

NDARC
National Drug & Alcohol Research Centre

The Difference is Research

Farrell,

Cannabinoids for the treatment of chronic non-cancer pain: an overview of the evidence

UNSW AUSTRALIA

Emily Stockings, Gabrielle Campbell, Wayne Hall, Suzi Nielsen, Dino Zagic, Rakin Rahman, Bridin Murnion, Megan Weier, Louisa Degenhardt, Michael Farrell (presenting author)

Medicine National Drug and Alcohol Research Centre APSAD 2018, Auckland

1

Conflicts of Interest

SN, MF, GC and LD have all been investigators on untied investigator-driven educational grants funded by Reckitt Benckiser. MF and LD have received an untied educational grant from Mundipharma for post-marketing surveillance studies of Reformulated OxyContin®. SN, MF and LD have been investigators on untied investigator-driven educational grants funded by Indivior. WH provided evidence to parliamentary committees on medical uses of cannabis in Australia and the United Kingdom. WH, MF, BM, GC, MW and LD have previously published manuscripts on the topic of therapeutic use of cannabis. Other authors declare no conflicts of interest. Conflict of interest statements will be available and updated on the project website at: <https://ndarc.med.unsw.edu.au/our-projects>


NDARC
National Drug & Alcohol Research Centre

The Difference is Research

2

Background

- Increasing attention to the role cannabis may play in treatment of CNCP
- Changes in legislation and use globally mean there will likely be an increase in the availability and use of cannabinoids for CNCP.
 - Relief from CNCP one of the most commonly cited reasons for use of cannabinoids in the United States.



NDARC
National Drug & Alcohol Research Centre

The Difference is Research

3

Pain

Emily Stockings
Gabrielle Campbell
Suzanne Nielsen
Wayne Hall
Louisa Degenhardt
Michael Farrell

NDARC
National Drug & Alcohol Research Centre

The Difference is Research

4

30% reduction in pain by pain condition

Study or Subgroup	Experimental Events	Experimental Total	Control Events	Control Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	OR, Fixed, 95% CI
5.34.1 Neuropathic pain - MS related							
Langford 2013a	83	167	77	152	31.1%	1.22 [0.89, 1.67]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	83	167	77	152		1.22 [0.89, 1.67]	
Total events: 83 Heterogeneity: not applicable Test for overall effect: Z=0.84 (P=0.40)							
5.34.2 Neuropathic pain - Non MS related							
Alonso 2007	13	25	8	25	2.3%	0.43 [0.03, 11.48]	
Karst 2003	8	9	2	10	0.001 [0.00, 0.00]		
MC70871 (AZA) (ZAV Pharmaceuticals 2008)	54	149	94	148	39.7%	0.88 [0.54, 1.37]	
Nurmala 2007	6	62	9	62	2.89 [0.01, 4.86]		
Saravanan 2010	6	15	3	14	3.1%	0.63 [0.14, 2.82]	
Singhal 2014	84	128	18	128	11.8%	1.89 [0.53, 5.53]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	131	369	377	344	54.0%	1.36 [0.99, 1.86]	
Total events: 131 Heterogeneity: Chi ² =11.01, df=4 (P=0.04), I ² =67% Test for overall effect: Z=1.92 (P=0.05)							
5.34.3 Chronic							
Zakaria 2010a	74	148	34	148	100.0%	0.43 [0.07, 2.15]	
Zakaria 2010b	92	184	46	184	100.0%	0.43 [0.07, 2.15]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	166	332	80	332	100.0%	0.43 [0.07, 2.15]	
Total events: 166 Heterogeneity: not applicable Test for overall effect: Z=1.92 (P=0.05)							
Total (95% CI)							
Total events: 249 Heterogeneity: Chi ² =11.01, df=4 (P=0.04), I ² =67% Test for overall effect: Z=1.92 (P=0.05)							

Response rate: 29.0% cannabinoids vs. 25.9% Placebo

Number Needed to Benefit (NNTB) overall: 24 (15 to 61)

NNTB MS-related CNCP: 33 (22 to 92)

Evidence grade: **⊕⊕⊕**

NDARC
National Drug & Alcohol Research Centre

The Difference is Research

5

50% reduction in pain by pain condition

Study or Subgroup	log(I)	SE	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
5.35.1 Neuropathic pain - MS related					
Langford 2013a	0.0989	0.2397	67.5%	1.10 [0.66, 1.77]	
Svensson 2004	2.0614	1.1974	2.7%	7.88 [0.75, 82.13]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			70.2%	1.19 [0.75, 1.89]	
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =2.58, df=1 (P=0.11), I ² =61% Test for overall effect: Z=0.74 (P=0.46)					
5.35.2 Neuropathic pain - Non MS related					
Karst 2003	1.3099	1.6969	1.3%	3.71 [0.13, 103.11]	
Nurmala 2007	1.0965	0.5609	12.3%	2.98 [0.98, 8.96]	
Serpell 2014	0.53	0.4908	16.1%	1.70 [0.65, 4.44]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			29.8%	2.22 [1.09, 4.49]	
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =0.85, df=2 (P=0.72), I ² =0% Test for overall effect: Z=2.21 (P=0.03)					
Total (95% CI)					
Total events: 100.0% Heterogeneity: not applicable Test for overall effect: Z=1.43 (P=0.15)					
Test for subgroup effect: I ² =0.00, Chi ² =0.00, P=0.99, I ² =0.0%					

