



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Gender differences in cannabis use disorder symptoms

A network analysis

Kroon, E.; Mansueto, A.; Kuhns, L.; Filbey, F.; Wiers, R.; Cousijn, J.

DOI

[10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2022.109733](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2022.109733)

Publication date

2023

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

Drug and Alcohol Dependence

License

CC BY-NC-ND

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Kroon, E., Mansueto, A., Kuhns, L., Filbey, F., Wiers, R., & Cousijn, J. (2023). Gender differences in cannabis use disorder symptoms: A network analysis. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 243, [109733]. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2022.109733>

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.



Gender differences in cannabis use disorder symptoms: A network analysis

Emese Kroon^{a,b,*}, Alessandra Mansueto^{b,c,f,g,1}, Lauren Kuhns^{a,b}, Francesca Filbey^d, Reinout Wiers^{b,c}, Janna Cousijn^{a,e}

^a Neuroscience of Addiction (NofA) Lab, Department of Psychology, University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands

^b ADAPT-laboratory, Department of Psychology, University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands

^c Centre for Urban Mental Health, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

^d School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences, University of Texas at Dallas, Dallas, TX, USA

^e Department of Psychology, Education & Child Studies, Erasmus University Rotterdam, the Netherlands

^f Psychological Methods, Department of Psychology, University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands

^g Amsterdam School of Communication Research (ASCoR), University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Cannabis
Gender
Sex
Network analysis
Addiction
Comorbidity

ABSTRACT

Background: While cannabis use in women is increasing worldwide, research into gender differences in cannabis use disorder (CUD) symptomatology is lacking. In response to limited effectiveness of addiction treatment, research focus has been shifting from clinical diagnoses towards interactions between symptoms, as patterns of symptoms and their interactions could be crucial in understanding etiological mechanisms in addiction. The aim of this study was to evaluate the CUD symptom network and assess whether there are gender differences therein.

Methods: A total of 1257 Dutch individuals reporting weekly cannabis use, including 745 men and 512 women, completed online questionnaires assessing DSM-5 CUD symptoms and additional items on plans to quit or reduce use, cigarette use, and the presence of psychological diagnoses. Gender differences were assessed for all variables and an Ising model estimation method was used to estimate CUD symptom networks in men and women using network comparison tests to assess differences.

Results: There were gender differences in the prevalence of 6 of the 11 symptoms, but symptom networks did not differ between men and women. Cigarette use appeared to only be connected to the network through *withdrawal*, indicating a potential role of cigarette smoking in enhancing cannabis withdrawal symptoms. Furthermore, there were gender differences in the network associations of mood and anxiety disorders with CUD symptoms.

Conclusion: The association between smoking and withdrawal as well as gender differences in the role of comorbidities in the CUD network highlight the value of using network models to understand CUD and how symptom interactions might affect treatment.

1. Introduction

Men compared to women use cannabis at almost double the rate (UNODC, 2019). However, cannabis use in women is increasing (Colell et al., 2013), paralleling the increasing legalisation of cannabis use in multiple countries and US states (SAMHSA, 2018; UNODC, 2019). Studies are suggestive of gender differences in both the acute effects of cannabis (Fogel et al., 2017; Matheson et al., 2020; Sholler et al., 2020) – with women usually showing larger subjective responses to similar doses of THC – and the withdrawal symptoms when ceasing cannabis use (Cutler et al., 2016; Schliez et al., 2017) – with women reporting more

nausea and anxiety and men reporting more sleep-related withdrawal symptoms (Bassir Nia et al., 2018; Khan et al., 2013). Also, while psychiatric comorbidities are highly prevalent (>90%) in men and women (Khan et al., 2013), women are more likely to report comorbid anxiety and mood disorders, specifically. Furthermore, women appear to transition more quickly from first use to cannabis use disorder (CUD) (Khan et al., 2013). Taken together, these differences could affect prevention and treatment efforts and highlights the importance of research into gender differences in cannabis use and CUD.

CUD is responsible for the most treatment entries for Illicit Substance Use Disorders (SUDs) worldwide (UNODC, 2018). While CUD treatment

* Correspondence to: P.O. box 15916, 1001 NK Amsterdam, the Netherlands.

E-mail address: e.kroon@uva.nl (E. Kroon).

¹ Both authors contributed equally to the manuscript.

efforts are unsuccessful for most, research into evidence-based CUD treatment is still limited (Gates et al., 2016). In response to the limited effective treatment for mental health problems including CUD (24–35% abstinence after 6 months; Denis et al., 2006; Hoch et al., 2013), research interest has been shifting towards a symptom network approach. Rather than focusing on a general clinical diagnosis, the network theory of mental disorders (Borsboom, 2017) proposes that individual symptoms and their interaction are crucial components in understanding the development and maintenance of mental disorders. Instead of viewing all symptoms as originating from a common cause, the mental disorder, symptoms should be studied as entities that interact with each other in causal ways giving rise to mental health problems. These interactions between symptoms can be seen as a network in which the nodes represent the symptoms, and the edges represent the association between pairs of symptoms (accounting for the presence of all other symptoms). The structure of the network as well as the weight of the connections between symptoms could provide valuable insights into the development of mental disorders, how they can effectively be treated, and even how treatment could be tailored to an individual using idiographic network models (e.g. Howe et al., 2020).

