

Research Paper

Prevalence and correlates of selling illicit cannabis among people who use drugs in Vancouver, Canada: A ten-year prospective cohort study

Hudson Reddon^{a,b}, Danya Fast^{a,c}, Kora DeBeck^{a,d}, Dan Werb^{e,f}, Kanna Hayashi^g, Evan Wood^{a,c}, M.-J. Milloy^{a,b,c,*}^a British Columbia Centre on Substance Use, 1045 Howe Street, Vancouver, BC, V6Z 2A9, Canada^b CIHR Canadian HIV Trials Network, 588-1081 Burrard Street, Vancouver, BC, V6B 3E6, Canada^c Department of Medicine, University of British Columbia, St. Paul's Hospital, 1081 Burrard St, Vancouver, BC, V6Z 1Y6, Canada^d School of Public Policy, Simon Fraser University, SFU Harbour Centre, 515 West Hastings Street, Vancouver, BC, V6B 5K3, Canada^e Division of Global Public Health, Department of Medicine, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, CA, 92093-0507, USA^f Centre for Urban Health Solutions, St. Michael's Hospital, Toronto, ON, M5B 1W8, Canada^g Faculty of Health Sciences, Simon Fraser University, 8888 University Drive, Burnaby, BC, V5A 1S6, Canada

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Cannabis
Dealing
Illicit drug use
Substance use
Prospective cohort study

ABSTRACT

Background: The illicit selling and use of cannabis is prevalent among marginalized people who use illicit drugs (PWUD). Given that participation in illicit drug markets has been previously associated with a range of health and social harms, we sought to examine the predictors of selling cannabis among PWUD in Vancouver, Canada, a setting with a *de facto* legalized cannabis market, on the eve of the planned implementation of legalized non-medical cannabis including measures to regulate the existing illicit market.

Methods: Multivariable generalized estimating equations (GEE) logistic regression was used to analyze longitudinal factors associated with selling illicit cannabis among three prospective cohorts of PWUD between September 2005 and May 2015.

Results: Among the 3258 participants included in this study, 328 (10.1%) reported selling illicit cannabis at baseline, and 46 (5.1%) initiated cannabis selling over the study period. In the multivariable analysis of the whole sample, factors significantly associated with selling cannabis included cannabis use (Adjusted Odds Ratio [AOR] = 4.05), dealing other drugs (AOR = 3.87), being male (AOR = 1.83), experiencing violence (AOR = 1.40), non-medical prescription opioid use (AOR = 1.32), non-custodial involvement in the criminal justice system (AOR = 1.31), being stopped by police (AOR = 1.30), crack use (AOR = 1.25), homelessness (AOR = 1.23), age (AOR = 0.96 per year) and participation in sex work (AOR = 0.67) (all $p < 0.05$). The subanalyses indicated that dealing drugs other than cannabis, cannabis use, and non-custodial involvement in the criminal justice system were the only factors significantly associated with selling cannabis in all four sub-groups.

Conclusion: These findings support existing evidence indicating that selling illicit cannabis is often a survival-driven strategy to support the basic needs and substance use of some PWUD. Our findings suggest jurisdictions with planned or impending cannabis legalization and regulation should consider the vulnerability of PWUD when seeking to eradicate illicit cannabis markets, for example, in setting criminal penalties for selling cannabis outside of regulatory frameworks.

Introduction

People who use drugs (PWUD) experience an array of physical, social and economic challenges owing to high-intensity substance use and dependence, structural marginalization and endemic

criminalization (Blum et al., 2018; Kerr et al., 2010, 2016; Marshall et al., 2016). As a result, many PWUD engage in survival-driven illicit activities to support their basic needs (Gwadz et al., 2009; Public Health Agency of Canada, 2006). One primary strategy for generating income among PWUD in urban settings is engaging in the illicit drug trade

* Corresponding author at: Department of Medicine, University of British Columbia, BC Centre on Substance Use, 1045 Howe Street, Vancouver, BC, V6Z 2A9, Canada.

E-mail address: bccsu-mjms@bccsu.ubc.ca (M.-J. Milloy).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugpo.2019.02.006>

(DeBeck et al., 2007; Ross, 2002). Studies from diverse settings in North America have estimated that a substantial proportion (e.g., 17–58%) of PWUD engage in selling illicit drugs, and selling illicit drugs is often a survival-driven strategy among PWUD (i.e., a means to subsidize their personal drug use and support their basic survival needs) (Bellair & McNulty, 2009; Friedman et al., 1998; Gwadz et al., 2009; Kerr et al., 2008; Small et al., 2013; Werb, Kerr, Li, Montaner, & Wood, 2008). Selling illicit drugs among PWUD is associated with high-risk drug use patterns and adverse health outcomes, including high-intensity drug use, high frequency injecting, infectious disease acquisition and the morbidity and mortality associated with overdose (Darke & Hall, 2003; Kerr et al., 2008; Sherman & Latkin, 2002). PWUD who engage in selling drugs almost exclusively occupy low-level retail roles at the bottom of the drug market hierarchy, and are often victim to violent altercations with other PWUD and confrontations with police (Erickson, 2001; Kerr, Small, & Wood, 2005; May & Hough, 2004; Small et al., 2013; Ti, Wood, Shannon, Feng, & Kerr, 2013). However, this research has traditionally focused on illegal drugs other than cannabis.

Cannabis is the most trafficked illicit drug worldwide and is the most commonly used illicit substance in North America (United Nations Office on Drugs & Crime, 2016). Compared to other drug markets, cannabis markets appear to have distinct characteristics and have been described as “the most peaceful of the illicit drug markets” (Hammersvik, 2015; Room, Fisher, Hall, Lenton, & Reuter, 2010). This has been attributed to the fact that many illicit cannabis producers tend to originate from traditional socio-economic backgrounds with minimal involvement in drug dealing and other types of criminal activity (Potter et al., 2015). Researchers have also found that a significant proportion of illicit cultivators engage in social supply, defined as the non-commercial supply of drugs to friends and acquaintances for little or no profit (Coomber et al., 2018). Together, the demographics of cannabis cultivators and the cohesive social networks among buyers and sellers contribute to the low prevalence of conflict and violence among illicit cannabis markets (Belackova & Vaccaro, 2013; Coomber et al., 2018; Hammersvik, 2015). Despite the scope of the research examining illicit cannabis markets, the characteristics and predictors of cannabis selling among marginalized and vulnerable individuals who use drugs other than or in addition to cannabis (herein referred to as PWUD) have not been well described. Existing studies have found that PWUD often engage in selling illicit drugs to support their personal drug dependence, fulfill basic survival needs (e.g., food or shelter) and a lack of employable job skills or past criminal histories often limit PWUD to prohibited income generating activities (DeBeck et al., 2007; Small et al., 2013). As a result, it is unclear whether selling cannabis among PWUD is associated with the health and social risks involved in traditional illicit drug markets (e.g., high-intensity drug use and violence), or is more consistent with non-violent cannabis markets where social supply is prevalent.

