

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<u>http://bmjopen.bmj.com</u>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email <u>info.bmjopen@bmj.com</u>

### Cannabinoids versus placebo for pain. A systematic review with meta-analysis and Trial Sequential Analysis; Protocol

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-031574
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	11-May-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Barakji, Jehad; The Copenhagen Trial Unit, Rigshospitalet Dept. 7812 Korang, Steven Kwasi; Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen Trial Unit; Holbaek Sygehus, Pediatric Dept. Feinberg, Joshua; Copenhagen Univ Hosp Maagard, Mathias; The Copenhagen Trial Unit, Rigshospitalet Dept. 7812 Gluud, Christian; Copenhagen Trial Unit (CTU), Center for Clinical Intervention Research Mathiesen, Ole; University of Copenhagen Jakobsen, Janus; Copenhagen Trial Unit, Centre for Clinical Intervention Research, Department 7812, Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen University Hospital
Keywords:	PAIN MANAGEMENT, Herbal medicine < THERAPEUTICS, Adverse events < THERAPEUTICS, CLINICAL PHARMACOLOGY, Health & safety < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

SCHOLARONE<sup>™</sup> Manuscripts

# Cannabinoids versus placebo for pain: A protocol systematic review with meta-analysis and Trial Sequential Analysis

Jehad A. Barakji<sup>1</sup>, Steven Kwasi Korang<sup>1</sup>, Joshua Rose-Hansen Feinberg<sup>1</sup>, Mathias Maagaard<sup>1</sup>, Christian Gluud<sup>1</sup>, Ole Mathiesen<sup>2,3</sup>, Janus C. Jakobsen<sup>1,4,5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The Copenhagen Trial Unit, Centre for Clinical Intervention Research, Department 7812, Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen University Hospital, Blegdamsvej 9, DK 2100 Copenhagen, Denmark

<sup>2</sup> Centre for Anaesthesiological Research, Department of Anaesthesiology, Zealand University Hospital, Koege, Denmark

<sup>3</sup> Department of Clinical Medicine, Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences, Copenhagen University, Copenhagen, Denmark

<sup>4</sup> Department of Cardiology, Holbæk Hospital, Holbæk, Denmark

<sup>5</sup> Department of Regional Health Research, The Faculty of Heath Sciences, University of Southern Denmark, Odense, Denmark

Corresponding author

Jehad A. Barakji

Tlf.: +45 21 52 07 80

Email: jehad.barakji@ctu.dk

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-031574 on 31 October 2019. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

#### 

#### Abstract

**Introduction** Pain is a frequent clinical symptom, and with significant impact on patient well-being. Therefore, sufficient pain management is of utmost importance. While cannabinoids have become a more popular alternative to traditional types of pain medication among patients, the quality of evidence supporting the use of cannabinoids has been questioned. The beneficial and harmful effects of cannabinoids in patients with pain is unknown. Accordingly, we aim to assess the efficacy, tolerability, and safety of cannabinoids (herbal, plant-derived extracts and synthetic) compared with placebo for any type of pain.

**Methods and analysis** We will conduct a systematic review of randomised clinical trials with meta-analysis and Trial Sequential Analysis to assess the beneficial and harmful effects of cannabinoids in any dose, formulation, and duration. We will accept placebo or no treatment as control interventions. We will include participants with any type of pain (acute and chronic pain, cancer-related pain, headache, neuropathic pain or any other types of pain). We will systematically search The Cochrane Library, MEDLINE, EMBASE, Science Citation Index, and BIOSIS for relevant literature. We will follow the recommendations by Cochrane and the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) statement. The risk of systematic errors (bias) and random errors (play of chance) will be assessed. The overall certainty of evidence will be evaluated using the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development, and Evaluation (GRADE) approach.

**Ethics and dissemination** Ethical approval is not a requirement since no primary data will be collected. The findings of this systematic review will be submitted for peer-reviewed publication and disseminated in national and international conferences.

**Discussion** Although cannabinoids are now being used to manage different pain conditions, the evidence for the clinical effects are unclear. The present review will systematically assess the current evidence for the benefits and harms of cannabinoids to inform practice and future research.

#### Strengths and limitations of this study

- Our methodology is based on the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions, the PRISMA guideline, and a systematic eight step procedure for valid assessments of statistical and clinical significance
- We systemically plan to assess risks of random errors ('play of chance) and systematic errors ('bias')
- We have systematically predefined minimal important differences for all outcomes
- The certainty of the evidence with be assessed using the GRADE approach

#### Description of pain

Pain is the most commonly reported symptom in the general population and in a medical setting [1-3]. Persistent pain is a major international health problem [4], prompting the World Health Organization (WHO) to endorse a global campaign against pain [5]. Pain is the leading reason for use of alternative medicines (e.g. acupuncture) [6]. Pain has been associated with a low degree of health-related quality of life and may lead to psychosocial distress, insomnia, and depressive symptoms [7-15]. Pain is also among the most common reasons for temporary or permanent work disability [16]. Pain is always subjective and may be defined as "an unpleasant sensory and emotional experience associated with actual or potential tissue damage" [17].

Pain may be caused by or be related to different clinical disorders and classified according to several different characteristics [18-21]. Below, we describe shortly some of these classifications.

#### Acute and chronic pain

Pain may be classified as 'acute pain' or 'chronic pain'.

- Acute pain usually has a well-defined onset and most often a readily identifiable cause (e.g. surgery).
  Acute pain is expected to run its course in a short time frame and management typically focuses on symptomatic relief until this happens [22]. Acute pain is a common symptom, affecting between 37% to 84% of hospitalised patients [23].
- Chronic pain is often characterised by an ill-defined onset and a prolonged, fluctuating course [22]. Chronic pain often persists past normal healing time and hence lacks the acute warning function of

Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies

physiological nociception [24]. Pain is usually regarded as chronic when it lasts or recurs for more than three to six months [17, 25]. A chronic pain patient usually does not appear to be in pain, and the only definitive way to determine the presence of pain is to obtain a verbal report from the patient [22]. A recent systematic review has demonstrated considerable heterogeneity in the criteria for a diagnosis of chronic pain applied in large epidemiological studies [26]. Chronic pain is a frequent condition, affecting an estimated 20% of people worldwide [27-30] and accounting for 15% to 20% of physician visits according to European observational studies [31, 32].

#### Cancer-related pain

Pain may also be classified based on whether it is cancer-related or non-cancer-related. Cancer-related pain is pain caused by the cancer itself (primary tumour and metastases) or its treatment (e.g. radiation therapy) [22, 33].

#### Postoperative pain

Postoperative pain includes pain from inflammation caused by tissue trauma (i.e. surgical incision, dissection, burns) or direct nerve injury (i.e. nerve transection, stretching, or compression) [34]. Inflammation results in activation and sensitisation of nociceptive pain pathways, resulting in primary and secondary hyperalgesia and central sensitisation, which is characterized by clinically increased pain, allodynia, and increased sensitivity from surrounding non-damaged anatomical areas [35].

#### Headache

Up to 90% of all patients with headaches may be classified as suffering from either tension-type headache, migraine, or cluster headache. While episodic tension-type headache is the most frequent headache type in population-based studies, migraine is the most common diagnosis in patients presenting to primary care physicians with headache [36].

#### Other types of pain

Pain in one or more anatomic regions where the aetiology is unknown is defined as idiopathic pain [37]. Examples of idiopathic pain are chronic widespread pain, fibromyalgia, irritable bowel syndrome, and back pain that is not diagnosed as musculoskeletal or as neuropathic pain [33].

#### Pain types defined according to specific mechanism causing the pain

#### Somatic nociceptive pain

Nociceptive pain is the most frequent type of pain. It results from activity in neural pathways caused by actual tissue damage or potentially tissue-damaging stimuli [31, 38] originating from somatic nociceptors from skin, bone, joints, or muscles [39].

#### Visceral nociceptive pain

The visceral nociceptive pain is pain resulting from viscera in the thoracic, pelvis, or abdominal organs [40-42]. Visceral pain is diffuse, less distinctive, and difficult to localise [42]. It is often characterised by referred visceral pain and followed by symptoms from the autonomic nerve system (e.g. nausea, sweating, cardiovascular symptoms) [43].

#### Neuropathic pain

The 2011 International Association for the Study of Pain definition of neuropathic pain is "pain caused by a lesion or disease of the somatosensory system" [44]. Neuropathic pain leads to a heterogeneous group of symptoms, including unremitting and spontaneous burning or shooting sensations, abnormal pain sensation to normal and harmless stimuli (allodynia), or a raised sensitivity to noxious stimuli (hyperalgesia) [45].

Neuropathic pain may be classified as central neuropathic pain or peripheral neuropathic pain. Central neuropathic pain conditions are mainly attributed to multiple sclerosis and post-stroke pain [46], while peripheral neuropathic pain is largely due to post-herpetic neuralgia and diabetic neuropathy [47]. Persistent postoperative pain (incidence up to 10% of surgical patients) may mostly be considered as iatrogenic neuropathic pain [48].

#### **Description of the intervention**

Cannabis (also called marijuana) is the most common illegally used psychoactive substance worldwide [49]. Cannabis was used by an estimated 182 million people worldwide in 2014, this corresponds to approximately 3.8 percent of the global adult population [49]. Cannabinoids refer to a heteromorphic group of molecules that

demonstrate activity upon cannabinoid receptors [50]. Cannabinoids may be classified into three groups: 1) endocannabinoids, 2) phytocannabinoids, and 3) synthetic cannabinoids [50].

#### Endocannabinoids

Endocannabinoids are characterised by being the endogenously generated cannabinoids [51]. The primary types of endocannabinoids are the lipid endocannabinoid arachidonoyl ethanolamide (named anandamide) [52] and the endocannabinoid 2-arachidonoylglycerol (2-AG) [53, 54]. Arachidonoyl ethanolamide binds to the brain cannabinoid receptor with high affinity and mimics the behavioural actions of tetrahydrocannabinol when injected into rodents (e.g. block peripheral pain, inhibiting gastric emptying) [52, 55-57]. A number of other endocannabinoids have been discovered, but follow-up studies about biosynthesis, cellular transport, metabolism, and biological function have focused primarily on anandamide and 2-AG [58].

#### Phytocannabinoids

Phytocannabinoids are cannabinoids found in the cannabis plant [59]. The best characterised phytocannabinoids are the psychotropic tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) and the primarily anti-inflammatory cannabidiol (CBD) [60]. Nabiximols (marketed as Sativex<sup>®</sup>) is a sublingually administered oromucosal spray based on a mixture of tetrahydrocannabinol and cannabidiol [61].

#### Synthetic cannabinoids

Synthetic cannabinoids are analogues of the cannabinoids found in natural marijuana that are chemically synthesised. They may have been commercially available in Europe since 2004 and in the United States since 2008 [62]. The use of synthetic cannabinoids is increasing in Europe [63]. From 2005 to 2011, synthetic cannabinoids represented two-thirds of all new substances reported to the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction Early Warning System [63].

The most commonly prescribed cannabinoid-based medicines are the synthetic cannabinoids dronabinol (marketed as Marinol<sup>®</sup>) and nabilone (marketed as Cesamet<sup>®</sup>) [61].

#### Endocannabinoid system

#### **BMJ** Open

All cannabinoids act on cannabinoid receptors. These cannabinoid receptors are located throughout the body but are mostly located in the brain [64]. The cannabinoid receptors and endocannabinoids (see paragraph above) are together named the endocannabinoid system [65].

The endocannabinoid system is thought to have three broad and overlapping functions in mammals [66]. The first function of the endocannabinoid system is a stress recovery role, operating in a feedback loop in which endocannabinoid signalling is activated by stress and functions to return endocrine, nervous, and behavioural systems to homeostatic balance [66]. The second function of the endocannabinoid system is to control energy balance through regulation of the intake, storage, and utilisation of food [66]. The third function of the endocannabinoid system involves immune regulation; endocannabinoid signalling is activated by tissue injury and modulates immune and inflammatory responses [66].

#### Cannabinoid receptors

There are two types of cannabinoid receptors, type I and type II [67]. Cannabinoid receptor type I are most abundant in the central nervous system, especially in areas promoting nociception, short-term memory, and in the basal ganglia, but are also found in the peripheral nerves, uterus, testis, and bones [67]. Tetrahydrocannabinol activates cannabinoid type I receptors in the dopaminergic mesolimbic brain circuit, resulting in enhanced release of dopamine [68]. Such activation of the so-called 'brain reward system' is hypothesised to mediate the positive reinforcing and rewarding effects of almost all drugs of abuse [58]. More than weekly use of cannabis downregulates brain cannabinoid type I receptors; abstinence results in receptor upregulation within several days [69]. These receptor changes are associated with an often uncomfortable or distressing cannabis withdrawal syndrome [70], which may serve as negative reinforcement to continue cannabis use in order to suppress the withdrawal symptoms.

In contrast, cannabinoid receptor type II, is mostly found in the periphery, often in conjunction with immune cells, but may appear in the central nervous system particularly under conditions of inflammation in association with microcytes [67]. The physiological responses that result from cannabinoid receptor activation are euphoria, psychosis, impaired memory and cognition, reduced locomotor function, increased appetite, as well as anti-emetic, pain-relieving, anti-spasticity, and sleep-promoting effects [71].

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-031574 on 31 October 2019. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de I Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

#### Applicability of cannabinoid-based medicines

Cannabis is most commonly consumed via smoked, inhaled vapor, or oral routes of administration [72]. Vaporising cannabis ('vaping') heats the material without burning which theoretically minimises potential carcinogens compared to smoking and may produce less respiratory irritation [73, 74]. Sublingual administration is used for some medical cannabis preparations (e.g. nabiximols).

In recent years, cannabinoid-based medicines have become increasingly available to patients in many countries [61]. Besides usage for treatment of different pain conditions [50], cannabinoid-based medicines are used for treatment of nausea and vomiting associated with cancer chemotherapy and the treatment of AIDS-associated anorexia [75]. Cannabinoid-based medicines are used to reduce seizure frequency in patients with drug-resistant epilepsy [76]. In Denmark, Sativex<sup>®</sup> (nabiximols) is approved for the treatment of moderate to severe spasticity due to multiple sclerosis in patients who have not responded adequately to other anti-spasticity medication [77]. An American survey indicated that 6% of adults (or 12 million) have utilised cannabis in attempts to treat chronic pain [78]. In pain clinics across Canada, the proportion of users of cannabinoid-based medicines is estimated to be between 12% to 15% [79].

#### Why it is important to do this review

We identified ten previous reviews with meta-analyses assessing the effects of cannabinoids on different types of pain [79-88]. Bearing in mind that some of the previous reviews investigated more than one type of pain, eight reviews assessed the effects of different cannabinoids on neuropathic pain [79-85, 88]; four reviews assessed the effects of different cannabinoids on nociceptive pain (e.g. rheumatoid arthritis) [79, 80, 83, 84]; three reviews assessed the effects of different cannabinoids on cancer-related pain [79, 83, 84]; four reviews assessed the effects of different cannabinoids on cancer-related pain [79, 80, 83, 87]; and three reviews assessed the effects of different cannabinoids on postoperative pain [79, 84, 86]. All the previous reviews included randomised clinical trials, but only two of the ten reviews systematically assessed the risk of bias in the trials [81, 88], and none of the previous reviews took into account the risks of random errors [79-88]. Only two out of the ten reviews used predefined Cochrane methodology [87, 88] and only four reviews used the GRADE approach [81, 86-88].

#### **BMJ** Open

Most of the reviews concluded that the assessed cannabinoids were effective against pain [79-83, 85, 88]. In **Table 1 (Additional file 1),** we have summarised the results and conclusions of the previous reviews. Five of the reviews reported serious adverse events (e.g. agitation, impaired memory, abuse, dissociation, acute psychosis, and death) [79, 81-83, 88]. The reviews also showed that the most commonly reported adverse events were sedation, dizziness, dry mouth, increased appetite, somnolence, confusion, nausea, and disturbances in concentration [79-82, 84, 85, 87, 88].

A correlation between psychiatric disorders (e.g. schizophrenia and psychosis) and increased cannabinoid consumption have previously been hypothesised [89-95]. Di Forti et. al recently conducted a study indicating that daily cannabis use was associated with increased odds of psychotic disorder compared with never users (adjusted odds ratio [OR] 3.2, 95% Cl 2.2–4.1), increasing to nearly five-times increased odds for daily use of high-potency (THC  $\geq$ 10%) types of cannabis (adjusted odds ratio [OR] 4.8, 95% Cl 2.5–6.3) [96].

#### Objective

The objective of our systematic review is to assess the beneficial and harmful effects of cannabinoids versus placebo or no intervention for any type of pain (acute and chronic pain, cancer-related pain, headache, neuropathic pain, or any other types of pain).

#### Methods

This systematic review protocol has been developed based on Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) guidelines for reporting systematic reviews evaluating healthcare interventions [97, 98]. A PRISMA-P checklist file is attached (Additional file 2).

#### Criteria for considering studies for this review

#### Type of studies

Randomised clinical trials irrespective of trial design, setting, publication status, publication year, and language. If we identify quasi-randomised studies and observational studies during our searches for randomised clinical trials, we will only include their reporting on harms in a narrative way. By not systematically searching for all observational studies on harm, we run the risk of putting more focus on benefit than harm. We are aware that this is a limitation of our review.

#### Types of participants

Participants with any type of pain, i.e. acute and chronic pain, cancer-related pain, headache, neuropathic pain, or any other types of pain (as defined by the trialists). Participants will be included irrespective of age, sex, and comorbidities.

#### **Types of interventions**

#### Experimental intervention

Any type of cannabinoids such as: herbal cannabis (hashish, marihuana), plant-based extracts (e.g. nabiximole), or synthetic cannabinoids (e.g. cannabidiol, dronabinol, levonantradol, nabilone). We will accept cannabinoids at any dose, by any route, administered for the relief of pain.

#### Control intervention

Placebo or no intervention.

#### Co-interventions

We will accept any co-intervention but only if this co-intervention is planned to be delivered similarly in both intervention groups. If this plan is not followed, then these trials will be assessed as a subgroup due to potential confounding.

#### **Patient and Public Involvement**

We have had email correspondence with several relevant patient associations in Denmark to select the most patient relevant outcomes. The patient associations we have been in contact with include: The Danish Diabetes Association, Steno Diabetes Centre Copenhagen, The Danish Rheumatism Association, The Danish Multiple Sclerosis Society, and Danish Cancer Society. We are very thankful for their input.

#### Types of outcome measures

#### Primary outcomes

- All-cause mortality
- Pain assessment on visual analogue scale (VAS) or numerical rating scale (NRS)

#### **BMJ** Open

Proportion of participants with a serious adverse event defined as any untoward medical occurrence that resulted in death; was life threatening; was persistent; or led to significant disability, nephrotoxicity, superinfection, need for respiratory support, need for circulatory support, or prolonged hospitalisation [99]. As we expect the trialists' reporting of serious adverse events to be heterogeneous and not strictly according to the ICH-GCP recommendations, we will include the event as a serious adverse if the trialists either: 1) use the term 'serious adverse event' but not refer to ICH-GCP, or 2) report the proportion of participants with an event we consider fulfils the ICH-GCP definition (e.g. myocardial infarction or hospitalisation). If several of such events are reported then we will choose the highest proportion reported in each trial.

Quality of life measured on any valid continuous scale

#### Secondary outcomes

- Dependence (as defined by trialists)
- Psychosis (as defined by trialists)
- Proportion of participants with one or more adverse event not considered to be serious
- Sleep quality measured on any valid continuous scale

#### Exploratory outcomes

- Each serious adverse event separately
- Each adverse event not considered serious separately.
- Twenty-four-hour morphine consumption (as defined by trialists)
- Physical function (as defined by trialists)
- Depressive symptoms (e.g. Hamilton Depression Rating Scale)

We will for all outcomes use the trial results reported at maximal follow-up except for acute pain. For acute pain, we will use the trials' results reported at the time point closest to 24 hours after the intervention is given.

#### Search methods for identification of studies

#### Electronic searches

We will search the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), Medical Literature Analysis and Retrieval System Online (MEDLINE), Excerpta Medica database (EMBASE), Latin American and Caribbean Health

Sciences Literature (LILACS), Science Citation Index Expanded on Web of Science, and BIOSIS in order to identify relevant trials. We will search all databases from their inception to the present. Searching other resources The reference lists of relevant publications will be checked for any unidentified randomised trials. We will contact authors of included studies, and major pharmaceutical companies, by email asking for unpublished randomised trials. Further, we will search for ongoing trials on:

- ClinicalTrials.gov (<u>www.clinicaltrials.gov</u>)
- Google Scholar (<u>https://scholar.google.dk/</u>)
- The Turning Research into Practice (TRIP) Database (https://www.tripdatabase.com/)
- European Medicines Agency (EMA) (http:// www.ema.europa.eu/ema/)
- United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA) (www.fda.gov)
- China Food and Drug Administration (CFDA) (http://eng.sfda.gov.cn/WS03/CL0755/)
- Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (<u>https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/</u> medicines-and-healthcare-products-regulatoryagency)
- The World Health Organization (WHO) International Clinical Trials Registry Platform (ICTRP) search portal (<u>http://apps.who.int/</u> trialsearch/)

We will also consider relevant for the review unpublished and grey literature trials, if we identify such trials.

#### Data collection and analysis

We will perform the review following the recommendations of Cochrane [100]. The analyses will be performed using Review Manager 5 [101] and Trial Sequential Analysis [102]. In case of Review Manager statistical software not being sufficient, we will use STATA 15 [103].

#### Selection of studies

Two authors (JB, SKK) will independently screen titles and abstracts. We will retrieve all relevant full-text study reports/publications, and four review authors (JB, SKK, JRF, MM) will independently screen the full text and identify and record reasons for exclusion of the ineligible studies. We will resolve any disagreement through

discussion or, if required, we will consult a fifth author (JCJ). Trial selection will be displayed in an adapted flow diagram as per the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statement [104]. **Data extraction and management** Four authors (JB, SKK, JRF, MM) will in pairs extract data independently from included trials. Disagreements will be resolved by discussion with a fifth author (JCJ). We will assess duplicate publications and companion papers of a trial together to evaluate all available data simultaneously (maximise data extraction, correct bias assessment). We will contact the trial authors by email to specify any additional data, which may not have been reported sufficiently or at all in the publication. *Trial characteristics* Bias risk components (as defined below); trial design (parallel, factorial, or crossover); number of intervention arms; length of follow-up; estimation of sample size; inclusion and exclusion criteria.

#### Participant characteristics and diagnosis

Number of randomised participants; number of analysed participants; number of participants lost to follow-up/ withdrawals/crossover; compliance with medication; age range (mean or median) and sex ratio; type of pain (acute and chronic pain, cancer-related pain, headache, neuropathic pain or any other types of pain); baseline pain score; drug and dosing regimen; study design (placebo or active control); study duration and follow-up; analgesic outcome measures and results; adverse events (participants experiencing any adverse event, or serious adverse event).

#### Co-intervention characteristics

Type of co-intervention; dose of co-intervention; duration of co-intervention; and mode of administration.

#### Outcomes

All outcomes listed above will be extracted from each randomised clinical trial, and we will identify if outcomes are incomplete or selectively reported according to the criteria described later in 'incomplete outcome data' bias domain and 'selective outcome reporting' bias domain.

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-031574 on 31 October 2019. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) .

to text

data mining, Al training, and similar technologies

Protected by copyright, including for uses related

#### Notes

> Funding of the trial and notable conflicts of interest of trial authors will be extracted, if available. We will note in the 'Characteristics of included studies' table if outcome data were not reported in a usable way. Four review authors (JB, SKK, JRF, MM) will independently transfer data into the Review Manager file [101]. Disagreements will be resolved through discussion or, if required, we will consult with a fifth author (JCJ).

#### Assessment of risk of bias in included studies

We will use the instructions given in the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions [100] in our evaluation of the methodology and hence the risk of bias of the included trials. We will evaluate the methodology in respect of:

- Random sequence generation
- Allocation concealment
- Blinding of participants and treatment providers
- Blinding of outcome assessment
- Incomplete outcome data
- Selective outcome reporting
- For-profit bias
- Overall risk of bias

These components enable classification of randomised trials as being at low risk of bias and at high risk of bias.

The latter trials tend to overestimate positive intervention effects and underestimate negative effects [105-

111].

We will classify the trials according to the following criteria.

#### Random sequence generation

- Low risk: If sequence generation was achieved using computer random number generator or a random number table. Drawing lots, tossing a coin, shuffling cards, and throwing dice were also considered adequate if performed by an independent adjudicator.
- Unclear risk: If the method of randomisation was not specified, but the trial was still presented as being randomised.

#### BMJ Open

• High risk: If the method of sequence generation was inadequate i.e. alternate medical record numbers or other non-random sequence generation.

#### Allocation concealment

- Low risk: If the allocation of patients was performed by a central independent unit, on-site locked computer, identical-looking numbered sealed envelopes, drug bottles, or containers prepared by an independent pharmacist or investigator.
- Uncertain risk: If the trial was classified as randomised but the allocation concealment process was not described.
- High risk: If the allocation sequence was familiar to the investigators who assigned participants.

#### Blinding of participants and treatment providers

- Low risk: If the participants and the treatment providers were blinded to intervention allocation and this was described.
- Uncertain risk: If the procedure of blinding was insufficiently described.
- High risk: If blinding of participants and the treatment providers was not performed.

#### Blinding of outcome assessment

- Low risk of bias: If it was mentioned that outcome assessors were blinded and this was described.
- Uncertain risk of bias: If it was not mentioned if the outcome assessors in the trial were blinded or the extent of blinding was insufficiently described.
- High risk of bias: If no blinding or incomplete blinding of outcome assessors was performed.

#### Incomplete outcome data

- Low risk of bias: If missing data were unlikely to make treatment effects depart from plausible values. This could be either (1) there were no drop-outs or withdrawals for all outcomes or (2) the numbers and reasons for the withdrawals and drop-outs for all outcomes were clearly stated and could be described as being similar to both groups. Generally, the trial is judged as at a low risk of bias due to incomplete outcome data if drop-outs are less than 5%. However, the 5% cut-off is not definitive.
- Uncertain risk of bias: If there was insufficient information to assess whether missing data were likely to induce bias on the results.

• High risk of bias: If the results were likely to be biased due to missing data either because the pattern of drop-outs could be described as being different in the two intervention groups or the trial used improper methods in dealing with the missing data (e.g. last observation carried forward).

#### Selective outcome reporting

- Low risk of bias: If a protocol was published before or at the time the trial was begun, and the outcomes specified in the protocol were reported on. If there is no protocol or the protocol was published after the trial has begun, reporting pain assessment on VAS or NRS and serious adverse events will grant the trial a grade of low risk of bias.
- Uncertain risk of bias: If no protocol was published and the outcome pain assessment on VAS or NRS and serious adverse events were not reported on.
- High risk of bias: If the outcomes in the protocol were not reported on.

#### For-profit bias

- Low risk of bias: If the trial appeared to be free of other components of for-profit bias.
- Unclear risk of bias: If it was unclear whether the trial was free of for-profit bias.
- High risk of bias: If there was a high risk of for-profit bias.

#### Overall risk of bias

- Low risk of bias: The trial will be classified at overall 'low risk of bias' only if all of the bias domains described in the above paragraphs are classified at 'low risk of bias'.
- High risk of bias: The trial will be classified at 'high risk of bias' if any of the bias risk domains described in the above are classified at 'unclear' or 'high risk of bias'.

We will assess the domains 'blinding of outcome assessment', 'incomplete outcome data', and 'selective outcome reporting' for each outcome result. Thus, we can assess the bias risk for each outcome assessed in addition to each trial. Our primary conclusions will be based on the results of our primary outcome results at overall low risk of bias. Both our primary and secondary analyses will be presented in the summary of findings tables.

#### Differences between the protocol and the review

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
/	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
10	
10	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
20	
20	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
20	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
50	
21	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	
60	

We will conduct the review according to this published protocol and report any deviations from it in the 'Differences between the protocol and the review' section of the systematic review.

#### Measures of treatment effect

#### Dichotomous outcomes

We will calculate risk ratios (RRs) with 95% confidence interval (CI) for dichotomous outcomes, as well as the Trial Sequential Analysis- adjusted CIs (see below).

#### Continuous outcomes

We will calculate the mean differences (MDs) and the standardised mean difference (SMD) with 95% CI for continuous outcomes, as well as the Trial Sequential Analysis-adjusted CIs (see below).

#### Dealing with missing data

We will, as first option, contact all trial authors to obtain any relevant missing data (i.e. for data extraction and for assessment of risk of bias, as specified above).

#### Dichotomous outcomes

We will not impute missing values for any outcomes in our primary analysis. In two of our sensitivity analyses (see paragraph below), we will impute data.

#### Continuous outcomes

We will primarily analyse scores assessed at single time points. If only changes from baseline scores are reported, we will analyse the results together with follow-up scores [100]. If standard deviations (SDs) are not reported, we will calculate the SDs using trial data, if possible. We will not use intention-to-treat data if the original report did not contain such data. We will not impute missing values for any outcomes in our primary analysis. In our sensitivity analysis (see paragraph below) for continuous outcomes, we will impute data.

#### Assessment of heterogeneity

We will primarily investigate forest plots to visually assess any sign of heterogeneity. We will secondly assess the presence of statistical heterogeneity by  $chi^2$  test (threshold P < 0.10) and measure the quantities of

heterogeneity by the l<sup>2</sup> statistic [112, 113]. We will investigate for heterogeneity through subgroup analyses. Ultimately, we may decide that a meta-analysis should be avoided [100].

#### Assessment of reporting biases

We will use a funnel plot to assess reporting bias if ten or more trials are included. We will visually inspect funnel plots to assess the risk of bias. We are aware of the limitations of a funnel plot (i.e. a funnel plot assesses bias due to small sample size). From this information, we assess possible reporting bias. For dichotomous outcomes, we will test asymmetry with the Harbord test [114] if  $\tau^2$  is less than 0.1 and with the Rücker test if  $\tau^2$  is more than 0.1. For continuous outcomes, we will use the regression asymmetry test [115] and the adjusted rank correlation [116].

#### Unit of analysis issues

We will only include randomised clinical trials. For trials using crossover design, only data from the first period will be included [100, 117]. There will therefore not be any unit of analysis issues.

#### Minimal important difference

In clinical intervention research it is of utmost importance always to define minimal important differences (MID) and to define thresholds for clinical significance [118]. If a large number of trial participants are randomised, small and clinically irrelevant intervention effects may lead to statistically significant results and rejection of the null hypothesis [119]. Jaeschke et al. defined the minimal important difference as "the smallest difference in score in the domain of interest which patients perceive as beneficial" [120].

Estimations of minimal important differences should be used as arbitrary strict precise thresholds. However, to avoid erroneous conclusions minimal important differences need to be estimated and predefined when assessing the effects of interventions for pain. Olsen et al. have conducted two systematic reviews on this matter in order to gather the evidence and present an estimate of the minimal important difference [121, 122]. Olsen et al. conducted a systematic review on the minimal important difference in patients with acute pain and concluded that the median of the studies' results was 17 mm on VAS (IQR 14 mm to 23 mm) [121]. Another systematic review conducted by Olsen et al. was on the minimal important difference in patients with chronic pain and the results showed a median of 23 mm on VAS (IQR 12 mm to 39 mm) when using the within-patient anchor-based method, while the median in studies using the sensitivity- and specificity-based method was 20 mm on VAS (IQR

#### **BMJ** Open

15 mm – 30 mm) [122]. We have described detailed considerations about minimal important differences in **Appendix 1**.

Based on the previously conducted systematic reviews we will choose at minimal important difference equivalent to 10 mm or 1 point on the visual analogue scale and the numerical rating scale, respectively, regarding a pain-relieving effect.

#### Data synthesis

#### Meta-analysis

We will undertake this meta-analysis according to the recommendations stated in the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions [100], Keus et al. [123], and the eight-step assessment suggested by Jakobsen et al. [118]. We will use the statistical software Review Manager 5.3 [101] provided by Cochrane to analyse data. We will assess our intervention effects with both random-effects meta-analyses [124] and fixedeffect meta-analyses [125]. We will use the more conservative point estimate of the two [118]. The more conservative point estimate is the estimate closest to zero effect. If the two estimates are similar, we will use the estimate with the highest P value [118]. We use four primary and four secondary outcomes, and therefore, we will consider a P value of 0.02 as the threshold for statistical significance [118, 126]. We will investigate for heterogeneity through subgroup analyses. Ultimately, we may decide that a meta-analysis should be avoided [100]. We will use the eight-step procedure to assess if the thresholds for statistical and clinical significance are crossed [118]. Our primary conclusion will be based on results with low risk of bias [118].

Where multiple trial intervention groups are reported in a single trial, we will include only the relevant groups. If two comparisons are combined in the same meta-analysis, we will halve the control group to avoid doublecounting [100]. Trials with a factorial design will be included.

If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, we will report the results in a narrative way.

#### Trial Sequential Analysis

Traditional meta-analysis runs the risk of random errors due to sparse data and repetitive testing of accumulating data when updating reviews. We wish to control the risks of type I errors and type II errors. We will therefore perform Trial Sequential Analysis on the outcomes, in order to calculate the required information

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-031574 on 31 October 2019. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de I Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

size (that is the number of participants needed in a meta-analysis to detect or reject a certain intervention effect) and the cumulative Z-curve's breach of relevant trial sequential monitoring boundaries [102, 127-135]. A more detailed description of Trial Sequential Analysis can be found in the Trial Sequential Analysis manual [128] and at <u>http://www.ctu.dk/tsa/</u>. For dichotomous outcomes, we will estimate the required information size based on the observed proportion of patients with an outcome in the control group (the cumulative proportion of patients with an event in the control groups relative to all patients in the control groups), a relative risk reduction of 20%, an alpha of 2.0% for our primary and secondary outcomes, a beta of 10%, and diversity as suggested by the trials in the meta-analysis. For the outcome "pain assessment on visual analogue scale (VAS) or numerical rating scale (NRS)", we will use a minimal important difference estimate based on previously conducted systematic reviews [121, 122]. We will accept a pain-relieving effect equivalent to 10 mm or 1 point on the visual analogue scale and the numerical rating scale, respectively, or a consumption of at least 5 mg morphine.

For all remaining continuous outcome, we will in the Trial Sequential Analysis use the observed SD, a mean difference of the observed SD/2, an alpha of 2.0% for our primary and secondary outcomes, and a beta of 10%.

#### Subgroup analysis and investigation of heterogeneity

#### Subgroup analysis

We will perform the following subgroup analysis when analysing the primary outcomes (All-cause mortality, pain assessment on VAS or NRS, serious adverse event, and quality of life).

- Trials at high risk of bias compared to trails at low risk of bias
- Trials compared according to type of pain (acute pain, chronic pain and cancer pain)
- Trials compared according to type of chronic pain
- Trials compared according to type of cannabinoids used
- Trials compared according to dosage of cannabinoids used (below median compared to median and above)
- Trials compared according to duration of cannabinoids administration (below median compared to median and above)
- Age of participants: 0 to 59 years compared to 60 to 79 years compared to above 80 years
- Trials compared according to baseline pain score (below median compared to median and above)

#### **BMJ** Open

We will use the formal test for subgroup interactions in Review Manager [101].

#### Sensitivity analysis

To assess the potential impact of the missing data for dichotomous outcomes, we will perform the two following sensitivity analyses on both the primary and secondary outcomes.

- 'Best-worst-case' scenario: We will assume that all participants lost to follow-up in the cannabinoid intervention group have survived and had no serious adverse event, and that all those participants lost to follow-up in the placebo group have not survived, and had a serious adverse event.
- 'Worst-best-case' scenario: We will assume that all participants lost to follow-up in the cannabinoid intervention group have not survived, and had a serious adverse event, and that all those participants lost to follow-up in the placebo group have survived, and had no serious adverse event.

We will present results of both scenarios in our review.

For all continuous outcome when analysing a 'beneficial outcome' will be the group mean plus two standard deviations (SDs) (we will secondly use one SD in another sensitivity analysis) of the group mean and a 'harmful outcome' will be the group mean minus two SDs (we will secondly use one SD in another sensitivity analysis) of the group mean [118].

To assess the potential impact of missing SDs for continuous outcomes, we will perform the following sensitivity analysis.

• Where SDs are missing and it is not possible to calculate them, we will impute SDs from trials with similar populations and low risk of bias. If we find no such trials, we will impute SDs from trials with a similar population. As the final option, we will impute SDs from all trials.

We will present results of this scenario in our review. Other post hoc sensitivity analyses might be warranted if unexpected clinical or statistical heterogeneity is identified during the analysis of the review results [118].

#### Summary of Findings

We will create a Summary of Findings table using each of the primary outcomes (all-cause mortality, pain assessment on VAS or NRS, serious adverse event, and quality of life). We will use the five GRADE considerations (bias risk of the trials, consistency of effect, imprecision, indirectness, and publication bias) to

assess the quality of a body of evidence as it relates to the studies which contribute data to the meta-analyses for the prespecified outcomes [118, 136-138]. We will use methods and recommendations described in Chapter 8 (Section 8.5) and Chapter 12 of the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions [100] using GRADEpro software. We will justify all decisions to downgrade the quality of studies using footnotes, and we will make comments to aid the reader's understanding of the review where necessary. Firstly, we will present our results in the Summary of Findings table based on the results from the trials with low risk of bias, and secondly, we will present the results based on all trials.

#### **Ethics and Dissemination**

Ethical approval is not a requirement since no primary data will be collected. The findings of this systematic review will be submitted for peer-reviewed publication and disseminated in national and international conferences and is expected to inform healthcare workers and providers about the occurrence of serious and non-serious adverse events following cannabinoid consumption. It is expected that the findings of this systematic review will identify some research gaps for future trials.

#### Discussion

This protocol aims at investigating the beneficial and harmful effects of cannabinoids in patients with any type of pain condition. The outcomes will be all-cause mortality, pain assessment on VAS or NRS, serious adverse events, quality of life, dependence, psychosis, non-serious adverse events, and sleep quality.

This protocol has several strengths. The predefined methodology is based on the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions [100], the eight-step assessment suggested by Jakobsen et al. [118], Trial Sequential Analysis [84], and GRADE assessment [136-138]. Hence, this protocol takes into account both the risk of random error and the risk of systematic error. We predefined evidence-based estimations of minimal important differences which will limit the risk of focusing on statistically significant results with questionable clinical importance. This threshold of minimal important difference is based on the estimations of several previously conducted studies and reviews [121, 122]. Moreover, we are including all types of cannabinoids and all types of pain which will increase the statistical power and make it possible to perform essential subgroup analyses. We have been in contact with several relevant patient associations which has assisted us in choosing the most clinically relevant outcomes.

#### **BMJ** Open

Our protocol also has several limitations. One of the potential limitations is that we include participants with all types of pain; cannabinoids might have different effects on different types of pain. It might e.g. be problematic to combine trials assessing the effects of cannabinoids on acute pain and chronic pain because of different underlying pathophysiological mechanisms [139]. On the other hand, the effects of cannabinoids on acute pain and chronic pain might be comparable and hence it might be valid to combine trials assessing the effects of cannabinoids on acute pain and chronic pain might be comparable and hence it might be valid to combine trials assessing the effects of cannabinoids on acute pain and chronic pain and chronic pain in meta-analysis, which would increase the statistical power. The results of the subgroup analysis comparing trials including participants with acute pain to participants with chronic pain will therefore be highlighted when reporting our review results. Moreover, we only intend to assess cannabinoids versus placebo or no intervention. Further systematic reviews with meta-analyses and Trial Sequential Analyses need to assess the benefits and harms of cannabinoids versus other pain killers, provided that cannabinoids show more benefit than harm in the present systematic review.

Furthermore, more than one active cannabinoid agent is often combined in the different intervention options provided to the patients with a pain condition, thereby making difficult to explore the analgesic effect and adverse event associated with a single cannabinoid agent. Hence, if we show a difference between the intervention options, it will be difficult to conclude what exactly caused the difference in effect. To minimise these limitations, we have planned a careful assessment of statistical and clinical heterogeneity as well as several subgroup analyses and sensitivity analyses. Another limitation is the large number of comparisons which increase the risk of type 1 error. We have adjusted our thresholds for significance according to the number of primary outcomes, but, as mentioned, we have also included multiple subgroup analyses. This large risk of type 1 error will be taken into account when interpreting the review results.

#### Acknowledgements

We hugely appreciate the contribution of The Danish Diabetes Association, Steno Diabetes Centre Copenhagen, The Danish Rheumatism Association, The Danish Multiple Sclerosis Society, and Danish Cancer Society in selecting the most patient relevant outcomes.

#### **Funding statement**

to text

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

#### Authors' contributions

5 6

7 8 9

10

11

12

17

22 23

24 25 26

27

28

29 30

31 32

33

34

35

36 37

38

39

40

41 42

43

44

45

46

47 48

49

50

51

52

53 54

JB drafted the protocol. JCJ, SKK, OM, CG, JRF and MM amended the protocol. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

#### **Competing interests**

The authors declare that they have no competing interests

#### Ethics approval and consent to participate

Not applicable.

#### Word Count

10835 words, including the full references.

#### References

- 1. Verhaak P, Kerssens J, Dekker J, Sorbi M, and Bensing J, Prevalence of chronic benign pain disorder among adults: a review of the literature. PAIN, 1998. 77(3): p. 231-9.
- 2. Kroenke K, Patients presenting with somatic complaints: epidemiology, psychiatric comorbidity and management. Int J Methods Psychiatr Res, 2003. 12(1): p. 34-43.
- Sternbach RA, Survey of pain in the United States: The nuprin pain report. The Clinical Journal of 3. Pain, 1986. 2(1): p. 49-53.
- 4. Gureje O, Von Korff M, Simon G, and Gater R, Persistent pain and well-being: a World Health Organization Study in Primary Care. Jama, 1998. 280(2): p. 147-51.
- Breivik H, International association for the study of pain: update on WHO-IASP activities. J Pain 5. Symptom Manage, 2002. 24(2): p. 97-101.
- 6. Astin J, Why patients use alternative medicine: Results of a national study. JAMA, 1998. **279**(19): p. 1548-1553.
- 7. Davison SN, Jhangri GS, and Johnson JA, Cross-sectional validity of a modified Edmonton symptom assessment system in dialysis patients: a simple assessment of symptom burden. Kidney Int, 2006. 69(9): p. 1621-5.
- 8. Davison SN, Jhangri GS, and Johnson JA, Longitudinal validation of a modified Edmonton symptom assessment system (ESAS) in haemodialysis patients. Nephrol Dial Transplant, 2006. **21**(11): p. 3189-95.

1		
2		
4 5	9.	Davison SN and Jhangri GS, Impact of pain and symptom burden on the health-related quality of life of hemodialysis patients. J Pain Symptom Manage, 2010. <b>39</b> (3): p. 477-85.
7 8	10.	Davison S, <i>Chronic pain in end-stage renal disease</i> . Adv Chronic Kidney Dis, 2005. <b>12</b> (3): p. 326-34.
9 10 11 12	11.	Kimmel PL, Emont SL, Newmann JM, Danko H, and Moss AH, <i>ESRD patient quality of life: symptoms, spiritual beliefs, psychosocial factors, and ethnicity.</i> Am J Kidney Dis, 2003. <b>42</b> (4): p. 713-21.
13 14 15	12.	Leinau L, Murphy TE, Bradley E, and Fried T, <i>Relationship between conditions addressed by hemodialysis guidelines and non-ESRD-specific conditions affecting quality of life.</i> Clin J Am Soc Nephrol, 2009. <b>4</b> (3): p. 572-8.
16 17 18 19	13.	Weisbord SD, Carmody SS, Bruns FJ, Rotondi AJ, Cohen LM, Zeidel ML, et al., <i>Symptom burden, quality of life, advance care planning and the potential value of palliative care in severely ill haemodialysis patients.</i> Nephrol Dial Transplant, 2003. <b>18</b> (7): p. 1345-52.
20 21 22 23	14.	Weisbord SD, Fried LF, Arnold RM, Fine MJ, Levenson DJ, Peterson RA, et al., <i>Prevalence, severity, and importance of physical and emotional symptoms in chronic hemodialysis patients.</i> J Am Soc Nephrol, 2005. <b>16</b> (8): p. 2487-94.
24 25 26	15.	Gamondi C, Galli N, Schonholzer C, Marone C, Zwahlen H, Gabutti L, et al., <i>Frequency and severity of pain and symptom distress among patients with chronic kidney disease receiving dialysis.</i> Swiss Med Wkly, 2013. <b>143</b> : p. w13750.
27 28 29	16.	Smith BH, Elliott AM, Chambers WA, Smith WC, Hannaford PC, and Penny K, <i>The impact of chronic pain in the community.</i> Fam Pract, 2001. <b>18</b> (3): p. 292-9.
30 31 32 33 34	17.	Merskey H, Lindblom U, Mumford JM, Nathan PW, and Sunderland S, Part III: Pain terms—a current list with definitions and notes on usage with definitions and notes on usage. In: Merskey H, Bogduk N editor(s). Classification of Chronic Pain, IASP Task Force on Taxonomy. IASP Press, 1994(2nd Edition): p. 209-14.
35	18.	Carr DB and Goudas LC, <i>Acute pain.</i> The Lancet, 1999. <b>353</b> (9169): p. 2051-2058.
36 37 38	19.	Ashburn MA and Staats PS, <i>Management of chronic pain</i> . The Lancet, 1999. <b>353</b> (9167): p. 1865-1869.
39	20.	Kanner R, <i>Pain Management.</i> JAMA, 1986. <b>256</b> (15): p. 2112-2114.
40	21.	Loeser J, Melzack R, <i>Pain: an overview</i> . The Lancet, 1999. <b>353</b> (9164): p. 1607-1609.
41	22.	Portenoy R and Dhingra L. Assessment of cancer pain. 2017 [cited 18/04 2018].
42 43 44	23.	Gregory J and McGowan L, <i>An examination of the prevalence of acute pain for hospitalised adult patients: a systematic review.</i> J Clin Nurs, 2016. <b>25</b> (5-6): p. 583-98.
45 46	24.	Treede R, <i>Entstehung der schmerzchronifizierung. Rückenschmerzen und nackenschmerzen.</i> 2016: Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
47 48	25.	American Geriatrics Society Panel <i>Pharmacological management of persistent pain in older persons.</i> J Am Geriatr Soc, 2009. <b>57</b> : p. 1331-46.
49 50 51 52	26.	Steingrimsdottir OA, Landmark T, Macfarlane GJ, and Nielsen CS, <i>Defining chronic pain in epidemiological studies: a systematic review and meta-analysis.</i> Pain, 2017. <b>158</b> (11): p. 2092-2107.
53 54 55 56 57 58	27.	Breivik H, Collett B, Ventafridda V, Cohen R, and Gallacher D, <i>Survey of chronic pain in Europe: prevalence, impact on daily life, and treatment.</i> Eur J Pain, 2006. <b>10</b> (4): p. 287-333.

