# Cannabis clinical reserch

Z. Klein

www.mgcisrael.com

## **History of Cannabis**



Fibre evidence suggests use of hemp at least 8000 B.C.

Jacques-Joseph Mareau: Physician founded the "Club of the Hashish Eaters" in Paris Notable "Eaters": Victor Hugo, Alexandre Dumas

Jews used cannabis (Exodus (30:22-23) "God told Moses to make holy oil containing cannabis"

# William B. O'Shaughnessy

"on the Preparations of the Indian Hemp, or Gunjah" 1839



# Cannabis has been utilized in one form or another for treatment of pain for longer than written history.

"Multum in Parvo" PRICE, St.00 MERCK'S 1899 MANUAL OF THE MATERIA MEDICA TOGETHER WITH A SUMMARY OF THERAPEUTIC INDICATIONS AND A CLASSIFICATION OF MEDICAMENTS A READY-REFERENCE POCKET BOOK FOR THE PRACTICING PHYSICIAN CONTAINING NAMES AND CHIEF SYNONYMS, PHYSICAL FORM AND APPEARANCE, SOLUBILI-TIES, PERCENTAGE STRENGTHS AND PHYSIOLOGICAL EFFECTS, THERA-PEUTIC USES, MODES OF ADMINISTRATION AND APPLICATION, REGULAR AND MAXIMUM DOSAGE, INCOMPATIBLES. ANTIDOTES, PRECAUTIONARY REQUIREMENTS, ETC., ETC., - OF THE CHEMICALS AND DRUGS USUAL IN MODERN MEDICAL PRACTICE Compiled from the Most Recent Authoritative Sources and Published by

#### Merck's Manual of the Materia Medica First Edition:1899

#### Prescribed Uses Of Cannabis Indica

Albuminuria Ascites Asthma Bladder, Irritable Bright's Disease, Acute Bright's Disease, Chronic Bronchitis, Chronic Cholera Asintica Chordee Chorea Climacteric Disorders Corns Coughs Cystitis Delerium Delerium Tremens Diarrhea Dropsy Dysmenorrhea Dyspepsia Dysuria Epilepsy Exophthalmos Gastralgia Gastric Ulcer Gonorrhea Headache Hematuria Hemicrania

Hiccough Hydrophobia Hysteria Impotence Inflammation Influenza Insomnia Labor Locomotor Ataxia Mania Melancholia Mennorrhagia Metrorrhagia Migraine Nephritis, Acute Neuralgia **Opium** Habit Ovarian Neuralgia Ovaritis Pain Paralysis Agitans Paralysis and Paresis Phthisis Sea-Sickness Tetanus Tic Douloureux Trismus Uterine Cancer Courtesy of The Cannabis Consultants

omptice from the stort necent Authoritative Sources and Published

MERCK & CO., NEW YORK

# *Why it became prohibited?*

### 1930s: **Harry Anslinger** 1937: Marijuana Tax Act



First Commissioner of the <u>U.S. Treasury</u> <u>Department</u>'s <u>Federal Bureau of Narcotics</u> (1930-1962)

### Beware! Young and Old - People in All Walks of Life!



Marthauna Convertie





by the friendly stranger. It contains the Killer Drug "Marihuana" -- a powerful narcotic in which lurks Murder! Insanity! Death! WARNING! Dope peddlers are shrewd! They may put some of this drug in the 🕥 in the " or in the tobacco cigarette. WRITE FOR DETAILED INFORMATION, ENCLOSING 12 CENTS IN POSTAGE --- MAILING COST THE INTER-STATE MARCOTIC ASSOCIATION Address: (Incorporated not for profit) 53 W. Jackson Blvd. Chicago, Illinois, U. S. A.

METROCITION FIRTLY a point in the same respective device, in Any is indicate an editorial respects to be 2.2 does in 10.10 to by in Friday Execute Flore and Factors for Freedom Flore and Factors and

The endogenous cannabinoid system might have evolved millions of years before the evolution of the *Cannabis* plant itself

## Rafael Mechoulam

Best known for his work in the isolation, and synthesis of  $\Delta^9$ -<u>tetrahydrocannabinol</u>, and for the isolation and the

identification of the endogenous cannabinoids <u>anandamide</u>.



# Anandamid



- In 1992, in <u>Raphael Mechoulam</u>'s lab, the first such compound was identified as arachidonoyl ethanolamine and named <u>anandamide</u>,
- a name derived from the <u>Sanskrit</u> word for bliss and -<u>amide</u>.
- Anandamide is derived from the <u>essential fatty acid</u> <u>arachidonic</u> <u>acid</u>.
- Anandamide binds to the central (CB<sub>1</sub>) and, to a lesser extent, peripheral (CB<sub>2</sub>) cannabinoid receptors, where it acts as a partial agonist. Anandamide is about as potent as THC at the CB<sub>1</sub> receptor
- This endocannabinoid mediated system permits the postsynaptic cell to control its own incoming synaptic traffic.
- Activation of cannabinoid receptors temporarily reduces the amount of conventional neurotransmitter released

