Qualitative Review of a Dialectical Behavior Therapy – Skills Training Intervention for Cigarette Smoking by Patients with Cancer

Marcia H. McCall,[1] Charlotte T. Boyd,[2] Nicole D. Kerr,[1] Ellen A. Nicola,[3] Sherona R. Sirkisoon,[4] Erica Fox,[5] Lindsay K. Seigenthaler,[5] Stephanie S. Daniel,[2] and Erin L. Sutfin[6]

[1]Department of Psychiatry and Behavior Medicine, Wake Forest University School of Medicine

[2]Department of Family and Community Medicine, Wake Forest University School of Medicine

[3]Behavioral Medicine, Atrium Health Wake Forest Baptist, Advocate Health

[4]Atrium Health Wake Forest Baptist Comprehensive Cancer Center, Advocate Health

[5]Psychosocial Oncology Program, Atrium Health Wake Forest Baptist Comprehensive Cancer Center, Advocate Health

[6]Department of Social Sciences and Health Policy, Division of Public Health Sciences, Wake Forest University School of Medicine

Author Note

Marcia H. McCall https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4206-1648

Charlotte T. Boyd https://orcid.org/0009-0001-5005-8599

Nicole D. Kerr https://orcid.org/0009-0005-0829-7018

Ellen A. Nicola https://orcid.org/0009-0000-8018-0395

Sherona R. Sirkisoon https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4313-0510

Erica Fox https://orcid.org/0009-0003-4632-6110

Lindsay K. Seigenthaler https://orcid.org/0009-0006-6549-009X

Stephanie S. Daniel https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5606-6146

Erin L. Sutfin https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2660-8383

We have no known conflicts of interest to disclose.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Marcia H. McCall, Department of Psychiatry & Behavioral Medicine, Wake Forest University School of Medicine, Medical Center Boulevard, Winston-Salem, NC 27157, United States.

Email: marcia.mccall@wfusm.edu

A preprint version of this manuscript was made available on MedRxiv at https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.08.19.25334013 to support grant applications currently under review.

Funding: Research supported in part by the Qualitative and Patient-Reported Outcomes Shared Resource, the Tobacco Control Center of Excellence, and the Cancer Prevention and Control Program of the Atrium Health Wake Forest Baptist Comprehensive Cancer Center's NCI Cancer Center Support Grant P30CA012197.

Data Availability: Comprehensive reports of patient and clinician thematic analyses are available from the corresponding author upon request.

Acknowledgments: The authors would like to acknowledge and thank James Morgan, Thomas Lycan, Jr., DO, Michael Farris, MD, Ryan Hughes, MD, William J. Petty, MD, and the Psychosocial Oncology Program therapists for recruiting patients to this study.

Abstract

Objective: Despite evidence that quitting smoking improves cancer treatment and outcomes, about one in eight patients with cancer smokes cigarettes. Current cessation approaches may not effectively address this population's psychosocial barriers to quitting, such as psychological distress and emotion dysregulation related to cancer diagnosis and treatment. To improve self-efficacy for quitting, we developed a brief virtual group intervention to teach patients skills in emotion regulation and distress tolerance using Dialectical Behavior Therapy – Skills Training (DBT-ST), a psychotherapeutic approach that has been applied successfully to improve coping skills and outcomes for patients with substance use disorders and patients with breast cancer but has not been applied to smoking among cancer populations. To enhance our intervention prior to a feasibility clinical trial, we obtained qualitative feedback from patients and clinicians.

Methods: We conducted qualitative interviews with patients with cancer who smoked or had quit and oncology physicians, psychotherapists, and nurses (*n*=17, 53% female, 82% White, average age=52.3). After reaching data saturation, we analyzed interviews using thematic analysis.

Results: Participants strongly supported the intervention for smoking cessation, notably the group format and DBT-ST skills for being present, managing emotions, and handling stress, while sharing mixed opinions on other components such as the virtual setting. Additional perceived benefits were improved quality of life, decreased anxiety and depression, and acquisition of universal skills for managing life's challenges.

Conclusions: These results indicate early enthusiasm and promise for our DBT-ST brief intervention for patients with cancer who smoke cigarettes, while suggesting modifications prior to a feasibility trial.

Keywords: Dialectical Behavior Therapy, cigarette smoking, cancer, behavioral intervention, thematic analysis

Public Health Significance Statement: Research into effective smoking cessation strategies for patients with cancer is a national priority. This study found that patients with cancer and their clinicians support our new cessation program, adapted from Dialectical Behavior Therapy – Skills Training, for teaching critical skills in managing emotions and stress so that patients with cancer can quit smoking and not relapse. We used their suggestions to improve our program prior to testing it in a clinical trial.

