

Initial Insights from a Quality Improvement Initiative to Develop an Evidence-informed Young Adult Substance Use Program

Halladay, J., Stead, V., McCarron, C., Kennedy, M., King, K., Venantius, M., Carter, A., Syan, S., Matthews, M., Khoshroo, S., Massey, M., Rahman, L., Burns, J., MacKillop, E., Raymond, H., MacKillop, J.

Corresponding Author: James MacKillop, jmackill@mcmaster.ca

Jillian Halladay, RN, MSc, PhD Peter Boris Centre for Addictions Research (PBCAR), St. Josephs Healthcare Hamilton (SJHH), Research Institute of St. Joe's Hamilton Mental Health and Addictions Research Program, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON, CA

Victoria Stead, PhD McMaster Department of Psychiatry and Behavioural Neurosciences, SJHH, Hamilton, ON, CA

Catherine McCarron, RSW, MSW, SJHH, Hamilton, ON, CA

Marina Kennedy, MSW, RSW SJHH, Hamilton, ON, CA

Kyla King, Community Support Counsellor, SJHH, Hamilton, ON, CA

Michelle Venantius, MD, FRCPC SJHH, Hamilton, ON, CA

A. Carter, RSW SJHH, Hamilton, ON, CA

Sabrina Syan, PhD PBCAR/SJHH, Hamilton, ON, CA

Mareena Matthews, NP SJHH, Hamilton, ON, CA

Saba Khoshroo, BA, MSc PBCAR/SJHH, Hamilton, ON, CA

Myra Massey, BA PBCAR/SJHH, Hamilton, ON, CA

Liah Rahman, BA PBCAR/SJHH, Hamilton, ON, CA

Jacinda Burns, BA PBCAR/SJHH, Hamilton, ON, CA

Kiran Punia, BSc, MSc, PBCAR/SJHH, Hamilton, ON, CA

Emily MacKillop, PhD, CPsych, ABPP McMaster Department of Psychiatry and Behavioural Neurosciences, SJHH, Hamilton, ON, CA

Holly Raymond, MHA, MSW, RSW PBCAR/SJHH, Hamilton, ON, CA

James MacKillop, PhD McMaster Department of Psychiatry and Behavioural Neurosciences, PBCAR/SJHH, Hamilton, ON, CA

Acknowledgements: We thank the Boris Family for their generous donation that made this program possible. We also want to thank all of the research, clinical, and young adult experts who consulted on program development including: Brandon Bergman, PhD; Khrista Boylan, MD, FRCP(C), PhD; Penny Burley, CRPO; Kim Corace, PhD; Andrew Costa, PhD; Sarah Feldstein Ewing, PhD; Melissa Griffin, PhD; Taylor Hatchard, PhD; Lisa Hawke, PhD; Joanna Henderson, PhD; Ellen Lipman, MD, FRCP(C), MSc; Lisa Jeffs, MA; Madeleine Luvisa, BSW; Leslie Martin, MD; Mackenzie Mawson, BScN, RN; Catherine McCarron, RSW, MSW; Bob Miranda, PhD MEd; Catharine Munn, MD, FRCP(C), MSc; Jim Murphy, PhD; Dawn Pierce, RN; Tim O'Shea, MD; Christine Squires, Community Support Worker; Elizabeth Osuch, MD; John Westland, MSW. We would also like to thank all the clinical and research trainees and staff who have worked with the YA-SUP. Lastly, we would like to thank the patients and families who trust us with their care.

Conflicts of Interest: JM is a principal in BEAM Diagnostics, Inc. and a consultant to Clairvoyant Therapeutics, Inc. No other authors have any conflicts of interest to declare.

Initial Insights from a Quality Improvement Initiative to Develop an Evidence-informed Young Adult Substance Use Program

Abstract

Background: High rates of substance misuse during emerging adulthood require developmentally appropriate clinical programs.

Objectives: This work outlines the development of an evidence-informed emerging adult outpatient substance use program, quality improvement process and protocol, and 1-year program insights.

Methods: Literature reviews, program reviews, environmental scans, and stakeholder consultations (including lived expertise) were used to develop the program. A 12-week emerging adult (17-25) measurement-based care program was developed including: 1) individual measurement-based care and motivational enhancement therapy sessions; 2) group programming focused on cognitive behavioural therapy, mindfulness, distress tolerance, and emotional regulation; 3) consults for diagnostic clarification and/or medication review; and 4) a separate education group for loved ones. A measurement system was concurrently created to collect clinical and program evaluation data at 6 time points.

Results: In the first year of the program, 96 young adults fully enrolled in the program (Mean age = 21 years old, 48% female gender) primarily reporting treatment targets of alcohol (70%) and cannabis (59%). Almost all patients (97%) surpassed at least one clinical threshold for co-

occurring mental health disorder, with the median/mode of positive psychiatric screens being for 5 conditions.

Conclusions: This program demonstrates that developing an integrative evidence-informed measurement-based care young adult substance use program is feasible, though requires flexibility and ongoing monitoring to meet local needs. Patient characteristics reveal very high rates of concurrent psychiatric disorders in addition to substance use disorders.

Key words: emerging adults; substance use; cannabis; alcohol; addiction

Introduction

Emerging adulthood, roughly operationalized as 17-25 years of age, putatively represents an “in-between” developmental period at the interface of adolescence and adulthood (1). Relative to adolescents and adults, emerging adults experience the highest incidence and prevalence of substance use disorders (SUDs) and comorbid mental health disorders (2-4). This occurs alongside many important neurodevelopmental and psychosocial changes, including the transition from pediatric to adult healthcare systems (1, 5). Thus, emerging adults may be seeking out substance use services for the first time or transitioning to new providers with the emergence of worsening and comorbid symptoms in a system that lacks navigation support and developmentally-tailored programs (6, 7). Existing substance use services are often aimed at adults in general, and emerging adults within these programs tend to have lower motivation to change, lower engagement and retention, and, ultimately, poorer responses to treatment (6). However, entering SUD treatment early has been related to better long-term quality of life and functioning (8), making developmentally-tailored clinical programs for emerging adults a very high priority.

To minimize the risk of emerging adults “falling through the cracks,” provincial and national governments have emphasized the need to increase integrated and concurrent treatment capabilities in all sectors of youth and adult care (9-12). However, there are gaps in the literature regarding emerging adult treatment that contributes, in part, to a lack of evidence-based emerging adult focused services (6, 7, 13). Given the unique developmental factors and sparsity of clinical research specific this age group, emerging adult substance use programs may benefit from taking a measurement-based care (MBC) approach. MBC is a contemporary approach to patient assessment, ongoing monitoring, and evaluation within healthcare systems involving

routine and repeated use of standardized scales integrated into care (14). MBC has been associated with multi-faceted clinical benefits, including greater retention, engagement, and therapeutic alliances during treatment with better patient outcomes that occur more quickly and last longer than traditional care (14-19). Further, MBC data can also be used for quality improvement and research. Collectively, these benefits may help improve treatment engagement and outcomes among emerging adults accessing current substance use services while contributing to critical gaps in research to inform future improvements. However, MBC is underutilized in mental health and substance use treatment (15, 20).

The emergence and implications of substance use and comorbid mental health concerns during this critical period, compounded with the mismatch in unique developmental needs with available adult SUD programs, calls for an urgent creation of emerging adult concurrent disorders programs. This paper focuses on the development considerations of a three-year MBC emerging adult outpatient concurrent disorders pilot program for emerging adults called, the Young Adult Substance Use Program (YA-SUP). Though the target patient population for this program is “emerging adults,” consultations with emerging adults with lived expertise did not resonate with this term and preferred the term young adult (young adult used subsequently). This paper outlines the program development process, MBC system approach, program structure, initial patient characteristics in the first year of the program, and future directions.

Methods

Context and Eligibility

The YA-SUP is a collaboration between the Peter Boris Centre for Addictions Research (PBCAR) and the General Psychiatry Services/Concurrent Disorders Program at St. Joseph’s

Healthcare Hamilton (SJHH) located in a large urban city (Hamilton, Ontario). Services are freely available to individuals 17-25 who are covered by the Ontario Health Insurance Plan (OHIP). The only additional eligibility requirement is an interest in changing substance use.

