**Supplemental Digital Content**

**Substance use treatment completion and criminal justice system contact in Chile: A retrospective, linked data, cohort study**

### Section 1. Specifics on the data collection process

We started with a cohort of SENDA patients used in other publications (CITAR?). Then, we managed to link these patients with Prossecutor’s Office data regarding offenses in which patients were participants (as victims or offenders). However, we focused on cases in which patients were found as offenders. We did not require any minimum duration of first SUT enrolment for study inclusion to reduce the risk of selection bias and strengthen the generalizability of results. Readers must know that dropouts occur when the patien explicitly state his/her will of not continuing, or non-attendance and/or loss of contact with the patient for a period equal or greater than 45 days.The time to event was defined after treatment outcome (completion or dropout). Thus, we avoided survival bias due to a dropout explained by the event (reverse causation). The process is summarise in Table SXZ.

Table SXZ. Sample flow chart

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Order** | **Description** | **Total patients** | **% Changed from the previous step** |
| 1 | Individuals with ongoing SUT between 2010 and 2019 | 85,048 |  |
| 2 | Patients that had records in Prosecutor’s Office | 74,833 | 88% |
| 3 | Exclude records with dates of commission after November 13th, 2019 (n= 47) | 74,786 | 99.9% |
| 4 | Erased records with missing information, discrepancies in ages between SENDA, and aberrant ages of commission | 74,745 | 99.9% |
| 5 | Exclude records with at least one of the conditions: administrative annulment, grouped to another criminal case (16,341), commission dates earlier than January 01, 2010 (n=17,506); duplicated records (n=7) | 74,535 | 99.7% |
| 6 | Exclude records of patients with at least one of the following conditions: found as a victim (n=20,624), if the patient did not receive a sentence (n=23,667) | 49,970 | 67% |
| 7 | Joined SENDAs database, but discarded records with missing dates of birth (n= 7) | 85,041 | 99.9% |
| 8 | Discarded patients where the first treatment corresponded to external referrals (n=), or ongoing treatments at the date of retrieval (November 13th, 2019) (n=8,657) | 70,863 | 83% |
| 9 | Excluded patients without treatment outcomes (n=9) | 70,854 | 99.9% |

### Section 2. Proportional hazards test, model specification and selection criteria

We divide this section into proportional hazards, model specification, selection criteria, and added a summary of the survival models.

**Proportional hazards test**

First, we used Schoenfeld’s global goodness of fit test of proportional hazards. The test indicated a significant deviation from expected proportionality in the modelling of time to any contact with the criminal justice system (X²(df=51)= 233.36, p<0.001), and time to contact leading to imprisonment (X²(df=51)= 160.56, p<0.001). Thus, evidence do not support the proportional hazards assumption.

**Model specification**

We tested different specifications, from 1 to 10 degrees of freedom to model time-dependent baseline distribution functions (i.e., restricted cubic spline on log cumulative hazard scale), and from 1 to 7 degrees of freedom to model time-dependent effects of treatment outcomes (both early and late discharge, vs. treatment completion). Then, we selected the models that showed the best trade-off between lower complexity and better fit. This is why we also considered the BIC. If a model with fewer parameters had greater or equal AIC (or differences lower than 4) but also had better BIC (<=3), we favoured the model with fewer parameters.

Supplemental Table ZX. Akaike and Bayesian Information Criteria for survival models of the time to any contact with the justice system with different survival probability distributions

