

The eleven-item Alcohol, Smoking and Substance Involvement Screening Test (ASSIST-11): Cross-cultural psychometric evaluation across 42 countries

Running title: Testing the ASSIST-11 across 42 countries

Chih-Ting Lee¹, Chung-Ying Lin^{2,3,*}, Mónika Koós^{4,5}, Léna Nagy^{4,5}, Shane W. Kraus⁶, Zsolt Demetrovics^{5,7}, Marc N. Potenza^{8,9}, Rafael Ballester-Arnal¹⁰, Dominik Batthyány¹¹, Sophie Bergeron¹², Joël Billieux^{13,14}, Julius Burkauskas¹⁵, Georgina Cárdenas-López¹⁶, Joana Carvalho¹⁷, Jesús Castro-Calvo¹⁸, Lijun Chen¹⁹, Giacomo Ciocca²⁰, Ornella Corazza^{21,22}, Rita I. Csako²³, David P. Fernandez²⁴, Elaine F. Fernandez²⁵, Hironobu Fujiwara^{26,27}, Johannes Fuss²⁸, Roman Gabrhelík^{29,30}, Ateret Gewirtz-Meydan³¹, Biljana Gjoneska³², Mateusz Gola^{33,34}, Joshua B. Grubbs³⁵, Hashim T. Hashim³⁶, Md. Saiful Islam^{37,38}, Mustafa Ismail³⁶, Martha Jiménez-Martínez^{39,40}, Tanja Jurin⁴¹, Ondrej Kalina⁴², Verena Klein⁴³, András Költő⁴⁴, Sang-Kyu Lee^{45,46}, Karol Lewczuk⁴⁷, Christine Lochner⁴⁸, Silvia López-Alvarado⁴⁹, Kateřina Lukavská^{29,50}, Percy Mayta-Tristán⁵¹, Ionut Milea⁵², Dan J. Miller⁵³, Olga Orosová⁵⁴, Gábor Orosz⁵⁵, Sungkyunkwan University's research team^{56,†}, Fernando P. Ponce⁵⁷, Gonzalo R. Quintana⁵⁸, Gabriel C. Quintero Garzola^{59,60}, Jano Ramos-Diaz⁶¹, Kévin Rigaud⁵⁵, Ann Rousseau⁶², Marco De Tubino Scanavino^{63,64}, Marion K. Schulmeyer⁶⁵, Pratap Sharan⁶⁶, Mami Shibata²⁶, Sheikh Shoib⁶⁷, Vera Sigre-Leirós^{13,68}, Luke Sniewski⁶⁹, Ognen Spasovski⁷⁰, Vesta Steibliene⁷¹, Dan J. Stein⁷², Julian Strizek⁷³, Berk C. Ünsal^{4,5}, Marie-Pier Vaillancourt-Morel⁷⁴, Marie Claire Van Hout⁷⁵, Beáta Bóthe⁷⁶

¹Department of Family Medicine, National Cheng Kung University Hospital, College of Medicine, National Cheng Kung University, Tainan, Taiwan

²Institute of Allied Health Sciences, College of Medicine, National Cheng Kung University, Tainan, Taiwan

³Biostatistics Consulting Center, National Cheng Kung University Hospital, College of Medicine, National Cheng Kung University, Tainan, Taiwan

⁴Doctoral School of Psychology, ELTE Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary

⁵Institute of Psychology, ELTE Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary

⁶Department of Psychology, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Las Vegas, NV, USA

⁷Centre of Excellence in Responsible Gaming, University of Gibraltar, Gibraltar, Gibraltar

⁸Yale University School of Medicine, New Haven, CT, USA

⁹Connecticut Council on Problem Gambling, Wethersfield, CT, USA

¹⁰Departamento de Psicología Básica, Clínica y Psicobiología, University Jaume I of Castellón, Spain

¹¹Institute for Behavioural Addictions, Sigmund Freud University Vienna, Austria

¹²Département de psychologie, Université de Montréal, Montréal, Canada

¹³Institute of Psychology, University of Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland

¹⁴Center for Excessive Gambling, Addiction Medicine, Lausanne University Hospitals (CHUV), Lausanne, Switzerland

¹⁵Laboratory of Behavioral Medicine, Neuroscience Institute, Lithuanian University of Health Sciences, Lithuania

¹⁶Virtual Teaching and Cyberpsychology Laboratory, School of Psychology, National Autonomous University of Mexico, Mexico

¹⁷William James Center for Research, Departamento de Educação e Psicologia, Universidade de Aveiro, Aveiro, Portugal; CPUP: Center for Psychology at Porto University

¹⁸Department of Personality, Assessment, and Psychological Treatments, University of Valencia, Spain

¹⁹Department of Psychology, College of Humanity and Social Science, Fuzhou University, China

²⁰Section of Sexual Psychopathology, Department of Dynamic and Clinical Psychology, and Health Studies, Sapienza University of Rome, Rome, Italy

²¹Department of Clinical, Pharmaceutical and Biological Sciences, University of Hertfordshire, United Kingdom

²²Department of Psychology and Cognitive Science, University of Trento, Italy

²³Department of Psychology and Neuroscience, Auckland University of Technology, Auckland, New Zealand

²⁴Nottingham Trent University, United Kingdom

²⁵HELP University, Malaysia

²⁶Department of Neuropsychiatry, Graduate School of Medicine, Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan

²⁷Decentralized Big Data Team, RIKEN Center for Advanced Intelligence Project, Tokyo, Japan

²⁸Institute of Forensic Psychiatry and Sex Research, Center for Translational Neuro- and Behavioral Sciences, University of Duisburg-Essen, Essen, Germany

²⁹Charles University, First Faculty of Medicine, Department of Addictology, Prague, Czech Republic

³⁰General University Hospital in Prague, Department of Addictology, Czech Republic

³¹School of Social Work, Faculty of Social Welfare and Health Sciences, University of Haifa, Israel

³²Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Republic of North Macedonia

³³Institute of Psychology, Polish Academy of Sciences, Poland

³⁴Institute for Neural Computations, University of California San Diego, USA

³⁵Bowling Green State University, United States

³⁶University of Baghdad, College of Medicine, Iraq

³⁷Department of Public Health and Informatics, Jahangirnagar University, Savar, Dhaka-1342, Bangladesh

³⁸Centre for Advanced Research Excellence in Public Health, Savar, Dhaka-1342, Bangladesh

³⁹Universidad Pedagógica y Tecnológica de Colombia, Colombia

⁴⁰Grupo de Investigación Biomédica y de Patología, Colombia

⁴¹Department of Psychology, Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, Croatia

⁴²Department of Educational Psychology and Psychology of Health, Pavol Jozef Safarik University in Kosice, Slovakia

⁴³School of Psychology, University of Southampton, United Kingdom

⁴⁴Health Promotion Research Centre, University of Galway, Republic of Ireland

⁴⁵Department of Psychiatry, Hallym University Chuncheon Sacred Heart Hospital, South Korea

⁴⁶Chuncheon Addiction Management Center, South Korea

⁴⁷Institute of Psychology, Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University, Warsaw, Poland

⁴⁸SAMRC Unit on Risk & Resilience in Mental Disorders, Stellenbosch University, South Africa

⁴⁹University of Cuenca, Ecuador

⁵⁰Charles University, Faculty of Education, Department of Psychology, Prague, Czech Republic

⁵¹Facultad de Medicina, Universidad Científica del Sur, Lima, Perú

⁵²Babeş-Bolyai University, Romania

⁵³James Cook University, Australia

⁵⁴Pavol Jozef Safarik University in Kosice, Department of Educational Psychology and Psychology of Health, Slovakia

⁵⁵Artois University, France

⁵⁶Department of Psychology, Sungkyunkwan University, South Korea

⁵⁷Escuela de Psicología, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Chile

⁵⁸Departamento de Psicología y Filosofía, Facultad de Ciencias Sociales, Universidad de Tarapacá, Arica, Arica y Parinacota, Chile

⁵⁹Florida State University, Republic of Panama

⁶⁰Sistema Nacional de Investigación (SNI), SENACYT, Panama

⁶¹Facultad de Ciencias de la Salud, Universidad Privada del Norte, Lima, Perú

⁶²Leuven School For Mass Communication, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium

⁶³Department of Psychiatry, Faculdade de Medicina, Universidade de São Paulo, Brazil

⁶⁴Experimental Pathophysiology Post Graduation Program, Faculdade de Medicina, Universidade de São Paulo, Brazil

⁶⁵Universidad Privada de Santa Cruz de la Sierra, Bolivia

⁶⁶Department of Psychiatry, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi -110029, India

⁶⁷Department of Psychology, Shardha University, India

⁶⁸Institute of Legal Psychiatry, Lausanne University Hospitals (CHUV), Lausanne, Switzerland

⁶⁹Auckland University of Technology, New Zealand

⁷⁰Faculty of Philosophy, University of Ss. Cyril and Methodius in Trnava, Slovakia

⁷¹Laboratory of Behavioral Medicine, Neuroscience Institute, Lithuanian University of Health sciences, Lithuania

⁷²SAMRC Unit on Risk & Resilience in Mental Disorders, Dept of Psychiatry & Neuroscience Institute, University of Cape Town

⁷³Austrian Public Health Institute, Austria

⁷⁴Département de Psychologie, Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières, Trois-Rivières, Canada

⁷⁵Public Health Institute, Faculty of Health, Liverpool John Moores University, United Kingdom

⁷⁶Département de Psychologie, Université de Montréal, Montréal, Canada

† The Sungkyunkwan University's research team includes Dr. Hyein Chang and Mr. Kyeongwoo Park.

Corresponding Author: Chung-Ying Lin, PhD, Institute of Allied Health Sciences, Departments of Occupational Therapy and Public Health, and Biostatistics Consulting Center, National Cheng Kung University Hospital, College of Medicine, National Cheng Kung University, 1 University Rd, Tainan 701401, Taiwan. **E-mail:** cylin36933@gmail.com; **Tel:** 886-6-2353535 ext. 5106; **Fax:** 886-6-2367981; **ORCID:** <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2129-4242>

Financial support: B.B. was supported by a postdoctoral fellowship from the SCOUP Team – Sexuality and Couples – Fonds de recherche du Québec, Société et Culture and the by the Banting Postdoctoral Fellowship (Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, SSHRC) during the preparation of the first draft of the manuscript.; C.-Y.L. was supported by the WUN Research Development Fund (RDF) 2021, the Higher Education Sprout Project, the Ministry of Education at the Headquarters of University Advancement at the National Cheng Kung University (NCKU), and the National Science and Technology Council, Taiwan (NSTC 112-2410-H-006-089-SS2); C.L. was supported by the WUN Research Development Fund (RDF) 2021; S.W.K. was supported by the Kindbridge Research Institute; G.O. was supported by the ANR grant of the Chaire Professeur Junior of Artois University and by the Strategic Dialogue and Management Scholarship (Phase 1 and 2); G.C.Q.G. was supported by the SNI #073–2022 (SENACYT, Rep. of Panama); H.F. was supported by Grant-in-Aid for Transformative Research Areas (A) (Japan Society for The Promotion of Science, JP21H05173), Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (B) (Japan Society for The Promotion of Science, 21H02849), and the smoking research foundation.; K. Lewczuk was supported by Sonatina grant awarded by National Science Centre, Poland, grant number: 2020/36/C/HS6/00005.; K.P. was supported by Brain Korea 21 (BK21) program of National

Research Foundation of Korea.; K.R. was supported by a funding from the Hauts-de-France region (France) called “Dialogue Stratégique de Gestion 2 (DSG2)”; L.C. was supported by the National Social Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 19BSH117); L.N. was supported by the ÚNKP-22-3 New National Excellence Program of the Ministry for Culture and Innovation from the source of the National Research, Development and Innovation Fund.; M.G. was supported by National Science Centre of Polant grant nb. 2021/40/Q/HS6/00219; M.K. was supported by the ÚNKP-22-3 New National Excellence Program of the Ministry for Culture and Innovation from the source of the National Research, Development and Innovation Fund.; R.I.C. was supported by Auckland University of technology, 2021 Faculty Research Development Fund; R.G. was supported by the Charles University institutional support programme Cooperatio (Health Sciences); S.B. was supported by a Tier 1 Canada Research Chair; S.W.K. was supported by the Kindbridge Research Institute; Z.D. was supported by the Hungarian National Research, Development, and Innovation Office (Grant numbers: KKP126835).

