**Title Page**

# Qualitative Evaluation of a Novel Dialectical Behavior Therapy Brief 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. Siegenthaler,[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

[4]Atrium Health Wake Forest Baptist Comprehensive Cancer Center

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

[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

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. Email: mmccall@wakehealth.edu

**Abstract**

**Introduction:** Despite evidence that quitting smoking improves cancer treatment and outcomes, about one in eight patients with cancer smokes cigarettes. The standard-of-care tobacco treatment – behavioral counseling and medication – 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 virtual, eight-session, group intervention to teach patients skills in emotion regulation, distress tolerance, and mindfulness. We adapted our intervention from Dialectical Behavior Therapy – Skills Training (DBT-ST), a psychotherapeutic approach that has been applied successfully to enhance coping skills and improve outcomes for patients with substance use disorders and patients with breast cancer. DBT-ST has not yet been applied to smoking cessation in cancer populations.

**Methods:** We conducted qualitative interviews, presenting the intervention to eight patient participants with cancer who smoked or had quit and nine provider participants including oncologists, psychotherapists, and nurses, for feedback. We analyzed interviews using thematic analysis.

**Results:** Patients and providers strongly supported the intervention, notably the group format and DBT-ST skills for being more present, managing emotions, and handling stress, while sharing mixed opinions on other components, such as its virtual setting and time commitment. Other perceived benefits were improved quality of life, enhanced social support, decreased anxiety and depression, and acquisition of universal skills for managing life's challenges.

**Conclusions:** These qualitative results indicate early enthusiasm and promise for our DBT-ST brief intervention, suggesting its potential for further development for patients with cancer who smoke cigarettes.

**Implications**: Research into effective smoking cessation interventions for patients with cancer is a national priority. Our novel brief intervention, adapted from Dialectical Behavior Therapy – Skills Training, shifts cessation treatment from cognitive and motivational techniques to enhancing skills in mindfully managing emotions and distress, two known drivers of persistent smoking. Positive patient and provider perspectives support our intervention for helping patients with cancer quit smoking and not relapse, as well as improving quality of life and ameliorating mental health conditions. We will continue intervention development with a clinical trial to evaluate its preliminary effects on inducing cessation attempts by patients with cancer.

## INTRODUCTION

Patients who continue smoking cigarettes after cancer diagnosis are at increased risk of death, failed treatment, treatment complications, and secondary tumor development compared to patients who stop smoking.[1–3] Succeeding disease site and stage, continued smoking is the strongest predictor of adverse cancer survival outcomes.[4] In contrast, the benefits of quitting smoking after 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.[3,5–8] Although a cancer diagnosis can be a catalyst for cessation, 12.7% of patients with cancer currently smoke cigarettes.[9] 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.[10] 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.[11] 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.[12–15] Research into more effective smoking cessation interventions for patients with cancer is a national priority.[14]

For people with long-term smoking histories, cigarette use is usually their primary mechanism for coping with negative experiences.[13,16] Cancer diagnosis and treatment can induce or worsen negative experiences, including distress, anxiety, depression, hopelessness, and interpersonal conflict.[5,13,16–18] These conditions predict fewer quit attempts and higher rates of relapse in the cancer population.[13,17,19] Difficulties with tolerating distressing experiences and

regulating emotions are transdiagnostic psychosocial mechanisms implicated in smoking persistence in the general population.[19–22] Standard-of-care cessation treatment for patients with cancer focuses on motivation and cognition, but does not directly address psychosocial 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.

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.[23] 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.[24] DBT is effective with populations from varied cultural backgrounds.[24–26] 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 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%.[27] 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.[28] To our knowledge, despite its potential benefits, DBT-ST has not been adapted as a smoking intervention for patients with cancer.

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.[29] Per the model, behavioral interventions progress through stages of evaluation, culminating in one or more randomized controlled trials to establish effectiveness.[29] 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.[29]

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.[28] 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.[28] 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.