Qualitative Review of a Dialectical Behavior Therapy – Skills Training Intervention for Cigarette Smoking by Patients with Cancer

Date Submitted: October 27, 2025

Patients who continue smoking cigarettes after their cancer diagnosis are at increased risk of death, failed treatment, treatment complications, and secondary tumor development compared to patients who stop smoking (Caini et al., 2022; US Office on Smoking and Health, 2014, 2020). Succeeding disease site and stage, continued smoking is the strongest predictor of adverse cancer survival outcomes (Jassem, 2019). In contrast, the benefits of quitting smoking after a cancer diagnosis are well established, among them improved survival, better surgical outcomes, lower likelihood of recurrence or new tumor sites, less fatigue, and increased psychosocial well-being compared to continuing to smoke (Caini et al., 2022; Chellappan, 2022; Cinciripini et al., 2024; Lucchiari et al., 2016; Mohebbi et al., 2025). Although a cancer diagnosis can be a catalyst for cessation, 12.7% of patients with cancer currently smoke cigarettes (Salloum et al., 2019). The standard-of-care smoking cessation treatment, counseling using motivational or cognitive therapy plus medication, helps patients manage withdrawal, plan for situations triggering a desire to smoke, connect motivation to quit with values and goals, and build confidence to quit (National Cancer Center Network, 2022). The standard treatment is effective for many patients with cancer, particularly more intensive treatment, with one study reporting 43.7% abstinence at nine months after six to eight counseling sessions plus medication (Cinciripini et al., 2019). However, the standard treatment is less effective for patients with cancer who have long-term smoking histories and repeated failures to quit, for reasons not well understood (Duffy et al., 2012; Sheeran et al., 2019; U.S. National Cancer Institute, 2022; Vinci, 2020). Research into

more effective smoking cessation interventions for patients with cancer is a national priority (U.S. National Cancer Institute, 2022).

For people with long-term smoking histories, cigarette use is usually their primary mechanism for coping with negative experiences (Duffy et al., 2012; Wells et al., 2017). Cancer diagnosis and treatment can induce or worsen negative experiences, including distress, anxiety, depression, hopelessness, and interpersonal conflict (Duffy et al., 2012; Lee et al., 2021; Lucchiari et al., 2016; Smith et al., 2017; Wells et al., 2017). These conditions predict fewer quit attempts and higher rates of relapse in the cancer population (Duffy et al., 2012; Lee et al., 2021; Schlam et al., 2020). Difficulties with tolerating distressing experiences and regulating emotions are transdiagnostic psychosocial mechanisms implicated in smoking persistence in the general population (Carmody et al., 2007; Leventhal & Zvolensky, 2015; Schlam et al., 2020; Veilleux, 2019). Standard-of-care cessation treatment for patients with cancer focuses on motivation and cognition, but does not directly address psychosocial skills deficits. A probable explanation for continued smoking by patients with cancer is the lack of attention during cessation treatment to enhancing skills for managing stress and emotions. Learning new psychosocial skills may help patients gain self-efficacy for quitting and preventing relapse.

Dialectical Behavior Therapy

A counseling approach developed for improving psychosocial skills is Dialectical Behavior Therapy (DBT), a mindfulness-based psychotherapy. *Dialectic* means the synthesis of opposites; in DBT, the dialectic is the synthesis of *change* in emotions and relationships and *acceptance* of distress and self (Dimeff & Linehan, 2008). DBT helps people gain proficiency in mindfulness, distress tolerance, emotion regulation, and interpersonal effectiveness through skills training. A guiding principle of DBT is for people to construct a “life worth living” instead of

giving in to fatalism and hopelessness (Linehan, 2015). DBT is effective with populations from varied cultural backgrounds (Anderson et al., 2013; Harned et al., 2022; Linehan, 2015). However, the time commitment for the comprehensive DBT program (at least a year) is not feasible for most people. To improve access, researchers have adapted and tested content from DBT's principal component, Skills Training (DBT-ST), as brief interventions. In the only known study of DBT-ST as a brief intervention for smoking, a small trial of women in a methadone clinic who smoked, the treatment was found feasible, with participants reducing cigarette use by 83% (Cooperman et al., 2019). In similar populations, such as people with substance use problems and patients with breast cancer in psychological distress, DBT-ST interventions have demonstrated positive effects (McCall et al., 2025). To our knowledge, despite its potential benefits, DBT-ST has not been adapted as a smoking intervention for patients with cancer.

DBT-ST Intervention Development

Given the need for effective treatment approaches for cigarette smoking by patients with cancer, we initiated development of a novel DBT-ST intervention for this population, guided by the NIH Stage Model for behavioral intervention development (Onken et al., 2014). Per the Stage Model, behavioral interventions progress through stages of evaluation, culminating in one or more randomized controlled trials to establish effectiveness (Onken et al., 2014). In Stage 1A of the Model, researchers 1) identify promising scientific findings to support intervention development, 2) design the new intervention, and 3) refine or modify the intervention for real-world settings (Onken et al., 2014).