This theoretical transition from diagnosis to symptoms is also reflected in the increasing number of studies using network models to assess mental disorders, such as depression (Hoorelbeke et al., 2016), psychosis (van Rooijen et al., 2017), and common comorbidities between psychopathologies (Fried et al., 2017; Isvoranu et al., 2021). However, while rapidly increasing, the number of studies assessing the symptom networks in SUDs is currently limited and the evidence base too small to inform treatment. Rhemtulla et al. (2016) applied network models to substance abuse and dependence symptoms of a variety of substances, including cannabis, in a large sample of adult twins that used at least one illicit substance a minimum of six times in their life (Rhemtulla et al., 2016). Across substances, *using more than planned* was the most central symptom, also showing a strong association with *tolerance*. However, there were substantial differences between substances in both edge weight between symptoms and centrality of specific symptoms in the network. Looking at cannabis, there was a strong association between *inappropriate timing of use, the time it takes to use and recover from it, and the interference of use with work and other obligations*. While this study showed the feasibility of using a network approach in assessing CUD symptoms, replication using the most recent DSM-5 CUD symptoms as well as the assessment of the potentially crucial role of gender is needed. With the previous differentiation between cannabis abuse and dependence symptoms in the DSM-IV, men reported more symptoms of abuse than women, but no differences emerged in symptoms of dependence (Khan et al., 2013). Now that the DSM-5 forgoes the differentiation between abuse and dependence, it is important to assess whether gender differences in CUD symptoms are still present.

The current study aimed to explore gender differences in CUD symptoms using a network approach in Dutch individuals that used cannabis at least once per week during the last year. First, we constructed a network including the 11 items of the Mini International Neuropsychiatric Interview (MINI) DSM-5 interview to assess the interaction between symptoms of CUD. Second, we assessed whether men and women differed in the prevalence of specific symptoms. Third, we assessed potential gender differences in the symptom networks as well as differences in pairwise symptom associations and measures of centrality. Fourth, analyses were run to assess the role of plans to quit or reduce cannabis use, daily cigarette use (particularly common in Dutch individuals that use cannabis; e.g. van Laar et al., 2020), and comorbid mental health problems in the CUD symptom networks in both men and women. As most previous studies were conducted in dissimilar samples (e.g., in countries with cannabis legislation incomparable with Dutch legislation), using different measures (e.g., DSM-IV instead of DSM-5), and not assessing the complex associations between CUD symptoms, cigarette use, and mental health problems in both men and women, all aims of this study were treated as exploratory.

2. Methods

2.1. Sample

Data were collected online as part of the screening process for an MRI study on CUD. All procedures were approved by the ethics committee of the department of psychology of the University of Amsterdam (2018-DP-9616). The Dutch-speaking participants, all between 18 and 30 years old and living in the Netherlands at the moment of assessment, were only included if they consented to the storage and use of the screening data, indicated using cannabis at least once a week during the last year, and identified as either man or woman. A total of 1257 individuals (59.3% men) met these inclusion criteria.

2.2. Measures

Qualtrics online questionnaire software was used. Age and gender ('What is your gender?'; answers: man, woman, other (non-binary, not further specified)) were assessed and a digitalized Dutch version of the DSM-5 CUD section of the MINI 7.0.2 (Sheehan et al., 1997) was administered to assess 11 CUD symptoms (Table 1). Participants also reported the average number of days per week they used cannabis over the last year, whether they had plans to either quit or reduce cannabis use, and whether they used cigarettes on a daily basis (yes/no). To assess additional substance use for descriptive purposes, participants completed the alcohol use disorder identification test (AUDIT; Saunders et al., 1993), and self-reported their lifetime use of any other substance (excluding alcohol, cigarettes and cannabis). To assess history of mental health problems, participants reported lifetime diagnoses of any psychological disorder. Disorders that fit within the categories of mood

Table 1
DSM-5 MINI Cannabis Use Disorder (CUD) Symptoms.