For this qualitative study, which completes Stage 1A of the NIH Stage Model, we conducted a formative evaluation of our proposed DBT-ST intervention by presenting our

intervention to patients with cancer and oncology providers, gathering feedback during semi-structured interviews. Our goals were to improve the intervention's content and structure and optimize patient recruitment and participation. We also sought input on outcome measures being considered for use in future intervention studies. We obtained regulatory approval from our Institutional Review Board to conduct this study.

## METHODS

### 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 provider 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 providers from diverse specialties and professions who were known to the team or suggested by other providers.

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 providers of the cancer center were eligible to participate, including oncology clinicians, 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, to suggest recruitment and engagement strategies, and to provide 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. Providers who responded affirmatively were consented via phone.

**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 provider 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.

The interviewers were four female members of the research team (CB, EF, NK, LS) with master's level training. CB is a health educator in family medicine and the study coordinator for this qualitative study, EF and LS are psychosocial oncology therapists in the comprehensive cancer center, and NK is 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.[35] 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 (CB) 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 CB from the study team.[36] 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.[36] Data saturation was met through the enrollment of 17 participants and emergence of alignment between participant responses.[37]

## RESULTS

### Study Sample and Interviews

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, but gender did not, as approximately half of the catchment area is female.

The study team emailed a diverse population of 13 providers to recruit them to the study, nine of whom completed the study and four who did not respond to recruitment efforts. The provider sample included three medical oncologists, two radiation oncologists, an advanced practice provider, an oncology nurse, and two psychosocial oncology therapists. Two providers were male, while seven were female. One provider was Asian and eight were White. No patients or providers were Hispanic or Latino. See **Table 2** for patient and provider demographic data.

For patients, interviews lasted about 30 to 70 minutes, with an average of 47 minutes. For providers, interviews lasted from 27 to 58 minutes, with an average of 40 minutes.

**Overview**

Overall, patients and providers supported the proposed DBT-ST intervention for smoking cessation in the cancer population. Patients were interested in the potential benefits, such as accessibility, social support, and learning DBT-ST skills to help them cope instead of smoking. Potential barriers to participation included talking about emotions or personal details in a group setting and scheduling difficulties. Patients found the outcome measures relevant and easy to understand.

Providers believed the DBT-ST intervention would help their patients with smoking cessation and with managing stress and anxiety. Other potential positive outcomes include increased accountability, improved quality of life, and feeling a sense of community. They emphasized the importance of the patient's healthcare team in encouraging intervention participation. Possible barriers to participation were session length, patient scheduling, and DBT

skills being too abstract or in conflict with patient beliefs. Providers found the outcome measures relevant and valid but potentially requiring too much time to complete.

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

**Intervention Structure**

Patients liked the group format because they thought it would make the experience "more personable" (PA13), and "support each other as far as people giving suggestions on what they're doing versus others" (PA17). One patient stated, "I have had people close to me fuss at me. I have never had any kind of support" (PA13). All patients favored the virtual format for saving travel time and for ease of scheduling, especially for patients living far away or amid treatment. Including those in later stages of cancer was favored because they could offer perspective, advice, solace, and solidarity to those in earlier stages. The inclusion of patients not ready to quit smoking had mixed reactions, with some doubting whether they would "commit to the program" (PA14). A few patients felt the proposed session number and length might be too burdensome due to time constraints. 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). Other patients evaluated the intervention format as likely to be "very helpful" (PA15).

Providers thought the group format offered social support and validation of personal struggles, with one stating, "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" (PR09). A few providers felt individual therapy might be preferred by many patients (PR08, PR12). Providers supported inclusion of patients along the cancer stage continuum to encourage accountability, as those further in treatment could prompt the "earlier-stage people to

take it more seriously" (PR01), and for patients to see how motivations to quit smoking can vary by stage (PR11). Providers were either supportive or neutral on including patients not ready to quit smoking, with some 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" (PR05). Regarding the virtual setting, provider opinions were mixed, citing technological barriers for older, rural, or lower-income adults to virtual sessions, while recognizing that changing to in-person sessions could create transportation barriers. Some providers were concerned about reduced engagement and distractions during virtual sessions (PR03, PR06). The number of sessions was deemed appropriate, but 90-minute sessions were considered too long, with 60-minute sessions recommended.