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

23

24

38

39

41

49

50

51

- 28. Goldberg DS and McGee SJ, Pain as a global public health priority. BMC Public Health, 2011. 11: p. 770. 29. Gureje O, Von Korff M, Kola L, Demyttenaere K, He Y, Posada-Villa J, et al., The relation between multiple pains and mental disorders: results from the World Mental Health Surveys. PAIN, 2008. **135**(1-2): p. 82-91. 30. Institute of Medicine (US) Committee on Advancing Pain Research, Care, and Education, Relieving pain in America: A blueprint for transforming prevention, care, education, and research. National Academies Press 2011. 31. Koleva D, Pain in primary care: an Italian survey. Eur J Public Health, 2005. 15: p. 475–79. 32. Mantyselka P, Kumpusalo E, Ahonen R, Kumpusalo A, Kauhanen J, Viinamaki H, et al., Pain as a reason to visit the doctor: a study in Finnish primary health care. PAIN, 2001. 89(2-3): p. 175-80. 33. Treede RD, Rief W, Barke A, Aziz Q, Bennett MI, Benoliel R, et al., A classification of chronic pain for ICD-11. PAIN, 2015. 156(6): p. 1003-7.
- 20 34. Kelly DJ, Ahmad M, and Brull SJ, Preemptive analgesia I: physiological pathways and 21 pharmacological modalities. Canadian Journal of Anaesthesia, 2001. 48(10): p. 1000-1010. 22
  - 35. Pogatzki-Zahn EM, Segelcke D, and Schug SA, Postoperative pain-from mechanisms to treatment. Pain Rep, 2017. 2(2): p. e588.
- 25 36. Bajwa ZH, Wootton J, and Wippold II FJ. Evaluation of headache in adults. 2018 [cited 2018. 26
  - 37. Lipowski Z, Chronic idiopathic pain syndrome. Annals of Medicine, 1990. 22(4): p. 213-217.
- 27 38. Goucke C, The management of persistent pain. Med J Aust, 2003. 178(9): p. 444-7. 28
- 39. Chang V. Approach to symptom assessment in palliative care. 2018 [cited 2018. 29
- 30 40. Knowles CH and Aziz Q, Basic and clinical aspects of gastrointestinal pain. Pain, 2009. 141(3): p. 31 191-209. 32
- Stein S L, Chronic pelvic pain. Gastroenterol Clin North Am, 2013. 42(4): p. 785-800. 41. 33
- 42. Schwartz ES and Gebhart GF, Visceral pain. Curr Top Behav Neurosci, 2014. 20: p. 171-97. 34
- Giamberardino M, Affaitati G, and Costantini R, Chapter 24 Referred pain from internal organs. 43. 35 36 Handb Clin Neurol, 2006. 81: p. 343-61. 37
  - 44. Jensen TS, Baron R, Haanpaa M, Kalso E, Loeser JD, Rice AS, et al., A new definition of neuropathic pain. Pain, 2011. 152(10): p. 2204-5.
- 45. Mannion RJ and Woolf CJ, Pain mechanisms and management: a central perspective. Clin J Pain, 40 2000. 16(3 Suppl): p. S144-56.
- 42 46. Headache Classification Committee of the International Headache Society, The International 43 Classification of Headache Disorders, 3rd edition (beta version). Cephalalgia, 2013. 33: p. 629-44 808.
- 45 47. Institute for clinical systems improvement, Health care guideline: Assessment and management 46 47 of chronic pain. 2009. 48
  - Kehlet H, Jensen TS, and Woolf CJ, Persistent postsurgical pain: Risk factors and prevention. The 48. Lancet, 2006. 367(9522):1618-25.
  - United Nations office on drugs and crime, World Drug Report, United Nations. 2016. 49.
- 52 50. Russo E, Cannabinoids in the management of difficult to treat pain. Ther Clin Risk Manag, 2008. 53 **4**(1): p. 245-59. 54

#### BMJ Open

1		
2		
3		
4	<b>F</b> 4	Linda N. Taukai K. and Lingua T. Matakalia anawara fan andarananakinaida and
5	51.	Ueda N, Isubol K, and Uyama I, <i>Metabolic enzymes for endocannabinolas and</i>
6		endocannabinoid-like mediators. 2015, Boston: Academic Press.
7	52.	Devane WA, Hanus L, Breuer A, Pertwee RG, Stevenson LA, Griffin G, et al., Isolation and
, 8	•	structure of a brain constituent that hinds to the cannabinaid recenter Science 1002
0		structure of a brain constituent that binas to the cannabilloid receptor. Science, 1992.
10		<b>258</b> (5090): p. 1946-9.
10	53.	Mechoulam R, Ben-Shabat S, Hanus L, Ligumsky M, Kaminski NE, Schatz AR, et al., Identification
11		of an endoaenous 2-monoalyceride present in canine aut that hinds to cannahinoid recentors
12		Dischara Dharmanal 1005 <b>FO</b> (1); r. 02.00
13		Biochem Pharmacol, 1995. <b>50</b> (1): p. 83-90.
14	54.	Sugiura T, Kondo S, Sukagawa A, Nakane S, Shinoda A, Itoh K, et al., 2-Arachidonoylglycerol: a
15		possible endogenous cannabinoid receptor ligand in brain. Biochem Biophys Res Commun, 1995.
16		<b>21E</b> (1): n 80 07
17		
18	55.	Shook JE and Burks IF, Psychoactive cannabinoids reduce gastrointestinal propulsion and
19		motility in rodents. Journal of Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics, 1989. 249(2): p.
20		444-449
21	FC	Calignano A. La Bana C. Ciuffrida A. and Diamalli D. Control of nain initiation by anderganous
22	50.	Calignatio A, La Rana G, Giunnua A, and Piomeni D, Control of puin initiation by endogenous
23		<i>cannabinoids.</i> Nature, 1998. <b>394</b> (6690): p. 277-81.
24	57.	Jaggar S I, Hasnie F S, Sellaturay S, and Rice A S, The anti-hyperalgesic actions of the cannabinoid
25		anandamide and the nutative CB2 recentor agonist nalmitovlethanolamide in visceral and
26		ana da ana the patative $OD2$ receptor agonist parmitojiethanolarinae in visceral ana comptini inflammatory pain $1002$ <b>TC</b> $(1, 2)$ in 180.00
27	_	<i>Somulic Influminulory pulli.</i> Palli, 1998. <b>76</b> (1-2): p. 189-99.
28	58.	Pacher P, Bátkai S, and Kunos G, The endocannabinoid system as an emerging target of
29		<i>pharmacotherapy</i> . Pharmacol Rev, 2006. <b>58</b> (3): p. 389-462.
30	50	Fisar 7 Phytocannahinoids and endocannahinoids Curr Drug Abuse Rev 2009 2(1): p 51-75
31	55. co	Tisar 2, Thytocannabinous and endocannabinous. Carr Drag Abase Rev, 2005. 2(1), p. 5175.
37	60.	Hauser W, Fitzcharles W, Radbruch L, and Petzke F, Cannabinoids in pain management and
32		palliative medicine. Deutsches Arzteblatt international, 2017. <b>114</b> (38): p. 627-634.
34	61.	Hazekamp A, Ware MA, Muller-Vahl KR, Abrams D, and Grotenhermen F, The medicinal use of
35		cannabis and cannabinaids—An international cross-sectional survey on administration forms
36		Laural of Dauch contine Druces 2012. <b>AF</b> (2): a 100-210
27		Journal of Psychoactive Drugs, 2013. <b>45</b> (3): p. 199-210.
20	62.	European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction, Understanding the spice
20		phenomenon. Lisabon. 2009.
39	63	EMCDDA Annual report on the state of the drugs problem in Europe 2012
40	05.	LINCODA, Annaul report on the state of the drugs problem in Europe: 2012.
41	64.	Watson SJ, Benson JA, and Joy JE, Marijuana and medicine: assessing the science base: a
42		summary of the 1999 Institute of Medicine report. Arch Gen Psychiatry, 2000. 57(6): p. 547-52.
43	65.	Brenneisen R. Chemistry and analysis of phytocannabinoids and other cannabis constituents, in
44		Marijuana and the Cannahinoida ElSobly M.A. Editor, 2007, Humana Bross: Totowa, NJ, p. 17
45		Multipuullu ullu the culliubiliolus, Elsoniy M A, Eultor. 2007, Hulliana Press. Totowa, NJ. p. 17-
46		49.
47	66.	Hillard C, Weinlander K, and Stuhr K, Contributions of endocannabinoid signaling to psychiatric
48		disorders in humans: genetic and higherical evidence Neuroscience 2012 <b>204</b> n 207-29
49	67	Dertwee D. Cannabis and cannabineids: Dharmaceleau and rationals for clinical use. Dharmacel
50	67.	Pertwee R, Cannubis and Cannubinolas. Pharmacology and rationale for Clinical use. Pharmacy
51		and Pharmacology Communications, 1997. <b>3</b> (11): p. 539-545.
52	68.	Solinas M, Goldberg SR, and Piomelli D, The endocannabinoid system in brain reward processes.
53		Br I Pharmacol. 2008. <b>154</b> (2): p. 369-83
54		
55		
56		
57		
58		
59		

- 69. D'Souza D, Cortes-Briones J, Ranganathan M, Thurnauer H, Creatura G, Surti T, et al., *Rapid Changes in CB1 Receptor Availability in Cannabis Dependent Males after Abstinence from Cannabis.* Biol Psychiatry Cogn Neurosci Neuroimaging, 2016. **1**(1): p. 60-67.
  - 70. American Psychiatric Association, *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders*. *Fifth Edition*. 2013.
- 71. Koppel BS, Brust J, Fife T, Bronstein J, Youssof S, Gronseth G, et al., *Systematic review: efficacy* and safety of medical marijuana in selected neurologic disorders: report of the Guideline Development Subcommittee of the American Academy of Neurology. Neurology, 2014. **82**(17): p. 1556-63.
- 72. Gorelick D, Saxon A, and Hermann R *Cannabis use and disorder: Pathogenesis and pharmacology*. UpToDate Cannabis use and disorder: Pathogenesis and pharmacology, 2018.[cited Access 2018 Access Date].
- 73. Morean ME, Kong G, Camenga DR, Cavallo DA, and Krishnan-Sarin S, *High school students' use of electronic cigarettes to vaporize cannabis.* Pediatrics, 2015. **136**(4): p. 611-616.
- 74. Loflin M and Earleywine M, No smoke, no fire: What the initial literature suggests regarding vapourized cannabis and respiratory risk. Canadian journal of respiratory therapy, 2015. **51**(1): p. 7-9.
- 75. Aggarwal SK, Carter GT, Sullivan MD, ZumBrunnen C, Morrill R, and Mayer JD, Medicinal use of cannabis in the United States: historical perspectives, current trends, and future directions. J Opioid Manag, 2009. **5**(3): p. 153-68.
- 76. Stockings E, Zagic D, Campbell G, Weier M, Hall WD, Nielsen S, et al., *Evidence for cannabis and cannabinoids for epilepsy: a systematic review of controlled and observational evidence*. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry, 2018. **89**(7): p. 741-753.
- 77. GW Pharmaceuticals, Sativex<sup>®</sup> approved in Denmark for the treatment of spasticity due to Multiple Sclerosis (MS). <u>https://www.gwpharm.com/about-us/news/sativex</u><sup>®</sup>-approveddenmark-treatment-spasticity-due-multiple-sclerosis-ms, 2011. **2018**.
- 78. ABC NEWS, STANFORD MEDICAL CENTER POLL: Broad Experience with Pain Sparks a Search for Relief. 2005.
- Aviram J and Samuelly-Leichtag G, Efficacy of Cannabis-Based Medicines for Pain Management: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. Pain Physician, 2017.
   20(6): p. E755-e796.
- 80. Lynch M, Campbell, F, *Cannabinoids for treatment of chronic non-cancer pain; a systematic review of randomized trials.* Br J Clin Pharmacol, 2011. **72**(5): p. 735-44.
- Meng H, Johnston B, Englesakis M, Moulin DE, and Bhatia A, Selective Cannabinoids for Chronic Neuropathic Pain: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. Anesth Analg, 2017. 125(5): p. 1638-1652.
- 82. Boychuk DG, Goddard G, Mauro G, and Orellana MF, *The effectiveness of cannabinoids in the management of chronic nonmalignant neuropathic pain: a systematic review.* J Oral Facial Pain Headache, 2015. **29**(1): p. 7-14.
- 83. Martin-Sanchez E, Furukawa TA, Taylor J, and Martin JL, *Systematic review and meta-analysis of cannabis treatment for chronic pain.* Pain Med, 2009. **10**(8): p. 1353-68.

1		
2		
3		
4	84.	Campbell FA. Tramèr MR. Carroll D. Reynolds DJ. Moore RA. and McQuay HJ. Are cannabinoids
5	-	an effective and safe treatment ontion in the management of nain? A qualitative systematic
6		an ejjeenve and saje treatment option in the management of paint A quantative systematic
7		<i>review.</i> Bivij (Clinical research ed.), 2001. <b>323</b> (7303): p. 13-16.
8	85.	Deshpande A, Mailis-Gagnon A, Zoheiry N, and Lakha SF, Efficacy and adverse effects of medical
9		marijuana for chronic noncancer pain: Systematic review of randomized controlled trials. Can
10		Fam Physician, 2015, <b>61</b> (8); p. e372-81.
11	86	Stevens AL and Higgins MD. A systematic review of the analaesic efficacy of cannabinoid
12	80.	stevens AJ and Higgins WD, A systematic review of the unargeste efficacy of cumubinou
13		<i>medications in the management of acute pain.</i> Acta Anaestnesiol Scand, 2017. <b>61</b> (3): p. 268-
14		280.
15	87.	Walitt B, Klose P, Fitzcharles MA, Phillips T, and Hauser W, Cannabinoids for fibromyalgia.
10		Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2016. 7: p. Cd011694.
17 10	88	Mucke M Phillins T Badhruch L Petzke E and Hauser W Cannahis-based medicines for chronic
10	00.	nourcenethis nain in adults. Coshrene Detabase Sust Doy. 2019. <b>2</b> , n. Cd012192
20	~~	neuroputnic punt in dudits. Cochrane Database Syst Rev, 2018. <b>5</b> . p. Cu012182.
20	89.	Boydell J, Van Os J, Caspi A, Kennedy N, Giouroukou E, Fearon P, et al., Trends in cannabis use
27		prior to first presentation with schizophrenia, in South-East London between 1965 and 1999.
23		Psychological Medicine, 2006. <b>36</b> (10): p. 1441-1446.
24	90.	Andreasson S. Allebeck P. Engstrom A. and Rydberg U. Cannabis and schizophrenia. A
25		longitudingl study of Swedish conscripts Lancet 1987 2(8577): p 1/83-6
26	01	Areanacult I. Conner M. Doulton D. Murroy D. Cosri A. and Moffitt TE. Connehis use in
27	91.	Arseneault L, Cannon W, Poulton R, Wurray R, Caspi A, and Wontitt TE, Cunnubis use in
28		adolescence and risk for adult psychosis: longitudinal prospective study. Bmj, 2002. <b>325</b> (7374):
29		p. 1212-3.
30	92.	van Os J, Bak M, Hanssen M, Bijl R V, de Graaf R, and Verdoux H, Cannabis use and psychosis: a
31		longitudingl nonulation-based study Am   Enidemiol 2002 <b>156</b> (4): n 319-27
32	02	Zammit S. Allebock D. Androaccon S. Lundborg L and Lowis G. Solf reported campabic use as a
33	95.	Zaminin 3, Anebeck P, Andreasson 3, Lundberg I, and Lewis G, Seij reported cumuois use us u
34		risk factor for schizophrenia in Sweaish conscripts of 1969: historical conort study. BmJ, 2002.
35		<b>325</b> (7374): p. 1199.
36	94.	Fergusson DM, Horwood LJ, and Ridder EM, Tests of causal linkages between cannabis use and
37		psychotic symptoms. Addiction, 2005. <b>100</b> (3): p. 354-66. 🦳
38	95	Henquet C Krahbendam I Snauwen I Kanlan C Lieb R Wittchen HIL et al. Prospective cohort
39	55.	study of canaphic use predicaction for psychosic, and psychotic symptoms in young people
40		study of cumuois use, predisposition for psychosis, and psycholic symptoms in young people.
41		Bmj, 2005. <b>330</b> (7481): p. 11.
42	96.	Di Forti M, Quattrone D, Freeman TP, Tripoli G, Gayer-Anderson C, Quigley H, et al., The
43		contribution of cannabis use to variation in the incidence of psychotic disorder across Europe
44 15		(EU-GEI): a multicentre case-control study. Lancet Psychiatry, 2019, 6(5): p. 427-436.
45 46	97	Shamseer I. Moher D. Clarke M. Ghersi D. Liberati A. Petticrew M. et al. Preferred reporting
40 47	57.	items for sustamatic review and meta anglusis protocols (DDISMA D) 2015, elaboration and
47 48		items jor systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISIVIA-P) 2015. Elaboration and
49		<i>explanation.</i> Bmj, 2015. <b>350</b> : p. g7647.
50	98.	Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al., Preferred reporting
51		items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. Syst Rev,
52		2015. <b>4</b> : n. 1.
53	00	International conference on harmonication of technical requirements for registration of
54	53.	anternational conjerence on narmonisation of technical requirements for registration of
55		pharmaceuticals for numan use (ICH) adopts consolidated guideline on good clinical practice in
56		
57		
58		
59		
60		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

5

6

7 8

9

58 59

60

the conduct of clinical trials on medicinal products for human use. Int Dig Health Legis, 1997. 48(2): p. 231-4. 100. Higgins J and Green S. Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions version 5.1.0. www.handbook.cochrane.org. 2011. Review Manager (RevMan). 2014, Copenhagen: the Nordic Cochrane Centre, The Cochrane 101. 10 Collaboration. 11 102. TSA—trial sequential analysis. Copenhagen Trial Unit. 12 103. StataCorp: Stata: Release 14. 2014, College Station, TX: StataCorp LP. 13 14 104. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, and Altman DG, Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews 15 and meta-analyses: The PRISMA statement. PLOS Medicine, 2009. 6(7): p. e1000097. 16 105. Gluud LL, Bias in clinical intervention research. Am J Epidemiol, 2006. **163**(6): p. 493-501. 17 106. Kjaergard LL, Villumsen J, and Gluud C, Reported methodologic quality and discrepancies 18 19 between large and small randomized trials in meta-analyses. Ann Intern Med, 2001. 135(11): p. 20 982-9. 21 107. Lundh A, Sismondo, S, Lexchin, J, Busuioc, OA, Bero, L, Industry sponsorship and research 22 outcome. Cochrane Database Syst Rev, 2012. 12: p. Mr000033. 23 108. Moher D, Pham, B, Jones, A, Cook, DJ, Jadad, AR, Moher, M et al., Does quality of reports of 24 25 randomised trials affect estimates of intervention efficacy reported in meta-analyses? Lancet, 26 1998. **352**(9128): p. 609-13. 27 109. Schulz KF, Chalmers I, Hayes RJ, and Altman DG, Empirical evidence of bias. Dimensions of 28 methodological quality associated with estimates of treatment effects in controlled trials. JAMA, 29 30 1995. 273(5): p. 408-12. 31 110. Wood L, Egger M, Gluud L, Schulz K, Jüni P, Altman D, et al., Empirical evidence of bias in 32 treatment effect estimates in controlled trials with different interventions and outcomes: meta-33 epidemiological study. BMJ, 2008. 336(7644): p. 601-605. 34 Savovic J, Jones H, Altman D, Harris R, Juni P, Pildal J, et al., Influence of reported study design 35 111. 36 characteristics on intervention effect estimates from randomised controlled trials: combined 37 analysis of meta-epidemiological studies. Health Technol Assess, 2012. 16(35): p. 1-82. 38 112. Higgins JP and Thompson SG, Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. Stat Med, 2002. 39 21(11): p. 1539-58. 40 41 113. Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, and Altman DG, Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. 42 BMJ, 2003. **327**(7414): p. 557-60. 43 114. Harbord RM, Egger M, and Sterne JA, A modified test for small-study effects in meta-analyses of 44 controlled trials with binary endpoints. Stat Med, 2006. 25(20): p. 3443-57. 45 115. Egger M, Davey Smith G, Schneider M, and Minder C, Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, 46 47 graphical test. BMJ, 1997. 315(7109): p. 629-34. 48 116. Begg CB and Mazumdar M, Operating characteristics of a rank correlation test for publication 49 bias. Biometrics, 1994. 50(4): p. 1088-101. 50 Elbourne D, Altman D, Higgins J, Curtin F, Worthington H, and Vail A, Meta-analyses involving 117. 51 52 cross-over trials: methodological issues. International Journal of Epidemiology, 2002. **31**(1): p. 53 140-149. 54 55 56 57

1		
2		
3		
4	118	Jakobsen IC Wettersley I Winkel P. Lange T. and Gluud C. Thresholds for statistical and clinical
5	110.	significance in sustances is reviewe with metry and cloud C, Intesholds Jor Statistical and clinical
6		significance in systematic reviews with meta-analytic methods. Bivic weakes wethodol, 2014.
7		<b>14</b> : p. 120.
8	119.	Hagg O, Fritzell P, and Nordwall A, The clinical importance of changes in outcome scores after
9		treatment for chronic low back pain Fur Spine I 2003 <b>12</b> (1) n 12-20
10	120	Lossphe D. Singer L. and Cuyott Cl. Maggurement of health status. Assortaining the minimal
11	120.	Jaeschke R, Singer J, and Guyatt GH, Medsurement Of neutrin status. Ascertaining the minimul
12		<i>clinically important difference.</i> Control Clin Trials, 1989. <b>10</b> (4): p. 407-15.
13	121.	Olsen MF, Bjerre E, Hansen MD, Hilden J, Landler NE, Tendal B, et al., Pain relief that matters to
14		patients: systematic review of empirical studies assessing the minimum clinically important
15		difference in acute nain BMC Med 2017 <b>15</b> (1): n 35
16	422	Ober ME Dieur F Hannen MD Tradel D Hilder Handel Hackinsterne A Adieire en elisierth
17	122.	Olsen MF, Bjerre E, Hansen MD, Tendal B, Hilden J, and Hrobjartsson A, Minimum clinically
18		important differences in chronic pain vary considerably by baseline pain and methodological
19		factors: systematic review of empirical studies. J Clin Epidemiol, 2018. <b>101</b> : p. 87-106.e2.
20	123	Keys F. Wettersley I. Gluud C. and van Laarboven CL. Evidence at a glance: error matrix approach
21	125.	for every invited and the suidence. DMC Med Dec Methodel. 2010, 10, p. 00.
22	-	<i>for overviewing available evidence.</i> Bivic Med Res Methodol, 2010. <b>10</b> : p. 90.
23	124.	DerSimonian R and Laird N, Meta-analysis in clinical trials. Control Clin Trials, 1986. 7(3): p. 177-
24		88.
25	125.	Demets DL. Methods for combining randomized clinical trials: strengths and limitations. Stat
26		Mod 1097 <b>6</b> (2): n 241 E0
27	120	
28	126.	Jakobsen J C, Wetterslev J, Lange T, and Gluud C, Viewpoint: taking into account risks of random
29		errors when analysing multiple outcomes in systematic reviews. Cochrane Database of
30		Systematic Reviews. 2016(3).
31	127	Wettersley I Thorlund K Brok L and Gluud C Trial sequential analysis may establish when firm
32	127.	vettersiev 3, monana k, brok 3, and Glada C, marsequential analysis may establish when jimi
33		evidence is reached in cumulative meta-analysis. J Clin Epidemiol, 2008. <b>61</b> (1): p. 64-75.
34	128.	Thorlund K W J, Brok J, Imberger G, Gluud C, User manual for trial sequential analysis (TSA).
35		2011.
36	129.	Brok J. Thorlund K. Gluud C. and Wettersley J. Trial sequential analysis reveals insufficient
37	120.	information size and notantially false positive results in many meta analysis (Clin Epidemiol
38		injormation size and potentially juise positive results in many meta-analyses. J Cliff Epidemiol,
39		2008. <b>61</b> (8): p. 763-9.
40	130.	Brok J, Thorlund K, Wetterslev J, and Gluud C, Apparently conclusive meta-analyses may be
41		inconclusiveTrial sequential analysis adjustment of random error risk due to repetitive testing
42		of accumulating data in apparently conclusive peopatal meta-analyses. Int I Epidemiol 2009
43		
44		<b>38</b> (1): p. 287-98.
45	131.	Thorlund K, Devereaux PJ, Wetterslev J, Guyatt G, Ioannidis JP, Thabane L, et al., Can trial
46		sequential monitoring boundaries reduce spurious inferences from meta-analyses? Int J
47		Enidemiol 2009 <b>38</b> (1): n 276-86
48	122	Wetterslov I. Therlund K. Brok I. and Cluud C. Estimating required information size by
49	132.	wellersiev J, monuna K, Brok J, and Gluda C, Estimating required information size by
50		quantifying diversity in random-effects model meta-analyses. BMC Med Res Methodol, 2009. 9:
51		р. 86.
52	133.	Thorlund K. Anema A. and Mills E. Interpreting meta-analysis according to the adequacy of
53	_00.	cample size An example using isoniazid chemonronhulavis for tuberculosis in purified protein
54		sumple size. An example using isoniuzia chemoprophylaxis jor tabercalosis in parijiea protein
55		aerivative negative HIV-infectea individuals. Clin Epidemiol, 2010. 2: p. 57-66.
56		
57		
58		
59		

134. Imberger G, Gluud C, Boylan J, and Wetterslev J, Systematic reviews of anesthesiologic interventions reported as statistically significant: problems with power, precision, and type 1 error protection. Anesth Analg, 2015. 121(6): p. 1611-22.

- Imberger G, Thorlund K, Gluud C, and Wetterslev J, False-positive findings in Cochrane meta-135. analyses with and without application of trial sequential analysis: an empirical review. BMJ Open, 2016. 6(8).
- 136. Guyatt G, Oxman A, Vist G, Kunz R, Falck-Ytter Y, Alonso-Coello P, et al., GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. BMJ, 2008. 336(7650): p. 924-926.
- 137. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Schunemann HJ, Tugwell P, and Knottnerus A, GRADE guidelines: a new series of articles in the Journal of Clinical Epidemiology. J Clin Epidemiol, 2011. **64**(4): p. 380-2.
- 138. Schunemann HJ, Best D, Vist G, and Oxman AD, Letters, numbers, symbols and words: how to communicate grades of evidence and recommendations. Cmaj, 2003. 169(7): p. 677-80.
- idencε Μ, When οι. 139. Voscopoulos C and Lema M, When does acute pain become chronic? Br J Anaesth, 2010. 105 Suppl 1: p. i69-85.

#### Appendix

#### **Minimal important difference**

For the determination of minimal important differences in clinical trials two types of methods are available; anchor-based methods and distributional-based methods [1].

#### Anchor-based methods

Anchor-based methods relate the change in on a person reported outcome score, (e.g. a score on the visual analog scale (VAS)) to a subjective global assessment rating (e.g. scores from the Clinical Global Impressions-Improvement (CGI-I)) which is used as an 'anchor' [1]. Ideally, there needs to be an established association between the person reported outcome score and the 'anchor' to make any meaningful inference about a minimal important difference [2].

There are two subtypes of anchor-based methods, i.e., the 'within-patient score' and the 'between-patients' score' [1].

- Within-patient score defines minimal important difference as the average minimal change in a given person's reported outcome score that leads to a clinically observable change in the subjective global assessment rating (the latter is used as an anchor) [1]. For example, to ascertain the minimal important difference regarding depression management, Moncrieff et. al describes the linking of within-patient scores (change from baseline) scores on the Hamilton Depression Rating Scale (the most commonly used depression rating scale) to scores on the Clinical Global Impressions-Improvement (CGI-I) scale, a scale which rates improvement on a scale of 1 (very much improved from baseline) through 4 (no change from baseline) to 7 (very much worse from baseline) [3]. Moncrieff et. al conclude that seven points on the Hamilton Depression Rating Scale correspond to a minimal important difference when using within-patient scores [3].
- The between-patients score method, also known as 'the group difference' method, compare the reported outcome scores between a group of people with no clinically observable change (based on a subjective global assessment rating (used as an anchor)) to a group of people with clinically observable change (based on a subjective global assessment rating (used as an anchor)). The minimal important difference is then estimated as the mean difference between these two groups [4]. For example, Musoro et. al defines the minimal important difference (MID) as the group difference in terms of quality of life assessed by HRQOL scores [5]. Participants were assigned to distinct subgroups reflecting various levels of change (e.g. no change, small positive changes, large positive changes, small negative changes or large negative changes). The group difference was identified by the

comparison of the average of the HRQOL scores of the group of participants with at 'small change' to the HRQOL scores of the group of participants with 'no change' [5].

There are also other anchor-based methods (e.g. the sensitivity- and specificity-based method and the social comparison method) [1]. The sensitivity- and specificity-based method aims to identify the minimal important difference that allows for the best discrimination between groups of patients (i.e., the score that produces the greatest sensitivity and specificity) [1]. For example, an outcome measure (e.g. NRS score) is considered a 'diagnostic test' and the anchor (e.g. Global Perceived Effect) is used as gold standard and hence standard methods may be used to estimate sensitivity and specificity. Sensitivity is the proportion of patients who report an improvement on the external criterion (anchor) and whose person reported outcome scores are above the threshold minimal important difference value [1]. Specificity is the proportion of patients who do not report an improvement on the external criterion (anchor) and whose person reported outcome scores are below the threshold minimal important difference value [1]. Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves are then used to identify the person reported outcome score with the greatest sensitivity and specificity [6-8].

#### The distributional-based methods

Distribution-based methods are based on the statistical characteristics of the obtained sample [9]. Crosby et. al [9] have identified two general types of distribution-based methods for estimations of minimal important differences:

The first type of distribution-based method evaluate change in relation to sample variation [9]. Different types of variation can be used: effect size, standardised response mean, and responsiveness statistic [9]. The effect size represents individual change in relation to the number of pre-test standard deviations (SDs) [9]. Cohen et. al has suggested benchmarks to better interpret the effect sizes: .20 for "small" effects, .50 for "moderate" effects, and .80 for "large" effects [10]. Whereas the effect size is the ratio of individual change to the baseline standard deviation of the sample, standardised response mean is the ratio of individual change to the standard deviation of that change [11]. A large standardised response mean indicates that the change is large in comparison to the background variability in the measurements [9]. Guyatt et. al has proposed a responsiveness statistic as a variation of standardised response mean; calculated by dividing the difference between pre-test and post-test by the standard deviation of change observed for a group of stable participants [12].
Page 35 of 61

#### **BMJ** Open

The second type distribution-based method is based on the measurement precision of the instrument [9]. This method include the standard error of the mean (SEM) and evaluate the change in relation to variation of the instrument as opposed to variation in the sample [9]. Standard error of the mean (SEM) is a measure of the precision of a test instrument and considered an attribute of the measure and not a characteristic of the sample per se [13]. The standard error of the mean (SEM) for a given measure is likely to vary across samples depending upon the method used to estimate reliability and the presence of extreme scores [9]. Different thresholds for a minimal important difference have been suggested, i.e., values of 1 SEM [14], 1.96 SEM [15], and 2.77 SEM [13, 15].

In conclusion, different methods for estimating minimal important differences exist, but no single method has been shown to be the optimal method. The question of whether to use anchor-based or distribution-based methods for determining clinically meaningful change has received considerable attention and debate [9]. Dworkin et. al defined the clinical importance of patient improvement as the clinically important changes in individuals that can be identified using either within-patient anchor-based method or distributional-based method [16, 17], while the clinical importance of group differences could be the clinical difference between a treatment group and a placebo group or between two different treatment groups [18]. Dworkin et. al claim that the clinical important difference identified in individuals cannot be directly extrapolated to the evaluation of group differences [17, 19-22]. The U.S. Food and Drug Administration also states in their web site "When defining meaningful change on an individual patient basis, that definition is generally larger than the minimum important difference for application to group mean comparisons" [22].

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

While it is claimed that the within-patient differences are larger than the between-group difference [22], based on the studies included in our review we are not able to find a significant difference between the minimal important difference estimated by the two different methods.

## Previously conducted reviews on this subject

- Lynch & Campbell and Boychuk et. al both concluded that cannabinoids are a modestly effective and a safe treatment option for neuropathic pain [23, 24]. Lynch & Campbell and Boychuk et. al did not publish a protocol on beforehand [23, 24].
- Meng et. al concluded that there is moderate quality evidence to suggest that nabiximols (phytocannabinoid mixture) is effective in reducing neuropathic pain [25].

#### **BMJ** Open

- Mücke et. al concluded that there is no high-quality evidence for the efficacy of any cannabis-based medicine in any condition with chronic neuropathic pain [26]. Mücke et. al further concluded that some adverse events may limit the clinical usefulness of cannabis-based medicines [26].
- Deshpande et. al concluded that current evidence suggests that very low-dose medical marijuana (< 34 mg/d) is associated with an improvement in refractory neuropathic pain of moderate severity in adults using concurrent analgesics. Deshpande et. al did not publish a protocol on beforehand [27].
- Martín-Sánchez et. al concluded that treatment of chronic pain based on cannabinoid compounds would entail more risk of adverse events than benefit [28]. Martín-Sánchez et. al included trials randomising participants with either neuropathic pain, cancer pain, fibromyalgia related pain and nociceptive pain [28]. Martín-Sánchez et. al did not publish a protocol on beforehand [28].
- Aviram et. al concluded that cannabinoid-based medicines were not effective for postoperative pain, however further investigation is advised [29]. Aviram et. al also concluded that evidence suggests a moderate to good treatment effect on neuropathic pain [29]. Furthermore, neuropathic pain patients should be advised that the inhalation of cannabinoids showed relatively better pain reduction effects than other routes of administration [29]. Aviram et. al stated that the total number of adverse events that were accumulated in the meta-analysis indicated that cannabinoid-based medicines should be used with caution [29]. Aviram et. al did not publish a protocol on beforehand [29].
- Campbell et. al concluded that levonantradol (synthetic cannabinoid analogue) was superior to placebo on postoperative pain but no more effective than codeine [30]. Campbell et. al also stated that there are suggestions of efficacy in spasticity and in neuropathic pain and that increasing the cannabinoid dose to increase the analgesia will increase adverse effects [30]. Campbell et. al did not publish a protocol on beforehand [30].
- Stevens et. al concluded that cannabinoids have no role in the management of acute pain, but cannabinoids were found to be well-tolerated, with most reported adverse effects only mild to moderate in severity [31].
- Walitt et. al concluded that no convincing, unbiased evidence suggests that nabilone (synthetic cannabinoid analog) is of value in treating people with fibromyalgia [32]. The tolerability of nabilone was low and adverse events (particularly somnolence, dizziness, vertigo) may limit its clinical usefulness [32].

TABEL 1

Page 37 of 61

BMJ	Open

													_			
Fir	s T	ïtl	Ye	De	Туре	Ту	Inform	No	Ν	Р	Outco	As	As	Acc	U	Conc
t	e		ar	sig	of	pe	ation		о.	u	mes	se	se	oun	s	lusio
211	.   ¯		of	n.0	conn	рс с	sourco	of	of	h				+c	0	n
au	-		01	11		3	source		01			33	33		e	11
no	r		pu		abin	OŤ	S	tri	ра	IS		m	m	for	0	
			bli		oid	par		als	rti	h		en	en	ran	f	
			са			tici			ci	е		t	t	do	t	
			tio			pa			pa	d		of	of	m	h	
			n			ntc			nt	nr		ad.	ric	erro	<u>م</u>	
						111.5				p		au	115			
									S	οι		ve	ĸ	ſ	G	
										ос		rs	ot		R	
										ol		е	bi		А	
												ev	as		D	
												en			F	
												+c			-	
<b>—</b>			20	6		N		10	70		<b>T</b> L -		N.	N.L.		0
Lyr	<sup>ו</sup> (C	a	20	Sys	Phyt	Ne	PubMe	18	76	N	Ine	Ye	Ye	NO	N	Over
ch	n	n	11	te	ocan	ur	d,	tri	6	0	primar	S	s,		0	all
&	2	hi		ma	nabi	ор	EMBAS	als			y		ex			ther
Ca	a			tic	noid	ath	E.	со			outco		ce			e is
mr				Re	c٠	ic	CINAH	m			me		nt			evid
	'   d	S		via	5, Smo	nai							fo			cviu
be	'   fc	or		vie	500	раг	L	pa			WdS		10			ence
[23	tr	re		W	ked	n,	(EBSCO	rin			pain in		r			that
]	a	t			cann	fib	),	g			subject		re			cann
	'n				abis,	ro	PsycInf	th			s with		ро			abin
					oro	mv	0	e			chroni		rti			oids
	n				muc	, alσ	(FBSCO	int			C		nσ			are
	0	ot			ocal	in		or					116 6:			cofo
	c	hr			USai	ia,	<i>),</i> me	ei			non-ca					sale
	0	ni			extra	rh	Cochra	ve			ncer		as,			and
	c				cts	eu	ne	nti			pain.		pu			mod
	n				of	ma	Library	on					bli			estly
	5				cann	toi	, ISI	wi			The		са			effec
	n	I-C			ahis-	Ч	, Weh of	th			second		tio			tive
	a	n			baco	ort	Scione	nla			200		n			in
	C	er			Dase		SCIEITC	pia			ary					111
	p	ai			a	nrı	e, ABI	ce			ουτςο		ומ			neur
	n	:			medi	tis,	Inform	bo			mes		as			opat
	a	<i>`</i>			cine,	an	(Proqu				were		an			hic
					and	d	est),				sleep,		d			pain
	S	ys			svnt	mi	Dissert				functio		fo			with
	te	e			botic	vo	ation				n and		r			proli
	m	na			neuc	xe					n, anu		1-			pren
	ti	ic			cann	d	Abstra				quality		pr			mina
	re	ev			abin	chr	cts				of life.		ofi			ry
					oids;	oni	(Proqu						t			evid
					nabil	с	est).						bi			ence
	W	V			one	nai	Δcado						25			of
	0	of			dra:	Pai	min						43			م <del>د</del> :-
	ra	an			uron	n.	mic									erric
	1				abin		Search									acv

	mi ze d tria ls			ol and a nove I THC anal ogue		Premie r (EBSCO) ), Clinical Trials.g ov, TrialsC entral. org, individ ual pharm aceutic al compa ny trials sites for Eli Lilly and GlaxoS mithKli ne, OAIste r (OCLC) and Google Scholar									in fibro myal gia and rheu mato id arthr itis. Did not pool data for meta - analy sis but data was descr ibed quali tativ ely.
Me ng et. al [25 ]	Sel ect ive Ca nn abi noi ds for Ch	20 17	Sys te ma tic Re vie w an d Me	Dron abin ol, nabil one and nabi ximo ls	Ne ur op ath ic pai n	Medlin e, Embas e, Cochra ne Library , PROSP ERO, elinical	11 (1 0 tri als co m pa rin g th	12 19	N O	The primar y outco me was intensi ty of pain record	Ye s	Ye s	Bon ferr oni adju stm ent for mul tipl e	Y e s	Selec tive cann abin oids provi de a small analg esic bana

Page 39 of 61

1

60

3							
4 5	nic	an	trials.g	e	after a	ng	fit in
5	Ne	aly	ov, and	int	minim	was	patie
7	ur	sis	Google	er	um of	not	nts
8	op		Scholar	ve	2	perf	with
9	ath			nti	weeks	orm	chro
10	ic			on	followi	od	nic
11			Dain		10110101	eu	nour
12	Pdl		Palli	WI	ng	dS	neur
13	n:		societi	th	initiati	per	opat
14 15	A		es	pla	on of	rec	hic
15	Sys		(Ameri	ce	selecti	om	pain.
17	te		can	bo	ve	me	
18	ma		Society	)	cannab	nda	
19	tic		of		inoid	tion	
20	Re		Anesth		and	s in	
21	vie		esiolog		placeb	the	
22	w/		ictc		o/com	Coc	
23	vv		Furana		0/com	bra	
24 25	dfi		Europe		parato	fira	
25	a		an		r	ne	
27	Me		Society		admini	Han	
28	ta-		of		stratio	dbo	
29	an		Anaest		n,	ok.	
30	aly		hesiolo		expres		
31	sis		gy,		sed on		
32			Interna		an NRS		
33			tional		(0—no		
34 35			Associ		nain to		
36			ation		10		
37			for the		10-		
38			for the		worst		
39			Study		possibl		
40			of		e		
41			Pain,		pain).		
42			Americ				
43			an		Second		
44			Society		ary		
46			of		outco		
47			Region		mes		
48			al		were		
49			ai Anosth		nrocon		
50			Allesti		presen		
51			esia		ce or		
52			and		absenc		
53 54			Pain		e of		
55			Medici		analge		
56			ne,		sia		
57			Europe		define		
58			an .		d as		
59				1			

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Society of of alreducti on in pain al7Anesth (NRS/V esia AAS) by and 3230%10Anesth (NRS/V esia AAS) by pain at 211and al and 230%12and and 230%13Pain Pain at 214Therap World more initiati pain) on of initiati pain)15y, and World more linitiati pain)16World World pain)17World were after interve last 2 years guality search also cd.22also functio n, search physic ed.18n, psycho logical functio n, sleep, overall patient satisfa ction, and and the inciden ce of also23Anesth ed.n, sleep, overall patient satisfa ction, and advers e e24Verall physic ed.n, sleep, overall patient satisfa ction, and the the the the satisfa ction, advers e e e25werk e	3							
ofon inRegionpainalscoresAnesth(NRS/V)esiaAS) byand $\geq 30\%$ regionat 2and $\geq 30\%$ regionat 2and $\geq 30\%$ regionat 2and $\geq 30\%$ regionat 2andorregionorvereofinitiatiafterregione ofinitiatiinitiatiregionas constructionregione ofregionas constructionregione ofregionas constructionregione ofregione ofregionas constructionregione ofregionas constructionregione ofregione ofregionas constructionregione ofregione ofregione ofregionas constructionregione ofregione of <tr< td=""><td>4</td><td></td><td></td><td>Society</td><td></td><td>reducti</td><td></td><td></td></tr<>	4			Society		reducti		
50007alscores9Anesth(NRS/V)90Anesth(NRS/V)91esiaAS) by11and $\geq$ 30%12and $\geq$ 30%13Painat 214Therapweeks15y, andor16Worldmore17Institutafter18Institutafter19e ofinititati10pain)on of12in theinterve18also(Qol),22is the exampleof life23also(Qol),24yearsquality25wereof life18also(Qol),28searchphysic29ed.al19orerallpatient20satisfainction21n,search22also(Qol),23satisfa24yearsquality25wereof life26satisfalogical27also(Qol),28satisfa29advers29advers29advers29advers29advers29advers29advers29advers29advers29advers29advers2	5			of		on in		
$7$ $region$ $pain$ $a$ $a$ scores $a$ $Anesth$ $(NRS/V)$ $11$ $esia$ $AS$ ) by $11$ $esia$ $AS$ ) by $11$ $and$ $\geq 30\%$ $11$ $and$ $\geq 20\%$ $11$ $and$ $\geq 20\%$ $11$ $and$ $\geq 20\%$ $12$ $and$ $\geq 20\%$ $13$ $Pain$ $at 2$ $14$ $Pain$ $at 2$ $14$ $Pain$ $at 2$ $14$ $Pain$ $or$ $14$ $Pain$ $or$ $17$ $World$ more $18$ $Institut$ $after$ $19$ $e$ $of$ $11$ $or$ $intitati$ $20$ $Pain$ $or$ $21$ $Iast 2$ $nion,$ $22$ $Iast 2$ $nion,$ $23$ $Iast 2$ $nion,$ $24$ $years$ $quality$ $25$ $were$ $of$ $26$ $also$ $(Ocl),$ $27$ $also$ $(Ocl),$ $28$ $search$ $physic$ $29$ $ed.$ $al$ $31$ $n,$ $pycho$ $32$ $al ai$ $Iuctio$ $32$ $al ai$ $al ai$ $44$ $adaexers$ $adaexers$ $45$ $adaexers$ $e$ $45$ $adaexers$ $e$ $46$ $adaexers$ $e$ $46$ $adaexers$ $e$ $46$ $adaexers$ $e$ $47$ $adaexe$	6			Desian				
$3$ alscores $10$ Anesth $(NRS/V)$ $10$ esiaAS) by $11$ and $\geq 30\%$ $12$ and $\geq 30\%$ $12$ and $\geq 30\%$ $12$ Therapweeks $13$ Vorldmore $14$ Therapweeks $15$ y, andor $16$ Worldmore $16$ Institutafter $19$ e ofinitiati $10$ Pain)on of $11$ inteinterve $12$ last 2ntion, $22$ last 2ntion, $22$ last 2ntion, $22$ last 2ntion, $24$ yearsquality $25$ wereof life $26$ also(QoL), $28$ searchphysic $29$ ed.al $31$ function, $32$ searchstisfa $33$ silep,overall $34$ satisfasatisfa $44$ satisfaadvers $44$ satisfaadvers $45$ selectiye $66$ selectiye $67$ <t< td=""><td>7</td><td></td><td></td><td>Region</td><td></td><td>pain</td><td></td><td></td></t<>	7			Region		pain		
9       Anesth       (NRS/V)         100       esia       AS) by         111       esia       AS) by         112       and       ≥30%         13       Pain       at 2         13       Therap       weeks         15       y, and       or         15       World       more         16       y, and       or         17       World       after         18       Institut       after         19       e of       initiati         20       Pain)       on of         21       inte       interve         22       inthe       interve         23       last 2       ntion,         24       years       quality         25       were       of life         26       also       (QoL),         27       also       intrition,         28       years       quality         29       ed.       al         310       n,       n,         323       setricita       no         334       setricita       al         344       setria	8			al		scores		
100 12 12 12esia and $\geq 30\%$ $\geq 30\%$ at 2 TherapAS) by $\geq 30\%$ at 2 $\sim 30\%$ or weeks $\sim 30\%$ at 2 $\sim 30\%$ or $\sim 30\%$ at 2 $\sim 30\%$ or $\sim 30\%$ at 2 $\sim 30\%$ or $\sim 30\%$ $\sim 30\%$ 	9			Anesth		(NRS/V		
and $\geq 30\%$ 13Painat 214Therapweeks15Y, andor16Y, andor17Institutafter18Institutafter19e ofinitiati20Pain)on of21in theinterve22last 2ntion,23yearsquality24yearsquality25wereof life26also(QoL),27searchphysic28searchphysic29ed.al30function,31n,32searchphysic29cd.al31functio32alsoction,33alsological44alsoal33functio34alal35alal36alal37alal38alal40adad41adad42adad43adad44adad45ad46ad47ad48ad49advers49advers49advers49advers49advers49advers49advers <td>10</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>esia</td> <td></td> <td>AS) bv</td> <td></td> <td></td>	10			esia		AS) bv		
12       11.0       E2000         13       Pain       at 2         14       Therap       weeks         15       Y, and       or         16       World       more         17       World       more         18       Institut       after         19       e of       initiati         20       Pain       on of         21       in the       interve         22       last 2       ntion,         23       last 2       ntion,         24       years       quality         25       were       of life         26       also       (QoL),         28       search       physic         29       ed.       al         30       functio       n,         31       n,       sisep,         32       n,       sisep,         33       satisfa       ction,         34       and       and         35       inciden       ce of         36       and       advers         99       advers       effects         99       advers       <	11			and		>30%		
13       Therap       weeks         15       y, and       or         15       World       more         15       institut       after         16       or       initiati         17       World       more         18       Institut       after         19       e of       initiati         20       Pain)       on of         21       in the       interve         22       iast 2       ntion,         23       last 2       ntion,         24       years       quality         25       were       of life         26       also       (Qol,),         27       search       physic         28       search       physic         29       ed.       al         30       n,       sigrad         31       n,       sigrad         32       n,       psycho         33       logical       patient         34       and       ction,         35       u       advers         36       u       advers         37       advers	12			Dain		<u>~</u> .50%		
Interap       Weeks         16       y, and       or         16       y, and       or         16       World       more         18       Institut       after         19       e of       initiati         20       Pain)       on of         21       in the       interve         22       last 2       ntion,         23       last 2       ntion,         24       years       quality         25       were       of life         26       also       (Qol),         27       also       (Qol),         28       search       physic         29       ed.       functio         11       psycho       logical         12       initiati       psycho         133       psycho       logical         141       satisfa       ction,         142       and       inciden         143       and       ction,         144       and       the         144       and       the         145       inciden       ce of         144       advers	15					alz		
72       y, and       or         16       World       more         177       World       more         178       Institut       after         199       e of       initiati         190       on of         201       Pain)       on of         21       in the       interve         22       last 2       ntion,         23       last 2       ntion,         24       years       quality         25       were       of life         26       search       physic         27       also       (Qol),         28       search       physic         29       ed.       al         30       functio       n,         31       n,       n,         32       stisfa       logical         44       stisfa       logical         55       were       overall         44       and       the         45       inciden       inciden         44       and       the         45       and       the         46       inciden       cof	14			Therap		weeks		
Worldmore181Institutafter182Institutafter183e ofinitiati204Pain)on of215in theinterve226last 2ntion,227alsoquality238gualityguality249yearsquality259ed.al260searchphysic299ed.al310function,323jsychological334juitationn,344satisfaction,355juitational366juitational378satisfaction,389andadversa399incidenction,444adverse456incidene456incidenselecti456incidenselecti456incideninciden456incideninciden456incideninciden456incideninciden456incideninciden456incideninciden456incideninciden456incideninciden456incideninciden456incideninciden456incideninciden456incideninciden457incideninciden458incideninciden <t< td=""><td>16</td><td></td><td></td><td>y, and</td><td></td><td>or</td><td></td><td></td></t<>	16			y, and		or		
BaseInstitutafter199e ofinitiati100Pain)on of111intheinterve122last 2ntion,123yearsquality244yearsquality25wereof life26also(Qol),27also(Qol),28searchphysic29ed.al101function,323searchlogical344n,steep,355n,sleep,366overalladvers393andthe444andadd455adverse464advers555advers555advers556anab566anab566anab575anab<	17			World		more		
99       e of       initiati         20       Pain)       on of         21       in the       interve         22       last 2       ntion,         23       years       quality         24       years       quality         25       were       of life         26       also       (Qol),         27       also       (Qol),         28       search       physic         29       ed.       al         30       functio       n,         31       n,       psycho         32       psycho       logical         33       satisfa       ction,         34       astisfa       ction,         35       and       patient         36       and       the         37       satisfa       ction,         38       and       advers         39       and       advers         41       advers       advers         42       advers       e         43       and       advers         44       advers       e         44       advers	18			Institut		after		
20       Pain       on of         21       in the       interve         22       last 2       ntion,         23       last 2       ntion,         24       years       quality         25       were       of life         26       also       (QoL),         28       search       physic         29       ed.       al         30       functio       n,         31       n,       psycho         32       n,       search       psycho         33       psycho       logical         34       overall       patient         35       nn,       satisfa         40       patient       satisfa         41       satisfa       ction,         42       quality       satisfa         43       quality       satisfa         44       quality       satisfa         45       quality       satisfa         46       quality       satisfa         47       quality       satisfa         48       quality       quality         50       quality       quality	19			eof		initiati		
21       in the       interve         22       in the       interve         23       last 2       ntion,         24       years       quality         25       were       of life         26       also       (QoL),         27       also       (QoL),         28       search       physic         29       ed.       al         30       functio       n,         32       psycho       logical         33       functio       n,         34       overall       patient         35       and       and         36       and       and         41       and       and         424       and       and         444       and       and         45       and       advers         46       advers       e         50       advers       e         51       advers       e         52       advers       advers         53       advers       advers         54       advers       advers         55       advers       advers <td>20</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Dain)</td> <td></td> <td>on of</td> <td></td> <td></td>	20			Dain)		on of		
22       in the       interve       interve         23       last 2       ntion,       interve         23       years       quality         25       were       of life         26       also       (QoL),         27       search       physic         28       search       physic         29       ed.       al         30       functio       n,         31       n,       psycho         32       search       psycho         33       nictio       n,         34       satisfa       functio         35       satisfa       ction,         38       satisfa       ction,         44       and       and         45       dthe       and         46       and       and         47       ce of       advers         48       advers       e         49       advers       e         51       advers       e         52       advers       cannab         53       advers       inoids.	21			Palli)				
23       last 2       ntion,         24       years       quality         25       were       of life         26       also       (QoL),         27       also       physic         28       search       physic         29       ed.       al         30       functio       n,         31       n,       psycho         32       seer,       logical         33       sleep,       overall         34       overall       patient         35       and       the         444       and       and         45       advers       e         56       e       effects         57       of       selecti         58       of       of         58       of       of         59       of       selecti         50       of       selecti         53       of       of         54       of       selecti         55       of       selecti         56       of       selecti         57       of       selecti      <	22			in the		interve		
24       years       quality       years         25       of life       of life         26       also       (Qol),         28       search       physic         29       ed.       al         30       functio       n,         31       n,       psycho         32       years       search       psycho         33       psycho       logical         34       sleep,       overall         35       overall       patient         36       years       and         37       satisfa       ction,         38       overall       and         40       and       the         41       and       and         42       and       and         43       and       the         44       and       the         45       and       advers         50       advers       e         51       advers       of         52       advers       advers         53       advers       advers         54       advers       advers         55 <td>23</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>last 2</td> <td></td> <td>ntion,</td> <td></td> <td></td>	23			last 2		ntion,		
225       were       of life       of life         260       also       (QoL),         270       search       physic         281       ed.       al         292       of life       n,         303       functio         314       n,         323       psycho         333       psycho         344       psycho         355       functio         366       n,         377       sleep,         388       overall         399       overall         400       and         41       and         42       and         434       and         444       and         444       and         444       and         455       advers         466       advers         477       advers         488       advers         499       advers         411       advers         422       advers         433       advers         444       advers         455       advers         46	24			years		quality		
227       also       (Qol),         228       physic         229       al         200       functio         31       n,         32       psycho         33       psycho         344       logical         355       functio         364       n,         37       sleep,         383       overall         384       patient         385       ction,         386       overall         387       satisfa         388       overall         399       overall         400       patient         411       satisfa         422       ction,         433       ction,         444       and         454       advers         464       inciden         477       e         488       e         499       advers         490       selecti         491       selecti         492       cannab         493       cannab         494       cannab         495       cananab <td>25</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>were</td> <td></td> <td>of life</td> <td></td> <td></td>	25			were		of life		
27       base       physic         28       search       physic         29       ed.       al         30       functio       n,         31       n,       psycho         32       logical       functio         33       logical       functio         34       logical       functio         35       functio       n,         36       n,       sleep,         37       sleep,       overall         38       overall       patient         41       and       atisfa         42       ction,       and         44       and       advers         45       effects       of         52       of       selecti         53       effects       of         53       effects       of         54       effects       of         55       effects       cannab         56       effects       inoids.	26			also		(001)		
28	27			coarch		nhycic		
29       al       al         30       functio         31       psycho         32       psycho         33       psycho         34       psycho         10gical       functio         35       functio         36       n,         37       sleep,         38       overall         39       overall         40       satisfa         41       satisfa         42       and         44       and         45       the         44       and         45       e         50       e         51       e         52       e         53       e         54       e         55       e         56       e         57       e         58       e         59       e         50       e         51       e         52       e         53       e         54       e         55       e         56       e	28			search		priysic		
30       functio       n,         31       psycho       logical         33       logical       functio         34       logical       functio         35       functio       n,         36       n,       sleep,         37       sleep,       overall         38       overall       patient         40       patient       satisfa         42       ction,       and         44       and       the         45       advers       e         50       effects       of         53       of       selecti         54       ve       cannab       inoids.	29			ed.		al		
31       n,       n,       psycho         32       psycho       logical         33       functio       n,         34       n,       sleep,         36       n,       sleep,         37       sleep,       overall         38       overall       patient         31       satisfa       ction,         33       and       the         44       and       advers         45       e       of         56       of       selecti         57       selecti       ve         56       cannab       inoids.	30					functio		
33       seec.       psycho       psycho         33       psycho       logical         34       functio       n,         35       psycho       n,         36       psycho       psycho         37       psycho       n,         38       psycho       psycho         39       psycho       psycho         40       patient       psient         41       satisfa       ction,         42       ction,       and         44       and       and         45       ce of       advers         66       effects       of         50       of       selecti         52       of       selecti         54       ve       cannab       inoids.	31					n <i>,</i>		
33       logical         344       functio         35       n,         36       n,         37       sleep,         39       overall         40       patient         41       satisfa         42       ction,         43       and         44       and         45       inciden         46       ce of         48       advers         49       e         50       e         51       offects         52       off         53       selecti         54       ve         55       cannab         56       inoids.	32					psycho		
34       functio         35       functio         36       n,         37       sleep,         38       overall         39       overall         40       patient         41       satisfa         42       ction,         43       and         44       the         45       inciden         47       ce of         48       advers         60       of         51       of         52       of         53       selecti         54       ve         55       canab         56       canab         57       inoids.	33							
36       n,       n,         37       sleep,         38       overall         39       overall         40       patient         41       satisfa         42       ction,         43       and         44       and         45       ction,         46       inciden         47       ce of         48       advers         60       of         51       of         52       of         53       selecti         54       ve         55       cannab         66       cannab         67       inoids.	54 25					functio		
37       Image: Section of the section of	36					Tunctio		
38       sleep,         39       overall         40       patient         41       satisfa         42       ction,         43       and         44       and         45       the         46       inciden         47       ce of         48       advers         49       e         50       effects         51       selecti         52       of         53       cannab         54       cannab         57       inoids.	37					n,		
39       overall         40       patient         41       satisfa         42       ction,         43       and         44       and         45       inciden         46       advers         48       advers         49       of         50       of         51       of         52       of         53       of         54       ve         55       cannab         56       cannab         57       inoids.	38					sleep,		
40       patient       satisfa         41       satisfa       ction,         42       and       the         43       inciden       ce of         44       advers       e         45       off       selecti         48       off       selecti         49       off       selecti         50       off       selecti         51       off       selecti         52       off       selecti         53       off       selecti         54       off       selecti         55       off       selecti         56       off       selecti         57       off       selecti         56       off       selecti         57       off       selecti         58       off       selecti         57       off       s	39					overall		
41       satisfa         42       satisfa         43       ction,         44       and         45       the         46       inciden         47       ce of         48       advers         49       e         50       effects         51       of         52       of         53       selecti         54       ve         55       inciden         56       inciden         57       inciden         57       inciden         58       inciden         59       inciden         50       inciden         51       inciden         52       of         53       inciden         54       inciden         55       inciden         56       inciden         57       inciden         57       inciden         57       inciden         57       inciden	40					patient		
42       ction,         43       and         44       the         45       inciden         46       ce of         48       advers         49       e         50       of         51       of         52       of         53       selecti         54       ve         55       of         56       cannab         57       inoids.	41					satisfa		
43       and       and         44       and       the         45       inciden       ce of         46       advers       e         47       advers       e         50       of       selecti         51       of       selecti         52       of       selecti         53       of       selecti         54       ve       cannab         55       inoids.       inoids.	42					ction		
44       and       and       the         45       the       inciden         46       inciden       ce of         47       advers       e         48       e       effects         50       of       selecti         51       of       selecti         52       of       selecti         53       selecti       ve         54       ve       cannab         55       selecti       ve         56       selecti       ve         57       selecti       selecti	43					cuon,		
45       the       the       the         46       inciden       ce of         47       advers       e         48       e       effects         50       of       selecti         51       of       selecti         52       of       selecti         53       cannab       inoids.	44					and		
46       inciden       inciden       inciden         47       inciden       inciden       inciden         48       advers       advers         49       inciden       inciden       inciden         50       inciden       inciden       inciden         51       inciden       inciden       inciden         52       inciden       inciden       inciden         53       inciden       inciden       inciden         54       inciden       inciden       inciden         55       inciden       inciden       inciden         56       inciden       inciden       inciden         57       inciden       inciden       inciden         57       inciden       inciden       inciden	45					the		
47       6       6       6       6       6         48       6       6       6       6       6         50       6       6       6       6       6         51       6       6       6       6       6         52       6       6       6       6       6         53       6       6       6       6       6         54       7       7       7       7       7       7	46					inciden		
48       advers       advers       advers         49       e       e         50       effects       effects         51       of       selecti         52       selecti       ve         53       ve       selecti         54       cannab       inoids.	47					ce of		
49       e         50       e         51       effects         52       of         53       selecti         54       ve         55       cannab         56       inoids.	48					advers		
50     effects       51     of       52     selecti       53     ve       54     ve       55     cannab       57     inoids.	49							
51       effects       of         52       of       selecti         53       ve       ve         54       cannab       inoids.	50					C .		
52       of       of         53       selecti         54       ve         55       cannab         57       inoids.	51					errects		
53       selecti       ve         54       ve       cannab         55       inoids.       inoids.	52					of		
54     ve     ve       55     cannab     inoids.	53					selecti		
56   cannab     56   inoids.	54					ve		
57 inoids.	55					cannah		
	56					inoida		
	5/ 50					inoius.		