In Stage 1A, we first conducted a scoping review of DBT-ST as a brief intervention for difficult-to-treat populations similar to patients with cancer who smoke: people with substance use disorders, people in severe psychological distress, and patients with breast cancer (McCall et

al., 2025). We found that DBT-ST demonstrated preliminary efficacy as a brief intervention for these populations and held promise as a smoking cessation intervention for patients with cancer (McCall et al., 2025). We then designed an eight-session intervention consisting of introduction and conclusion sessions, two sessions on mindfulness, two sessions on emotion regulation, and two sessions on distress tolerance. We planned the intervention as a virtual group, with 6-10 patients meeting via videoconference once per week for 90 minutes, led by a facilitator with DBT-ST training. The patients could be from any stage of the cancer journey, with interest in quitting smoking ranging from ready to not ready. During intervention design, we collaborated with a multi-disciplinary advisory board of oncology and family medicine physicians, nurses, behavioral health clinicians, and a patient with cancer who had quit tobacco use, meeting six times for intervention feedback and revision.

Qualitative Review of DBT-ST Intervention

For this qualitative study, which completes Stage 1A of the NIH Stage Model, we conducted a formative review of our proposed DBT-ST intervention by presenting our intervention to patients with cancer who smoked or had quit and to oncology clinicians, gathering feedback during semi-structured interviews. Our primary goals were to obtain feedback to improve the intervention's content and structure. Our secondary goals were to obtain input on optimizing patient recruitment and engagement and on outcome measures being considered for use in future intervention studies. We obtained regulatory approval from our Institutional Review Board to conduct this study.

Method

We report how we determined our sample size, all data exclusions (if any), all manipulations, and all measures in the study. We followed Journal Article Reporting Standards

for Qualitative Research (Levitt et al., 2018) and the Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research (O'Brien et al., 2014). This study's design and its analysis were not pre-registered.

Setting

The setting for this qualitative study was a large comprehensive cancer center in the southeastern United States.

Participants

The study team recruited participants from the patient and clinician populations of the cancer center. Potential patient participants were identified by medical and radiation oncologists, psychosocial oncology therapists, and cancer center study coordinators and referred to the research team for screening. The team contacted clinicians from diverse specialties and professions who were known to the team or suggested by other clinicians.

Included were English-speaking adult patients aged 18 years or older with cancer, active or in remission, who were currently smoking or had quit. We excluded patients with cognitive impairment or altered cognition due to psychiatric illness or psychoactive drug use. Patients were compensated for their participation with $10 gift cards. All clinicians of the cancer center were eligible to participate, including oncology physicians, advanced practice providers, nurses, and psychotherapists. Potential participants were informed the purpose of the study was to provide feedback on an intervention being developed to help patients with cancer who smoke cigarettes to reduce or quit smoking, as well as suggestions for recruitment and engagement strategies and feedback on surveys being considered for future intervention studies.

Patients satisfying screening criteria were contacted either in person at their oncology visit or by phone to learn about the study and complete the consent and enrollment process. Clinicians who responded affirmatively were consented via phone.

The sample size was not predetermined but was set when data saturation was reached. Data saturation is defined as the point in data collection when all important issues or insights are exhausted from data, generally from 9 to 17 interviews for an interview-based study such as ours (Hennink & Kaiser, 2022).

Interviews

Using a semi-structured interview format, participants were interviewed about the DBT-ST intervention structure and content, study recruitment and engagement, and patient-reported outcome measures under consideration for future studies. Prior to their interviews, patient participants completed the outcome measures while clinician participants reviewed the measures. During the interviews, participants were sufficiently informed about the intervention to provide knowledgeable feedback. **Table 1** details the interview approach for each of these topic areas.

Table 1. *Interview Topic Areas and Approaches*

Topic Area	Approach
Intervention structure	Questions focused on: 1. Whether the virtual setting, group format, number of sessions (eight), and session length (90 minutes) were appropriate for the patient population and sufficient for the content 2. Appropriateness of inclusion of patients at all stages of cancer treatment and of patients both ready and not ready to quit cigarette smoking 3. Summative evaluation of the helpfulness, practicality, and convenience of the intervention structure

Topic Area	Approach
Interview content	Questions focused on: 1. Mindfulness skills: described as allowing a patient with cancer to "press the pause button" when experiencing an upsetting event, thought, or feeling to prevent being overwhelmed and to regain the ability to make conscious, healthy behavior choices 2. Emotion regulation skills: presented as helping patients during emotionally intense moments, thereby preventing hasty or inappropriate behavior and restoring healthy emotional functioning 3. Distress tolerance skills: described as helping patients make stressful or painful situations more tolerable, making it possible to refrain from behaviors that could make situations worse 4. Summative evaluation of the helpfulness and practicality of the DBT-ST skills content
Recruitment and engagement	Questions focused on likelihood of patients with cancer who smoke cigarettes enrolling in, engaging with, and completing the intervention, and how to best recruit this patient population to future intervention studies
Patient-reported outcome measures	Measures included: 1. Cancer Patient Tobacco Use Questionnaire (C-TUQ)(Land et al., 2016) 2. Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale (DERS)(Gratz & Roemer, 2004) 3. Distress Tolerance Scale (DTS)(Simons & Gaher, 2005)

Topic Area	Approach
	4. Depression Anxiety and Stress Scales (DASS-42)(Crawford & Henry, 2003) 5. Mental Adjustment to Cancer Scale (MAC)(Watson & Homewood, 2008) Patient participants completed the measures and provided feedback. Clinicians reviewed the measures and provided feedback.

