Study of Some Psychoactive Drugs and Their Role in Increasing the Risk of Suicide
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The study aims to evaluate some predictors in the statement of suicidal thoughts in the last year by students from Timisoara universities, Romania. The student population consisted of 2536 young people aged 18-29, with an average age of 21.06 years and a standard deviation of 1.529 years, 64.5% girls and 35.5% boys. It was conducted a transversal population survey. In the logarithmic model of predictors in the context of social and psychoactive drugs use in students regarding the likelihood of suicidal thoughts in the last year, we have identified predictors with OR between 1.5-2, poorly significant: dissatisfaction with the relationship with parents (OR = 1.782), drug use frequency (OR = 1.697), dissatisfaction with the relationship with current friends (OR = 1.531).
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...non-fatal outcome, for which there is evidence, either implicit or explicit, that the person intended to commit suicide. These definitions suggest that suicidal behavior involves a self-imposed act, carried out with the intention of dying [11, 12].

This research has been performed to evaluate predictors of suicidal thought reported during the last year among students in Timis County, Romania.

Experimental part

The study group consisted of 2536 students from universities in Timis County, Romania, 64.5% girls and 35.5% boys. The age of the students was between 18-29 years, with an average age of 21.06 years and a standard deviation of 1.529 years. A transversal population study was conducted using the Health Risks Questionnaire for Teenagers and Young People [13, 14]. The study was approved by the Ethics Commission of the Victor Babes University of Medicine and Pharmacy Timisoara, in accordance to the rules of the Helsinki Declaration and to some reported models [15-17]. The inclusion process of the studied population was carried out only based of the
free consent expressed by each participant, respecting its individual rights.

The data were processed using the PASW 18 (SPSS18) 2010 program. The statistical significance threshold was set at p < 0.05, except where the Bonferroni correction was applied. For the ordinal data comparisons, we used the Mann-Whitney and Kruskal-Wallis test. The Chi-square test was used in ordinal/nominal data tables. The logarithmic regression test was also used to predict different patterns of association between risk behaviors.

Results and discussions

Predictive pattern of suicidal thought reporting

We have applied the multivariate logarithmic regression to evaluate the association of some variables of the social and psychoactive substance context with the likelihood that the investigated students will have suicidal thoughts during the last year.

The model contained 12 independent variables: gender, parental rules frequency, satisfaction with parents, satisfaction with brothers, frequency of parental compliance, satisfaction with the family financial situation, frequency of school absences due to illness, frequency of school absences due to truancy, school situation, frequency of binge-drinking, frequency of drug use.

The complete model containing all predictors was statistically significant, $\chi^2 (12, N = 2536) = 119.2, p < 0.001$, indicating that the model can distinguish between respondents who had suicidal thoughts and those who did not indicate this. The whole model explained between 5.7% and 13.5% of the variance of the presence or not of suicidal thoughts and correctly classified 92.2% of the cases. Predictors who contributed significantly to the pattern were: the high degree of dissatisfaction with parenting (OR = 1.782); the high degree of dissatisfaction with the relationship with colleagues (OR = 1.531); each degree inferior to thankfulness; increased risk of reporting suicidal thoughts by 78%; increased frequency of drug use (OR = 1.697); female gender (OR = 1.406). Each category in addition to non-consumer status presents an additional risk of 69%. Each degree in minus than happy status increased the risk of reporting suicidal thoughts by 53%. Each degree inferior to the satisfied status increased the risk of reporting suicidal thoughts by 49% (table 1).

The degree of satisfaction with the relationship with parents

Dissatisfaction with parenting is present in increased frequencies, 15.2% of boys and 10.7% of girls who have had suicidal thoughts during the last year (fig. 2).

Boys who had suicidal thoughts during the last year were significantly more dissatisfied with the relationship with their parents, after excluding those without parents, $U = 19232, z = -5.74, p < 0.001$. Girls who had suicidal thoughts during the last year were significantly more dissatisfied with the relationship with their parents, after excluding those without parents, $U = 5405, z = -5.47, p < 0.001$.

The relationship with parents is crucial for the material and psychological support that they can give to the young adult, the dissatisfaction with the relationship with parents can be a major risk factor for addictive behaviors [18, 19, 43]. If the young person has a family environment favorable to development, family harmony, well-defined parental models promoting positive social and educational standards where parents discuss the repercussions of risk behaviors (smoking, alcohol, drugs, sexual relations), then youngster has less chances of experiencing drugs, being aware of the associated risks [20].

