Substance Use Disorders and Recovery Pathways

When Administrative Stress Becomes a Relapse Trigger

Jamal Williams, 34, had been clean for eighteen months. Opioid use disorder that started with a prescription after a construction accident, escalated to heroin, bottomed out in a tent encampment under an overpass in Louisville. The third treatment attempt finally worked. Maybe it was the buprenorphine that quieted cravings without methadone's fog. Maybe it was the counselor who'd been through it himself. Maybe Jamal was finally ready.

He worked as a peer recovery specialist at the treatment center that saved his life, twenty hours weekly at $16 an hour, helping others navigate early recovery. Weekend warehouse shifts brought his monthly total to about 85 hours, just over Kentucky's 80-hour requirement. He attended weekly counseling, took his buprenorphine daily, went to NA meetings when he felt shaky. The structure held him together.

In June, the work verification notice arrived. Thirty days to document his hours or lose coverage. He had two employers: the treatment center, where his peer specialist role existed ambiguously between work and program participation, and a warehouse where he was technically a contractor through a disorganized staffing agency.

He called both. The treatment center's HR wasn't sure how to classify his role. The staffing agency's automated system disconnected him twice; when he reached a representative, she said verification would be mailed eventually. The stress built in familiar ways. Racing thoughts at 2 AM. Tightness in his chest checking the mailbox. The deadline felt like countdown to disaster.

His counselor noticed the agitation. He'd seen this pattern before: clients stable for months, destabilized by administrative stress activating everything they'd worked to manage. He offered to help, but there was only so much he could do. The staffing agency hadn't sent verification. The deadline was two weeks away.

The night before the deadline, Jamal couldn't sleep. He'd submitted what he had: a letter from the treatment center, partial pay stubs, a handwritten explanation of the complications. He didn't know if it was enough.

He knew where to find relief. He'd driven past his old dealer's corner a hundred times without stopping. That night, he stopped.

One hit became three days lost. He missed work at both jobs. He missed the deadline. When he surfaced, sick with withdrawal and shame, a voicemail from Kentucky Medicaid informed him coverage had been terminated for non-compliance.

Without Medicaid, buprenorphine cost $847 monthly. He had $203 in his account. He rationed the medication, cutting doses. His psychiatrist had warned against this specifically. The cravings returned with force he'd forgotten was possible.

Six weeks after the verification notice arrived, Jamal overdosed in his apartment. His roommate found him blue and barely breathing. Narcan brought him back. The emergency department stabilized him and connected him with a social worker who helped him apply for emergency

Medicaid. He was alive. But he'd lost eighteen months of recovery, lost his job at the treatment center, lost his apartment.

The social worker helped him apply for medical exemption based on treatment re-entry. It was approved. He had coverage again. But Jamal was changed. The relapse wasn't just a setback. It was confirmation of what he'd always feared: that eventually he'd fall back into the hole.

Eight months later, he worked part-time at a grocery store, rebuilding again. The treatment center didn't rehire him as peer specialist. They needed someone with longer sustained recovery. He understood.

The verification notice didn't cause his relapse. But the administrative stress became the trigger activating vulnerabilities his recovery had managed, not eliminated. The system designed to encourage work destroyed the stability enabling him to work. The coverage termination prevented access to medication that might have shortened the crisis.

Demographics and Scope

Substance use disorders affect 750,000-1.3 million expansion adults, approximately 4-7% of the population subject to work requirements. This population spans the spectrum from active use through sustained recovery, with varying treatment engagement, work capacity, and support needs.

The substance distribution within this population reflects regional epidemic patterns and individual trajectories. Opioid use disorder, including prescription opioids, heroin, and fentanyl, accounts for 40-45% of the SUD expansion population. Alcohol use disorder represents 35-40%. Stimulant use disorder, primarily methamphetamine and cocaine, comprises 25-30%. Cannabis use disorder at clinical severity affects 15-20%. Polysubstance use, involving multiple substances simultaneously or sequentially, characterizes 45-50% of this population. The boundaries between categories blur in practice, as people often use multiple substances and shift between primary substances over time.

