The role of social network support in treatment outcomes for medication for opioid use disorder: a systematic review

Navin Kumar[*], William Oles[†], Benjamin A. Howell[‡], Kamila Janmohamed[§], Selena T. Lee[¶], Melissa C. Funaro[‖], Patrick G. O'Connor[**], Marcus Alexander[††]

Abstract

Background. Social connections can lead to contagion of healthy behaviors. Successful treatment of patients with opioid use disorder, as well as recovery of their communities from the opioid epidemic, may lay in rebuilding social networks. Strong social networks of support can reinforce the benefits of medication treatments that are the current standard of care and the most effective tool physicians have to fight the opioid epidemic.

Methods. We conducted a systematic review of electronic research databases, specialist journals and grey literature up to August 2020 to identify experimental and observational studies of social network support in patient populations receiving medication for opioid use disorder (MOUD). We place the studies into a conceptual framework of dynamic social networks, examining the role of networks before MOUD treatment is initiated, during the treatment, and in the long-term following the treatment. We analyze the results across three sources of social network support: partner relationships, family, and peer networks. We also consider the impact of negative social connections.

Results. Of 5193 articles screened, 46 studies were identified as meeting inclusion criteria (12 were experimental and 34 were observational). 39 studies indicated that social network support, or lack thereof, had a statistically significant relationship with improved MOUD treatment outcomes. We find the strongest support for the positive impact of family and partner relationships when integrated into treatment attempts. We also identify strong evidence for a negative impact of maintaining contacts with the drug-using network on treatment outcomes.

[*]Department of Sociology and Yale Institute for Network Science, Yale University

[†]Yale Institute for Network Science, Yale University

[‡]National Clinician Scholars Program and Section of General Internal Medicine, Yale University School of Medicine and Yale-New Haven Hospital, and VA Connecticut Healthcare System

[§]Yale Institute for Network Science, Yale University

[¶]Yale Institute for Network Science, Yale University

[‖]Harvey Cushing/John Hay Whitney Medical Library, Yale University

[**]Section of Internal Medicine, Yale University School of Medicine and Yale-New Haven Hospital

[††]Yale Institute for Network Science, 17 Hillhouse Ave, New Haven, CT 06520; email: marcus.alexander@yale.edu, Human Nature Lab

Conclusions. Social networks significantly shape effectiveness of opioid use disorder treatments. While negative social ties reinforce addiction, positive social support networks can amplify the benefits of medication treatments. Targeted interventions to reconstruct social networks can be designed as a part of medication treatment with their effects evaluated in improving patients' odds of recovery from opioid use disorder and reversing the rising trend in opioid deaths.

Introduction

Opioid dependence continues to be a serious challenge to public and global health. The number of years of life lost due to opioid dependence was 3.6 million worldwide as of 2016 [1]. From 1990 to 2014, opioid prescription sales increased four-fold, and by 2016, 236 million prescriptions were written yearly in the US, enough for every adult American to have one. Recent initiatives to limit over-prescription have mirrored an increase in opioid-related injury and death linked to illicit opioids like heroin and fentanyl [2, 3]. In the 12-month period ending on February 2020, 72,780 opioid deaths were reported, accounting for an 8.4 percent increase from the year before [4]. On average, 199 Americans die every day from opioids.

Increasing access to medication for opioid use disorder (MOUD) treatment programs is a key public health strategy in combating the opioid overdose epidemic [5, 6]. MOUD has shown several benefits such as decreases in mortality, increases in treatment adherence, decreases in heroin use, and augmented health, social and criminal justice outcomes [7, 8, 9]. MOUD refers to several medications, primarily opioid-agonist medications, like methadone and buprenorphine, and opioid-antagonist medications, like naltrexone [10]. Specifically, methadone and buprenorphine block drug-induced euphoria, reduce cravings and binge behaviors, and prevent withdrawal symptoms. Although MOUD approaches are the most efficacious evidence-based treatment for opioid use disorder [11], a significant number of MOUD patients do not have favorable treatment outcomes [12, 13], signaling the need to explore factors beyond medication that might influence treatment.

This review fills gaps in the current body of literature on MOUD outcomes in a numbers of areas. A large portion of the research on MOUD has aimed to identify both protective factors predicting successful treatment and risk factors predicting treatment failure. Of this body of work, much of it has focused on either clinical delivery characteristics, like medication dose, or patient-centered descriptors, such as age, comorbid mental health diagnoses, or attitude towards treatment [14, 15, 16]. Novel treatment paradigms, such as open-access models, have gone a long way in decreasing barriers to treatment and improving engagement, but there is still unexplained variability in treatment success and therefore an opportunity for improvement [17]. Less research has focused on how patients' social environments generally and social networks, in particular, are associated with treatment outcomes.

Phenomena as diverse as cooperation, obesity, drug use, smoking, and alcohol use are associated with social network structure and social tie influence [18, 19, 20, 21]. Similarly, recent work suggests that social networks ties influence patterns of substance use, help-seeking behaviors, and adherence [22, 23, 24]. Previous systematic reviews have detailed psychosocial interventions that complement MOUD [16, 25, 26] and the effectiveness of psychosocial plus pharmacological intervention versus pharmacological intervention alone [27]. However, only a small subset of psychosocial interventions, such as family counseling or network therapy, actively involve patient social relationships in treatment [28]. Overall, there is limited research on the role of social network support on MOUD treatment outcomes, especially on the changes in such networks over the treatment timeline.

This review adopts a social network lens to consider the outcomes of those in MOUD programs. The impact of social ties, and the mosaic of ties which make up social networks, on health has been conceptualized by both social support and social influence [29]. Social support between two individuals has been categorized into different types—for example, emotional support might refer to the amount of love and caring available from another, while instrumental support refers



Figure 1: **Social network change over treatment timeline.** Narrative framework for how dynamic social network changes might accompany successful MOUD treatment outcomes, before, during, and after treatment, with particular emphasis on developing more non-substance-using relationships.

to aid or assistance with tangible needs. High levels of social support are not only important to maintaining relationships but also in maintaining psychological well-being, and it has been shown that the presence or absence of social support is predictive of mental and physical health outcomes [30, 31, 32]. Although this review does not distinguish between social support types, we chose to investigate different types of network relationships with the assumption that they might offer different types of support. Social relationships can also impact individual health through social influence, which can be thought of as the tendency to conform to the attitudes and behaviors of those with whom you are connected in a network [29]. Recent work to investigate how individual drug-use is influenced by social contacts has found that there exists strong peer-to-peer influence in initiation and continuation of drug-use [22, 33, 34, 35]. While this suggests that outcomes might be improved if those in treatment have little contact with other substance users, the influence of social ties may be more complicated; positive relationships with others may buffer the effects of stress, for example, but these relationships may be with other substance users, who can model drug-use or provide cues for relapse.

Given the proposed influence of social network ties on treatment, the selected studies were classified by relationship type investigated—family, partner, or peer—as well as the time in the treatment timeline at which social support information was elicited—pre-treatment, during treatment, or post-treatment. With both social support and social influence in mind, studies were also classified as assessing positive (e.g., presence of emotional support, abstinence-positive social

influence) and negative impacts of social ties (e.g., lack of support or high conflict, drug-use-encouraging social influence) among those in treatment. The purpose of this paper is to review existing scientific evidence on the following research question: For MOUD patients, what influence does social network support, or lack thereof, have on MOUD treatment outcomes? This review seeks to provide policymakers, administrators, practitioners and researchers with a systematic and reproducible strategy to query the literature around the role of social network support on MOUD treatment outcomes.

Methods

We conformed to frameworks and standard tools of the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) [36, 37, 38] and Synthesis without meta-analysis (SWiM) guidelines [39]. The protocol was pre-registered on PROSPERO (CRD42018095645) on May 24, 2018.

Search strategy

A systematic search of the literature was performed on August 30, 2018 and updated on August 3, 2020 to capture any new studies. Databases searched included Ovid MEDLINE, Embase, APA Psycinfo, and Sociological Abstracts. An experienced medical librarian (MF) consulted on methodology and ran a medical subject heading (MeSH) analysis of known key articles provided by the research team [mesh.med.yale.edu]. In each database, scoping searches were used alongside an iterative process to translate and refine the searches. To maximize sensitivity, the formal search used a minimal controlled vocabulary terms and synonymous free-text words to capture concepts for "social network support" and "medication for opioid use disorder" (see **??** for full list of search terms). The search was limited to English language. No date limit was applied. In addition, the authors searched references in previous reviews/guidelines, and clinicaltrials.gov.

Inclusion/exclusion criteria

Studies that met the following criteria were included:

- randomized controlled trials, quasi-experimental studies and observational studies published in peer-reviewed journals; other scientific publications (e.g., scientific monographs); non-peer reviewed journals and grey literature (technical reports, conference papers). Studies excluded from review were case reports, systematic literature reviews, qualitative studies, opinion pieces, editorials, comments, news articles, and letters.
- participants sought treatment for opioid use or met criteria for opioid abuse, opioid dependence or opioid use disorder.
- one or more variants of MOUD were offered (e.g., methadone, buprenorphine, naltrexone).
- the study reported social network support (e.g., family/partner/peer support, social network interventions [31, 32]) as interventions or as predictors for the outcome.

- the study reported a form of adherence to MOUD as an outcome (e.g., medication adherence, concurrent abstinence during treatment, program retention).
- the study did not exclusively look at peer support groups (e.g., Narcotics Anonymous) or group psychotherapy as a form of social support. Studies involving peer support group attendance as a form of treatment are both numerous and valuable and are therefore significant enough to be deserving of their own review.



Figure 2: **PRISMA flow diagram.** Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) flow diagram of study selection, detailing stages of selection, exclusion, and review.

Category assignment

Studies were assigned into the following categories based on when social network support was assessed: pre-treatment, during treatment, and post-treatment. Social network support was assessed at multiple time points in some studies. Pre-treatment indicated studies where social

network support was assessed at baseline, before patients commenced an MOUD program. During treatment connoted studies where social network support was assessed while participants were actively participating in an MOUD program. Post-treatment denoted studies where social network support was determined after patients had completed the prescribed MOUD program. The intention of this categorization was to investigate whether the presence or lack of social support seems to be more important at a certain point in the treatment timeline and, more generally, whether there are gaps in the literature at particular points of the timeline.

Studies were assigned to one of the following social network support categories: family, partner, peer. Multiple forms of social network support were assessed in some studies. Family social network support connoted studies where family members such as parents, siblings, or children provided support to the patient. Partner social network support denoted studies where partners, married or otherwise, provided support to the patient. Peer social network support denoted studies where peers such as friends, colleagues or other patients provided support. Studies which solely assessed the impact of mutual peer support groups (e.g., Narcotics Anonymous, Alcoholics Anonymous) or group psychotherapy were excluded. The authors acknowledge the importance of such programs and the wealth of literature on their potential efficacy, and therefore believe that they warrant their own review. It should be noted that some studies describe general family relationships, which may be inherently inclusive of a partner; therefore, any studies which noted general family relationships were assumed to assess both family and partner relationships in our category assignment. Studies were also assigned as assessing either negative or positive social network support. Some studies assessed both positive and negative social network relationships. Examples of positive social network ties include those that provide the knowledge that one is cared for or that encourage treatment, such as family members who sponsor a patient through an MOUD program. Examples of negative social network ties include those that may be sources of conflict or that encourage drug-use, such as individuals going through marital status changes or drug-using peers.

Category assignment choices are driven by our hypothesized narrative for the role of social network structure in MOUD outcomes based on previous literature, shown in Fig 1. In this narrative, successful treatment is accompanied by a transition in social network ties from pre-treatment to post-treatment away from the drug-using network and towards the non-using support network, typically formed by close family and friends, including members of a sober network that may be part of a recovery program. The idea that treatment outcomes are related to social relationships, which either reinforce drug use or reinforce abstinence, is long-standing and provides a rationale for the methods of many of the studies under review here [40, 41, 42, 43, 44]. However, no other study has systematically applied such a narrative of social network change over the treatment timeline to frame outcomes reported in the literature.

