

SUPPORTING INFORMATION 9. RISK OF BIAS ASSESSMENT

The main sources of bias were: a lack of any pre-specified analysis plan to allow us to assess whether results were selected among multiple analyses/measures; high proportions of missing data that were likely to depend on the true value of the outcome (e.g., due to participant relapse); the use of self-reported data gathered from participants who were likely aware of their group allocation; a lack of information regarding the randomization and allocation concealment and baseline differences between intervention groups suggesting a problem with randomization; and a lack of clarity regarding the number of participants who were randomized to each intervention and/or included in analyses. The detailed assessments for each Risk of Bias 2 domain are presented in Table 1. 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. Risk of Bias 2 assessment for each study and outcome at the end of treatment

Study	Interventions	Outcome	Domain 1	Domain 2	Domain 3	Domain 4	Domain 5	Overall	Comments
Babor 2004 ¹	1. Wait 2. MET/CBT	Continuous abstinence at end of treatment	Low	Low	High	High	Some concerns	High	D3: Some missing data and likely that it could depend on the true value of the outcome. D4: The outcome was self-reported and participants were likely aware of their group allocation. D5: No pre-specified analysis plan.
		Completion of treatment	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	
		Frequency of cannabis use at end of treatment	Low	Low	Low	High	Some concerns	High	D4: The outcome was self-reported and participants were likely aware of their group allocation. D5: No pre-specified analysis plan.
		Quantity of cannabis use at end of treatment	Low	Low	High	High	Some concerns	High	D3: Some missing data and likely that it could depend on the true value of the outcome. D4: The outcome was self-reported and participants were likely aware of their group allocation. D5: No pre-specified analysis plan.
Buckner 2019 ²	1. MET/CBT 2. ICART	Point abstinence at end of treatment	Low	Some concerns	High	Low	Low	High	D2: Number of participants randomized to each arm is uncertain, therefore analysis approach is unclear. D3: Some missing data and likely that it could depend on the true value of the outcome.
		Completion of treatment	Low	Some concerns	Low	Low	Low	Some concerns	D2: Number of participants randomized to each arm is uncertain, therefore analysis approach is unclear.
		Quantity of cannabis use at end of treatment	Low	Some concerns	High	High	Low	High	D2: Number of participants randomized to each arm is uncertain, therefore analysis approach is unclear. D3: Some missing data and likely that it could depend on the true value of the outcome.

Study	Interventions	Outcome	Domain 1	Domain 2	Domain 3	Domain 4	Domain 5	Overall	Comments
									D4: The outcome was self-reported and participants were likely aware of their group allocation.
Budak 2024 ³	1. Wait 2. Mind/Edu	Completion of treatment	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	High	D1: Descriptions of randomization procedure throughout the manuscript are conflicting, and limited information regarding allocation process.
Budney 2000 ⁴	1. MET/BT 2. MET/BT/ CM-ab	Point abstinence at end of treatment	Low	Low	High	Low	Some concerns	High	D3: Limited information regarding missing data and likely that it could depend on the true value of the outcome. D5: No pre-specified analysis plan.
		Continuous abstinence at end of treatment	Low	Low	High	Low	Some concerns	High	D3: Limited information regarding missing data and likely that it could depend on the true value of the outcome. D5: No pre-specified analysis plan
		Completion of treatment	Low	Low	Low	High	Low	High	D4: Outcome measured as the number of participants who attended at least one treatment session and gave a urine specimen during the last two weeks of the trial. Inappropriate for this outcome.
		Duration of continuous abstinence at end of treatment	Low	Low	High	Low	Some concerns	High	D3: Some missing data and likely that it could depend on the true value of the outcome. D5: No pre-specified analysis plan.
		Frequency of cannabis use at end of treatment	Low	Low	High	High	Some concerns	High	D3: Some missing data and likely that it could depend on the true value of the outcome. D4: The outcome was self-reported and participants were likely aware of their group allocation. D5: No pre-specified analysis plan.
Budney 2006 ⁵	1. CM-ab 2. MET/CBT/ CM-at 3. MET/CBT/ CM-ab	Point abstinence at end of treatment	Low	Low	High	Low	Some concerns	High	D3: Some missing data and likely that it could depend on the true value of the outcome. D5: No pre-specified analysis plan.
		Continuous abstinence at end of treatment	Low	Low	High	Low	Some concerns	High	D3: Some missing data and likely that it could depend on the true value of the outcome. D5: No pre-specified analysis plan.
		Completion of treatment	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	
		Duration of continuous abstinence at end of treatment	Low	Low	High	Low	Some concerns	High	D3: Some missing data and likely that it could depend on the true value of the outcome. D5: No pre-specified analysis plan.
		Frequency of cannabis use at end of treatment	Low	Low	High	High	Some concerns	High	D3: Some missing data and likely that it could depend on the true value of the outcome. D4: The outcome was self-reported and participants were likely aware of their group

