

EDITORIAL

Editorial: Analytical Challenges in Drugs of Abuse Testing

Muhammad Aamir

Drugs of Abuse (DOA) group includes drugs ranging from therapeutic drugs e.g., benzodiazepines, opioids to illegal drugs e.g., Phencyclidine, lysergic acid diethylamide etc. Prevalence of DOA is on the rise in our society.¹ According to United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime (UNODC) there are 6.7 million drug users in Pakistan which also happens to be the largest consumer of heroin in south east Asia.² Besides addiction, drug abuse is linked to a variety of health problems, including HIV/AIDS, cancer, heart disease, and many more. It is also linked to homelessness, crime, and violence. In essence, DOA addiction is costly to both individuals and society. Keeping in view the increasing use of DOA in our society, its testing has become an indispensable service in modern laboratories and many large or medium sized medical laboratories in Pakistan are involved in DOA testing. From emergency departments and workplace compliance programs to pain management clinics and forensic investigations, laboratories play a central role in detecting these drugs that can impair judgement, threaten safety or contribute to morbidity and mortality. However, as new patterns of substance of abuse evolve and analytical technologies advance, laboratories face mounting scientific, operational, ethical and regulatory challenges in delivering accurate and clinically meaningful results. One of the most pressing challenges is the rapid proliferation of new psychoactive substances leading to shifting in patterns of drug abuse.³ Synthetic cannabinoids, designer stimulants, novel benzodiazepines and synthetic opioids like fentanyl analogues have complicated traditional testing paradigms. Standard immunoassay screening panels that are designed to detect common drugs like opiates, cannabinoids, cocaine, amphetamines, benzodiazepines and barbiturates often fail to identify newer compounds or cross react unpredictably. This puts the laboratories under pressure to develop and validate

methods for the new drugs that have joined the DOA menu.

Most laboratories rely on a two-tiered approach: rapid immunoassay screening followed by confirmatory testing using Gas Chromatography-mass spectrometry (GC-MS) or Liquid chromatography-tandem mass spectrometry (LC-MS/MS).⁴ While immunoassays offer speed and cost effectiveness, they are inherently limited by cross reactivity (False positive results) and variable sensitivity (False Negative results).⁵ False positive results due to administration of some over the counter prescriptions can have devastating consequences in clinical, occupational or legal contexts. Conversely false negative results may provide false reassurance particularly in overdose settings.⁶ Confirmatory technologies though are more specific but have very high upfront costs, require specialized expertise to handle the technology and may not be available around the clock in smaller institutions. Laboratories must therefore strike a delicate balance between turnaround time and analytical rigor especially in emergency medicine where clinical decisions are time-sensitive.

Interpretation of results of DOA are also complex and context-dependant. Factors such as drug metabolism, timing of ingestion, Specimen type (Urine, blood, oral fluid, hair) and individual variability can specifically influence findings.⁷ For example, urine testing reflects prior exposure rather than current impairment.⁸ Blood concentrations may correlate closely with intoxication but are more invasive and logistically demanding. Laboratories bear the responsibility of not only generating accurate results but also educating clinicians about the limitations of drug testing. Misinterpretation can strain patient-provider relationship.

Laboratories must adhere to strict standards for chain of custody documents and reporting results that have forensic implications requiring Forensic Toxicology services must be accredited under ISO standards along with robust quality system management with continual proficiency testing.

When it comes to DOA testing laboratories are often

Correspondence:

Prof. Dr. Muhammad Aamir

Consultant Chemical Pathologist

Shifa International Hospital Islamabad

E-mail: ashmir83@yahoo.com

Received: March 17, 2026; Accepted: March 18, 2026

<https://doi.org/10.57234/jiimc.march26.2985>

caught at the intersection of public health objectives and individual rights. The expansion of drug testing in workplaces, schools and even prenatal-care have raised ethical questions about consent, privacy and potential discrimination. As addiction is increasingly recognized as a chronic medical condition rather than a moral failure, laboratories must ensure that testing policies align with principles of fairness, transparency and clinical necessity.

The above mentioned challenges require a multifaceted approach. It requires investment in advanced analytical technologies,⁹ continuous assay developments and enhanced collaborations between laboratorians, toxicologists and clinicians. Moreover, interpretation guidelines are needed to be standardized to withstand legal challenges¹⁰ along with education initiatives to ensure appropriate test ordering and their interpretation. We also need to safeguard patients interest while supporting public safety. The goal is not merely to detect drugs but to provide reliable information that supports sound clinical care, informed policy and compassionate responses to one of the most complex public health challenges of our time.

REFERENCES

1. S Yousra, Jafri L, Majid M, Khan NU, Sidiqa Ayesha, Khan AH et al. Exploring landscape of drug of abuse trends in Pakistan: A decade and a half of clinical laboratory big data analysis. PLOS Glob Public Health. 2025 May 5;5(5):

e0004424. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgph.0004424>

2. Report on Drug Use in Pakistan 2013 reveals high levels of drug use and dependency. www.unodc.org.

3. Hou X, Wang J, Zhang Y, Zhang Y, Shangguan J, Qin G et al. Exploring the topic structure and abuse trends of new psychoactive substance since the 21st century from a bibliometric perspective. Saudi Pharmaceutical Journal. April 2024: 3214. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsps.2024.101991> journal.pgph.0004424.

4. Mekonnen BA, Yizengaw MG, Adugna KF. The clinical applications of drugs and their metabolites analysis in biological fluids and commonly used analytical techniques for bioanalysis: review. Front. Anal.Sci., Volume 4 November 2024. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frans.2024.1490093>.

5. Kiechle FL, Franke DDH. September 2007. Immunoassays for drugs of abuse: Limitations. Journal of clinical Ligand Assay 30(3): 105-112.

6. Hadland SE, Levy S. Objective Testing: Urine and Other Drug Tests. Child Adolesc Psychiatr Clin N Am. 2016 Jul;25(3):549-65. doi: 10.1016/j.chc.2016.02.005. Epub 2016 Mar 30. PMID: 27338974; PMCID: PMC4920965.

7. Kale N. Urine Drug Tests: Ordering and Interpretation. Am Fam Physician. 2019;99(1): 33-39.

8. Nelson ZJ, Stellpflug SJ, Engebretsen KM. What can a urine drug screening immunoassay really tell us? J Pharm Pract 2016; 29:516–26. doi:10.1177/0897190015579611.

9. Anzar N, Suleman S, Singh Y, Kumari S, Parvez S, Pilloton, R et al. The evolution of illicit-drug detection: From conventional approaches to cutting edge immunosensors- A comprehensive review. Biosensors 2024. 14(10), 477; <https://doi.org/10.3390/bios14100477>.

10. Casparsen C. The role of toxicology in forensic investigation. IJFM 2024; 6(1): 31-33. <https://doi.org/10.33545/27074447.2024.v6.ila.76>.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Authors declared no conflicts of Interest.

GRANT SUPPORT AND FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

Authors have declared no specific grant for this research from any funding agency in public, commercial or nonprofit sector.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution- Non-Commercial 2.0 Generic License.

.....