The interviewers were four female members of the research team with master's level training, including a health educator in family medicine and the study coordinator for this qualitative study, two psychosocial oncology therapists in the comprehensive cancer center, and a community-based mental health counselor. They received two hours of qualitative interview training from the in-house Qualitative and Patient-Reported Outcomes (Q-PRO) shared resource staffed by experienced qualitative researchers.

Data Collection

Individual interviews were conducted over the phone or via video call by one of the four interviewers. Field notes were recorded by each interviewer immediately following interviews. Interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed by a professional transcription service. Transcripts were reviewed and compared to the audio files by the study team member to ensure accuracy. No follow-up interviews or transcript clarification with participants were needed.

Data Analysis

Interview transcripts were imported and coded in ATLAS.ti version 24 software (*ATLAS.Ti*, 2023). Transcripts were reviewed and a codebook was developed. Both deductive and inductive coding strategies were used to develop the codebook, creating a framework from the interview guide and research questions and adding codes emerging from the participant discussions. One Q-PRO researcher and a study team member independently coded the textual data and met weekly to compare coding. Discrepancies in coding were discussed and resolved. The codebook was adjusted as needed based on discussions of code meanings and application. Text segments were reviewed by code and summarized. Code summaries were synthesized into themes and organized using principles of thematic analysis by two Q-PRO researches and the study team member (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Themes were selected using a combination of the following criteria: (1) prevalence, or the frequency with which an idea is shared across participants; (2) strength, or the emphasis participants give to a point; and (3) valence, or how relevant the point is to the research question or context (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

Transparency and Openness

Comprehensive reports of patient and clinician thematic analyses are available from the corresponding author upon request.

Results

Study Sample and Interviews

Data saturation was met through interviews of 17 participants and emergence of alignment between participant responses (Hennink & Kaiser, 2022). The sample of 17 participants was 53% female (*n*=8) and 82% White (*n*=13), with two Black participants and one Asian participant. No participants were Hispanic or Latino. The average age of participants was 52.3 years, with ages ranging from 37 to 80 years. See **Table 2** for demographic data.

Table 2. *Sociodemographic Characteristics of Participants*

Characteristics of Participants	Patient		Clinician		Total Sample	
	n	*%*	*n*	*%*	*n*	*%*
Sex						
Male	6	75	2	22	8	47
Female	2	25	7	78	9	53
Age in Years						
Average Age	60.6		44.9		52.3	
Age Range	51-80		37-62		37-80	
Race						
Black	2	25			2	12
White	6	75	8	89	14	82
Asian			1	11	1	6
Clinician Participant Professions						
Medical oncologist			3			
Radiation oncologist			2			
Oncology physician assistant			1			
Oncology nurse navigator			1			
Psychosocial oncology therapist			2			

Eight patient participants agreed, consented, and completed the interviews. Two patients declined participation, and one was lost to follow-up. Two patients were female and six were male. Two patients were Black and six were White. The race and ethnicity distribution matched the cancer center's catchment area demographics for smoking prevalence (smoking prevalence by sex not available).

The study team emailed a diverse population of 13 clinicians to recruit them to the study, nine of whom completed the study and four who did not respond to recruitment efforts. The clinician sample included three medical oncologists, two radiation oncologists, an advanced practice provider, an oncology nurse, and two psychosocial oncology therapists. Seven clinicians were female, while two were female. One clinician was Asian and eight were White. (Sex, race, and ethnicity statistics for cancer center clinicians are not available for comparison.)

Participant interviews lasted between 27 and 70 minutes, with an average of 43 minutes.

Overview of Findings

Overall, participants supported the proposed DBT-ST intervention for smoking cessation in the cancer population. They identified potential benefits including using DBT-ST skills to help patients cope with stress and anxiety instead of smoking, positives of group participation such as social support and accountability for changing smoking behaviors, and improved quality of life. Potential barriers to participation included reluctance by some patients to talk about emotions or personal details in a group setting, sessions being too long, scheduling difficulties for this patient population, and DBT mindfulness skills being too abstract or in conflict with patient beliefs. Participants found the outcome measures relevant, easy to understand, and valid, although clinicians were concerned about the measures being burdensome, such as taking too long to complete.

The following qualitative results are summarized in **Table 3** by topic area.

Table 3. *Summary of Qualitative Results by Topic Area*

Topic Area	Results
Intervention structure	Supportive feedback • Using a group format for learning, accountability, and social support • Having eight sessions • Including patients from all stages of cancer Mixed supportive and critical feedback • Using a virtual setting due to potential technology access issues • Having 90-minute sessions which may be too long • Including patients not ready to quit who may be uncommitted • Scheduling patients who are busy with treatment and other cancer-related concerns such as not feeling well
Interview content	Supportive feedback • Teaching DBT-ST skills for smoking cessation • Improving patients' lives beyond smoking cessation with DBT-ST skills Mixed supportive and critical feedback • Revising skills training materials for low literacy • Revising mindfulness skills training; may be too abstract or conflict with religious beliefs