#### 1 ett ally ul Ucalilla Dilloi

THC

Tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) is the primary psychoactive component of the Cannabis plant. Delta-9-<u>tetrahydrocannabinol</u> ( $\Delta^9$ -THC, THC) and *delta*-8tetrahydrocannabinol ( $\Delta^8$ -THC), mimic the action of anandamide, a neurotransmitter produced naturally in the body. These two THC's produce the effects associated with cannabis by binding to the CB<sub>1</sub> cannabinoid receptors in the brain. THC appears to ease moderate pain (analgesic) and to be <u>neuroprotective</u>. Studies show THC reduces neuroinflammation and stimulates <u>neurogenesis</u>.[15][16][17] THC has approximately equal affinity for the  $CB_1$  and  $CB_2$ receptors.<sup>[18]</sup>







- Cannabidiol (CBD) is not <u>psychoactive</u>, and was thought not to affect the psychoactivity of THC However, recent evidence shows that smokers of cannabis with a higher CBD/THC ratio were less likely to experience schizophrenia-like symptoms
- Cannabidiol has little affinity for <u>CB<sub>1</sub></u> and <u>CB<sub>2</sub></u> receptors but acts as an indirect antagonist of cannabinoid agonists
- It appears to relieve convulsion, inflammation, anxiety, and nausea. CBD has a greater affinity for the CB<sub>2</sub> receptor than for the CB<sub>1</sub> receptor
- Cannabidiol has also been shown to act as a <u>5-HT<sub>1A</sub> receptor</u> agonist,<sup>[24]</sup> an action that is involved in its <u>antidepressant</u>,<sup>[25][26]</sup> <u>anxiolytic</u>,<sup>[26][27]</sup> and <u>neuroprotective<sup>[28][29]</sup></u> effects





cannabigerol (CBG) (Gaoni and Mechoulam, 1964) СH<sub>5</sub> ОН НО С<sub>5</sub>H<sub>11</sub>

cannabidiol (CBD) (Mechoulam and Shvo, 1963)



△<sup>9</sup>etrahydrocannabinol<sup>4</sup>/<sup>2</sup>THC) (Gaoni and Mechoulam, 1964)



cannabinol (CBN) (Adams et al., 1940)



cannabichromene (CBC) (Claussen et al., 1966; Mechoulam and Gaoni, 1966)



cannabicyclol (CBL) (Crombie et al., 1968)

### **Representative natural cannabinoids**

More then 113 Cannabinoids and over 100 Terpenes



Figure 1. Pharmacological actions of non-psychotropic cannabinoids (with the indication of the proposed mechanisms of action). Abbreviations:  $\Delta^9$ -THC,  $\Delta^9$ -tetrahydrocannabinol;  $\Delta^8$ -THC,  $\Delta^8$ -tetrahydrocannabinol; CBN, cannabinol; CBD, cannabidiol;  $\Delta^9$ -THCV,  $\Delta^9$ -tetrahydrocannabivarin; CBC, cannabichromene; CBG, cannabigerol;  $\Delta^9$ -THCA,  $\Delta^9$ -tetrahydrocannabinolic acid; CBDA, cannabidiolic acid; TRPV1, transient receptor potential vanilloid type 1; PPARy, peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor  $\gamma$ ; ROS, reactive oxygen species; 5-HT<sub>1A</sub>, 5-hydroxytryptamine receptor subtype 1A; FAAH, fatty acid amide hydrolase. (+), direct or indirect activation; 1, increase; 1, decrease.





# Proven cannabis indication?

- Hunger stimulation for wasting syndrome
- Anti-emetic and anti-nausea properties in AIDS or cancer chemotherapy
- Anti-spasmotic properties for MS
- Epilepsy and other neurological dysfunctions
- Reducing intra-ocular eye pressure in glaucoma
- Analgesic properties in a large number of chronic conditions.



# Cannabis medical research

 Every year there are dozens of cannabis research articles

- Mainly basic science and clinical case reports
- Most articles regarding cannabis addiction and side effects (Psychosis, COPD, Schizophrenia, Atherosclerosis, CVA and more)
- All most no good efficacy "double blind randomized placebo controlled"

🗧 C 💧 https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/results/details?term=cannabis&type=Intr&cond=pain&strd\_s=01%2F01%2F2000&strd\_e=01%2F01%2F2019

66 Studies found for: cannabis | Interventional Studies | pain | Start date from 01/01/2000 to 01/01/2



List By Topic On Map Search Details

#### Terms and Synonyms Searched:

| Terms     | Search Results* | Entire Database** |  |
|-----------|-----------------|-------------------|--|
| Synonyms  |                 |                   |  |
| cannabis  | 66 studies      | 820 studies       |  |
| Marihuana | 22 studies      | 521 studies       |  |
| Sativex   | 21 studies      | 57 studies        |  |
| Pot       | 4 studies       | 56 studies        |  |
| Hash      | 2 studies       | 14 studies        |  |
| Weed      |                 | 26 studies        |  |
| pain      | 66 studies      | 16,724 studies    |  |
| Painful   | 6 studies       | 527 studies       |  |
| AChE      |                 | 27 studies        |  |
| Dolor     |                 | 6 studies         |  |

Ū,

Ξi

N

.....