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Model Specification** | **AIC** | **BIC** |
| rp (df=9) tvc (df=1) | 135187.0 | 135691.7 |
| rp (df=10) tvc (df=1) | 135187.6 | 135700.4 |
| rp (df=9) tvc (df=3) | 135189.7 | 135726.5 |
| rp (df=9) tvc (df=2) | 135189.8 | 135710.6 |
| rp (df=10) tvc (df=3) | 135190.3 | 135735.1 |
| rp (df=8) tvc (df=1) | 135190.3 | 135687.1 |
| rp (df=10) tvc (df=2) | 135190.4 | 135719.2 |
| rp (df=9) tvc (df=4) | 135193.2 | 135746.0 |
| rp (df=8) tvc (df=3) | 135193.2 | 135722.0 |
| rp (df=8) tvc (df=2) | 135193.2 | 135705.9 |
| rp (df=7) tvc (df=1) | 135193.2 | 135681.9 |
| rp (df=10) tvc (df=4) | 135193.7 | 135754.6 |
| rp (df=9) tvc (df=5) | 135195.2 | 135764.1 |
| rp (df=9) tvc (df=6) | 135195.9 | 135780.7 |
| rp (df=10) tvc (df=5) | 135195.9 | 135772.7 |
| rp (df=7) tvc (df=2) | 135196.0 | 135700.8 |
| rp (df=7) tvc (df=3) | 135196.1 | 135716.8 |
| rp (df=10) tvc (df=6) | 135196.5 | 135789.4 |
| rp (df=8) tvc (df=4) | 135196.5 | 135741.3 |
| rp (df=6) tvc (df=1) | 135197.9 | 135678.6 |
| rp (df=8) tvc (df=6) | 135198.2 | 135775.0 |
| rp (df=8) tvc (df=5) | 135198.5 | 135759.3 |
| rp (df=7) tvc (df=4) | 135199.3 | 135736.0 |
| rp (df=9) tvc (df=7) | 135199.5 | 135800.4 |
| rp (df=7) tvc (df=5) | 135200.4 | 135753.2 |
| rp (df=10) tvc (df=7) | 135200.4 | 135809.3 |
| rp (df=7) tvc (df=6) | 135200.4 | 135769.3 |
| rp (df=6) tvc (df=3) | 135200.6 | 135713.4 |
| rp (df=6) tvc (df=2) | 135200.7 | 135697.5 |
| rp (df=8) tvc (df=7) | 135200.9 | 135793.8 |
| rp (df=6) tvc (df=4) | 135203.7 | 135732.5 |
| rp (df=5) tvc (df=1) | 135204.3 | 135677.0 |
| rp (df=6) tvc (df=5) | 135205.3 | 135750.1 |
| rp (df=7) tvc (df=7) | 135205.9 | 135790.7 |
| rp (df=6) tvc (df=6) | 135206.8 | 135767.6 |
| rp (df=5) tvc (df=3) | 135206.9 | 135711.6 |
| rp (df=5) tvc (df=2) | 135207.2 | 135696.0 |
| rp (df=5) tvc (df=4) | 135209.8 | 135730.6 |
| rp (df=6) tvc (df=7) | 135210.4 | 135787.3 |
| rp (df=5) tvc (df=7) | 135210.9 | 135779.8 |
| rp (df=5) tvc (df=6) | 135211.4 | 135764.2 |
| rp (df=5) tvc (df=5) | 135212.6 | 135749.4 |
| rp (df=4) tvc (df=7) | 135213.4 | 135774.3 |
| rp (df=4) tvc (df=6) | 135214.3 | 135759.1 |
| rp (df=3) tvc (df=7) | 135216.6 | 135769.4 |
| rp (df=3) tvc (df=6) | 135216.7 | 135753.5 |
| rp (df=4) tvc (df=5) | 135221.2 | 135750.0 |
| rp (df=3) tvc (df=5) | 135223.1 | 135743.9 |
| rp (df=4) tvc (df=3) | 135225.0 | 135721.8 |
| rp (df=4) tvc (df=1) | 135225.7 | 135690.4 |
| rp (df=4) tvc (df=2) | 135228.6 | 135709.3 |
| rp (df=4) tvc (df=4) | 135231.7 | 135744.5 |
| rp (df=3) tvc (df=4) | 135247.2 | 135751.9 |
| rp (df=3) tvc (df=1) | 135257.3 | 135714.0 |
| rp (df=3) tvc (df=3) | 135259.3 | 135748.0 |
| rp (df=3) tvc (df=2) | 135259.9 | 135732.6 |
| rp (df=2) tvc (df=6) | 135266.7 | 135795.5 |
| rp (df=2) tvc (df=7) | 135267.0 | 135811.8 |
| rp (df=2) tvc (df=5) | 135271.6 | 135784.4 |
| rp (df=2) tvc (df=4) | 135285.9 | 135782.6 |
| rp (df=2) tvc (df=3) | 135313.8 | 135794.5 |
| rp (df=1) tvc (df=6) | 135425.7 | 135946.4 |
| rp (df=1) tvc (df=7) | 135426.1 | 135962.9 |
| rp (df=1) tvc (df=5) | 135430.7 | 135935.4 |
| rp (df=2) tvc (df=2) | 135439.3 | 135904.0 |
| rp (df=2) tvc (df=1) | 135439.5 | 135888.1 |
| rp (df=1) tvc (df=4) | 135444.4 | 135933.1 |
| rp (df=1) tvc (df=3) | 135466.7 | 135939.4 |
| rp (df=1) tvc (df=2) | 135593.9 | 136050.6 |
| rp (df=1) tvc (df=1) | 136344.2 | 136784.9 |

*RP = Restricted cubic splines in the baseline cumulative hazards; tvc= Restricted cubic splines in time-varying coefficients.*

The best model had 8 degrees of freedom in the baseline hazard function (with potentially 7 nodes, possibly located at 12.5th, 25th, 37.5th, 50th, 62.5th, 75th, and 87.5th percentiles of the log-time distribution), and an effect that represents a monothonic increase or decrease (1 d.f.) of treatment outcomes (shape) over follow-up time.

