A large Australian longitudinal cohort registry demonstrates sustained safety and efficacy of oral medicinal cannabis for at least two years
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Abstract

Title: A large Australian longitudinal cohort registry demonstrates sustained safety and efficacy of oral medicinal cannabis for at least two years.

Introduction: Oral medicinal cannabis (MC) has been increasingly prescribed for a wide range of clinical conditions since 2016. Despite an exponential rise in prescriptions and publications, high quality clinical efficacy and safety studies are lacking. The outcomes of a large Australian clinical electronic registry cohort are presented.

Methods: A prospective cannabis-naïve patient cohort prescribed oral MC participated in an ongoing longitudinal registry at a network of specialised clinics. Patient MC dose, safety and validated outcome data were collected regularly over two years and analysed.

Results: 3,961 patients (mean age 56.07 years [SD 19.08], 51.0% female) with multimorbidity (mean diagnoses 5.14 [SD 4.08]). and polypharmacy (mean 6.26 medications [SD 4.61]). Clinical indications were for; chronic pain (71.9%) psychiatric (15.4%), neurological (2.1%), and other diagnoses (10.7%). Median total oral daily dose was 10mg for Δ9-tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) and 22.5mg for cannabidiol (CBD). A stable dose was observed for over two years. Treatment related adverse events (37.3%) were mild (dry mouth 79.9%), dose-related (sedation/dizziness, 68.2%) with fewer than 2% (n=23) experiencing severe and only two serious adverse events.

Highly significant improvements across all outcomes were sustained for over two years, including: clinical global impression (CGI-E, +39%; CGI-I, +52%; p<0.001), pain interference and severity (BPI, 26.1% and 22.2%; p<0.001), mental health (DASS-21, depression 24.5%, anxiety 25.5%, stress 27.7%; p<0.001), insomnia (ISI, 35.0%; p<0.001), and health status (RAND SF36: Physical function, 34.4%):
Emotional well-being, 37.3%; p<0.001). Mean number of concomitant medications did not significantly change over 2 years.

Conclusions: Oral MC was demonstrated to be safe and well-tolerated for a sustained period in a large complex cohort of cannabis-naïve, multimorbid patients with polypharmacy. There was highly significant improvement across all clinical outcomes over two years. Results are subject to limitations of real world data for causation and generalisability. Future high quality randomised controlled trials are awaited.
Introduction

Following regulatory access to the medical prescription of Good Manufacturing Product (GMP)-
grade medicinal cannabis (MC) in November 2016, up to 100,000 Australians are now actively taking
regularly prescribed MC. [1] Australians can access a prescription for MC from their treating
physician for a wide range of clinical conditions via a Special Access Scheme. [1,2] Recreational
cannabis (RC) remains illegal in nearly all State and Territories. This provides a unique environment
in Australia to evaluate oral MC where efficacy and safety can be assessed by Real World Data
(RWD) without conflation with privately consumed unregulated and indeterminate dosed RC or
inhaled MC.

The number of medicinal cannabis producers and products has rapidly increased in Australia, with at
least 375 available MC products and brands, varying in ranges of ratios, profiles, concentrations,
excipients, and delivery systems. The Therapeutic Goods Administration (TGA), Australia’s
therapeutics good regulator, has grouped MC products into five categories reflecting the varying
concentrations and ratios of the two major cannabinoids, Δ9-tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) and
regulates MC production standards through the Therapeutic Goods -(Standard for Medicinal
Cannabis) (TGO 93) Order 2017 and the Office of Drug Control (ODC). This standard provides
appropriate regulatory controls to ensure quality, stability, and safety. THC is a 'Controlled Drug'
under Schedule 8 (S8) of the Poisons Standard, and CBD is a Schedule 4 (S4) Prescription Only
Medicine. CBD products are Schedule 4 and must be prescribed by a registered medical practitioner
and must contain at least 98% CBD and 2% or less of other minor cannabinoids including THC.