0

→ C 🍵 https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/results/details?term=cannabis&recrs=e&type=Intr&cond=pain&strd\_s=01%2F01%2F2000&strd\_e=01%2F01%2F2019



#### Terms and Synonyms Searched:

| Terms     | Search Results* | Entire Database** |  |
|-----------|-----------------|-------------------|--|
| Synonyms  |                 |                   |  |
| cannabis  | 39 studies      | 820 studies       |  |
| Sativex   | 20 studies      | 57 studies        |  |
| Marihuana | 13 studies      | 521 studies       |  |
| Pot       | 2 studies       | 56 studies        |  |
| Hash      | 1 studies       | 14 studies        |  |
| Weed      |                 | 26 studies        |  |
| pain      | 39 studies      | 16,724 studies    |  |
| Painful   | 4 studies       | 527 studies       |  |
| AChE      |                 | 27 studies        |  |
| Dolor     |                 | 6 studies         |  |

- -- No studies found
- \* Number of studies in the search results containing the term or synonym
- \*\* Number of studies in the entire database containing the term or synonym



Articles That Address



### RESEARCH ON MARIJUANA

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services National Institutes of Health National Institute on Drug Abuse

# FDA Accepts Marijuana for PTSD Protocol

#### THE OBSTRUCTION OF MEDICAL CANNABIS RESEARCH IN THE U.S.

A REVIEW OF THE GROWING CONTROVERSY REGARDING A FEDERAL MONOPOLY ON THE SUPPLY OF MEDICAL CANNABIS FOR RESEARCH



AmericansFor SafeAccess

 Although both MAPS and the FDA are satisfied with the protocol design, we cannot begin the study until passes yet another review process with the National Institute on Drug Abuse/Public Health Service (NIDA/PHS). This redundant review, which may take another year or more, is required solely because NIDA has a monopoly on the supply of marijuana for research, and NIDA/PHS must review the protocol before allowing us to purchase marijuana from the agency. NIDA's mission does not include exploring the potential beneficial uses of marijuana.



# Clinical Cannabis studies

### IRB (Institutional Review Board)

 Basic, animal, safety in human (side effect and risk), efficacy, post marketing/long term

### Prospective

- Interventional (action or medication)
- Subjects consistency
- Indication consistency
- Double blind
- Randomized
- Placebo controlled
- Long term



# Problematic area in cannabis research

### ◆ IRB

- Difficulty to approve the use of a medication that is not backed by a producer company
- Approval of a medication that is define by law as a illegal drug
- Require a national review board approval





Problematic area in cannabis research suggested solution Research and development committee **Basic science** Clinician Agricultural Industry Administrator Designated IRB committee member Create specific legislation for cannabis research



Problematic area in cannabis research Medication Cannabis is not a approved medication Consistency of the medication (plant base drug, active ingredients, batch consistency over time) Consistency of intervention (inhaled, smoked, sublingual, eaten, ointment and more)

Starting dose and titration

### First AND Second Choice Strains of Chronic Pain Patients



Problematic area in cannabis research suggested solution

- Building a supply chain that will produce as close to medication as possible.
- Have supervision on the quality of the product. Consistency of the drug.
- Allow the consistency of strain and profile of other cannabinoids
- Build a registry from the beginning of your program

## **SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS**



### **Medical Grade Cannabis**

### **Clinical Guide**

IMC-GCP - Israeli Medical Cannabis - Good Clinical Practices

Written and edited by:

Mgr. Yuval Landschaft, Buaz Albo (M.Sc.), Prof. Rafael Mechoulum, Prof. Arnon Afek



The Israeli Medical Cannabis Agency (IMCA), Office of the Associated Director Canaral, Ministry of Health

Draft edition 1.1 - January 2017

The National Academies of SCIENCES • ENGINEERING • MEDICINE

REPORT

### The Health Effects of Cannabis and Cannabinoids

THE CURRENT STATE OF EVIDENCE AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR RESEARCH

