

# PSYCHOSOCIAL INTERVENTIONS IN STIMULANT USE DISORDERS: A FOCUS ON WOMEN

*Riccardo De Giorgi <sup>a\*</sup>, Gian Loreto D'Alo <sup>b</sup>, Franco De Crescenzo <sup>a, c</sup>*

<sup>a</sup> Department of Psychiatry, University of Oxford, Warneford Lane, Oxford, OX3 7JX, UK

<sup>b</sup> School of Hygiene and Preventive Medicine, University 'Tor Vergata', Rome, Italy

<sup>c</sup> Institute of Psychiatry and Psychology, Catholic University of Sacred Heart, Rome, Italy

\* Author of correspondence: Riccardo De Giorgi; Department of Psychiatry, University of Oxford, Warneford Lane, Oxford, OX3 7JX, UK; +44 (0) 1865 901 000;  
Riccardo.DeGiorgi@psych.ox.ac.uk

## **Abstract**

### ***Purpose of review:***

Stimulant use disorders are significant contributors to the global burden of disease, with a growing impact on women. Psychosocial interventions are the gold-standard for treating this condition, but several barriers may prevent women from accessing appropriate treatment. Therefore, we systematically reviewed the most recent findings about psychosocial interventions for stimulant use disorders, focussing on results relevant to women.

### ***Recent findings:***

Twenty-two eligible studies were identified. Psychosocial interventions in stimulant use disorders were examined in 17 recent studies, but no analyses for sex-related differences were performed. These aspects were investigated in further 5 studies, either through secondary analyses on the female subgroup, or specifically examining a female-only sample. Contingency management (CM), either alone or in combination with other interventions, provided the most positive results on several outcome measures. Only one pilot study showed good potential for an alternative approach of systemic family therapy, warranting further research in this direction.

### ***Summary:***

Research in stimulant use disorders shows an increasing interest in exploring interventions capable of addressing gender-specific issues. Combined therapy including CM plus other treatments appears the most promising option, but larger secondary studies are needed to rank the efficacy of different psychosocial interventions while considering their feasibility and acceptability in specific subpopulations, including women.

### **Keywords**

Stimulant use disorders, psychosocial interventions, women, sex characteristics

### **Abbreviations**

ASSIST: Alcohol, Smoking and Substance Involvement Screening Test

ATS: amphetamine-type substances

CBT: cognitive behavioural therapy

CI: confidence interval

CM: contingency management

CRA: community reinforcement approach

MD: mean difference

ROC: regulation of craving

RR: relative risk

SMD: standardised mean difference

TAU: treatment as usual

## **Introduction**

Stimulant use disorders are characterised by continuous use of cocaine, amphetamine-type substances (ATS; including amphetamines, methamphetamines, and “ecstasy”), or other psychostimulants leading to substantial functional impairment and distress [1]. Cocaine and ATS are the most commonly abused stimulants worldwide, with an annual prevalence of 0.38% and 1.20% respectively in those aged 15-64 years [2]. A growing number of new amphetamine-like psychoactive substances adds to the burden of disease [3]. Moreover, the illegal sharing and trading of prescription stimulants for non-medical use is an emerging phenomenon amongst younger populations [4,5]. Men are more likely than women to use cocaine or ATS, although the gender divide is narrower among young people than among adults [2].

The burden of disease is large [6] and special consideration is warranted for women using stimulants. Firstly, these women have unmet needs for contraception, especially for the most effective methods [7]. This can lead to unintended pregnancies with consequent poor physical and psychosocial outcomes [8], with only a few studies for addressing the needs of this specific subpopulation [9]. Then, prenatal substance use has the potential to cause foetal harm, calling into question their maternal fitness and often leading to punitive responses [10]. The social costs are further inflated by the association between stimulants use and high-risk

behaviour, crime, violence, and sexual abuse [11,12], with a growing number of girls and women arrested for drug-related felonies such as drug-selling of illicit [2,13] and prescribed stimulants [14], an emergent association between cocaine female-users and offending [15], and an elevated likelihood of received aggression [16]. The odds of violence rise as social isolation and drug use increase [17], with a recent study showing that almost half of homeless and unstably-housed women use stimulants at baseline, and those who are not using at baseline being at high-risk to start using in a short time period [18]. Moreover, there is evidence of very strong correlations between involvement in sex trading and crack cocaine use, with these women also reporting higher frequency and intensity of cocaine use [19]. Overall, some authors argued that female addicts have not been studied more systematically because they are perceived as being “doubly stigmatised”, not only for the stigma attached to drug use, but also because they are felt to have failed their role as spouses and mothers; as a result, even when they seek help, addicted women can be denigrated as more pathological than their male counterpart [20].