Randomised controlled trials (RCTs) are the gold standard for assessing efficacy of pharmaceuticals
but have been challenging in the area of MC because of the various formulations (oral, inhaled,
topical), varying concentration and ratios of cannabinoids, and the generic nature of MC. This has
limited research in RCT [4]. Real World Data (RWD) is a mechanism for bridging the evidentiary gap and can help to inform design of RCTs on clinical indications and doses of cannabinoids. RWD studies, by definition have broader inclusion criteria which can provide additional and unexpected insights into the safety and efficacy of MC on those who are either ineligible or not represented in RCTs. [5]

Recent observational studies and RWD analysis of registries in the UK, and Canada have reported on the safety of MC and shown improvements in outcomes such as pain, sleep, anxiety and quality of life (QoL). These studies have nearly all included smaller numbers of patients (fewer than 200) and have reported on shorter outcomes at 6 or 12 month follow up periods. In addition, they have little or no information on doses or ratios of THC and CBD [6,7,8,9]. A recent study by Schneider et al 2022 of registry data of 10,000 patients from Israel’s largest clinic, observed high safety, decrease in pain levels and improvements in QOL on 4166 patients that reported at 6-month follow-up, however this study included a range of MC formulations smoking, vaporised or sublingual oil [10]. MC registries in other jurisdictions where RC and inhaled products are included, have been required to estimate dose and exposure to these major cannabinoids based on patient reported usage [8,11,12] and makes it difficult to determine optimal dose.

The Australian Emyria Clinical e-Registry (AECeR) describes the longitudinal monitoring of cannabis naive patients who commence a defined dose of oral MCs utilising the available range of TGA regulated MC products in Australia. Oil-based plant extracted oral MCs have been the dominant prescribed product in Australia, however inhaled “flower” products have recently increased, accounting for up to 40% of MC prescriptions [1]. MC products in Australia attract no government subsidy and little private subsidisation, with Department of Veteran Affairs subsidies available for specific approved conditions [13]. The out-of-pocket cost for MC is decreasing and is approximately $AUD 2-4,000 per year [1].
We present up to date data from the AECeR which commenced in December 2018 and has monitored nearly 4,000 patients taking prescribed oral MC for up to 24 months.

Methods

Description of the Australian Emyria Clinical e-Registry (AECeR)

The AECeR is the first Australian national web-based medicinal cannabis treatment electronic registry. It commenced in December 2018 and is privately owned by Emyria Ltd.

This study reviews the use of medical cannabis for more than 2 years in the largest cohort review of oral MC to date. Data were collected in the electronic patient registry from consented patients who attend the national Emerald Clinics Network. Patients with data collected between December 2018 and April 2022, who received a prescription for oral MC as a treatment for their indication are included in this analysis. All patients included in the registry undergo a comprehensive assessment by a multidisciplinary team. Baseline data were prospectively entered by patients and clinicians including demographic and routine clinical information, comorbidities, concomitant medication, alcohol and other drug use, and symptom-related data. Clinician and patient standardised validated questionnaires were completed and reviewed to assess degree of impairment of physical and mental health function, daily activities, quality of life, adverse events, dosing and additional information required for personalised patient care. A urine screening test for THC is conducted. Presence of urinary-THC is an exclusion for AECeR except in compassionate use (e.g., palliative care). Pregnancy and breast feeding, serious cardiac disease, and serious mental health conditions (including past history of psychosis and suicidality) were also excluded.

The standard practice database is of clinical trial grade, with all staff handling patient data having completed the International Conference on Harmonisation – Good Clinical Practice (ICH-GCP) and data privacy training. Participants are prescribed oral oils or capsules, available on the Special Access
Scheme – Category B (SAS-B), with an available Certificate of Analysis (COA) demonstrating GMP compliance and stability. This ensures that all products were within expiry and contained the prescribed active ingredients and excipients.

Description of the Patient Cohort

The patient cohort described had regular, approximately two monthly, clinical monitoring visits. Data collection was repeated, reviewed, and monitored for adherence and validity. The patients’ physical and mental health status was assessed through clinical assessment and validated surveys completed by the patient and health care professionals. The surveys included: Clinical Global Impression (CGI), Brief Pain Inventory (BPI), Depression Anxiety and Stress Scale 21 (DASS-21), Insomnia Severity Index (ISI) and the RAND 36 Item Short Form Survey (SF-36). Where clinically appropriate, additional questionnaires were also completed, such as the Cannabis Use Disorders Identification Test (CUDIT), Douleur Neuropathique en 4 (DN4), IBS Symptom Severity Score (IBS-SSS) for Irritable Bowel Syndrome (IBS) and the Autistic Behaviour Checklist (ABC) for Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD). These instruments were selected to ensure quality-assured, validated and standardised documentation of all treatment-relevant data for the routine care of patients.