**Intervention Content**

Patients spoke positively about the DBT-ST skills, especially the distress tolerance skills, breathing practices, and learning to be more present in their lives. Several patients thought regulating their emotions and breathing would help them as they try to change their smoking behaviors (PA15, PA19). Other patients did not associate emotions with smoking (PA14) or needed to put emotions aside to deal with cancer (PA10). 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. Barriers for quitting included 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 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. Overall, patients thought DBT-ST skills were both practical, helpful, and transferable to life situations.

Providers 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. One provider summarized DBT-ST skills as being "helpful for literally everyone," particularly those going through "stressful cancer treatment" (PR03). Distress tolerance skills were especially well-received, with one provider 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" (PR11). One provider 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?" (PR07). Providers also believed the DBT-ST intervention could enhance other patient outcomes such as improving quality of life, lowering dependence on medications or nicotine patches, and decreasing anxiety and depression. Lastly, one provider postulated 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" (PR03). Provider concerns included the abstract nature of some content and concepts, with some patients seeing mindfulness as more of a "religious thing" crossing their ethical and religious boundaries "rather

than a ‘mental health thing’” (PR05). Providers suggested more accessible language throughout the intervention for individuals with lower literacy.

**Recruitment and Participation**

Patients shared recruitment suggestions including flyers in waiting areas and clinic spaces, provider referral, and social media advertising. They discussed specific barriers to participation and completion such as dislike for the group setting, time constraints, concerns about the program being prescriptive/judgmental, and fatigue from treatment. Patients also 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 suggestions to facilitate participation included interesting content, appropriately sized groups, and personable group leaders.

Most providers supported having the patient’s healthcare team introduce the intervention, especially trusted figures like oncologists, as long as it was framed 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 (PR07; PR09). Nurses and other clinic staff were seen as valuable recruiters due to their patient interaction. Providers suggested advertising the overall benefits of the skills taught in the intervention as life skills, rather than being solely for smoking cessation. Perceived barriers to participation include access issues such as internet, computer, and technology issues; time constraints; language barriers; and patients feeling unwell from treatment or illness.

**Patient-Reported Outcome Measures**

Patients found the patient-reported outcome measures relevant and easy to understand. They 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.

Providers found the proposed measures relevant and valid for measuring intervention outcomes, but raised concerns about patient comprehension and survey length, noting repetitive or related questions could be confusing. 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 study of our proposed DBT-ST intervention for cigarette smoking by patients with cancer resulted in valuable patient and provider feedback. Providers and patients 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 time commitment 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.

Patient and provider feedback aligned regarding including patients from all stages of cancer together in groups, reducing session length below 90 minutes, carefully managing scheduling challenges, and having providers initiate or endorse patient referral to future intervention studies. Opinions varied among both patient and provider participants on whether

groups should include patients who were not ready to quit smoking and whether to deliver the intervention in a group setting versus individual. The patient and provider interview groups differed from each other in two key areas: virtual versus in-person sessions and planned outcome measures. Patients were uniformly supportive of virtual sessions for accessibility and ease of scheduling. Providers 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 providers thought patients might find them confusing, repetitive, or too much of a time burden. The cross-cutting theme is that patients felt more capable and less burdened regarding virtual technology and outcome measures than providers perceived they would.

Our results are supported by recent qualitative research into cessation interventions for patients with cancer. Shenton, et al., (2023) interviewed patients, providers, and cessation program staff to discover barriers and facilitators to smoking cessation in a single cancer center.[38] 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.[39] 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,[29] intervention testing for preliminary efficacy. These modifications include the following:

- Reducing session length to 60 minutes each (while retaining eight sessions)
- Offering sessions in late afternoons or evenings to accommodate 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**

The study's small sample size may have limited the diversity of perspectives. Nonetheless, patient and provider 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 to determine further its feasibility, efficacy, effectiveness, and sustainability.

