Long-term and serious harms of medical cannabis and cannabinoids for chronic pain: A systematic review of non-randomized studies

Dena Zeraatkar, *methodologist*

Department of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON

Department of Biomedical Informatics, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA

Matthew Adam Cooper, *medical student*

Michael G. Degroote School of Medicine

McMaster University, Hamilton, ON

Arnav Agarwal, *resident physician*

Department of Medicine

University of Toronto, Toronto, ON

Robin W. M. Vernooij, *methodologist*

Netherlands Comprehensive Cancer Organization (IKNL)

Utrecht, the Netherlands

Gareth Leung, *methodologist*

Department of Public Health and Primary Care,

University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

Kevin Loniewski, *nursing student*

Faculty of Health, Seneca College, King City, ON.

York University, Toronto, ON

Jared E. Dookie, *medical student*

Schulich School of Medicine and Dentistry

Western University, London, ON

Muhammad Muneeb Ahmed, *medical student*

Michael G. Degroote School of Medicine

McMaster University, Hamilton, ON

Brian Younho Hong, *resident physician*

Division of Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery

University of Toronto, Toronto, ON

Chris J. Hong, *resident physician*

Department of Otolaryngology-Head & Neck Surgery

University of Toronto, Toronto, ON

Patrick Jiho Hong, *resident physician*

Department of Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine

University of Toronto, Toronto, ON

Rachel Couban, *medical librarian*

Department of Anesthesia

Department of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact

McMaster University, Hamilton, ON

Thomas Agoritsas, *assistant professor*

Department Medicine, University Hospitals of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland

Department of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON

Jason W. Busse, *associate professor**

Department of Anesthesia

Department of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact

McMaster University, Hamilton, ON

bussejw@mcmaster.ca

*Corresponding author

Running head: Harms of medical cannabis

Abbreviations: Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), Palmitoylethanolamide (PEA), tetrahydrocannabinol (THC)

Keywords: Medical cannabis, chronic pain, adverse events, harms, non-randomized studies, observational studies

Disclaimers: None.

Funding: DZ is supported by a Banting Postdoctoral Fellowship.

Ethics approval: The systematic review is exempt from ethics approval.

Data: Data will be made available upon publication: <https://osf.io/ut36z/>

Acknowledgements: We thank the members of the Rapid Recommendations panel for critical feedback on the selection of the adverse events of interest. We thank James MacKillop, PhD, for his help with the interpretation of problematic cannabis use, abuse, dependence and withdrawal syndrome within studies.

Authors' Contributions: JWB and TA conceived the idea. RC designed and conducted the search. DZ, MAC, AA, GL, KL, JD, BYH, CH, and PJH screened search records, extracted data, and assessed the risk of bias of the eligible studies. DZ conducted analyses. DZ, JWB, and TA interpreted the data. DZ wrote the first draft of the manuscript. JWB and TA critically revised the manuscript. All authors reviewed and approved the final version. DZ and JWB are the guarantors.

* I, the Submitting Author, have the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees.

Word count: 5,170

Abstract

Objective: To establish the risk and prevalence of long-term and serious harms of medical cannabis and cannabinoids for chronic pain.

Design: Systematic review and meta-analysis.

Data sources: MEDLINE, EMBASE, PsycInfo, and the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) from inception to April 1, 2020.

Study selection: Non-randomized studies reporting on harms of medical cannabis or cannabinoids in people living with chronic pain with ≥ 4 weeks of follow-up.

Data extraction and synthesis: A parallel guideline panel provided input on the design and interpretation of the systematic review, including selection of adverse events for consideration. Two reviewers, working independently and in duplicate, screened the search results, extracted data, and assessed risk of bias. We used random-effects models for all meta-analyses and the GRADE approach to evaluate the certainty of evidence.

Results: We identified 39 eligible studies that enrolled 12,143 patients with chronic pain. Very low certainty evidence suggests that adverse events are common (prevalence: 26.0%; 95% CI 13.2 to 41.2) among users of medical cannabis or cannabinoids for chronic pain, particularly any psychiatric adverse events (prevalence: 13.5%; 95% CI 2.6 to 30.6). However, very low certainty evidence indicates serious adverse events, adverse events leading to discontinuation, cognitive adverse events, accidents and injuries, and dependence and withdrawal syndrome are uncommon and typically occur in fewer than one in 20 patients. We compared studies with < 24 weeks and ≥ 24 weeks cannabis use and found more adverse events reported among studies with longer follow-up (test of interaction $p < 0.01$). Palmitoylethanolamide was usually associated with few to no adverse events. We found insufficient evidence addressing the harms of medical cannabis compared to other pain management options, such as opioids.

Conclusions: There is very low certainty evidence that adverse events are common among people living with chronic pain who use medical cannabis or cannabinoids, but that few patients experience serious adverse events. Future research should compare long-term and serious harms of medical cannabis with other management options for chronic pain, including opioids.

106 Systematic review registration <https://osf.io/25bxf>

107 What is already known on this topic

- 108 • Medical cannabis and cannabinoids are increasingly used for the management of chronic pain.
- 109 • Clinicians and patients considering medical cannabis or cannabinoids as a treatment option for
- 110 chronic pain require evidence on benefits and harms, including long-term and serious adverse
- 111 events to make informed decisions.

112 What this study adds

- 113 • Very low certainty evidence suggests that adverse events are common among people living with
- 114 chronic pain who use medical cannabis or cannabinoids, including psychiatric adverse events,
- 115 though serious adverse events, adverse events leading to discontinuation, cognitive adverse
- 116 events, accidents and injuries, and dependence and withdrawal syndrome are uncommon.
- 117 • There is insufficient evidence comparing the harms of medical cannabis or cannabinoids to other
- 118 pain management options, such as opioids.

119

120

Background

Chronic pain is the primary cause of health care resource use and disability among working adults in North America and Western Europe.^{1 2} The use of cannabis for the management of chronic pain is becoming increasingly common due to pressure to reduce opioid use, increased availability and changing legislation, shift in public attitudes and decreased stigma, and aggressive marketing.^{3 4} The two most-studied cannabinoids in medical cannabis are delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) and cannabidiol (CBD).⁵ THC binds to cannabinoid receptors type 1 and 2, is an analog to the endogenous cannabinoid, anandamide, and has shown psychoactive, analgesic, anti-inflammatory, antioxidant, antipruritic, anti-spasmodic, and muscle-relaxant activities. CBD directly interacts with various ion channels to produce analgesic, anti-inflammatory, anti-convulsant and anxiolytic activities, without the psychoactive effect of THC.⁵ Use of cannabis for therapeutic purposes, however, remains contentious due to its known and suspected harms.⁶⁻⁹

Though common adverse events caused by medical cannabis, including nausea, vomiting, headache, drowsiness, and dizziness, have been well documented in randomized controlled trials and reviews of randomized controlled trials,^{10 11} less is known about potentially uncommon but serious adverse events, particularly events that may occur with longer durations of medical cannabis use, such as dependence, withdrawal symptoms, and psychosis.^{4 12-17} Such adverse events are usually observed in large non-randomized studies that recruit larger numbers of patients and typically follow them for longer durations of time. Further, evidence from non-randomized studies may be more generalizable, since randomized controlled trials typically use strict eligibility criteria.

The objective of this systematic review and meta-analysis is to summarize the evidence on the risks and, when evidence on risk is not available, the prevalence of adverse events related to medical cannabis and cannabinoids from non-randomized studies. This evidence synthesis is part of the *BMJ Rapid Recommendations* project, a collaborative effort from the *MAGIC Evidence Ecosystem Foundation* (www.magicevidence.org) and the *BMJ*.¹⁸ A guideline panel helped define the study question and selected adverse events for review. The adverse events of interest include psychiatric and cognitive adverse events, injuries and accidents, and dependence and withdrawal. It is one of four systematic reviews that together informed a parallel guideline on medical cannabis and cannabinoids published on bmj.com and the *MAGICapp*.^{11 19-21} A parallel systematic review addressed evidence from randomized trials.¹¹

Methods

We report our systematic review in accordance with the PRISMA Harms Checklist.²² We registered the protocol for our review at OSF (<https://osf.io/25bxf>).²²

Guideline panel involvement

A guideline panel helped define the study question and selected the adverse events for review. The panel included nine content experts (two general internists, two family physicians, a pediatrician, a physiatrist, a pediatric anesthesiologist, a clinical pharmacologist, and a rheumatologist), nine methodologists (five of whom are also front-line clinicians), and three people living with chronic pain (one of whom used cannabinoids for medical purposes).

Patient and public involvement

Three patient partners were included as part of the guideline panel and contributed to the selection and prioritization of outcomes, protocol, and interpretation of review findings, and provided insight on values and preferences.

Search

A medical librarian searched MEDLINE, EMBASE, PsychInfo, and Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) from inception to April 1, 2020, with no restrictions on language, for non-randomized studies reporting on harms or adverse events of medical cannabis or cannabinoids for chronic pain (Appendix 1). We scanned reference lists of relevant reviews to identify any eligible studies not retrieved by our electronic search and solicited content experts from our panel for unpublished studies.

