A contingency management intervention to reduce cannabis use and time to relapse in early psychosis: the CIRCLE RCT

Sonia Johnson,¹* Luke Sheridan Rains,¹ Steven Marwaha,² John Strang,³ Thomas Craig,⁴ Tim Weaver,⁵ Paul McCrone,⁶ Michael King,¹ David Fowler,⁷ Stephen Pilling,⁸ Louise Marston,⁹ Rumana Z Omar,¹⁰ Meghan Craig,¹ Jonathan Spencer⁴ and Mark Hinton¹¹

- ¹Division of Psychiatry, University College London, London, UK
- ²Mental Health and Wellbeing, Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, Coventry, UK
- ³Addictions Department, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology & Neuroscience, King's College London, London, UK
- ⁴Health Service and Population Research Department, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology & Neuroscience, King's College London, London, UK
- ⁵Mental Health, Social Work and Interprofessional Learning, Middlesex University, London, UK
- ⁶Department of Health Service and Population Research, King's Health Economics, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology & Neuroscience, King's College London, London, UK
- ⁷Department of Psychology, University of Sussex, Brighton, UK
- ⁸Clinical Psychology and Clinical Effectiveness, University College London, London, UK
- ⁹Department of Primary Care and Population Health and PRIMENT Clinical Trials Unit, University College London, London, UK
- ¹⁰Department of Statistical Science, University College London, London, UK
- ¹¹Centre for Posttraumatic Mental Health, Department of Psychiatry, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, VIC, Australia

*Corresponding author s.johnson@ucl.ac.uk

Declared competing interests of authors: Michael King is a member of the Clinical Trial Units funded by the National Institute for Health Research and the Rapid Trials and Add-on Studies Board. Rumana Z Omar is a member of the Health Technology Assessment General Board. John Strang reports grants from Camurus (Lund, Sweden), Martindale Pharma (now Ethypharm UK, Woodburn Green, UK), Mundipharma (Mundipharma International Limited, Cambridge, UK) and Braeburn Pharma (Braeburn Inc., Plymouth Meeting, PA, USA), and other from Martindale Pharma and Braeburn Pharma outside the submitted work. In addition, John Strang has a patent Euro-Celtique SA issued and a patent pending with King's College London.

Published August 2019 DOI: 10.3310/hta23450

Plain English summary

The CIRCLE trial

Health Technology Assessment 2019; Vol. 23: No. 45 DOI: 10.3310/hta23450

NIHR Journals Library www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

Plain English summary

A large proportion of people with psychosis use cannabis, despite the negative impact that it has on their recovery. So far, a clearly effective way of helping young people in the early stages of psychosis to cut down their cannabis use has not been found. The CIRCLE trial investigated if an approach known as contingency management (CM) would be beneficial for this group. This approach involves offering voucher rewards for not using cannabis. It has been effective in addressing drug use problems in general, but there is not much evidence about its effects on cannabis use in those with psychosis.

A total of 551 service users with psychosis who used cannabis agreed to enter the trial. Half of the sample group was chosen by a chance method to receive CM. The other half formed a comparison group. The CM group received shopping vouchers if urine samples showed that they had not used cannabis for the previous week, measured over 12 weekly sessions. Participants could obtain £240-worth of vouchers if they did not use cannabis during the treatment period. The participants in both groups were also offered a six-session psychoeducation programme about the pros and cons of cannabis use and ways to reduce use of it.

The main comparison in the trial was the average length of time in each group before a relapse of psychosis occurred, which was recorded for each participant over 18 months after they joined the trial. The results found no difference between the two trial groups in this measure. Furthermore, there were no differences found between the groups in terms of the levels of cannabis use, clinical symptoms, or engagement with work or education. However, a cost-effectiveness analysis found an 85% chance of CM being more effective than the treatment-as-usual psychoeducation package, which appears to be because of the lower use of inpatient services by those receiving CM. However, it is difficult to understand why this was, because there was no drop in cannabis use. The results suggest that CM is unlikely to be clinically effective and that alternative treatments are still needed.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2019. This work was produced by Johnson *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This issue may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts (or indeed, the full report) may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Health Technology Assessment

ISSN 1366-5278 (Print)

ISSN 2046-4924 (Online)

Impact factor: 3.819

Health Technology Assessment is indexed in MEDLINE, CINAHL, EMBASE, The Cochrane Library and the Clarivate Analytics Science Citation Index.

This journal is a member of and subscribes to the principles of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (www.publicationethics.org/).

