



Trauma and Addiction: A Clinician's Guide to Treatment

17

Lisa M. Najavits

This chapter focuses on the link between trauma and addiction, emphasizing that it is not simply about applying treatments for each but rather understanding how each impacts the other; as well as how to engage in successful strategies without worsening the other. The chapter lists all behavioral therapy models that have at least one randomized controlled trial in a sample with current PTSD (full or subthreshold) and current SUD, which is the most commonly studied addiction. Recommendations for practice and a case study are offered,

17.1 Introduction

In the past decade, trauma and addiction have become prominent topics in the treatment field and, more broadly, in the culture at large. They are in the news daily and impact untold numbers of people. Moreover, the connection between trauma and addiction has also become much more widely understood than in earlier eras.

This chapter focuses on PTSD (the psychiatric disorder most associated with trauma) and substance use disorder (the most studied addiction, in contrast to other addictions such as gambling disorder).

The comorbidity signifies a more difficult course of recovery and greater impairment than either disorder alone (Najavits et al. 2017; Ouimette and Read 2013). The presence of SUD also impacts how PTSD is addressed in treatment. The whole is not the sum of its parts—addressing PTSD/SUD is not simply about applying

L. M. Najavits (✉)
University of Massachusetts Medical School, Worcester, MA, USA
Treatment Innovations, Newton Centre, MA, USA
e-mail: director@treatment-innovations.org

treatments for each but requires conceptualization of how each disorder affects the other and how to engage in successful strategies to address each without worsening the other. It is like a seesaw that needs careful balancing to prevent tipping too far to one side.

Too often, either the SUD or the PTSD is not addressed by clinicians. Patients still frequently hear messages from earlier eras:

- “Get your addiction under control and then we can address the PTSD.”
- “You must go to Alcoholics Anonymous.”
- “Your trauma is the root issue—if we just get to that, your substance use will decrease too.”
- “If you don’t stop using substances, I will not treat you.”
- “Your substance use means you are avoiding your PTSD.”
- “You need to hit bottom.”

As will be explored in this chapter, these old messages are generally not helpful to PTSD/SUD patients and can impede recovery. Splits between PTSD and SUD treatment are well known, and most clinicians never receive formal training in both. Patients have often been left to try to integrate what our field has not. Although PTSD and SUD may be viewed separately, they are strongly intertwined in the day-to-day experience of patients’ lives.

This chapter offers a brief summary of models for PTSD/SUD, key findings from outcome research, practice principles, and future directions.

17.2 Various Models

Various models have been developed specifically for PTSD/SUD or studied in that population. This represents an important recognition that the comorbidity presents unique challenges that need clinical attention.

The list below represents all behavioral therapy models that have at least one randomized controlled trial (RCT) in a sample with current PTSD (full or sub-threshold) and current SUD. Due to space limits, it is not possible to describe each model nor list all research citations pertaining to them, but they are described in Najavits et al. (2020), which is the source of this list. Some models are integrated (they address PTSD and SUD at the same time by the same clinician), which are identified with an asterisk; others were designed for just one of the disorders.

Models With a Published Treatment Manual

Models are listed in order of the manuals’ publication date:

- *Relapse Prevention* (Marlatt and Gordon 1985)
- *Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing Therapy* (Shapiro 1995)
- *Prolonged Exposure* (Foa and Rothbaum 1998)

- *BRENDA* (Volpicelli et al. 2001) where the acronym refers to Biopsychosocial evaluation, Report to the patient on assessment, Empathic understanding of the patient's situation, Needs collaboratively identified by the patient and treatment provider, Direct advice to the patient on how to meet those needs, and Assess reaction of the patient to advice and adjust as necessary for best care.
- **Seeking Safety* (Najavits 2002)
- **Concurrent Treatment of PTSD and Substance Use Disorders using Prolonged Exposure (COPE)* (Back et al. 2015)
- **Creating Change* (Najavits, in press)

Models Without a Published Treatment Manual

Models without a published treatment manual (listed in order of first RCT citation for the model):

- **Integrated Cognitive Behavioral Therapy* (McGovern et al. 2011)
- *Individual Addiction Counseling* (McGovern et al. 2011)
- *Structured Writing Therapy for PTSD* (van Dam et al. 2013)
- **Integrated Treatment* (Sannibale et al. 2013)
- *Alcohol Support* (Sannibale et al. 2013)
- *Modified Prolonged Exposure* (Coffey et al. 2016)

Other models were developed for PTSD/SUD but did not meet the criteria named above. For example, Substance Dependence PTSD Therapy (Triffleman 2000) was excluded as outcomes were never reported for the model per se; its RCT combined results with another model, 12-Step Facilitation. Some models had RCTs relevant to PTSD/SUD but both disorders were not current in the study sample.

17.3 Major Findings

Several findings can be observed across the literature at this point, including some surprises. Even for clinicians who do not specialize in PTSD/SUD treatment, it is worth understanding the current state of the field. As it is said, every clinician has PTSD/SUD patients in their practice, whether they know it or not. For details on the findings, see Najavits et al. (2017, 2020).

