

SUPPORTING INFORMATION 8. PROGRESS-PLUS CHARACTERISTICS

Numbering of tables is specific to this Supporting Information document. References relating to this Supporting Information are included at the end of this document.

Table 1 presents characteristics of participants in the included studies that are considered to stratify health opportunities and outcomes.¹ We also present a narrative summary of the relevant characteristics.

The mean age of participants in the included studies ranged from 16 years²⁻⁴ to 48 years.⁵ Five studies specifically focused on younger participants, only recruiting people aged 25 years or under.^{2-4,6,7}

Data were predominantly from the United States (15 studies).^{2,4-17} Two studies were conducted in Iran,^{18,19} and one study was conducted in each of Turkey,²⁰ Australia,²¹ Germany²² and Pakistan.²³ The final study was a multi-site European trial, conducted in Belgium, France, Germany, Switzerland and the Netherlands.³ Place of residence was not well described in the studies, but several authors reported that those with difficulties attending the treatment site were excluded, including those with excessive commuting distance, transportation difficulties, or unstable living situations.^{11,13-15,23} Consequently, those in more rural areas, with poorer transport links, and people living with homelessness or in temporary housing may have been excluded from these studies.

For five studies, almost all participants were White (90-100%).^{4,10,11,16,17} Although not reported, this may also be the case for Copeland 2001,²¹ where an Australian cohort were recruited, but only the proportion of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islanders was given (3.1%). Most of the remaining studies recruited a more diverse sample of participants, but still with a majority of White people, ranging from 51% to 71% of participants, with only 12% to 23.6% Black participants.^{2,5,8,9,13-15} Two studies reported the inclusion of 60-64% Black participants.^{6,12} Wolitzky-Taylor 2022⁷ included a more diverse range of ethnicities, including 25% Hispanic and 17% Asian participants. Six studies did not provide information on race/ethnicity of participants,^{3,18-20,22,23} but three of these did report some language restrictions – limiting participation to those who spoke the local language.^{3,22,23}

Twelve studies reported that the majority of participants were working, on either a full-time or part-time basis.^{8-17,21,23} Of the remaining studies, three did not provide information on employment status, but specifically enrolled young people, aged ≤ 18 .²⁻⁴ Two included a majority of participants who were unemployed (51% in Carroll 2006, 85% in Budak 2024).^{6,20} Hoch 2014²² indicated that 33.3% of participants were employed and 19.6% were at school, but did not account for the remaining participants. Four studies did not provide any information on employment status,^{5,7,18,19} although one of these only recruited veterans.⁵

All of the included studies recruited a majority of male participants, with an average of 80.4% males across the studies. This ranged from a minimum of 56.4% males⁹ to 100% males.¹⁸⁻²⁰ One study reported pregnancy as an exclusion criterion.⁵

Education was reported differently across the studies. Seven studies indicated the mean number of years of education for participants, which was 13.5 years across the studies.^{8,10,11,13-16} Ten further studies provided a breakdown of educational attainment across participants.^{6,9,12,17-23} They predominantly included a mix of participants, some of whom had completed secondary school only, some with college education, and some with university degrees. A small number of

studies required participants to have specific educational attainment for participation, including either a reading age at fifth-grade level,^{2,13,14} English-literacy²¹ or an IQ ≥ 70 .³

Only eight studies reported information on socioeconomic status. Four provided information on income; either monthly income (mean \$906 USD in Budney 2000, and \$1294 USD in Budney 2006),^{10,11} or annual income (mean \$20,220 USD in Stephens 1994, 75% with income \geq \$10,000 USD in Litt 2020).^{15,17} Three studies provided information on socioeconomic status, including Hoch 2014²² (described as predominantly lower/lower-middle social class), Khalily 2023²³ (predominantly middle social class), and Stanger 2009⁴ (average socioeconomic status of 7.05 on the Hollingshead scale, corresponding to roles such as teachers and administrators). Two studies gave information on home ownership (46% in Stephens 1994, 47% in Babor 2004).^{8,17}

Ten studies reported on the number of participants who were married or co-habiting; on average across the studies this was 36% of participants.^{8,13-17,20-23} Four studies reported on the percentage of participants who were never married, which ranged from 57.5 to 96%.^{6,10-12} Two studies in younger participants reported on the percentage who were living with family (89.7% in Rigtger 2013, 100% in Stanger 2009).^{3,4}