Recovery status varies dramatically within the SUD population and matters enormously for work capacity and exemption needs. Approximately 30-40% are in active use, experiencing ongoing substance use that may or may not include treatment engagement. Another 40-50% are in early recovery, typically defined as less than five years since last use, the period of highest relapse risk and most intensive treatment need. The remaining 20-30% have achieved sustained recovery of five or more years, with substantially lower relapse rates and higher employment stability.

Geographic concentration reflects epidemic patterns. Opioid crisis regions including Appalachia, New England, and parts of the Southwest show elevated opioid use disorder prevalence. Methamphetamine concentrates in the rural Midwest, Western states, and tribal communities. Urban areas have higher absolute numbers but rural areas face more severe treatment infrastructure gaps. Someone in rural Kentucky may drive 90 minutes each way for methadone dosing. Someone in rural Montana may have no MAT provider within 200 miles. These geographic realities shape both treatment access and work requirement compliance possibilities.

Treatment engagement patterns reveal both the importance of coverage and the fragmentation of care. Between 60-65% of the SUD expansion population has received some form of treatment in

the past two years, whether residential, outpatient, or medication-assisted treatment. However, only 25-35% of those with opioid use disorder are engaged with medication-assisted treatment, far below the clinical standard of care. The average pathway to sustained recovery spans 5-7 years and typically includes multiple treatment episodes. Relapse rates of 40-60% in the first year after treatment are normal for chronic illness management, not treatment failure.

Co-occurring conditions create compounded challenges for the majority of this population. Mental health conditions co-occur in 60-70%, with depression, anxiety, PTSD, and bipolar disorder most common. Criminal justice involvement affects 40-50%, with active probation or parole affecting 15-25%. Housing instability or homelessness affects 25-35%. Chronic health conditions including hepatitis C, HIV, liver disease, and cardiovascular problems affect 50-60%. Chronic pain conditions that may have contributed to initial substance use affect 40-50%. This population is multiply-burdened, rarely facing substance use as an isolated challenge.

Treatment time burdens directly affect work capacity. Residential treatment lasting 30-90 days precludes employment entirely. Intensive outpatient programs require 9-15 hours weekly of structured participation. Methadone maintenance requires daily clinic visits, typically 30-60 minutes each, for months before earning take-home doses. Even stable outpatient treatment with buprenorphine requires 2-4 hours weekly for counseling and monthly prescriber visits. Recovery support group attendance adds another 2-6 hours weekly for those engaged. These treatment commitments compete directly with the 80-hour monthly work requirement.

Employment patterns among the SUD population show substantial work engagement despite barriers. Between 45-55% are currently employed at some level, though often part-time or in unstable arrangements. Full-time employment characterizes only 20-25%. Part-time, gig work, and day labor account for another 25-30%. Peer recovery specialist roles, working in treatment settings helping others navigate recovery, employ 5-8%. Recovery housing staff positions, often involving room and board rather than wages, employ another 3-5%. The cognitive recovery lag matters here: executive function restoration after sustained substance use takes 6-24 months, affecting capacity for complex employment even when acute symptoms resolve.

Criminal justice involvement creates additional employment barriers for substantial portions of this population. Between 40-50% have criminal records that limit employment options regardless of recovery status. Active probation or parole supervision affects 15-25%, often including drug testing, check-ins, and court appearances that compete with work schedules. Court-ordered treatment participation affects 20-30%, creating treatment time burdens that are legally mandated rather than voluntary. Drug court participation, affecting 5-10%, requires intensive monitoring and treatment engagement. Someone with a felony conviction faces employment discrimination that work requirements cannot address. The system demands employment from people whom employers legally refuse to hire.

Family involvement creates both motivation and complication for the SUD population. Between 10-15% are actively involved in child welfare proceedings, with children in foster care and reunification contingent on demonstrated recovery and stability. These parents face simultaneous demands: treatment engagement, parenting classes, supervised visitation, court appearances, and now work requirements. The stakes couldn't be higher, as custody often depends on meeting all

requirements simultaneously. Someone choosing between treatment hours and work hours may be choosing between keeping children and keeping coverage.