Outcomes

Examples of primary outcomes were 1) MOUD retention which refers to time in treatment or length of stay; 2) MOUD adherence which pertains to medication (days the patient took their MOUD etc.); 3) opioid or other illicit drug use (cocaine, methamphetamine etc.), defined as the percentage of urine samples negative for opioids and/or self-reported drug use.

Data extraction, review methods, quality assessments and data synthesis

A standardized template was utilized to extract data from each study. More detail on data extraction, review methods, quality assessments and data synthesis can be found in **??**.

Results

Included studies

Results from the study selection process are indicated in Fig 2 and general study characteristics are displayed in Tables 1 and 2. Systematic searches yielded 7995 papers imported for screening, with 5193 studies screened for review (2802 duplicates, see Fig 2). Screening yielded 225 articles for full-text review by two independent reviewers. Fourty-six studies were deemed relevant to the review, summarized in Table 1. Twelve were experimental studies, 34 were observational studies. Thirty-nine studies indicated that at least one variant of social network support, or lack thereof, assessed in the study had a statistically significant relationship with MOUD treatment outcomes. Twenty-four studies assessed social network support pre-treatment, 25 during treatment, and five post-treatment. Forty-eight studies detailed family social network support, 46 indicated partner support, and 22 explored peer social network support. The United States (19 studies) and China (10 studies) were the most represented nations. Treatment and comparison groups were all drawn from opioid-dependent populations. Thirty-six interventions involved maintenance on methadone, 4 involved naltrexone, 2 involved methadone or buprenorphine, 1 involved methadone or buprenorphine/naloxone, 1 involved methadone or LAAM (levo-alpha-acetyl-methadol), and 2 involved methadone or naltrexone.

Table 1. Study characteristics

Table 2. Network and timeline characteristics

Quality assessments

Tables 3 and 4 indicated the quality of experimental and observational studies. For experimental studies, allocation concealment was rarely reported and its impact on bias was not clear. Impact of bias referred to the impact of the quality categories in Table 3 on the administration of the experimental method and therefore was not completed for observational studies. The quality ratings for observational studies were high overall. Relevant evidence and statistical significance for observational (see Fig 3) and experimental studies (see Fig 4) were indicated with a harvest plot [45]. Thirty observational studies met all five criteria. Three observational studies met four criteria. Of observational studies assessing social network support pre-treatment, nineteen met five criteria and two met four criteria. Eleven studies assessing social network support during treatment and three studies assessing social support post-treatment met five criteria, respectively. Two studies assessing social support pre-treatment and two studies during treatment met four criteria. No experimental studies met all five criteria. Two experimental studies that assessed social network support during treatment and a single post-treatment met four criteria. The remaining studies in this review met between zero and three criteria.



Figure 3: **Observational study harvest plot.** Evidence for observational studies regarding the role of social network support on treatment outcomes for medication for opioid use disorder. Each study falls into a category represented by a stacked bar. The height of each component corresponds to a quality score representing the suitability of study design with respect to five quality measures: description of inclusion/exclusion criteria, clear presentation of main results, explanation of methodology, presence of descriptive data and definition of variables. Each bar is annotated with the sample size, statistical significance of outcome, and form of social network support.



Figure 4: **Experimental study harvest plot.** Evidence for experimental studies regarding the role of social network support on treatment outcomes for medication for opioid use disorder.Each study falls into a category represented by a stacked bar. The height of each component corresponds to a quality score representing the suitability of study design with respect to five quality measures: allocation concealment, addressing of incomplete outcome data, intent-to-treat analysis, addressing of selection bias and adequate sequence generation. Each bar is annotated with the sample size, statistical significance of outcome, and form of social network support. Studies without above quality measures are represented with no bar.

Pre-treatment

Studies characterized as assessing social network characteristics pre-treatment were often studies which gathered baseline survey information about their participants, typically at treatment initiation. Information at this point in the treatment timeline is of particular importance for two reasons: first, because it reveals patterns in the social network composition of individuals entering MOUD programs, and second, because levels of support at treatment initiation may be predictive of treatment success at later time points. Twenty-four studies assessed participant social network support pre-treatment. Two were experimental and 22 were observational. Nineteen studies indicated that pre-treatment-assessed social network ties were significantly related to MOUD treatment outcomes, while two studies had non-significant results and three studies had mixed results.

Family social network support

Seventeen of 22 studies exploring family social network ties pre-treatment demonstrated statistically significant relationships with treatment outcomes. Among the observational studies, many evaluated self-reports of perceived family support [46, 47, 48, 49] or cohabitation with family members [50, 51]. For example, one study (N=2728) found that patients who lived with family or who had good relationships with their family were more likely to be retained in treatment for a longer period than those that did not [52]. Other studies noted the negative effects of having family conflicts [53], perceived criticism from family [54], or contact with drug-using family members [55] at baseline. One study (N=2446) analyzing Addiction Severity Index items noted that those who reported having family problems or having family members who used heroin were more likely to use heroin concurrently during treatment [46]. Another study (N=435) that utilized a specific effects model to link pre-treatment social factors, engagement during treatment, and post-treatment outcomes found significant correlations between perceived family dysfunction and peer drug-use at intake [44]. Interestingly, the authors' model supported the idea that family dysfunction and peer deviance were related to lower psychosocial functioning which was related to greater engagement in treatment—greater treatment engagement predicted a lower number of days of drug-use one-year after treatment termination.

Partner social network support

Twenty-two studies explored partner social network support and 18 demonstrated statistically significant relationships with treatment outcomes. In general, studies that explored partner relationships were often classified as assessing family relationships as well, so the classification results have significant overlap. One observational study (N=635) which looked at partner-specific support found that marriage predicted fewer heroin-positive urine samples during treatment and that high perceived closeness to partners among married participants predicted even fewer positive urine screens [56].

Peer social network support

Eight studies explored peer social network support, and all were observational studies. Six demonstrated statistically significant relationships with treatment outcomes, while two studies had mixed

results. Common themes included analysis of respondent's perceived support from friends, co-habitating with non-family friends, and having less contact with drug-using peers. One study (N=1212) which assessed the peer component of the Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support found that greater perceived peer support at intake, even when controlling for family support and family relationship quality, predicted longer program retention [57]. Another study (N=10398) noted that reports of having no contact with peer drug users in last month significantly predicted longer retention [58]. Of the studies with significant results, only one (N=178) reported that perceived peer support as assessed by the Community Assessment Inventory was associated with a higher likelihood of dropout [59].

During treatment

Studies characterized as assessing social network support during treatment were either those that gathered self-report information about participant social ties after treatment had already begun or those that actively involved participant social ties in treatment. All experimental studies inherently had at least one during-treatment component to be included in the review. Twenty-five studies assessed participant social network support during treatment. Twelve were experimental and 13 were observational. Nineteen studies indicated that during-treatment-assessed social network support was significantly associated with MOUD treatment outcomes, while six studies were non-significant. Nine of the 12 RCTs that involved social network support in MOUD treatment showed improved outcomes.

Family social network support

Seventeen out of 22 studies exploring family social network support during treatment demonstrated statistically significant relationships with treatment outcomes. Improvements in treatment outcome were found in both experimental and observational studies. One experimental study (N=119) explored the efficacy of family therapy versus standard treatment involving methadone maintenance and individual counseling, finding that there was a significantly larger number of drug-free participants in the treatment group at both 6- and 12-month follow-ups [60]. Family support in this case included attendance to biweekly therapy sessions which emphasized rebuilding relationships and methadone reduction. Still, another experimental study randomly employed Brief Social Behavior and Network Therapy—which allows MOUD patients to map their social network of significant others and invite them to treatment sessions—found no significant difference in number of days abstinent from heroin between the treatment group (N=26), control (N=30), and individual therapy groups (N=27) at three or 12 month follow-ups [41]. It should be noted that this study recorded particularly low attendance to treatment sessions (44% attendance), which continues to be a primary obstacle for psychosocial interventions in many clinical settings.

Observational studies in the during treatment group reported similar findings to those in the pre-treatment group, citing improvements in treatment outcomes related to perceived social support during treatment [40, 61, 62] and having family members remind the patient to take medication [63], while risk factors for unsuccessful treatment were experiencing family conflicts and maintaining contact with drug-using family members during treatment [40, 64, 65].

Partner social network support

Seventeen of 21 studies exploring partner social network support during treatment noted a significant relationship with treatment outcomes. In general, studies which explored partner relationships were often classified as assessing family relationships as well, so the classification results have significant overlap. However, three experimental studies looked specifically at the impact of partner-specific involvement in treatment. One experimental study randomly employed Behavioral Couples Therapy centered around partners practicing positive reinforcement of abstinence, finding that those in the couples therapy condition (N=19) had fewer positive urine screens during treatment than those in the individual therapy condition (N=17) [66]. Another study (N=47) cited improvements in retention and percentage opiate-free urine screens among a group receiving couples therapy [67], while the last study (N=48) which utilized a randomized intervention to educate spouses about the harm reduction approach found a significant improvement in marital satisfaction but no significant difference in retention at one month or six months [68].

Peer social network support

Seven of the 10 studies which explored peer social support during treatment found a significant association with treatment outcomes. All 10 studies which included assessments of peer support also included family or partner support, so the classification results have significant overlap. Some studies noted the general positive impact of perceived support from friends or non-using friend involvement in treatment [43, 69], while one observational study (N=510) in particular noted that patients who disclosed their health status to friends rather than family missed a significantly lower number of MOUD doses [70]. Most studies that assessed peer relationship information did so in the context of peer drug use and found a negative impact of maintaining contact with peers in the drug-using network during treatment on outcomes [61, 64, 71, 41, 42].

Post-treatment

Studies characterized as assessing social network support post-treatment were those that elicited information from study participants with a follow-up that lasted beyond the end of treatment termination. Studies that assessed post-treatment social support were of particular importance, as there are gaps in the understanding of patient social environments after treatment termination despite high rates of attrition and high rates of repeated treatment attempts in MOUD programs. Five studies assessed participant social network support post-treatment. Three were experimental and two were observational. Three studies indicated that post-treatment-assessed social network support was significantly associated with MOUD treatment outcomes, while one study found non-significant associations and one study reported mixed effects.

Family social network support

All of the post-treatment studies explored at least one form of family social ties. Improvements in treatment outcomes were found in both experimental and observational studies. In one experimental study, parents in MOUD were randomly assigned to the Focus on Families intervention—a curriculum that combines parent skills training and home-based case management—and given a follow-up interview within a month of the program termination. The authors noted that parents

in the intervention group (N=82) had significantly more family discussions regarding their drug use, better relapse coping skills, and a lower frequency of opiate use at follow-up compared to the control group (N=62) [72]. Another observational study completed a 12-year follow-up with the same cohort of 144 participants in the Focus on Families intervention, finding generally high rates of incarceration, residential displacement, and health problems among all participants. Importantly, the authors noted that the small proportion of participants who maintained recovery (i.e., continued abstinence, no incarceration, clean urinalysis) for at least 5 years were predicted by having less relationship disruptions (e.g., less changes in marital status, maintaining relationships with children)[73].

Partner social network support

Four of the five post-treatment studies also included assessment of partner social support, so the classification results have significant overlap. One of the previously mentioned experimental studies which included a randomly assigned Behavioral Family Counseling component of which a high proportion of participants completed with their partner also elicited post-treatment information of participants at a one-year follow-up. The authors noted that both the treatment and control groups in the study saw significant decreases in percentage of days abstinent and length of continuous abstinence that year, that both groups also had significant improvements in the social and family functioning component of the Addiction Severity Index at follow-up, and that those in the treatment group (N=62) had significantly better outcomes and social/family functioning at follow-up than the control group (N=62) [74].

Peer social network support

Three out of five post-treatment studies assessed a component of peer social network support, so the classification results have significant overlap. An aforementioned study (N=144) which investigating a 12-year follow-up of the Focus on Families cohort found that, in addition to less family relationship disruptions, recovery for at least five years was also negatively associated with having someone who actively used illicit substances among one's four closest friends [73]. Another observational study (N=1269) which interviewed participants about their perceived social support from family and friends at least five years after MOUD termination found that those those with higher perceived social support at the time of interview were also more likely to be heroin abstinent [75].

