Peer Support Models for People With a History of Injecting Drug Use Undertaking Assessment and Treatment for Hepatitis C Virus Infection
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People who inject drugs (PWID) are the group most affected by HCV; however, treatment uptake has been low. Engagement between PWID and healthcare workers has been characterized by mistrust and discrimination. Peer support for HCV is one way to overcome these barriers. Peer support models for chronic disease management have been successfully applied for other diseases. HCV peer support models have been implemented in various settings, but those that include opioid substitution treatment have been more common. Most models have been either service generated (provider led) or community controlled (peer led). Peer support models have been implemented successfully, with a range of outcomes including increased treatment knowledge and uptake and improved service provision. Genuine partnerships between peers and services were common across models and led to positive transformations for both clients and services. Further investigation of peer support for HCV treatment and its impact on both individuals and services is recommended.
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In most developed nations, the burden of hepatitis C virus (HCV) infection is borne by people with a history of injecting drug use. Around 50% of existing cases and up to 90% of new cases are attributable to injecting drug use [1], while the prevalence of HCV among people who inject drugs (PWID) ranges from 65% to 90% [2]. Early advances in HCV treatment were achieved by replacing interferon monotherapy with combination pegylated interferon and ribavirin therapy. More recently, the development of direct-acting antiviral therapies with improved tolerability and efficacy have given the treatment sector reason for further optimism [3].

Among PWID, HCV treatment uptake remains relatively low with patient-, physician-, and structural-related factors contributing to the low uptake [4]. Factors include patient mistrust [5] of the medical system; patients often find the system to be discriminatory or impenetrable [6]. While the treatment adherence and response to therapy of this patient group has been demonstrated as acceptable [7], some health workers still question the adherence capacities of PWID [8].

There is strong stigma associated with HCV, largely due to its link to injecting drug use and the illegality of drug use [9]. Stigma and discrimination are still unacceptable common within the healthcare sector [9, 10]. Healthcare workers are often either not aware of their discrimination or do not see their practice as discriminatory [11]. Both real and perceived discrimination impact greatly the assessment and treatment engagements [11] and can be closely linked to fear of disclosure of HCV status, as it implies drug use [12].

Peer support has been successfully implemented for people needing chronic disease management, including heart disease [13], diabetes [14], cancer [15], and human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) infection [16]. In the field of HCV, few papers have been published.
Peer support models investigated to date can be grouped into 2
categories: community controlled and service generated.

Community-controlled peer support models have generally
been implemented by peer-based drug user organizations in
partnership with local service providers [17–20]. In Australia,
these organizations have had a formal role in representing
those most affected by HCV and feature strongly in these
models. As will be discussed, these models are largely one-
on-one support models based around OST clinics in which
peer support workers (PSWs) offer detailed and ongoing
support through the journey of HCV assessment and treat-
ment. These models are completely controlled and implement-
ated by the affected community through drug user organiza-
tions and are grass-roots community responses.

An early proponent of HCV peer support was the Organiza-
tion to Achieve Solutions in Substance-Abuse (OASIS) clinic in
Oakland, California [21]. This model—the OASIS model as we
will refer to it—is service generated and peer supported.
This type of model is conceived by the service or health center
and uses peer groups of people considering or undergoing HCV
treatment. These individuals are recruited and supported by the
service itself. Group sessions are sometimes based around the
existing structures and frameworks of self-help groups [21, 23, 25].
Key components of the model are outlined in the section
“Service-Generated Models” below.

Peer support models are a valid feature of HCV assessment
and treatment. Supporting communities of people who inject
drugs to be involved in the delivery of peer-based support pro-
grams is important. Well-designed research is required to gain
further understanding of the complexities of this type of model
both in the context of OST delivery and in other settings. Recent
work shows that HCV treatment peer support that is offered
outside of drug treatment programs can also be viable [24].
Models that emphasize community self-determination should be
further studied and implemented.