Editorial contact: journals.library@nihr.ac.uk

The full HTA archive is freely available to view online at www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/hta. Print-on-demand copies can be purchased from the report pages of the NIHR Journals Library website: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

Criteria for inclusion in the Health Technology Assessment journal

Reports are published in *Health Technology Assessment* (HTA) if (1) they have resulted from work for the HTA programme, and (2) they are of a sufficiently high scientific quality as assessed by the reviewers and editors.

Reviews in *Health Technology Assessment* are termed 'systematic' when the account of the search appraisal and synthesis methods (to minimise biases and random errors) would, in theory, permit the replication of the review by others.

HTA programme

The HTA programme, part of the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR), was set up in 1993. It produces high-quality research information on the effectiveness, costs and broader impact of health technologies for those who use, manage and provide care in the NHS. 'Health technologies' are broadly defined as all interventions used to promote health, prevent and treat disease, and improve rehabilitation and long-term care.

The journal is indexed in NHS Evidence via its abstracts included in MEDLINE and its Technology Assessment Reports inform National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidance. HTA research is also an important source of evidence for National Screening Committee (NSC) policy decisions.

For more information about the HTA programme please visit the website: http://www.nets.nihr.ac.uk/programmes/hta

This report

The research reported in this issue of the journal was funded by the HTA programme as project number 09/144/50. The contractual start date was in January 2012. The draft report began editorial review in April 2018 and was accepted for publication in February 2019. The authors have been wholly responsible for all data collection, analysis and interpretation, and for writing up their work. The HTA editors and publisher have tried to ensure the accuracy of the authors' report and would like to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments on the draft document. However, they do not accept liability for damages or losses arising from material published in this report.

This report presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR). The views and opinions expressed by authors in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the HTA programme or the Department of Health and Social Care. If there are verbatim quotations included in this publication the views and opinions expressed by the interviewees are those of the interviewees and do not necessarily reflect those of the authors, those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the HTA programme or the Department of Health and Social Care.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2019. This work was produced by Johnson *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This issue may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts (or indeed, the full report) may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Published by the NIHR Journals Library (www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk), produced by Prepress Projects Ltd, Perth, Scotland (www.prepress-projects.co.uk).

NIHR Journals Library Editor-in-Chief

Professor Ken Stein Professor of Public Health, University of Exeter Medical School, UK

NIHR Journals Library Editors

Professor John Powell Chair of HTA and EME Editorial Board and Editor-in-Chief of HTA and EME journals. Consultant Clinical Adviser, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE), UK, and Honorary Professor, University of Manchester, and Senior Clinical Researcher and Associate Professor, Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford, UK

Professor Andrée Le May Chair of NIHR Journals Library Editorial Group (HS&DR, PGfAR, PHR journals) and Editor-in-Chief of HS&DR, PGfAR, PHR journals

Professor Matthias Beck Professor of Management, Cork University Business School, Department of Management and Marketing, University College Cork, Ireland

Dr Tessa Crilly Director, Crystal Blue Consulting Ltd, UK

Dr Eugenia Cronin Senior Scientific Advisor, Wessex Institute, UK

Dr Peter Davidson Consultant Advisor, Wessex Institute, University of Southampton, UK

Ms Tara Lamont Director, NIHR Dissemination Centre, UK

Dr Catriona McDaid Senior Research Fellow, York Trials Unit, Department of Health Sciences, University of York, UK

Professor William McGuire Professor of Child Health, Hull York Medical School, University of York, UK

Professor Geoffrey Meads Professor of Wellbeing Research, University of Winchester, UK

Professor John Norrie Chair in Medical Statistics, University of Edinburgh, UK

Professor James Raftery Professor of Health Technology Assessment, Wessex Institute, Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton, UK

Dr Rob Riemsma Reviews Manager, Kleijnen Systematic Reviews Ltd, UK

Professor Helen Roberts Professor of Child Health Research, UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, UK

Professor Jonathan Ross Professor of Sexual Health and HIV, University Hospital Birmingham, UK

Professor Helen Snooks Professor of Health Services Research, Institute of Life Science, College of Medicine, Swansea University, UK

Professor Ken Stein Professor of Public Health, University of Exeter Medical School, UK

Professor Jim Thornton Professor of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, University of Nottingham, UK

Professor Martin Underwood Warwick Clinical Trials Unit, Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, UK

Please visit the website for a list of editors: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/about/editors

Editorial contact: journals.library@nihr.ac.uk