Importantly, people affected by stimulant use disorders are increasingly seeking out treatment [2], but there is no clear consensus about the use of specific treatments. Gender differences in treatment response are well-known from old to recent studies, where women seem to show a more stable response to treatment long-term [21–23]. However, access to treatment has historically highlighted practical barriers for women such as male-only services, services that are unable to accommodate women with children, or women with children fearing that children could be removed from their custody if they presented for treatment [24]. Currently, psychosocial interventions remain the gold-standard for the treatment of stimulant use disorders as endorsed by international clinical guidelines [25–27]. However, these recommendations do not account for the latest updates from research and lack information about the specific issues faced by women who use stimulant drugs. The

prominence of being attentive to gender differences goes beyond routine clinical practice; indeed, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime states that “drug use undermines the aspect of sustainable development related to gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls” [2].

In this article, we aim to review the most recent evidence published in the literature about psychosocial interventions trialled in stimulant use disorders. Because clinicians are increasingly encouraged to pursue a gender-specific approach, we will focus on results relevant to the needs and goals of women.

### **Literature search**

A comprehensive computer literature search of Cochrane Drugs and Alcohol Group Register of Trials, Medline, Embase, CINAHL, ISI Web of Science, and PsycINFO was conducted according to a previously validated search strategy [28]. A hand search of the reference list of retrieved articles was also performed. All study typologies were included provided they were relevant for the purpose of this narrative review. The search was restricted to a 2-year review period as per journal policy.

### **Findings**

We identified 22 eligible studies: 17 discussed psychosocial interventions in stimulant use disorders but did not include analyses for gender differences [28-44], whereas 5 had a focus on women [21,45-48]. A brief overview of the most recent studies on psychosocial interventions in stimulant use disorders is provided in the next paragraph, followed by a detailed discussion of the papers specific to women. The results are summarised in Table 1.

### ***Psychosocial interventions in stimulant use disorders***

A recent Cochrane review assessed the efficacy and acceptability of several psychosocial interventions: contingency management (CM), cognitive behavioural interventions - including cognitive behavioural therapy (CBT), coping skills training/relapse prevention, and community reinforcement approach (CRA) -, motivational interviewing, interpersonal therapy, psychodynamic therapies, and 12-step programmes. When compared to no treatment, any psychosocial intervention reduced the dropout rate (risk ratio [RR]: 0.83, 95% confidence interval [CI]: 0.76 to 0.91, moderate quality evidence), increased the continuous abstinence at the end of treatment (RR: 2.14, 95% CI: 1.27 to 3.59, low quality evidence), and increased the longest period of abstinence (standardised mean difference [SMD]: 0.48, 95% CI: 0.34 to 0.63, high quality evidence), but did not significantly increase continuous abstinence at the longest follow-up (RR: 2.12, 95% CI 0.77 to 5.86, low quality evidence). When compared to treatment as usual (TAU), any psychosocial intervention reduced the dropout rate (RR: 0.72, 95% CI 0.59 to 0.89, moderate quality evidence), but did not increase either the continuous abstinence at the end of treatment (RR: 1.27, 95% CI 0.94 to 1.72, low quality evidence) or the longest period of abstinence (mean difference [MD]: -3.15 days, 95% CI -10.35 to 4.05, low quality evidence) [28]. This study could not produce hierarchies for evidence-based treatment, and no sensitivity analysis for exploring sex differences in response to treatment was performed.

Several clinical trials were published in the review period: most studies focussed on CM either alone or in addition to other manualised therapies [31, 37-39], others on cognitive behavioural interventions [35,43], counselling [36,42], motivational interviewing [34], combined treatments [30,32], and ancillary treatments [29,33,40,41,44], see Table 1, upper part.

### ***Psychosocial interventions in stimulant use disorders: a focus on women***

An increasing number of researchers have been attentive to gender-specific issues; with regards to psychosocial interventions in stimulant use disorders, there were 5 studies published in the review period that did either secondary analyses for sex-related differences or specifically focussed on a female population. These results are summarised in Table 1, lower part.