Funding: Research supported in part by the Qualitative and Patient-Reported Outcomes Shared Resource of the Wake Forest Baptist Comprehensive Cancer Center's NCI Cancer Center Support Grant P30CA012197.

Declaration of Interests: There are no reportable conflicts of interest for any authors of this paper

Data Availability: Comprehensive reports of patient and provider 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.

REFERENCES


1. US Office on Smoking and Health. *The Health Consequences of Smoking—50 Years of Progress: A Report of the Surgeon General*. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (US); 2014.

2. US Office on Smoking and Health. *Smoking Cessation: A Report of the Surgeon General*. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (US); 2020:700. https://stacks.cdc.gov/view/cdc/84557

3. Caini S, Del Riccio M, Vettori V, et al. Quitting smoking at or around diagnosis improves the overall survival of lung cancer patients: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Thoracic Oncology*. 2022;17(5):623-636. doi:10.1016/j.jtho.2021.12.005

4. Jassem J. Tobacco smoking after diagnosis of cancer: Clinical aspects. *Transl Lung Cancer Res*. 2019;8(Suppl 1):S50-S58. doi:10.21037/tlcr.2019.04.01

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

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

7. Cinciripini PM, Kypriotakis G, Blalock JA, et al. Survival outcomes of an early intervention smoking cessation treatment after a cancer diagnosis. *JAMA Oncol*. Published online October 31, 2024:e244890. doi:10.1001/jamaoncol.2024.4890

8. Mohebbi E, Guthrie G, Patil S, et al. Postdiagnosis smoking cessation and survival outcomes of head and neck cancer patients. *Head & Neck*. n/a(n/a). doi:10.1002/hed.28182

9. Salloum RG, Huo J, Lee JH, et al. Tobacco and e-cigarette use among cancer survivors in the United States. *PLoS One*. 2019;14(12):e0226110. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0226110

10. National Cancer Center Network. NCCN Smoking Cessation Guidelines Detail. NCCN. August 30, 2022. Accessed November 6, 2022. https://www.nccn.org/guidelines/guidelines-detail

11. Cinciripini PM, Karam-Hage M, Kypriotakis G, et al. Association of a comprehensive smoking cessation program with smoking abstinence among patients with cancer. *JAMA Network Open*. 2019;2(9):e1912251. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2019.12251

12. Sheeran P, Jones K, Avishai A, et al. What works in smoking cessation interventions for cancer survivors? A meta-analysis. *Health Psychology*. 2019;38(10):855-865. doi:10.1037/hea0000757

13. Duffy SA, Louzon SA, Gritz ER. Why do cancer patients smoke and what can providers do about it? *Community Oncol*. 2012;9(11):344-352. doi:10.1016/j.cmonc.2012.10.003

14. U.S. National Cancer Institute. *Treating Smoking in Cancer Patients: An Essential Component of Cancer Care. National Cancer Institute Tobacco Control Monograph 23.* U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health, National Cancer Institute; 2022:325.

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

16. Wells M, Aitchison P, Harris F, et al. Barriers and facilitators to smoking cessation in a cancer context: A qualitative study of patient, family and professional views. *BMC Cancer*. 2017;17. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12885-017-3344-z

17. Lee J, Cheong J, Markham MJ, Lam J, Warren GW, Salloum RG. Negative affect and the utilization of tobacco treatment among adult smokers with cancer. *Psycho-Oncology*. 2021;30(1):93-102. doi:10.1002/pon.5543

18. Smith JD, Shuman AG, Riba MB. Psychosocial issues in patients with head and neck cancer: An updated review with a focus on clinical interventions. *Curr Psychiatry Rep*. 2017;19(9):56. doi:10.1007/s11920-017-0811-9

19. Schlam TR, Baker TB, Smith SS, Cook JW, Piper ME. Anxiety sensitivity and distress tolerance in smokers: Relations with tobacco dependence, withdrawal, and quitting success. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research*. 2020;22(1):58-65. doi:10.1093/ntr/ntz070

20. Veilleux JC. The relationship between distress tolerance and cigarette smoking: A systematic review and synthesis. *Clinical Psychology Review*. 2019;71:78-89. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2019.01.003

21. Carmody TP, Vieten C, Astin JA. Negative affect, emotional acceptance, and smoking cessation. *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs*. 2007;39(4):499-508.