SERVICE-GENERATED MODELS

Service-generated models in Oakland [21], Vancouver, Can-
da [23], and New York [25] share a number of common
classroom. While all sites offer OST, only the New York
site is primarily an OST clinic [25]. The models used at these
sites share key elements with the biopsychosocial approach
to substance use reduction or abstinence. This makes the
approach similar to those who have been involved in sub-
stance use treatment [21]. These approaches include self-help
groups, peer interventions, and therapeutic communities.
These elements of substance use treatment were “instinctively
incorporated” by Sylvestre et al in design of the model used at
OASIS [21].

Key Components

In these models the self-help group cofacilitation by peers and
service workers or researchers was central. In all models re-
viewed, large numbers of clients need to be engaged. Clients
who completed treatment were engaged by the service to cofa-
icitate groups, and themes of self-transformation and telling of
one’s story are core to the group [21, 23, 25, 26]. Group leaders
use the Socratic approach to deliver information, with ques-
tions being used to allow the participants to come up with
answers rather than straight delivery of information. Peer edu-
cators are crucial to the process; although the medical system
has information, many peers distrust that system [26]. When
the groups meet [21, 23, 25, 26], medical treatment including
HCV assessment occurs concurrently, and participants may be
called out of the group to access medical care if they have re-
quested it.

Training and Support

All sites incorporate training and mentorship [21, 23, 25, 26].
The initiative in New York outlines a comprehensive training
package developed over many years of delivery [25]. At this site
the peer educator’s roles are clear, and these are similar across
the sites. They include recruitment of new patients, cofacili-
tation of biweekly HCV support and education groups, cofacili-
tation of weekly HCV group treatment sessions, patient escort to
off-site procedures, development and implementation of peer-
led HCV education, and participation in HCV advocacy activi-
ties. Supervision of peer educators is also outlined as crucial.
There are weekly group sessions and individual meetings. This
encourages reflective practice and review [25].

Outcomes

These models engage large numbers of clients with many
members of the client group being referred to HCV assessment
and treatment. In 2007, OASIS had tested 3500 people for
HCV infection and treated several hundred people [21]. The
application of the OASIS model in Vancouver also led to large

numbers of people assessed and treated for HCV infection, with 204 participants accepting referral to the HCV support group. Of these, 53% were assessed for HCV and of these 13% had initiated or completed treatment before attending the support group; treatment was deferred in 25%; 10% were under evaluation; and 52% initiated treatment [23]. The Vancouver model also showed that attendees’ lives improved in other areas including nutrition and health. Along with assessment and uptake, the potential for transformation both by the peers and the educator is highly emphasized. Peer HCV educators involved in the OASIS model speak strongly of the change in themselves and their peers through the processes [26]. The peer educator role in this model can be practical and focuses on modeling positive behaviors [25, 26]. All models demonstrate that peer support can be an effective strategy for increasing HCV assessment and treatment uptake.

COMMUNITY-CONTROLLED MODELS

In most developed nations, the primary community affected by HCV infection is people who inject or have a history of injecting drugs. In Australia, national and regional drug user organizations have a mandate to represent these communities and draw their staff and membership from the affected community. Community-controlled support models have largely arisen from work in Australia [17–20]. Two models run by NSW (New South Wales) Users & AIDS Association (NUAA) and one by Harm Reduction Victoria (formerly VivAIDS) are discussed here. NUAA is a New South Wales–based organization, while Harm Reduction Victoria is the Victoria state–based user organization. In these states the drug user organizations are funded to undertake peer education and support for people with a history of injecting drug use. A clear priority is working on HCV prevention and assessment as well as treatment support and advocacy. While the models to be discussed were generated by the affected community, it is clear that partnerships across the sector are crucial [17–20].

OST Paradigm

The peer support models run by NUAA were based in specialized OST clinics. A short summary of the OST context is useful. It is often the case that the environment in which OST is delivered in NSW is highly regulated and other healthcare services are not usually offered, unlike the North American clinics such as OASIS, which offer a range of services for drug users. This intensive regulation is potential problematic for the delivery of HCV treatment programs because the relationships between many OST clients and their clinic are not optimal and they have the potential to clash with the therapeutic needs of successful HCV treatment [6, 26]. Early evaluations of 1 HCV peer support site show that some OST clinic staff doubt the suitability of OST clinics for delivering HCV treatment [26], given that OST clinics are often guilty of systemic and structural discrimination [6, 9, 26]. This discrimination is sometimes invisible to staff and clients alike but highly visible to clients [26]. In Australia, there is a mix of private fee-based clinics and public free clinics. The models run by NUAA were offered in each clinic setting.

