medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.21.22273594; this version posted April 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

ADDICTION SSA SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF ADDICTION

DBS for substance use disorders? An exploratory qualitative study of perspectives of people currently in treatment

Journal:	*Addiction*
Manuscript ID	Draft
Manuscript Type:	Research Report
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Versalovic, Erika; University of Washington, Philosophy Klein, Eran; Oregon Health & Science University School of Medicine, Department of Neurology; University of Washington, Department of Philosophy Goering, Sara; University of Washington, Philosophy Department Ngo, Quyen; Hazelden Betty Ford Foundation, Butler Center for Research Gliske, Kate; Hazelden Betty Ford Foundation, Butler Center for Research Boulicault, Marion; Massachusetts Institute of Technology, College of Computing Specker Sullivan, Laura; Fordham University, Department of Philosophy Thomas, Mark; University of Minnesota System, Medical Discovery Team on Addiction; University of Minnesota System, Department of Psychiatry & Behavioral Sciences Widge, Alik; University of Minnesota System, Medical Discovery Team on Addiction; University of Minnesota System, Department of Psychiatry & Behavioral Sciences
SUBSTANCE:	multisubstance
METHOD:	qualitative research
FIELD OF STUDY:	social sciences
Keywords:	deep brain stimulation, DBS, substance use disorder, SUD, qualitative, neural technology, neuroethics

SCHOLARONE™ Manuscripts

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.21.22273594; this version posted April 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

TITLE PAGE

DBS for substance use disorders? An exploratory qualitative study of perspectives of people currently in treatment

Erika Versalovic[1,2], Eran Klein[1,2,3], Sara Goering[1,2], Quyen Ngo[4], Kate Gliske[4], Marion Boulicault[5], Laura Specker Sullivan[6], Mark J Thomas[7,8], Alik S Widge[8,9]

[1]Department of Philosophy, University of Washington
[2]Center for Neurotechnology, University of Washington
[3]Department of Neurology, Oregon Health & Science University School of Medicine
[4]Butler Center for Research, Hazelden Betty Ford Foundation
[5]College of Computing, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
[6]Department of Philosophy, Fordham University
[7]Department of Neuroscience, University of Minnesota
[8]Medical Discovery Team on Addiction, University of Minnesota
[9]Department of Psychiatry & Behavioral Sciences, University of Minnesota

RUNNING HEAD: Qualitative Study on DBS for SUDs

DECLARATION OF COMPETING INTEREST: ASW receives research device donations from Medtronic, which manufacturers deep brain stimulation systems. He receives consulting income from Dandelion Science. He holds multiple granted and pending patents in the general area of deep brain stimulation for psychiatric and substance use disorders, none of which are commercially licensed.

PRIMARY FUNDING: P30DA048742 (MJT), R21DA052568 (ASW, MJT), MnDRIVE Brain Conditions Initiative, and University of Minnesota Medical Discovery Team on Addiction; also NIH 1RF1MH117800-01 (SG, EK, EV)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.21.22273594; this version posted April 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

DBS for substance use disorders? An exploratory qualitative study of perspectives of people currently in treatment

Erika Versalovic[1,2], Eran Klein[1,2,3], Sara Goering[1,2], Quyen Ngo[4], Kate Gliske[4], Marion Boulicault[5], Laura Specker Sullivan[6], Mark J Thomas[7,8], Alik S Widge[8,9]

[1]Department of Philosophy, University of Washington
[2]Center for Neurotechnology, University of Washington
[3]Department of Neurology, Oregon Health & Science University School of Medicine
[4]Butler Center for Research, Hazelden Betty Ford Foundation
[5]College of Computing, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
[6]Department of Philosophy, Fordham University
[7]Department of Neuroscience, University of Minnesota
[8]Medical Discovery Team on Addiction, University of Minnesota
[9]Department of Psychiatry & Behavioral Sciences, University of Minnesota

ABSTRACT:

Background and Aims: Deep brain stimulation (DBS) has shown promise as a treatment option for substance use disorders (SUDs), but may have unique ethical risks due to stigma and other factors. Previous studies have elicited researcher and clinician opinions on those risks, but none have studied perspectives of people living with SUDs.

Methods: Participants were recruited through a national inpatient treatment network employing purposive sampling for representation of minoritized groups and diversity of substances. Participants viewed a short video introducing DBS, followed by a 1.5 hour semi-structured interview on their experiences with SUDs and their perspectives on DBS as a future treatment option. Interviews were analyzed by multiple coders who iteratively identified salient themes.

Results: We interviewed 20 people in 12-step based, inpatient treatment programs (10 [50%] white/Caucasian, 7 Black/African American [35%], 2 Asian [10%], 1 Hispanic/Latino [5%], and 1 [5%] Alaska Native/American Indian; 11 [45%] women). Interviewees described a variety of barriers they currently faced through the course of their disease that mirrored barriers often associated with DBS (stigma, invasiveness, maintenance burdens, privacy risks). The majority of respondents expressed interest in DBS as a future treatment option, emphasizing the importance of exploring novel treatment options and keeping individual treatment goals as key guiding considerations.

Conclusions: The perspectives of people with lived experience of SUDs contrasted with previous surveys of provider attitudes on DBS for SUDs. Individuals with SUDs gave relatively less weight to surgical risks and clinical burdens associated with DBS. These differences derived largely from their experiences living with an often-fatal disease, encountering limitations of current treatment options, and their familiarity with 12-step treatment paradigms that prioritize having multiple therapeutic "tools." These findings support the study of DBS as a treatment option for SUDs, with extensive input from people with SUDs and advocates.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.21.22273594; this version posted April 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

KEYWORDS (6-10): deep brain stimulation/DBS, substance use disorders/SUD, qualitative, neural technology, neuroethics

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.21.22273594; this version posted April 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

INTRODUCTION

Deep brain stimulation (DBS) is a rapidly expanding treatment option for a wide range of conditions, including Parkinson's disease, essential tremor, dystonia, obsessive-compulsive disorder, and epilepsy. Conflicting randomized controlled trial evidence suggests possible efficacy in depression (Sullivan et al. 2021). Given this relative success, DBS has been proposed as a treatment for a wide range of other conditions, including anorexia, schizophrenia, and substance use disorders (SUDs) (Wang et al. 2018). Case reports of experimental DBS in SUDs have reported notable improvements (Qu et al. 2019; Gonçalves-Ferreira et al. 2016; Muller et al. 2013), but these have largely been small samples without the resources for strong methodological rigor. Further, that enthusiasm has been tempered by concerns from researchers and bioethicists that it may be difficult to study DBS for those disorders without coercion (Pisapia et al. 2017). SUDs in particular are socially stigmatized and often criminalized, increasing the risk of people being pressured to pursue treatments to avoid prosecution. It is also unclear whether individuals would accept a physically invasive neurosurgical intervention for SUDs. Past research has argued that SUDs are fundamentally less disabling or dangerous than other DBS indications (Ali et al. 2016; Lee et al. 2016).