All patients provided written informed consent for health data collection and use, and agreed to the prescription and regular monitoring of unregistered prescription medication/s. Health data included information related to adverse effects, concomitant medications and Australian regulatory restrictions or exclusions for the use of MC. Restrictions on driving, use of heavy machinery and certain vocational activities were adhered to as per current Australian regulations. Current ‘zero tolerance’ drug driving legal frameworks in Australia, criminalise the presence of THC in bodily fluids irrespective of impairment.

Emerald Clinical Network is independent from and has no affiliation with MC producers. All clinicians are independent contractors who choose individually for whom, when and what MC product to
prescribe for referred patients. Patients who are eligible are prescribed oral MC products, which are dispensed at independent pharmacies. MC products are divided into categories based on proportion of CBD and THC content compared with the total cannabinoid (including predominantly THC) content. Table 1 provides an overview of the different MC categories.

Table: 1 Medicinal cannabis treatment categories by active ingredients of cannabidiol (CBD) and tetrahydrocannabinol (THC).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Cannabidiol content (CBD)</th>
<th>Tetrahydrocannabinol content (THC)</th>
<th>Category description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CBD only</td>
<td>≥ 98%</td>
<td>0% to ≤ 2%</td>
<td>Comprises 98% or more CBD, with the remainder derived from other cannabinoids including THC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CBD-dominant</td>
<td>≥ 60% to &lt; 98%</td>
<td>0% to ≤ 40%</td>
<td>Comprises 60% or more to less than 98% of CBD, with the remainder principally THC and other cannabinoids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>≥ 40% to &lt; 60%</td>
<td>0% to ≤ 60%</td>
<td>Comprises 40% or more and less than 60% of CBD, with the remainder principally THC and other cannabinoids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>THC-dominant</td>
<td>≥ 2% to ≤ 40%</td>
<td>≥ 60% to ≤ 98%</td>
<td>Comprises 60% or more and 98% or less of THC, with the remainder principally CBD and other cannabinoids</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Patients undergo a two-week careful monitored deliberate dose titration and are monitored at least every 8-weeks for up to 12 months and then 12-weekly. Treatment Related Adverse events (TRAEs) were collected at each subsequent prescription visit. This is a continuous accumulating registry with approximately 120-150 new enrolments every month (or approximately 1800 new enrolments per year).

Description of the validated questionnaires presented

The RAND Short Form Health Survey (SF-36) is a patient self-report 36 item quality of life questionnaire [14] used for the routine monitoring and assessment of well-being and care outcomes. Questions include items related to physical functioning, bodily pain, role limitations due to physical health, personal or emotional problems, emotional well-being, social functioning, energy/fatigue and general health perceptions.

The Brief Pain Inventory – Short Form (BPI-SF) is a validated self-report participant questionnaire [15] which assesses the severity of pain and its impact on daily functions. Assessment areas include severity of pain, impact of pain on daily function, location of pain, pain medications and amount of pain relief in the past 24 hours or the past week. The BPI-SF assesses pain scores by Numeric Rating Scale, with responses ranging from 0 – 10, with 0 = no pain, to 10= pain as bad as you can imagine.

The Depression Anxiety and Stress Scale-21 (DASS-21) is a validated symptom scale designed to measure the state of depression, anxiety and stress [16]. The DASS-21 asks patients to rate 21 statements from a 4-point score of 0-3 according to the following: 0= it did not apply to me at all – “Never”, 1= Applied to me to some degree, or some of the time – “Sometimes”, 2= Applied to me to
a considerable degree, or a good part of time – “Often”, and 3= Applied to me very much, or most of
the time – “Almost always”.