A key study investigated the impact of sex on the longest duration of abstinence and the percentage of negative urine samples in a large sample of 323 cocaine-using methadone patients from four prior randomised clinical trials comparing CM plus TAU (i.e. methadone) to TAU alone. Firstly, CM was confirmed as a highly effective intervention regardless of sex: the longest duration of abstinence was more than doubled for patients randomised to the CM condition compared to TAU (means and standard errors:  $4.4 \pm 0.3$  weeks versus  $1.9 \pm 0.4$  weeks,  $p=0.001$ ), and the percentage of negative samples was also higher with CM (means and standard errors:  $52.6\% \pm 3.1$  versus  $36.8 \pm 3.6$ ,  $p<0.001$ ). Secondly, despite displaying several worse prognostic factors (i.e. lower income, more severe problems in medical, employment, family/social, and psychological domains on the Addiction Severity Index subscales), women had a greater longest duration of abstinence than men by approximately 1 week (respectively, means and standard errors:  $3.8 \pm 0.3$  weeks versus  $2.6 \pm 0.4$  weeks,  $p<0.001$ ), and they also submitted a greater percentage of negative samples relative to men (respectively, means and standard errors:  $48.3\% \pm 3.1$  versus  $41.2\% \pm 3.8$ ,  $p=0.001$ ). Hence, the authors inferred that such improved outcomes may reflect that methadone maintained women who use cocaine may be more motivated to achieve abstinence than their male counterparts [21]. A conceptually similar trial examined a large sample of 920 men and women with substance use disorders, of whom 376 were male and 407 were female cocaine users. Participants were randomised to either CM or TAU (i.e. outpatient group therapy

sessions): again, CM proved better than TAU, with participants assigned to CM staying in treatment for 1 week longer (means and standard errors:  $6.45 \pm 0.17$  weeks versus  $5.13 \pm 0.20$ ), achieving approximately 2 additional weeks of abstinence (means and standard errors:  $5.47 \pm 0.16$  versus  $3.44 \pm 0.19$ ), and submitting higher percentages of negative samples (means and standard errors:  $82.20\% \pm 1.00$  versus  $77.66\% \pm 1.19$ ). In this study, females performed similarly to males and no sex differences were elicited for any outcomes. However, the authors noticed that equivalent results were achieved in men and women despite the latter presenting with more predictors of poor outcomes at the beginning of treatment (i.e. lower educational achievement, more unemployment, younger age, increased likelihood of submitting a positive urine sample at intake) [46].

Two further studies concentrated on an especially high-risk subgroup of women trading sex for drugs or money. A secondary analysis of several previous trials included 493 women with cocaine use disorder and compared CM to TAU. As per other studies, patients assigned to CM did better than those under TAU ( $p < 0.05$ ) as they were retained in treatment for longer (means and standard errors:  $6.8 \pm 0.3$  weeks versus  $5.7 \pm 0.3$  weeks), achieved longer continuous duration of abstinence (means and standard errors:  $5.4 \pm 0.3$  weeks versus  $3.0 \pm 0.3$  weeks), and submitted more negative samples (means and standard errors:  $78.4\% \pm 1.9$  versus  $72.5\% \pm 2.6$ ). Importantly, this study also revealed that a history of sex trading was associated with further episodes of sex trading, less education, unemployment, and HIV infection ( $p < 0.05$ ); however, these women responded to treatment equally well in terms of retention and abstinence ( $p > 0.71$ ). Conversely, shorter duration of abstinence during treatment was linked to continued involvement in sex trading (OR: 0.84 95% CI: 0.74 to 0.95,  $p = 0.005$ ), with each additional week of abstinence during treatment associated with a 16% reduction in the likelihood of trading sex over a 9-month follow-up. Based on these data, the authors advocated the importance of intensive and directed approaches for

addressing this high-risk behaviour, especially because this subpopulation responded to treatment similarly to their non sex-trade counterparts, with the advantage that the duration of abstinence obtained during treatment was significantly inversely associated with the likelihood of continued involvement in sex trading, yielding long-term personal and societal benefits such as decreasing HIV and other disease risks [47]. Another preliminary study did not report data on effectiveness, but is worth mentioning because it showed moderate feasibility (31% of eligible women completed the treatment course) for an innovative approach combining conditional cash transfer (i.e. a type of CM) and CBT in a high-risk population of Cambodian female sex workers using ATS, who live in a resource-limited area; further studies will need to evaluate the potential of this strategy for reducing ATS use and optimise HIV prevention [45].