Conflict of interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest with the content of this manuscript. SWK discloses that he has received funding from the International Center for Responsible Gaming, MGM Resorts International, Center for the Application of Substance Abuse Technologies, Taylor Francis, Springer Nature, The Nevada Problem Gambling Project, Sports Betting Alliance, and Kindbridge Research Institute. Dr. Potenza discloses that he has consulted for and advised Game Day Data, Addiction Policy Forum, AXA, Idorsia, Baria-Tek, and Opiant Therapeutics; been involved in a patent application involving Novartis and Yale; received research support from the Mohegan Sun Casino, Children and Screens and the Connecticut Council on Problem Gambling; consulted for or advised legal, gambling and non-profit entities on issues related to impulse control and addictive

behaviours; provided clinical care related to impulse-control and addictive behaviours; performed grant reviews; edited journals/journal sections; given academic lectures in grand rounds, CME events and other clinical/scientific venues; and generated books or chapters for publishers of mental health texts. The University of Gibraltar receives funding from the Gibraltar Gambling Care Foundation, an independent, not-for-profit charity. However, these funding sources are not related to this study, and the funding institutions had no role in the study design or the collection, analysis, and interpretation of the data, the writing of the manuscript, or the decision to submit the paper for publication.

Acknowledgements: The authors would like to thank Anastasia Lucic for her help with project administration and data collection; Natasha Zippan, Yasmin Benoit, Raquel Savage, Anne-Marie Menard, Club Sexu, Telex.hu, and Panamanian newspapers for media coverage (Crítica, Día a Día, El Siglo and La Estrella de Panamá); L’Avenir de l’Artois, la voix du Nord, Wéo and Le Parisien for their help with data collection.

Ethical standards: The collaborating countries applied for ethics approval and obtained the approval in their local sites (https://osf.io/n3k2c/?view_only=838146f6027c4e6bb68371d9d14220b5). All procedures in the ISS survey were conducted in accordance with the Helsinki Declaration. It took about 25 to 70 minutes for a participant to anonymously complete the entire ISS survey.

Author contributions: Conceptualization: C.-T.L., C.-Y.L., M.K., L.N., S.W.K., Z.D., M.N.P., and B.B.

Data curation: C.-T.L., C.-Y.L., M.K., L.N., S.W.K., Z.D., M.N.P., R.B.-A., D.B., S.B., J. Billieux, J. Burkauskas, G.C.-L., J.C., J.C.-C., L.C., G.C., O.C., R.I.C., D.P.F., E.F.F., H.F.,

J.F., R.G., A.G.-M., B.G., M.G., J.B.G., H.T.H., M.S.I., M.I., M.J.-M., T.J., O.K., V.K.,
A.K., S.-K.L., K. Lewczuk, C.L., S.L.-A., K. Lukavská, P.M.-T., I.M., D.J.M., O.O., G.O.,
K.P., F.P.P., G.R.Q., G.C.Q.G., J.R.-D., K.R., A.R., M.D.T.S., M.K.S., P.S., M.S., S.S., V.S.-
L., L.S., O.S., V.S., D.J.S., J.S., B.C.Ü., M.-P.V.-M., M.C.V.H., and B.B.

Formal analysis: C.-Y.L.

Funding acquisition: C.-Y.L., M.K., L.N., S.W.K., Z.D., S.B., H.F., R.G., M.G., K. Lewczuk,
C.L., K.P., K.R., D.J.S., and B.B.

Investigation: C.-T.L., C.-Y.L., M.K., L.N., S.W.K., Z.D., M.N.P., R.B.-A., D.B., S.B., J.
Billieux, J. Burkauskas, G.C.-L., J.C., J.C.-C., L.C., G.C., O.C., R.I.C., D.P.F., E.F.F., H.F.,
J.F., R.G., A.G.-M., B.G., M.G., J.B.G., H.T.H., M.S.I., M.I., M.J.-M., T.J., O.K., V.K.,
A.K., S.-K.L., K. Lewczuk, C.L., S.L.-A., K. Lukavská, P.M.-T., I.M., D.J.M., O.O., G.O.,
K.P., F.P.P., G.R.Q., G.C.Q.G., J.R.-D., K.R., A.R., M.D.T.S., M.K.S., P.S., M.S., S.S., V.S.-
L., L.S., O.S., V.S., D.J.S., J.S., B.C.Ü., M.-P.V.-M., M.C.V.H., and B.B.

Methodology: C.-T.L., C.-Y.L., M.K., L.N., S.W.K., Z.D., M.N.P., and B.B.

Project administration: C.-Y.L., M.K., L.N., S.W.K., Z.D., and B.B.

Resources: C.-Y.L., M.K., L.N., S.W.K., Z.D., R.B.-A., S.B., J. Burkauskas, G.C.-L., J.C.,
J.C.-C., J.F., R.G., A.G.-M., B.G., M.G., J.B.G., H.T.H., M.S.I., M.I., M.J.-M., O.K., V.K.,
S.-K.L., K. Lewczuk, K. Lukavská, P.M.-T., O.O., K.P., G.C.Q.G., A.R., O.S., V.S., B.C.Ü.,
M.-P.V.-M., M.C.V.H., and B.B.

Software: C.-T.L. and C.-Y.L.

Supervision: C.-Y.L., S.W.K., Z.D., M.N.P., R.B.-A., D.B., S.B., J. Billieux, J. Burkauskas,
G.C.-L., J.C., J.C.-C., L.C., G.C., O.C., R.I.C., D.P.F., E.F.F., H.F., J.F., R.G., A.G.-M.,
B.G., M.G., J.B.G., H.T.H., M.S.I., M.I., T.J., O.K., V.K., A.K., G.C.Q.G., M.-P.V.-M., and
B.B.

Validation: C.-T.L., C.-Y.L., M.K., L.N., S.W.K., Z.D., M.N.P., P.S., and B.B.

Visualization: C.-T.L., C.-Y.L., S.B., R.G., and M.G.

Writing - original draft: C.-T.L. and C.-Y.L.

Writing - review & editing: C.-Y.L., M.K., L.N., S.W.K., Z.D., M.N.P., R.B.-A., D.B., S.B., J. Billieux, J. Burkauskas, G.C.-L., J.C., J.C.-C., L.C., G.C., O.C., R.I.C., D.P.F., E.F.F., H.F., J.F., R.G., A.G.-M., B.G., M.G., J.B.G., H.T.H., M.S.I., M.I., M.J.-M., T.J., O.K., V.K., A.K., S.-K.L., K. Lewczuk, C.L., S.L.-A., K. Lukavská, P.M.-T., I.M., D.J.M., O.O., G.O., K.P., F.P.P., G.R.Q., G.C.Q.G., J.R.-D., K.R., A.R., M.D.T.S., M.K.S., P.S., M.S., S.S., V.S.-L., L.S., O.S., V.S., D.J.S., J.S., B.C.Ü., M.-P.V.-M., M.C.V.H., and B.B.

Transparency and openness: Materials and analysis code for this study are available by emailing the corresponding author. The International Sex Survey (ISS) follows open sciences practices (Bothe et al., 2021). Forty-two countries followed the International Sex Survey (ISS) guidelines to conduct an online survey using a cross-sectional study design (see preregistered study: https://osf.io/uyfra/?view_only=6e4f96b748be42d99363d58e32d511b8). Collaborating countries obtained local ethical approval from their institutions (https://osf.io/n3k2c/?view_only=838146f6027c4e6bb68371d9d14220b5). The list of related publications using the ISS dataset is uploaded to the OSF (journal publications: https://osf.io/jb6ey/?view_only=0014d87bb2b546f7a2693543389b934d; conference publications: https://osf.io/c695n/?view_only=7cae32e642b54d049e600ceb8971053e). Sociodemographic information (e.g., biological sex, gender identity, sexual orientation, age, and level of education) and sexuality-related questions were queried as described in https://osf.io/jcz96/?view_only=9af0068dde81488db54638a01c8ae118. The translations of the ASSIST-11 in 26 languages can be found at https://osf.io/jcz96/?view_only=9af0068dde81488db54638a01c8ae118. The detailed analytic plan was preregistered (<https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/DK78R>).

Detailed sociodemographic characteristics by country can be found at

https://osf.io/n3k2c/?view_only=838146f6027c4e6bb68371d9d14220b5.

Word count: 3817.

Abstract

The Alcohol, Smoking and Substance Involvement Screening Test (ASSIST) is an instrument to screen substance-use-related health risks. However, little is known whether the ASSIST could be further shortened while remaining psychometrically sound across different countries, languages, gender identities, and sexual-orientation-based groups. The study aimed to validate a shortened 11-item ASSIST (ASSIST-11). Using the International Sex Survey data, 82,243 participants ($M_{\text{age}}=32.39$ years) across 42 countries and 26 languages completed questions from the ASSIST-11 regarding gender identity, sexual orientation, and other information. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and multigroup CFA (MGCFA) evaluated ASSIST-11 structure and tested measurement invariance across groups. Cronbach's α and McDonald's ω were used to examine the internal consistency. Cohen's d and independent t -tests were used to examine known-group validity. The ASSIST-11 was unidimensional across countries, languages, age groups, gender identities (i.e., men, women, and gender-diverse individuals), and sexual orientations (i.e., heterosexual and sexual minority individuals). Cronbach's α was 0.63 and McDonald's ω was 0.68 for the ASSIST-11. Known-group validity was supported by Cohen's d (range between 0.23 and 0.40) with significant differences (p -values <0.001). The ASSIST-11 is a modified instrument with a unidimensional factor structure across different languages, age groups, countries, gender identities, and sexual orientations. The low internal consistency of the ASSIST-11 might be acceptable as it assesses a broad concept (i.e., use of several different substances). Healthcare providers and researchers may use the ASSIST-11 to quickly assess substance-use information from general populations and evaluate the need to follow up with more detailed questions about substance use.