The Insomnia Severity Index (ISI) is a validated patient self-report 7-item questionnaire that assesses
the nature, severity and impact of insomnia [17]. The dimensions evaluated include severity of sleep
onset, sleep maintenance, early morning awakening, sleep dissatisfaction, interference of sleep,
difficulties with daytime functioning, noticeability of sleep problems by others and distress caused
by the sleep difficulties. The ISI uses a 5-point Likert scale of 0–4 to rate each item (0 = no problem; 4
= very severe problem), yielding a total score ranging from 0 to 28. The total score is interpreted as
follows: absence of insomnia (0–7); sub-threshold insomnia (8–14); moderate insomnia (15–21); and
severe insomnia (22–28).

The Clinical Global Impression Scale ( CGI) [18] was developed to provide a clinician’s global
assessment of the patient’s functioning before and after commencement of medication. Using a 7-
point scale to assess the patient change since initiation of treatment (1=very much improved
2=much improved; 3=minimally improved; 4=no change; 5=minimally worse; 6= much worse; 7=very
much worse) This takes into account the experienced clinician’s knowledge of the patient’s history,
circumstances, symptoms, behaviour, and function as well as the 16-point Efficacy Index which
considers both medication efficacy and safety.

Ethics

The AECeR database provides an observational study of real-world patients receiving routine care,
attending Emerald Clinics specialist cannabinoid clinics. The study adhered to the Strengthening the
Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology guidelines [19]. All assessments were performed
as part of routine quality assurance clinical care adhering to relevant TGA standards for an
'unapproved' therapeutic good, good medical practice, therapeutic guideline requirements, and
informed consent. The data registry, utilisation and analysis were reviewed by the Australian National
Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) certified Bellberry Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC 29th May 2020) who determined the quality assurance analysis exempt from ethical review due to their being no foreseeable risks of participant inconvenience or discomfort. The National Statement is Australia’s national guidance for ensuring compliance with the Declaration of Helsinki (as revised in 2013) and our independent advice outlined that we were compliant with both.

Patients provide written informed consent for their data to be included in the AECeR and for the use of de-identified health data for publication. All patients are provided written, relevant informed consent documents before their initial appointment. Consent is further discussed by the treating clinician at the initial appointment. This shared decision making is achieved through a process of discussion and communication between the patient or guardian and the clinician before completion of written informed consent. Each person or guardian’s decision is given voluntarily, and they agree to MC treatment with adequate knowledge and understanding of the benefits and material risks of the proposed treatment. ICH-GCP certified clinicians respect the intellectual capacity or maturity of adults or children involved in informed consent. The level of maturity has implications for involvement and when appropriate is necessary for agreement for participation of both the child and guardian.

**Statistical Methods**

Data were extracted from the AECeR registry in April 2022. Descriptive statistics presenting the respective numbers and proportions of patients – as well as means and standard deviations (SD), where applicable – were used to describe the demographic, clinical, medication use, and adverse events of patients included in the registry. To assess the patterns over time regarding patient and clinician reported outcomes, each outcome measure was plotted at baseline (before going on treatment) as well as select follow-up windows – that is, 3, 6, 12, 18, and 24 months after commencing MC. As this is continuous RWD registry data there are fewer participants at the end.
time points than the beginning time points. Retention rates at those intervals were 100, 98, 68, 45, and 35 percent, respectively. In addition, and to test whether the observed differences when undergoing this health intervention are not only quantitatively meaningful but also statistically important on conventional levels of statistical significance, independent t-tests were performed between baseline and the corresponding follow-up scores. Note that statistical significance was tested at the $p = 0.05$ level throughout all figures and tables. Finally, all analyses were performed using R 4.2.1.

Results

Of 6,523 patients enrolled for assessment at Emerald Clinics Between Dec 2018 and April 2022, 3,961 patients completed initial assessments and questionnaires for prescription of oral MC. Patient demographics at baseline are reported in Table 2, showing an even distribution of gender, a mean age of 56.07 years (range 2-96 years, SD 19.18). Of the 60% who reported education level, only 8.8% did not complete secondary schooling, and 53.4% of patients were not part of the labour force due largely to being retirees. This also includes children and those electing not to work.
Table 2: Basic demographic details of Emyria patients (N=3,961) at baseline (before treatment).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2,039</td>
<td>(51.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1,822</td>
<td>(46.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (in years); mean (std. dev.)</td>
<td>56.07</td>
<td>(19.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational attainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate degree</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>(3.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor or honors</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>(9.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced diploma or certificate</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>(15.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 12</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>(20.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school not completed</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>(8.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reporteda</td>
<td>2,088</td>
<td>(42.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour force status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed full-time</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>(13.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed part-time</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>(9.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in the labour forceb</td>
<td>2,115</td>
<td>(53.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>(23.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: aIncludes those still attending primary or high school as well as anyone where the highest level of educational achievement could not be determined. bIncludes individuals looking for full-time or part-time work, students, retirees, and those not working by choice (such as homemakers), in addition to anyone unable to work due to a medical or health condition.