That cautious position may not adequately reflect the widespread and severe nature of SUDs, and the limitations of current treatment (Mojtabai et al. 2019, Substance Abuse and Mental Health 2020). While inpatient treatment can help people with SUDs achieve initial abstinence, the rate of relapse is high (Andersson et al. 2019; Gil-Rivas et al. 2009). Agonist therapies are primarily indicated for opioid use disorders, and are often difficult to access. In the context of limited alternatives, DBS may be more attractive to people living with SUDs than researchers imagine. Indeed, research target population preferences may differ significantly from researcher or clinician perspectives (e.g. Anderson 2004). Consultation with potential or actual device users can reveal novel considerations about neurotechnology development that can help guide future research (Goering & Klein 2020; Collinger et al. 2013).

Here, we report a qualitative study that explored the values, interests and concerns of people with SUDs in relation to the prospect of DBS as a treatment option. We interviewed people in treatment centers in the early abstinence phase of their SUDs, asking about participants' experiences with their disorder and treatment, and their perspectives on DBS across five themes: personal agency, social dynamics, stigma, privacy, and interactions with the healthcare system. These aspects reveal how some common concerns surrounding DBS (e.g., invasiveness and maintenance burdens) compare to the burdens already experienced through the course of SUDs and their treatment. Considering them in tandem, along with the desperation participants expressed for additional treatment tools, suggests that patients are largely interested in further research into DBS and related therapies.

METHODS

We conducted 20 semi-structured interviews with people in residential treatment for substance use disorders. Interview guides were developed collaboratively through a series of discussions among all authors, building on previous work related to neurotechnologies (Versalovic et al. 2020, Goering et al. 2017, Klein et al. 2016) and with attention to the particular circumstances of people in treatment for SUDs. Purposive sampling methods were used for representation of a range of substances, and of racial groups often excluded from medical device research (Fox-Rawlings et al.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.21.22273594; this version posted April 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

2018). Participants were recruited through the [anonymized for review] treatment system in California and Minnesota. The study was reviewed by the [anonymized for review] (STUDY00009975) and [anonymized for review].

Participants were initially asked about their personal experiences with addiction and treatment. They were then shown a five-minute video introducing deep brain stimulation (DBS) and its potential as a treatment for substance use disorders (see supplemental materials). The interview guide (see supplemental materials) was structured around common ethical and social concerns that have arisen in the application of DBS to mental health disorders to explore their saliency within this particular potential user population. These themes included agency (ex: how could you imagine a DBS enhancing or undermining a user's sense of agency?), social relationships (ex: would you involve loved ones in the process of getting a DBS?), stigma (ex: how could possible stigma of a neural device interact with stigma surrounding SUDs?), privacy (ex: who should have access to neural data?), and interactions with the healthcare system (ex: what kind of support is needed for follow-up appointments?). At the end of the interview, participants were asked if DBS would be something they personally might consider if it became available, who they identified as the most appropriate target users, the value of gathering end- or target-user perspectives, and whether they wished to add to or amend any of their responses.

Interviews were conducted and recorded through HIPAA-compliant Zoom by EK and EV and lasted 1.5 hours on average. Demographic surveys were administered online after the interview. Participants were compensated $25 through a gift card. Interviews were transcribed using an online transcription service, and anonymized and cleaned by EV. SG, EK, and EV read the interviews and conducted thematic content analysis. The first 12 transcripts were each independently, inductively coded on atlas.ti, followed by extensive discussions to reconcile code differences to arrive at the final coding scheme. The final 8 were primarily coded by EV, and reviewed by EK and SG to check for discrepancies. To ensure continued sensitivity to the lived experience of SUDs and the treatment process, we used a team-based approach (Giesen and Roeser 2020) with monthly meetings of the full authorial team, including our SUDs subject matter experts, to check in, discuss any difficulties, and make collaborative decisions about the research process (e.g., timeline, determining coding schemes, broadening recruitment, etc.). Data were collected from September 2020 to May 2021 and analyzed from May 2021 to December 2021. Methods reported here are in line with the COREQ (Tong et al. 2007) and RATS (Clark 2003) checklists (Neale & West 2015).

RESULTS

Demographics

Participant demographics (gender, race/ethnicity, age, education levels, etc.) are provided in Table 1. Specifics regarding primary substance, prior treatment, co-occurring disorders, and family history are in Table 2. Of particular note, there was nearly equal representation of female and male participants (11:9 respectively). Ten of the 20 participants were white, with seven identifying as Black/African American, two as Asian, one as American Indian/Alaska Native, and one as Hispanic/Latino. There was a spread across ages 25-64 and in education level from some high school to completion of a graduate degree. Participants had backgrounds in a wide range of substances: alcohol being the most prominent (90%), with just under a third identifying marajuana

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.21.22273594; this version posted April 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

(30%) and with two to three of participants identifying each of the categories of opioids, cocaine, and methamphetamines. 17 of the 20 participants had a family history of SUDs.

Findings

Initial Reaction to DBS: Unfamiliar and apprehensive, yet interested.

Most participants initially expressed unease and concern regarding the physically invasive nature of DBS. While two participants had heard of DBS before, none were familiar with how it worked or its current applications. First impressions often described DBS as 'weird' and 'scary': "wow, it's crazy, because going deep inside the brain is something that you can't really play with" (H12) and "Unlike taking an oral pill or taking a shot, it's invasive. To be honest, that's a little scary" (H14). Despite that initial unease, when prompted at the conclusion of the interview as to whether or not DBS was something they would ever personally consider, only one participant said no outright: "it reminds me of shock therapy … Oh God. I don't want something in my head" (H6).

The majority of participants expressed interest, but differed in their perceptions of when DBS would be a reasonable option. Some expressed hesitancy about the exploratory nature of research: "If there's incentive, yeah I'd do it. But this is research. So it's dangerous. I'm a little scared" (H20). Many described seeing DBS as a "last resort," but there was high variation in where people identified that threshold. Some described being open only if they had exhausted all other existing treatment options, while others said they could see themselves reaching last resort desperation with a single relapse: "if I relapse one more time then yeah, I'm all for it" (H16). Others saw themselves as early adopters: "And who to target? … Would it be me at, probably, six months ago? I would definitely raise my hand to say, 'Hey, let me jump on ship'" (H12) and "I would imagine it if it was available now and we're all good to go, I would say, "Let's do it" (H5).

Perspectives on Living with Substance Use Disorder, Treatment, and DBS

Participants described their experiences living with SUDs and in treatment, and then offered perspectives on the prospect of DBS. In this way, their prior experiences shaped the considerations they had regarding DBS. Responses were structured by the five themes from our guide -- personal agency, social relationships, stigma, privacy, and relationship with healthcare and research.

Living with a Substance Use Disorder (Table 3). A common theme revolved around addiction being difficult to overcome and, all too often, fatal. Participants felt out of control and at the mercy of their cravings. One participant likened their disorder to a "puppet master" making them do things they could not stop. Participants reported family histories of substance abuse that often involved recurrent relapse, family trauma, and death.

Participants recounted struggling with shame about ways their SUDs had harmed loved ones. They felt judged by family members and work colleagues. Nearly all had experienced stigma, e.g. SUD understood as a matter of willpower or indicative of moral failure. Most participants struggled to maintain relationships and reported isolating themselves to hide their substance use and avoid stigma. While some participants described how they were before the SUD, many claimed being an "addict" as part of their identity. They sometimes shared struggles with self-trust and concerns about manipulating others that stemmed from their understanding of the "addict" part of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.21.22273594; this version posted April 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

themselves. This "master manipulator" label may be a problematic feature of some treatment programs, but the participants themselves often used exactly this language.