Response rate: 18.2% cannabinoids vs. 14.4% Placebo

NNTB (overall): Unable to calculate (=)

NNTB (Non-MS Neuropathic pain): 39 (23 to 346)

Evidence grade: **⊕⊕⊕ MODERATE**

NDARC
National Drug & Alcohol Research Centre

The Difference is Research

6

Multiple Sclerosis

A review of reviews confirmed benefit from use of Medicinal Cannabis for spasticity related to MS

7

Primary outcomes

- Pain ($n = 7$ reviews):
 - 2 reviews = pain and painful spasms
 - 3 reviews = insufficient evidence or mixed findings
 - 1 review = no effect
 - 1 review = no conclusion
- Spasticity ($n = 7$ reviews), mostly used Modified Ashworth Scale (MAS)
 - 4 reviews = small spasticity
 - 1 review = may be effective
 - 1 review = insufficient evidence
 - 1 review = no conclusion

8

Epilepsy

Emily Stockings
Wayne Hall
Louisa Degenhardt
Michael Farrell
Expert: Associate Professor Geoffrey Herkes

9

Outcomes: Epilepsy

- Complete seizure freedom
- 50% or greater reduction in seizure frequency (responder rate)
- Quality of life outcomes
- Withdrawals – adverse events or any reason
- Adverse events
- Serious adverse events

10

Meta-analysis results

In 3 RCT studies, CBD was significantly better than placebo at:

- Achieving complete seizure freedom
- Seizure reduction of 50% or more
- Improved quality of life

In comparison to placebo, patients were significantly more likely to:

- Withdraw from the trial
- Experience adverse events (especially SAEs)

11

Conclusions: Epilepsy

- Limited RCTs indicate there may be therapeutic benefit of CBD in treating epilepsy and seizures – both seizure freedom and significant reduction in seizures
- CBD relatively well tolerated; evidence for THC and CBD:THC products are all observational
- Observational trials are positive, but many limited by lack of control and data on dosing
- Safety issues: dosing, product concentrations, interactions with other medications, non-medically supervised delivery

12

References

Evidence for cannabis and cannabinoids for epilepsy: a systematic review of controlled and observational evidence

Emily Stockings, Dino Zagic, Gabrielle Campbell, Megan Weier, Wayne D Hall, Suzanne Nielsen, Geoffrey K Herkes, Michael Farrell, Louisa Degenhardt

The use of cannabis and cannabinoids in treating symptoms of multiple sclerosis: a systematic review of reviews

Suzanne Nielsen, Rada Germanos, Megan Weier, John Pollard, Louisa Degenhardt, Wayne Hall, Nicholas Buckley, Michael Farrell

Systematic review and meta-analysis of cannabinoids in palliative medicine

Martin Mücke, Megan Weier, Christopher Carter, Jan Copeland, Louisa Degenhardt, Henning Cuhls, Lukas Radbruch, Winfried Häuser, Rupert Conrad

Cannabis and cannabinoids for the treatment of people with chronic noncancer pain conditions a systematic review and meta-analysis of controlled and observational studies Stockings, Emily^{a,1}; Campbell, Gabrielle^a; Hall, Wayne D.^{b,c}; Nielsen, Suzanne^a; Zagic, Dino^a; Rahman, Rakin^a; Murnion, Bridin^{d,e}; Farrell, Michael^a; Weier, Megan^a; Degenhardt, Louisa^a

PAIN: October 2018 - Volume 159 - Issue 10 - p 1932-1954

<https://www.tga.gov.au/medicinal-cannabis-guidance-documents>

13

Take a look at the broader picture

What is the question

Research Evidence unlikely to resolve questions in immediate future

Global changes in Cannabis Legislation with legalisation in Uruguay, Canada, 10 States in US, Trial in Netherlands and Referendum in NZ

In Colorado now moving to eliminate distinction between medical and recreational cannabis supply
Need for consumer protection of medicines supplied through commercial pharma industry, TGA key tool

14

Need to ameliorate expectations and not oversell likely benefits to vulnerable population
Where possible need to ensure access to effective and palliative medication
Need to avoid the lure of master strokes
Need to maintain appropriate regulatory control.
Need further research in a reasoned and objective environment but the debate around cannabis often leaves reason at the door from both pro and anti camps with highly polarised positions.

15