Fourteen studies excluded individuals with serious mental health issues, including psychosis or suicidal ideation.^{2,4-7,9-11,13,16-18,20,22} One study excluded any participant with any DSM-IV Axis 1 (mental health) conditions, unless they were sufficiently mild as to not interfere with treatment.²¹ Eight excluded participants who required inpatient treatment for a condition, or with other serious medical problems.^{2,3,6,10-13,15} Three studies specifically included participants with certain psychological features, including people with features of anxiety or depression^{9,19} or more negative affect.⁷

Finally, although several studies included participants involved with or referred by the legal system, four studies excluded those in whom incarceration was imminent,^{8,10-12} and one excluded participant who had any legal problems.¹³

Table 1. PROGRESS-Plus characteristics

Study ID	Age (years)	Place of residence	Race, ethnicity, culture, language	Occupation	Gender/sex (% male)	Education	Socio-economic Status	Social capital	Other PROGRESS details
Babor 2004 ⁸	M=36.45 (SD=8.45), range 18-62	United States	71% White, 16% Hispanic, 12% African American, 1% Other	71% employed full-time, 13% employed part-time, 12% unemployed, 4% student/retired/homemaker	71	M=14.28 years of education (SD=2.30)	47% own residence, 51% rent residence, 2% live in room/shelter	60% not married; Excluded those who were unable to provide a contact person	Legal issues: Excluded people in whom legal status might have interfered with treatment (e.g., mandated treatment, pending jail sentencing)
Buckner 2019 ⁹	M=23.15 (SD=7.38), range 18-65 [inclusion criterion]	United States	63.6% Non-Hispanic White, 23.6% Non-Hispanic African American, 10.9% Hispanic White, 1.8% Multiracial	21.8% employed full-time, 47.2% employed part-time	56.4	14.5% high school education, 63.6% some college education, 5.5% technical degree, 16.4% Bachelor's degree	NR	NR	Mental health: Included only those who met DSM-5 criteria for an anxiety disorder. Excluded those with psychiatric disorders that precluded participation (e.g. psychosis) and those with severe suicidal ideation
Budak 2024 ²⁰	Mean NR 51.6% aged 18-28; 35% aged 29-39; 13.3% aged 40-50	Turkey	NR	15% working, 85% not working	100	8.3% literate, 25% primary education, 38.3% secondary education, 28.3% university education	NR	38.3% married, 61.7% single; 11.6% living alone, 88.3% living with family; 13.33% had children	Mental health: Excluded those with comorbid psychiatric diagnoses, and those with 'communication problems'
Budney 2000 ¹⁰	M=32.85 (SD=8.52), range ≥18 [inclusion criterion]	United States	100% Caucasian	65% employed full time	85	M=13.25 years of education (SD=2.58)	Monthly income M=\$906 (SD=\$814) USD	57.5% never married	Legal issues: 32.5% involved with legal system; Excluded those with imminent incarceration. Mental health: Excluded those with active psychosis, severe psychiatric/medical disorders that would impede attendance for outpatient counselling.
Budney 2006 ¹¹	M=33.1 (SD=10.3), range ≥18 [inclusion criterion]	United States	96% White	58% employed full-time	77	M=12.83 years of education (SD=4.15)	Monthly income M=\$1294 (SD=1273) USD	58% never married	Legal issues: 32% of participants involved with the

Study ID	Age (years)	Place of residence	Race, ethnicity, culture, language	Occupation	Gender/sex (% male)	Education	Socio-economic Status	Social capital	Other PROGRESS details
		Excluded those with unstable living situation.							legal system. Excluded those with imminent incarceration. Mental health: Excluded those with active psychosis/ severe medical or psychiatric disorder.
Carroll 2006 ⁶	M=21 (SD=2.1), range 18-25 [inclusion criterion]	United States	60% African American, 13% Latin American, 23% European American	21% employed full-time job, 28% employed part-time, 51% unemployed	90	35% high school graduates, 18% completed some college-level work, 48% did not complete high school	NR	96% never married	Legal issues: All referred by probation service. Mental health: Excluded those who required inpatient treatment, had current psychotic disorder or severe medical problems, or had a risk of homicide.
Carroll 2012 ¹²	M=25.7 (SD=7.1), range ≥18 [inclusion criterion]	United States	18.9% Caucasian, 63.8% African American, 12.6% Hispanic, 0.8% Asian, 3.9% Biracial	40.9% unemployed	84.3	62.2% completed high school	NR	90.6% never married/ living alone	Legal issues: 93.7% referred by criminal justice system. Excluded those where imminent incarceration was likely. Mental health: Excluded those who required inpatient treatment
Copeland 2001 ²¹	M=32.3 (SD=7.9), range 18-59	Australia	3.1% Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander	63.8% full-time/self-employment, 17.0% part-time/casual employment, 11.8% unemployed, 4.8% government benefit/pension, 5.2% student*	69.4*	57.6% completed secondary school, 42.3% did not complete secondary school, 22.7% university qualification; All English-literate for inclusion	NR	47.9% married/ co-habiting, 16.6% with partner, not co-habiting, 9.2% separated/divorced, 26.6% single/ never married*	Mental health: Excluded participants with DSM-IV Axis I diagnoses if symptoms were not currently stable or sufficiently mild as to cause no impact on their ability to participate
Davoudi 2021a ¹⁸	M=26.41 (SD=6.65), range 18-45	Iran	NR	NR	100	13% no higher education, 48% diploma, 39%	NR	NR	Mental health: Excluded those with current or past