Topic Area	Results
Recruitment and engagement	Recruitment ideas • Posting flyers in waiting areas and clinic spaces • Advertising via social media • Encouraging clinician referral • Having patient's healthcare team introduce the intervention • Advertising overall benefits, e.g., training in life skills Potential barriers to engagement • Disliking the group setting • Having time constraints due to patient treatment regimens • Patients feeling unwell or fatigued from treatment or illness • Patients having technology-specific access issues Recommendations to facilitate engagement • Creating highly interesting content • Appropriately sizing the groups • Having personable group leaders
Patient-reported outcome measures	• Relevant and easy to understand • Valid for measuring intervention outcomes • Captured feelings of depression and anxiety and how patients cope with these emotions • Prompted patients to reflect on and understand their experiences • Clinician suggestions: use simpler language, shorten the surveys

Intervention Structure

Participants thought the group format offered social support and validation of personal struggles, making the experience “more personable” (PA13), allowing group members to “support each other as far as people giving suggestions on what they’re doing versus others” (PA17), and “very helpful” (PA15). According to a clinician, “It’s a great thought to bring people who are going through similar experiences together to have each other weigh in. If one is down, the other can lift, and vice versa” (C09). One patient stated, “I have had people close to me fuss at me. I have never had any kind of support” (PA13). Patients who described themselves as “shy” (PA04) or “introverted” (PA 10) felt reluctant to participate but were willing to do so “if it’s gonna help me reach that final goal” (PA10). However, a few clinicians felt individual therapy might be preferred by some patients (C08, C12).

All patients favored the virtual setting for saving travel time and for ease of scheduling, especially for patients living far away or amid treatment. Clinician opinions on the virtual setting were mixed, with some citing potential technological barriers for older, rural, or lower-income adults to virtual sessions, while recognizing that changing to in-person sessions could create transportation barriers. A few clinicians were concerned about reduced engagement and distractions during virtual sessions (C03, C06).

Regarding group membership, including patients in later stages of cancer was favored because they could offer perspective, advice, solace, and solidarity to those in earlier stages, as well as encourage accountability, as those further along in treatment could prompt the “earlier-stage people to take it more seriously” (C01), and for patients to see how motivations to quit smoking can vary by stage (C11). The inclusion of patients not ready to quit smoking had mixed reactions from participants, with some doubting whether they would “commit to the program”

(PA14) and others believing being with patients committed to quitting would help such patients gain motivation to quit: “It can be helpful to be with other people who are more committed. That can help tip them over the edge to make that commitment” (C05).

Participants had concerns about the 90-minute session length as too burdensome due to patient time constraints, with 60-minute sessions recommended. The number of sessions was deemed appropriate by most participants.

Intervention Content

Participants responded positively to the DBT-ST skills, noting their potential to support smoking cessation by helping patients understand emotions and triggers, manage stress and anxiety related to diagnosis and treatment, and make health-promoting decisions. They spoke well about breathing practices and learning to be more present in life. Overall, participants thought DBT-ST skills were practical, helpful, and transferable to other life situations. One clinician summarized DBT-ST skills as being “helpful for literally everyone,” particularly those going through “stressful cancer treatment” (C03).

Distress tolerance skills were especially well-received, with one clinician stating, “I think giving them [patients] these detailed instructions of ‘when you have cravings, these are physical things that you can try to reduce that craving.’ I really liked that. I thought that that could be very effective” (C11). Participants thought that patients regulating their emotions and breathing would help them as they try to change their smoking behaviors (PA15, PA19). One clinician stressed the importance of “being able to deal with your emotions in a separate way instead of reaching for a cigarette. How do you deal with those emotions? How do you face this new reality?” (C07). However, some patients did not associate emotions with smoking (PA14) or needed to put emotions aside to deal with cancer (PA10). A specific clinician concern was the potentially

abstract nature of mindfulness and that some patients might see mindfulness as a “religious thing” crossing their ethical and religious boundaries “rather than a ‘mental health thing’” (C05). Clinicians also suggested more accessible language throughout the intervention for individuals with lower literacy.

Participants believed the DBT-ST intervention could enhance patient outcomes such as decreasing anxiety and depression and improving quality of life. Patients thought the skills were inclusive of their experiences with depression and anxiety, sharing specific experiences and noting how helpful and practical the DBT-ST skills would be in helping them cope. Clinicians anticipated that using DBT-ST skills could lower dependence on medications or nicotine patches, with one clinician postulating this intervention could spur “lower rates of urgent visits or calls” as well as “lower rates of frantic calls about cancer recurrence or worry about recurrence” because patients will gain a “general better sense for their own body and for when things are going wrong and whatnot” (C03).

Patients spontaneously offered barriers to quitting including stress caused by cancer diagnoses, general distressing emotions, being around cigarette smoking, and switching from environments where they could not smoke to environments in which they could. Patients suggested incorporating these triggers for smoking into the skills aspect of the intervention. Patients also mentioned incentives to quit including the wake-up call of a cancer diagnosis, knowing the effects of smoking on their health, the cost of smoking on top of the financial stress of cancer treatment, feelings of guilt, and the assistance of nicotine replacement.