Negative and positive social connections

Twenty-seven studies investigated positive social network support, seven studies investigated negative social network ties, and 13 studies investigated both positive and negative social ties. Of the studies that assessed an aspect of positive social support, 36 included family ties, 35 included partner ties, and 22 included peer ties. Of the studies that assessed an aspect of negative social ties, 20 included family ties, 19 included partner ties, and 14 included peer ties.

Of the studies that included negative social ties, there was a large cluster that included specific discussion of the negative influence of maintaining peer ties in the drug-using network. For example, one observational study (N=118) which utilized the Important People Drug and

Alcohol interview to map egocentric patient networks found a weak positive impact of having network members that actively supported treatment and a strong negative impact of having network members that used heroin with respect to respondent's heroin abstinence in the previous month [40].

Synthesis

Table 5 synthesized included studies and indicated if there were statistically significant findings or no effect. Table 5 also indicated whether biases may have understated or over-reported treatment effects, if any. Evidence was not consistent for all points at which social network support was assessed, although studies overall indicated that social network support, or lack thereof, was statistically significantly associated with MOUD treatment outcomes. This information was derived from Tables 3 and 4. For experimental studies, bias was considered likely to understate positive outcomes in 0 studies, to exaggerate in two and unclear in the remaining studies. The most common source of bias for experimental studies was lack of intent-to-treat analysis.

Table 5. Synthesis

Discussion

Despite the vast body of research conducted on the use of medication for opioid use disorder, there are still wide gaps in our understanding of how the social network environments of patients may mediate the success of various treatment approaches. Given the persistent impact of the opioid epidemic, it is critical that those who are exploring ways to improve MOUD access and outcomes—from clinicians to politicians—are informed of the significant role that certain social relationships play in those undergoing treatment in community settings.

This systematic review represents the current body of knowledge on the role of social network support and social network ties on MOUD treatment outcomes. The effect of three types of social network relationships—family, partner, and peer—categorized at three time points—pre-treatment, during treatment, and post-treatment—was recorded with respect to MOUD treatment outcomes. Fourty-six observational and experimental studies over a range of social network support variants were considered. Results from the reviewed studies generally support the idea that certain characteristics of social network ties can have positive and negative associations with treatment outcomes, although some non-significant findings indicate that more research is necessary to firmly establish the relationship between network support and MOUD treatment outcomes. Variation in results may also be attributed to the variability of outcome types, differences in comparison groups, and different pharmacological interventions. Due to the variation in outcomes, a meta-analysis of experimentally-driven studies was not possible.

The bulk of the studies considered in this review evaluated pre-treatment or during treatment sources of social support and were relatively consistent with the dynamic network framework proposed in Fig 1. Such a framework is based on patterns in the literature and holds that, at a basic level, a patient's successful treatment outcome in MOUD will be accompanied by a shift in their network composition away from the drug-using network and towards other relationships that are significant sources of social support throughout treatment. Observational studies relating social relationship factors before and during treatment to outcomes are valuable for two reasons:

first, because they reveal patterns in the social network composition of individuals entering MOUD programs, and second, because levels of support at treatment initiation may be predictive of treatment success at a later time point. The picture at these time points provided by the studies reviewed here suggests that, in general, patient social support from non-drug-using network individuals is low at treatment initiation while contact with the drug-using network is high. With considerable evidence that social support, fewer relationship conflicts, and little exposure to other substance users are positively associated with desired treatment outcomes, future efforts may utilize such observational methods to identify individuals at-risk of terminating treatment early on. Overall, there were few studies which followed and documented patient social network support after discharge and its relation to continued abstinence, despite a major challenge to MOUD being long-term recovery, demonstrating an area for further study.

The experimental studies reviewed here actively involved other individuals in the patient's network in treatment; results suggested that outcomes were generally improved using such interventions. Despite the wide body of work on the efficacy of administering psychosocial interventions in addition to pharmacological treatment, and the numerous reviews to this effect [16, 25, 26], there is very little work looking into psychosocial interventions which specifically leverage significant others in patient networks. While two studies utilized network mapping methods to identify others to participate in therapy [41, 67], the most prominent positive effects of interventions involving network members seemed to be relationships-specific, such as couples therapy between partners [66, 60] or parent skills training between parents and children [76, 72].

While the results of our review did not decisively indicate whether a particular social network relationship was inherently influential, the evidence base for family social network support appears the most significant. It should be noted that the importance of relationships are themselves mediated by other factors, such as local norms. Family social network support was particularly emphasized in East Asian countries, where family assumes a particularly important role in a patient's life [46, 47, 48, 49, 54]. Future research might explore how certain relationship involvement in treatment can leverage local socio-cultural norms to improve MOUD outcomes. More generally, many of the studies reviewed here reveal that characteristics of relationships, and not the particular types of relationships, may be the most influential aspects of social ties during treatment. For example, evidence from several studies across different time points suggests that, regardless of the type of relationship, having and maintaining social ties during treatment that are non-judgemental of MOUD or abstinence-positive [54, 77, 68, 60, 76, 63], that have little conflict [65, 64, 53], that are mutually non-substance-using [69, 43, 74, 78], or that involve cohabitation [61, 50, 56] is positively associated with successful treatment outcomes.

Given that the majority of the studies reviewed here are consistent with our theoretical framework for how social network changes accompany successful treatment, future work might also aim to further investigate network change over time in the community clinic setting. With networks in mind, the hypothesized role of relationships in treatment is complex, as perceptions of family, partner, and peers may directly impact treatment, may indirectly impact treatment through a mediator such as motivation to attend clinic, may be altered by treatment progression, or there may be a combination of above factors [44]. Nonetheless, past research on social networks of both tobacco and alcohol users has indicated that there is significant contagion of both use and quitting behavior between social contacts [18, 79], warranting further investigation of opioid use and treatment through the social network lens. However, network change approaches may not be realistic if, for example, participants are trying to decrease contact with another substance user

that is a close friend or cohabitee. Leveraging findings from this review, it may be possible engage patients with such networks in disseminating harm reduction-centric and abstinence-positive information around opioid use to their social network during treatment. This may extend the reach of social network support interventions in not only improving patient outcomes, but also improving broader community well-being. Interventions might also be selectively geared towards social tie creation for patients who have few social contacts at baseline. One study that encouraged participants who did not have a drug-free contact in their network to attend community activities like church noted the potential positive impact of such engagement in creating new drug-free ties, though the effect on outcomes in the study was non-significant potentially due to low attendance [69].

Our findings are of great relevance given the current gap in understanding of MOUD treatment outcomes, and particularly those problems raised by rates of high attrition and high illicit substance use concurrent with treatment. The results presented here suggest that social network information can be utilized to personalize existing interventions or leveraged to innovate new approaches. With psychosocial interventions that supplement pharmacological treatment becoming the norm in combating opioid dependence, it is critical that researchers develop the most efficacious MOUD interventions. The current review also provides wider policy implications. Governments and public health authorities seeking to improve treatment outcomes might incorporate successful, network-targeting MOUD interventions noted in our review. Public health authorities can encourage treatment providers to explore social network support or other similar techniques to augment MOUD. Such agencies might also incentivize treatment providers to include different forms of social network support in their programs to determine which is most efficacious and simultaneously build upon the research base of network support in MOUD approaches. Similarly, in absence of a large evidence base for social network support-based MOUD approaches, treatment providers with generic approaches (i.e., without any form of behavioral/psychosocial intervention) might informally encourage patients to seek social support from their family, friends or peers.

Most of the studies had key methodological concerns. We emphasized more robust study designs and assessed the probable impact of bias to compensate for methodological weaknesses. Possible sources of bias included group baseline differences, selection bias, attrition bias, and differential rates of follow-up. Selection bias may have exaggerated or under-reported treatment effects. If rates of attrition were relatively high or greater in untreated groups, there may be a possibility that treatment effects were overestimated if participants lost to follow-up had greater negative outcomes. A few studies in this review conducted analysis to control for bias through multivariate analysis and/or comparison of losses to follow-up with those followed-up. Attempts to account for biases may not always be successful, and we thus assessed the risk of biases (see Table 4), providing an assessment of probable impact of bias on various outcomes.

Limitations also arose from differences in methods of reviewed studies, making it more complex to assess or synthesize all studies under the same rubric. The details provided on methods and analysis was highly varied, possibly leading to fluctuations in the confidence level of results. Finally, there were limitations in our classification method that arose from the high variability between study methods and analysis. For example, because assumptions had to be made about relationships assessed in some studies, some results may be based primarily one one relationship despite a distinction not being drawn in the original study and therefore not drawn here (e.g., study describing family and partner support in which vast majority of participants elicit support from partner). Additionally, peer relationships in particular were limited by definition in our review,

often unspecified or generally specified as friends. Future studies might aim to assess 'weak' peer ties, such as co-workers, employers, or clinic care providers.

Conclusions

Although evidence was occasionally mixed, social network support and social tie influence measured across various points in the treatment timeline was generally related to MOUD treatment outcomes. Interventions around social network support could potentially augment MOUD treatment outcomes, possibly playing a role in mitigating the current epidemic of opioid dependence and overdose. Future research should explore social network changes across the treatment timeline and leverage patterns in the changes to address obstacles to MOUD success.

References

[1] Degenhardt Louisa, Charlson Fiona, Ferrari Alize, et al. The global burden of disease attributable to alcohol and drug use in 195 countries and territories, 1990–2016: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016 *The Lancet Psychiatry.* 2018;5:987–1012.

[2] Murphy SL, Xu J, Kochanek KD. Arias E. mortality in the United States *NCHS Data Brief.* 2017;2018:1–8.

[3] Brown Rick, Morgan Anthony. The opioid epidemic in North America: Implications for Australia. *Trends & Issues in Crime & Criminal Justice.* 2019.

[4] Ahmad FB, Rossen LM, Sutton P. Provisional drug overdose death counts. National Center for Health Statistics 2020.

[5] Murthy Vivek H. Ending the opioid epidemic—a call to action *New England Journal of Medicine.* 2016;375:2413–2415.

[6] Crowley Ryan, Kirschner Neil, Dunn Andrew S, Bornstein Sue S. Health and public policy to facilitate effective prevention and treatment of substance use disorders involving illicit and prescription drugs: An American College of Physicians position paper *Annals of internal medicine.* 2017;166:733–736.

[7] Mattick Richard P, Breen Courtney, Kimber Jo, Davoli Marina. Methadone maintenance therapy versus no opioid replacement therapy for opioid dependence *Cochrane database of systematic reviews.* 2009.

[8] Gowing Linda, Farrell Michael, Bornemann Reinhard, Sullivan Lynn E, Ali Robert. Substitution treatment of injecting opioid users for prevention of HIV infection *Cochrane database of systematic reviews.* 2008.

[9] Tilson Hugh, Aramrattana Apinun, Bozzette Samuel, et al. Preventing HIV infection among injecting drug users in high-risk countries: an assessment of the evidence *Washington, DC: Institute of Medicine.* 2007.

[10] Hedrich Dagmar, Alves Paula, Farrell Michael, Stöver Heino, Møller Lars, Mayet Soraya. The effectiveness of opioid maintenance treatment in prison settings: a systematic review *Addiction.* 2012;107:501–517.

[11] Fanucchi Laura, Springer Sandra A, Korthuis P Todd. Medications for Treatment of Opioid Use Disorder among Persons Living with HIV *Current HIV/AIDS Reports.* 2019;16:1–6.

[12] Feelemyer Jonathan, Des Jarlais Don, Arasteh Kamyar, Abdul-Quader Abu S, Hagan Holly. Retention of participants in medication-assisted programs in low-and middle-income countries: an international systematic review *Addiction.* 2014;109:20–32.

[13] Burns Lucy, Gisev Natasa, Larney Sarah, et al. A longitudinal comparison of retention in buprenorphine and methadone treatment for opioid dependence in New South Wales, Australia *Addiction.* 2015;110:646–655.

[14] Kelly Sharon M, O'Grady Kevin E, Mitchell Shannon Gwin, Brown Barry S, Schwartz Robert P. Predictors of methadone treatment retention from a multi-site study: a survival analysis *Drug and alcohol dependence.* 2011;117:170–175.