PTSD/SUD Studies Consistently Show Positive Outcomes

In the outcome studies conducted thus far, the pattern of results has consistently been positive. Improvements have been found in PTSD, SUD, and other domains such as self-compassion, cognitions, coping skills, psychopathology, and functioning. Treatment satisfaction was strong in studies that addressed it. Early concerns that addressing PTSD in the context of SUD would worsen patients' state have not been borne out. But it is important to remember that all studies used new models specifically designed for PTSD/SUD or made major changes to classic PTSD therapies to make them tolerable and feasible for SUD samples (Najavits et al. 2020).

The Most Evidence-Based Model at This Point Is Seeking Safety (SS)

SS has been very widely implemented in treatment programs for PTSD/SUD as well as for either SUD alone and for subthreshold SUD patients. It has been the subject of the majority of PTSD/SUD studies, including numerous pilots, controlled studies, and RCTs. It is also the model with the largest number of studies by independent investigators, which are less subject to positive bias (Chambless and Hollon 1998). SS has had consistently positive outcomes and has been studied with the most vulnerable PTSD/SUD clients (for summaries, see Najavits et al. 2020; Hien et al. 2019; and Najavits and Hien 2013; for a meta-analysis, see Lenz et al. 2016). It ranks as one of the top SUD models for cost-effectiveness in an independent government evaluation (Washington State Institute for Public Policy 2018), and has shown strong continued adoption and satisfaction in multi-year evaluations (Rodriguez et al. 2018; Hien et al. 2020).

Studies Using a Trauma Processing (TP) Approach Typically Combine It with a SUD Coping Skills (CS) Approach

A major current discussion in the field is the relative merit of TP versus CS approaches to PTSD treatment. Broadly speaking, models that focus on exposure-based or other emotionally intense exploration of trauma memories are termed here *TP*. In contrast, CS models focus on coping skills and education but do not explore trauma memories in detail (Najavits 2013). Alternate terms in the literature have been *past-focused* versus *present-focused*. Note, however, that a common misnomer is *trauma-focused* to refer to TP. It is a misnomer because all CS PTSD models directly focus on trauma. The difference is how they approach it. TP models focus primarily on the intense, detailed trauma narrative and memories. CS PTSD models explicitly omit detailed exploration of the detailed trauma narrative and instead offer education and coping skills to help patients work on PTSD in the present (e.g., learn to identify and manage trauma symptoms; improve functioning; increase safety in their current actions, thinking, and behavior; and promote overall stabilization). Moreover, the term *non-trauma-focused treatment* for present-focused PTSD models is problematic; it is comparable to referring to women as “non-men” or children as “non-adults.” Thus the terms *trauma processing* and CS models are used here.

The Majority of PTSD/SUD Studies Thus Far Use CS Rather Than TP Approaches

In recent years, there has been the healthy development of trying to evaluate whether TP approaches may be safely used with PTSD/SUD populations. Importantly, virtually every study using a TP PTSD approach combined it with a CS SUD model. Concurrent Treatment of PTSD and Substance Use Disorders Using Prolonged Exposure (COPE; Mills et al. 2012) combines PTSD exposure therapy (Foa and Rothbaum 1998) with two CBT SUD models (Baker et al. 2003; Carroll 1998). Prolonged Exposure (PE) (Foa et al. 2007) was combined with BRENDA, a SUD model (Volpicelli et al. 2001) in the study by Foa et al. (2013).

The Integrated Treatment Study (Sannibale et al. 2013) combined PTSD therapies (exposure and PTSD cognitive restructuring) with SUD treatment manuals from Project MATCH, an acronym that refers to Matching Alcoholism Treatments To Client Heterogeneity (Kadden et al. 1995) and Project COMBINE (Miller 2004). A study by van Dam et al. (2013) combined Structured Writing Therapy for PTSD (SWT; van Emmerik et al. 2008) with SUD group CBT (Emmelkamp and Vedel 2006). Creating Change is a purely TP model for PTSD/SUD but it has components that take into account SUD such as preparation for the work, readiness evaluation, strong safety monitoring, and theme-based session topics (Najavits et al. 2018; Najavits 2013). In sum, no investigator has used any TP PTSD approach as-is with a SUD population.

Moreover, it is notable that most studies that included a TP component were delivered in individual modality rather than group and were typically restricted to less complex samples than CS studies, in keeping with the PTSD-alone literature. “Less complex” means that patients were typically excluded if they had drug use disorders (rather than alcohol only), current domestic violence, homelessness, suicidality, violence, cognitive impairment, serious mental illness, and/or criminal justice involvement. In contrast, CS models were primarily group modality and accepted a much broader range of patients (Najavits and Hien 2013). (See below for more on this point.)