#### ישמן קוביה הפואי IMC-Medical Grade ישמן קוביה

| E.P                 | Ехр.            | CBN                | CBD                 | тнс                                      | פריט                            | 210         |
|---------------------|-----------------|--------------------|---------------------|--|---------------------------------|-------------|
| קיזיקום חצי שנה ב   | •5              | 245                | 0%                  | דטופן קוביה הנואי TO CBD ישפן קוביה אואי |                                 |             |
|                     | (Up to 1.5%)    | (205 - 205)        | (0.5% - 0.0%)       | *C24                                     |                                 |             |
| קידיקום מצי שוא ד   | •5              | 205                | 1%                  | ישמן קוביה הנואי CBD                     |                                 |             |
|                     | (Up to 1.5%)    | (245-145)          | (2.5% - 0.0% )      | -T1/C20                                  | CBD                             |             |
| קיריקרה חצי שוא ב.2 | •5              | 115                | 3%                  | ישפן קובים הוואי CBD                     | Rich                            |             |
|                     | (Up to 1.5%)    | (195-115)          | (2.25 - 0.25)       | *T3/C15                                  |                                 |             |
| -                   |                 | •5                 | 10%                 | -5                                       | ישפן קובים הואי CBD             |             |
| כידיקרה אצי שנה ב   | (Up to 1.5%)    | (145-45)           | (7.5% - 2.5%)       | -T5/C10                                  |                                 |             |
| 6.6                 | קיזיקוה חצי שוח | •5<br>(Up to 1.5%) | 105<br>(145 - 45 )  | 105<br>(145-65)                          | -T10/C10 ישקן קוניה יד          |             |
| •                   | קידיטום חצי שוח | 05<br>(Up to 1.5%) | 2%<br>(3.5% - 0.2%) | 105<br>(145-65)                          | ישען קוניט וטואי T10/C2.        |             |
| •                   | קידיקרה חצי שות | 05 (Up to 1.5%)    | 35<br>(22.0-22.2)   | 115<br>(101-291)                         | • T15/C3 איניט רפואי ד          | THC<br>Rich |
| -                   | קיליקרה חצי שנה | (Up to 1.5%)       | 45 (75-15)          | 20%<br>(24% - 16%)                       | -T20/C4 איפן קוניט דען קוניט די | 1           |

# Problematic area in cannabis research

### Medication

- Consistency of intervention (inhaled, smoked, sublingual, eaten, ointment and more)
- Most patients prefer smocking
- Smoking VS PO is inherently different in pharmacology (time to activity, T/2, metabolites and more)
- Starting dose and titration

Problematic area in cannabis research suggested solution Prefer PO to inhaled or smoked Easier to control dose and create placebo Prefer inhaled over smoking Use smart consistent inhalers Synthetic vs plant based medication

# **Evaluation of a vaporizing device (Volcano) for the • purmonary administration of tetrahydrocannabinol**.

Hazekamp A, Ruhaak R, Zuurman L, van Gerven J, Verpoorte R.

<u>J Pharm Sci.</u> 2006 Jun;95(6):1308-17. 🔶

#### Source 🔶

Division of Pharmacognosy, Institute of Biology, Leiden University, Leiden, The Netherlands. ahazekamp@rocketmail.com

#### Abstract 🔶

What is currently needed for optimal use of medicinal cannabinoids is a feasible, nonsmoked, rapid-onset delivery system. Cannabis "vaporization" is a technique aimed at suppressing irritating respiratory toxins by heating cannabis to a temperature where active cannabinoid vapors form, but below the point of combustion where smoke and associated toxins are produced. The goal of this study was to evaluate the performance of the Volcano vaporizer in terms of reproducible delivery of the bioactive cannabinoid tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) by using pure cannabinoid preparations, so that it could be used in a clinical trial. By changing parameters such as temperature setting, type of evaporation sample and balloon volume, the vaporization of THC was systematically improved to its maximum, while preventing the formation of breakdown products of THC, such as cannabinol or delta-8-THC. Inter- and intradevice variability was tested as well as relationship between loaded- and delivered dose. It was found that an average of about 54% of loaded THC was delivered into the balloon of the vaporizer, in a reproducible manner. When the vaporizer was used for clinical administration of inhaled THC, it was found that on average 35% of inhaled THC was directly exhaled again. Our results show that with the Volcano a safe and effective cannabinoid delivery system seems to be available to patients. The final pulmonal uptake of THC is comparable to the smoking of cannabis, while avoiding the respiratory disadvantages of smoking.

(c) 2006 Wiley-Liss, Inc. and the American Pharmacists Association 🔶






# Problematic area in cannabis research

Placebo and double blinding

- Difficulty to hide the psychogenic effect from the subject
- Difficulty to hide the typical taste and smell of the cannabis
- Consistency of the placebo and purity
  - Different cannabinoids
  - The effect of the terpenes

cannabis flos variëteit bedrobinol

5 gram

LOS

Ministerie van Volksgezondheid, Welzijn en Sport Bureau voor Medicinale Cannabis Den Haag Problematic area in cannabis research suggested solution

- Some companies created a placebo that is without THC or CBD.
- Using intelligent systems that will randomize the medication (Syke)
- Starting cannabis studies early in the establishment of medical cannabis program





## **Raw Cannabis**



## Structural Modification





## **Preloaded** Cartridges

#### Metered-Dose Delivery



Problematic area in cannabis research

Choice of subjects

- Always a problem but more on pain studies
- Many parallel diagnosis in neuropathic pain
- Previous experience vs naivety with cannabis
- Recruitment
- No gold standards for analgesic efficacy



Problematic area in cannabis research suggested solution

- Starting cannabis studies early in the establishment of medical cannabis program (naivety and ease of recruitment)
- Base studies on non-subjective parameter as possible.
  - Reduction of medication
  - Reduction of medical services use (visits, procedures)
  - Monitoring devices (Actigraf for sleep, monitoring watches for movement and other prameters of HR BP ECG and more



Problematic area in cannabis research

Drug company
Funding
Patenting
Problematic aspects of cannabis (addiction, schedule 1 drug and more
The federal government DEA FDA NIDA

## The "big ones" enter into the field

syqe







## Selective-dose cannabis inhaler









## Point to remember Very few good studies Results are not impressive Multiple difficulties for clinical research Initial planning will help to create good studies Always remember what is the

alternative (Opioids, Anti-depressant, Anti-convulsant, Benzodiazepines)

www.mgcisrael.com



## Smoked medicinal cannabis for neuropathic pain in **• HIV:** a randomized, crossover clinical trial.

Ellis R), Toperoff W, Vaida F, van den Brande G, Gonzales J, Gouaux B, Bentley H, Atkinson JH. Neuropsychopharmacology 2009;34(3):672-680.

