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M Mofizul Islam  
Lecturer/Research Fellow, Australian Primary Health Care Research Institute  
Australian National University, Canberra, Australia  

Prof Christopher Morrey  
Editor, BMC Pharmacology and Toxicology  

Dear Prof Morrey,  

Re: Manuscript submission: An inevitable wave of prescription drug monitoring programs: pros, cons and tensions  

In an effort to reduce diversion and misuse of prescription medications electronic prescription drug monitoring programs (PDMP) have been introduced in North-American countries, Australia and some parts of Europe. In this manuscript we discuss, based upon the available literature, the pros and cons of PDMP in achieving the overarching goal of reduced diversion of prescription medication, particularly opioids, without hampering access to those essential medications for those with genuine needs, and tensions around PDMP implementation. Literature suggest PDMPs may help alleviate diversion and over-prescription, prompt drug treatment referrals, avoid awkward drug urine test; and inform spatial changes in prescribing practices for tailored interventions. Conversely, fear of legal retribution, privacy and data security, potential confusion about addiction and pseudo-addiction and pushing some patients to illicit market are the major cons. There are tensions about unintended consequence of excessive regulatory enforcements, corresponding collateral damages particularly about inadequate prescribing for patients with genuine needs, and mandatory consultation requirements of PDMP. Despite having a number of cons, PDMPs is likely to continue, and some external forces such as the information technology breakthroughs will continue to drive it forward.

To our knowledge no previous article discussed these three aspects together and analysed the topic the way we did. We think it suits better as a commentary. However, if you think it rather suits better as a debate or simply as an article, we are happy to comply with that. We strongly believe that our manuscript will appeal to the Journal’s readership and will arouse discussion, as PDMP is a highly discussed issue at this moment.

Since this manuscript is prepared based on a literature review and that it is just a commentary, it does not need an ethics approval. This manuscript, or any of its part, has not been published anywhere; and is not under submission elsewhere. All authors report no conflicts of interest. This work received no funding from anywhere.

Thank you for considering our work for publication in the BMC Pharmacology and Toxicology.

M Mofizul Islam