Keywords: addictive behaviors; cross-cultural study; factor structure; measurement invariance; psychometrics

Introduction

Use of licit (e.g., cigarette and alcohol) and illicit substances (e.g., heroin or marijuana) is a significant problem worldwide (Chang et al., 2022a; Chen et al., 2022). People who use substances often experience poor sleep, low quality of life, behavioral addictions, and other stress-related concerns (Chang & Lin, 2015; Chang et al., 2014; Fan et al., 2022; Gjoneska et al., 2022; Lin et al., 2016; Saffari et al., 2022a). They may also encounter stigma, which may reduce motivation to seek professional treatment (Chang et al., 2019b, 2020, 2022b; Cheng et al., 2019). Thus, healthcare systems may experience burdens relating to addressing substance-related health concerns (Ryan & Rosa, 2020). Early interventions could help reduce healthcare costs (Chang et al., 2017; Chang et al., 2019a). The World Health Organization (WHO) developed the Alcohol, Smoking and Substance Involvement Screening Test (ASSIST) to assist with early identification of substance-use related health risk and substance use disorders (SUDs) in primary and other healthcare settings (WHO ASSIST Working Group, 2002).

The ASSIST was developed partly due to the successful experience of another screening tool developed by the WHO: the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT), developed in 1982 (Allen, 1997). The AUDIT focuses on alcohol and is valid, psychometrically-sound, and widely used in healthcare settings worldwide (Allen, 1997; Babor & Higgins-Biddle, 2000; Gecaite-Stonciene et al., 2021). Although some instruments assessing different types of psychoactive substances (e.g., Addiction Severity Index, Substance Abuse Module of the Composite International Diagnostic Interview, and CAGE-Adapted to Include Drugs) have been developed with satisfactory psychometric properties (Brown & Rounds, 1995; Cottler et al., 1989; McLellan et al., 1985), they are limited by the following: (i) being lengthy and time-consuming; (ii) having a focus on dependence and not less severe concerns; and (iii) often lacking cross-cultural validation (Khan et al., 2011;

Basedow et al., 2021).

After the ASSIST was initially developed in 2002 (WHO ASSIST Working Group, 2002), its feasibility has been evaluated across multiple populations, including children and adolescents (Friso et al., 2021; Källmén et al., 2019; Kane et al., 2016), university students (Christoff et al., 2016; Mostardinha et al., 2019; Onifade et al., 2014; Tiburcio Sainz et al., 2016), older people (Khan et al., 2012), clinical populations with or without psychotic disorders (Henrique et al., 2004; Hides et al., 2009; Humeniuk et al., 2008; Johnson et al., 2015; Khan et al., 2011; Kumar et al., 2016; O’Grady et al., 2016; López-Lazcano et al., 2021; McNeely et al., 2014, 2016; Rubio Valladolid et al., 2014; Sun et al., 2010; van der Westhuizen et al., 2016; Yee et al., 2016), and general populations (Altin & Coskunol, 2019; Muhamad et al., 2018; Newcombe et al., 2016; Soto-Brandt et al., 2014). The ASSIST appears to be a psychometrically sound instrument for assessing SUDs across these populations. Although the ASSIST assesses the frequency of an individual using different types of substances (including tobacco, alcohol, cannabis, cocaine, amphetamines, inhalants, sedatives, hallucinogens, opioids, and others), previous research has demonstrated that the ASSIST has a unidimensional structure (Khan et al., 2012), potentially reflecting polysubstance use (Kluwe-Schiavon et al., 2022), which could contribute to its low internal consistency.

The ASSIST contains eight items, each having sub-items. Specifically, the first item asks the use of 10 different substances; then, subsequent questions ask details regarding such use. Therefore, responses to and scoring of the ASSIST are complex. Thus, shortening the ASSIST to ask about the frequency of use of the 10 different substances with one open question as supplement may reduce administration time and provide a simpler scoring method. Therefore, we tested an 11-item version (ASSIST-11).

The ASSIST has been validated in different languages (e.g., English [O’Grady et al.,

2016], French [Khan et al., 2011], Turkish [Altin & Coskunol, 2019], Malay [Yee et al., 2016], Chinese [Sun et al., 2010], and Spanish [Rubio Valladolid et al., 2014]). Here, we tested the ASSIST-11 in various languages and cultures, including new, underserved, and underrepresented populations. Multi-language cross-cultural investigations are important given worldwide concerns related to substance use. A large-scale study involving different countries may test the instrument across cultures and aid in healthcare provision broadly.

Psychometric properties of the ASSIST remain insufficiently explored across sex and gender. Biological, epidemiological, and treatment-related differences exist between genders/sexes in SUDs, with more research needed (McHugh et al., 2018). To aid future studies examining sexuality-/gender-related differences in SUDs, it is important to have a valid instrument for assessing SUDs without potential sexuality-/gender-related bias.

Minority stress related to sexual orientation may contribute to different levels of substance use. For example, adolescents who report sexual-minority status are particularly likely to use substances (Corliss et al., 2010; Költő et al., 2019). As a result, we examined whether the ASSIST-11 assessed SUDs across gender-identity and sexual-orientation groups similarly.

The present study had the following aims. First, we examined whether the modified ASSIST-11 had a unidimensional factor structure with satisfactory internal consistency in the total sample. Second, we conducted measurement invariance tests to examine if the ASSIST-11 was invariant across language, country, age, gender-identity, and sexual-orientation groups. Third, we tested known-group validity via several items assessing addictive behaviors. We hypothesized that (i) the ASSIST-11 would have a unidimensional factor structure; (ii) the unidimensional factor structure would be invariant across language, age, country, gender-identity, and sexual-orientation groups; and (iii) participants with more severe addictive behaviors would have higher ASSIST-11 scores than those with less severe addictive behaviors.

Methods

Procedure and participants

Forty-two countries¹ followed the International Sex Survey (ISS) guidelines to conduct an online survey using a cross-sectional study design described by Bóthe, Koós et al. (2021). (details of the preregistered study methods can be found here:

https://osf.io/uyfra/?view_only=6e4f96b748be42d99363d58e32d511b8). For the present study validating the ASSIST-11 across countries, the non-English-speaking collaborating countries initially translated the ISS English survey battery into local languages with a robust translation procedure proposed by Beaton et al. (2000). Then, the collaborating countries obtained local ethics approval from their institutions

(https://osf.io/n3k2c/?view_only=838146f6027c4e6bb68371d9d14220b5). Subsequently, the online survey (via the Qualtrics Research Suite) commenced simultaneously in all countries and data collection was conducted between October 2021 and May 2022. All procedures in the ISS survey were conducted in accordance with the Helsinki Declaration. On average, it took about 25 to 70 minutes for a participant to complete the anonymous survey. There were no specific exclusion criteria; however, the participants needed to have been of a legal age to provide consent for participation. Therefore, the minimal age for participation depended on the laws of each country (e.g., participants needed to be aged 20 years or above in Taiwan).

The list of related publications using the ISS dataset is uploaded on the OSF (journal publications: https://osf.io/jb6ey/?view_only=0014d87bb2b546f7a2693543389b934d;

¹ Egypt, Iran, Pakistan, and Romania were included in the study protocol paper as collaborating countries (Bóthe, Koós, et al., 2021); however, it was not possible to get ethical approval for the study in a timely manner in these countries. Chile was not included in the study protocol paper as a collaborating country (Bóthe, Koós, et al., 2021) as it joined the study after publishing the study protocol. Therefore, instead of the planned 45 countries (Bóthe, Koós, et al., 2021), only 42 individual countries are considered in the present study; see details at <https://osf.io/n3k2c/>.

conference publications:

https://osf.io/c695n/?view_only=7cae32e642b54d049e600ceb8971053e).

Measures

Background information. Sociodemographic information (e.g., biological sex, gender identity, sexual orientation, age, and level of education) and sexuality-related questions were queried as described in

https://osf.io/jcz96/?view_only=9af0068dde81488db54638a01c8ae118 (Bóthe et al., 2021).

Moreover, as described in the study protocol (Bóthe et al., 2021), several questions were used to ask regarding mental health/emotional problems (without a timeframe), traditional gambling experiences (timeframes of ever or the past year), online gambling experiences (timeframes of ever or the past year), and seeking professional help for self-perceived uncontrolled sexual urges/behaviors (timeframe of current or the past year).

Eleven-item Alcohol, Smoking and Substance Involvement Screening Test

(ASSIST-11). The ASSIST-11 screens for substance use. The ASSIST was developed by the WHO (Humeniuk et al., 2010; WHO ASSIST Working Group, 2002) with validations in self-administered forms (Lopez-Rodriguez & Rubio Valladolid, 2018; Tiburcio Sainz et al., 2016). A unidimensional factor structure has been supported (Khan et al., 2012). The first 10 ASSIST-11 items ask if a respondent has used specific types of substances *in a time frame of last three months*: (item 1) tobacco, (item 2) alcohol, (item 3) cannabis, (item 4) cocaine, (item 5) amphetamine, (item 6) inhalants, (item 7) sedatives, (item 8) hallucinogens, (item 9) opioids, and (item 10) others. Examples of each type of substance (except “others”) are given (e.g., cigarettes for tobacco). The last item in the ASSIST-11 is an open-ended question to specify other substances as indicated. All ASSIST-11 items (except for item 11) are rated using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (never), 1 (once or twice), 2 (monthly), 3 (weekly), and 4 (daily or almost daily), all in the last three months. Because item 11 was

supplementary to the 10 items, item 11 was not used in psychometric testing here. Using the first 10 items, the ASSIST-11 total score ranged between 0 and 40. Moreover, the timeframe of the ASSIST-11 follows that of the original ASSIST (i.e., in the past three months) to maintain consistency. The language translations of the ASSIST-11 are available at <https://osf.io/th4j6>.

Statistical analysis

Statistical analyses involved four main steps: (i) descriptive statistics with normality checks (using IBM SPSS software); (ii) factor structure and internal consistency tests (using *lavaan* and *psych* packages in R software); (iii) measurement invariance tests across languages, countries, age, gender identities, and sexual orientations (using the *lavaan* package in R software); (iv) known-group validity tests (using the *effectsize* package in R software). The detailed analytic plan was preregistered (<https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/DK78R>).

Descriptive statistics and normality checks. Descriptive statistics summarized participants' characteristics (e.g., age, gender) and properties of ASSIST-11 items. Apart from means, standard deviations (SDs), frequencies, and percentages, skewness and kurtosis were used to check normality of each ASSIST-11 item, with normal distributions having absolute values of skewness smaller than 3 and kurtosis smaller than 10 (Kline, 2011).

Factor structure and internal consistency. Similar to most factor structure validation studies (Chen et al., 2023; Hu et al., 2022; Wu et al., 2023), confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) with a diagonally weighted least squares (DWLS) estimator was used to evaluate whether the ASSIST-11 would yield a one-factor structure. The use of DWLS is an appropriate estimator for Likert-type scales (Finney & DiStefano, 2013). If ASSIST-11 data fit well to a one-factor structure, the CFA fit indices should have comparative fit indices (CFIs) of > 0.9 ; Tucker-Lewis indices (TLIs) of > 0.9 ; root mean square errors of

approximation (RMSEAs) of < 0.08 ; and standardized root mean square residuals (SRMRs) of < 0.08 (Browne & Cudeck, 1993). Two methods testing internal consistency (Cronbach's α and McDonald's ω) were used.

Measurement invariance test. Multigroup CFA (MGCFA) with the DWLS estimator examined measurement invariance across subgroups based on language, age, country, gender identity, and sexual orientation. Each subgroup needed a minimum of 560 participants, according to Monte Carlo simulations (see: <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/DK78R>). The grouping rationale is reported at <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/DK78R>. To overcome convergence problems in measurement invariance tests, the following grouping methods were used. The original 26 language subgroups were regrouped into two subsets according to the alphabetical order of the name of the language in English; the original 42 country-based subgroups were regrouped into two subsets according to the countries' English name in alphabetical order; the age subgroups were the following: young adults (aged below 30 years), early middle-aged adults (aged between 30 and 44.99 years), older middle-aged adults (aged between 45 and 59.99 years), and older adults (aged 60 years or above); the original five gender identity subgroups were regrouped into three groups (man, woman, and gender-diverse individual). The original eight sexual orientation subgroups were regrouped into two (heterosexual and sexual minority), see <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/DK78R>.