Many people believe that TP models are more powerful than present-focused models, perhaps because they are experienced as more emotionally intense. Yet RCTs that included TP PTSD treatment found null results (no difference) on either PTSD or SUD at the end of treatment compared to a control condition that was CS only (Mills et al. 2012; Foa et al. 2013; Sannibale et al. 2013; van Dam et al. 2013; Najavits et al. 2018). The only divergent study at this point is Norman et al. (2019) but that study did not use acceptable standards of fidelity and training so is challenging to interpret (Najavits 2019a). End of treatment is emphasized as that is the most rigorous time point for evaluating the impact of a model relative to a control. Both past- and CS models worked, but TP was not superior to CS, even on PTSD where it would be expected to if the “emotional intensity” hypothesis held. One explanation for the null results is that combining TP methods with CS diluted the TP work (Foa et al. 2013). Another explanation is that TP models may be too intense for patients who are struggling with SUD, which is consistent with the high dropout rate found in classic TP PTSD treatments (Lewis et al. 2020; Najavits 2015; Hoge et al. 2014). See also the recent meta-analysis by Gerger et al. (2013), which found that the PTSD treatment models they reviewed, which were predominantly TP, worked best with simpler rather than more complex patients, when compared to nonspecific therapies such as supportive therapy and relaxation training. A study sample was identified as complex if 80% met at least two of four clinical criteria: (a) duration of symptoms lasting more than 6 months; (b) presence of multiple problems (e.g., comorbid mental disorders, being in an ongoing violent relationship; being a refugee); (c) presence of a complex psychological traumatization, that is,

childhood, multiple, or intentional trauma; and (d) the presence of a formal PTSD diagnosis per the DSM.

Overall, with PTSD/SUD patients, greater emotional intensity in sessions does not equal better outcomes. Both present- and TP models may be helpful to patients, based on readiness of the patient and clinician, training, setting, and other contextual factors. The bottom line is that clinicians have a lot of choice in which models to use.

Some Studies Addressed Complex PTSD/SUD Populations

It is heartening that some PTSD/SUD studies addressed a broad range of patients: those with substance dependence rather than just substance abuse, those with drug disorders rather than just alcohol, and often those with issues such as homelessness, domestic violence, suicidality, violence, serious and persistent mental illness, criminal justice involvement, unemployment, multiple prior treatment episodes, and low education. These types of patients have consistently been excluded from classic PTSD-alone studies (i.e., TP models). Among PTSD/SUD studies, those with TP models also had the most exclusions (see Najavits et al. 2020 for more detail). Examples of exceptions for TP models are Mills et al. (2012), Najavits and Johnson (2014), and Najavits et al. (2005, 2018), all of which had a broader range of patients.

It Appears Easier to Change PTSD Than SUD

In the literature thus far, when there were differences between conditions, they were more often on PTSD or other mental health variables and less often on SUD (Najavits et al. 2020). This may indicate that in PTSD/SUD patients, PTSD and mental health issues may be easier to treat than SUD. This pattern also fits the current view of PTSD as amenable to time-limited treatment, whereas SUD (severe SUD in particular) is conceptualized as a chronic relapsing disorder needing ongoing care (Arria and McLellan 2012).

17.4 Recommendations for Practice

Attend to Both PTSD and SUD If the Patient Has Both

This may seem simple but all too often is not done in practice. There are many reasons for it, including lack of sufficient training on PTSD and/or SUD in professional degree programs. The disorders are also known to evoke strong emotional reactions in clinicians and, for SUD in particular, stigma and negative attitudes (Imhof 1991; Pearlman and Saakvitne 1995). Clinicians may shy away from addressing them, may feel incompetent to manage them, or may simply not notice them. Yet just as a patient with cancer and diabetes needs help with both, so too the patient with PTSD and SUD needs help with both. The treatment plan will depend on many factors. Some clinicians may be the primary treater for both; others may treat one or the

other or refer out for both. But the “no wrong door” principle still applies: address both in some fashion if present.

Conduct a Thorough and Accurate Assessment

Accurately identify both PTSD and SUD, along with other diagnoses and problems that may be present. Use validated instruments rather than homegrown instruments or ad hoc questions. There are at this point many assessments that are easy to obtain, including screening tools, diagnostic interviews, and self-report measures of problem areas. (See Najavits 2004, 2019b; Ouimette and Read 2013.)

Work Together with the Patient to Explore Treatment Options

Collaboration is crucial. Ultimatums often drive the patient away and reinforce distrust of professionals. “My way or the highway” approaches are sometimes used with SUD patients out of frustration or a misguided view that harsh confrontation or “hitting bottom” is needed to overcome SUD denial. Yet research shows that a supportive stance is best when working with SUD (Miller et al. 1993; Miller and Rollnick 1991) as well as PTSD. Offer the patient as many treatment options as possible and empower patients to try out as many as possible before they choose which fit best for them. A helpful strategy is to encourage them to attend up to three sessions of various treatments. According to research, the therapeutic alliance is established by about the third session (Garfield and Bergin 1994). If the alliance is weak at that point, have the patient try other approaches. Pushing patients to stay in treatments they do not like is counterproductive and can drive patients away for good. To learn about treatment resources for PTSD and SUD, search online and find manuals that address PTSD/SUD.

Be Compassionate

Listen closely and convey empathy. PTSD/SUD patients have typically lived lives of extraordinary pain. They are often highly sensitive and feel enormous self-hatred. They are used to being misunderstood by their own families, communities, and, unfortunately, sometimes by clinicians. If they perceive you as aloof or judgmental, they will be less likely to open up. They may drop out of treatment. A caring professional stance is the basis of good treatment. However, remember that true compassion does not mean letting go of standards, making excuses, tolerating unacceptable behavior, or otherwise “enabling” patients. It is about being kind and caring when you enforce treatment expectations and boundaries.