Key Components

In partnership with the University of New South Wales, as part of a large study to assess HCV treatment and uptake among PWID in the OST setting, NUAA developed 2 community-controlled models of care in Sydney and Newcastle, Australia [18–20]. The Harm Reduction Victoria (HRV) Healthy Liver Campaign in Melbourne, Australia, was developed in partnership with a primary health center [17].

The models consist of peer support workers (PSWs) closely supporting individuals through one-on-one support during HCV assessment and treatment. PSWs were members of a multidisciplinary team and facilitated referrals and recruitment into treatment and aimed to enhance treatment adherence and support [17]. The PSWs roles vary according to service models and restrictions, but they all provide support during assessment and treatment and provide a peer perspective to staff and a mediating role to service users [17–20]. The NUAA models developed as part of the Enhancing Treatment of Hepatitis C in Opiate Substitution Settings (ETHOS) Study differ in the nature of the peer relationship between PSWs and service users. At the regional site, which is a free public clinic, the PSW is not a patient of the clinic and is regarded as a service team member who assists in supporting access to blood tests and clinical services. This is very similar to the HRV HLC model. At the metropolitan private clinic, which is part of the ETHOS Study, clients of the service are employed as PSWs and this affects the role they are free to undertake. The clinical support that is provided in the regional setting is not offered due to constraints on service clients’ freedom of movement in the clinic.

NUAA PSWs operate from the clinic’s waiting area, where people queue to receive pharmacotherapy. Here, the PSWs undertake information sessions, recruitment into the cohort study, health promotions, and a range of activities around HCV assessment and treatment [20].

Training and Support

The PSWs at all 3 models were employed, trained, and supervised by the local drug user organization. At the site where the PSWs were also clients of the service, NUAA ensured 2 PSWs were always employed together to offer mutual peer support. The restrictions placed on these workers were greater than those for the PSWs at other sites, who had greater access and
were a part of a multidisciplinary team [20]. So, within
the same project and with the same duties, the PSWs at 1 site were
treated differently from those at the other site because they
were clients of the service, despite the fact that this was the only
real difference between the PSWs. Although the peers were
paid workers, part of a supervised and managed research
project, and highly valued by the external project, their status
within the site was marginalized because they were, in the
end, clients. It is interesting that the locus of control still sits
squarely with the organization and its needs [20]. NUAA pro-
vided initial and ongoing training as well as supervision for the
NUAA PSWs [20].

The following challenges arose for the peer worker model,
including at times feeling lonely and isolated at the clinic as
well as feeling challenged by being expected to share informa-
tion that may have been detrimental to a person’s OST, for
example, disclosure of drug use [17]. At each site, evaluations
have clearly shown that service users had strong relationships
with the PSWs and that these relationships eased fears around
HCV treatment and made participation more likely [17–20].

Outcomes

The narrative of transformation is strong throughout the
service-generated models; however, it relates solely to the client
or PSW. One key difference with the outcomes of the commu-
nity models of peer support is a degree of transformation on
the part of service providers as well. While there is evidence of
client transformations occurring through the ETHOS sites [19],
the actual clinics changed noticeably over time. The peer
support model was recognized to have transformed the services
and subsequently the experiences of service users, particularly
on the days at the HCV clinic. As one service user who was in-
terviewed said, “I think this place has improved out of sight as
far as the feeling, the vibe of the place,” which is confirmed by a
staff member who state, “the atmosphere changes [when the
PSWs are present]. And everyone’s in a good mood.” Staff also
credited the service for showing that they are interested in the
clients’ overall welfare and involved in the health of clients [19].
As one PSW put it after the service installed a TV and DVD
player in the waiting room, “[clients] see [the clinic] giving some-
thing back and not just taking [dosing fees] all the time” [20].