Table SXZ. Adjusted coefficients, time to any contact with the justice system

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Term (exp)** | **Estimate** | **95%CI lo** | **95%CI up** | **Sig.** |
| Early discharge | 1.74 | 1.66 | 1.83 | <0.001 |
| Late discharge | 1.58 | 1.52 | 1.65 | <0.001 |
| time-independent: knot 1 | 2.66 | 2.59 | 2.73 | <0.001 |
| time-independent: knot 2 | 1.11 | 1.10 | 1.12 | <0.001 |
| time-independent: knot 3 | 1.05 | 1.04 | 1.06 | <0.001 |
| time-independent: knot 4 | 1.02 | 1.02 | 1.03 | <0.001 |
| time-independent: knot 5 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.02 | <0.001 |
| time-independent: knot 6 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | <0.001 |
| time-independent: knot 7 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | <0.001 |
| time-independent: knot 8 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.01 | <0.001 |
| time-independent: Early discharge | 0.91 | 0.88 | 0.94 | <0.001 |
| time-independent: Late discharge | 0.94 | 0.92 | 0.97 | <0.001 |
| time-dependent: knot 1 | 0.98 | 0.95 | 1.00 | <0.001 |
| time-dependent: knot 2 | 0.11 | 0.10 | 0.12 | <0.001 |
| time-dependent: knot 3 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.05 | <0.001 |
| time-dependent: knot 4 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.03 | <0.001 |
| time-dependent: knot 5 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.02 | <0.001 |
| time-dependent: knot 6 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | <0.001 |
| time-dependent: knot 7 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | <0.001 |
| time-dependent: knot 8 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | <0.001 |
| time-dependent: Early discharge (log) | -0.10 | -0.13 | -0.07 | <0.001 |
| time-dependent: Late discharge (log) | -0.06 | -0.09 | -0.03 | <0.001 |

Note: knots represent knot areas (knots +1).

The model identified an association of 1.74 (95% CI 1.66, 1.83) for Early vs. completion, and 1.58 (95% CI 1.52, 1.65) for Late vs. completion. In this case, however, the shape seems to show a monothonic decrease in the association of Early and Late discharge vs. treatment completion, in which the hazard ratio will likely decreasing over time (See Table SXZ).

Supplemental Table ZX. Akaike and Bayesian Information Criteria for survival models of the time to contact with the justice system leading to imprisonment with different survival probability distributions

