹۵ درصد برابر با ۲۵۵۵–۱۴۴۹) ۲۵۵۱ به برآورد گذرور گذرور با مرف مواد در دو منبع به ترتیب ۱۳۴۱ و ۲۴۱۸ به دست آمد. بیشترین مسمومیتها در طبقه سنی ۲۵ تا مرض اشتراک تمام و ۵۰ درصد مجهول الهویه ها در دو منبع به ترتیب ۱۳۴۱ و ۱۴۴۱۸ نفر به دست آمد. بیشترین مسمومیتها در طبقه سنی ۲۵ تا سال و در مردان مشاهده گردید. استانهای کرمانشاه، همدان و زنجان به ترتیب بیشترین میزان بروز تجمعی را از مرگ بر اثر مواد داشتند. شایع ترین علت زمینهای فوت در متوفیان در منبع وزارت بهداشت، عوارض ناشی از داروی مخدر متادون بود

نتیجه گیری: در مطالعه حاضر از منابع تخصصی ثبت مرگ ناشی از مصرف مواد استفاده شد. بهتر است جهت جلوگیری از خطا و کمثبتی، ترکیب اطلاعات دو منبع هنگام ثبت مد نظر قرار گیرد.

واژگان کلیدی: مرگ؛ اختلالات سوء مصرف مواد؛ ایران

ارجاع: باباخانیان مسعوده، ضرغامی مهران، علیپور عباس، خسروی اردشیر، هاشمی نظری سید سعید، صابری مهدی، قدیرزاده محمدرضا. بر آورد مرگ به علت مصرف مواد در ایران با روش صید بازصید طی سالهای ۹۵–۱۳۹۳. مجله اعتیاد و سلامت ۱۳۹۹؛ ۱۲ (۲): ۹۷–۸۷.

تاریخ دریافت: ۱۳۹۸/۹/۴

تاریخ پذیرش: ۱۳۹۸/۱۰/۲۶

- ۶– سازمان پزشکی قانونی، تهران، ایران
- ۷- مرکز تحقیقات پزشکی قانونی، سازمان پزشکی قانونی، تهران، ایران

نویسنده مسؤول: مهران ضرغامی؛ مرکز تحقیقات روانپزشکی و علوم رفتاری، پژوهشکده اعتیاد و گروه روانپزشکی، دانشکده پزشکی، دانشگاه علوم پزشکی مازندران، ساری، ایران Email: zarghami@gmail.com

۱– مرکز تحقیقات روانپزشکی و علوم رفتاری، پژوهشکده اعتیاد، دانشگاه علوم پزشکی مازندران، ساری، ایران

۲- مرکز تحقیقات روان پزشکی و علوم رفتاری، پژوهشکده اعتیاد و گروه روان پزشکی، دانشکده پزشکی، دانشگاه علوم پزشکی مازندران، ساری، ایران

۳- گروه پزشکی اجتماعی، دانشکده پزشکی، دانشگاه علوم پزشکی مازندران، ساری، ایران

۴- معاونت بهداشتی، وزارت بهداشت، درمان و آموزش پزشکی، تهران، ایران

۵- مرکز تحقیقات ایمنی و پیشگیری از اَسیب و گروه اپیدمیولوژی، دانشکده بهداشت، دانشگاه علوم پزشکی شهید بهشتی، تهران، ایران