Study ID	Age (years)	Place of residence	Race, ethnicity, culture, language	Occupation	Gender/sex (% male)	Education	Socio-economic Status	Social capital	Other PROGRESS details
						university student or graduate; At least secondary education for inclusion			history of major psychiatric disorders
Davoudi 2021b ¹⁹	M=25.85 (SD=4.99), range 18-45 [inclusion criterion]	Iran	NR	NR	100	8% below high-school diploma level, 50% achieved high school diploma, 42% university student or graduate; A minimum of a secondary school diploma for inclusion	NR	NR	Mental health: Included only those with a score of at least 13 on the Beck Depression and Anxiety questionnaire
Hoch 2014 ²²	M=26.6 (SD=8.2), range 16-63	Germany	Fluent in the German language for inclusion	33.3% employed, 19.6% at school	86.7	Secondary educational attainment: 26.7% Hauptschule (vocational secondary school), 33.3% Realschule, Fachschule (intermediate secondary school), 7.9% Fachhochschulreife (advanced vocational certificate); 19.2% Abitur (school leaving examination), 11.7% school dropout, 1.3% other, 19.6% currently at school	Social class: 17.4% lower, 27.2% lower middle, 45.3% middle, 9.1% upper middle, 1.1% upper; Income: 46.5% salary, 3% partner's salary, 1.5% pension, 0.7% property income, 32.1% unemployment compensation, 7.8% apprenticeship, 29.5% other	86% not married	Mental health: Excluded those with severe major depression, panic disorder, psychotic disorders or suicidal tendencies. Learning disability: Excluded those with learning disability/pervasive developmental disorder.

Study ID	Age (years)	Place of residence	Race, ethnicity, culture, language	Occupation	Gender/sex (% male)	Education	Socio-economic Status	Social capital	Other PROGRESS details
Kadden 2007 ¹³	M=32.7 (SD=9.6), range ≥18 [inclusion criterion]	United States Excluded those with lack of reliable transport to the treatment site, or excessive commuting distance	60% White	73% employed	71	M=13 years of education (SD=1.8); Reading ability at least at fifth grade level for inclusion	NR	45.4% married	Legal issues: Excluded those with legal problems. Mental health: Excluded those with acute medical or psychiatric problems that required inpatient treatment (e.g., acute psychosis, or serious suicide/homicide risk).
Kaminer 2017 ²	M=16.11 (SD NR), range 13-18	United States	Race: 77% Caucasian, 16% Black or African American, 2% Asian, 1% American Indian/Alaska Native, 4% More than one race; Ethnicity: 32% Hispanic or Latino, 68% not Hispanic or Latino*	NR	83*	Comprehend and read English at a fifth-grade level for inclusion	NR	NR	Mental health: Excluded those suicidal in the past 30 days, and those with any medical conditions compromising the ability to regularly participate in the study, including anyone with schizophrenia
Khalily 2023 ²³	M=24.7 (SD=3.4), range 18-30 [inclusion criterion]	Pakistan Excluded those who were unable to engage in study procedures at the study site due to transport difficulties	Indigenously adapted intervention, conducted using Urdu	24% student, 6% government employee, 9% private, 61% self-employee	95	24% primary, 48% secondary, 28% graduation	Socioeconomic status: 26% low, 61% middle, 13% high	55% joint family, 45% nuclear family; 28% married, 70% unmarried, 3% divorced	NR
Litt 2013 ¹⁴	M=32.7 (SD=10), range ≥18 [inclusion criterion]	United States Excluded those with lack of reliable transportation to treatment site, or lack of stable residence	68.1% White, 2.2% Black, 16.4% Hispanic, 3.3% other	74.9% employed full or part-time	68	M=13.2 years of education (SD=2.2); Excluded those who had tested reading ability below the fifth grade level	NR	34.9% married or co-habiting	NR