Despite management with opioids and other pain modifying therapies, neuropathic pain continues to reduce the quality of life and daily functioning in HIV-infected individuals. Cannabinoid receptors in the central and peripheral nervous systems have been shown to modulate pain perception. We conducted a clinical trial to assess the impact of smoked cannabis on neuropathic pain in HIV. This was a phase II, doubleblind, placebo-controlled, crossover trial of analgesia with smoked cannabis in HIVassociated distal sensory predominant polyneuropathy (DSPN). Eligible subjects had neuropathic pain refractory to at least two previous analgesic classes; they continued on their prestudy analgesic regimens throughout the trial. Regulatory considerations dictated that subjects smoke under direct observation in a hospital setting. Treatments were placebo and active cannabis ranging in potency between 1 and 8% Delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol, four times daily for 5 consecutive days during each of 2 treatment weeks, separated by a 2-week washout. The primary outcome was change in pain intensity as measured by the Descriptor Differential Scale (DDS) from a pretreatment baseline to the end of each treatment week. Secondary measures included assessments of mood and daily functioning. Of 127 volunteers screened, 34 eligible subjects enrolled and 28 completed both cannabis and placebo treatments. Among the completers, pain relief was greater with cannabis than placebo (median difference in DDS pain intensity change, 3.3 points, effect size=0.60; p=0.016). The proportions of subjects achieving at least 30% pain relief with cannabis versus placebo were 0.46 (95% CI 0.28, 0.65) and 0.18 (0.03, 0.32). Mood and daily functioning improved to a similar extent during both treatment periods. Although most side effects were mild and self-limited, two subjects experienced treatment-limiting toxicities. Smoked cannabis was generally well tolerated and effective when added to concomitant analgesic therapy in patients with medically refractory pain due to HIV DSPN.





## Smoked cannabis for chronic neuropathic pain: a randomized controlled trial

Mark A. Ware MBBS, Tongtong Wang PhD, Stan Shapiro PhD, Ann Robinson RN, Thierry Ducruet MSc, Thao Huynh MD, Ann Gamsa PhD, Gary J. Bennett PhD, Jean-Paul Collet MD PhD

Methods: Adults with post-traumatic or postsurgical neuropathic pain were randomly assigned to receive cannabis at four potencies (0%, 2.5%, 6% and 9.4% tetrahydrocannabinol) over four 14-day periods in a crossover trial. Participants inhaled a single 25-mg dose through a pipe three times daily for the first five days in each cycle, followed by a nine-day washout period. Daily average pain intensity was measured using an 11-point numeric rating scale. We recorded effects on mood, sleep and quality of life, as well as adverse events. **Results:** We recruited 23 participants (mean age 45.4 [standard deviation 12.3] years, 12 women [52%]), of whom 21 completed the trial. The average daily pain intensity, measured on the 11-point numeric rating scale, was lower on the prespecified primary contrast of 9.4% v. 0% tetrahydrocannabinol (5.4 v. 6.1, respectively; difference = 0.7, 95% confidence interval [CI] 0.02–1.4). Preparations with intermediate potency yielded intermediate but nonsignificant degrees of relief. Participants receiving 9.4% tetrahydrocannabinol reported improved ability to fall asleep (easier, p = 0.001; faster, p < 0.001; more drowsy, p = 0.003) and improved quality of sleep (less wakefulness, p = 0.01) relative to 0% tetrahydrocannabinol. We found no differences in mood or quality of life. The most common drug-related adverse events during the period when participants received 9.4% tetrahydrocannabinol were headache, dry eyes, burning sensation in areas of neuropathic pain, dizziness, numbness and cough. Conclusion: A single inhalation of 25 mg of 9.4% tetrahydrocannabinol herbal cannabis three times daily for five days reduced the intensity of

pain, improved sleep and was well tolerated

## A Randomized, Placebo-Controlled, Crossover Trial of Cannabis Cigarettes in Neuropathic Pain.

Wilsey B, Marcotte T, Tsodikov A, Millman J, Bentley H, Gouaux B, Fishman S. 🔷 🔶 J Pain. 2008 Apr 8 [Epub ahead of print] 🔶 The Food and Drug Administration (FDA), Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), and the National Institute for Drug Abuse (NIDA) report that no sound scientific studies support the medicinal use of cannabis. Despite this lack of scientific validation, many patients routinely use "medical marijuana," and in many cases this use is for pain related to nerve injury. We conducted a double-blinded, placebocontrolled, crossover study evaluating the analgesic efficacy of smoking cannabis for neuropathic pain. Thirty-eight patients with central and peripheral neuropathic pain underwent a standardized procedure for smoking either high-dose (7%), low-dose (3.5%), or placebo cannabis. In addition to the primary outcome of pain intensity, secondary outcome measures included evoked pain using heat-pain threshold, sensitivity to light touch, psychoactive side effects, and neuropsychological performance. A mixed linear model demonstrated an analgesic response to smoking cannabis. No effect on evoked pain was seen. Psychoactive effects were minimal and well-tolerated, but neuropsychological impairment was problematic, particularly with the higher concentration of study medication.