Recognize Differences Among PTSD/SUD Patients

They vary in many ways, including the presence or absence of co-occurring personality disorders, physical health problems, financial concerns, and legal issues. They also differ in strengths, such as ability to get along with others and level of intelligence. Each patient's kaleidoscope of features will impact treatment. PTSD/SUD patients are not a homogeneous population.

Attend to the Severity of PTSD and SUD, Not Order of Onset

Some clinicians erroneously believe that if the PTSD occurred first (which it does in most cases), then addressing PTSD is primary. Yet rather than order of onset of PTSD and SUD, it is the *severity* of each that most determines the treatment plan. By the time the patient is sitting in front of you with both disorders, which came first is much less important than what happens next. Both disorders will need attention. And severe disorders will need the most immediate and strong help. Severity refers to both level of symptoms and also negative consequences, such as which disorder gets them in the most trouble, causes the most harm, etc. Some patients are equally severe on both disorders; others are more severe on one or the other. Use validated instruments to assess the severity of each to help determine the plan.

Directly Monitor Substance Use

Good SUD care requires the clinician to actively inquire about substance use at every visit. Ideally, this will be verified by urinalysis, breathalyzer, or other biological methods. Even if those are not possible, which may be the case in private practice settings, it is crucial to use a valid self-report instrument and to have a clear written contract on substance use. The contract targets the goal per substance, such as “No more than 1 drink a day, measured with a shot glass,” “No substance use at all,” or whatever other goal is established. Inquire about substance use at each session, including amount and frequency; patients will often not bring it up directly. PTSD symptoms should also be assessed ongoing.

Do Not Push Trauma Processing Treatments

Patients are sometimes overly strongly pushed into TP models with statements such as “You’re avoiding if you don’t do it,” “This is the only way to really recover,” and “If you do this work, it will get to the root of your problems and you won’t need substances anymore” (Najavits et al. 2017). Even if well intentioned, these are not accurate for most PTSD/SUD patients, especially those with severe SUD. As reviewed earlier, scientific evidence at this point indicates that past- and CS approaches work equally well for PTSD/SUD patients. Be direct with patients about the evidence base and let them choose what is right for them without pressure. Some are ready for TP work, want to do it, and can benefit. Others do not.

Attend to Behavioral Addictions as Well as SUD

There is increasing focus on behavioral addictions such as excessive gambling, work, exercise, internet, pornography, sex, etc. (Najavits 2014; Freimuth 2005). Most are not in DSM-5 yet still warrant attention. Ask patients explicitly about these and offer options for help as needed.

Provide Up-to-Date Information

Strive to stay current. Even if well intentioned, inaccurate messages can do more harm than good. See the beginning of this chapter for examples of such messages. Read updated books on PTSD/SUD. Reading on PTSD alone or SUD alone can be helpful but are not sufficient for the combination of PTSD/SUD combination. Get a broad understanding and seek training as needed.

Address Cultural Factors

PTSD and SUD are influenced by cultural factors in both their development and their recovery. Both are subject to stigma and to silencing, which can become deeply internalized. Help clients explore how the cultures they have experienced may have had an impact on their PTSD and SUD. These include cultural aspects based on ethnicity, race, gender and age, but also aspects such as occupation (first responders, military), type of trauma (sexual assault versus car accident), geography (rural versus urban), political affiliation, and many other aspects. For a detailed example of adaptation of a PTSD/SUD treatment based on culture, see Marsh et al. (2016).

Choose PTSD/SUD Models Based on Realistic Factors

Both the clinician and patient need models that fit for them. Factors such as preference for individual versus group work, past treatment experiences, appeal of various treatments, insurance coverage, and other factors will play a role. Additional guidance for choosing treatment models is described in Najavits et al. (2020), including these considerations:

- whether the model has been tested across a broad range of SUDs
- whether the model has only been tested within intensive SUD treatment
- whether studies included complex SUD patients
- whether the model can be conducted in group modality
- workforce requirements
- the cost of treatments

17.5 Future Developments

Overall, various models have emerged to address the widespread suffering endured by PTSD/SUD patients. Such models have evidenced positive impact and can bring innovation and inspiration to clinical work. In the decades ahead, empirical efforts are needed to continue to expand understanding of how to best help these patients.

From a broader lens, it is also worth recognizing that no therapy model in and of itself is ever likely to quickly resolve what for many of these patients have

been decades of abuse, neglect, violence, substance use, and associated problems, such as homelessness, criminal justice involvement, job problems, poverty, discrimination, and physical health problems. Many are multiply burdened (Brown et al. 1995), chronic in their PTSD and SUD, and come from generations of family who have also struggled with these issues. They often have few resources for care and receive treatment from some of the least trained clinical staff. They often end up in public health systems of care. Thus, it is worth considering options beyond therapy models per se and which may potentially boost the impact of models.