Table 3 shows the medications used by participating patients recorded at baseline. Very low levels of non-prescribed or recreational cannabinoids (0.01%) distinguishes this study from previously recorded, medical cannabis studies. 79% of patients were taking opioids whilst 53% were taking antidepressants and 43% benzodiazepines. “Other” includes medication for concomitant chronic disease such as diabetes, hypertension or chronic lung disease.
The primary diagnosis of participating patients is noted in Table 4 and indicates the majority (71.9%) of patients were prescribed oral MC for: chronic pain related conditions, mental health disorders (15.4%). Other conditions include neurodegenerative diseases, irritable bowel syndrome and chronic fatigue syndrome.

Table 3: Concomitant medication use by Emyria patients (N=3,961) at baseline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple analgesics</td>
<td>2,032</td>
<td>(51.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opioids</td>
<td>1,844</td>
<td>(46.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antidepressants</td>
<td>1,656</td>
<td>(41.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzodiazepines</td>
<td>1,333</td>
<td>(33.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GABA analogue</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>(20.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other pain medications</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>(10.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antipsychotics</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>(5.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compound analgesics</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>(3.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3,036</td>
<td>(76.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of medications; median (range)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(0–34)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *Corresponds to (medicinal) cannabis use by individuals at baseline prior to commencing treatment.
Table 4: Primary diagnosis as well as the number of comorbidities of Emryia patients (N=3,961) at baseline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary diagnosis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pain</td>
<td>2,846</td>
<td>(71.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic non-cancer pain</td>
<td>2,528</td>
<td>(63.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer pain</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>(6.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migraine/headache</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>(1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatric</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>(15.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insomnia</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>(6.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>(3.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-traumatic stress disorder</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>(3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>(1.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurological</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>(2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkinson’s disease</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epilepsy</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>(0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple sclerosis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other b</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>(10.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of comorbidities (in addition to the primary diagnosis); mean (std. dev.)</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>(4.08)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: a Includes back pain and complex regional pain syndrome. b Includes alcohol use disorder, Alzheimer’s disease, anorexia and wasting, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, autism, behavioural disorder, chemotherapy-induced nausea and vomiting, chronic fatigue syndrome, dementia, endometriosis, essential tremor, hemiplegic migraine, inflammatory bowel disease, irritable bowel syndrome, motor neuron disease, multiple sclerosis, obsessive compulsive disorder, panic disorder and benzodiazepine dependence, refractory nausea and vomiting, spasticity, tinnitus, and tourette syndrome.

Table 5 describes the oral MC prescribed with 81.2% of patients taking only one oral MC product mostly containing a “Balanced” ratio of TCH/CBD (50.3%) and 31.1% taking "CBD-only". For those taking more than one product the majority were taking "CBD-only" during the day and a “THC-dominant” product at night (data not shown). The overall median daily dose was: THC 10.0 mg, CBD
Table 5: Medical cannabis prescriptions (N=14,718) by number of products and across different categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of medical cannabis products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>11,951</td>
<td>(81.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>2,159</td>
<td>(14.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or more</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>(4.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical cannabis categories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced</td>
<td>7,400</td>
<td>(50.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD only</td>
<td>4,570</td>
<td>(31.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THC-dominant</td>
<td>2,030</td>
<td>(13.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD-dominant</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>(4.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THC only</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1 demonstrates prescribing patterns over time for THC/CBD dose and ratios. Total cannabinoid dose rose to 87.9mg at 6 months and remained stable over the next 2 years. Historically, prescribing ratios have changed over two years. Balanced product was predominant in 2019 (90%) down in 2022 to 33%, and a rise of CBD-only product from <10% in 2019 to 45% of all prescribed products in 2022.