Intervention: The Young Adult Substance Use Program (YA-SUP)

Program Development Process

Program development broadly followed recommendations for developing and evaluating complex interventions (21), environmental scans in health services research (22), and is consistent with the Quality Enhancement Research Initiative (QUERI) Roadmap for Implementation Quality Improvement (23). First, the YA-SUP was iteratively developed through a comprehensive environmental scan using internal and external data sources (24). Both passive (i.e., existing data, reports, guidelines, research) and active (i.e., observations, consultations) data sources were collected. Internal sources included reviewing the adult program procedures, structure, and data as well as consulting with clinicians, leadership, and administrators. A similar approach was taken with related internal clinical programs. External passive sources included reviewing current best practices for adolescent and adult substance use and concurrent disorders, local service gaps, novel research on emerging adult substance use concerns, existing adolescent and emerging adult mental health and substance use program components and structures at other institutions, and evaluated psychotherapeutic manuals. External active sources of data included stakeholder consultations with key informants including national and international experts leading research and clinical practice related to adolescent or emerging adult substance use, local emerging adults with lived expertise, and clinicians within pediatric mental health services. A foundational program model was created based on existing best practices that was presented to

stakeholders updated based on feedback. See Supplementary Materials for a list of stakeholders (summary of consults available upon request).

Throughout program development, emerging adult perspectives were incorporated and amplified in several ways. First, we drew heavily on published reports and papers that have systematically collected and synthesized youth voice related to mental health care, substance use services, and transitions to the adult system. Second, we consulted with researchers and clinicians who routinely engage in co-creation and youth engagement for their services and projects. Third, in line with national standards for youth engagement (25-27), we engaged in direct youth consultations with two local emerging adults with lived experience prior to and following the initial program launch (28).

Environmental Scan Summary

Broadly, substance use treatment tailored to emerging adults should be grounded in harm-reduction, take a trauma-informed and concurrent disorders lens, be multidisciplinary and grounded in the biopsychosocial model, be patient-centred and driven, foster inclusivity, and focus on engagement rather than strict adherence (6, 29, 30). Emerging adults are unique, biologically, socially, and psychologically yet research looking specifically at treatments for emerging adults is sparse. However, recommendations of “meeting the patient where they are at,” being non-judgemental, and emphasizing patient self-efficacy and collaborative treatment planning are consistent with both the principles of motivational interviewing (31) and the existing practice recommendations for SUDs among adolescents and adults.

Cognitive behavioural therapy (CBT) combined with motivational enhancement therapy (MET) is the current recommended first line psychotherapeutic approach for treating both adolescent and adult SUDs (32, 33). Of note, many guidelines recommend simultaneous

screening and treatment of both substance use and other mental health disorders (34) and CBT is first line psychotherapeutic treatment for common co-occurring mental health disorders like anxiety and depression in both adolescents and adults (35-41). A review of treatment for adolescent-specific substance use indicated the most promising treatments are family-based therapies, CBT, and multicomponent approaches (e.g., MET/CBT) (42). A meta-analysis of 12-20 year olds further extended support for the importance of family-based interventions, brief motivational interviewing, and MET/CBT for youth alcohol use, other drug use, and related substance use problems (43). Although they did not find effective interventions for youth cannabis use (43), evidence was limited and imprecise. Specific to motivational brief interventions, although several reviews have not found changes in frequency of use regarding cannabis use (43, 44), there are benefits for alcohol and other substance use problems among adolescents (45) and adults (46, 47) and some evidence of benefit regarding other cannabis-related outcomes among emerging adults (44). Specific to emerging adults, though limited, existing research has shown potential benefits from cognitive-behavioural and motivational interventions, integrated mental health and substance use treatment, and higher emerging adult retention when programs include CBT (6, 48, 49).

For adolescents, there is also emerging evidence for adjunctive approaches, some of which include: exercise, goal setting and progress monitoring, and third wave CBT including mindfulness, Dialectical Behaviour Therapy (DBT) skills (namely, emotion regulation), and adolescent community reinforcement approach (ACRA) (42, 50-52). ACRA combines key CBT ingredients and family-based approaches with a strong focus on substance-free reinforcements (53). ACRA has been considered part of an emerging field of behavioural economic approaches for addiction (54), which focus on minimizing demand and craving for substances, enhancing

future oriented thinking and reducing impulsivity, and reducing substance-related reinforcement while maximizing substance-free reinforcements (54). Interventions for emerging adults substance use often incorporate values exploration, a behavioural economic strategy; values exercises are consistent with developmental characteristics of emerging adults who have increased self-awareness and engagement in identify exploration and formation (1, 55). Overall, these findings are in line with recommendations for emerging adults with SUDs, which primarily suggests a suite of CBT interventions, and additionally encourages incorporating social support interventions and increasing engagement in substance-free activities (6).

Although the adult healthcare system typically operates independent from the family, family-based approaches have demonstrated some of the strongest benefits for adolescent substance use (32, 43) and there appears to be continued clinical importance of family engagement during emerging adulthood (6, 56). Experts and emerging adults have also indicated that parent, caregiver, and partner involvement should be offered, while simultaneously respecting the emerging adults' autonomy and independence, such as through separate programming (6, 29, 56, 57). There is a version of ACRA created for the loved ones called Community Reinforcement Approach and Family Training (CRAFT), which supports individuals in understanding and implementing: positive contingencies and natural consequences, positive communication and motivational strategies, and self-care strategies to improve their personal well-being (58). CRAFT is commonly recommended in family-involvement calls to action (56, 57) as CRAFT has previously been shown to increase patient engagement in treatment (59, 60), improve family functioning (58, 60), reduce the patients' substance use (61), and improve the loved ones' perceived empowerment (62) and mental health (63).

Lastly, it is important to ensure access to medications for both psychiatric concerns and addictions, particularly for opioid use disorder (49, 64, 65). Although it is important to simultaneously treat psychiatric disorders with medications where indicated, solely intervening with medications for non-substance related psychiatric concerns is insufficient to treat adolescent SUD (66) and other psychological and pharmacological interventions for SUDs should be delivered concurrently (67).

Initial YA-SUP Model

The YA-SUP's mission is to provide young adults with the support and skills to: a) reduce the negative impact of substance use on their lives, whether that be through abstinence, reduction in use, or other harm reduction approaches; b) improve mental health and wellbeing by considering the whole-person; and c) increase engagement in substance-free activities and create a life that aligns with their values and goals. The YA-SUP values include: providing young adult centered care, creating a safe(r) space, considering the whole person, collaboration with young adults and community providers, and using evidence-based practices and contributing to evidence. The YA-SUP acknowledges the contribution of biological, psychological, and sociocultural factors in the development of addiction as well as recovery (68). This approach to treatment incorporates: a) psychological treatment including identification, psychoeducation, and treatment related to comorbid mental health concerns as well as offering psychotherapy to increase coping, identification and management of triggers, and promote ongoing recovery; b) sociocultural treatment including enhancing social support for recovery and establish a set of pleasurable substance-free activities; and c) biological and medical treatment including providing diagnostic assessments and pharmacotherapy where warranted. The program theory (21) has been simplified and visualized into a causal model and a logic model (See Supplementary

Materials). The program development process has been conceptualized as a Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) cycle (See Figure 1).

[Figure 1]

Young Adult Stream. Structurally, the YA-SUP operates around a core 12-week cycle including 2 separate streams for young adults and their loved ones. The Young Adult stream includes: 1) 5 individual sessions (the core components) grounded in MBC and MET which are supplemented by behavioural economics and ACRA interventions (e.g., values, substance-free reinforcers, quality of life and related goals); 2) near daily group programming (peripheral and adaptable components, presented as a menu of options) including CBT skills (strongly recommended as a core component), Mindfulness Based Stress Reduction, DBT informed emotion regulation and distress tolerance skills, substance related health promotion (i.e., exercise, sleep, nutrition); and 3) consults for diagnostic clarification and/or medication review and initiation.

Individual and group sessions are structured to facilitate assessment, treatment, and referrals for young adults within ~12-week cycles (target dose: 2 sessions or groups per week, 24 sessions in 12 weeks), however, young adults in the program can still access care beyond the 12-week period. The 12-week cycle was selected to balance evidence-based research, where manualized treatments are often last 8-12 weeks, and available resources (See Figure 2). The Young Adult Stream is based on common core components of existing evidence-based manuals that were adapted prior to program launch to meet the unique needs of emerging adults. To address these multi-pronged goals, the YA-SUP has a multi-disciplinary and collaborative team which includes a Social Worker, Community Support Counsellors, Nurse Practitioner, Clinical Psychologists and trainees, Psychiatrist, and substance use and mental health researchers.

Frontline staff were provided training related to all manualized sessions (e.g., CBT, MET, CRAFT). Please see Figure 3 for a summary of the YA-SUP Functional Analysis of how each program component fits into our overarching view of causal mechanisms of emerging adult substance use (based predominantly on: MacKillop (54) and Bergman, Kelly (6)).