60

3																
4	Ma	Svs	20	Me	Phvt	Ch	Medlin	18	?	Ν	The	Ye	Ye	No	Ν	Curr
5	rtín	te	09	ta-	ocan	ro	e/Pub	_	-	0	nrimar	s	s	_	0	ently
6	Sá	mo	05	20	nahi	nic	mod			Ŭ		5	з, ох		Ŭ	avail
/	-54	1110		ali			Tuchaa				y auton		C.			avan
0	ncn	tic		aiy	noia	раг	Embas				outco		ce			able
10	ez	Re		SIS	S	n	e, and				me		pt			evid
11	et.	vie			and	of	The				was		fo			ence
12	al	w			synt	а	Cochra				intensi		r			sugg
13	[28	an			hetic	pat	ne				ty of		re			ests
14	1	d			deriv	hol	Contro				pain as		ро			that
15	-	Me			ates	ogi	lled				scored		rti			cann
16		ta-			of	cal	Trials				hv		nø			ahis
17		20				or	Rogisto				numeri		hi			troat
10					cuch	+r2	r				col		20			mont
20		diy			Such	lid					Cal		as,			
21		SIS			as	um	(CENTR				rang		ae			IS .
22		ot			dron	ati	AL)				scales.		te			mod
23		Ca			abin	С					The		cti			erate
24		nn			ol,	ori					Second		on			ly
25		abi			nabil	gin					ary		bi			effic
26		S			one,						outco		as			aciou
27		Tre			or						mes		an			s for
28		at			henz						were		d			treat
30		mo			onvr						CNS		fo			mont
31		nt			anon						rolated		r r			of
32		f a u			anop						relateu		1-			01
33		for			eriai						events		pr			chro
34		Ch			ne (a								ofi			nic
35		ro			synt								t			pain,
36		nic			hetic								bi			but
3/		Pai			nitro								as			bene
30		n			gen											ficial
40					anal											effec
41					og of											ts
42					THC)											may
43					1110)											ho
44																0 <del>0</del>
45																parti
46 47																ally
4/ /8																(or
49																com
50																plete
51																ly)
52																offse
53																t bv
54																, pote
55																ntiall
56 57																v
57 58																y corio
50	L															26110

															us harm s.
Воу	Th	20	Sys	Phyt	Ne	PubMe	13	77	Ν	Outco	Ye	Ye	No	Ν	Cann
chu	e	15	te	ocan	ur	d,		1	0	mes	S	s,		0	abis-
k	Eff		ma	nabi	ор	Embas				consid		ex			base
et.	ect		tic	noid	ath	e, Web				ered		ce			d
al	ive		Re	s;	IC	OT Cuinna				were		pt			medi
124	ne		vie	smo	pai	Scienc				reducti		TO			cinal
1	ss		w	кеа	n	e, and				on in pain		r,			extra
				abic		all				intonsi		ne			usod
	nn			cann						ty and		p0 rti			useu in
	ahi			ahis-		hased				advers		nσ			diffe
	noi			base		medici				P		hi			rent
	ds			d		ne				events.		as.			nonu
	in			medi		review				erentor		bu			latio
	the			cinal		s						bli			ns of
	Ma			extra		and						са			chro
	na			cts		databa						tio			nic
	ge			(CB		ses						n			non-
	me			ME)		(Cochr						bi			mali
	nt			in		ane						as			gnan
	of			the		Databa						an			t
	Ch			form		se of						d			neur
	ro			of		System						fo			opat
	nic			oro		atic						r-			hic
	No			muc		Review						pr			pain
	nm			osal		s, ASP						ofi			patie
	ali			spra		Journal						t			nts
	gn			ys		Club,						bi			may
	ant			(nabi		Databa						as			provi
	Ne			ximo		se of									de
	ur			ls),		Abstra									effec
	ор			vapo		cts of									tive
	ath			rized		Review									anaig
				cann		S OI Effocto									esia
	Pal			dDIS,											III cond
	Δ			anu synt		and									ition
	A Svc			hotic		, anu Cochra									s
	to			cann		ne									s that
	ma			ahin		Contro									are
	tic			oids:		lled									refra
	Re			dron											ctorv

2	
3	
1	
-	
2	
6	
/	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
40 //1	
41	
42	
45	
44 45	
45	
46	
4/	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
50	
59	
00	

	w		ol, nabil one, and CT-3		Registe r [CCTR] )									othe r treat ment s.
Mü cke et. al [26 ]	Ca 20 nn 13 abi s pro du cts for ad ult s wit h chr oni c ne uro pat hic pai n	0 Co 8 chr an e Re vie w	Phyt ocan nabi noid s; oro muc osal spra y cont ainin g THC or THC/ CBD mix, smo ked cann abis cont ainin g THC, THC, CBD mix, smo ked cann abis cont ainin g THC, CBD mix, smo ked cann abis cont ainin g tHC, and cBD as extra ct of cann abis sativ as extra cann abis sativ as extra cann abis cont and cBD	Ne ur op ath ic pai n	Cochra ne Library , MEDLI NE and EMBAS E. Followi ng clinical trials databa ses were search ed for additio nal data includi ng unpubl ished data: US Nation al Institut es of Health clinical trial registe r (www.	16 (1 5 of th e tri als co m pa rin g th e int er ve nti on wi th pla ce bo )	17 50	Yes	Primar y outco mes: Partici pant- report ed pain relief of 50% or greate r. We preferr ed compo site neurop athic pain scores over single- scale generi c pain scores if both measu res were used by studies ;	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	The pote ntial bene fits of cann abis-base d medi cine (her bal cann abis, plant - deriv ed or synt hetic THC, THC/CBD oro muc osal spray) in chro nic neur opat hic pain migh

2	
3	
4 5	
6	
7	
8	
9 10	
11	
12	
13 14	
15	
16	
17 18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
24	
25	
26 27	
28	
29	
30 31	
32	
33	
34 35	
36	
37	
38 39	
40	
41	
42 43	
44	
45	
46 47	
48	
49	
50 51	
52	
53	
54	
55 56	
57	
58	
59	

hetic	Trials.g	PGIC	outw
cann	<u>ov</u> ),	(Patien	eigh
abin	Europe	t	ed
oids;	an	Global	by
nabil	Union	Impres	their
one,	Clinical	sion of	pote
dron	Trials	Chang	ntial
abin	Registe	e)	harm
ol	r	much	S.
	( <u>www.</u>	or very	
	<u>clinical</u>	much	
	<u>trialsre</u>	improv	
	gister.	ed;	
	<u>eu</u> ),		
	World	Withdr	
	Health	awals	
	Organi	due to	
	zation	advers	
	(WHO)	e	
	Interna	events	
	tional	(tolera	
	Clinical	bility);	
	Trials		
	Registr	Seriou	
	У	S	
	Platfor	advers	
	m	e	
	(ICTRP)	events	
	(apps.	(safety	
	who.in	).	
	t/trials	Seriou	
	earch/)	S	
	, and	advers	
	Interna	e	
	tional	events	
	Associ	typicall	
	ation	y y	
	for	include	
	Canna	any	
	binoid	untow	
	Medici	ard	
	nes	medica	
	databa	occurr	
	nk	ence	

2									
4				1		or			
5				( <u>www.</u>		offect			
6						enect			
7				<u>IS-</u>		that at			
8				<u>med.or</u>		any			
9				<u>g/studi</u>		dose			
10				<u>es/stu</u>		results			
12				dy.php		in			
13				)		death.			
14				,		is life-			
15						throat			
16						unicat			
17						ening,			
18						requir			
19						es			
20						hospit			
21						alisatio			
22						n or			
24						prolon			
25						gation			
26						of			
27									
28						existin			
29						g			
30						hospit			
31						alisatio			
32						n,			
34						results			
35						in			
36						nersist			
37						ont or			
38						cignific			
39						Signific			
40						ant			
41						disabili			
42						ty or			
45 44						incapa			
45						city, is			
46						а			
47						conge			
48						nital			
49						anomo			
50						anoma			
51						iy or			
52						birth			
53						defect,			
54 55						is an			
55 56						'impor			
57						tant			
58						modica			
59						metuild			

										l event' that may jeopar dise the person , or may requir e an interve ntion to preven t one of the above charac teristic s/cons equen					
Avi	Effi	20	Me	Phyt	Ch	MEDLI	43	24	N	The	Ye	Ye	No	N	The
ra	cac	17	ta-	ocan	ro	NE/Pu	tri	37	о	outco	S	s,		о	curre
m	у		An	nabi	nic	bmed	als			me		ex			nt
et.	of		aly	noid	(ca	and in	со			measu		ce			syste
al	Ca		sis	s;	nc	Google	m			re that		pt			mati
[29	nn			Sativ	er	Scholar	ра			was		fo			C
]]	abi			ex/n	an	using	rin			cnosen		r,			revie
	s- Ra			mol	u no	al	в th			the		no			w รมฮฮ
	se			cann	n-	Subiec	e			variabl		rti			ests
	d			abidi	са	t	int			e "pain		ng			that
	Me			ol,	nc	Headin	er			intensi		bi			cann
	dic			cann	er)	g	ve			ty", as		as,			abin
	ine			abin	pai	(MeSH	nti			scored		pu			oid-
	s			oid	n	) terms	on			by the		bli			base
	for			cigar	an		wi			numeri		са			d
	Pai			ettes	d		th			cal		tio			medi
	n			/vap	ac		bo			rating		n h:			cines
	ivia no			orize	ute		tn (ac					ומ			mign
	ιid σΑ			1,	yn sto		ac tiv			(INRS- 11)		dS an			effer
1	5	1	1	1	5.0	1	U V	1	1	· · · · /,	1	un	1	1	

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Page 47 of 61

me	and	pe	e		numeri	d		tive
nt:	synt	rat	dr		cal 11-	fo		for
A	hetic	ive	ug		point	r-		chro
Sys	cann	pai	S'		box	pr		nic
te	abin	n	an		(BS-	oti		pain
ma	oids;		d		11),	t		treat
tic	dron		pla		visual	bi		ment
Re	abin		ce		analog	as		,
vie	ol		bc		scale			base
W	and				(VAS),			don
an	nabil				and			limit
d	one,				the			ed
Me	CT-3,				VAS			evid
ta-	ajule				section			ence,
An	mic				of the			prim
aly	acid,				questi			arily
SIS	synt				onnair			tor
of	hetic				e short			neur
Ra	nitro				form			opat
nd	gen							hic
om	anal				Pain			pain
IZE	og of				Questi			patie
a	tetra				onnair			nts.
Co	nyar				e.			
ntr	ocan							
OII	nabi							
ed								
dis	, fattu							
	acid							
	aciu							
	annu							
	bydr							
	olaso							
	_1							
	inhih							
	itor							
	(PF-							
	0445							
	7845							
	)							
	/ (bloc							

Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technol	Enseignement Superieur (ABES) .
ğ	

				king degr adati on of endo cann abin oids) , benz opyr anop eridi ne (BPP ), and levo nant											
Ca mp bell et. al [30 ]	Ar e ca nn abi noi ds an eff ect ive an d saf e tre at nt opt ion in the ma na	20 01	Sys te ma tic Re vie w	radol Oral THC, an oral synt hetic nitro gen anal ogue of THC (NIB) , oral benz opyr anop eridi ne (BPP ), and intra mus cular	Ac ute , chr oni c no n- ma lig na nt pai n, an d ca nc er pai n	MEDLI NE, EMBAS E, Oxford Pain Databa se, and Cochra ne Library	9	22 2	N O	Outco me measu res for pain intensi ty; pain relief; the use of supple menta ry analge sia; patient s' prefer ences; and advers e effects	Yes	Ye s, ex ce pt fo r, re po rti ng bi as, pu bli ca tio n bi as an d fo r- pr	No	N O	Cann abin oids are no more effec tive than code ine in contr ollin g pain and have depr essa nt effec ts on the centr

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

	ge me nt of pai n? A qu alit ati ve sys te ma tic rev ie w			levo nant radol								ofi t bi as			al nerv ous syste m that limit their use. Theif wide spre ad intro duct on into clinic al pract ice for pain man age men is ther efore unde sirab le. In
															ther efore unde sirab le. In acut e
															post oper ative pain they shou d no be
Des hpa	Effi cac	20 15	Sys te	Cigar ettes	Ne ur	MEDLI NE,	6 tri	22 6	N o	For outco	Ye s	Ye s,	No	N o	The e is

nd	У	ma	or	ор	EMBAS	als	mes,	ex		evi
e	an	tic	vapo	ath	E, and	со	pain	ce		end
et.	d	Re	rizer	ic	the	m	scores	pt		for
al	ad	vie	cont	pai	Interna	ра	were	fo		the
[27	ver	w	ainin	n	tional	rin	extract	r,		use
]	se		g		Pharm	g	ed	re		of
	eff		delta		aceutic	int	using	рс	)	low
	ect		-9-		al	er	the	rti		dos
	S		тнс		Abstra	ve	visual	ng		me
	of				cts	nti	analog	bi		cal
	me					on	ue	as	,	ma
	dic					wi	scale	ρι	I	uar
	al					th	(VAS)	bl	i	in
	ma					pla	or an	ca		ref
	riju					ce	alterna	tic	)	cto
	an					bo	tive	n		neu
	а					.	numeri	bi		ора
	for					Pla	cal	as		hic
	chr					ce	pain	ar	1	pai
	oni					bo	rating	d		in
	с					bei	tool. If	fo		cor
	no					ng	pain	r-		und
	nc					cig	scores	pr		on
	an					ar	were	of	i	wit
	cer					ett	not	t		tra
	pai					es	report	bi		tio
	n					or	ed,	as		1
						va	surrog			ana
						ро	ate			esi
						riz	measu			Ho
						er	res of			eve
						со	effecti			tria
						nt	veness			we
						ain	were			lim
						ing	include			ed
						0%	d			by
						del	(sleep,			sho
						ta-	functio			dui
						9-	n, and			tio
						ТН	quality			var
						C	of life).			bili
						or	Freque			in
						wi	ncy of			dos
						th	serious			g
						ca	and			and

2							
5 4							
5				nn	most		stren
6				abi	comm		gth
7				no	only		of
8				id	report		delta
9				re	ed		-9-
10				m	advers		tetra
12				ov	e		hydr
13				al	effects		ocan
14					was		nabi
15					collect		nol.
16					ed.		and
/ 19					Cui		lack
19							of
20							funct
21							ional
22							
23							outc
24							ome
25 26							S.
27							Altho
28							ugh
29							well
30							toler
31							ated
32							in
34							the
35							short
36							term
37							. the
38							long-
39							term
40							offor
42							ts of
43							
44							hose
45							noac
46							tive
47 48							and
49							neur
50							ocog
51							nitiv
52							e
53							effec
54 55							ts of
56							medi
57							cal
58							marii
59		 	1				

															uana rema in unkr
Ste	Α	20	Svs	Levo	Ac	MEDIT	7	61	Y	The	Ye	Ye	No	Y	Base
ven	svs	17	te	nant	ute	NE.	tri	1	es	primar	s	s.		e	d on
S	te		ma	radol	po	EMBAS	als			V		ex		S	the
et.	ma		tic	,	sto	Ε,	со			outco		ce			avai
al	tic		Re	nabil	pe	Cochra	m			me		pt			able
[31	rev		vie	one,	rat	ne	ра			was		fo			ranc
]	ie		w	AZD	ive	Library	rin			the		r,			omiz
	w			1940	pai	, and	g			qualita		pu			ed
	of			,	n	the	int			tive		bli			cont
	the			GW8		World	er			analysi		са			olled
	an			4216		Health	ve			s of		tio			trial
	alg			6,		Organi	nti			the		n			evid
	esi			dron		zation	on			analge		bi			ence
	с			abin		Interna	wi			sic		as			canr
	effi			ol,		tional	th			efficac		an			abin
	cac			△-9-T		Clinical	pla			y of		d			oids
	У			HC		Trials	ce			cannab		fo			have
	of					Registr	bo			inoids		r-			no
	са					У	,			in the		pr			role
	nn					Platfor	Ке			manag		ofi			in
	abi					m	to			ement		t			the
	noi						pr			of		bi			man
	d						of			acute		as			age
	me						en			pain					men
	dic						,			compa					of
	ati						Pe			red to					acut
	on						thi			placeb					е.
	s in						di			o or					pain
	the						ne			active					
	ma						, N.			compa					
	na						Na			rator.					
	ge						pr			ine					
	me						OX			second					
	of						en			ary					
							, 22			mo					
							d			was					
	noi						u Ih			the					
	pai   n									auslits					
							up			tivo					

2
- २
1
4 5
с С
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
10
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
20
29
50 21
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
42
44 47
45 47
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
55
20
5/
58
59

							en			s of the report ed advers e effects					
Wa litt et. al [32 ]	Ca nn abi noi ds for fib ro my alg ia	20 16	Co chr an e Re vie w	Nabil one	Fib ro my alg ia	Cochra ne Library , MEDLI NE and EMBAS E	2 tri als co m pa rin g th e int e v nti o wi t h e r n g th e int e v e ti o m g th e int e v th e int e v th e int e v th e int o v th e int o int int o int int o i i i int o i i int o int o int o i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	72 (4 0)	Yes	Primar y outco mes: Partici pant-r eporte d pain relief of 50% or greate r. PGIC (Patien t Global Impres sion of Chang e) much or very much improv ed. Withdr awal due to advers e events	Yes	Ye s, ex ce pt fo r pu bli ca tio n bi as.	No	Yes	We foun d no convi ncing , unbi ased, high quali ty evid ence sugg estin g that nabil one is of value in treat ing peop le with fibro myal gia. The toler abilit y of nabil one

#### BMJ Open

			(tolera	was	;
			bility).	low	
				in	
			Seriou	peo	р
			s	le	
			advers	with	า
			e	fibr	0
			events	mya	al
			(safety	gia.	
			).		
			Seriou		
			s		
			advers		
			e		
			events		
			typicall		
			V		
			, include		
			anv		
			untow		
			ard		
			medica		
			I		
			occurr		
			ence		
			or		
			effect		
			that at		
			any		
			dose		
			results		
			in		
			death		
			is		
			life_thr		
			ostoni		
			ng		
			ng,		
			requir		
			to hospit		
			alicatio		
			proion		
			gation		
			OT		

2					
4	[]				
5				existin	
6				g	
7				hospit	
8				alisatio	
9				n,	
10 11				results	
12				in	
13				persist	
14				entor	
15				signific	
16				ant	
17				dicabili	
18				uisabiii	
19				ty or	
20				incapa	
22				city, is	
23				а	
24				conge	
25				nital	
26				anoma	
27				lv or	
28				hirth	
30				defect	
31				is an	
32				limpor	
33				Impor	
34				tant	
35				medica	
36 27					
38				event'	
39				that	
40				may	
41				jeopar	
42				dise	
43				the	
44 45				person	
45 46				or	
47				, 01	
48				roquir	
49				requir	
50				e an	
51				interve	
52				ntion	
53				to	
54 55				preven	
55 56				t one	
57				of the	
58				above	
59					
60					

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

					charac			
					teristic			
					s/cons			
					equen			
					ces.			

# References

- Copay AG, Subach BR, Glassman SD, Polly DW, and Schuler TC, Understanding the minimum clinically important difference: a review of concepts and methods. Spine J, 2007. 7(5): p. 541-6.
- Guyatt GH, Osoba D, Wu AW, Wyrwich KW, and Norman GR, Methods to Explain the Clinical Significance of Health Status Measures. Mayo Clinic Proceedings, 2002. 77(4): p. 371-383.
- 3. Moncrieff J and Kirsch I, *Empirically derived criteria cast doubt on the clinical significance of antidepressant-placebo differences*. Contemp Clin Trials, 2015. **43**: p. 60-2.
- 4. Hagg O, Fritzell P, and Nordwall A, *The clinical importance of changes in outcome scores after treatment for chronic low back pain.* Eur Spine J, 2003. **12**(1): p. 12-20.
- 5. Musoro ZJ, Hamel J, Ediebah DE, Cocks K, King MT, Groenvold M, et al., *Establishing* anchor-based minimally important differences (MID) with the EORTC quality-of-life measures: a meta-analysis protocol. BMJ Open, 2018. **8**(1).
- 6. Stratford PW, Binkley JM, Riddle DL, and Guyatt GH, *Sensitivity to change of the Roland-Morris Back Pain Questionnaire: part 1.* Phys Ther, 1998. **78**(11): p. 1186-96.
- 7. Riddle DL, Stratford PW, and Binkley JM, *Sensitivity to change of the Roland-Morris Back Pain Questionnaire: part 2.* Phys Ther, 1998. **78**(11): p. 1197-207.
- 8. Van der Roer N, Ostelo RW, Bekkering GE, van Tulder MW, and de Vet HC, *Minimal clinically important change for pain intensity, functional status, and general health status in patients with nonspecific low back pain*. Spine (Phila Pa 1976), 2006. **31**(5): p. 578-82.
- 9. Crosby RD, Kolotkin RL, and Williams GR, *Defining clinically meaningful change in health*related quality of life. J Clin Epidemiol, 2003. **56**(5): p. 395-407.
- 10. Cohen J, CHAPTER 1 The Concepts of Power Analysis, in Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences, Cohen J, Editor. 1977, Academic Press. p. 1-17.
- 11. Fayers PM and Machin D, *Quality of life: assessment, analysis and interpretation.* John Wiley & Sons, 2000.
- Guyatt GH, Bombardier C, and Tugwell PX, Measuring disease-specific quality of life in clinical trials. CMAJ : Canadian Medical Association journal = journal de l'Association medicale canadienne, 1986. 134(8): p. 889-895.
- Wyrwich KW, Tierney WM, and Wolinsky FD, Further evidence supporting an SEM-based criterion for identifying meaningful intra-individual changes in health-related quality of life. J Clin Epidemiol, 1999. 52(9): p. 861-73.
- 14. Wolinsky FD, Wan GJ, and Tierney WM, *Changes in the SF-36 in 12 months in a clinical sample of disadvantaged older adults.* Med Care, 1998. **36**(11): p. 1589-98.
- 15. McHorney CA and Tarlov AR, *Individual-patient monitoring in clinical practice: are available health status surveys adequate?* Qual Life Res, 1995. **4**(4): p. 293-307.

1		
2		
3		
4	16.	Lydick E and Epstein RS. Interpretation of auglity of life changes. Qual Life Res. 1993. <b>2</b> (3):
5		n 221-6
6	17	Poston DE Rombardiar C Katz IN Wright IC Walls C Roars M at al Looking for
/	17.	beaton DE, Bonnbardier C, Katz JN, Wright JG, Weils G, Boers W, et al., Looking Jor
8		important change/differences in studies of responsiveness. OMERACT MCID Working
9 10		Group. Outcome Measures in Rheumatology. Minimal Clinically Important Difference. J
10		Rheumatol, 2001. <b>28</b> (2): p. 400-5.
17	18.	Dworkin RH, Turk DC, McDermott MP, Peirce-Sandner S, Burke LB, Cowan P, et al.,
13		Interpreting the clinical importance of group differences in chronic pain clinical trials:
13		MAMPACT recommendations Dain 2000 <b>146</b> (2): p 228 44
15	10	InviviPACI Teconimentuations. Pain, 2009. <b>140</b> (5). p. 256-44.
16	19.	Cella D, Builinger M, Scott C, and Barotsky I, Group vs individual approaches to
17		understanding the clinical significance of differences or changes in quality of life. Mayo Clin
18		Proc, 2002. <b>77</b> (4): p. 384-92.
19	20.	Guyatt GH, Making sense of quality-of-life data. Med Care, 2000. 38(9 Suppl): p. li175-9.
20	21.	Testa MA. Interpretation of auglity-of-life outcomes: issues that affect magnitude and
21		megning Med Care 2000 <b>38</b> (9 Suppl): n Ji166-74
22	22	LLS Department of Health (Juman Services EDA Center for Drug Evaluation Research, LLS
23	ΖΖ.	0.5. Department of Health Human Services FDA Center for Drug Evaluation Research, 0.5.
24		Department of Health Human Services FDA Center for Biologics Evaluation Research, U.S.
25		Department of Health Human Services FDA Center for Devices Radiological Health,
20		Guidance for industry: patient-reported outcome measures: use in medical product
27		development to support labeling claims: draft guidance. 2006. <b>4</b> : p. 79.
20	23.	I vnch M E and Campbell F. Cannabinoids for treatment of chronic non-cancer pain: a
30	20.	systematic review of randomized trials Br I Clin Pharmacol 2011 <b>72</b> (5): n 735-14
31	24	Beyehult D.C. Coddard C. Maura C. and Orallana M.F. The effectiveness of emperimeids in
32	24.	Boychuk D G, Goddard G, Mauro G, and Orellana M F, The effectiveness of cannabinoids in
33		the management of chronic nonmalignant neuropathic pain: a systematic review. J Oral
34		Facial Pain Headache, 2015. <b>29</b> (1): p. 7-14.
35	25.	Meng H, Johnston B, Englesakis M, Moulin D E, and Bhatia A, Selective Cannabinoids for
36		Chronic Neuropathic Pain: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. Anesth Analg, 2017.
37		<b>125</b> (5): n 1638-1652
38	26	Mücke M. Phillips T. Padbruch I. Potzke E. and Häuser W. Cannabis based medicines for
39	20.	where is nouron othis name in adulta. Cookrens Database of Systematic Davisure 2010(2)
40	_	chronic neuropathic pain in daults. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, 2018(3).
41	27.	Deshpande A, Mailis-Gagnon A, Zoheiry N, and Lakha S F, Efficacy and adverse effects of
42		medical marijuana for chronic noncancer pain: Systematic review of randomized controlled
43		<i>trials.</i> Can Fam Physician, 2015. <b>61</b> (8): p. e372-81.
44 45	28.	Martin-Sanchez E. Furukawa T A. Taylor J. and Martin J L. Systematic review and meta-
46		analysis of cannabis treatment for chronic pain Pain Med 2009 <b>10</b> (8): p 1353-68
47	20	Aviram Land Samuelly Leichtag C. Efficacy of Cannabis Pased Medicines for Dain
48	29.	Avitanti Janu Santueny-Leichtag G, Ejjicucy Oj Cunnubis-Buseu Weulchtes joi Punn
49		Management: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials.
50		Pain Physician, 2017. <b>20</b> (6): p. E755-e796.
51	30.	Campbell F A, Tramèr M R, Carroll D, Reynolds D J M, Moore R A, and McQuay H J, Are
52		cannabinoids an effective and safe treatment option in the management of pain? A
53		<i>aualitative systematic review</i> . Bmi. 2001. <b>323</b> (7303): p. 13.
54	31	Stevens A Land Higgins M D. A systematic review of the analaesic efficacy of canadinoid
55	51.	medications in the management of acute nain. Acts Apporthesial Scond 2017 61/2): 2
56		$\mu$
57		208-280.
58		
59 60		
00		

32. Walitt B, Klose P, Fitzcharles M A, Phillips T, and Hauser W, Cannabinoids for fibromyalgia.
Cochrane Database Syst Rev, 2016. 7: p. Cd011694.

for peer teriew only

	First author	Title	Year of Design publicatio n	Type of cannabing id	Types of participan ts	Information sources	No. of trials	No. of Published participan protocol ts	Outcomes	Assessmen of adverse events	t Assessment of risk of bias	Accounts for random error	Use of the GRADE	Conclusion
	Lynch & Campbell	Cannabino ids for treatment of chronic non-cancer pain; a systematic review of randomize d trials	2011 Systemati Review	<ul> <li>Phytocan nabinoids; Smoked cannabis, oromucosa l extracts of cannabis- based medicine, and synthetic cannabinoi ids; nabilone, dronabinoi and a novel TMC analogue.</li> </ul>	Neuropathi c pain, fibromyalg ia, rheumatoi d arthritis, and mixed chronic pain.	PubMed EMIASE, CIMHI (ESSCO), Psychrife (ESSCO), Psychrife (ESSCO), The Cochrane Library, ISI Inform (Proquest), Dissertation Abstracts (Proquest), Academic Saarch Premier Saarch Premier Saarch Premier (ESSCO), Clinical Trials-genv, Trials-genv, Trials-genv, Trials-genv, Trials-genv, Trials-genv, Trials-genv, Trials-genv, Trials-genv, Trials-genv, GascomithKiloe, Okister (OCC) and Gospile Scholar,	18 comparin the interventin n with placebo	vij Ope	The primary outcome was pain in subjects with choice from cancer pain. The secondary outcomes were sleep, function, and quality of life.	Yes	Yes, except for reporting bias, publication bias and for- profit bias	No .	No	Overall there is evidence that comabinoids are safe and modestly effective in meuropathic pain with proliminary evidence of efficacy in fiberomyaligs and rhoumatol attribution did not pool data for meta-analysis but qualitatively.
	Meng et. al	Selective Cannabino ids for Chronic Neuropath c Pain: A Systematic Review and Meta- analysis	2017 Systema Review and Meta analysis	c Dronabinolo , nabilone and nabiximols	Neuropathi	Medlino, Embase, Cochrane Library, PROSPENO, Ciliniatitalia, gov, and Google Scholar. Pain societies (American Society of Anesthesiology). International Association for the Association f	11 (10 trials comparin the interventi n with placebo)	1219 No 8 0	The primary outcome was likensity of pains recorded lafter a minimum of 2 waster. following initiatization and galaxelox (comparation and galaxelox (comparation diministration, expressed on an NSI (0)—rep rais to diministration, expressed on an NSI (0)—rep rais to compare the second and pain accores (NSI/SVA) by 2050 at 22 weeks or more after initiation of intercome, NSI/SVA) paylical function, psychological function, psychological function psychological	Yes	Yes	Bonferroni adjustment for multiple testing was not performed as per recommend ations in the Cochrane Handbook.	Yes	Selective camabinolid provide a small analgetic benefit in patients with chronic neuropathic pain.
	Martin-Sán	Systematic Review and Meta-anal ysis of Cannabis Treatment for Chronic Pain	2009 Meta-ana ysis	Phytocan nabinoids and synthetic derivates of THC, such as dronabinoi , nabilone, or benzopyra noperidine (a synthetic nitrogen analog of THC)	Chronic pain of a pathologic al or traumatic origin	Medline/Pubmed, Embase, and The Cochrane Controlled Trials Register (CENTRAL)	18	? No	The primary outcome was intensity of pain as socored by numerical rang scales. The Secondary outcomes were CNS related events	Yes	Yes, except for reporting bias, detaction bias and for profit bias	No	No	Currently available evidence suggests that cannabls treatment is moderately efficacious for treatment of chronic ani, but baneficial effects may be partially (or completely) offset by potentially serious harms.
	Boychuk et. al	The Effectiven ess of Cannabino ids in the Managem ent of Chronic Nonmalign ant Neuropathi c Paln: A Systematic Review	2015 Systemati Review	c Phytocean mabinoids; smokid cannabis, cannabis, based medicinal extracts (CBME) in the form of oromucosa I sprays (nabiximol s), vaporized cannabis; and synthetic cannabinoi ds; dronabinoi, nabilone, and CT-3	Neuropathi	PubMed, Embase, Web of Science, and all evidence-based madicine reviews and databases (Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, ASP Journal Chub, Database of Reviews, ASP Journal (DARE), and Cochrane Controlled Trials Register [CCTR])	13	771 No	Outcomes considered main were reduction frain interarity and adverse events.	Yes	Yes, except for, reporting blas, publication blas and for- profit blas	No .	No	Cannabis-based medicinal extracts used in different populations of chronic non- malignant neuropathic pain neuropathic pain patients may provide effective analgesia in conditions that are refractory to other treatments.
	Mücke et. al	Cannabis products for adults with chronic neuropathi c pain	2018 Cochrane Bevlew	Phytocan nabinoids; oromucosa i spray containing THC or THC/CBD mix, smokad cannabis containing THC, THC and CBD as extract of cannabis sativa L, and s extract cannabis sativa L, and sitis sativa L, and shifting shiftin	Neuropathi c pain	Cochrane Library, MEDLINE and KMASCH Following clinical trial databases vore scatched for additional data including unpublished data: US National Institutes of Haalth clinical trial register (www.clinical Trials. Register) (www.clinical Trials. Register) (www.clinical Trials. Register) (Work) International Clinical (Irals. Registry Flatform (UCRW) Association for (Work) Association for (	16 (15 of the trials comparin the interventi n with placebo)	1750 Ves 8 0	Prinary outcomes: Participant reported pains relief of 50% or greater. We preferred composite over indiper scale genetic more and pre-scale genetic scalings: Price (Periae Global Improvide) Price (Periae Global Improvide) Price (Periae Global Improved) Withdrawals due to adverse events (tolerability): Stations adverse counts (rafest), Safotos adverse owent: spicality include any utchanal molical any utchanal molical	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	The potential benefit of canobit-based medicine (herbal canobit, plant canobit, plant canobit, plant canobit, plant canobit, plant oromicosal grayh and funcin neuropart pain might be outweight day that potential harms.
	Aviram et. al	Efficacy of Cannabis- Based Medicines for Pain Managem ent: A Systematic Review and Meta- Analysis of Randomize d Controlled Trials	2017 Meta- Analysis	Phytocan nabinoids; Satives/na bikimol, cannabidio I, cannabidio I, cannabidio d cigarettes/ vaporizer, and synthetic cannabinol and nabilone, CT-3, ajulemic acid, synthetic acid, synthetic and synthetic and nabilone, CT-3, ajulemic acid, synthetic and and nabilone, CT-3, ajulemic acid, synthetic acid synthetic acid, synthetic acid	Chronic (cancer and non- cancer) pain and acute postoperat hve pain	MEDINF/Pubmed and in Google Scholar using Medical Subject Heading (MeSH) terms	43 trials comparin the interventi n with both 'active drugs' an placebo	2437 No 0 d	The outcome measure that was chosen was the variable "pain interopit" as socred by the paint one of the (MSF 111, Assail avalag scale (MAS), and Point box (MS-111, Assail avalag scale (MAS), and the VAS section of the quastionnaire short form MGGII Pain Caustionnaire	Yes	Yes, except for, reporting blas, publication blas and for profit blas	No .	No	The current systematic review suggests that cannabinolid-based medicines might be effective for chronic pain treatment, base primarily for neuropathic pain patients.
	Campbell et. al	Are cannabinoi ds an effective and safe treatment the manageme nt of pain? A qualitative systematic review	2001 Systemati Review	CODy, any Conal THC, an oral synthetic nitrogen analogue of THC (NIB), oral benzopyra noperidine (BPP), and intramuscu lar levonantra dol	Acute, chronic non- malignant pain, and cancer pain	MEDLINE, EMBASE, Oxford Pain Database, and Cochrane Library	9	222 No	Outcome measures for pain intensity; pain reliaf; the use of supplementary anafgesia; patients' preferences; and adverse effects.	Yes	Yes, except for, reporting bias, publication bias and for- profit bias		No	Cannabinoids are no more effective than codeline in controlling pain and have depressant effects on the central nervous system that limit the use. Their widespress introduction into cilinical practice for pain management is therefore postoparative pain they should not be used.
	Deshpand e et. al	Efficacy and adverse effects of medical marijuana for chronic noncancer pain	2015 Systemati Review	c Cigarettes or vaporizer containing delta-9- THC	Neuropathi	MEDINE, EMBASE, and the international Pharmaceutical Abstracts	6 trials comparin interventin with placebo. Placebo being cigarette: or vaporizer containin 0% dalta- THC or with cannabin d remova	226 No 0 8 9- 0	For outcomes, pain scores were extracted uning the visual analogue scale (VAS) or an alternative numerical pain rating took if pain subject to the pain ratio subject of the pain subject of the pain feedback measures of feedback scores and advances of the pain advances of the pain advances of the pain scale score and pain scale score and pain scale score advances of the pain advances of the pain advances of the pain scale score advances of the pain scale score score score advances of the pain score s	Yes	Yes, except for, reporting blas, publication blas and for profit blas	No	No	There is suddence for the use of foundate medical marijuana in refractory neuropathic pain in conjunction with traditional analgesise. However, trials wave limited by schert duration, variability in dosing and strength of delta 9- tetrahydrocannabinoi and stark of functions and strength of delta 9- tetrahydrocannabinoi and stark of functions of delta for the source schert term, the long- tespichaestive and neurocognithe effects of medical marijuana remain unknown.
	Stevens et. al	A systematic review of the analgesic efficacy of cannabinoi d medication s in the manageme nt of acute pain	2017 Systemati Review	c Levonantra dol, nabilone, AZD1940, GW842166 , dronabinol , *-9-THC	Acute postoperat ive pain	MEDLINE, EMBASE, Cochrane Library, and the World Health Organization International Clinical Trials Registry Platform	7 trials comparin interventi n with placebo, Ketoprofe Pethidine Naproxen and Ibuprofen	611 Yes 8 m	The primary outcome was the qualitative analysis of the analysis of efficacy of cannabinoids in the management of acute pain compared to placebo or active comparator. The secondary outcome was the qualitative analysis of the reported adverse effects	Yes	Yes, except for, publication bias and for- profit bias	No	Yes	Based on the available randomized controlled trial evidence, cannabinoids have no role in the management of acute pain.
Form	Walitt et. al	Cannabino ids for fibromyalg ia	2016 Cochrane Review	Nabilone	Fibromyalg ia	Cochrane Library, MEDLINE and EMBASE	2 trials comparin the interventi n with either (1) placebo c (1) amitriptyl ne	72 (40) Yes	Primary outcomes: Participant-reported pain ralief of 50% or greater. PGIC (Patient Global impression of Change) much or very much improved. Welthdawal due to adverse events (tolerability). Seriour adverse ovents (rafety). Serious adverse	Yes	Yes, except for publication bias.	No	Yes	We found no convincing, unbiased high quality wridence suggesting that mabilities is of value in treating project with fibromyralgia. The locarability of nabilities was low in people with fibromyralgia.

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj worker of the state of the

PRISMA - P (Pro	forror	BMJ Open BMJ Open BMJ Open BMJ Open BMJ Open Structure BMJ Open Structure St	tems to
address in a syst	<u>emati</u> Item	c review protocol*	(Page No.#)
	No		
ADMINISTRATIV	E INFO		
Title:		ate	
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	1
Update	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	
Registration	2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number	
Authors:		a nde	
Contact	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mathing address of corresponding author	1
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	25-26
Amendments	4	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments	
Support:			
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	25
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	
Role of sponsor or funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	3-9
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participents, Interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	9
METHODS		ýgies	
Eligibility criteria	8	Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such as years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review	10-12
Information sources	9	Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases, contact with study authors, trail registers or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage	12-13
Search strategy	10	Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned limited such that it could be repeated	
		For peer review only - http://bmiopen.bmi.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml <b>de</b>	

		BMJ Open S PP	
		rright, ii	
Study records:		nclu	
Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review $\hat{g}$	13
Selection process	11b	State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)	
Data collection process	11c	Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such as piloting forms, done independence by an duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators	13
Data items	12	List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding sources) and simplifications	
Outcomes and prioritization	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and addes and outcomes, with rationale	1
Risk of bias in individual studies	14	Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether the study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis	1:
Data synthesis	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised	
	15b	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods $\mathbf{\hat{d}}$ and $\mathbf{\hat{d}}$ and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (such as I <sup>2</sup> , Kendal 3).	19
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regrese on g	22
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	
Meta-bias(es)	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selectize regorting within studies)	
Confidence in cumulative evidence	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)	
* It is strongly reconclarification on the clarification on the PRISMA-P Group a From: Shamseer L, M meta-analysis protoc	mmeno items. and is Moher I cols (PH	Amendments to a review protocol should be tracked and dated. The copyright for PRISMA-P (including checklist) is held be distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution Licence 4.0. D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart L, PRISMA-P Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic RISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. BMJ. 2015 Jan 2;349(jan02 1):g7647.	portan by the <i>reviev</i>
		ýger (* 1997) Jernes (* 1997)	
		ce Bibliographique d	

**BMJ** Open

# **BMJ Open**

# Cannabinoids versus placebo for pain. Protocol for a systematic review with meta-analysis and Trial Sequential Analysis

Journal:	BMJ Open						
Manuscript ID	omjopen-2019-031574.R1						
Article Type:	Protocol						
Date Submitted by the Author:	16-Jul-2019						
Complete List of Authors:	Barakji, Jehad; The Copenhagen Trial Unit, Rigshospitalet Dept. 7812 Korang, Steven Kwasi; Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen Trial Unit; Holbaek Sygehus, Pediatric Dept. Feinberg, Joshua; Copenhagen Univ Hosp Maagard, Mathias; The Copenhagen Trial Unit, Rigshospitalet Dept. 7812 Gluud, Christian; Copenhagen Trial Unit (CTU), Center for Clinical Intervention Research Mathiesen, Ole; University of Copenhagen Jakobsen, Janus; Copenhagen Trial Unit, Centre for Clinical Intervention Research, Department 7812, Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen University Hospital						
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b> :	Pharmacology and therapeutics						
Secondary Subject Heading:	Anaesthesia, Evidence based practice, Complementary medicine						
Keywords:	PAIN MANAGEMENT, Herbal medicine < THERAPEUTICS, Adverse events < THERAPEUTICS, CLINICAL PHARMACOLOGY, Health & safety < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT						
	·						

SCHOLARONE<sup>™</sup> Manuscripts

# Cannabinoids versus placebo for pain: Protocol for a systematic review with meta-analysis and Trial Sequential Analysis

Jehad A. Barakji<sup>1</sup>, Steven Kwasi Korang<sup>1</sup>, Joshua Rose-Hansen Feinberg<sup>1</sup>, Mathias Maagaard<sup>1</sup>, Christian Gluud<sup>1</sup>, Ole Mathiesen<sup>2,3</sup>, Janus C. Jakobsen<sup>1,4,5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The Copenhagen Trial Unit, Centre for Clinical Intervention Research, Department 7812, Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen University Hospital, Blegdamsvej 9, DK 2100 Copenhagen, Denmark

<sup>2</sup> Centre for Anaesthesiological Research, Department of Anaesthesiology, Zealand University Hospital, Koege,

Denmark

<sup>3</sup> Department of Clinical Medicine, Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences, Copenhagen University, Copenhagen, Denmark

<sup>4</sup> Department of Cardiology, Holbæk Hospital, Holbæk, Denmark

<sup>5</sup> Department of Regional Health Research, The Faculty of Heath Sciences, University of Southern Denmark, Odense, Denmark

Corresponding author

Jehad A. Barakji

Tlf.: +45 21 52 07 80

Email: jehad.barakji@ctu.dk

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-031574 on 31 October 2019. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

#### 

# Abstract

**Introduction** Pain is a frequent clinical symptom, and with significant impact on patient well-being. Therefore, sufficient pain management is of utmost importance. While cannabinoids have become a more popular alternative to traditional types of pain medication among patients, the quality of evidence supporting the use of cannabinoids has been questioned. The beneficial and harmful effects of cannabinoids in patients with pain is unknown. Accordingly, we aim to assess the efficacy, tolerability, and safety of cannabinoids (herbal, plant-derived extracts and synthetic) compared with placebo for any type of pain.

**Methods and analysis** We will conduct a systematic review of randomised clinical trials with meta-analysis and Trial Sequential Analysis to assess the beneficial and harmful effects of cannabinoids in any dose, formulation, and duration. We will accept placebo or no treatment as control interventions. We will include participants with any type of pain (acute and chronic pain, cancer-related pain, headache, neuropathic pain or any other types of pain). We will systematically search The Cochrane Library, MEDLINE, EMBASE, Science Citation Index, and BIOSIS for relevant literature. We will follow the recommendations by Cochrane and the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) statement. The risk of systematic errors (bias) and random errors (play of chance) will be assessed. The overall certainty of evidence will be evaluated using the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development, and Evaluation (GRADE) approach.

**Ethics and dissemination** Ethical approval is not a requirement since no primary data will be collected. The findings of this systematic review will be submitted for peer-reviewed publication and disseminated in national and international conferences.

**Discussion** Although cannabinoids are now being used to manage different pain conditions, the evidence for the clinical effects are unclear. The present review will systematically assess the current evidence for the benefits and harms of cannabinoids to inform practice and future research.

# Strengths and limitations of this study

- Our methodology is based on the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions, the PRISMA guideline, and a systematic eight step procedure for valid assessments of statistical and clinical significance
- We systemically plan to assess risks of random errors ('play of chance) and systematic errors ('bias')
- We have systematically predefined minimal important differences for all outcomes
- The certainty of the evidence with be assessed using the GRADE approach

Pain is the most commonly reported symptom in the general population and in a medical setting [1-3]. Persistent pain is a major international health problem [4], prompting the World Health Organization (WHO) to endorse a global campaign against pain [5]. Pain is the leading reason for use of alternative medicines (i.e. acupuncture, etc.) [6]. Pain has been associated with a low degree of health-related quality of life and may lead to psychosocial distress, insomnia, and depressive symptoms [7-15]. Pain is also among the most common reasons for temporary or permanent work disability [16]. Pain is always subjective and may be defined as "an unpleasant sensory and emotional experience associated with actual or potential tissue damage" [17].

Cannabinoids have emerged as a potential alternative for the treatment of intractable pain [18]. Before the healthcare systems globally can endorse the applicability of cannabinoids for pain, the potential short-time and long-term adverse events encumbered with long-term use of cannabinoids must be investigated. This is of utmost importance because patients who consume cannabinoids to alleviate their chronic pain will most likely need to consume cannabinoids for the rest of their lifespan.

# **Description of pain**

Pain may be caused by or be related to different clinical disorders and classified according to several different characteristics [19-22]. Below, we describe shortly some of these classifications.

# Acute and chronic pain

Pain may be classified as 'acute pain' or 'chronic pain'.

• Acute pain usually has a well-defined onset and most often a readily identifiable cause (i.e. surgery, etc.). Acute pain is expected to run its course in a short time frame and management typically focuses on

#### **BMJ** Open

symptomatic relief until this happens [23]. Acute pain is a common symptom, affecting between 37% to 84% of hospitalised patients [24].

 Chronic pain is often characterised by an ill-defined onset and a prolonged, fluctuating course [23]. Chronic pain often persists past normal healing time and hence lacks the acute warning function of physiological nociception [25]. Pain is usually regarded as chronic when it lasts or recurs for more than three to six months [17, 26]. Chronic pain is a frequent condition, affecting an estimated 20% of people worldwide [27-30] and accounting for 15% to 20% of physician visits according to European observational studies [31, 32].

#### Cancer-related pain

Pain may also be classified based on whether it is cancer-related or non-cancer-related. Cancer-related pain is pain caused by the cancer itself (primary tumour and metastases) or its treatment (i.e. radiation therapy, etc.) [23, 33].

## Postoperative pain

Postoperative pain includes pain from inflammation caused by tissue trauma (i.e. surgical incision, dissection, burns, etc.) or direct nerve injury (e.g. nerve transection, stretching, or compression) [34]. Inflammation results in activation and sensitisation of nociceptive pain pathways, resulting in primary and secondary hyperalgesia and central sensitisation, which is characterized by clinically increased pain, allodynia, and increased sensitivity from surrounding non-damaged anatomical areas [35].