Figure 1: Medical cannabis dosing across different treatment periods

Figure 2 Shows scores from the RAND 36-Item Short Form Health Survey (SF-36) for routine monitoring and assessment of well-being and care outcomes. The eight scores are aggregated in the graphs into Physical and Mental health well-being scores. There is overall highly significant sustained improvement across all measured parameters over 2 years.

Figure 2: Patient-based SF-36 scores across different treatment periods

Figure 3 Shows scores from the Brief Pain Inventory – Short Form (BPI-SF), the Depression Anxiety Stress Scale (DASS-21) and the Insomnia Severity Index (ISI) questionnaires used for routine
assessment of well-being, sleep and care outcomes. There is overall sustained highly significant improvement in all measured parameters over 2 years.

Figure 3: Alternative patient-based survey scores across different treatment periods

Figure 4 demonstrates the clinician reported outcomes using the Clinical Global Impression (CGI-I) and Efficacy Index (CGI-E). This results in a highly significant (p<0.001) improvement in the clinician’s perceived improvement of patient global functioning after initiating MC including the efficacy of the medication in relation to adverse effects, safety, patient symptoms and the patient’s ability to function.

Figure 4: CGI rating scores

Table 6 compares mean scores between baseline and the respective follow-up windows at 3, 12, and 24 months after commencing treatment. The results confirm the findings in Figures 2, 3, and 4 – that we observe a highly statistically significant (p<0.001) difference in scores at each follow-up window relative to baseline for up to two years. The mean number of medications each patient was taking initially (6.26: 95%CI 6.11-6.40) nearly halved at 3 months (3.28: 95%CI 3.18-3.38) but by 24 months was not significantly different (6.38: 95%CI 6.08-6.67).
Of the 3,961 patients included in the analysis, 1,477 patients (37.3 percent) reported experiencing at least one adverse event deemed by the treating doctor to be possibly, likely or definitely related to the oral MC treatment. Table 6 represents an overview of the most frequent types of treatment-related adverse events (TRAEs) across the different levels of clinician-assessed severity. Sedation/sleepiness and dry mouth are the two most commonly reported TRAEs, with the majority (68.2 percent and 79.9 percent, respectively) assessed as “mild”. There were 77 severe TRAEs (<2%) requiring a dose adjustment or cessation of oral MC treatment without lasting sequelae. Two isolated TRAEs (hallucination and mania) were considered Serious, which is defined as an important medical event requiring hospitalisation or lifesaving intervention.


**Discussion**

This is the largest and longest real-world analysis of the efficacy and safety of GMP-like oral medicinal cannabis (MC) in a continuous enrolment cohort registry. 3,961 heterogenous, cannabis naïve patients with a wide range of ages, clinical and complex conditions, and concomitant medications, prescribed oral MC, demonstrated a rapid and significant improvement across all measured patient and clinical reported validated outcomes. This highly significant improvement was maintained and sustained for over two years. Oral MC was well tolerated, with fewer than 2% experiencing severe TRAEs and only 2 serious TRAEs (hallucination and mania). This safety is particularly salient in contrast to the safety and tolerability of prescribed long-term opioids [20].

The Australian Emryia Clinical e-Registry (AECeR) collected clinical, demographic, dosing and safety data, as well as over 200,000 individual standardised validated questionnaires over this period. Large data sets drawn from Real World Data have weaknesses. Such data sets can often be unstructured, incomplete or inconsistent [21]. The development of the bespoke AECeR data system has auditing and compliance mechanisms to improve the rigor and comprehensiveness of the data.
capture. Patient adherence to monitoring and questionnaire compliance in normal administrative
data sets can be uneven. Quality Real World Data requires ongoing maintenance and support.