The program implemented unique service delivery and structural characteristics recommended for emerging adult programs. Where possible, we utilize technology, such as program promotion through social media, co-creation of a program webpage, text messaging appointment reminders, and telemedicine or e-delivery of programming (6, 29, 42). Groups were delivered through telemedicine, and individual follow-ups were available via telemedicine if desired (though most chose to attend in-person). Flexible drop-in programming and short wait times, such as same-day appointments and rolling recruitment were offered (6, 13, 29). Further, in line with recommendations to include harm-reduction as a goal to treatment, clean supplies and naloxone kits are available for patients who need them.

Loved Ones Stream. An 8-session Loved Ones Education Group was created based on CRAFT (58, 69) and tailored to the specific needs of the loved ones of emerging adults (e.g., drawing on content from Change (70)). The sessions include: 1) Group overview, safety, and self-care; 2) understanding substance use; 3) understanding co-occurring mental health concerns; 4) positive communication; 5) past patterns and new strategies; 6) rewards and coping with intoxications; 7) allowing negative consequences; 8) talking about treatment, review, and next steps. The specific goals for our Loved Ones Education Group are to create a sense of community, increase knowledge, and provide attendees with new strategies.

[Figure 2]

[Figure 3]

Studying the Program

Creating a Measurement-Based Care System

The YA-SUP was developed to be a learning health system, whereby data is collected and used to continuously update the program and respond to patient needs (23). Alongside clinical chart reviews, a priority for the YA-SUP was to embed measurement-based care (MBC) in the program. MBC refers to a structured system of assessments to promote personalized and adaptive treatment. The YA-SUP assessment (called the “battery”) evolved through literature reviews, discussion of clinically important outcomes with stakeholders, and previous batteries that have been successfully deployed in similar clinical settings (71-73).

We adopt the definition of recovery from Witkiewitz and colleagues (2020) (74), that defines recovery as *“a dynamic process of change characterized by improvements in health and social functioning, as well as increases in well-being and purpose in life.”* This definition supports both abstinence and harm reduction goals which have been highlighted as important aspects of emerging adult care (6, 29, 30), allowing for a person-centred approach and capturing the multidimensionality and heterogeneity of symptoms and recovery (51, 52, 67). This also follows Diagnostic Statistical Manual 5 (75) definitions of SUD remission, where the focus is on reducing problems related to use, enhancing meaningful activities, and increasing control over use rather than narrowly focusing on abstinence or reductions in substance use. It also supports expansion of clinical outcomes to include problems related to substance use such as: mental health and wellbeing; social, academic, and occupational functioning; quality of life and valued living; and engagement in substance free activities which are particularly relevant for young adults (43, 44, 55). Published reports and papers that have systematically summarized youth voices related to mental health care, substance use services, and transitions to the adult system

(29, 30, 76-78) indicate improvements in quality of life is perceived as more important than substance use and mental health symptom reduction, which was echoed in stakeholder consultations. Thus, the core objectives of the YA-SUP program evaluation are to examine whether participation in the YA-SUP results in reductions in substance use and improvements in mental health and quality of life among young people with substance use concerns.

The battery was created with the aim of capturing the complexity of factors seen in emerging adults presenting to addictions services. We include questions related to (See Table 1): demographics, historical experiences, substance-use, mental health symptoms, quality of life and functioning, possible mechanisms of substance use recovery and vulnerability, and satisfaction. Emerging adults are asked to complete assessments via RedCap (79) on five occasions (with the support of a clinical research assistant): at intake, three check-in appointments approximately 4 weeks apart, and ~12 weeks after discharge. These assessments are used to generate near real-time reports at multiple levels including personalized feedback for the young adult at each individual session, a clinician summary report to aid in conceptualizations and clinical decision making for each individual session, and a weekly program monitoring report using aggregated patient data (also supports internal data monitoring), while building a database to use for subsequent program quality improvement and research (Hamilton Integrated Research Ethics Board #12926). The clinician report includes a summary of patient demographics, frequency of substance use and readiness to change, history of trauma or head injury, and flags for whether patients surpassed clinical cut-offs for all psychiatric concerns assessed. The key components for personalized feedback reports include: 1) substance use frequency and targets for treatment; 2) quality of life; 3) SUD symptom scores; 4) anxiety and depression symptoms; and 5) personal values. Further, when iteratively adjusting the program based on clinical feedback, we follow

PDSA cycle procedures by identifying key areas of improvement, creating and piloting program modifications, and evaluating the effectiveness of those changes using data from the embedded measurement system and related clinical discussions (23). See Supplementary Materials for example clinician and personalized feedback reports.

[Table 1]

Analysis Plan

Using an observational cohort design, the measurement system enables the program to: 1) characterize young adults accessing the program; 2) gather ongoing insight into feasibility (e.g., engagement, retention) and acceptability (e.g., satisfaction); and 3) quantify changes in substance use, mental health, and quality of life related outcomes throughout the program and at 6 months follow-up. This paper will provide detailed descriptive statistics (objective 1) regarding the clinical characteristics of patients accessing the YA-SUP in the first year, between February 22, 2021, to February 28, 2022.

Results

During the first year of the program, 183 young adult intakes were scheduled, 124 intakes initiated, and 96 fully enrolled (i.e., completed both intake sessions) in the program (77% of intakes). For intakes, there was a 33% absentee rate and 17% did not fully enroll in program. See Table 2 for full descriptive statistics.

Of young adults who fully enrolled in the first year (n=96), patients were on average 21 years of age and 46% were women. Most young adults were coming to the program for their alcohol (67%), cannabis (60%), cigarette (37%), and/or cocaine use (27%) (Supplementary Materials). There were high levels of comorbid types of SUDs (Figure 4A). Almost all young

adults (97%) surpassed at least one clinical threshold for co-occurring non-substance mental health symptoms; on average, young adults surpassed 5 different co-occurring clinical thresholds (Figure 4B). In terms of specific conditions, 76% endorsed moderate to severe depressive symptoms, 81% moderate to severe generalized anxiety symptoms, and there was near universal trauma exposure (91%) with 54% surpassing PTSD thresholds (Figure 4C). Notably, 46% surpassed cut-offs for GAD, Depression, BPD, and PTSD. On average, young adults were reporting 4 out of 10 across various youth-specific domains of quality of life at intake (Supplementary Materials). Further, 54% of the patients were living with their family and 26% with others (partners, friends, roommates), highlighting the importance of the Loved Ones Education group.

The program also delivered three cycles of the Loved Ones Education Group, with all attendees identifying as parents or caregivers of young adults with substance use concerns. Of the attendees ($n \sim 33$), a majority of their young adult loved ones were not in treatment (76%) and predominantly using cannabis (82%), alcohol (48%), and/or cigarettes (24%).

[Table 2]

[Figure 4]

Discussion

The Young Adult Substance Use Program (YA-SUP) represents the combination of best practices, contemporary research, and stakeholder input, while operating within the parameters of available program resources. This program demonstrates that developing an integrative evidence-informed measurement-based care young adult substance use program is feasible, though requires flexibility and ongoing adaptations to meet local needs. In the first year of the program, alcohol and cannabis use were the most common reasons for treatment and emerging

adults presented with a high degree of comorbidity, particularly regarding internalizing mental health disorders and near-universal trauma exposure. The level of complexity and comorbidity among young adults presenting to the program was higher than anticipated. By taking a measurement-based care and learning health system approach, we have been able to simultaneously monitor who our program is serving and how our program is doing to inform immediate improvements to the program and contribute to gaps in research.

We made a number of notable, iterative, systematic modifications to the delivery and evaluation of the program during the first year (23). These adaptations included: separating content initially developed for single sessions into multiple sessions (e.g., intake, CBT identifying and challenging thoughts); adjusting group structure (e.g., reducing number of young adult group options) and content (e.g., adding more co-occurring mental health content for loved ones); clarifying, adding, and streamlining questions in the assessment battery and refining clinician reports and patient personalized feedback based on these assessments (i.e., the measurement system); and expanding the clinical team (notably, hiring a community support worker focused on community outreach, engagement, collaboration, and capacity building). By reviewing young adult characteristics from the battery alongside implementation outcomes (such as reach, uptake, and dose), clinical insights from the care team, and follow-ups with young adults, we are continuing to iteratively improve the program. Specifically, like other similar programs, we have seen relatively high levels of service disengagement early in the program (80-82). By leveraging our measurement system, we have been able to explore predictors of retention and engagement in our population. Accordingly, the clinicians are leading the development and implementation of pilot programming focused on individualized harm reduction, trauma, and

group readiness (including related anxiety, severe emotion dysregulation, and behavioural activation and planning).