Study selection

Reviewers, working independently and in duplicate, reviewed titles and abstracts of search records and subsequently full texts of records found potentially eligible at the title and abstract screening stage. Reviewers resolved disagreements by discussion or by adjudication by a third reviewer (DZ).

We included all non-randomized studies that reported on any patient-important harm or adverse event associated with the use of any formulation of medical cannabis or cannabinoids in adults or children, living with chronic pain (pain lasting for ≥ 3 months) or a medical condition associated with chronic pain

(i.e., fibromyalgia, arthritis, multiple sclerosis, neuropathy, inflammatory bowel disease, stroke, or advanced cancer) or that compared adverse events associated with medical cannabis or cannabinoids with another pharmacologic or non-pharmacologic intervention. Based on input from the guideline panel, we excluded studies in which patients used cannabis for less than 4 weeks because we anticipated that four weeks would be the minimum amount of time after which we would reasonably expect to observe potential serious or long term harms associated with medical cannabis.²³ We looked for explicit statements or evidence that patients were experiencing chronic pain. We excluded studies in which: (1) fewer than 25 patients used medical cannabis or cannabinoids, (2) patients did not suffer from chronic pain or a condition that commonly causes chronic pain or more than 20% of patients reported using medical cannabis or cannabinoids for a condition other than chronic pain, (3) patients were using medical cannabis for recreational reasons, (4) only surrogate measures of patient-important harms and adverse effects (e.g., performance on cognitive tests, lab values) were reported, and (5) systematic reviews and other types of studies that did not describe primary data.

Data extraction and risk of bias

Reviewers, working independently and in duplicate and using a standardized and pilot-tested data collection form, extracted the following information from each eligible study: (1) study design, (2) patient characteristics (age, sex, condition/diagnosis), (3) characteristics of medical cannabis or cannabinoids (name of product, dose, and duration), and (4) number of patients that experienced adverse events, including all adverse events, serious adverse events, and withdrawal due to adverse events. We classified adverse events as serious based on the classification used in primary studies. For comparative studies, we collected results from models adjusted for confounders, when reported, and unadjusted models when results for adjusted models were not reported.

When studies reported the number of events rather than the number of patients experiencing adverse events, we only extracted the number of events if they were infrequent (the number of events accounted for less than 10% of the total number of study participants). For studies that reported on adverse events at multiple timepoints, we extracted data for the longest point of follow-up that included, at minimum, 80% of the patients recruited into the study. Reviewers resolved disagreements by discussion or by adjudication with a third reviewer (DZ).

We used the Cochrane-endorsed ROBINS-I tool to rate the risk of bias of studies as low, moderate, serious, or critical across seven domains: (1) bias due to confounding, (2) selection of patients into the

study, (3) classification of the intervention, (4) bias due to deviations from the intended intervention, (5) missing data, (6) measurement of outcomes, and (7) selection of reported results.²⁴ Appendix 2 presents additional details on the assessment of risk of bias. Studies were rated at low risk of bias overall when all domains were at low risk of bias; moderate risk of bias if all domains were rated at low or moderate risk of bias; at serious risk of bias when all domains were rated either at low, moderate, or serious risk of bias; and at critical risk of bias when one or more domains were rated as critical.

Data synthesis

In this review, we synthesize data on serious adverse events and adverse events that may emerge with longer duration of medical cannabis use for which data is typically not reported in randomized trials. Identified by a parallel BMJ Rapid Recommendations guideline panel as important, these patient-important outcomes included psychiatric and cognitive adverse events, injuries and accidents, and dependence and withdrawal. Data on all other adverse events reported in primary studies are available in an open-access database (<https://osf.io/ut36z/>).

Adverse events are reported as binary outcomes. For comparative studies, when possible, we present risk differences and associated 95% confidence intervals (95% CIs). Since there were only two eligible comparative studies each with different comparators, we did not perform meta-analysis. For single-arm studies, we pooled the proportion of patients experiencing adverse events of interest by first applying a Freeman-Tukey type arcsine square root transformation to stabilize the variance. Without this transformation, very high or very low prevalence estimates can produce confidence intervals that contain values lower than 0% or higher than 100%. All meta-analyses used DerSimonian-Laird random-effects models, which are conservative as they consider both within- and between-study variability.²⁵⁻²⁷ We evaluated heterogeneity for all pooled estimates through visual inspection of forest plots and calculation of tau-squared (τ^2), because some statistical tests of heterogeneity (I^2 and Cochrane's Q) can be misleading when sample sizes are large and CIs are therefore narrow.²⁸ For studies that reported estimates for all-cause adverse events and those deemed to be potentially related to cannabis use, we preferentially synthesized results for all adverse events.

For analyses for which we observed high clinical heterogeneity (i.e., substantial differences in the estimates of individual studies and minimal overlap in the confidence intervals), we presented results narratively.

We classified adverse events as serious based on the classification used in primary studies.

We performed tests of interaction to establish whether subgroups differed significantly from one another. We assessed the credibility of significant subgroup effects (test of interaction $p < 0.05$) using published criteria.^{29 30}

We performed all analyses using the ‘meta’ package in R (version 3.5.1, R Foundation for Statistical Computing).³¹

Certainty of evidence

We used the GRADE approach to rate the certainty of evidence.^{32 33} Based on GRADE guidance for using the ROBINS-I tool, evidence starts at high certainty and is downgraded by one level when the majority of the evidence comes from studies at moderate risk of bias, two levels when the majority of the evidence comes from studies at high risk of bias, and three levels when the majority of the evidence comes from studies rated at critical risk of bias.³² We additionally considered potential limitations due to indirectness if the population, intervention, or adverse events assessed in studies did not reflect the populations, interventions, or adverse events of interest, inconsistency if there was important unexplained differences in the results of studies, and imprecision if the upper and lower bounds of confidence intervals indicated appreciably different rates of adverse events. For assessing inconsistency and imprecision for the outcome all adverse events, based on feedback from the guideline panel, we deemed a 20% difference in the prevalence of all adverse evidence to be patient-important; a 10% difference for adverse events leading to discontinuation, serious adverse events, and psychiatric, cognitive, withdrawal and dependence, injuries; and a 3% difference for potentially fatal adverse events, such as suicides and motor vehicle accidents. We followed GRADE guidance for communicating our findings.³⁴ Guideline panel members interpreted the magnitude of adverse events and decided whether the observed prevalence of adverse events was sufficient to affect patients’ decisions to use medical cannabis or cannabinoids for chronic pain.

Results

Study selection

Our search yielded 17,178 unique records of which 39 were eligible for review (Figure 1, Appendix 3).³⁵⁻⁷³ Appendix 4 presents studies excluded at the full-text screening stage and accompanying reasons for exclusion.

Description of studies

Studies included 12,143 adults living with chronic pain and included a median of 100 (IQR 34 to 361) participants (Table 1). Most studies (30/39; 76.9%) were longitudinal in design. Eighteen studies (46.2 %) were conducted in Western Europe, fourteen (35.9%) in North America, six (15.4%) in Israel, and two (5.1%) in the United Kingdom. Ten studies (25.6%) were funded by industry alone or industry in combination with government and institutional funds; the remainder were funded either by governments, institutions, or not-for-profit organizations (n=9; 23.1%), did not receive funds (n=3; 7.7%), or did not report funding information (n=17; 43.6%).

Thirty studies (76.9%) reported on people living with chronic non-cancer pain, eight (n=20.5%) with mixed cancer and non-cancer chronic pain, and one (2.6%) with chronic cancer pain. All studies reported on adults. Sixteen studies reported on mixed types of herbal cannabis (e.g., buds for smoking, vaporizing, and ingesting, hashish, oils, extracts, edibles), nine on palmitoylethanolamide (PEA), four each on nabiximols and dronabinol, two on nabilone, one each on Trokie lozenges and extracts, and four did not report the type of medical cannabis used. One study reported on three types of medical cannabis (dronabinol, nabiximols, and mixed herbal) separately. The median duration of medical cannabis use was 24 weeks (IQR 12.0 to 33.8 weeks). Two studies were comparative: one study compared nabilone with gabapentin and another compared herbal cannabis with standard care.^{39 48} Studies reported a total of 525 unique adverse events.

Risk of bias

Appendix 5 presents the risk of bias of included studies. We rated all results at critical risk of bias except for the comparative results from two studies,^{39 48} which were rated at serious and moderate risk of bias. The primary limitation across studies was inadequate control for potential confounding either due to the absence of a control group or inadequate adjustment for confounders. A third of studies were rated at serious risk of bias for selection bias, primarily because they included prevalent users of medical cannabis. Such studies may underestimate the incidence of adverse events since patients that experience adverse events are more likely to discontinue medical cannabis early. Such studies may also include adverse events that may have been present at inception and that are unrelated to medical cannabis use.

