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Disclaimer

• I am a member of the faculty at the University of Vermont, my expertise in this area comes from:
  – Teaching medical students CNS pharmacology including treatments for pain and drugs of abuse
  – Co-director of Medical Cannabis course

• Materials presented here represent my own findings, views and opinions and do not necessarily reflect the legal views or opinions of the University of Vermont

• Conflict of Interest: Pharmaceuticals will be presented according to their FDA approvals and clinical trials. I have no financial interests to disclose.
Objectives

• Outline the biologically active components in cannabis
• Describe the components of the endocannabinoid system that confers the biological effects of cannabinoids
• Outline the cannabinoids with FDA approval and in clinical trials
• Describe the current clinical data supporting use of cannabinoids and cannabis in pain, nausea and seizures.
• Outline the evidence for use of cannabinoids in pediatric patients
• Discuss the abuse potential and vulnerability of adolescent children to cannabis-dependence disorders
Cannabis: Medicine or Drug of Abuse?
A Brief History of Cannabis

- 10,000 BCE - 0: Cultivation for food and fiber
- 100: Sacramental use
- 1500: Medicinal use
- 1700: Documented in first Herbals

**Cannabis sativa classified**

- 1930: Harrison Narcotics Tax Act
- 1964: Controlled Substances Act
- 1970: Marinol approved
- 1985: CB1 & CB2 discovered
- 1988: Endogenous Cannabinoids
- 1992: Compassionate Use Act
- 1996: Genome sequenced
- 2011: 25 medical states
- 2014: Gains popularity as a therapeutic drug

25 medical states
Cannabis and Phytocannabinoids

- *Cannabis* sativa produces many compounds that are secreted by trichromes in the flowers and leaves.
- Different strains of *Cannabis* can produce different levels of biologically active components:
  - Hemp
  - Charlotte’s Web
  - Sativa/Indica
Biologically Active Cannabinoids

*Cannabis* produces over 100 cannabinoids

- **Delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol (THC)**
  - Partial Agonist CB1/CB2 receptors
  - Psychoactive
  - Anti-pain, anti-nausea
  - Anti-spasm, anti-immune

- **Cannabidiol (CBD)**
  - Antagonist CB1/CB2 receptors
  - Not psychoactive
  - Anti-seizure activity, anti-pain
  - Possible non-receptor activities

- Activated by heating the plant (smoking, vaping, baking, heat extraction)
Other Cannabis Compounds with Biological Activity

• Terpenes/terpenoids (over 500 compounds)
  – Myrcene, limonene (also produced by many fruits)
  – **Entourage Effect:** affect uptake or metabolism of THC

Myrcene

Limonene
The Endocannabinoid System

• Cannabinoid Receptors
  – CB1: Expressed in many tissues, highest in neurons
  – CB2: Expressed highly in immune cells, some in neurons
  – Both are G protein (Gi)-coupled receptors that inhibit neuronal signaling

• Endocannabinoids (anandamide, 2-AG) are expressed in many tissue types
  – Expression in neurons is induced by excess Glutamate receptor signaling
  – Thought to be a feedback mechanism to limit neuronal activity (similar to opioid activity)
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Dronabinol (Marinol™)

- Synthetic delta-9-THC
- US FDA approved for nausea due to cancer chemotherapy in 1986
- Approved for HIV-AIDS associated weight loss
- Marinol is an FDA approved Schedule III drug, although dronabinol (THC) is Schedule I
- **Side effects:** primarily CNS-related dysphoria
Cannabis Extracts in Development

- In Phase III Clinical Trials: Plant-derived cannabinoids
  - 1:1 THC/CBD (Sativex™) sublingual spray
  - CBD (Epidiolex™) oral solution
    - FDA approved 2018 for childhood seizure disorders
Cannabinoids in US clinical development

- Epidiolex (CBD)
- Sativex (THC:CBD)
Location of Cannabinoid Receptors in Pain Pathways

• CB1 Receptors
  – High Density in the CNS
  – Sensory Neurons (afferents going to the brain)
  – Autonomic Nervous System (efferents that communicate with organs)