## Randomised Placebo Controlled Double Blind Clinical Trial of Cannabis Based Medicinal Product (Sativex) in Painful Diabetic Neuropathy: Depression is a Major Confounding Factor

Selvarajah D, Gandhi R, Emery CJ, Tesfaye S. • Diabetes Care. 2010 Jan;33(1):128-30. •

Objective- To assess the efficacy of Sativex, a cannabis based 🔷 🔶 medicinal extract, as adjuvant treatment in painful-DPN. Research design and methods- In this randomized controlled trial, 30 subjects with painful-DPN received daily Sativex or placebo. Primary outcome measure was change in mean daily pain scores and secondary outcome measures included quality of life assessments. Results- There was significant improvement in pain scores in both groups but mean change between groups was not significant. There were no significant differences in secondary outcome measures. Patients with depression had significantly greater baseline pain scores that improved regardless of intervention. Conclusion- This first ever, trial assessing the efficacy of cannabis has shown it to be no more efficacious than placebo in painful-DPN. Depression was a major confounder and may have important implications for future painful-DPN trials.

## **Cannabinoid-induced** effects on the nociceptive system: a **neurophysiological study in patients with secondary** progressive multiple sclerosis.

Conte A, Bettolo CM, Onesti E, Frasca V, Iacovelli E, Gilio F, Giacomelli E, Gabriele M, Aragona M, Tomassini V, Pantano P, Pozzilli C, Inghilleri M.

#### Eur J Pain. 2009 May;13(5):472-7.

Although clinical studies show that cannabinoids improve central pain in patients with multiple sclerosis (MS) neurophysiological studies are lacking to investigate whether they also suppress these patients' electrophysiological responses to noxious stimulation. The flexion reflex (FR) in humans is a widely used technique for assessing the pain threshold and for studying spinal and supraspinal pain pathways and the neurotransmitter system involved in pain control. In a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, cross-over study we investigated cannabinoid-induced changes in RIII reflex variables (threshold, latency and area) in a group of 18 patients with secondary progressive MS. To investigate whether cannabinoids act indirectly on the nociceptive reflex by modulating lower motoneuron excitability we also evaluated the Hreflex size after tibial nerve stimulation and calculated the H wave/M wave (H/M) ratio. Of the 18 patients recruited and randomized 17 completed the study. After patients used a commercial delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) and cannabidiol mixture as an oromucosal spray the RIII reflex threshold increased and RIII reflex area decreased. The visual analogue scale score for pain also decreased, though not significantly. Conversely, the H/M ratio measured before patients received cannabinoids remained unchanged after therapy. In conclusion, the cannabinoid-induced changes in the RIII reflex threshold and area in patients with MS provide objective neurophysiological evidence that cannabinoids modulate the nociceptive system in patients with MS.

**Conclusions:** Cannabis-based medicine is effective in reducing pain and sleep disturbance in patients with multiple sclerosis related central neuropathic pain and is mostly well tolerated

Three Cannabis Based Medicinal Extracts (CBMEs) for sublingual use for patients with chronic, mainly neuropathic, pain and associated symptoms to explore efficacy, tolerability, safety and dosages. Three CBMEs were given over a 12-week period. After an initial open-label period, the CBMEs were used in a randomised, double-blind, placebo controlled, crossover trial. **Extracts which contained THC proved most effective in symptom control** 



## Are cannabinoids an effective and safe treatment option in the management of pain? A qualitative systematic review

Fiona A Campbell, Martin R Tramèr, Dawn Carroll, D John M Reynolds, R Andrew Moore, Henry J McQuay