[15] Proctor Steven L, Copeland Amy L, Kopak Albert M, Hoffmann Norman G, Herschman Philip L, Polukhina Nadiya. Predictors of patient retention in methadone maintenance treatment. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors.* 2015;29:906.

[16] Dugosh Karen, Abraham Amanda, Seymour Brittany, McLoyd Keli, Chalk Mady, Festinger David. A systematic review on the use of psychosocial interventions in conjunction with medications for the treatment of opioid addiction *Journal of addiction medicine.* 2016;10:91.

[17] Madden Lynn M, Farnum Scott O, Eggert Kathryn F, et al. An investigation of an open-access model for scaling up methadone maintenance treatment *Addiction.* 2018;113:1450–1458.

[18] Christakis Nicholas A, Fowler James H. The collective dynamics of smoking in a large social network *New England journal of medicine.* 2008;358:2249–2258.

[19] Fowler James H, Christakis Nicholas A. Cooperative behavior cascades in human social networks *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.* 2010;107:5334–5338.

[20] Kim David A, Hwong Alison R, Stafford Derek, et al. Social network targeting to maximise population behaviour change: a cluster randomised controlled trial *The Lancet.* 2015;386:145–153.

[21] Shakya Holly B, Stafford Derek, Hughes D Alex, et al. Exploiting social influence to magnify population-level behaviour change in maternal and child health: study protocol for a randomised controlled trial of network targeting algorithms in rural Honduras *BMJ open.* 2017;7:e012996.

[22] Knerich Verena, Jones Andrea A, Seyedin Sam, et al. Social and structural factors associated with substance use within the support network of adults living in precarious housing in a socially marginalized neighborhood of Vancouver, Canada *PloS one.* 2019;14:e0222611.

[23] Kidorf Michael, Latkin Carl, Brooner Robert K. Presence of drug-free family and friends in the personal social networks of people receiving treatment for opioid use disorder *Journal of substance abuse treatment.* 2016;70:87–92.

[24] Wagner Karla D, Iverson Ellen, Wong Carolyn F, et al. Personal social network factors associated with overdose prevention training participation *Substance use & misuse.* 2013;48:21–31.

[25] Brown Aaron R. A systematic review of psychosocial interventions in treatment of opioid addiction *Journal of Social Work Practice in the Addictions.* 2018;18:249–269.

[26] Dutra Lissa, Stathopoulou Georgia, Basden Shawnee L, Leyro Teresa M, Powers Mark B, Otto Michael W. A meta-analytic review of psychosocial interventions for substance use disorders *American Journal of Psychiatry.* 2008;165:179–187.

[27] Amato Laura, Minozzi Silvia, Davoli Marina, Vecchi Simona. Psychosocial and pharmacological treatments versus pharmacological treatments for opioid detoxification *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews.* 2011.

[28] Moran Garrett, Knudsen Hannah, Snyder Caroline. Psychosocial Supports in Medication-Assisted Treatment: Recent Evidence and Current Practice tech. rep.Department of Health and Human Services 2019. Library Catalog: aspe.hhs.gov.

[29] Berkman Lisa F, Glass Thomas, Brissette Ian, Seeman Teresa E. From social integration to health: Durkheim in the new millennium *Social science & medicine.* 2000;51:843–857.

[30] Kawachi Ichiro, Berkman Lisa F. Social ties and mental health *Journal of Urban health.* 2001;78:458–467.

[31] Huberman Bernardo A, Romero Daniel M, Wu Fang. Social networks that matter: Twitter under the microscope *arXiv preprint arXiv:0812.1045.* 2008.

[32] Pearson Judith E. The definition and measurement of social support. *Journal of Counseling & Development.* 1986.

[33] Barman-Adhikari Anamika, Rice Eric, Winetrobe Hailey, Petering Robin. Social network correlates of methamphetamine, heroin, and cocaine use in a sociometric network of homeless youth *Journal of the Society for Social Work and Research.* 2015;6:433–457.

[34] El-Bassel Nabila, Gilbert Louisa, Wu Elwin, Chang Mingway. A social network profile and HIV risk among men on methadone: do social networks matter? *Journal of Urban Health.* 2006;83:602–613.

[35] Valente Thomas W, Gallaher Peggy, Mouttapa Michele. Using social networks to understand and prevent substance use: A transdisciplinary perspective *Substance use & misuse.* 2004;39:1685–1712.

[36] Moher David, Shamseer Larissa, Clarke Mike, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement *Systematic reviews.* 2015;4:1.

[37] Liberati Alessandro, Altman Douglas, Tetzlaff Jennifer, et al. The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate healthcare interventions *Bmj.* 2009;339.

[38] Higgins Julian PT, Green Sally. *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions*;4. John Wiley & Sons 2011.

[39] Campbell Mhairi, McKenzie Joanne E, Sowden Amanda, et al. Synthesis without meta-analysis (SWiM) in systematic reviews: reporting guideline *bmj.* 2020;368.

[40] Day E., Copello A., Karia M., et al. Social network support for individuals receiving opiate substitution treatment and its association with treatment progress *European Addiction Research.* 2013;19:211–21.

[41] Day E., Copello A., Seddon J. L., et al. A pilot feasibility randomised controlled trial of an adjunct brief social network intervention in opiate substitution treatment services *BMC Psychiatry.* 2018;18:8.

[42] Wasserman D. A., Stewart A. L., Delucchi K. L.. Social support and abstinence from opiates and cocaine during opioid maintenance treatment *Drug & Alcohol Dependence.* 2001;65:65–75.

[43] Shen L., Assanangkornchai S., Liu W., et al. Influence of social network on drug use among clients of methadone maintenance treatment centers in Kunming, China *PLoS ONE [Electronic Resource].* 2018;13:e0200105.

[44] Griffith J. D., Knight D. K., Joe G. W., Simpson D. D.. Implications of family and peer relations for treatment engagement and follow-up outcomes: An integrative model *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors.* 1998;12:113–126.

[45] Crowther Mark, Avenell Alison, MacLennan Graeme, Mowatt Graham. A further use for the Harvest plot: a novel method for the presentation of data synthesis *Research Synthesis Methods.* 2011;2:79–83.

[46] Feng N., Lin C., Hsieh J., Rou K., Li L.. Family Related Factors and Concurrent Heroin Use in Methadone Maintenance Treatment in China *Substance Use & Misuse.* 2018;53:1674–1680.

[47] Hikmayani N. H., Rahardjo S. S., Doewes M.. Correlates of dropout from community-based methadone maintenance treatment program in Indonesia *Value in Health.* 2012;15 (4):A85.

[48] Lin C., Wu Z., Detels R.. Family support, quality of life and concurrent substance use among methadone maintenance therapy clients in China *Public Health.* 2011;125:269–74.

[49] Lin H. C., Chen K. Y., Wang P. W., et al. Predictors for dropping-out from methadone maintenance therapy programs among heroin users in southern Taiwan *Substance Use & Misuse.* 2013;48:181–91.

[50] Cerovecki V., Tiljak H., Ozvacic Adzic Z., Krizmaric M., Pregelj P., Kastelic A.. Risk factors for fatal outcome in patients with opioid dependence treated with methadone in a family medicine setting in Croatia *Croatian Medical Journal.* 2013;54:42–8.

[51] Lundgren L. M., Sullivan L. M., Maina A. W., Schilling R. F.. Client factors associated with length of stay in methadone treatment among heroin users who inject drugs: quantitative analysis of state-level substance abuse treatment utilization data *Journal of Addiction Medicine.* 2007;1:26–32.

[52] Yang F., Lin P., Li Y., et al. Predictors of retention in community-based methadone maintenance treatment program in Pearl River Delta, China *Harm Reduction Journal.* 2013;10:3.

[53] Mutasa H. C.. Risk factors associated with noncompliance with methadone substitution therapy (MST) and relapse among chronic opiate users in an Outer London community *Journal of Advanced Nursing.* 2001;35:97–107.

[54] Lee C. H., Wang T. J., Tang H. P., Liu Y. H., Bell J.. Familial expressed emotion among heroin addicts in methadone maintenance treatment: does it matter? *Addictive Behaviors.* 2015;45:39–44.

[55] Lister J. J., Xuan S. Y., Greenwald M., Ledgerwood D. M.. Interpersonal predictors of short-term treatment outcomes among African-American women in MMT *Drug and Alcohol Dependence.* 2017;171:e121–e122.

[56] Heinz A. J., Wu J., Witkiewitz K., Epstein D. H., Preston K. L.. Marriage and relationship closeness as predictors of cocaine and heroin use *Addictive Behaviors.* 2009;34:258–63.

[57] Zhou K., Li H., Wei X., Li X., Zhuang G.. Relationships between perceived social support and retention among patients in methadone maintenance treatment in mainland China *Psychology Health & Medicine.* 2017;22:493–500.

[58] Zhou K., Li H., Wei X., Li X., Zhuang G.. Medication Adherence in Patients Undergoing Methadone Maintenance Treatment in Xi'an, China *Journal of Addiction Medicine.* 2017;11:28–33.

[59] Sarasvita R., Tonkin A., Utomo B., Ali R.. Predictive factors for treatment retention in methadone programs in Indonesia *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment.* 2012;42:239–46.

[60] Yandoli Dennis, Eisler Ivan, Robbins Claire, Mulleady Geraldine, Dare Christopher. A comparative study of family therapy in the treatment of opiate users in a London drug clinic *Journal of Family Therapy.* 2002;24:402–422.

[61] Gogineni A., Stein M. D., Friedmann P. D.. Social relationships and intravenous drug use among methadone maintenance patients *Drug & Alcohol Dependence.* 2001;64:47–53.

[62] Hoang T., Nguyen H., Shiraishi R. W., et al. Factors associated with concurrent heroin use among patients on methadone maintenance treatment in Vietnam: A 24-month retrospective analysis of a nationally representative sample *International Journal of Drug Policy.* 2018;55:113–120.

[63] Nguyen L. H., Nguyen H. T. T., Nguyen H. L. T., Tran B. X., Latkin C. A.. Adherence to methadone maintenance treatment and associated factors among patients in Vietnamese mountainside areas *Substance Abuse Treatment, Prevention, & Policy.* 2017;12:31.

[64] Gu Jing, Xu Huifang, Lau Joseph T. F., et al. Situation-specific factors predicting nonadherence to methadone maintenance treatment: a cross-sectional study using the case-crossover design in Guangzhou, China *AIDS Care.* 2014;26:S107–S112.

[65] Hoang T. V., Ha T. T., Hoang T. M., et al. Impact of a methadone maintenance therapy pilot in Vietnam and its role in a scaled-up response *Harm Reduction Journal.* 2015;12:39.

[66] Fals-Stewart W., O'Farrell T. J., Birchler G. R.. Behavioral couples therapy for male methadone maintenance patients: Effects on drug-using behavior and relationship adjustment *Behavior Therapy.* 2001;32:391–411.

[67] Rothenberg J. L., Sullivan M. A., Church S. H., et al. Behavioral naltrexone therapy: an integrated treatment for opiate dependence *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment.* 2002;23:351–60.

[68] Hojjat S. K., Rezaei M., Hatami S. E., Kohestani M., Norozi Khalili M.. The Effectiveness of Group Family Training About the Principles of Harm Reduction Approach on Marital Satisfaction of Spouses of Patients Under Methadone Maintenance Treatment *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy.* 2017;43:68–77.

[69] Kidorf M.. Mobilizing drug-free support and modifying social network ties using close network supports *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research.* 2018;42 (Supplement 1):292A.

[70] Tran B. X., Nguyen L. H., Tran T. T., Latkin C. A.. Social and structural barriers for adherence to methadone maintenance treatment among Vietnamese opioid dependence patients *PLoS ONE [Electronic Resource].* 2018;13:e0190941.

[71] Li L., Lin C., Wan D., Zhang L., Lai W.. Concurrent heroin use among methadone maintenance clients in China *Addictive Behaviors.* 2012;37:264–8.

[72] Catalano R. F., Haggerty K. P., Gainey R. R., Hoppe M. J.. Reducing parental risk factors for children's substance misuse: preliminary outcomes with opiate-addicted parents *Substance Use & Misuse.* 1997;32:699–721.

