

Most investigators would discount a significant abuse potential for phenteramine and similar drugs on the basis of the data available in the literature.

The drugs have just not proven to elicit sufficiently rewarding responses in comparison to associated discomfort.

Yet, we cannot sell the human animal short. A lesser crutch will frequently be acceptable if the parent is not available, even though it is reasonable to assume that unwanted side effects will be proportionately amplified with higher doses.

Although not as extensively studied as amphetamine, phenteramine, and other drugs with similar activity have been well characterized pharmacologically.

Jerome Jaffe in the standard text, Goodman & Gilman cites the work of Martin and his associates—*Clin. Pharmacol. Ther.* 12:245, 1971—which suggest that some representatives of the series can produce central nervous system stimulation in experimental animals comparable to that of amphetamine depending upon the dose administered.

Since human investigations have been restricted to recommended doses, the relevancy of these data in humans cannot be defined. However, as a response to the invitation to discuss this problem with you I have explored this possibility further.

A former classmate and expert in the pharmacology of drug addiction, Dr. Gerald Deneau, and we have heard from Dr. Jasinski on the same thing earlier, provided me with data showing that primates under given conditions will self-administer some of these presumably less stimulant sympathomimetics. These data support the work of Martin, and others, and suggest that the appreciated amphetamine responses might be obtainable with elevated doses.

It is difficult for me to judge what the relevancy of these data are.

Any evidence suggesting a significant abuse potential requires critical evaluation before conclusions are warranted.

To achieve a conclusion that a given amphetamine-related product possesses abuse potential of an order to dictate added sanctions, it should be possible to document an increasing incidence of abuse.

In contradiction to my reporter friend, another close observer has failed to note any remarkable or alarming upsurge in recreational, nonmedical use of the amphetamine-related drugs.

He states that fenfluramine, a newer introduction more likely to produce drowsiness than stimulation, appears to present as many problems as some of the older products.

Yet, on the basis of limited data, it seems that baboons, at least, do not enjoy fenfluramine and will not self-administer the drug abnormally. Perhaps baboons are more discriminating than humans.

Undoubtedly our DEA, regulatory officials will be able to provide us with more definitive information in regard to the current incidence of cases of confirmed abuse of amphetamine-related drugs; particularly the incidence associated with the inhalation and intravenous routes of administration.

We do not know what the abuse potential is for these related drugs at this date. I think we have to find out.

If indeed the related drugs prove to possess an abuse potential approaching that of amphetamine, then clearly they should be placed in category II.