The importance of this evidence gap is magnified by the fact that many jurisdictions are planning or have implemented frameworks to legalize and regulate the production, distribution, sale and non-medical use of cannabis by adults. In Canada, the federal government recently passed the *Cannabis Act*, legalizing and regulating the production, distribution and sale of cannabis to adults for non-medical use (House of Commons of Canada, 2018). This legislation has a primary goal of eliminating the illicit (i.e., pre-legalization) market and enacts harsh penalties (e.g., up to 14 years imprisonment) for individuals selling cannabis outside the legal framework (House of Commons of Canada, 2018). The justification for these penalties is based on targeting organized crime or people who make cannabis available to youth (Cannabis Legislation & Regulation, 2018). However, many authors have argued that these penalties are disproportionate compared to other psychoactive substances and may lead to unintentional negative consequences for marginalized drug users who are involved in the illicit cannabis trade as a means of economic survival (Valleriani, Lavalley, & McNeil, 2018). In Vancouver, our study setting, the municipal police

department has followed a *de facto* policy of cannabis use decriminalization since 2005. Beginning in 2015, retail storefronts selling cannabis to adults have proliferated and a high degree of judicial discretion has been applied to determine individual penalties for street-level cannabis selling (Capler et al., 2017; Coomber et al., 2018). In an effort to understand the possible impacts of cannabis legalization and regulation on the health, well-being and economic security of PWUD in Canada, we sought to estimate the prevalence and correlates of selling illicit cannabis in a *de facto* decriminalized jurisdiction prior to the implementation of non-medical cannabis legalization and regulation.

Methods

Study procedure

The analyses for this study were performed with linked data obtained from three ongoing, open and prospective cohort studies of people who use drugs: the Vancouver Injection Drug Users Study (VIDUS), a cohort of HIV-negative people who inject drugs; the AIDS Care Cohort to evaluate Exposure to Survival Services (ACCESS), a cohort of HIV-positive people who use illicit drugs other than or in addition to cannabis; and the At-Risk Youth Study (ARYS), a cohort of street-involved youth (i.e., 14–26 years old) who use illicit drugs other than or in addition to cannabis. The methodology for each of these studies has been described in detail previously (Palepu et al., 2006; Strathdee et al., 1997; Wood, Stoltz, Montaner, & Kerr, 2006). To enroll in any of the three studies, participants were required to reside in the Greater Vancouver Regional District and provide written informed consent. At baseline and at every six-month follow-up contact, participants complete an interviewer-administered questionnaire to collect data related to substance use patterns, income generating activities, drug-related harms and engagement with health and social services. They also complete a nurse-administered questionnaire focused on health status and provide blood samples for diagnostic testing (e.g., HIV and HCV antibody and HIV clinical monitoring). The data for the present analysis were collected from September 2005 to May 2015. Harmonized recruitment and data collection procedures allow combined analyses of data from all three cohorts. At each study visit participants receive \$30 CAD as remuneration for their time. The University of British Columbia/Providence Health Care Research Ethics Board has approved these studies.

Participants and measures

In the present study, we included all VIDUS, ACCESS and ARYS participants aged ≥ 18 years and completed at least one follow-up visit over the study period (September 2005–May 2015). The primary outcome of interest was self-reported engagement in selling cannabis in the last six months. To provide a comprehensive assessment of predictors of cannabis selling, we selected potential explanatory variables to include in the analysis *a priori* based on previous studies of drug selling among PWUD (DeBeck et al., 2007; Kerr et al., 2008; Werb et al., 2008). These variables included demographic factors such as: age (per year older); sex (male vs. female); self-reported ethnicity/ancestry (white vs. others); and high-school completion (high school education or greater achieved vs. less than high school level education). Drug-related variables included: cannabis use (yes vs. no); binge alcohol use, defined as using alcohol more than usual (yes vs. no); crack cocaine use (yes vs. no); injection heroin use (yes vs. no); injection cocaine use (yes vs. no); and non-medical prescription opioid use (yes vs. no). Social/structural exposure variables included: experiencing violence (having been attacked, assaulted, or suffered any kind of violence, (yes vs. no); homelessness (yes vs. no); employment (having a regular, temporary, or self-employed work vs. none); encounters with police, including being stopped, searched or detained by police without arrest (yes vs. no); having an arrest warrant (yes vs. no); incarceration, defined as

spending at least one night in a detention centre, jail, prison or penitentiary (yes vs. no); non-custodial involvement in the criminal justice system, defined as having a bail/parole condition including an area restriction (yes vs. no); involvement in selling drugs other than cannabis (yes vs. no); involvement in sex work (yes vs. no); and engagement with alcohol or drug treatment programs (yes vs. no). The definitions of these variables are consistent with previous studies and all behavioural variables refer to the six-month period preceding the interview (Wood et al., 2001).

Statistical analysis

First, we examined the characteristics at baseline of the study sample stratified by selling cannabis in the last six months. Second, to estimate the relationships between the outcome and each explanatory variable, we employed logistic regression with generalized estimating equations and an exchangeable correlation structure to account for the correlated data from repeated measures of each participant. We used a previously described backward selection process whereby variables with a significant bivariable association with cannabis selling, at the $p < 0.10$ threshold, were included in the final multivariable model (Maldonado & Greenland, 1993). The lowest quasilielihood under the independence model criterion (QIC) value was used to identify the model with the best overall fit (Pan, 2001). Since engagement with selling illicit drugs has been found to vary by gender and age, and because of strong age and gender correlates of cannabis selling in the preliminary analyses, we also conducted subanalyses to identify predictors of selling cannabis in specific sex and age strata (Bellair & McNulty, 2009; Fast, Shoveller, & Kerr, 2017; Gwadz et al., 2009; Hepburn et al., 2016; Mayock, 2005). These additional models included subgroups of females ≤ 30 years old, males ≤ 30 years old, females > 30 years old, males > 30 years old. These four additional models applied the same model building approach as the primary analysis that included the entire sample of participants. Given that the amount of missing data for the predictor variables was low ($< 1\%$), these values were excluded from the analysis. If participants were missing data for a specific follow-up visit, these values were imputed using data from the next most recent follow-up interview. SAS version 9.4 (SAS Institute, USA) was used for all statistical analyses and all tests of significance were two sided.

