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 Nicola,[3] Sherona R. Sirkisoon,[4] Erica Fox,[5] Lindsay 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 Eastchester, Atrium Health Wake Forest Baptist

[4]Data Coordinating Center, 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. This qualitative study evaluated our novel intervention to improve cessation self-efficacy by teaching patients skills in emotion regulation, distress tolerance, and mindfulness. We adapted our virtual, eight-session group intervention from Dialectical Behavior Therapy – Skills Training (DBT-ST). As a brief intervention, DBT-ST has been successfully applied to treat similar conditions, enhancing coping skills and improving outcomes for patients with substance use disorders and patients with breast cancer. DBT-ST has not yet been applied to address smoking cessation in cancer populations.

Methods: We conducted qualitative interviews with eight patient participants with cancer who smoked or had quit and nine provider participants – oncologists, psychotherapists, and nurses. Interviews were analyzed 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: An effective intervention is needed for patients with cancer who continue to smoke despite their cancer diagnosis. Positive patient and provider perspectives on this prospective intervention suggest that further studies should pursue the effectiveness of virtually delivered group DBT-ST to address the biopsychosocial and emotional drivers behind continued tobacco use. The virtual format shows promise in large population reach and filling a significant gap in tobacco cessation efforts.

INTRODUCTION

Patients who continue smoking cigarettes after cancer diagnosis are at increased risk of death, failed treatment, treatment complications, and secondary tumors compared to patients who stop smoking after diagnosis.[1–3] After disease site and stage, continued smoking is the strongest predictor of adverse cancer survival outcomes.[4] In contrast, the benefits of quitting smoking during or after cancer treatment 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 are currently smoking cigarettes.[9] The standard-of-care smoking cessation treatment – counseling using motivational or cognitive therapy plus medication – helps patients manage withdrawal, plan for situations that trigger 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 that are

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 distress, anxiety, depression, hopelessness, and interpersonal conflict,[5,13,16–18] conditions that predict fewer quit attempts and higher rates of relapse in the cancer population.[13,17,19] Difficulties with tolerating distress 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 enhance 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 distress tolerance and emotion regulation 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] 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] To our knowledge, despite its potential benefits, DBT-ST has not been studied 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.[28] Behavioral interventions progress through phases of evaluation, culminating in one or more randomized controlled trials to establish effectiveness.[28] 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.[28]

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.[29] 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.[29] 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 that met six times and included oncology and family medicine physicians, nurses, and behavioral health clinicians, as well as a patient with cancer who had quit tobacco use.

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 interviewing patients and providers. 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. Included were English-speaking adult patients aged 18 or older with cancer, active or in remission, who were currently smoking or had quit within the past year. 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 that 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 and to provide feedback on surveys being considered for future intervention studies.

Patients were referred to the study by oncology providers. After screening by the research team, patients were contacted either in person at their oncology visit or by phone to learn about

the study and complete the consent and enrollment process. Eight patient participants agreed, consented, and completed the interviews. Two patients declined participation, and one was lost to follow-up. 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. Providers who responded affirmatively were consented via phone.

Interviews

Using a semi-structured interview format, participants were interviewed about the DBT-ST intervention, study recruitment and engagement, and patient-reported outcome measures under consideration for future studies. Questions regarding the intervention structure assessed 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. Participants were asked about the inclusion of patients at all stages of cancer treatment and of patients both ready and not ready to quit cigarette smoking. Participants were asked for a summative evaluation of the helpfulness, practicality, and convenience of the intervention structure.

Interview questions regarding content assessed whether the DBT-ST skills to be taught during the intervention were appropriate, useful, and helpful for patients with cancer who smoke cigarettes. Included in the intervention were DBT-ST mindfulness, emotion regulation, and distress tolerance skills. The interviewer first described each DBT-ST skill area, then gave examples of skills. Mindfulness skills were described as allowing a patient with cancer to “press the pause button” when experiencing an upsetting event, thought, or feeling so as not to be overcome by it. By pausing and gaining understanding of their experiences, patients could regain their power to choose healthy behaviors. Emotion regulation skills were presented as helping patients during emotionally intense moments, thereby preventing hasty or inappropriate behavior

and restoring healthy emotional functioning. Distress tolerance skills were described as helping patients make challenging or painful situations more tolerable, making it possible to refrain from behaviors that could make situations worse. Participants were asked for a summative evaluation of the helpfulness and practicality of the DBT-ST skills content.