In addition to the social costs of SUDs, participants described financial and emotional costs, often with negative consequences for personal and work relationships, financial resources, and self-esteem.

Perspectives on SUD Treatment (Table 4). Participants' sentiments about their treatment and prospect of recovery were often marked by uncertainty, desperation, and determination as they reflected on how much they had lost to their SUD. Some were skeptical of their own ability to recover, given that they had watched peers struggle and relapse. A common concern was uncertainty related to the unpredictability of cravings: "Honestly, I feel like, once complete treatment, if I were to have a bad enough day, I could potentially say just screw it and go get a drink and snowball back to where I was or even worse" (H19). Nearly all participants viewed SUDs as a long-term disease and recognized their recovery as potentially fragile. As one participant put it, "12 steps is lifelong. It's forever" (H20). Participants often shared lessons from their 12-step based programs: the need to rely on others, recognition that they could not maintain abstinence alone, and that even with support, they still have to "do the work" to maintain abstinence. Many also mentioned the importance of surrendering to a higher power.

Unprompted, five participants expressed concerns regarding limited treatment options for SUDs. Some had negative experiences with existing treatments (e.g., anti-craving medications with side effects). Financial costs of treatment and the difficulties of finding time in busy schedules were described as burdensome. Participants expressed openness to a variety of methods to achieve recovery, often using the metaphor of "tools in the toolbox" to describe this multi-faceted approach.

While many participants emphasized the importance of understanding and minimizing cravings as a recovery goal, even more participants named building social community and repairing relationships as key recovery aims: "It's the isolation part of it. It's crazy because you hear that the opposite of addiction isn't sobriety. The opposite of addiction is connection. It blows my mind how true that is" (H7). A majority of participants also expressed the desire to gain self-understanding and learn how to better process emotions.

Perspectives on Deep Brain Stimulation (Table 5). Participants expressed concerns regarding DBS risks such as surgical complications or DBS' limited evidence. These were often balanced against existing concerns regarding the high risks of relapse and a desire to aggressively avoid that possibility. Many participants saw overcoming cravings as the hardest obstacle to recovery and were drawn to the possibility of DBS to help quiet cravings and understand their patterns: "I am hopeful to get over these cravings eventually to regain control, to find out more about the causes of why I'm like this, kind of like putting myself out there to myself" (H13). Participants who had co-occurring disorders, some of which might also be treatable with DBS, expressed increased interest in DBS if it could simultaneously help them with their depression or OCD.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.21.22273594; this version posted April 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Some participants noted how DBS did not seem drastically different from anti-craving medications, and might even be better: "Honestly the DBS kind of sounds more concrete or reassuring than, because I can have a bad day and just say screw it and not take the pill and then succumb to my craving, whereas I can't just take that out of my head" (H19). Others found the physical invasiveness potentially off-putting. A couple participants expressed an openness to potentially using the device, but only temporarily, implying that continued reliance on it might be worrisome: "Getting all-natural is definitely the end goal, for sure, but if I need something to kickstart it, all else has failed, so I'm not opposed to it" (11).

Participants viewed the possibility of DBS stigma from others as real, but potentially less concerning than stigma for other SUD treatment. "I don't know why they would view me any differently with one of the devices or taking pills. Well, I would say the pros for this device would be, there's no bottles in my bathroom" (H5). Others thought that any stigma associated with the visibility of the device -- scarring, visible wires or battery packs -- would be counterbalanced by potential benefits: "If it's not totally obvious. I mean I've got scars everywhere. But ultimately if it is to help with my addiction, I choose my life or this device over something that's noticeable. You know, drunk [name]'s pretty noticeable" (H19).

Nearly all the participants spontaneously mentioned the idea of DBS being another tool in their recovery toolbox. They envisioned DBS as working in tandem with other recovery support systems rather than as a singularly curative intervention. Instead of worrying about the stigma of having a device, for instance, one participant recommended "Being completely upfront with people, saying like, 'This is simply just a tool as is all of these 12 steps.' If that's 12 tools that you have in the 12 steps, this is just my 13th tool that kind of gives me a little bit more help. But it's still always up to me" (H1).

Participants recognized that a neural device that records information could be viewed as giving access to others regarding the individual's private experiences, or to a kind of surveillance. Some participants jokingly referenced conspiracy theories about implanted chips and trackers, even as they acknowledged the potential value of allowing health care professionals, and sometimes family members, access to DBS data. Other participants raised concerns about sharing that information, however, even with close family members. Neural information was considered too personal, and participants were not certain they could trust others with it. Concerns regarding distrust in law enforcement led to most participants not wanting law enforcement officers ever to have access to neural data. Conversely, one participant with experience wearing an alcohol monitoring bracelet had a positive experience with the bracelet being a helpful accountability mechanism, and thought DBS data might serve a similar role.

Some participants were concerned about the financial and time burdens of anticipated DBS programming appointments. Others, however, noted that substitution therapies for SUDs already often require regular check-ins and the associated burdens of appointments, monitoring, and time off from work. Similarly, participants who worked with therapists were already used to making space in their schedules for regular appointments, and found the regular contact helpful for personal accountability and health maintenance.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.21.22273594; this version posted April 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

The importance of patient perspectives for technology development (Table 6)

Reflecting on the interviews themselves, most participants saw them as critical for informing the research process by incorporating perspectives derived from personal experience. Some participants also noted the importance of collecting a wide range of perspectives from people with SUDs, to prevent over-generalization. A different take on the value of these interviews framed them as serving an important outreach function of helping inform people with SUDs about the prospect of DBS.

DISCUSSION

Our results show that people in treatment for SUDs are open to the possibility of DBS, despite initial apprehensions regarding its physical invasiveness and novelty. This openness often arose from the difficulties and high burdens participants had faced from their SUDs, and their frustrations with the limitations of existing treatment options. In this way, participants' responses contrasted with prior studies of clinicians and researchers that advocated for more restrictive “last resort” criteria (Ali et al. 2016; Lee et al. 2016). Participants viewed SUDs as serious diseases that need better treatment options, and considered DBS risks as reasonable in the context of their previous experience.

Our five themes – personal agency, social dynamics, stigma, privacy, and interactions with the healthcare system – tracked the ways this potential user group’s experiences with their SUD and treatment shaped their thresholds of interest in DBS.

Personal agency

The language of agency is commonly used, by both people with SUDs and clinicians, to discuss SUDs and treatment programs (e.g. McCullough & Anderson 2013). Our findings underscore the salience of personal agency in the experience of addiction. They further reinforce findings, from our team and others, that a person’s interest in implantable neurotechnology is shaped by their experience of how disease and treatment options affect their agency (Versalovic & Klein 2020; Mathers et al. 2016; Maier et al. 2013). Participants shared how cravings can lead to a perceived near-total loss of agency, the paradox of needing to surrender control to regain it (e.g., 12-step based programs), and the ultimate aim of regaining agency in their lives. Though control over cravings were often cited as the most difficult barrier to recovery, aims for recovery went further. They included being able to better achieve life goals, repair relationships, and rebuild a healthier community. As a result, DBS was seen as “another tool in the toolbox” that would ideally ease the intensity of cravings but could never do the complex and expansive work recovery often requires.