Results

A total of 3258 participants were enrolled into the VIDUS (N = 1210), ACCESS (N = 833) or ARYS (N = 1215) cohorts during the study period (September 2005–May 2015), completed at least one interview, and were included in this analysis. The mean number of follow-up visits completed by the participants was 7.6 (standard deviation = 5.9). The median age of participants at baseline was 33.2 years (interquartile range [IQR] = 22.8–44.3), 2195 (67.4%) were male, and 2025 (62.2%) were white. Participants completed a median of six study visits (IQR = 2–13) and the median observation time per participant was 44.5 months (IQR = 12.0–94.2).

At baseline, 328 (10.1%) participants reported selling cannabis in the past six months and 46 (5.1%) initiated selling cannabis at least once during the study period. The number of participants reporting cannabis selling was greatest at baseline and the prevalence decreased significantly over the remaining follow-up visits (Fig. 1). The prevalence of selling cannabis at baseline varied between study cohorts (ARYS: 229, 18.8%; ACCESS: 34, 4.1%; VIDUS: 65, 5.4%), and 1294 (39.7%) reported selling drugs of any kind. The baseline characteristics of the study participants, stratified by involvement in cannabis selling, are summarized in Table 1. The bivariable and multivariable analyses are reported in Table 2. Time-updated factors positively associated with cannabis selling in the multivariable analyses included cannabis use (adjusted odds ratio [AOR] = 4.05; 95% confidence interval [CI]:




Fig. 1. Number of participants reporting selling cannabis at baseline (follow-up visit 0) and each subsequent follow-up visit.

3.12–5.24), selling drugs other than cannabis (AOR = 3.87; 95% CI: 3.18–4.71), male sex (AOR = 1.83; 95% CI: 1.38–2.43), experiencing violence (AOR = 1.40; 95% CI: 1.19–1.65), non-medical prescription opioid use (AOR = 1.32; 95% CI: 1.06–1.64), non-custodial involvement in the criminal justice system (AOR = 1.31; 95% CI: 1.08–1.59), being stopped by police (AOR = 1.30; 95% CI: 1.11–1.51), crack use (AOR = 1.25; 95% CI: 1.04–1.50) and homelessness (AOR = 1.23; 95% CI: 1.03–1.45). Older age (per year older) (AOR = 0.96; 95% CI: 0.94–0.97) and involvement in sex work (AOR = 0.67; 95% CI: 0.49–0.92) were negatively associated with selling cannabis.

The subanalyses of the four sex and age subgroups (females ≤ 30 years old, males ≤ 30 years old, females > 30 years old, males > 30 years old) demonstrated that dealing drugs other than cannabis, cannabis use, and non-custodial involvement in the criminal justice system were the only three factors significantly associated with selling cannabis in all four subgroups. Homelessness and encounters with police were significantly associated with selling cannabis in all subgroups, except for among females over 30 years old. Non-medical prescription opioid use was positively associated with selling cannabis in the overall analysis and this association was only significant among females over 30 years old, while involvement in sex work was negatively associated with selling cannabis in the overall analysis and only significant among females ≤ 30 years old (Table 3).

Discussion

Our findings indicate that nearly 15% of our PWUD sample living in Vancouver, Canada engaged in selling cannabis during the approximately 10-year study period. Consistent with previous research, many of the correlates identified are consistent with cannabis selling being a survival-driven economic strategy to support the substance use and basic needs of PWUD, especially among members of certain age and sex groups (Bellair & McNulty, 2009; Gwadz et al., 2009; Kerr et al., 2008; Public Health Agency of Canada, 2006; Werb et al., 2008). However, previous studies have also reported that drug dealing is associated with intense patterns of drug use such as high frequency injecting, and we did not observe these associations with cannabis selling in the present study (Kerr et al., 2008; Sherman & Latkin, 2002).

We observed greater likelihoods of cannabis selling among younger individuals and males, consistent with cohort data from at-risk youth in North America reporting that over half of the participants have engaged in drug dealing, while studies of older PWUD report prevalence estimates of 17–25% (Gwadz et al., 2009; Kerr et al., 2008; Semple, Strathdee, Zians, & Patterson, 2013; Werb et al., 2008). Many PWUD initiate and continue drug dealing despite the associated risks, due to the need to support ongoing drug use, as well as the stigmatization and marginalization that persist as barriers to participation in the legal economy (Fast et al., 2017; Hepburn et al., 2016; Small et al., 2013; Werb et al., 2011). Looking beyond economic explanations, qualitative work suggests that drug dealing can enmesh individuals in valued forms of sociality, morality, dignity and belonging in places characterized by

Table 1
Baseline characteristics of the study sample stratified by involvement in cannabis selling in the past six months.