Label	Description	Item
UseMore	Use more	During times when you use the drug, did you end up using more cannabis than you planned when you started?
RedQuit	Reduce or quit attempt	Did you repeatedly want to reduce or control your cannabis use? OR* Did you try to cut down or control your cannabis use but were unsuccessful?
Time	Time investment	On the days that you used cannabis, did you spend substantial time obtaining cannabis, using it, or recovering from its effects?
Crave	Craving	Did you crave or have a strong desired or urge to use cannabis?
Respon.	Responsibilities	Did you spend less time meeting your responsibilities at work, at school or at home, because of your repeated cannabis use?
Social	Social effects	If your cannabis use caused problems with your family or other people, did you still keep on using it?
Risky	Risky use	Did you use cannabis more than once in any situation where you or others were physically at risk, for example, driving a car, riding a motorbike, using machinery, boating, etc.?
Health	Health effects	Did you continue to use cannabis, even though it was clear that the cannabis has caused or worsened psychological or physical problems?
Activ.	Less activities	Did you reduce or give up important work, social or recreational activities because of your cannabis use?
Toler.	Tolerance	Did you need to use cannabis a lot more in order to get the same effect that you got when you first started using it or did you get much less effect with continues use of the same amount?
Withd.	Withdrawal	When you cut down on heavy or prolonged use of the drug, did you have any of the following withdrawal symptoms?

Note: * Both questions were asked as separate items and later score according to the scoring guidelines.

disorder (dysthymia, depression & bipolar disorder), anxiety disorder (social anxiety, generalized anxiety disorder, OCD & PTSD) or externalizing disorder (ODD, ADHD & ADD) were included in the analysis.

2.3. Data analysis

Gender differences on all measures were assessed using Mann-Whitney U tests (violation of normality assumption) or chi-square tests (categorical variables) using JASP 0.14.1.0 (JASP Team, 2020). All other analyses were performed with R version 4.0.2 and 4.2.0 (R Core Team, 2020). Network analysis was performed for the full sample and separately for men and women with the eLasso method and the Ising model using the R package Bootnet (Epskamp et al., 2018; default = "IsingFit"). Model selection was based on the Extended Bayesian Information Criterion (EBIC) with $\gamma = 0.25$ and the AND-rule. Strength centrality was estimated with the R package qgraph (Epskamp et al., 2012). Bootstrapped confidence intervals (1000 bootstraps) were used to investigate accuracy of edge-weights (Supplementary Figs. S2-S7), case-dropping bootstraps (1000 bootstraps) were used to investigate the stability of strength centrality (Supplementary Figs. S8-S10), and bootstrapped difference tests (1000 bootstraps) were used to test for significant differences between edges within the same network (Supplementary Fig. S11; Epskamp et al., 2018). To test for gender differences in the network structure, global strength, strength of all nodes, and weight of all edges, we performed a network comparison test with the R package NetworkComparisonTest (van Borkulo et al., 2017; 1000 iterations, $\gamma = 0.25$, AND-rule). Two participants with missing data on the variables "plan to reduce" and "plan to quit" were excluded from the network analyses including these variables. All analyses should be considered exploratory in nature.

3. Results

3.1. Sample characteristics

On average, participants used cannabis 5.3 days per week ($SD = 1.9$; Table 2). Their average CUD severity score was 5.0 ($SD = 3.0$), indicative of moderate CUD. Men scored higher on CUD severity, cannabis use days per week, and alcohol use and related problems (AUDIT). Women were more likely to have self-reported diagnoses of mood and anxiety disorders (Table 2).

3.2. CUD Symptom Network

Fig. 1A represents the full sample symptom network in which the nodes represent all MINI CUD symptoms and edges represent partial associations (controlled for all other associations) between those symptoms. The network was dense (mean weight = .37), with 43 non-zero edges over 55 possible edges. As can be seen from the edges,

craving was associated with several other symptoms including *unsuccessful quit attempts*, *withdrawal*, *tolerance*, *time spent on use* and *social effects*. Furthermore, there was an association between *using more than planned* and having experienced *unsuccessful quit attempts*. While most symptoms were closely interconnected and similarly central based on strength, *tolerance* and *risky use* were less interconnected. *Risky use* was connected to the rest of the network solely through *social effects*, *health effects* and *responsibilities*, while *tolerance* had the strongest direct relationship with *craving*. This was also reflected in the lower strength of *tolerance* and *risky use* (Supplementary Fig. S1A).

3.3. CUD symptoms in men and women

Men and women were equally likely to report *using more than planned* (1), *reducing or giving up activities* (9), and *experiencing craving* (4), *health problems* (8), or *withdrawal symptoms* (11; Table 3). However, men more often reported *unsuccessful attempts to reduce or quit use* (2), a *substantial time investment* (3), *less time spend on responsibilities* (5), *social effects* (6), *risky use* (7), and *tolerance* (10).

3.4. Gender Differences in CUD Symptom Networks

Estimated CUD symptom networks of men (Fig. 1D) and women (Fig. 1C) were similar; they did not differ in structure ($M = 0.60$, $p = .94$), global strength ($S = 0.11$, $p = .97$) or centrality (strength: lowest p -value = .19; Supplementary Fig. S1B & S1C). Like the network including the full sample, the networks were dense (men: mean weight = 0.34, 38 non-zero edges over 55 possible edges; women: mean weight = 0.34, 37 non-zero edges over 55 possible edges; all edge weights presented in Supplementary Table S1). Most associations appeared similar between genders, except for *tolerance*; for men *tolerance* was connected through *craving*, *time investment* and *responsibilities*, while in women *tolerance* was connected through *using more than expected*, *less activities* and *craving*. When comparing specific edges between genders, there only appeared to be one significant difference in the association between *time investment* and *tolerance* ($p = .02$); while there was a direct association between *tolerance* and *time investment* in men, even after controlling for the presence of all other associations, this association was not observed in women.