Recruitment and Participation

Participants shared recruitment suggestions including flyers in waiting areas and clinic spaces, social media advertising, and clinician referral. They also suggested advertising the

overall benefits of the skills taught in the intervention as life skills, rather than being solely for smoking cessation. Most supported having the patient's healthcare team introduce the intervention, especially trusted figures like oncologists. Nurses and other clinic staff were seen as valuable recruiters due to their patient interaction. Clinicians suggested advertisement framing the intervention as patient-centered rather than research-focused due to stigma associated with being involved in research, especially for "patients from minority groups [because] they have less trust [in the healthcare field]," and "don't enroll in trials as often" as a result (C07; C09).

Participants discussed specific barriers to engagement and completion such as dislike for the group setting, time constraints, concerns about the program being prescriptive/judgmental, and patients feeling unwell from treatment or illness. Internet, computer, and technology experience issues were mentioned as access barriers. Suggestions to facilitate engagement included interesting content, appropriately sized groups, and personable group leaders. Patients shared personal motivators for wanting to participate in an intervention like the one proposed, with one patient stating, "If my final goal is to live, there's gotta be something there to help me. I'd probably go wrestle a bear if it could help me, you know what I mean?" (PA10).

Patient-Reported Outcome Measures

Participants found the patient-reported outcome measures relevant, easy to understand, and valid for measuring intervention outcomes. Patients thought the measures did a decent job at capturing their feelings of depression and anxiety, and the way they cope with these emotions. The measures prompted them to reflect on and understand their experiences. Clinicians raised concerns about patient comprehension and survey length, noting repetitive or related questions could be confusing. Clinician suggestions regarding the assessments included using clear, simple language, shortening the surveys, reducing the number of related questions to avoid confusion,

and sharing with patients how their data is being used to benefit them and other patients with cancer who smoke.

Discussion

This qualitative review of our proposed DBT-ST intervention for cigarette smoking by patients with cancer resulted in valuable feedback from participants. They strongly supported aspects of the intervention, such as teaching patients DBT-ST skills for being more present, managing emotions, and dealing with stress, while sharing mixed opinions on other intervention components, such as the session length and the virtual format. Perceived benefits of the intervention extended beyond smoking cessation to improved quality of life, enhanced social support, decreased anxiety and depression, and acquisition of skills universally applicable to managing life's challenges, including cancer.

A cross-cutting theme is that patients felt more capable and less burdened regarding virtual technology and outcome measures than clinicians perceived they would. Patients were uniformly supportive of virtual sessions for accessibility and ease of scheduling. Clinicians were concerned their older, rural, and lower-income patients would struggle with video technology or that patients would become disengaged or distracted during sessions; however, no patients spoke of technology or disengagement during sessions as concerns. Regarding outcome measures, patients had positive feedback and expressed no concerns, while clinicians thought patients might find them confusing, repetitive, or too much of a time burden.

Our results are supported by recent qualitative research into cessation interventions for patients with cancer. Shenton, et al., (2023) interviewed patients, clinicians, and cessation program staff to discover barriers and facilitators to smoking cessation in a single cancer center. They found that patients endorsed interventions focused on stress management to enable quitting,

and they recommended that cessation services tailored to patients with cancer be offered throughout treatment and survivorship. Charlot, et al., (2019) conducted a mindfulness-based group cessation intervention for patients with cancer from low socioeconomic and minority populations. The authors reported that participants reduced cigarette use by 41% on average, were satisfied with the program, and made positive lifestyle changes.

Given the results of this qualitative study, several modifications to the intervention are recommended in preparation for Stage 1B of the NIH Stage Model (Onken et al., 2014), intervention testing for preliminary efficacy. Resulting modifications to our intervention will include the following:

- Reducing session length to 60 minutes each (while retaining eight sessions)
- Offering sessions in late afternoons or evenings to accommodate complex patient schedules
- Offering session materials to participants who must miss due to emergencies or illness
- Having a staff member at each session dedicated to helping participants successfully join the online group
- Taking care with language, framing of concepts, and instructions to make the intervention concrete, value-neutral, and easy to understand
- Ensuring skills training incorporates smoking cessation barriers and facilitators identified by patients

Limitations

Despite reaching qualitative data saturation (Hennink & Kaiser, 2022), with the final interviews not yielding new data, the study's sample size and composition may have limited the diversity of perspectives and generalizability to other cancer populations. Our patient participants were primarily male. While our patient racial/ethnic distribution matched our catchment area’s

smoking population, our overall study sample was predominantly White (82%). Nonetheless, patient and clinician feedback were sufficient to improve the intervention. Some interview questions yielded brief responses, resulting in limited data for certain topics., which could be a bias arising from self-selection for this virtual interview.

Conclusion

These results suggest our DBT-ST intervention has potential to provide an effective smoking cessation intervention for patients diagnosed with cancer and serves as an important addition to the literature. We will continue to develop this DBT-ST intervention for the oncological patient population using the NIH Stage Model (Onken et al., 2014) to determine further its feasibility, efficacy, effectiveness, and sustainability.