All adverse events

Twenty longitudinal and two cross-sectional studies, including 4,108 patients, reported the number of patients experiencing one or more adverse events.^{36-43 46 47 54 56-60 62 64 65 69 70 73} Seven studies reported on PEA, five on mixed herbal cannabis, three each on nabilone and nabiximols, two on dronabinol, and one each on extracts and Trokie lozenges. The median duration of medical cannabis use was 24 weeks [IQR 12 to 32]. We observed substantial unexplained heterogeneity and so summarize the results descriptively (Appendices 6 to 9). The prevalence of any adverse event ranged between 0% to 92.1%. Studies with less than 24 weeks of cannabis use typically reported fewer adverse events than those with more than 24 weeks. Patients using PEA experienced no adverse events. The evidence was overall very uncertain due to risk of bias and inconsistency.

One study suggested that nabilone may reduce the risk of adverse events compared to gabapentin (-13.1%; 95% CI -26.2 to 0), but the certainty of evidence was very low due to risk of bias and imprecision (Table 2).

Adverse events leading to discontinuation

Twenty longitudinal studies, including 6,509 patients, reported on the number of patients that discontinued medical cannabis or cannabinoids due to adverse events.^{37 39 41-44 46-49 52 54 56 57 59 62 63 65 70 73} Eight studies reported on PEA, four studies on mixed herbal cannabis, three on nabiximols, two on nabilone, and one each on dronabinol and extracts, and one study did not report the type of medical cannabis used by patients. The median duration of cannabis use was 24 weeks [IQR 8.6 to 32]. We observed substantial unexplained heterogeneity and so summarize the results descriptively (Appendices 10 to 12). The prevalence of discontinuations due to adverse events ranged between 0% to 27.0%. Studies with less than 24 weeks of cannabis use typically reported fewer discontinuations than those with more than 24 weeks. Patients using PEA experienced no adverse events. The evidence was overall very uncertain due to risk of bias and inconsistency.

One study suggested herbal cannabis may increase the risk of adverse events leading to discontinuation compared to standard care without cannabis (4.7%; 95% CI 1.8 to 7.5). Another study suggested that nabilone may reduce the risk of adverse events leading to discontinuation compared to gabapentin (-9.4%; 95% CI -18.5 to -0.2). The certainty of evidence was low to very low due to risk of bias and imprecision.

Serious adverse events

Twenty-two longitudinal and two cross-sectional studies, including 4,273 patients, reported on the number of patients experiencing one or more serious adverse events.^{35-37 39-43 46 48 49 52 54-60 62 65 70 71 73} Eight studies reported on mixed herbal cannabis, eight on PEA, two each on nabilone and nabiximols each, and one study each on dronabinol, extracts, and Trokie lozenges, and one study did not report the type of cannabis used. The median duration of medical cannabis or cannabinoid use was 24 weeks (IQR 12 to 32), and few patients experienced serious adverse events (1.2%; 95% CI 0.1 to 3.1; $I^2=91\%$) (Figure 2) (Appendices 13 to 15). There was a statistically significant subgroup effect across different types of medical cannabis though serious adverse events appeared consistently uncommon among different types (low credibility). The certainty of evidence was very low overall due to serious risk of bias.

One study suggested herbal cannabis increased the risk of serious adverse events compared to standard care without cannabis (1.5%; 95% CI -8.3 to 20.2). Another study found use of nabilone vs. gabapentin showed no difference in the risk of serious adverse events. The certainty of evidence was low to very low for both studies due to risk of bias and imprecision.

Psychiatric adverse events

Eleven longitudinal and two cross-sectional studies, including 6,600 patients, reported on any psychiatric adverse events, including psychiatric disorders, suicide, suicidal thoughts, depression, mania, hallucinations, delusions, paranoia, anxiety, and euphoria (Appendices 16 to 25).^{35-37 43 47 48 60 63 67 68 70} Five studies reported on mixed herbal cannabis, four on nabiximols, one each on dronabinol, nabilone, and mixed types and one study did not specify the type of medical cannabis. The median duration of cannabis use across studies was 52 weeks (IQR 20 to 52). Approximately one in seven medical cannabis users experienced one or more psychiatric disorders or adverse events (13.5%; 95% CI 2.6 to 30.6; $I^2=98\%$). The most frequently occurring psychiatric adverse events were paranoia (5.6%; 9% CI 0 to 19.2; $I^2=85\%$) and anxiety (7.4%; 95% CI 0 to 26.9; $I^2=99\%$). The certainty of evidence was very low due to risk of bias, inconsistency (for psychiatric disorders and paranoia), and imprecision (for psychiatric disorder, paranoia, and anxiety).

One study suggested that herbal cannabis may result in a trivial to moderate increase in the risk for psychiatric disorders, mania, hallucinations, depression, paranoia, anxiety, and euphoria and a reduction in the risk for suicides and delusions, compared with standard care without cannabis, though the certainty of evidence was low to very low due to risk of bias and imprecision.

Cognitive and attentional adverse events

Eleven longitudinal studies, including 6,257 patients, reported on cognitive adverse events, including memory impairment, confusion, disorientation, and impaired attention (Appendices 26 to 29).^{35-37 43 47 48}

^{60 63 67 68 70} Five studies reported on herbal cannabis, three on nabiximols, three on mixed types of cannabis, and one each on dronabinol and nabilone. The median duration of cannabis use was 52 weeks (IQR 24 to 52). The prevalence of cognitive adverse events ranged from 1.6% (95% CI 0.6 to 3.0; $I^2=88\%$) to 5.3% (95% CI 2.1 to 9.6; $I^2=96\%$) for disorientation and memory impairment, respectively. The certainty of evidence was very low due to risk of bias.

One study suggests herbal cannabis may slightly increase the risk for memory impairment and disturbances in attention compared to standard care without cannabis, but reduce the risk for confusion, though the certainty of evidence was low to very low due to risk of bias and imprecision.

Accidents and injuries

One longitudinal study, including 431 patients, reported on accidents and injuries in patients using mixed herbal cannabis for 52 weeks (Appendices 30 & 31).⁴⁸ This study suggests herbal cannabis used for medical purposes may slightly increase the risk of motor vehicle accidents (0.5%; 95% CI -0.4 to 1.4) but may not increase the risk of falls (0%; 95% CI -2.8 to 2.9). The certainty of evidence was low due to risk of bias.

Dependence and withdrawal

Four longitudinal and one cross-sectional study, including 2,248 patients, reported on dependence-related adverse events, including dependence (one study reported on 'abuse' based on unspecified criteria, one study reported on 'problematic use' using the Alcohol Use Disorder and Associated Disabilities Interview Schedule–Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders–Fourth Edition (AUDADIS-IV)⁷⁴, and one study reported on 'dependence' using the Alcohol, Smoking, and Substance Involvement Screening Test⁷⁵), withdrawal symptoms (defined as one or moderate or severe withdrawal symptoms including sleep difficulties, anxiety, irritability, and appetite disturbance), and withdrawal syndrome (two studies that used unspecified criteria) (Appendices 32 to 34).^{48 53 56 67 70} Two studies reported on herbal cannabis, one each on nabiximols and nabilone, and one did not specify type of medical cannabis used by patients. Follow-up ranged from 12 to 52 weeks. Though dependence and withdrawal syndrome were uncommon with a prevalence of 4.4% (95% CI 0.0 to 19.9; $I^2=99\%$) and 2.1%

(95% CI 0 to 8.2; $I^2=89\%$), respectively, withdrawal symptoms were common (67.8%; 95% CI 64.1 to 71.4). The certainty of evidence was very low due to risk of bias, inconsistency, imprecision (for dependence), and indirectness due to definitions of outcomes in studies were too vague to confidently distinguish between dependence, addiction, withdrawal symptoms, and withdrawal syndrome.

One study suggested that herbal cannabis compared to standard care may slightly increase the risk of withdrawal syndrome (0.5%; 95% CI -0.4 to 1.4) but the certainty of evidence was low due to risk of bias.

Discussion

Main findings

Our systematic review and meta-analysis provides evidence that adverse events are common among people living with chronic pain who use medical cannabis or cannabinoids, with approximately one in four experiencing at least one adverse event—though the certainty of evidence is very low and the true prevalence of adverse events may be substantially different. In contrast, serious adverse events, adverse events leading to discontinuation, cognitive adverse events, accidents and injuries, and dependence and withdrawal syndrome are uncommon. We compared studies with <24 weeks and ≥ 24 weeks cannabis use and found more adverse events reported among studies with longer follow-up. This may be explained by increased tolerance (tachyphylaxis) with prolonged exposure, necessitating increases in dosage with consequent increased risk of harms. PEA, compared to other formulations of medical cannabis, may result in the fewest adverse events. Though adverse events appear to be common, few patients discontinued medical cannabis due to adverse events suggesting that most adverse events are transient and/or outweighed by perceived benefits.