## Other types of pain

Pain in one or more anatomic regions where the aetiology is unknown is defined as idiopathic pain [36]. Examples of idiopathic pain are chronic widespread pain, fibromyalgia, irritable bowel syndrome, and back pain that is not diagnosed as musculoskeletal or as neuropathic pain [33].

Pain types defined according to specific mechanism causing the pain Somatic nociceptive pain

#### **BMJ** Open

Nociceptive pain is the most frequent type of pain. It results from activity in neural pathways caused by actual tissue damage or potentially tissue-damaging stimuli [31, 37] originating from somatic nociceptors from skin, bone, joints, or muscles [38].

Visceral nociceptive pain

The visceral nociceptive pain is pain resulting from viscera in the thoracic, pelvis, or abdominal organs [39-41]. Visceral pain is diffuse, less distinctive, and difficult to localise [41] and is often characterised by referred visceral pain [42].

#### Neuropathic pain

The 2011 International Association for the Study of Pain definition of neuropathic pain is "pain caused by a lesion or disease of the somatosensory system" [43].

Neuropathic pain may be classified as central neuropathic pain or peripheral neuropathic pain. Central neuropathic pain conditions are mainly attributed to multiple sclerosis and post-stroke pain [44], while peripheral neuropathic pain is largely due to post-herpetic neuralgia and diabetic neuropathy [45].

# Description of the intervention

Cannabis (also called marijuana) is the most common illegally used psychoactive substance worldwide [46]. Cannabinoids refer to a heteromorphic group of molecules that demonstrate activity upon cannabinoid receptors [47]. Cannabinoids may be classified into three groups: 1) endocannabinoids, 2) phytocannabinoids, and 3) synthetic cannabinoids [47].

#### Endocannabinoids

Endocannabinoids are characterised by being the endogenously generated cannabinoids [48]. The primary types of endocannabinoids are the lipid endocannabinoid arachidonoyl ethanolamide (named anandamide) [49] and the endocannabinoid 2-arachidonoylglycerol (2-AG) [50, 51].

Phytocannabinoids

Phytocannabinoids are cannabinoids found in the cannabis plant [52]. The best characterised phytocannabinoids are the psychotropic tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) and the primarily anti-inflammatory cannabidiol (CBD) [53]. Nabiximols (marketed as Sativex<sup>®</sup>) is a sublingually administered oromucosal spray based on a mixture of tetrahydrocannabinol and cannabidiol [54].

# Synthetic cannabinoids

Synthetic cannabinoids are analogues of the cannabinoids found in natural marijuana that are chemically synthesised. The most commonly prescribed cannabinoid-based medicines are the synthetic cannabinoids dronabinol (marketed as Marinol<sup>®</sup>) and nabilone (marketed as Cesamet<sup>®</sup>) [54].

# Endocannabinoid system

All cannabinoids act on cannabinoid receptors. These cannabinoid receptors are located throughout the body but are mostly located in the brain [55]. The cannabinoid receptors and endocannabinoids (see paragraph above) are together named the endocannabinoid system [56].

# Cannabinoid receptors

There are two types of cannabinoid receptors, type I and type II [57]. Cannabinoid receptor type I are most abundant in the central nervous system, especially in areas promoting nociception, short-term memory, and in the basal ganglia, but are also found in the peripheral nerves, uterus, testis, and bones [57]. Tetrahydrocannabinol activates cannabinoid type I receptors in the dopaminergic mesolimbic brain circuit, resulting in enhanced release of dopamine [58]. Such activation of the so-called 'brain reward system' is hypothesised to mediate the positive reinforcing and rewarding effects of almost all drugs of abuse [58].

In contrast, cannabinoid receptor type II, is mostly found in the periphery, often in conjunction with immune cells, but may appear in the central nervous system particularly under conditions of inflammation in association with microcytes [57]. The physiological responses that result from cannabinoid receptor activation are euphoria, psychosis, impaired memory and cognition, reduced locomotor function, increased appetite, as well as anti-emetic, pain-relieving, anti-spasticity, and sleep-promoting effects [59].

# Administration of cannabinoids

#### **BMJ** Open

Cannabis is most commonly consumed via smoked, inhaled vapor, or oral routes of administration [60]. Vaporising cannabis ('vaping') heats the material without burning which theoretically minimises potential carcinogens compared to smoking and may produce less respiratory irritation [61, 62]. Sublingual administration is used for some medical cannabis preparations (i.e. nabiximols, etc.).

# Why it is important to do this review

We identified ten previous reviews with meta-analyses assessing the effects of cannabinoids on different types of pain [63-72]. Bearing in mind that some of the previous reviews investigated more than one type of pain, eight reviews assessed the effects of different cannabinoids on neuropathic pain [63-69, 72]; four reviews assessed the effects of different cannabinoids on nociceptive pain (i.e. rheumatoid arthritis, etc.) [63, 64, 67, 68]; three reviews assessed the effects of different cannabinoids on cancer-related pain [63, 67, 68]; four reviews assessed the effects of different cannabinoids on cancer-related pain [63, 67, 71]; and three reviews assessed the effects of different cannabinoids on postoperative pain [63, 68, 70]. All the previous reviews included randomised clinical trials, but only two of the ten reviews systematically assessed the risk of bias in the trials [65, 72], and none of the previous reviews took into account the risks of random errors [63-72]. Only two out of the ten reviews used predefined Cochrane methodology [71, 72] and only four reviews used the GRADE approach [65, 70-72].

Most of the reviews concluded that the assessed cannabinoids were effective against pain [63-67, 69, 72]. In **Table 1 (Additional file 1),** we have summarised the results and conclusions of the previous reviews. Five of the reviews reported serious adverse events (i.e. agitation, impaired memory, abuse, dissociation, acute psychosis, death, etc.) [63, 65-67, 72]. The reviews also showed that the most commonly reported adverse events were sedation, dizziness, dry mouth, increased appetite, somnolence, confusion, nausea, and disturbances in concentration [63-66, 68, 69, 71, 72].

A correlation between psychiatric disorders (i.e. schizophrenia and psychosis etc.) and increased cannabinoid consumption have previously been hypothesised [73-79]. Di Forti et. al recently conducted a study indicating that daily cannabis use was associated with increased odds of psychotic disorder compared with never users (adjusted odds ratio [OR] 3.2, 95% Cl 2.2–4.1), increasing to nearly five-times increased odds for daily use of high-potency (THC  $\geq$ 10%) types of cannabis (adjusted odds ratio [OR] 4.8, 95% Cl 2.5–6.3) [80].

#### **BMJ** Open

Compared to previous systematic reviews on cannabinoids, we want to assess the effects of all types of cannabinoid versus placebo or no intervention for all different forms of pain. This increases the power and precision over the overall analysis and make it possible to conduct subgroup analyses and sensitivity analyses that may identify pain areas where cannabinoid could be especially beneficial and cause the least harms. In addition, we will implement a minimal clinically important threshold regarding analgesic efficacy based on previously conducted methodological studies which ensures that analgesic efficacy is of a firm significance before acceptance. Finally, by instigating all types of cannabinoids treated for any type of pain this systematic review will aid trialist in optimising the design of future randomised clinical trials by illuminating any research pitfalls of all previously conducted randomised clinical trials on this topic.

## Objective

The objective of our systematic review is to assess the analgesic efficacy and adverse events encumbered with the use of cannabinoids compared to placebo or no intervention in participants with any type of pain (acute and chronic pain, cancer-related pain, headache, neuropathic pain, or any other types of pain). A secondary objective of this systematic review is to assess the impact of cannabinoid use on the quality of sleep and quality of life which is especially decreased in participants with chronic pain.

# Methods

This systematic review protocol has been developed based on Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) guidelines for reporting systematic reviews evaluating healthcare interventions [81, 82]. A PRISMA-P checklist file is attached (Additional file 2).

## Criteria for considering studies for this review

## Type of studies

Randomised clinical trials irrespective of trial design, setting, publication status, publication year, and language. If we identify quasi-randomised studies and observational studies during our searches for randomised clinical trials, we will only include their reporting on harms in a narrative way. By not systematically searching for all observational studies on harm, we run the risk of putting more focus on benefit than harm. We are aware that this is a limitation of our review.
# Types of participants

Participants with any type of pain, i.e. acute and chronic pain, cancer-related pain, headache, neuropathic pain, or any other types of pain (as defined by the trialists). Participants will be included irrespective of age, sex, and comorbidities.

# Types of interventions

### Experimental intervention

Any type of cannabinoids such as: herbal cannabis (hashish, marihuana), plant-based extracts (i.e. nabiximole, etc.), or synthetic cannabinoids (i.e. cannabidiol, dronabinol, levonantradol, nabilone, etc.). We will accept cannabinoids at any dose, by any route, administered for the relief of pain.

### Control intervention

Placebo or no intervention.

#### Co-interventions

We will accept any co-intervention but only if this co-intervention is planned to be delivered similarly in both intervention groups. If this plan is not followed, then these trials will be assessed as a subgroup due to potential confounding.

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-031574 on 31 October 2019. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) .

data mining, AI training, and similar technologies

Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text

# Types of outcome measures

Primary outcomes

- All-cause mortality
- Pain assessment on visual analogue scale (VAS) or numerical rating scale (NRS)
- Proportion of participants with a serious adverse event defined as any untoward medical occurrence that resulted in death; was life threatening; was persistent; or led to significant disability, nephrotoxicity, superinfection, need for respiratory support, need for circulatory support, or prolonged hospitalisation [83]. As we expect the trialists' reporting of serious adverse events to be heterogeneous and not strictly according to the ICH-GCP recommendations, we will include the event as a serious adverse if the trialists either: 1) use the term 'serious adverse event' but not refer to ICH-GCP, or 2) report the proportion of

Page 10 of 61

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-031574 on 31 October 2019. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES)

Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies

participants with an event we consider fulfils the ICH-GCP definition. If several of such events are reported then we will choose the highest proportion reported in each trial.

• Quality of life measured on any valid continuous scale

### Secondary outcomes

- Dependence (as defined by trialists)
- Psychosis (as defined by trialists)
- Proportion of participants with one or more adverse event not considered to be serious
- Quality of sleep measured on any valid continuous scale

### Exploratory outcomes

- Each serious adverse event separately
- Each adverse event not considered serious separately.
- Twenty-four-hour morphine consumption (as defined by trialists)
- Physical function (as defined by trialists)
- Depressive symptoms (e.g. Hamilton Depression Rating Scale)

We will for all outcomes use the trial results reported at maximal follow-up except for acute pain. For acute pain, we will use the trials' results reported at the time point closest to 24 hours after the intervention is given.

### **Patient and Public Involvement**

We have had email correspondence with several relevant patient associations in Denmark to select the most patient relevant outcomes. The patient associations we have been in contact with include: The Danish Diabetes Association, Steno Diabetes Centre Copenhagen, The Danish Rheumatism Association, The Danish Multiple Sclerosis Society, and Danish Cancer Society. Initially we presented our potential outcomes for the aforementioned patient associations and requested for their opinion. Initially we had not included quality of sleep as an outcome however this was mentioned by almost all patient associations and it was included as a crucial secondary outcome. All-cause mortality was questioned by one of the patient associations however we have chosen to keep this outcome because of potential increased risk of both acute coronary syndrome and chronic cardiovascular disease associated with cannabis use [84]. We are very thankful for their input.

Search	n methods for identification of studies
Electro	nic searches
We wil	I search the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), Medical Literature Analysis
Retriev	al System Online (MEDLINE), Excerpta Medica database (EMBASE), Latin American and Caribbean
Science	es Literature (LILACS), Science Citation Index Expanded on Web of Science, and BIOSIS in order to i
releva	nt trials. The preliminary search strategy for CENTRAL, MEDLINE (Ovid), Embase (Ovid), LILACS, We
Science	e and BIOSIS is given in Additional file 3.
We wil	l search all databases from their inception to the $1^{st}$ of October 2019.
Search	ing other resources
The re	erence lists of relevant publications will be checked for any unidentified randomised trials. We wi
contac	t authors of included studies, and major pharmaceutical companies, by email asking for unpublish
randor	nised trials. Further, we will search for ongoing trials on:
•	ClinicalTrials.gov ( <u>www.clinicaltrials.gov</u> )
•	Google Scholar ( <u>https://scholar.google.dk/</u> )
•	The Turning Research into Practice (TRIP) Database ( <u>https://www.tripdatabase.com/</u> )
•	European Medicines Agency (EMA) (http:// <u>www.ema.europa.eu/ema/</u> )
•	United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA) ( <u>www.fda.gov</u> )
•	China Food and Drug Administration (CFDA) ( <u>http://eng.sfda.gov.cn/WS03/CL0755/</u> )
•	Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency
	(https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/ medicines-and-healthcare-products-regulatory
	agency)
•	The World Health Organization (WHO) International Clinical Trials Registry Platform (ICTRP) sear
	portal ( <u>http://apps.who.int/</u> trialsearch/)
We wil	l also consider relevant for the review unpublished and grey literature trials, if we identify such tri

We will perform the review following the recommendations of Cochrane [85]. The analyses will be performed using Review Manager 5 [86] and Trial Sequential Analysis [87]. In case of Review Manager statistical software not being sufficient, we will use STATA 15 [88].

# Selection of studies

Two authors (JB, SKK) will independently screen titles and abstracts. We will retrieve all relevant full-text study reports/publications, and four review authors (JB, SKK, JRF, MM) will independently screen the full text and identify and record reasons for exclusion of the ineligible studies. We will resolve any disagreement through discussion or, if required, we will consult a fifth author (JCJ). Trial selection will be displayed in an adapted flow diagram as per the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statement [89].

### Data extraction and management

Four authors (JB, SKK, JRF, MM) will in pairs extract data independently from included trials. Disagreements will be resolved by discussion with a fifth author (JCJ). We will assess duplicate publications and companion papers of a trial together to evaluate all available data simultaneously (maximise data extraction, correct bias assessment). We will contact the trial authors by email to specify any additional data, which may not have been reported sufficiently or at all in the publication.

# Trial characteristics

Bias risk components (as defined below); trial design (parallel, factorial, or crossover); number of intervention arms; length of follow-up; estimation of sample size; inclusion and exclusion criteria.

# Participant characteristics and diagnosis

Number of randomised participants; number of analysed participants; number of participants lost to follow-up/ withdrawals/crossover; compliance with medication; age range (mean or median) and sex ratio; type of pain (acute and chronic pain, cancer-related pain, headache, neuropathic pain or any other types of pain); baseline pain score; drug and dosing regimen; study design (placebo or active control); study duration and follow-up; analgesic outcome measures and results; adverse events (participants experiencing any adverse event, or serious adverse event).

Co-intervention characteristics

Type of co-intervention; dose of co-intervention; duration of co-intervention; and mode of administration.

#### Outcomes

All outcomes listed above will be extracted from each randomised clinical trial, and we will identify if outcomes are incomplete or selectively reported according to the criteria described later in 'incomplete outcome data' bias domain and 'selective outcome reporting' bias domain.

### Notes

Funding of the trial and notable conflicts of interest of trial authors will be extracted, if available. We will note in the 'Characteristics of included studies' table if outcome data were not reported in a usable way. Four review authors (JB, SKK, JRF, MM) will independently transfer data into the Review Manager file [86]. Disagreements will be resolved through discussion or, if required, we will consult with a fifth author (JCJ).

# Assessment of risk of bias in included studies

We will use the instructions given in the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions [85] in our evaluation of the methodology and hence the risk of bias of the included trials. We will evaluate the methodology in respect of:

- Random sequence generation
- Allocation concealment
- Blinding of participants and treatment providers
- Blinding of outcome assessment
- Incomplete outcome data
- Selective outcome reporting
- For-profit bias
- Overall risk of bias

These components enable classification of randomised trials as being at low risk of bias and at high risk of bias. The latter trials tend to overestimate positive intervention effects and underestimate negative effects [90-96]. We will classify the trials according to the following criteria.

### Random sequence generation

- Low risk: If sequence generation was achieved using computer random number generator or a random number table. Drawing lots, tossing a coin, shuffling cards, and throwing dice were also considered adequate if performed by an independent adjudicator.
- Unclear risk: If the method of randomisation was not specified, but the trial was still presented as being randomised.
- High risk: If the method of sequence generation was inadequate e.g. alternate medical record numbers or other non-random sequence generation.

# Allocation concealment

- Low risk: If the allocation of patients was performed by a central independent unit, on-site locked computer, identical-looking numbered sealed envelopes, drug bottles, or containers prepared by an independent pharmacist or investigator.
- Uncertain risk: If the trial was classified as randomised but the allocation concealment process was not described.
- High risk: If the allocation sequence was familiar to the investigators who assigned participants.

# Blinding of participants and treatment providers

- Low risk: If the participants and the treatment providers were blinded to intervention allocation and this was described.
- Uncertain risk: If the procedure of blinding was insufficiently described.
- High risk: If blinding of participants and the treatment providers was not performed.

# Blinding of outcome assessment

- Low risk of bias: If it was mentioned that outcome assessors were blinded and this was described.
- Uncertain risk of bias: If it was not mentioned if the outcome assessors in the trial were blinded or the extent of blinding was insufficiently described.
- High risk of bias: If no blinding or incomplete blinding of outcome assessors was performed.

# Incomplete outcome data

• Low risk of bias: If missing data were unlikely to make treatment effects depart from plausible values. This could be either (1) there were no drop-outs or withdrawals for all outcomes or (2) the numbers

#### **BMJ** Open

	BMJ (
	Open:
could be	first p
f bias due to	bubli
definitive.	shed
ita were likely	as 10.11: Prote
se the pattern	36/bm ected
trial used	njope by c
l, etc.).	n-2019-0315 opyright, ind
nd the	574 on 31 cluding f
ocol was	or us
us adverse	ober 201 Enseigne ses relat
n VAS or NRS	19. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on ement Superieur (ABES) . ed to text and data mining, Al training, and simila
s domains	n June 12 ar technc
nains described	ŀ, 2025 at Ager ₀logies.
selective	ICe B
assessed in	ibliographic
	Ē

de

and reasons for the withdrawals and drop-outs for all outcomes were clearly stated and could be described as being similar to both groups. Generally, the trial is judged as at a low risk of bias due to incomplete outcome data if drop-outs are less than 5%. However, the 5% cut-off is not definitive.

- Uncertain risk of bias: If there was insufficient information to assess whether missing data were likely to induce bias on the results.
- High risk of bias: If the results were likely to be biased due to missing data either because the pattern of drop-outs could be described as being different in the two intervention groups or the trial used improper methods in dealing with the missing data (i.e. last observation carried forward, etc.).

# Selective outcome reporting

- Low risk of bias: If a protocol was published before or at the time the trial was begun, and the
  outcomes specified in the protocol were reported on. If there is no protocol or the protocol was
  published after the trial has begun, reporting pain assessment on VAS or NRS and serious adverse
  events will grant the trial a grade of low risk of bias.
- Uncertain risk of bias: If no protocol was published and the outcome pain assessment on VAS or NRS and serious adverse events were not reported on.
- High risk of bias: If the outcomes in the protocol were not reported on.

# For-profit bias

- Low risk of bias: If the trial appeared to be free of other components of for-profit bias.
- Unclear risk of bias: If it was unclear whether the trial was free of for-profit bias.
- High risk of bias: If there was a high risk of for-profit bias.

# Overall risk of bias

- Low risk of bias: The trial will be classified at overall 'low risk of bias' only if all of the bias domains described in the above paragraphs are classified at 'low risk of bias'.
- High risk of bias: The trial will be classified at 'high risk of bias' if any of the bias risk domains described in the above are classified at 'unclear' or 'high risk of bias'.

We will assess the domains 'blinding of outcome assessment', 'incomplete outcome data', and 'selective outcome reporting' for each outcome result. Thus, we can assess the bias risk for each outcome assessed in

addition to each trial. Our primary conclusions will be based on the results of our primary outcome results at overall low risk of bias. Both our primary and secondary analyses will be presented in the summary of findings tables.

# Differences between the protocol and the review

We will conduct the review according to this published protocol and report any deviations from it in the 'Differences between the protocol and the review' section of the systematic review.

# Measures of treatment effect

# Dichotomous outcomes

We will calculate risk ratios (RRs) with 95% confidence interval (CI) for dichotomous outcomes, as well as the Trial Sequential Analysis- adjusted CIs (see below).

# Continuous outcomes

We will calculate the mean differences (MDs) and the standardised mean difference (SMD) with 95% CI for continuous outcomes, as well as the Trial Sequential Analysis-adjusted CIs (see below).

# Dealing with missing data

We will, as first option, contact all trial authors to obtain any relevant missing data (i.e. for data extraction and for assessment of risk of bias, as specified above).

# Dichotomous outcomes

We will not impute missing values for any outcomes in our primary analysis. In two of our sensitivity analyses (see paragraph below), we will impute data.

# Continuous outcomes

We will primarily analyse scores assessed at single time points. If only changes from baseline scores are reported, we will analyse the results together with follow-up scores [85]. If standard deviations (SDs) are not reported, we will calculate the SDs using trial data, if possible. We will not use intention-to-treat data if the original report did not contain such data. We will not impute missing values for any outcomes in our primary analysis. In our sensitivity analysis (see paragraph below) for continuous outcomes, we will impute data.

## Assessment of heterogeneity

We will primarily investigate forest plots to visually assess any sign of heterogeneity. We will secondly assess the presence of statistical heterogeneity by chi<sup>2</sup> test (threshold P < 0.10) and measure the quantities of heterogeneity by the I<sup>2</sup> statistic [97, 98]. We will investigate for heterogeneity through subgroup analyses. Ultimately, we may decide that a meta-analysis should be avoided [85].

### Assessment of reporting biases

We will use a funnel plot to assess reporting bias if ten or more trials are included. We will visually inspect funnel plots to assess the risk of bias. We are aware of the limitations of a funnel plot (i.e. a funnel plot assesses bias due to small sample size, etc.). From this information, we assess possible reporting bias. For dichotomous outcomes, we will test asymmetry with the Harbord test [99] if  $\tau^2$  is less than 0.1 and with the Rücker test if  $\tau^2$  is more than 0.1. For continuous outcomes, we will use the regression asymmetry test [100] and the adjusted rank correlation [101].

### Unit of analysis issues

We will only include randomised clinical trials. For trials using crossover design, only data from the first period will be included [85, 102]. There will therefore not be any unit of analysis issues.

### Minimal important difference

In clinical intervention research it is of utmost importance always to define minimal important differences (MID) and to define thresholds for clinical significance [103]. If a large number of trial participants are randomised, small and clinically irrelevant intervention effects may lead to statistically significant results and rejection of the null hypothesis [104]. Jaeschke et al. defined the minimal important difference as "the smallest difference in score in the domain of interest which patients perceive as beneficial" [105].

Estimations of minimal important differences should be used as arbitrary strict precise thresholds. However, to avoid erroneous conclusions minimal important differences need to be estimated and predefined when assessing the effects of interventions for pain. Olsen et al. have conducted two systematic reviews on this matter in order to gather the evidence and present an estimate of the minimal important difference [106, 107]. Olsen et al. conducted a systematic review on the minimal important difference in patients with acute pain and concluded Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-031574 on 31 October 2019. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de I Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

#### **BMJ** Open

that the median of the studies' results was 17 mm on VAS (IQR 14 mm to 23 mm) [106]. Another systematic review conducted by Olsen et al. was on the minimal important difference in patients with chronic pain and the results showed a median of 23 mm on VAS (IQR 12 mm to 39 mm) when using the within-patient anchor-based method, while the median in studies using the sensitivity- and specificity-based method was 20 mm on VAS (IQR 15 mm – 30 mm) [107]. We have described detailed considerations about minimal important differences in **Appendix 1**.

Based on the previously conducted systematic reviews we will choose at minimal important difference equivalent to 10 mm or 1 point on the visual analogue scale and the numerical rating scale, respectively, regarding an analgesic effect.

### Data synthesis

### Meta-analysis

We will undertake this meta-analysis according to the recommendations stated in the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions [85], Keus et al. [108], and the eight-step assessment suggested by Jakobsen et al. [103]. We will use the statistical software Review Manager 5.3 [86] provided by Cochrane to analyse data. We will assess our intervention effects with both random-effects meta-analyses [109] and fixedeffect meta-analyses [110]. We will use the more conservative point estimate of the two [103]. The more conservative point estimate is the estimate closest to zero effect. If the two estimates are similar, we will use the estimate with the highest P value [103]. We use four primary and four secondary outcomes, and therefore, we will consider a P value of 0.02 as the threshold for statistical significance [103, 111]. We will investigate for heterogeneity through subgroup analyses. Ultimately, we may decide that a meta-analysis should be avoided [85]. We will use the eight-step procedure to assess if the thresholds for statistical and clinical significance are crossed [103]. Our primary conclusion will be based on results with low risk of bias [103].

Where multiple trial intervention groups are reported in a single trial, we will include only the relevant groups. If two comparisons are combined in the same meta-analysis, we will halve the control group to avoid doublecounting [85]. Trials with a factorial design will be included.

If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, we will report the results in a narrative way.

Trial Sequential Analysis

Page 19 of 61

#### **BMJ** Open

Traditional meta-analysis runs the risk of random errors due to sparse data and repetitive testing of accumulating data when updating reviews. We wish to control the risks of type I errors and type II errors. We will therefore perform Trial Sequential Analysis on the outcomes, in order to calculate the required information size (that is the number of participants needed in a meta-analysis to detect or reject a certain intervention effect) and the cumulative Z-curve's breach of relevant trial sequential monitoring boundaries [87, 112-120]. A more detailed description of Trial Sequential Analysis can be found in the Trial Sequential Analysis manual [113] and at <a href="http://www.ctu.dk/tsa/">http://www.ctu.dk/tsa/</a>. For dichotomous outcomes, we will estimate the required information size based on the observed proportion of patients with an outcome in the control group (the cumulative proportion of patients with an event in the control groups relative to all patients in the control groups), a relative risk reduction of 20%, an alpha of 2.0% for our primary and secondary outcomes, a beta of 10%, and diversity as suggested by the trials in the meta-analysis. For the outcome "pain assessment on visual analogue scale (VAS) or numerical rating scale (NRS)", we will use a minimal important difference estimate based on previously conducted systematic reviews [106, 107]. We will accept an analgesic effect equivalent to 10 mm or 1 point on the visual analogue scale and the numerical rating scale, respectively, or a consumption of at least 5 mg morphine.

For all remaining continuous outcome, we will in the Trial Sequential Analysis use the observed SD, a mean difference of the observed SD/2, an alpha of 2.0% for our primary and secondary outcomes, and a beta of 10%.

# Subgroup analysis and investigation of heterogeneity

### Subgroup analysis

We will perform the following subgroup analysis when analysing the primary outcomes (All-cause mortality, pain assessment on VAS or NRS, serious adverse event, and quality of life).

- Trials at high risk of bias compared to trails at low risk of bias
- Trials compared according to type of pain (acute pain, chronic pain and cancer pain)
- Trials compared according to type of chronic pain
- Trials compared according to type of cannabinoids used

We will use the formal test for subgroup interactions in Review Manager [86].

Sensitivity analysis

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-031574 on 31 October 2019. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de I Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

To assess the potential impact of the missing data for dichotomous outcomes, we will perform the two following sensitivity analyses on both the primary and secondary outcomes.

- 'Best-worst-case' scenario: We will assume that all participants lost to follow-up in the cannabinoid intervention group have survived and had no serious adverse event, and that all those participants lost to follow-up in the placebo group have not survived, and had a serious adverse event.
- 'Worst-best-case' scenario: We will assume that all participants lost to follow-up in the cannabinoid intervention group have not survived, and had a serious adverse event, and that all those participants lost to follow-up in the placebo group have survived, and had no serious adverse event.

We will present results of both scenarios in our review.

For all continuous outcome when analysing a 'beneficial outcome' will be the group mean plus two standard deviations (SDs) (we will secondly use one SD in another sensitivity analysis) of the group mean and a 'harmful outcome' will be the group mean minus two SDs (we will secondly use one SD in another sensitivity analysis) of the group mean [103].

To assess the potential impact of missing SDs for continuous outcomes, we will perform the following sensitivity analysis.

• Where SDs are missing and it is not possible to calculate them, we will impute SDs from trials with similar populations and low risk of bias. If we find no such trials, we will impute SDs from trials with a similar population. As the final option, we will impute SDs from all trials.

We will present results of this scenario in our review. Other post hoc sensitivity analyses might be warranted if unexpected clinical or statistical heterogeneity is identified during the analysis of the review results [103].

# Summary of Findings

We will create a Summary of Findings table using each of the primary outcomes (all-cause mortality, pain assessment on VAS or NRS, serious adverse event, and quality of life). We will use the five GRADE considerations (bias risk of the trials, consistency of effect, imprecision, indirectness, and publication bias) to assess the quality of a body of evidence as it relates to the studies which contribute data to the meta-analyses for the prespecified outcomes [103, 121-123]. We will use methods and recommendations described in Chapter 8 (Section 8.5) and Chapter 12 of the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions [85]

using GRADEpro software. We will justify all decisions to downgrade the quality of studies using footnotes, and we will make comments to aid the reader's understanding of the review where necessary. Firstly, we will present our results in the Summary of Findings table based on the results from the trials with low risk of bias, and secondly, we will present the results based on all trials.

#### Ethics and Dissemination

Ethical approval is not a requirement since no primary data will be collected. The findings of this systematic review will be submitted for peer-reviewed publication and disseminated in national and international conferences and is expected to inform healthcare workers and providers about the occurrence of serious and non-serious adverse events following cannabinoid consumption. It is expected that the findings of this systematic review will identify some research gaps for future trials.

# Discussion

This protocol aims at investigating the beneficial and harmful effects of cannabinoids in patients with any type of pain condition. The outcomes will be all-cause mortality, pain assessment on VAS or NRS, serious adverse events, quality of life, dependence, psychosis, non-serious adverse events, and sleep quality.

This protocol has several strengths. The predefined methodology is based on the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions [85], the eight-step assessment suggested by Jakobsen et al. [103], Trial Sequential Analysis [84], and GRADE assessment [121-123]. Hence, this protocol takes into account both the risk of random error and the risk of systematic error. We predefined evidence-based estimations of minimal important differences which will limit the risk of focusing on statistically significant results with questionable clinical importance. This threshold of minimal important difference is based on the estimations of several previously conducted studies and reviews [106, 107]. Moreover, we are including all types of cannabinoids and all types of pain which will increase the statistical power and make it possible to perform essential subgroup analyses. We have been in contact with several relevant patient associations which has assisted us in choosing the most clinically relevant outcomes.

Our protocol also has several limitations. One of the potential limitations is that we include participants with all types of pain; cannabinoids might have different effects on different types of pain. It might e.g. be problematic

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-031574 on 31 October 2019. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de I Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

to combine trials assessing the effects of cannabinoids on acute pain and chronic pain because of different underlying pathophysiological mechanisms [124]. On the other hand, the effects of cannabinoids on acute pain and chronic pain might be comparable and hence it might be valid to combine trials assessing the effects of cannabinoids on acute pain and chronic pain in meta-analysis, which would increase the statistical power. The results of the subgroup analysis comparing trials including participants with acute pain to participants with chronic pain will therefore be highlighted when reporting our review results. Moreover, we only intend to assess cannabinoids versus placebo or no intervention. Further systematic reviews with meta-analyses and Trial Sequential Analyses need to assess the benefits and harms of cannabinoids versus other pain killers, provided that cannabinoids show more benefit than harm in the present systematic review.

Furthermore, more than one active cannabinoid agent is often combined in the different intervention options provided to the patients with a pain condition, thereby making difficult to explore the analgesic effect and adverse event associated with a single cannabinoid agent. Hence, if we show a difference between the intervention options, it will be difficult to conclude what exactly caused the difference in effect. To minimise these limitations, we have planned a careful assessment of statistical and clinical heterogeneity as well as several subgroup analyses and sensitivity analyses. Another limitation is the large number of comparisons which increase the risk of type 1 error. We have adjusted our thresholds for significance according to the number of primary outcomes, but, as mentioned, we have also included multiple subgroup analyses. This large risk of type 1 error will be taken into account when interpreting the review results.

#### Acknowledgements

We hugely appreciate the contribution of The Danish Diabetes Association, Steno Diabetes Centre Copenhagen, The Danish Rheumatism Association, The Danish Multiple Sclerosis Society, and Danish Cancer Society in guiding us to select the most patient relevant outcomes.

The expert help from Sarah Louise Klingenberg (Information Specialist, The Cochrane Hepato-Biliary Group, Copenhagen Trial Unit, Copenhagen, Denmark) in making the search strategy is hugely appreciated.

#### **Funding statement**

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

### Authors' contributions

JB drafted the protocol. JCJ, SKK, OM, CG, JRF and MM amended the protocol. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

#### **Competing interests**

None declared

### Ethics approval and consent to participate

Not applicable.

### Word Count

10835 words, including the full references.

# References

1. Verhaak P, Kerssens J, Dekker J, Sorbi M, and Bensing J, *Prevalence of chronic benign pain disorder among adults: a review of the literature.* PAIN, 1998. **77**(3): p. 231-9.

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-031574 on 31 October 2019. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de Enseignement Superieur (ABES)

Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies

- 2. Kroenke K, *Patients presenting with somatic complaints: epidemiology, psychiatric comorbidity and management.* Int J Methods Psychiatr Res, 2003. **12**(1): p. 34-43.
- 3. Sternbach RA, *Survey of pain in the United States: The nuprin pain report.* The Clinical Journal of Pain, 1986. **2**(1): p. 49-53.
- 4. Gureje O, Von Korff M, Simon G, and Gater R, *Persistent pain and well-being: a World Health Organization Study in Primary Care.* Jama, 1998. **280**(2): p. 147-51.
- 5. Breivik H, International association for the study of pain: update on WHO-IASP activities. J Pain Symptom Manage, 2002. **24**(2): p. 97-101.
- Astin J, Why patients use alternative medicine: Results of a national study. JAMA, 1998. 279(19): p. 1548-1553.
- 7. Davison SN, Jhangri GS, and Johnson JA, *Cross-sectional validity of a modified Edmonton symptom assessment system in dialysis patients: a simple assessment of symptom burden.* Kidney Int, 2006. **69**(9): p. 1621-5.
- Davison SN, Jhangri GS, and Johnson JA, Longitudinal validation of a modified Edmonton symptom assessment system (ESAS) in haemodialysis patients. Nephrol Dial Transplant, 2006.
   21(11): p. 3189-95.
  - 9. Davison SN and Jhangri GS, *Impact of pain and symptom burden on the health-related quality of life of hemodialysis patients.* J Pain Symptom Manage, 2010. **39**(3): p. 477-85.

- 10. Davison S, Chronic pain in end-stage renal disease. Adv Chronic Kidney Dis, 2005. 12(3): p. 326-34.
- Kimmel PL, Emont SL, Newmann JM, Danko H, and Moss AH, ESRD patient quality of life: 11. symptoms, spiritual beliefs, psychosocial factors, and ethnicity. Am J Kidney Dis, 2003. 42(4): p. 713-21.
- 12. Leinau L, Murphy TE, Bradley E, and Fried T, Relationship between conditions addressed by hemodialysis guidelines and non-ESRD-specific conditions affecting quality of life. Clin J Am Soc Nephrol, 2009. 4(3): p. 572-8.
- 13. Weisbord SD, Carmody SS, Bruns FJ, Rotondi AJ, Cohen LM, Zeidel ML, et al., Symptom burden, quality of life, advance care planning and the potential value of palliative care in severely ill haemodialysis patients. Nephrol Dial Transplant, 2003. 18(7): p. 1345-52.
- 14. Weisbord SD, Fried LF, Arnold RM, Fine MJ, Levenson DJ, Peterson RA, et al., Prevalence, severity, and importance of physical and emotional symptoms in chronic hemodialysis patients. J Am Soc Nephrol, 2005. 16(8): p. 2487-94.
- 15. Gamondi C, Galli N, Schonholzer C, Marone C, Zwahlen H, Gabutti L, et al., Frequency and severity of pain and symptom distress among patients with chronic kidney disease receiving dialysis. Swiss Med Wkly, 2013. 143: p. w13750.
  - 16. Smith BH, Elliott AM, Chambers WA, Smith WC, Hannaford PC, and Penny K, The impact of chronic pain in the community. Fam Pract, 2001. 18(3): p. 292-9.
  - 17. Merskey H, Lindblom U, Mumford JM, Nathan PW, and Sunderland S, Part III: Pain terms—a current list with definitions and notes on usage with definitions and notes on usage.. In: Merskey H, Bogduk N editor(s). Classification of Chronic Pain, IASP Task Force on Taxonomy. IASP Press, 1994(2nd Edition): p. 209-14.
- Vuckovic S, Srebro D, Vujovic K S, Vucetic C, and Prostran M, Cannabinoids and Pain: New 18. Insights From Old Molecules. Frontiers in pharmacology, 2018. 9: p. 1259. 34
  - Carr DB and Goudas LC, Acute pain. The Lancet, 1999. 353(9169): p. 2051-2058. 19.
- 36 Ashburn MA and Staats PS, Management of chronic pain. The Lancet, 1999. 353(9167): p. 1865-20. 37 1869. 38
- 21. Kanner R, Pain Management. JAMA, 1986. 256(15): p. 2112-2114. 39

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

29

30 31

32

33

35

40 41

48

49

50

51 52

53

- 22. Loeser J, Melzack R, Pain: an overview. The Lancet, 1999. **353**(9164): p. 1607-1609.
- 23. Portenoy R and Dhingra L. Assessment of cancer pain. 2017 [cited 18/04 2018].
- 42 Gregory J and McGowan L, An examination of the prevalence of acute pain for hospitalised adult 24. 43 patients: a systematic review. J Clin Nurs, 2016. 25(5-6): p. 583-98. 44
- 25. Treede R, Entstehung der schmerzchronifizierung. Rückenschmerzen und nackenschmerzen. 45 2016: Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg. 46 47
  - 26. American Geriatrics Society Panel Pharmacological management of persistent pain in older persons. J Am Geriatr Soc, 2009. 57: p. 1331-46.
  - 27. Breivik H, Collett B, Ventafridda V, Cohen R, and Gallacher D, Survey of chronic pain in Europe: prevalence, impact on daily life, and treatment. Eur J Pain, 2006. 10(4): p. 287-333.
  - 28. Goldberg DS and McGee SJ, Pain as a global public health priority. BMC Public Health, 2011. 11: p. 770.

1 2		
3 ⊿		
5	29.	Gureje O, Von Korff M, Kola L, Demyttenaere K, He Y, Posada-Villa J, et al., The relation between
6		multiple pains and mental disorders: results from the World Mental Health Surveys. PAIN, 2008.
7		<b>135</b> (1-2): p. 82-91.
8	30.	Institute of Medicine (US) Committee on Advancing Pain Research, Care, and Education,
9 10		Relieving pain in America: A blueprint for transforming prevention, care, education, and
11		research. National Academies Press 2011.
12	31.	Koleva D, <i>Pain in primary care: an Italian survey.</i> Eur J Public Health, 2005. <b>15</b> : p. 475–79.
13	32.	Mantyselka P, Kumpusalo E, Ahonen R, Kumpusalo A, Kauhanen J, Viinamaki H, et al., Pain as a
14 15		reason to visit the doctor: a study in Finnish primary health care. PAIN, 2001. <b>89</b> (2-3): p. 175-80.
15	33.	Treede RD, Rief W, Barke A, Aziz Q, Bennett MI, Benoliel R, et al., A classification of chronic pain
17		<i>for ICD-11.</i> PAIN, 2015. <b>156</b> (6): p. 1003-7.
18	34.	Kelly DJ, Ahmad M, and Brull SJ, Preemptive analgesia I: physiological pathways and
19		pharmacological modalities. Canadian Journal of Anaesthesia, 2001. 48(10): p. 1000-1010.
20 21	35.	Pogatzki-Zahn EM, Segelcke D, and Schug SA, Postoperative pain-from mechanisms to
21		<i>treatment.</i> Pain Rep, 2017. <b>2</b> (2): p. e588.
23	36.	Lipowski Z, Chronic idiopathic pain syndrome. Annals of Medicine, 1990. <b>22</b> (4): p. 213-217.
24	37.	Goucke C, The management of persistent pain. Med J Aust, 2003. <b>178</b> (9): p. 444-7.
25	38.	Chang V. Approach to symptom assessment in palliative care. 2018 [cited 2018.
26 27	39.	Knowles CH and Aziz Q, Basic and clinical aspects of gastrointestinal pain. Pain, 2009. 141(3): p.
27		191-209.
29	40.	Stein S L, <i>Chronic pelvic pain.</i> Gastroenterol Clin North Am, 2013. <b>42</b> (4): p. 785-800.
30	41.	Schwartz ES and Gebhart GF, <i>Visceral pain.</i> Curr Top Behav Neurosci, 2014. <b>20</b> : p. 171-97.
31	42.	Giamberardino M, Affaitati G, and Costantini R, Chapter 24 Referred pain from internal organs.
32		Handb Clin Neurol, 2006. <b>81</b> : p. 343-61.
33 34	43.	Jensen TS, Baron R, Haanpaa M, Kalso E, Loeser JD, Rice AS, et al., A new definition of neuropathic
35		<i>pain.</i> Pain, 2011. <b>152</b> (10): p. 2204-5.
36	44.	Headache Classification Committee of the International Headache Society, The International
37		Classification of Headache Disorders, 3rd edition (beta version). Cephalalgia, 2013. 33: p. 629-
38		808.
39 40	45.	Institute for clinical systems improvement, Health care guideline: Assessment and management
41		of chronic pain. 2009.
42	46.	United Nations office on drugs and crime, World Drug Report, United Nations. 2016.
43	47.	Russo E. Cannabinoids in the management of difficult to treat pain. Ther Clin Risk Manag. 2008.
44 45		<b>4</b> (1): p. 245-59.
45 46	48.	Ueda N. Tsuboi K. and Uvama T. Metabolic enzymes for endocannabinoids and
47	-	endocannabinoid-like mediators, 2015. Boston: Academic Press.
48	49.	Devane WA. Hanus L. Breuer A. Pertwee RG. Stevenson LA. Griffin G. et al., Isolation and
49		structure of a brain constituent that binds to the cannabinoid recentor. Science, 1992.
50 51		<b>258</b> (5090): p. 1946-9.
52	50.	Mechoulam R. Ben-Shabat S. Hanus L. Ligumsky M. Kaminski NF. Schatz AR. et al., Identification
53		of an endogenous 2-monoalyceride, present in canine aut, that binds to cannabinoid receptors.
54		Biochem Pharmacol. 1995. <b>50</b> (1): p. 83-90.
55		
50 57		
58		
59		
60		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

- Sugiura T, Kondo S, Sukagawa A, Nakane S, Shinoda A, Itoh K, et al., 2-Arachidonoylglycerol: a possible endogenous cannabinoid receptor ligand in brain. Biochem Biophys Res Commun, 1995.
   215(1): p. 89-97.
  - 52. Fisar Z, *Phytocannabinoids and endocannabinoids*. Curr Drug Abuse Rev, 2009. **2**(1): p. 51-75.
- 53. Häuser W, Fitzcharles M, Radbruch L, and Petzke F, *Cannabinoids in pain management and palliative medicine*. Deutsches Arzteblatt international, 2017. **114**(38): p. 627-634.
- 54. Hazekamp A, Ware MA, Muller-Vahl KR, Abrams D, and Grotenhermen F, *The medicinal use of cannabis and cannabinoids—An international cross-sectional survey on administration forms.* Journal of Psychoactive Drugs, 2013. **45**(3): p. 199-210.
- 55. Watson SJ, Benson JA, and Joy JE, *Marijuana and medicine: assessing the science base: a summary of the 1999 Institute of Medicine report.* Arch Gen Psychiatry, 2000. **57**(6): p. 547-52.
- Brenneisen R, Chemistry and analysis of phytocannabinoids and other cannabis constituents, in Marijuana and the Cannabinoids, ElSohly M A, Editor. 2007, Humana Press: Totowa, NJ. p. 17-49.
- 57. Pertwee R, *Cannabis and cannabinoids: Pharmacology and rationale for clinical use*. Pharmacy and Pharmacology Communications, 1997. **3**(11): p. 539-545.
- 58. Solinas M, Goldberg SR, and Piomelli D, *The endocannabinoid system in brain reward processes*. Br J Pharmacol, 2008. **154**(2): p. 369-83.
- 59. Koppel BS, Brust J, Fife T, Bronstein J, Youssof S, Gronseth G, et al., Systematic review: efficacy and safety of medical marijuana in selected neurologic disorders: report of the Guideline Development Subcommittee of the American Academy of Neurology. Neurology, 2014. **82**(17): p. 1556-63.
- Gorelick D, Saxon A, and Hermann R *Cannabis use and disorder: Pathogenesis and pharmacology*. UpToDate Cannabis use and disorder: Pathogenesis and pharmacology, 2018.[cited Access 2018 Access Date].
  - 61. Morean ME, Kong G, Camenga DR, Cavallo DA, and Krishnan-Sarin S, *High school students' use of electronic cigarettes to vaporize cannabis.* Pediatrics, 2015. **136**(4): p. 611-616.
- Loflin M and Earleywine M, No smoke, no fire: What the initial literature suggests regarding vapourized cannabis and respiratory risk. Canadian journal of respiratory therapy, 2015. 51(1):
   p. 7-9.
  - Aviram J and Samuelly-Leichtag G, Efficacy of Cannabis-Based Medicines for Pain Management: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. Pain Physician, 2017.
     20(6): p. E755-e796.
- 44
   45
   46
   47
   47
   46
   47
   47
   48
   49
   49
   49
   49
   40
   41
   41
   42
   43
   44
   45
   46
   47
   47
   47
   48
   49
   49
   49
   40
   41
   41
   42
   42
   43
   44
   44
   45
   46
   47
   47
   47
   48
   49
   49
   40
   41
   41
   42
   43
   44
   44
   45
   44
   46
   47
   47
   47
   47
   47
   48
   49
   49
   41
   41
   41
   42
   43
   44
   44
   44
   45
   46
   47
   47
   47
   47
   47
   48
   49
   49
   49
   49
   40
   41
   41
   41
   42
   43
   44
   44
   44
   45
   46
   47
   47
   48
   49
   49
   40
   41
   41
   42
   43
   44
   44
   44
   44
   44
   44
   44
   44
   44
   44
   44
   44
   44
   44
   44
   44
   44
   44
   44
   44
   44
   44
   44
   44
   4
  - Meng H, Johnston B, Englesakis M, Moulin DE, and Bhatia A, Selective Cannabinoids for Chronic Neuropathic Pain: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. Anesth Analg, 2017. 125(5): p. 1638-1652.
  - 66. Boychuk DG, Goddard G, Mauro G, and Orellana MF, *The effectiveness of cannabinoids in the management of chronic nonmalignant neuropathic pain: a systematic review.* J Oral Facial Pain Headache, 2015. **29**(1): p. 7-14.