• CB2 Receptors
  – Highly expressed in immune-related organs
  – Spinal Sensory Neurons (afferents going to the brain)
  – Role of CB2 in pain is thought to be mostly immune cell-mediated
Cannabis as a Medicine

• Proven effectiveness (THC):
  • Chronic Pain
  • Chemotherapy-induced Nausea
  • Seizures
  • Spasticity (MS and Cerebral Palsy)
  • Cachexia (wasting disorder)

• Likely effective and in clinical trials (THC):
  • Eating Disorders
  • Glaucoma
  • Anxiety Disorders (OCD, PTSD)

• Possibly effective, needs more research (THC)
  • Addiction
  • Parkinson's/Alzheimer's
  • Inflammatory Diseases
  • Cancer

Proven effectiveness is through randomized clinical trials using THC. Whole plant cannabis has been found effective for Pain, Nausea and Seizures, but these trials are sparse and nonexistent for other conditions.

CBD has only been found effective against seizures, other trials have not shown significant effectiveness, but more are needed.


Cannabinoids in Treatment of Pain
Pain Control with Opioids

- Examples: morphine, hydrocodone (Vicodin), oxycontin, Percocet, fentanyl

- Agonist for the mu opioid receptor
  - Inhibits neuron activity
  - Coupled to Gi
    - Inhibits Ca2+ entry
  - Exhibit tolerance
Cannabinoid Receptors reduce neuronal activity in response to pain

- Both endocannabinoids and cannabis reduce both pain signal and interpretation of pain
  - Not as effective
  - Produce less tolerance
  - Less risk of addiction
  - Low risk of overdose

Inhibiting the breakdown of endogenous opioids and cannabinoids to alleviate pain, 2012
http://www.nature.com/nrd/journal/v11/n4/full/nrd3673.html
Meta-analysis of efficacy: intensity of pain by visual analog scale (VAS). * Parallel design

Studies included cannabis, purified or synthetic THC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean (SD, p=0.3) Cannabis</th>
<th>Mean (SD, p=0.3) Placebo</th>
<th>SMD (fixed) (95 % CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noyes 1975a</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-3.05 (1.77)</td>
<td>-0.90 (1.77)</td>
<td>-1.16 (-2.13, -0.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noyes 1975b</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-3.80 (3.82)</td>
<td>-1.90 (3.82)</td>
<td>-0.49 (-0.97, -0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staquet 1978a</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-4.72 (3.54)</td>
<td>-2.15 (3.54)</td>
<td>-0.72 (-1.26, -0.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staquet 1978b</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-4.40 (2.08)</td>
<td>-1.87 (2.08)</td>
<td>-1.18 (-1.97, -0.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wade 2003</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-1.90 (4.44)</td>
<td>-1.20 (4.44)</td>
<td>-0.15 (-0.95, 0.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rog 2005*</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-2.73 (2.60)</td>
<td>-1.41 (2.70)</td>
<td>-0.49 (-0.99, 0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wissel, 2006</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-1.60 (4.05)</td>
<td>0.30 (4.05)</td>
<td>-0.45 (-1.23, 0.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (95 % CI)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>-0.61 (-0.84, -0.37)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heterogeneity: $\chi^2 = 5.31$, $I^2 = 0\%$ (P = 0.50)

Efficacy analysis (visual analog scales) displayed a difference in standardized means in favor of the cannabis arm of -0.61 (-0.84 to -0.37)

Improvement in Pain

Odds indicate 30% or greater improvement in pain with cannabinoid compared with placebo, stratified according to cannabinoid. The square data markers indicate odds ratios (ORs) from primary studies, with sizes reflecting the statistical weight of the study using random-effects meta-analysis. The horizontal lines indicate 95% CIs. The blue diamond data markers represent the subtotal and overall OR and 95% CI. The vertical dashed line shows the summary effect estimate, the dotted shows the line of no effect (OR = 1).
Advantage of adding cannabinoid to opioid regimen for pain