Characteristic	Cannabis selling		Odds Ratio (95% CI)	p-value
	Yes (n = 328) n (%)	No (n = 2930) n (%)		
Age (per year older)				
Median	22.8	34.9	0.93 (0.92–0.94)	< 0.001
IQR	(20.4–28.0)	(23.3–45.0)		
Male				
Yes	75 (22.9)	988 (33.7)	1.72 (1.31–2.25)	< 0.001
No	253 (77.1)	1942 (66.3)		
Caucasian ethnicity				
Yes	227 (69.2)	1798 (61.4)	1.43 (1.12–1.83)	0.005
No	100 (30.5)	1131 (38.6)		
Homeless^A				
Yes	235 (71.6)	1388 (47.4)	2.81 (2.19–3.62)	< 0.001
No	92 (28.0)	1529 (52.2)		
High-school diploma				
Yes	119 (36.3)	1305 (44.5)	0.70 (0.55–0.89)	0.003
No	204 (62.2)	1564 (53.4)		
Employment^A				
Yes	160 (48.8)	985 (33.6)	1.88 (1.49–2.37)	< 0.001
No	168 (51.2)	1945 (66.4)		
Sex work^A				
Yes	23 (7.0)	414 (14.1)	0.46 (0.29–0.71)	< 0.001
No	303 (92.4)	2489 (84.9)		
Dealing drugs other than cannabis^A				
Yes	77 (23.5)	82 (2.8)	10.65 (7.61–14.9)	< 0.001
No	251 (76.5)	2848 (97.2)		
Cannabis use^A				
Yes	291 (88.7)	1909 (65.2)	4.17 (2.54–5.92)	< 0.001
No	37 (11.3)	1012 (34.5)		
Binge alcohol use^A				
Yes	33 (10.1)	180 (6.1)	1.71 (1.16–2.52)	0.009
No	294 (89.6)	2737 (93.4)		
Crack use^A				
Yes	210 (64.0)	2059 (70.3)	0.76 (0.60–0.96)	0.026
No	116 (35.4)	861 (29.4)		
Injection cocaine use^A				
Yes	74 (22.6)	985 (33.6)	0.57 (0.44–0.75)	< 0.001
No	254 (77.4)	1932 (65.9)		
Injection heroin use^A				
Yes	115 (35.1)	1308 (44.6)	0.66 (0.52–0.84)	0.001
No	213 (65.1)	1610 (54.9)		
Prescription opioid use^A				
Yes	104 (31.7)	778 (26.6)	1.31 (1.02–1.68)	0.035
No	216 (65.9)	2119 (72.3)		
Victim of violence^A				
Yes	160 (48.8)	860 (29.4)	2.30 (1.82–2.90)	< 0.001
No	163 (49.7)	2013 (68.7)		
Encounters with police^A				
Yes	155 (47.3)	836 (28.5)	2.33 (1.85–2.95)	< 0.001
No	163 (49.7)	2052 (70.0)		
Arrest warrant^A				
Yes	130 (39.6)	575 (19.6)	2.71 (2.13–3.45)	< 0.001
No	193 (58.8)	2316 (79.0)		
Recent incarceration^A				
Yes	87 (26.5)	469 (16.0)	1.91 (1.46–2.49)	< 0.001
No	236 (72)	2429 (82.9)		
Non-custodial involvement in the criminal justice system^A				
Yes	84 (25.6)	394 (13.4)	2.25 (1.71–2.94)	< 0.001
No	237 (72.3)	2496 (85.2)		
Participation in alcohol or drug treatment^A				
Yes	114 (34.8)	1278 (43.6)	0.68 (0.54–0.87)	0.002
No	211 (64.3)	1612 (55.0)		

Notes: CI: confidence interval; IQR: interquartile range; p-values based on Fischer exact test; ^A denotes activities in the six months prior to follow-up interview; bold values indicate p-values < 0.05.

entrenched marginalization and exclusion (Bourgois, 1996; Cheng et al., 2016; Fast, Shoveller, Shannon, & Kerr, 2010, 2017; Wakeman, 2016). Therefore, expanding low-threshold employment opportunities for PWUD and pairing these opportunities with addiction services may not only serve to alleviate economic constraints, but also provide PWUD with valued forms of sociality and belonging outside of the illicit

drug market (DeBeck et al., 2007). The health, social and economic benefits of integrating employment opportunities for PWUD with substance use treatment have been reported in settings such as Portugal, where the average employment rate of PWUD undergoing treatment is nearly 50% (Goncalves, Lourenco, & Silva, 2015; Hughes & Stevens, 2010). Our finding that selling cannabis was more common among

Table 2
Bivariable and multivariable GEE analysis of factors associated with cannabis selling.

Characteristic	Unadjusted Odds Ratio (95% CI)	Adjusted Odds Ratio (95% CI)
Age (per year older)	0.94 (0.93–0.95)	0.96 (0.94–0.97)
Sex (male vs. female)	2.21 (1.74–2.80)	1.83 (1.38–2.43)
Caucasian ethnicity (yes vs. no)	1.22 (0.98–1.51)	–
Homeless ^A (yes vs. no)	3.08 (2.61–3.63)	1.23 (1.03–1.45)
High school diploma (yes vs. no)	0.70 (0.57–0.87)	0.91 (0.73–1.14)
Employment ^A (yes vs. no)	1.52 (1.29–1.78)	1.21 (1.00–1.47)
Sex work ^A (yes vs. no)	0.71 (0.53–0.94)	0.67 (0.49–0.92)
Dealing drugs other than cannabis ^A (yes vs. no)	4.67 (3.94–5.52)	3.87 (3.18–4.71)
Cannabis use ^A (yes vs. no)	6.81 (5.38–8.63)	4.05 (3.12–5.24)
Binge alcohol use ^A (yes vs. no)	1.86 (1.45–2.40)	1.11 (0.85–1.46)
Crack use ^A (yes vs. no)	1.36 (1.15–1.62)	1.25 (1.04–1.50)
Injection cocaine use ^A (yes vs. no)	0.99 (0.82–1.20)	–
Injection heroin use ^A (yes vs. no)	1.22 (1.01–1.48)	0.97 (0.77–1.23)
Prescription opioid use ^A (yes vs. no)	1.96 (1.65–2.33)	1.32 (1.06–1.64)
Victim of violence ^A (yes vs. no)	2.92 (2.51–3.40)	1.40 (1.19–1.65)
Encounters with police ^A (yes vs. no)	3.16 (2.72–3.67)	1.30 (1.11–1.51)
Arrest warrant ^A (yes vs. no)	2.40 (2.02–2.86)	0.87 (0.71–1.06)
Recent incarceration ^A (yes vs. no)	2.67 (2.23–3.20)	1.12 (0.91–1.37)
Non-custodial involvement in the criminal justice system ^A (yes vs. no)	2.81 (2.39–3.31)	1.31 (1.08–1.59)
Participation in alcohol or drug treatment ^A (yes vs. no)	0.77 (0.64–0.93)	1.00 (0.83–1.20)

Notes: CI: confidence interval; ^A denotes activities in the six months prior to follow-up interview; bold values indicate p-values < 0.05.

males and is associated with experiencing violence is also congruent with previous research (Bourgeois, Prince, & Moss, 2004; Denton & O'Malley, 1999; Hayashi et al., 2016; Hepburn et al., 2016; Mayock, 2005). With no recourse to legal dispute settlement mechanisms, street-based drug dealing is often animated by gendered hierarchies and forms of sociality that position men in dominant roles with greater control over resources, as well as at higher risk for experiencing violence (Bourdieu, 2001; Epele, 2002; Fairbairn, Small, Shannon, Wood, & Kerr, 2008). As a result, women tend to be systematically excluded from illicit drug markets altogether, or excluded from upper-level roles in the drug dealing hierarchy, and derive less benefit from involvement in illicit drug trade (Braitstein et al., 2003; Fairbairn et al., 2008; Maher & Daly, 1996; Shannon et al., 2008; Small et al., 2013). Nevertheless, previous literature has shown that some female participants engage in drug dealing as a temporary reprieve from less desirable forms of income generation, such as sex work (Maher, 1997; Small et al., 2013).