Participants were asked about the likelihood that patients would enroll in, engage with, and complete the intervention, and how to best recruit patients. Patient participants completed several outcome measures considered for use in future intervention studies and were asked for feedback. Providers were asked to review the measures and provide feedback. The measures included the Cancer Patient Tobacco Use Questionnaire (C-TUQ),[30] the Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale (DERS),[31] the Distress Tolerance Scale (DTS),[32] the Depression Anxiety and Stress Scales (DASS-42),[33] and the Mental Adjustment to Cancer Scale (MAC).[34]

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 mental health counselors in psychosocial oncology in the 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 service staffed by experienced qualitative researchers.

Data Collection

Individual interviews were conducted over the phone or via video call (Webex) 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 accurate transcription. 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 that emerged from the participant discussions. One Q-PRO researcher and the 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.[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

The patient sample consisted of eight patients. 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 provider sample consisted of nine providers, including 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 1** for 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 for themselves and others, such as accessibility of the virtual format, social support, having patients from different cancer stages and levels of readiness to quit, and learning DBT-ST skills to help them cope instead of smoking. Barriers to participation included not associating emotions with smoking, the group format not appealing to introverted patients, and the challenges of scheduling a busy patient population. They stated that other patients would be motivated to participate in the intervention. Patients found the outcome measures relevant and easy to understand.

Providers believed that the group DBT-ST intervention would help their patients, except for one provider who was confident their patient population was unlikely to stop smoking. They endorsed the group format for accountability and social support, the inclusion of patients with varied cancer types and stages, and levels of readiness to quit. Providers believed the DBT-ST skills would help with smoking cessation and with managing stress and anxiety from cancer diagnosis and treatment. Potential positive outcomes include improved quality of life, feeling a sense of community, and reducing psychological distress. They emphasized the importance of the patient's healthcare team in encouraging participation in the intervention. Concerns included

the virtual format not being accessible to older and rural patients, the sessions being too long at 90 minutes, difficulties scheduling patients who were busy with treatment or not feeling well, and DBT skills such as mindfulness being too abstract or in conflict with patient religious beliefs. Providers found the outcome measures relevant and valid, but potentially confusing to patients and requiring too much time to complete. Overall, most providers thought the intervention had exciting potential to "really make a difference" (PR03) in smoking cessation and quality of life while navigating cancer diagnosis and treatment.

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 that 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 that 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 that 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 facilitators for quitting 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 – improving quality of life, lowering dependence on medications or nicotine patches, and decreasing anxiety and depression. Lastly, one provider postulated that 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" that crosses 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 that may surround 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 that 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 . 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 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 varied across both patient and provider participants. However, patients and providers as a group differed 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 that their older, rural, and lower-income patients would struggle with video technology or would become disengaged or distracted during sessions. 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, which could be a bias arising from self-selection for this virtual interview.

Given the results of this qualitative study, several modifications to the intervention are recommended in preparation for Stage 1B of the NIH Stage Model, 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 online group

- Taking care with language, framing of concepts, and instructions to make the intervention concrete, value-neutral, and easy to understand
- Ensuring that skills training incorporates smoking cessation barriers and facilitators identified by patients
- Training group facilitators in virtual group engagement

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.

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 further determine 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, and William J. Petty, MD, for recruiting patients to this study.

REFERENCES (50 allowed)

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. 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
29. 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

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

Table 1. 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

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Table 2: Patient Codebook

Code	**Comment**
A. Questionnaires	Parent code
a1. Experience taking questionnaires	Participant's experience taking questionnaires, especially being able to understand and answer the questions.
a2. Depressive/anxious feelings relevant to cancer and smoking	Participant's thoughts on how depressive and anxious feelings and stress are relevant to their cancer experience and to smoking.
a3. Stress relevant to cancer and smoking	Participant's thoughts on how stress is relevant to their cancer experience and to smoking.
a4. Tolerate stress/distress relevance to cancer and smoking	Participant's thoughts on how the ability to tolerate and manage distressing emotions and stress are relevant to their cancer experience and to smoking. Captures information related to DTS.
a5. Mental adjustment to cancer relevant to cancer and smoking	Participant's thoughts on how the mental adjustment to cancer is relevant to their cancer experience and to smoking. Captures information related to MAC.
a6. Additional experiences cancer and smoking	Participant's additional thoughts about their experiences with cancer and continued smoking.

