and opioid therapy may be initiated with immediate release alone. The benefit and safety of controlled release or sustained release over immediate release preparations is not clearly established. Some patients, when switching from immediate release to comparable dose sustained release, require larger doses in order to acquire a similar analgesic effect. The release profile of all sustained or controlled release preparations is not the same and may vary for the same drug among patients. Individuals misusing opioids favour immediate release opioid preparations, regardless of the route of administration.[2]

Regarding the last point, a structured survey of 8304 individuals entering treatment for opioid use disorder found that only 4% selected extended-release opioids as their preferred formulation, while 66% favoured short-acting opioids; the remainder (30%) had no preference.[3]

Dr Persaud suggests that differences between the Canadian guideline and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) guideline[4] are owing to bias. Dr Persaud might well be right: The CDC panel was largely restricted to experts who have been critical of opioid use for chronic noncancer pain. In addition, the CDC guideline, relative to ours, had limited involvement of patients, excessive restrictions on selection of evidence (eg, insisting on studies with a follow-up of 1 year or more excluded every randomized controlled trial of treatment with opioids), suboptimal application of the GRADE (Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation) rating system to address evidence quality, excessive use of strong recommendations in the face of low-quality evidence, and vagueness in some recommendations.[5] These factors, in addition to bias as a function of restricting panelists largely to those who were already on record as being critics of opioid use, explain differences between the 2 guidelines.

The Canadian guideline is available here in an interactive, multi-layered format, with patient decision aids for all weak recommendations: **www.magicapp.org/public/guideline/8nyb0E**.

We reiterate our view that, if followed, the 2017 Canadian guideline will promote evidence-based prescribing of opioids for chronic noncancer pain.

—Jason W. Busse DC PhD
Hamilton, Ont
—David Juurlink MD PhD
Toronto, Ont
—D. Norman Buckley MD
—Gordon H. Guyatt MD MSc
Hamilton, Ont

Competing interests

All authors were members of the steering committee for the Canadian opioid guideline. **Dr Juurlink** has received payment for lectures and medicolegal opinions regarding the safety and effectiveness of analgesics, including opioids. He is a member of Physicians for Responsible Opioid Prescribing, a volunteer organization that seeks to reduce opioid-related harm through more cautious prescribing practices. **Dr Buckley** reports grants from Purdue Pharma and Janssen Inc outside the submitted work.

References

1. Persaud N. Will the new opioid guidelines harm more people than they help? No [Debates]. *Can Fam Physician* 2018;64:102-4 (Eng), 107-9 (Fr).
2. Busse J, editor. *The 2017 Canadian guideline for opioids for chronic non-cancer pain*. Hamilton, ON: National Pain Centre, McMaster University; 2017. Available from: **http://nationalpaincentre.mcmaster.ca/documents/Opioid%20GL%20for%20CMAJ_01may2017.pdf**. Accessed 2018 Apr 6.
3. Cicero TJ, Ellis MS, Kasper ZA. Relative preferences in the abuse of immediate-release versus extended-release opioids in a sample of treatment-seeking opioid abusers. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2017;26(1):56-62. Epub 2016 Sep 4.
4. Dowell D, Haegerich TM, Chou R. CDC guideline for prescribing opioids for chronic pain — United States, 2016. *MMWR Recomm Rep* 2016;65(1):1-49. Erratum in: *MMWR Recomm Rep* 2016;65(11):295.
5. Busse JW, Juurlink D, Guyatt GH. Addressing the limitations of the CDC guideline for prescribing opioids for chronic noncancer pain. *CMAJ* 2016;188(17-18):1210-1. Epub 2016 Nov 21.

Correction

In the article "Pathways to rural family practice at Memorial University of Newfoundland," published in the March issue of *Canadian Family Physician*, an error appears in the Methods section within the discussion on the L&L (Learners and Locations) database.[1] The statement "Smaller centres with less than 50% commuting flows to larger centres were categorized in accordance with the larger centre" should have read as follows:

> Smaller centres with more than 50% commuting flows to larger centres were categorized in accordance with the larger centre.

Canadian Family Physician apologizes for this error and any confusion it might have caused.

Reference

1. Rourke J, O'Keefe D, Ravalia M, Moffatt S, Parsons W, Duggan N, et al. Pathways to rural family practice at Memorial University of Newfoundland. *Can Fam Physician* 2018;64:e115-25. Available from: **www.cfp.ca/content/cfp/64/3/e115.full.pdf**. Accessed 2018 Mar 23.

Make your views known!

To comment on a particular article, open the article at **www.cfp.ca** and click on the **eLetters** tab. eLetters are usually published online within 1 to 3 days and might be selected for publication in the next print edition of the journal. To submit a letter not related to a specific article published in the journal, please e-mail **letters.editor@cfpc.ca**.

Faites-vous entendre!

Pour exprimer vos commentaires sur un article en particulier, accédez à cet article à **www.cfp.ca** et cliquez sur l'onglet **eLetters**. Les commentaires sous forme d'eLetters sont habituellement publiés en ligne dans un délai de 1 à 3 jours et pourraient être choisis pour apparaître dans le prochain numéro imprimé de la revue. Pour soumettre une lettre à la rédaction qui ne porte pas sur un article précis publié dans la revue, veuillez envoyer un courriel à **letters.editor@cfpc.ca**.