Our results also have important implications for drug policy. Canada's recently-passed *Cannabis Act* legalizes and regulates the production, distribution and sale of non-medical cannabis by certain producers and retailers, depending on the jurisdiction. These regulations include criminal penalties for the illegal distribution and sale of

cannabis ranging from small fines for unauthorized street-level sales to adults, to up to 14 years imprisonment for offences such as unauthorized distribution to minors (House of Commons of Canada, 2018). The Cannabis Act received criticism for introducing additional criminal offences related to cannabis, including penalties for possession of illicitly-sourced cannabis that are drastically disproportionate to infractions involving any other licit substance (Bill C-45, 2018; Valleriani et al., 2018). Evidence from Portugal, which has decriminalized the possession of all illicit drugs, reported that the social cost of drugs decreased by 12% in the five years following the approval of the National Strategy for the Fight Against Drugs (Goncalves et al., 2015). Other criticized shortcomings of Cannabis Act include the failure to expunge cannabis-related offences that were legalized in October 2018. These penalties are a legal and social burden to members of marginalized groups such as PWUD and racial minorities and failure to implement the appropriate reparations will allow these disparities to continue post-legalization (Valleriani et al., 2018). As an example, cannabis-related charges have decreased significantly in US states that have legalized access to non-medical cannabis, yet the racial disparities in these charges have continued (Valleriani et al., 2018).

The current evidence, including the findings from this study, demonstrate that there is a high prevalence of illicit drug selling among PWUD and the harsh penalties for drug selling offences may be misplaced among of PWUD (Dwyer & Moore, 2010; Fitzgerald, 2009; Small et al., 2013). This is particularly relevant for at-risk youth who use drugs, where the prevalence of drug selling has been found to be over 60% in some settings (Cheng et al., 2016; Hepburn et al., 2016; Werb et al., 2008). In addition to their social and economic vulnerability, these PWUD are struggling with other forms of illicit drug use, which is supported by the observation that people who sell cannabis are also more likely to report the use of crack and illicit prescription opioids (Decker, 2000; Fast, Small, Wood, & Kerr, 2009; Small et al., 2013). Lastly, the challenges faced by PWUD who sell drugs are compounded by high rates of homelessness and violent encounters with other PWUD and law enforcement (Marshall et al., 2016; May, 2004). Together, these findings demonstrate that many PWUD are contending with the intersection of multiple social, economic and health vulnerabilities. There is also evidence suggesting that participation in drug dealing is often a means of economic survival that provides alternate forms of sociality, mediates boredom of 'life in the margins' and is a strategy to support their addiction, rather than as a method of gainful employment (DeBeck et al., 2007; Fast et al., 2017). In fact, a previous study reported that decreased intensity of drug use was an independent predictor of drug dealing cessation among PWUD (Werb et al., 2011). Linking low-threshold employment opportunities with addiction services may be an opportunity for PWUD to replace their participation in illicit drug selling with productive legal occupations, and prevent PWUD from transitioning into other forms of drug selling that are often more violent than illicit cannabis markets (DeBeck et al., 2007; Hammersvik, 2015).

The findings from the subanalyses highlighted unique correlates of cannabis selling in these cohorts. Cannabis use, dealing drugs other than cannabis and non-custodial involvement in the criminal justice system were the only factors associated with cannabis selling in all four age and sex subgroups. Given that people who sell drugs often do so to gain access to illicit substances, it is not surprising that cannabis selling was common among those who use cannabis (Small et al., 2013). In contrast to previous studies of illicit drug markets, cannabis selling was not significantly associated with high-risk drug use patterns such as injection drug use or binge drug use, and injection drug use was only significantly associated with cannabis selling among males over 30 years old and this was restricted to cocaine use (Kerr et al., 2008). Cannabis selling was however significantly associated with being a victim of violence, encounters with police and homelessness, which is consistent with existing studies of illicit drug markets (Erickson, 2001; Kerr et al., 2005; May & Hough, 2004; Small et al., 2013; Ti et al.,

Table 3Multivariable GEE analysis of factors associated with selling cannabis among female and male participants stratified by age (≤ 30 years old vs. > 30 years old).

Characteristic	Females		Males	
	≤ 30 years old Odds Ratio (95% CI)	> 30 years old Odds Ratio (95% CI)	≤ 30 years old Odds Ratio (95% CI)	> 30 years old Odds Ratio (95% CI)
Caucasian ethnicity (yes vs. no)	–	–	–	–
Homeless^A (yes vs. no)	1.69 (1.42–2.01)	–	1.69 (1.42–2.02)	1.70 (1.43–2.03)
High school diploma (yes vs. no)	0.80 (0.65–1.00)	–	–	–
Employment^A (yes vs. no)	1.53 (1.28–1.82)	–	–	–
Sex work^A (yes vs. no)	0.62 (0.46–0.83)	–	–	–
Dealing drugs other than cannabis^A (yes vs. no)	4.03 (3.31–4.91)	4.00 (3.35–4.77)	3.72 (3.09–4.48)	3.72 (3.09–4.48)
Cannabis use^A (yes vs. no)	5.16 (4.03–6.61)	6.20 (4.89–7.85)	5.51 (4.34–6.99)	5.54 (4.37–7.04)
Binge alcohol use^A (yes vs. no)	–	–	1.21 (0.93–1.58)	–
Crack use^A (yes vs. no)	–	–	0.94 (0.78–1.14)	0.94 (0.78–1.15)
Injection cocaine use^A (yes vs. no)	–	–	0.74 (0.61–0.91)	0.74 (0.61–0.90)
Injection heroin use^A (yes vs. no)	0.87 (0.68–1.11)	–	–	–
Prescription opioid use^A (yes vs. no)	1.24 (1.00–1.54)	1.22 (1.01–1.46)	1.19 (0.99–1.45)	1.19 (0.98–1.44)
Victim of violence^A (yes vs. no)	1.57 (1.34–1.86)	–	1.61 (1.36–1.89)	1.62 (1.37–1.91)
Encounters with police^A (yes vs. no)	1.45 (1.24–1.71)	–	1.43 (1.22–1.68)	1.43 (1.22–1.68)
Arrest warrant^A (yes vs. no)	1.08 (0.88–1.32)	–	1.03 (0.84–1.27)	1.03 (0.84–1.27)
Recent incarceration^A (yes vs. no)	–	1.52 (1.24–1.86)	1.14 (0.93–1.41)	1.15 (0.93–1.42)
Non-custodial involvement in the criminal justice system^A (yes vs. no)	1.43 (1.17–1.74)	1.70 (1.42–2.03)	1.41 (1.16–1.72)	1.41 (1.16–1.71)
Participation in alcohol or drug treatment^A (yes vs. no)	0.90 (0.75–1.09)	–	–	–

Notes: CI: confidence interval; ^A denotes activities in the six months prior to follow-up interview; bold values indicate p-values < 0.05 .