B. Overview of Format	Any general information or additional thoughts about the format of the intervention. Exclusion: Child codes
b1. Group intervention	Participants thoughts about using a group intervention for patients with cancer.
b10. Participant demographics group format	Participant's thoughts on demographic factors impacting group format.
b2. Cancer stage	Participant's thoughts about including patients at any cancer stage or phase of treatment.
b3. Inclusion of smokers	Participant's thoughts about including patients not committed to quitting smoking.
b4. Virtual group	Participant's thoughts about conducting the group virtually.
b5. Length of session	Participant's thoughts about length of sessions.
b6. Number of sessions	Participant's thoughts about number of sessions.
b7. Additional thoughts format	Participant's additional thoughts or suggestions on group format.
b8. Helpfulness of group format	Participant's ratings on a scale of 1-5 of the helpfulness of the DBT skills. Inclusion: Additional comments
b9. Practicality/convenience of group format	Participant's ratings on a scale of 1-5 of the practicality/convenience of the DBT skills. Inclusion: Additional comments
C. DBT skills	Parent code
c1. Mindfulness skills	Participant's thoughts about mindfulness skills.
c10. Helpfulness of skills	Participant's rating of the helpfulness of suggested DBT skills on a scale of 1-5. Include: additional comments regarding helpfulness of DBT skills.
c11. Practicality of skills	Participant's rating of the helpfulness of suggested DBT skills on a scale of 1-5. Include: additional comments regarding practicality of DBT skills.
c2. Emotion regulation skills	Participant's thoughts about emotion regulation skills.
c3. Distress tolerance skills	Participant's thoughts about distress tolerance skills.
c4. Skills help reduce or quit smoking	Participant's thoughts on how the skills would help them reduce or quit smoking.
c5. Skills help with depressive and anxious feelings	Participant's thoughts on how the skills would help them address depressive and anxious feelings.
c6. Skills help with stress levels	Participant's thoughts on how the skills would help with their stress levels.
c7. Skills help with ability to tolerate and manage distressing emotions and stress	Participant's thoughts on how the skills would help with their ability to tolerate and manage distressing emotions and stress.
c8. Skills help with mental adjustment to cancer	Participant's thoughts on how the skills would help them mentally adjust to cancer.
c9. Other thoughts or comments on skills	Participant's other thoughts or comments about the DBT skills.

D. Recruitment, Participation, and Retention	Parent code
d1. Participating and Completing Program	Participant's thoughts on participating in and completing this type of program.
d2. Discourages participation and completion	Participant's thoughts on what discourages them from participating and/or staying in the program.
d3. Encourage participation and completion	Participant's thoughts on how we can encourage participation and completion of this program.
d4. Suggestions for advertising	Participant's suggestions for advertising they would recommend for reaching other patients who may be interested in reducing or quitting smoking.
d5. Additional thoughts recruitment	Participant's additional thoughts or suggestions on recruitment.
E. Other	
F. Smoking cessation	Participant's thoughts and comments regarding experiences of smoking cessation including smoking cessation clinic, medications, and NRT.

Table 3: Provider Codebook

Code	**Comment**
A. Overview of Format	Any general information or additional thoughts about the format of the intervention. Exclusion: Child codes
a1. Group Intervention	Participants thoughts about using a group intervention for patients with cancer
a10. Participant Demographics Practicality	Participants thoughts on how patients from differing races/ethnicities, geographic locations, socioeconomic status, and/or educational levels might find this group format practical and/or convenient or not.
a2. Cancer Stage	Participant's thoughts about including patients at any cancer stage or phase of treatment.
a3. Inclusion of Smokers	Participant's thoughts about including patients not committed to quitting smoking.
a4. Virtual Group	Participant's thoughts about conducting the group virtually including pros and cons of conducting the group virtually and comparisons of virtual versus in person sessions.
a5. Length of Session	Participant's thoughts about length of sessions.
a6. Number of Sessions	Participant's thoughts about number of sessions.