Racial and ethnic disparities shape both SUD prevalence and treatment access. While overall SUD rates are similar across racial groups, consequences differ dramatically. Black Americans with SUD are more likely to face criminal justice involvement than treatment referral. Hispanic Americans face language barriers in treatment settings. Native American communities experience SUD at elevated rates with severely limited treatment infrastructure on many reservations. These disparities mean that work requirement systems failing to accommodate SUD will compound existing inequities in how addiction is treated across communities.

Failure Modes: When Recovery Meets Administrative Demands

The interaction between addiction's neurobiological reality, recovery's fragility, treatment's time demands, and administrative systems' rigidity creates systematic compliance impossibility for substantial portions of the SUD population. These failures aren't moral weaknesses. They're structural mismatches between what addiction does to brains and what administrative systems demand of them.

The cognitive recovery lag creates the foundational failure. Active substance use impairs executive function, decision-making, memory, and impulse control. These impairments don't resolve when someone stops using. Neurological recovery takes 6-24 months depending on substances, duration, and individual biology. Someone three months into recovery may be showing up for work reliably but struggling to organize multi-step administrative processes, remember deadlines without external prompts, or maintain focus on complex paperwork.

Monthly verification requires executive function at every step: receiving and opening mail, reading dense instructions, understanding documentation requirements, contacting employers or treatment providers, following up when materials don't arrive, submitting before deadlines, navigating appeals if something fails. Someone capable of performing repetitive warehouse tasks may genuinely lack capacity for administrative navigation. The system punishes people for cognitive impairments that are symptoms of the condition, not evidence of unwillingness to comply.

The relapse-as-violation failure manifests because administrative systems treat relapse as rule-breaking rather than expected disease course. Clinical research establishes that 40-60% of people in recovery experience relapse within the first year. For chronic substance use disorders, multiple treatment episodes before sustained recovery is the norm. Relapse indicates that someone has a chronic relapsing condition, not that treatment failed or effort was lacking.

Standard verification systems have no framework for someone who was working successfully, relapsed, entered treatment, and will likely work again once stable. The person working in May loses their job during June's relapse, enters residential treatment in July, emerges in September to find coverage terminated for missing the August deadline. The system terminated coverage for failing to work while in treatment for the condition that prevented work. The August deadline didn't know about July's relapse. Administrative calendars don't accommodate biological crises.

The treatment-as-barrier paradox occurs when engaging in evidence-based treatment makes meeting work requirements impossible. Residential treatment lasting 30-90 days permits no

employment. Someone in residential can't work 80 hours monthly because they're in 24-hour structured care. Intensive outpatient programs requiring 12 hours weekly consume 48 monthly hours, leaving only 32 hours for employment to reach the 80-hour threshold. Methadone clinics open 5:30-11 AM require daily visits for months, making first-shift jobs impossible.

The paradox is cruel: doing what clinicians recommend prevents meeting administrative requirements. If states don't count treatment hours as qualifying activity, people must choose between treatment and coverage. Skipping treatment to work more hours risks the relapse that makes work impossible. The system punishes therapeutic engagement.

The disclosure and stigma barrier creates challenges unique to substance use disorders. Someone with diabetes can explain medical appointments to employers without consequence. Someone in recovery for heroin use disorder faces employment discrimination if disclosed, housing discrimination if landlords learn, custody consequences if documented in court-accessible records, and social stigma affecting every relationship.

Work requirements demand disclosure for exemption. Proving that treatment prevents full-time work requires revealing the treatment's purpose. Employers may terminate workers who disclose addiction history. Someone working successfully may manage recovery privately, attending treatment during off-hours, explaining absences vaguely. Requiring documentation forces disclosure that destroys the employment the system claims to encourage. The verification process itself becomes the threat to employment stability.