| Chronic non-malignant pain               |   |         |  |  |   |   |  |  |  |
|--|---|---------|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| Holdcroft<br>et al <sup>25</sup>         | n=1; n of 1<br>crossover design;<br>pain: abdominal<br>(Mediterranean<br>fever); follow up<br>6 weeks   | 1, 2, 0 | THC 10 mg x 5<br>capsules/day;<br>placebo x 5<br>capsules/day (each<br>treatment 1 week)   | No data  | VAS (ranges): THC<br>4.8-6.2 mm;<br>placebo 5.5-6.1<br>mm; NS   | Daily<br>morphine<br>consumption<br>less in THC<br>group<br>(P<0.001) |  | Nausea and vomiting<br>throughout<br>study;dysphoria and<br>irritability associated<br>with placebo weeks  | Experienced<br>cannabis user able<br>to identify THC<br>capsules for first 4<br>weeks of trial |
| Maurer et<br>al <sup>26</sup>            | n=1; n of 1<br>crossover design;<br>pain: spinal cord<br>pathology; follow<br>up 5 months   | 1, 2, 0 | THC 5 mg x 18;<br>codeine 50 mg x 18;<br>placebo x 18                                      | No data  | VAS (50 mm<br>scale): THC 25.6<br>mm; codeine 19.7<br>mm; placebo 34.3<br>mm; P<0.05 for<br>THC and codeine <i>v</i><br>placebo | THC had<br>only<br>antispasticity<br>effect                           |  | THC and codeine<br>better than placebo for<br>mood, sleep,<br>concentration, control<br>of micturition, global<br>effect; no altered state<br>of consciousness |  |
| Postoperat                               | ive pain  |         |  |  |   |   |  |  |  |
| Jain et al<br>(phase<br>1) <sup>27</sup> | n=36 (36<br>analysed); parallel<br>group design;<br>postoperative or<br>trauma<br>(moderate to<br>severe pain);<br>follow up 6<br>hours         | 1, 1, 1 | Intramuscular:<br>levonantradol<br>1.5 mg x 1;<br>levonantradol 2.0<br>mg x 1; placebo x 1 | AUDC: P<0.05 for<br>levonantradol v<br>placebo at each<br>dose | AUDC: P<0.05 for<br>levonantradol <i>v</i><br>placebo at each<br>dose   |   | No of patients<br>with reactions:<br>levonantradol<br>23/40; placebo<br>2/16 | Drowsiness common  | _  |
|  |   |         |  |  |   |   |  | Dry mouth, dizziness,<br>and dysphoria<br>uncommon   |  |
|  |   |         |  |  |   |   |  | Levonantradol:<br>increased heart rate<br>and reduced blood<br>pressure (no dose<br>response)  | -  |
| Jain et al<br>(phase<br>2) <sup>27</sup> | n=36 (36<br>analysed); parallel<br>group design;<br>pain:<br>postoperative or<br>trauma<br>(moderate<br>baseline pain);<br>follow up 6<br>hours | 1, 1, 1 | Intramuscular:<br>levonantradol<br>2.5 mg x 1;<br>levonantradol 3.0<br>mg x 1; placebo x 1 | AUDC: P<0.05 for<br>levonantradol v<br>placebo at each<br>dose | AUDC: P<0.05 for<br>levonantradol v<br>placebo at each<br>dose  |   |  |  |  |

BPP=benzopyranoperidine;THC=9-delta-tetrahydrocannabinol; NIB=nitrogen analogue THC.

AUDC=areas under the difference curves (sum of change from baseline to six hours for pain intensity, pain relief, and pain analgesic scores).

SPID=summed pain intensity difference.

VAS=visual analogue scale.

Analysis of nine randomised controlled trials of effectiveness of cannabinoids for three types of pain (cancer pain, chronic non-malignant pain, and postoperative pain)