a7. Helpfulness of group format	Participants ratings on a scale of 1-5 of the helpfulness of the group format to help implement DBT skill, thus reducing smoking. Inclusion: Additional comments
a8. Practicality of group format	Participants ratings on a scale of 1-5 of the practicality/convenience of the group format. Inclusion: Additional comments
a9. Participant Demographics Helpfulness	Participants thoughts on how patients from differing races/ethnicities, geographic locations, socioeconomic status, and/or educational levels might find this group format helpful or not. Include: what kind of changes would be needed to make the intervention more helpful.
B. DBT Skills	Any general information about DBT skills mentioned by the participant. Exclusion: Child codes. Include: Additional thoughts/suggestions on DBT skills.
b1. Mindfulness skills	Participants thoughts on how mindfulness skills might help patients reduce or quit smoking.
b2. Emotion regulation skills	Participants thoughts on how emotion regulation skills might help patients reduce or quit smoking.
b3. Distress tolerance skills	Participants thoughts on how distress tolerance skills might help patients reduce or quit smoking.
b4. Helpfulness of skills	Participants ratings on a scale of 1-5 of the degree of helpfulness of the DBT skills. Inclusion: Additional comments, if not helpful.
b5. Practicality of skills	Participants ratings on a scale of 1-5 of the practicality/convenience of the DBT skills. Inclusion: Additional comments
b6. Participant Demographics Helpfulness	Participants thoughts on how patients from differing races/ethnicities, geographic locations, socioeconomic status, and/or educational levels might find the DBT skills helpful or not. Include: how skills are presented (literacy level).
b7. Participant Demographics Practicality	Participants thoughts on how patients from differing races/ethnicities, geographic locations, socioeconomic status, and/or educational levels might find the DBT skills practical and/or convenient, or not.
C. Recruitment and participation	Any general information about recruitment or participation mentioned by the participant. Exclusion: Child codes
c1. Patient participation	Participants thoughts on likelihood of patients to participate in the intervention.

c10. Recruitment thoughts and suggestions	Participants additional thoughts and suggestions on recruitment.
c11. Participation thoughts and suggestions	Participants additional thoughts and suggestions on participation.
c2. Patient completion	Participants thoughts on likelihood of patients to complete the intervention. Include: participant receptivity.
c3. Barriers to recruitment	Participants thoughts on barriers to recruitment.
c4. Barriers to participation	Participants thoughts on barriers to participation.
c5. Recruiting methods	Participants thoughts on successful recruiting methods for support programs.
c6. Oncology clinician sign up encouragement	Participants thoughts on other oncology clinicians being willing to encourage patients to sign up for this intervention.
c7. Oncology staff sign up encouragement	Participants thoughts on other oncology staff being willing to encourage patients to sign up for this intervention.
c8. Oncology clinician encourage participation	Participants thoughts on other oncology clinicians being willing to encourage patients to participate in this intervention.
c9. Oncology staff encourage participation	Participants thoughts on other oncology staff being willing to encourage patients to participate in this intervention.
D. Intervention Outcomes	Any general information about intervention outcomes mentioned by the participant. Exclusion: Child codes
d1. Smoking reduction	Participants thoughts on how intervention could lead to smoking reduction and cessation.
d2. Improvement of patient outcomes	Participants thoughts on how intervention could improve overall patient outcomes.

E. Patient Assessments/ Factors	Any general information about patient assessment/factors mentioned by the participant. Exclusion: Child codes
e1. Influence on patient smoking behaviors	Participants thoughts on how the factors measured in the assessments influence their patients' smoking behaviors.
e2. Assessments measuring intended factors	Participants opinion on how well the assessments measured the intended factors.
e3. Factors not included that should be	Participants thoughts on factors that are not included in the assessments that they feel influence their patients' smoking behaviors.
F. General additional thoughts	Participants additional thoughts based on their experiences.
G. Medications	Participant's comments about using medication for tobacco cessation.
H. Research/Publications	Participant's comments about research regarding this intervention.
I. Smoking status	Participant's smoking status
J. Other	Any information not included in other codes.