The cohort were cannabis naïve with those testing positive for urinary THC at baseline
excluded. The mean age at baseline was 56.07 years (SD 19.18) and ranged in age from 2 years to 96
years. The Emerald Clinical Network is a private clinic with supplemental Medicare funding but
largely patient self-funded. In Australia oral MC is not subsidised, costing the patient an additional
$AUD 1000-2000 per year. Despite this the retention rate in the AECeR was over 90% at six months
and nearly 70% at 12 months. The average number of concomitant medications 6.26 (SD 4.61) was
high demonstrating polypharmacy with multiple analgesic medications and other medications
associated with a high number of comorbidities (5.14, SD 4.08) such as hypertension, diabetes or
other chronic diseases. There were over 40 different primary clinical indications for prescription of
oral MC: pain (71.9%), psychiatric (15.4%) and neurological (2.1%).

Previous smaller studies have demonstrated improvements in patient reported outcomes over
shorter periods of time and with mixed cannabis delivery systems including inhaled and oromucosal
medications [7, 22], and for specific clinical conditions in pain [23, 24], anxiety [25,26], cancer
[27,28], and sleep [29]. This is the first comprehensive analysis of this magnitude and length of time
for oral MC daily dosages prescribed in a cannabis naïve cohort.

The Emerald Clinical Network is independent of oral MC licensed producers and the non-aligned
clinicians select from the range of products available from five TGA categories of products subject to
the Therapeutic Goods -(Standard for Medicinal Cannabis) (TGO 93) Order 2017. The TGO 93
regulatory controls ensure that the quality of medicinal cannabis is of acceptable standard and is
safe for consumers in the Australian market. The use of oral MC in this analysis provides increased
understanding of dose (mg) and ratio (THC:CBD) for efficacy and safety of oral MC. The oral
cannabinoid dose and ratio remained stable over two years (Fig 1.) following careful titration over six
months and did not result in tachyphylaxis or dose escalation. No addictive or dependence behaviours were detected and there was no increase in concomitant medications. The median daily total dose of THC was 10mg concomitant with 22.5mg of CBD.

Regular recreational users according to the Australian National Alcohol and Drug Knowledgebase (NADK) [30] use 150-250mg THC per day with unknown concentrations and doses of the hundreds of other cannabinoids, including CBD. In cancer patients using inhaled and/or sublingual MC daily, doses of THC were 70-100mg [27]. The median daily dose of oral THC for this cohort is approximately 10% of the average recreational user. Recreational cannabis even for medical purposes is largely inhaled [31]. Inhaled cannabis is rapidly absorbed, and reaches peak serum concentration (Cmax) in minutes [32] giving the well-known “high”. In contrast oral oils are slowly absorbed over hours. [33] All patients presented in the AECeR cohort were prescribed oral oil-based MC with careful titration of dose and ratio to safely achieve clinical goals with minimal Adverse Effects (AEs). AEs importantly include all cognitive effects ascribed to THC such as sedation, “feeling high”, “lack of concentration”. These were recognised treatment related AEs and subsequently required alteration of the MC ratio and often reduction in THC dose.

The RAND SF36 scores (Fig 2) are significantly improved for over two years across all of the measured parameters. The developers of the SF-36 advise that a five-point difference is considered 'clinically and socially relevant'. [34] Across all parameters the average improvement was greater than ten, two times the reported minimum clinically important difference (MCID) This was particularly pronounced in mental health (65 points) and less in physical function (5 points)

For the Insomnia Severity Score (Fig 3) it is believed that a 6-point reduction represents a clinically meaningful improvement in individuals with primary insomnia. [35] The cohort presented here most often had secondary insomnia from chronic persistent pain. Baseline mean 15.58 (CI15.35-15.82)
decreasing at 24 months to 9.94 (CI9.37-10.50). The mean difference reduction was 5 points that
was maintained over two years.

For the DASS-21 measures (Fig 3) the negative emotional states of depression, anxiety and stress. A
normative sample of 1,794 members of the general adult UK population (979 female, 815 male)
demonstrated mean scores for Depression, Anxiety and Stress as 5.66 (SD 7.74), 3.76 (SD 5.90) and
9.46 (SD 8.40) respectively [36]. For this cohort the baseline mean for Depression 15.65 (CI15.28-
16.05), Anxiety 11.78(CI11.48-12.08), and Stress 18.35 (CI18.00-18.69) scores falling at three months
to 11.91, 9.86 and 14.08 points (p<0.001) respectively and those scores maintained and sustained
for over two years. The MCID for the DASS subscales is defined as a change of 5 or more points
coupled with a move to a different severity category [37].