1		
2		
3 ⊿		
5	67.	Martin-Sanchez E, Furukawa TA, Taylor J, and Martin JL, <i>Systematic review and meta-analysis of cannabis treatment for chronic pain.</i> Pain Med, 2009. <b>10</b> (8): p. 1353-68.
7 8 9	68.	Campbell FA, Tramèr MR, Carroll D, Reynolds DJ, Moore RA, and McQuay HJ, Are cannabinoids an effective and safe treatment option in the management of pain? A qualitative systematic review, BML (Clipical research ed.), 2001, <b>272</b> (7202); p. 12-16
10 11 12	69.	Deshpande A, Mailis-Gagnon A, Zoheiry N, and Lakha SF, Efficacy and adverse effects of medical marijuana for chronic noncancer pain: Systematic review of randomized controlled trials. Can
13 14 15 16	70.	Fam Physician, 2015. <b>61</b> (8): p. e3/2-81. Stevens AJ and Higgins MD, A systematic review of the analgesic efficacy of cannabinoid medications in the management of acute pain. Acta Anaesthesiol Scand, 2017. <b>61</b> (3): p. 268- 280
17 18 19	71.	Walitt B, Klose P, Fitzcharles MA, Phillips T, and Hauser W, <i>Cannabinoids for fibromyalgia</i> . Cochrane Database Syst Rev, 2016. <b>7</b> : p. Cd011694.
20 21 22	72.	Mucke M, Phillips T, Radbruch L, Petzke F, and Hauser W, <i>Cannabis-based medicines for chronic neuropathic pain in adults</i> . Cochrane Database Syst Rev, 2018. <b>3</b> : p. Cd012182.
23 24 25	73.	Boydell J, Van Os J, Caspi A, Kennedy N, Giouroukou E, Fearon P, et al., <i>Trends in cannabis use prior to first presentation with schizophrenia, in South-East London between 1965 and 1999.</i> Psychological Medicine, 2006. <b>36</b> (10): p. 1441-1446.
26 27 28	74.	Andreasson S, Allebeck P, Engstrom A, and Rydberg U, <i>Cannabis and schizophrenia</i> . A <i>longitudinal study of Swedish conscripts</i> . Lancet, 1987. <b>2</b> (8574): p. 1483-6.
29 30 31	75.	Arseneault L, Cannon M, Poulton R, Murray R, Caspi A, and Moffitt TE, <i>Cannabis use in adolescence and risk for adult psychosis: longitudinal prospective study.</i> Bmj, 2002. <b>325</b> (7374): p. 1212-3.
32 33 34	76.	van Os J, Bak M, Hanssen M, Bijl R V, de Graaf R, and Verdoux H, <i>Cannabis use and psychosis: a longitudinal population-based study.</i> Am J Epidemiol, 2002. <b>156</b> (4): p. 319-27.
35 36 37	77.	Zammit S, Allebeck P, Andreasson S, Lundberg I, and Lewis G, Self reported cannabis use as a risk factor for schizophrenia in Swedish conscripts of 1969: historical cohort study. Bmj, 2002. <b>325</b> (7374): p. 1199.
38 39 40	78.	Fergusson DM, Horwood LJ, and Ridder EM, <i>Tests of causal linkages between cannabis use and psychotic symptoms.</i> Addiction, 2005. <b>100</b> (3): p. 354-66.
41 42 43	79.	Henquet C, Krabbendam L, Spauwen J, Kaplan C, Lieb R, Wittchen HU, et al., <i>Prospective cohort study of cannabis use, predisposition for psychosis, and psychotic symptoms in young people.</i> Bmj, 2005. <b>330</b> (7481): p. 11.
44 45 46 47	80.	Di Forti M, Quattrone D, Freeman TP, Tripoli G, Gayer-Anderson C, Quigley H, et al., <i>The</i> contribution of cannabis use to variation in the incidence of psychotic disorder across Europe (EU-GEI): a multicentre case-control study. Lancet Psychiatry, 2019. <b>6</b> (5): p. 427-436.
48 49 50 51	81.	Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al., <i>Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation</i> . Bmj, 2015. <b>350</b> : p. g7647.
52 53 54 55 56	82.	Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al., <i>Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement</i> . Syst Rev, 2015. <b>4</b> : p. 1.
57 58 59		
60		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

- 83. International conference on harmonisation of technical requirements for registration of pharmaceuticals for human use (ICH) adopts consolidated guideline on good clinical practice in the conduct of clinical trials on medicinal products for human use. Int Dig Health Legis, 1997. 48(2): p. 231-4.
- Richards J R, Bing M L, Moulin A K, Elder J W, Rominski R T, Summers P J, et al., Cannabis use 84. and acute coronary syndrome. Clinical toxicology (Philadelphia, Pa.), 2019: p. 1-11.
- 85. Higgins J and Green S. Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions version 5.1.0. www.handbook.cochrane.org. 2011.
- 86. Review Manager (RevMan). 2014, Copenhagen: the Nordic Cochrane Centre, The Cochrane Collaboration.
- TSA—trial sequential analysis. Copenhagen Trial Unit. 87.
- 88. StataCorp: Stata: Release 14. 2014, College Station, TX: StataCorp LP.
- Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, and Altman DG, Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews 89. and meta-analyses: The PRISMA statement. PLOS Medicine, 2009. 6(7): p. e1000097.
- 90. Gluud LL, Bias in clinical intervention research. Am J Epidemiol, 2006. 163(6): p. 493-501.
- 91. Kjaergard LL, Villumsen J, and Gluud C, Reported methodologic quality and discrepancies between large and small randomized trials in meta-analyses. Ann Intern Med, 2001. 135(11): p. 982-9.
- 92. Lundh A, Sismondo, S, Lexchin, J, Busuioc, OA, Bero, L, Industry sponsorship and research outcome. Cochrane Database Syst Rev, 2012. 12: p. Mr000033.
- 28 93. Moher D, Pham, B, Jones, A, Cook, DJ, Jadad, AR, Moher, M et al., Does quality of reports of 29 30 randomised trials affect estimates of intervention efficacy reported in meta-analyses? Lancet, 1998. 352(9128): p. 609-13. 32
  - 94. Schulz KF, Chalmers I, Hayes RJ, and Altman DG, Empirical evidence of bias. Dimensions of methodological quality associated with estimates of treatment effects in controlled trials. JAMA, 1995. 273(5): p. 408-12.
  - 95. Wood L, Egger M, Gluud L, Schulz K, Jüni P, Altman D, et al., Empirical evidence of bias in treatment effect estimates in controlled trials with different interventions and outcomes: metaepidemiological study. BMJ, 2008. 336(7644): p. 601-605.
- 39 96. Savovic J, Jones H, Altman D, Harris R, Juni P, Pildal J, et al., Influence of reported study design 40 41 characteristics on intervention effect estimates from randomised controlled trials: combined 42 analysis of meta-epidemiological studies. Health Technol Assess, 2012. 16(35): p. 1-82.
- 43 97. Higgins JP and Thompson SG, Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. Stat Med, 2002. 44 **21**(11): p. 1539-58. 45
- 98. Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, and Altman DG, Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. 46 47 BMJ, 2003. 327(7414): p. 557-60. 48
  - 99. Harbord RM, Egger M, and Sterne JA, A modified test for small-study effects in meta-analyses of controlled trials with binary endpoints. Stat Med, 2006. 25(20): p. 3443-57.
- 50 Egger M, Davey Smith G, Schneider M, and Minder C, Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, 100. 51 52 graphical test. BMJ, 1997. 315(7109): p. 629-34. 53
- 101. Begg CB and Mazumdar M, Operating characteristics of a rank correlation test for publication 54 bias. Biometrics, 1994. 50(4): p. 1088-101.
- 55 56 57

49

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27

31

33

34

35 36

37

38

1 2		
3 4 5 6	102.	Elbourne D, Altman D, Higgins J, Curtin F, Worthington H, and Vail A, <i>Meta-analyses involving cross-over trials: methodological issues.</i> International Journal of Epidemiology, 2002. <b>31</b> (1): p.
7	102	140-149.
8 9 10	103.	significance in systematic reviews with meta-analytic methods. BMC Med Res Methodol, 2014.
11	104	14: p. 120. Hagg O Fritzell P and Nordwall A The clinical importance of changes in outcome scores after
12 13	104.	treatment for chronic low back pain Fur Spine L 2003 <b>12</b> (1): p 12-20
14	105.	laeschke R. Singer I. and Guyatt GH. Measurement of health status. Ascertaining the minimal
15	105.	clinically important difference. Control Clin Trials. 1989. <b>10</b> (4): p. 407-15.
16	106.	Olsen MF. Bierre F. Hansen MD. Hilden J. Landler NF. Tendal B. et al., Pain relief that matters to
17 18 19	1001	patients: systematic review of empirical studies assessing the minimum clinically important difference in acute pain. BMC Med. 2017. <b>15</b> (1): p. 35.
20	107.	Olsen MF, Bjerre E, Hansen MD, Tendal B, Hilden J, and Hrobjartsson A, Minimum clinically
21 22		important differences in chronic pain vary considerably by baseline pain and methodological
22		factors: systematic review of empirical studies. J Clin Epidemiol, 2018. 101: p. 87-106.e2.
24	108.	Keus F, Wetterslev J, Gluud C, and van Laarhoven CJ, Evidence at a glance: error matrix approach
25		for overviewing available evidence. BMC Med Res Methodol, 2010. <b>10</b> : p. 90.
26	109.	DerSimonian R and Laird N, Meta-analysis in clinical trials. Control Clin Trials, 1986. 7(3): p. 177-
27 28		88.
20	110.	Demets DL, Methods for combining randomized clinical trials: strengths and limitations. Stat
30		Med, 1987. <b>6</b> (3): p. 341-50.
31	111.	Jakobsen J C, Wetterslev J, Lange T, and Gluud C, Viewpoint: taking into account risks of random
32		errors when analysing multiple outcomes in systematic reviews. Cochrane Database of
33 34		Systematic Reviews, 2016(3).
35	112.	Wetterslev J, Thorlund K, Brok J, and Gluud C, Trial sequential analysis may establish when firm
36		evidence is reached in cumulative meta-analysis. J Clin Epidemiol, 2008. <b>61</b> (1): p. 64-75.
37	113.	Thorlund K W J, Brok J, Imberger G, Gluud C, User manual for trial sequential analysis (TSA).
38 20		2011.
40	114.	Brok J, Thorlund K, Gluud C, and Wetterslev J, Trial sequential analysis reveals insufficient
41		information size and potentially false positive results in many meta-analyses. J Clin Epidemiol,
42		2008. <b>61</b> (8): p. 763-9.
43 44	115.	Brok J, Thorlund K, Wetterslev J, and Gluud C, Apparently conclusive meta-analyses may be
44 45		inconclusiveTrial sequential analysis adjustment of random error risk due to repetitive testing
46		of accumulating data in apparently conclusive neonatal meta-analyses. Int J Epidemiol, 2009.
47		<b>38</b> (1): p. 287-98.
48	116.	Thorlund K, Devereaux PJ, Wetterslev J, Guyatt G, Ioannidis JP, Thabane L, et al., Can trial
49 50		sequential monitoring boundaries reduce spurious inferences from meta-analyses? Int J
50 51		Epidemiol, 2009. <b>38</b> (1): p. 276-86.
52	117.	Wetterslev J, Thorlund K, Brok J, and Gluud C, Estimating required information size by
53		quantifying diversity in random-effects model meta-analyses. BMC Med Res Methodol, 2009. 9:
54 F F		p. 86.
55 56		
57		
58		

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-031574 on 31 October 2019. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text ta mining, Al training, and similar technologies

- 118. Thorlund K, Anema A, and Mills E, *Interpreting meta-analysis according to the adequacy of sample size. An example using isoniazid chemoprophylaxis for tuberculosis in purified protein derivative negative HIV-infected individuals.* Clin Epidemiol, 2010. **2**: p. 57-66.
  - 119. Imberger G, Gluud C, Boylan J, and Wetterslev J, Systematic reviews of anesthesiologic interventions reported as statistically significant: problems with power, precision, and type 1 error protection. Anesth Analg, 2015. **121**(6): p. 1611-22.
- 120. Imberger G, Thorlund K, Gluud C, and Wetterslev J, *False-positive findings in Cochrane metaanalyses with and without application of trial sequential analysis: an empirical review.* BMJ Open, 2016. **6**(8).
- 121. Guyatt G, Oxman A, Vist G, Kunz R, Falck-Ytter Y, Alonso-Coello P, et al., *GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations.* BMJ, 2008. **336**(7650): p. 924-926.
- 122. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Schunemann HJ, Tugwell P, and Knottnerus A, *GRADE guidelines: a new* series of articles in the Journal of Clinical Epidemiology. J Clin Epidemiol, 2011. **64**(4): p. 380-2.
- 123. Schunemann HJ, Best D, Vist G, and Oxman AD, *Letters, numbers, symbols and words: how to communicate grades of evidence and recommendations.* Cmaj, 2003. **169**(7): p. 677-80.
- 124. Voscopoulos C and Lema M, *When does acute pain become chronic?* Br J Anaesth, 2010. **105 Suppl 1**: p. i69-85.

# Appendix

# **Minimal important difference**

For the determination of minimal important differences in clinical trials two types of methods are available; anchor-based methods and distributional-based methods [1].

# Anchor-based methods

Anchor-based methods relate the change in on a person reported outcome score, (e.g. a score on the visual analog scale (VAS)) to a subjective global assessment rating (e.g. scores from the Clinical Global Impressions-Improvement (CGI-I)) which is used as an 'anchor' [1]. Ideally, there needs to be an established association between the person reported outcome score and the 'anchor' to make any meaningful inference about a minimal important difference [2].

There are two subtypes of anchor-based methods, i.e., the 'within-patient score' and the 'between-patients' score' [1].

- Within-patient score defines minimal important difference as the average minimal change in a given person's reported outcome score that leads to a clinically observable change in the subjective global assessment rating (the latter is used as an anchor) [1]. For example, to ascertain the minimal important difference regarding depression management, Moncrieff et. al describes the linking of within-patient scores (change from baseline) scores on the Hamilton Depression Rating Scale (the most commonly used depression rating scale) to scores on the Clinical Global Impressions-Improvement (CGI-I) scale, a scale which rates improvement on a scale of 1 (very much improved from baseline) through 4 (no change from baseline) to 7 (very much worse from baseline) [3]. Moncrieff et. al conclude that seven points on the Hamilton Depression Rating Scale correspond to a minimal important difference when using within-patient scores [3].
- The between-patients score method, also known as 'the group difference' method, compare the reported outcome scores between a group of people with no clinically observable change (based on a subjective global assessment rating (used as an anchor)) to a group of people with clinically observable change (based on a subjective global assessment rating (used as an anchor)). The minimal important difference is then estimated as the mean difference between these two groups [4]. For example, Musoro et. al defines the minimal important difference (MID) as the group difference in terms of quality of life assessed by HRQOL scores [5]. Participants were assigned to distinct subgroups reflecting various levels of change (e.g. no change, small positive changes, large positive changes, small negative changes or large negative changes). The group difference was identified by the

comparison of the average of the HRQOL scores of the group of participants with at 'small change' to the HRQOL scores of the group of participants with 'no change' [5].

There are also other anchor-based methods (e.g. the sensitivity- and specificity-based method and the social comparison method) [1]. The sensitivity- and specificity-based method aims to identify the minimal important difference that allows for the best discrimination between groups of patients (i.e., the score that produces the greatest sensitivity and specificity) [1]. For example, an outcome measure (e.g. NRS score) is considered a 'diagnostic test' and the anchor (e.g. Global Perceived Effect) is used as gold standard and hence standard methods may be used to estimate sensitivity and specificity. Sensitivity is the proportion of patients who report an improvement on the external criterion (anchor) and whose person reported outcome scores are above the threshold minimal important difference value [1]. Specificity is the proportion of patients who do not report an improvement on the external criterion (anchor) and whose person reported outcome scores are below the threshold minimal important difference value [1]. Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves are then used to identify the person reported outcome score with the greatest sensitivity and specificity [6-8].

### The distributional-based methods

Distribution-based methods are based on the statistical characteristics of the obtained sample [9]. Crosby et. al [9] have identified two general types of distribution-based methods for estimations of minimal important differences:

The first type of distribution-based method evaluate change in relation to sample variation [9]. Different types of variation can be used: effect size, standardised response mean, and responsiveness statistic [9]. The effect size represents individual change in relation to the number of pre-test standard deviations (SDs) [9]. Cohen et. al has suggested benchmarks to better interpret the effect sizes: .20 for "small" effects, .50 for "moderate" effects, and .80 for "large" effects [10]. Whereas the effect size is the ratio of individual change to the baseline standard deviation of the sample, standardised response mean is the ratio of individual change to the standard deviation of that change [11]. A large standardised response mean indicates that the change is large in comparison to the background variability in the measurements [9]. Guyatt et. al has proposed a responsiveness statistic as a variation of standardised response mean; calculated by dividing the difference between pre-test and post-test by the standard deviation of change observed for a group of stable participants [12].

Page 33 of 61

### **BMJ** Open

The second type distribution-based method is based on the measurement precision of the instrument [9]. This method include the standard error of the mean (SEM) and evaluate the change in relation to variation of the instrument as opposed to variation in the sample [9]. Standard error of the mean (SEM) is a measure of the precision of a test instrument and considered an attribute of the measure and not a characteristic of the sample per se [13]. The standard error of the mean (SEM) for a given measure is likely to vary across samples depending upon the method used to estimate reliability and the presence of extreme scores [9]. Different thresholds for a minimal important difference have been suggested, i.e., values of 1 SEM [14], 1.96 SEM [15], and 2.77 SEM [13, 15].

In conclusion, different methods for estimating minimal important differences exist, but no single method has been shown to be the optimal method. The question of whether to use anchor-based or distribution-based methods for determining clinically meaningful change has received considerable attention and debate [9]. Dworkin et. al defined the clinical importance of patient improvement as the clinically important changes in individuals that can be identified using either within-patient anchor-based method or distributional-based method [16, 17], while the clinical importance of group differences could be the clinical difference between a treatment group and a placebo group or between two different treatment groups [18]. Dworkin et. al claim that the clinical important difference identified in individuals cannot be directly extrapolated to the evaluation of group differences [17, 19-22]. The U.S. Food and Drug Administration also states in their web site "When defining meaningful change on an individual patient basis, that definition is generally larger than the minimum important difference for application to group mean comparisons" [22].

While it is claimed that the within-patient differences are larger than the between-group difference [22], based on the studies included in our review we are not able to find a significant difference between the minimal important difference estimated by the two different methods.

# Previously conducted reviews on this subject

- Lynch & Campbell and Boychuk et. al both concluded that cannabinoids are a modestly effective and a safe treatment option for neuropathic pain [23, 24]. Lynch & Campbell and Boychuk et. al did not publish a protocol on beforehand [23, 24].
- Meng et. al concluded that there is moderate quality evidence to suggest that nabiximols (phytocannabinoid mixture) is effective in reducing neuropathic pain [25].

- Mücke et. al concluded that there is no high-quality evidence for the efficacy of any cannabis-based medicine in any condition with chronic neuropathic pain [26]. Mücke et. al further concluded that some adverse events may limit the clinical usefulness of cannabis-based medicines [26].
- Deshpande et. al concluded that current evidence suggests that very low-dose medical marijuana (< 34 mg/d) is associated with an improvement in refractory neuropathic pain of moderate severity in adults using concurrent analgesics. Deshpande et. al did not publish a protocol on beforehand [27].
- Martín-Sánchez et. al concluded that treatment of chronic pain based on cannabinoid compounds would entail more risk of adverse events than benefit [28]. Martín-Sánchez et. al included trials randomising participants with either neuropathic pain, cancer pain, fibromyalgia related pain and nociceptive pain [28]. Martín-Sánchez et. al did not publish a protocol on beforehand [28].
- Aviram et. al concluded that cannabinoid-based medicines were not effective for postoperative pain, however further investigation is advised [29]. Aviram et. al also concluded that evidence suggests a moderate to good treatment effect on neuropathic pain [29]. Furthermore, neuropathic pain patients should be advised that the inhalation of cannabinoids showed relatively better pain reduction effects than other routes of administration [29]. Aviram et. al stated that the total number of adverse events that were accumulated in the meta-analysis indicated that cannabinoid-based medicines should be used with caution [29]. Aviram et. al did not publish a protocol on beforehand [29].
- Campbell et. al concluded that levonantradol (synthetic cannabinoid analogue) was superior to placebo on postoperative pain but no more effective than codeine [30]. Campbell et. al also stated that there are suggestions of efficacy in spasticity and in neuropathic pain and that increasing the cannabinoid dose to increase the analgesia will increase adverse effects [30]. Campbell et. al did not publish a protocol on beforehand [30].
- Stevens et. al concluded that cannabinoids have no role in the management of acute pain, but cannabinoids were found to be well-tolerated, with most reported adverse effects only mild to moderate in severity [31].
- Walitt et. al concluded that no convincing, unbiased evidence suggests that nabilone (synthetic cannabinoid analog) is of value in treating people with fibromyalgia [32]. The tolerability of nabilone was low and adverse events (particularly somnolence, dizziness, vertigo) may limit its clinical usefulness [32].

TABEL 1

Page 35 of 61

BMJ	Open

Fii	rs	Titl	Ye	De	Туре	Ту	Inform	No	Ν	Р	Outco	As	As	Acc	U	Conc
t		e	ar	sig	of	pe	ation		0.	u	mes	se	se	oun	s	lusio
2	ıt	_	of	n	cann	c	SOURCE	of	of	hl		55	55	ts	6	n
ba			51		cuini	of	source	+#:	5			55	55	for		
	) I		pu			01	5		pa	15		m	m	IOr	0	
			bli		oid	par		als	rti	h		en	en	ran	t	
			са			tici			ci	e		t	t	do	t	
			tio			ра			ра	d		of	of	m	h	
			n			nts			nt	pr		ad	ris	erro	e	
									s	ot		ve	k	r	G	
									5	00		rc	of	•	D	
												13	61 b:			
										01		е	ומ		A	
												ev	as		D	
												en			E	
												ts				
Ly	/n	62	20	Sys	Phyt	Ne	PubMe	18	76	Ν	The	Ye	Ye	No	Ν	Over
ch	n	Ca	11	te	ocan	ur	d.	tri	6	0	primar	S	S.		0	all
8,		nn		ma	nahi	on	EMBAS	alc	-	-	V	•	Δγ			thor
		abi		tic	noid	op ath					y outco					
Ca		noi			noiu	atii		0			outco		Le			
m	p	ds		ке	s;	IC	CINAH	m			me		pt			evid
be	ell	for		vie	Smo	pai	L	ра			was		fo			ence
[2	3	tre		W	ked	n,	(EBSCO	rin			pain in		r			that
]		ot			cann	fib	),	g			subject		re			cann
		at			abis,	ro	PsycInf	th			s with		po			abin
		me			oro	mv	0	e			chroni		rti			oids
		nt			muc	, 2Ισ		int			c		nσ			aro
		of			acal	aig in							h:			are
		chr			USAI	Id,	), me	er			non-ca		ומ			sale
		oni			extra	rn	Cochra	ve			ncer		as,			and
		с			cts	eu	ne	nti			pain.		pu			mod
		no			of	ma	Library	on					bli			estly
		n_c			cann	toi	<i>,</i> ISI	wi			The		са			effec
		n-c			abis-	d	Web of	th			second		tio			tive
		an			hase	art	Scienc	nla			arv		n			in
		cer			d	hri					outco		hi			neur
		pai			u modi	+:0	C, ADI	ha			mas					onot
		n;			mear	us,		υu			mes		dS			upat
		a			cine,	an	(Proqu				were		an			nic
		sys			and	d	est),				sleep,		d			pain
		te			synt	mi	Dissert				functio		fo			with
		ma			hetic	xe	ation				n, and		r-			preli
		1110			cann	d	Abstra				quality		pr			mina
		CIC			ahin	chr	cts				of life		ofi			rv
		rev			abili		(Drocu				or me.		+			ovid
		ie			01 <b>0</b> \$;	oni	(Proqu						ι.			evid
		w			nabil	С	est),						bi			ence
		of			one,	pai	Acade						as			of
		ran			dron	n.	mic									effic
		do			abin		Search									acy
		uυ														•

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

	mi ze d tria ls			ol and a nove I THC anal ogue		Premie r (EBSCO ), Clinical Trials.g ov, TrialsC entral. org, individ ual pharm aceutic al compa ny trials sites for Eli Lilly and GlaxoS mithKli ne, OAIste r (OCLC) and Google Scholar									in fibro myal gia and rheu mato id arthr itis. Did not pool data for meta - analy sis but data was descr ibed quali tativ ely.
Me ng et. al [25 ]	Sel ect ive Ca nn abi noi ds for Ch	20 17	Sys te ma tic Re vie w an d Me	Dron abin ol, nabil one and nabi ximo ls	Ne ur op ath ic pai n	Medlin e, Embas e, Cochra ne Library , PROSP ERO.	11 (1 0 tri als co m pa rin g	12 19	N O	The primar y outco me was intensi ty of pain record	Ye s	Ye s	Bon ferr oni adju stm ent for mul tipl	Y e s	Selec tive cann abin oids provi de a small analg esic

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Page 37 of 61

1 2

3										
4	nic	an		trials ø	ρ	after a		ng	fit in	]
5	No	alv		ov and	int	minim		B Was	natio	
6		aly			or	um of		was	patie	
/	ur	515		Google	er			not	nts	
8	ор			Scholar	ve	2		perf	with	
9 10	ath			•	nti	weeks		orm	chro	
11	ic				on	followi		ed	nic	
12	Pai			Pain	wi	ng		as	neur	
13	n:			societi	th	initiati		per	opat	
14	A			es	pla	on of		rec	hic	
15	Svs			(Ameri	ce	selecti		om	pain.	
16	te			can	ho	VA		me	P	
1/	m			Socioty	٥0 ۱	cannah		nda		
18	+10			of	,	incid		tion		
20						inoid		uon		
21	ке			Anesth		and		sin		
22	vie			esiolog		placeb		the		
23	W			ists,		o/com		Coc		
24	an			Europe		parato		hra		
25	d			an		r		ne		
26	Me			Society		admini		Han		
27	ta-			of		stratio		dbo		
20 29	an			Anaest		n.		ok.		
30	alv			hesiolo		exnres		••••		
31				av		sod on				
32	515			5y, Intorna						
33				tional						
34				tional		(0—no				
35				Associ		pain to				
30 37				ation		10—				
38				for the		worst				
39				Study		possibl				
40				of		е				
41				Pain,		pain).				
42				Americ						
43				an		Second				
44				Society		arv				
45 46				of						
47				Region		mes				
48				al		iiies				
49				di Anasth		were				
50				Anestri		presen				
51				esia		ce or				
52				and		absenc				
53 54				Pain		e of				
55				Medici		analge				
56				ne,		sia				
57				Europe		define				
58				an		d as				
59			1				I	I		J

Society	reducti
of	on in
Region	pain
al	scores
Anesth	(NRS/V
esia	AS) by
and	≥30%
Pain	at 2
Therap	weeks
y, and	or
World	more
Institut	after
e of	initiati
Pain)	on of
in the	interve
last 2	ntion,
years	quality
were	of life
also	(QoL),
search	physic
ed.	al
	functio
	n,
	psycho
	logical
	functio
	n,
	sleep,
	overall
	patient
	satisfa
	ction,
	and
	the
	inciden
	ce of
	advers
	e
	effects
	of
	selecti
	ve
	cannab
	inoids.

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Page 39 of 61

4	Ma	Sys	20	Me	Phyt	Ch	Medlin	18	?	Ν	The	Ye	Ye	No	Ν	Curr
5	rtín	te .	09	ta-	ocan	ro	e/Pub			0	primar	s	S.		0	ently
0	_S á	ma		2n	nahi	nic	med			•	V	Ū	ον		•	avail
/	-54	1110					nieu,				У		C.			avan
0	ncn	τic		aiy	noid	раг	Embas				outco		се			able
9 10	ez	Re		sis	S	n	e, and				me		pt			evid
10	et.	vie			and	of	The				was		fo			ence
12	al	w			synt	а	Cochra				intensi		r			sugg
13	[28	an			, hetic	nat	ne				ty of		re			ests
14	1	d			doriv	hol	Contro				nain ac		no			that
15	1	u			uenv						pairras		μ0 			tilat
16		ivie			ates	ogi	lied				scored		rti			cann
17		ta-			of	cal	Trials				by		ng			abis
18		an			THC,	or	Registe				numeri		bi			treat
19		aly			such	tra	r				cal		as,			ment
20		sis			as	um	(CENTR				rang		de			is
21		of			dron	ati	Δ1)				scales		tΔ			mod
22					ahin	au 0	<b>Λ</b> ι)						رت ج+:			arata
23		Cd			abin	ί.					ine		cu			erate
24		nn			ol,	ori					Second		on			ly
25		abi			nabil	gin					ary		bi			effic
20 27		S			one,						outco		as			aciou
27		Tre			or						mes		an			s for
20		at			benz						were		Ь			treat
30		mρ			onvr						CNS		fo			ment
31					opyi						rolotod		5			of
32											related		[-			
33		for			eridi						events		pr			chro
34		Ch			ne (a								ofi			nic
35		ro			synt								t			pain,
36		nic			hetic								bi			but
37		Pai			nitro								as			bene
38		n			σen											ficial
39					anal											offoc
40					allal											enec
41					og of											ts
42					THC)											may
45																be
45																parti
46																ally
47																(or
48																COM
49																
50																piete
51																ly)
52																offse
53																t by
54																pote
55																ntiall
57																v
58																y cori-
59																seno

Boy chu e17h 2020Sys FystPhyt NeNe PubMe1377 NN outcoOutco YeYe YeNo NN S.Boy chu e15te tic moi allop allin11o omes mes ss s ss s ss s so allNo allN S.Outco s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s sNo allNo s <b< th=""><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th>us</th></b<>																us
Boy ChuTh20SysPhyt NNePubMe N1377 NNOutcomes NSSNo<																harm
BoyTh20SysPhytNePubMe1377NOutcoYeYeNeNCannchue15teocanurd,10messss,oabis-et.ectiticnoidathe,WebiticiticeredceeredceddaliveRes;icofitic </td <td></td> <td>s.</td>																s.
chu       e       15       te       ocan       ur       d,       1       o       mes       s       s,       o       abis-base         k       Eff       ma       nabi       op       Embas       ered       cered       ce         al       ive       Re       s;       ic       of       severe       pt       medi         [24       ne       vie       smo       pai       Scienc       a       onin       r,       extra         of       cann       all       eviden       intensi       po       used         nabi       abis,       eviden       intensi       po       used         noi       base       medici       e       bi       rent         ds       d       ne       ne       events.       as,       poul         in       medi       review       in       events.       as,       poul       latio         na       cts       databa       s       in       non-       no       no         ge       (CB       ses       s       in       as       gran       to       no         gant       of <td>Воу</td> <td>Th</td> <td>20</td> <td>Sys</td> <td>Phyt</td> <td>Ne</td> <td>PubMe</td> <td>13</td> <td>77</td> <td>Ν</td> <td>Outco</td> <td>Ye</td> <td>Ye</td> <td>No</td> <td>Ν</td> <td>Cann</td>	Воу	Th	20	Sys	Phyt	Ne	PubMe	13	77	Ν	Outco	Ye	Ye	No	Ν	Cann
kEffmanabiopEmbasconsidexbaseet.etttitnoidathe, WeberedcedaliveRes;icofwereptmedi[24neviesmopaiSciencreductifocinaljsswkedne, andon inr,extraofcanalipainrectsCaabis,evidenintensipousednncannce-ty andrtiinabiabis-basemediciebireftnoibasemediciebireftnoidsdneevents.as,populatioinmedireviewpulationicnicmactsdatabaitionicnicnicge(CBsesnnnon-meME)(CochrbimalintinaneasgnanoftheDatabaantnicoroaticr-hicnicoroaticr-hicnicoroaticr-hicnicoroaticr-hicnitinaneasgnannitinbatabaininnit <t< td=""><td>chu</td><td>e</td><td>15</td><td>te</td><td>ocan</td><td>ur</td><td>d,</td><td></td><td>1</td><td>0</td><td>mes</td><td>S</td><td>s,</td><td></td><td>0</td><td>abis-</td></t<>	chu	e	15	te	ocan	ur	d,		1	0	mes	S	s,		0	abis-
et.ettticnoidathe, WeberedcedaliveRes;icofwereptmedi[24]neviesnopaiSciencreductifocinal[24]neviesnopaiSciencreductifocinal[3]sswkedne, andon inr,extraofcannallpainrectsctsCaabis,evidenintensipousednncannce-ty andrtiinabiabis-basedadversngoffifenoibasemediciebirentdsdneevents.as,popuinmedireviewpulationactsdatabationicge(CBsesnnon-meME)(CochrbimalintinaneasgnanoftheDatabaantnicoroaticr-hicnoiosals, ASPofipaiealisyraClub,bimaynicoroaticr-hicnicoroaticr-hicnicoroaticr-hicnose ofdr-hicni <td>k</td> <td>Eff</td> <td></td> <td>ma</td> <td>nabi</td> <td>ор</td> <td>Embas</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>consid</td> <td></td> <td>ex</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>base</td>	k	Eff		ma	nabi	ор	Embas				consid		ex			base
aliveRes;icofwereptmedi[24neviesmopaiSciencreductifocinal]sswkedne, andon inr,extraofcannallpainrectsctsCaabis,evidenintensipousednncannce-ty andrtiinabiabis-basedadversngdiffenoibasemediciebirentdsdneevents.as,popuinmedireviewpulatiothecinalsblins ofMaextraandcachronactsdatabationicge(CBsesnnntinaneasgnanoftheDatabaantncoroaticr-hicnicoroaticr-hicnicoroaticr-hicnicoroaticr-hicnicoroaticr-hicnicoroaticr-hicnooroaticr-hicnoofSystemofdnicoroaticr-hicniccannse ofrr </td <td>et.</td> <td>ect</td> <td></td> <td>tic</td> <td>noid</td> <td>ath</td> <td>e, Web</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>ered</td> <td></td> <td>ce</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>d</td>	et.	ect		tic	noid	ath	e, Web				ered		ce			d
[24neviesmopaiSciencreductifocinaljsswkedne, andon inr,extraofcannallpainrectsCaabis,evidenintensipousednncannce-ty andrtiinabiabis-basedadversngdiffenoibasemediciebirentdsdneevents.as,popuinmedireviewpulatioinmedireviewpulatioinmedireviewpulationactsdatabationicge(CBsesnnon-meME)(CochrbimalintinaneasgnantheDatabaantchformse ofdneurroofSystemfoopatnicoroaticr-hicnmosals, ASPofipainnmosals, ASPofipainnmosals, ASPofipainnmosals, ASPofipainnmosals, ASPofipainnmosals, ASPofipainnmosals, ASPofipainnm	al	ive		Re	s;	ic	of				were		pt			medi
jsswkedne, andon inr,extraofabis,evidenintensipousednncannce-ty andrtiinabiabis-basedadversngdiffenoibasemediciebirentdsdneevents.as,popuinmedireviewpulatiothecinalsbiins ofMaextraandcachronactsdatabationicge(CBsesnnntinaneasgg(CBsesnntinaneasgrofSystemfonicoroaticr-nicoroaticr-nicoroaticr-nicoroaticr-nicoroaticr-nicoroaticr-nicoroaticr-nicoroaticr-nicoroaticr-nicoroaticr-nicoroaticr-nicoroaticr-nicoroaticr-nicoroaticr-nicoroaticr-nicoroaticr-nic	[24	ne		vie	smo	pai	Scienc				reducti		fo			cinal
ofcanallpainrectsCaabis,evidenintensipousednncannce-ty andrtiinabiabis-basedadversngdiffenoibasemediciebirentdsdneevents.as,popuinmedireviewpulationthecinalsbins ofMaextraandcachronactsdatabationicge(CBsesnnon-meME)(CochrbimalintinaneasgnantheDatabaantoftheDatabaantnicoroaticr-hicNomucReviewprpainnmosals, ASPofipainnmosals, ASPofipainnicoroaticr-hicNomucReviewprpainnmosals, ASPofipainnmosals, ASPofipainnmosals, ASPofipaiealispraJournalttnmosals, ASPofipaiaalispraJournalttnmosals, Astraas <td< td=""><td>]</td><td>SS</td><td></td><td>w</td><td>ked</td><td>n</td><td>e, and</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>on in</td><td></td><td>r,</td><td></td><td></td><td>extra</td></td<>	]	SS		w	ked	n	e, and				on in		r,			extra
Caabis,evidenintensipousednncancety andrtiinabiabis-basedadversngdiffenoibasemediciebirentdsdneevents.as,popuinmedireviewpulatiothecinalsblins ofMaextraandccachronactsdatabationicge(CBsesnnon-meME)(CochrbimalintinaneasgnanoftheDatabaantnicoroaticrhicnoofSystemfoopatnicoroaticrhicNomucReviewprpainnicoroaticrhicnicoroaticrhicnicoroaticrhicnicoroaticrhicnicoroaticrhicnicoroaticrhicnicoroaticrhicnicoroaticrhicnicoroaticrhicnicorosofrhicninmasofrr-		of			cann		all				pain		re			cts
nncannce-ty andrtiinabiabis-basedadversngdiffenoibasemediciebirentdsdneevents.as,popuinmedireviewpulatiothecinalsblins ofMaextraandcachronactsdatabationicge(CBsesnnon-meME)(CochrbimalintinaneasgnanoftheDatabaantnicoroaticr-hicnicoroaticr-hicnicoroaticr-hicnicoroaticr-hicNomucReviewprpainnmosals, ASPofipatiealispraJournalttnmosals, ASPofimayant(nabiDatabaasprovinmosafsofinaticniccannse ofinaticnicoroaticinasgnysClub,bimayant(nabiDatabaasproviniabis,Effectsininniand[DARE]ininpai<		Ca			abis,		eviden				intensi		ро			used
abiabis-basedadversngdiffenoibasemediciebirentdsdneevents.as,popuinmedireviewpulatioinmedireviewpulatioinmedireviewpulatioinmedireviewpulatiomaictsdatabationicge(CBsesnnmeME)(CochrbimalintinaneasgnanoftheDatabaantroofSystemfoopatnicoroaticr-hicnomosals, ASPofipatiealispraJournalttnmosals, ASPofipatiealispraJournaltntsgnysClub,bimayant(nabiDatabaasproviNeximose ofiiurls),Abstraiiopvapocts ofiiiccannsofiipaiabis,Effectsiipaiabis,Effectsiipaiabis,Effectsispaiabis,Controispaiabis,<		nn			cann		ce-				ty and		rti			in
noibasemediciebirentdsdneevents.as,popuinmediireviewpulatiothecinalsbins ofMaextraandcachronactsdatabationicge(CBsesnnmeME)(CochrbimalintinaneasgnanoftheDatabaantchformse ofdneurroofSystemfoopatnicoroaticrhicnomosals, ASPofipatiealispraJournalttnmosals, ASPofipatiealispraJournaltntnmosals, ASPofipatiealispraJournaltntnmosals, ASPofigasant(nabiDatabaasproviNeximose ofiiurls)Abstraiiopvapocts ofiin:and[DARE]iipaiabis,Effectsiin:and[DARE]iipaiabis,Effectsiin:andicontro<		abi			abis-		based				advers		ng			diffe
dsdneevents.as,popuinmedireviewpulatiothecinalsblins ofMaextraandcachronactsdatabationicge(CBsesnnon-meME)(CochrbimalintinaneasgnanoftheDatabaantchformse ofdneurroofSystemfoopatnicoroaticr-hicNomucReviewprpainnmosals, ASPofipatiealispraJournalttgnysClub,bimayant(nabiDatabaasproviNeximose ofudeurls),Abstraaseffecopvapocts ofuuanalgiccanns ofuanalgiccanns ofuanalgiccanns ofuarePaiabis,EffectsuuAsynt<,and		noi			base		medici				e		bi			rent
inmedireviewpulatiothecinalsblins ofMaextraandcachronactsdatabationicge(CBsesnnon-meME)(CochrbimalintinaneasgnanoftheDatabaantchformse ofdneurroofSystemfoopatnicoroaticr-hicNomucReviewprpainnmosals, ASPofipatiealispraJournaltntsgnysClub,bimayant(nabiDatabaasproviNeximose ofdedeurls),Abstraasgenvipaiabis,Effectsininn:and[DARE]incondpaiabis,Effectsininn:and[DARE]itionspaiabis,EffectsinitionsysheticCochrasstecannethatmaabinControarerefraabinControarerefraabinControarerefradronrefrarefradronrefra <td></td> <td>ds</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>d</td> <td></td> <td>ne</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>events.</td> <td></td> <td>as,</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>popu</td>		ds			d		ne				events.		as,			popu
thecinalsblins ofMaextraandcachronactsdatabationicge(CBsesnnon-meME)(CochrbimalintinaneasgnanoftheDatabaantchformse ofdneurroofSystemfoopatnicoroaticr-hicNomucReviewprpatiealispraJournaltntgnysClub,bimayant(nabiDatabaasproviNeximose ofdedeurls),Abstraasproviniccannsofinanalinat(nabi)DatabaasproviNeximose ofininniadsis,Effectsininni<		in			medi		review						pu			latio
Maextraandcachronactsdatabationicge(CBsesnnon-meME)(CochrbimalintinaneasgnanoftheDatabaantChformse ofdneurroofSystemfoopatnicoroaticr-hicNomucReviewprpainnmosals, ASPofipatiealispraJournaltntsgnysClub,bimayant(nabiDatabaasproviNeximose ofddeurls),Abstraasgnalopvapocts ofineffectathrizedReviewininn:and[DARE]incondAsynt, anditionsSysheticCochrasstecanneitionSysheticCochrastecannereframaabinControarerefradronilledrefra		the			cinal		S						bli			ns of
nactsdatabationicge(CBsesnnon-meME)(CochrbimalintinaneasgnanoftheDatabaantChformse ofdneurroofSystemfoopatnicoroaticr-hicNomucReviewprpainnmosals, ASPofipatiealispraJournaltntgnysClub,bimayant(nabiDatabaasproviNeximose ofdedeurls),Abstraaseffecopvapocts ofinanalgiccanns ofincondn:and[DARE]incondAsynt, anditionsysheticCochrasstecannnessmaabinControssRodronllediterrefra		Ma			extra		and						са			chro
ge(CBsesnnon-meME)(CochrbimalintinaneasgnanoftheDatabaantChformse ofdneurroofSystemfoopatnicoroaticr-hicNomucReviewprpainnmosals, ASPofipatiealispraJournaltntsgnysClub,asproviNeximose ofasproviNeximose ofasprovinmosals, ASPasprovignysClub,bimayant(nabiDatabaasproviNeximose ofuuurls),Abstraasproviopvapocts ofuun:and[DARE]ucondpaiabis,Effectsuustiann:and[DARE]ssthatmaabinControuarethatmaabinControuarerefrapaiabinControuarethatmaabinControuarethatmaabinControuarethatmaabinControu<		na			cts		databa						tio			nic
meME)(CochrbimalintinaneasgnanoftheDatabaantChformse ofdneurroofSystemfoopatnicoroaticr-hicNomucReviewprpainnmosals, ASPofipatiealispraJournaltntsgnysClub,asproviant(nabiDatabaasproviNeximose ofasprovinmisl),AbstraasproviathrizedReviewininn:and[DARE]incondAsynt, anditionsSysheticCochrasstecannneitionreraabinControarerefraabinControarerefraabinControarerefraabinControare		ge			(CB		ses						n			non-
ntinaneasgnanoftheDatabaantChformse ofdneurroofSystemfoopatnicoroaticr-hicNomucReviewprpainnmosals, ASPofipatiealispraJournaltntsgnysClub,bimayant(nabiDatabaasproviNeximose ofasproviNeximose ofaseffecopvapocts ofathrizedReviewanhrizedReviewanalgesiaiccanns ofanditionSysheticCochrasstecannnethatmaabinControareticoids;lledrefra		me			ME)		(Cochr						bi			mali
oftheDatabaantChformse ofdneurroofSystemfoopatnicoroaticr-hicNomucReviewprpainnmosals, ASPofipatiealispraJournaltntsgnysClub,bimayant(nabiDatabaasproviNeximose ofdedeurls),Abstraaseffecopvapocts ofinanalgiccanns ofesiainn:and[DARE]condstitionSysheticCochrasstecannnethatmaabinControareticoids;lledcontroRodronsetcotro		nt			in		ane						as			gnan
Chformse ofdneurroofSystemfoopatnicoroaticr-hicNomucReviewprpainnmosals, ASPofipatiealispraJournaltntsgnysClub,bimayant(nabiDatabaasproviNeximose ofdeeffecopvapocts ofinanalgiccanns ofininn:and[DARE]conditionSysheticCochrasstecannnethatmaabinControareticoids;lledrefra		of			the		Databa						an			t
roofSystemfoopatnicoroaticr-hicNomucReviewprpainnmosals, ASPofipatiealispraJournaltntsgnysClub,bimayant(nabiDatabaasproviNeximose ofdedeurls),Abstraaseffecopvapocts ofinanalgiccanns ofininn:and[DARE]incondAsynt, anditionSysheticCochrasstecannneitionrefabinControareticoids;lleduRodeurefraabin		Ch			torm		se of						d			neur
nicoroaticr-hicNomucReviewprpainnmosals, ASPofipatiealispraJournaltntsgnysClub,bimayant(nabiDatabaasproviNeximose ofdedeurls),Abstraaseffecopvapocts ofiiveathrizedReviewanalgesiaiccanns ofinitionPaiabis,EffectsincondAsynt, anditionsSysheticCochrasstecannnethatmaabinControareticoids;lledrefra		ro			of		System						to			opat
NomucReviewprpainnmosals, ASPofipatiealispraJournaltntsgnysClub,bimayant(nabiDatabaasproviNeximose ofdeurls),Abstraeffecopvapocts oftiveathrizedReviewanalgiccanns ofesiaPaiabis,Effectsinn:and[DARE]condAsynt, anditionSysheticCochrastecannnethatmaabinControareticoids;lledrefra		nic			oro		atic						r-			hic
nmosals, ASPofipatiealispraJournaltntsgnysClub,bimayant(nabiDatabaasproviNeximose ofdedeurls),Abstraeffecopvapocts oftiveathrizedReviewanalgiccanns ofesiaPaiabis,Effectsinn:and[DARE]condAsynt, andstitonSysheticCochrastecannnethatmaabinControareticoids;lledctori		NO			muc		Review						pr			pain
alispraJournaltntsgnysClub,bimayant(nabiDatabaasproviNeximose ofdeurls),Abstraeffecopvapocts ofiathrizedReviewanalgiccanns ofinPaiabis,Effectsinn:and[DARE]condAsynt, anditionSysheticCochrastecannnethatmaabinControareticoids;llediter		nm			osal		s, ASP						ofi			patie
gnysClub,bimayant(nabiDatabaasproviNeximose ofdeurls),Abstraeffecopvapocts oftiveathrizedReviewanalgiccanns ofesiaPaiabis,Effectsinn:and[DARE]condAsynt, anditionSysheticCochrastecannnethatmaabinControareticoids;lledctori		alı			spra		Journal						t			nts
ant(nabiDatabaasproviNeximose ofdeurls),Abstraeffecopvapocts ofanalgathrizedReviewanalgiccanns ofesiaPaiabis,Effectsinn:and[DARE]condAsynt, anditionSysheticCochrastecannnethatmaabinControareticoids;lledctory		gn .			ys		Club,						bi			may .
Neximose ofurIs),Abstraopvapocts ofathrizedReviewiccanns ofPaiabis,Effectsn:and[DARE]Asynt, andSysheticCochratecannnemaabinControticoids;Iled		ant			(nabi		Databa						as			provi
uris),Abstraopvapocts ofathrizedReviewiccanns ofPaiabis,Effectsn:and[DARE]Asynt, andSysheticCochratecannnetaabinControticoids;lled		Ne			ximo		Se or									ae
opvapocts oftiveathrizedReviewanalgiccanns ofesiaPaiabis,Effectsinn:and[DARE]condAsynt, anditionSysheticCochrastecannnethatmaabinControareticoids;lledcontro		ur			15),		ADSURA									tivo
athHzedReviewathiccanns ofPaiabis,Effectsn:and[DARE]Asynt, andSysheticCochratecannnemaabinControticoids;lled		op			vapo		CLS OI Doviour									uve
IcIcIcIcIcIcPaiabis,Effectsinn:and[DARE]condAsynt, anditionSysheticCochrastecannnethatmaabinControareticoids;lledrefra		ic			cann		s of									anaig
Pairabis,Lifectsn:and[DARE]Asynt, andSysheticCochratecannnemaabinControticoids;lledPairdron		Dai			ahis		S UI Effocts									in
Asynt, anditionSysheticCochrastecannnethatmaabinControareticoids;lledrefra		n.			auis,											cond
SysheticCochraSysheticCochratecannnemaabinControticoids;IledPadrop		Δ			svnt		and									ition
te     cann     ne     that       ma     abin     Contro     are       tic     oids;     Iled     refra		Svc			hotic		Cochra									s
ma     abin     Contro     are       tic     oids;     Iled     refra		te			cann		ne									that
tic oids; Iled refra		ma			ahin		Contro									are
		tic			oids		lled									refra
		Re			dron											ctory

	w			abin ol, nabil one, and CT-3		Trials Registe r [CCTR] )								
Mi	Ca	20	Со	Phyt	Ne	Cochra	16	17	Y	Primar	Ye	Ye	No	Y
cke	nn	18	chr	ocan	ur	ne	(1	50	es	v	s	s		e
et.	abi		an	nabi	qo	Library	5			outco				s
al	s		e	noid	ath		of			mes.				
[26	nro		Ro	c.	ic	, MEDLI	th			meet				
1	du		vio	oro	nai	NE and				Dartici				
1	ctc		VIC W	muc	par		tri			nont				
	for		vv	and	11					pant-				
	IO			osai		E.	ais			report				
	ad			spra			со			ed				
	ult			У		Followi	m			pain				
	S			cont		ng	ра			relief				
	wit			ainin		clinical	rin			of 50%				
	h			g		trials	g			or				
	chr			THC		databa	th			greate				
	oni			or		ses	e			r. We				
	с			THC/		were	int			preferr				
	ne			CBD		search	er			ed				
	uro			mix,		ed for	ve			compo				
	bat			smo		additio	nti			site				
	hic			ked		nal	on			neurop				
	nai			cann		data	wi			athic				
	n			ahis		includi	th			nain				
	"			cont		ng				scoros				
				oinin		11g Unnuhl				SCOLES				
				amn		iahad	ce			over				
				g		Isned	00			single-				
				THC,		data:	)			scale .				
				THC		US				generi				
				and		Nation				c pain				
				CBD		al				scores				
				as		Institut				if both				
				extra		es of				measu				
				ct of		Health				res				
				cann		clinical				were				
				abis		trial				used				
				sativ		registe				bv				
				al		r				studies				
				and										
				anu	1	( <u>vv vv vv</u> .				,	1			

2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
3/	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
45 11	
44	
46	
40	
48	
40	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	

1

hetic	Trials.g	PGIC	outw
cann	<u>ov</u> ),	(Patien	eigh
abin	Europe	t	ed
oids;	an	Global	by
nabil	Union	Impres	their
one,	Clinical	sion of	pote
dron	Trials	Chang	ntial
abin	Registe	e)	harm
ol	r	much	S.
	( <u>www.</u>	or very	
	<u>clinical</u>	much	
	<u>trialsre</u>	improv	
	gister.	ed;	
	<u>eu</u> ),		
	World	Withdr	
	Health	awals	
	Organi	due to	
	zation	advers	
	(WHO)	e	
	Interna	events	
	tional	(tolera	
	Clinical	bility);	
	Trials		
	Registr	Seriou	
	У	S	
	Platfor	advers	
	m	e	
	(ICTRP)	events	
	(apps.	(safety	
	who.in	).	
	t/trials	Seriou	
	earch/)	S	
	, and	advers	
	Interna	e	
	tional	events	
	ASSOCI	typicali	
	ation	y in aluala	
		include	
	binoid	dily	
	Modici	untow	
		aru	
	nk		
	11K	ence	

60

2									
4				()		or			
5				cannah		offort			
6				ic <u>cannab</u>		that at			
/				<u>15-</u>		that at			
0 9				mea.or		any			
10				<u>g/studi</u>		dose			
11				<u>es/stu</u>		results			
12				<u>dy.php</u>		in			
13				)		death,			
14						is life-			
15						threat			
17						ening,			
18						requir			
19						es .			
20						hospit			
21						alisatio			
22						n or			
23						nrolon			
24						proion			
25						gation			
27						of			
28						existin			
29						g			
30						hospit			
31						alisatio			
32						n,			
34						results			
35						in			
36						persist			
37						ent or			
38						signific			
39						ant			
40						dill			
41						disabili			
43						ty or			
44						incapa			
45						city, is			
46						а			
47						conge			
48						nital			
49 50						anoma			
50						ly or			
52						, birth			
53						defect			
54						is an			
55						'impor			
56						tort			
57						tant 			
50 50						medica			

										l event' that may jeopar dise the person , or may requir e an interve ntion to preven t one of the above charac teristic s/cons equen					
Avi	Effi	20	Me	Phyt	Ch	MEDLI	43	24	N	The	Ye	Ye	No	N	The
ra	cac	17	ta-	ocan	ro	NE/Pu	tri	37	0	outco	s	s,		о	curre
m	У		An	nabi	nic	bmed	als			me		ex			nt
et.	of		aly	noid	(ca	and in	со			measu		ce			syste
al	Ca		sis	s;	nc	Google	m			re that		pt			mati
[29	nn			Sativ	er	Scholar	ра			was		fo			С
J	abi			ex/n	an	using	rin			chosen		r,			revie
	S-			abixi	a		g +h			was		re			W
	Bd			moi,	n0 n-	di Subiec				variabl		po rti			Sugg
	d			ahidi	 Ca	t subjec	e int			e "nain		ng			that
	Me			ol.	nc	Headin	er			intensi		hi			cann
	dic			cann	er)	g	ve			tv". as		as.			abin
	ine			abin	, pai	(MeSH	nti			scored		pu			oid-
	s			oid	n	) terms	on			by the		bli			base
	for			cigar	an		wi			numeri		са			d
	Pai			ettes	d		th			cal		tio			medi
	n			/vap	ас		bo			rating		n			cines
	Ma			orize	ute		th			scale		bi			migh
	na			r,	ро		'ac			(NRS-		as			tbe
	ge				sto		tiv		1	11),	1	an		1	ettec

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml
Page 45 of 61

me	hne	n≏	<u>م</u>	numeri	Ь	tive
nt.	cunt	rat			fo	for
Δ	hotic	ive			r_	chro
SVC	cann	nai	۵ <u>۶</u>	box	nr	nic
5y3	ahin	pai	3		ofi	nic
	abin	11		(11)	+	troot
liid	olus,		u	11),	l h:	lieat
	aron		ріа	visual	ומ	ment
Re	abin		ce	analog	as	,
vie	OI .		bo	scale		base
w	and			(VAS),		d on
an	nabil			and		limit
d	one,			the		ed
Me	CT-3,			VAS		evid
ta-	ajule			section		ence,
An	mic			of the		prim
aly	acid,			questi		arily
sis	synt			onnair		for
of	hetic			e short		neur
Ra	nitro			form		opat
nd	gen			McGill		hic
om	anal			Pain		pain
ize	ogof			Questi		patie
d	tetra			onnair		nts
Co	bydr			erinan		1103.
ntr	ocan					
	nabi					
be	nol					
Tri						
ais	, fattu					
	Tally					
	acid					
	amid					
	e					
	hydr					
	olase					
	-1					
	(FAA					
	H1)					
	inhib					
	itor					
	(PF-					
	0445					
	7845					
	)					
	, (bloc					

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Protected by copyright, inclu	
uding for uses related to text and data mir	Enseignement Superieur (ABEt
ning, Al training, and similar technologie:	S) .