Study ID	Age (years)	Place of residence	Race, ethnicity, culture, language	Occupation	Gender/sex (% male)	Education	Socio-economic Status	Social capital	Other PROGRESS details
Litt 2020 ¹⁵	M=36 (SD=12), range ≥18 [inclusion criterion]	United States Excluded those with lack of reliable transport or excessive commute	51% White, 28% Black, 14% Hispanic, 7% Other	60% employed full or part-time	58	M=13.7 years of education (SD=5.8)	75% with income ≥\$10,000 USD per year	20% living with spouse/ partner	Mental health: Excluded those who required inpatient treatment
NCT02102230 2014 ⁵	M=48.34 (SD=15.83), range 19-64	United States	Race: 61.7% White, 20% Black or African American, 15% unknown or not reported, 1.7% American Indian or Alaska Native, 1.7% Asian, 0% Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander or More than one race; Ethnicity: 10% Hispanic or Latino, 81.7% Not Hispanic or Latino, 8.3% unknown or NR	All veterans	95	NR	NR	NR	Mental health: Excluded those with history of, or current, psychotic symptoms, active suicidal/homicidal intent. Reproductive health: Excluded those with current pregnancy.
Rigter 2013 ³	M=16.3 (SD=1.2), range 13-18 [inclusion criterion]	Belgium, France, Germany, Netherlands, Switzerland	Excluded those with inability to speak and read the local language	NR	85	75% attended school; Excluded those with IQ <70	NR	89.7% living with family	Mental health: Excluded those with mental disorders requiring inpatient treatment
Stanger 2009 ⁴	M=16 (SD=1.05), range 12-18 [inclusion criterion]	United States	91.3% Caucasian, 5.8% African American, 2.9% Hispanic	NR	82.6		M=7.05 (SD=1.59) on Hollingshead scale	All living with parent/ guardian (who agreed to participate)	Legal issues: 22% 'legal problems'. Mental health: Excluded those with active psychosis, suicidal behaviour or severe medical illness.
Stephens 1994 ¹⁷	M=31.91 (SD NR), range 18-65	United States	95% White	85% employed	76	40% completed some college**	Annual income M=\$20,220 (SD=\$14,354) USD; 46% home ownership; 66%	44% married	Mental health: Excluded those with psychosis

Study ID	Age (years)	Place of residence	Race, ethnicity, culture, language	Occupation	Gender/sex (% male)	Education	Socio-economic Status	Social capital	Other PROGRESS details
							ability to pay bills		
Stephens 2000 ¹⁶	M=34 (SD=6.85), range	United States	95% Caucasian*	76% employed full time*	77*	M=14 years of education (SD=2.80)*	NR	55% single*	Mental health: Excluded those with severe psychological distress (suicidal intentions or psychotic thought process)
Wolitzky-Taylor 2022 ⁷	M=22.16 (SD=1.98), range 18–25 [inclusion criterion]	United States	42% White, 4% Black, 17% Asian, 6% Pacific Islander, 6% Multi-racial, 25% Hispanic/Latino; fluent in English for inclusion	NR	57.7	NR	NR	NR	Learning disability: Excluded those with marked cognitive impairment. Mental health: Excluded those with unstable manic or psychotic symptoms, and those with severe suicidality. Included only those with score >1 SD above the norm on the Positive and Negative Affect Scale-Negative Affect Subscale and > 1 SD above the norm on either the Anxiety Sensitivity Index, the Distress Tolerance Scale, or the suppression subscale of the Emotion Regulation Questionnaire.

Note: No study provided information regarding religion.

* Characteristic is only reported for the entire cohort of randomized participants. For the purposes of the review, only some groups of this trial were eligible for inclusion.

** Characteristic is only reported for those who completed the trial.

M, mean; NR, not reported; SD, standard deviation; USD, United States dollars.