2013). These associations were observed in the overall analysis (Table 2) as well as in all age and sex subgroups except females over 30 years old (Table 3). Interestingly, the subgroup analyses indicated that selling cannabis was negatively associated with participation in sex work but this was restricted to females younger than 30 years of age. This may lend support to previous findings that female PWUD engage in drug selling as a temporary reprieve from sex work (Small et al., 2013). Therefore, PWUD engaged in selling cannabis appear to share some characteristics of other illicit markets, and experience health and economic insecurities that are less common in traditional cannabis markets (Hammersvik, 2015; Potter et al., 2015).

The strengths of this study include the prospective repeated measures design, the nine year and eight month follow-up period, and the thorough data collection procedures. Including three different cohorts of participants also provided data from PWUD at varying points in their drug use career. The limitations of this study include self-reported data collection, which creates the potential for socially desirable responding of stigmatized and criminalized behaviours and recall error. Measurement error associated with an exposure generally produces an underestimate of the true effect size (Reddon, Gueant, & Meyre, 2016). However, self-reported drug use data has been found to produce reliable and valid measures in previous studies (Darke, 1998). Since these cohorts do not represent random samples of PWUD, these results may not be generalizable to PWUD in other settings. It is also important to note that analyzing the three study cohorts as a combined sample may have prevented the identification of associations that were specific to

individual cohorts. There is also a possibility that the correlates of cannabis selling may differ among people who inject drugs and people who do not inject drugs, and this was not analyzed in the present study. Lastly, residual confounding may have influenced the association between the independent variables and cannabis selling since this was an observational study.

The findings from the present study support the existing evidence indicating that many PWUD engage in selling drugs as a survival strategy to meet their basic financial needs and support their illicit drug use. The illicit sale of cannabis was also associated with experiences of violence and confrontations with police. Future cannabis legalization policy should consider the vulnerability of PWUD when designing the criminal penalties for selling cannabis outside of the regulatory framework.

Contributors

HR and MM designed the study. HR and MM drafted the article, all authors contributed substantially critically reviewing the article for intellectual content, and approved the final version.

Competing interests

None to declare.

CRedit authorship contribution statement

Hudson Reddon: Conceptualization, Investigation, Writing - original draft. **Danya Fast:** Funding acquisition, Writing - original draft. **Kora DeBeck:** Funding acquisition, Writing - original draft. **Dan Werb:** Writing - original draft. **Kanna Hayashi:** Funding acquisition, Writing - original draft. **Evan Wood:** Funding acquisition, Writing - original draft. **M.-J. Milloy:** Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Investigation, Methodology, Writing - original draft.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank the study participants for their contribution to the research, as well as current and past researchers and staff. We would specifically like to thank Carly Hoy, Jennifer Matthews, Peter Vann, Steve Kain, Dr. Lorena Mota, Dr. Ekaterina Nosova, and Ana Prado for their research, statistical and administrative support. The study was supported by the US National Institutes of Health (U01-DA038886, U01-DA0251525) and the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) (MOP-286532). This research was undertaken, in part, thanks to funding from the Canada Research Chairs program through a Tier 1 Canada Research Chair in Inner City Medicine which supports Dr. Evan Wood. This study was supported by the CIHR Canadian HIV Trials Network (CTN 222). Dr. Hudson Reddon is supported by a Sponsor/CTN Postdoctoral Fellowship Award. Dr. Kora DeBeck is supported by a Michael Smith Foundation of Health Research (MSFHR) / St. Paul's Hospital Foundation-Providence Health Care Career Scholar Award and a CIHR New Investigator Award. Dr. M-J Milloy is supported in part by the United States National Institutes of Health (U01-DA021525), a New Investigator Award from CIHR and a Scholar Award from MSFHR. His institution has received an unstructured gift to support him from NG Biomed, Ltd., a private firm applying for a government license to produce cannabis. The Canopy Growth professorship in cannabis science was established through unstructured gifts to the University of British Columbia from Canopy Growth, a licensed producer of cannabis, and the Ministry of Mental Health and Addictions of the Government of British Columbia. Dr. Dan Werb is supported by an Avenir Award from the U.S. National Institute of Drug Abuse (DP2-DA040256-01), a CIHR New Investigator Award and an Early Researcher Award from the Ontario Ministry of Research, Innovation and Science. Dr. Kanna Hayashi is supported by a CIHR New Investigator Award (MSH-141971), a MSFHR Scholar Award, and the St. Paul's Foundation.