PTSD/SUD Patients May Need Ongoing Support Rather Than Time-Limited Help

Some less severe patients may do well with a round of short-term treatment. But the clinical reality is that many cycle repeatedly through the revolving door of treatment. SUD in particular has been conceptualized as a disorder comparable to diabetes in needing long-term management rather than short-term models (Arria and McLellan 2012). This is reflected in the wisdom of 12-step approaches that provide free ongoing support to sustain abstinence from substances and which grew up as a grass-roots model by addicts themselves. For PTSD, there is as yet no widespread supportive resource of this type. Becoming creative about developing resources for chronic patients, beyond 12-step groups, may be an important public health goal. Some of the models identified in this article can perhaps be used in such ways.

The Workforce Treating These Patients Also Needs Support

Many clinicians have their own histories of trauma and addiction. They often handle large caseloads of complex patients without sufficient support or training. There is little research on how best to select and retain them and how to best support their work. Treatment models for PTSD/SUD are an important resource, but their professional needs go beyond models. Clinicians treating PTSD/SUD report notable gratification in the work but also significant stressors (Najavits et al. 2010).

Beyond the “Horse Race” of Models, Focus on Cost, Appeal, Ease of Implementation, and Sustainability

Several decades of research indicate that well-constructed therapy models relevant to PTSD and SUD have positive impact but do not differ notably in their outcomes (Imel et al. 2008; Benish et al. 2007; Powers et al. 2010; Najavits et al. 2018). However, they may differ in other important ways such as how much they cost, how easy they are to implement, and how sustainable they are. A model with slightly lower outcomes but greater strength in these factors may be an excellent choice. In the PTSD/SUD field, such factors have largely not yet been researched in relation to treatment models.

17.6 Case Example

To help highlight some of the themes in this chapter, the following case example is offered, using Seeking Safety as the treatment.

Implementation of Seeking Safety (SS)

SS arose out of the need for a trauma intervention that could be used safely and effectively with substance abuse clients, most of whom have major trauma histories yet may not be able to tolerate emotionally intense TP PTSD therapies. SS is consistent with the stage-based approach to trauma recovery (Herman 1992; van der Hart and Brown 1992) that identifies the first stage of work, safety, as CS, i.e., present-focused (stabilization and coping). SS focuses solely on this phase. Later work may include TP if needed. In the years since Herman's framework was published, there is now understanding that the different types of work don't have to be sequential and some patients may choose to do just one type or another or that the order of the sequencing can be flexible and determined by patient preference and need (Cloitre et al. 2015).

SS emphasizes education and coping skills for trauma survivors. It is optimistic, building hope through emphasis on ideals, humanistic language, inspiring quotations, and concrete strategies. Originally designed for co-occurring trauma and substance abuse, it is now used for either or both. SS is highly flexible: for males, females, all trauma types, adults, adolescents, groups, individuals, and any counselor, setting, and duration. It has been implemented successfully with numerous vulnerable populations including people who are homeless, living with HIV, incarcerated, suicidal, and cognitively impaired. Each SS topic offers a coping skill to build resilience, such as *Asking for Help*, *Honesty*, *Coping with Triggers*, *Self-Nurturing*, and *Healing from Anger*.

The Case

Jolene is a 45-year-old African-American female veteran who served in the army 20 years ago. She survived a brutal sexual assault by a military commander, resulting in mild traumatic brain injury (mTBI) and severe PTSD. The mTBI resolved eventually, but the PTSD was so severe that she was virtually housebound for 20 years, living off of her benefits, unable to work, and in contact only with her siblings (her parents having died some years ago). She developed severe alcohol use disorder and came in for therapy on the advice of her primary care physician, who identified liver problems from the alcohol. She had never told anyone about the sexual assault until the SS therapy. In SS, patients can share the nature of their traumas, but we do not go into a detailed narrative of it. "Headlines, not details" is the guiding principle. Jolene expressed relief that she could work on her PTSD in SS without having to revisit the painful trauma narrative. She

continually blamed herself for the trauma, saying “If I had been a better soldier, I would have been able to defend myself.” Before the assault she had had outstanding success in her military career but after it was unable to function and was discharged. “It’s as if I was two different people: the person before and the person after.”

The Treatment

Jolene was hesitant to come to therapy and canceled the first several appointments. I encouraged her to try just one session. I let her know that it would be up to her whether or not she wanted to continue—thus striving from this first phone contact to empower her to choose what was best for her. Empowerment is a core aspect of SS. The model conveys that there are many ways to cope safely, and patients can choose what works for them, even if it is different than what others choose. “Safety” is a rich concept in SS, referring to safety in relationships, thinking, and behavior, with no harm to self or others.

Jolene ultimately attended a full course of SS with weekly sessions over 6 months. She was highly intelligent and conscientious, with military-style, responsible behavior—showing up on time, reading the handouts ahead of time, and following through on most of her therapy commitments (the latter is the SS term for homework). But emotionally she was all over the place—tearful, lacking focus, obsessing about small details, not taking care of her health (poor diet, no exercise), and unable to stop drinking every day.