References

Anderson, R. C., Jensik, K., Peloza, D., & Walker, A. (2013). Use of the dialectical behavior therapy skills and management of psychosocial stress with newly diagnosed breast cancer patients. *Plastic Surgical Nursing: Official Journal of the American Society of Plastic and Reconstructive Surgical Nurses*, *33*(4), 159–163. https://doi.org/10.1097/PSN.0000000000000018

ATLAS.ti (Version V. 23.2.1). (2023). [Computer software]. Scientific Software Development GmbH. https://atlasti.com

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Caini, S., Del Riccio, M., Vettori, V., Scotti, V., Martinoli, C., Raimondi, S., Cammarata, G., Palli, D., Banini, M., Masala, G., & Gandini, S. (2022). Quitting smoking at or around diagnosis improves the overall survival of lung cancer patients: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Thoracic Oncology*, *17*(5), 623–636. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtho.2021.12.005

Carmody, T. P., Vieten, C., & Astin, J. A. (2007). Negative affect, emotional acceptance, and smoking cessation. *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs*, *39*(4), 499–508. https://doi.org/10.1080/02791072.2007.10399889

Chellappan, S. (2022). Smoking cessation after cancer diagnosis and enhanced therapy response: Mechanisms and significance. *Current Oncology*, *29*(12), 9956–9969. https://doi.org/10.3390/curroncol29120782

Cinciripini, P. M., Karam-Hage, M., Kypriotakis, G., Robinson, J. D., Rabius, V., Beneventi, D., Minnix, J. A., & Blalock, J. A. (2019). Association of a comprehensive smoking

cessation program with smoking abstinence among patients with cancer. *JAMA Network Open*, *2*(9), e1912251. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2019.12251

Cinciripini, P. M., Kypriotakis, G., Blalock, J. A., Karam-Hage, M., Beneventi, D. M., Robinson, J. D., Minnix, J. A., & Warren, G. W. (2024). Survival outcomes of an early intervention smoking cessation treatment after a cancer diagnosis. *JAMA Oncology*, e244890. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaoncol.2024.4890

Cooperman, N. A., Rizvi, S. L., Hughes, C. D., & Williams, J. M. (2019). Field test of a dialectical behavior therapy skills training-based intervention for smoking cessation and opioid relapse prevention in methadone treatment. *Journal of Dual Diagnosis*, *15*(1), 67–73. https://doi.org/10.1080/15504263.2018.1548719

Crawford, J. R., & Henry, J. D. (2003). The Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS): Normative data and latent structure in a large non-clinical sample. *The British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *42*, 111–131.

Dimeff, L. A., & Linehan, M. M. (2008). Dialectical behavior therapy for substance abusers. *Addiction Science & Clinical Practice*, *4*(2), 39–47.

Duffy, S. A., Louzon, S. A., & Gritz, E. R. (2012). Why do cancer patients smoke and what can providers do about it? *Community Oncology*, *9*(11), 344–352. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmonc.2012.10.003

Gratz, K. L., & Roemer, L. (2004). Multidimensional assessment of emotion regulation and dysregulation: Development, factor structure, and initial validation of the Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, *26*(1), 41–54. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:JOBA.0000007455.08539.94

Harned, M. S., Coyle, T. N., & Garcia, N. M. (2022). The inclusion of ethnoracial, sexual, and gender minority groups in randomized controlled trials of dialectical behavior therapy: A systematic review of the literature. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, *29*(2), 83–93. https://doi.org/10.1037/cps0000059

Hennink, M., & Kaiser, B. N. (2022). Sample sizes for saturation in qualitative research: A systematic review of empirical tests. *Social Science & Medicine*, *292*, 114523. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2021.114523

Jassem, J. (2019). Tobacco smoking after diagnosis of cancer: Clinical aspects. *Translational Lung Cancer Research*, *8*(Suppl 1), S50–S58. https://doi.org/10.21037/tlcr.2019.04.01

Land, S. R., Warren, G. W., Crafts, J., Hatsukami, D., Ostroff, J. S., Willis, G., Chollette, V., Mitchell, S. A., Folz, J., Gulley, J. L., Szabo, E., Brandon, T. H., Duffy, S., & Toll, B. (2016). Cognitive testing of tobacco use items for administration to cancer patients and survivors in clinical research. *Cancer*, *122*(11), 1728–1734. https://doi.org/10.1002/cncr.29964

Lee, J., Cheong, J., Markham, M. J., Lam, J., Warren, G. W., & Salloum, R. G. (2021). Negative affect and the utilization of tobacco treatment among adult smokers with cancer. *Psycho-Oncology*, *30*(1), 93–102. https://doi.org/10.1002/pon.5543

Leventhal, A. M., & Zvolensky, M. J. (2015). Anxiety, depression, and cigarette smoking: A transdiagnostic vulnerability framework to understanding emotion–smoking comorbidity. *Psychological Bulletin*, *141*(1), 176–212. https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000003

Levitt, H. M., Bamberg, M., Creswell, J. W., Frost, D. M., Josselson, R., & Suárez-Orozco, C. (2018). Journal article reporting standards for qualitative primary, qualitative meta-analytic, and mixed methods research in psychology: The APA Publications and

Communications Board task force report. *American Psychologist*, *73*(1), 26–46. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000151

Linehan, M. M. (2015). *Dialectical behavioral therapy skills training manual*. The Guilford Press.