In the MGCFA, nested models testing for configural invariance (Model 0), metric invariance (Model 1), scalar invariance (Model 2), and residual invariance (Model 3) were compared. Model 0 examined if the subgroups shared the same one-factor model. Model 1 constrained the factor loadings being equal across subgroups. Model 2 additionally constrained item intercepts as being equal across subgroups. Model 3 additionally constrained residuals as being equal across subgroups. For metric, scalar, and residual invariance, invariances were first examined if full invariance was achieved using the following indices:

Δ CFI (i.e., CFI between every two nested modes) > -0.010 , Δ TLI > -0.010 , Δ RMSEA < 0.03 (for metric invariance) or < 0.015 (for scalar and residual invariance), and Δ SRMR < 0.03 (Chen, 2007; Cheung & Rensvold, 2002; Rutkowski & Svetina, 2013). When full invariance was not achieved for any of the metric, scalar, or residual invariance, partial invariance that relaxed constraints of factor loadings, item intercepts, or residuals were also tested (Milfont & Fischer, 2010). Following the MGCFA, latent mean differences were computed to explore if different demographic groups had different latent scores on the ASSIST-11. The statistical analysis for the latent mean differences anchored a subgroup to have a latent of 0. Then, the other groups' latent means were checked to see their values differed from 0. This difference was used as an effect size indicator. In this regard, the latent mean difference at 0.2 indicated a small effect in difference, 0.5 a moderate effect in difference, and 0.8 a large effect in difference.

Known-group validity testing. Known-group validity was examined using Cohen's d with independent samples t -tests. Participants with (versus without) substance-use problems were compared on ASSIST-11 total scores: having mental health/emotional problems, ever having traditional gambling experiences, past-year traditional gambling experiences, ever having online gambling experiences, past-year online gambling experiences, ever seeking professional help for self-described uncontrolled sexual urges/behaviors, and currently seeking professional help for self-described uncontrolled sexual urges/behaviors. These variables were chosen for known-group validity as we considered that people having high total ASSIST-11 scores would be more likely to have these other behaviors/concerns. The magnitude of effect size was considered small for 0.2 Cohen's d ; moderate for 0.5 Cohen's d ; and large for 0.8 Cohen's d (Cohen, 1998).

Results

Most participants ($N = 82243$; mean_{age} = 32.39 years) self-identified as women ($n =$

46874; 57.0%), followed by men ($n = 32549$; 39.6%), non-binary individuals ($n = 2315$; 2.8%), and individuals identifying with other gender identities ($n = 468$; 0.6%), with 40.3% being biologically male ($n = 33245$). Nearly three-fourths of participants had the highest education as tertiary ($n = 60896$; 74.0%) and nearly one-fourth had secondary education ($n = 20325$; 24.7%). Detailed sociodemographic characteristics by country can be found at https://osf.io/n3k2c/?view_only=838146f6027c4e6bb68371d9d14220b5. All ASSIST-11 items, except for items 1 and 2 (skewness = 1.32 and 0.26; kurtosis = -0.01 and -1.31) violated normal distributions (skewness = 2.65 to 12.52; kurtosis = 6.58 to 184.92). In general, most items had floor effects (Table 1). There were some missing data (<10%) in the present study. Thus, subsequent analyses were conducted using a pairwise method to handle missing data.

(Insert Table 1 here)

CFA results of the ASSIST-11 are reported in Table 2. A one-factor structure of the ASSIST-11 was supported by fit indices: CFI = 0.936; TLI = 0.917; RMSEA (90% CI) = 0.030 (0.028, 0.031); and SRMR = 0.080. However, standardized factor loadings derived from the CFA were acceptable for items 1 to 5 (range between 0.306 and 0.628) but not for items 6 to 10 (range between 0.062 and 0.273). Moreover, the CFA fit indices were acceptable or nearly acceptable for most of the countries (CFI = 0.852 to 1.000, TLI = 0.810 to 1.123, and RMSEA = 0.000 to 0.042), except for the SRMR (ranged between 0.046 and .289; for detailed information, please see Appendix Table S1). The internal consistency was poor with McDonald's ω at 0.68 and Cronbach's α at 0.63. Corrected item-total correlations showed relatively low correlations for items 6, 7, 9, and 10 (range between 0.068 and 0.194). Appendix Table S2 reports internal consistency for each language version.

(Insert Table 2 here)

The MGCFA examined measurement invariance of the ASSIST-11 across languages,

age groups, countries, gender identities, and sexual orientations (Table 3). In the MGCFA, the unidimensional structure was used because, although low factor loadings were observed in the baseline model in the case of some items, the fit indices supported the unidimensional structure, and the ASSIST-11 is a screening tool with a clear rationale for a one-factor structure. Regarding language-based measurement invariance tests, configural invariance (CFI = 0.937; TLI = 0.919; RMSEA = 0.029; SRMR = 0.074), full metric invariance (Δ CFI = -0.015; Δ TLI = -0.008; Δ RMSEA = 0.001; Δ SRMR = 0.002), full scalar invariance (Δ CFI = -0.017; Δ TLI = -0.008; Δ RMSEA = 0.002; Δ SRMR = 0.002), and partial residual invariance with residuals of items 2 and 3 relaxed (Δ CFI = -0.016; Δ TLI = -0.007; Δ RMSEA = 0.001; Δ SRMR = 0.030) were achieved.

Regarding country-based measurement invariance tests, configural invariance (CFI = 0.936; TLI = 0.918; RMSEA = 0.030; SRMR = 0.074), full metric invariance (Δ CFI = -0.005; Δ TLI = 0.004; Δ RMSEA = -0.001; Δ SRMR = 0.001), full scalar invariance (Δ CFI = -0.008; Δ TLI = -0.001; Δ RMSEA = 0.000; Δ SRMR = 0.001), and full residual invariance (Δ CFI = -0.009; Δ TLI = 0.000; Δ RMSEA = 0.000; Δ SRMR = 0.006) were achieved.

Regarding age-based measurement invariance tests, configural invariance (CFI = 0.941; TLI = 0.924; RMSEA = 0.029; SRMR = 0.075), full metric invariance (Δ CFI = -0.012; Δ TLI = -0.001; Δ RMSEA = 0.000; Δ SRMR = 0.001), partial scalar invariance with item intercept of item 2 relaxed (Δ CFI = -0.011; Δ TLI = 0.000; Δ RMSEA = 0.000; Δ SRMR = 0.000), and partial residual invariance with residuals of items 1, 2, 3, and 8 relaxed (Δ CFI = -0.005; Δ TLI = 0.002; Δ RMSEA = 0.013; Δ SRMR = 0.023) were achieved.

Regarding gender-identity-based measurement invariance tests, configural invariance (CFI = 0.938; TLI = 0.920; RMSEA = 0.029; SRMR = 0.074), full metric invariance (Δ CFI = -0.006; Δ TLI = 0.005; Δ RMSEA = -0.001; Δ SRMR = 0.000), full scalar invariance (Δ CFI = -0.013; Δ TLI = -0.003; Δ RMSEA = 0.001; Δ SRMR = 0.001), and partial residual invariance

with the residual of item 2 relaxed ($\Delta\text{CFI} = -0.008$; $\Delta\text{TLI} = -0.002$; $\Delta\text{RMSEA} = -0.001$; $\Delta\text{SRMR} = 0.016$) were achieved.

Regarding sexual-orientation-based measurement invariance tests, configural invariance ($\text{CFI} = 0.939$; $\text{TLI} = 0.922$; $\text{RMSEA} = 0.028$; $\text{SRMR} = 0.073$), full metric invariance ($\Delta\text{CFI} = -0.019$; $\Delta\text{TLI} = -0.013$; $\Delta\text{RMSEA} = 0.003$; $\Delta\text{SRMR} = -0.001$), partial scalar invariance with item intercept of item 3 relaxed ($\Delta\text{CFI} = -0.014$; $\Delta\text{TLI} = -0.007$; $\Delta\text{RMSEA} = 0.001$; $\Delta\text{SRMR} = -0.001$), and partial residual invariance with residuals of items 2 and 3 relaxed ($\Delta\text{CFI} = -0.017$; $\Delta\text{TLI} = -0.007$; $\Delta\text{RMSEA} = 0.001$; $\Delta\text{SRMR} = 0.041$) were achieved.

In the measurement invariance testing, latent mean differences of the ASSIST-11 across the demographics were: -0.29 in the two language subgroups, from -0.12 to 0.82 in the four age subgroups (the highest latent mean in the early middle-aged adult subgroup and the lowest latent mean in the older adult subgroup), -0.08 in the two country subgroups, from -0.01 to 0.11 in the three gender identity subgroups (the highest latent mean in the gender-diverse individual subgroup and the lowest latent mean in the woman subgroup), and -0.23 in the two sexual orientation subgroups (Table 3).

(Insert Table 3 here)

Known-group validity was next examined using measures of mental health problems, gambling behaviors and problematic sexual behaviors, using individuals without these characteristics as comparator groups. Participants reporting mental health problems had higher total ASSIST-11 scores, with a small to moderate effect size (Cohen's $d = 0.32$; $p < 0.001$). Participants reporting traditional gambling had higher total ASSIST-11 scores, with small to moderate effect sizes (Cohen's $d = 0.25$ and 0.24 ; $p < 0.001$). Participants reporting online gambling had higher total ASSIST-11 scores, with small to moderate effect sizes (Cohen's $d = 0.24$ and 0.23 ; $p < 0.001$). Participants reporting having sought professional help for sexual urge problems had higher total ASSIST-11 scores, with small to moderate

effect sizes (Cohen's $d = 0.30$ and 0.40 ; $p < 0.001$) (Table 4).

(Insert Table 4 here)

Discussion

Consistent with expectations, we found that the ASSIST-11 (a shortened ASSIST) is a unidimensional instrument in a large-scale cross-sectional investigation across 40+ countries and 20+ languages. The unidimensional factor structure was invariant across country, age, language, gender identity (three subgroups of men, women, and gender-diverse individuals), and sexual orientation (two subgroups of heterosexual and sexual-minority individuals) groups. However, items 2 and 3 needed to be relaxed in their item intercepts (sexual-orientation groups) or residuals (language, gender-identity, and sexual-orientation groups) to achieve full invariance. Moreover, some items (i.e., items 6, 7, 9, and 10) had relatively low factor loadings. Nevertheless, the known-group validity supported the entire ASSIST-11 score to distinguish people reporting (versus not) potentially addictive behaviors.

The unidimensional factor structure noted in the present sample is consistent with prior ASSIST studies (Khan et al., 2012). The online survey mode in the present cross-cultural study (i.e., the ISS) corroborates prior evidence that the ASSIST may be completed in a self-administered manner (Lopez-Rodriguez, & Rubio Valladolid, 2018; Tiburcio Sainz et al., 2016) in addition to the original interview-based format (Humenuik et al., 2010; WHO ASSIST Working Group, 2002). Thus, the feasibility and efficiency of using the ASSIST-11 were corroborated. Healthcare providers, policymakers, and researchers may consider using the ASSIST-11 to quickly evaluate or screen whether an individual may have substance-use problems.