We had three major priorities in our work. First, we focused on coping—what she could do each week to move forward in her life, in any way possible. For example, the week that we covered the topic *Taking Good Care of Yourself*, she could see that her isolation was not healthy. That week she chose to attend an online AA meeting (an in-person meeting was not something she was willing to try). Another week we focused on *Setting Boundaries in Relationships*, and she was able to say no to her sister’s request for money rather than giving into it as she had done too often in the past. Each session, we related the SS coping skills in meaningful yet also practical ways to her current struggles. Even small successes meant a lot to her, showing her that she was no longer stuck in the same old patterns but able to make new choices and to keep learning from them. SS, at its core, is all about learning—trying new strategies and adapting, refining, and changing them as needed to keep progressing. Such learning is both unique to each person yet also universal.

Our second major focus was reducing the alcohol use. Given the many years of daily drinking, her physician worked with her on the physiological aspects to prevent seizures that can occur with abrupt reduction of alcohol. In SS, I would gently bring up the alcohol either during the session, as part of our SS topic, weaving it in here and there to question, nudge, and guide her to see more clearly its impact on her life and to explore alternative actions she could

do when she had a craving to drink. I would ask questions such as, “Would you be willing to try drinking only every other day?” and we would explore that, always coming back to how the SS coping skills might help her to achieve that goal. Helping her see the linkages between her trauma and alcohol use was also a repeated theme. She said, “I can see it now much more clearly. I just wish I could have seen it 20 years ago.” There was deep sadness with such statements, and her course of alcohol use had some ups and downs, but by the last third of the therapy, she had reduced her drinking by half and was moving toward abstinence.

Our third major focus was to bring a compassionate approach to her self-hatred about her trauma. She had spent decades blaming and judging herself for not fighting off the attacker. We worked on SS topics such as *Compassion*, *Creating Meaning*, and *Integrating the Split Self* to help her respond to herself in kind ways when her inner critical voices arose. She was better able to get through her day with increased functionality as she learned to coach herself through her daily struggles rather than giving up. She was able to recognize too that there really had been no way for her to prevent the trauma—no matter how fine and strong a soldier she had been—and that her task now was to create a better future for herself rather than staying stuck in “beating herself up” about the past.

The case management component of SS also came into play, identifying referrals for additional treatments that she would be willing to attend. She had limited social contact, often none in any given week, but was able to join a women's therapy group and the online AA meetings. We also worked on referral to a nutrition consult to help with her poor diet.

She ended the SS therapy with greater hopefulness, even though there was still recovery work to do. “It has felt so healing to be able to start living more—to expand my world, to move forward.”

17.7 Closing

The first generation of PTSD/SUD research is impressive in attending to patients who were consistently excluded from most prior outcome research on PTSD. The development of new models for this population has advanced the field and offers clinicians various options. The most studied and widely used model remains Seeking Safety at this point. Yet much remains to be done to advance the next generation of research and continue to refine models. Patients with PTSD/SUD have greater impairment and worse prognosis than those with either disorder alone. They are a highly vulnerable population in need of strong and accessible treatments, and compassionate, skilled clinicians.

References

- Arria AM, McLellan AT (2012) Evolution of concept, but not action, in addiction treatment. *Subst Use Misuse* 47(8–9):1041–1048
- Back SE, Foa EB, Killeen TK, Mills KL, Teesson M, Dansky Cotton B et al (2015) Concurrent treatment of PTSD and substance use disorders using prolonged exposure (COPE): therapist guide. Oxford University Press, New York, NY
- Baker A, Kay-Lambkin F, Lee NK, Claire M, Jenner L (2003) A brief cognitive behavioural intervention for regular amphetamine users. Australian Government Department of Health and Ageing, Canberra, ACT
- Benish S, Imel Z, Wampold B (2007) The relative efficacy of bona fide psychotherapies for treating post-traumatic stress disorder: a meta-analysis of direct comparisons. *Clin Psychol Rev* 28:746–758
- Brown VB, Huba G, Melchior L (1995) Level of burden: women with more than one co-occurring disorder. *J Psychoactive Drugs* 27:339–346
- Carroll K (1998) A cognitive-behavioral approach: treating cocaine addiction. NIH publication 98-4308. National Institute on Drug Abuse, Rockville, MD
- Chambless D, Hollon S (1998) Defining empirically supported therapies. *J Consult Clin Psychol* 66:7–18
- Cloitre M (2015) The “one size fits all” approach to trauma treatment: Should we be satisfied?. *Eur J Psychotraumatol* 6(1):27344
- Coffey SF, Schumacher JA, Nosen E, Littlefield AK, Henslee AM, Lappen A et al (2016) Trauma-focused exposure therapy for chronic posttraumatic stress disorder in alcohol and drug dependent patients: a randomized controlled trial. *Psychol Addict Behav* 30(7):778–790
- van Dam D, Ehring T, Vedel E, Emmelkamp PM (2013) Trauma-focused treatment for posttraumatic stress disorder combined with CBT for severe substance use disorder: a randomized controlled trial. *BMC Psychiatry* 13(1):172
- Emmelkamp PMG, Vedel E (2006) Evidence-based treatments for alcohol and drug abuse: a practitioner’s guide to theory, methods, and practice. Routledge, New York, NY
- van Emmerik AAP, Kamphuis JH, Emmelkamp PMG (2008) Treating acute stress disorder and posttraumatic stress disorder with cognitive behavioral therapy or structured writing therapy: a randomized controlled trial. *Psychother Psychosom* 77(2):93–100
- Foa EB, Rothbaum BO (1998) Treating the trauma of rape: cognitive-behavioral therapy for PTSD. Guilford, New York, NY
- Foa EB, Hembree EA, Rothbaum BO (2007) Prolonged exposure therapy for PTSD: emotional processing of traumatic experiences. Oxford University Press, New York, NY
- Foa EB, Yusko DA, McLean CP, Suvak MK, Bux DA Jr, Oslin D, O’Brien CP, Imms P, Riggs DS, Volpicelli J (2013) Concurrent naltrexone and prolonged exposure therapy for patients with comorbid alcohol dependence and PTSD: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 310(5):488–495
- Freimuth M (2005) Hidden addictions: assessment practices for psychotherapists, counselors, and health care providers. Jason Aronson, Northvale, NJ
- Garfield S, Bergin A (1994) Handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change. John Wiley & Sons, Inc, New York, NY
- Gerger H, Munder T, Barth J (2013) Specific and nonspecific psychological interventions for PTSD symptoms: a meta-analysis with problem complexity as a moderator. *J Clin Psychol* 70:601–615
- Herman JL (1992) Trauma and recovery. Basic Books, New York, NY
- Hien D, Litt L, Cohen LR (2019) Seeking safety: a present-focused integrated treatment for PTSD and substance use disorders. In: Vujanovic AA, Back SE (eds) Posttraumatic stress and substance use disorders: a comprehensive clinical handbook. Routledge, London