Lucchiari, C., Masiero, M., Botturi, A., & Pravettoni, G. (2016). Helping patients to reduce tobacco consumption in oncology: A narrative review. *SpringerPlus*, *5*(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40064-016-2798-9

McCall, Boyd, C. T., Kerr, N. D., Daniel, S. S., & Sutfin, E. L. (2025). Dialectical Behavior Therapy Skills Training as a brief intervention for cigarette smoking by patients with cancer: A scoping review and narrative synthesis of related literature. *Psycho-Oncology*, *34*(1), e70074. https://doi.org/10.1002/pon.70074

Mohebbi, E., Guthrie, G., Patil, S., Benjamin IV, W., Tan, M., Giurintano, J. P., Witek, M. E., Ahn, P. H., Taylor, K., Wolf, G., Fan, R., & Rozek, L. S. (2025). Postdiagnosis smoking cessation and survival outcomes of head and neck cancer patients. *Head & Neck*, *47*. https://doi.org/10.1002/hed.28182

National Cancer Center Network. (2022, August 30). *NCCN Smoking Cessation Guidelines Detail*. NCCN. https://www.nccn.org/guidelines/guidelines-detail

O'Brien, B. C., Harris, I. B., Beckman, T. J., Reed, D. A., & Cook, D. A. (2014). Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research: A Synthesis of Recommendations. *Academic Medicine*, *89*(9), 1245. https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000000388

Onken, L. S., Carroll, K. M., Shoham, V., Cuthbert, B. N., & Riddle, M. (2014). Reenvisioning clinical science: Unifying the discipline to improve the public health. *Clinical*

Psychological Science: A Journal of the Association for Psychological Science, *2*(1), 22–34. https://doi.org/10.1177/2167702613497932

Salloum, R. G., Huo, J., Lee, J.-H., Lee, J., Dallery, J., George, T., & Warren, G. (2019). Tobacco and e-cigarette use among cancer survivors in the United States. *PLoS ONE*, *14*(12), e0226110. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0226110

Schlam, T. R., Baker, T. B., Smith, S. S., Cook, J. W., & Piper, M. E. (2020). Anxiety sensitivity and distress tolerance in smokers: Relations with tobacco dependence, withdrawal, and quitting success. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research*, *22*(1), 58–65. https://doi.org/10.1093/ntr/ntz070

Sheeran, P., Jones, K., Avishai, A., Symes, Y. R., Abraham, C., Miles, E., Wright, C. E., Mayer, D. K., & Ribisl, K. M. (2019). What works in smoking cessation interventions for cancer survivors? A meta-analysis. *Health Psychology*, *38*(10), 855–865. https://doi.org/10.1037/hea0000757

Simons, J. S., & Gaher, R. M. (2005). The Distress Tolerance Scale: Development and validation of a self-report measure. *Motivation and Emotion*, *29*(2), 83–102. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-005-7955-3

Smith, J. D., Shuman, A. G., & Riba, M. B. (2017). Psychosocial issues in patients with head and neck cancer: An updated review with a focus on clinical interventions. *Current Psychiatry Reports*, *19*(9), 56. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11920-017-0811-9

U.S. National Cancer Institute. (2022). *Treating smoking in cancer patients: An essential component of cancer care. National Cancer Institute Tobacco Control Monograph 23.* (p. 325). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health,

National Cancer Institute. https://cancercontrol.cancer.gov/brp/tcrb/monographs/monograph-23

US Office on Smoking and Health. (2014). *The health consequences of smoking—50 years of progress: A report of the Surgeon General*. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (US). https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK179276/

US Office on Smoking and Health. (2020). *Smoking cessation: A report of the Surgeon General* (p. 700). Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (US). https://www.cdc.gov/tobacco-surgeon-general-reports/reports/2020-smoking-cessation/index.html

Veilleux, J. C. (2019). The relationship between distress tolerance and cigarette smoking: A systematic review and synthesis. *Clinical Psychology Review*, *71*, 78–89. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2019.01.003

Vinci, C. (2020). Cognitive behavioral and mindfulness-based interventions for smoking cessation: A review of the recent literature. *Current Oncology Reports*, *22*(6). http://dx.doi.org.wake.idm.oclc.org/10.1007/s11912-020-00915-w

Watson, M., & Homewood, J. (2008). Mental Adjustment to Cancer Scale©: Psychometric properties in a large cancer cohort. *Psycho-Oncology*, *17*(11), 1146–1151. https://doi.org/10.1002/pon.1345

Wells, M., Aitchison, P., Harris, F., Ozakinci, G., Radley, A., Bauld, L., Entwistle, V., Munro, A., Haw, S., Culbard, B., & Williams, B. (2017). Barriers and facilitators to smoking cessation in a cancer context: A qualitative study of patient, family and professional views. *BMC Cancer*, *17*. http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12885-017-3344-z