However, the internal consistency of the ASSIST-11 was somewhat low, and this could be due to some items having low factor loadings (i.e., items 6 [inhalants], 7 [sedatives], 9 [opioids], and 10 [others]) and/or a broader concept in the ASSIST-11. A possible

explanation for low factor loadings is that inhalants, sedatives, and other substances (those not listed in the ASSIST-11) have low usage prevalence estimates (Chang et al., 2022a; United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2015). Indeed, items 6 related to inhalants use (mean score = 0.02; skewness = 12.27; kurtosis = 184.92), 7 related to sedatives use (mean score = 0.02; skewness = 12.52; kurtosis = 184.60), and 10 to other addictive substances (mean score = 0.03; skewness = 11.81; kurtosis = 142.87) had the lowest scores and largest skewness and kurtosis values.

Speculatively, the low factor loading of item 9 assessing opioid use may reflect methadone maintenance treatment for patients who are treated for opioid use disorder (Chang et al., 2014; Chang & Lin, 2015; Lin et al., 2016). A considerable portion of people reporting opioid use received methadone maintenance treatment (Chang et al., 2014; Chang & Lin, 2015; Lin et al., 2016), and they might have different interpretations regarding whether they have used opioids (e.g., using opioids as a pharmacological treatment for pain). Some may consider that they did not use it because of receiving methadone, while some may consider methadone as opioid use. Therefore, different interpretations may have confounded the item assessing opioid use and resulted in low factor loading.

Nevertheless, the low internal consistency and factor loadings were deemed to be acceptable due to several reasons. First, when a broad concept (i.e., different substances) is measured using a limited number of items (i.e., 10 items in the ASSIST-11), constructing them into one factor is often considered more reasonable than constructing them into different factors (Khan et al., 2012). Second, the unidimensional factor structure of the ASSIST-11 has theoretical support with clinical relevance (Humeniuk et al., 2010; WHO ASSIST Working Group, 2002). Third, the fit indices derived from the CFA findings in the present study were acceptable for a unidimensional factor structure.

The unidimensional factor structure of the ASSIST-11 was found to be invariant (mostly

full invariance with some partial invariance) across different groups based on country, language, gender identity, and sexual orientation. The measurement invariance findings indicate that using the ASSIST-11 to assess substance use across these groups is acceptable because the false implications related to measurement biases and invalid comparisons may be minimal (Jeong & Lee, 2019). Moreover, partial invariance was found mostly at the level of residual invariance, and full invariance was supported for metric and scalar invariance in almost all groups, suggesting that comparing means across these groups is meaningful. Specifically, residual invariance suggests the errors (i.e., the variance or residuals not captured by the latent concept) are invariant across groups, and this type of invariance does not influence the test of mean differences because residuals are not part of the latent factor (Putnick & Bornstein, 2016; Vandenberg & Lance, 2000).

Following invariance testing, our MGCFA showed that the latent mean scores of the ASSIST-11 were not substantially different in different countries (when grouping the countries into two), gender identities, and sexual orientations. This indicates that substance use problems could be similar across countries, gender identities, and sexual orientations. However, large effects were found in the latent mean differences between different age subgroups: early middle-aged adults had the highest latent mean (0.82 as compared with older middle-aged adults) and followed by young adults (0.27 as compared with older middle-aged adults); while older adults had the lowest latent means (-0.12 as compared with older middle-aged adults). Early middle-aged adults as compared with individuals in other age groups might have the highest levels of craving and abilities to obtain different substances, which might explain why this group had the highest ASSIST-11 latent mean scores. Therefore, special attention may need to be paid to this age group to prevent potential problems in their substance use.

Apart from the factor structure of the ASSIST-11, the present findings demonstrated that

the ASSIST-11 had satisfactory known-group validity. The timeframes between the ASSIST-11 (three months) and the variables for known-group validity (e.g., no specific timeframe for mental health/emotional problems; past year for traditional gambling experiences, online gambling experiences, and seeking professional help for self-perceived uncontrolled sexual urges/behaviors) differed. It is unclear how the different timeframes may have impacted the findings, and the possible influences of timeframes should be examined directly in future studies. However, the ASSIST-11 may efficiently distinguish people potentially having addictive behaviors (including traditional gambling, online gambling, and compulsive sexual behaviors) from those not having these potential addictive behaviors. The present findings and prior evidence (Burleigh et al., 2019) suggest that substance use and other potentially addictive behaviors co-occur. Moreover, the known-group validity of the ASSIST-11 indicates that people with mental health/emotional problems had higher ASSIST-11 scores than those without such problems. These results resonate with prior data that people with versus without SUDs have worse mental health, with findings extending to substance use behaviors (Connery et al., 2020).

There are study limitations warranting mention. The general limitations in the entire ISS are documented online:

https://osf.io/6kscb?view_only=838146f6027c4e6bb68371d9d14220b5. Additionally specific

limitations for the present study are listed below. First, some important psychometric properties such as test-retest and responsiveness of the ASSIST-11 were not examined.

Future studies are warranted to examine these properties using large-scale samples across different countries. Second, the present sample did not examine individuals with diagnosed SUDs (i.e., a clinical sample), as reflected in attenuated ranges for many reported substances. Therefore, the present study cannot determine whether the ASSIST-11 can accurately differentiate people with and without diagnosed SUDs, and this needs direct examination.

Third, all gender-diverse and sexual minority individuals were collapsed into a same gender identity and sexual orientation group, respectively. Future studies are thus needed to examine and replicate the examination of measurement invariance of ASSIST across different groups of gender identities and sexual orientations.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the present study showed that the shortened ASSIST (i.e., ASSIST-11) is an instrument with a unidimensional factor structure and works similarly across different languages, countries, age groups, gender identities, and sexual orientations. Although the entire internal consistency of the ASSIST-11 was lower than some acceptable cutoffs, we consider this as acceptable because the ASSIST-11 assesses a broad concept (i.e., including a variety of substances). Apart from the low internal consistency, the ASSIST-11 showed good known-group validity as it distinguished people with and without reported non-substance addictive behaviors. Moreover, the current findings support the use of ASSIST-11 in general populations across more than 40 countries. Therefore, the potential practice and research implications of the present findings is to make the ASSIST-11 available in at least 20 languages, including non-WEIRD (Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, and Democratic) countries. Given that most research in the field of addiction focuses on WEIRD countries (Baxter et al., 2013; Brady et al., 2018; Cheon et al., 2020; Degenhardt et al., 2011; Tindle, 2021), the present findings extend the use of ASSIST-11 to non-WEIRD countries. Nevertheless, future studies using other psychometric testing methods such as Rasch analysis and network analysis (Li et al., 2022; Saffari et al., 2022b) are encouraged to further corroborate the psychometric robustness of the ASSIST-11.

References

- Allen, J.P., Litten, R.Z., Fertig, J.B., Babor, T., 1997. A review of research on the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT). *Alcohol Clin Exp Res.* 21(4), 613-619. Retrieved from <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/9194913/>
- Altin, D., Coşkunol, H., 2020. Turkish Validity and Reliability of the Alcohol, Smoking and Substance Involvement Screening Test. *ADDICTA: The Turkish Journal on Addictions.* 6, 67-86. <https://doi.org/10.5152/addicta.2020.19067>
- Babor, T.F., Higgins-Biddle, J.C., 2000. Alcohol screening and brief intervention: dissemination strategies for medical practice and public health. *Addiction.* 95(5), 677-686. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1360-0443.2000.9556773.x>
- Basedow, L.A., Kuitunen-Paul, S., Eichler, A., Roessner, V., Golub, Y., 2021. Diagnostic Accuracy of the Drug Use Disorder Identification Test and Its Short Form, the DUDIT-C, in German Adolescent Psychiatric Patients. *Front Psychol.* 12, 678819. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.678819>
- Baxter, A.J., Patton, G., Scott, K.M., Degenhardt, L., Whiteford, H.A., 2013. Global epidemiology of mental disorders: what are we missing? *PLoS One.* 8(6), e65514. <https://doi.org/10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0065514>
- Beaton, D.E., Bombardier, C., Guillemin, F., Ferraz, M.B., 2000. Guidelines for the process of cross-cultural adaptation of self-report measures. *Spine.* 25(24), 3186-3191. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00007632-200012150-00014>
- Bóthe, B., Koós, M., Nagy, L., Kraus, S.W., Potenza, M.N., Demetrovics, Z., 2021. International Sex Survey: Study protocol of a large, cross-cultural collaborative study in 45 countries. *J Behav Addict.* 10(3), 632-645. <https://doi.org/10.1556/2006.2021.00063>
- Brady, L.M., Fryberg, S.A., Shoda, Y., 2018. Expanding the interpretive power of psychological science by attending to culture. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 115(45),

11406-11413. <https://doi.org/10.1073/PNAS.1803526115>

Brown, R.L., Rounds, L.A., 1995. Conjoint screening questionnaires for alcohol and other drug abuse: criterion validity in a primary care practice. *Wis Med J.* 94(3), 135-140.

Retrieved from <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/7778330/>

Browne, M.W., Cudeck, R. 1993. Alternative ways of assessing model fit. *Sociological Methods & Research.* 21(2), 230-258. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124192021002005>

Burleigh, T.L., Griffiths, M.D., Sumich, A., Stavropoulos, V., Kuss, D.J., 2019. A Systematic Review of the Co-occurrence of Gaming Disorder and Other Potentially Addictive Behaviors. *Curr Addict Rep.* 6(4), 383-401. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40429-019-00279-7>

Chang, C.C., Chang, K.C., Hou, W.L., Yen, C.F., Lin, C.Y., Potenza, M.N., 2020.

Measurement invariance and psychometric properties of Perceived Stigma toward People who use Substances (PSPS) among three types of substance use disorders: Heroin, amphetamine, and alcohol. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 216, 108319.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2020.108319>

Chang, C.W., Chang, K.C., Griffiths, M.D., Chang, C.C., Lin, C.Y., Pakpour, A.H., 2022b.