				king degr adati on of endo cann abin oids) , benz opyr anop eridi ne (BPP ), and levo nant radol											
Ca mp bell et. al [30 ]	Ar e ca nn abi noi ds an eff ect ive an d saf e tre at me nt opt ion in the ma na	20 01	Sys te ma tic Re vie w	Oral THC, an oral synt hetic nitro gen anal ogue of THC (NIB) , oral benz opyr anop eridi ne (BPP ), and intra mus cular	Ac ute , chr oni c no n- ma lig na nt pai n, an d ca nc er pai n	MEDLI NE, EMBAS E, Oxford Pain Databa se, and Cochra ne Library	9	22 2	No	Outco me measu res for pain intensi ty; pain relief; the use of supple menta ry analge sia; patient s' prefer ences; and advers e effects	Yes	Ye s, ex ce pt fo r, re po rti ng bi as, pu bli ca tio n bi as an d fo r- pr	No	NO	Cann abin oids are no more effec tive than code ine in contr ollin g pain and have depr essa nt effec ts on the centr

	ge			levo								ofi			al
	me			nant								t			nerv
	nt			radol								bi			ous
	of											as			syste
	pai														m
	n?														that
	А														limit
	qu														their
	alit														use.
	ati														Their
	ve														wide
	sys														spre
	te														ad
	ma														intro
	tic														ducti
	rev														on
	ie														into
	w														clinic
															al
															pract
															ice
															for
															pain
															man
															age
															ment
															is
															ther
															efore
															unde
															sirab
															le. In
															acut
															е
															post
															oper
															ative
															pain
															they
															shou
															d not
															be
															used
Des	Effi	20	Sys	Cigar	Ne	MEDLI	6	22	Ν	For	Ye	Ye	No	N	Ther
hpa	cac	15	te	ettes	ur	NE,	tri	6	0	outco	S	S,		0	e is

Page	48	of	61
------	----	----	----

nd	У	ma	or	ор	EMBAS	als	mes,	ex	evid
е	an	tic	vapo	ath	E, and	со	pain	ce	ence
et.	d	Re	rizer	ic	the	m	scores	pt	for
al	ad	vie	cont	pai	Interna	ра	were	fo	the
[27	ver	w	ainin	n	tional	rin	extract	r,	use
]	se		g		Pharm	g	ed	re	of
	eff		delta		aceutic	int	using	ро	low-
	ect		-9-		al	er	the	rti	dose
	S		THC		Abstra	ve	visual	ng	med
	of				cts	nti	analog	bi	cal
	me					on	ue	as,	mar
	dic					wi	scale	pu	uan
	al					th	(VAS)	bli	in
	ma					pla	or an	са	refr
	riju					ce	alterna	tio	ctor
	an					bo	tive	n	neu
	а						numeri	bi	ора
	for					Pla	cal	as	hic
	chr					ce	pain	an	pair
	oni					bo	rating	d	in
	С					bei	tool. If	fo	con
	no					ng	pain	r-	unc
	nc					cig	scores	pr	on
	an					ar	were	ofi	with
	cer					ett	not	t	trac
	pai					es	report	bi	tion
	n					or	ed,	as	1
						va	surrog		ana
						ро	ate		esic
						riz	measu		Hov
						er	res of		eve
						со	effecti		tria
						nt	veness		wer
						ain	were		limi
						ing	include		ed
						0%	d		by
						del	(sleep,		sho
						ta-	functio		dura
						9-	n, and		tion
						TH	quality		vari
						C	of life).		bilit
						or	Freque		in
						wi	ncy of		dos
						th	serious		g
						са	and		and

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

60

2				
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 5 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 9 30 31 32 33 43 5 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 50 51 52 53 45 55 57 58 59		nn abi no id re m ov al	most comm only report ed advers e effects was collect ed.	stren gth of delta -9- tetra hydr ocan nabi nol, and lack of funct ional outc ome s. Altho ugh well toler ated in the short term , the long- term effec ts of psyc hoac tive and lack of s. Altho ugh well toler ated in the short term , the long- term effec ts of psyc hoac tive and neur ocog nitiv e effec ts of medi cal marij

•

															uana rema in unkr own
Ste	Α	20	Sys	Levo	Ac	MEDLI	7	61	Υ	The	Ye	Ye	No	Υ	Base
ven	sys	17	te	nant	ute	NE,	tri	1	es	primar	S	s,		е	d on
S	te		ma	radol	ро	EMBAS	als			У		ex		S	the
et.	ma		tic	,	sto	Ε,	со			outco		ce			avai
al	tic		Re	nabil	ре	Cochra	m			me		pt			able
[31	rev		vie	one,	rat	ne	ра			was		fo			ranc
]	ie		w	AZD	ive	Library	rin			the		r,			omiz
	w			1940	pai	, and	g			qualita		pu			ed
	of			,	n	the	int			tive		bli			cont
	the			GW8		World	er			analysi		са			olled
	an			4216		Health	ve			s of		tio			trial
	alg			6,		Organi	nti			the		n			evid
	esi			dron		zation	on			analge		bi			ence
	C C			abin		Interna	WI			SIC		as			canr
	em					Clinical	n n n			enicac		an			abin
				≏-9-1   ⊔C		Triple	pia			y UI		u fo			bow
	y of					Rogistr	ho			inoids		r_			no
						v	00			in the		nr			role
	nn					Platfor	, Ke			manag		ofi			in
	abi					m	to			ement		t			the
	noi						pr			of		bi			man
	d						of			acute		as			age
	me						en			pain					men
	dic						,			compa					of
	ati						Pe			red to					acut
	on						thi			placeb					е
	s in						di			o or					pain
	the						ne			active					
	ma						,			compa					
	na						Na			rator.					
	ge						pr			The					
	me						ох			second					
	nt						en			ary					
	of						,			outco					
	ас						an			me					
	ute						d			was					
	pai						dl			the					
	n						up			qualita					

2
2
2
4
5
6
7
8
Q
10
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
17
18
19
20
21
22
22
21
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
21
51
32
33
34
35
36
37
20
20
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
75 16
40
4/
48
49
50
51
50
5Z
53
54
55
56
57
58
50
27

							rof en			analysi s of the report ed advers e effects					
Wa litt et. al [32 ]	Ca nn abi noi ds for fib ro my alg ia	20 16	Co chr an e Re vie w	Nabil one	Fib ro my alg ia	Cochra ne Library , MEDLI NE and EMBAS E	2 tri als co m pa rin g th e int e r v e int o r in g th e int e r v e n n with e int e r in g th e int o m v n m g th e int o r in s th e r in s th e in s in s in s in s in s in s in s in	72 (4 0)	Y es	Primar y outco mes: Partici pant-r eporte d pain relief of 50% or greate r. PGIC (Patien t Global Impres sion of Chang e) much or very much improv ed. Withdr awal due to advers e events	Ye S	Ye s, ex ce pt fo r bli ca tio n bi as.	No	Y e s	We foun d no convi ncing , unbi ased, high quali ty evid ence sugg estin g that nabil one is of value in treat ing peop le with fibro myal gia. The toler abilit y of nabil one

	(tolera	was
	bility).	low
		in
	Seriou	peop
	S	le
	advers	with
	e	fibro
	events	mval
	(safety	gia.
	).	
	Seriou	
	s	
	advers	
	events	
	typicall	
	y in clude	
	include	
	any	
	untow	
	ard	
	medica	
	1	
	occurr	
	ence	
	or	
	effect	
	that at	
	any	
	dose	
	results	
	in	
	death,	
	is	
	life-thr	
	eateni	
	ng.	
	requir	
	es	
	hosnit	
	alisatio	
	gation	
	OT	

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

2 3				
4			ovictin	
5			existin	
6			8 haanit	
7			nospit	
8			alisatio	
10			n,	
11			results	
12			in	
13			persist	
14			ent or	
15			signific	
17			ant	
18			disabili	
19			ty or	
20			incapa	
21			city, is	
22			a	
24			conge	
25			nital	
26			anoma	
27			ly or	
28			hirth	
30			defect	
31			is an	
32			limpor	
33			tant	
34				
35			medica	
30			1	
38			event	
39			that	
40			may	
41			jeopar	
4Z 43			dise	
44			the	
45			person	
46			, or	
47			may	
48			requir	
49 50			e an	
51			interve	
52			ntion	
53			to	
54			preven	
55			tone	
56 57			of the	
58			ahove	
59			abuve	
60				

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

					charac			
					teristic			
					s/cons			
					equen			
					ces.			

# References

- Copay AG, Subach BR, Glassman SD, Polly DW, and Schuler TC, Understanding the minimum clinically important difference: a review of concepts and methods. Spine J, 2007. 7(5): p. 541-6.
- Guyatt GH, Osoba D, Wu AW, Wyrwich KW, and Norman GR, Methods to Explain the Clinical Significance of Health Status Measures. Mayo Clinic Proceedings, 2002. 77(4): p. 371-383.
- 3. Moncrieff J and Kirsch I, *Empirically derived criteria cast doubt on the clinical significance of antidepressant-placebo differences*. Contemp Clin Trials, 2015. **43**: p. 60-2.
- 4. Hagg O, Fritzell P, and Nordwall A, *The clinical importance of changes in outcome scores after treatment for chronic low back pain.* Eur Spine J, 2003. **12**(1): p. 12-20.
- 5. Musoro ZJ, Hamel J, Ediebah DE, Cocks K, King MT, Groenvold M, et al., *Establishing* anchor-based minimally important differences (MID) with the EORTC quality-of-life measures: a meta-analysis protocol. BMJ Open, 2018. **8**(1).
- 6. Stratford PW, Binkley JM, Riddle DL, and Guyatt GH, *Sensitivity to change of the Roland-Morris Back Pain Questionnaire: part 1.* Phys Ther, 1998. **78**(11): p. 1186-96.
- 7. Riddle DL, Stratford PW, and Binkley JM, *Sensitivity to change of the Roland-Morris Back Pain Questionnaire: part 2.* Phys Ther, 1998. **78**(11): p. 1197-207.
- 8. Van der Roer N, Ostelo RW, Bekkering GE, van Tulder MW, and de Vet HC, *Minimal clinically important change for pain intensity, functional status, and general health status in patients with nonspecific low back pain*. Spine (Phila Pa 1976), 2006. **31**(5): p. 578-82.
- 9. Crosby RD, Kolotkin RL, and Williams GR, *Defining clinically meaningful change in health*related quality of life. J Clin Epidemiol, 2003. **56**(5): p. 395-407.
- 10. Cohen J, CHAPTER 1 The Concepts of Power Analysis, in Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences, Cohen J, Editor. 1977, Academic Press. p. 1-17.
- 11. Fayers PM and Machin D, *Quality of life: assessment, analysis and interpretation.* John Wiley & Sons, 2000.
- Guyatt GH, Bombardier C, and Tugwell PX, Measuring disease-specific quality of life in clinical trials. CMAJ : Canadian Medical Association journal = journal de l'Association medicale canadienne, 1986. 134(8): p. 889-895.
- Wyrwich KW, Tierney WM, and Wolinsky FD, Further evidence supporting an SEM-based criterion for identifying meaningful intra-individual changes in health-related quality of life. J Clin Epidemiol, 1999. 52(9): p. 861-73.
- 14. Wolinsky FD, Wan GJ, and Tierney WM, *Changes in the SF-36 in 12 months in a clinical sample of disadvantaged older adults.* Med Care, 1998. **36**(11): p. 1589-98.
- 15. McHorney CA and Tarlov AR, *Individual-patient monitoring in clinical practice: are available health status surveys adequate?* Qual Life Res, 1995. **4**(4): p. 293-307.

1		
2		
3		
4 5 6	16.	Lydick E and Epstein RS, Interpretation of quality of life changes. Qual Life Res, 1993. 2(3): p. 221-6.
7	17.	Beaton DE, Bombardier C, Katz JN, Wright JG, Wells G, Boers M, et al., <i>Looking for</i>
8		important change/differences in studies of responsiveness. OMERACT MCID Working
9		Group Outcome Measures in Rheumatology Minimal Clinically Important Difference
10		Bhoumatal 2001 <b>29</b> (2): p. 400 E
11	10	Rifeundior, 2001. 26(2). p. 400-5.
12	18.	DWORKIN RH, TURK DC, MCDermott MP, Peirce-Sandner S, Burke LB, Cowan P, et al.,
13		Interpreting the clinical importance of group differences in chronic pain clinical trials:
14		IMMPACT recommendations. Pain, 2009. <b>146</b> (3): p. 238-44.
15 16	19.	Cella D, Bullinger M, Scott C, and Barofsky I, Group vs individual approaches to
10		understanding the clinical significance of differences or changes in quality of life. Mayo Clin
18		Proc, 2002. <b>77</b> (4): p. 384-92.
19	20.	Guyatt GH, Making sense of quality-of-life data. Med Care, 2000. <b>38</b> (9 Suppl): p. li175-9.
20	21.	Testa MA. Interpretation of auglity-of-life outcomes: issues that affect magnitude and
21		<i>meaning</i> . Med Care, 2000. <b>38</b> (9 Suppl): p. li166-74.
22	22	IIS Department of Health Human Services EDA Center for Drug Evaluation Research IIS
23	22.	Department of Health Human Services FDA Center for Piologics Evaluation Research, U.S.
24 25		Department of Health Human Services FDA Center for Devices Pedialogical Health
25		Department of Health Human Services FDA Center for Devices Radiological Health,
27		Guidance for industry: patient-reported outcome measures: use in medical product
28		development to support labeling claims: draft guidance. 2006. <b>4</b> : p. 79.
29	23.	Lynch M E and Campbell F, Cannabinoids for treatment of chronic non-cancer pain; a
30		systematic review of randomized trials. Br J Clin Pharmacol, 2011. 72(5): p. 735-44.
31	24.	Boychuk D G, Goddard G, Mauro G, and Orellana M F, The effectiveness of cannabinoids in
32		the management of chronic nonmalignant neuropathic pain: a systematic review. J Oral
27 22		Facial Pain Headache. 2015. <b>29</b> (1): p. 7-14.
35	25.	Meng H. Johnston B. Englesakis M. Moulin D.F. and Bhatia A. Selective Connabinoids for
36	20.	Chronic Neuronathic Pain: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis Anesth Analg 2017
37		<b>12E</b> (5): p. 1628 1652
38	26	123(5), p. 1030-1052.
39	26.	Mucke W, Phillips T, Radbruch L, Petzke F, and Hauser W, Cannabis-based medicines for
40		chronic neuropathic pain in adults. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, 2018(3).
41	27.	Deshpande A, Mailis-Gagnon A, Zoheiry N, and Lakha S F, <i>Efficacy and adverse effects of</i>
42		medical marijuana for chronic noncancer pain: Systematic review of randomized controlled
45 44		<i>triαls.</i> Can Fam Physician, 2015. <b>61</b> (8): p. e372-81.
45	28.	Martin-Sanchez E, Furukawa T A, Taylor J, and Martin J L, Systematic review and meta-
46		analysis of cannabis treatment for chronic pain. Pain Med, 2009. <b>10</b> (8): p. 1353-68.
47	29.	Aviram Land Samuelly-Leichtag G. Efficacy of Cannabis-Based Medicines for Pain
48	23.	Management: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials
49		Dain Dhysician 2017 <b>20</b> (6): n E755 o796
50	20	Comphell E A. Tromper M.D. Correll D. Downelds D.L.M. Moore D.A. and McQuey H.L. Are
51	30.	Campbell F A, Tramer IVI R, Carroll D, Reynolds D J IVI, Moore R A, and MicQuay H J, Are
52		cannabinoids an effective and safe treatment option in the management of pain? A
53 54		<i>qualitative systematic review.</i> Bmj, 2001. <b>323</b> (7303): p. 13.
55	31.	Stevens A J and Higgins M D, A systematic review of the analgesic efficacy of cannabinoid
56		medications in the management of acute pain. Acta Anaesthesiol Scand, 2017. 61(3): p.
57		268-280.
58		
59		
60		

Walitt B, Klose P, Fitzcharles M A, Phillips T, and Hauser W, Cannabinoids for fibromyalgia.
Cochrane Database Syst Rev, 2016. 7: p. Cd011694.

for peer teriew only

Dage 57 of (1	First author	fitle	Year of D publicatio n	Design	Type of Types of cannabino participar id ts	Information sources	No. of trials	No. of Published participan protocol ts	Outcomes	Assessmen of adverse events	of risk of bias	t Accounts Use of the for random GRADE error	Conclusion
1 2 3 4	Lynch & Campbell	Cannabino ids for treatment of chronic of chronic systematic review of randomize d trials	2011 \$ R	ystematic leview	Phytocan Neuropath nabinoldis; cpain, moked fibromyaj cannabis, la, oromucosa theumatol lextracts darthritis, based pain. maticine, dronabino idis; nabilone, dronabinol and a novel THC analogue.	PubMed, EMBASE, CINNIN, (ESSCO), The Cochrane Library, ISI Poychrio (ESSCO), The Cochrane Library, ISI Inform (Proquest), Cochrane Library, ISI (Proquest), Academic Sech Pynnine (ESSCO), Clinical (ESSCO), Clini	18 Comparing comparing the interventin n with placebo		The primary outcome was pain in adjects with chronic non-career pain. The secondary outcomes were sleep, function, and quality of Its.	Yes	Yes, except for reporting blas, bublication blas and fo profit blas	r. No No	Overall there is evidence that comabilitied are safe and modesly effective in meuropatic pain with preliminary ordence of efficency in filteromyakips and chieven apple atheristic. There speed white is the same described qualitatively.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Meng et. al	Selective Cannabine Chronic Neuropath Review and Meta- analysis	2017 S	yztematic tevšew ind Meta- inalysis	Unnahon Neuropath , nablone c pain and nabbenols	Medines, rimosis, PROSPERO, PROSPERO, PROSPERO, Conjel scholar, Pain societies (American Society of American Society of Regional American Society of Pain, American Society of Regional American Society of Pain, American Society of Regional American Society of Regional American	11 (10 trials comparing the interventin n with placebo)	1119 NO 6 10	Inter primary outcome was there a notinione of 2 weeks following institution of a leafestive cannabined and plashed/comparation of a leafestive cannabined and ministration, expressed on an NS (0—rea pair to be and the second plasming of the second plasming of the absence of analgesta of the leafest of analgesta defined as reduction in pain scores (NSIS/NSI) public defined as reduction in pairs scores (NSIS/NSI) public defined as reduction in pairs scores (NSIS/NSI) public defined as reduction in plantic statisfaction, and function, spechological function, spechological tele incidence of adverte effect of askette effect of askette	Tes	Yes	balgestonest for adjustancest for for multiple testing was not as per recommend adjoins in the cohrane Hambook.	Saonabarodis prodeta a sonall analygici banefit in gaziente with chronic neuropathic pain.
12 13 14 15 16 17	Martin-Sái	n Systematic Review and Meta-anal ysis of Cannabis Treatment for Chronic Pain	2009 N	Aeta-anal sis	Phytocan Chronic nabinolis pain of a and pathologia synthetic al or derivates traumatic derivates traumatic derivates traumatic derivates aufornabinol , nabilone, or benzopyna noperioline (a synthetic nitrogen analog of THC)	Medilne/Pubmed, Embase, and The Cochrane Controlled Trials Register (CENTRAL)	18	? No	The primary outcome was intensity of pain as scored by numerical rang scales. The Secondary outcomes were CNS related events	Yes	Yes, except for reporting bias, dataction bias and fo profit bias	: No No r.	Currently available evidence suggests that cannabis treatment is moderately efficacious for treatment of chronic pain, but beneficial effects may be partially (or completely) offset by potentially serious harms.
18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Boychuk et. al	The Effectiven ess of Cannabine ids in the Managem ent of Chronic Neuropathi c Paln: A Systematic Review	2015 S	ystematic laview	Phytesan Neuropath mabinedis c pain sanakadis c pain cannabis, based medicinal extracts (CDME) of Neuromacous (CDME) of neuromacous	I Publick [Cmbase, Web of Science, and all evidence-based madicine reviews and databases (Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, ASP Journal Chub, Database of Reviews of Effects [DARE], and Cochrane Controlled Trials Register [CCTR]]	• 13	771 No	Outcomes considered were reduction were reduction with intervity and adverse events.	Yes	Yes, except for, reporting bias, publication bias and fo profit bias	r. No No	Canabis-based medicinal outcuts used in different populations of chronic non- malignant neuropathic pain patients may provide effective analgesia patients may provide effective analgesia references that are references that are references that are
25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33	Mücke et. al	Cannabis products for adults with chronic neuropath c pain	2018 C	Cochrane leview	Physican Neuropain makinadis cipatin oromucosa Lipray containing TIKC or TIKC/EDD mik, sanabad sacanabad sacanabad sacanabad sacanabad sato fu canabals and GBD as estrast. of canabals sativa L. and sativa L. and display abalino, display anab	a Cocheme Library, MEDUNE and EMBASE Following clinical trials databases were searched for additional unpolitiched data: US National institutes of Haalth clinical trial reproductional institutes of Haalth clinical trial reproductional institutes of Haalth clinical trials reproduct trials Register Viewow.clinicaltrialsregister vow.clinicaltrialsregister (UCTAR)	16 (15 of the trials comparing the intervents n with placebo)	3750 Yes S G	Primary outcomes: Participant-reported paint lief of 50% or greater. We preferred compatible on the second second second pain cores if both macaures: used by studies; PACC (Painter Clobal Imprestion of Change) much or very much limprover; Undersambilistic (Indersambilistic); Statistica adverse events (safets), Statistica adverse converts typically include outcomes or inflict that any dose results in any dose results in any dose and the second second second converses or inflict that	Yes	Yes	No Yes	The potential benefits of cannabis-based medicine (herbal cannabis, plant- derived or synthetic terror, neorgatic etroris, neor
34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41	Aviram et.	Efficacy of Cannabis- Based Medicines for Paln Managem ent: A Systematic Review and Meta- Analysis of Randomiza d Controlled Trials	2017 N A	Aeta- malysis	Phytecan Chronic Cancer) nakinoidis (cancer) sativerini (cancer) canabilo pias (cancer) canabilo piastender digarettaci (cancer) digarettaci (cancer) and and and and and and and and	MEDUREPJamed and in Google Scholar using Medical Sobject Heading (MeSH) terms	43 trials g comparing the interventi n with both 'active drugs' and placebo	2437 No 0	The autocome measure variable "gains intercept", and the variable "gains intercept", summerical neuroscienticable (HBS-111, Moral analog scale (VAS), and He VAS saction of the specific market due to the scale of the specific market gasettomatics Guestformative	Yes	Yes, except for, reporting blas, publication blas and fo profit blas	r. No No	The current systematic reliev suggests that constrained and the systematic endering an
42 43 44 45 46	Campbell et. al	Are cannabinol ds an effective and safe treatment option in the manageme nt of pain? A qualitative systematic review	2001 S	ystematic laview	Crail THC, Acute, an oral chronic main nitrogen mailgenain analogue pain, and of THC cancer (MB), crail pain benzopyra noperifikme (BPP), and intramuscu lar levonantra dol	MEDLINE, EMBASE, Oxford Pain Database, and Cochrane Library	9	222 No	Outcome measures for pain intensity; pain relief; the use of supplementary manigenia patients' preferences; and adverse effects.	Yes	Yes, except for, reporting bias, publication bias and fo profit bias	: No No	Cannabinoids are no more effective than coderine in controlling pain and have depressant effects on the contral nervous system that limit their use. Their widespread introduction into clinical practice for pain management is therefore undestrable, in acute postoperative pain they should not be used.
4/ 48 49 50 51 52 53 54	Deshpand e et. al	Etticacy and adverse effects of medical marijuana for chronic noncancer pain	2015 S	ystematic leview	ugarettes Neuropati or cpain vaporter deta-9- THC	ndt:LURE_EMBASE and the international Pharmaceutical Abstracts	o trials comparing interventi n with placebo. Placebo or vaporizer containing 0% daita: THC or with cannabin d removal	228 No 10 5 5 9 9 0 1	•re outcomes, pain scores sere extracted uning the visual analogue apple (VAS) ore with a series of the pain rating tool. If pain pain rating tool. If pain frequency of actions and eadwarse affects was collected.	fes	Yes, except for, reporting bias, publication blas and fo profit bias	r No No	There is addence for the use of low-dose medical marijana in infractory with control of the second second control of the second cont
55 56 57 58	Stevens et	A systematic review of the analgesic efficacy of cannabinoi d medication s in the manageme nt of acute pain	2017 S	ystematic laview	Levonantra Acute dol, postopera nabilone, ive pain AZD1940, GW842166 , dronabinol , +-9-THC	MEDLINE, EMBASE, E Cochrane Library, and the World Health Organization International Clinical Trials Registry Platform	7 trials comparing interventi n with placebo, Ketoprofe , Pethidine, Naproxen and Ibuprofen	611 Yes 8 50 50 50	The primary outcome was the qualitative analysis of the analysis of efficacy of cannabinoids in the management of acute pain compared to placebo or active comparator. The secondary outcome was the qualitative analysis of the reported adverse effects	Yes	Yes, except for, publication bias and fo profit bias	r. No Yes	Based on the available randomized controlled trial evidence, caenabinods have no role in the management of acute pain.
59 60	Walitt ot.	Cannabino ids for fibromyalg ia	2016 C	ochrane leview	Nabilone Fibromyalı ia		2 trials comparing the interventi n with either (1) placebo o (1) amitriptyl ne	72 (40) Yes	Primary outcomes: Participant-reported pain relief of 50% or greater. PGIC (Pattern Global impression of Change) much or very much improved. Withdrawal due to adverse events (tolerability). Sarious adverse (safery). Serious adverse (common-patterne).	Yes	Yes, except for publication bias.	1 No Yes	We found no convincing, unbiased, high quality evidence suggesting that abilities is of value in treating people with fibromyalgia. The tolerability of nabiline was low in people with fibromyalgia.

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

> te/about/guidelines.xhtml peer review only

PRISMA - P (Pro	forror	BMJ Open	tems to
address in a syst	emati Item	c review protocol*	(Page No.#)
	No		
ADMINISTRATIV	E INFO		
Title:		ate	
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	1
Update	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	
Registration	2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number	
Authors:		a priede	
Contact	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mathing address of corresponding author	1
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	25-26
Amendments	4	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments	
Support:			
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	25
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	
Role of sponsor or funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	3-9
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participents, Interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	9
METHODS		ýgies gies	
Eligibility criteria	8	Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such as years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review	10-12
Information sources	9	Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases, contact with study authors, trail registers or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage	12-13
Search strategy	10	Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned limits such that it could be repeated	
		For peer review only - http://bmiopen.bmi.com/site/about/quidelines.xhtml <b>de</b>	

		BMJ Open	
		2019-03 yright, ji	
Study records:		nclu	
Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review $\frac{di}{ds}$	1
Selection process	11b	State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)	
Data collection process	11c	Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such as piloting forms, done independently on duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators	1.
Data items	12	List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding sources) and simplifications	
Outcomes and prioritization	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and a definitional and a definition of main and a def	1
Risk of bias in individual studies	14	Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether the back of the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis	1:
Data synthesis	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised	
	15b	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods $\vec{a}$ $\vec{b}$ alling data and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (such as I <sup>2</sup> , Kendal's $\vec{b}$ )	1
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regressions	22
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	
Meta-bias(es)	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selectized reporting within studies)	
Confidence in cumulative evidence	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)	
* It is strongly record clarification on the PRISMA-P Group : From: Shamseer L, M meta-analysis protoc	mmend items. and is Moher I cols (PH	Amendments to a review protocol should be tracked and dated. The copyright for PRISMA-P (including checklist) is held be distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution Licence 4.0. D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart L, PRISMA-P Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic RISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. BMJ. 2015 Jan 2;349(jan02 1):g7647.	portan by the reviev
		t Agence Bibliographique c	

2 3	
4 5 6	
7 8	Prelin
9 10 11 12	Total number of records identified Number of duplicates removed Number of records in final list
13 14	The Cochrane Central Register of C
15 16 17 18 19	hits) #1 MeSH descriptor: [Cannabis] #2 MeSH descriptor: [Cannabino #3 (cannabi* or mari*uana or nal or levonantradol* or anandamid*) #4 #1 or #2 or #3
20 21 22 23	#4         #1 of #2 of #5           #5         MeSH descriptor: [Pain] explo (pain* or ache* or migraine*)           #6         (pain* or ache* or migraine*)           #7         #5 or #6           #8         #4 and #7
24 25	MEDLINE Ovid (1946 to July 2019)
26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43	<ol> <li>exp Cannabis/</li> <li>exp Cannabinoids/</li> <li>(cannabi* or mari*uana or nabixmol levonantradol* or anandamid* or 2-AC word, floating sub-heading word, keyw supplementary concept word, rare diser</li> <li>1 or 2 or 3</li> <li>exp Pain/</li> <li>(pain* or ache* or migraine*).mp. [r floating sub-heading word, keyword he concept word, rare disease supplementar</li> <li>5 or 6</li> <li>4 and 7</li> <li>(random* or blind* or placebo* or n subject heading word, floating sub-hea protocol supplementary concept word, 10. 8 and 9</li> </ol>
43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	<ul> <li>Embase Ovid (1974 to July 2019) (18</li> <li>1. exp cannabis/</li> <li>2. exp cannabinoid/</li> <li>3. (cannabi* or mari*uana or nabixmol levonantradol* or anandamid* or 2-AC manufacturer, drug manufacturer, devid</li> <li>4. 1 or 2 or 3</li> <li>5. exp pain/</li> <li>6. (pain* or ache* or migraine*).mp. [n manufacturer, drug manufacturer, devid</li> <li>7. 5 or 6</li> <li>8. 4 and 7</li> <li>9. (random* or blind* or placebo* or n title, device manufacturer, drug manufacture</li></ul>

#### LILACS (Bireme; 1982 to July 2019) (51 hits)

60

Total number of records identified	4106 records
Number of duplicates removed	1079 records
Number of records in final list	3027 records

# ontrolled Trials (CENTRAL) in the Cochrane Library (2019, Issue 6) (961

- explode all trees
- oids] explode all trees
- bixmol\* or dronabinol\* or marinol\* or nabilon\* or cesamet\* or hash\* or hemp\*
- ode all trees

#### (465 hits)

\* or dronabinol\* or marinol\* or nabilon\* or cesamet\* or hash\* or hemp\* or 3).mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading vord heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol ase supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]

np=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, eading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary ary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]

neta-analys\*).mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, ding word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]

#### 829 hits)

\* or dronabinol\* or marinol\* or nabilon\* or cesamet\* or hash\* or hemp\* or 3).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device ce trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]

np=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device ce trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]

neta-analys\*).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original acturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term

1	
2	
2	
1	
-+	(connabile or marily and or nabivmalle or dranabinalle or marinalle or nabilante or accompte or backet or barret
5	(cannably of mariyuana of nabixmoly of dronabinoly of marinoly of nabilony of cesamely of nashy of nemps of
6	levonantradols or anandamids or 2-AG) [words] and (pains or aches or migraines) [words]
7	
8	Science Citation Index Expanded (1900 to July 2019) and Conference Proceedings Citation Index – Science (1990
9	to July 2019) (Web of Science) (623 hits)
10	#5 #4 AND #3
11	#4 TS=(random* or blind* or placebo* or meta-analys*)
12	#3 #2 AND #1
13	#2 TS=(pain* or ache* or migraine*)
14	#1 TS=(cannabi* or mari*uana or nabixmol* or dronabinol* or marinol* or nabilon* or cesamet* or hash* or hemp* or
15	levonantradol* or anandamid* or 2-AG)
15	
10	BIOSIS (1969 to July 2019; Web of Science) (177 hits)
17	#5 #4 AND #3
18	#4 TS=(random* or blind* or placebo* or meta-analys*)
19	#3 #2 AND #1
20	#2 TS=(pain* or ache* or migraine*)
21	#1 TS=(cannabi* or mari*uana or nabixmol* or dronabinol* or marinol* or nabilon* or cesamet* or hash* or hemp* or
22	levonantradol* or anandamid* or 2-AG)
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
29	
20	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
13	
- <del>1-1</del> 15	
4J 46	
40 47	
4/	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	

# **BMJ Open**

# Cannabinoids versus placebo or no intervention for pain. Protocol for a systematic review with meta-analysis and Trial Sequential Analysis

Journal:	BMJ Open					
Manuscript ID	omjopen-2019-031574.R2					
Article Type:	Protocol					
Date Submitted by the Author:	07-Sep-2019					
Complete List of Authors:	Barakji, Jehad; The Copenhagen Trial Unit, Rigshospitalet Dept. 7812 Korang, Steven Kwasi; Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen Trial Unit; Holbaek Sygehus, Pediatric Dept. Feinberg, Joshua; Copenhagen Univ Hosp Maagard, Mathias; The Copenhagen Trial Unit, Rigshospitalet Dept. 7812 Gluud, Christian; Copenhagen Trial Unit (CTU), Center for Clinical Intervention Research Mathiesen, Ole; University of Copenhagen Jakobsen, Janus; Copenhagen Trial Unit, Centre for Clinical Intervention Research, Department 7812, Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen University Hospital					
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b> :	Pharmacology and therapeutics					
Secondary Subject Heading:	Anaesthesia, Evidence based practice, Complementary medicine					
Keywords:	PAIN MANAGEMENT, Herbal medicine < THERAPEUTICS, Adverse events < THERAPEUTICS, CLINICAL PHARMACOLOGY, Health & safety < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT					
	·					

SCHOLARONE<sup>™</sup> Manuscripts

# Cannabinoids versus placebo or no intervention for pain: Protocol for a systematic review with meta-analysis and Trial Sequential Analysis

Jehad A. Barakji<sup>1</sup>, Steven Kwasi Korang<sup>1</sup>, Joshua Rose-Hansen Feinberg<sup>1</sup>, Mathias Maagaard<sup>1</sup>, Christian Gluud<sup>1</sup>, Ole Mathiesen<sup>2,3</sup>, Janus C. Jakobsen<sup>1,4,5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The Copenhagen Trial Unit, Centre for Clinical Intervention Research, Department 7812, Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen University Hospital, Blegdamsvej 9, DK 2100 Copenhagen, Denmark

<sup>2</sup> Centre for Anaesthesiological Research, Department of Anaesthesiology, Zealand University Hospital, Køge,

Denmark

<sup>3</sup> Department of Clinical Medicine, Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences, Copenhagen University, Copenhagen, Denmark

<sup>4</sup> Department of Cardiology, Holbæk Hospital, Holbæk, Denmark

<sup>5</sup> Department of Regional Health Research, The Faculty of Heath Sciences, University of Southern Denmark, Odense, Denmark

Corresponding author

Jehad A. Barakji

Tlf.: +45 21 52 07 80

Email: jehad.barakji@ctu.dk

# Abstract

**Introduction** Pain is a frequent clinical symptom with significant impact on the patient's well-being. Therefore, adequate pain management is of utmost importance. While cannabinoids have become a more popular alternative to traditional types of pain medication among patients, the quality of evidence supporting the use of cannabinoids has been questioned. The beneficial and harmful effects of cannabinoids in patients with pain is unknown. Accordingly, we aim to assess the efficacy, tolerability, and safety of cannabinoids (herbal, plant-derived extracts and synthetic) compared with placebo or no intervention for any type of pain.

**Methods and analyses** We will conduct a systematic review of randomised clinical trials with meta-analysis and Trial Sequential Analysis to assess the beneficial and harmful effects of cannabinoids in any dose, formulation, and duration. We will accept placebo or no treatment as control interventions. We will include participants with any type of pain (acute and chronic pain, cancer-related pain, headache, neuropathic pain, or any other types of pain). We will systematically search The Cochrane Library, MEDLINE, EMBASE, Science Citation Index, and BIOSIS for relevant literature. We will follow the recommendations by Cochrane and the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) statement. The risk of systematic errors (bias) and random errors (play of chance) will be assessed. The overall certainty of evidence will be evaluated using the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development, and Evaluation (GRADE) approach.

**Ethics and dissemination** Ethical approval is not a requirement since no primary data will be collected. The findings of this systematic review will be submitted for peer-reviewed publication and disseminated in national and international conferences.

**Discussion** Although cannabinoids are now being used to manage different pain conditions, the evidence for the clinical effects are unclear. The present review will systematically assess the current evidence for the benefits and harms of cannabinoids to inform practice and future research.

# Strengths and limitations of this study

- Our methodology is based on the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions, the PRISMA guideline, and a systematic eight step procedure for valid assessments of statistical and clinical significance
- We systemically plan to assess risks of random errors ('play of chance') and systematic errors ('bias')
- We have systematically predefined minimal important differences for all outcomes
- The certainty of the evidence will be assessed using the GRADE approach

Pain is the most commonly reported symptom in the general population and in a medical setting [1-3]. Persistent pain is a major international health problem [4], prompting the World Health Organization (WHO) to endorse a global campaign against pain [5]. Pain is the leading reason for use of alternative medicines (i.e. acupuncture, etc.) [6]. Pain has been associated with a low degree of health-related quality of life and may lead to psychosocial distress, insomnia, and depressive symptoms [7-15]. Pain is also among the most common reasons for temporary or permanent work disability [16]. Pain is always subjective and may be defined as "an unpleasant sensory and emotional experience associated with actual or potential tissue damage" [17].

Cannabinoids have emerged as a potential alternative to other painkillers for the treatment of intractable pain [18]. Before the healthcare systems globally can endorse the applicability of cannabinoids for pain, the potential short-time and long-term benefits and harms with use of cannabinoids must be investigated. This is of utmost importance because patients who consume cannabinoids to alleviate their chronic pain will most likely need to consume cannabinoids for the rest of their lifespan.

# **Description of pain**

Pain may be caused by or be related to different clinical disorders and classified according to several different characteristics [19-22]. Below, we describe shortly some of these classifications.

# Acute and chronic pain

Pain may be classified as 'acute pain' or 'chronic pain'.

- Acute pain usually has a well-defined onset and most often a readily identifiable cause (i.e. surgery, etc.).
   Acute pain is expected to run its course in a short time frame and management typically focuses on symptomatic relief until this happens [23]. Acute pain is a common symptom, affecting between 37% to 84% of hospitalised patients [24].
- Chronic pain is often characterised by an ill-defined onset and a prolonged, fluctuating course [23].
   Chronic pain often persists past normal healing time and hence lacks the acute warning function of physiological nociception [25]. Pain is usually regarded as chronic when it lasts or recurs for more than three to six months [17, 26]. Chronic pain is a frequent condition, affecting an estimated 20% of people worldwide [27-30] and accounting for 15% to 20% of physician visits according to European observational studies [31, 32].

#### Cancer-related pain

Pain may also be classified based on whether it is cancer-related or non-cancer-related. Cancer-related pain is pain caused by the cancer itself (primary tumour and metastases) or its treatment (i.e. radiation therapy, etc.) [23, 33].

#### Postoperative pain

Postoperative pain includes pain from inflammation caused by tissue trauma (i.e. surgical incision, dissection, burns, etc.) or direct nerve injury (e.g. nerve transection, stretching, or compression) [34]. Inflammation results in activation and sensitisation of nociceptive pain pathways, resulting in primary and secondary hyperalgesia and central sensitisation, which is characterized by clinically increased pain, allodynia, and increased sensitivity from surrounding non-damaged anatomical areas [35].

#### Other types of pain

Pain in one or more anatomic regions where the aetiology is unknown is defined as idiopathic pain [36]. Examples of idiopathic pain are chronic widespread pain, fibromyalgia, irritable bowel syndrome, and back pain that is not diagnosed as musculoskeletal or as neuropathic pain [33].

Pain types defined according to specific mechanism causing the pain

Somatic nociceptive pain Nociceptive pain is the most

Nociceptive pain is the most frequent type of pain. It results from activity in neural pathways caused by actual tissue damage or potentially tissue-damaging stimuli [31, 37] originating from somatic nociceptors from skin, bone, joints, or muscles [38].

Visceral nociceptive pain

The visceral nociceptive pain is pain resulting from viscera in the thoracic, pelvis, or abdominal organs [39-41]. Visceral pain is diffuse, less distinctive, and difficult to localise [41] and is often characterised by referred visceral pain [42].

# Neuropathic pain

The 2011 International Association for the Study of Pain definition of neuropathic pain is "pain caused by a lesion or disease of the somatosensory system" [43]. Neuropathic pain may be classified as central neuropathic pain or peripheral neuropathic pain. Central neuropathic pain conditions are mainly attributed to multiple sclerosis and post-stroke pain [44], while peripheral neuropathic pain is largely due to post-herpetic neuralgia and diabetic neuropathy [45].

# **Description of the intervention**

Cannabis (also called marijuana) is the most common illegally used psychoactive substance worldwide [46]. Cannabinoids refer to a heteromorphic group of molecules that demonstrate activity upon cannabinoid receptors [47]. Cannabinoids may be classified into three groups: 1) endocannabinoids, 2) phytocannabinoids, and 3) synthetic cannabinoids [47].

# Endocannabinoids

Endocannabinoids are characterised by being the endogenously generated cannabinoids [48]. The primary types of endocannabinoids are the lipid endocannabinoid arachidonoyl ethanolamide (named anandamide) [49] and the endocannabinoid 2-arachidonoylglycerol (2-AG) [50, 51].

Phytocannabinoids

Phytocannabinoids are cannabinoids found in the cannabis plant [52]. The best characterised phytocannabinoids are the psychotropic tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) and the primarily anti-inflammatory cannabidiol (CBD) [53]. Nabiximols (marketed as Sativex<sup>®</sup>) is a sublingually administered oromucosal spray based on a mixture of tetrahydrocannabinol and cannabidiol [54].

#### Synthetic cannabinoids

Synthetic cannabinoids are analogues of the cannabinoids found in natural marijuana that are chemically synthesised. The most commonly prescribed cannabinoid-based medicines are the synthetic cannabinoids dronabinol (marketed as Marinol<sup>®</sup>) and nabilone (marketed as Cesamet<sup>®</sup>) [54].

# Endocannabinoid system

All cannabinoids act on cannabinoid receptors. These cannabinoid receptors are located throughout the body but are mostly located in the brain [55]. The cannabinoid receptors and endocannabinoids (see paragraph above) are together named the endocannabinoid system [56].

# Cannabinoid receptors

There are two types of cannabinoid receptors, type I and type II [57]. Cannabinoid receptor type I are most abundant in the central nervous system, especially in areas promoting nociception, short-term memory, and in the basal ganglia, but are also found in the peripheral nerves, uterus, testis, and bones [57]. Tetrahydrocannabinol activates cannabinoid type I receptors in the dopaminergic mesolimbic brain circuit, resulting in enhanced release of dopamine [58]. Such activation of the so-called 'brain reward system' is hypothesised to mediate the positive reinforcing and rewarding effects of almost all drugs of abuse [58].

In contrast, cannabinoid receptor type II, is mostly found in the periphery, often in conjunction with immune cells, but may appear in the central nervous system particularly under conditions of inflammation in association with microcytes [57]. The physiological responses that result from cannabinoid receptor activation are euphoria, psychosis, impaired memory and cognition, reduced locomotor function, increased appetite, as well as anti-emetic, pain-relieving, anti-spasticity, and sleep-promoting effects [59].

# Administration of cannabinoids

#### **BMJ** Open

Cannabis is most commonly consumed via smoked, inhaled vapor, or oral routes of administration [60]. Vaporising cannabis ('vaping') heats the material without burning which theoretically minimises potential carcinogens compared to smoking and may produce less respiratory irritation [61, 62]. Sublingual administration is used for some medical cannabis preparations (i.e. nabiximols, etc.).

# Why it is important to do this review

We identified ten previous reviews with meta-analyses assessing the effects of cannabinoids on different types of pain [63-72]. Bearing in mind that some of the previous reviews investigated more than one type of pain, eight reviews assessed the effects of different cannabinoids on neuropathic pain [63-69, 72]; four reviews assessed the effects of different cannabinoids on nociceptive pain (i.e. rheumatoid arthritis, etc.) [63, 64, 67, 68]; three reviews assessed the effects of different cannabinoids on cancer-related pain [63, 67, 68]; four reviews assessed the effects of different cannabinoids on cancer-related pain [63, 67, 71]; and three reviews assessed the effects of different cannabinoids on postoperative pain [63, 68, 70]. All the previous reviews included randomised clinical trials, but only two of the ten reviews systematically assessed the risk of bias in the trials [65, 72], and none of the previous reviews took into account the risks of random errors [63-72]. Only two out of the ten reviews used predefined Cochrane methodology [71, 72] and only four reviews used the GRADE approach [65, 70-72].

Most of the reviews concluded that the assessed cannabinoids were effective against pain [63-67, 69, 72]. In **Table 1 (Additional file 1),** we have summarised the results and conclusions of the previous reviews. Five of the reviews reported serious adverse events (i.e. agitation, impaired memory, abuse, dissociation, acute psychosis, death, etc.) [63, 65-67, 72]. The reviews also showed that the most commonly reported adverse events were sedation, dizziness, dry mouth, increased appetite, somnolence, confusion, nausea, and disturbances in concentration [63-66, 68, 69, 71, 72].

A correlation between psychiatric disorders (schizophrenia, psychosis, etc.) and increased cannabinoid consumption has previously been hypothesised [73-79]. Di Forti et al. recently conducted a study indicating that daily cannabis use was associated with increased odds of psychotic disorders compared with never users (adjusted odds ratio [OR] 3.2, 95% confidence interval (CI) 2.2 to 4.1), increasing to nearly five-times increased odds for daily use of high-potency (THC  $\geq$  10%) types of cannabis (adjusted OR 4.8, 95% CI 2.5 to 6.3) [80].

Compared to previous systematic reviews on cannabinoids, we want to assess the effects of all types of cannabinoid versus placebo or no intervention for all different forms of pain. Depending on the data results provided by the included trials this could increase the power and precision of the overall analysis and make it possible to conduct subgroup analyses and sensitivity analyses that may identify pain areas where cannabinoid could be especially beneficial and cause the least harms. In addition, we will implement a minimal clinically important threshold regarding analgesic efficacy based on previously conducted methodological studies which ensures that analgesic efficacy is of a firm significance before acceptance. Finally, by instigating all types of cannabinoids treated for any type of pain this systematic review will aid trialist in optimising the design of future randomised clinical trials by illuminating any research pitfalls of all previously conducted randomised clinical trials on this topic.

#### Objective

The objective of our systematic review is to assess the analgesic efficacy and adverse events encumbered with the use of cannabinoids compared with placebo or no intervention in participants with any type of pain (acute and chronic pain, cancer-related pain, headache, neuropathic pain, or any other types of pain). A secondary objective of this systematic review is to assess the impact of cannabinoid use on the quality of sleep and quality of life which is especially decreased in participants with chronic pain.

# Methods

This systematic review protocol has been developed based on Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) guidelines for reporting systematic reviews evaluating healthcare interventions [81, 82]. A PRISMA-P checklist file is attached (**Additional file 2**).

#### Criteria for considering studies for this review

#### Type of studies

Randomised clinical trials irrespective of trial design, setting, publication status, publication year, and language. If we identify quasi-randomised studies and observational studies during our searches for randomised clinical trials, we will only include their reporting on harms in a narrative way. By not systematically searching for all

observational studies on harm, we run the risk of putting more focus on benefit than harm. We are aware that this is a limitation of our review.

#### Types of participants

Participants with any type of pain, i.e. acute and chronic pain, cancer-related pain, headache, neuropathic pain, or any other types of pain (as defined by the trialists). Participants will be included irrespective of age, sex, and comorbidities.

# Types of interventions

# Experimental intervention

Any type of cannabinoids such as: herbal cannabis (hashish, marihuana), plant-based extracts (i.e. nabiximols, etc.), or synthetic cannabinoids (i.e. cannabidiol, dronabinol, levonantradol, nabilone, etc.). We will accept cannabinoids at any dose, by any route, administered for the relief of pain.

# Control intervention

Placebo or no intervention.

# Co-interventions

We will accept any co-intervention but only if this co-intervention is planned to be delivered similarly in both intervention groups. If this plan is not followed, then these trials will be assessed as a subgroup due to potential confounding.

# Types of outcome measures

Primary outcomes

- All-cause mortality
- Pain assessment on visual analogue scale (VAS) or numerical rating scale (NRS)
- Proportion of participants with a serious adverse event defined as any untoward medical occurrence that resulted in death; was life threatening; was persistent; or led to significant disability, nephrotoxicity, superinfection, need for respiratory support, need for circulatory support, or prolonged hospitalisation [83]. As we expect the trialists' reporting of serious adverse events to be heterogeneous and not strictly

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-031574 on 31 October 2019. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) .

Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies

#### **BMJ** Open

according to the ICH-GCP recommendations, we will include the event as a serious adverse if the trialists either: 1) use the term 'serious adverse event' but not refer to ICH-GCP, or 2) report the proportion of participants with an event we consider fulfils the ICH-GCP definition. If several of such events are reported then we will choose the highest proportion reported in each trial.

Quality of life measured on any valid continuous scale

#### Secondary outcomes

- Dependence (as defined by trialists)
- Psychosis (as defined by trialists)
- Proportion of participants with one or more adverse event not considered to be serious
- Quality of sleep measured on any valid continuous scale

#### Exploratory outcomes

- Each serious adverse event separately
- Each adverse event not considered serious separately
- Twenty-four-hour morphine consumption (as defined by trialists)
- Physical function (as defined by trialists)
- Depressive symptoms (e.g. Hamilton Depression Rating Scale)

We will for all outcomes use the trial results reported at maximal follow-up except for acute pain. For acute pain, we will use the trials' results reported at the time point closest to 24 hours after the intervention is given.

#### Patient and public Involvement

We have had email correspondence with several relevant patient associations in Denmark to select the most patient-relevant outcomes. The patient associations we have been in contact with included: The Danish Diabetes Association, Steno Diabetes Centre Copenhagen, The Danish Rheumatism Association, The Danish Multiple Sclerosis Society, and Danish Cancer Society. Initially we presented our potential outcomes for the patient associations and requested for their opinion. We had not included quality of sleep as an outcome, however, this was mentioned by almost all patient associations and it was included as a crucial secondary outcome. All-cause mortality was questioned by one of the patient associations, however, we want to keep this

outcome because of potential increased risk of both acute coronary syndrome and chronic cardiovascular disease associated with cannabis use [84].

# Search methods for identification of studies

# Electronic searches

We will search the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), Medical Literature Analysis and Retrieval System Online (MEDLINE), Excerpta Medica database (EMBASE), Latin American and Caribbean Health Sciences Literature (LILACS), Science Citation Index Expanded on Web of Science, and BIOSIS in order to identify relevant trials. The preliminary search strategy for CENTRAL, MEDLINE (Ovid), Embase (Ovid), LILACS, Web of Science and BIOSIS is given in **Additional file 3**.

We will search all databases from their inception to the 1<sup>st</sup> of October 2019.

# Searching other resources

The reference lists of relevant publications will be checked for any unidentified randomised trials. We will contact authors of included studies, and major pharmaceutical companies, by email asking for unpublished randomised trials. Further, we will search for ongoing trials on:

- ClinicalTrials.gov (<u>www.clinicaltrials.gov</u>)
- Google Scholar (<u>https://scholar.google.dk/</u>)
- The Turning Research into Practice (TRIP) Database (<u>https://www.tripdatabase.com/</u>)
- European Medicines Agency (EMA) (http:// www.ema.europa.eu/ema/)
- United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA) (<u>www.fda.gov</u>)
- China Food and Drug Administration (CFDA) (<u>http://eng.sfda.gov.cn/WS03/CL0755/</u>)
- Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (<u>https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/</u> medicines-and-healthcare-products-regulatoryagency)
- The World Health Organization (WHO) International Clinical Trials Registry Platform (ICTRP) search portal (<u>http://apps.who.int/</u> trialsearch/)

We will also consider relevant for the review unpublished and grey literature trials, if we identify such trials.