Study	Interventions	Outcome	Domain 1	Domain 2	Domain 3	Domain 4	Domain 5	Overall	Comments
									allocation. D5: No pre-specified analysis plan.
Carroll 2006 ⁶	1. NS 2. CM-ab-at/ NS 3. MET/CBT 4. MET/CBT/ CM-ab-at	Completion of treatment	Some concerns	Low	Low	Low	Low	Some concerns	D1: Limited information regarding randomization and allocation process.
		Duration of continuous abstinence at end of treatment	Some concerns	Low	High	Low	Some concerns	High	D1: Limited information regarding randomization and allocation process D3: Some missing data and likely that it could depend on the true value of the outcome. D5: No pre-specified analysis plan.
		Frequency of cannabis use at end of treatment	Some concerns	Low	High	Low	Some concerns	High	D1: Limited information regarding randomization and allocation process D3: Some missing data and likely that it could depend on the true value of the outcome. D5: No pre-specified analysis plan.
Carroll 2012 ⁷	1. CM-ab 2. MET/CBT 3. MET/CBT/ CM-at 4. MET/CBT/ CM-ab	Completion of treatment	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	
		Duration of continuous abstinence at end of treatment	Low	Low	High	High	Some concerns	High	D3: Some missing data and likely that it could depend on the true value of the outcome. D4: The outcome was self-reported and participants were likely aware of their group allocation. D5: Insufficient detail in the trial registration to know whether this analysis was pre-specified.
		Frequency of cannabis use at end of treatment	Low	Low	High	High	Low	High	D3: Some missing data and likely that it could depend on the true value of the outcome. D4: The outcome was self-reported and participants were likely aware of their group allocation.
Davoudi 2021a ⁸	1. NS 2. DBT	Point abstinence at end of treatment	Some concerns	Low	High	Low	Some concerns	High	D1: Limited information regarding allocation process. D3: Some missing data and likely that it could depend on the true value of the outcome. D5: Only retrospective trial registration available. Some inconsistencies with the paper.
		Completion of treatment	Some concerns	Low	Low	Low	Low	Some concerns	D1: Limited information regarding allocation process.
		Frequency of cannabis use at end of treatment	Some concerns	Low	High	Low	Some concerns	High	D1: Limited information regarding allocation process. D3: Some missing data and likely that it could depend on the true value of the outcome. D5: Only retrospective trial registration available. Some inconsistencies with the paper.
		Cravings at end of treatment	Some concerns	Low	High	Low	Some concerns	High	D1: Limited information regarding allocation process. D3: Some missing data and likely that it could depend on the true value of the outcome.

Study	Interventions	Outcome	Domain 1	Domain 2	Domain 3	Domain 4	Domain 5	Overall	Comments
									D5: Only retrospective trial registration available. Some inconsistencies with the paper.
Davoudi 2021b ⁹	1. NS 2. ACT	Point abstinence at end of treatment	Some concerns	Low	Low	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns	D1: Limited information regarding allocation process, and baseline differences between intervention groups. D5: Only retrospective trial registration available. Some inconsistencies with the paper.
		Completion of treatment	Some concerns	Low	Low	Low	Low	Some concerns	D1: Limited information regarding allocation process, and baseline differences between intervention groups.
		Frequency of cannabis use at end of treatment	Some concerns	Some concerns	Some concerns	Some concerns	Some concerns	Some concerns	D1: Limited information regarding allocation process, and baseline differences between intervention groups. D2: Appears that a per protocol analysis was used, but judged unlikely to have substantial impact on the results. D3: Some missing data but reasons for exclusion provided - unlikely that missingness depended on the true value of outcome. D4: Outcome self-reported but it is likely that some blinding was attempted. D5: Only retrospective trial registration available. Some inconsistencies with the paper.
Hoch 2014 ¹⁰	1. Wait 2. MET/CBT	Point abstinence at end of treatment	Low	Low	High	Some concerns	High	High	D3: Limited information regarding missing data and likely that it could depend on the true value of the outcome. D4: Limited information regarding measurement methods. D5: Discrepancy between the trial registration and the article in the definition of outcome.
Kadden 2007 ¹¹	1. NS 2. CM-ab 3. MET/CBT 4. MET/CBT/ CM-ab	Continuous abstinence at end of treatment	Low	Low	Low*	High	Some concerns	High	D4: The outcome was self-reported and participants were likely aware of their group allocation. D5: No pre-specified analysis plan. Unclear why self-report was preferred over urine samples.
		Completion of treatment	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	
		Duration of continuous abstinence at end of treatment	Low	Low	High	High	Some concerns	High	D3: Some missing data and likely that it could depend on the true value of the outcome. D4: The outcome was self-reported and participants were likely aware of their group allocation. D5: No pre-specified analysis plan. Unclear why self-report was preferred over urine samples.
		Frequency of cannabis use at end of treatment	Low	Low	High	High	Some concerns	High	D3: Some missing data and likely that it could depend on the true value of the outcome. D4: The outcome was self-reported and participants were likely aware of their group allocation. D5: No pre-specified analysis plan.