Generalizability regarding specific program components and patients is limited due to the program being created for and implemented in a single city. Further, several best practices and stakeholder suggestions have not yet been incorporated, in part due to resource limitations. Thus, future considerations for our programs and others include: expanding flexibility in the referral pathways, street outreach, timing, and location of services; expanding program offerings to focus on other areas of health and functioning (e.g., occupational support, housing, exercise, finance, substance-free activities); increasing access to longer term psychopharmacotherapy monitoring; mutual support or weekly structured relapse prevention groups; and community capacity building for adolescent services in collaboration with other local youth substance use services.

Overall, this paper summarizes: 1) the rationale and key considerations for the development of an outpatient program for emerging adult co-occurring substance use and mental health concerns; 2) the development and implementation of an embedded measurement system that provides the structure for future program evaluation; and 3) initial patient characteristics, clinical insights, and iterative clinically-reactive adaptations following year 1 of program launch. This program overview can help inform the development and evaluation of future tailored programs.

References

1. Arnett JJ. Emerging adulthood: what is it, and what is it good for? *Child Dev Perspect* [Internet]. 2007 [cited 2022 May 24];1(2):68-73. Available from: <https://srcd.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1750-8606.2007.00016.x> DOI: 10.1111/j.1750-8606.2007.00016.x.
2. Pearson C, Janz T, Ali J. Statistics Canada [Internet]. Canada: Minister of Industry Health Canada; 2013 Sep [cited 2022 May 24]. Available from: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/82-624-x/2013001/article/11855-eng.pdf>
3. Rush B, Urbanoski K, Bassani D, Castel S, Wild TC, Strike C, et al. Prevalence of co-occurring substance use and other mental disorders in the Canadian population. *Can J Psychiatry* [Internet]. 2008 Dec [cited 2022 May 24];53(12):800-9. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19087478/> DOI: 10.1177/070674370805301206.
4. Solmi M, Radua J, Olivola M, Croce E, Soardo L, de Pablo GS, et al. Age at onset of mental disorders worldwide: large-scale meta-analysis of 192 epidemiological studies. *Mol Psychiatry* [Internet]. 2021 Jun [cited 2022 May 24];27(1):281-295. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34079068/> DOI: 10.1038/s41380-021-01161-7.
5. Casey BJ, Jones RM. Neurobiology of the adolescent brain and behavior: implications for substance use disorders. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry* [Internet]. 2010 Oct 8 [cited 2022 May 24];49(12):1189-285. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21093769/> DOI: 10.1016/j.jaac.2010.08.017.
6. Bergman BG, Kelly JF, Nargiso JE, McKowen JW. "The age of feeling in-between": addressing challenges in the treatment of emerging adults with substance use disorders. *Cogn Behav Pract* [Internet]. 2016 [cited 2022 May 24];23(3):270-88. Available from: <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2016-02611-001> DOI: 10.1016/j.cbpra.2015.09.008.
7. Carver J, Cappelli M, Davidson S. Taking the next step forward: building a responsive mental health and addictions system for emerging adults [Internet]. Ottawa: Mental Health Commission of Canada; 2015 Jul 17 [cited 2022 May 24]. 108 p. Available from: https://www.mentalhealthcommission.ca/wp-content/uploads/drupal/Taking%252520the%252520Next%252520Step%252520Forward_0.pdf
8. Kelly JF, Greene MC, Abry A, Bergman BG. Independent effects of entering recovery as a young versus older adult on long-term functioning and quality of life: results from a US national study of recovering persons. *Drug Alcohol Depen* [Internet]. 2020 Dec 24 [cited 2022 May 24];219:108493. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33360637/> DOI: 10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2020.108493
9. Ontario's Mental Health & Addictions Leadership Advisory Council. Mental health and addictions: realizing the vision - better mental health means better health [Internet]. Ontario: Care MoHaL-T; 2017 [cited 2022 May 25]. 20 p. Available from: https://www.health.gov.on.ca/en/common/ministry/publications/reports/bmhmbh_2017/vision_2017.pdf
10. Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care. Open minds, healthy minds: Ontario's comprehensive mental health and addictions strategy [Internet]. Ontario: Care OMoHaL-T; 2011 Jun [cited 2022 May 25]. 28 p. Available from: https://www.health.gov.on.ca/en/common/ministry/publications/reports/mental_health2011/mentalhealth.aspx

11. Mental Health Commission of Canada. Changing directions, changing lives: the mental health strategy for Canada. Calgary: MHCC; 2012.
12. Urbanoski K. Strengthening performance measurement for mental health and addiction in Ontario: Center for Addiction and Mental Health [Internet]. Hamilton: CAMH; 2017 Mar 6 [cited 2022 May 25]. 67 p. Available from: https://eenet.ca/sites/default/files/pdfs/DTFP-ON_Performance%20Measurement%20for%20MHA_FINAL.pdf
13. Representative for Children and Youth. Youth substance use services in B.C. – an update [Internet]. Victoria: RCY; 2020 Mar [cited 2022 May 25]. 78 p. Available from: <https://rcybc.ca/reports-and-publications/reports/monitoring-reports/youth-substance-use-services-in-b-c-an-update/>
14. Lewis CC, Boyd M, Puspitasari A, Navarro E, Howard J, Kassab H, et al. Implementing measurement-based care in behavioral health: a review. JAMA psychiat [Internet]. 2019 Mar 1 [cited 2022 May 25];76(3):324-35. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30566197/> DOI: 10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2018.3329.
15. Scott K, Lewis CC. Using measurement-based care to enhance any treatment. Cogn Behav Pract [Internet]. 2015 Jun 16 [cited 2022 May 25];22(1):49-59. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4910387/> DOI: 10.1016%2Fj.cbpra.2014.01.010.
16. Peterson K, Anderson J, Bourne D. Evidence brief: use of patient reported outcome measures for measurement-based care in mental health shared decision-making [Internet]. Washington: Department of Veterans Affairs (US). 2018 Nov [cited 2022 May 25]. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK536143/>.
17. Hawkins EJ, Lambert MJ, Vermeersch DA, Slade KL, Tuttle KC. The therapeutic effects of providing patient progress information to therapists and patients. Psychother Res [Internet]. 2006 Aug 19 [cited 2022 May 25];14(3):308-27. Available from: <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2004-16752-003> DOI: 10.1093/ptr/kph027.
18. Lambert MJ, Whipple JL, Vermeersch DA, Smart DW, Hawkins EJ, Nielsen SL, et al. Enhancing psychotherapy outcomes via providing feedback on client progress: a replication. Clin Psychol Psychot [Internet]. 2002 Mar [cited 2022 May 25];9(2):91-103. Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/227704229_Enhancing Psychotherapy Outcomes via Providing Feedback on Client Progress A Replication DOI: 10.1002/cpp.324.
19. Hickie IB, Scott EM, Cross SP, Iorfino F, Davenport TA, Guastella AJ, et al. Right care, first time: a highly personalised and measurement-based care model to manage youth mental health. Med J Australia [Internet]. 2019 Nov [cited 2022 May 25];211(Suppl 9):S3-S46. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31679171/> DOI: 10.5694/mja2.50383.
20. Hatfield DR, Ogles BM. The use of outcome measures by psychologists in clinical practice. Prof Psychol-Res Pr [Internet]. 2004 [cited 2022 May 25];35(5):485-91. Available from: <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2004-19170-008> DOI: 10.1037/0735-7028.35.5.485.
21. Skivington K, Matthews L, Simpson SA, Craig P, Baird J, Blazeby JM, et al. A new framework for developing and evaluating complex interventions: update of Medical Research Council guidance. BMJ [Internet]. 2021 30 Sep [cited 2022 May