- Hien D, Kropp F, Wells EA, Campbell A, Hatch-Maillette M, Hodgkins C, Killeen T et al (2020) The 'Women and Trauma' study and its national impact on advancing trauma specific approaches in community substance use treatment and research. *J Subst Abus Treat* 112:12–17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsat.2020.02.003>
- Hoge CW, Grossman SH, Auchterlonie JL, Riviere LA, Milliken CS, Wilk JE (2014) PTSD Treatment for soldiers after combat deployment: low utilization of mental health care and reasons for dropout. *Psychiatr Serv* 65:997
- Imel Z, Wampold B, Miller S, Fleming R (2008) Distinctions without a difference: direct comparisons of psychotherapies for alcohol use disorders. *Psychol Addict Behav* 22:533–543
- Imhof J (1991) Countertransference issues in alcoholism and drug addiction. *Psychiatr Ann* 21:292–306
- Kadden R, Carroll K, Donovan D, Cooney N, Monti P, Abrams D, Litt M, Hester R (1995) Cognitive-behavioral coping skills therapy manual: a clinical research guide for therapists treating individuals with alcohol abuse and dependence, vol 3. U. S. Department of Health and Human Services, Rockville, MD
- Lenz AS, Henesy R, Callender K (2016) Effectiveness of seeking safety for co-occurring post-traumatic stress disorder and substance use. *J Couns Dev* 94(1):51–61. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcad.12061>
- Lewis C, Roberts NP, Gibson S, Bisson JI (2020) Dropout from psychological therapies for Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) in adults: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Psychotraumatol* 11(1):1709709. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20008198.2019.1709709>
- Marlatt GA, Gordon JR (1985) Relapse prevention: maintenance strategies in the treatment of addictive behaviors. The Guilford Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy Series. Guilford, New York, NY
- Marsh T, Young N, Cote-Meek S, Najavits L, Toulouse P (2016) Impact of indigenous healing and Seeking Safety on intergenerational trauma and substance use in an aboriginal sample. *J Addict Res Therapy* 7(3):284. <https://doi.org/10.4172/2155-6105.1000284>
- McGovern MP, Lambert-Harris C, Alterman AI, Meier A (2011) A randomized controlled trial comparing integrated cognitive behavioral therapy versus individual addiction counseling for co-occurring substance use and posttraumatic stress disorders. *J Dual Diagn* 7(4):207–227
- Miller WR (ed) (2004) Combined behavioral intervention manual: a clinical research guide for therapists treating people with alcohol abuse and dependence (vol. 1, COMBINE mono- graph series): DHHS Publication No. (NIH) 04–5288. NIAAAA, Bethesda, MD
- Miller WR, Rollnick S (1991) Motivational interviewing: preparing people to change addictive behavior. The Guilford Press, New York, NY
- Miller WR, Benefield RG, Tonigan JS (1993) Enhancing motivation for change in problem drinking: a controlled comparison of two therapist styles. *J Consult Clin Psychol* 61:455–461
- Mills KL, Teesson M, Back SE, Brady KT, Baker AL, Hopwood S, Sannibale C, Barrett EL, Merz S, Rosenfeld J, Ewer PL (2012) Integrated exposure-based therapy for co-occurring post-traumatic stress disorder and substance dependence: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA* 308(7):690–699
- Najavits LM (2002) Seeking safety: a treatment manual for PTSD and substance abuse. The Guilford Press, New York, NY
- Najavits LM (2004) Assessment of trauma, PTSD, and substance use disorder: a practical guide. In: Wilson JP, Keane TM (eds) Assessment of psychological trauma and PTSD. Guilford, New York, NY, pp 466–491
- Najavits L (2013) Creating change: a new past-focused model for PTSD and substance abuse. In: Ouimette P, Read JP (eds) Handbook of trauma, PTSD and substance use disorder comorbidity. American Psychological Association Press, Washington, DC
- Najavits LM (2014) Creating change: a past-focused model for PTSD and substance abuse. The Guilford Press, New York, NY