The treatment structure barrier emerges because recovery-focused work doesn't fit standard verification models. Peer recovery specialists work at treatment centers helping others navigate the experience they've survived. Is this employment or program participation? The ambiguity creates documentation complications. Recovery housing residents often work as house managers, providing 30 hours weekly of valuable work in exchange for reduced rent rather than wages. No paystub exists. The work is real but unverifiable through standard channels.

Gig economy work and day labor, common among people in early recovery needing schedule flexibility, create similar verification gaps. Someone working through temp agencies or apps may genuinely work 80+ hours monthly across multiple platforms with no single employer able to verify total hours. The fragmented employment that accommodates recovery's unpredictability doesn't generate the consolidated documentation that verification requires.

The MAT scheduling conflict affects hundreds of thousands on medication-assisted treatment. Methadone requires daily clinic visits, typically early morning, for months before earning take-home doses. Someone must arrive at the clinic by 6 AM, dose, and then get to work. Jobs starting at 7 AM become impossible if the clinic is 30 minutes away. The medication that enables recovery limits employment options. Work requirements don't accommodate that the treatment preventing relapse may also prevent certain work schedules.

The stress-as-trigger failure mode is perhaps most insidious. Administrative stress, verification deadlines, documentation gathering, uncertainty about coverage status, activates the same neurobiological pathways that substances previously quieted. For someone in early recovery, stress is a primary relapse trigger. The verification process designed to encourage work can trigger the relapse that destroys work capacity. Jamal's experience isn't unusual. The administrative

demand became the trigger that activated vulnerabilities his recovery had managed but not eliminated.

The 42 CFR Part 2 confidentiality tension creates legal complexity around SUD documentation. Federal law provides special confidentiality protections for substance use disorder treatment records, stricter than HIPAA. Exemption systems requiring treatment documentation may conflict with these protections. Sharing treatment information with Medicaid eligibility systems may require specific consent forms different from standard medical releases. Treatment providers unfamiliar with work requirements may refuse to provide documentation, believing it violates federal confidentiality rules. The legal complexity around SUD records creates barriers not present for other medical conditions.

The recovery timeline mismatch affects expectations about when people should be working. Clinical evidence suggests that meaningful, sustained recovery typically develops over 5-7 years with multiple treatment episodes. The first year after treatment carries 40-60% relapse rates. Cognitive function continues restoring for 6-24 months after last use. Employment readiness develops gradually as people rebuild skills, networks, and stability. Work requirements applying immediately upon Medicaid enrollment assume recovery progresses faster than clinical evidence supports.

The rural treatment access barrier compounds verification challenges. Someone in rural Appalachia may drive 90 minutes each way for methadone dosing, consuming 3+ hours daily before work begins. Someone in rural Montana may have no MAT prescriber within 200 miles, making buprenorphine maintenance impossible without relocating. Treatment scarcity in rural areas means people either go without evidence-based care or spend enormous time accessing it. Work requirements don't accommodate that geography determines treatment burden.

The overdose-to-termination cascade represents the most lethal failure mode. Someone experiences overdose, survives through Narcan, and presents to emergency care. This should trigger immediate connection to treatment and coverage protection. Instead, the person may have missed verification deadlines during the crisis, face coverage termination while still medically unstable, and lose access to the MAT that prevents future overdose. The near-death experience that should accelerate treatment access instead triggers administrative penalties that make treatment harder to obtain.

State Policy Choices: Treatment or Termination

The policy architecture states construct around substance use disorders reveals fundamental choices about whether addiction is a chronic illness deserving accommodation or a behavioral problem deserving punishment. These choices manifest in verification design, exemption criteria, and relapse response.

The treatment-as-qualifying-activity question represents the most consequential policy choice. Should hours spent in residential treatment, intensive outpatient programs, counseling sessions, medication management appointments, and recovery support meetings count toward the 80-hour monthly requirement? Counting treatment hours removes the impossible choice between treatment and coverage. Someone attending 40 hours of IOP monthly plus working 40 hours meets

requirements through combined activity. States refusing to count treatment force people to choose between clinical recommendations and administrative compliance.