Social dynamics

Caregivers and significant others play a major role in how people understand and experience SUDs and treatment (Earnshaw et al. 2019). Participants often had extensive family histories with addiction and intimate understandings of the ways both their substance use, and those of other family members, had harmed people around them. Participants’ perspectives on different family relationships were complex and varied; they typically wished to repair at least some familial relationships, often identified a need to build more intentional boundaries with certain family

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.21.22273594; this version posted April 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

members, and occasionally aimed to build a new support community entirely. As such, there was wide variation in the amount of trust participants had in family members and in what role they envisioned family playing in DBS monitoring. Trials of DBS for psychiatric disorders often expect participants to have at least one family member involved with their care and to provide support (Widge & Dougherty 2015). Our results highlight the need to treat this topic with heightened care in the SUD population. Participants often noted personal shame regarding past actions and mourned the loss of trust/faith of loved ones. Many desired to make amends in treatment. Notably, some respondents viewed DBS as a potential tool towards those amends, by "proving" their commitment to treatment to loved ones (in hopes of regaining trust).

Stigma

Stigma is a well-recognized challenge in SUDs, and is a barrier to both treatment and long-term recovery (Cernasev et al. 2021; Agterberg et al. 2020). Our results suggest that stigma and shame may be present in, but not a barrier to, DBS trials in SUDs. Some potential participants will be deterred by concerns about stigma, but others said they would be relatively comfortable even with visible external signs of treatment, for example, cranial scars. Participants expressed that certain kinds of treatment, particularly agonist medications that require regular visits to specialty clinics, were likely more stigmatizing than DBS. Addressing stigma related to neurotechnology is important (Racine & Bell 2012), and may require recognizing the complicated interplay between hopes of reducing disease-related stigma and taking on device-related stigma (Goering et al. 2021). In the current study, an added part of this interplay was a frequent sense that DBS could reduce stigma by proving to others that SUDs are biological diseases (not mere "choices" or "moral failings").

Privacy

People with SUDs experience limitations on and threats to privacy due to the degree of criminalization and stigma of SUDs (Kleinman & Morris 2021; AWHONN Position). Limitations on privacy occur, for instance, at the intersection of SUDs and the criminal justice system (e.g., drug monitoring) (Polles et al. 2021; Chang 2020). While much of the discussion of privacy in the context of novel neurotechnology, like DBS, has focused on data security (Bonaci et al. 2014), data ownership (Naufel & Klein 2020), or agency (Schönau et al. 2021), our findings suggest that privacy related to the DBS and the criminal justice system is an underappreciated concern for SUDs specifically.

Interactions with the health care system

Addiction has a complicated relationship to the health care system; there is often fragmented care, limited access to addiction specialists, and, in the United States in particular, insurance barriers. Even with efforts to understand SUD as a disease and not a personal failing, medical professionals may still be inclined to wonder why individuals do not simply stop using. SUDs exist at a nexus of failures of health care access, biased beliefs about responsibility for use, and personal blame and shame. Our participants were already in treatment, and so had surmounted the initial access to care barrier. They were used to regular followup treatment, and the likelihood of some surveillance from their providers and 12 step groups to support their sobriety. They were not intimidated by the prospect of followup treatment for DBS settings adjustment and upkeep, with oversight from

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.21.22273594; this version posted April 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

medical professionals. That said, participants' references to the histories of research misconduct on vulnerable populations such as the USPHS syphilis study at Tuskegee and lobotomies flagged their concern for the potential misuse of neural technology.

In sum, our participants' reports suggest that prospective users' views of emerging neurotechnology like DBS are inextricably bound up with prior experiences and assumptions about SUD treatment. Considering the specific therapeutic context is key to understanding risks and benefits of an invasive, novel therapy. For example, participants expressed higher comfort with the potential visibility of a DBS device perhaps due to their familiarity and comfort with the broad SUD disclosure their 12-step program encouraged. Additionally, the 12-steps' emphasis on having a number of tools in the recovery toolbox led to participants making sense of DBS as another "tool in the toolbox" rather than as an independent treatment option.

From this, we note the importance of talking with people with the conditions under consideration for neural device development. Contra Carter et al. (2011), we found that people in SUD treatment, regardless if for alcohol or opioids, view addiction as "deadly" and available addiction treatments (e.g., anti-craving medications) as either ineffective or coming with undesired side effects. This was broadly true regardless of primary substance of use. Many participants are living with co-occurring disorders that have been proposed as clinical trial exclusions (Ali et al. 2016). But given how many people in our study and the broader SUD population have co-occurring disorders (Han et al. 2017), this perspective should perhaps be reconsidered. The potential reduction of confounding study variables may not be justified if it makes the data inapplicable to the majority of people with severe SUDs (Compton et al. 2007). Indeed, people who are in SUD treatment refractory with frequent relapses may be more likely to live with co-occurring disorders (Najt et al. 2011; Bradizza et al. 2006). There is some reason to expect dual benefit; the most studied DBS target for SUDs (the nucleus accumbens and surrounding white matter) also has evidence for relieving depressive and anxious symptoms (Sullivan et al. 2021; Widge et al. 2018).

Finally, many researchers (Carter et al. 2011, Ali et al. 2016, Lee et al. 2016) suggest that DBS should initially only be trialed for those who have exhausted other treatment options. While this approach is understandable, our results make clear the complexity of identifying what participants view as "last resort" circumstances. The deadliness of SUDs may incline some people toward invasive interventions after relatively few rounds of treatment. Further, this approach may neglect the fact that standard treatment options are often not fully available to all people or compatible with their recovery (e.g., with work and family commitments).

These findings have limitations. Participants were drawn from two clinics within the same treatment system and, notably, all expressed positive experiences with their current treatment program. This trust could have led to more positive appraisals of the potential of DBS, and research more broadly. Further, though we extended recruitment to achieve higher racial diversity, we undersampled many minoritized perspectives, particularly those who hold Asian, Native American, Latino, and Queer identities. Finally, discussion surrounding DBS remained theoretical; no participants had direct experience with the technology. This lack of experience could have led to stronger framing effects from the video and interview guide. As such, we echo the calls of others for future work to address

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.21.22273594; this version posted April 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

these perspective gaps (Goering et al. 2022, Wexler & Specker-Sullivan 2021; Shen 2020) and conduct qualitative work with trial participants to continue tracking these issues as clinical trials for DBS for SUDs expand.