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Model Specification** | **AIC** | **BIC** |
| rp (df=9) tvc (df=1) | 43635.0 | 44034.3 |
| rp (df=8) tvc (df=1) | 43635.1 | 44027.9 |
| rp (df=7) tvc (df=1) | 43635.4 | 44021.6 |
| rp (df=6) tvc (df=1) | 43635.7 | 44015.4 |
| rp (df=10) tvc (df=1) | 43637.0 | 44042.8 |
| rp (df=9) tvc (df=2) | 43638.5 | 44050.8 |
| rp (df=8) tvc (df=2) | 43638.6 | 44044.4 |
| rp (df=7) tvc (df=2) | 43638.8 | 44038.1 |
| rp (df=6) tvc (df=2) | 43639.2 | 44031.9 |
| rp (df=10) tvc (df=2) | 43640.4 | 44059.4 |
| rp (df=5) tvc (df=1) | 43641.3 | 44014.4 |
| rp (df=9) tvc (df=3) | 43641.5 | 44066.9 |
| rp (df=8) tvc (df=3) | 43641.6 | 44060.5 |
| rp (df=7) tvc (df=3) | 43642.0 | 44054.3 |
| rp (df=9) tvc (df=4) | 43642.1 | 44080.7 |
| rp (df=6) tvc (df=3) | 43642.2 | 44048.0 |
| rp (df=7) tvc (df=4) | 43642.3 | 44067.8 |
| rp (df=8) tvc (df=4) | 43642.5 | 44074.5 |
| rp (df=6) tvc (df=4) | 43642.6 | 44061.6 |
| rp (df=10) tvc (df=3) | 43643.4 | 44075.4 |
| rp (df=10) tvc (df=4) | 43644.2 | 44089.3 |
| rp (df=5) tvc (df=4) | 43644.6 | 44057.0 |
| rp (df=5) tvc (df=2) | 43644.7 | 44030.9 |
| rp (df=7) tvc (df=5) | 43645.0 | 44083.6 |
| rp (df=6) tvc (df=5) | 43646.1 | 44078.1 |
| rp (df=9) tvc (df=5) | 43646.2 | 44097.8 |
| rp (df=8) tvc (df=5) | 43646.3 | 44091.4 |
| rp (df=7) tvc (df=6) | 43646.8 | 44098.4 |
| rp (df=9) tvc (df=6) | 43647.5 | 44112.3 |
| rp (df=5) tvc (df=3) | 43647.8 | 44047.1 |
| rp (df=8) tvc (df=6) | 43648.0 | 44106.2 |
| rp (df=10) tvc (df=5) | 43648.0 | 44106.2 |
| rp (df=6) tvc (df=6) | 43648.9 | 44094.0 |
| rp (df=4) tvc (df=1) | 43649.6 | 44016.1 |
| rp (df=5) tvc (df=6) | 43650.2 | 44088.7 |
| rp (df=10) tvc (df=6) | 43650.4 | 44121.7 |
| rp (df=4) tvc (df=6) | 43650.4 | 44082.4 |
| rp (df=8) tvc (df=7) | 43650.5 | 44121.8 |
| rp (df=5) tvc (df=5) | 43652.1 | 44077.6 |
| rp (df=7) tvc (df=7) | 43652.6 | 44117.4 |
| rp (df=9) tvc (df=7) | 43652.9 | 44130.7 |
| rp (df=4) tvc (df=2) | 43653.0 | 44032.6 |
| rp (df=3) tvc (df=6) | 43653.0 | 44078.5 |
| rp (df=5) tvc (df=7) | 43653.8 | 44105.4 |
| rp (df=4) tvc (df=7) | 43654.1 | 44099.2 |
| rp (df=10) tvc (df=7) | 43654.2 | 44138.6 |
| rp (df=6) tvc (df=7) | 43654.6 | 44112.8 |
| rp (df=4) tvc (df=3) | 43654.9 | 44047.6 |
| rp (df=3) tvc (df=7) | 43656.0 | 44094.5 |
| rp (df=3) tvc (df=5) | 43656.6 | 44069.0 |
| rp (df=4) tvc (df=4) | 43656.7 | 44062.5 |
| rp (df=3) tvc (df=1) | 43657.0 | 44017.0 |
| rp (df=4) tvc (df=5) | 43657.8 | 44076.7 |
| rp (df=2) tvc (df=6) | 43659.1 | 44078.0 |
| rp (df=3) tvc (df=2) | 43660.4 | 44033.5 |
| rp (df=2) tvc (df=7) | 43662.3 | 44094.3 |
| rp (df=2) tvc (df=5) | 43662.4 | 44068.2 |
| rp (df=3) tvc (df=4) | 43662.9 | 44062.1 |
| rp (df=3) tvc (df=3) | 43663.4 | 44049.6 |
| rp (df=2) tvc (df=4) | 43665.9 | 44058.7 |
| rp (df=1) tvc (df=6) | 43669.3 | 44081.7 |
| rp (df=2) tvc (df=3) | 43670.0 | 44049.6 |
| rp (df=1) tvc (df=7) | 43672.6 | 44098.0 |
| rp (df=1) tvc (df=5) | 43672.8 | 44072.1 |
| rp (df=1) tvc (df=4) | 43676.1 | 44062.3 |
| rp (df=1) tvc (df=3) | 43679.4 | 44052.5 |
| rp (df=2) tvc (df=1) | 43690.1 | 44043.5 |
| rp (df=2) tvc (df=2) | 43693.2 | 44059.7 |
| rp (df=1) tvc (df=2) | 43702.8 | 44062.8 |
| rp (df=1) tvc (df=1) | 43818.5 | 44165.4 |

*RP = Restricted cubic splines in the baseline cumulative hazards; tvc= Restricted cubic splines in time-varying coefficients.*

The best model had 6 degrees of freedom in the baseline hazard function (with 5 nodes potentially located at the 17th, 33rd, 50th, 67th, and 83rd percentiles of the log-time distribution), and an effect that represents a constant increase or decrease (1 d.f.) of treatment outcomes (shape) over follow-up time.