[73] Skinner M. L., Haggerty K. P., Fleming C. B., Catalano R. F., Gainey R. R.. Opiate-addicted parents in methadone treatment: long-term recovery, health, and family relationships *Journal of Addictive Diseases.* 2011;30:17–26.

[74] Fals-Stewart W., O'Farrell T. J.. Behavioral family counseling and naltrexone for male opioid-dependent patients *Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology.* 2003;71:432–42.

[75] Zhu Y., Evans E. A., Mooney L. J., et al. Correlates of Long-Term Opioid Abstinence After Randomization to Methadone Versus Buprenorphine/Naloxone in a Multi-Site Trial *Journal Of Neuroimmune Pharmacology: The Official Journal Of The Society On NeuroImmune Pharmacology.* 2018;09:09.

[76] Catalano R. F., Gainey R. R., Fleming C. B., Haggerty K. P., Johnson N. O.. An experimental intervention with families of substance abusers: one-year follow-up of the focus on families project *Addiction.* 1999;94:241–54.

[77] Anton R. F., Hogan I., Jalali B., Riordan C. E., Kleber H. D.. Multiple family therapy and naltrexone in the treatment of opiate dependence *Drug & Alcohol Dependence.* 1981;8:157–68.

[78] Goehl L., Nunes E., Quitkin F., Hilton I.. Social networks and methadone treatment outcome: the costs and benefits of social ties *American Journal of Drug & Alcohol Abuse.* 1993;19:251–62.

[79] Rosenquist J Niels, Murabito Joanne, Fowler James H, Christakis Nicholas A. The spread of alcohol consumption behavior in a large social network *Annals of internal medicine.* 2010;152:426–433.

[english]babel [utf8x]inputenc hyperref graphicx setspace placeins stfloats [numbers]natbib [margin=1in]geometry import [table]xcolor pdflscape afterpage capt-oflongtable hhline rotating wrapfig lscape epstopdf lineno [table]xcolor subfiles makecell array

Table 1: Study characteristics related to design of study, MOUD drug used, target population, outcome, number of participants, study length

Author, date	Place	Study Design	MOUD drug	Population	Outcomes	Sample characteristics (N, % male, age, ethnicity)	Study length
Anton et al., 1981	USA	Observational, retrospective study	Naltrexone	Opioid dependent self-referred patients	Naltrexone maintenance for three months or more	N: 65 (total), 40 (naltrexone + HIP), 25 (naltrexone + HIP + MFT) % male: 89 Mean age: 26.1 Ethnicity: 54% White; 46% Black	2 years
Carroll et al., 2001	USA	RCT	Naltrexone	Opioid dependent patients who had completed outpatient detoxification	Compliance with naltrexone treatment	N: 127 (total), 44 (naltrexone), 35 (naltrexone + CM), 48 (naltrexone + CM + SO) % male: 76 Mean age: 32 Ethnicity: 77% White	Unclear
Catalano et al., 1997	USA	RCT	Methadone	Opioid dependent parents who had been in methadone treatment for a minimum of 90 days and have one or more children between the ages of 3 and 14 years old living with them at least 50% of the week	Parent self-reported drug-use	N: 144 (total), 62 (control), 82 (FOF) % male: 25 Mean age: 35.4 Ethnicity: 77% White; 18% Black; Mixed/Other: 5%	3 years
Catalano et al., 1999	USA	RCT	Methadone	Opioid dependent parents who had been in methadone treatment for a minimum of 90 days and have one or more children between the ages of 3 and 14 years old living with them at least 50% of the week	Self-reported frequency of use of marijuana, cocaine, opiates and drug use in previous month	N: 144 (total), 62 (control), 82 (FOF) % male: 25 Mean age: 35.4 Ethnicity: 77% White; 18% Black; Mixed/Other: 5%	3 years
Cerovecki et al., 2013	Croatia	Observational, prospective study	Methadone	Opioid dependent patients treated in family medicine setting	Fatal outcome risk factors like quality or relationships and continuation of drug use during previous therapeutic attempts	N: 287 % male: NA Mean age: NA Ethnicity: NA	12 years

Table 1: Study Characteristics (continued)

Author, date	Place	Study Design	MOUD drug	Population	Outcomes	Sample characteristics (N, % male, age, ethnicity)	Study length
Davila Torres, 2011	USA	Observational, retrospective study	Methadone	Latino opioid dependent patients	Retention and treatment program completion	N: 291 % male: 67 Mean age: NA Ethnicity: 100% Hispanic	1 year
Day et al., 2013	UK	Cross-sectional analysis	Methadone or buprenorphine	Opioid dependents	Heroin use in the previous month	N: 118 % male: 79 Mean age: 35.5 Ethnicity: 73% White; 14% South Asian; 4% Black, 8% Mixed	6 months
Day et al., 2018	UK	RCT	Methadone or buprenorphine	Opioid dependent individuals who had been prescribed methadone or buprenorphine for the past 12 months and had reported heroin use on one or more days 28 days prior to beginning of the study	Number of days of heroin use in the past month	N: 83 (total), 30 (TAU), 26 (TAU + B-SNBT), 27 (TAU + PGS) % male: 79 Mean age: 35.5 Ethnicity: 73% White; 14% South Asian; 4% Black; 8% Mixed	1 year
Fals-Stewart et al., 2001	USA	RCT	Methadone	Opioid dependent male partners who had been married for at least 1 year or in a stable common-law relationship for at least 2 years who had to refrain from seeking additional substance abuse treatment except for self-help meetings like Alcoholics Anonymous	Urine tests	N: 43 (total), 22 (individual counseling), 21 (BCT) % male: 100 Mean age: 38.1 Ethnicity: 18% White; 15% Black; 3% Hispanic	3 years

Table 1: Study Characteristics (continued)

Author, date	Place	Study Design	MOUD drug	Population	Outcomes	Sample characteristics (N, % male, age, ethnicity)	Study length
Fals-Stewart and O'Farrell, 2003	USA	RCT	Naltrexone	Opioid dependent individuals living with at least one parent/spouse/intimate partner/family member willing to participate and did not have a current substance use disorder or meet DSM-III-R criteria for schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, or psychosis	Percentage of opioid-free urines	N: 124 (total), 62 (individual counseling), 62 (BFC) % male: 100 Mean age: 32.9 Ethnicity: 66% White; 26% Black; 3% Hispanic; 5% Other	1 years
Feng et al., 2018	China	Observational, retrospective study	Methadone	Opioid dependent patients enrolled in methadone clinic	Self-reported heroin use or a positive urine morphine test result	N: 2446 % male: 79 Mean age: NA Ethnicity: NA	1 year
Goehl et al., 1993	USA	Observational, prospective study	Methadone	Adult patients in a community-based, university-affiliated methadone maintenance treatment program in New York	Abstinence (percentage of positive urinalysis in 3 month period)	N: 70 % male: 67 Mean age: 35 Ethnicity: 64% White/Caucasian, 17% African-American, 19% Hispanic-American	3 months
Gogineni et al., 2001	USA	Observational, prospective study	Methadone	Opioid dependent patients enrolled in MMT clinic	Continued opioid use	N: 252 % male: 56 Mean age: 40.3 Ethnicity: 64% White; 22% Black; 9% Latino/Hispanic; 2% Native American; 3% Other	Unclear
Grey et al., 1986	USA	Observational, prospective study	Methadone or naltrexone	Opioid dependent patients who had been opiate-free for 7 days prior to treatment (for naltrexone) and opiate dependents for at least 1 year for methadone maintenance treatment	Retention (number of required clinic appointments kept)	N: 60 % male: 73 Mean age: NA Ethnicity: 58.3% White; 11.7% Black; 30.0% Hispanic	3 months

Table 1: Study Characteristics (continued)

Author, date	Place	Study Design	MOUD drug	Population	Outcomes	Sample characteristics (N, % male, age, ethnicity)	Study length
Griffith et al., 1998	USA	Observational, retrospective study	Methadone	Opioid drug users who were admitted to three publicly funded methadone treatment clinics in Texas participating in the Drug Abuse Treatment for AIDS-Risk Reduction (DATAR) project from April 1990 through August 1993	Deviance at 1-year follow-up (Three measures were of opioid use and included self-reported heroin use, self-reported speedball use, and the urinalysis results)	N: 960 % male: 69 Mean age: 37 Ethnicity: 37% White; 21% Black; 37% Hispanic; 2% Other	3 years
Gu et al., 2013	China	RCT	Methadone	Heroin dependent patients recently admitted to the three participating MMT clinics	Attrition from the MMT service, which was defined as a failure to visit the MMT clinic consecutively for at least 1 month immediately prior to the study's completion date	N: 288 (total), 146 (control), 142 (psychosocial intervention) % male: 92 Mean age: NA Ethnicity: 98.9% Han	1 year
Gu et al., 2014	China	Case-crossover design	Methadone	Opioid dependent patients	Methadone maintenance clinic nonattendance	N: 131 % male: 88 Mean age: NA Ethnicity: NA	1 month
Heinz et al., 2009	USA	Observational, retrospective study	Methadone	Opioid dependent patients with a history of cocaine use	Positive urinalysis tests for cocaine and opiates	N: 635 % male: 54 Mean age: 39.2 Ethnicity: 39.5% White; 59% Black; 1.5% Other	6 years
Hikmayani et al., 2012	Indonesia	Observational, prospective study	Methadone	Heroin dependent patients	Retention rate in methadone management treatment clinics	N: 98 % male: NA Mean age: 31.6 Ethnicity: NA	1 year and 6 months
Hoang et al., 2015	Vietnam	Observational, prospective study	Methadone	Opioid dependent patients	Concurrent heroin use after methadone treatment initiation	N: 965 % male: 95 Mean age: 32.3 Ethnicity: NA	10 months

Table 1: Study Characteristics (continued)

Author, date	Place	Study Design	MOUD drug	Population	Outcomes	Sample characteristics (N, % male, age, ethnicity)	Study length
Hoang et al., 2018	Vietnam	Observational, retrospective study	Methadone	Opioid dependent patients	Concurrent heroin use after methadone treatment initiation	N: 500 % male: 97 Mean age: NA Ethnicity: NA	5 years
Hojjat et al., 2017	Iran	RCT	Methadone	Individuals with a substance dependent husband with no history of drug dependence	Relapse rate	Total N: 50 (total), 25 (control), 25 (partner education intervention) % male: 100 Mean age: 31.5 Ethnicity: NA	1 year and 2 months
Kidorf, 2018	Unclear	RCT, single group design	Methadone	Opioid dependent individuals recruited from a community syringe exchange or from a methadone maintenance program	Rate of alcohol and other drug use	N: 66 % male: 47 Mean age: 43.2 Ethnicity: NA	Unclear
Lee et al., 2015	Taiwan	Observational, prospective study	Methadone	Heroin dependent patients enrolled in MMT clinic	Treatment retention	N: 177 % male: 60 Mean age: 37.2 Ethnicity: NA	Unclear
Li et al., 2012	China	Observational, prospective study	Methadone	Patients enrolled in a participating MMT clinic	Concurrent heroin use during MMT	N: 178 % Male: 66 Mean age: NA Ethnicity: NA	Unclear
Lin et al., 2011	China	Cross-sectional study	Methadone	Opioid dependent patients enrolled in MMT clinic	Self-reported drug use and urine tests	N: 560 % male: 84 Mean age: 33 Ethnicity: NA	7 months
Lin et al., 2013	Taiwan	Observational, prospective study	Methadone	Opioid dependent patients enrolled in MMT clinic	Retention rate in MMT clinics	N: 368 % male: 86 Mean age: 37.2 Ethnicity: NA	1 year

Table 1: Study Characteristics (continued)