- Najavits LM (2015) The problem of dropout from “gold standard” PTSD therapies. *F1000Prime Rep* 7:43. <https://doi.org/10.12703/P12707-12743>
- Najavits LM (2019a) Comment on Norman et al. Concerns about potential bias in a randomized clinical trial of integrated prolonged exposure therapy vs Seeking Safety integrated coping skills therapy – reply. *JAMA Psychiatry* 76:1316. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2019.2229>
- Najavits LM (2019b) *Finding your best self: recovery from addiction, trauma, or both*. The Guilford Press, New York, NY. Revised edition
- Najavits LM, Hien DA (2013) Helping vulnerable populations: a comprehensive review of the treatment outcome literature on substance use disorder and PTSD. *J Clin Psychol* 69:433–480
- Najavits LM, Johnson KM (2014) Pilot study of creating change, a new past-focused model for PTSD and substance abuse. *Am J Addict* 23:415. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1521-0391.2014.12127>
- Najavits LM, Schmitz M, Gotthardt S, Weiss RD (2005) Seeking safety plus exposure therapy: an outcome study on dual diagnosis men. *J Psychoactive Drugs* 37:425–435
- Najavits LM, Norman SB, Kivlahan D, Kosten TR (2010) Improving PTSD/substance abuse treatment in the VA: a survey of providers. *Am J Addict* 19(3):257–263
- Najavits LM, Lung J, Froias A, Bailey GL, Paull N (2014) A study of multiple behavioral addictions in a substance abuse sample. *Subst Use Misuse* 49:479–484
- Najavits LM, Hyman SM, Ruglass LM, Hien DA, Read JP (2017) Substance use disorder and trauma. In: Gold S, Cook J, Dalenberg C (eds) *Handbook of trauma psychology*. American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, pp 195–214
- Najavits LM, Krinsley K, Waring ME, Gallagher MW, Skidmore W (2018) A randomized controlled trial for veterans with PTSD and substance use disorder: creating change versus seeking safety. *Subst Use Misuse* 53:1788. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10826084.2018.1432653>
- Najavits LM, Clark HW, DiClemente CC, Potenza MN, Shaffer HJ, Sorensen JL, Tull MT, Zweben A, Zweben JE (2020) PTSD/substance use disorder comorbidity: treatment options and public health needs. *Curr Treat Opt Psychiatry* 7:1–15
- Norman SB, Trim R, Haller M, Davis BC, Myers US, Colvonen PJ, Blanes E, Lyons R, Siegel EY, Angkaw AC, Norman GJ (2019) Efficacy of integrated exposure therapy vs integrated coping skills therapy for comorbid posttraumatic stress disorder and alcohol use disorder: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Psychiatry* 76(8):791–799
- Quimette P, Read JP (eds) (2013) *Handbook of trauma, PTSD and substance use disorder comorbidity*. American Psychological Association Press, Washington, DC
- Pearlman LA, Saakvitne KW (1995) *Trauma and the therapist: countertransference and vicarious traumatization in psychotherapy with incest survivors*. WW Norton, New York, NY
- Powers MB, Halpern JM, Ferenschak MP, Gillihan SJ, Foa EB (2010) A meta-analytic review of prolonged exposure for posttraumatic stress disorder. *Clin Psychol Rev* 30(6):635–641
- Rodriguez A, Lau AS, Wright B, Regan J, Brookman-Frazee L (2018) Mixed-method analysis of program leader perspectives on the sustainment of multiple child evidence-based practices in a system-driven implementation. *Implement Sci* 13(1):44. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-018-0737-6>
- Sannibale C, Teesson M, Creamer M, Sitharthan T, Bryant RA, Sutherland K et al (2013) Randomized controlled trial of cognitive behaviour therapy for comorbid posttraumatic stress disorder and alcohol use disorders. *Addiction* 108:1397–1410
- Shapiro F (1995) *Eye movement desensitization and reprocessing: basic principles, protocols, and procedures*. Guilford, New York, NY
- Triffleman E (2000) Gender differences in a controlled pilot study of psychosocial treatments in substance dependent patients with post-traumatic stress disorder: design considerations and outcomes. *Alcohol Treat Q* 18(3):113–126
- Van der Hart O, Brown P (1992) Abreaction re-evaluated. *Dissoc Progr Dissociat Disord* 5(3):127–140

-
- Volpicelli J, Pettinati H, McLellan A, O'Brien C (2001) Combining medication and psychosocial treatments for addictions: the BRENDA approach. Guilford, New York, NY
- Washington State Institute for Public Policy (2018) Benefit-cost results: substance use disorders—seeking safety. Washington State Institute for Public Policy, Washington, DC. www.wsipp.wa.gov/BenefitCost/Program/307. Accessed 28 Apr 2018