Ultimately, our study shows the importance of understanding the specific contextual features of a disorder, how it is experienced by people who are differently socially positioned, what their treatment options are, and how treatment affects their perspectives on themselves in order to evaluate the possibility of a novel therapy. Addressing the challenges of SUDs will require a multi-pronged approach that makes use of a variety of intervention and support strategies. Participants' openness to DBS as one "tool in the toolbox" for SUD treatment is warranted, but should be considered against the backdrop of substantially unequal access to existing forms of treatment and support, and pressing social problems that contribute to and exacerbate the experience of SUDs. DBS may be able to help some people make significant strides in their recovery, but it cannot address all the broader SUD challenges entangled in our social world.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS: We thank Ms. Christi Sullivan for filming and editing the DBS briefing video, Hazelden's Adam Erdman for helping with interview logistics, and all of our participants who generously offered their time and shared their personal experiences with SUDs and their treatment.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.21.22273594; this version posted April 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

References

Agterberg S, Schubert N, Overington L, Corace K. (2020) Treatment barriers among individuals with co-occurring substance use and mental health problems: examining gender differences. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 112;29-35.

Ali R, DiFrancesco MF, Ho AL, Kampman KM, Caplan AL, & Halpern CH. (2016). Attitudes Toward Treating Addiction With Deep Brain Stimulation. *Brain Stimulation*, 9, 466-468. doi: 10.1016/j.brs.2016.03.009

Andersson HW, Wenaas M, Nordfjærn T. (2019). Relapse after inpatient substance use treatment: A prospective cohort study among users of illicit substances. *Addict Behav*, 90:222-228. doi: 10.1016/j.addbeh.2018.11.008

Anderson, K. (2004). Targeting Recovery: Priorities of the Spinal Cord-Injured Population. *Journal of Neurotrauma*, 21(10: 1371–1383.

AWHONN Position Statement. (2015). Criminalization of Pregnant Women with Substance Use Disorders. *Journal of Obstetric, Gynecologic, & Neonatal Nursing*, 44;155-157. doi: 10.1111/1552-6909.12531

Bonaci T, Calo R, and Chizeck HJ. (2014). "App stores for the brain: Privacy & security in Brain-Computer Interfaces," *2014 IEEE International Symposium on Ethics in Science, Technology and Engineering*, 1-7. doi: 10.1109/ETHICS.2014.6893415

Bradizza CM, Stasiewicz PR, & Paas ND. (2006). Relapse to alcohol and drug use among individuals diagnosed with co-occurring mental health and substance use disorders: a review. *Clinical psychology review*, 26(2), 162–178. doi: 10.1016/j.cpr.2005.11.005

Carter A, & Hall W. (2011). Ethical Issues Raised by Proposals to Treat Addiction Using Deep Brain Stimulation. *Neuroethics*, 4(2), 129-142. doi: 10.1007/s12152-010-9091-3

Cernasev A, Hohmeier KC, Frederick K, Jasmin H, Gatwood J. (2021). A systematic literature review of patient perspectives of barriers and facilitators to access, adherence, stigma, and persistence to treatment for substance use disorder. *Exploratory Research in Clinical and Social Pharmacy*, doi:10.1016/j.rcsop.2021.100029

Chang G. (2020). Maternal substance use: consequences, identification, and interventions. *Alcohol Research: Current Reviews*, 40(2). doi: 10.35946/arcr.v40.2.06

Clark JP. (2003). How to peer review a qualitative manuscript. In *Peer Review Health Sciences*. Second edition. Edited by Godlee F, Jefferson T. London: BMJ Books; 219-235.

Compton WM, Thomas YF, Stinson FS, Grant BF. (2007). Prevalence, correlates, disability, and comorbidity of DSM-IV drug abuse and dependence in the United States: results from the national epidemiologic survey on alcohol and related conditions. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 64(5):566-76. doi: 10.1001/archpsyc.64.5.566. PMID: 17485608.

Earnshaw VA, Bogart LM, Menino DD, Kelly JF, Chaudoir SR, Brousseau N, Levy S. (2019). Disclosure, Stigma, and Social Support Among Young People Receiving Treatment for Substance Use Disorders and Their Caregivers: a Qualitative Analysis. *International Journal of Mental Health & Addiction*, 17(6):1535-1549. doi:10.1007/s11469-018-9930-8

Klein E, Goering S, Gagne J, Shea CV, Franklin R, Zorowitz S, Dougherty D & Widge AS. (2016). Brain-computer interface-based control of closed-loop brain stimulation: attitudes and ethical considerations. *Brain-Computer Interfaces*, DOI: 10.1080/2326263X.2016.1207497

Fox-Rawlings SR, Gottschalk LB, Doamekpor LA, Zuckerman DM. (2018). Diversity in Medical Device Clinical Trials: Do We Know What Works for Which Patients? *Milbank* Q, 96(3):499-529. doi: 10.1111/1468-0009.12344. PMID: 30203600; PMCID: PMC6131322.

Gil-Rivas V, Prause J, Grella CE. (2009). Substance use after residential treatment among individuals with co-occurring disorders: the role of anxiety/depressive symptoms and trauma exposure. *Psychol Addict Behav*, 23(2):303-314. doi:10.1037/a0015355

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.21.22273594; this version posted April 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Goering S, Brown TE, McCusker D, Montes N, Schönau A, Versalovic E, Klein E. (2022). Integrating Equity Work throughout Bioethics. *Am J Bioeth*, 22(1):26-27. doi: 10.1080/15265161.2021.2001108

Gonçalves-Ferreira A, do Couto FS, Rainha Campos A, Lucas Neto LP, Gonçalves-Ferreira D, Teixeira J. (2016). Deep Brain Stimulation for Refractory Cocaine Dependence. *Biological Psychiatry*, 79(11):e87–9.

Han B, Compton WM, Blanco C, Colpe LJ. (2017). Prevalence, Treatment, And Unmet Treatment Needs Of US Adults With Mental Health And Substance Use Disorders. *Health Aff*. 36(10):1739-1747. doi: 10.1377/hlthaff.2017.0584

Kleinman RA, & Morris NP. (2021). Rethinking the Criminalization of Personal Substance Use and Possession. *J GEN INTERN MED*, doi: 10.1007/s11606-021-06628-5

Lee KE, Bhati MT, & Halpern CH. (2016). A Commentary on Attitudes Towards Deep Brain Stimulation for Addiction. *J Neurol Neuromedicine*, *1*(8), 1-3.

Maier F, Lewis CJ, Horstkoetter N, Eggers C, Kalbe E, Maarouf M, Kuhn J, Zurowski M, Moro E, Woopen C, Timmermann L. (2013). Patients' expectations of deep brain stimulation, and subjective perceived outcome related to clinical measures in Parkinson's disease: a mixed-method approach. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry*, 84:1273-1281.

Mathers J, Rick C, Jenkinson C, Garside R, Pall H, Mitchell R, Bayliss S, Jones LL. (2016) Patients' experiences of deep brain stimulation for Parkinson's disease: a qualitative systematic review and synthesis. *BMJ Open*, 6:e011525. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-011525

McCullough L, & Anderson M. (2013). Agency lost and recovered: A social constructionist approach to smoking addiction and recovery. *Addiction Research & Theory*, *21*(3), 247–257.

Mojtabai R, Mauro C, Wall MM, Barry CL, Olfson M. (2019). Medication Treatment For Opioid Use Disorders In Substance Use Treatment Facilities. *Health Aff*. 38(1):14-23. doi: 10.1377/hlthaff.2018.05162

Müller UJ, Voges J, Steiner J, Galazky I, Heinze H-J, Möller M, Pisapia J, Halpern C, Caplan A, Bogerts B, Kuhn J. (2013). Deep brain stimulation of the nucleus accumbens for the treatment of addiction. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1282(1):119–28.

