Drugs in oral fluid in randomly selected drivers
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AIM: To determine the prevalence of cannabis (THC), methamphetamine (MA) and methylenedioxy-methamphetamine (MDMA) in randomly selected drivers of motor vehicles in Victoria.

METHODS: A preliminary breath test for alcohol was first conducted on randomly selected drivers stopped at a road block. If this was below the prescribed legal limit police conducted a drug test using the DrugWipe II® (Securetec) from a tongue wipe while the driver was still in the vehicle. The presence of a clear positive band for either THC or MA, or both, resulted in a second test conducted in a specially designed “Drug Bus” using a specimen of oral fluid collected by the Cozart Collector. An aliquot of oral fluid collected was tested on the Rapiscan®. The methamphetamines test strip had similar cross-reactivity to MA and MDMA. Oral fluid on presumptive positive cases was sent to the laboratory for confirmation using GC-MS with limits of quantification of 5, 5 and 2 ng/mL for MA, MDMA and THC, respectively. In cases where oral fluid could not be taken blood was collected and analyzed by similar methods.

RESULTS: Recovery experiments conducted in the laboratory showed quantitative recovery of analytes from the Cozart collector. There were 13,176 road-side drug tests performed in the first year of the random drug testing program conducted in the state of Victoria. These road-side tests gave 313 positive cases following GC-MS confirmation. These comprised 269, 118 and 87 cases positive to MA, MDMA and THC, respectively. The median oral concentrations (undiluted) of MA, MDMA and THC was 1136, 2724 and 81 ng/mL. The overall drug positive rate was 2.4 % of the screened population. This rate was highest in drivers of cars (2.8 %). The average age of drivers detected with a positive drug reading was 28 years. Large vehicle (trucks over 4.5 tonnes) drivers were older on average at 38 years. Females accounted for 19 % of all positives, although none of the positive heavy vehicle drivers were female. There was one false positive to cannabis when the results of both on-site devices were considered and four to methamphetamines.

CONCLUSIONS: These results show a drug positive rate for the selected drugs 240 % higher prevalence than for alcohol and confirm the presence of a significant drug-driving problem in this State. It is hoped that these random testing programs will continue and will ultimately not only reduce the incidence of drug driving but associated road trauma.
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