The mediating role of perceived social support in the relationship between perceived stigma and depression among individuals diagnosed with substance use disorders. *J Psychiatr Ment Health Nurs.* 29(2), 307-316. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jpm.12794>

Chang, K.C., Chen, H.P., Huang, S.W., Chen, J.S., Potenza, M.N., Pakpour, A.H., Lin, C.Y., 2022a. Comparisons of psychological distress and self-stigma among three types of substance use disorders receiving treatment-as-usual approaches: real-world data from a 9-month longitudinal study. *Ther Adv Chronic Dis.* 13, 20406223221140393.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/20406223221140393>

Chang, K.-C., Lee, K.-Y., Lu, T.-H., Hwang, J.-S., Lin, C.-N., Ting, S.-Y., Chang, C.-C.,

Wang, J.-D., 2019a. Opioid agonist treatment reduces losses in quality of life and

- quality-adjusted life expectancy in heroin users: Evidence from real world data. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 201, 197-204. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2019.05.003>
- Chang, K.C., Wang, J.D., Saxon, A., Matthews, A.G., Woody, G., Hser, Y.I., 2017. Causes of death and expected years of life lost among treated opioid-dependent individuals in the United States and Taiwan. *Int J Drug Policy.* 43, 1-6.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugpo.2016.12.003>
- Chang, K.C., Lin, C.Y., 2015. Effects of publicly funded and quality of life on attendance rate among methadone maintenance treatment patients in Taiwan: an 18-month follow-up study. *Harm Reduct J.* 12, 40. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12954-015-0076-8>
- Chang, K.C., Lin, C.Y., Chang, C.C., Ting, S.Y., Cheng, C.M., Wang, J.D., 2019b. Psychological distress mediated the effects of self-stigma on quality of life in opioid-dependent individuals: A cross-sectional study. *PLoS One.* 14(2), e0211033.
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0211033>
- Chang, K.-C., Wang, J.-D., Tang, H.-P., Cheng, C.-M., Lin, C.-Y., 2014. Psychometric evaluation, using Rasch analysis, of the WHOQOL-BREF in heroin-dependent people undergoing methadone maintenance treatment: further item validation. *Health Qual Life Outcomes.* 12(1), 148. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12955-014-0148-6>
- Chen, F.F., 2007. Sensitivity of Goodness of Fit Indexes to Lack of Measurement Invariance. *Struct Equ Modeling.* 14(3), 464-504. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705510701301834>
- Chen, I.H., Chang, K.C., Chang, C.W., Huang, S.W., Potenza, M.N., Pakpour, A.H., Lin, C.Y., 2022. Temporal associations between problematic use of the internet and self-stigma among people with substance use disorders: A cross-lagged model across one year. *J Psychiatr Res.* 156, 339-348. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychires.2022.10.044>
- Chen, I.-H., Chang, Y.-L., Yang, Y.-N., Yeh, Y.-C., Ahorsu, D. K., Adjorlolo, S., Strong, C., Hsieh, Y.-P., Huang, P.-C., Pontes, H. M., Griffiths, M. D., Lin, C.-Y., 2023.

- Psychometric properties and development of the Chinese versions of Gaming Disorder Test (GDT) and Gaming Disorder Scale for Adolescents (GADIS-A). *Asian J Psychiatr.* Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajp.2023.103638>
- Cheng, C.M., Chang, C.C., Wang, J.D., Chang, K.C., Ting, S.Y., Lin, C.Y., 2019. Negative Impacts of Self-Stigma on the Quality of Life of Patients in Methadone Maintenance Treatment: The Mediated Roles of Psychological Distress and Social Functioning. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 16(7). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16071299>
- Cheon, B.K., Melani, I., Hong, Y.-y., 2020. How USA-Centric Is Psychology? An Archival Study of Implicit Assumptions of Generalizability of Findings to Human Nature Based on Origins of Study Samples. *Soc Psychol Personal Sci.* 11(7), 928-937. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550620927269>
- Cheung, G.W., Rensvold, R.B., 2002. Evaluating Goodness-of-Fit Indexes for Testing Measurement Invariance. *Struct Equ Modeling.* 9(2), 233-255. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15328007SEM0902_5
- Christoff, A.O., Barreto, H.G., Boerngen-Lacerda, R., 2016. Development of a Computer-Based Format for the Alcohol, Smoking, and Substance Involvement Screening Test (ASSIST) With University Students. *Subst Use Misuse.* 51(9), 1207-1217. <https://doi.org/10.3109/10826084.2016.1161053>
- Cohen, J. 1988. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*, second ed. Routledge, New York. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203771587>
- Connery, H.S., McHugh, R.K., Reilly, M., Shin, S., Greenfield, S.F., 2020. Substance Use Disorders in Global Mental Health Delivery: Epidemiology, Treatment Gap, and Implementation of Evidence-Based Treatments. *Harv Rev Psychiatry.* 28(5), 316-327. <https://doi.org/10.1097/hrp.000000000000271>
- Corliss, H.L., Rosario, M., Wypij, D., Wylie, S.A., Frazier, A.L., Austin, S.B., 2010. Sexual

- orientation and drug use in a longitudinal cohort study of U.S. adolescents. *Addict Behav.* 35(5), 517-521. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2009.12.019>
- Cottler, L.B., Robins, L.N., Helzer, J.E., 1989. The reliability of the CIDI-SAM: a comprehensive substance abuse interview. *Br J Addict.* 84(7), 801-814. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1360-0443.1989.tb03060.x>
- Degenhardt, L., Bucello, C., Calabria, B., Nelson, P., Roberts, A., Hall, W., Lynskey, M., Wiessing, L., Mora, M.E., Clark, N., Thomas, J., Briegleb, C., McLaren, J., 2011. What data are available on the extent of illicit drug use and dependence globally? Results of four systematic reviews. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 117(2-3), 85-101. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2010.11.032>
- Fan, C.W., Chang, K.C., Lee, K.Y., Yang, W.C., Pakpour, A.H., Potenza, M.N., Lin, C.Y., 2022. Rasch Modeling and Differential Item Functioning of the Self-Stigma Scale-Short Version among People with Three Different Psychiatric Disorders. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 19(14). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19148843>
- Finney, S.J., DiStefano, C. 2013. Non-normal and categorical data in structural equation modeling, in: Hancock, G.R., Mueller, R.O. (Eds.), *Structural equation modeling: A second course*, second ed. Information Age Publishing., Charlotte, North Carolina, pp. 439–492.
- Friso, F., Saucedo, G., Villanueva, J., Politi, M., 2021. Administration of the Alcohol, Smoking and Substance Involvement Screening Test (ASSIST) among high school students in the Peruvian Amazon. *J Ethn Subst Abuse*, 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332640.2021.1956393>
- Gecaite-Stonciene, J., Steibliene, V., Fineberg, N.A., Podlipskyte, A., Bunevicius, A., Liaugaudaite, V., Juskiene, A., Mickuviene, N., Burkauskas, J., 2021. Multidimensional Structure of the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test: Factorial Validity and

Reliability in Patients With Anxiety and Mood Disorders in Lithuania. *Alcohol Alcohol.* 56(1), 109-115. <https://doi.org/10.1093/alcalc/agaa118>

Gjoneska, B., Potenza, M.N., Jones, J., Corazza, O., Hall, N., Sales, C.M.D., Grünblatt, E., Martinotti, G., Burkauskas, J., Werling, A.M., Walitza, S., Zohar, J., Menchón, J.M., Király, O., Chamberlain, S.R., Fineberg, N.A., Demetrovics, Z., 2022. Problematic use of the internet during the COVID-19 pandemic: Good practices and mental health recommendations. *Compr Psychiatry.* 112, 152279. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comppsy.2021.152279>

Henrique, I.F., De Micheli, D., Lacerda, R.B., Lacerda, L.A., Formigoni, M.L., 2004. [Validation of the Brazilian version of Alcohol, Smoking and Substance Involvement Screening Test (ASSIST)]. *Rev Assoc Med Bras* (1992). 50(2), 199-206. <https://doi.org/10.1590/s0104-42302004000200039>

Hides, L., Cotton, S.M., Berger, G., Gleeson, J., O'Donnell, C., Proffitt, T., McGorry, P.D., Lubman, D.I., 2009. The reliability and validity of the Alcohol, Smoking and Substance Involvement Screening Test (ASSIST) in first-episode psychosis. *Addict Behav.* 34(10), 821-825. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2009.03.001>

Hu, F.-W., Lin, C.-H., Yueh, F.-R., Lo, Y.-T., & Lin, C.-Y., 2022. Development and Psychometric Evaluation of the Physical Resilience Instrument for Older Adults (PRIFOR). *BMC Geriatr.* 22, 229. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-022-02918-7>

Humeniuk, R., Ali, R., Babor, T.F., Farrell, M., Formigoni, M.L., Jittiwutikarn, J., de Lacerda, R.B., Ling, W., Marsden, J., Monteiro, M., Nhwatiwa, S., Pal, H., Poznyak, V., Simon, S., 2008. Validation of the Alcohol, Smoking and Substance Involvement Screening Test (ASSIST). *Addiction.* 103(6), 1039-1047. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1360-0443.2007.02114.x>

Humeniuk, R., Henry-Edwards, S., Ali, R., Poznyak, V., Monteiro, M.G., World Health, O.,

2010. The Alcohol, Smoking and Substance involvement Screening Test (ASSIST): manual for use in primary care. World Health Organization, Geneva.
- Jeong, S., Lee, Y., 2019. Consequences of Not Conducting Measurement Invariance Tests in Cross-Cultural Studies: A Review of Current Research Practices and Recommendations. *Adv Dev Hum Resour.* 21(4), 466-483. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422319870726>
- Johnson, J.A., Bembry, W., Peterson, J., Lee, A., Seale, J.P., 2015. Validation of the ASSIST for Detecting Unhealthy Alcohol Use and Alcohol Use Disorders in Urgent Care Patients. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res.* 39(6), 1093-1099. <https://doi.org/10.1111/acer.12733>
- Källmén, H., Berman, A.H., Jayaram-Lindström, N., Hammarberg, A., Elgán, T.H., 2019. Psychometric Properties of the AUDIT, AUDIT-C, CRAFFT and ASSIST-Y among Swedish Adolescents. *Eur Addict Res.* 25(2), 68-77. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000496741>
- Kane, J.C., Murray, L.K., Bass, J.K., Johnson, R.M., Bolton, P., 2016. Validation of a substance and alcohol use assessment instrument among orphans and vulnerable children in Zambia using Audio Computer Assisted Self-Interviewing (ACASI). *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 166, 85-92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2016.06.026>
- Khan, R., Chatton, A., Nallet, A., Broers, B., Thorens, G., Achab-Arigo, S., Poznyak, V., Fleischmann, A., Khazaal, Y., Zullino, D., 2011. Validation of the French version of the alcohol, smoking and substance involvement screening test (ASSIST). *Eur Addict Res.* 17(4), 190-197. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000326073>
- Khan, R., Chatton, A., Thorens, G., Achab, S., Nallet, A., Broers, B., Calzada, G., Poznyak, V., Zullino, D., Khazaal, Y., 2012. Validation of the French version of the alcohol, smoking and substance involvement screening test (ASSIST) in the elderly. *Subst Abuse Treat Prev Policy.* 7, 14. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1747-597x-7-14>
- Kline, R.B., 2011. Principles and practice of structural equation modeling, third ed. Guilford Press, New York.