Study	Interventions	Outcome	Domain 1	Domain 2	Domain 3	Domain 4	Domain 5	Overall	Comments
Kaminer 2017 ¹²	1. MET/CBT 2. ComReinf	Point abstinence at end of treatment	Some concerns	Low	High	Low	Low	High	D1: Limited information regarding allocation process, and baseline differences between intervention groups. D3: Some missing data and likely that it could depend on the true value of the outcome.
		Completion of treatment	Some concerns	Low	Low	Low	Low	Some concerns	D1: Limited information regarding allocation process, and baseline differences between intervention groups.
Khaliy 2023 ¹³	1. NS 2. ComReinf	Continuous abstinence at end of treatment	Low	Low	Low	High	High	High	D4: The outcome was self-reported and participants were likely aware of their group allocation. D5: No pre-specified analysis plan. The result could have been selected from multiple eligible outcome measurements.
		Completion of treatment	Low	Low	Low	Low	High	High	D5: No pre-specified analysis plan. The result could have been selected from multiple eligible outcome measurements.
Litt 2013 ¹⁴	1. NS 2. MET/CBT/CM-ab 3. MET/CBT/CM-at	Continuous abstinence at end of treatment	Low	Some concerns	High	High	Some concerns	High	D2: Number of participants included in analysis unclear. D3: Some missing data and likely that it could depend on the true value of the outcome. D4: The outcome was self-reported and participants were likely aware of their group allocation. D5: No pre-specified analysis plan. Unclear why self-report was preferred over urine samples.
		Duration of continuous abstinence at end of treatment	Low	Some concerns	High	High	Some concerns	High	D2: Number of participants included in analysis unclear. D3: Some missing data and likely that it could depend on the true value of the outcome. D4: The outcome was self-reported and participants were likely aware of their group allocation. D5: No pre-specified analysis plan. Unclear why self-report was preferred over urine samples.
		Frequency of cannabis use at end of treatment	Low	Some concerns	High	High	Some concerns	High	D2: Number of participants included in analysis unclear. D3: Some missing data and likely that it could depend on the true value of the outcome. D4: The outcome was self-reported and participants were likely aware of their group allocation. D5: No pre-specified analysis plan.
Litt 2020 ¹⁵	1. MET/CBT 2. MET/CBT/CM-ab 3. IATP 4. IATP/CM-ab	Continuous abstinence at end of treatment	Low	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns	Some concerns	Some concerns	D3: Some missing data which could depend on the true value of outcome. There was a larger proportion of events relative to missing data, but we considered that missing data could still potentially impact the outcome. D4: Outcome assessment was unblinded (self-reported) but considered unlikely to influence the outcome based on urine verification. D5: No pre-specified analysis plan.
		Completion of treatment	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	