References

- Belackova, V., & Vaccaro, C. A. (2013). "A friend with weed is a friend indeed": Understanding the relationship between friendship identity and market relations among marijuana users. *Journal of Drug Issues*, 43(3), 289–313.
- Bellair, P. E., & McNulty, T. L. (2009). Gang membership, drug selling, and violence in neighborhood context. *Justice Quarterly*, 26(4), 644–669. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07418820802593394>.
- Bill C-45 (2018). *An act respecting cannabis and to amend the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act, the Criminal Code and other Acts*. Royal Assent June 21, 2018. 42nd Parliament, 1st session. Retrieved from the Parliament of Canada website Retrieved from <http://www.parl.ca/DocumentViewer/en/42-1/bill/C-45/royal-assent>.
- Blum, K., Han, D., Modestino, E. J., Saunders, S., Roy, A. K., 3rd, Jacobs, W., & Gold, M. S. (2018). A Systematic, Intensive Statistical Investigation of Data from the Comprehensive Analysis of Reported Drugs (CARD) for compliance and illicit opioid abstinence in substance addiction treatment with buprenorphine/naloxone. *Substance Use & Misuse*, 53(2), 220–229. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10826084.2017.1400064>.
- Bourdieu, P. (2001). *Masculine domination*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Bourgois, P. (1996). *In search of respect: Selling crack in El Barrio*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourgois, P., Prince, B., & Moss, A. (2004). The everyday violence of hepatitis C among young women who inject drugs in San Francisco. *Human Organization*, 63(3), 253–264.
- Braitstein, P., Li, K., Tyndall, M., Spittal, P., O'Shaughnessy, M. V., Schilder, A., & Schechter, M. T. (2003). Sexual violence among a cohort of injection drug users. *Social Science & Medicine*, 57(3), 561–569.
- Cannabis Legalization and Regulation. (2018). Government of Canada: Department of Justice. Retrieved from <https://http://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/cj-jp/cannabis/>.
- Capler, R., Walsh, Z., Crosby, K., Belle-Isle, L., Holtzman, S., Lucas, P., ... Callaway, R. (2017). Are dispensaries indispensable? Patient experiences of access to cannabis from medical cannabis dispensaries in Canada. *The International Journal of Drug Policy*, 47, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugpo.2017.05.046>.
- Cheng, T., Kerr, T., Small, W., Nguyen, P., Wood, E., & DeBeck, K. (2016). High prevalence of risky income generation among street-involved youth in a Canadian setting. *The International Journal of Drug Policy*, 28, 91–97. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugpo.2015.12.022>.
- Coomber, R., Moyle, L., Belackova, V., Decorte, T., Hakkarainen, P., Hathaway, A., & Werse, B. (2018). The burgeoning recognition and accommodation of the social supply of drugs in international criminal justice systems: An eleven-nation comparative overview. *The International Journal of Drug Policy*, 58, 93–103. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugpo.2018.05.010>.
- Darke, S. (1998). Self-report among injecting drug users: A review. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 51(3), 253–263 discussion 267–258.
- Darke, S., & Hall, W. (2003). Heroin overdose: Research and evidence-based intervention. *Journal of Urban Health*, 80(2), 189–200. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jurban/jtg022>.
- DeBeck, K., Shannon, K., Wood, E., Li, K., Montaner, J., & Kerr, T. (2007). Income generating activities of people who inject drugs. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 91(1), 50–56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2007.05.003>.
- Decker, S. (2000). Legitimizing drug use: A note on the impact of gang membership and drug sales on the use of illicit drugs. *Justice Quarterly*, 17, 393–410.
- Denton, B., & O'Malley, P. (1999). Gender, trust, and business: Women drug dealers in the illicit economy. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 39(4), 513–530.
- Dwyer, R., & Moore, D. (2010). Beyond neoclassical economics: Social process, agency and the maintenance of order in an Australian illicit drug marketplace. *The International Journal of Drug Policy*, 21(5), 390–398. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugpo.2010.03.001>.
- Epele, M. E. (2002). Gender, violence and HIV: Women's survival in the streets. *Culture, Medicine and Psychiatry*, 26(1), 33–54.
- Erickson, P. (2001). *Drugs, violence and public health: What does the harm reduction approach have to offer?* Vancouver, BC: The Fraser Institute.
- Fairbairn, N., Small, W., Shannon, K., Wood, E., & Kerr, T. (2008). Seeking refuge from violence in street-based drug scenes: Women's experiences in North America's first supervised injection facility. *Social Science & Medicine*, 67(5), 817–823. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2008.05.012>.
- Fast, D., Small, W., Wood, E., & Kerr, T. (2009). Coming' down here': Young people's reflections on becoming entrenched in a local drug scene. *Social Science & Medicine*, 69(8), 1204–1210. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2009.07.024>.
- Fast, D., Shoveller, J., Shannon, K., & Kerr, T. (2010). Safety and danger in downtown Vancouver: Understandings of place among young people entrenched in an urban drug scene. *Health & Place*, 16(1), 51–60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2009.07.004>.
- Fast, D., Shoveller, J., & Kerr, T. (2017). The material, moral, and affective worlds of dealing and crime among young men entrenched in an inner city drug scene. *The International Journal of Drug Policy*, 44, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugpo.2017.01.003>.
- Fitzgerald, J. L. (2009). Mapping the experience of drug dealing risk environments: An ethnographic case study. *The International Journal of Drug Policy*, 20(3), 261–269. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugpo.2008.10.002>.
- Friedman, S. R., Furst, R. T., Jose, B., Curtis, R., Neaigus, A., Des Jarlais, D. C., ... Ildefonso, G. (1998). Drug scene roles and HIV risk. *Addiction*, 93(9), 1403–1416.
- Goncalves, R., Lourenco, A., & Silva, S. N. (2015). A social cost perspective in the wake of the Portuguese strategy for the fight against drugs. *The International Journal of Drug Policy*, 26(2), 199–209. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugpo.2014.08.017>.
- Gwadz, M. V., Gostnell, K., Smolenski, C., Willis, B., Nish, D., Nolan, T. C., & Ritchie, A. S. (2009). The initiation of homeless youth into the street economy. *Journal of Adolescence*, 32(2), 357–377. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2008.01.004>.
- Hammersvik, E. (2015). Four barriers and a set of values that prevent violence among cannabis growers. *The International Journal of Drug Policy*, 26(3), 290–295. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugpo.2014.08.011>.
- Hayashi, K., Daly-Grafstein, B., Dong, H., Wood, E., Kerr, T., & DeBeck, K. (2016). The relationship between violence and engagement in drug dealing and sex work among street-involved youth. *Canadian Journal of Public Health*, 107(1), e88–93. <https://doi.org/10.17269/cjph.107.5219>.
- Hepburn, K., Barker, B., Nguyen, P., Dong, H., Wood, E., Kerr, T., ... DeBeck, K. (2016). Initiation of drug dealing among a prospective cohort of street-involved youth. *The American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse*, 42(5), 507–512. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00952990.2016.1186684>.
- House of Commons of Canada (2018). *Statutes of Canada, Chapter 16. Bill C-45. An Act respecting cannabis and to amend the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act, the Criminal Code and other Acts*. Retrieved from <http://www.parl.ca/DocumentViewer/en/42-1/bill/C-45/royal-assent>.
- Hughes, C. E., & Stevens, A. (2010). What can we learn from the portugese decriminalization of illicit drugs? *The British Journal of Criminology*, 50, 999–1022. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azq038>.
- Kerr, T., Small, W., & Wood, E. (2005). The public health and social impacts of drug market enforcement: A review of the evidence. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 16(3), 12–34.
- Kerr, T., Small, W., Johnston, C., Li, K., Montaner, J. S., & Wood, E. (2008). Characteristics of injection drug users who participate in drug dealing: Implications for drug policy. *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs*, 40(2), 147–152. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02791072.2008.10400624>.
- Kerr, T., Small, W., Buchner, C., Zhang, R., Li, K., Montaner, J., ... Wood, E. (2010). Syringe sharing and HIV incidence among injection drug users and increased access