The post-treatment grace period question affects the highest-risk recovery phase. Should someone completing residential treatment or intensive outpatient receive automatic exemption for 90-180 days afterward? Early recovery is fragile. Cognitive function is still restoring. Employment is often unavailable immediately. The period after treatment discharge carries highest relapse risk precisely when verification demands arrive. Automatic grace periods protect coverage during this vulnerable window without requiring people in early recovery to navigate exemption paperwork.

The relapse accommodation question reveals assumptions about addiction's nature. When someone in recovery relapses and re-enters treatment, should this trigger automatic exemption, or should it require new documentation proving incapacity? Should prior verification compliance history carry over, or does relapse reset the administrative clock? States treating relapse as expected chronic illness course can provide seamless coverage continuation. States treating relapse as compliance failure compound medical crisis with administrative penalty.

The MAT accommodation question affects medication access. Should daily methadone clinic attendance count toward work hours? Should buprenorphine patients receive reduced hour requirements recognizing that medication management consumes time? The medications that prevent overdose death require ongoing treatment engagement. Policies making MAT continuation difficult undermine the most effective intervention for opioid use disorder.

The peer recovery specialist question affects a growing workforce. Should work at treatment centers providing peer support count as employment, program participation, or both? People in recovery helping others navigate recovery represent valuable workforce development. Unclear classification creates verification complications that may discourage employment in the recovery support field where lived experience matters most.

The fundamental tension is between administrative controllability and clinical reality. Addiction is a chronic relapsing condition. Recovery takes years. Relapse is common. Treatment is time-consuming. Cognitive restoration is gradual. Administrative systems assuming stable capacity, predictable schedules, and linear improvement will systematically fail people whose conditions don't match these assumptions.

The criminalization intersection creates additional policy complexity. Many SUD expansion adults are simultaneously navigating criminal justice supervision with its own requirements: drug testing, check-ins, court appearances, mandated treatment. Work requirements add another layer of demands that may conflict with supervision requirements. Someone required by probation to attend treatment three times weekly and required by Medicaid to work 80 hours monthly faces mathematical impossibility if treatment hours don't count. States must decide whether criminal justice-mandated treatment satisfies work requirements or whether overlapping bureaucracies create compounded burdens.

The harm reduction accommodation question affects people not yet ready for abstinence-based recovery. Should coverage continue for people in active use who aren't engaged in formal treatment? Some states may view coverage continuation during active use as enabling. Clinical evidence suggests that coverage access during active use preserves the option for treatment when

Syam Adusumilli, Chief Evangelist, *syam.a@groundgame.health*

readiness develops. Terminating coverage during active use may prevent treatment access precisely when someone becomes willing to engage. The harm reduction versus abstinence debate plays out in exemption policy design.

The recovery capital recognition question affects how states view the recovery process. Recovery capital includes employment, housing, relationships, skills, and community connections that support sustained recovery. Building recovery capital takes time and may precede formal employment. Someone stabilizing in recovery housing, rebuilding family relationships, and developing daily structure is doing the work of recovery even if not employed. States must decide whether to recognize recovery capital building as meaningful activity or demand employment regardless of recovery stage.

Stakeholder Roles in Supporting SUD Populations

The structural failures in verification systems for SUD populations require multiple stakeholders to adapt their operations. Each occupies a different position in the recovery ecosystem and can address different failure modes.

Managed Care Organizations bear responsibility for identifying SUD members and integrating work requirement support into existing care management. MCOs should use diagnosis codes, pharmacy claims for MAT medications, and treatment utilization data to identify members likely needing exemption support. Care coordinators specializing in behavioral health should understand exemption frameworks and proactively address verification before deadlines arrive. When treatment claims appear, coordinators should contact members to ensure coverage continues rather than waiting for members to navigate systems while in early recovery. MCOs preventing coverage loss during treatment and early recovery avoid the downstream costs of relapse, overdose, and emergency interventions.