Study	Interventions	Outcome	Domain 1	Domain 2	Domain 3	Domain 4	Domain 5	Overall	Comments
		Duration of continuous abstinence at end of treatment	Low	Low	High	Some concerns	Some concerns	High	D3: Some missing data and likely that it could depend on the true value of the outcome. D4: Outcome assessment was unblinded (self-reported) but interventions are all of similar intensity, and there may be no pre-conceived notion regarding superiority. D5: No pre-specified analysis plan.
		Frequency of cannabis use at end of treatment	Low	Low	High	Some concerns	Some concerns	High	D3: Some missing data and likely that it could depend on the true value of the outcome. D4: Outcome assessment was unblinded (self-reported) but interventions are all of similar intensity, and there may be no pre-conceived notion regarding superiority. D5: No pre-specified analysis plan.
NCT02102230 2014 ¹⁶	1. NS 2. CBT-I 3. CBT-I	Point abstinence at end of treatment	Some concerns	High	High	Some concerns	High	High	D1: Limited information regarding randomization and allocation process. D2: Trial terminated early. Unclear why data not available for all randomized participants. D3: Some missing data and likely that it could depend on the true value of the outcome. D4: Outcome assessment was unblinded (self-reported) but interventions are all of similar intensity, and there may be no pre-conceived notion regarding superiority. D5: Discrepancy between statistical analysis plan and the article in the definition of outcome. Abstinence measured by self-report and urine testing. However, only self-reported outcome available.
		Completion of treatment	Some concerns	High	Low	Low	Low	High	D1: Limited information regarding randomization and allocation process. D2: Trial terminated early. Unclear why data not available for all randomized participants.
		Adverse events	Some concerns	High	High	Some concerns	Some concerns	High	D1: Limited information regarding randomization and allocation process. D2: Trial terminated early. Unclear why data not available for all randomized participants. D3: High proportion of missing data. No information regarding those who did not complete treatment. D4: Limited information regarding measurement methods. D5: No mention of this outcome in the statistical analysis plan.
		Frequency of cannabis use at end of treatment	Some concerns	High	High	Some concerns	Some concerns	High	D1: Limited information regarding randomization and allocation process. D2: Trial terminated early. Unclear why data not available for all randomized participants. D3: Some missing data and likely that it could depend on the true value of the outcome. D4: Outcome assessment was unblinded (self-reported) but interventions are all of similar intensity, and there may be no pre-conceived notion regarding superiority. D5: Discrepancy between statistical analysis plan and the article in the definition of outcome.

Study	Interventions	Outcome	Domain 1	Domain 2	Domain 3	Domain 4	Domain 5	Overall	Comments
Rigter 2013 ¹⁷	1. MET/CBT 2. MFFT	Completion of treatment	Some concerns	Low	Low	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns	D1: There is some information about allocation concealment but there is a risk that a sequence could be predicted due to very small block size. D5: Data at the end of the treatment period are not fully reported.
		Frequency of cannabis use at end of treatment	Some concerns	Low	High	High	Some concerns	High	D1: There is some information about allocation concealment but there is a risk that a sequence could be predicted due to very small block size. D3: Some missing data and likely that it could depend on the true value of the outcome. D4: The outcome was self-reported and participants were likely aware of their group allocation. D5: No pre-specified analysis plan.
Stanger 2009 ¹⁸	1. MET/CBT/ CM-at/NS 2. MET/CBT/ CM-ab/NS	Point abstinence at end of treatment	Low	Low	Some concerns	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns	D3: Some missing data which could depend on the true value of outcome. However, the extent of missingness is considered to be smaller for the assessment of point abstinence outcome. D5: No pre-specified analysis plan.
		Continuous abstinence at end of treatment	Low	Low	High	Some concerns	Some concerns	High	D3: Some missing data and likely that it could depend on the true value of the outcome. D4: Outcome assessors were not blinded and it is possible that the outcome was self-reported. D5: No pre-specified analysis plan.
		Completion of treatment	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	
		Duration of continuous abstinence at end of treatment	Low	Low	High	Some concerns	Some concerns	High	D3: Some missing data and likely that it could depend on the true value of the outcome. D4: Outcome assessors were not blinded and it is possible that the outcome was self-reported. D5: No pre-specified analysis plan.
		Frequency of cannabis use at end of treatment	Low	Low	Some concerns	High	Some concerns	High	D3: Some missing data which could depend on the true value of outcome. However, the extent is considered to be small. D4: The outcome was self-reported and participants were likely aware of their group allocation. D5: No pre-specified analysis plan.
		Adverse events	Low	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns	Some concerns	Some concerns	D3: Some missing data which could depend on the true value of outcome. However, the extent is considered to be small. D4: Outcome assessment was likely unblinded. No indication that knowledge of the intervention influenced reporting of adverse events (no events were reported). D5: No pre-specified analysis plan.
Stephens 1994 ¹⁹	1. NS 2. RelPrev	Continuous abstinence at end of treatment	Some concerns	Low	Low	Some concerns	Some concerns	Some concerns	D1: Limited information regarding allocation process, and baseline differences between intervention groups. D4: Outcome assessment was unblinded (self-reported) but considered unlikely to