Najt P, Fusar-Poli P, & Brambilla P. (2011). Co-occurring mental and substance abuse disorders: a review on the potential predictors and clinical outcomes. *Psychiatry research*, 186(2-3), 159–164. doi: 10.1016/j.psychres.2010.07.042

Naufel S, Klein E. (2020). Brain-computer interface (BCI) researcher perspectives on neural data ownership and privacy. *J Neural Eng*, 17(1):016039. doi: 10.1088/1741-2552/ab5b7f

Neale J, & West R. (2015). Guidance for reporting qualitative manuscripts [Editorial]. *Addiction*, *110*(4), 549–550. https://doi.org/10.1111/add.12857

Pisapia JM, Halpern CH, Muller UJ, Vinai P, Wolf JA, Whiting DM, Wadden TA, Baltuch GH, Caplan AL. (2013). Ethical Considerations in Deep Brain Stimulation for the Treatment of Addiction and Overeating Associated With Obesity. *AJOB Neurosci*, 4(2):35-46. doi:10.1080/21507740.2013.770420

Polles A, Christopher B, Jacobs W, Merlo LJ. (2021). Adaptations to substance use disorder monitoring by physician health programs in response to COVID-19. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 125. doi: 10.1016/j.jsat.2021.108281

Qu L, Ge S, Li N, Wang W, Yang K, Wu P, Wang X, Shi J. (2019). Clinical evaluation of deep brain stimulation of nucleus accumbens/anterior limb of internal capsule for opioid relapse prevention: protocol of a multicentre, prospective and double-blinded study. *BMJ Open*, **9:**e023516. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2018-023516

Racine E, & Bell E. (2012). Responding Ethically to Patient and Public Expectations About Psychiatric DBS. *AJOB Neuroscience* 3(1);21-29. dOI: 10.1080/21507740.2011.633959

Shen FX. (2020). Racial Injustice and Neuroethics: Time for Action. *AJOB Neuroscience*, 11(3);212-216. doi: 10.1080/21507740.2020.1778133

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.21.22273594; this version posted April 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. (2021). Key substance use and mental health indicators in the United States: Results from the 2020 National Survey on Drug Use and Health (HHS Publication No. PEP21-07-01-003, NSDUH Series H-56). Rockville, MD: Center for Behavioral Health Statistics and Quality, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. Retrieved from https://www.samhsa.gov/data/

Sullivan CRP, Olsen S, Widge AS. (2021). Deep brain stimulation for psychiatric disorders: From focal brain targets to cognitive networks. NeuroImage. 225:117515.

Thomson CJ, Segrave RA, Fitzgerald PB, Richardson KE, Racine E and Carter A. (2021). “Nothing to Lose, Absolutely Everything to Gain”: Patient and Caregiver Expectations and Subjective Outcomes of Deep Brain Stimulation for Treatment-Resistant Depression. Front. Hum. Neurosci. 15:755276. doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2021.755276

Tong A, Sainsbury P, & Craig J. (2007). Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International journal for quality in health care : journal of the International Society for Quality in Health Care*, 19(6), 349–357. doi: 10.1093/intqhc/mzm042

Versalovic E, & Klein E. (2020). "Who Will I Be?": Relational Identity, Living with Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis, and Future-Oriented Decisionmaking. *Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics*, 29(4), 617-629.

Wang TR, Moosa S, Dallapiazza RF, Elias WJ, & Lynch WJ. (2018). *Deep brain stimulation for the treatment of drug addiction* (45th ed., Vol. 2). Neurosurgery Focus.

Wexler A & Specker-Sullivan L. (2021). Translational Neuroethics: A Vision for a More Integrated, Inclusive, and Impactful Field. *AJOB Neuroscience*. doi: 10.1080/21507740.2021.2001078

Widge, A., & Dougherty, D. (2015). Managing patients with psychiatric conditions treated with deep brain stimulation. In W. Marks, Jr (Ed.), *Deep Brain Stimulation Management* (pp. 124-137). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi: 10.1017/CBO9781316026625.012

Widge AS, Malone DAJ, Dougherty DD. (2018). Closing the loop on deep brain stimulation for treatment-resistant depression. *Front Neurosci*, 12:175.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.21.22273594; this version posted April 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

TABLES

Table 1: General Demographics

Gender	**# (%)**
Male	11 (55%)
Female	9 (45%)
Nonbinary	0 (0%)
Race/Ethnicity*	
White or Caucasian	10 (50%)
Hispanic or Latino	1 (5%)
Black or African American	7 (35%)
Asian	2 (10%)
American Indian/Alaska Native	1 (5%)
Age	
25-34	7 (35%)
35-44	8 (40%)
45-54	2 (10%)
55-64	3 (15%)
Over 65	0 (0%)
Education level	
Some high school	3 (15%)
Some college	6 (30%)
2-year college degree	3 (15%)
4-year college degree	6 (30%)
Graduate-level degree	2 (10%)

Table 2: Substance use disorder demographics

Substance*	
Alcohol	18 (90%)
Cannabis	6 (30%)
Opioids	3 (15%)
Cocaine	3 (15%)
Methamphetamine	3 (15%)
Prescription Pills	2 (10%)
Co-Occurring Disorders*	
Depression	7 (35%)
Anxiety	5 (25%)
OCD	2 (10%)
Other (ADD, Diabetes, Panic Disorder)	3 (15%)
None Disclosed	11 (55%)
Prior Treatment	

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.21.22273594; this version posted April 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

None prior	10 (50%)
Intensive outpatient (IOP) prior	4 (20%)
Inpatient once prior	4 (20%)
Inpatient more than once	2 (10%)
Family history	
Yes	17 (85%)
No	3 (15%)
Age of first use	
<10	1 (5%)
10-14	8 (40%)
15-19	8 (40%)
>19	3 (15%)

*Respondents could select more than one option; totals may add up to over the number of participants.

Table 3: Perspectives on Living with a Substance Use Disorder

SUDs	
Personal agency	"**It's like a puppet master**. Like, "I know I'm moving. I know I'm doing this. Why can't I stop?" Because **something else is controlling me**." (16) "**I don't make the right decisions when I'm drunk**. So if I'm drunk all the time, ... **I'm just wasting money** on things that I'm not supposed to be wasting on... maybe I wouldn't have dropped out of school because I started drinking and **I dropped out of school**." (20)
Social dynamics	"I didn't know how to make friends before I started using so that's why I sought out drugs... Other than my family, **I haven't really had friendships that didn't involve drugs.**" (3) "My entire step side of the family, **I can feel the judgment when I walk into the doors**. I mean, they all knew I was a drug addict... People talk about us behind our backs and we know it, and **there's all this judgment that goes on**... I've said many, many things that I regret, things that made me ashamed of who I was, I've broken [their] trust and there's **a lot of things to recover there**... **So I've seen this addiction affect every loved one in my life**." (1) "**I shut my whole family out**. I just stopped talking to them. I was embarrassed and I didn't want to be ridiculed. I felt like I didn't want to explain anything to anybody. I just wanted to drink." (18)
Stigma	"Because of the stigmatism with it, **I drank to hide who I actually was, so that I could actually have relationships, because I thought that was the only way I'd be able to have them, if people didn't know who I wa**s." (6) "There is such a stigma... I used to work in [a clinical setting]. And when an