• Enhances pain control
  – Different receptor mechanism
• Reduced opioid side effects
  – Nausea and constipation
• Reduced dose of opioid needed
  – Additive pain relief
• Reduced risk of dependence
  – Can reduce withdrawal pain
Cannabinoids in the Treatment of Chemotherapy-induced Nausea
CB1 Receptor Activation Inhibits the Vomiting Center: Physiological antagonist to 5-HT3 receptor action

CTZ=chemoreceptor trigger zone

Courtesy Mike Harlos, University of Manitoba
# Effectiveness of Dronabinol and Nabilone

Review: Cannabinoids for nausea and vomiting in adults with cancer receiving chemotherapy
Comparison: 1 Cannabinoid versus placebo
Outcome: 2 Absence of vomiting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or subgroup</th>
<th>Cannabinoid n/N</th>
<th>Placebo n/N</th>
<th>Risk Ratio IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Risk Ratio IV, Random, 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Dronabinol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levitt 1982</td>
<td>29/36</td>
<td>4/36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (95% CI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>7.25 [2.84, 18.52]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total events: 29 (Cannabinoid), 4 (Placebo)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Heterogeneity: not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td>Test for overall effect: Z = 4.14 (P = 0.000035)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang 1979a</td>
<td>6/32</td>
<td>2/32</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>3.00 [0.65, 13.76]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang 1981</td>
<td>0/16</td>
<td>0/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not estimable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (95% CI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>3.00 [0.65, 13.76]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total events: 6 (Cannabinoid), 2 (Placebo)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Heterogeneity: not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td>Test for overall effect: Z = 1.41 (P = 0.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (95% CI)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>5.69 [2.56, 12.64]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total events: 35 (Cannabinoid), 6 (Placebo)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.0; Chi² = 0.93, df = 1 (P = 0.33); I² = 0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test for overall effect: Z = 4.27 (P = 0.000020)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Test for subgroup differences: Chi² = 0.93, df = 1 (P = 0.33), I² = 0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2015 Nov 12;11:CD009464
Only 3 Clinical Trials for whole plant Cannabis as anti-emetic following chemotherapy

- Two trials were in patients that had failed dronabinol, 25% effective
- Only 1 randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled comparison trial for smoked cannabis with older anti-emetics
  - Canadian study
  - 35% preferred dronabinol
  - 20% preferred smoked cannabis
  - 45% no preference

Reviewed in: Cannabis in Cancer Care
Abrams and Guzman, Clin Pharm. Therap. 97:575. 2015
Cannabis vs. Synthetic THC in Cancer Care

• Advantages of Cannabis
  – “Entourage Effect”
    • Other cannabinoids and terpenes contribute to effects and may reduce side effects (especially CNS side effects)
  – Delivery
    • Inhalation gives faster relief
    • Metabolism profile is different

• Disadvantages of Cannabis
  – Illegal in many states (patients hesitant to use)
  – Few clinical trials to determine effectiveness or drug interactions
  – Difficult to standardize dose
    • Different strains, processing, etc.
Pediatric Clinical Trials: Few studies

• Most parallel adult results
  – Effective in Pain, nausea, seizure (THC or CBD)
  – Encouraging data in autism
  – Encouraging data for spasticity
    • cerebral palsy

• Adult Cannabinoid trials: >400 current trials, 100 related to abuse

• Pediatric Cannabinoid trials: 125 current trials, 120 related to abuse, 5 related to epilepsy
Cannabis Legalization: What’s the Harm?