- to sterile syringes. *American Journal of Public Health*, 100(8), 1449–1453. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2009.178467>.
- Kerr, T., Shannon, K., Ti, L., Strathdee, S., Hayashi, K., Nguyen, P., & Wood, E. (2016). Sex work and HIV incidence among people who inject drugs. *AIDS*, 30(4), 627–634. <https://doi.org/10.1097/QAD.0000000000000948>.
- Maher, L. (1997). *Sexed work: Race and resistance in a Brooklyn drug market*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Maher, L., & Daly, K. (1996). Women in the street-level drug economy: continuity or change? *Criminology*, 34(4), 465–491.
- Maldonado, G., & Greenland, S. (1993). Simulation study of confounder-selection strategies. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 138(11), 923–936.
- Marshall, B. D., Elston, B., Dobrer, S., Parashar, S., Hogg, R. S., Montaner, J. S., & Milloy, M. J. (2016). The population impact of eliminating homelessness on HIV viral suppression among people who use drugs. *AIDS*, 30(6), 933–942. <https://doi.org/10.1097/QAD.0000000000000990>.
- May, T., & Hough, M. (2004). Drug markets and distribution systems. *Addiction Research & Theory*, 12(6), 549–563.
- Mayock, P. (2005). 'Scripting' risk: Young people and the construction of drug journeys. *Drugs Education Prevention & Policy*, 12, 349–368.
- Palepu, A., Tyndall, M. W., Joy, R., Kerr, T., Wood, E., Press, N., & Montaner, J. S. (2006). Antiretroviral adherence and HIV treatment outcomes among HIV/HCV co-infected injection drug users: The role of methadone maintenance therapy. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 84(2), 188–194. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2006.02.003>.
- Pan, W. (2001). Akaike's information criterion in generalized estimating equations. *Biometrics*, 57(1), 120–125.
- Potter, G. R., Barratt, M. J., Malm, A., Bouchard, M., Blok, T., Christensen, A. S., & Wouters, M. (2015). Global patterns of domestic cannabis cultivation: Sample characteristics and patterns of growing across eleven countries. *The International Journal of Drug Policy*, 26(3), 226–237. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugpo.2014.12.007>.
- Public Health Agency of Canada (2006). *Ottawa: Street youth in Canada: Findings from enhanced surveillance of Canadian street youth, 1999–2003*.
- Reddon, H., Gueant, J. L., & Meyre, D. (2016). The importance of gene-environment interactions in human obesity. *Clinical Science (London)*, 130(18), 1571–1597. <https://doi.org/10.1042/CS20160221>.
- Room, R., Fisher, B., Hall, W., Lenton, S., & Reuter, P. (2010). *Cannabis policy: Moving beyond stalemate*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ross, T. (2002). Using and dealing in Calle 19: A high risk street community in central Bogota. *The International Journal of Drug Policy*, 13(45).
- Semple, S. J., Strathdee, S. A., Zians, J., & Patterson, T. L. (2013). Correlates of drug dealing in female methamphetamine users. *Journal of Urban Health*, 90(3), 529–541. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11524-012-9748-9>.
- Shannon, K., Kerr, T., Allinott, S., Chettiar, J., Shoveller, J., & Tyndall, M. W. (2008). Social and structural violence and power relations in mitigating HIV risk of drug-using women in survival sex work. *Social Science & Medicine*, 66(4), 911–921. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2007.11.008>.
- Sherman, S. G., & Latkin, C. A. (2002). Drug users' involvement in the drug economy: Implications for harm reduction and HIV prevention programs. *Journal of Urban Health*, 79(2), 266–277. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jurban/79.2.266>.
- Small, W., Maher, L., Lawlor, J., Wood, E., Shannon, K., & Kerr, T. (2013). Injection drug users' involvement in drug dealing in the downtown eastside of Vancouver: Social organization and systemic violence. *The International Journal of Drug Policy*, 24(5), 479–487. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugpo.2013.03.006>.
- Strathdee, S. A., Patrick, D. M., Currie, S. L., Cornelisse, P. G., Rekart, M. L., Montaner, J. S., & O'Shaughnessy, M. V. (1997). Needle exchange is not enough: Lessons from the Vancouver injecting drug use study. *AIDS*, 11(8), F59–65.
- Ti, L., Wood, E., Shannon, K., Feng, C., & Kerr, T. (2013). Police confrontations among street-involved youth in a Canadian setting. *The International Journal of Drug Policy*, 24(1), 46–51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugpo.2012.06.008>.
- United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (2016). *New York: World drug report* Retrieved from <http://www.unodc.org/wdr2016/>.
- Valleriani, J., Lavalley, J., & McNeil, R. (2018). A missed opportunity? Cannabis legalization and reparations in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Public Health*, 109(5–6), 745–747. <https://doi.org/10.17269/s41997-018-0121-y>.
- Wakeman, S. (2016). The moral economy of heroin in 'Austerity Britain'. *Critical Criminology*, 24(3), 363–377. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10612-015-9312-5>.
- Werb, D., Kerr, T., Li, K., Montaner, J., & Wood, E. (2008). Risks surrounding drug trade involvement among street-involved youth. *The American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse*, 34(6), 810–820. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00952990802491589>.
- Werb, D., Bouchard, M., Kerr, T., Shoveller, J., Qi, J., Montaner, J., ... Wood, E. (2011). Drug dealing cessation among a cohort of drug users in Vancouver, Canada. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 118(2–3), 459–463. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2011.05.008>.
- Wood, E., Tyndall, M. W., Spittal, P. M., Li, K., Kerr, T., Hogg, R. S., & Schechter, M. T. (2001). Unsafe injection practices in a cohort of injection drug users in Vancouver: could safer injecting rooms help? *CMAJ*, 165(4), 405–410.
- Wood, E., Stoltz, J. A., Montaner, J. S., & Kerr, T. (2006). Evaluating methamphetamine use and risks of injection initiation among street youth: The ARYS study. *Harm Reduction Journal*, 3, 18. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1477-7517-3-18>.