

Supplemental file

Table S1 Inductive thematic content analysis of the social dimensions of harms and resilience to cannabis

Initial read through text data	Identify specific Meaning units to create categories	Reduce overlap and redundancy among the categories: 9 themes	Major emergent themes relate to the initial guiding questions. Three themes with subthemes.
<p>~160 individual free nodes related to two principal questions:</p> <p>“Was local will for cannabis demand and harm reduction demonstrated?” and “What resources were identified for harm and demand reduction in the local social context of the study communities?”</p>	<p>Meaning units coded to over 27 initial categories</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self and others need to quit • Stress from abstinence • Family, cultural rights, quitting for responsibilities, relationships • Health • Engagement supports quitting • Cannabis and other substances as calmatives • Not spending on cannabis is a good thing • Cue exposure in the community • Cannabis is not a problem 	<p>Resources that reduce demand</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People want to quit or want others to quit • Engagement in activities can reduce demand and stress • Family, cultural relationships and responsibilities <p>Cannabis is associated with a range of harms</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stress during abstinence • Financial impacts and wasting resources • Health and mental health • High use among youth <p>Barriers to demand reduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cue exposure – high supply, use and boredom • People like cannabis, self-medicate or manage potential harms

Note: Adapted from Creswell, 2002, Figure 9.4, p. 266 in Thomas, 2003

Table S2 Rubric for categorising community members’ attitudes towards heavy cannabis use mediated by their concerns for community level impacts, social effects and reported need for harm and demand reduction strategies

Category - attitude towards cannabis use in the community	Three major themes are: demand reduction barriers; cannabis harms; demand reduction resources	Example
<p>1 - no real concerns –</p> <p>May discuss perceived negatives but not in relation to themselves; may outright state that there is no problem; on balance not very concerned about cannabis harms; seem unlikely to participate in harm reduction</p>	<p>Of any use status and any age or gender; current users indicate no intention to change current use.</p> <p>Demand reduction barriers - Identify more ‘demand reduction barriers’ than ‘demand-reduction resources’ including explicit statements that they like cannabis or dislike nothing about it, explicitly identifying an intention to continue using cannabis (question x and y from the survey); may mention that cue exposure is problematic abstinence is required or desired.</p> <p>Identify few or no harms – state that they can manage potential harms; may mention that others can be susceptible to harms.</p> <p>No or vague references to demand reduction resources – deny cannabis related stress or describe ways in which they manage stress; do not view demand reduction as needed.</p>	<p>Relax and chill out; No dislike; no, happy smoking; Didn't worry, stayed calm and relaxed; Friends, socialising and peer pressure; Alright, bad for young people and when, mix with alcohol.</p>
<p>2 - have some concerns –</p> <p>Discuss some harms in a manner suggesting an authentic recognition of the issues; not emphatic, may also indicate tolerance of a certain amount of use;</p>	<p>Of any use status and any age or gender;</p> <p>Barriers to demand reduction - may report liking cannabis outright, or report a mixture of likes and dislikes or disliking cannabis; describe cue exposure as a barrier to quit attempts and increasing likelihood of uptake; describe community environment boredom and supply as problematic.</p> <p>Cannabis harms - current smokers will identify a desire to quit OR report a personally held view that cannabis causes harms for some individuals and the broader community, even if they feel comfortable with their own use; unambiguously mention personal, individual and / or community level harms; Identify personally held views that cannabis causes harm to the individual or community;</p> <p>Demand reduction resources - Identify demand reduction resources which they use or recommend should be available; may be ambivalent about legal action and supply reduction but report favourably with respect to demand reduction initiatives.</p>	<p>Gave up in 2011 for kids, wants to have a good effect on them; feel good; distract myself; go hunting or yarn with someone who doesn't smoke; lost appetite; no problems giving up.</p>
<p>3 - very concerned –</p> <p>Emphatic statements about cannabis harms; deep personal concept of harm with no apologies for cannabis use; may have had serious problems that they associate with the drug or they express general disgust, anger or concern.</p>	<p>Current cannabis users were excluded from this category – any age or gender. Young former users included if emphatic about harms. These participants reported a strong aversion to cannabis in reporting cannabis harms, having stopped using, never used and never likely to use (survey questions x, y, z).</p> <p>Demand reduction barriers: may or may not identify cue exposure as problematic but clearly communicate dislike for cannabis;</p> <p>Cannabis harms – clearly and emphatically indicate personally held views that cannabis is harmful at personal, individual and / or community level.</p> <p>Demand reduction resources – may mention resources that have helped themselves or others cease use or protective factors that prevent uptake.</p>	<p>Need to get better jobs for young people. Different 20 years ago. Recent years people came from outside, use indigenous boys to sell to our people. We talk to our nephews - you filling the pockets of the dealer - should be working for yourself. Outside age range, was talking with her 50 year old sister also.</p>