Finally, a single study assessed the effectiveness of ecologically-based family therapy (i.e. a 12-session family systems therapy that targets specific dysfunctional interactions linked to the development of problem behaviour) against TAU (i.e. women's health education, a 12-session manualised educational intervention) in mothers of 8- to 16-year-old children. A separate regression analysis for cocaine showed that mothers receiving the intervention exhibited a faster rate of decrease in cocaine use ( $p < 0.05$ ); therefore, the authors suggested that family systems therapy should undergo further research since its implementation has prospective benefits on both mothers using substances and their children [48].

## **Conclusion**

In summary, stimulant use disorders have a large epidemiological relevance in women. Females using stimulants show greater vulnerability to physical and mental illness and face many other challenges including the potential of motherhood, the experience of violence and homelessness, and the exposure to high levels of stigma. These factors may hinder the

pathway of recovery as direct barriers to a continuous access to care. Despite these predictors of poorer prognosis, women respond to treatment at least as well as their male counterparts, and therefore we advocate for all these additional hurdles to be seen in fact as potential avenues for increasing engagement with treatment and improving longer-term outcomes.

Psychosocial interventions are the only evidence-based treatment for stimulant use disorders. In the last few years, several studies in this area either examined gender differences or expressly focussed on women. Behavioural approaches, and especially CM either alone or in add-on, showed the most promising results in terms of feasibility (both in low- and high-income countries), acceptability, and efficacy. Such interventions, based on positive reinforcement from operant conditioning models, seem to apply particularly well to people affected by stimulant use disorders, and their value can be further augmented in women when other psychological therapies and social support are used for addressing those specific issues described above. Interestingly, these findings appear confirmed by a prior study highlighting the benefits of those interventions with an emphasis on the enhancement of goal-directed behaviour and the application of more desirable habits to replace habitual drugs use; on the contrary, punitive approaches are ineffective at best [49], if not liable of increasing distress and stigma.

Overall, most recent trials supported the use of combined approaches that include CM, but secondary research and updated guidelines need to pool such evidence, benchmark different interventions, and consider sex differences for evaluating outcomes appropriately. On this basis, we will be able to endorse the implementation by clinicians and healthcare systems of integrated therapies for stimulant use disorders that include CM in combination with other psychosocial interventions, tailored to gender-specific needs and aspirations.

### **Key points**

- Stimulant use disorders affect a growing number of women, with dire repercussions on their life and on society.
- Current research is increasingly accounting for gender-related differences when studying psychosocial interventions for stimulant use disorders.
- Most recent trials on people with stimulant use disorders seem to favour combined psychosocial interventions involving CM.
- Further secondary studies are required to confirm the validity of these findings and promote the implementation of integrated bespoke treatments for men and women with stimulant use disorders.

### **Acknowledgments**

We would like to thank Clare Churchman and Marco Ciabattini for their precious advice about the content, the language, and the structure of this review.

### **Financial support and sponsorship**

None

### **Conflicts of interest**

None.

### **References and recommended reading**

Papers of particular interest, published within the annual period of review, have been highlighted as:

\* of special interest

\*\* of outstanding interest

1. American Psychiatric Association. Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders. 5th Edition. American Psychiatric Publishing, editor. Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Association; 2013.
2. \*\* United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. World Drug Report 2016. Vienna; 2016.  
This report is produced yearly by the United Nations. It is the most comprehensive source of epidemiological data with regards to illicit substances. Each type of drugs is examined separately and demographic trends are highlighted, including considerable information about stimulant use disorders in women.
3. Miliano C, Serpelloni G, Rimondo C et al. Neuropharmacology of New Psychoactive Substances (NPS): Focus on the Rewarding and Reinforcing Properties of Cannabimimetics and Amphetamine-Like Stimulants. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*. Frontiers; 2016 Apr 19;10:153.
4. Lasopa SO, Striley CW, Cottler LB. Diversion of prescription stimulant drugs among 10-18-year-olds. *Curr Opin Psychiatry*; 2015 Jul;28(4):292-8.
5. Wang Y, Cottler LB, Striley CW. Differentiating patterns of prescription stimulant medical and nonmedical use among youth 10-18years of age. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 2015 Dec 1;157:83-9.
6. Degenhardt L, Whiteford HA, Ferrari AJ et al. Global burden of disease attributable to illicit drug use and dependence: findings from the Global Burden of Disease Study 2010. *The Lancet*. 2013 Nov 9;382(9904):1564–74.
7. Terplan M, Hand DJ, Hutchinson M et al. Contraceptive use and method choice among women with opioid and other substance use disorders: A systematic review. *Preventive medicine*. 2015 Nov;80:23–31.