Table SXZ. Adjusted coefficients, time to contact with the justice system leading to imprisonment

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Term (exp)** | **Estimate** | **95%CI lo** | **95%CI up** | **Sig.** |
| Early discharge | 1.99 | 1.79 | 2.22 | <0.001 |
| Late discharge | 1.65 | 1.51 | 1.81 | <0.001 |
| time-independent: knot 1 | 2.18 | 2.07 | 2.30 | <0.001 |
| time-independent: knot 2 | 1.07 | 1.06 | 1.09 | <0.001 |
| time-independent: knot 3 | 1.03 | 1.02 | 1.05 | <0.001 |
| time-independent: knot 4 | 1.02 | 1.01 | 1.03 | <0.001 |
| time-independent: knot 5 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.02 | <0.001 |
| time-independent: knot 6 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | <0.001 |
| time-independent: Early discharge | 0.90 | 0.85 | 0.95 | <0.001 |
| time-independent: Late discharge | 0.92 | 0.87 | 0.97 | 0.004 |
| time-dependent: knot 1 | 0.78 | 0.73 | 0.83 | <0.001 |
| time-dependent: knot 2 | 0.07 | 0.06 | 0.08 | <0.001 |
| time-dependent: knot 3 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.04 | <0.001 |
| time-dependent: knot 4 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.03 | <0.001 |
| time-dependent: knot 5 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.02 | <0.001 |
| time-dependent: knot 6 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | <0.001 |
| time-dependent: Early discharge | -0.11 | -0.17 | -0.05 | <0.001 |
| time-dependent: Late discharge | -0.08 | -0.14 | -0.03 | 0.004 |

Note: knots represent knot areas (knots +1).

The model found an association of 1.99 (95% CI 1.79, 2.22) in Early dropout vs. completion, and 1.65 (95% CI 1.50, 1.81) in Late dropout vs. completion. Nevertheless, the

shape seems to show a monothonic decrease in the association of Early and Late discharge vs. treatment completion, in which the hazard ratio will likely decreasing over time (See Table SXZ).

### Section 3. Alternative analysis with complete cases & imputing comorbidities in study

The imputation was carried out using chained random forests through the missRanger package. We used 200 trees, 3 candidate values of predictive matching (thus, avoiding unlikely numbers), with a maximum of 50 iterations per chaining steps. (CITAS)

After 5 iterations, we obtained fairly low standardized mean squared errors reductions (Mdn= 5e-04 Q1= 0, Q3= 0.0024).

We compared the probabilities and restricted mean survival times to those obtained by imputing missing data only.

Differences were similar in terms of direction and significance, with less survival and average survival at different time points for those who dropout when compared to those who complete, while more survival and average survival at different years for those who had a late dropout vs. those who dropout early(See Table SXZ).

Table SXZ. Differences in survival probabilities, time to any contact with the justice system for complete case analysis (a) and with imputed values replacing comorbidities in study (b)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **a)** |  |  | **b)** |  |  |
| **Time** | **Comp. vs Late** | **Comp. vs Early** | **Early vs Late** | **Comp. vs Late** | **Comp. vs Early** | **Early vs Late** |
| Probs. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1\_yr | -5.3 (-5.9,-4.8) | -6.8 (-7.6,-6.1) | 1.5 (0.9,2.2) | -5.6 (-6.1,-5.1) | -7.6 (-8.3,-7.0) | 2.0 (1.5,2.6) |
| 3\_yrs | -8.2 (-9.0,-7.4) | -9.9 (-10.9,-8.8) | 1.7 (0.7,2.6) | -8.6 (-9.3,-7.9) | -11.1 (-11.9,-10.2) | 2.4 (1.7,3.2) |
| 5\_yrs | -9.1 (-10.0,-8.2) | -10.5 (-11.8,-9.3) | 1.5 (0.4,2.5) | -9.6 (-10.4,-8.8) | -11.9 (-12.9,-11.0) | 2.4 (1.5,3.2) |
| RMST |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1\_yr | -0.034 (-0.037,-0.030) | -0.045 (-0.050,-0.040) | 0.011 (0.006,0.016) | -0.035 (-0.039,-0.032) | -0.050 (-0.054,-0.045) | 0.014 (0.010,0.019) |
| 3\_yrs | -0.171 (-0.187,-0.154) | -0.214 (-0.236,-0.192) | 0.044 (0.023,0.064) | -0.180 (-0.195,-0.165) | -0.239 (-0.258,-0.221) | 0.060 (0.043,0.076) |
| 5\_yrs | -0.340 (-0.372,-0.309) | -0.414 (-0.457,-0.371) | 0.074 (0.036,0.112) | -0.359 (-0.387,-0.330) | -0.465 (-0.500,-0.430) | 0.107 (0.076,0.137) |

Differences were similar in terms of direction and significance, with less survival and average survival at different time points for those who dropout when compared to those who complete, while more survival and average survival at different years for those who had a late dropout vs. those who dropout early(See Table SXZ).