- 25];374:n2061. Available from: <https://www.bmj.com/content/374/bmj.n2061> DOI: 10.1136/bmj.n2061.
22. Charlton P, Doucet S, Azar R, Nagel DA, Boulos L, Luke A, et al. The use of the environmental scan in health services delivery research: a scoping review protocol. *BMJ Open* [Internet]. 2019 Sep 6 [cited 2022 May 25];9(9):e029805. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31494613/> DOI: 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-029805.
23. Goodrich DE M-LI, Braganza MZ, Wawrin N, Kilbourne AM. The QUERI roadmap for implementation and quality improvement [Internet]. Washington: Department of Veterans Affairs (US); 2020 [cited 2022 May 25]. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK566223/>
24. Charlton P, Kean T, Liu RH, Nagel DA, Azar R, Doucet S, et al. Use of environmental scans in health services delivery research: a scoping review. *BMJ Open* [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2022 May 25];11:e050284. Available from: <https://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/bmjopen/11/11/e050284.full.pdf> DOI: 10.1136/bmjopen-2021-050284.
25. Darnay K, Hawke LD, Chaim G, Henderson J, INNOVATE Research Team. Youth engagement guidebook for researchers [Internet]. Toronto: Centre for Addiction and Mental Health; 2019 [cited 2022 May 25]. 76 p. Available from: <https://foundrybc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/E.12-INNOVATE-Research-Youth-Engagement-Guidebook.pdf>
26. Ontario Centre of Excellence for Child & Youth Mental Health. Quality standard for youth engagement [Internet]. Ottawa: Centre of Excellence; 2021 Mar [cited 2022 May 25]. 58 p. Available from: <https://iknow-oce.esolutionsgroup.ca/api/ServiceItem/GetDocument?clientId=A1B5AA8F-88A1-4688-83F8-FF0A5B083EF3&documentId=95029f32-b824-4e0a-ad7c-7aa08ba2e10b>
27. Canadian Institute of Health Research. Strategy for patient-oriented research - patient engagement framework [Internet]. Canada: CIHR; 2019 May 27 [cited 2022 May 25]. Available from: <https://cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/48413.html>
28. Pereira N. Ready... set... engage! Building effective youth/adult partnerships for a stronger child and youth mental health system [Internet]. Toronto: Children's Mental Health Ontario and The Provincial Centre of Excellence for Child and Youth Mental Health at CHEO; 2007 Nov [cited 2022 May 25]. 76 p. Available from: <https://www.homelesshub.ca/resource/ready-set-engage-building-effective-youthadult-partnerships-stronger-child-and-youth-mental>
29. Hawke LD, Mehra K, Settipani C, Relihan J, Darnay K, Chaim G, et al. What makes mental health and substance use services youth friendly? A scoping review of literature. *BMC Health Serv Res* [Internet]. 2019 Apr 27 [cited 2022 May 25];19(257). Available from: <https://bmchealthservres.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12913-019-4066-5> DOI: 10.1186/s12913-019-4066-5.
30. Settipani CA, Hawke LD, Cleverley K, Chaim G, Cheung A, Mehra K, et al. Key attributes of integrated community-based youth service hubs for mental health: a scoping review. *Int J Ment Health Syst* [Internet]. 2019 Jul 23;13(52). Available from: <https://ijmhs.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13033-019-0306-7#citeas> DOI: 10.1186/s13033-019-0306-7.
31. Miller WR, Rollnick S. Motivational interviewing: helping people change. 3rd ed. New York: Guilford Press; 2013.

32. Burkstein O. Approach to treating substance use disorder in adolescents [Internet]. Massachusetts: UpToDate Inc.; 2022 [cited 2022 May 25]. Available from: <https://www.uptodate.com/contents/approach-to-treating-substance-use-disorder-in-adolescents>
33. McKay JR. Psychotherapies for substance use disorders [Internet]. Massachusetts: UpToDate Inc.; 2020 [cited 2022 May 25]. Available from: <https://www.uptodate.com/contents/psychotherapies-for-substance-use-disorders>
34. Alsuhaibani R, Smith DC, Lowrie R. Scope, quality and inclusivity of international clinical guidelines on mental health and substance abuse in relation to dual diagnosis, social and community outcomes: a systematic review. BMC Psychiatry [Internet]. 2021 Apr 23 [cited 2022 May 25];21(209): 1-23. Available from: <https://bmcpsy psychiatry.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12888-021-03188-0#citeas> DOI: 10.1186/s12888-021-03188-0
35. Pan L, Brent DA. BMJ Best Practice: Depression in children [Internet]. London: BMJ Publishing Group; c2022 [updated 2022 Apr 13; cited 2022 May 25]. Available from: <https://bestpractice.bmj.com/topics/en-gb/785>
36. Creswell C, Waite P, Cooper PJ. Assessment and management of anxiety disorders in children and adolescents. Arch Dis Child [Internet]. 2014 Jul [cited 2022 May 25];99(7):674-8. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24636957/> DOI: 10.1136/archdischild-2013-303768.
37. Rush AJ. Unipolar major depression in adults: choosing initial treatment [Internet]. Massachusetts: UpToDate Inc.; 2021 [cited 2022 May 25]. Available from: <https://www.uptodate.com/contents/unipolar-depression-in-adults-and-initial-treatment-general-principles-and-prognosis>
38. MacKinnon DF. Depression in adults [Internet]. [place unknown]: BMJ Best Practice; 2021 May 10 [cited 2022 May 25]. Podcast: 20 min. Available from: <https://soundcloud.app.goo.gl/YDFoQkUbM3m6Pkz26>
39. Gorelick DA. Cannabis use disorder in adults [Internet]. Massachusetts: UpToDate Inc.; 2021 [cited 2022 May 25]. Available from: <https://www.uptodate.com/contents/cannabis-use-disorder-in-adults#:~:text=Cannabis%20use%20disorder%20develops%20in,as%20mood%20disorders%20and%20psychosis>
40. Kingston RE, Marel C, Mills KL. A systematic review of the prevalence of comorbid mental health disorders in people presenting for substance use treatment in Australia. Drug Alcohol Rev [Internet]. 2017 Jul [cited 2022 May 25];36(4):527-39. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27786426/> DOI: 10.1111/dar.12448.
41. Teesson M, Slade T, Mills K. Comorbidity in Australia: findings of the 2007 national survey of mental health and wellbeing. Aust Nz J Psychiat. [Internet]. 2009 Jul [cited 2022 May 25];43(7):606-14. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19530017/> DOI: 10.1080/00048670902970908.
42. Fatus MC, Squeglia LM, Valadez EA, Tomko RL, Bryant BE, Gray KM. Adolescent substance use disorder treatment: an update on evidence-based strategies. Curr Psychiat Rep [Internet]. 2019 Sep 14 [cited 2022 May 25];21(10):96. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7241222/> DOI: 10.1007%2Fs11920-019-1086-0.

43. Steele DW, Becker SJ, Danko KJ, Balk EM, Saldanha IJ, Adam GP, et al. Interventions for substance use disorders in adolescents: a systematic review [Internet]. Comparative Effectiveness Review, No. 225. Rockville: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (US); 2020 May. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK557291/>
44. Halladay J, Scherer J, Mackillop J, Woock R, Petker T, Linton V, et al. Brief interventions for cannabis use in emerging adults: a systematic review, meta-analysis, and evidence MAP. Drug Alcohol Depen [Internet]. 2019 Nov 1 [cited 2022 May 25];204:107565. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31751868/> DOI: 10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2019.107565.
45. Steele DW, Becker SJ, Danko KJ, Balk EM, Adam GP, Saldanha IJ, et al. Brief behavioral interventions for substance use in adolescents: a meta-analysis. Pediatrics [Internet]. 2020 Oct [cited 2022 May 25] 146(4):e20200351. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32928988/> DOI: 10.1542/peds.2020-0351.
46. O'Connor EA, Perdue LA, Senger CA, Rushkin M, Patnode CD, Bean SI, et al. Screening and behavioral counseling interventions to reduce unhealthy alcohol use in adolescents and adults: updated evidence report and systematic review for the US preventive services task force. JAMA [Internet]. 2018 Nov 13 [cited 2022 May 25];320(18):1910-28. Available from: <https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/2714536> DOI: 10.1001/jama.2018.12086.
47. Tanner-Smith EE, Parr NJ, Schweer Collins M, Saitz R. Effects of brief substance use interventions delivered in general medical settings: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Addiction [Internet]. 2021 Oct 14 [cited 2022 May 25];117(4):877-889. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34647649/> DOI: 10.1111/add.15674.
48. Bergman BG, Greene MC, Slaymaker V, Hoepfner BB, Kelly JF. Young adults with co-occurring disorders: substance use disorder treatment response and outcomes. J Subst Abuse Treat [Internet]. 2014 [cited 2022 May 25];46(4):420-8. Available from: <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2014-07536-003> DOI: 10.1016/j.jsat.2013.11.005.
49. Dalton K, Bishop L, Darcy S. Investigating interventions that lead to the highest treatment retention for emerging adults with substance use disorder: a systematic review. Addict Behav [Internet]. 2021 Jun 3 [cited 2022 May 25]; 122:107005. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34119856/> DOI: 10.1016/j.addbeh.2021.107005.
50. Hawkins EH. A tale of two systems: co-occurring mental health and substance abuse disorders treatment for adolescents. Annu Rev Psychol [Internet]. 2009 [cited 2022 May 25];60:197-227. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19035824/> DOI: 10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163456.
51. Henderson JL, Brownlie E, McMains S, Chaim G, Wolfe DA, Rush B, et al. Enhancing prevention and intervention for youth concurrent mental health and substance use disorders: the research and action for teens study. Early Interv in Psychia [Internet]. 2017 Jul 26 [cited 2022 May 25];13(1):110-9. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6492445/> DOI: 10.1111/eip.12458.
52. McKee SA. Concurrent substance use disorders and mental illness: Bridging the gap between research and treatment. Can Psychol [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2022 May 25];58(1):50-7. Available from: <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2017-04477-006> DOI: 10.1037/cap0000093.