3.5. CUD Symptoms, Comorbidity, and Plans to Reduce or Quit Networks: Gender Differences

Network analyses showed that *cigarette use* was associated with the CUD symptom network through *withdrawal* and *time investment*, a potential effect of the co-occurrence of nicotine dependence in these individuals (Fig. 2A). *Plans to quit* and *plans to reduce* were related to each other but differentially connected to symptoms. *Plans to reduce* were primarily related to previous *unsuccessful attempts to reduce or quit*, while

Table 2
Sample Characteristics.

Measure	Women (N = 512)		Men (N = 745)		Total (N = 1257)			
	M (SD)	Mdn	M (SD)	Mdn	M (SD)	Mdn	Comparison test	
General	Age	21.8 (3.2)	21	21.6 (3.1)	21	21.7 (3.1)	21	$U = 184529.50$, $p = .32$
Cannabis use	CUD severity score	4.7 (2.9)	4	5.2 (3.0)	5	5.0 (3.0)	5	$U = 209065.50$, $p = .004$
	Last year days per week	5.1 (2.1)	6	5.5 (1.8)	6	5.3 (1.9)	6	$U = 210461.50$, $p < .001$
	Plans to reduce	N = 270 (52.7%)		N = 409 (54.9%)		N = 679 (54.0%)		$\chi^2(1, N = 1255) = .65$, $p = .42$
Other substance use	Plans to quit	N = 59 (11.5%)		N = 114 (15.3%)		N = 173 (13.8%)		$\chi^2(1, N = 1255) = 3.72$, $p = .05$
	Daily cigarette use	N = 317 (61.9%)		N = 472 (63.4%)		N = 789 (62.8%)		$\chi^2(1, N = 1257) = .27$, $p = .60$
	AUDIT score	7.2 (4.9)	6	8.4 (5.7)	7	7.9 (5.4)	7	$U = 211899.50$, $p < .001$
Mental Health	Other substance use	76.3 (204.1)	20	112.9 (573.8)	22	98.0 (460.8)	21	$U = 201795.00$, $p = .08$
	Mood disorder	N = 143 (27.9%)		N = 96 (12.9%)		N = 239 (19.0%)		$\chi^2(1, N = 1257) = 44.60$, $p < .001$
	Anxiety disorder	N = 97 (19.9%)		N = 30 (4.0%)		N = 127 (10.1%)		$\chi^2(1, N = 1257) = 74.36$, $p < .001$
	Externalizing disorder	N = 95 (18.6%)		N = 159 (21.3%)		N = 254 (20.2%)		$\chi^2(1, N = 1257) = 1.46$, $p = .23$

Note: AUDIT = alcohol use disorder identification test; CUD = cannabis use disorder; M = mean; Mdn = median; SD = standard deviation




Fig. 1. Cannabis use disorder (CUD) symptom networks. Nodes represent the eleven MINI CUD symptoms. The edges represent their positive associations, controlled for all other associations. Edge width and saturation reflect edge weight. To improve comparability, edge width and saturation were scaled to the largest edge weight across the three networks (edge weight = 1.141). Wider nodes' margins and bold nodes' legends indicate symptoms that were different in men and women. The average of the Spring layout of the men and women networks were used to plot all networks to improve network comparability and visibility. N = 1257.

Table 3
Gender Differences in Reported Cannabis Use Disorder Symptoms.

Symptom	Women (N = 512) N (%)	Men (N = 745) N (%)	Comparison test	Result	Total (N = 1257) N (%)
1 Use more	273 (53.3%)	385 (52.2%)	$\chi^2 = (1, N = 1257) = 0.15, p = .74$	M ≈ W	662 (52.7%)
2 Reduce or quit	270 (52.7%)	437 (58.6%)	$\chi^2 = (1, N = 1257) = 4.33, p = .04$	M > W	707 (56.2%)
3 Time investment	194 (37.9%)	333 (44.7%)	$\chi^2 = (1, N = 1257) = 5.78, p = .02$	M > W	527 (41.9%)
4 Craving	340 (66.4%)	512 (68.7%)	$\chi^2 = (1, N = 1257) = 0.75, p = .39$	M ≈ W	852 (67.8%)
5 Responsibilities	201 (39.3%)	369 (49.5%)	$\chi^2 = (1, N = 1257) = 12.92, p < .001$	M > W	570 (45.3%)
6 Social effects	126 (24.6%)	244 (32.8%)	$\chi^2 = (1, N = 1257) = 9.69, p = .002$	M > W	370 (29.4%)
7 Risky use	56 (10.9%)	154 (20.7%)	$\chi^2 = (1, N = 1257) = 20.66, p < .001$	M > W	210 (16.7%)
8 Health effects	230 (44.9%)	320 (43.0%)	$\chi^2 = (1, N = 1257) = 0.48, p = .49$	M ≈ W	550 (43.8%)
9 Less activities	114 (22.3%)	174 (23.4%)	$\chi^2 = (1, N = 1257) = 0.20, p = .65$	M ≈ W	288 (22.9%)
10 Tolerance	331 (64.6%)	559 (75.0%)	$\chi^2 = (1, N = 1257) = 15.83, p < .001$	M > W	890 (70.8%)
11 Withdrawal	263 (51.4%)	367 (49.3%)	$\chi^2 = (1, N = 1257) = 0.54, p = .46$	M ≈ W	630 (50.1%)