Table SXZ. Differences in survival probabilities, time to contact with the justice system leading to imprisonment for complete case analysis (a) and with imputed values replacing comorbidities in study (b)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **a)** |  |  | **b)** |  |  |
| **Time** | **Comp. vs Late** | **Comp. vs Early** | **Early vs Late** | **Comp. vs Late** | **Comp. vs Early** | **Early vs Late** |
| Probs. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1\_yr | -1.2 (-1.4,-1.0) | -1.8 (-2.1,-1.4) | 0.5 (0.2,0.9) | -1.2 (-1.5,-1.0) | -2.0 (-2.3,-1.7) | 0.8 (0.5,1.0) |
| 3\_yrs | -2.1 (-2.5,-1.7) | -3.1 (-3.6,-2.5) | 0.9 (0.4,1.4) | -2.2 (-2.5,-1.8) | -3.5 (-3.9,-3.0) | 1.3 (0.9,1.7) |
| 5\_yrs | -2.6 (-3.1,-2.1) | -3.7 (-4.3,-3.0) | 1.1 (0.5,1.7) | -2.6 (-3.1,-2.2) | -4.3 (-4.8,-3.7) | 1.6 (1.1,2.1) |
| RMST |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1\_yr | -0.007 (-0.009,-0.006) | -0.011 (-0.013,-0.009) | 0.004 (0.001,0.006) | -0.008 (-0.009,-0.006) | -0.012 (-0.014,-0.010) | 0.005 (0.003,0.007) |
| 3\_yrs | -0.041 (-0.049,-0.033) | -0.059 (-0.070,-0.049) | 0.018 (0.009,0.028) | -0.042 (-0.049,-0.034) | -0.068 (-0.077,-0.059) | 0.026 (0.018,0.034) |
| 5\_yrs | -0.087 (-0.103,-0.071) | -0.125 (-0.147,-0.104) | 0.038 (0.018,0.058) | -0.089 (-0.103,-0.074) | -0.144 (-0.162,-0.126) | 0.055 (0.039,0.071) |

### Section 4. Original and extended Cox model

As a sensitivity analysis, we obtained the hazard ratios from the original Cox model under the proportional hazards assumption, and adjusting for covariates. Additionally, the R package "coxphw" was used to conduct weighted Cox analysis while accounting for non-proportional hazard and adjusting for covariates. This method uses inverse probability weighting to adjust for censoring and to estimate robust standard errors, ruling out outlying survival times that may affects the value of parameter estimates. The method has been shown to be effective in both parametric and non-parametric survival models, and It has been used in a variety of applications, including studies of cancer, COVID-19, heart disease, and HIV/AIDS (REFS).

Using the Cox model under the proportional hazard assumption, patients with late and early dropouts had a 53% (HR= 1.53 95% CI 1.47, 1.59) and 66% (HR= 1.66 95% CI 1.58, 1.74) greater likelihood of any contact with the criminal justice system vs. those who completed treatment, respectively, while 58% (HR= 1.58 95% CI 1.45, 1.72) and 88% (HR= 1.88 95% CI 1.70, 2.09) greater likelihood of contact with the criminal justice system leading to imprisonment vs. those who completed treatment.

However, these hazards dropped in terms of magnitude but not in direction. Also, none of them overlap the null association. An exception was the comparison between patients who dropped late from treatment vs. those who completed in the time to any contact with the criminal justice system, which remained stable and with narrower but with arguably biased confidence intervals (See Table SXZ).

Table SXZ. Averaged adjusted HRs from weighted Cox model

| **Term** | **Time to…** | **Estimation** | **95% CI** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Early dropout vs. tr. completion | Condemnatory Sentence | 1.70 | 1.59, 1.81 |
| Late dropout vs. tr. completion | Condemnatory Sentence | 1.54 | 1.46, 1.62 |
| Early dropout vs. tr. completion | Imprisonment | 1.82 | 1.57, 2.11 |
| Late dropout vs. tr. completion | Imprisonment | 1.48 | 1.31, 1.66 |