• Increased accidental ingestion (no deaths)
  – Particular problem with Edibles
• Cannabis intoxication
  – Impaired driving
• Cannabis Dependence
  – Adolescent vulnerability
Cannabis Intoxication:

- **Attributed to THC action in the brain**
- Head rush and euphoria (Reward Pathway)
- Appetite increase (Hypothalamus)
- Decreased attention, sedation (Hippocampus-Prefrontal cortex)
- Altered Perceptions (Pre-frontal cortex: inhibition)
  - Awareness of the senses and of music may be increased
  - Distorted sense of time
  - Preoccupation with distractions
  - Giggles
Cannabis Effects on Attention:  
Impaired ability to drive

- Peripheral attention reduced
  - A person who is high may become absorbed in an object, event, or process to the exclusion of everything else

- Memory
  - Both short-term and long-term memory impairment

- Color/Image Perception
  - Hallucinogenic effects

- Motor Coordination
  - Impaired, but much less than alcohol or opioids

States with legalized recreational use have seen increased car accidents in the population that has combined alcohol and cannabis, but there is no significant difference in fatal car accidents in states with legalized cannabis
Cannabis Addiction Potential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug Type</th>
<th>Percent of General Population Ever Used</th>
<th>Percent of Those Users Who Ever Became Dependent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heroin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocaine</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-anxiety drugs</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Young People are Particularly Vulnerable

- Substantially higher risk for Substance use disorder when an addicting drug is started before the age of 18, even higher risk with younger patients
- Chronic adverse effects of cannabis are more likely to develop in younger patients
- Amotivation disorder with chronic use
Substance Use Disorders Among Persons 12 and Older, by Age of First Use

Source: CASA analysis of the National Household Survey on Drug Use and Health (NSDUH), 2009.
Drug use in Vermont

Past 30 Day Alcohol, Marijuana, and Cigarette Use

- Alcohol: 42% (2007), 33% (2017)
- Cigarettes: 18% (2007), 9% (2017)

May 2018

VERMONT DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
Vermont Trends: Perception of Harm

High School students believing there is a great risk of harm from:

- Binge drinking regularly: 36%
- Smoking a pack or more of cigarettes: 68%
- Using marijuana regularly: 24%

Youth Risk Behavior Survey 2017
Perception of harm is inversely correlated with use
Marketing
American Academy of Pediatrics

- Opposes medical marijuana outside FDA process
- Opposes legalization for recreational use
- Supports research (move from schedule I to schedule II)
- Strict enforcement of rules against marketing and sale to children (age 21 minimum)
- Supports decriminalization for both adults and youth
- Opposes smoking in any form
- Strongly Discourages any use in the presence of children
Navigating the Vermont Medical Marijuana Laws
Eligibility: Debilitating Medical Conditions

• Patients diagnosed with a specific disease or condition where reasonable medical efforts have been made over a reasonable amount of time to relieve the symptoms of:
  • Cancer
  • Multiple sclerosis
  • HIV
  • AIDS
  • glaucoma
  • or
  • The treatment of these conditions, if the disease or the treatment results in severe, persistent, and intractable symptoms;
  • or
  • A disease, medical condition, or its treatment that is chronic, debilitating, and produces one or more of the following intractable symptoms: cachexia or wasting syndrome; chronic pain; severe nausea; or seizures
Defined: Health Care Professional

• an individual licensed as:
  • an MD or DO
  • a naturopathic physician
  • an Advanced Practice Registered Nurse
  • an individual certified as a physician assistant,

• this includes individuals who are professionally licensed in New Hampshire, Massachusetts, or New York, except for naturopaths
Bona fide health care professional–patient relationship

- A treating or consulting relationship of not less than three months:
  - in the course of which a full assessment of the registered patient’s medical history and current medical condition, including a personal physical exam
  - the three month requirement shall not apply if a patient has been diagnosed with:
    - (A) a terminal illness,
    - (B) cancer, or
    - (C) acquired immune deficiency syndrome
    - (D) or is currently under hospice care
The VT Registry Process

- The patient who is a VT resident, over 18 years of age, visits the Marijuana Registry website, downloads and completes the Registered Patient Application form

- Patient gives their Health Care Professional a Verification Form to complete

- Patient returns both forms, notarized with $50 fee and digital ID photograph to the state

- Upon approval, patient receives a registration card (valid for 1 year) within 30 days
For more information:
Cannabis Science and Medicine
Continuing Medical Education (CME)

• Five, two-hour online modules focused on Cannabis for therapeutics


• Developed at UVM by: Monique McHenry, Karen Lounsbury, Kalev Freeman, and Wolfgang Dostmann