The importance of this transformation is simply that people
actually see the service as a place where they might access more
than a daily dose. The PSWs were clearly seen as peers and as
agents of change by service users. One PSW noted, “I like that
we have our own peers. . . . For someone like me . . . instead of
having a text book person there, I listen more [to PSWs] . . .
because they’ve been there and done that . . . yet are still on the
‘done . . . you know people might not be interested but it slowly
sinks in. . . . And I just think it’s a top idea as opposed to the
people who are dosing doing it” [19]. This identification with
the PSWs was also made clear in the evaluation of the HLC
model [17].

As with the HLC model, the ETHOS PSWs are supervised
by the state drug user organization. This has been crucial, in-
cluding in managing challenges. As an endeavor with a range
of partners and stakeholders, communication is key to ensuring
that everyone involved has the same understanding of the
project, where it is going, and how to get there. True partner-
ships based around trust have grown between the peer workers,
the services, NUAA, and the researchers, and these partner-
ships have made it possible to meet challenges honestly and
quickly [20].

DISCUSSION

Peer support for people with a history of injecting drug use un-
dergoing HCV assessment and treatment offers a range of ben-
efits for both the individuals and the services involved. While
the 6 models reviewed are all nominally about peer support for
people undertaking HCV assessment and treatment, any com-
parisons must be understood in the context of treatment and
service delivery. The North American models are based in ser-
dices that are community-based models and that are flexible
and responsive services that work on the principles to reduce
harm reduction [21–23]. The Australian models, on the other
hand, are set in a highly regulated environment with inherent
structural barriers [26].

The service-generated models have evolved in settings
that are conducive to, or already offer, substance use support
groups [21, 25]. It is clear there was meaningful peer involve-
ment at all sites, but the parameters of the peer support models
are set largely by the services. In the community-controlled
models, peers set the parameters of these models, and in the
context of these regulated environments, it is inevitable that
these parameters may include service change.

In the community-controlled models the level of identifica-
tion between peer workers and service users is very high [17].
This has the capacity to overcome the mistrust that many
service users feel for OST services [19] and offers intensive
support for people with multiple issues. Nevertheless, the peer
workers at both the HLC and ETHOS sites were outsiders to
the service, and their clear identification with service users
could lead to feelings of isolation [17] as well as camarade-
rie [19]. The ETHOS site peer workers were treated differently,
depending on their status as a client, the very quality that
makes them a peer. Investigation of the impact of such issues
should be undertaken.

The service-generated models were highly effective at man-
aging large numbers of clients through the process [21] and are
well received by those who are ready for a sharing and group model approach [25]. Peer support phone-lines are common outside of HCV treatment. There are some examples within the sector, and their impact should be evaluated further also. Peer support models are an effective approach both in terms of assessment and treatment uptake as well as in terms of individual and, sometimes, service transformation. Where there is resourced support, peers can independently plan and implement models of peer support as equal partners. Organizational barriers, particularly in highly regulated OST environments, must be diminished to allow these partnerships genuine equality.

In addition, peer-driven research and equitable involvement in research development should be further undertaken to ensure that the needs of the PSWs and peer organizations are better understood and that peer support models can be matched to service models effectively.

Notes

Acknowledgments. The authors thank Jason Grebely (Kirby Institute, University of New South Wales) for review and comments on this manuscript. The authors also thank Annie Madden (Australian Injecting & Illicit Drug Users League), Jenny Kelsall (Harm Reduction Victoria), Stephen Musgrove, Hope Everingham, the ETHOS Peer Support Workers (all NUAAs), and the Kirby Institute.

Supplement sponsorship. This article was published as part of a supplement entitled “Prevention and Management of Hepatitis C Virus Among People Who Inject Drugs: Moving the Agenda Forward,” sponsored by an unrestricted grant from the International Network on Hepatitis in Sub-Users (INHSU), The Kirby Institute (University of New South Wales), Abbvie, Gilead Sciences, Janssen-Cilag, and Merck.

Potential conflicts of interest. The authors are members of the ETHOS Peer Support Subcommittee. NUAA is engaged in the ETHOS Peer Support component of the ETHOS cohort study and received funds to undertake this. Both authors: No reported conflicts.

Both authors have submitted the ICMJE Form for Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest. Conflicts that the editors consider relevant to the content of the manuscript have been disclosed.

References