References

1. O'Neill J, Tabish H, Welch V, Petticrew M, Pottie K, Clarke M, et al. Applying an equity lens to interventions: using PROGRESS ensures consideration of socially stratifying factors to illuminate inequities in health. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*. 2014;67(1):56-64.
2. Kaminer Y, Ohannessian CM, Burke RH. Adolescents with cannabis use disorders: adaptive treatment for poor responders. *Addictive behaviors*. 2017;70:102-6.
3. Rieger H, Henderson CE, Pelc I, Tossmann P, Phan O, Hendriks V, et al. Multidimensional family therapy lowers the rate of cannabis dependence in adolescents: a randomised controlled trial in Western European outpatient settings. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*. 2013;130(1):85-93.
4. Stanger C, Budney AJ, Kamon JL, Thostensen J. A randomized trial of contingency management for adolescent marijuana abuse and dependence. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*. 2009;105(3):240-7.
5. NCT02102230. CBT-I for Cannabis Use. <https://clinicaltrials.gov/show/NCT02102230>. 2014.
6. Carroll KM, Easton CJ, Nich C, Hunkele KA, Neavins TM, Sinha R, et al. The use of contingency management and motivational/skills-building therapy to treat young adults with marijuana dependence. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 2006;74(5):955-66.
7. Wolitzky-Taylor K, Glasner S, Tanner A, Ghahremani DG, London ED. Targeting maladaptive reactivity to negative affect in emerging adults with cannabis use disorder: a preliminary test and proof of concept. *Behaviour research and therapy*. 2022;150:104032.
8. Babor TF. Brief Treatments for Cannabis Dependence: Findings From a Randomized Multisite Trial. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 2004;72(3):455-66.
9. Buckner JD, Zvolensky MJ, Ecker AH, Schmidt NB, Lewis EM, Paulus DJ, et al. Integrated cognitive behavioral therapy for comorbid cannabis use and anxiety disorders: a pilot randomized controlled trial. *Behaviour research and therapy*. 2019;115:38-45.
10. Budney AJ, Higgins ST, Radonovich KJ, Novy PL. Adding voucher-based incentives to coping skills and motivational enhancement improves outcomes during treatment for marijuana dependence. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 2000;68(6):1051-61.
11. Budney AJ, Moore BA, Rocha HL, Higgins ST. Clinical trial of abstinence-based vouchers and cognitive-behavioral therapy for cannabis dependence. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 2006;74(2):307-16.
12. Carroll KM, Nich C, Lapaglia DM, Peters EN, Easton CJ, Petry NM. Combining cognitive behavioral therapy and contingency management to enhance their effects in treating cannabis dependence: less can be more, more or less. *Addiction*. 2012;107(9):1650-9.
13. Kadden RM, Litt MD, Kabela-Cormier E, Petry NM. Abstinence rates following behavioral treatments for marijuana dependence. *Addictive behaviors*. 2007;32(6):1220-36.
14. Litt MD, Kadden RM, Petry NM. Behavioral treatment for marijuana dependence: randomized trial of contingency management and self-efficacy enhancement. *Addictive behaviors*. 2013;38(3):1764-75.
15. Litt MD, Kadden RM, Tennen H, Petry NM. Individualized assessment and treatment program (IATP) for cannabis use disorder: randomized controlled trial with and without contingency management. *Psychology of addictive behaviors*. 2020;34(1):40-51.
16. Stephens RS, Roffman RA, Curtin L. Comparison of extended versus brief treatments for marijuana use. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 2000;68(5):898-908.
17. Stephens RS, Roffman RA, Simpson EE. Treating adult marijuana dependence: a test of the relapse prevention model. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 1994;62(1):92-9.
18. Davoudi M, Allame Z, Foroughi A, Taheri AA. A pilot randomized controlled trial of dialectical behavior therapy (DBT) for reducing craving and achieving cessation in patients with

marijuana use disorder: feasibility, acceptability, and appropriateness. *Trends in psychiatry and psychotherapy*. 2021;43(4):302-10.

19. Davoudi M, Taheri A, Foroughi A. Effectiveness of Acceptance and Commitment Therapy on Depression, Anxiety and Cessation in Marijuana Use Disorder: a Randomized Clinical Trial. *International journal of behavioral sciences*. 2021;15(3):194-200.

20. Budak FK, Akbeniz A, Erkan FM, Gultekin A, Cumurcu HB. The effect of mindfulness-based psychoeducation on negative automatic thoughts and medication adherence in individuals with cannabis use disorder: A randomized controlled trial. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*. 2024:1-14.

21. Copeland J, Swift W, Roffman R, Stephens R. A randomized controlled trial of brief cognitive-behavioral interventions for cannabis use disorder. *Journal of substance abuse treatment*. 2001;21(2):55-64.

22. Hoch E, Bühringer G, Pixa A, Dittmer K, Henker J, Seifert A, et al. CANDIS treatment program for cannabis use disorders: findings from a randomized multi-site translational trial. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*. 2014;134:185-93.

23. Khalily MT, Hussain B, Hallahan B, Irfan S, Ehsan N, Saghir M, et al. Indigenously adapted community reinforcement approach (ia-cra) for cannabis users: A randomized controlled trial. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*. 2023:1-12.