22. Leventhal AM, Zvolensky MJ. Anxiety, depression, and cigarette smoking: A transdiagnostic vulnerability framework to understanding emotion–smoking comorbidity. *Psychological Bulletin*. 2015;141(1):176-212. doi:10.1037/bul0000003

23. Dimeff LA, Linehan MM. Dialectical behavior therapy for substance abusers. *Addict Sci Clin Pract*. 2008;4(2):39-47.

24. Linehan MM. *Dialectical Behavioral Therapy Skills Training Manual*. The Guilford Press; 2015.

25. Anderson RC, Jensik K, Peloza D, Walker A. Use of the dialectical behavior therapy skills and management of psychosocial stress with newly diagnosed breast cancer patients. *Plast Surg Nurs*. 2013;33(4):159-163. doi:10.1097/PSN.0000000000000018

26. Harned MS, Coyle TN, Garcia NM. 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*. 2022;29(2):83-93. doi:10.1037/cps0000059

27. Cooperman NA, Rizvi SL, Hughes CD, Williams JM. Field test of a dialectical behavior therapy skills training-based intervention for smoking cessation and opioid relapse prevention in methadone treatment. *J Dual Diagn*. 2019;15(1):67-73. doi:10.1080/15504263.2018.1548719

28. McCall MH, Boyd CT, Kerr ND, Daniel SS, Sutfin EL. 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*. 2025;34(1):e70074. doi:10.1002/pon.70074

29. Onken LS, Carroll KM, Shoham V, Cuthbert BN, Riddle M. Reenvisioning clinical science: Unifying the discipline to improve the public health. *Clin Psychol Sci*. 2014;2(1):22-34. doi:10.1177/2167702613497932

30. Land SR, Warren GW, Crafts J, et al. Cognitive testing of tobacco use items for administration to cancer patients and survivors in clinical research. *Cancer*. 2016;122(11):1728-1734. doi:10.1002/cncr.29964

31. Gratz KL, Roemer L. 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*. 2004;26(1):41-54. doi:10.1023/B:JOBA.0000007455.08539.94

32. Simons JS, Gaher RM. The Distress Tolerance Scale: Development and validation of a self-report measure. *Motiv Emot*. 2005;29(2):83-102. doi:10.1007/s11031-005-7955-3

33. Crawford JR, Henry JD. The Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS): Normative data and latent structure in a large non-clinical sample. *The British Journal of Clinical Psychology*. 2003;42:111-131.

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

35. ATLAS.ti. Published online 2023. Accessed July 10, 2024. https://atlasti.com

36. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*. 2006;3(2):77-101. doi:10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

37. Hennink M, Kaiser BN. Sample sizes for saturation in qualitative research: A systematic review of empirical tests. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2022;292:114523. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2021.114523

38. Shenton LM, Perera U, Leader A, Klassen AC. Perceptions of Facilitators and Barriers to Smoking Cessation Among Patients and Providers in a Cancer Center: A Single Institution Qualitative Exploratory Study. *Integrative Cancer Therapies*. 2023;22. doi:10.1177/15347354231198072

39. Charlot M, D'Amico S, Luo M, Gemei A, Kathuria H, Gardiner P. Feasibility and Acceptability of Mindfulness-Based Group Visits for Smoking Cessation in Low-Socioeconomic Status and Minority Smokers with Cancer. *The Journal of Alternative and Complementary Medicine*. 2019;25(7):762-769. doi:10.1089/acm.2019.0016