Our review represents the most comprehensive review of evidence from non-randomized studies addressing adverse events of medical cannabis or cannabinoid use in people living with chronic pain. While several previous reviews have summarized the evidence on short-term and common adverse events of medical cannabis reported in randomized trials, such as oral discomfort, dizziness, and headaches, our review focuses on serious and rare adverse events—the choice of which was informed by a panel including patients, clinicians, and methodologists—and non-randomized studies, which can follow larger numbers of patients for longer periods of time and thus may detect adverse events that are infrequent or that are associated with longer durations of cannabis use.^{10 76-80} A parallel systematic review of evidence from randomized controlled trials found no evidence to inform long-term harms of medical cannabis as no eligible trial followed patients for more than 5.5 months.¹¹ One previously

published review that included non-randomized studies searched the literature until 2007, included studies exploring medical cannabis for any indication (excluding synthetic cannabinoids) of which only two enrolled people living with chronic pain.¹² The review also did not synthesize adverse event data from non-randomized studies.¹² Unlike previous reviews, we focused exclusively on medical cannabis for chronic pain and excluded recreational cannabis, because cannabis used for recreational purposes often contains higher concentrations of tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) than medical cannabis. We also focused on chronic pain because this patient population may be susceptible to different adverse events. Depression and anxiety, for example, are commonly occurring comorbidities of chronic pain, which may be exacerbated by cannabis.¹⁵⁻¹⁷

Strengths and limitations

Strengths of this systematic review and meta-analysis include a comprehensive search for non-randomized studies, explicit eligibility criteria, screening of studies and collection of data in duplicate to increase reliability, and use of the GRADE approach to evaluate the certainty of evidence.

Our review is limited by the non-comparative design of most studies, which precludes confident inferences regarding the proportion of adverse events that can be attributed to medical cannabis or cannabinoids and the magnitude by which medical cannabis may increase or decrease the risk of adverse events compared to other pain management options. Though adverse events appear common among medical cannabis users, it is possible that other management options for chronic pain, particularly opioids, may be associated with more (and more severe) adverse events.⁸¹ Partly due to the non-comparative design of most studies, nearly all results included in our review were at serious or critical risk of bias for confounding, either due to the absence of a control group or due to insufficient adjustment for important confounders. Further, a third of studies were at high risk of selection bias, primarily because they included prevalent cannabis users. In such studies, the prevalence of adverse events may be underestimated. Our review provides limited evidence on the harms of medical cannabis beyond one year of use since most studies reported adverse events for less than one year of follow-up.

We observed some inconsistency for many adverse events of interest and substantial inconsistency for all adverse events and adverse events leading to discontinuation. We downgraded the certainty of evidence when we observed important inconsistency and we did not present estimates from meta-analyses for all adverse events and adverse events leading to discontinuation due to substantial inconsistency.

Sixteen of 39 studies reported on herbal medical cannabis, some of which were consumed by smoking or vaporizing, and may be associated with different adverse events (e.g. respiratory) than other formulations of medical cannabis. We attempted to perform subgroup analyses based on the type of medical cannabis. Results for subgroups, however, lacked credibility due to inconsistency and/or imprecision.

Clinicians and patients may be more inclined to use medical cannabis or cannabinoids for pain relief if adverse events are mild; however, the evidence on whether adverse events are transient, life threatening, or the extent to which they impact quality of life is limited. While more than half of studies reported on the proportion of adverse events that were serious, criteria for ascertaining severity were rarely reported. None of the included studies reported the duration for which patients experienced adverse events. Further, most primary studies did not report adequate details on methods for the ascertainment of adverse events, including definitions or diagnostic criteria. The two studies that reported on withdrawal syndrome, for example, did not provide diagnostic criteria.^{48 56} However, the DSM-5 requires ≥ 3 of 7 withdrawal symptoms to be present within a week of stopping cannabis use to meet a diagnosis of cannabis withdrawal syndrome.⁸² It is therefore reasonable that people living with chronic pain that use medical cannabis would be more likely to experience withdrawal symptoms vs. withdrawal syndrome.

While children and youth account for approximately 15% of all chronic pain patients, we did not identify any evidence addressing the harms of medical cannabis in this population.⁸³ As such, the extent to which our findings are generalizable to pediatric populations is uncertain. Although there is evidence that cannabis use during youth is associated with increased risk of acute psychotic disorders, particularly acute psychosis,⁸⁴ such studies have explored use of recreational cannabis that contains greater amounts of THC than is typically seen in medical preparations. Further, the population of patients with chronic pain on which the studies report may not be representative of all patients with chronic pain—particularly rare conditions that cause chronic pain.

Finally, we excluded studies from meta-analyses when they did not explicitly report the adverse events of interest to our panel members. This may have overestimated the prevalence of adverse events if the adverse events of interest were not observed in the studies in which they were not reported. This was, however, not possible to confirm because methods for the collection and reporting of adverse event

data across studies were variable (e.g., active monitoring vs. passive surveillance; collecting data on specific adverse events vs. all adverse events) and poorly described in study reports.

Implications

Our systematic review and meta-analysis shows that evidence regarding long-term and serious harms of medical cannabis or cannabinoids is insufficient—an issue with important implications for patients and clinicians considering this management option for chronic pain. While the evidence suggests that adverse events are common in patients using medical cannabis for chronic pain, serious adverse events appear uncommon, which suggests that the potential benefits of medical cannabis or cannabinoids (although very modest) may outweigh potential harms for some patients.^{11 21}

Clinicians and patients considering medical cannabis should be aware that more adverse events were reported among studies with longer follow-up, necessitating long term follow-up of patients and re-evaluation of pain treatment options. Our findings also have implications for the choice of medical cannabis. We found PEA, for example, to consistently be associated with few or no adverse events across studies, though the evidence on the efficacy of PEA is limited.¹¹

We found very limited evidence comparing medical cannabis or cannabinoids with other pain management options. Other pharmacological treatments for chronic pain, such as gabapentinoids, antidepressants, and opioids, may be associated with more (and more serious) adverse events.⁸⁵⁻⁸⁷ To guide patients' and clinicians' decisions on medical cannabis for chronic pain, future research should compare the harms of medical cannabis and cannabinoids with other pain management options, including opioids, ideally beyond one year of use, and adjust results for confounders. Future research could also explore whether the harms of medical cannabis vary depending on the type of chronic pain.

Our review highlights the need for standardization of reporting of adverse events in non-randomized studies since such studies represent a critical source of data on long-term and infrequently occurring harms. To enhance the interpretability of adverse event data, future studies should also report the duration and severity of adverse events, since these factors are important to patients' decisions.

A valuable output of our systematic review is an open-source database of over 500 unique adverse events reported to date in non-randomized studies of medical cannabis or cannabinoids for chronic pain with corresponding assessments of risk of bias. This database was compiled in duplicate by trained and calibrated data extractors and is freely available to those interested in further analyzing the prevalence

of different types of adverse or to those interested in expanding the database to include adverse events in patients using medical cannabis or cannabinoids for other indications.

Conclusion

Our systematic review and meta-analysis found very low certainty evidence that suggests that adverse events are common among people living with chronic pain using medical cannabis or cannabinoids, but that serious adverse events, adverse events causing discontinuation, cognitive adverse events, motor vehicle accidents, falls, and dependence and withdrawal syndrome are uncommon. We also found very low certainty evidence that longer duration of use was associated more adverse events and that PEA, compared with other types of medical cannabis, may result in few or no adverse events. Future research should compare the risks of adverse events of medical cannabis and cannabinoids with alternative pain management options, including opioids, and adjust for potential confounders.

511

512 Tables

Table 1: Study characteristics

Study	Design	Country	Condition	Cannabis/ comparator	Dose	# of participants	Duration of cannabis use (weeks)
Ware, 2003 ³⁵	cross-sectional*	Canada	mixed non-cancer pain	mixed herbal	frequency: rarely (n=9), weekly (n=8), daily (n=5), >once daily (n=7) dose: 1-2 puffs (n=4), 3-4 puffs (n=13), whole joint (n=8), more than one joint (n=4)	32	NR
Lynch, 2006 ³⁶	longitudinal*	Canada	mixed non-cancer pain	mixed herbal	mean: 2.5 g/day	30	mean: 94.4
Rog, 2007 ³⁷	longitudinal*	UK	multiple sclerosis	nabiximols	mean: 7.5 sprays/day	63	66.1
Weber, 2009 ³⁸	longitudinal*†	Germany	mixed non-cancer pain	dronabinol	median: 7.5 mg/day	172	mean: 31
Bestard, 2011 ³⁹	longitudinal*	Canada	peripheral neuropathic pain	nabilone	mean: 3.0 mg/day	104	24
				gabapentin	mean: 2.3 g/day	107	
Fiz, 2011 ⁴⁰	cross-sectional*	Spain	fibromyalgia	mixed herbal	~1 to 2 cigarettes or spoonful daily (n=12) once every 2 to 4 days (n=5), less than twice a week (n=3), or occasionally (n=8)	28	<52 (n=11), 52 to 156 (n=9), >156 weeks (n=8)
Dominguez, 2012 ⁴¹	longitudinal*	Spain	lumbosciatica	PEA	300 mg bid	64	4
Gatti, 2012 ⁴²	longitudinal††	Italy	mixed cancer and non-cancer pain	PEA	600 mg bid three weeks; 600 mg/day for four weeks	564	7
Toth, 2012 ⁴³	longitudinal*†	Canada	diabetic peripheral neuropathy	nabilone	mean: 2.85 mg/day	37	4
Schifilliti, 2014 ⁴⁴	longitudinal††	Italy	diabetic neuropathy	PEA	300 mg bid	30	8.6
Storr, 2014 ⁴⁵	cross-sectional*	Canada	Crohn's disease (n=42), ulcerative colitis (n=10), indeterminate colitis (n=4)	mixed herbal	NR	56	<4 (n=3), 4 to 24 (n=9), 24 to 52 (n=5), >52 (n=32)
Del Giorno, 2015 ⁴⁶	longitudinal††	Italy	fibromyalgia	PEA	600 mg bid first month; 300 mg bid in the next 2 months	35	12
Hoggart, 2015 ⁴⁷	longitudinal††	UK, Czech Republic, Romania, Belgium, Canada	diabetic neuropathy	nabiximols	median: 6 to 8 sprays/day	380	median: 35.6
Ware, 2015 ⁴⁸	longitudinal*†	Canada	mixed non-cancer pain	mixed herbal	median: 2.5 g/day	215	52