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-031574 on 31 October 2019. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de I Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

#### 

We will perform the review following the recommendations of Cochrane [85]. The analyses will be performed using Review Manager 5 [86] and Trial Sequential Analysis [87]. In case of Review Manager statistical software is not being sufficient, we will use STATA 15 [88].

#### Selection of studies

Two authors (JB, SKK) will independently screen titles and abstracts. We will retrieve all relevant full-text study reports/publications, and four review authors (JB, SKK, JRF, MM) will independently screen the full texts and identify and record reasons for exclusion of the ineligible studies. We will resolve any disagreement through discussion or, if required, we will consult a fifth author (JCJ). Trial selection will be displayed in an adapted flow diagram as per the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statement [89].

#### Data extraction and management

Four authors (JB, SKK, JRF, MM) will in pairs extract data independently from included trials. Disagreements will be resolved by discussion with a fifth author (JCJ). We will assess duplicate publications and companion papers of a trial together to evaluate all available data simultaneously (maximise data extraction, correct bias assessment). We will contact the trial authors by email to specify any additional data, which may not have been reported sufficiently or at all in the publication.

#### Trial characteristics

Bias risk components (as defined below); trial design (parallel, factorial, or crossover); number of intervention arms; length of follow-up; estimation of sample size; inclusion and exclusion criteria.

# Participant characteristics and diagnosis

Number of randomised participants; number of analysed participants; number of participants lost to follow-up/ withdrawals/crossover; compliance with medication; age range (mean or median) and sex ratio; type of pain (acute and chronic pain, cancer-related pain, headache, neuropathic pain or any other types of pain); baseline pain score; drug and dosing regimen; study design (placebo or active control); study duration and follow-up; serious adverse event).

#### **BMJ** Open

analgesic outcome measures and results; adverse events (participants experiencing any adverse event, or

Co-intervention characteristics Type of co-intervention; dose of co-intervention; duration of co-intervention; and mode of administration. Outcomes All outcomes listed above will be extracted from each randomised clinical trial, and we will identify if outcomes are incomplete or selectively reported according to the criteria described later in 'incomplete outcome data' bias domain and 'selective outcome reporting' bias domain. Notes Funding of the trial and notable conflicts of interest of trial authors will be extracted, if available. We will note in the 'Characteristics of included studies' table if outcome data were not reported in a usable

way. Four review authors (JB, SKK, JRF, MM) will independently transfer data into the Review Manager file [86]. Disagreements will be resolved through discussion or, if required, we will consult with a fifth author (JCJ).

#### Assessment of risk of bias in included studies

We will use the instructions given in the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions [85] in our evaluation of the methodology and hence the risk of bias of the included trials. We will evaluate the methodology in respect of:

- Random sequence generation
- Allocation concealment
- Blinding of participants and treatment providers
- Blinding of outcome assessment
- Incomplete outcome data
- Selective outcome reporting
- For-profit bias
- Overall risk of bias

These components enable classification of randomised trials as being at low risk of bias and at high risk of bias. The latter trials tend to overestimate positive intervention effects and underestimate negative effects [90-96].

We will classify the trials according to the following criteria.

# Random sequence generation

- Low risk: If sequence generation was achieved using computer random number generator or a random number table. Drawing lots, tossing a coin, shuffling cards, and throwing dice were also considered adequate if performed by an independent adjudicator.
- Unclear risk: If the method of randomisation was not specified, but the trial was still presented as being randomised.
- High risk: If the method of sequence generation was inadequate e.g. alternate medical record numbers or other non-random sequence generation.

# Allocation concealment

- Low risk: If the allocation of patients was performed by a central independent unit, on-site locked computer, identical-looking numbered sealed envelopes, drug bottles, or containers prepared by an independent pharmacist or investigator.
- Uncertain risk: If the trial was classified as randomised but the allocation concealment process was not described.
- High risk: If the allocation sequence was familiar to the investigators who assigned participants.

# Blinding of participants and treatment providers

- Low risk: If the participants and the treatment providers were blinded to intervention allocation and this was described.
- Uncertain risk: If the procedure of blinding was insufficiently described.
- High risk: If blinding of participants and the treatment providers was not performed.

# Blinding of outcome assessment

- Low risk of bias: If it was mentioned that outcome assessors were blinded and this was described.
- Uncertain risk of bias: If it was not mentioned if the outcome assessors in the trial were blinded or the extent of blinding was insufficiently described.
- High risk of bias: If no blinding or incomplete blinding of outcome assessors was performed.

#### BMJ Open

Incomplete outcome data

- Low risk of bias: If missing data were unlikely to make treatment effects depart from plausible values. This could be either (1) there were no drop-outs or withdrawals for all outcomes or (2) the numbers and reasons for the withdrawals and drop-outs for all outcomes were clearly stated and could be described as being similar to both groups. Generally, the trial is judged as at a low risk of bias due to incomplete outcome data if drop-outs are less than 5%. However, the 5% cut-off is not definitive.
- Uncertain risk of bias: If there was insufficient information to assess whether missing data were likely to induce bias on the results.
- High risk of bias: If the results were likely to be biased due to missing data either because the pattern of drop-outs could be described as being different in the two intervention groups or the trial used improper methods in dealing with the missing data (i.e. last observation carried forward, etc.).

#### Selective outcome reporting

- Low risk of bias: If a protocol was published before or at the time the trial was begun, and the outcomes specified in the protocol were reported on. If there is no protocol or the protocol was published after the trial has begun, reporting pain assessment on VAS or NRS and serious adverse events will grant the trial a grade of low risk of bias.
- Uncertain risk of bias: If no protocol was published and the outcome pain assessment on VAS or NRS and serious adverse events were not reported on.
- High risk of bias: If the outcomes in the protocol were not reported on.

#### For-profit bias

- Low risk of bias: If the trial appeared to be free of other components of for-profit bias.
- Unclear risk of bias: If it was unclear whether the trial was free of for-profit bias.
- High risk of bias: If there was a high risk of for-profit bias.

#### Overall risk of bias

• Low risk of bias: The trial will be classified at overall 'low risk of bias' only if all of the bias domains described in the above paragraphs are classified at 'low risk of bias'.

• High risk of bias: The trial will be classified at 'high risk of bias' if any of the bias risk domains described in the above are classified at 'unclear' or 'high risk of bias'.

We will assess the domains 'blinding of outcome assessment', 'incomplete outcome data', and 'selective outcome reporting' for each outcome result. Thus, we can assess the bias risk for each outcome assessed in addition to each trial. Our primary conclusions will be based on the results of our primary outcome results at overall low risk of bias. Both our primary and secondary analyses will be presented in the summary of findings tables.

# Differences between the protocol and the review

We will conduct the review according to this published protocol and report any deviations from it in the 'Differences between the protocol and the review' section of the systematic review.

#### Measures of treatment effect

#### Dichotomous outcomes

We will calculate risk ratios (RRs) with 95% confidence interval (CI) for dichotomous outcomes, as well as the Trial Sequential Analysis- adjusted CIs (see below).

#### Continuous outcomes

We will calculate the mean differences (MDs) and the standardised mean difference (SMD) with 95% CI for continuous outcomes, as well as the Trial Sequential Analysis-adjusted CIs (see below).

# Dealing with missing data

We will, as first option, contact all trial authors to obtain any relevant missing data (i.e. for data extraction and for assessment of risk of bias, as specified above).

#### Dichotomous outcomes

We will not impute missing values for any outcomes in our primary analysis. In two of our sensitivity analyses (see paragraph below), we will impute data.

#### Continuous outcomes

We will primarily analyse scores assessed at single time points. If only changes from baseline scores are reported, we will analyse the results together with follow-up scores [85]. If standard deviations (SDs) are not reported, we will calculate the SDs using trial data, if possible. We will not use intention-to-treat data if the original report did not contain such data. We will not impute missing values for any outcomes in our primary analysis. In our sensitivity analysis (see paragraph below) for continuous outcomes, we will impute data.

#### Assessment of heterogeneity

We will primarily investigate forest plots to visually assess any sign of heterogeneity. We will secondly assess the presence of statistical heterogeneity by chi<sup>2</sup> test (threshold P < 0.10) and measure the quantities of heterogeneity by the I<sup>2</sup> statistic [97, 98]. We will investigate for heterogeneity through subgroup analyses. Ultimately, we may decide that a meta-analysis should be avoided [85].

#### Assessment of reporting biases

We will use a funnel plot to assess reporting bias if ten or more trials are included. We will visually inspect funnel plots to assess the risk of bias. We are aware of the limitations of a funnel plot (i.e. a funnel plot assesses bias due to small sample size, etc.). From this information, we assess possible reporting bias. For dichotomous outcomes, we will test asymmetry with the Harbord test [99] if  $\tau^2$  is less than 0.1 and with the Rücker test if  $\tau^2$  is more than 0.1. For continuous outcomes, we will use the regression asymmetry test [100] and the adjusted rank correlation [101].

#### Unit of analysis issues

We will only include randomised clinical trials. For trials using crossover design, only data from the first period will be included [85, 102]. There will therefore not be any unit of analysis issues.

#### Minimal important difference

In clinical intervention research it is of utmost importance always to define minimal important differences (MID) and to define thresholds for clinical significance [103]. If a large number of trial participants are randomised, small and clinically irrelevant intervention effects may lead to statistically significant results and rejection of the null hypothesis [104]. Jaeschke et al. defined the minimal important difference as "the smallest difference in score in the domain of interest which patients perceive as beneficial" [105].

Estimations of minimal important differences should be used as arbitrary strict precise thresholds. However, to avoid erroneous conclusions minimal important differences need to be estimated and predefined when assessing the effects of interventions for pain. Olsen et al. have conducted two systematic reviews on this matter in order to gather the evidence and present an estimate of the minimal important difference [106, 107]. Olsen et al. conducted a systematic review on the minimal important difference in patients with acute pain and concluded that the median of the studies' results was 17 mm on VAS (IQR 14 mm to 23 mm) [106]. Another systematic review conducted by Olsen et al. was on the minimal important difference in patients with chronic pain and the results showed a median of 23 mm on VAS (IQR 12 mm to 39 mm) when using the within-patient anchor-based method, while the median in studies using the sensitivity- and specificity-based method was 20 mm on VAS (IQR 15 mm – 30 mm) [107]. We have described detailed considerations about minimal important differences in **Appendix 1**.

Based on the previously conducted systematic reviews we will choose at minimal important difference equivalent to 10 mm or 1 point on the visual analogue scale and the numerical rating scale, respectively, regarding an analgesic effect.

#### Data synthesis

#### Meta-analysis

We will undertake this meta-analysis according to the recommendations stated in the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions [85], Keus et al. [108], and the eight-step assessment suggested by Jakobsen et al. [103]. We will use the statistical software Review Manager 5.3 [86] provided by Cochrane to analyse data. We will assess our intervention effects with both random-effects meta-analyses [109] and fixedeffect meta-analyses [110]. We will use the more conservative point estimate of the two [103]. The more conservative point estimate is the estimate closest to zero effect. If the two estimates are similar, we will use the estimate with the highest P value [103]. We use four primary and four secondary outcomes, and therefore, we will consider a P value of 0.02 as the threshold for statistical significance [103, 111]. We will investigate for heterogeneity through subgroup analyses. Ultimately, we may decide that a meta-analysis should be avoided [85]. We will use the eight-step procedure to assess if the thresholds for statistical and clinical significance are crossed [103]. Our primary conclusion will be based on results with low risk of bias [103]. and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies

Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text
#### **BMJ** Open

Where multiple trial intervention groups are reported in a single trial, we will include only the relevant groups. If two comparisons are combined in the same meta-analysis, we will halve the control group to avoid doublecounting [85]. Trials with a factorial design will be included.

If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, we will report the results in a narrative way.

### Trial Sequential Analysis

Traditional meta-analysis runs the risk of random errors due to sparse data and repetitive testing of accumulating data when updating reviews. We wish to control the risks of type I errors and type II errors. We will therefore perform Trial Sequential Analysis on the outcomes, in order to calculate the required information size (that is the number of participants needed in a meta-analysis to detect or reject a certain intervention effect) and the cumulative Z-curve's breach of relevant trial sequential monitoring boundaries [87, 112-120]. A more detailed description of Trial Sequential Analysis can be found in the Trial Sequential Analysis manual [113] and at <a href="http://www.ctu.dk/tsa/">http://www.ctu.dk/tsa/</a>. For dichotomous outcomes, we will estimate the required information size based on the observed proportion of patients with an outcome in the control group (the cumulative proportion of patients with an event in the control groups relative to all patients in the control groups), a relative risk reduction of 20%, an alpha of 2.0% for our primary and secondary outcomes, a beta of 10%, and diversity as suggested by the trials in the meta-analysis. For the outcome "pain assessment on visual analogue scale (VAS) or numerical rating scale (NRS)", we will use a minimal important difference estimate based on previously conducted systematic reviews [106, 107]. We will accept an analgesic effect equivalent to 10 mm or 1 point on the visual analogue scale and the numerical rating scale, respectively, or a consumption of at least 5 mg morphine.

For all remaining continuous outcome, we will in the Trial Sequential Analysis use the observed SD, a mean difference of the observed SD/2, an alpha of 2.0% for our primary and secondary outcomes, and a beta of 10%.

## Subgroup analysis and investigation of heterogeneity

#### Subgroup analysis

We will perform the following subgroup analysis when analysing the primary outcomes (All-cause mortality, pain assessment on VAS or NRS, serious adverse event, and quality of life).

Trials at high risk of bias compared to trials at low risk of bias

- Trials at risk of vested interests compared to trial with no risk of vested interests
- Trials compared according to type of pain (acute pain, chronic pain, and cancer pain)
- Trials compared according to type of chronic pain
- Trials compared according to type of cannabinoids used

We will use the formal test for subgroup interactions in Review Manager [86].

# Sensitivity analysis

To assess the potential impact of the missing data for dichotomous outcomes, we will perform the two following sensitivity analyses on both the primary and secondary outcomes.

- 'Best-worst-case' scenario: We will assume that all participants lost to follow-up in the cannabinoid intervention group have survived and had no serious adverse event, and that all those participants lost to follow-up in the placebo group have not survived, and had a serious adverse event.
- 'Worst-best-case' scenario: We will assume that all participants lost to follow-up in the cannabinoid intervention group have not survived, and had a serious adverse event, and that all those participants lost to follow-up in the placebo group have survived, and had no serious adverse event.

We will present results of both scenarios in our review.

For all continuous outcome when analysing a 'beneficial outcome' will be the group mean plus two standard deviations (SDs) (we will secondly use one SD in another sensitivity analysis) of the group mean and a 'harmful outcome' will be the group mean minus two SDs (we will secondly use one SD in another sensitivity analysis) of the group mean [103].

To assess the potential impact of missing SDs for continuous outcomes, we will perform the following sensitivity analysis.

• Where SDs are missing and it is not possible to calculate them, we will impute SDs from trials with similar populations and low risk of bias. If we find no such trials, we will impute SDs from trials with a similar population. As the final option, we will impute SDs from all trials.

We will present results of this scenario in our review. Other post hoc sensitivity analyses might be warranted if unexpected clinical or statistical heterogeneity is identified during the analysis of the review results [103].

#### Summary of Findings

We will create a Summary of Findings table using each of the primary outcomes (all-cause mortality, pain assessment on VAS or NRS, serious adverse event, and quality of life). We will use the five GRADE considerations (bias risk of the trials, consistency of effect, imprecision, indirectness, and publication bias) to assess the quality of a body of evidence as it relates to the studies which contribute data to the meta-analyses for the prespecified outcomes [103, 121-123]. We will use methods and recommendations described in Chapter 8 (Section 8.5) and Chapter 12 of the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions [85] using GRADEpro software. We will justify all decisions to downgrade the quality of studies using footnotes, and we will make comments to aid the reader's understanding of the review where necessary. Firstly, we will present our results in the Summary of Findings table based on the results from the trials with low risk of bias, and secondly, we will present the results based on all trials.

#### Ethics and dissemination

Ethical approval is not a requirement since no primary data will be collected. The findings of this systematic review will be submitted for peer-reviewed publication and disseminated in national and international conferences and is expected to inform healthcare workers and providers about the occurrence of serious and non-serious adverse events following cannabinoid consumption. It is expected that the findings of this systematic review will identify some research gaps for future trials.

# Discussion

This protocol aims at investigating the beneficial and harmful effects of cannabinoids in patients with any type of pain condition. The outcomes will be all-cause mortality, pain assessment on VAS or NRS, serious adverse events, quality of life, dependence, psychosis, non-serious adverse events, and sleep quality.

This protocol has several strengths. The predefined methodology is based on the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions [85], the eight-step assessment suggested by Jakobsen et al. [103], Trial Sequential Analysis [84], and GRADE assessment [121-123]. Hence, this protocol takes both the risk of random

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-031574 on 31 October 2019. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de I Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

error and the risk of systematic error into account. We predefined evidence-based estimations of minimal important differences which will limit the risk of focusing on statistically significant results with questionable clinical importance. This threshold of minimal important difference is based on the estimations of several previously conducted studies and reviews [106, 107]. Moreover, we are including all types of cannabinoids and all types of pain which will increase the statistical power and make it possible to perform essential subgroup analyses. We have been in contact with several relevant patient associations which has assisted us in choosing the most clinically relevant outcomes.

underlying pathophysiological mechanisms [124]. On the other hand, the effects of cannabinoids on acute pain and chronic pain might be comparable and hence it might be valid to combine trials assessing the effects of cannabinoids on acute pain and chronic pain in meta-analysis, which would increase the statistical power. The results of the subgroup analysis comparing trials including participants with acute pain to participants with chronic pain will therefore be highlighted when reporting our review results. Moreover, we only intend to assess cannabinoids versus placebo or versus no intervention. Further systematic reviews with meta-analyses and Trial Sequential Analyses need to assess the benefits and harms of cannabinoids versus other pain killers, provided that cannabinoids show more benefit than harm in the present systematic review.

Furthermore, more than one active cannabinoid agent is often combined in the different intervention options provided to the patients with a pain condition, thereby making difficult to explore the analgesic effect and adverse event associated with a single cannabinoid agent. Hence, if we show a difference between the intervention options, it will be difficult to conclude what exactly caused the difference in effect. To minimise these limitations, we have planned a careful assessment of statistical and clinical heterogeneity as well as several subgroup analyses and sensitivity analyses. Another limitation is the large number of comparisons which increase the risk of type 1 error. We have adjusted our thresholds for significance according to the number of primary outcomes, but, as mentioned, we have also included multiple subgroup analyses. This large risk of type 1 error will be taken into account when interpreting the review results.

## Acknowledgements

We hugely appreciate the contribution of The Danish Diabetes Association, Steno Diabetes Centre Copenhagen, The Danish Rheumatism Association, The Danish Multiple Sclerosis Society, and Danish Cancer Society in guiding us to select the most patient relevant outcomes.

The expert help from Sarah Louise Klingenberg (Information Specialist, The Cochrane Hepato-Biliary Group, Copenhagen Trial Unit, Copenhagen, Denmark) in making the search strategy is hugely appreciated.

#### **Funding statement**

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

### Authors' contributions

JB drafted the protocol. JCJ, SKK, OM, CG, JRF, and MM amended the protocol. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

#### **Competing interests**

None declared

#### Ethics approval and consent to participate

Not applicable.

#### Word Count

10191 words, including the full references.

# References

- 1. Verhaak P, Kerssens J, Dekker J, Sorbi M, and Bensing J, Prevalence of chronic benign pain disorder among adults: a review of the literature. PAIN, 1998. 77(3): p. 231-9.
- 2. Kroenke K, Patients presenting with somatic complaints: epidemiology, psychiatric comorbidity and management. Int J Methods Psychiatr Res, 2003. 12(1): p. 34-43.
- 3. Sternbach RA, Survey of pain in the United States: The nuprin pain report. The Clinical Journal of Pain, 1986. 2(1): p. 49-53.

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

29 30

31

32

33

34

35 36

37

38

39

40 41

42

43

44

45

46 47

48

49

50

51 52

53

54

60

4. Gureje O, Von Korff M, Simon G, and Gater R, Persistent pain and well-being: a World Health Organization Study in Primary Care. Jama, 1998. 280(2): p. 147-51. 5. Breivik H, International association for the study of pain: update on WHO-IASP activities. J Pain Symptom Manage, 2002. 24(2): p. 97-101. 6. Astin J, Why patients use alternative medicine: Results of a national study. JAMA, 1998. 279(19): p. 1548-1553. 7. Davison SN, Jhangri GS, and Johnson JA, Cross-sectional validity of a modified Edmonton symptom assessment system in dialysis patients: a simple assessment of symptom burden. Kidney Int, 2006. 69(9): p. 1621-5. 8. Davison SN, Jhangri GS, and Johnson JA, Longitudinal validation of a modified Edmonton symptom assessment system (ESAS) in haemodialysis patients. Nephrol Dial Transplant, 2006. **21**(11): p. 3189-95. 9. Davison SN and Jhangri GS, Impact of pain and symptom burden on the health-related quality of life of hemodialysis patients. J Pain Symptom Manage, 2010. 39(3): p. 477-85. Davison S, Chronic pain in end-stage renal disease. Adv Chronic Kidney Dis, 2005. 12(3): p. 326-10. 34. 11. Kimmel PL, Emont SL, Newmann JM, Danko H, and Moss AH, ESRD patient quality of life: symptoms, spiritual beliefs, psychosocial factors, and ethnicity. Am J Kidney Dis, 2003. 42(4): p. 713-21. 12. Leinau L, Murphy TE, Bradley E, and Fried T, Relationship between conditions addressed by hemodialysis quidelines and non-ESRD-specific conditions affecting quality of life. Clin J Am Soc Nephrol, 2009. 4(3): p. 572-8. 13. Weisbord SD, Carmody SS, Bruns FJ, Rotondi AJ, Cohen LM, Zeidel ML, et al., Symptom burden, quality of life, advance care planning and the potential value of palliative care in severely ill haemodialysis patients. Nephrol Dial Transplant, 2003. 18(7): p. 1345-52. Weisbord SD, Fried LF, Arnold RM, Fine MJ, Levenson DJ, Peterson RA, et al., Prevalence, 14. severity, and importance of physical and emotional symptoms in chronic hemodialysis patients. J Am Soc Nephrol, 2005. 16(8): p. 2487-94. 15. Gamondi C, Galli N, Schonholzer C, Marone C, Zwahlen H, Gabutti L, et al., Frequency and severity of pain and symptom distress among patients with chronic kidney disease receiving dialysis. Swiss Med Wkly, 2013. 143: p. w13750. Smith BH, Elliott AM, Chambers WA, Smith WC, Hannaford PC, and Penny K, The impact of 16. chronic pain in the community. Fam Pract, 2001. 18(3): p. 292-9. 17. Merskey H, Lindblom U, Mumford JM, Nathan PW, and Sunderland S, Part III: Pain terms—a current list with definitions and notes on usage with definitions and notes on usage.. In: Merskey H, Bogduk N editor(s). Classification of Chronic Pain, IASP Task Force on Taxonomy. IASP Press, 1994(2nd Edition): p. 209-14. 18. Vuckovic S, Srebro D, Vujovic K S, Vucetic C, and Prostran M, Cannabinoids and Pain: New Insights From Old Molecules. Frontiers in pharmacology, 2018. 9: p. 1259. 19. Carr DB and Goudas LC, Acute pain. The Lancet, 1999. 353(9169): p. 2051-2058. 20. Ashburn MA and Staats PS, Management of chronic pain. The Lancet, 1999. 353(9167): p. 1865-1869. For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

1		
2		
3 ⊿		
5	21.	Kanner R <i>, Pain Management.</i> JAMA, 1986. <b>256</b> (15): p. 2112-2114.
6	22.	Loeser J, Melzack R, <i>Pain: an overview</i> . The Lancet, 1999. <b>353</b> (9164): p. 1607-1609.
7	23.	Portenoy R and Dhingra L. Assessment of cancer pain. 2017 [cited 18/04 2018].
8	24.	Gregory J and McGowan L, An examination of the prevalence of acute pain for hospitalised adult
9 10		<i>patients: a systematic review.</i> J Clin Nurs, 2016. <b>25</b> (5-6): p. 583-98.
10	25.	Treede R, Entstehung der schmerzchronifizierung. Rückenschmerzen und nackenschmerzen.
12		2016: Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
13	26.	American Geriatrics Society Panel Pharmacological management of persistent pain in older
14		<i>persons.</i> J Am Geriatr Soc, 2009. <b>57</b> : p. 1331-46.
15	27.	Breivik H, Collett B, Ventafridda V, Cohen R, and Gallacher D, Survey of chronic pain in Europe:
10		prevalence, impact on daily life, and treatment. Eur J Pain, 2006. <b>10</b> (4): p. 287-333.
18	28.	Goldberg DS and McGee SJ, Pain as a global public health priority. BMC Public Health, 2011. 11:
19		p. 770.
20	29.	Gureje O, Von Korff M, Kola L, Demyttenaere K, He Y, Posada-Villa J, et al., The relation between
21		multiple pains and mental disorders: results from the World Mental Health Surveys. PAIN, 2008.
22		<b>135</b> (1-2): p. 82-91.
24	30.	Institute of Medicine (US) Committee on Advancing Pain Research, Care, and Education,
25		Relieving pain in America: A blueprint for transforming prevention, care, education, and
26		research. National Academies Press 2011.
2/	31.	Koleva D, <i>Pain in primary care: an Italian survey</i> . Eur J Public Health, 2005. <b>15</b> : p. 475–79.
28 29	32.	Mantyselka P, Kumpusalo E, Ahonen R, Kumpusalo A, Kauhanen J, Viinamaki H, et al., Pain as a
30		reason to visit the doctor: a study in Finnish primary health care. PAIN, 2001. <b>89</b> (2-3): p. 175-80.
31	33.	Treede RD, Rief W, Barke A, Aziz Q, Bennett MI, Benoliel R, et al., A classification of chronic pain
32		for ICD-11. PAIN. 2015. <b>156</b> (6): p. 1003-7.
33 34	34.	Kelly DJ. Ahmad M. and Brull SJ. Preemptive analaesia I: physiological pathways and
35	-	pharmacological modalities. Canadian Journal of Anaesthesia. 2001. <b>48</b> (10): p. 1000-1010.
36	35.	Pogatzki-Zahn FM. Segelcke D. and Schug SA. Postoperative pain-from mechanisms to
37		<i>treatment</i> . Pain Rep. 2017. <b>2</b> (2): p. e588.
38	36.	Lipowski Z. Chronic idiopathic pain syndrome. Annals of Medicine, 1990, <b>22</b> (4): p. 213-217.
39 40	37.	Goucke C. The management of persistent pain. Med J Aust. 2003. <b>178</b> (9): p. 444-7.
41	38.	Chang V. Approach to symptom assessment in palliative care, 2018 [cited 2018.
42	39.	Knowles CH and Aziz O. Basic and clinical aspects of aastrointestinal pain. Pain. 2009. <b>141</b> (3): p.
43	001	191-209
44	40	Stein S.L. Chronic nelvic nain, Gastroenterol Clin North Am, 2013, <b>42</b> (4): n, 785-800
45 46	те. 41	Schwartz FS and Gebhart GE Visceral nain Curr Ton Behav Neurosci 2014 <b>20</b> : n 171-97
40	41. 42	Giamberardino M. Affaitati G. and Costantini R. Chanter 24 Referred pain from internal organs
48	72.	Handh Clin Neurol 2006 <b>81</b> : p. 343-61
49	13	Iensen TS Baron B Haannaa M Kalso E Loeser ID Rice AS et al. A new definition of neuronathic
50	45.	ngin Dain 2011 <b>152</b> (10): p. 2204-5
51	4.4	Handacha Classification Committee of the International Headache Society. The International
52	44.	Classification of Handacha Disorders, 2rd edition (heta version) Conhololaria, 2012, <b>22</b> : p. 620
54		
55		
56		
57 58		
59		
60		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

- 45. Institute for clinical systems improvement, Health care guideline: Assessment and management of chronic pain. 2009.
  - 46. United Nations office on drugs and crime, World Drug Report, United Nations. 2016.
  - 47. Russo E, Cannabinoids in the management of difficult to treat pain. Ther Clin Risk Manag, 2008. **4**(1): p. 245-59.
  - Ueda N, Tsuboi K, and Uyama T, Metabolic enzymes for endocannabinoids and 48. endocannabinoid-like mediators. 2015, Boston: Academic Press.
- 49. Devane WA, Hanus L, Breuer A, Pertwee RG, Stevenson LA, Griffin G, et al., Isolation and structure of a brain constituent that binds to the cannabinoid receptor. Science, 1992. 258(5090): p. 1946-9.
  - 50. Mechoulam R, Ben-Shabat S, Hanus L, Ligumsky M, Kaminski NE, Schatz AR, et al., Identification of an endogenous 2-monoglyceride, present in canine gut, that binds to cannabinoid receptors. Biochem Pharmacol, 1995. 50(1): p. 83-90.
- 51. Sugiura T, Kondo S, Sukagawa A, Nakane S, Shinoda A, Itoh K, et al., 2-Arachidonoylqlycerol: a possible endogenous cannabinoid receptor ligand in brain. Biochem Biophys Res Commun, 1995. 215(1): p. 89-97.
- 52. Fisar Z, *Phytocannabinoids and endocannabinoids*. Curr Drug Abuse Rev, 2009. **2**(1): p. 51-75.
- 53. Häuser W, Fitzcharles M, Radbruch L, and Petzke F, Cannabinoids in pain management and palliative medicine. Deutsches Arzteblatt international, 2017. **114**(38): p. 627-634.
- 54. Hazekamp A, Ware MA, Muller-Vahl KR, Abrams D, and Grotenhermen F, The medicinal use of cannabis and cannabinoids—An international cross-sectional survey on administration forms. Journal of Psychoactive Drugs, 2013. 45(3): p. 199-210.
- 55. Watson SJ, Benson JA, and Joy JE, Marijuana and medicine: assessing the science base: a summary of the 1999 Institute of Medicine report. Arch Gen Psychiatry, 2000. 57(6): p. 547-52.
- 56. Brenneisen R, Chemistry and analysis of phytocannabinoids and other cannabis constituents, in Marijuana and the Cannabinoids, ElSohly M A, Editor. 2007, Humana Press: Totowa, NJ. p. 17-49.
- 57. Pertwee R, Cannabis and cannabinoids: Pharmacology and rationale for clinical use. Pharmacy and Pharmacology Communications, 1997. 3(11): p. 539-545.
- 58. Solinas M, Goldberg SR, and Piomelli D, The endocannabinoid system in brain reward processes. Br J Pharmacol, 2008. 154(2): p. 369-83.
- 42 59. Koppel BS, Brust J, Fife T, Bronstein J, Youssof S, Gronseth G, et al., Systematic review: efficacy and safety of medical marijuana in selected neurologic disorders: report of the Guideline Development Subcommittee of the American Academy of Neurology. Neurology, 2014. 82(17): p. 1556-63.
  - 60. Gorelick D, Saxon A, and Hermann R Cannabis use and disorder: Pathogenesis and pharmacology. UpToDate Cannabis use and disorder: Pathogenesis and pharmacology, 2018. [cited Access 2018 Access Date].
    - Morean ME, Kong G, Camenga DR, Cavallo DA, and Krishnan-Sarin S, High school students' use 61. of electronic cigarettes to vaporize cannabis. Pediatrics, 2015. **136**(4): p. 611-616.

59 60

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

29 30

31

32

33

34

35 36

37

38

39

40 41

43

44

45

46 47

48

49

50

51 52

## BMJ Open

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.	Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-031574 on 31 October 2019. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 12, 2025 at Ac
---	---

ω

62.	Loflin M and Earleywine M, No smoke, no fire: What the initial literature suggests regardir vapourized cannabis and respiratory risk. Canadian journal of respiratory therapy, 2015, <b>51</b> (1)
	p. 7-9.
63.	Aviram J and Samuelly-Leichtag G, Efficacy of Cannabis-Based Medicines for Pain Management A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. Pain Physician, 201 <b>20</b> (6): p. F755-e796.
64.	Lynch M, Campbell, F, Cannabinoids for treatment of chronic non-cancer pain; a systemat review of randomized trials. Br J Clin Pharmacol, 2011. <b>72</b> (5): p. 735-44.
65.	Meng H, Johnston B, Englesakis M, Moulin DE, and Bhatia A, Selective Cannabinoids for Chron Neuropathic Pain: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. Anesth Analg, 2017. <b>125</b> (5): p. 1638 1652.
66.	Boychuk DG, Goddard G, Mauro G, and Orellana MF, The effectiveness of cannabinoids in the management of chronic nonmalignant neuropathic pain: a systematic review. J Oral Facial Pa Headache, 2015. <b>29</b> (1): p. 7-14.
67.	Martin-Sanchez E, Furukawa TA, Taylor J, and Martin JL, <i>Systematic review and meta-analysis cannabis treatment for chronic pain</i> . Pain Med, 2009. <b>10</b> (8): p. 1353-68.
58.	Campbell FA, Tramèr MR, Carroll D, Reynolds DJ, Moore RA, and McQuay HJ, Are cannabinoid an effective and safe treatment option in the management of pain? A qualitative systemat review. BMJ (Clinical research ed.), 2001. <b>323</b> (7303): p. 13-16.
59.	Deshpande A, Mailis-Gagnon A, Zoheiry N, and Lakha SF, <i>Efficacy and adverse effects of medic</i> marijuana for chronic noncancer pain: Systematic review of randomized controlled trials. Ca Fam Physician, 2015, <b>61</b> (8): p. e372-81.
70.	Stevens AJ and Higgins MD, A systematic review of the analgesic efficacy of cannabinon medications in the management of acute pain. Acta Anaesthesiol Scand, 2017. <b>61</b> (3): p. 268 280
71.	Walitt B, Klose P, Fitzcharles MA, Phillips T, and Hauser W, Cannabinoids for fibromyalgia Cochrane Database Syst Rev, 2016. 7: p. Cd011694.
72.	Mucke M, Phillips T, Radbruch L, Petzke F, and Hauser W, <i>Cannabis-based medicines for chron</i> neuropathic pain in adults. Cochrane Database Syst Rev, 2018. <b>3</b> : p. Cd012182.
73.	Boydell J, Van Os J, Caspi A, Kennedy N, Giouroukou E, Fearon P, et al., <i>Trends in cannabis us prior to first presentation with schizophrenia, in South-East London between 1965 and 199</i> . Psychological Medicine, 2006. <b>36</b> (10): p. 1441-1446.
74.	Andreasson S, Allebeck P, Engstrom A, and Rydberg U, <i>Cannabis and schizophrenia. longitudinal study of Swedish conscripts.</i> Lancet, 1987. <b>2</b> (8574): p. 1483-6.
75.	Arseneault L, Cannon M, Poulton R, Murray R, Caspi A, and Moffitt TE, <i>Cannabis use a adolescence and risk for adult psychosis: longitudinal prospective study.</i> Bmj, 2002. <b>325</b> (7374 p. 1212-3.
76.	van Os J, Bak M, Hanssen M, Bijl R V, de Graaf R, and Verdoux H, <i>Cannabis use and psychosis:</i> longitudinal population-based study. Am J Epidemiol, 2002. <b>156</b> (4): p. 319-27.
77.	Zammit S, Allebeck P, Andreasson S, Lundberg I, and Lewis G, Self reported cannabis use as risk factor for schizophrenia in Swedish conscripts of 1969: historical cohort study. Bmj, 200. <b>325</b> (7374): p. 1199.

- 78. Fergusson DM, Horwood LJ, and Ridder EM, Tests of causal linkages between cannabis use and psychotic symptoms. Addiction, 2005. 100(3): p. 354-66.
- 79. Henquet C, Krabbendam L, Spauwen J, Kaplan C, Lieb R, Wittchen HU, et al., Prospective cohort study of cannabis use, predisposition for psychosis, and psychotic symptoms in young people. Bmj, 2005. 330(7481): p. 11.
- 80. Di Forti M, Quattrone D, Freeman TP, Tripoli G, Gayer-Anderson C, Quigley H, et al., The contribution of cannabis use to variation in the incidence of psychotic disorder across Europe (EU-GEI): a multicentre case-control study. Lancet Psychiatry, 2019. 6(5): p. 427-436.
- 81. Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al., Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and *explanation.* Bmj, 2015. **350**: p. g7647.
- 82. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al., Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. Syst Rev, 2015. **4**: p. 1.
- 83. International conference on harmonisation of technical requirements for registration of pharmaceuticals for human use (ICH) adopts consolidated guideline on good clinical practice in the conduct of clinical trials on medicinal products for human use. Int Dig Health Legis, 1997. 48(2): p. 231-4.
- 84. Richards J R, Bing M L, Moulin A K, Elder J W, Rominski R T, Summers P J, et al., Cannabis use and acute coronary syndrome. Clinical toxicology (Philadelphia, Pa.), 2019: p. 1-11.
- 28 Higgins J and Green S. Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions version 5.1.0. 85. 29 30 www.handbook.cochrane.org. 2011. 31
  - 86. Review Manager (RevMan). 2014, Copenhagen: the Nordic Cochrane Centre, The Cochrane Collaboration.
- 33 87. TSA—Trial Sequential Analysis. Copenhagen Trial Unit. http://www.ctu.dk/tsa/ 34
- StataCorp: Stata: Release 14. 2014, College Station, TX: StataCorp LP. 88. 35

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27

32

46 47

48

49

50

51 52

- 36 89. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, and Altman DG, Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews 37 and meta-analyses: The PRISMA statement. PLOS Medicine, 2009. 6(7): p. e1000097. 38
  - 90. Gluud LL, Bias in clinical intervention research. Am J Epidemiol, 2006. 163(6): p. 493-501.
- 39 91. Kjaergard LL, Villumsen J, and Gluud C, Reported methodologic quality and discrepancies 40 41 between large and small randomized trials in meta-analyses. Ann Intern Med, 2001. 135(11): p. 42 982-9.
- 43 92. Lundh A, Sismondo, S, Lexchin, J, Busuioc, OA, Bero, L, Industry sponsorship and research 44 outcome. Cochrane Database Syst Rev, 2012. 12: p. Mr000033. 45
  - 93. Moher D, Pham, B, Jones, A, Cook, DJ, Jadad, AR, Moher, M et al., Does quality of reports of randomised trials affect estimates of intervention efficacy reported in meta-analyses? Lancet, 1998. **352**(9128): p. 609-13.
    - 94. Schulz KF, Chalmers I, Hayes RJ, and Altman DG, Empirical evidence of bias. Dimensions of methodological quality associated with estimates of treatment effects in controlled trials. JAMA, 1995. 273(5): p. 408-12.

1 ว		
2		
4	05	Mood L Egger M Cluud L Schulz K Jüni D Altmon D et al. Empirical avidence of bigs in
5	95.	wood L, Egger IVI, Gluud L, Schulz K, Juni P, Altman D, et al., Empirical evidence of bias in
6		treatment effect estimates in controlled trials with different interventions and outcomes: meta-
7		epidemiological study. BMJ, 2008. <b>336</b> (7644): p. 601-605.
8	96.	Savovic J, Jones H, Altman D, Harris R, Juni P, Pildal J, et al., Influence of reported study design
9 10		characteristics on intervention effect estimates from randomised controlled trials: combined
10		analysis of meta-epidemiological studies. Health Technol Assess, 2012. <b>16</b> (35): p. 1-82.
12	97.	Higgins JP and Thompson SG, Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. Stat Med, 2002.
13		<b>21</b> (11): p. 1539-58.
14	98.	Higgins JP. Thompson SG. Deeks JJ. and Altman DG. <i>Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses</i> .
15		BMI 2003 <b>327</b> (7414): n 557-60
16	00	Harbord BM Egger M and Sterne IA A modified test for small-study effects in meta-analyses of
17	55.	controlled trials with bingry and points. Stat Mod. 2006. 2E(20): p. 2442.57
18	100	Controlled thus with bindry endpoints. Stat Med, 2006. <b>23</b> (20). p. 5445-57.
19 20	100.	Egger M, Davey Smith G, Schneider M, and Minder C, Bids in meta-analysis detected by a simple,
20		graphical test. BMJ, 1997. <b>315</b> (7109): p. 629-34.
22	101.	Begg CB and Mazumdar M, Operating characteristics of a rank correlation test for publication
23		<i>bias.</i> Biometrics, 1994. <b>50</b> (4): p. 1088-101.
24	102.	Elbourne D, Altman D, Higgins J, Curtin F, Worthington H, and Vail A, Meta-analyses involving
25		cross-over trials: methodological issues. International Journal of Epidemiology, 2002. 31(1): p.
26		140-149.
27 28	103.	Jakobsen JC, Wetterslev J, Winkel P, Lange T, and Gluud C, Thresholds for statistical and clinical
20 29		significance in systematic reviews with meta-analytic methods. BMC Med Res Methodol, 2014.
30		<b>14</b> : n. 120.
31	104	Hagg O Fritzell P and Nordwall A The clinical importance of changes in outcome scores after
32	104.	treatment for chronic low back nain Eur Spine 1 2003 <b>12</b> (1): p 12-20
33	105	Looschko P. Singer I. and Guyatt CH. Measurement of health status. Ascertaining the minimal
34 25	105.	slinically important difference. Control Clin Triole 1080 10(4): p. 407.15
35 36	100	Clinically important all perence. Control Clini Inais, 1989. 10(4): p. 407-15.
30 37	106.	Olsen MF, Bjerre E, Hansen MD, Hilden J, Landler NE, Tendal B, et al., Pain relief that matters to
38		patients: systematic review of empirical studies assessing the minimum clinically important
39		difference in acute pain. BMC Med, 2017. <b>15</b> (1): p. 35.
40	107.	Olsen MF, Bjerre E, Hansen MD, Tendal B, Hilden J, and Hrobjartsson A, Minimum clinically
41		important differences in chronic pain vary considerably by baseline pain and methodological
42		factors: systematic review of empirical studies. J Clin Epidemiol, 2018. 101: p. 87-106.e2.
43	108.	Keus F, Wetterslev J, Gluud C, and van Laarhoven CJ, Evidence at a glance: error matrix approach
44 15		for overviewing available evidence. BMC Med Res Methodol, 2010. <b>10</b> : p. 90.
46	109.	DerSimonian R and Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. Control Clin Trials. 1986. 7(3): p. 177-
47		88
48	110	DeMets DL Methods for combining randomized clinical trials: strengths and limitations. Stat
49	110.	Mod $1097 \ 6(2)$ = 241 EQ
50	111	Meu, 1967. <b>6</b> (5). p. 541-50.
51	111.	Jakobsen J C, wetterslev J, Lange T, and Gluud C, viewpoint: taking into account risks of random
52 53		errors wrien analysing multiple outcomes in systematic reviews. Cochrane Database of
55		Systematic Reviews, 2016(3).
55		
56		
57		

59 60

112. Wetterslev J, Thorlund K, Brok J, and Gluud C, *Trial sequential analysis may establish when firm evidence is reached in cumulative meta-analysis.* J Clin Epidemiol, 2008. **61**(1): p. 64-75.

- 113. Thorlund K W J, Brok J, Imberger G, Gluud C, User manual for trial sequential analysis (TSA). 2011.
- 114. Brok J, Thorlund K, Gluud C, and Wetterslev J, *Trial sequential analysis reveals insufficient information size and potentially false positive results in many meta-analyses.* J Clin Epidemiol, 2008. **61**(8): p. 763-9.
- 115. Brok J, Thorlund K, Wetterslev J, and Gluud C, Apparently conclusive meta-analyses may be inconclusive--Trial sequential analysis adjustment of random error risk due to repetitive testing of accumulating data in apparently conclusive neonatal meta-analyses. Int J Epidemiol, 2009. 38(1): p. 287-98.
- 116. Thorlund K, Devereaux PJ, Wetterslev J, Guyatt G, Ioannidis JP, Thabane L, et al., *Can trial sequential monitoring boundaries reduce spurious inferences from meta-analyses?* Int J Epidemiol, 2009. **38**(1): p. 276-86.
  - 117. Wetterslev J, Thorlund K, Brok J, and Gluud C, *Estimating required information size by quantifying diversity in random-effects model meta-analyses.* BMC Med Res Methodol, 2009. **9**: p. 86.
- 118. Thorlund K, Anema A, and Mills E, Interpreting meta-analysis according to the adequacy of sample size. An example using isoniazid chemoprophylaxis for tuberculosis in purified protein derivative negative HIV-infected individuals. Clin Epidemiol, 2010. **2**: p. 57-66.
- 119. Imberger G, Gluud C, Boylan J, and Wetterslev J, Systematic reviews of anesthesiologic interventions reported as statistically significant: problems with power, precision, and type 1 error protection. Anesth Analg, 2015. **121**(6): p. 1611-22.
- 120. Imberger G, Thorlund K, Gluud C, and Wetterslev J, False-positive findings in Cochrane metaanalyses with and without application of trial sequential analysis: an empirical review. BMJ Open, 2016. **6**(8).
- Guyatt G, Oxman A, Vist G, Kunz R, Falck-Ytter Y, Alonso-Coello P, et al., GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. BMJ, 2008.
  336(7650): p. 924-926.
- 122. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Schunemann HJ, Tugwell P, and Knottnerus A, *GRADE guidelines: a new* series of articles in the Journal of Clinical Epidemiology. J Clin Epidemiol, 2011. **64**(4): p. 380-2.
- 123. Schunemann HJ, Best D, Vist G, and Oxman AD, Letters, numbers, symbols and words: how to communicate grades of evidence and recommendations. CMAJ, 2003. **169**(7): p. 677-80.
  - 124. Voscopoulos C and Lema M, *When does acute pain become chronic?* Br J Anaesth, 2010. **105 Suppl 1**: p. i69-85.

First author	Title	Year of publicatio n	Design	Type of cannabino id	Types of participan ts	Information sources	No. of trials	No. of participan ts	Published protocol	Outcomes	Assessmen of adverse events	t Assessment of risk of bias	Accounts of for random of error	Use of the GRADE	Conclusion
Lynch & Campbell	Cannabino ids for treatment of chronic non-cancer pain; a systematic review of randomize d trials	2011	Systematic Review	Phytocan nabinolds; Smoked cannabis, oromucosa l extracts of cannabis- based medicine, and synthetic cannabino ids; nobilone, dronabinol and a novel THC	Neuropathi c pain, fibromyalg ia, rheumatoi d arthritis, and mixed chronic pain.	PubMed: EMIASE, CINAHI, (EBSCO), Paycinfi (EBSCO), Paycinfi (EBSCO), Cochrane Libros, Itali Web of Science, ABI Inform (Proquest), Discartation Abstracts Discartification, Control (Proquest), Academic Saarch Premier (EBSCO), Clinical Trials.gew, Trials.central.eg, Individual pharmaceutical company trials sites for Eli LIIIy and Giascsmithkline, Okister (OLCL) and Google Scholar.	18 comparin the interventi n with placebo	via C	<sup>2</sup> pei	e primary outcrews with chronic non-cancer pain The secondary outcrews were sleep, function, an quality of life.	s Yes	Yes, except for reporting bias, publication bias and for profit bias	No 1	No	Overall three is evidence that cannabinolds are safe and modestly effective in neuropathic pain with pelliminary evidence of efficary in filteromyakia pain with theomatoid arthritis. Did not pool data for meta-analysis but data was described qualitatively.
Meng et. al	Selective Cannabino ids for Chronic Neuropathi c Pain: A Systematic Review and Meta- analysis	2017	Systematic Review and Meta- analysis	Dronabinol , nabilone and nabiximols	Neuropathi	Medline, Embase, Cochrane Libray, Cochrane Libray, PROSPERO, Cilincaltrials, gov, and Google Scholar. Pain Societise (American Societise) (American Societise) (American Society of Anasethesiology, International Association for the Study of Pain, Medicine, Society of Ragional Anesthesia and Pain Medicine, European Society of Ragional Anesthesia and Pain Therapy, and World Institute of Pain in the last 2 years were also searched.	11 (10 trials comparin the interventi n with placebo)	1219 8 8 io	No	The primary outcome we internative of a final mean of a final	s Yes d d	Yes	Bonferoni * adjustment for multiple for multiple testing was not performed as per recommend ations in the Cochrane Handbook.	Yes	Selective canabinologie provide a cmail andgesic benefit in patients with cheroic meuropathic pain.
Martín-Sór	Systematic Review and Meta-anal ysis of Cannabis Treatment for Chronic Pain	2009	Meta-anal ysis	Phytocan nabinoids and synthetic derivates of THC, such as dronabinol , nabilone, or benzopyra noperidine (a synthetic nitrogen analog of THC)	Chronic pain of a pathologic al or traumatic origin	Medline/Pubmed, Embase, and The Cochrane Controlled Trials Register (CENTRAL)	18	3	No	The primary outcome we interative of pain as scored by numerical ran scales. The Secondary outcome were CNS related events	s Yes	Yes, except for reporting bias, detection bias and for profit bias	No 1	No	Currently available evidence suggests that cannabis treatment is moderately efficacious for efficacious for ef
Boychuk et. al	The Effectiven ess of Cannabino ids in the Managem ent of Chronic Chronic Noomalign ant Neuropathi c Paln: A Systematic Review	2015	Systematic Review	Phytocan nabinoids; smokad cannabis, cannabis, cannabis, extracts (CBME) in the form of oromucosa (CBME) in the form of oromucosa (CBME) in the form of oromucosa (CBME) in the form of oromucosa synthetic cannabinon , nabilone, , nabilone, and CT-3	Neuropathi c pain	PubMed, Embase, Web of Science, and all evidence-based medicine reviews and databases (Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, ASP Journal Club, Database of Reviews, ASP Journal (DAR), and Cochrane Controlled Trials Register [CCTR]]	13	771	No	Outcomes considered were reduction twice in the output intensity and adverse events:	Yes	Yes, except for, reporting bias, publication bias and for- profit bias	No 1	No	Canabis-based medicinal extracts used in different populations of chronic non- malignant neuropathic pain patients may provide effective analgesia effective analgesia conditions that are refractory to other treatments.
Mücke et. al	Cannabis products for adults with chronic neuropathi c pain	2018	Cochrane Review	Phytocan nabinolds; oromucosa 1 spray containing THC or THC/CBD smokad cannabis containing THC/THC/CBD and CBD as extract of cannabis sative L, and s synthetic cannabilone, dronabinol	Neuropathi c pain	Cochrane Ulbrary, MEDLINE and EMARSE Following clinical trials databases were searched for additional upoblibited data: US National Institutes of Health clinical trial register (www.clinical Trials.Register (www.clinical Trials.Register (www.clinical Trials.Register (www.clinical Trials.Register (www.clinical Trials.Register (www.clinical Trials.Register (www.clinical Trials.Register (www.clinical Trials.Register (www.clinical Trials.Register (www.clinical Trials.Register (clinical Trials.Register) (clinical Trials.Register (k), and Issemational Medicines (k), and Issemational Medicines	16 (15 of the trials comparin the intervent n with placebo)	1750 8 io	Yes	Primary outcomes: Participant-reported pai relief of 50% or greaters neurosabile pain zones pain conves i for an energy pain conves i for an energy macacres were used by studies; PGIC (Patient Global Impression of Champy PGIC (Patient Global Impression of Champy Resource); PGIC (Patient Global Impression of Champy Mohran events tolerability); Stefous adverse events (cafety), Selious adverse (cafety), Seli	Yes	Yes	No 1	Yes	The potential benefits of cannabit-based medicine (herbal cannabis, plant. derived or synthetic THC, THC/CBD, and the original or the original pain might be outweighed by their potential harms.
Aviram et. al	Efficacy of Cannabis- Based Medicines for Pain Managem ent: A Systematic Review and Meta- Analysis of Randomize d Controlled Trials	2017	Meta- Analysis	Phytocan nabinoids; Satives/na bikimol, cannabidio l, cannabinol d cigarettes/ vaporizer, and synthetic cannabinol and nabilone, CT-3, ajulemic acid, synthetic nitrogen analog of tetrahydro cannabinol	Chronic (cancer and non- cancer) pain and acute postoperat hve pain	(www.cannabis- MCDUNE/FWamed and In Google Scholar using Medical Subject Heading (MeSri) terms	43 trials comparin the intervent n with both 'active drugs' an placebo	g 2437 io d	No	at any does results in The outcome measure that uses chosen was the variable "public barrows of numerical rating scale numerical rating scale (MS-11), numerical 11- point box (MS-1), values analog scale (VAS), and the VAS access of the MGCIII pain Questionnaire	Yes	Yes, except for, reporting blas, publication blas and for profit blas	No 1	No	The current systematic review suggests that cannabinol-based melticless might be effective for dronoic effective for dronoic pathanet for pathanet for patients.
Campbell et. al	Are cannabinoi ds an effective and safe treatment option in the manageme nt of pain? A qualitative systematic review	2001	Systematic Review	(NIB), fatty Crail THC, an oral synthetic nitrogen analogue of THC (NIB), oral benzopyra noperidine (BPP), and intramuscu lar levonantra dol	Acute, chronic non- malignant pain, and cancer pain	MEDIINE, EMBASE, Oxford Pain Database, and Cochrane Ubrary	9	222	No	Outcome measures for pain intensity; pain relie the use of upplementary analgenia; patients' preferences; and advers effects.	Yes ; ;	Yes, except for, reporting bias, publication bias and for- profit bias	No I	No	Cannabinoids are no more effective than codeline in controlling pain and have depressant effects on the central nervous system that limit their the central nervous system that limit their cancel and the system cancel and the system pain management Is therefore understable. In acute postoperative pain they should not be used.
Deshpand e et. al	Efficacy and adverse effects of medical marijuana for chronic noncancer pain	2015	Systematic Review	Cigarettes or vaporizer containing delta-9- THC	Neuropathi c pain	MEDUNE, EMBASE, and the International Phormaceutical Abstracts	6 trials comparin interventi n with placebo. Placebo being cigarette: or vaporizer containin 0% delta- THC or with cannabin d remova	226 6 8 9 	No	For automes, pain scores some extracted uning the visual analogs cole (VA3) or an alternative numerical pain rating root. If pain scores some not reported forctiveness were included (sleep, function diffectiveness were included (sleep, function diffectiveness were included (sleep, function diffectiveness were included (sleep, function adverse affects was collected.	Yes	Yes, except for, reporting bias, publication bias and for profit bias	No 1	No	There is evidence for the use of low-dose refractory "upon in refractory" neuropathic pain in conjunction with traditional analgesisc. However, trials were limited by wariability in dosing and strength of data- 9. tstrahydrocannabinol, and lake of functional and strength of data- 9. tstrahydrocannabinol, and strength of data- 9. tstrahydrocannabinol, and strength of data- 9. tstrahydrocannabinol, and strength of data- 9. tstrahydrocannabinol, and tsrength of the strahydrocannabinol, and t
Stevens et	A systematic review of the analgesic efficacy of cannabinoi d medication s in the manageme nt of acute pair	2017	Systematic Review	Levonantra dol, nabilone, A2D1940, GW842166 , dronabinol , +-9-THC	Acute postoperat ive pain	MEDLINE, EMBASE, Cochrane Library, and the World Health Organization International Clinical Trials Registry Platform	7 trials comparin interventi n with placebo, Ketoprofe , Pethidine Naproxen and Ibuprofen	611 8 io 8 5 6	Yes	The primary outcome wi the qualitative analysis the analgetic efficacy or cannabinoids in the management of acute pain compared to placel or active comparator. The secondary outcome was the qualitative analysis of the reported adverse effects	s Yes if	Yes, except for, publication bias and for- profit bias	No y	Yes	Based on the available randomized controlled trial evidence, cannabinoids have no role in the management of acute pain.
Walitt et. al	pain Cannabino ids for fibromyalg ia	2016	Cochrane Review	Nabilone	Fibromyalg	Cochrane Library, MEDLINE and EMBASE	2 trials comparin the interventi n with either (1) placebo c (1) amitriptyl ne	72 (40) 8 57 11	Yes	Primary outcomes: Participant-reported pair relief of 50% or greater. PGIC (Patient Global Improved. Withdrawal due to adverse events (tolerability). Sorious adverse events (colarability).	Yes	Yes, except for publication bias.	No	Yes	We found no convincing, unbiased, high quality oxidence suggesting that nabilitone is of values in treating people with forcomyaligis. The tolerability of nabilicene vas low in people with forcomyaligis.