53. Godley SH, Smith JE, Passetti LL, Subramaniam G. The Adolescent Community Reinforcement Approach (A-CRA) as a model paradigm for the management of adolescents with substance use disorders and co-occurring psychiatric disorders. *Subst Abuse* [Internet]. 2014;35(4):352-63. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25035906/> DOI: 10.1080/08897077.2014.936993.
54. MacKillop J. The behavioral economics and neuroeconomics of alcohol use disorders. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res* [Internet]. 2016 Apr [cited 2022 May 25];40(4):672-85. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4846981/> DOI: 10.1111%2Facer.13004.
55. Silvers JA, Squeglia LM, Rømer Thomsen K, Hudson KA, Feldstein Ewing SW. Hunting for what works: adolescents in addiction treatment. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res* [Internet]. 2019 Apr [cited 2022 May 25];43(4):578-92. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6443447/> DOI: 10.1111%2Facer.13984.
56. Hogue A, Becker SJ, Wenzel K, Henderson CE, Bobek M, Levy S, et al. Family involvement in treatment and recovery for substance use disorders among transition-age youth: research bedrocks and opportunities. *J Subst Abuse Treat* [Internet]. 2021 Apr 14 [cited 2022 May 25];129:108402. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34080559/> DOI: 10.1016/j.jsat.2021.108402.
57. Bagley SM, Ventura AS, Lasser KE, Muench F. Engaging the family in the care of young adults with substance use disorders. *Pediatrics* [Internet]. 2021 Jan [cited 2022 May 25];147(Suppl 2):S215-S9. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33386324/> DOI: 10.1542/peds.2020-023523C.
58. Manuel JK, Austin JL, Miller WR, McCrady BS, Tonigan JS, Meyers RJ, et al. Community reinforcement and family training: a pilot comparison of group and self-directed delivery. *J Subst Abuse Treat* [Internet]. 2011 Dec 5 [cited 2022 May 25];43(1):129-36. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22154038/> DOI: 10.1016/j.jsat.2011.10.020.
59. Archer M, Harwood H, Stevelink S, Rafferty L, Greenberg N. Community reinforcement and family training and rates of treatment entry: a systematic review. *Addiction* [Internet]. 2020 Jan 3 [cited 2022 May 25];115(6):1024-37. Available on: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31770469/> DOI: 10.1111/add.14901.
60. Waldron HB, Kern-Jones S, Turner CW, Peterson TR, Ozechowski TJ. Engaging resistant adolescents in drug abuse treatment. *J Subst Abuse Treat* [Internet]. 2007 Mar [cited 2022 May 25];32(2):133-42. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2175207/> DOI: 10.1016%2Fj.jsat.2006.07.007.
61. Brigham GS, Slesnick N, Winhusen TM, Lewis DF, Guo X, Somoza E. A randomized pilot clinical trial to evaluate the efficacy of Community Reinforcement and Family Training for Treatment Retention (CRAFT-T) for improving outcomes for patients completing opioid detoxification. *Drug Alcohol Depend* [Internet]. 2014 Feb 13 [cited 2022 May 25];138:240-3. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24656054/> DOI: 10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2014.02.013.
62. Ameral V, Yule A, McKowen J, Bergman BG, Nargiso J, Kelly JF. A naturalistic evaluation of a group intervention for parents of youth with substance use disorders. *Alcohol Treat Quarterly* [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2022 May 26];38(3):379-94. Available

- from: <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2020-48933-002> DOI: 10.1080/07347324.2019.1633978.
63. Bischof G, Iwen J, Freyer-Adam J, Rumpf HJ. Efficacy of the community reinforcement and family training for concerned significant others of treatment-refusing individuals with alcohol dependence: a randomized controlled trial. *Drug Alcohol Depend* [Internet]. 2016 Apr 19 [cited 2022 May 26];163:179-85. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27141840/> DOI: 10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2016.04.015.
 64. Bergman BG, Fallah-Sohy N, Hoffman LA, Kelly JF. Psychosocial approaches in the treatment of opioid use disorders. In: Kelly JF, Wakeman SE, editors. *Treating opioid addiction*. 1st ed. New York: Humana Press; 2019. p. 109-38.
 65. Becker SJ, Scott K, Helseth SA, Danko KJ, Balk EM, Saldanha IJ, et al. Effectiveness of medication for opioid use disorders in transition-age youth: a systematic review. *Journal of Subst Abuse Treat* [Internet]. 2021 May 29 [cited 2022 May 26];132:108494. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34098208/> DOI: 10.1016/j.jsat.2021.108494.
 66. Scott K, Becker SJ, Helseth SA, Saldanha IJ, Balk EM, Adam GP, et al. Pharmacotherapy interventions for adolescent co-occurring substance use and mental health disorders: a systematic review. *Fam Pract* [Internet]. 2022 Mar 24 [cited 2022 May 26];1. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34448853/> DOI: 10.1093/fampra/cmab096.
 67. Corace K, Willows M, Schubert N, Overington L, Howell G. Youth require tailored treatment for opioid use and mental health problems: a comparison with adults. *Can J Addict* [Internet]. 2018 Dec [cited 2022 May 26];9(4):15-24. Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/332748077_Youth_Require_Tailored_Treatment_for_Opioid_Use_and_Mental_Health_Problems_A_Comparison_with_Adults DOI: 10.1097/CXA.0000000000000032.
 68. Skewes MC, Gonzalez VM. The biopsychosocial model of addiction. *Prin Addict* [Internet]. 2013 Dec [cited 2022 May 26];1:61-70. Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/288535465_The_Biopsychosocial_Model_of_Addiction DOI: 10.1016/B978-0-12-398336-7.00006-1.
 69. Scruggs S, Meyer R, Kayo R. Community reinforcement and family training, support and prevention (CRAFT-SP). Oklahoma City: Department of Veterans Affairs, South Central Mental Illness Research, Education, and Clinical Centre. 2005.
 70. The Center for Motivation and Change. The parents 20 minute guide [Internet]. Version 2.0. New York: The Centre; 2016 [Updated 2016; cited 2022 May 26]. Available from: <https://the20minuteguide.com/parents/introduction-guide/>.
 71. Halladay J, Horricks L, Amlung M, MacKillop J, Munn C, Nasir Z, et al. The CAMP study: feasibility and clinical correlates of standardized assessments of substance use in a youth psychiatric inpatient sample. *Child Adol Psych Men* [Internet]. 2021 Sep 13 [cited 2022 May 25];15(48). Available from: <https://capmh.biomedcentral.com/track/pdf/10.1186/s13034-021-00403-4.pdf> DOI: 10.1186/s13034-021-00403-4
 72. Levitt EE, Syan SK, Sousa S, Costello MJ, Rush B, Samokhvalov AV, et al. Optimizing screening for depression, anxiety disorders, and post-traumatic stress disorder in inpatient addiction treatment: A preliminary investigation. *Addict Behav* [Internet]. 2021 Jan [cited