8. Black KI, Day CA. Improving Access to Long-Acting Contraceptive Methods and Reducing Unplanned Pregnancy Among Women with Substance Use Disorders. *Substance abuse: research and treatment*. 2016 May;10(Suppl 1):27–33.
9. \* Terplan M, Ramanadhan S, Locke A et al. Psychosocial interventions for pregnant women in outpatient illicit drug treatment programs compared to other interventions. In: Terplan M, editor. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2015. p. CD006037.

This Cochrane study systematically reviewed the effectiveness of psychosocial interventions in pregnant women with substance use disorders on maternal and neonatal outcomes.

10. Terplan M, Kennedy-Hendricks A, Chisolm MS. Prenatal Substance Use: Exploring Assumptions of Maternal Unfitness. *Substance abuse : research and treatment*. 2015 Sep;9(Suppl 2):1–4.
11. Diehl A, Pillon SC, dos Santos MA et al. Criminality and Sexual Behaviours in Substance Dependents Seeking Treatment. *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs*. 2016 Mar 14;48(2):124–34.
12. McGinty EE, Choksy S, Wintemute GJ. The Relationship Between Controlled Substances and Violence. *Epidemiologic Reviews*. 2016 Feb 11;38(1):mxv008.
13. Oteo Pérez A, Benschop A, Blanken P, Korf DJ. Criminal Involvement and Crime Specialization Among Crack Users in the Netherlands. *European Addiction Research*. 2015;21(2):53–62.
- 14.\* Striley CW, Kelso-Chichetto NE, Cottler LB. Nonmedical Prescription Stimulant Use Among Girls 10-18 Years of Age: Associations With Other Risky Behavior. *J Adolesc Health*. 2017 Mar;60(3):328-332.

This secondary analysis of the National Monitoring of Adolescent Prescription Stimulants Study (2008-2011) showed a significant association between non-medical use of

prescription stimulants and high-risk conducts including weight control behavior and gambling in adolescent girls.

- 15.\* Pierce M, Hayhurst K, Bird SM et al. Quantifying crime associated with drug use among a large cohort of sanctioned offenders in England and Wales. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*. 2015 Oct 1;155:52–9.

This large UK-based survey assessed the relationship between positive drug testing and prior offending, showing a strong association between cocaine use and crime only among women.

16. \* Decker MR, Benning L, Weber KM et al. Physical and Sexual Violence Predictors - 20 Years of the Women's Interagency HIV Study Cohort. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*. 2016 Nov;51(5):731–42.

This 20-yearlong study on a cohort of HIV-positive women revealed that the use of crack, cocaine, and heroin was associated with a high-risk of gender-based received violence.

17. Riley ED, Cohen J, Knight KR et al. Recent violence in a community-based sample of homeless and unstably housed women with high levels of psychiatric comorbidity. *American journal of public health*. 2014 Sep;104(9):1657–63.

18. \* Riley ED, Shumway M, Knight KR et al. Risk factors for stimulant use among homeless and unstably housed adult women. *Drug and alcohol dependence*. 2015 Aug 1;153:173–9.

This cohort study in the US showed that unstably housed women have very high odds of both current and prospective use of cocaine and amphetamine-type substances.

19. \* Jiwatram-Negrón T, El-Bassel N. Correlates of Sex Trading among Drug-Involved Women in Committed Intimate Relationships: A Risk Profile. *Women's health issues* : official publication of the Jacobs Institute of Women's Health. 2015 Jul;25(4):420–8.

This US-based study highlighted a biunivocal direct relationship between crack cocaine use and sex trading in women.