> For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj common and the state of the

# Appendix

### **Minimal important difference**

For the determination of minimal important differences in clinical trials two types of methods are available; anchor-based methods and distributional-based methods [1].

#### Anchor-based methods

Anchor-based methods relate the change in on a person reported outcome score, (e.g. a score on the visual analog scale (VAS)) to a subjective global assessment rating (e.g. scores from the Clinical Global Impressions-Improvement (CGI-I)) which is used as an 'anchor' [1]. Ideally, there needs to be an established association between the person reported outcome score and the 'anchor' to make any meaningful inference about a minimal important difference [2].

There are two subtypes of anchor-based methods, i.e., the 'within-patient score' and the 'between-patients' score' [1].

- Within-patient score defines minimal important difference as the average minimal change in a given person's reported outcome score that leads to a clinically observable change in the subjective global assessment rating (the latter is used as an anchor) [1]. For example, to ascertain the minimal important difference regarding depression management, Moncrieff et. al describes the linking of within-patient scores (change from baseline) scores on the Hamilton Depression Rating Scale (the most commonly used depression rating scale) to scores on the Clinical Global Impressions-Improvement (CGI-I) scale, a scale which rates improvement on a scale of 1 (very much improved from baseline) through 4 (no change from baseline) to 7 (very much worse from baseline) [3]. Moncrieff et. al conclude that seven points on the Hamilton Depression Rating Scale correspond to a minimal important difference when using within-patient scores [3].
- The between-patients score method, also known as 'the group difference' method, compare the reported outcome scores between a group of people with no clinically observable change (based on a subjective global assessment rating (used as an anchor)) to a group of people with clinically observable change (based on a subjective global assessment rating (used as an anchor)). The minimal important difference is then estimated as the mean difference between these two groups [4]. For example, Musoro et. al defines the minimal important difference (MID) as the group difference in terms of quality of life assessed by HRQOL scores [5]. Participants were assigned to distinct subgroups reflecting various levels of change (e.g. no change, small positive changes, large positive changes, small negative changes or large negative changes). The group difference was identified by the

#### **BMJ** Open

comparison of the average of the HRQOL scores of the group of participants with at 'small change' to the HRQOL scores of the group of participants with 'no change' [5].

There are also other anchor-based methods (e.g. the sensitivity- and specificity-based method and the social comparison method) [1]. The sensitivity- and specificity-based method aims to identify the minimal important difference that allows for the best discrimination between groups of patients (i.e., the score that produces the greatest sensitivity and specificity) [1]. For example, an outcome measure (e.g. NRS score) is considered a 'diagnostic test' and the anchor (e.g. Global Perceived Effect) is used as gold standard and hence standard methods may be used to estimate sensitivity and specificity. Sensitivity is the proportion of patients who report an improvement on the external criterion (anchor) and whose person reported outcome scores are above the threshold minimal important difference value [1]. Specificity is the proportion of patients who do not report an improvement on the external criterion (anchor) and whose person reported outcome scores are below the threshold minimal important difference value [1]. Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves are then used to identify the person reported outcome score with the greatest sensitivity and specificity [6-8].

### The distributional-based methods

Distribution-based methods are based on the statistical characteristics of the obtained sample [9]. Crosby et. al [9] have identified two general types of distribution-based methods for estimations of minimal important differences:

The first type of distribution-based method evaluate change in relation to sample variation [9]. Different types of variation can be used: effect size, standardised response mean, and responsiveness statistic [9]. The effect size represents individual change in relation to the number of pre-test standard deviations (SDs) [9]. Cohen et. al has suggested benchmarks to better interpret the effect sizes: .20 for "small" effects, .50 for "moderate" effects, and .80 for "large" effects [10]. Whereas the effect size is the ratio of individual change to the baseline standard deviation of the sample, standardised response mean is the ratio of individual change to the standard deviation of that change [11]. A large standardised response mean indicates that the change is large in comparison to the background variability in the measurements [9]. Guyatt et. al has proposed a responsiveness statistic as a variation of standardised response mean; calculated by dividing the difference between pre-test and post-test by the standard deviation of change observed for a group of stable participants [12].

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

• The second type distribution-based method is based on the measurement precision of the instrument [9]. This method include the standard error of the mean (SEM) and evaluate the change in relation to variation of the instrument as opposed to variation in the sample [9]. Standard error of the mean (SEM) is a measure of the precision of a test instrument and considered an attribute of the measure and not a characteristic of the sample per se [13]. The standard error of the mean (SEM) for a given measure is likely to vary across samples depending upon the method used to estimate reliability and the presence of extreme scores [9]. Different thresholds for a minimal important difference have been suggested, i.e., values of 1 SEM [14], 1.96 SEM [15], and 2.77 SEM [13, 15].

In conclusion, different methods for estimating minimal important differences exist, but no single method has been shown to be the optimal method. The question of whether to use anchor-based or distribution-based methods for determining clinically meaningful change has received considerable attention and debate [9]. Dworkin et. al defined the clinical importance of patient improvement as the clinically important changes in individuals that can be identified using either within-patient anchor-based method or distributional-based method [16, 17], while the clinical importance of group differences could be the clinical difference between a treatment group and a placebo group or between two different treatment groups [18]. Dworkin et. al claim that the clinical important difference identified in individuals cannot be directly extrapolated to the evaluation of group differences [17, 19-22]. The U.S. Food and Drug Administration also states in their web site "When defining meaningful change on an individual patient basis, that definition is generally larger than the minimum important difference for application to group mean comparisons" [22].

While it is claimed that the within-patient differences are larger than the between-group difference [22], based on the studies included in our review we are not able to find a significant difference between the minimal important difference estimated by the two different methods.

## Previously conducted reviews on this subject

- Lynch & Campbell and Boychuk et. al both concluded that cannabinoids are a modestly effective and a safe treatment option for neuropathic pain [23, 24]. Lynch & Campbell and Boychuk et. al did not publish a protocol on beforehand [23, 24].
- Meng et. al concluded that there is moderate quality evidence to suggest that nabiximols (phytocannabinoid mixture) is effective in reducing neuropathic pain [25].

- Mücke et. al concluded that there is no high-quality evidence for the efficacy of any cannabis-based medicine in any condition with chronic neuropathic pain [26]. Mücke et. al further concluded that some adverse events may limit the clinical usefulness of cannabis-based medicines [26].
- Deshpande et. al concluded that current evidence suggests that very low-dose medical marijuana (< 34 mg/d) is associated with an improvement in refractory neuropathic pain of moderate severity in adults using concurrent analgesics. Deshpande et. al did not publish a protocol on beforehand [27].
- Martín-Sánchez et. al concluded that treatment of chronic pain based on cannabinoid compounds would entail more risk of adverse events than benefit [28]. Martín-Sánchez et. al included trials randomising participants with either neuropathic pain, cancer pain, fibromyalgia related pain and nociceptive pain [28]. Martín-Sánchez et. al did not publish a protocol on beforehand [28].
- Aviram et. al concluded that cannabinoid-based medicines were not effective for postoperative pain, however further investigation is advised [29]. Aviram et. al also concluded that evidence suggests a moderate to good treatment effect on neuropathic pain [29]. Furthermore, neuropathic pain patients should be advised that the inhalation of cannabinoids showed relatively better pain reduction effects than other routes of administration [29]. Aviram et. al stated that the total number of adverse events that were accumulated in the meta-analysis indicated that cannabinoid-based medicines should be used with caution [29]. Aviram et. al did not publish a protocol on beforehand [29].
- Campbell et. al concluded that levonantradol (synthetic cannabinoid analogue) was superior to placebo on postoperative pain but no more effective than codeine [30]. Campbell et. al also stated that there are suggestions of efficacy in spasticity and in neuropathic pain and that increasing the cannabinoid dose to increase the analgesia will increase adverse effects [30]. Campbell et. al did not publish a protocol on beforehand [30].
- Stevens et. al concluded that cannabinoids have no role in the management of acute pain, but cannabinoids were found to be well-tolerated, with most reported adverse effects only mild to moderate in severity [31].
- Walitt et. al concluded that no convincing, unbiased evidence suggests that nabilone (synthetic cannabinoid analog) is of value in treating people with fibromyalgia [32]. The tolerability of nabilone was low and adverse events (particularly somnolence, dizziness, vertigo) may limit its clinical usefulness [32].

TABEL 1

Fire	Ti+l	Vo	Πο	Type	Tv	Inform	No	N	D	Outco	٨с	٨c	Acc	11	Conc
+		) ie	cig	of	no	ation				mac	A3 60			6	lucio
ι ου+		of	51g	cann	pe	courco	of	of	u hl	iiies	30	30	tc	3	n
hor			11	abin	of	source	+ri	0	ic		33 m	33 m	for		
101		pu bli		abin	nor	5		pa rti	h b		on	on	ran	f f	
				oiu	pai tici		ais	ci			+	+	do	+	
		tio			no				с 4		ι of	ι of	m	L h	
		n			pa ntc			pa nt	u			ric	orro		
		11			iits				pi ot		au		r	e	
								5			ve	к of		D	
											15	hi			
									01		e				
											ev	as			
											en to			E	
Lvn		20	Svc	Dhyt	Νο	DubMo	18	76	N	The		Vo	No	N	Over
ch	Ca	11	to	ocan		d	tri	6		nrimar	s ie	s			all
8	nn	11	ma	nahi	on			0	0	v	3	з, оv		0	thor
	abi		tic	noid	op ath	F				y outco					
mn	noi		Re	c.	ic	ς. Γίναη	m			me		nt			evid
hell	ds		vie	Smo	nai		na			was		fo			ence
[23	for		w	ked	n	(FBSCO	rin			nain in		r			that
1	tre			cann	fib	).	σ			subject		re			cann
1	at			abis.	ro	" PsycInf	th			s with		po			abin
	me			oro	mv	0	e			chroni		rti			oids
	nt of			muc	alg	(EBSCO	int			с		ng			are
	chr			osal	ia,	), The	er			non-ca		bi			safe
	oni			extra	rh	Cochra	ve			ncer		as,			and
				cts	eu	ne	nti			pain.		pu			mod
	no			of	ma	Library	on					bli			estly
	n-c			cann	toi	, ISI	wi			The		са			effec
	an			abis-	d	Web of	th			second		tio			tive
	cer			base	art	Scienc	pla			ary		n			in
	nai			d	hri	e, ABI	ce			outco		bi			neur
	n.			medi	tis,	Inform	bo			mes		as			opat
	a			cine,	an	(Proqu				were		an			hic
	svs			and	d	est),				sleep,		d			pain
	te			synt	mi	Dissert				functio		fo			with
	ma			hetic	xe	ation				n, and		r-			preli
	tic			cann	d	Abstra				quality		pr			mina
	rev			abin	chr	cts				of life.		ofi			ry
	ie			oids;	oni	(Proqu						t			evid
	w			nabil	С	est),						bi			ence
	of			one,	pai	Acade						as			of
	ran			dron	n.	mic									effic
	do			abin		Search									асу

	mi			ol		Premie									in
	ze			and		r									fibro
	d			2		(FBSCO									myal
	u 1			u											a'-
	tria			nove		),									gia
	ls			ITHC		Clinical									and
				anal		Trials.g									rheu
				ogue		ov.									mato
				-0		TrialsC									id
				•		ontrol									orthr
						entral.									
						org,									itis.
						individ									Did
						ual									not
						pharm									pool
						aceutic									data
						al									for
						ai									101
						compa									meta
						ny									-
						trials									analy
						sites									sis
						for Fli									but
															data
						Lilly									uata
															was
						GlaxoS									desci
						mithKli									ibed
						ne,									quali
						OAlste									tativ
						r									elv.
															<i>c.y.</i>
						and									
						Google									
						Scholar									
Mo	امک	20	Svc	Dron	Νο	Modlin	11	12	N	The	٧o	٧o	Bon	v	Soloc
		17	- Jy S		1.00		11	10		nrimer			form		
ng	ect	1/	le	abin	ur	е,	1	19	0	primar	S	S	ierr	e	uve
et.	ive		ma	ol,	ор	Embas	0			У			oni	S	cann
al	Ca		tic	nabil	ath	e,	tri			outco			adju		abin
[25	nn		Re	one	ic	Cochra	als			me			stm		oids
1	abi		vie	and	pai	ne	со			was			ent		provi
1	noi		w/	nahi	n	Library	m			intonci			for		do 9
	de		vv	vina	11	Library									
	us		d[]			,	ha i			ly 01					small
	for		d	ls		PROSP	rin			pain			tipl		analg
	Ch		Me			ERO,	g			record			e		esic
		1													

nic	an	trials.g	e	after a	ng	fit in
Ne	aly	ov, and	int	minim	was	patie
ur	sis	Google	er	um of	not	nts
ор		Scholar	ve	2	perf	with
ath			nti	weeks	orm	chro
ic			on	followi	ed	nic
Pai		Pain	wi	ng	as	neur
n:		societi	th	initiati	per	opat
A		es	pla	on of	rec	hic
Sys		(Ameri	ce	selecti	om	pain.
te		can	bo	ve	me	
ma		Society	)	cannab	nda	
tic		of		inoid	tion	
Re		Anesth		and	s in	
vie		esiolog		placeb	the	
w		ists,		o/com	Coc	
an		Europe		parato	hra	
d		an		r	ne	
Me		Society		admini	Han	
ta-		of		stratio	dbo	
an		Anaest		n,	ok.	
aly		hesiolo		expres		
sis		gy,		sed on		
		Interna		an NRS		
		tional		(0—no		
		Associ		pain to		
		ation		10—		
		for the		worst		
		Study		possibl		
		of		e		
		Pain,		pain).		
		Americ				
		an		Second		
		Society		ary		
		of		outco		
		Region		mes		
		al		were		
		Anesth		presen		
		esia		ce or		
		and		absenc		
		Pain		e of		
		Medici		analge		
		ne,		sia		
		Europe		define		
		an		d as		

Society	reducti	
of	on in	
Region	nain	
	scores	
Anesth	(NRS/V	
esia	AS) by	
and	≥30%	
Pain	at 2	
Therap	weeks	
v and	or	
y, and		
World	more	
Institut	after	
e of	initiati	
Pain)	on of	
in the	interve	
	ntion	
years	quality	
were	of life	
also	(QoL),	
search	physic	
ed		
	functio	
	Tunctio	
	n,	
	psycho	
	logical	
	functio	
	n.	
	sleen	
	overall	
	patient	
	satisfa	
	ction,	
	and	
	the	
	insiden	
	Inciden	
	ce of	
	advers	
	e	
	effects	
	of	
	ve	
	cannab	
	inoids.	

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
, פ
0
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
20
27
20
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
70 /0
77 50
50
21
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 59 60

Ма	Sys	20	Me	Phyt	Ch	Medlin	18	?	Ν	The	Ye	Ye	No	Ν	Curr
rtín	te	09	ta-	ocan	ro	e/Pub			0	primar	S	s,		0	ently
-Sá	ma		an	nabi	nic	med,				y		ex			avail
nch	tic		aly	noid	pai	Embas				outco		ce			able
ez	Re		sis	s	n	e, and				me		pt			evid
et.	vie			and	of	The				was		fo			ence
al	w			synt	а	Cochra				intensi		r			sugg
[28	an			hetic	pat	ne				ty of		re			ests
]	d			deriv	hol	Contro				pain as		ро			that
	Me			ates	ogi	lled				scored		rti			cann
	ta-			of	cal	Trials				by		ng			abis
	an			THC,	or	Registe				numeri		bi			treat
	aly			such	tra	r				cal		as,			ment
	SIS			as	um	(CENTR				rang		de			is .
	of			dron	ati	AL)				scales.		te			mod
	Ca			abin	C					Ine		CTI			erate
	nn			OI, nahil	ori					Second		on hi			ly
				nabii	gin					ary					
	S Tro			or						mes		as			s for
	at			henz						were		d			treat
	me			onvr						CNS		fo			ment
	nt			anop						related		r-			of
	for			eridi						events		pr			chro
	Ch			ne (a								ofi			nic
	ro			synt								t			pain,
	nic			hetic								bi			but
	Pai			nitro								as			bene
	n			gen											ficial
				anal											effec
				og of											ts
				THC)											may
															be
															parti
															ally
															(or
															com
															plete
															ly)
															t by
															L DY
															ntiall
															v
															y serio
L			I					I	I						30110

1
2
3
4
5
5
0
/
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
1/
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
27
20
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
20
20
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58

															us harı s.
Воу	Th	20	Sys	Phyt	Ne	PubMe	13	77	Ν	Outco	Ye	Ye	No	Ν	Can
chu	e	15	te	ocan	ur	d <i>,</i>		1	0	mes	S	s,		0	abi
k	Eff		ma	nabi	ор	Embas				consid		ex			bas
et.	ect		tic	noid	ath	e, Web				ered		ce			d
al	ive		Re	s;	ic	of				were		pt			me
[24	ne		vie	smo	pai	Scienc				reducti		fo			cin
]	SS		w	ked	n	e, and				on in		r,			ext
	of			cann		all				pain		re			cts
	Ca			abis,		eviden				intensi		ро			use
	nn			cann		ce-				ty and		rti			in
	abi			abis-		based				advers		ng			dif
	noi			base		medici				e		bi			rer
	ds			d		ne				events.		as,			ро
	in			medi		review						pu			lat
	the			cinal		S						bli			ns
	Ma			extra		and						са			chi
	na			cts		databa						tio			nic
	ge			(CB		ses						n			no
	me			ME)		(Cochr						bi			ma
	nt			in		ane						as			gn
	of			the		Databa						an			t
	Ch			form		se of						d			ne
	ro			of		System						fo			ор
	nic			oro		atic						r-			hic
	No			muc		Review						pr			pai
	nm			osal		s, ASP						ofi			pat
	ali			spra		Journal						t			nts
	gn			ys		Club,						bi			ma
	ant			(nabi		Databa						as			pro
	Ne			ximo		se of									de
	ur			ls),		Abstra									eff
	ор			vapo		cts of									tiv
	ath			rized		Review									ana
	ic			cann		s of									esi
	Pai			abis,		Effects									in
	n:			and		[DARE]									cor
	A			synt		, and									itic
	Sys			hetic		Cochra									S
	te			cann		ne									tha
	ma			abin		Contro									are
	tic			oids;		lled									ref
	Re			dron											cto

	vie w			abin ol, nabil one, and CT-3		Trials Registe r [CCTR] )									to othe r treat men s.
Mü cke et. al [26 ]	Ca nn abi s pro du cts for ad ult s wit h chr oni c ne uro pat hic pai n	20 18	Co chr an e Re vie w	Phyt ocan nabi noid s; oro muc osal spra y cont ainin g THC or THC/ CBD mix, smo ked cann abis cont ainin g THC, THC, CBD mix, smo ked cann abis cont ainin g THC, CBD mix, smo ked cann abis cont ainin scont abis cont ainin scont abis cont ainin g THC, can can abis cont ainin g THC, can can abis cont ainin g THC, cont abis cont ainin g THC, cont abis cont ainin abis cont ainin g THC, cont abis cont ainin g THC, cont abis cont ainin g THC, cont abis cont con cont cont cont cont cont cont	Ne ur op ath ic pai n	Cochra ne Library , MEDLI NE and EMBAS E. Followi ng clinical trials databa ses were search ed for additio nal data includi ng unpubl ished data: US Nation al Institut es of Health clinical trial registe r	16 (1 5 of th e tri als co m pa rin g th e int er ve nti on wi th pla ce bo )	17 50	Yes	Primar y outco mes: Partici pant- report ed pain relief of 50% or greate r. We preferr ed compo site neurop athic pain scores over single- scale generi c pain scores if both measu res were used by studies	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	The pote ntial bene fits of canr abis- base d med cine (her bal canr abis, plan - deriv ed o synt hetio THC, CBD oro muc osal spra ) in chro nic neur opat hic pain

	hetic	Trials.g	PGIC	outw
	cann	ov),	(Patien	eigh
	abin	Furope		ed
	oids	an	Global	by
	nabil	Union	Impros	by thoir
	парп		inpres	then
	one,		sion of	pote
	dron	Trials	Chang	ntial
	abin	Registe	e)	harm
	ol	r	much	S.
		(www.	or very	
		clinical	much	
		trialsre	improv	
		gister	ed:	
		$\left \frac{\mathbf{C}\mathbf{U}}{\mathbf{U}}\right $		
		world	vvitnar	
		Health	awals	
		Organi	due to	
		zation	advers	
		(WHO)	e	
		Interna	events	
		tional	(tolera	
		Clinical	bility):	
		Triple	Sincy,	
		Dogistr	Coriou	
		Registr	Seriou	
		Y	S .	
		Platfor	advers	
		m	e	
		(ICTRP)	events	
		(apps.	(safety	
		who.in	).	
		t/trials	Seriou	
		earch/)	s	
		and	advors	
		, anu	auvers	
		Interna	e	
		tional	events	
		Associ	typicall	
		ation	У	
		for	include	
		Canna	any	
		binoid	untow	
		Medici	ard	
		nos	modica	
		databa	occurr	
		nk	ence	

3								
4				(\\\\\\\\		or		
5				<u>cannah</u>		offoct		
6						enect		
7				<u>IS-</u>		that at		
8				<u>med.or</u>		any		
9				g/studi		dose		
10				es/stu		results		
11				<u>cs/stu</u>		in		
12				<u>ay.pnp</u>				
13				)		death,		
14						is life-		
15						threat		
16						ening		
17						roquir		
18						requir		
19						es		
20						hospit		
21						alisatio		
22						nor		
23 24						nrelen		
24						proton		
25						gation		
20						of		
27						existin		
20						g		
30						bosnit		
31						nospit		
32						alisatio		
33						n,		
34						results		
35						in		
36						norsist		
37						persise		
38						ent or		
39						signific		
40						ant		
41						disabili		
42						ty or		
43						incono		
44						incapa		
45						city, is		
46						a		
47						conge		
48						nital		
49						20000		
50								
51						ly or		
52						birth		
53						defect,		
54						is an Ó		
55						limnor		
56								
57						tant		
58						medica		
59	· (		•		 1		 ·	

÷											1					
											event'					
)											that					
,											that					
)											may .					
0											jeopar					
1											dise					
2											the					
3											person					
4											, or					
5											may					
											requir					
											ean					
											intorvo					
											ntion					
											το					
											preven					
											t one					
											of the					
)											above					
											charac					
											teristic					
)											s/cons					
											equen					
											CAS					
	Δνί	Ffi	20	Mo	Dhyt	Ch	MEDIT	12	2/	N	Tho	٧o	٧o	No	N	The
		C2C	17	+2	0.000	ro		+J	27		outco	rc c	rc c			curro
	Id	Lat	1/	ld-	Ucall	10	INE/PU		57	0	outco	3	5,		0	curre
	m	y ,		An		nic	omed	ais			me		ex			nt
	et.	OT		aly	noid	(ca	and in	со			measu		ce			syste
	al	Ca		sis	s;	nc	Google	m			re that		pt			mati
	[29	nn			Sativ	er	Scholar	ра			was		fo			С
	]	abi			ex/n	an	using	rin			chosen		r,			revie
		S-			abixi	d	Medic	g			was		re			w
		Ва			mol,	no	al	th			the		ро			sugg
		se			cann	n-	Subiec	e			variabl		rti			ests
		d			abidi	са	t	int			e "pain		ng			that
		Me			ol	nc	- Headin	er			intensi		hi			cann
		dic			cann	orl	σ				ty" ac		20			ahin
		inc			cailli	C1)	5 (Macu	ve ~+:			ly, as		as,			auni
		me			abin	par		nti			scorea		pu			
		S			oid	n	) terms	on			by the		bli			base
		for			cigar	an		wi			numeri		са			d
		Pai			ettes	d		th			cal		tio			medi
		n			/vap	ac		bo			rating		n			cines
		Ma			orize	ute		th			scale		bi			migh
		na			r,	ро		'ac			(NRS-		as			tbe
		ge				sto		tiv			11).		an			effec
)	L	05					1			I	//	[		I	I	

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

me	and	ре	e	numeri	d	tive
nt:	synt	rat	dr	cal 11-	fo	for
A	hetic	ive	ug	point	r-	chro
Sys	cann	pai	s'	box	pr	nic
te	abin	n	an	(BS-	ofi	pain
ma	oids;		d	11),	t	treat
tic	dron		pla	visual	bi	ment
Re	abin		ce	analog	as	,
vie	ol		bo	scale		base
w	and			(VAS),		d on
an	nabil			and		limit
d	one.			the		ed
Me	CT-3.			VAS		evid
ta-	aiule			section		ence.
An	mic			of the		prim
alv	acid.			questi		arily
sis	svnt			onnair		for
of	hetic			e short		neur
Ra	nitro			form		onat
nd	gen			McGill		hic
om	anal			Pain		nain
izo	or of			Questi		pani
d	tetra			onnair		nts
Co	bydr			onnan		1103.
ntr	ocan			E.		
	bcan					
od	nol					
Tri						
ais	, fatty					
	Tally					
	aciu					
	amid					
	e					
	nyar					
	olase					
	-1					
	(FAA					
	H1)					
	inhib					
	itor					
	(PF-					
	0445					
	7845					
	)					
	(bloc					

Page 47	7 of 61
---------	---------

				king degr adati on of endo cann abin oids) , benz opyr anop eridi ne (BPP ), and levo nant radol											
Ca mp	Ar e	20 01	Sys te	Oral THC.	Ac ute	MEDLI NE.	9	22 2	N O	Outco me	Ye s	Ye s.	No	N O	Cann abin
bell	са		ma	an	,	EMBAS				measu		ex			oids
et.	nn		tic	oral	chr	Ε,				res for		ce			are
al	abi		Re	synt	oni	Oxford				pain		pt			no
[30	noi		vie	hetic	с	Pain				intensi		fo			more
]	ds		w	nitro	no	Databa				ty;		r,			effeo
	an			gen	n-	se, and				pain		re			tive
	eff			anal	ma	Cochra				relief;		po r+:			than
	ect			ogue	ng	ne Library				the use of		ru			ino
	an			тнс	nt	ылагу				sunnle		hi			in
	d			(NIB)	pai					menta		as.			cont
	saf			, oral	n,					ry		pu			ollin
	e			benz	an					analge		bli			g
	tre			opyr	d					sia;		са			pain
	at			anop	са					patient		tio			and
	me			eridi	nc					s'		n			have
	nt			ne	er					prefer		bi			depr
	opt			(BPP	pai					ences;		as			essa
	ion			), and	n					and		an d			nt
	IN the			and						advers		a fo			errec
	ma			muc						e		10			
	1 111 -														TNO

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Des Effi 20 Sys Cigar Ne MEDUL 6 22 N For Ye Ye No N Ther
Des Effi 20 Sys Cigar Ne MEDLI 6 22 N For Ye Ye No N Ther

Page 49 of 61

1 2

3													
4	nd	v	ma	or	op	EMBAS	als		mes.		ex		evid
5	ρ	, an	tic	vano	ath	F and	0		nain		Ce		ence
6 7	ot	d	Ro	rizor	ic	tho	m		scores		nt		for
/ Q	et.	u	Ne	11201		lintowno			300103		μι fa		
9		ad	vie	cont	par	interna	pa		were		10		the
10	[27	ver	W	ainin	n	tional	rın		extract		r,		use
11	J	se		g		Pharm	g		ed		re		of
12		eff		delta		aceutic	int		using		ро		low-
13		ect		-9-		al	er		the		rti		dose
14		s		тнс		Abstra	ve		visual		ng		medi
15		of				cts	nti		analog		bi		cal
16		me					on		ue		as.		marii
17 19		dic					wi		scale		nu		uana
18		al					th				hli		in
20		ai maa							(VA3)				rofro
21		iiid					pia				Cd		rena
22		riju					ce		alterna		τιο		ctory
23		an					bo		tive		n		neur
24		а					•		numeri		bi		opat
25		for					Pla		cal		as		hic
26 27		chr					ce		pain		an		pain
27		oni					bo		rating		d		in
29		с					bei		tool. If		fo		conj
30		no					ng		pain		r-		uncti
31		nc					cig		scores		nr		on
32		an					ar		wore		ofi		with
33		cor					ott		not		+		tradi
34		cei mai							not		ι 		tiana
35		раг					es		report		וט		
37		n					or		ea,		as		· .
38							va		surrog				analg
39							ро		ate				esics.
40							riz		measu				How
41							er		res of				ever,
42							со		effecti				trials
43							nt		veness				were
44 45							ain		were				limit
46							ing		include				ed
47							0%		d				hv
48							dol l		(sleen				short
49							+2		functio				dura
50									n and				tion
51							9-		n, and				tion,
52							IH		quality				varia
55 54							C		ot life).				bility
55							or		Freque				in
56							wi		ncy of				dosin
57							th		serious				g
58							ca		and				and
59								1		1			

nn	most	stren
abi	comm	gth
no	only	of
id	report	delta
re	ed	-9-
m	advers	tetra
ov	e	hydr
al	effects	ocan
	was	nabi
	collect	nol.
	ed.	and
		lack
		of
		funct
		ional
		outc
		ome
		s
		Altho
		ugh
		well
		toler
		ated
		in
		the
		short
		term
		the
		term
		effec
		ts of
		tivo
		and
		anu
		neur
		ocog
		e
		effec
		ts of
		medi
		cal
		marij

Page 51 of 61
---------------

		1		1	1		-		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
															uana
															rom
															in
															in .
															unk
															owr
Ste	A	20	Sys	Levo	Ac	MEDLI	7	61	Y	The	Ye	Ye	No	Y	Base
ven	sys	17	te	nant	ute	NE <i>,</i>	tri	1	es	primar	S	s,		e	d or
S	te		ma	radol	ро	EMBAS	als			y		ex		S	the
et.	ma		tic	,	sto	Ε,	со			outco		ce			ava
al	tic		Re	nabil	pe	Cochra	m			me		pt			able
[31	rev		vie	one.	rat	ne	pa			was		fo			ran
1	ie		w	Δ7D	ive	Library	rin			the		r			omi
1				19/0	nai	and	σ			chie dualita		", nu			۵d
	of			1340	par	tho	Б int			tivo		hli			con
	101				11										
	the			GW8		vvoria	er			analysi		ca			one
	an			4216		Health	ve			S OT		τιο			tria
	alg			6,		Organi	nti			the		n			evid
	esi			dron		zation	on			analge		bi			enc
	С			abin		Interna	wi			sic		as			can
	effi			ol,		tional	th			efficac		an			abiı
	cac			△-9-T		Clinical	pla			y of		d			oids
	У			HC		Trials	ce			cannab		fo			hav
	of					Registr	bo			inoids		r-			no
	са					y	<b>,</b>			in the		pr			role
	nn					Platfor	Ке			manag		ofi			in
	abi					m	to			ement		t			the
	noi						pr			of		bi			mai
	d						of			acute		as			age
	me						en			nain					mei
	dic									comna					of
	ati						, Do			red to					201
	au						+hi			nlacoh					acu
	011 c.in						d:			placeb					e
							ai								pan
	the						ne			active					
	ma						,			compa					
	na						Na			rator.					
	ge						pr			The					
	me						ох			second					
	nt						en			ary					
	of						,			outco					
	ac						an			me					
	ute						d			was					
	pai						Ib			the					
	n						un			gualita					
					1		۳۳			1 999910	1			1	1

BMJ	Open
-----	------

Page	52	of	61
------	----	----	----

						rof en			analysi s of the report ed advers e effects					
Wa Ca litt nn et. ab al no [32 ds ] for fib ro my alg ia	20 16 16 17 9 9 9 8	Co chr an e Re vie w	Nabil one	Fib ro my alg ia	Cochra ne Library , MEDLI NE and EMBAS E	2 tri als co m pa rin g th e int er ve nti on wi th e int e ve nti on wi th e int e r ve nti o m pa rin g th e int e int o th e int o th e int o th e int o th e int o int int o int o int o int int o int o int o int o int int o int int o int o int int o int int o int int o int int o int o int o int o int int o int o int o i i i i int i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	72 (4 0)	Yes	Primar y outco mes: Partici pant-r eporte d pain relief of 50% or greate r. PGIC (Patien t Global Impres sion of Chang e) much or very much improv ed. Withdr awal due to advers e events	Yes	Ye s, ex ce pt fo r pu bli ca tio n bi as.	No	Yes	We foun d no convi ncing , unbi ased, high quali ty evid ence sugg estin g that nabil one is of value in treat ing peop le with fibro myal gia. The toler abilit y of nabil one

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

-					(tolera	was
					bility).	low
						in
					Seriou	peop
					s	le
0					advers	with
1						fibro
2					ovents	myal
4					events (cofoty	riyar
5					(Salety	gia.
5					).	
7					Seriou	
3					S	
9					advers	
)					e	
ן ר					events	
2					typicall	
, 1					v	
5					include	
5					anu	
7					dily	
3					untow	
)					ard	
)					medica	
					1	
2					occurr	
1					ence	
5					or	
5					effect	
7					that at	
3						
Ð					dity	
)					dose	
					results	
2					in	
1					death,	
5					is	
5					life-thr	
7					eateni	
3					ng	
Ð					roquir	
)						
					es	
<u>/</u>					nospit	
) 1					alisatio	
т 5					n or	
5					prolon	
7					gation	
8					of	
9	L	1	I	 1		 ]

Γ						existin		
						g		
						hospit		
						alisatio		
						n,		
						results		
						in		
						persist		
						ent or		
						signific		
						ant		
						disabili		
						ty or		
						incapa		
						city, is		
						а		
						conge		
						nital		
						anoma		
						ly or		
						birth		
						defect,		
						is an		
						'impor		
						tant		
						medica		
						event		
						that		
						may		
						Jeopar		
						alse		
						nercon		
						person		
						, 01 may		
						roquir		
						o an		
						interve		
						ntion		
						to		
						nreven		
						tone		
						of the		
						ahove		
						above		
1

2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31 22	
22 22	
27	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
4/	
48	
49 50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	
60	

 	_	 	 					
					charac			
					teristic			
					s/cons			
					equen			
					ces.			

## References

- Copay AG, Subach BR, Glassman SD, Polly DW, and Schuler TC, Understanding the minimum clinically important difference: a review of concepts and methods. Spine J, 2007. 7(5): p. 541-6.
- Guyatt GH, Osoba D, Wu AW, Wyrwich KW, and Norman GR, Methods to Explain the Clinical Significance of Health Status Measures. Mayo Clinic Proceedings, 2002. 77(4): p. 371-383.
- 3. Moncrieff J and Kirsch I, *Empirically derived criteria cast doubt on the clinical significance of antidepressant-placebo differences.* Contemp Clin Trials, 2015. **43**: p. 60-2.
- 4. Hagg O, Fritzell P, and Nordwall A, *The clinical importance of changes in outcome scores after treatment for chronic low back pain*. Eur Spine J, 2003. **12**(1): p. 12-20.
- Musoro ZJ, Hamel J, Ediebah DE, Cocks K, King MT, Groenvold M, et al., Establishing anchor-based minimally important differences (MID) with the EORTC quality-of-life measures: a meta-analysis protocol. BMJ Open, 2018. 8(1).
- 6. Stratford PW, Binkley JM, Riddle DL, and Guyatt GH, *Sensitivity to change of the Roland-Morris Back Pain Questionnaire: part 1.* Phys Ther, 1998. **78**(11): p. 1186-96.
- 7. Riddle DL, Stratford PW, and Binkley JM, *Sensitivity to change of the Roland-Morris Back Pain Questionnaire: part 2.* Phys Ther, 1998. **78**(11): p. 1197-207.
- 8. Van der Roer N, Ostelo RW, Bekkering GE, van Tulder MW, and de Vet HC, *Minimal clinically important change for pain intensity, functional status, and general health status in patients with nonspecific low back pain.* Spine (Phila Pa 1976), 2006. **31**(5): p. 578-82.
  - 9. Crosby RD, Kolotkin RL, and Williams GR, *Defining clinically meaningful change in health*related quality of life. J Clin Epidemiol, 2003. **56**(5): p. 395-407.
  - 10. Cohen J, CHAPTER 1 The Concepts of Power Analysis, in Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences, Cohen J, Editor. 1977, Academic Press. p. 1-17.
- 11. Fayers PM and Machin D, *Quality of life: assessment, analysis and interpretation.* John Wiley & Sons, 2000.
- Guyatt GH, Bombardier C, and Tugwell PX, *Measuring disease-specific quality of life in clinical trials*. CMAJ : Canadian Medical Association journal = journal de l'Association medicale canadienne, 1986. 134(8): p. 889-895.
- Wyrwich KW, Tierney WM, and Wolinsky FD, Further evidence supporting an SEM-based criterion for identifying meaningful intra-individual changes in health-related quality of life. J Clin Epidemiol, 1999. 52(9): p. 861-73.
  - 14. Wolinsky FD, Wan GJ, and Tierney WM, *Changes in the SF-36 in 12 months in a clinical sample of disadvantaged older adults*. Med Care, 1998. **36**(11): p. 1589-98.
- 15. McHorney CA and Tarlov AR, *Individual-patient monitoring in clinical practice: are available health status surveys adequate?* Qual Life Res, 1995. **4**(4): p. 293-307.

Lydick E and Epstein RS, Interpretation of quality of life changes. Qual Life Res, 1993. 2(3):

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

29 30

31

32

33

34

35 36

37

38

39

40 41

42

43

44

45

46 47

48

49

50

51 52

53

54

55

56

16.

p. 221-6.

17. Beaton DE, Bombardier C, Katz JN, Wright JG, Wells G, Boers M, et al., Looking for important change/differences in studies of responsiveness. OMERACT MCID Working Group. Outcome Measures in Rheumatology. Minimal Clinically Important Difference. J Rheumatol, 2001. 28(2): p. 400-5. 18. Dworkin RH, Turk DC, McDermott MP, Peirce-Sandner S, Burke LB, Cowan P, et al., Interpreting the clinical importance of group differences in chronic pain clinical trials: IMMPACT recommendations. Pain, 2009. 146(3): p. 238-44. 19. Cella D, Bullinger M, Scott C, and Barofsky I, Group vs individual approaches to understanding the clinical significance of differences or changes in quality of life. Mayo Clin Proc, 2002. 77(4): p. 384-92. 20. Guyatt GH, Making sense of quality-of-life data. Med Care, 2000. 38(9 Suppl): p. li175-9. 21. Testa MA, Interpretation of quality-of-life outcomes: issues that affect magnitude and meaning. Med Care, 2000. 38(9 Suppl): p. li166-74. 22. U.S. Department of Health Human Services FDA Center for Drug Evaluation Research, U.S. Department of Health Human Services FDA Center for Biologics Evaluation Research, U.S. Department of Health Human Services FDA Center for Devices Radiological Health, Guidance for industry: patient-reported outcome measures: use in medical product development to support labeling claims: draft guidance. 2006. 4: p. 79. 23. Lynch M E and Campbell F, Cannabinoids for treatment of chronic non-cancer pain; a systematic review of randomized trials. Br J Clin Pharmacol, 2011. 72(5): p. 735-44. 24. Boychuk D G, Goddard G, Mauro G, and Orellana M F, The effectiveness of cannabinoids in the management of chronic nonmalignant neuropathic pain: a systematic review. J Oral Facial Pain Headache, 2015. 29(1): p. 7-14. 25. Meng H, Johnston B, Englesakis M, Moulin D E, and Bhatia A, Selective Cannabinoids for Chronic Neuropathic Pain: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. Anesth Analg, 2017. **125**(5): p. 1638-1652. 26. Mücke M, Phillips T, Radbruch L, Petzke F, and Häuser W, Cannabis-based medicines for chronic neuropathic pain in adults. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, 2018(3). 27. Deshpande A, Mailis-Gagnon A, Zoheiry N, and Lakha S F, Efficacy and adverse effects of medical marijuana for chronic noncancer pain: Systematic review of randomized controlled trials. Can Fam Physician, 2015. 61(8): p. e372-81. 28. Martin-Sanchez E, Furukawa T A, Taylor J, and Martin J L, Systematic review and metaanalysis of cannabis treatment for chronic pain. Pain Med, 2009. 10(8): p. 1353-68. 29. Aviram J and Samuelly-Leichtag G, Efficacy of Cannabis-Based Medicines for Pain Management: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. Pain Physician, 2017. 20(6): p. E755-e796. 30. Campbell F A, Tramèr M R, Carroll D, Reynolds D J M, Moore R A, and McQuay H J, Are cannabinoids an effective and safe treatment option in the management of pain? A qualitative systematic review. Bmj, 2001. 323(7303): p. 13. 31. Stevens A J and Higgins M D, A systematic review of the analgesic efficacy of cannabinoid medications in the management of acute pain. Acta Anaesthesiol Scand, 2017. 61(3): p. 268-280.

1 2 3	
4 32. 6	Walitt B, Klose P, Fitzcharles M A, Phillips T, and Hauser W, <i>Cannabinoids for fibromyalgia.</i> Cochrane Database Syst Rev, 2016. <b>7</b> : p. Cd011694.
7 8	
10 11	
12 13 14	
15 16 17	
18 19	
20 21 22	
23 24 25	
26 27 28	
29 30 21	
32 33	
35 36	
37 38 39	
40 41 42	
43 44 45	
46 47 48	
49 50 51	
52 53	
54 55 56	
57 58 59	
60	

PRISMA - P (Pro	forror	BMJ Open	tems to
address in a syst	emati Item	c review protocol*	(Page No.#)
	No		
ADMINISTRATIV	E INFO		
Title:		ate	
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	1
Update	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	
Registration	2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number	
Authors:		a priede	
Contact	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mathing address of corresponding author	1
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	25-26
Amendments	4	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments	
Support:			
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	25
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	
Role of sponsor or funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	3-9
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participents, Interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	9
METHODS		ýgies gies	
Eligibility criteria	8	Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such as years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review	10-12
Information sources	9	Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases, contact with study authors, trail registers or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage	12-13
Search strategy	10	Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned limits such that it could be repeated	
		For peer review only - http://bmiopen.bmi.com/site/about/quidelines.xhtml <b>de</b>	

		BMJ Open	
		vright, j	
Study records:		nclu	
Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review $\frac{d}{ds}$	1.
Selection	11b	State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)	
Data collection process	11c	Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such as piloting forms, done independently on duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators	1.
Data items	12	List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding sources)	
Outcomes and prioritization	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and a define all outcomes, with rationale	1
Risk of bias in individual studies	14	Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether the state be done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis	1:
Data synthesis	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised	
	15b	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (such as I <sup>2</sup> , Kendall's s)	19
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regressions	22
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	
Meta-bias(es)	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)	
Confidence in cumulative evidence	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)	
From: Shamseer L, N meta-analysis protoc	And is a Aoher I	Amendments to a review protocol should be tracked and dated. The copyright for PRISMA-P (including checklist) is held b distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution Licence 4.0. D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart L, PRISMA-P Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic RISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. BMJ. 2015 Jan 2;349(jan02 1):g7647.	y the
		gence Bibliographique o	

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

2	
4	
5 6	
7 8	Prelin
9 10 11 12	Total number of records identified Number of duplicates removed Number of records in final list
12	The Cochrone Central Register of C
14 15	hits)
16 17 18	#1MeSH descriptor: [Cannabis]#2MeSH descriptor: [Cannabino#3(cannabi* or mari*uana or nator levonantradol* or anandamid*)
20	#4 #1 or #2 or #3
21 22	<ul> <li>#5 Mesh descriptor. [Pan] explanation</li> <li>#6 (pain* or ache* or migraine*)</li> <li>#7 #5 or #6</li> </ul>
23	#8 #4 and #7
24 25	MEDI INE Ovid (1046 to July 2010)
26	1. exp Cannabis/
27	2. exp Cannabinoids/
28	3. (cannabi* or mari*uana or nabixmol
29	levonantradol* or anandamid* or 2-AC
30 21	supplementary concept word, rare dise
37	4. 1 or 2 or 3
33	5. exp Pain/
34	6. (pain* or ache* or migraine*).mp. [r
35	floating sub-heading word, keyword he
36	7 5 or 6
37	8. 4 and 7
38	9. (random* or blind* or placebo* or n
39 40	subject heading word, floating sub-hea
41	protocol supplementary concept word,
42	10. 8 and 9
43	Embase Ovid (1974 to July 2019) (18
44	1. exp cannabis/
45	2. exp cannabinoid/
40 47	3. (cannabi* or mari*uana or nabixmol
48	never the second
49	4. 1 or 2 or 3
50	5. exp pain/
51	6. (pain* or ache* or migraine*).mp. [r
52	manufacturer, drug manufacturer, devi
53	7. 5 or 6
54 55	8. 4 and / 9. (random* or blind* or placebo* or p
55 56	title device manufacturer drug manufa
50 57	word]
58	10. 8 and 9
59	

1

### LILACS (Bireme; 1982 to July 2019) (51 hits)

60

Total number of records identified	4106 records
Number of duplicates removed	1079 records
Number of records in final list	3027 records

# ontrolled Trials (CENTRAL) in the Cochrane Library (2019, Issue 6) (961

- explode all trees
- oids] explode all trees
- bixmol\* or dronabinol\* or marinol\* or nabilon\* or cesamet\* or hash\* or hemp\*
- ode all trees

#### (465 hits)

\* or dronabinol\* or marinol\* or nabilon\* or cesamet\* or hash\* or hemp\* or 3).mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading vord heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol ase supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]

np=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, eading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary ary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]

neta-analys\*).mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, ding word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]

### 829 hits)

\* or dronabinol\* or marinol\* or nabilon\* or cesamet\* or hash\* or hemp\* or 3).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device ce trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]

np=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device ce trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]

neta-analys\*).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original acturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term

1	
2	
2	
1	
-+	(connabile or marily and or nabivmalle or dranabinalle or marinalle or nabilante or accompte or backet or barret
5	(cannably of mariyuana of nabixmoly of dronabinoly of marinoly of nabilony of cesamely of nashy of nemps of
6	levonantradols or anandamids or 2-AG) [words] and (pains or aches or migraines) [words]
7	
8	Science Citation Index Expanded (1900 to July 2019) and Conference Proceedings Citation Index – Science (1990
9	to July 2019) (Web of Science) (623 hits)
10	#5 #4 AND #3
11	#4 TS=(random* or blind* or placebo* or meta-analys*)
12	#3 #2 AND #1
13	#2 TS=(pain* or ache* or migraine*)
14	#1 TS=(cannabi* or mari*uana or nabixmol* or dronabinol* or marinol* or nabilon* or cesamet* or hash* or hemp* or
15	levonantradol* or anandamid* or 2-AG)
15	
10	BIOSIS (1969 to July 2019; Web of Science) (177 hits)
17	#5 #4 AND #3
18	#4 TS=(random* or blind* or placebo* or meta-analys*)
19	#3 #2 AND #1
20	#2 TS=(pain* or ache* or migraine*)
21	#1 TS=(cannabi* or mari*uana or nabixmol* or dronabinol* or marinol* or nabilon* or cesamet* or hash* or hemp* or
22	levonantradol* or anandamid* or 2-AG)
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
29	
20	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
13	
- <del>1-1</del> 15	
4J 46	
40 47	
4/	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

58 59 60