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.21.22273594; this version posted April 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

	alcoholic would come in they'd be like, "**Oh, put him in the back.**" They're definitely treated differently." (9) "My [parent] for example, "**Why can't you just quit drinking?" He does not understand addiction. He believes it's all willpower, stuff like that.**"" (19) "I feel like I get stereotyped as that typical drunk [ethnicity] guy, at the store buying alcohol first thing in the morning, getting drunk, sitting out all day, just drinking and lazy [ethnicity] stereotype... That actually bugs me because I typically, at least at a minimum put in about a 70 hour work week, easily... I've worked very hard at what I do, but **I do feel like I get stereotyped as that lazy alcoholic minority.**" (10) "I live in wine country. There are people drinking at 10 o'clock in the morning, and nobody says anything. So, **once you say you're an alcoholic, the way people treat you is going to change rather than, 'I'm a wine aficionado.'** And I definitely think living near [city] and stuff, the **stigma around like meth, heroin and stuff is a lot greater than alcohol**. Even though it's the same disease just manifested in a different way." (9)
Privacy	"When you're going through addiction, **you're hiding almost everything**." (10) "I would say my addiction would keep me more private as in holding, like not saying certain things about myself, or **hiding that I went out** and got drunk last night." (9) "I **isolated hardcore**. Like, most of the people in my life had, and maybe some of them still do. They have no idea." (6)
Interactions with Healthcare System	"So like I said, **bad experience at detox**, literally went there, came out, drank a whole handle and it just got worse…" (14) "I do believe there is so many beneficial things that the healthcare system does for us that it's just absolutely ignorant to completely distrust them fully. But also it gets to a point where sometimes **the opioid pandemic is kind of started by doctors. They continue to prescribe people with these opioids that they actually don't need**. I mean, if I get my teeth pulled, give me five Vicodin, and I'm fine. Don't give me 30 of them and then three more refills, which that didn't happen to me, but that's just an example of things that I've seen before." (2) "In terms of me with my primary care physician, I've moved around a lot for work, so I've bounced different primary care physicians. I never had an ongoing long term therapist... **Until I came here, I really haven't dealt with healthcare providers.**" (4)

*(bolding in tables done for emphasis by authors)

Table 4: Perspectives on Substance Use Disorder Treatment

Treatment

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.21.22273594; this version posted April 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Personal agency	"**There's some dudes up there, they've been in rehab eight times**. You can see that they really want to try. It's just life hits you hard, bro. Things happen. You get triggered just like you get... This disease is no joke." (20) "They always tell you, 'Depend on your higher power.' Depend on that power that's higher than yourself, because you can't depend on just you. Because if you could depend on just you to get up out of this, you wouldn't be in this situation of addiction. You wouldn't have the relapses. You wouldn't have the cravings or the urges, if you could just depend on yourself. So **apparently we can't just depend on ourselves or rely on ourselves**. We need that help." (12) "A lot of people that have alcoholism, they probably drink most of their money away. And if they're working to stay on their feet, them getting a job, they better put their sobriety first... But bills don't give a damn about that at the end of the day. You know what I'm saying? **Bills don't give a f*** about sobriety**." (20)
Social Dynamics	"So I'm **looking forward to mending those relationships sober**. I'm looking forward to that. It's not going to be easy cause I did a lot of wrong stuff and I feel really guilty for a lot of the stuff that I did and I'm going to have to make amends for it and apologize and put myself out there. That's the **hardest part of recovery**... how much you have to put yourself out there so that you can get better, so that you can recover and not drink." (18)
Stigma	"Yeah. I feel like there is. I mean, it's like, "**So-and-So's back in treatment again**,"" (10) "I think **being an inpatient, there's a lot more stigma** than if I would have just said, "I'm going to have to go to therapy for my drinking." Therapy now is kind of what everybody does." (9)
Privacy	"I know that a **big part of being in recovery is to be honest and open** about our addiction and stuff, but I know **a lot of people that want to be private** about them." (7) "**My addiction counselor had mentioned, 'Tell as many people as you can** because the more people that are on board with this, the easier it is because you need your people.' Because in active use, I isolated so much that I had no one really other than my partner." (6) "**Just my privacy things**. I'm super concerned, even, to have any mention of this on my medical record, or anything, just because I work in a large hospital, and I know it's easy to get to other people's medical records, and then give them stuff. **I don't want people to think I'm a f***ing opioid addict**." (10)
Interactions with Healthcare System	"I have to focus on my money. **It's my life**, as well. What's more important is actually getting my life. I mean, money comes and goes. My life is once. It's once in a lifetime. But it's **always a financial aspect**, especially when you have to take care of a family or when you're responsible for X amount within a household." (12)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.21.22273594; this version posted April 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

	"**They give you your antidepressants, you got to come back in six weeks to see if it's working for you and then come back three months later**. I mean, anytime you are doing something or taking something that's supposed to continually help you, but there's still risk of side effects, it's absolutely ignorant to not continue to follow up with your healthcare provider." (1) "I mean, in this fast paced American lifestyle that we live in, everybody's working 40 plus hours a week, you got kids, you got sports activities, schooling and all this stuff that, I mean, sometimes I don't go to the dentist just because I don't have time to go to the dentist. It's the **fear of going into the healthcare system**, but also the **inconvenience of trying to fit it into our busy, crazy daily schedules**." (1)

Table 5: Perspectives on Deep Brain Stimulation

DBS	
Personal agency	"Everybody in the AA community knows that **you can't do it yourself**. And if your higher power, it just happens to be some little magical box that they stuck in your head to help refresh your brain once in a while. I think that would actually be embraced." (1) "So **now I might have an extra leg up**. I might have an extra tool in my utility belt, but I still got to go out here and do this kung fu... I'm using it, but what if I have a relapse? What if I have a craving or urge? Oh, guess what? I got the device up in me, so it's going to help me with that craving or that urge. And then, from that, I can go back to my book, and I can go back to my steps, or that I can use another tool, my open line of communication with a sponsor, going to a meeting" (12) "You have to put everything on the table and I think that's the hardest part… I'm hoping that I will make amends. I'm willing and **I don't see how that device can do that**. **You got to kind of, like, make that happen**." (18) "**I would be afraid that I would get addicted to using it**... one of those videos about what addiction is, it showed the mouse who was pressing the button. He got stimulated, and somehow, I can't remember, it totally overtook everything. So, I just pictured me as a mouse and not drinking, but then not necessarily getting better." (6) "At this point, I just don't trust my brain to make the right decision at all times. If there's an off chance that I might be able to use it to stimulate it kind of like a drug... **I don't want to end up abusing it**. My goal is to get into recovery and have it last... **I'm just not sure at this point I trust myself quite**." (15)
Social relationships	"I would probably wear one of those as a **badge of honor**, one of those deep brain things just like, "**See, I did everything I could.**"" (9)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.21.22273594; this version posted April 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