20. \* Becker JB, McClellan M, Reed BG. Sociocultural context for sex differences in addiction. *Addiction Biology*. 2016 Sep;21(5):1052–9.

This narrative review explored how environmental aspects of substance use, especially cocaine and amphetamines, shaped the societal perception of women addicted to drugs.

21. \*\* Burch AE, Rash CJ, Petry NM. Sex effects in cocaine-using methadone patients randomized to contingency management interventions. *Experimental and Clinical Psychopharmacology*. 2015 Aug;23(4):284–90.

This secondary analysis of several previous randomised controlled trials confirmed the efficacy of contingency management in both women and men maintained on methadone and using cocaine. Female-users appeared to respond better than their male counterparts to interventions that involve frequent monitoring of abstinence.

22. Weiss RD, Martinez-Raga J, Griffin ML et al. Gender differences in cocaine dependent patients: a 6 month follow-up study. *Drug and alcohol dependence*. 1997 Jan 10;44(1):35–40.

23. Kosten TA, Gawin FH, Kosten TR, Rounsaville BJ. Gender differences in cocaine use and treatment response. *Journal of substance abuse treatment*. 10(1):63–6.

24. \*\* Cumming C, Troeung L, Young JT et al. Barriers to accessing methamphetamine treatment: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Drug and alcohol dependence*. 2016 Nov 1;168:263–73.

This systematic review of 11 studies across 5 countries described several factors preventing appropriate access to amphetamine services for women. The authors supported a re-shaping of current services to address gender-specific needs.

25. Center for Substance Abuse Treatment. *Treatment for Stimulant Use Disorders*. Treatment for Stimulant Use Disorders. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (US); 1999.

26. Kleber HD, Weiss RD, Anton RF et al. Treatment of patients with substance use disorders, second edition. American Psychiatric Association. The American journal of psychiatry. 2007 Apr;164(4 Suppl):5–123.
27. \*\* NICE. Drug misuse in over 16s: psychosocial interventions | Guidance and guidelines | NICE. NICE; 2016;

This was the most recent update to the UK guidelines for treating substance use disorders. Psychosocial interventions were maintained as the most evidence-based treatment. No major changes were introduced since their first publication in 2007.

28. \*\* Minozzi S, Saulle R, De Crescenzo F, Amato L. Psychosocial interventions for psychostimulant misuse. Minozzi S, editor. The Cochrane database of systematic reviews. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2016 Sep 29;9:CD011866.

This systematic review and meta-analysis was the only one including all psychosocial interventions used specifically in stimulants use disorders. Psychosocial interventions yielded some positive results on measures of efficacy and acceptability.

29. Agarwal RP, Kumar A, Lewis JE. A pilot feasibility and acceptability study of yoga/meditation on the quality of life and markers of stress in persons living with HIV who also use crack cocaine. Journal of alternative and complementary medicine (New York, NY). 2015 Mar;21(3):152–8.
30. Campbell ANC, Nunes E V, Pavlicova M et al. Gender-based Outcomes and Acceptability of a Computer-assisted Psychosocial Intervention for Substance Use Disorders. Journal of substance abuse treatment. 2015 Jun;53:9–15.
31. Carroll KM, Nich C, Petry NM et al. A randomized factorial trial of disulfiram and contingency management to enhance cognitive behavioral therapy for cocaine dependence. Drug and alcohol dependence. 2016 Mar 1;160:135–42.
32. Cochran G, Stitzer M, Campbell ANC et al. Web-based treatment for substance use