|  |   | Quality score |  | Efficacy data  |   |  | Adverse drug reactions  |   |   |
|--|---|---------------|--|--|---|--|---|---|---|
| Trial  | Study<br>chacterisitcs  |               | , Intervention (oral<br>unless indicated<br>otherwise)                                       | Pain relief (total<br>pain relief or<br>AUDC)  | Pain intensity<br>(SPID orVAS)  | Other  | Quantitatively  | Qualitatively   | Comments  |
| Cancer pai                                     | n   |               |  |  |   |  |   |   |   |
| Jochimsen<br>et al <sup>2†</sup>               | n=37 (35<br>analysed);<br>crossover design;<br>pain: cancer<br>(moderate<br>baseline pain);<br>follow up 6<br>hours | 1, 2, 0       | BPP 2 mg x 1; BPP<br>4 mg x 1; codeine<br>60 mg x 1; codeine<br>120 mg x 1; placebo<br>x 1   | Complete: BPP 2<br>mg 2/35; BPP<br>4 mg 3/35;<br>codeine 60 mg<br>9/35; codeine<br>120 mg 8/35;<br>placebo 4/35  | Reduced: BPP 2<br>mg 19/35; BPP 4<br>mg 20/35; codeine<br>60 mg 25/35;<br>codeine 120 mg<br>31/35; placebo<br>25/35   |  |   | 11 item self<br>assessment scale<br>showed no difference<br>in psychotomimetic<br>effect. Sedation for<br>both doses of BPP<br>similar to both doses<br>of codeine. No<br>difference in blood<br>pressure, heart rate,<br>psychiatric interview                             | 37 patients entered,<br>35 completed ( no<br>reason given for 2<br>who did not<br>complete); analgesic<br>effect of codeine 120<br>mg better than<br>placebo, BPP 4 mg<br>worse than placebo;<br>adverse effects not<br>significantly different |
| Noyes et<br>al <sup>22</sup>                   | n=10 (9<br>analysed);<br>crossover design;<br>pain: cancer<br>(moderate<br>baseline pain);<br>follow up 6<br>hours  | 1, 2, 0       | THC 5 mg x 1; THC<br>10 mg x 1; THC<br>15 mg x 1; THC<br>20 mg x 1; placebo<br>x 1           | Total (mean±SE):<br>THC 5 mg<br>4.7±0.95; THC<br>10 mg 4.4±0.98;<br>THC 15 mg<br>5.8±0.84; THC 20<br>mg 10.8±1.19;<br>placebo 5.1±1.65;  | SPID (mean±SE):<br>THC 5 mg<br>2.6±0.53; THC<br>10 mg 1.4±0.42;<br>THC 15 mg<br>3.6±0.65; THC<br>20 mg 4.6±0.66;<br>placebo 0.9±0.3   | Progressive<br>pain relief<br>with<br>increasing<br>doses of<br>THC<br>(P<0.001) | No of reactions<br>per 10 patients:<br>THC 5 mg 37;<br>THC 10 mg 47;<br>THC 15 mg 64;<br>THC 20 mg 70;<br>placebo 16  | Progressive sedation<br>and mental clouding<br>(THC 20 mg caused<br>heavy sedation in all<br>patients); reduced<br>blood pressure and<br>heart rate; euphoria in<br>2 patients receiving<br>THC 15 mg and 20<br>mg, 1 of whom was<br>the only experienced<br>marijuana user | Dose response for<br>analgesia and<br>adverse effects with<br>THC   |
| Noyes et<br>al <sup>23</sup>                   | n=36 (34<br>analysed);<br>crossover design;<br>pain: cancer<br>(moderate<br>baseline pain);<br>follow up 7<br>hours | 1, 2, 0       | THC 10 mg x 1;<br>THC 20 mg x 1;<br>codeine 60 mg x 1;<br>codeine 120 mg x 1;<br>placebo x 1 | Total (mean±SE):<br>THC 10 mg<br>9.8±1.40; THC 20<br>mg 12.9±1.46;<br>codeine 60 mg<br>9.4±1.38; codeine<br>120 mg 12.2±1.57;<br>placebo 6.8±0.95;<br>P<0.05=THC 20<br>mg and codeine<br>120 mg <i>v</i> placebo | SPID (mean±SE):<br>THC 10 mg<br>2.9±0.62; THC<br>20 mg 4.7±0.65;<br>codeine 60 mg<br>3.6±0.75; codeine<br>120 mg 4.3±0.78;<br>placebo 1.9±0.44;<br>P<0.05 for THC<br>20 mg and codeine<br>120 mg <i>v</i> placebo | Analgesic<br>effect of<br>THC in 5<br>hours,<br>codeine in 3<br>hours            | No of reactions<br>per 34 patients:<br>THC 10 mg 186;<br>THC 20 mg 259;<br>codeine 60 mg<br>120; codeine<br>120 mg 13;<br>placebo 92.<br>Withdrawal<br>owing to<br>reactions: THC<br>2; codeine or<br>placebo 0 | Reduced blood<br>pressure with THC  | THC 20 mg highly<br>sedating and<br>produced mental<br>effects prohibiting its<br>use. THC 10 mg was<br>well tolerated and<br>somewhat sedating,<br>but only equipotent<br>to codeine 60 mg   |
| Staquet et<br>al<br>(study<br>1) <sup>24</sup> | n=30 (26<br>analysed);<br>crossover design;<br>pain: cancer<br>(moderate<br>baseline pain);<br>follow up 6<br>hours | 1, 2, 1       | NIB 4 mg x 1;<br>codeine 50 mg x 1;<br>placebo x 1   | No data  | SPID (mean±SE):<br>NIB 4.72±3.33;<br>codeine 4.79±3.19;<br>placebo 2.15±2.56;<br>P<0.05 for NIB<br>and codeine <i>v</i><br>placebo  |  | Drowsiness (%<br>of patients): NIB<br>40%; codeine<br>44%; placebo<br>21%   | 4 withdrawals<br>unrelated to study<br>drug   |   |
| Staquet et<br>al<br>(study<br>2) <sup>24</sup> | n=15 (15<br>analysed);<br>crossover design;<br>pain: cancer<br>(moderate<br>baseline rain);                         | 1, 2, 1       | NIB 4 mg x 1;<br>secobarbital 50 mg<br>x 1; placebo x 1                                      | No data  | SPID (mean±SE):<br>NIB 4.40±2.06;<br>secobarbital<br>2.13±1.77; placebo<br>1.87±1.30; P<0.05<br>for NIB #   |  | Drowsiness: (%<br>of patients): NIB<br>40%;<br>secobarbital<br>33%; placebo<br>21%  |   | Secobarbital did not<br>reduce pain intensity<br>more than placebo,<br>indicating that<br>hypnotic properties<br>do not imply pain  |



## Conclusion

The best that can be achieved with single dose cannabis in nociceptive pain is analgesia equivalent to single dose codeine 60 mg, which rates poorly on relative efficacy compared with non-steroidal antiinflammatory drugs or simple analgesics. Increasing the cannabinoid dose to increase the analgesia will increase adverse effects. More intriguing perhaps than these relatively negative analgesic results in nociceptive pain are the suggestions of efficacy in spasticity and in neuropathic pain, where the therapeutic need is greater than in postoperative pain.