				standard care		216	
Haroutounian, 2016 ⁴⁹	longitudinal*	Israel	mixed cancer and non-cancer pain	mixed herbal	mean: 43.2 g/month	206	30
	longitudinal*				Capsule: 10 mg /8 to 10 hours		
Bellnier, 2017 ⁵⁰		US	mixed cancer and non-cancer pain	mixed herbal	Vapor pen inhaler for breakthrough pain: 2 mg THC, 0.1 mg CBD; 1 to 5 puffs every 15 minutes until pain relief; could be used every 4 to 6 hours	29	12
Cranford, 2017 ⁵¹	cross-sectional*	US	mixed non-cancer pain	NR	0 (n=69), <1/8 oz/week (n=130), 1/8 to 1/4 oz/week (n=156), 1/4 to 1/2 oz/week (n=179), 1/2 to 1 oz/week (n=122), 1 or more oz/week (n=115)	775	NR
Fanelli, 2017 ⁵²	longitudinal††	Italy	mixed cancer and non-cancer pain	mixed herbal	mean: 69.5 mg/day bediol; 67.0 mg/day bedrocan	341	mean: 14.01
Feingold, 2017 ⁵³	cross-sectional*	Israel	mixed cancer and non-cancer pain	mixed herbal	NR	406	NR
Paladini, 2017 ⁵⁴	longitudinal††	Italy	failed back surgery syndrome	PEA	600 mg bid for one month; 600 mg/day for one month	35	8
Passavanti, 2017 ⁵⁵	longitudinal††	Italy	lower back pain	PEA	600 mg bid	30	24
Schmrigk, 2017 ⁵⁶	longitudinal*†	Germany, Austria	multiple sclerosis	dronabinol	range: 7.5 to 15 mg/day	209	32
Chirchiglia, 2018 ⁵⁷	longitudinal††	Italy	lower back pain	PEA	1.2 g/day	100	4
Crowley, 2018 ⁵⁸	longitudinal*	US	mixed non-cancer pain	Trokie lozenges	NR	35	4 to 60
Habib, 2018 ⁵⁹	longitudinal*	Israel	fibromyalgia	mixed herbal	mean: 26 g/month	26	mean: 41.6
Anderson, 2019 ⁶⁰	longitudinal*	US	cancer pain	mixed herbal	NR	1120	16
Bonar, 2019 ⁶¹	cross-sectional††	US	mixed non-cancer pain	NR	0 (n=95), <1/8 oz/week (n=126), 1/8 to 1/4 oz/week (n=158), 1/4 to 1/2 oz/week (n=174), 1/2 to 1 oz/week (n=119), 1 or more oz/week (n=119)	790	NR
Cervigni, 2019 ⁶²	longitudinal†	Italy	interstitial cystitis/bladder pain syndrome	PEA	400 mg m-PEA plus 40 mg polydatin bid for 3 months, od for 3 months	32	24
Cremer-Schaeffer, 2019 ⁶³	longitudinal††	Germany	mixed cancer and non-cancer pain	dronabinol	NR	2017	52
				mixed herbal	NR	656	
				nabiximols	NR	393	
Lejczak, 2019 ⁶⁴	longitudinal†	France	mixed cancer and non-cancer pain	dronabinol	range: 2.5 to 30 mg/day	148	range: 4 to 24 weeks
Loi, 2019 ⁶⁵	longitudinal*	Italy	endometriosis	PEA	600 mg/bid for 10 days; 400 mg m-PEA plus 40 mg polydatin bid	28	12.9
Naftali, 2019 ⁶⁶	longitudinal*	Israel	inflammatory bowel disease	mixed herbal	mean: 31 g/month	127	median: 176

mean: 21 g/day THC; 170 g/day CBD							
Perron, 2019 ⁶⁷	cross-sectional*	US	mixed non-cancer pain	NR	daily (n=580), weekly (n=85)	618	≥12
Sagy, 2019 ⁶⁸	longitudinal††	Israel	mixed cancer and non-cancer pain	mixed herbal	median: 1000 mg/day cannabis	239	24
Sinclair, 2019 ⁶⁹	cross-sectional*	Australia	endometriosis	mixed herbal	median: 140 mg/day THC; 39 mg/day CBD less than once per week (n=12), once per week (n=6), two to six times per week (n=9), daily or multiple times per day (n=21)	48	NR
Ueberall, 2019 ⁷⁰	longitudinal*	Germany	low back pain (n=234), failed back surgery syndrome (n=148), shoulder/neck pain (n=91), post-herpetic neuralgia (n=72), peripheral diabetic neuropathy (n=56), brachial plexus injury (n=48), lumbar spinal stenosis (n=38), cancer (n=31), fibromyalgia (n=26), peripheral/focal nerve lesions (n=22), phantom pain (n=19), osteoarthritis (n=15)	nabiximols	mean: 7.1 sprays/day	800	12
Vigil, 2017 ⁷¹	longitudinal*	US	mixed non-cancer pain	NR	NR	37	mean: 82.4
Yassin, 2019 ⁷²	longitudinal††	Israel	fibromyalgia	mixed herbal	20 to 30 g/month	31	24
Giorgi, 2020 ⁷³	longitudinal††	Italy	fibromyalgia	extracts	10 to 30 drops/day; no more than 120 drops/day	102	24

NR=not reported

*Patient-report

†Clinician-report

††NR

513

514

515

Table 2: Prevalence of adverse events from non-comparative studies

Outcome	Number of studies	Number of participants	Duration of follow-up (weeks)	Prevalence % (95% CI)	I ² (%)	Certainty	Reasons for downgrading
All adverse events	22	4,108	4 to 94	The prevalence of adverse events ranged between 0% to 92.1%. Studies with less than 24 weeks of cannabis use typically reported fewer adverse events than those with more than 24 weeks. Patients using PEA experienced no adverse events. The evidence was overall very uncertain due to risk of bias and inconsistency.		very low	risk of bias (3 levels), inconsistency
Adverse events causing discontinuation	20	6,509	4 to 66	The prevalence of discontinuations due to adverse events ranged between 0% to 27.0%. Studies with less than 24 weeks of cannabis use typically reported fewer discontinuations than those with more than 24 weeks. Patients using PEA experienced no adverse events. The evidence was overall very uncertain due to risk of bias and inconsistency.		very low	risk of bias (3 levels), inconsistency
Serious adverse events	24	4,273	4 to 94	1.2 (0.1 to 3.1)	91	very low	risk of bias (3 levels)
Psychiatric adverse events							
Psychiatric disorder	4	1,458	12 to 66	13.5 (2.6 to 30.6)	98	very low	risk of bias (3 levels), inconsistency, imprecision
Suicide	1	215	52	0 (0 to 0.8)	NA	very low	risk of bias (3 levels)
Suicidal thoughts	1	3,066	52	0.1 (0 to 0.5)	44	very low	risk of bias (3 levels)
Depression	6	4,144	12 to 66	1.7 (0.9 to 2.7)	71	very low	risk of bias (3 levels)
Mania	1	215	52	0.5 (0 to 2)	NA	very low	risk of bias (3 levels)
Hallucinations	6	3,583	24 to 66	0.5 (0.1 to 1.3)	69	very low	risk of bias (3 levels)
Delusions	4	3,281	52	0.4 (0.2 to 0.6)	0	very low	risk of bias (3 levels)
Paranoia	3	277	52 to 94; one cross-sectional study	5.6 (0 to 19.2)	85	very low	risk of bias (3 levels), inconsistency, imprecision