Author, date	Place	Study Design	MOUD drug	Population	Outcomes	Sample characteristics (N, % male, age, ethnicity)	Study length
Lister et al., 2017	USA	Observational, prospective study	Methadone	African American individuals with past year opioid dependence, 30-day opioid use prior to enrollment in MMT, and positive urinalyses at intake	Number of days retained in treatment; Proportion of positive opioid UDS during first month of treatment	N: 101 % Male: 0 Mean age: 50 Ethnicity: 100% African American	1 year and 3 months
Lundgren et al., 2007	USA	Observational, prospective study	Methadone	Opioid dependent patients enrolled in MMT clinic	Longest consecutive stay in MMT clinic	N: 8258 % male: 66 Mean age: 36.5 Ethnicity: 68.6% White; 25.9% Latino; 5.5% Black	6 years
Mutasa, 2001	UK	Observational, prospective study	Methadone	Opioid dependent individuals living within catchment area	MST noncompliance (misuse drugs)	N: 45 % male: 67 Mean age: NA Ethnicity: 88.89% White; 6.67% South Asian; 4.44% Black	Unclear
Nguyen et al., 2017	Vietnam	Observational, prospective study	Methadone	Opioid dependent patients enrolled in MMT clinic	Treatment adherence	N: 241 % male: NA Mean age: NA Ethnicity: NA	4 months
Roozen et al., 2003	Netherlands	RCT	Methadone or naltrexone	Opioid dependent patients	Abstinence for a 6-month treatment period	N: 44 (total), 24 (naltrexone), 20 (methadone) % male: 84.7 Mean age: 30.2 Ethnicity: NA	2 years
Rothenberg et al., 2002	US	Prospective study	Naltrexone	Opioid dependent individuals with a significant other who could commit to participating in treatment	Retention in treatment	N: 82 % male: 77 Mean age: 33.6 Ethnicity: 64% White; 25% Hispanic; 11% Black	Unclear

Table 1: Study Characteristics (continued)

Author, date	Place	Study Design	MOUD drug	Population	Outcomes	Sample characteristics (N, % male, age, ethnicity)	Study length
Sarasvita et al., 2012	Indonesia	Observational, prospective study	Methadone	Opioid dependent patients enrolled in MMT clinic	Duration of treatment in days	N: 178 % male: 90 Mean age: 27.2 Ethnicity: 32.6% Javanese; 16.3% Sudanese; 4.5% Bataknese	1 year and 6 months
Shen et al., 2018	China	Observational, prospective study	Methadone	Opioid dependent patients enrolled in MMT clinic	Positive urinalysis tests for heroin use	N: 324 % male: 77 Mean age: 45.2 Ethnicity: 83% Han	1 year
Skinner et al., 2011	USA	Observational, prospective study	Methadone	Opioid addicted adults with 3- 14-year old children enrolled in MMT	30-day drug use	N: 144 % Male: 26 Mean age: 48.5 Ethnicity: 78% White; 17% Black; 2% Other; 2% Mixed	12 years
Smith, 2002	USA	Observational, prospective study	Methadone	Male veteran literate opioid dependents individuals	Retention as measured by length of time in treatment	N: 80 % male: 60 Ethnicity: 60% Black; 38.8% White; 1.2% Latino	12 weeks
Tang, 2016	China	Observational, prospective study	Methadone	Opioid dependent patients with a history of quitting attempts	Treatment adherence	N: 523 % male: 76 Mean age: 38.5 Ethinicity: NA	9 months
Torrens et al., 1996	Spain	Observational, prospective study	Methadone	Opioid dependent patients	Retention rate	N: 370 % male: 66 Mean age: 29.6 Ethnicity: NA	2 years and 10 months
Tran et al., 2018	Vietnam	Observational, prospective study	Methadone	Opioid dependent patients enrolled in MMT clinic	Self-reported medication adherence	N: 510 % male: 98 Mean age: 36.6 Ethnicity: NA	5 months
Wasserman et al., 2001	USA	Observational, prospective study	Methadone or LAAM	Opioid dependent patients with at least 1 month enrollment in methadone or LAAM maintenance	Biochemically confirmed opiate and cocaine abstinence	N: 128 % male: 55 Mean age: 45 Ethnicity: 50% White	Unclear

Table 1: Study Characteristics (continued)

Author, date	Place	Study Design	MOUD drug	Population	Outcomes	Sample characteristics (N, % male, age, ethnicity)	Study length
Yandoli et al., 2002	UK	RCT	Methadone	Patients with at least six months' duration of opioid dependence who agreed to be seen with their partner/family during treatment if required	Frequency of opiate use (allocated as opiate free, occasional users, regular users)	N: 119 (total), 40 (low-contact), 38 (standard), 41 (family counseling) % male: 63 Mean age: 28.2 Ethnicity: NA	14 months
Yang et al., 2013	China	Observational, retrospective study	Methadone	Opioid dependent patients enrolled in MMT clinic	Retention rate in MMT clinic	N: 2728 % male: 73 Mean age: 36.4 Ethnicity: NA	4 years and 9 months
Zhou et al., 2017 (1)	China	Observational, ambispective cohort study	Methadone	Adult patients enrolled in MMT	Treatment retention	N: 1212 % Male: 77 Mean age: 42 Ethnicity: NA	2 years
Zhou et al., 2017 (2)	China	Observational, retrospective cohort study	Methadone	Adult patients enrolled in MMT	Medication adherence	N: 10398 % Male: 84 Mean age: 38 Ethnicity: NA	8 years
Zhu et al., 2018	USA	Observational, retrospective study	Methadone or buprenor-phine/naloxone	Opioid dependent patients	Long-term opioid abstinence (at least 5 years)	N: 699 % male: 65 Mean age: 37.4 Ethnicity: NA	3 years

Abbreviations: B-SBNT (Brief Social Behavior and Network Therapy), BCT - Behavioral couples therapy (refers to intensive therapy treatment involving once-weekly couples therapy, individual counseling and methadone for substance-abusing participants), BMT - Buprenorphine maintenance treatment, FOF - Focus on Families intervention (refers to parent skills training and case management), HIP - high intervention program of methadone plus individual counseling, CM - Contingency management, CRA - Community reinforcement approach (refers to a combination of psychoeducation, pharmacotherapy, compliance therapy, relation therapy and job counselling), LAAM - Levo-alpha-acetylmethadol harm reduction, MFT - Multiple family therapy (refers to a combination of multi-generational, structural and general supportive approaches to therapy for patients and their families), MMT - Methadone maintenance treatment, PGS - Personal Goal Setting counseling, RCT - Randomized controlled trial, SO - significant other involvement, TAU - treatment as usual.

Table 2: Network and Timeline Characteristics

Author, date	Form of social network support	Network tie type	Point in treatment	Conclusions
Anton et al., 1981	Family - parents, siblings Partner	Positive	During treatment	Higher retention rate for patients treated with multiple family therapy (MFT) than those who did not receive MFT.
Carroll et al., 2001	Family - parent, child, or sibling (non-using) Partner (non-using) Peer (non-using)	Positive	During treatment	Patients who attended at least 1 family counselling session had better results for those under the significant other (SO) than those in the contingency management (CM) group with regards to retention, compliance and drug use outcomes.
Catalano et al., 1997	Family - child (cohabiting)	Positive	During treatment	Parents in the experimental group (standard methadone treatment + supplemental parenting program) who had lower levels of opiate use than subject in standard methadone treatment group.
Catalano et al., 1999	Family - child (cohabiting)	Positive	During and Post-treatment	Parents in experimental group who did a parent skills training and home-based case management to reduce parents' risk for relapse had lower levels of opiate use than control subjects.
Cerovecki et al., 2013	Family	Negative (unstable relationship/lack of support)	Pre-treatment	Increased fatal outcome for patients with more unstable relationships and loss of continuity of care.
Davila Torres, 2011	Family (cohabiting) Partner (cohabiting)	Positive	Pre-treatment	Successful treatment completion associated with living in stable housing and higher perceived physician/nurse support.
Day et al., 2013	Family Partner Peer	Positive Negative (network drug use)	During treatment	Social contacts who use heroin was higher amongst patients who had used heroin in the past month, no significant effect of social contacts who supported treatment.
Day et al., 2018	Family - parents, siblings, children Partner Peer	Positive Negative (network drug use)	During and Post-treatment	No significant differences were found between the 3 intervention arms in primary or secondary outcome measures: treatment as usual (TAU, Brief Social Behavior and Network Therapy (BSBNT) ± TAU or Personal Goal Setting (PGS) ± TAU).
Fals-Stewart et al., 2001	Partner (cohabiting, non-using)	Positive	Pre- and During treatment	Patients who received BCT reported greater reductions in drug use severity and family and social problems from baseline to post treatment than patients receiving standard MM treatment.
Fals-Stewart and O'Farrell, 2003	Family (cohabiting, non-using) Partner (cohabiting, non-using)	Negative (unstable relationship/lack of support)	Pre- During and Post-treatment	Male opioid-dependents who completed BFC with non-using family member produced better outcomes than individual therapy during treatment.

Table 2: Network and Timeline Characteristics (continued)

Author, date	Form of social network support	Network tie type	Point in treatment	Conclusions
Feng et al., 2018	Family (drug-using) Partner (drug-using)	Positive Negative (unstable relationship/lack of support AND network drug use)	Pre-treatment	Higher heroin use concurrent with treatment for patients with family members with history of heroin use. Those with family conflicts were more likely to use, while those with family who totally supported them on treatment were less likely to use.
Goehl et al., 1993	Family (non-using and drug-using) Partner (non-using and drug-using) Peer (non-using and drug-using)	Positive Negative (network drug use)	Pre-treatment	Social support was correlated with positive affect, and stress with negative affect but no measures of social support, affect, or stress correlated with the proportion of drug positive urines. However, patients with at least one drug user among the closest significant others had more positive urines than those without a drug-using significant other.
Gogineni et al., 2001	Family (drug-using) Partner (cohabiting, drug-using) Peer (drug-using)	Positive Negative (network drug use)	During treatment	Patients with substance-using live-in partners or drug-using social relationships had higher drug use, while those with emotional support had lower.
Grey et al., 1986	Family Partner	Positive	Pre-treatment	Drug abuse was correlated significantly with perceived family support.
Griffith et al., 1998	Family Partner Peer (drug-using)	Positive Negative (unstable relationship/lack of support AND network drug use)	Pre-treatment	A history of poor family relations was related to perceived family dysfunction and peer deviance at treatment entry; these 2 factors in turn predicted poor psychosocial functioning, which was related to higher levels of motivation. Higher motivation was associated with greater treatment engagement, which was associated with reduced opioid use and criminality.
Gu et al., 2013	Family - parents, siblings, other significant others Partner	Positive	During treatment	Patients who received a combination of psycho-social intervention with the standard of-care (SOC) MMT service as compared to that of the SOC MMT service alone showed lower likelihood of attrition.
Gu et al., 2014	Family Peer (drug-using)	Negative (unstable relationship/lack of support AND network drug use)	During treatment	Increased nonattendance at MMT clinics for patients with interpersonal conflicts with family, financial difficulty and with worry about police arrest.
Heinz et al., 2009	Partner (cohabiting)	Positive	Pre-treatment	Reduced cocaine and heroin use for married participants who reported a close relationship with one's partner.
Hikmayani et al., 2012	Family Partner	Positive	Pre-treatment	Low retention significantly associated with absence of family support.
Hoang et al., 2015	Family Partner	Negative (unstable relationship/lack of support)	Pre- and During treatment	Increased continued use of heroin after MMT with likelihood of family conflict.

Table 2: Network and Timeline Characteristics (continued)

Author, date	Form of social network support	Network tie type	Point in treatment	Conclusions
Hoang et al., 2018	Family Partner	Positive	Pre- and During treatment	Increased odds of concurrent heroin use during treatment for patients with no emotional support from family or financial stability.
Hojjat et al., 2017	Partner (cohabiting)	Positive	During treatment	Harm reduction education in families of patients undergoing MMT can be effective on their marital satisfaction and treatment retention.
Kidorf, 2018	Family - parents, siblings, children (non-using) Partner (non-using) Peer (non-using)	Positive	During treatment	Patients with drug-free community support benefited from it clinically.
Lee et al., 2015	Family Partner	Positive Negative (unstable relationship/lack of support)	Pre-treatment	Increased expressed emotion between family members and patients is linked to retention.
Li et al., 2012	Family (drug-using) Partner (drug-using) Peer (drug-using)	Negative (network drug use)	During treatment	Maintenance clients with substance users in their social network increase the chance of concurrent heroin use.
Lin et al., 2011	Family	Positive	During treatment	Perceived family support associated with improved health and negatively correlated with concurrent substance abuse.
Lin et al., 2013	Family Partner	Positive	Pre- and During treatment	Perceived higher family support predicted a lower risk of MMT dropout.
Lister et al., 2017	Family - parents, siblings (drug-using) Partner (drug-using)	Negative (network drug use)	Pre-treatment	Close family member substance abuse associated with worse short- and long-term outcomes.
Lundgren et al., 2007	Family - children (cohabiting)	Positive	Pre-treatment	Patients who resided with children, were younger and had no public health insurance were more likely to stay in MMT for 6 months or less.
Mutasa, 2001	Family Partner Peer (drug-using)	Positive Negative (unstable relationship/lack of support AND network drug use)	Pre-treatment	Medication noncompliance was associated with social company availability, family-related conflicts and peer association.
Nguyen et al., 2017	Family Partner	Positive	During treatment	Patients who were reminded by family members by mobile phone to adhere to treatment were more likely to do so.
Roozen et al., 2003	Family Partner (cohabiting) Peer	Positive	During treatment	Patients who received a combination of naltrexone and CRA (community reinforced approach) had better outcomes than those with traditional treatment.