	"If anything, **I'd be happy to show people that I'm willing to do whatever it takes to fix what's going on**." (11) "My [partner] doesn't have very much experience with it [addiction], so they just don't understand. I know **they just want the madness to stop**. After I finish my phone call with you, I'm going to talk to them about it, and my guess is they would probably applaud me too. Especially if the side effects were minimal, **I think they would push me to do it** [get DBS]." (10) "Having something visible like if she goes and sees her [parent] and her [parent] sees that and she knows what it's for, could just keep making her angry. Just a **reminder that my daughter's a fuck up to her**. I don't know. Or there's something wrong with you. But no, there's not. Whatever." (7) "**If it can help me, wow, I mean, could it really improve my life, quality of life and my relationships? Can it help me stay out of the depths of self-pity and depression and not finding things in life fun?** I mean, I don't know if it helps with dopamine or anything like that, but can I find things, small things enjoyable or does it always have to be a rush or a high, or something like that?" (15)
Stigma	"Would I want something in my head right now, if everything was considered safe and everything? I think I would pick that as an option. I think I would. Yeah. As long as it had a skinny thingy. I got plenty of hair to cover, but yeah... **I don't want to look like Herman Munster** when I go outside" (14) "And then committing to a device like that, might even take that stigma... **I almost feel like there is more of a stigma on inpatient treatment than there would be with the external device**... Once you attach a medical thing to something, people are like, 'Well, that's what my doctor told me to do.'" (10) "There's **so many people nowadays just so against prescriptions and pills**...' I can see some stigmas like, 'You need to go to the extent of getting a device?' Well, I feel like that's where it brings light that yes it is serious enough that technology needs to be involved... **I feel like there'd be more stigma against the medication, or more negativeness to the medication versus the device**, because obviously the device is a much more serious note." (19)
Privacy	"**If I relapsed**, it's my choice to figure out what I need to do. **I don't want anybody like the relapse police running over to my house**, "I know you just relapsed," or somebody calling me on the phone saying, "You just relapsed and you just had a drink and you wasn't supposed to."" (14) "It's like having a service dog or a service animal and they're like, 'Well what is this animal for?' First of all **you don't have to disclose that information but if you feel comfortable enough with someone, you will**." (12) "If I could take care of those cravings, I would've preferred not to have to be so open and share so much information about myself... I feel like there'd be, **I'd be**

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.21.22273594; this version posted April 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

	able to maintain more privacy with the device." (19) **"I wouldn't want someone to know I have a thingy in my head**. Unless it was because they're part of my team to make sure I'm safe, to make sure it's helping me out or whatever... I just always **want to be able to tell my own story**." (6) "[Law enforcement accessing neural data] That I probably do have an issue with. **I have been manipulated by the justice system several times. I have very little trust in them...** I have several [relatives] doing life sentences... I have seen how they apply pressure to people that have absolutely nothing to do with it... **I've never felt a law enforcement officer was there to help me**... **My trust in law enforcement, the entire system and several officers personally, it's absolutely zero**. I'd have a huge problem with that, actually." (11) "So **it's kind of like a house arrest bracelet**, however you can leave the property and things like that. It just monitors the alcohol intake from your sweat... But I do think that is good because I do need those consequences, otherwise I'm just going to fall right back down the rabbit hole. So **if someone is on probation or some sort of anything involving law enforcement, I do believe they should have access to it [neural data]. However, if it's just me being a free bird, I don't think they should be able to.**" (19) "You don't want that to be used against you in court or something like that. **One of the things people mentioned about George Floyd was his substance abuse and that wasn't even the major factor.** Despite a person having addictions or whatever it may have been the case, it was wrong, the action. So **you can't discriminate for that, but people hear something, then they demonize substances**." (18) "**People feel more comfortable seeing a paramedic more than they would be a police officer**, because when police show up it's more of an aggressive factor." (17)
Interactions with Healthcare System	"Unfortunately, most alcoholics that are out there are middle-class and poor. **They're not rich**. They don't have a lot of time. Like me, I make okay money, but I got to put in a lot of hours. So like once every two weeks, yeah, I'd agree to it. I'd probably mess around with it, but this is all research, like you said. **How long would the thing take?** How long would it take?" (20) "For me, things like more **logistical things would be of importance**. How long is the study? How often do I have to go see a clinician or a doctor or whatever? Where are they located? Especially, I live in [city], so the **traffic's pretty bad**." (15) "It's just a thing. Not necessarily good or bad, it's **just part of the treatment**. I don't know. **I already see a therapist regularly**, so... I had to meet with the person that does my psych meds like once a month anyways... I don't think there's any medical treatment that I'm aware of where you don't have to check in with the doctor periodically." (3)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.21.22273594; this version posted April 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

	"To me, that's [follow-up clinic visits] **just part of the maintenance of it**. I've only been here a week and they've adjusted my medications three times already… if I personally had it, I could see myself getting irritated without the instant fixing of the cravings I guess. I could see that, but it's not like my [anti-craving medication] NAC, started working immediately." (19) "I know in the African-American communities, some people would be okay with it. A lot of people wouldn't. **It's just bad connotations with medicine**. A lot of people would point to Tuskegee but it's many incidents. Where the distrust… But **it would be beneficial for people**, all colors, all types because some people feel like they're powerless against drugs and certain substances, especially alcohol." (18) "**Money talks, bullshit walks, and this is dealing with the brains**. So you're going to have to come out of pocket… it's all about figuring out how to compensate them because putting something in somebody's head and if they have to make out once every two weeks… Most of these people are like me and they got to work. So compensate them." (20)

Table 6: Reflections on the importance of patient perspectives for technology development

Importance of interviews with people living with SUDs.
"I mean, no offense to any researchers and doctors, I guess, you probably shouldn't take offense, but a lot of you guys aren't drug addicts and alcoholics. **And as much as you can understand about the brain and how these things work, you haven't actually experienced these things**." (1)
"If you think that this treatment option is going to be successful for addicts or other people with substance abuse, you should engage them … To get their feedback on how they would view it, how they may, just to make sure it's actually going to work. **Rather than investing in going down this path and then finding that a lot of people would never be open to this type of treatment.**" (4)
"You want to have these conversations. These are the things you really want to do because, **the more involved they are in a process like this, the better the outcome will be**… You want somebody that can actually A, understand you, B, relate to you, C, help you do it. So these conversations are more than helpful." (12)
"I think involving people who are dealing with addiction or have family members who are dealing with addiction, **looping them in even when this is just a possibility and not even a current treatment would be very helpful** … With technologies, there's a level of expertise needed to truly understand it. And so, the common man or woman, they either have to have trust from their provider, or they're going to have to build a pretty extensive understanding of it, or some combination of those things to buy in, in my perspective. **Knowing the population and their ability to understand neurological treatment, I think the more trust you can build over time, the better. After talking to you, I would feel more comfortable**." (12)
"A lot of people do not understand alcoholism or substance abuse. They just don't. And unless you've been in that you won't know. **Even if they say they do from observation, looking on the**

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.21.22273594; this version posted April 25, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

outside in is not the same as a person that's been going through it physically, mentally, all of that." (18)
"**I feel honored to be part of trying to figure this thing out**." (5)