Anxiety	5	1,695	12 to 94; two cross-sectional studies	7.4 (0 to 26.9)	99	very low	risk of bias (3 levels), imprecision
Euphoria	7	4,501	4 to 66	2.1 (0.9 to 3.8)	96	very low	risk of bias (3 levels)
Cognitive adverse events							
Memory impairment	6	4,484	4 to 176	5.3 (2.1 to 9.6)	96	very low	risk of bias (3 levels)
Confusion	7	1,654	4 to 176	1.8 (0.3 to 4.2)	81	very low	risk of bias (3 levels)
Disorientation	6	4,485	12 to 52	1.6 (0.6 to 3.0)	88	very low	risk of bias (3 levels)
Attention disorder or deficit	8	5,477	12 to 82	3.4 (1.3 to 6.3)	95	very low	risk of bias (3 levels)
Accidents and injuries							
Falls	1	215	52	2.3 (0.7 to 4.9)	NA	very low	risk of bias (3 levels)
Motor vehicle accidents	1	215	52	0.5 (0 to 2.0)	NA	very low	risk of bias (3 levels)
Dependence and withdrawal							
Dependence	3	1,824	12; one cross-sectional study	4.4 (0.0 to 19.9)	99	very low	risk of bias (3 levels), inconsistency, imprecision, indirectness
Withdrawal syndrome	2	424	32 to 52	2.1 (0 to 8.2)	89	very low	risk of bias (3 levels), indirectness
Withdrawal symptoms	1	618	NA; cross-sectional	67.8 (64.1 to 71.4)	NA	very low	risk of bias (3 levels), indirectness

Table 3: Risk differences for adverse events from comparative studies

Outcome	Exposure	Number of studies	Number of participants	Follow-up (weeks)	Risk with cannabis (/1000)	Risk with comparator (/1000)	Risk difference (95% CI)	Certainty	Reasons for downgrading
All adverse events	Nabilone vs. gabapentin	1	220	24	404	534	-13.1% (-26.2 to 0)	Very low	Risk of bias (2 levels), imprecision
Adverse events causing discontinuation	Herbal cannabis vs. standard care	1	431	52	47	0	4.7% (1.8 to 7.5)	Low	Risk of bias (2 levels),
	Nabilone vs. gabapentin	1	220	24	96	190	-9.4% (-18.5 to -0.2)	Very low	Risk of bias (2 levels), imprecision
Serious	Herbal cannabis vs. standard care	1	431	52	130	194	1.5% (-8.3 to 20.2) *	Low	Risk of bias, imprecision
	Nabilone vs. gabapentin	1	220	24	0	0	0% (0 to 0)	Very low	Risk of bias (2 levels), imprecision
Psychiatric disorder	Herbal cannabis vs. standard care	1	431	52	219	97	16.9% (5.8 to 40.5) †	Very low	Risk of bias (2 levels), imprecision
Suicide	Herbal cannabis vs. standard care	1	431	52	0	5	-0.5% (-1.4 to 0.4)	Low	Risk of bias (2 levels)
Mania	Herbal cannabis vs. standard care	1	431	52	5	0	0.5% (-0.4 to 1.4)	Low	Risk of bias (2 levels)
Hallucinations	Herbal cannabis vs. standard care	1	431	52	5	0	0.5% (-0.4 to 1.4)	Low	Risk of bias (2 levels)
Delusions	Herbal cannabis vs. standard care	1	431	52	0	5	-0.5% (-1.4 to 0.4)	Low	Risk of bias (2 levels)
Depression	Herbal cannabis vs. standard care	1	431	52	47	46	0.1% (-4 to 4)	Low	Risk of bias (2 levels)
Paranoia	Herbal cannabis vs. standard care	1	431	52	9	0	0.9% (-0.4 to 2.2)	Low	Risk of bias (2 levels)
Anxiety	Herbal cannabis vs. standard care	1	431	52	47	9	3.8% (0.6 to 6.8)	Low	Risk of bias (2 levels)
Euphoria	Herbal cannabis vs. standard care	1	431	52	42	0	4.2% (1.5 to 6.9)	Low	Risk of bias (2 levels)

Memory impairment	Herbal cannabis vs. standard care	1	431	52	19	0	1.9% (0.1 to 3.7)	Low	Risk of bias (2 levels)
Confusion	Herbal cannabis vs. standard care	1	431	52	14	19	-0.5% (-2.8 to 1.9)	Low	Risk of bias (2 levels)
Disturbance in attention	Herbal cannabis vs. standard care	1	431	52	23	9	1.4% (-1 to 3.8)	Low	Risk of bias (2 levels)
Falls	Herbal cannabis vs. standard care	1	431	52	23	23	0% (-2.8 to 2.9)	Low	Risk of bias (2 levels)
Motor vehicle accidents	Herbal cannabis vs. standard care	1	431	52	5	0	0.5% (-0.4 to 1.4)	Low	Risk of bias (2 levels)
Withdrawal syndrome	Herbal cannabis vs. standard care	1	431	52	5	0	0.5% (-0.4 to 1.4)	Very low	Risk of bias (2 levels),
* Risk difference calculated from adjusted incident rate ratio reported in study.									
† Risk difference calculated from unadjusted incident rate ratio reported in study.									

Figures

Figure 1: Study selection process

Figure 2: Forest plot of the meta-analysis for all adverse events stratified by type of medical cannabis

References

1. Mills SEE, Nicolson KP, Smith BH. Chronic pain: a review of its epidemiology and associated factors in population-based studies. *Br J Anaesth* 2019;123(2):e273-e83. doi: 10.1016/j.bja.2019.03.023 [published Online First: 2019/05/14]
2. Mills SEE, van Hecke O, Smith BH. Handbook of Pain and Palliative Care: Biopsychosocial and Environmental Approaches for the Life Course. 2019.
3. Keyhani S, Steigerwald S, Ishida J, et al. Risks and Benefits of Marijuana Use: A National Survey of U.S. Adults. *Ann Intern Med* 2018;169(5):282-90. doi: 10.7326/m18-0810 [published Online First: 2018/07/25]
4. Dai H, Richter KP. A National Survey of Marijuana Use Among US Adults With Medical Conditions, 2016-2017. *JAMA Netw Open* 2019;2(9):e1911936. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2019.11936 [published Online First: 2019/09/21]
5. National Academies of Sciences E, Medicine, Health, et al. The National Academies Collection: Reports funded by National Institutes of Health. The Health Effects of Cannabis and Cannabinoids: The Current State of Evidence and Recommendations for Research. Washington (DC): National Academies Press (US)
- Copyright 2017 by the National Academy of Sciences. All rights reserved. 2017.
6. Carr D, Schatman M. Cannabis for Chronic Pain: Not Ready for Prime Time. *American Journal of Public Health* 2019;109(1):50-51. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2018.304593 [published Online First: 2019/01/]
7. Ziemianski D, Capler R, Tekanoff R, et al. Cannabis in medicine: a national educational needs assessment among Canadian physicians. *BMC Med Educ* 2015;15:52. doi: 10.1186/s12909-015-0335-0 [published Online First: 2015/04/19]
8. Kahan M, Srivastava A. Is there a role for marijuana in medical practice? No. *Can Fam Physician* 2007;53(1):22-5. [published Online First: 2007/09/18]
9. Ware MA. Is there a role for marijuana in medical practice? Yes. *Can Fam Physician* 2007;53(1):22-5. [published Online First: 2007/09/18]
10. Deshpande A, Mailis-Gagnon A, Zoheiry N, et al. Efficacy and adverse effects of medical marijuana for chronic noncancer pain: Systematic review of randomized controlled trials. *Can Fam Physician* 2015;61(8):e372-81. [published Online First: 2015/10/28]
11. Wang L, Hong P, May C, et al. Medical cannabis for chronic pain: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials. *BMJ* 2020;Submitted
12. Wang T, Collet JP, Shapiro S, et al. Adverse effects of medical cannabinoids: a systematic review. *Cmaj* 2008;178(13):1669-78. doi: 10.1503/cmaj.071178 [published Online First: 2008/06/19]
13. Whiting PF, Wolff RF, Deshpande S, et al. Cannabinoids for Medical Use: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Jama* 2015;313(24):2456-73. doi: 10.1001/jama.2015.6358 [published Online First: 2015/06/24]
14. Hill KP, Hurley-Welljams-Dorof WM. Low to moderate quality evidence demonstrates the potential benefits and adverse events of cannabinoids for certain medical indications. *Evid Based Med* 2016;21(1):17. doi: 10.1136/ebmed-2015-110264 [published Online First: 2015/10/23]
15. Bair MJ, Robinson RL, Katon W, et al. Depression and pain comorbidity: a literature review. *Arch Intern Med* 2003;163(20):2433-45. doi: 10.1001/archinte.163.20.2433 [published Online First: 2003/11/12]
16. Magni G, Marchetti M, Moreschi C, et al. Chronic musculoskeletal pain and depressive symptoms in the National Health and Nutrition Examination. I. Epidemiologic follow-up study. *Pain* 1993;53(2):163-8. doi: 10.1016/0304-3959(93)90076-2 [published Online First: 1993/05/01]