- 2022 July 14];112:106649. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32979691/> DOI: 10.1016/j.addbeh.2020.106649
73. Patel H, Holshausen K, Oshri A, Andrews K, Penta S, Raymond H, et al. Posttraumatic stress disorder symptomology and substance use in an outpatient concurrent disorders sample. *Can J Psychiatry* [Internet]. 2021 Sep [cited 2022 July 14];66(9):788-797. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33878938/> DOI: 10.1177/07067437211011851
74. Witkiewitz K, Montes KS, Schwebel FJ, Tucker JA. What is recovery? *Alcohol Res-Curr Rev* [Internet]. 2020 Sep 24 [cited 2022 May 26];40(3):01. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32983748/> DOI: 10.35946/arcr.v40.3.01.
75. American Psychiatric Association. *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders: DSM-5*. Arlington: APA; 2013.
76. Mental Health Commission of Canada. *Consensus statement on the mental health of emerging adults: making transitions a priority in Canada*. Ottawa: Commission of Canada; 2017.
77. Randall GE, Mulvale GM, Wakefield PA, Embrett MG, Barr NG, Miatello AM, et al. Mapping the policy to practice landscape for youth mental health in Ontario: a report from the “youth to adult transitions in health care – the case of mental health services in Ontario” research team [Internet]. Hamilton: McMaster University; 2016 [cited 2022 May 26]. 58 p. Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/299676766_Mapping_the_policy_to_practice_landscape_for_youth_mental_health_in_Ontario_A_report_from_the_youth_to_adult_transitions_in_health_care_-_the_case_of_mental_health_services_in_Ontario_research_team
78. Youth Action Committee. *From crisis to quality: bridging gaps in child and youth mental health services* [Internet]. Ontario: Children’s Mental Health Ontario; 2018 Nov [cited 2022 May 26]. Available from: <https://cmho.org/wp-content/uploads/From-Crisis-to-Quality-English-min.pdf>
79. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. A metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. *J Biomed Inform* [Internet]. 2009 [cited 2022 July 14];42:337-381. Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/291256200_A_metadata-driven_methodology_and_workflow_process_for_providing_translational_research_informatics_support DOI: 10.1016/j.jbi.2008.08.010
80. Schroder R, Sellman D, Frampton C, Deering D. Youth retention: factors associated with treatment drop-out from youth alcohol and other drug treatment. *Drug Alcohol Rev* [Internet]. 2009 Nov;28(6):663-8. Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/40023484_Youth_retention_Factors_associated_with_treatment_drop-out_from_youth_alcohol_and_other_drug_treatment DOI: 10.1111/j.1465-3362.2009.00076.x.
81. Pagey B, Deering D, Sellman D. Retention of adolescents with substance dependence and coexisting mental health disorders in outpatient alcohol and drug group therapy. *Int J Ment Health Nu* [Internet]. 2010 Nov 3 [cited 2022 May 26];19(6):437-44. Available from: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1447-0349.2010.00693.x> DOI: 10.1111/j.1447-0349.2010.00693.x.

82. Bowers AL. Factors influencing service engagement of youth in services for concurrent disorders: a mixed-methods approach [dissertation on the Internet]. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto; 2021 [cited 2022 May 26]. Available from: <https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/handle/1807/110518>
83. Spinella TC, Stewart SH, Barrett SP. Context matters: characteristics of solitary versus social cannabis use. *Drug Alcohol Rev* [Internet]. 2019 Mar [cited 2022 Jun 7];38(3):316-20. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30779237/> DOI: 10.1111/dar.12912.
84. Moyers TB, Martin T, Houck JM, Christopher PJ, Tonigan JS. From in-session behaviors to drinking outcomes: a causal chain for motivational interviewing. *J Consult Clin Psychol* [Internet]. 2009 Dec [cited 2022 Jun 7];77(6):1113-24. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2819223/> DOI: 10.1037%2Fa0017189.
85. Adamson SJ, Kay-Lambkin FJ, Baker AL, Lewin TJ, Thornton L, Kelly BJ, et al. An improved brief measure of cannabis misuse: The Cannabis Use Disorders Identification Test-Revised (CUDIT-R) [Internet]. *Drug Alcohol Depen*. 2010 Jul [cited 2022 Jun 7];110(1-2):137-43. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20347232/> DOI: 10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2010.02.017.
86. Babor TF, Higgins-Biddle JC, Saunders JB, Monteiro MG. The alcohol use disorders identification test [Internet]. 2nd Ed. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2001 [cited 2022 Jun 7]. Available from: http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/67205/WHO_MSD_MSB_01.6a.pdf;jsessionid=A76A480C86CAF7185E4489B9088FEC44?sequence=1
87. Berman AH, Bergman H, Palmstierna T, Schlyter F. DUDIT (drug use disorders identification test) [Internet]. Version 1. European Addiction Research. 2003 Mar [cited 2022 Jun 7]. Available from: <https://paihdelinkki.fi/sites/default/files/duditmanual.pdf>
88. Spitzer RL, Kroenke K, Williams JB, Löwe B. A brief measure for assessing generalized anxiety disorder: the GAD-7. *Arch Internal Med* [Internet]. 2006 May 2022 [cited 2022 Jun 7];166(10):1092-7. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/16717171/> DOI: 10.1001/archinte.166.10.1092
89. Kroenke K, Spitzer RL. The PHQ-9: a new depression diagnostic and severity measure. *Psychiat Ann* [Internet]. 2002 Sep 1 [cited 2022 June 7];32(9):509-15. Available from: <https://journals.healio.com/doi/10.3928/0048-5713-20020901-06> DOI: 10.3928/0048-5713-20020901-06.
90. Weathers FW, Litz BT, Keane TM, Palmieri PA, Marx BP, Schnurr PP. The ptsd checklist for dsm-5 (pcl-5) [Internet]. Washington: National Centre for PTSD; 2013 [cited 2022 June 7]. 206 p. Available from: <https://www.ptsd.va.gov/professional/assessment/adult-sr/ptsd-checklist.asp>
91. Kwan B, Rickwood DJ, Telford NR. Development and validation of MyLifeTracker: a routine outcome measure for youth mental health. *Psychol Res Behav Manag* [Internet]. 2018 Apr 3 [cited 2022 may 26];2018(11):67-77. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5892955/> DOI: 10.2147%2FPRBM.S152342.
92. World Health Organization. The world health organization quality of life (WHOQOL)-BREF [Internet]. Version .02. Geneva: W.H.O.; 2004 [Updated 2012, cited 2022 June 7]. Available from: <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/77773>

93. Kessler RC, Adler L, Ames M, Demler O, Faraone S, Hiripi E, et al. The World Health Organization Adult ADHD Self-Report Scale (ASRS): a short screening scale for use in the general population. *Psychol Med* [Internet]. 2005 Feb [cited 2022 June 7];35(2):245-56. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/15841682/> DOI: 10.1017/s0033291704002892.
94. Zanarini MC, Vujanovic AA, Parachini EA, Boulanger JL, Frankenburg FR, Hennen J. A screening measure for BPD: The McLean Screening Instrument for Borderline Personality Disorder (MSI-BPD). *J Pers Disord* [Internet]. 2003 [cited 2022 June 7];17(6):568-73. Available from: <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2004-10325-009> DOI: 10.1521/pedi.17.6.568.25355.
95. Loewy RL, Bearden CE, Johnson JK, Raine A, Cannon TD. The prodromal questionnaire (PQ): preliminary validation of a self-report screening measure for prodromal and psychotic syndromes. *Schizophr Res* [Internet]. 2005 Nov 1 [cited 2022 June 7];79(1):117-25. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/16276559/> DOI: 10.1016/j.schres.2005.03.007.
96. Striegel-Moore RH, Perrin N, DeBar L, Wilson GT, Rosselli F, Kraemer HC. Screening for binge eating disorders using the Patient Health Questionnaire in a community sample. *Int J Eat Disorder* [Internet]. 2010 [cited 2022 June 7];43(4):337-43. Available from: <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2010-08282-006> DOI: 10.1002/2Feat.20694.
97. Duncan L, Georgiades K, Wang L, Comeau J, Ferro MA, Van Lieshout RJ, et al. The 2014 Ontario Child Health Study Emotional Behavioural Scales (OCHS-EBS) part I: a checklist for dimensional measurement of selected DSM-5 disorders. *Can J Psychiatry* [Internet]. 2019 Jun [cited 2022 June 8];64(6):423-33. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30376365/> DOI: 10.1177/0706743718808250.
98. Ferris JA, Wynne HJ. The Canadian problem gambling index: final report [Internet]. Ottawa: the Canadian Centre on Substance Abuse; 2001 Feb 19 [cited 2022 June 8]. 59 p. Available from: [https://www.greo.ca/Modules/EvidenceCentre/files/Ferris%20et%20al\(2001\)The_Canadian_Problem_Gambling_Index.pdf](https://www.greo.ca/Modules/EvidenceCentre/files/Ferris%20et%20al(2001)The_Canadian_Problem_Gambling_Index.pdf)
99. Wilson KG, Sandoz EK, Kitchens J, Roberts M. The Valued Living Questionnaire: defining and measuring valued action within a behavioral framework. *Psychol Rec* [Internet]. 2010 [cited 2022 June 8];60(2):249-72. Available from: <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2010-08614-005> DOI: 10.1007/BF03395706.
100. Schnurr PP, Vielhauer MJ, Findler MN. BTQ: Brief Trauma Questionnaire. *JAMA* [Internet]. 2009 [cited 2022 June 8];71:44-51. Available from: https://www.abortiontraumatreatment.org/uploads/1/0/3/3/10335594/brief_trauma_questionnaire.pdf
101. Brown KW, Ryan RM. The benefits of being present: mindfulness and its role in psychological well-being. *J Pers Soc Psychol* [Internet]. 2003 Apr [cited 2022 June 8];84(4):822-48. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12703651/> DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.84.4.822.
102. Koffarnus MN, Bickel WK. A 5-trial adjusting delay discounting task: accurate discount rates in less than one minute. *Exp Clin Psychopharm* [Internet]. 2014 Jun [cited 2022 June 8];22(3):222-8. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24708144/> DOI: 10.1037/a0035973.