- disorders: Differential effects by primary substance. *Addictive Behaviors*. 2015 Jun;45:191–4.
33. De La Garza R, Yoon JH, Thompson-Lake DGY et al. Treadmill exercise improves fitness and reduces craving and use of cocaine in individuals with concurrent cocaine and tobacco-use disorder. *Psychiatry Research*. 2016 Nov 30;245:133–40.
  34. Gryczynski J, Mitchell SG, Gonzales A et al. A randomized trial of computerized vs. in-person brief intervention for illicit drug use in primary care: Outcomes through 12months. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*. 2015 Mar;50:3–10.
  35. Lopez RB, Onyemekwu C, Hart CL et al. Boundary conditions of methamphetamine craving. *Experimental and clinical psychopharmacology*. 2015 Dec;23(6):436–44.
  36. McCollister K, Yang X, McKay JR. Cost-effectiveness analysis of a continuing care intervention for cocaine-dependent adults. *Drug and alcohol dependence*. 2016 Jan 1;158:38–44.
  37. Miguel AQC, Madruga CS, Cogo-Moreira H et al. Contingency management is effective in promoting abstinence and retention in treatment among crack cocaine users in Brazil: A randomized controlled trial. *Psychology of addictive behaviors : journal of the Society of Psychologists in Addictive Behaviors*. 2016;30(5):536–43.
  38. Petry NM, Alessi SM, Barry D, Carroll KM. Standard magnitude prize reinforcers can be as efficacious as larger magnitude reinforcers in cocaine-dependent methadone patients. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*. 2015 Jun;83(3):464–72.
  39. Rash CJ, Alessi SM, Petry NM. Substance Abuse Treatment Patients in Housing Programs Respond to Contingency Management Interventions. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*. 2017 Jan;72:97–102.
  40. Rawson RA, Chudzynski J, Mooney L et al. Impact of an exercise intervention on methamphetamine use outcomes post-residential treatment care. *Drug and alcohol*

- dependence. 2015 Nov 1;156:21–8.
41. Rostami R, Dehghani-Arani F. Neurofeedback Training as a New Method in Treatment of Crystal Methamphetamine Dependent Patients: A Preliminary Study. *Applied psychophysiology and biofeedback*. 2015 Sep 19;40(3):151–61.
  42. Shepard DS, Daley MC, Neuman MJ et al. Telephone-based continuing care counseling in substance abuse treatment: Economic analysis of a randomized trial. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*. 2016 Feb 1;159:109–16.
  43. Strickland JC, Reynolds AR, Stoops WW. Regulation of cocaine craving by cognitive strategies in an online sample of cocaine users. *Psychology of addictive behaviors : journal of the Society of Psychologists in Addictive Behaviors*. 2016;30(5):607–12.
  44. Zhu D, Xu D, Dai G et al. Beneficial effects of Tai Chi for amphetamine-type stimulant dependence: a pilot study. *The American journal of drug and alcohol abuse*. 2016 Jul 3;42(4):469–78.
  45. \*\* Carrico AW, Nil E, Sophal C et al. Behavioral interventions for Cambodian female entertainment and sex workers who use amphetamine-type stimulants. *Journal of behavioral medicine*. 2016 Jun 18;39(3):502–10.

This pilot study investigated a form of contingency management in a population of female sex workers using amphetamines-type stimulants who dwell in Cambodia. Despite being often addressed as an intervention that carries excessive costs to health services, contingency management proved feasible in a notoriously low-income country.

46. \*\* Rash CJ, Petry NM. Contingency management treatments are equally efficacious for both sexes in intensive outpatient settings. *Experimental and clinical psychopharmacology*. 2015 Oct;23(5):369–76.

This study was a secondary analysis of numerous randomised controlled trials on the efficacy of contingency management in substance use disorders. Although no separate analysis was

performed, cocaine-users accounted for the largest part of the sample. Women showed response outcomes comparable to men in this study.

47. \*\* Rash CJ, Burki M, Montezuma-Rusca JM, Petry NM. A retrospective and prospective analysis of trading sex for drugs or money in women substance abuse treatment patients. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*. 2016 May 1;162:182–9.

This study examined the efficacy of contingency management in a subpopulation of female cocaine-users involved in sex trading. Such intervention proved beneficial on abstinence outcomes. Moreover, increased abstinence was inversely correlated to further involvement in sex trading.

48. \*\* Slesnick N, Zhang J. Family systems therapy for substance-using mothers and their 8- to 16-year-old children. *Psychology of addictive behaviors: Journal of the Society of Psychologists in Addictive Behaviors*. 2016;30(6):619–29.

This study was the only one in literature that considered mothers affected by substance use disorders and their children as an interlaced system, thus justifying the use of a form of systemic family therapy. A separate analysis for cocaine-using mothers was performed, yielding preliminary positive results in terms of efficacy.

49. \* Ersche KD, Gillan CM, Jones PS et al. Carrots and sticks fail to change behavior in cocaine addiction. *Science (New York, NY)*. 2016 Jun 17;352(6292):1468–71.

This study provided the rationale behind current behavioural approaches in stimulant use disorders, showing that cocaine users seemed to respond better to interventions focussing on positive reinforcement rather than punishment.