17. Wilson KG, Eriksson MY, D'Eon JL, et al. Major depression and insomnia in chronic pain. *Clin J Pain* 2002;18(2):77-83. doi: 10.1097/00002508-200203000-00002 [published Online First: 2002/03/08]
18. Siemieniuk RA, Agoritsas T, Macdonald H, et al. Introduction to BMJ Rapid Recommendations. *Bmj* 2016;354:i5191. doi: 10.1136/bmj.i5191 [published Online First: 2016/09/30]
19. Zeng L, Lytvyn L, Wang X, et al. Values and preferences towards medical cannabis among patients with chronic pain: A mixed methods systematic review. *BMJ* 2020;Submitted
20. Noori A, Miroshnychenko A, Shergill Y, et al. Opioid-Sparing effects of medical cannabis for chronic pain: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized and observational studies. *BMJ* 2020;Submitted
21. Busse J, Vankrunkelsven P, Zeng L, et al. Medical cannabis for chronic pain: a clinical practice guideline. *BMJ* 2020;Submitted.
22. Zorzela L, Loke YK, Ioannidis JP, et al. PRISMA harms checklist: improving harms reporting in systematic reviews. *Bmj* 2016;352:i157. doi: 10.1136/bmj.i157 [published Online First: 2016/02/03]
23. Busse JW, Bartlett SJ, Dougados M, et al. Optimal Strategies for Reporting Pain in Clinical Trials and Systematic Reviews: Recommendations from an OMERACT 12 Workshop. *J Rheumatol* 2015;42(10):1962-70. doi: 10.3899/jrheum.141440 [published Online First: 2015/05/17]
24. Sterne JA, Hernán MA, Reeves BC, et al. ROBINS-I: a tool for assessing risk of bias in non-randomised studies of interventions. *Bmj* 2016;355:i4919. doi: 10.1136/bmj.i4919 [published Online First: 2016/10/14]
25. Freeman MF, Tukey JW. Transformations related to the angular and the square root. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 1950:607-11.
26. DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. *Controlled clinical trials* 1986;7(3):177-88.
27. Murad M, Montori V, Ioannidis J, et al. Fixed-effects and random-effects models. *Users' guide to the medical literature A manual for evidence-based clinical practice McGraw-Hill, 3rd ed New York, America* 2015
28. Rücker G, Schwarzer G, Carpenter JR, et al. Undue reliance on I(2) in assessing heterogeneity may mislead. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2008;8:79. doi: 10.1186/1471-2288-8-79 [published Online First: 2008/11/28]
29. Sun X, Briel M, Walter SD, et al. Is a subgroup effect believable? Updating criteria to evaluate the credibility of subgroup analyses. *Bmj* 2010;340:c117. doi: 10.1136/bmj.c117 [published Online First: 2010/04/01]
30. Schandelmaier S, Briel M, Varadhan R, et al. Development of the Instrument to assess the Credibility of Effect Modification Analyses (ICEMAN) in randomized controlled trials and meta-analyses. *Cmaj* 2020;192(32):E901-e06. doi: 10.1503/cmaj.200077 [published Online First: 2020/08/12]
31. Schwarzer G. meta: An R package for meta-analysis. *R news* 2007;7(3):40-45.
32. Schünemann HJ, Cuello C, Akl EA, et al. GRADE guidelines: 18. How ROBINS-I and other tools to assess risk of bias in nonrandomized studies should be used to rate the certainty of a body of evidence. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2019;111:105-14. doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2018.01.012 [published Online First: 2018/02/13]
33. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist GE, et al. GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. *Bmj* 2008;336(7650):924-6. doi: 10.1136/bmj.39489.470347.AD [published Online First: 2008/04/26]
34. Santesso N, Glenton C, Dahm P, et al. GRADE guidelines 26: informative statements to communicate the findings of systematic reviews of interventions. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2020;119:126-35. doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2019.10.014 [published Online First: 2019/11/13]

35. Ware MA, Doyle CR, Woods R, et al. Cannabis use for chronic non-cancer pain: results of a prospective survey. *Pain* 2003;102(1-2):211-6.
36. Lynch ME, Young J, Clark AJ. A case series of patients using medicinal marihuana for management of chronic pain under the Canadian Marihuana Medical Access Regulations. *Journal of Pain & Symptom Management* 2006;32(5):497-501.
37. Rog DJ, Nurmikko TJ, Young CA. Oromucosal delta9-tetrahydrocannabinol/cannabidiol for neuropathic pain associated with multiple sclerosis: an uncontrolled, open-label, 2-year extension trial. *Clinical Therapeutics* 2007;29(9):2068-79.
38. Weber J, Schley M, Casutt M, et al. Tetrahydrocannabinol (Delta 9-THC) treatment in chronic central neuropathic pain and fibromyalgia patients: Results of a multicenter survey. *Anesthesiology Research and Practice* 2009;2009 (no pagination)(827290) doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2009/827290>
39. Bestard JA, Toth CC. An open-label comparison of nabilone and gabapentin as adjuvant therapy or monotherapy in the management of neuropathic pain in patients with peripheral neuropathy. *Pain Practice* 2011;11(4):353-68. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-2500.2010.00427.x>
40. Fiz J, Duran M, Capella D, et al. Cannabis use in patients with Fibromyalgia: Effect on symptoms relief and health-related quality of life. *PLoS ONE* 2011;6 (4) (no pagination)(e18440) doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0018440>
41. Domínguez CM, Martín AD, Ferrer FG, et al. N-palmitoylethanolamide in the treatment of neuropathic pain associated with lumbosciatica. *Pain Manag* 2012;2(2):119-24. doi: 10.2217/pmt.12.5 [published Online First: 2012/03/01]
42. Gatti A, Lazzari M, Gianfelice V, et al. Palmitoylethanolamide in the treatment of chronic pain caused by different etiopathogenesis. *Pain Medicine* 2012;13(9):1121-30. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1526-4637.2012.01432.x>
43. Toth C, Mawani S, Brady S, et al. An enriched-enrolment, randomized withdrawal, flexible-dose, double-blind, placebo-controlled, parallel assignment efficacy study of nabilone as adjuvant in the treatment of diabetic peripheral neuropathic pain. *Pain* 2012;153(10):2073-82. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pain.2012.06.024>
44. Schifilliti C, Cucinotta L, Fedele V, et al. Micronized palmitoylethanolamide reduces the symptoms of neuropathic pain in diabetic patients. *Pain Res Treat* 2014;2014:849623. doi: 10.1155/2014/849623 [published Online First: 2014/05/08]
45. Storr M, Devlin S, Kaplan GG, et al. Cannabis use provides symptom relief in patients with inflammatory bowel disease but is associated with worse disease prognosis in patients with Crohn's disease. *Inflammatory Bowel Diseases* 2014;20(3):472-80. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1097/01.MIB.0000440982.79036.d6>
46. Del Giorno R, Skaper S, Paladini A, et al. Palmitoylethanolamide in Fibromyalgia: Results from Prospective and Retrospective Observational Studies. *Pain and Therapy* 2015;4(2):169-78. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s40122-015-0038-6>
47. Hoggart B, Ratcliffe S, Ehler E, et al. A multicentre, open-label, follow-on study to assess the long-term maintenance of effect, tolerance and safety of THC/CBD oromucosal spray in the management of neuropathic pain. *Journal of Neurology* 2015;262(1):27-40. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00415-014-7502-9>
48. Ware MA, Wang T, Shapiro S, et al. Cannabis for the Management of Pain: Assessment of Safety Study (COMPASS). *Journal of Pain* 2015;16(12):1233-42. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jpain.2015.07.014>
49. Haroutounian S, Ratz Y, Ginosar Y, et al. The Effect of Medicinal Cannabis on Pain and Quality-of-Life Outcomes in Chronic Pain: A Prospective Open-label Study. *Clinical Journal of Pain* 2016;32(12):1036-43.