In divided families or where one parent or even both parents are drug users, in families with abusive parents, young people tend to present various psychological and even sociological issues [21-23]. Those verbally and physically abused seek in drugs a refuge, a relief that allows them to be detached from these family problems. A proportion of 6.6% of young drug users admit that they have

| Variables                                                                 | OR model | CI 95% al OR |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|--------------|
| Gender (♂)                                                               | 1.406    | 0.924 - 2.109|
| The degree of dissatisfaction with parenting                              | 1.782    | 1.391 - 2.283|
| The degree of dissatisfaction with the relationship with parents          | 1.102    | 0.962 - 1.251|
| Frequency of behavior children’s rules                                   | 0.881    | 0.722 - 1.074|
| The degree of satisfaction with the family financial situation           | 1.330    | 1.134 - 1.552|
| The degree of dissatisfaction with the relationship with colleagues      | 1.493    | 1.133 - 1.957|
| The degree of dissatisfaction with the relationship with current friends  | 1.351    | 1.018 - 1.836|
| Frequency of school absences due to illness                              | 1.147    | 0.966 - 1.351|
| Frequency of school absences due to truancy                              | 1.125    | 0.978 - 1.316|
| School situation                                                         | 1.120    | 0.908 - 1.381|
| Frequency of binge-drinking                                               | 0.825    | 0.781 - 1.121|
| Frequency of drug use                                                     | 1.067    | 1.029 - 2.042|

Table 1  PREDICTIVE MODEL VARIABLES FOR SUICIDAL THOUGHTS DURING THE LAST YEAR FOR STUDENTS
personal/family problems [24-27]. If one or both parents frequently use alcohol and drugs, young people often have easy access to them. However, some of them will do exactly the opposite and avoid all substances, wanting to avoid even the things that have destroyed the lives of their parents or have led to traumatic experiences for them, such as abuse or neglect.

**Frequency of drug use throughout life**

In male students with suicidal thoughts over the past year, drug use over the lifetime is reported by 32.8% of them: 18.8% have experimental consumption (1-2 times), 9.4% occasional consumption (1-3 times/month), 3.1% consume drugs more than once/day, and 1.6% have a daily consumption with one administration. Among female students with suicidal thoughts during the last year, drug use over the course of life is reported by 12% of them: 9% have experimental consumption (1-2 times), 2.3% occasional consumption (1-3 times/month), 0.8% have daily consumption (fig. 3).

Respondents have tried new psychoactive substances that mimic the effects of illicit drugs and 3% have used them over the past 12 months. On average, these substances appear to be more commonly used than amphetamines, ecstasy, cocaine or LSD, which have lower prevalence rates for lifetime consumption [24].

Psychoactive drugs act on the brain, producing a variety of effects on perception, mood, thought, and behavior. Harmful effects may occur especially in the context of acute intoxications, as drugs can make the user euphoric and can greatly affect his thinking and physical coordination [31-33]. People who suffer from depression, under the influence of drugs can act impulsively and may have suicide attempts. Drug addicts can engage in violence, often in a social context that facilitates such behavior.

Chronic and sustained drug use can lead to addiction syndrome. Consumers continue to use it despite the harm to personal health, welfare and health of family members and relationships with friends. Chronic consumption can produce or exacerbate mental symptoms and physical disorders, lead to failures in school and/or professional performance, and reducing social roles. In severe cases, increased and frequent use of drugs can undermine personal care and can often lead to loss of work and housing [34].

The degree of dissatisfaction with the relationship with current friends

The dissatisfaction with the relationship with current friends is indicated at a rate of 8.1% for boys and 6.1% for girls who have had suicidal thoughts during the last year (fig. 4).
consequences for them, for example, fear of not being accepted by their friends, of being teased, humiliated, rejected, and even aggressed [35-38]. Young people using drugs are likely to interact primarily with drug-using colleagues, so relationships with friends, including relationships with the opposite sex, can be unhealthy, and the young person can develop a limited repertoire of social skills [39-42].

Conclusions
Suicidal thoughts were reported by 18-29-year-old Timisoara students in the context of a multivariate prediction model created with 12 independent variables. In the prediction model in the context of social and psychoactive drug use in students regarding the likelihood of suicidal thoughts during the last year, we have identified predictors with OR between 1.5-2, poorly significant: dissatisfaction with the relationship with parents (OR = 1.782), drug use frequency (OR = 1.697), dissatisfaction with the relationship with current friends (OR = 1.531).
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