- Kluwe-Schiavon, B., Viola, T.W., Grassi-Oliveira, R., Tractenberg, S.G., 2022. Editorial: Polysubstance Abuse and Cognitive Dysfunction. *Front Behav Neurosci.* 16, 916921. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2022.916921>
- Költő, A., Cosma, A., Young, H., Moreau, N., Pavlova, D., Tesler, R., Thorsteinsson, E.B., Vieno, A., Saewyc, E.M., Nic Gabhainn, S., 2019. Romantic Attraction and Substance Use in 15-Year-Old Adolescents from Eight European Countries. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 16(17). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16173063>
- Kumar, P.C., Cleland, C.M., Gourevitch, M.N., Rotrosen, J., Strauss, S., Russell, L., McNeely, J., 2016. Accuracy of the Audio Computer Assisted Self Interview version of the Alcohol, Smoking and Substance Involvement Screening Test (ACASI ASSIST) for identifying unhealthy substance use and substance use disorders in primary care patients. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 165, 38-44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2016.05.030>
- Li, L., Mamun, M. A., al Mamun, F., Ullah, I., Hosen, I., Zia, S. A., Poorebrahim, A., Pourgholami, M., Lin, C.-Y., Pontes, H. M., Griffiths, M. D., Pakpour, A. H., 2022. A network analysis of the Internet Disorder Scale–Short Form (IDS9-SF): A largescale cross-cultural study in Iran, Pakistan, and Bangladesh. *Curr Psychol.* Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-022-03284-8>
- Lin, C.Y., Chang, K.C., Wang, J.D., Lee, L.J., 2016. Quality of life and its determinants for heroin addicts receiving a methadone maintenance program: Comparison with matched referents from the general population. *J Formos Med Assoc.* 115(9), 714-727. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfma.2015.07.007>
- López-Lazcano, A.I., López-Pelayo, H., Balcells-Oliveró, M., Segura, L., Gual Solé, A., 2022. Validation of the Alcohol Smoking and Substance Involvement Screening Test (ASSIST) in acute psychiatric inpatients. *Adicciones.* 34(4), 259-272. <https://doi.org/10.20882/adicciones.1496>

- Lopez-Rodriguez, J.A., Rubio Valladolid, G., 2018. Web-Based Alcohol, Smoking, and Substance Involvement Screening Test Results for the General Spanish Population: Cross-Sectional Study. *J Med Internet Res.* 20(2), e57. <https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.7121>
- McHugh, R.K., Votaw, V.R., Sugarman, D.E., Greenfield, S.F., 2018. Sex and gender differences in substance use disorders. *Clin Psychol Rev.* 66, 12-23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2017.10.012>
- McLellan, A.T., Luborsky, L., Cacciola, J., Griffith, J., Evans, F., Barr, H.L., O'Brien, C.P., 1985. New data from the Addiction Severity Index. Reliability and validity in three centers. *J Nerv Ment Dis.* 173(7), 412-423. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00005053-198507000-00005>
- McNeely, J., Strauss, S.M., Rotrosen, J., Ramautar, A., Gourevitch, M.N., 2016. Validation of an audio computer-assisted self-interview (ACASI) version of the alcohol, smoking and substance involvement screening test (ASSIST) in primary care patients. *Addiction.* 111(2), 233-244. <https://doi.org/10.1111/add.13165>
- McNeely, J., Strauss, S.M., Wright, S., Rotrosen, J., Khan, R., Lee, J.D., Gourevitch, M.N., 2014. Test-retest reliability of a self-administered Alcohol, Smoking and Substance Involvement Screening Test (ASSIST) in primary care patients. *J Subst Abuse Treat.* 47(1), 93-101. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsat.2014.01.007>
- Milfont, T.L., Fischer, R., 2010. Testing measurement invariance across groups: applications in cross-cultural research. *Int J Psychol Res.* 3(1), 111-130. <https://doi.org/10.21500/20112084.857>
- Mostardinha, A.R., Bártolo, A., Bonifácio, J., Pereira, A., 2019. [Validation of The Alcohol, Smoking and Substance Involvement Screening Test (ASSIST) Among University Students]. *Acta Med Port.* 32(4), 279-288. <https://doi.org/10.20344/amp.10650>
- Muhamad, N., Mihat, O., Ramly, R., Aziz, A., Kamaruddin, R., Arifin, W.N., Abdullah, N.,

- Noor, M., Ismail, R., Wisman, W., Lodz, N.A., Mohd Yusoff, M.F., 2018. Translation, Cross-Cultural Adaptation, Reliability and Validity of the Malay Version of Alcohol, Smoking and Substance Involvement Screening Test (ASSIST) V3.1. *Health*. 10, 985-997. <https://doi.org/10.4236/health.2018.107073>
- Newcombe, D., Tanielu, H., 2016. The validation of the Alcohol, Smoking and Substance Involvement Screening Test (ASSIST) amongst Pacific People in New Zealand. *New Zealand journal of psychology*. 45, 30-39. Retrieved from <https://www.psychology.org.nz/journal-archive/NZJP-Vol-44-No-1-April-2016.pdf#page=30>
- O'Grady, K.E., Gryczynski, J., Mitchell, S.G., Ondersma, S.J., Schwartz, R.P., 2016. Confirmatory factor analysis of the Alcohol, Smoking and Substance Involvement Screening Test (ASSIST) in community health center patients. *Am J Addict*. 25(4), 259-263. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajad.12360>
- Onifade, P., Bello, A., Abiodun, O., Sotunsa, J., Ladipo, O., Adesanya, O., 2014. Psychometric Properties of Alcohol Smoking and Substance Involvement Screening Test (Assist V3.0) Among University Students. *J Addict Behav Ther Rehabil*. 3, 3. <https://doi.org/10.4172/2324-9005.1000126>
- Putnick, D.L., Bornstein, M.H., 2016. Measurement Invariance Conventions and Reporting: The State of the Art and Future Directions for Psychological Research. *Dev Rev*. 41, 71-90. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2016.06.004>
- Rubio Valldolid, G., Martínez-Raga, J., Martínez-Gras, I., Ponce Alfaro, G., de la Cruz Bértolo, J., Jurado Barba, R., Rigabert Sánchez-Junco, A., Zarco Montejó, J., 2014. Validation of the Spanish version of the Alcohol, Smoking and Substance Involvement Screening Test (ASSIST). *Psicothema*. 26(2), 180-185. <https://doi.org/10.7334/psicothema2013.172>

- Rutkowski, L., Svetina, D., 2013. Assessing the Hypothesis of Measurement Invariance in the Context of Large-Scale International Surveys. *Educ Psychol Meas.* 74(1), 31-57.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164413498257>
- Ryan, J.L., Rosa, V.R., 2020. Healthcare cost associations of patients who use illicit drugs in Florida: a retrospective analysis. *Subst Abuse Treat Prev Policy.* 15(1), 73.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s13011-020-00313-2>
- Saffari, M., Chen, H.P., Chang, C.W., Fan, C.W., Huang, S.W., Chen, J.S., Chang, K.C., Lin, C.Y., 2022a. Effects of sleep quality on the association between problematic internet use and quality of life in people with substance use disorder. *BJPsych Open.* 8(5), e155.
<https://doi.org/10.1192/bjo.2022.557>
- Saffari, M., Fan, C.-W., Chang, Y.-L., Huang, P.-C., Tung, S. E. H., Poon, W. C., Lin, C.-C., Yang, W.-C., Lin, C.-Y., Potenza, M. N., 2022b. Yale Food Addiction Scale 2.0 (YFAS 2.0) and Modified YFAS 2.0 (mYFAS 2.0): Rasch Analysis and Differential Item Functioning. *J Eat Disord.* 10, 185. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40337-022-00708-5>
- Soto-Brandt, G., Portilla Huidobro, R., Huepe Artigas, D., Rivera-Rei, Á., Escobar, M.J., Salas Guzmán, N., Canales-Johnson, A., Ibáñez, A., Martínez Guzmán, C., Castillo-Carniglia, Á., 2014. [Validity evidence of the Alcohol, Smoking and Substance Involvement Screening Test (ASSIST) in Chile]. *Adicciones.* 26(4), 291-302.
<https://doi.org/10.20882/adicciones.27>
- Sun, H.-M., Zeng, Q.-Z., Du, J., Chen, H.-H., Fan, C.-L., Jiang, H.-F., Zhao, M., 2010. Reliability and validity of the Chinese version of Alcohol, Smoking, and Substance Use Involvement Screening Test. *Chinese Mental Health Journal.* 24, 351-355. Retrieved from <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2010-10700-006>
- Tiburcio Sainz, M., Rosete-Mohedano, M.G., Natera Rey, G., Martínez Vélez, N.A., Carreño García, S., Pérez Cisneros, D., 2016. Validity and Reliability of the Alcohol, Smoking,

- and Substance Involvement Screening Test (ASSIST) in University Students. *Adicciones*. 28(1), 19-27. <https://doi.org/10.20882/adicciones.786>
- Tindle, R., 2021. Improving the global reach of psychological research. *Discov Psychol*. 1(1), 5. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44202-021-00004-4>
- United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2015. World Drug Report 2015. <https://www.unodc.org/wdr2015> (accessed 22 January, 2015)
- van der Westhuizen, C., Wyatt, G., Williams, J.K., Stein, D.J., Sorsdahl, K., 2016. Validation of the Alcohol, Smoking and Substance Involvement Screening Test in a low- and middle-income country cross-sectional emergency centre study. *Drug Alcohol Rev*. 35(6), 702-709. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dar.12424>
- Vandenberg, R.J., Lance, C.E., 2000. A Review and Synthesis of the Measurement Invariance Literature: Suggestions, Practices, and Recommendations for Organizational Research. *Organ Res Methods*. 3(1), 4-70. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109442810031002>
- WHO ASSIST Working Group, 2002. The Alcohol, Smoking and Substance Involvement Screening Test (ASSIST): development, reliability and feasibility. *Addiction*. 97(9), 1183-1194. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1360-0443.2002.00185.x>
- Wu, T.-Y., Huang, S.-W., Chen, J.-S., Kamolthip, R., Kukreti, S., Strong, C., Pontes, H. M., Lin, I.-C., Lin, C.-Y., Potenza, M. N., & Pakpour, A. H., 2023. Translation and validation of the Gaming Disorder Test and Gaming Disorder Scale for Adolescents into Chinese for Taiwanese Young Adults. *Compr Psychiatry*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comppsy.2023.152396>
- Yee, A., Salina, M., Rusdi, A. R., Zahari, M. M., Sharmilla, K., 2016. Psychometric Properties of the Malay Version of Alcohol, Smoking and Substance Involvement Screening Test (ASSIST-M). *Malaysian J Psychiat*. 25(2), 3-13. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/333041268_Psychometric_Properties_of_the_

Malay_Version_of_Alcohol_Smoking_and_Substance_Involvement_Screening_Test_A
SSIST-M

Supplementary File Caption

Appendix Table S1. Confirmatory factor analysis results of the 11-item Alcohol, Smoking and Substance Involvement Screening Test in each country

Appendix Table S2. Internal consistency of the 11-item Alcohol, Smoking and Substance Involvement Screening Test in each language version

Table 1. Participants' characteristics and descriptive statistics for the 11-item Alcohol, Smoking and Substance Involvement Screening Test (ASSIST-11) (N = 82,243)

	Mean (SD)	n (%)	Min	Max	Skewness	Kurtosis
Age	32.39 (12.52)	82,230 (99.98)	18	99	1.18 (0.01)	0.97 (0.02)
Age groups						
Young adult (younger than 30 years)		43,424 (52.8)				
Early middle-aged adult (30-44.99 years)		24,826 (30.2)				
Older middle-aged adult (45-59.99 years)		10,787 (13.1)				
Older adults (60 years or above)		3,206 (3.9)				
Gender						
Man		32,549 (39.6)				
Woman		46,874 (57.0)				
Non-binary individuals		2,315 (2.8)				
Individuals identifying with other genders		468 (0.6)				
Biological sex						
Male		33,245 (40.3)				
Female		48,987 (59.7)				
Educational level						
Primary school		1,002 (1.2)				
Secondary school		20,325 (24.7)				
Tertiary school		60,896 (74.0)				
Sexual orientation						
Heterosexual		56,125 (68.2)				
Gay or lesbian		4,607 (5.6)				
Bisexual		7,688 (9.3)				