Treatment Providers serve as primary documentation sources yet often don't understand work requirements or fear confidentiality violations. Residential programs and IOPs should integrate exemption documentation into discharge planning, ensuring that treatment completion triggers coverage protection rather than coverage vulnerability. MAT prescribers should understand that patients on buprenorphine or methadone may need accommodation documentation for the treatment time burden. Provider training must emphasize that simple attestation of treatment participation suffices and that 42 CFR Part 2 permits disclosure for benefits eligibility with appropriate consent.

Peer Recovery Specialists provide uniquely effective navigation because they understand addiction and recovery from lived experience. Peers recognize relapse warning signs, understand treatment demands, anticipate verification barriers, and provide hope through example. Recovery community organizations employing peer specialists should add work requirement navigation to their scope. Peers accompanying members to appointments, helping complete paperwork, and advocating when problems arise can prevent the administrative failures that cascade into relapse.

Recovery Housing Providers interact with residents daily and can identify when someone is struggling before crisis develops. House managers noticing that a resident is stressed about verification can intervene with documentation support. Recovery housing coalitions should train

staff in work requirement navigation. The housing-recovery intersection makes supportive living environments natural partners in coverage maintenance.

Employers shape whether people in recovery can maintain employment compatible with treatment. Employers offering flexible scheduling accommodate counseling appointments and MAT clinic visits. Employers trained in recovery-friendly workplace practices understand that accommodation during early recovery retains valuable employees who stabilize into reliable workers. The construction company that required Jamal to take overtime during his vulnerable period could have accommodated his need for consistent sleep and schedule, retaining an experienced worker rather than triggering the relapse that lost him.

Harm Reduction Organizations reach people not yet in recovery but at risk of losing coverage that might enable eventual treatment. Syringe services programs, overdose prevention sites, and street outreach teams can provide work requirement information to people in active use. Coverage maintenance during active use preserves the option for treatment when someone becomes ready. Harm reduction navigation prevents coverage termination that might otherwise preclude treatment access when the moment arrives.

Educational Institutions provide qualifying activities compatible with early recovery. Community colleges offering flexible scheduling, online options, and supportive services can help people in recovery accumulate qualifying hours while building skills for future employment. GED programs serve the many SUD individuals whose education was interrupted by addiction. Vocational training provides pathways to recovery-compatible employment. Educational participation during early recovery, when employment may be premature, builds the human capital that enables later workforce success.

Faith Communities provide recovery support outside clinical systems. Many people in recovery connect with faith-based programs like Celebrate Recovery, church-based support groups, or recovery ministries. These communities offer relationships, structure, and meaning that support recovery maintenance. Faith community leaders trained in work requirement navigation can help members understand exemption options without requiring engagement with secular systems some may distrust. The spiritual dimensions many people find essential to recovery deserve respect in navigation approaches.

Drug Courts and Criminal Justice Partners supervise many SUD expansion adults and can coordinate work requirement compliance with supervision requirements. Drug court case managers already tracking treatment attendance can verify participation for work requirement purposes. Probation officers understanding work requirements can help supervisees navigate documentation. The criminal justice system's existing infrastructure for monitoring can support rather than complicate work requirement compliance when systems communicate.

The common thread across stakeholders is recognizing that recovery is fragile and administrative stress is real. Jamal's cascade from verification notice to relapse to termination to overdose could have been interrupted at multiple points. A care coordinator proactively addressing verification. A treatment center completing documentation before discharge. A peer specialist helping gather employer verification. The absence of any stakeholder stepping into that support role left Jamal alone with administrative demands that became triggers his recovery couldn't withstand.

Jamal's Situation as Structural Pattern

Jamal Williams's experience follows predictable trajectories when administrative systems can't accommodate addiction as chronic illness. His eighteen months of recovery, his meaningful peer specialist work, his verification stress, his relapse, his coverage termination, his medication discontinuation, his overdose all represent structural patterns affecting over 750,000 expansion adults with substance use disorders.