Note: N and percentages reflect the number and the percentage of individuals that reported experiencing the presented symptom; Bold text reflects the symptoms with significant gender differences; M = Men, W = Women.

plans to quit were more consistently associated with real-life outcomes of heavy use, such as health problems, less activities, social effects, and effects on responsibilities. The presence of externalizing disorders was not

connected to the network. The presence of mood disorders was connected primarily through withdrawal and was connected to the presence of anxiety disorders, which in turn was only connected to the CUD network




Fig. 2. Cannabis use disorder (CUD) symptom networks including exploratory variables. Nodes represent the eleven MINI CUD symptoms and additional exploratory variables. The edges represent their positive associations, controlled for all other associations. Edge width and saturation reflect edge weight. To improve comparability, edge width and saturation were scaled to the largest edge weight across the three networks (edge weight = 2.039). Wider nodes' margins and bold node legends indicate variables that were different in men and women. Different node colors represent different groups of variables (CUD symptoms, comorbidities, and plans). The average of the Spring layout of the men and women networks was used to plot all networks to improve network comparability and visibility. $N = 1255$.

through mood disorders.

Comparing these networks across genders (Fig. 2B-2 C), while daily smoking was only connected to the network in men, this did not constitute a significant difference between genders ($p = .77$). The connection of anxiety and mood disorders with the network did differ between men and women. In men, anxiety was connected to unsuccessful reduce or quit attempts while this was not the case in women (significant difference, $p = .004$). Also, in men, mood disorders were only connected to CUD symptoms through their association with anxiety, while the reverse was true for women, in which anxiety was only related to CUD symptoms through its association with mood disorders. Mood disorders in women connected to the rest of the network differently than anxiety did in men. The direct associations were with craving (significant difference, $p = .03$) and withdrawal (no significant difference, $p = .23$). In these models, the difference in the association between time investment and tolerance was still significant ($p = .006$). Additional differences were observed in the associations between responsibilities and risky use ($p = .04$) and between less activities and tolerance ($p = .03$), which were

only present in women, and in the association between craving and social effects ($p = .04$), which was only present in men. When correcting results for multiple comparisons with the Holm–Bonferroni method, the gender difference in the relationship between anxiety and unsuccessful reduce or quit attempts remained significant (all edge weights presented in Supplementary Table S2).

4. Discussion

We evaluated the associations between DSM-5 CUD symptoms in individuals reporting weekly cannabis use using a network approach, with a specific focus on gender differences. While several symptoms were more commonly reported by men than women, the pattern and strength of the associations between symptoms appeared similar between genders. However, exploratory analyses assessing the association of comorbid mental health problems with CUD symptoms did reveal gender differences; while the presence of anxiety and mood disorders were associated with each other in both men and women, the way they

connected to the CUD symptom network was different.

The estimated CUD symptom network was dense, in line with a previous study assessing the DSM-IV CUD symptom network (Rhemtulla et al., 2016), and consistent between men and women. This density might theoretically affect the developmental trajectory of CUD; in denser networks, when one symptom occurs (e.g., *craving*) the pathology can more easily spread (i.e., other symptoms develop) through the network because the initial symptom is connected to many other symptoms (e.g. Borsboom and Cramer, 2013). Centrality was similar for most symptoms, except *risky use* and *tolerance*. *Tolerance* was primarily associated with other symptoms through *craving*, which could indicate that while there are reciprocal connections between *craving* and *tolerance*, *tolerance* mainly affects other symptoms through *craving*. *Risky use*, a former DSM-IV criteria of abuse rather than dependence, was only connected to the rest of the network through *responsibility*, *social effects*, and *health effects*. Consequently, individuals reporting risky cannabis use could represent a clinically relevant sub-group. Of note, only 16.7% reported *risky use* (Table 3). Dutch young adults (mean age = 21.7) may encounter limited situations in which risky use would occur (e.g., due to lack of car ownership), warranting replication in other countries, including samples with a wider age range.