Queer and pansexual	2,926 (3.6)
Homo- and hetero-flexible identities	6,734 (8.2)
Asexual	1,064 (1.3)
Questioning	1,951 (2.4)
Other	807 (1.0)
Language	
Arabic	142 (0.2)
Bangla	332 (0.4)
Croatian	2,522 (3.1)
Czech	1,583 (1.9)
Dutch	518 (0.6)
English	13,994 (17.0)
French	3,941 (4.8)
German	3,494 (4.2)
Hebrew	1,315 (1.6)
Hindi	17 (<0.1)
Hungarian	10,937 (13.3)
Italian	2,437 (3.0)
Japanese	466 (0.6)
Korean	1,437 (1.7)
Lithuanian	2,094 (2.5)
Macedonian	1,301 (1.6)
Mandarin-simplified characters	2,474 (3.0)
Mandarin-traditional characters	2,685 (3.3)
Polish	10,343 (12.6)

Portuguese-Brazil	3,650 (4.4)
Portuguese-Portugal	2,277 (2.8)
Slovak	2,118 (2.6)
Spanish-Latin America	8,926 (10.9)
Spanish-Spain	2,312 (2.8)
Turkish	
Country	
Algeria	24 (<0.1)
Australia	639 (0.8)
Austria	746 (0.9)
Bangladesh	373 (0.5)
Belgium	644 (0.8)
Bolivia	385 (0.5)
Brazil	3,579 (4.4)
Canada	2,541 (3.1)
Chile	1,173 (1.4)
China	2,428 (3.0)
Colombia	1,913 (2.3)
Croatia	2,390 (2.9)
Czechia	1,640 (2.0)
Ecuador	276 (0.3)
Egypt	54 (0.1)
France	1,706 (2.1)
Germany	3,271 (4.0)
Gibraltar	64 (0.1)

Hungary	11,200 (13.6)
India	194 (0.2)
Iraq	99 (0.1)
Ireland	1,702 (2.1)
Israel	1,334 (1.6)
Italy	2,401 (2.9)
Japan	562 (0.7)
Lithuania	2,015 (2.5)
Malaysia	1,170 (1.4)
Mexico	2,137 (2.6)
New Zealand	2,834 (3.4)
North Macedonia	1,251 (1.5)
Panama	333 (0.4)
Peru	2,672 (3.2)
Poland	9,892 (12.0)
Portugal	2,262 (2.8)
Slovakia	1,134 (1.4)
South Africa	1,849 (2.2)
South Korea	1,464 (1.8)
Spain	2,327 (2.8)
Switzerland	1,144 (1.4)
Taiwan	2,668 (3.2)
Turkey	820 (1.0)
United Kingdom	1,412 (1.7)
United States of America	2,398 (2.9)

Other		1,123 (1.4)				
ASSIST1: tobacco	0.91 (1.52)	74,181	0	4	1.32 (0.009)	-0.01 (0.018)
ASSIST2: alcohol	1.47 (1.33)	74,191	0	4	0.26 (0.009)	-1.31 (0.018)
ASSIST3: cannabis	0.39 (0.91)	74,167	0	4	2.65 (0.009)	6.58 (0.018)
ASSIST4: cocaine	0.04 (0.26)	74,147	0	4	7.69 (0.009)	72.22 (0.018)
ASSIST5: amphetamine	0.06 (0.32)	74,166	0	4	7.12 (0.009)	61.98 (0.018)
ASSIST6: inhalants	0.02 (0.19)	74,148	0	4	12.27 (0.009)	184.92 (0.018)
ASSIST7: sedatives	0.13 (0.56)	74,141	0	4	5.13 (0.009)	28.12 (0.018)
ASSIST8: hallucinogens	0.04 (0.24)	74,150	0	4	6.88 (0.009)	59.47 (0.018)
ASSIST9: opioids	0.02 (0.22)	74,046	0	4	12.52 (0.009)	184.60 (0.018)
ASSIST10: others	0.03 (0.31)	74,065	0	4	11.81 (0.009)	142.87 (0.018)

Table 2. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and internal consistency results of the 11-item Alcohol, Smoking and Substance Involvement Screening Test (ASSIST-11)

Item level statistics	Standardized factor loading	Item-total correlation
ASSIST1	0.628	0.436
ASSIST2	0.544	0.405
ASSIST3	0.544	0.417
ASSIST4	0.306	0.302
ASSIST5	0.308	0.312
ASSIST6	0.132	0.148
ASSIST7	0.212	0.194
ASSIST8	0.273	0.307
ASSIST9	0.119	0.154
ASSIST10	0.062	0.068
Scale level statistics	Fit indices	
McDonald's ω	0.68	
Cronbach's α	0.63	
χ^2 (df)/p-value in CFA	2186.57 (35)/ <0.001	
Comparative fit index (CFI)	0.936	
Tucker-Lewis index (TLI)	0.917	
RMSEA (90% CI)	0.030 (0.028, 0.031)	
SRMR	0.080	

Notes. RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation; SRMR = standardized root mean square residual

Table 3. Measurement invariance of the 11-item Alcohol, Smoking and Substance Involvement Screening Test (ASSIST-11)

Fit indices Group	Model					
	M0 Configural	M1 Metric	M2 Scalar	M2P ^a Partial scalar	M3 Residual	M3P ^{a,b,c,d} Partial residual
Language (latent means: 0.00 [first subgroups] vs. -0.29 [second subgroup])						
χ^2 (df) or $\Delta\chi^2$ (Δ df)	2164.67 (70)	483.64 (9)	565.47 (9)	--	1199.90 (10)	556.30 (8)
p-value	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	--	<0.001	<0.001
CFI or Δ CFI	0.937	-0.015	-0.017	--	-0.039	-0.016
TLI or Δ TLI	0.919	-0.008	-0.008	--	-0.023	-0.007
RMSEA or Δ RMSEA	0.029	0.001	0.002	--	0.003	0.001
SRMR or Δ SRMR	0.074	0.002	0.002	--	0.033	0.030
Age groups (latent means: 0.00 [older middle-aged adults], 0.82 [early middle-aged adults], 0.27 [young adults], and -0.12 [older adults])						
χ^2 (df) or $\Delta\chi^2$ (Δ df)	2244.53 (140)	462.01 (27)	1023.60 (27)	409.59 (24)	--	202.59 (18)
p-value	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	--	<0.001
CFI or Δ CFI	0.941	-0.012	-0.028	-0.011	--	-0.005
TLI or Δ TLI	0.924	-0.001	-0.015	0.000	--	0.002
RMSEA or Δ RMSEA	0.029	0.000	0.003	0.000	--	0.013
SRMR or Δ SRMR	0.075	0.001	0.000	0.000	--	0.023
Country (latent means: 0.00 [first subgroup] vs. -0.08 [second subgroup])						
χ^2 (df) or $\Delta\chi^2$ (Δ df)	2223.21 (70)	170.46 (9)	287.56 (9)	--	305.90 (10)	--
p-value	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	--	<0.001	--
CFI or Δ CFI	0.936	-0.005	-0.008	--	-0.009	--
TLI or Δ TLI	0.918	0.004	-0.001	--	0.000	--

RMSEA or Δ RMSEA	0.030	-0.001	0.000	--	0.000	--
SRMR or Δ SRMR	0.074	0.001	0.001	--	0.006	--
Gender identity (latent means: 0.00 [man], -0.01 [woman], and 0.11 [gender-diverse individual])						
χ^2 (df) or $\Delta\chi^2$ (Δ df)	2212.45 (105)	212.78 (18)	468.14 (18)	--	1063.80 (20)	289.44 (18)
p-value	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	--	<0.001	<0.001
CFI or Δ CFI	0.938	-0.006	-0.013	--	-0.031	-0.008
TLI or Δ TLI	0.920	0.005	-0.003	--	-0.016	-0.002
RMSEA or Δ RMSEA	0.029	-0.001	0.001	--	0.003	-0.001
SRMR or Δ SRMR	0.074	0.000	0.001	--	0.017	0.016
Sexual orientation (latent means: 0.00 [sexual minority] vs. -0.23 [heterosexual])						
χ^2 (df) or $\Delta\chi^2$ (Δ df)	2058.52 (70)	638.56 (9)	698.88 (9)	481.26 (8)	--	553.93 (8)
p-value	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	--	<0.001
CFI or Δ CFI	0.939	-0.019	-0.021	-0.014	--	-0.017
TLI or Δ TLI	0.922	-0.013	-0.012	-0.007	--	-0.007
RMSEA or Δ RMSEA	0.028	0.003	0.002	0.001	--	0.001
SRMR or Δ SRMR	0.073	-0.001	-0.001	-0.001	--	0.041

Notes. ^a Relaxed the item intercept for ASSIST3 in the sexual orientation-based measurement invariance test and relaxed the item intercept for ASSIST2 in the age group measurement invariance test.

^b Relaxed the residuals for ASSIST2 and ASSIST3 in the language-based measurement invariance test and sexual orientation-based measurement invariance test.

^c Relaxed the residuals for ASSIST2 in the gender identity-based measurement invariance test.

^d Relaxed the residuals for ASSIST1, ASSIST2, ASSIST3, and ASSIST8 in the age group measurement invariance test.

CFI=comparative fit index; TLI=Tucker-Lewis index; RMSEA=root mean square error of approximation; SRMR=standardized root mean square residual.

M0=configural model; M1=model with factor loadings constrained equal across groups; M2=model with factor loadings and item intercepts

constrained equal across groups; M2P=M2 with relaxed items in intercept across groups; M3=model with factor loadings, item intercepts, and residual constrained equal across groups; M3P=M3 with relaxed items in intercept across groups.

For the language-based measurement invariance tests, the languages were regrouped into two subsets according to the languages' names in English following alphabetical order. For the country-based measurement invariance tests, countries were regrouped into two subsets according to the countries' English name following alphabetical order in English. For gender-identity-based measurement invariance tests, participants were regrouped into three groups (man, woman, and gender-diverse individuals). For sexual-orientation-based measurement invariance tests, participants were regrouped into two groups (heterosexual and sexual minority individuals).

Table 4. Known-group validity of the 11-item Alcohol, Smoking and Substance Involvement Screening Test (ASSIST-11)

	Mean (SD)	Cohen's d (95% CI)	t (p-value)
Currently having mental health/emotional problems		0.32 (-0.33, -0.29)	36.56 (<0.001)
Yes	3.86 (3.76)		
No	2.81 (3.11)		
Having engaged in traditional gambling (ever)		0.25 (-0.27, -0.24)	33.88 (<0.001)
Yes	3.60 (3.45)		
No	2.75 (3.24)		
Having engaged in traditional gambling (past year)		0.24 (-0.26, -0.22)	22.69 (<0.001)
Yes	3.80 (3.63)		
No	3.00 (3.29)		
Having engaged in online gambling (ever)		0.24 (-0.25, -0.22)	24.05 (<0.001)
Yes	3.77 (3.56)		
No	2.98 (3.29)		
Having engaged in online gambling (past year)		0.23 (-0.25, -0.20)	18.33 (<0.001)
Yes	3.80 (3.63)		
No	3.05 (3.31)		
Having sought professional help for self-described uncontrolled sexual urges/behaviors (past year)		0.30 (-0.35, -0.25)	9.77 (<0.001)
Yes	4.11 (4.06)		
No	3.11 (3.34)		
Having sought professional help for self-described uncontrolled sexual urges/behaviors (currently)		0.40 (-0.49, -0.32)	6.91 (<0.001)
Yes	4.48 (4.48)		

No

3.13 (3.35)