The Brief Pain Inventory across the entire cohort showed a reduction of approximately 25% for pain
interference and 24% for pain severity which is maintained for 2 years (p<0.001). The IMMPACT
group recommendation for assessing clinical significance is that a point change of greater than or
equal to 10% represents MCID and greater than or equal to 30% represents a moderate clinically
important change [38]. In addition, the Clinical global impression (Fig 4) the from GCP trained expert
global assessment of patient outcomes demonstrated consistently overall improvement and
improved efficacy with minimal impact of adverse events from the commencement of the
medication.

Importantly the group mean change in patient reported outcomes is underestimated as all
questionnaire results are incorporated including those with normal scores. Although numerical, a
‘normal’ response for patient reported outcomes gives a value above zero (ie a DASS-21 anxiety
score <8 is normal). These normal results are included in the total group mean change for
completeness across this large heterogenous cohort. In patient reported outcomes someone with a
“normal” score is likely to continue over time to register a “normal” score. This is true for all of the
PROMs measured. For instance, in our cohort for anxiety, 54% of 3,350 responses at baseline were normal (<8), mild/moderate 14%, severe 16%, extremely severe 16%. Similarly other observational studies have shown effect on moderate to severe symptoms of anxiety, but not mild symptoms of anxiety [39]. Further sub analysis of the AECeR registry will be conducted to determine outcome differences in different severity categories.

Limitations

Real-world evidence enables analysis of a range of clinical experience across a large and diverse heterogenous distribution of patients, providing insights into real-world treatment patterns. However, this study design is not without limitations including lack of randomisation which reduces the internal validity of the data. The lack of a control group precludes ruling out regression to the mean, placebo effects, selection and survival bias among other biases, in contributing to changes in Patient and Clinician Reported Outcome Measures over time. The placebo effect has previously been shown to have maximal effect within the first four to six months and then stabilises before gradually wearing off [40]. For this study, although observed effects cannot be causally attributed to oral MC, the size, ubiquity and sustainability of the improvements over time provides greater confidence to the reliability of the outcomes.

Additionally, due to continuous ongoing enrolment and drop out in the registry, there were fewer data available at later time points although retention rates were maintained at nearly 70% at 12 months. As such there is greater uncertainty in outcome estimates at later relative to earlier time points. It is not clear if attrition is related to treatment cost, adverse effects, ineffectiveness, or another reason. It is also noted that not all participants consistently completed questionnaires at all timepoints, which may have impacted data consistency. This is not uncommon in real world data collection settings where greater flexibility is required in participant scheduling and assessments as compared to RCTs. It is important that real-world evidence is used to complement rather than
replace randomised controlled trial evidence on oral MC but it provides another evidentiary mechanism.

This uncontrolled cohort real-world analysis presents observed data and all data have been included across the entire cohort. Emerald Clinical Network does not have any affiliation with the MC producers and clinicians at the Emerald Clinical Network are independent contractors that choose for whom, when and what to prescribe for patients referred to the clinic. Clinicians are not provided inducement or instruction to prescribe any brand or formulation of MC product.

Conclusions

This large Australian longitudinal cohort registry of cannabis naïve, complex chronic disease patients treated with oral MC for over 24 consecutive months, demonstrates safety of oral generic medicinal cannabis, and demonstrated oral MC improves patient and clinician reported impact of pain, sleep and well-being.

The AECeR addresses some of the limitations inherent to RWD and previously published cannabis registries. The detailed data curation and rigour of a very large bespoke registry, with a heterogeneous complex cohort, over an extended period of time, with high retention rates, provides greater reassurance about efficacy and safety of oral MC. It also provides detailed information on oral doses of THC and CBD to inform future studies. Further sub analyses with regard to specific clinical indications and patient reported outcomes are planned and future matched cohort or appropriately powered randomised controlled studies should be considered.
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Figure 3: Alternative patient-based survey scores across different treatment periods.
Figure 1: Medical cannabis dosing across different treatment periods.
Panel A: SF-36 physical component domains

Panel B: SF-36 mental component domains

Figure 2: Patient-based SF-36 survey scores across different treatment periods.