Men over-reported six out of eleven MINI CUD symptoms compared to women, while total CUD scores differed less than one point on average (Table 2). Interestingly, while symptom prevalence differed, symptom networks did not; when present, the symptoms interacted in the same way in men and women. So, while this could indicate that the CUD symptom network is activated through different symptoms, and that different symptoms might pose early warning signs for CUD in men and women, symptoms appear to interact in similar ways. As the network is dense and interconnected in both men and women, targeting treatment to those symptoms that are central and pose the biggest daily life problem for a specific individual will likely also help diminish other symptoms (e.g. Borsboom and Cramer, 2013).

Plans to reduce or quit, which might trigger seeking treatment, were related to each other. Having *plans to reduce*, was associated to the network through *unsuccessful attempts to quit* – potentially indicative of a lack of self-efficacy in quitting, but a persistent willingness to reduce use. *Plans to quit* were associated with the network through several symptoms that are indicative of daily life negative effects (i.e., *social effects*, *health effects*, *less activities*, and *affected responsibilities*) – potentially initiating the desire to quit (e.g. Copersino et al., 2006; Terry-McElrath et al., 2008).

Given the high co-occurrence in individuals that use cannabis (Connor et al., 2013), we assessed how daily cigarette smoking and the presence of mood disorders, anxiety disorders, and externalizing disorders were associated with CUD symptoms. Cigarette use was primarily related to the network through withdrawal, an association that might arise from associated nicotine withdrawal. While further investigation into different types of withdrawal symptoms and how they associate with CUD symptoms in individuals that also report using cigarettes is crucial, our results highlight the importance of considering cigarette smoking in treatment for CUD to potentially prevent withdrawal-related return to use. Further research is needed to assess whether simultaneous cessation negatively affects the chance one returns to use (e.g. Vandrey et al., 2008) or not (e.g. Apollonio et al., 2016). Notably, when looking at both men and women separately, daily smoking was connected to withdrawal only in men, but gender differences were not significant.

Looking at comorbidities, externalizing disorders were very prevalent (20.2%) but did not relate to the CUD symptom network. This indicates that individuals reporting weekly cannabis use who have an externalizing disorder are not more or less likely to report one or more CUD symptoms compared to other individuals reporting weekly cannabis use. While having an externalizing disorder might be a risk factor for heavy cannabis use and CUD (e.g. Farmer et al., 2015), within a group of individuals reporting weekly cannabis use, externalizing disorder presence may not influence CUD symptoms.

The prevalence of both mood (women: 27.9%; men: 12.9%) and anxiety disorders (women: 19.9%; men: 4.0%) was higher in women than men. Depression and anxiety were related to each other in both genders, but the way they were associated with the CUD symptoms differed. In men, anxiety disorders were related to CUD symptoms through unsuccessful attempts to reduce or quit, which could increase anxiety but also be increased by anxiety (i.e., possible feedback loop). Mood disorders were only related to CUD symptoms through anxiety disorders in men. In contrast, in women, depression was associated with CUD symptoms through craving and withdrawal, while anxiety only related to the rest of the network through mood disorders. This could indicate potential gender-specific self-medication mechanisms (e.g. Levin et al., 2010). Since using to reduce anxiety or depressive feelings is part of the withdrawal spectrum, these associations could be indicative of a self-medication feedback loop between depression and using to feel better, which in turn also affects craving and additional CUD symptoms. Nevertheless, research into specific withdrawal symptoms is crucial to unravel these mechanisms.

Some limitations should be noted. First, the MINI DSM-5 CUD semi-structured interview (Sheehan et al., 1997) is not validated for use as an online self-report. While this warrants clinical validation, assessment of the DSM-5 CUD symptoms through online self-report can be highly informative as large-scale data collection is not feasible in in-person interview settings. Second, the current sample is a convenience sample and large samples based on set criteria that ensure matching on most variables are needed to confirm our results. Third, splitting the data by gender did affect our sample size, which resulted in two smaller groups of unequal size. However, sample size differences were not large enough to justify concerns with regards to the network comparison test results. Furthermore, we identified stable edges in women that were not present in men (Supplementary Figs. S2-S7), making it unlikely that sample size affected our outcomes. Nevertheless, the relatively small sample size of the subgroups made it unfeasible to test more complex models in which continuous levels of other drug use and AUDIT scores could be added. Future studies with sufficient power should assess how CUD symptoms are associated with a wider range of substances, including more detailed assessments of substance use and related problems. Fourth, individual time series data is needed to further assess and confirm the proposed development of symptomology based on current results. Finally, while our results can be important to guide future hypotheses, our study was exploratory and the findings should be treated as such.

5. Conclusions

Our study shows that CUD symptoms are highly interconnected and that while there are gender differences in prevalence of symptoms, the symptoms interact with each other in similar ways in men and women. However, gender differences in how comorbidities are associated with CUD symptoms as well as the association between cigarette use and withdrawal symptoms highlight the importance of further research into complex associations between these factors to inform clinical practice.

Role of Funding

This research was supported by grant 1R01 DA042490-01A1 awarded to Janna Cousijn and Francesca Filbey from the National Institute on Drug Abuse/National Institute of Health.