Table 2: Network and Timeline Characteristics (continued)

Author, date	Form of social network support	Network tie type	Point in treatment	Conclusions
Rothenberg et al., 2002	Partner	Positive	During treatment	Poorer outcomes for patients who used methadone regularly at baseline than heroin only.
Sarasvita et al., 2012	Family Partner Peer	Positive	Pre-treatment	Patients with family support and with less peer support were less likely to drop out.
Shen et al., 2018	Family - parents, children, other Partner Peer (non-using and drug-using)	Positive Negative (network drug use)	During treatment	Patients with a spouse, child or who had a close family member were less likely to have positive urine tests for heroin.
Skinner et al., 2011	Family Partner Peer (drug-using)	Positive Negative (unstable relationship/lack of support AND network drug use)	Post-treatment	Association with drug-using friends was related to continued drug abuse.
Smith, 2002	Family Partner Peer	Positive	Pre-treatment	Length of time in treatment was not predicted by social support, but interaction of perceived social support and orientation towards social support predict therapeutic alliance and adherence.
Tang, 2016	Family Partner Peer	Positive	Pre-treatment	Patients were more likely to engage in sexual activity, have stronger family relationships, and experience improved health status post-treatment.
Torrens et al., 1996	Family Partner	Positive	Pre-treatment	Patients living with family or stable partners had higher rates of retention.
Tran et al., 2018	Family Partner Peer	Positive Negative (unstable relationship/lack of support)	During treatment	Low rate of MMT non-adherence associated with job stability, engagement in self-care, and active participation of partners, family and friends in the treatment process.
Wasserman et al., 2001	Family Partner Peer (non-using and drug-using)	Positive Negative (network drug use)	During treatment	Having social networks with less drug users (abstinence specific structural support) correlated with reduced drug use and demoralization for cocaine abstinence but not opiate abstinence. There was no effect for general support.
Yandoli et al., 2002	Family Partner	Positive	During treatment	Family therapy produced significantly more drug-free subjects than standard treatment at six months and at twelve months.
Yang et al., 2013	Family Partner	Positive Negative (unstable relationship/lack of support)	Pre-treatment	Protective factors for MMT retention were: strong relationships with family, living on support of family or friends and not communicating with former drug taking peers in the past month.

Table 2: Network and Timeline Characteristics (continued)

Author, date	Form of social network support	Network tie type	Point in treatment	Conclusions
Zhou et al., 2017 (1)	Family Partnee Peer	Positive	Pre-treatment	Patients with poor social support are more likely to terminate treatment.
Zhou et al., 2017 (2)	Family (cohabiting) Partner (cohabiting) Peer (drug-using)	Positive Negative (network drug use)	Pre-treatment	Patients who had no contact with peer drug users had a lower dropout risk.
Zhu et al., 2018	Family Partner Peer	Positive	Post-treatment	Long-term abstinence was positively associated with greater social support.

Abbreviations: BMT - Buprenorphine maintenance treatment, CM - Contingency management, LAAM - Levo-alpha-acetylmethadol harm reduction, MMT - Methadone maintenance treatment, RCT - Randomized controlled trial

Table 3: Quality of Experimental Studies

Study	Sequence generation adequate	Allocation concealment	Baseline data/selection bias	Incomplete outcome data adequately addressed	Intent-to-treat analysis	Other limitations discussed by authors	Possible impact of bias on treatment
Carroll et al., 2001	Yes: urn randomization program	Unclear	No	Unclear: high attrition after detoxification	Yes	Retrospective study. Those that dropped out prior to randomization more likely to be women.	Unclear
Catalano et al., 1997	Yes: block randomization	Unclear	Yes, no randomization	No: missing data mentioned, but method of addressing omitted	Yes	Results produced at post-test only show immediate effects after intervention, not overall efficacy. Bias from sole examination of parent differences post-test. Does not study molecular processes of family change that produce observed findings.	Unclear
Catalano et al., 1999	Yes: block randomization	Unclear	Yes, no randomization	Unclear	Unclear	Retrospective study. Follow-up data unavailable. Generalizability depends on the skills of NCM caring for patients.	Unclear
Day et al., 2018	Yes: independent randomization algorithm	None: Open trial	Yes, no randomization	Yes: high attrition in experimental group addressed with high recruitment in experimental group	Yes	Organizational barriers. Discontinuity in staff delivering treatment. Inadequate recruitment for outcome measurement.	Unclear
Fals-Stewart and O'Farrell, 2003	Unclear	Unclear	Yes, no randomization	Yes: multiple imputation	No	Naltrexone pharmacotherapy intervention not fully standardized or manually driven. Complacence measured by self-reports. Key secondary outcomes (family relationship function and HIV-risk) behaviors not measured. Poor generalizability due to study sample characteristics and low rate of study participation.	Exaggerate

Table 3: Quality of Experimental Studies (continued)

Study	Sequence generation adequate	Allocation concealment	Baseline data/selection bias	Incomplete outcome data adequately addressed	Intent-to-treat analysis	Other limitations discussed by authors	Possible impact of bias on treatment
Fals-Stewart et al., 2001	Unclear	Unclear	Yes, no randomization	No: 5 participants who did not complete treatment were excluded	No	Small sample size. Recall bias from strategy used for scheduling interviews with patients. Underreporting due to stigma and impact of opioid dependence. Bias from retrospective data collection, lack of blinding and the use of proxy informants.	Unclear
Gu et al., 2013	Yes: block randomization	Adequate: Central allocation	Yes, no randomization	Unclear: attrition from MMT service was primary outcome	No	Small sample size. Sample overrepresented males. Assessment of family interaction processes limited by self-reporting measures.	Unclear
Hojjat et al., 2017	Yes: computerized random numbers	Unclear	Yes, no randomization	Unclear: no missing data reported	No	Patients in cohort experiments other interventions not captured by study.	Unclear
Kidorf, 2018	Unclear	Unclear	Yes, no randomization	Unclear	No	Self-selection into treatment group	Unclear
Roozen et al., 2003	No randomization	None: No randomization	Yes, no randomization	Unclear	No	Not indicated	Unclear
Rothenberg et al., 2002	No randomization	None: No randomization	Yes, no randomization	No: participants who failed to complete treatment were removed from the trial	No	Inadequate accounting for potential change in family and peer relations as a result of treatment participation.	Unclear
Yandoli et al., 2002	Unclear	Adequate: Central allocation	Yes, no randomization	No: follow-up groups not comparable; high attrition at second follow up leading to differences between treatment groups.	Yes	Temporal ambiguity due to cross-sectional design. Recall bias and social desirability bias due to self-reporting. Underreporting of heroin use as the urine morphine test could only detect use in the past seven days rather than the 30 day period of self-reporting. Poor generalizability as drug-using patterns and economic situations differ across other provinces.	Exaggerate

Table 4: Quality of Observational Studies

Study	Methodology explained	Inclusion/ exclusion criteria described	Variables defined	Number of individuals at each state reported/descriptive data	Main results clearly presented	Limitations/bias discussed by authors
Anton et al., 1981	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not a randomized study due to unavailability or unwillingness of patients to participate. Poor generalizability due to small proportion of addicts with families willing to participate in therapy sessions.
Cerovecki et al., 2013	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sample size of deceased group too small to determine association between mortality risk and other factors. Recall bias from interview scheduling. Underreporting due to the stigma of opioid dependence. Bias from retrospective data collection, lack of blinding and the use of proxy informants.
Davila Torres, 2011	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor generalizability due to old age of study sample.
Day et al., 2013	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cross-sectional study design obscures causal inferences between network support factors and continuing drug use. Poor generalizability due to the exclusion of social support, environment and developmental upbringing.
Feng et al., 2018	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Baseline limited to making causal inferences due to RCT source. Bias from self-reporting. Weak measure of family members' support on MMT from a single-item question.
Goehl et al., 1993	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sample excluded depressed and anxious patients
Gogineni et al., 2001	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not randomized. Results not confirmed by toxicology Cross-sectional study design obscures causal inference between continued injection and social relationships. Measured of important constructs based on single survey questions with limited response formats.
Grey et al., 1986	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Small sample size without cross-validation.
Griffith et al., 1998	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear.
Gu et al., 2014	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Reporting bias from self-reporting. Failure to study all episodes of attendance and non-attendance. Inadequate recording of non-attendance period. Limited generalizability because participants were recruited from two MMT clinics from one city.

Table 4: Quality of Observational Studies (continued)

Study	Methodology explained	Inclusion/ exclusion criteria described	Variables defined	Number of individuals at each state reported/descriptive data	Main results clearly presented	Limitations/bias discussed by authors
Heinz et al., 2009	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Reliance on one dichotomous measure as a proxy for relationship closeness. Lack of information on partner substance use. High selective attrition leading to more unhappily married individuals dropping out of treatment. Insufficient sample of married individuals for outcome comparison. Bias in lack of differentiation between single participants without a significant other and with a significant other but without a close and personal relationship.
Hikmayani et al., 2012	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Unclear
Hoang et al., 2015	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor generalizability due to selection bias in sample for wealthier, more motivated individuals with more stable families. Sample disproportionately male Bias from loss to follow-up.
Hoang et al., 2018	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unverified information obtained from MMT clinical records. Overestimation of concurrent heroin use due to high level of missing data. Biased from loss of patients to follow-up. Missing data limit analysis on association between psychiatric comorbidities and concurrent heroin use.
Lee et al., 2015	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Temporal ambiguity from cross-sectional study design. Recall bias and social-desirability due to self-reporting. Inconsistency in drug use assessment tools affected verification of status. Self-reporting for the past 30 days and urine test (limited to past 7 days) gave inconsistent assessments. Poor generalizability because of specific geographic focus of study.
Li et al., 2012	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Temporal ambiguity from cross-sectional study design. Inconsistency in drug use assessment tools affected verification of status. Self-reporting for the past 30 days and urine test (limited to past 7 days) gave inconsistent assessments. Results subject to self-reporting bias, recall bias, and social-desirability bias.
Lin et al., 2011	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cross-sectional study design limited causal inferences. Poor generalizability due to modesty of drug use in study sites.
Lin et al., 2013	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Poor generalizability due to specificity of study group.

Table 4: Quality of Observational Studies (continued)

Study	Methodology explained	Inclusion/ exclusion criteria described	Variables defined	Number of individuals at each state reported/descriptive data	Main results clearly presented	Limitations/bias discussed by authors
Lister et al., 2017	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unstandardised questionnaires used to assess baseline psychosocial risk factors. Context of close family member substance abuse history not assessed.
Lundgren et al., 2007	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor generalizability due to expansive insurance coverage and treatment programs of study location.
Mutasa, 2001	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Statistical short-fall due to small sample numbers.
Nguyen et al., 2017	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Recall bias due to self-reporting. Poor generalizability as sampling method was limited to mountainous settings. Cross-sectional design obscured causal relations between MMT adherence and determinants.
Sarasvita et al., 2012	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Invalid predictors of retention for longer studies due to six-month observation period.
Shen et al., 2018	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Cross-sectional study design hinders causal inference. Social desirability and recall biases due to self-reporting. Underestimation of heroin use prevalence due to the 7-day detection limit of urine tests. Unrobust measure of social network functionality function due to assessment form a single question. Poor generalizability of the study due to location.
Skinner et al., 2011	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Limited external validity for drug users who do not enter methadone treatment.
Smith, 2002	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor generalizability due to homogeneity of sample (same gender and shared military history). Fully male sample. Limited follow-up interviews due to compromised power to detect significant findings.
Tang, 2016	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Social desirability bias through under-reporting drug use and availability of comprehensive psychological counseling to MMT clients. Poor generalizability due to study location.
Torrens et al., 1996	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Retention rate in Spain influenced by long-term methadone policy. Poor generalizability of study to countries with greater experience with methadone maintenance.

