medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.01.23289286; this version posted May 2, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Is Medical Cannabis Evidence-Based Medicine? Concerns Based on Qualifying Conditions and the National Academy of Sciences Report

Elena L. Stains[1*], Amy L. Kennalley MBS[1], Alexander S. Bachir[1], Chadd K. Kraus, DO, DrPH[2], Brian J. Piper, PhD[1,3]

[1]Department of Medical Education, Geisinger Commonwealth School of Medicine, Scranton, PA

[2]Department of Emergency Medicine, Geisinger Medical Center, Danville, PA

[3]Center for Pharmacy Innovation and Outcomes, Geisinger, Danville, PA

*estains@som.geisinger.edu

Ethics: This report was approved by the IRB of Geisinger as exempt.

Abbreviations

MC: medical cannabis; NAS: National Academy of Sciences; QC: Qualifying Conditions; US: United States

Figures: 1, Tables: 0, Supplemental Figure: 1, Supplemental Table: 1, Supplemental Data: 1

Abstract:

This study aims to examine the coherence of state-level qualifying conditions (QCs) for medical cannabis (MC) with the evidence-based conclusions of the 2017 National Academies of Sciences (NAS) report. Data was collected for the QCs from 38 states where MC was legal in 2023 and compared to the QC data from 31 states where MC was legal in 2017. Each condition was divided into a NAS-established category based on the level of evidence supporting their effectiveness. The findings revealed wide variation in the number of QCs between states, with only an average of 8.4% of QCs in each state generally satisfying the substantial evidence category. Over three fourths of states included QCs with limited evidence of ineffectiveness (78.9%) or no/insufficient evidence (76.3%). Additionally, four fifths (81.6%) of states included QCs not covered in the NAS report. Only a few states appeared to have updated their QCs after the NAS report was released. This investigation highlights a large discrepancy between the state-level recommendations for MC and the supporting data.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.01.23289286; this version posted May 2, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Introduction:

Almost three-quarters (74%) of states, representing 73% of the United States (US) population, have legislation or regulation for medical cannabis (MC) and 2.5% of Americans reported using cannabis for medical needs in 2019-2020.[1] The National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (NAS) published a report in 2017 on the evidence, or lack thereof, of the therapeutic effects of cannabis for over twenty conditions.[2] Our objective was to compare each state's current and past qualifying conditions (QCs) for MC with the NAS report's findings to assess gaps in evidence-based recommendations made for cannabis use.

Methods:

We collected the QCs of each of the 38 states (including Washington, D.C.) where MC was legal in 2023[3]. We then used an internet archive tool to identify the QCs for the 31 states where MC was legal in 2017,[4] the year the NAS report was published. Conditions were divided into NAS-established categories: substantial evidence of effectiveness (e.g. chronic pain), moderate or limited evidence of effectiveness (e.g. PTSD), limited evidence of ineffectiveness (e.g. glaucoma), and no/insufficient evidence to support or refute effectiveness (e.g. epilepsy) (Supplemental Table 1A). QCs that only partially fit into the NAS-established categories, when taken exactly as written, were categorized as "partial" (Supplemental Table 1B).

Results:

The number of QCs for medical cannabis in 2023 varied widely between states (mean = 16.4), with South Dakota having the fewest (5) and Illinois the most (52) (Supplemental Figure 1). Twelve states included with their list of QCs the ability of physicians to recommend MC at their discretion–while three (Washington, D.C., Virginia, and Oklahoma) left the decision entirely up to the physician, no QCs.

Most (89.5%) of states had at least one QC with substantial evidence. On average, only 8.4% of a state's QCs met this standard (Figure 1A). In contrast, 78.9% of states listed one or more QCs with limited evidence of *ineffectiveness* (Figure 1B). Three-quarters *(*76.3%) of states had at least one QC with no/insufficient evidence to support or refute effectiveness, and 36.8% of states had three or more of such conditions. Four-fifths (81.6%) of states had at least one QC that was not in the NAS report. On average, 19.6% of a state's QCs were not included in the NAS report, and 40.2% of QCs were partial.

There was only partial evidence that states changed their QCs to establish consistency following publication of the NAS report. Nineteen of 31 states added one or more QCs since 2017. Following these additions, 32.3% of states listed a higher percentage of QCs with substantial evidence in 2023 than in 2017, but another 32.3% listed a lower percentage. However, half (51.6%) had a lower percentage of ineffective QCs by 2023, and only 9.7% had a higher percentage. Another 53.3% also had a lower percentage of QCs that were partial.

Discussion:

Despite the 2017 NAS report, the vast majority of QCs that states use to qualify patients for medical cannabis recommendation do not align with evidence. Most states have MC use for QCs

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.01.23289286; this version posted May 2, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

that have not been well-studied–ALS symptoms, Parkinson's, opioid dependence—or are known to some degree to be ineffective–dementia symptoms and depression. When comparing QCs from 2017 (the time of publication of the NAS report[2]), to the present, states have incompletely updated their recommendations to align with this evidence. It is possible that states are using other information to guide their QCs,[5] including voter initiatives.