Author Contributors

All authors reviewed and approved the final version. *Conceptualization*: EK, AM, RW & JC; *Methodology*: EK, LK, JC & AM; *Investigation*: EK & LK; *Formal Analysis*: EK & AM; *Data curation*: EK & AM; *Writing – Original draft*: EK & AM; *Writing – Review & Editing*: LK, RW, FF & JC; *Visualization*: AM; *Supervision*: JC & RW; *Funding Acquisition*: JC & FF.

Preprint

A preprint version of this article is available at psyarxiv.com/2je5c (DOI: 10.31234/osf.io/2je5c).

Conflict of interest

No conflict declared.

Data Availability

The data, code and materials of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Appendix A. Supporting information

Supplementary data associated with this article can be found in the online version at [doi:10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2022.109733](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2022.109733).

References

- Apollonio, D., Philipps, R., Bero, L., 2016. recovery from substance use disorders (Review). <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD010274.pub2>. www.cochranelibrary.com.
- Borsboom, D., 2017. A network theory of mental disorders. *World Psychiatry* 16, 5–13. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20375>.
- Borsboom, D., Cramer, A.O.J., 2013. Network analysis: An integrative approach to the structure of psychopathology. *Annu Rev. Clin. Psychol.* 9, 91–121. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-050212-185608>.
- Colell, E., Sánchez-Niubò, A., Domingo-Salvany, A., 2013. Sex differences in the cumulative incidence of substance use by birth cohort. *Int. J. Drug Policy* 24, 319–325. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugpo.2012.09.006>.
- Connor, J.P., Gullo, M.J., Chan, G., Young, R.M.D., Hall, W.D., Feeney, G.F.X., 2013. Polysubstance use in cannabis users referred for treatment: Drug use profiles, psychiatric comorbidity and cannabis-related beliefs. *Front Psychiatry* 4, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2013.00079>.
- Copersino, M., Boyd, S., Tashkin, D., Huestis, M., Heishman, S., Dermand, J., Simmons, M., Gorelick, D., 2006. Quitting among non-treatment-seeking marijuana users: Reasons and changes in other substance use. *Am. J. Addict.* 15, 297–302. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10550490600754341>.
- Cuttler, C., Mischley, L.K., Sexton, M., 2016. Sex differences in cannabis use and effects: a cross-sectional survey of cannabis users. *Cannabis Cannabinoid Res* 1, 166–175. <https://doi.org/10.1089/can.2016.0010>.
- Denis, C., Lavie, E., Fatseas, M., Auriacombe, M., 2006. Psychotherapeutic interventions for cannabis abuse and/or dependence in outpatient settings. *Cochrane Database Syst. Rev. (Online)* 3, CD005336.
- Epskamp, S., Cramer, A.O.J., Waldorp, L.J., Schmittmann, V.D., Borsboom, D., 2012. Qgraph: network visualizations of relationships in psychometric data. *J. Stat. Softw.* 48 <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v048.i04>.
- Epskamp, S., Borsboom, D., Fried, E.I., 2018. Estimating psychological networks and their accuracy: a tutorial paper. *Behav. Res Methods* 50, 195–212. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-017-0862-1>.
- Farmer, R.F., Seeley, J.R., Kosty, D.B., Gau, J.M., Duncan, S.C., Lynskey, M.T., Lewinsohn, P.M., 2015. Internalizing and externalizing psychopathology as predictors of cannabis use disorder onset during adolescence and early adulthood. *Psychol. Addict. Behav.* 29, 541–551. <https://doi.org/10.1037/adb0000059>.
- Fogel, J.S., Kelly, T.H., Westgate, P.M., Lile, J.A., 2017. Sex differences in the subjective effects of oral Δ^9 -THC in cannabis users. *Pharm. Biochem Behav.* 152, 44–51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pbb.2016.01.007>.
- Fried, E.I., van Borkulo, C.D., Cramer, A.O.J., Boschloo, L., Schoevers, R.A., Borsboom, D., 2017. Mental disorders as networks of problems: a review of recent insights. *Soc. Psychiatry Psychiatr. Epidemiol.* 52 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-016-1319-z>.
- Gates, P.J., Sabioni, P., Copeland, J., le Foll, B., Gowing, L., 2016. Psychosocial interventions for cannabis use disorder. *Cochrane Database Syst. Rev.* 2016. <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD005336.pub4>.
- Hoch, E., Dittmer, K., Bühringer, G., Wittchen, H.U., Seifert, A., Pixa, A., Henker, J., 2013. CANDIS treatment program for cannabis use disorders: findings from a randomized multi-site translational trial. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 134, 185–193. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2013.09.028>.
- Hoorelbeke, K., Marchetti, I., de Schryver, M., Koster, E.H.W., 2016. The interplay between cognitive risk and resilience factors in remitted depression: a network analysis. *J. Affect Disord.* 195, 96–104. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2016.02.001>.