Table 4: Quality of Observational Studies (continued)

Study	Methodology explained	Inclusion/ exclusion criteria described	Variables defined	Number of individuals at each state reported/descriptive data	Main results clearly presented	Limitations/bias discussed by authors
Tran et al., 2018	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Cross-sectional design obscured causal associations between adherence and its determinants. Recall bias from self-reporting. Sample size too small due to convenience sampling. Poor accuracy of medication adherence measurement due to self-reporting.
Wasserman et al., 2001	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Short follow-up period limited detection of independent effects. Single instrument used to measure social support. Undercounting of social network participants due to restriction to household members only. Study cannot make causal inferences about social support and abstinence.
Yang et al., 2013	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor generalizability due to limited geographic location of study participants.
Zhou et al., 2017 (1)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Limitations include incomplete baseline information (no psychological status variables), patients in two-year follow-up were not new admits (influence of perceived social support on retention may be confounded), and concerns of generalizability due to clinics being in Xi'an.
Zhou et al., 2017 (2)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Selection bias from exclusion of incomplete patient records. Poor generalizability due to limited geographic location of study participants.
Zhu et al., 2018	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Recall bias due to self-reporting opioid use. Potential correlates associated with opioid abstinence not measured.Statistical significance of difference between abstinent and non-abstinent groups needs to be further ascertained.

Table 5: Synthesis

Study	Study type	Statistical significance of outcome at p<.05	Form of social network support	Point in treatment timeline that social network is assessed	MOUD drug used	Intervention (if any)
Anton et al., 1981	Observational	Statistically significant	Family - parents, siblings Partner	During treatment	Naltrexone	Multiple family therapy (no randomization, self-elected) Standard: naltrexone + individual counseling
Carroll et al., 2000	Experimental	No effect	Family - parent, child, or sibling (non-using) Partner (non-using) Peer (non-using)	During treatment	Naltrexone	Significant other involvement + Contingency management + standard treatment Contingency management + standard treatment Standard: Naltrexone + treatment Cognitive Behavioral Therapy in group setting
Catalano et al., 1997	Experimental	Statistically significant	Family - child (cohabiting)	During and Post-treatment	Methadone	Family counseling (Focus on Families intervention: parent skills training and home-based case management service) Standard: not specified
Catalano et al., 1999	Experimental	Statistically significant	Family - child (cohabiting)	During treatment	Methadone	Family counseling (Focus on Families intervention: parent skills training and home-based case management service) Standard: not specified
Cerovecki et al., 2013	Observational	Statistically significant	Family	Pre-treatment	Methadone	Standard: not specified
Davila Torres, 2011	Observational	Statistically significant	Family (cohabiting) Partner (cohabiting)	Pre-treatment	Methadone	Standard: MMT
Day et al., 2013	Observational	Statistically significant [Positive (family, partner, peer)] Statistically significant [Negative (family, partner, peer)]	Family Partner Peer	During treatment	Methadone or buprenorphine	Standard: not specified

Table 5: Synthesis (continued)

Study	Study type	Statistical significance of outcome at p<.05	Form of social network support	Point in treatment timeline that social network is assessed	MOUD drug used	Intervention (if any)
Day et al., 2018	Experimental	No effect [Positive (family, partner, peer)] No effect [Negative (family, partner, peer)]	Family - parents, siblings, children Partner Peer	During and Post-treatment	Methadone or buprenorphine	Standard + Brief Social Behavior and Network Therapy (B-SBNT) Standard + Personal Goal Setting (PSG) Standard: individual case management
Fals-Stewart et al., 2001	Experimental	Statistically significant	Partner (cohabiting, non-using)	Pre- and During treatment	Methadone	Behavioral Couples Therapy + standard treatment Standard: MMT + individual counseling
Fals-Stewart and O'Farrell, 2003	Experimental	Statistically significant	Family (cohabiting, non-using) Partner (cohabiting, non-using)	Pre-, During and Post-treatment	Naltrexone	Behavioral family counseling + standard treatment Standard: individual based therapy (individual counseling, group counseling)
Feng et al., 2018	Observational	Statistically significant [Positive (family, partner)] Statistically significant [Negative (family, partner)]	Family (drug-using) Partner (drug-using)	Pre-treatment	Methadone	Standard: MMT
Goehl et al., 1993	Observational	No effect [Positive (family, partner, peer)] Statistically significant [Negative (family, partner, peer)]	Family (non-using and drug-using) Partner (non-using and drug-using) Peer (non-using and drug-using)	Pre-treatment	Methadone	Standard : MMT
Gogineni et al., 2000	Observational	Statistically significant	Family (drug-using) Partner (cohabiting, drug-using) Peer (drug-using)	During treatment	Methadone	Standard: not specified
Grey et al., 1986	Observational	Statistically significant	Family Partner	Pre-treatment	Methadone or naltrexone	Standard: not specified

Table 5: Synthesis (continued)

Study	Study type	Statistical significance of outcome at p<.05	Form of social network support	Point in treatment timeline that social network is assessed	MOUD drug used	Intervention (if any)
Griffith et al., 1998	Observational	Statistically significant [Positive (family, partner)] Statistically significant [Negative (family, peer)]	Family Partner Peer (drug-using)	Pre- treatment	Methadone	Standard: MMT with individual and group counseling
Gu et al., 2013	Experimental	Statistically significant	Family - parents, siblings Partner	During treatment	Methadone	Behavioral maintenance therapy + standard treatment Standard: MMT (no counseling)
Gu et al., 2014	Observational	Statistically significant	Family Peer (drug-using)	During treatment	Methadone	Standard: not specified
Heinz et al., 2009	Observational	Statistically significant	Partner (cohabiting)	Pre-treatment	Methadone	Standard: MMT + contingency management + individual counseling
Hikmayani et al., 2012	Observational	Statistically significant	Family Partner	Pre-treatment	Methadone	Standard: MMT
Hoang et al., 2015	Observational	Statistically significant	Family Partner	Pre- and During treatment	Methadone	Standard: not specified
Hoang et al., 2018	Observational	Statistically significant	Family Partner	Pre- and During treatment	Methadone	Standard: not specified
Hojjat et al., 2016	Experimental	No effect	Partner (cohabiting)	During treatment	Methadone	Standard + Group training Standard: MMT
Kidorf, 2018	Experimental	Statistically significant	Family - parents, siblings, children (non-using) Partner (non-using) Peer (non-using)	During treatment	Methadone	Social network activation group therapy + standard treatment Standard: MMT + individual and group counselling + community activity (mutual peer-support groups or church)
Lee et al., 2015	Observational	No effect [Positive (family, partner)] Statistically significant [Negative (family, partner)]	Family Partner	Pre-treatment	Methadone	Standard: MMT

Table 5: Synthesis (continued)

Study	Study type	Statistical significance of outcome at p<.05	Form of social network support	Point in treatment timeline that social network is assessed	MOUD drug used	Intervention (if any)
Li et al., 2012	Observational	Statistically significant	Family (drug-using) Partner (drug-using) Peer (drug-using)	During treatment	Methadone	Standard: MMT
Lin et al., 2011	Observational	No effect	Family	During treatment	Methadone	Standard: MMT
Lin et al., 2013	Observational	No effect	Family Partner	Pre- and During treatment	Methadone	Standard: MMT
Lister et al., 2017	Observational	Statistically significant	Family - parents, siblings (drug-using) Partner (drug-using)	Pre-treatment	Methadone	Standard: MMT
Lundgren et al., 2007	Observational	No effect	Family - children (cohabiting)	Pre-treatment	Methadone	Standard: MMT
Mutasa, 2001	Observational	No effect [Positive (family, partner, peer)] Statistically significant [Negative (family, partner, peer)]	Family Partner Peer (drug-using)	Pre-treatment	Methadone	Standard: MMT
Nguyen et al., 2017	Observational	Statistically significant	Family Partner	During treatment	Methadone	Standard: not specified
Roozen et al., 2003	Experimental	Statistically significant	Family Partner (cohabiting) Peer	During treatment	Methadone or naltrexone	Naltrexone + CRA (with social network emphasis) Standard: MMT
Rothenberg et al., 2002	Experimental	Statistically significant	Partner	During treatment	Naltrexone	Standard: Behavioral Naltrexone Therapy (naltrexone + network therapy + CRA)
Sarasvita et al., 2012	Observational	Statistically significant	Family Partner Peer	Pre-treatment	Methadone	Standard: MMT
Shen et al., 2018	Observational	Statistically significant [Positive (family, partner, peer)] Statistically significant [Negative (family, partner, peer)]	Family - parents, children, other Partner Peer (non-using and drug-using)	During treatment	Methadone	Standard: MMT

Table 5: Synthesis (continued)

Study	Study type	Statistical significance of outcome at p<.05	Form of social network support	Point in treatment timeline that social network is assessed	MOUD drug used	Intervention (if any)
Skinner et al., 2011	Observational	No effect [Positive (family, partner)] Statistically significant [Negative (partner, peer)]	Family Partner Peer (drug-using)	Post-treatment	Methadone	Standard: not specified (10 year follow up to original Focus on Families study, which included parent counseling and home-based case management for parents with OUD)
Smith, 2002	Observational	Statistically significant	Family Partner Peer	Pre-treatment	Methadone	Standard: MMT
Tang, 2016	Observational	Statistically significant	Family Partner Peer	Pre-treatment	Methadone	Standard: MMT
Torrens et al., 1996	Observational	Statistically significant	Family Partner	Pre-treatment	Methadone	Standard: MMT
Tran et al., 2018	Observational	Statistically significant [Positive (peer)] Statistically significant [Negative (partner)]	Family Partner Peer	During treatment	Methadone	Standard: MMT
Wasserman et al., 2000	Observational	No effect [Positive (family, partner, peer)] No effect [Negative (family, partner, peer)]	Family Partner Peer (non-using and drug-using)	During treatment	Methadone or LAAM	Standard: MMT/LAAMMT
Yandoli et al., 2002	Experimental	Statistically significant	Family Partner	During treatment	Methadone	Supportive psychotherapy + standard treatment Family therapy + standard treatment Standard: MMT (called low contact treatment)
Yang et al., 2013	Observational	Statistically significant [Positive (family, partner)] Statistically significant [Negative (family, partner, peer)]	Family Partner	Pre-treatment	Methadone	Standard: MMT
Zhou et al., 2017 (1)	Observational	Statistically significant	Family Partner Peer	Pre-treatment	Methadone	Standard: MMT

Table 5: Synthesis (continued)

Study	Study type	Statistical significance of outcome at p<.05	Form of social network support	Point in treatment timeline that social network is assessed	MOUD drug used	Intervention (if any)
Zhou et al., 2017 (2)	Observational	Statistically significant [Positive (family, partner)] Statistically significant [Negative (peer)]	Family (cohabiting) Partner (cohabiting) Peer (drug-using)	Pre-treatment	Methadone	Standard: MMT
Zhu et al., 2018	Observational	Statistically significant	Family Partner Peer	Post-treatment	Methadone or buprenorphine/naloxone	Standard: randomized to either MMT or buprenorphine/naloxone

Abbreviations: BMT - Buprenorphine maintenance treatment, CM - Contingency management, LAAM - Levo-alpha-acetylmethadol harm reduction, MMT - Methadone maintenance treatment, RCT - Randomized controlled trial

Note: Observational studies do not have randomized treatment and therefore don't have impact of bias

Note: For the Statistical significance of outcome at p<.05 column, we denoted the statistical significance of positive and negative ties if such information was provided (see Table 2)