The financial calculus exposes the policy's self-defeating nature. His annual coverage cost approximately $6,000 including MAT and counseling. His overdose-related emergency care and treatment re-entry cost approximately $47,000. The coverage termination generated costs eight times higher than continued coverage. The human cost exceeds accounting: he lost eighteen months of recovery, lost the peer specialist job that gave his experience meaning, lost confidence that recovery was possible for someone like him.

The policy question is whether requirements should treat addiction as choice that willpower overcomes, or accommodate documented reality of chronic relapsing brain disease requiring long-term management. December 2026 will reveal which approach states choose. Jamal's situation, multiplied across the SUD population, will demonstrate whether work requirements can coexist with addiction treatment or whether administrative demands will systematically undermine the recovery they claim to encourage.

References

1. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. "Key Substance Use and Mental Health Indicators in the United States: Results from the 2023 National Survey on Drug Use and Health." SAMHSA. 2024.
2. McLellan AT, Lewis DC, O'Brien CP, Kleber HD. "Drug Dependence, a Chronic Medical Illness: Implications for Treatment, Insurance, and Outcomes Evaluation." JAMA. 2000;284(13):1689-1695.
3. National Institute on Drug Abuse. "Principles of Drug Addiction Treatment: A Research-Based Guide." Fourth Edition. NIH Publication. 2024.
4. Dennis ML, Scott CK. "Managing Addiction as a Chronic Condition." Addiction Science & Clinical Practice. 2007;4(1):45-55.
5. Volkow ND, Koob GF, McLellan AT. "Neurobiologic Advances from the Brain Disease Model of Addiction." New England Journal of Medicine. 2016;374(4):363-371.
6. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. "Medications for Opioid Use Disorder: Treatment Improvement Protocol (TIP) 63." SAMHSA. 2024.
7. Kelly JF, Humphreys K, Ferri M. "Alcoholics Anonymous and Other 12-Step Programs for Alcohol Use Disorder." Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2020;3:CD012880.
8. White WL, Kelly JF. "Recovery Management: What If We Really Believed That Addiction Was a Chronic Disorder?" Journal of Substance Use and Addiction Treatment. 2023;154:209156.

Syam Adusumilli, Chief Evangelist, *syam.a@groundgame.health*

9. Wakeman SE, Larochelle MR, Ameli O, et al. "Comparative Effectiveness of Different Treatment Pathways for Opioid Use Disorder." JAMA Network Open. 2020;3(2):e1920622.
10. Legal Action Center. "Know Your Rights: Rights for Individuals on Medication-Assisted Treatment." Legal Action Center Publication. 2023.
11. Reif S, Braude L, Lyman DR, et al. "Peer Recovery Support for Individuals with Substance Use Disorders: Assessing the Evidence." Psychiatric Services. 2014;65(7):853-861.
12. National Council for Mental Wellbeing. "Peer Support Services in Behavioral Health: An Essential Element of Recovery." 2024.
13. American Society of Addiction Medicine. "The ASAM National Practice Guideline for the Treatment of Opioid Use Disorder: 2020 Focused Update." Journal of Addiction Medicine. 2020;14(2S):1-91.
14. Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. "How Work Requirements in Medicaid Affect People with Substance Use Disorders." CBPP Analysis. 2024.
15. Pew Charitable Trusts. "Medication-Assisted Treatment Improves Outcomes for Patients with Opioid Use Disorder." Research Brief. 2024.
16. Kentucky Cabinet for Health and Family Services. "Kentucky HEALTH Section 1115 Demonstration Waiver." 2023.
17. 42 CFR Part 2. "Confidentiality of Substance Use Disorder Patient Records." Code of Federal Regulations.
18. Humphreys K, Bickel WK. "Toward a Neuroscience of Long-Term Recovery from Addiction." JAMA Psychiatry. 2018;75(9):875-876.
19. National Association of Recovery Residences. "Quality Standards for Recovery Housing." NARR. 2023.
20. Faces and Voices of Recovery. "Recovery Community Organizations: An Essential Element of the Recovery-Oriented System of Care." 2024.

Syam Adusumilli, Chief Evangelist, *syam.a@groundgame.health*