103. Cyders MA, Littlefield AK, Coffey S, Karyadi KA. Examination of a short English version of the UPPS-P Impulsive Behavior Scale. *Addict Behav* [Internet]. 2014 Mar [cited 2022 June 8];39(9):1372-6. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24636739/> DOI: 10.1016/j.addbeh.2014.02.013.
104. Fowles JR, O'Brien MW, Wojcik WR, d'Entremont L, Shields CA. A pilot study: validity and reliability of the CSEP- PATH PASB-Q and a new leisure time physical activity questionnaire to assess physical activity and sedentary behaviours. *Appl Physiol Nutr Metab* [Internet]. 2017 Jun [cited 2022 June 8];42(6):677-80. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28264170/> DOI: 10.1139/apnm-2016-0412.

Table 1. Summary of key measures

General Construct	Time Point(s)	Specific Variables
Demographics	Intake	Age, gender, sex, race, living status, subjective social status, education, student status, employment status, recent mental health related Emergency Department visit, recent controlled environment (e.g., hospital, residential treatment, jail)
Substance use variables		
Prevalence (lifetime, past 3 months)	All	☐ Alcohol ☐ Cannabis ☐ Tobacco Cigarette
Past month frequency (1, never to 8, more than once per day)	All	☐ E-cigarette ☐ Cocaine ☐ Prescription Stimulants ☐ Methamphetamine ☐ Sedatives ☐ Opioids
Primary and Secondary reasons for treatment	Intake	☐ Ecstasy, MDMA, molly ☐ Hallucinogens (LSD, acid, mushrooms) ☐ Inhalants ☐ Other
Solitary Use (adapted (83))	All	☐ Alcohol, Cannabis, and Other drugs
Readiness, Importance, and Confidence Rulers (84)	Intake 3 months 6 months	☐ Alcohol, Cannabis, Other drugs
Age at first use	Intake	☐ Alcohol, cannabis, tobacco cigarette, e-cigarette

Substance Use Disorder	Intake	☐	Symptoms of cannabis use disorder (85)
Symptoms	3 months	☐	Symptoms of alcohol use disorder (86)
	6 months	☐	Symptoms of drug use disorder (87)
Substance-specific questions	Intake	☐	Medicinal cannabis use with or without authorization
		☐	Number of cigarettes per day
		☐	Type of e-cigarettes
Mental Health Related Indicators			
Mental Health Symptom and Wellbeing Scales (session-by-session trackers)	All	•	Generalized Anxiety Disorder (88)
		•	Depression (89)
		•	Post-Traumatic Stress disorder (90)
		•	Youth-Centric Quality of Life (general well-being, day-to-day activities, relationships with friends, relationships with family, coping without substances) (adapted (91))
		•	Global quality of life item and health item (92)
Mental Health Symptom Scales (intake and discharge assessment + research)	Intake	☐	Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (93)
	3 months	☐	Borderline Personality Disorders (94)
	6 months	☐	Prodromal Symptoms of Psychosis (95)
		☐	Eating Disorder Symptoms (96)
		☐	Social Phobia (97)
		☐	Oppositional Defiant Disorder (adapted: (97))
		☐	Conduct Disorder (adapted (97))
		☐	Problem Gambling Severity (98)
Intake Only Historical Experiences and Values	Intake	•	Valued Living (adapted (99))
		•	Brief Trauma Questionnaire (100)
		•	Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI)
Candidate Mechanisms and Satisfaction			
Candidate Mechanisms	Intake	•	Mindfulness (adapted (101))
	3 months	•	Delay Discounting (102)
	6 months	•	Impulsivity (positive urgency, negative urgency, sensation seeking, lack of perseverance, lack of premedication; (103)

		• Frequency of physical activity (104) • Sleep (items from depression and PTSD measures)
Discharge only	~3 months	• Satisfaction with the program • Perceived helpfulness of the program

Table 2. Demographic and Clinical Patient Characteristics (n=96)

<i>Socio-demographics</i>	Mean (SD) or % (n)
Age	21.1 (2.6); range 16-25
White	83.3% (80)
Female	54.2% (52)
Gender	
Woman	45.8% (44)
Man	45.8% (44)
Non-binary, don't know, prefer not to answer	8.2% (8)
Living Situation	
Living with family	54.2% (52)
Living independently	16.7% (16)
Living with a partner, roommate(s), or in residence	26.0% (25)
Living in a group home, shelter, or homeless	3.1% (3)
Subjective Socioeconomic Status	
Not enough to pay bills	11.5% (11)
Enough to pay bill, but have to cut-back	26.0% (25)
Enough to pay bills without cutting back	25.0% (24)
Enough for extras	37.5% (36)
Student	
Not a student	66.7% (64)
Part time or less	11.4% (11)
Full time	21.9% (21)
Employment	
Not employed	42.7% (41)
Casual or part time	34.4% (33)
Full time	22.9% (22)

<i>Substance Use</i>	Any use in the past 3 months % (n)	Frequency of past month use^a mean (SD)	
Alcohol	84.4% (81)	4.3	(2.1)
Cannabis	87.5% (84)	6.5	(2.4)
Tobacco Cigarettes	75.0% (72)	6.0	(2.6)
E-cigarettes	58.3% (56)	6.2	(2.5)
Cocaine	31.3% (30)	3.2	(2.1)
Prescription stimulants	11.5% (11)	3.3	(2.6)
Methamphetamine	7.3% (7)	2.7	(2.5)
Sedatives or Tranquilizers	13.5% (13)	2.5	(1.1)
Opioids	13.5% (13)	2.6	(2.0)
Ecstasy, MDMA, molly	8.3% (8)	2.0	(0.8)
LSD, Acid, or mushrooms	18.8% (18)	2.3	(1.1)

<i>Readiness Rulers^b</i>	Readiness Mean (SD)	Importance Mean (SD)	Confidence Mean (SD)
Alcohol	6.5 (3.3)	6.3 (3.5)	6.1 (3.3)
Cannabis	4.8 (3.7)	5.1 (3.8)	4.3 (3.5)
Other Drugs	7.5 (3.2)	6.9 (3.8)	7.0 (3.2)

<i>Mental Health Indicators</i>	Mean (SD)	Clinical Threshold	% (n) surpassing threshold
Quality of Life (0-50)	20.1 (10.7)	N/A	N/A
Trauma Exposure (0-11)	3.3 (2.4)	1+	90.6% (87)
Traumatic Brain Injury (0-5)	1.4 (1.4)	1+	65.6% (63)
Alcohol Use Disorder (0-40) ^{b,c}	17.5 (10.1)	Moderate: 8-14 High: 15+	Moderate: 20.8% (20) High: 47.9% (46)
Cannabis Use Disorder (0-32) ^b	18.2 (8.5)	Moderate: 8-11 High: 12+	Moderate: 7.3% (7) High: 66.7% (64)
Drug Use Disorder (0-44) ^b	19.2 (10.9)	High: 15+	18.8% (18)
Generalized Anxiety Disorder (0-21)	14.9 (5.4)	Moderate: 10-14 Severe: 15+	Moderate: 20.8% (20) Severe: 60.4% (58)
Depression (0-27)	18.0 (6.2)	Moderate: 10-14	Moderate: 13.5% (13)

		Mod-Severe: 15-19	Mod-Severe: 31.3% (30)
		Severe: 20+	Severe: 44.8% (43)
Social Anxiety Disorder (0-10)	6.4 (2.9)	10+	18.8% (18)
PTSD (0-80)	44.2 (20.3)	42+	54.2% (52)
Psychosis (0-16)	7.3 (4.2)	6+	66.7% (64)
Borderline Personality Disorder (0-10)	6.9 (2.6)	7+	61.5% (59)
ADHD (0-24)	15.3 (5.4)	4+ of select variables	61.5% (59)
Oppositional Defiant Behaviours (0-12)	5.0 (3.2)	7+	36.5% (35)
Conduct Behaviours (0-22)	3.5 (3.6)	7+	15.6% (15)
Surpassing any non-SUD mental health threshold	4.8 (2.3)	1+	96.9% (93)

^aCoded: 1=not in the past 4 weeks, 2=1 day in the past 4 weeks, 3=2 to 3 days in the past 4 weeks, 4=1 to 2 days per week, 5=3 to 4 days per week, 6=5 to 6 days per week, 7=once per day, 8=more than once per day.

^bAmong those endorsing any use in the 3 months prior to intake.

^cDue to an administrative error, response options were slightly different from the original measure. See SMI for details.

