Table 1: Bivariate Results

Table 1. Divariate results	Table 1. Divariate Nesatis						
	Full Methadone Excl						
	Sample*	Sample					
Perceived SSA Support							
Medication Adopters	mean=2.6±0.9	mean = 2.5±0.9					
Medication Non-adopters	mean=2.1±0.9	mean = 2.1 ± 0.9					
<i>t</i> -test	<i>t</i> =-3.58, <i>p</i> <.001	<i>t</i> =-3.07, <i>p</i> <.01					
Rates of Medication Adoption by							
Policy Awareness Typology							
Neither Medicaid nor state	19%	16%					
contract funding							
Medicaid but not state contract	46%	42%					
funding							
State contract funding but not	36%	33%					
Medicaid							
Both policies (Medicaid and state	79%	69%					
contract funding)							
Chi-square test	χ^2 =52.8, <i>df</i> =3, <i>p</i> <.001	χ^2 =35.3, df=3, p<.001					
*The secretation are non-manufaction the manufaction of an included 40							

^{*}These statistics are reported in the manuscript on page 13.

We then re-estimated the multivariate model of medication adoption with the methadone adopters excluded from the sample. Table 2 (please see next page) presents these new results alongside the original odds ratios from the manuscript. In the methadone-excluded analysis, perceived SSA support remains significantly associated with medication adoption, with nearly identical odds ratios. Similar to the original results, programs aware of at least one medication on the Medicaid formulary were more likely to have adopted at least one SUD medication than those aware of neither policy. Awareness of the state contract policy continued to be non-significant, as it was in the original analysis. The difference based on awareness of both policies was on the cusp of significance (p=.053), once the methadone-offering programs were excluded.

Table 2: Multivariate Models of Medication Adoption

Variable	Full Sample Odds Ratio*	<i>p</i> -value	Methadone Excluded Odds Ratio	<i>p</i> -value
Perceived state policy				
environment				
Single state agency's support for medications	2.25	.001	2.27	.002
Typology of awareness of				
state funding policies for				
medications				
Neither Medicaid nor state contract funding	Reference		Reference	
Medicaid but not state contract funding	3.00	.03	2.89	.04
State contract funding but not Medicaid	2.00	.26	2.18	.22
Both policies (Medicaid and state contract funding)	3.92	.02	3.49	.053

Organizational characteristics				
Government-owned (vs. privately owned)	1.40	.54	1.38	.57
Located in a health care				
setting (vs. non-health care	1.89	.23	2.15	.16
setting)				
Accredited by external				
organization (vs. not	3.09	.005	3.27	.005
accredited)				
Offers detoxification services	4.13	.02	3.85	.03
(vs. not offered)	1.10	.02	0.00	.00
Only offers outpatient				
treatment (vs. not outpatient- only)	.55	.18	.66	.37
Number of physicians on staff	2.85	.002	2.86	.003
Number of physicians on	1.94	.003	1.82	.011
contract	1.34	.003	1.02	.011
Number of nurses on staff	1.49	.004	1.48	.008
Twelve-step treatment orientation	.82	.33	.81	.29

^{*}These are the odds ratios reported in Table 2 of the manuscript.