50. Bellnier T, Brown G, Ortega T, et al. A preliminary evaluation of the efficacy, safety, and costs associated with the treatment of chronic pain with medical marijuana in the elderly. *Consultant Pharmacist* 2017;32 (10):597. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4140/TCPn.2017.577>
51. Cranford JA, Arnedt JT, Conroy DA, et al. Prevalence and correlates of sleep-related problems in adults receiving medical cannabis for chronic pain. *Drug & Alcohol Dependence* 2017;180:227-33. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2017.08.017>
52. Fanelli G, De Carolis G, Leonardi C, et al. Cannabis and intractable chronic pain: an explorative retrospective analysis of Italian cohort of 614 patients. *Journal of pain research* 2017;10:1217-24. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.2147/JPR.S132814>
53. Feingold D, Goor-Aryeh I, Bril S, et al. Problematic Use of Prescription Opioids and Medicinal Cannabis Among Patients Suffering from Chronic Pain. *Pain Medicine* 2017;18(2):294-306. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1093/pm/pnw134>
54. Paladini A, Varrassi G, Bentivegna G, et al. Palmitoylethanolamide in the Treatment of Failed Back Surgery Syndrome. *Pain Res Treat* 2017;2017:1486010. doi: 10.1155/2017/1486010 [published Online First: 2017/09/07]
55. Passavanti MB, Fiore M, Sansone P, et al. The beneficial use of ultramicronized palmitoylethanolamide as add-on therapy to Tapentadol in the treatment of low back pain: a pilot study comparing prospective and retrospective observational arms. *BMC Anesthesiology* 2017;17(1):171. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12871-017-0461-9>
56. Schimrigk S, Marziniak M, Neubauer C, et al. Dronabinol Is a Safe Long-Term Treatment Option for Neuropathic Pain Patients. *European Neurology* 2017;78(5-6):320-29. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1159/000481089>
57. Chirchiglia D, Chirchiglia P, Signorelli F. Nonsurgical lumbar radiculopathies treated with ultramicronized palmitoylethanolamide (umPEA): A series of 100 cases. *Neurologia i Neurochirurgia Polska* 2018;52(1):44-47. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pjnns.2017.11.002>
58. Crowley K, de Vries ST, Moreno-Sanz G. Self-Reported Effectiveness and Safety of Trokie R Lozenges: A Standardized Formulation for the Buccal Delivery of Cannabis Extracts. *Frontiers in Neuroscience* 2018;12:564. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2018.00564>
59. Habib G, Artul S. Medical Cannabis for the Treatment of Fibromyalgia. *JCR: Journal of Clinical Rheumatology* 2018;24(5):255-58. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1097/RHU.0000000000000702>
60. Anderson SP, Zylla DM, McGriff DM, et al. Impact of medical cannabis on patient-reported symptoms for patients with cancer enrolled in Minnesota's medical cannabis program. *Journal of Oncology Practice* 2019;15(6):E338-E45. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1200/JOP.18.00619>
61. Bonar EE, Cranford JA, Arterberry BJ, et al. Driving under the influence of cannabis among medical cannabis patients with chronic pain. *Drug & Alcohol Dependence* 2019;195:193-97. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2018.11.016>
62. Cervigni M, Nasta L, Schievano C, et al. Micronized Palmitoylethanolamide-Polydatin Reduces the Painful Symptomatology in Patients with Interstitial Cystitis/Bladder Pain Syndrome. *BioMed Research International* 2019;2019 (no pagination):9828397. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2019/9828397>
63. Cremer-Schaeffer P, Schmidt-Wolf G, Broich K. [Cannabis medicines in pain management : Interim analysis of the survey accompanying the prescription of cannabis-based medicines in Germany with regard to pain as primarily treated symptom]. *Der Schmerz* 2019;33(5):415-23. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00482-019-00399-z>
64. Lejczak S, Rousselot H, Di Patrizio P, et al. Dronabinol use in France between 2004 and 2017. *Revue Neurologique* 2019;175(5):298-304. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neurol.2018.07.011>
65. Loi ES, Pontis A, Cofelice V, et al. Effect of ultramicronized-palmitoylethanolamide and co-micronized palmitoylethanolamide/polydatin on chronic pelvic pain and quality of life in

- endometriosis patients: An open-label pilot study. *International Journal of Women's Health* 2019;11:443-49. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2147/IJWH.S204275>
66. Naftali T, Bar-Lev Schleider L, Sklerovsky Benjaminov F, et al. Medical cannabis for inflammatory bowel disease: real-life experience of mode of consumption and assessment of side-effects. *European Journal of Gastroenterology & Hepatology* 2019;31(11):1376-81. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1097/MEG.0000000000001565>
67. Perron BE, Holt KR, Yeagley E, et al. Mental health functioning and severity of cannabis withdrawal among medical cannabis users with chronic pain. *Drug & Alcohol Dependence* 2019;194:401-09. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2018.09.029>
68. Sagy I, Bar-Lev Schleider L, Abu-Shakra M, et al. Safety and Efficacy of Medical Cannabis in Fibromyalgia. *Journal of Clinical Medicine* 2019;8(6):05. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.3390/jcm8060807>
69. Sinclair J, Smith CA, Abbott J, et al. Cannabis Use, a Self-Management Strategy Among Australian Women With Endometriosis: Results From a National Online Survey. *Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology Canada: JOGC* 2020;42(3):256-61. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jogc.2019.08.033>
70. Ueberall MA, Essner U, Mueller-Schwefe GHH. Effectiveness and tolerability of THC:CBD oromucosal spray as add-on measure in patients with severe chronic pain: Analysis of 12-week open-label real-world data provided by the German pain e-registry. *Journal of Pain Research* 2019;12:1577-604. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2147/JPR.S192174>
71. Vigil JM, Stith SS, Adams IM, et al. Associations between medical cannabis and prescription opioid use in chronic pain patients: A preliminary cohort study. *PLoS ONE [Electronic Resource]* 2017;12(11):e0187795. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0187795>
72. Yassin M, Oron A, Robinson D. Effect of adding medical cannabis to analgesic treatment in patients with low back pain related to fibromyalgia: an observational cross-over single centre study. *Clinical & Experimental Rheumatology* 2019;37 Suppl 116(1):13-20.
73. Giorgi V, Bongiovanni S, Atzeni F, et al. Adding medical cannabis to standard analgesic treatment for fibromyalgia: a prospective observational study. *Clinical & Experimental Rheumatology* 2020;38 Suppl 123(1):53-59.
74. Grant BF, Dawson DA, Stinson FS, et al. The Alcohol Use Disorder and Associated Disabilities Interview Schedule-IV (AUDADIS-IV): reliability of alcohol consumption, tobacco use, family history of depression and psychiatric diagnostic modules in a general population sample. *Drug Alcohol Depend* 2003;71(1):7-16. doi: 10.1016/s0376-8716(03)00070-x [published Online First: 2003/06/25]
75. Humeniuk R, Ali R. Validation of the Alcohol, Smoking and Substance Involvement Screening Test (ASSIST) and pilot brief intervention: a technical report of phase II findings of the WHO ASSIST Project. Validation of the alcohol, smoking and substance involvement screening test (ASSIST) and pilot brief intervention: a technical report of phase II findings of the WHO ASSIST Project 2006.
76. Stockings E, Campbell G, Hall WD, et al. Cannabis and cannabinoids for the treatment of people with chronic noncancer pain conditions: a systematic review and meta-analysis of controlled and observational studies. *Pain* 2018;159(10):1932-54. doi: 10.1097/j.pain.0000000000001293 [published Online First: 2018/05/31]
77. Allan GM, Finley CR, Ton J, et al. Systematic review of systematic reviews for medical cannabinoids: Pain, nausea and vomiting, spasticity, and harms. *Can Fam Physician* 2018;64(2):e78-e94. [published Online First: 2018/02/17]

78. Campeny E, López-Pelayo H, Nutt D, et al. The blind men and the elephant: Systematic review of systematic reviews of cannabis use related health harms. *Eur Neuropsychopharmacol* 2020;33:1-35. doi: 10.1016/j.euroneuro.2020.02.003 [published Online First: 2020/03/14]
79. Memedovich KA, Dowsett LE, Spackman E, et al. The adverse health effects and harms related to marijuana use: an overview review. *CMAJ Open* 2018;6(3):E339-e46. doi: 10.9778/cmajo.20180023 [published Online First: 2018/08/18]
80. Nugent SM, Morasco BJ, O'Neil ME, et al. The Effects of Cannabis Among Adults With Chronic Pain and an Overview of General Harms: A Systematic Review. *Ann Intern Med* 2017;167(5):319-31. doi: 10.7326/m17-0155 [published Online First: 2017/08/15]
81. Els C, Jackson TD, Kunyk D, et al. Adverse events associated with medium- and long-term use of opioids for chronic non-cancer pain: an overview of Cochrane Reviews. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2017;10(10):Cd012509. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD012509.pub2 [published Online First: 2017/10/31]
82. Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders : DSM-5. Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Association 2013.
83. Goodman JE, McGrath PJ. The epidemiology of pain in children and adolescents: a review. *Pain* 1991;46(3):247-64. doi: 10.1016/0304-3959(91)90108-a [published Online First: 1991/09/01]
84. Myles H, Myles N, Large M. Cannabis use in first episode psychosis: Meta-analysis of prevalence, and the time course of initiation and continued use. *Aust N Z J Psychiatry* 2016;50(3):208-19. doi: 10.1177/0004867415599846 [published Online First: 2015/08/20]
85. Shanthanna H, Gilron I, Rajarathinam M, et al. Benefits and safety of gabapentinoids in chronic low back pain: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *PLoS Med* 2017;14(8):e1002369. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1002369 [published Online First: 2017/08/16]
86. Ferraro MC, Bagg MK, Wewege MA, et al. Efficacy, acceptability, and safety of antidepressants for low back pain: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Syst Rev* 2021;10(1):62. doi: 10.1186/s13643-021-01599-4 [published Online First: 2021/02/26]
87. Busse JW, Craigie S, Juurlink DN, et al. Guideline for opioid therapy and chronic noncancer pain. *Cmaj* 2017;189(18):E659-e66. doi: 10.1503/cmaj.170363 [published Online First: 2017/05/10]