Study	Interventions	Outcome	Domain 1	Domain 2	Domain 3	Domain 4	Domain 5	Overall	Comments
									influence the outcome based on collateral reports. D5: No pre-specified analysis plan.
		Frequency of cannabis use at end of treatment	Some concerns	High	High	Some concerns	High	High	D1: Limited information regarding allocation process, and baseline differences between intervention groups. D2: Analysis did not include all randomized participants. D3: Some missing data and likely that it could depend on the true value of the outcome. D4: Outcome assessment was unblinded (self-reported) but considered unlikely to influence the outcome based on collateral reports. D5: No pre-specified analysis plan. Discrepancy between methods and results sections - outcome was not reported at stated timepoint.
Stephens 2000 ²⁰	1. Wait 2. RelPrev	Continuous abstinence at end of treatment	Some concerns	Some concerns	High	High	Some concerns	High	D1: Limited information regarding allocation process, and baseline differences between intervention groups. D2: Proportion of participants attending treatment outside of trial (higher in control than intervention). D3: Some missing data and likely that it could depend on the true value of the outcome. D4: The outcome was self-reported and participants were likely aware of their group allocation. D5: No pre-specified analysis plan.
		Completion of treatment	Some concerns	Some concerns	Low	Low	Low	Some concerns	D1: Limited information regarding allocation process, and baseline differences between intervention groups. D2: Proportion of participants attending treatment outside of trial (higher in control than intervention).
		Frequency of cannabis use at end of treatment	Some concerns	Some concerns	High	High	Some concerns	High	D1: Limited information regarding allocation process, and baseline differences between intervention groups. D2: Proportion of participants attending treatment outside of trial (higher in control than intervention). D3: Some missing data and likely that it could depend on the true value of the outcome. D4: The outcome was self-reported and participants were likely aware of their group allocation. D5: No pre-specified analysis plan.
Wolitzky-Taylor 2022 ²¹	1. MET/CBT 2. AMT	Completion of treatment	Some concerns	Low	Low	Low	Low	Some concerns	D1: Limited information regarding allocation process.
		Frequency of cannabis use at end of treatment	Some concerns	Low	High	High	High	High	D1: Limited information regarding allocation process. D3: Some missing data and likely that it could depend on the true value of the outcome. D4: The outcome was self-reported and participants were likely aware of their group allocation. D5: Pre-specified primary outcome measure was not reported.

*In Kadden 2007, for continuous abstinence at end of treatment, the contrast between interventions MET/CBT and NS was rated as high risk for Domain 3. All remaining contrasts for this outcome were rated as Low risk for Domain 3, as indicated in the table.

Note that Copeland 2001 is not included in this table as it only reported outcomes at medium follow-up.

D1, risk of bias arising from the randomization process; D2, risk of bias due to deviations from intended interventions; D3, risk of bias due to missing outcome data; D4, risk of bias in measurement of the outcome; D5, risk of bias in selection of the reported result.

ACT, acceptance and commitment therapy; AMT, affect management therapy; BT, behavioural therapy; CBT, cognitive-behavioural therapy; CBT-I, CBT for insomnia; CM-ab/at, contingency management based on abstinence/attendance; ComReinf, community reinforcement; DBT, dialectical behavioural therapy; ICART, integrated cannabis and anxiety reduction treatment; MET, motivation enhancement therapy; Mind/Edu, mindfulness psychoeducation; NS, nonspecific comparator; RelPrev, relapse prevention; Wait, waitlist.

References

1. Babor TF. Brief Treatments for Cannabis Dependence: Findings From a Randomized Multisite Trial. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 2004;72(3):455-66.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
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. 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.
8. 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.
9. 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.
10. 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.
11. Kadden RM, Litt MD, Kabela-Cormier E, Petry NM. Abstinence rates following behavioral treatments for marijuana dependence. *Addictive behaviors*. 2007;32(6):1220-36.
12. Kaminer Y, Ohannessian CM, Burke RH. Adolescents with cannabis use disorders: adaptive treatment for poor responders. *Addictive behaviors*. 2017;70:102-6.
13. 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.
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. NCT02102230. CBT-I for Cannabis Use. <https://clinicaltrials.gov/show/NCT02102230>. 2014.
17. Rigter 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.

18. 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.
19. 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.
20. 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.
21. 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.