Overall, these data show a large gap between state-level recommendations for medical cannabis and the quality evidence to support them.

References

1. Rhee TG, Rosenheck RA. Increasing use of cannabis for medical purposes among US residents, 2013-2020. *Am J Prev Med* 2023; S0749-3797(23)00132-0. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2023.03.005
2. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. The health effects of cannabis and cannabinoids: the current state of evidence and recommendations for research. *The National Academies Press*. 2017. https://doi.org/10.17226/24625.
3. Medical marijuana laws. NORML. https://norml.org/laws/medical-laws/. Published February 2, 2023. Accessed March 30, 2023.
4. Internet archive: digital library of free & borrowable books, movies, music & wayback machine. https://archive.org/. Accessed March 30, 2023.
5. Schlag AK, Zafar RR, Lynskey MT, Athanasiou-Fragkouli A, Phillips LD, Nutt DJ. The value of real world evidence: the case of medical cannabis. *Front Psychiatry*. 2022; 13:1027159. doi: 10.3389/fpsyt.2022.1027159.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.01.23289286; this version posted May 2, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



Figure 1. Percent of each state's QCs that have substantial evidence of effectiveness (a) and limited evidence of ineffectiveness (b) according to the National Academy of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (NAS).[2] Alabama's program was not yet in effect as of 4/27/2023.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.01.23289286; this version posted May 2, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Supplemental Table 1. Categories of evidence established by the 2017 National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (NAS) report (a). Common state qualifying conditions that were deemed "partial" due to broad wording, compared with evidence found by NAS (b).

a.

National Academies of Sciences categories of evidence	Conditions/symptoms
Substantial evidence of effectiveness	
	For the treatment of chronic pain in adults
	As antiemetics in the treatment of chemotherapy-induced nausea and vomiting
	For improving patient-reported multiple sclerosis spasticity symptoms
Moderate evidence of effectiveness	
	Improving short-term sleep outcomes in individuals with sleep disturbance associated with obstructive sleep apnea syndrome, fibromyalgia, chronic pain, and multiple sclerosis
Limited evidence of effectiveness	
	Increasing appetite and decreasing weight loss associated with HIV/AIDS
	Improving clinician-measured multiple sclerosis spasticity symptoms
	Improving symptoms of Tourette syndrome
	Improving anxiety symptoms, as assessed by a public speaking test, in individuals with social anxiety disorders
	Improving symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder
Limited evidence of a statistical association	
	Better outcomes (i.e., mortality, disability) after a traumatic brain injury or intracranial hemorrhage
Limited evidence of ineffectiveness	
	Improving symptoms associated with dementia
	Improving intraocular pressure associated with glaucoma
	Reducing depressive symptoms in individuals with chronic pain or multiple sclerosis
No/insufficient evidence to support or refute effectiveness	
	Cancers, including glioma
	Cancer-associated anorexia cachexia syndrome and anorexia nervosa
	Symptoms of irritable bowel syndrome
	Epilepsy
	Spasticity in patients with paralysis due to spinal cord injury
	Symptoms associated with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis
	Chorea and certain neuropsychiatric symptoms associated with Huntington's disease
	Motor system symptoms associated with Parkinson's disease or the levodopa-induced dyskinesia

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.01.23289286; this version posted May 2, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

	Dystonia
	Achieving abstinence in the use of addictive substances
	Mental health outcomes in individuals with schizophrenia or schizophreniform psychosis

b.

Qualifying Condition	NAS evidence related to this condition
Anxiety	Limited Evidence for: anxiety symptoms in those with social anxiety
Cachexia	Limited Evidence for: increased appetite and decreased weight loss in HIV/AIDS. Insufficient Evidence for: anorexia/cachexia syndrome in cancer
Cancer	Substantial Evidence of effectiveness for: chronic pain in cancer, chemotherapy-induced nausea and vomiting. Insufficient evidence of effectiveness for: cancer regression, cancer-associated anorexia/cachexia syndrome.
HIV or AIDS	Limited Evidence of effectiveness for: increased appetite and decreased weight loss in HIV/AIDS
Multiple Sclerosis	Substantial Evidence for: patient-reported MS spasticity, chronic pain due to MS. Moderate Evidence for: improved short term sleep outcomes for MS. Limited Evidence for: clinician-measured MS spasticity. Limited Evidence of ineffectiveness for: depressive symptoms due to MS.
Nausea	Substantial Evidence for: chemotherapy-induced nausea and vomiting.
Seizure	Insufficient Evidence for: Epilepsy
Severe and persistent muscle spasms	Substantial Evidence for: patient-reported MS spasticity. Limited Evidence for: clinician-measured MS spasticity. Insufficient Evidence for: spasticity due to paralysis due to spinal cord injury, dystonia, Parkinson's disease motor system symptoms or levodopa-induced dyskinesia.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.01.23289286; this version posted May 2, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



Supplemental Figure 1. Number of approved Qualifying Conditions (QC) per state in 2023. Washington, D.C., Oklahoma, and Virginia were not displayed due to lack of QC list.