- Howe, E., Bosley, H.G., Fisher, A.J., 2020. Idiographic network analysis of discrete mood states prior to treatment. *Couns. Psychother. Res.* <https://doi.org/10.1002/capr.12295>.
- Isvoranu, A.-M., Ziermans, T., Schirmbeck, F., Borsboom, D., Geurts, H.M., de Haan, L., van Amelsvoort, T., Bartels-Velthuis, A.A., Simons, C.J.P., van Os, J., 2021. Autistic symptoms and social functioning in psychosis: a network approach. *Schizophr. Bull.* 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbab084>.
- JASP Team, 2020. JASP (Version 0.14.1).
- Khan, S.S., Secades-Villa, R., Okuda, M., Wang, S., Pérez-Fuentes, G., Kerridge, B.T., Blanco, C., 2013. Gender differences in cannabis use disorders: results from the national epidemiologic survey of alcohol and related conditions. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 130, 101–108. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2012.10.015>.
- Levin, K.H., Copersino, M.L., Heishman, S.J., Liu, F., Kelly, D.L., Boggs, D.L., Gorelick, D.A., 2010. Cannabis withdrawal symptoms in non-treatment-seeking adult cannabis smokers. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 111, 120–127. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2010.04.010>.
- Matheson, J., Sproule, B., di Ciano, P., Fares, A., le Foll, B., Mann, R.E., Brands, B., 2020. Sex differences in the acute effects of smoked cannabis: evidence from a human laboratory study of young adults. *Psychopharmacol. (Berl.)* 237, 305–316. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00213-019-05369-y>.
- R Core Team, 2020. R: A language and environment for statistical computing.
- Rhemtulla, M., Fried, E.I., Aggen, S.H., Tuerlinckx, F., Kendler, K.S., Borsboom, D., 2016. Network analysis of substance abuse and dependence symptoms. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 161, 230–237. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2016.02.005>.
- SAMHSA, 2018. Key Substance Use and Mental Health Indicators in the United States: Results from the 2017 National Survey on Drug Use and Health, HHS Publication No. SMA 18–5068, NSDUH Series H-53. Rockville, MD.
- Saunders, J.B., Aasland, O.G., Babor, T.F., de la Fuente, J.R., Grant, M., 1993. Development of the alcohol use disorders identification test (audit): who collaborative project on early detection of persons with harmful alcohol consumption-II. *Addiction* 88, 791–804. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1360-0443.1993.tb02093.x>.
- Schlienz, N.J., Budney, A.J., Lee, D.C., Vandrey, R., 2017. Cannabis withdrawal: a review of neurobiological mechanisms and sex differences. *Curr. Addict. Rep.* 4, 75–81. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40429-017-0143-1>.
- Sheehan, D. v. Lecrubier, Y., Sheehan, K.H., Janavs, J., Weiller, E., Keskiner, A., Schinka, J., Knapp, E., Sheehan, M.F., Dunbar, G.C., 1997. The validity of the Mini International Neuropsychiatric Interview (MINI) according to the SCID-P and its reliability. *Eur. Psychiatry* 12. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0924-9338\(97\)83297-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0924-9338(97)83297-X).
- Sholler, D.J., Strickland, J.C., Spindle, T.R., Weerts, E.M., Vandrey, R., 2020. Sex differences in the acute effects of oral and vaporized cannabis among healthy adults. *Addict. Biol.* 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1111/adb.12968>.
- Terry-McElrath, Y.M., O'Malley, P.M., Johnston, L.D., 2008. Saying no to marijuana: why American youth report quitting or abstaining. *J. Stud. Alcohol Drugs* 69, 796–805. <https://doi.org/10.15288/jsad.2008.69.796>.
- UNODC, 2018. Global overview of drug demand and supply, in: *World Drug Report 2018*, pp. 1–66. <https://doi.org/10.18356/bdc264f4-en>.
- UNODC, 2019. Cannabis and Hallucinogens, in: *World Drug Report 2019*.
- van Borkulo, C.D., Boschloo, L., Kossakowski, J.J., Tio, P., Schoevers, R.A., Borsboom, D., Waldorp, L.J., 2017. Comparing network structures on three aspects: A permutation test, Manuscript submitted for publication. <https://doi.org/10.1037/met0000476>.
- van Laar, M.W., Oomen, P.E., van Miltenburg, C.J.A., Vercoulen, E., Freeman, T.P., Hall, W.D., 2020. Cannabis and COVID-19: reasons for concern. *Front Psychiatry* 11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2020.601653>.
- van Rooijen, G., Isvoranu, A.M., Meijer, C.J., van Borkulo, C.D., Ruhé, H.G., de Haan, L., 2017. A symptom network structure of the psychosis spectrum. *Schizophr. Res* 189, 75–83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2017.02.018>.
- Vandrey, R.G., Budney, A.J., Hughes, J.R., Liguori, A., 2008. A within-subject comparison of withdrawal symptoms during abstinence from cannabis, tobacco, and both substances. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 92, 48–54. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2007.06.010>.