**Table 1. Interview Topic Areas and Approaches**

| Topic Area | Approach |
|---|---|
| Intervention structure | Questions focused on:<br>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<br>2. Appropriateness of inclusion of patients at all stages of cancer treatment and of patients both ready and not ready to quit cigarette smoking<br>3. Summative evaluation of the helpfulness, practicality, and convenience of the intervention structure |
| Interview content | Questions focused on:<br>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<br>2. Emotion regulation skills: presented as helping patients during emotionally intense moments, thereby preventing hasty or inappropriate behavior and restoring healthy emotional functioning<br>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<br>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:<br>1. Cancer Patient Tobacco Use Questionnaire (C-TUQ)[30]<br>2. Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale (DERS)[31]<br>3. Distress Tolerance Scale (DTS)[32]<br>4. Depression Anxiety and Stress Scales (DASS-42)[33]<br>5. Mental Adjustment to Cancer Scale (MAC)[34]<br>Patient participants completed the measures and provided feedback.<br>Providers reviewed the measures and provided feedback. |

**Table 2. Participant Demographic Data**

| Participant Demographics | n (%) |
|---|---|
| Patient Data: | |
| *Gender* | |
| Male | 6 (75%) |
| Female | 2 (25%) |
| *Race* | |
| Black | 2 (25%) |
| White | 6 (75%) |
| Provider data: | |
| *Gender* | |
| Male | 2 (22%) |
| Female | 7 (78%) |
| *Race* | |
| Asian | 1 (11%) |
| White | 7 (89%) |
| *Provider Participant Roles* | |
| Medical oncologist | 3 |
| Radiation oncologist | 2 |
| Oncology physician assistant | 1 |
| Oncology nurse navigator | 1 |
| Psychosocial oncology therapist | 2 |

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

| Topic Area | Results | |
|---|---|---|
| | **Patient Participants** | **Provider Participants** |
| Intervention structure | Supported:<br>• group and virtual formats<br>• including patients from all stages of cancer<br>Mixed feedback:<br>• including patients not ready to quit<br>• number and length of sessions | Supported:<br>• group format<br>• including patients from all stages of cancer<br>• including patients not ready to quit<br>• number of sessions<br>Mixed feedback:<br>• virtual format<br>Did not support:<br>• length of sessions |
| Interview content | Supported:<br>• DBT-ST skills overall<br>• Skills helping improve patients' lives beyond smoking cessation<br>Mixed feedback: | Supported:<br>• DBT-ST skills overall<br>• Skills helping improve patients' lives beyond smoking cessation<br>Mixed feedback: |

| Topic Area | Results | |
|---|---|---|
| | **Patient Participants** | **Provider Participants** |
| | • Not associating emotions with smoking | • Suitability of materials for low literacy<br>• Mindfulness seen as abstract or conflicting with religious beliefs |
| Recruitment and engagement | • Recruitment: flyers in waiting areas and clinic spaces, provider referral, and social media advertising<br>• Potential barriers to participation: dislike for the group setting, time constraints, concerns about the program being prescriptive/judgmental, and fatigue from treatment<br>• Potential facilitators to participation: personal motivators, interesting content, appropriately sized groups, and personable group leaders | • Recruitment: have the patient's healthcare team introduce the intervention, advertise overall benefits of skills as life skills<br>• Potential barriers to participation: technology-specific access issues, time constraints, language barriers, patients feeling unwell from treatment or illness |
| Patient-reported outcome measures | • Outcome measures relevant and easy to understand<br>• Captured feelings of depression and anxiety and how patients cope with these emotions<br>• Prompted participants to reflect on and understand their experiences | • Outcome measures relevant and valid for measuring intervention outcomes<br>• Concerns about patient comprehension and survey length<br>• Suggestions: use simple language, shorten the surveys, reduce the number of related questions to avoid confusion, and share with patients how their data is being used to benefit them and other patients |